1. **Introduction**

QTC Projects were appointed to carry out the Post Occupancy Evaluation following the submission of a fee proposal for services dated 5 September 2013 to the Development Director, University Estate Office. Instructions to proceed were given on 17 September 2013.

2. **Background**

The University has a policy of carrying out post occupancy evaluations on its major capital projects and wishes to extend this process to cover minor capital works approved by the Space Management Committee (SMC). SMC also cover revenue projects of lower value but wished to concentrate on the minor capital works for this review.

The SMC receives schemes for its consideration on an ongoing annual basis and approves projects provided they meet specified criteria and objectives.

The following projects approved for the budget year 2011-12 have been selected for review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>ES Reference</th>
<th>Budget £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translation Suite</td>
<td>Hallward Library</td>
<td>ES2524</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology upgrade: D Level Labs</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>ES2539</td>
<td>137,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetabled Room refurbishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Easter</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>ES2619</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Summer</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>ES2611</td>
<td>243,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer MDL’s to Timetabling</td>
<td>Medical School</td>
<td>ES2612</td>
<td>146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter 2012 AV refurbishment</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>ES2626</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2012 AV refurbishment</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>ES2646/47</td>
<td>598,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Centre</td>
<td>Royal Derby Hospital</td>
<td>ES2642</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Lab improvements</td>
<td>L3 and L4 Buildings</td>
<td>ES2688</td>
<td>361,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering new Lab space</td>
<td>L3 Building</td>
<td>ES2689</td>
<td>484,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS Lab Refurbishment</td>
<td>CBS Building B60</td>
<td>ES2690</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Scope of the Review**

**Evaluation Technique**

The evaluation was conducted at Project Review stage (1 – 2 years after handover) and is based on completion of individual review sheets for each project (see appendix 1).
Users, Estate Office, IT Services and Consultants (where appointed) were identified and contacted to discuss the projects. Where a response has been received, the comments have been summarised in the review sheets.

Interviews were held with:

Tim Brooksbank, Development Director, Estate Office
Kevin Strauther, Project Officer, Estate Office
Hugo Bloch, Project Officer, Estate Office
Lisa Haynes, Space Resources Manager, Estate Office

Carl Winfield, Building and Operations Manager, CBS
Louise Cupitt, CBS Safety Officer
Paul Antcliff, Faculty of Engineering Technical Manager
Dr Douglas Brown, Faculty of Engineering Safety Co-ordinator
Joanna East, Centre Manager, Student Services Centre, Royal Derby Hospital
Chris Jones, Teaching Lab Manager, Life Sciences, Medical School
Prof Wyn Morgan, Pro Vice Chancellor Teaching and Learning
Dr Yvonne Lee, Lecturer, School of Cultures, Languages and Area Studies

Simon Henshaw, Technical Support Team Leader, IT Services
Dave Halford, Group Leader, IT Services
Geoff Yarnall, Group Leader Language Support, IT Services

Tom Burton, Surveyor, Innes England Property Consultants
Jon Marriott, D H Squires Building Services Consultants

The following were contacted but no response was received:

Dr Paul Scotting, Associate Professor, Life Sciences, Medical School
Jonathan Kavanagh, Students’ Union, Inter-site Support Worker

Where possible, comments have been obtained regarding quality of finished project, performance of the contractor, services provided by the Estate Office and IT Services and the project approval process overseen by SMC.

All projects were inspected by the reviewer and where possible photographs taken.

4. General Comments

Overall, comments from user Departments on the completed projects have been very good with positive benefits/outcomes achieved. On the timetabled rooms for general teaching, students would prefer more lecture capture facilities.

It is noticeable that 50% of projects reviewed relate to timetabled rooms, emphasising the recent focus by SMC on these facilities.

Costs have been managed well with projects kept within the budget approved by SMC.

Where appointed, Consultants have performed well. However, some specialist subcontractors/suppliers have not always given the required service expected.

Refurbishment/upgrade programmes of timetabled rooms are carried out independently. Attempts to co-ordinate/integrate activities have not always been successful.
Early design meetings with the Estate Office have worked well for Engineering Faculty and result in less surprises when the scheme is presented to SMC.

