



Meeting Minutes Sponsor Board

Meeting date	14 September 2020
Meeting location	Virtual Meeting
Meeting time	3.30pm – 6.30pm

Members Present

Liz Peace, Chair
Lord Best
Lord Carter of Coles
Lord Deighton
Damian Hinds MP
Brigid Janssen
Marta Phillips
Baroness Scott of Needham Market
Tommy Sheppard MP
Mark Tami MP
Simon Thurley
Simon Wright

Attendees	Item
John Benger, Clerk of the House of Commons	All
Ed Ollard, Clerk of the Parliaments	All
Sarah Johnson, CEO, Sponsor Body	All
Lucy Owen, Chief of Staff, Sponsor Body	All
Johanna Porter, Board Secretary, Sponsor Body	All
Karen Watling, EA, Sponsor Body	All
David Goldstone, CEO, Delivery Authority	All
Matt White, Programme Director, Delivery Authority	All
David Yass, Strategic Review Lead, Sponsor Body	4
Amanda Colledge, Business Case Director, Sponsor Body	5 & 6
Ainsley Moore, Business Case Consultant, Sponsor Body	5 & 6
Andy Piper, Design Director, Delivery Authority	5 & 6
Graham McClements, BDP	5 & 6
Bethan Evans, Business Case Consultant, Sponsor Body	5
Nick Lane, Business Case Consultant, Sponsor Body	6
Amanda Wharton, Sustainability Co-Lead, Delivery Authority	7
Ying Seow, Sustainability Officer, Delivery Authority	7



1. Welcome, agenda & declarations of interest

1.1 The Chair welcomed those present to the sixth meeting of the Sponsor Board.

1.2 The Chair gave the Board an overview of her engagement activities since the last meeting. These had included:

20 July	Baroness Evans of Bowes Park, the Leader of the House of Lords
7 September	Jacob Rees-Mogg, the Leader of the House of Commons
9 September	Leader of the House of Lords, and Sir Lindsay Hoyle, Mr. Speaker
11 September	Ian Ailles, Director General, House of Commons
13 September	Lord Fowler, Lord Speaker
14 September	House of Commons Commission

The Chair and CEO were due to meet with the Lord's Commission on 15 September 2020; most meetings for this period had been in regard to the Programme's Strategic Review.

1.3 No apologies were received for the meeting. Damian Hinds had to leave the meeting early (5.50pm)

1.4 No changes were tabled to the Board meeting agenda (SB/20/069)

1.5 There were no declarations of interest made relevant to the items on the agenda.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising

2.1 The minutes of the 13 July 2020 meeting (SB/20/070) were APPROVED subject to the tabled revision.

2.2 The Board NOTED the progress made against the actions (SB/20/071).

3. Sponsor Body Progress Report

(SB/20/072)

Period: June – July 2020

Official: Sarah Johnson, CEO, Sponsor Body

3.1 The Chief Executive Officer gave the Board an overview of the work of the Sponsor Body for the period.

3.2 The following points were raised and noted:

- The Programme was continuing to work remotely. There had been some discussion regarding a phased return to the office for a small number of people. The digital provision for 7 Millbank would have to be upgraded to support Programme hardware and software requirements before staff could return.
- It was said that it would be unlikely that the Board would be able to meet in person for the foreseeable future, and for at least the remainder of the calendar year.
- Richard Caseby was stepping down as the Interim External Affairs Director; he was thanked for his hard work. It was noted that Claire Maugham would be joining the programme on Monday 28 September as Director of External Affairs.

3.3 The Board NOTED the contents of the Sponsor Body Progress Report for the period to late July 2020.



4. Strategic Review

Officials: Sarah Johnson, CEO, Sponsor Body

David Yass, Strategic Review Lead, Sponsor Body

4.1 The CEO said that they had hoped to bring the Board up to date on the work of the Strategic Review Team for the period. However, the team had received significant feedback from the House of Commons Commission that morning which would require further consideration; a timetable of future events relating to the Review would be shared with the Board once further discussions had taken place.

4.2 The following points were raised and noted:

- The need to understand the impact of the current political and social climate on the way the Programme's scope and costs were perceived.
- The intent to set out as part of the Review a description of a 'do minimum' scheme for the Palace to help Parliamentary colleagues better understand where the main costs lie, and where compromises might need to be made.
- The concern in Parliament over the cost and disruption of a full decant and the consequent requirement that the need for this should be thoroughly understood and justified.
- The legal obligation, as set out in the 2019 Act, to deliver value for money.

5. R&R Delivery Authority Programme Report

Period: June 2020 (SB/20/073)

July 2020 (SB/20/074)

Officials: David Goldstone, CEO, Delivery Authority

Matt White, Programme Director, Delivery Authority

5.1 The Delivery Authority's Chief Executive Officer and Programme Director gave the Board an overview of the work of the Delivery Authority for the previous periods, with a focus on the July report.

