



Minutes Sponsor Board

Meeting date	8 February 2021
Meeting location	Virtual Meeting
Meeting time	3.30pm – 6.30pm

Members Present
Liz Peace, Chair
Baroness Scott of Needham market
Brigid Janssen
Damian Hinds MP
Ian Levy MP
Lord Best
Lord Deighton
Mark Tami MP
Marta Phillips
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
Claire Maugham, Communications Director, Sponsor Body	1 - 7
David Goldstone, CEO, Delivery Authority	1 - 7
Johanna Porter, Board Secretary, Sponsor Body	1 - 7
Lucy Owen, Chief of Staff, Sponsor Body	1 - 7
Matt White, Programme Director, Delivery Authority	1 - 7
Bev Weston, Director of Capital Investment, House of Commons	5
Nigel Hall, Project Manager, Palace Technical Design Challenge, Jacobs	5
Daniel Walder, BDP	5
Amanda Colledge, Business Case Director, Sponsor Body	6
Ainsley Moore, Business Case Consultant, Jacobs	6

Private session

Official: Liz Peace, Chair, Sponsor Board

There were no minutes for this item.



1. Welcome, agenda and declarations of interest

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Chair gave an overview of her engagement activities since the last meeting.
- 1.3 Tommy Sheppard MP had sent apologies for the meeting. Ian Levy MP had to leave the meeting at the end of the Board's private session to attend to House business.
- 1.4 The Board meeting agenda (SB/21/009) was NOTED. No changes were proposed.
- 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 **DECISION:** The Board APPROVED the minutes of the previous meeting (January) (SB/21/010).

2.2 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the progress made against the action log (SB/21/011).

- 2.2.1 It was noted that action SBA.21.014 regarding the inflation rates used in the Phase 1 Expenditure Limit (P1EL) had been completed. This would be updated in the action log accordingly.

3. Sponsor Body progress report

(SB/21/012)

Period: January 2021

Official: Sarah Johnson, CEO, Sponsor Body

3.1 The Sponsor Body progress report was taken as read. Further information was requested regarding the year-end financial forecast figures for corporate and legal services.

3.2 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the Sponsor Body Progress Report for January 2021.

4. Delivery Authority update

Officials: David Goldstone, CEO, Delivery Authority

Matt White, Programme Director, Delivery Authority

4.1 The Programme Director gave the Board a verbal update on the work of the DA since the last meeting. The following points were raised and noted:

- 4.1.1 The options papers and scheme variables for the Palace of Westminster project had been completed. Planning for Phase 1 was approximately 80% complete, this work covered detailed activity plans for the next two years of the project including how data would be exchanged with the Business Case Team, project governance arrangements and the necessary engagement activities.

- 4.1.2 The House of Lords project team was now looking at the 'Option 0 – minimal intervention' mandate. Meetings also had taken place with the In-House Services team



and the planning authorities to better understand the potential role of Richmond House and the Northern Estate in any future decant requirements.

- 4.1.3 COVID-19 restrictions within the Palace continued to prevent survey work from recommencing on the Heritage Collections Decant project.
- 4.1.4 Concern was raised about the pause in the Heritage Collections Decant project whilst the Parliament team re-set their operating model including how storage of heritage items was to be undertaken in the long-term. The CEO for the DA said that there were many different collections that needed to be considered in the decant process and each needed to be considered. He hoped that it would be possible to provide the Board with an agreed way forward at the May meeting.
- 4.1.5 It was asked if the Programme could discuss with Parliament whether early work on Victoria Tower could be progressed. The CEO for the Sponsor Body reminded the Board that, whilst the Programme was in favour of this approach, the Parliamentary Buildings (Restoration and Renewal) Act 2019 prevented both the DA and the Sponsor Body from carrying out any construction work within Phase 1 of the Programme. The CEO for the DA undertook to follow this up with the in-house Parliament team as the programme team had been asked this question a number of times recently.

5. Parliamentary Masterplan

(SB/21/013)

Officials: Bev Weston, Director of Capital Investment, House of Commons

Nigel Hall, Project Manager, Palace Technical Design Challenge Jacobs

Daniel Walder, BDP

Chris Harding, Masterplan Lead – Principal Architect, Technical Assurance & Design Management, BDP

5.1 The Director of Capital Investments, House of Commons, introduced the work of the Parliamentary Estate masterplanning team. It was explained that the masterplan would provide clear strategic objectives and a cohesive vision for the Parliamentary Estate over the short-, medium- and long-term.