5. SMC Approval Process

SMC is an essential part of the monitoring and management of the use of space and needs to vet applications for additions/changes of space. Submission of proposals and their format are defined as part of the submission requirements. However, looking at the projects that form part of this review, there is a wide and varying range of information submitted and there appears to be no consistency.

Departments therefore need to ensure the right level of information is submitted in the required format and this needs to be stressed by SMC.

Some Departments have commented that there are occasions when projects have short lead-in times (eg when dealing with external sponsors or applying for specific research grants) and this does not always fit with the SMC meeting schedule (SMC meets every 3 months). In certain circumstances SMC needs to be more flexible, tailoring meetings to specific projects.

Once project proposals have been submitted, these are presented at the SMC meeting by the Estate Office. Departments identify an SMC member for their application who should be fully briefed to offer support at the meeting. Alternatively, it may be prudent to also invite the author of the scheme submission paper to answer any detailed or technical questions.

IT Customer Services would like to set up more formal communications with the Estate Office. There used to be Pre meetings before SMC met to discuss project proposals. The pre meetings brought together AV services, Timetabling and Estate Office. IT Customer Services would like these meetings re-instated as a means of improving communication and resolving issues prior to the scheme being presented to SMC.

Recommendations

- Departments need to ensure the right level of information is submitted in the required format and this needs to be stressed by SMC.
- SMC to schedule meetings to take into account projects with short lead-in times
- SMC to consider inviting authors to the meeting to present submission papers
- Consider re-instating pre-meetings between AV Services, Timetabling and Estate Office

6. Comments/Recommendations on Specific Projects

a) Translation Suite Hallward Library

- Lighting emits high frequency (14-16KHz) noise within main room which some people can hear. This needs to be taken into account in acoustically challenged environments
- Consider the users’ request for controlled access to LG105 and LG106
b) Biology Upgrade of D Level Labs, Medical School

- Manufacturer and Installer of Fume Cupboards, Mach-Aire, are considered unreliable in keeping appointments. This is also confirmed by the Building Services Consultants appointed on this project. Estate Office should review their performance and take appropriate action. A clause in the construction contract could be included regarding attendance on site.

c) Upgrade and Transfer Medical School MDL’s to Timetabling System

- Programme of work submitted to SMC showed AV upgrades to C33 and C1 suites for completion summer 2012. Only C33 suite has been upgraded. Programme of work submitted to SMC also showed AV upgrades to C99 and C2 suites for completion summer 2013 but these have not been done. This needs to be reported to SMC and a revised programme submitted.
- The AV contractor did not perform well on this project and it is understood that they have not been included in the revised AV Contractor Framework.
- Better communication between the Schools and IT Services is needed. The School of Biomedical Sciences were not entirely clear on their AV requirements and with IT Services lack of knowledge of the existing systems’ functionality (system owned by the School) this led to programme slippage.

d) Rolling Programmes of Timetabled Room Improvements

- Where possible need to ensure the rolling programme is linked with AV upgrade programme operated by IT Services.
- Students would prefer more lecture capture facilities.

e) Engineering Lab Improvements L3 and L4 Buildings

- There was a problem with Mach-Aire who caused two months delay in finishing due to installation of fume cupboards ("obstructive and not forthcoming"). Estate Office should review their performance and take appropriate action – (see earlier comment).

f) Student Services Centre: Royal Derby Hospital

- Problems of noise from the Activity Area are causing disturbance to the Library. This is being resolved by removing connecting door and sealing up (subject to Fire Officer approval).
- No mechanical ventilation installed in this area - only high level openable windows. Data logging taking place to check ventilation and air flow. Proposals for ventilation improvement should be implemented if found to be needed.
- Some items that were to be done retrospectively have not been followed through. This needs further discussion with the Centre Manager.
g) CBS Lab Refurbishment B60

- The user representatives consulted on this project felt that liaison with the Estate Office was poor - difficulty in obtaining information. The Estate Office considered that the original request did not reflect what was actually needed and it took a long time to get this. The need to present the project to SMC with limited information may have contributed to an inadequate design brief.