5.2 The following points were raised and noted:

- The DA's CEO provided details of the three main issues on the risk schedules; that user requirements were defined; that roles, responsibilities and accountabilities at the Programme interfaces were clarified; and that future decision-making processes were agreed.
- The Programme Director told the Board that whilst the Common Elements papers remained critical in achieving the Outline Business Case (OBC) resource had been diverted from managing the production of options papers to supporting the Strategic Review which would result in a 1-2 month extension on the production of scheme options for the OBC.
- Survey work had recommenced both at the Palace and the QEII Centre. This was being carried out in a safe and measured way.
- The earliest time at which the House of Lords (HoL) could expect to decant would be mid-2025.
- The new report style was commended; however, clarification was requested in relation to the data shown in the 'cost efficiency' schedule. It was confirmed that the expenditure was being reviewed over the coming three-months with a focus on 'forecasting accuracy'. A significant underspend was forecast for the period.



5.3 The Board NOTED the contents of the R&R Programme Progress Reports for June and July 2020.

6. Fire Options

(SB/20/075)

Officials: Amanda Colledge, Business Case Director, Sponsor Body
Ainsley Moore, Business Case Consultant, Sponsor Body
Bethan Evans, Business Case Consultant, Sponsor Body
Andy Piper, Design Director, Delivery Authority
Graham McClements, BDP

6.1 The Business Case Director gave the Board an overview of the Fire Options paper.

6.2 The following points were raised and noted:

- The Business Case Director reiterated to the Board that all decisions made in the Options Papers would be re-tested in the Common Elements Paper. This was to ensure that the individual strategies worked together. The Design Team were aware of the conflicts arising between the individual options and proposals to align the requirements inherent in the different options would be set out in the Common Elements paper. Further, all proposals would have heritage planning risks and might need to be modified following consultation with Heritage England and Westminster City Council (WCC).
- A tension exists between the need to minimise disruption to the building fabric whilst maximising the opportunity to promote life safety. It was noted that the current Palace was built because of fire, and that the original fire protections allowed for in the design had been undermined over the years by building modification.
- The Clerk of the Parliaments said that they had ultimate responsibility and accountability for building and personnel safety. They had a duty of care to uphold and would like to see greater improvement in fire safety. It was highlighted that in 2014 the fire safety regulator had said that the R&R Programme would be expected to deliver on building safety where the current round of improvements within the Palace could not.
- The Board discussed the greater intervention of Option D, noting that whilst it required a greater level of intervention to the fabric and heritage of the building the increased number of fire cores, and other recommendations would be of benefit. If the building were lost to fire there would be no heritage, and therefore the greater intervention might be justified.
- It was noted that Option A, did not allow for phased evacuation or meet the accessibility requirements needed. It was thought that this option would neither meet the requirements of the regulator nor be considered a long-term viable solution by the Palace's Fire Team.
- The Board were inclined toward Option D over Option C but noted the Business Case Team's recommendations. The Board requested that each element of Option D was given robust consideration in future design work.

6.3 The Board ENDORSED Option C as the preferred option to be taken forward to the next stages of design, with the opportunity to incorporate particular components of Option D (i.e. certain firefighting cores, or certain compartmentation lines), if the heritage disbenefit becomes justifiable in the context of the wider building works;

6.4 The Board ACKNOWLEDGED the risks inherent with Option C (e.g. technical feasibility and heritage challenges, particularly in relation to circulation cores, and the reliance on fire doors), and acknowledged the implications that Option C may have on the broader scheme (e.g. restricted use of courtyards if fire engine access was still required); and



6.5 The Board ACKNOWLEDGED the fact that the preferred option to be taken forward represents a high level design at this stage, and that further detailed design development, including the Qualitative Design Review (QDR), as well as consultation with regulatory authorities (e.g. Historic England) is necessary and may result in minor variations to the strategy, however, they should not materially change the relative level of aspiration or the relative assessment of key delivery considerations (i.e. cost, schedule) that would undermine the decision made by the SB in endorsing a preferred Value-For-Money option.

7. Security Options

(SB/20/076)

Officials: Amanda Colledge, Business Case Director, Sponsor Body
Ainsley Moore, Business Case Consultant, Sponsor Body
Nick Lane, Business Case Consultant, Sponsor Body
Andy Piper, Design Director, Delivery Authority
Graham McClements, BDP