5.2 The following points were raised and noted:

- 5.2.1 The masterplan had been designed to be modular so that the seven spatial strategies could be updated in isolation as needed.
- 5.2.2 The spatial strategies had been created in consultation with senior stakeholders across Parliament. Input had been sought from the Lords Management Board and the Administration Committees. Workshops had also been organised with MPs to canvas views. Findings from these groups had also been fed into the Joint Working Group and Business Case Team as well as informing the masterplan.
- 5.2.3 A 'Westminster Campus' had been identified that comprised a core group of historically significant buildings. These buildings currently provided inflexible and cellular accommodation. However, it was anticipated that if activities could be relocated by business need in the future using a zoning mechanism, then significant space (around 30%) could be saved across the campus. This recovered space could then be reallocated as flexible working space or meeting space.



- 5.2.4 Pedestrianisation of the public realm immediately surrounding the campus would be of huge benefit for visitors and employees alike. It was anticipated that security provisions could also be greatly improved as a result.
- 5.2.5 The masterplanning team were reviewing the current spatial strategies with a view to developing and refining them through the spring and publishing them in the summer. Further discussion was required between Parliament and the Programme to clarify the expected impact of any recommendations made in the masterplan on the outcomes of R&R.
- 5.2.6 It was pointed out that the Programme, with its early insight into the recommendations, was already considering the masterplan in its project development work. R&R would not be able to address all of the long-term aspirations laid out in the plan but would take Parliament a long way towards achieving them. The contents of the masterplan would have a fundamental impact on the Outline Business Case particularly in the context of the security and energy options proposed.
- 5.2.7 The masterplan was not yet complete but reflected current knowledge and best practice. It was anticipated that it would continue to evolve as more information became available. The team were re-using information already available to develop their understanding of the many requirements and prevent 'survey fatigue' in stakeholders.
- 5.2.8 All future projects on the Parliamentary Estate should contribute toward the aspirations of the masterplan. The team was now focused on addressing the 'unanswered questions' and establishing a broad strategic consensus, noting that the 30-year horizon helped to strip away significantly diverging views as to the future of the Parliamentary Estate.
- 5.2.9 It was noted that following feedback the term 'Westminster Campus' was being re-considered.
- 5.2.10 A question was raised as to how the cost of delivering specific recommendations made in the masterplan, such as the covering of open spaces to make them more useable, would be met, whether this would be by Parliament or R&R. It was agreed that further clarification would be provided.

6. An Introduction to Business Cases

(SB/21/014)

Officials: Amanda Colledge, Business Case Director, Sponsor Body
Ainsley Moore, Business Case Consultant, Jacobs

- 6.1 The CEO for the Sponsor Body said that the introduction to business cases had been provided to the Board as a reminder about the theoretical side of the business case process, and to highlight recent changes to HM Treasury's Green Book approach.
- 6.2 The Chair requested that the discussion on this item be deferred due to meeting time constraints. A briefing session would be offered to Board members instead.



HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT

R&R SPONSOR BODY

7. Comments, announcements, and other business

7.1 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the future agenda (SB/21/015).

7.2 The following comments were made:

7.2.1 Marta Phillips made some suggestions to improve the clarity of the Quarterly Report.

7.2.2 The CEO for the Sponsor Body would update the Board following the House of Commons Commission meeting which was due to take place in either the week commencing the 15 February or week commencing the 22 February 2021.

7.2.3 The publication of the Strategic Review had been delayed; Board members would be kept up to date on revised publication plans.

7.3 The date of the next meeting would be Monday 8 March 2021.

7.4 The meeting was brought to a close at 6.12pm.

8. Papers enclosed for information

9.1 Risk, Audit & Assurance Joint Committee Meeting Minutes	(SB/21/016)
9.2 Quarterly Report R&R Programme: Q3 2020/21	(SB/21/017)
9.3 Strategic Review Report (v0.6)	(SB/21/018)
9.4 Letter: 22/01 Sarah Johnson to Mr Speaker Re: Next Steps for R&R	(SB/21/019)
9.5 Letter: 03/02 Lord Speaker to Mr Speaker & Sarah Johnson Re: R&R Mandate	(SB/21/020)

Signed by: _____

Date: 8 February 2021 _____