CBS’s review led to the following internal recommendations

- CBS to develop pro-forma/checklist to inform initial brief
- Early review of proposals needed with Estate Office prior to SMC submission
- Ensure single point of contact with end user
- Develop model for dealing with LEV and gases in a complicated lab arrangement
TRANSLATION/INTERPRETATION SUITE
Views of LG105 and LG106 prior to conversion/refurbishment
TRANSLATION/INTERPRETATION SUITE – HALLWARD LIBRARY

Main area of Translation Suite with booths around perimeter

View from Translation Booth
# Translation Suite Hallward Library LG105 including AV/PC contribution

| SMC Approval | £2524 |
| Project Officer | Kevin Strauther |
| IT Services Representative | Geoffrey Yarnall, Language Support Group |
| User Representative (Academic) | Pierre-Alexis Meyer, Cultures, Languages and Area Studies |
| User Representative (Academic) | Dr Yvonne Lee, Cultures, Languages and Area Studies |
| Contractor/Main Supplier | J Seamer & Son, Televic Education |

## 1. Project Description

To create a professional Translation Suite for training purposes as part of MA course in English Translation (Cultures, Languages and Area Studies)

## 2. Project Objectives

To convert LG105/106 (formerly CETL space) in the Hallward Library

## 3. Project Data

- **Start Date:** 19 Sep 2011
- **Finish Date:** 17 Oct 2011
- **Outstanding Issues:**
  - No Issues. Client very pleased

## 4. Cost

- **Budget:** £75,000
- **£50,000 (AV/PC)**
- **Final Cost:** £129,000

### Comments:

Final cost within the 5% allowable tolerance
5. Project Officer (Estate Office) Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Good liaison with users and specialist soundproofing contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/Supplier performance</td>
<td>Good performance from the main contractor, J Seamer and specialist installers, Televic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with other professional Service Departments</td>
<td>Good liaison with other service departments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. User Rep Comments

How has the project benefitted the School/Unit?

Room used regularly for teaching and special events/conferences. Facilities match those used by United Nations in Geneva. Currently just used for Chinese translation/interpretation. Next year this will be extended to other languages

Comments from Dr Yvonne Lee

I have been using both the translation and interpreting suites in the library (LG 105 and 106). Our teaching has benefited from facility in both rooms and I do appreciate the University’s support and initiative in installing the software and hardware. My feedback, therefore, will reflect on how the existing space management system affects the use and maintenance of these two rooms and the facilities within.

1. Security
Both rooms are currently centrally timetabled rooms and are freely accessible if not booked for teaching. Both rooms contain specialised training equipment/software (Televis interpreting training system, industry-standard interpreting booths and SDL TRADOS) that command a substantial cost to maintain. We have experienced numerous cases of vandalism (all have been reported and recorded), which in turn cost the IT service a significant amount to replace the broken parts, let alone the disruption caused to teaching because of equipment failure. We have also seen students wandering in in the middle of a lecture, thinking the room is available to use. We would therefore appreciate the University/Estate Office to grant controlled access to both rooms to ensure security of the facility and to circumvent unnecessary maintenance cost.

2. Accessibility
We learned from student feedback that more practice/practical time is needed on top of existing contact hours. We can either book additional practice sessions (subject to University timetabling regulation) or provide remote access to some of our facility (TRADOS or recording app in distance-learning mode). I understand that for translation technological support there are licensing issues; however, if we can provide one or two for students to use remotely, we can provide more learning support and enhance student learning experience.

3. Technical issues
Although sporadic, we do experience technical failure in both rooms. In 106 in particular, there were cases where students were working on translation using Trados, and an abrupt technical fault resulted in corrupted files or loss of data. In 105, we have had problems with data transmission (audio files) into individual booths. We understand that maintenance requires continual budgetary support and would appreciate that maintenance cost be factored in in the evaluation process.

