



## Meeting Minutes

### Sponsor Board

---

<b>Meeting date</b>	7 December 2020
<b>Meeting location</b>	Virtual Meeting
<b>Meeting time</b>	3.30pm – 6.30pm

---

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

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	1,2 & 4 - 10
David Goldstone, CEO, Delivery Authority	1,2 & 4 - 10
Johanna Porter, Board Secretary, Sponsor Body	1,2 & 4 - 10
Karen Watling, Executive Assistant, Sponsor Body	1,2 & 4 - 10
Lucy Owen, Chief of Staff, Sponsor Body	1,2 & 4 - 10
Matt White, Programme Director, Delivery Authority	1,2 & 4 - 10
Gurdip Juty, Finance & Corporate Services Director, Sponsor Body	5
James Tringham, Head of Engagement, Sponsor Body	6
Corrine Galloway, Public Engagement Manager, Sponsor Body	6
Ainsley Moore, Business Case Consultant, Sponsor Body	7
Amanda College, Business Case Director, Sponsor Body	7
Andy Piper, Design Director, Delivery Authority	7
Laura Smith, Mechanical & Electrical Engineer, BDP	7
Nicholas Lane, Business Case Consultant, Sponsor Body	7



### 1. Welcome, agenda and declarations of interest

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting. The Chair informed the Board that Sir Robert Syms MP had stood down as a member of the Sponsor Board, and that Ian Levy MP would be taking his place. Ian was elected as Member of Parliament for Blythe Valley at the 2019 general election.
- 1.2 The Chair gave the Board an overview of her engagement activities since the last meeting.
- 1.3 Lord Deighton and Ian Levy MP sent their apologies for the meeting.
- 1.4 The Board meeting agenda (SB/20/103) was revised from its initial circulation. The Chair had requested that the Board hold a closed session with Sarah Johnson, Sponsor Body CEO to discuss the progress of the Strategic Review in place of the Sponsor Body Progress Report.
- 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 (SB/20/104).
- 2.2 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the progress made against the action log (SB/20/105).
- 2.3 Actions SBA.20.0045 and SBA.20.0046 would be brought as a single update to the Board at its February meeting.

### 3. Sponsor Body Progress Report

(SB/20/106)

Period: November 2020

Official: Sarah Johnson, CEO, Sponsor Body

- 3.1 Further to the Board's closed session the CEO told members that the office would be closed between Christmas and the new year.
- 3.2 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the Sponsor Body Progress Report for November 2020

### 4. Delivery Authority Programme Report

(SB/20/107)

Period: October 2020

Officials: David Goldstone, CEO, Delivery Authority

Matt White, Programme Director, Delivery Authority

- 4.1 The CEO told the Board that Tanya Coff, Chief Financial Officer and Jane Mee, General Counsel had today joined the Delivery Authority (DA) so the DA was now near to completing the Executive Team. He also told the Board that the DA was now, with the draft findings of the Strategic Review having been distributed, and the development of the draft Business Plan to be discussed later, looking at re-prioritising its project work and reviewing its commercial contracts to ensure that the right processes and teams were in place ahead of the work to develop the Outline Business Case.



4.2 The Programme Director updated the Board on the work of the Delivery Authority for October 2020.

4.3 The following points were raised and noted:

- 4.3.1 No HSW incidents had been reported.
- 4.3.2 The DA's HSW Team were due to complete a series of safety reviews carried out in conjunction with the Elizabeth Tower team shortly. These reviews had been a useful learning exercise.
- 4.3.3 Further to the publication of the Strategic Review the teams were now re-focussing on gathering the user and business requirements for the Palace of Westminster (PoW) and House of Lords (HoL) decant projects.
- 4.3.4 Non-intrusive survey work had recommenced within the Palace but in a limited capacity. Works information was being compiled with a view to awarding contracts for ten intrusive surveys in March 2021.
- 4.3.5 Innovation remained a key area of work for the DA. The CLIK team were looking at capturing lessons learnt from other organisations with a view to embedding the knowledge into the Programme and identifying key review check points.
- 4.3.6 Work was ongoing to expand the use of the Building Information Model (BIM) or Digital Twin to record HSW information. It was intended that all contractors would eventually have access to a single model.
- 4.3.7 The Data & Digital Team had started work to investigate the most appropriate way to bring the design data in-house.
- 4.3.8 The Programme inception point for the cost performance report was clarified as being 2012. The Board were told that this was under review and that in future spending would be tracked from the point at which the DA became substantive, with historical spending noted separately.