7.1 The Business Case Director gave the Board an overview of the Security Options paper.

7.2 The following points were raised and noted:

- The Business Case Director told the Board that the Business Case Team had recommended a hybrid of Options D/E, noting that the external realm proposals had significant interdependencies with the Parliament Square Streetscape Project and the Estate's Masterplan.
- The Business Case Team advised that the proposals for security would have an impact on the heritage of the whole site, and that consultation would include not only Parliament, Westminster City Council (WCC) and Historic England (HE) but also UNESCO and the International Council on Monuments & Sites (ICOMOS).
- It was accepted that at this point there were many uncertainties and interdependencies in these proposals, particularly with reference to the external realm. The Board acknowledged that the overall strategy for the business case (including individual option papers which the Board had previously considered), would be reviewed once the Strategic Review had concluded.
- The Board was aware that it needed to endorse an option to allow work to continue and was content to accept the BCT recommendation. However, the Board was clear that there was a need to split the internal and external realm proposals, and that the design should progress more slowly on the external elements. The Chair asked the CEO to consider how best to implement this.
- The Board was concerned that both the threats, and the technology available to meet them, were changing rapidly and solutions would be available in the future that were not available today. Consequently, although it was necessary for Business Case purposes to have a general idea of the likely preferred options, firm decisions could, and should, be deferred as long as possible.

7.3 The Board ENDORSED a hybrid of options D and E as the preferred approach to be taken forward to the next stages of design, which consists of Option E, less the additional 'state of the art' monitoring technology proposed beyond that included in Option C.

7.4 The Board ACKNOWLEDGED the risks inherent with the hybrid Option D/E (e.g. the ability to achieve the relevant consents / permissions in the External Realm to implement the desired security



requirements in the Parliament Square Streetscape Project and on Bridge Street) as well as the inherent cost uncertainty at this stage.

- 7.5 The Board ACKNOWLEDGED that further engagement and consultation on the External Realm will also include discussions relating to the governance, delivery and funding arrangements for the proposed interventions, including the interdependencies with the ongoing PSSP scheme arrangements. This will take place in co-ordination and alignment with the R&R Masterplan as the design progresses.
- 7.6 The Board ACKNOWLEDGED the fact that the preferred option to be taken forward represents a high level design at this stage, and that further detailed design development, including additional detailed surveys / studies (e.g. Blast Modelling, Door / Window surveys) as well as consultation with planning and heritage bodies is necessary and will impact how the design proposals are integrated into a full scheme.
- 7.7 The Board ACKNOWLEDGED that the threats to Security are evolving and that the DA will continue to engage with PSD and other security stakeholders to enable the R&R Programme to stay abreast of changing threats and adapt the design accordingly.
- 7.8 The Business Case Director thanked the members of the Board that had been involved in the production of both the Fire and Security Options Papers, noting that it had taken up a significant amount of their time.

8. Sustainability Briefing

(SB/20/077)

Officials Amanda Wharton, Sustainability Co-Lead, Delivery Authority
Ying Seow, Sustainability Officer, Delivery Authority

- 8.1 The DA's Programme Director introduced the paper on sustainability, noting that its findings were in line with the sustainable development goals laid out by the UN and by the requirements for buildings set out in the BREEAM standard; it had been previously endorsed by the DA Board. The Sustainability Co-Lead took the Board through the detail.
- 8.2 The following points were raised and noted:
- It was explained that sustainability was a cross-cutting theme for the programme covering social, economic, environmental, health and wellbeing objectives.
 - Sustainability was considered in a series of layers that flowed down from the strategic themes and goals to policies, aspirations, objectives, and implementation plans.
 - Both current and incoming best practice, legislation, standards, and guidelines were being monitored to ensure that recommendations were fit for purpose and remained on point.
 - It was noted that detailed targets had not yet been set, but that these were to be reviewed at the DA's next Health, Safety, Wellbeing and Sustainability Committee.
 - There was a question on the objectives as to why biodiversity and ecological values had been chosen as a priority over other objectives. It was explained that the team had felt there was more opportunity for the programme to innovate in this area. Members felt however that there



were limits to what could be achieved in terms of preservation or promotion of biodiversity; and that the cultural significance of the building and site should not be overlooked. The Board noted that the exclusion of the cultural elements was a conspicuous gap in the priority objectives and should be revisited.

- The Board noted that this area of work provided positive opportunities to engage with the public, and that the public would expect this. It would also be an area of significant scrutiny.

8.3 The Sponsor Board ENDORSED the contents of the Sustainability Workstream Briefing Paper, including the proposed sustainability strategy and policy statements.

9. Comments, Announcements and Other Business

9.1 The Board NOTED the future agenda (SB/20/079), and the Quarterly Report (SB/20/081).

9.2 The Board NOTED the 2021 Board Meeting Dates (SB/20/078).

9.3 The date of the next meeting would be 5 October 2020.

9.4 The Chair brought the meeting to a close at 6.05pm

10. Papers for Information

10.1	Future agenda	(SB/20/079)
10.2	Corporate Plan	(SB/20/080)
10.3	Quarterly Report from the R&R Programme to the Corporate Officers of both Houses: Q1 2020/2021 – April to June 2020	(SB/20/081)

Signed By: 

Date: 5 October 2020