8. Other Comments/recommendations

Tim Brooksbank comments:
There was an issue with the location chosen for the Translation and Interpretation Suite. This was space much appreciated by the Library and it was thought that the location would be short term.
CLAS would have preferred to have had the facility in Trent Building but no available space was found.
A plan form was found that worked but it was a challenge to fit everything in and some space is wasted due to the necessary layout.
The Estate Office
Medical School - D Floor
Asset no. 3101_D
D Floor Rooms 11/13/14 & 15
September 2011
Not to Scale - Existing Room Photos
BIOLOGY UPGRADE OF D LEVEL LABS – MEDICAL SCHOOL
## 1. Project Description

The refurbishment of D11 and D13, QMC and Dr Paul Scotting’s laboratories in order to conform with safety legislation.

## 2. Project Objectives

To bring the laboratories up to a satisfactory Health and Safety standard in order to safeguard current research being carried out.

To provide an improved and stimulating environment for teaching and supervision of research students.

## 3. Project Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date: 30 Jan 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finish Date: 5 April 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outstanding Issues:

None

## 4. Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget: £137,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Cost: £137,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
5. Project Officer (Estate Office) Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Good quality finish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor/Supplier performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay due to asbestos but no major problem in completing project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good performance from contractor and most subcontractors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fume Cupboards**

Mach-Aire is the company used by the University to maintain the fume cupboards in the Medical School. This company can sometimes be unreliable in keeping to appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liaison with other professional Service Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. IT Services Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor/Supplier performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liaison with other professional Service Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. User Rep Comments

How has the project benefitted the School/Unit?

Service provided by the Estate Office/IT Services

Any other issues

8. Other Comments/recommendations
As part of a rolling programme of refurbishments and AV upgrades a list of rooms has been identified for minor improvements (redecorcation and carpets). 23 rooms identified for improvement over Easter 2012.

To maintain the University's Timetabled Rooms to an acceptable standard in terms of finishes, furniture and equipment

5 Year rolling programme for timetabled rooms. Heavily used rooms need regular refurbishment

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Easter 2012 refurbishment of Timetabled Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMC Approval</td>
<td>Jan-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>Kevin Strauther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Services Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Representative</td>
<td>Wyn Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/Main Supplier</td>
<td>Newton Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Project Description

As part of a rolling programme of refurbishments and AV upgrades a list of rooms has been identified for minor improvements (redecorcation and carpets). 23 rooms identified for improvement over Easter 2012.

2. Project Objectives

To maintain the University's Timetabled Rooms to an acceptable standard in terms of finishes, furniture and equipment

5 Year rolling programme for timetabled rooms. Heavily used rooms need regular refurbishment

Start Date: 2 April 2012
Finish Date: 27 April 2012

Outstanding Issues:

None

3. Project Data

Start Date: 2 April 2012
Finish Date: 27 April 2012

Outstanding Issues:

None

4. Cost

Budget: £140,000
Final Cost: £85,000

Comments:

underspend used as contribution to final cost of Summer Refurb programme
5. Project Officer (Estate Office) Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Project Officer is satisfied with the quality of the refurbishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/Supplier performance</td>
<td>Good contractor who performed well and kept within programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with other professional Service Departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. IT Services Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/Supplier performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with other professional Service Departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. User Rep Comments

How has the project benefitted the School/Unit?

Service provided by the Estate Office/IT Services

Any other issues

8. Other Comments/recommendations

Co-ordination of AV with IT Services
Where possible need to ensure rolling programme is linked with AV upgrade programme operated by IT Services.
AV budget now transferred from IT Services and managed by SMC (through Estate Office)
As part of a rolling programme of refurbishments and AV upgrades a list of rooms has been identified for minor improvements (redecorating and carpets). 58 rooms identified for improvement over Summer 2012. AV upgrades are also to be included in some rooms.

To maintain the University's Timetabled Rooms to an acceptable standard in terms of finishes, furniture and equipment.

5 Year rolling programme for timetabled rooms. Heavily used rooms need regular refurbishment.

As part of the refurbishment programme, the University's Timetabled Rooms are being upgraded to an acceptable standard. The project is part of a 5-year rolling programme and involves rooms being identified for minor improvements, including redecoration and AV upgrades.