4.4 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the Delivery Authority Programme Report for October 2020.

## 5. Business Plan Briefing

(SB/20/108)

Official: David Goldstone, CEO, Delivery Authority

Gurdip Juty, Finance & Corporate Services Director, Sponsor Body

5.1 The CEO for the Delivery Authority briefed the Board on the development of the Business Plan, he reminded the Board that it was not being asked for a decision today and that it would see the paper in full at its January meeting.

5.2 The following points were raised and noted:

- 5.2.1 The paper had been seen by the Delivery Authority Board at its November meeting.



- 5.2.2 The Programme would continue to challenge itself on costs, being mindful of the demands on public expenditure. High standards of cost effectiveness would be applied.
- 5.2.3 The Phase 1 Objectives outlined in the Business Plan would enable the DA to support the production of the Outline Business Case (OBC) and prepare the organisation for delivery. These objectives had been broken down into a comprehensive set of 375 deliverables, which had then been split into five categories which represented the responsible teams.
- 5.2.4 The Programme planned to adopt a philosophy that moved further towards employed staff over a contractor consultant model. A committed and recruited team was key to ensure that the DA had the right people for the job.
- 5.2.5 More work was to be done to benchmark R&R against other large programmes. Initial, but incomplete, work had benchmarked the Programme favourably against both Thames Tideway and the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA). It was commented that there were not many projects similar in set up to R&R, but that the comparators were useful. Kings Cross St Pancras and Manchester Town Hall were cited as interesting project references due to their size and complexity within a heritage space.
- 5.2.6 There would be significant investment into the Data & Digital service at the early stages of the Programme. This would provide a solid foundation for efficient delivery of all aspects of programme.
- 5.2.7 A close working relationship was being developed with Parliament to ensure that the digital platforms could be integrated and transferred later. Jacobs had been recruited by Parliament to help bring its BIM strategy up to date.
- 5.2.8 The Board's attention was drawn to the business planning assumptions.
- 5.2.9 It was asked that the Programme timeline be drawn out more clearly so that the planning and delivery phases were clearly illustrated.
- 5.2.10 The Board members were invited to receive a more detailed briefing on the Business Plan before it came back to the Board for approval in January.

5.3 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the work on the Sponsor Body & Delivery Authority Business Plans.

## 6. Public Engagement Strategy

(SB/20/109)

Officials: Claire Maugham, Communications Director, Sponsor Body

James Tringham, Head of Engagement, Sponsor Body

Corrine Galloway, Public Engagement Manager, Sponsor Body

6.1 The Communications Director presented the Public Engagement Strategy to the Board. She thanked the Board for its input and guidance. The strategy was due for publication by the end of 2020.

6.2 The following points were raised and noted:



- 6.2.1 Over the summer and autumn, a series of small group discussions had taken place. These deliberative panels had occurred virtually and brought together participants from all four nations. The groups had provided an invaluable platform for a respectful and moderated conversation. It had been found that people were proud of the Palace, its UNESCO World Heritage status and appreciated the beauty of the building regardless of their location and whether they had visited in person.
- 6.2.2 It was noted, on the basis of these small samples, that the public seemed generally to support the R&R Programme and were concerned at the prospect of the Palace falling into further disrepair. They had nuanced opinions around accessibility and sustainability. The public were also engaged with the further reaching benefits of the Programme such as the opportunity for apprenticeships and job creation around the UK.
- 6.2.3 The Board discussed its desire to set realistic expectations around the outcome of any consultation and/or public engagement. The Communications Director assured the Board that the public would be engaged in a careful and considered manner when their input would be meaningful. Formal consultation would take place when required, for example around planning applications.
- 6.2.4 The Board would be kept up to date on the Programme's public engagement.

