



Meeting:	Estates Policy Committee	Attendees: Prof. Veronica Campbell (Bursar/Director of Strategic Innovation, Acting Chair) Prof. Christine Casey (Professor in Architectural History) - CC Mr Mike Clark (Director of Campus Infrastructure) - MC	
Date:	02/12/2019	Mr Andrew Grainger (External member) - AG Mr Ciaran O'Connor (Principle Architect, Office of Public Works - external member) - COC	
Chair:	Veronica Campbell (Acting)	Mr Peter Reynolds (Chief Financial Officer) - CFO Ms Geraldine Ruane (Secretary, Chief Operating Officer) - COO Dr Ruth Doherty (minutes)	
		Apologies: Ms Shaz Oye (President, Graduate Students' Union) – SO Prof. John Parnell (Professor of Systematic Botany) - JP Dr Aidan Seery (Chair, Estates Policy Committee) - AS	
No	Title /Agenda item	Decision / Action	Assigned to:
1	Welcome	The Acting Chair welcomed the attendees.	
2	Apologies	Apologies were noted from John Parnell, Aidan Seery, and Shaz Oye.	
EPC/19-20/008	Review of minutes of 04 October 2019	The minutes were approved.	
EPC/19-20/009	Matters Arising/Actions taken	Relevant minutes and actions from Finance Committee will be brought to the attention of Estates Policy Committee. The CFO gave a verbal update on relevant items from the Finance Committee of 18 November 2019.	
Section A			
EPC/19-20/010	Old Library Redevelopment Project	Helen Shenton (Project Sponsor), Marc Sharifi (Programme Manager), Róisín Heneghan and Kasia Turza-Rachwal (Heneghan Peng Architects), and Richard McLoughlin (Lotts Architecture & Urbanism) joined the meeting. Helen Shenton provided a brief introduction, and the architects presented on stage 2b of the project.	



Several queries were raised in relation to the proposed visitor arrival and services area in the Berkeley podium. It was confirmed that the new shop will be larger than currently exists, the podium area will be artificially lit and a separate entrance and exit door will facilitate a single direction of movement of visitors, and there will be multiple means of escape in the event of emergency.

It is proposed that there be two lifts in the East Pavilion, one to be dedicated to movement of visitors, and the other to be a goods lift dedicated to movement of the Library's collections. This design is intended to facilitate the space as a working library open to visitors.

Several queries were raised in relation to the lifts:

- In response to queries on the location of the lifts, it was noted that they will be located in the East Pavilion because Library collections displaced from the East Pavilion will have to be transported between the Berkeley Library and the new Research Study Centre in the Old Library, and collections stored in the East Colonnade would also have to be transported down to the Study Centre.
- A concern was raised that having only one lift available for visitor use could tend to produce a bottleneck at the lift area; in response it was noted that visitors would be encouraged to use the stairs whenever possible.



- A query was raised as to whether the area could be designed so that visitors encounter the stairs before the lift, to encourage stair use.
- A concern was raised as to the demographic of visitors to the Old Library, in relation to their fitness to climb two flights of stairs. A further point was made that some visitors may be willing to climb one flight of stairs, but not two.
- It was noted that it could be possible for visitors to use the goods lift at appropriate times.

There was discussion on upgrade of the stairs in the West Pavilion; it was noted that this is the university's only surviving interior designed by Richard Castle.

- A concern was raised regarding these stairs meeting current safety standards, and regarding the possible effect of safety upgrades on the appearance of the stairs. The architects provided reassurance on these points.

The Acting Chair invited comments from the Committee.

- The project team were commended on the scheme as a whole; in particular it was noted that locating the plant room under Fellows' Square is a good approach. It was noted that many options for the location of the plant room and the visitor arrival and services area were discussed before arriving at the current proposal.



- The Committee noted that it was a pity to see the ABK stairs being removed as part of this project, but agreed that this removal was necessary.
- A query was raised regarding the ramp on the east end of the podium; in response it was noted that subsequent illustrations of the design show the ramp without a balustrade, but the length of the ramp remains the same.
- It was noted that the construction phase will present a risk to the Long Room, and a query was raised regarding the ability to remake carvings in the Long Room should damage to the Room occur. In response it was noted that a detailed point cloud survey will be undertaken. The Committee noted the importance of detail on the depth of carvings, and proposed that a highly detailed scan of one bay of the Old Library be undertaken.
- There was a discussion on the fire suppression system proposed for the Old Library; the architects advised that the appropriate amounts of water and appropriate water pressure have been considered. The Committee recommended site-specific tests of misting.
- A query was raised as to whether the lifts will be fire-operational lifts; this is to be confirmed with Dublin Fire Brigade. The Committee offered its support in liaising with the Brigade. Fire-operational lifts will



be maintained as an assumption in the design.