6.3 **DECISION:** The Board APPROVED the Public Engagement Strategy

## 7. Building Services Options

(SB/20/110)

Official: Amanda College, Business Case Director, Sponsor Body  
Ainsley Moore, Business Case Consultant, Sponsor Body  
Nicholas Lane, Business Case Consultant, Sponsor Body  
Andy Piper, Design Director, Delivery Authority  
Laura Smith, Mechanical Electrical Engineer, BDP

- 7.1 The Business Case Director introduced the Building Services Options paper. She reminded the Board that the paper was for briefing purpose only. Further decisions on Building Service Options would be deferred until after members had seen the revised Business Case Strategy, post Strategic Review.
- 7.2 The following points were raised and noted in regard to the Mechanical & Electrical proposals:
- 7.2.1 The Board were told that the work of Henrik Schoenefeldt, Professor for Sustainability in Architectural Heritage, University of Kent had given the Design Team a good understanding as to how the old ventilation voids and systems might be upgraded to run new systems. The Board was assured that using these voids would not impact on any building compartmentalisation necessary for fire protection, or service maintenance and replacement.
- 7.2.2 The challenge of upgrading the plant and plant rooms was acknowledged by the Board. Concerns were raised about both the conflicting space requirements with the PoW and the heritage impact created by proposals that would extend the existing plant rooms or insert additional subterranean space. It was discussed that offsite



plant rooms may be quicker to install and less contentious from a heritage perspective. There were several 'archeologically sterile' sites within the vicinity of the PoW. It was noted that not all building services could be removed offsite, and some, such as ventilation, would need to remain relatively close to the building.

7.3 The following points were raised and noted in regard to the sustainability proposals:

- 7.3.1 Given the heritage and age of the building it would be very challenging for the PoW to reach the Government's and Westminster City Council's (WCC) net zero carbon targets. The Design Team were looking at a range of options as to what could be achieved in relation to energy savings and carbon emissions. It was noted that very few measures would achieve payback, and it would be increasingly expensive to achieve marginal gains. It therefore needed to be recognised that this was as much a policy decision as a financial decision.
- 7.3.2 A benchmarking exercise would be useful that would compare the PoW to other heritage buildings such as Westminster Abbey, cathedrals, and parish churches none of which would meet current carbon requirements. It was suggested the Historic England would hold some data. It was discussed whether other targets might be reasonably achieved, such as 'lowest carbon emissions per square metre for a heritage building'. A question was asked as to whether the Programme was looking to be net carbon zero even if the PoW could not be.
- 7.3.3 Ground source heating was being considered for the PoW. There was concern that gas was being proposed to make up any shortfall in the heating provisions, noting that Castle Howard in Yorkshire was heated entirely by ground source, and many National Trust properties used PRV (Pressure Relief Valves). The team agreed to investigate these points further.
- 7.3.4 The Board asked the Team to explore the technology available to the Programme and to continue to be as innovative as possible understanding that there would be limitations to any solutions proposed.

7.4 **DECISIONS:** The Board:

- NOTED the preferred Internal Environment & Resilience and Replacement option is Option C, noting that this is not a formal decision, and options will be revisited post the strategic review.
- NOTED the option leads to a reduction in the Net Usable Area of the Palace. The space strategy will consider this together with the system requirements resulting from redesign of the Palace.
- NOTED the factors that influence the need to make improvements to the energy use and carbon footprint of the PoW including legislation, planning targets, and Parliament's ambition.
- NOTED the Energy Use and Carbon Reduction interventions and proposed next steps:
  - Interventions that are expected to achieve financial payback, notably photovoltaic panels and water source heat pumps are presumed to be taken forward to later stages of design.
  - Interventions that do not achieve financial payback but have a low absolute cost and contribute to energy and carbon reduction targets, such as roof and wall insulation, are presumed as necessary to achieve planning and will form part of the design development.



- Interventions that are high cost but have cross cutting strategic benefits may justify their inclusion in later design stages having taken into account any planning negotiations. This includes high specification secondary glazing and air permeability improvements.
- CONSIDERED the Board's ambition for environmental sustainability with regards to exploiting the opportunities noted above and continuing to explore further opportunities beyond what is required to achieve planning permission.
- NOTED the risks with the preferred options, notably the need to justify any heritage impacts to the planning authorities, and the inherent cost and schedule uncertainties at this stage.

## 8. Board Secretary Appointment

(SB/20/111)

Official: Sarah Johnson, CEO, Sponsor Body

8.1 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the appointment of Johanna Porter as secretary for the Sponsor Body.

## 9. Comments, Announcements and Other Business

9.1 **DECISION:** The Board NOTED the Future agenda (SB/20/112).

9.2 There were no further comments or announcements.

9.3 The date of the next meeting would be Monday 4 January 2021. The Board would receive their papers on Wednesday 23 December 2020

9.4 The meeting was brought to a close at 6.14pm

## 10. Papers Enclosed for Information

10.1 Future of the Northern Estate Programme Letters

(SB/20/113)

Signed By:

---

Date: 7 December 2020

---