- The Committee offered support to the project team regarding specialist input on security. It was noted that passive security would be implemented where possible, and CCTV would be used.

There was discussion on energy efficiency; it was noted that a balance has been struck between the needs of the collections and the conditions created by the levels of visitors. The fabric of the building sets a limit to various efficiency measures e.g. a returning air system.

A query was raised regarding the level of stakeholder engagement on the project; a concern was raised regarding the impact of the project on services and on the university commercial strategy. In response it was noted that regular stakeholder meetings were held, and that the Committee is asked today only to approve the project design in advance of submission for planning permission.

The Acting Chair thanked the project team; the team then left the meeting.

The Committee expressed confidence in the design team but suggested that a larger plant room might be required.

It was noted that the business case of the project is not yet finalised, and concerns were raised regarding potential lost revenue during the construction phase, as well as the potential for positive impact on the philanthropic campaign.

The project was approved in terms of the design process as it currently stands – the issues raised in



		<p>today's discussion will be brought to the project stakeholder group. It was noted that work on the commercial, financial and funding aspects of the project was ongoing.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Highly detailed scan of one bay of the Old Library to be undertaken.2. The Committee recommended site-specific tests of fire-suppression misting.3. Project to confirm with Dublin Fire Brigade whether the lifts will be fire-operational lifts. The Committee offered its support in liaising with the Brigade. Fire-operational lifts will be maintained as an assumption in the design.4. The Committee offered support to the project team regarding specialist input on security.5. The Committee recommended a review of the size of the proposed plant room, as it was felt that a larger-scale room might be required.	
EPC/19-20/011	TTEC project update	<p>Diarmuid O'Brien, the Chief Innovation and Enterprise Officer, was invited to join the meeting.</p> <p>Development of Trinity's TTEC campus was noted as a chance to do something disruptive and transformational. Some sites in the area are not owned by Trinity. Investment in the site over the next 12 months or so will get it ready for development; the draft masterplan will be developed into a full masterplan once the development partner is in place.</p>	



		<p>It is expected that a design firm will be appointed by mid-February 2019, and that a submission of a planning permission application would be made in May/June 2020.</p> <p>The project will present to Board in stages to request approval for tranches of funding. The project has met with the Minister for Housing.</p> <p>There was positive feedback from the Committee. The Committee requested regular updates on the project.</p> <p>Diarmuid O'Brien left the meeting; GR also left the meeting.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">6. The project is to provide regular progress updates to Estates Policy Committee.	
EPC/19-20/012	Campus masterplan	<p>MC provided an update.</p> <p>The Committee welcomed this proposal for a Campus Masterplan, and noted student experience and staff experience as important components of such a plan.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">7. The Committee recommended a clearer statement of the purpose of the Masterplan in terms of supporting the university's academic mission, and recommended that the Masterplan contain a clear articulation of the university's relationship to the public realm and national heritage.8. MC and COC are to consult on identifying the stage/phases of the Masterplan, and a report will be provided under Matters	



		Arising at the meeting of Estates Policy Committee on 06 March 2020.	
EPC/19-20/013	Estates Policy Committee terms of reference	<p>A version of the terms of reference with tracked changes (incorporating feedback from VC, GR, MC, AG, and JP) was circulated to the Committee in advance of today's meeting. The Committee were asked for their views, noting that this was an interim update – the updated terms of reference will be brought to Executive Officers Group, and then back to Estates Policy Committee, for approval.</p> <p>There was discussion on the expertise available to the Committee; it was proposed that the terms of reference could articulate the Committee's links with other university committees.</p> <p>The value of having projects presented to the Committee at an early stage as well as at the point of submission for planning permission was noted; there was discussion of the various projects underway and planned. It was proposed that the terms of reference should make reference to the timing of presentations to this Committee.</p> <p>The Committee were asked to submit any further feedback on the terms of reference via email.</p> <p>Actions:</p> <p>9. It was recommended that the wording 'The Estates Policy Committee is a Principal Committee of the Board responsible for the review of policy in the area of the development and operation of the College's sites, physical facilities and utilities;' be revised to make clear whether the</p>	



		Committee has a role in making recommendations to Board. 10. The terms of reference should make reference to the timing of presentations to this Committee.	
EPC/19-20/014	Next meeting – 06 March 2020, 11.00-13.00 - Space Allocation policy - Estates Policy Committee terms of reference	The next meeting will be held on 06 March 2020, 11.00-13.00. Agenda: - report on stages/phases of Campus Masterplan (under Matters Arising) - Space Allocation policy - Estates Policy Committee terms of reference	
Section B, C – no items			
EPC/19-20/015	AOB	Circulation of Committee papers will move to Diligent Boards. Provision can be made for setup on iPad for internal Committee members.	