The project is expected to be completed by September 7, 2012. The budget for the project is £243,000, and the final cost is £262,000. The overspend is funded from underspend on the Easter Refurbishment programme.
### 5. Project Officer (Estate Office) Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Project Officer is satisfied with the quality of the refurbishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/Supplier performance</td>
<td>Good contractor who performed well and kept within programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Liaison with other professional Service Departments

### 6. IT Services Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor/Supplier performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liaison with other professional Service Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
7. User Rep Comments Comments

How has the project benefitted the School/Unit?

Service provided by the Estate Office/IT Services

Any other issues

8. Other Comments/recommendations

Co-ordination of AV with IT Services
Where possible need to ensure rolling programme is linked with AV upgrade programme operated by IT Services.
AV budget now transferred from IT Services and managed by SMC (through Estate Office)
TRANSFER OF MULTI-DISCIPLINARY LABS TO TIMETABBING

Medical School Labs awaiting AV upgrade

View of labs prior to upgrading

Upgraded C33 Lab Suite

View of mobile console
SPACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  POST OCCUPANCY EVALUATION

Project Title: Transfer Medical School Multi Disciplinary Laboratories to the Timetabling System including AV/PC contribution

SMC Approval: Jan-12  ES2612

Project Officer: Tim Brooksbank
IT Services Officer: Simon Henshaw
User Representative: Chris Jones  Medical School Lab Manager
Contractor/Main Supplier: P Reilly Contractors  AV Contractor: Nuway Ltd

1. Project Description
The School of Biomedical Sciences wishes to upgrade the AV equipment and carry out minor works to the MDL's which would then be transferred into the Timetabling System

2. Project Objectives
To ensure spaces are maintained to University teaching space standards
To improve space utilisation
To comply with the policy of moving existing School labs onto the Timetabling System
To reduce the School of Biomedical Sciences space allocation of 1,379sq m

3. Project Data
Start Date: 9 July 2012
Finish Date: 3 Sept 2012
Outstanding Issues: None
Initially quite a few snags with AV. Not knowing the full functionality of the system contributed to slippage on the programme
Programme of work submitted to SMC showed AV upgrades to C33 and C1 suites for completion summer 2012. Only C33 suite has been upgraded
Programme of work submitted to SMC also showed AV upgrades to C99 and C2 suites for completion summer 2013 but these have not been done

4. Cost
Budget: £12,000  £134,000 (AV/PC)
Final Cost:

Comments:
5. Project Officer (Estate Office) Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>There were only minor building works and these were carried out in a satisfactory manner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor/Supplier performance</th>
<th>There were no problems with the contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liaison with other professional Service Departments</th>
<th>Liaison with Information Services (AV Services) worked well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. IT Services Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>24 - 46” LCD screens installed + 4 projectors, digital with full HD capability and controlled by one touch screen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor/Supplier performance</th>
<th>The AV contractor did not perform well due to lack of resources. They were not on site full time. Corners were cut in some areas (cables loose with no ties, lack of adequate labelling). Nuway Ltd not on new AV contractor framework.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liaison with other professional Service Departments</th>
<th>Liaison with Schools could be improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
7. User Rep Comments Comments

How has the project benefitted the School/Unit?

Service provided by the Estate Office/IT Services

Any other issues

8. Other Comments/recommendations

These were the first labs to be transferred to central timetabling control.

Comments from IT Customer Services:
Better communication with the Schools is needed. The School of Biomedical Sciences were not entirely clear on their requirements. Different lecturers have different requirements.
Much more difficult to retrofit functionality.
The existing system was owned by the School so little knowledge of system.
AV systems in these rooms now centrally supported so better service provided by IT.
Customer Services
**SPACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  POST OCCUPANCY EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>AV refurbishments and PC/Laptop replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMC Approval</td>
<td>Jan/March 12 ES2626 ES2646 ES2647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>Tim Brooksbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Services Officer</td>
<td>Simon Henshaw  Dave Halford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Representative</td>
<td>Wyn Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/Main Supplier</td>
<td>GV Media Nuway Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Project Description**

   A rolling plan to refurbish AV equipment in Central Timetabled Rooms over Easter/Summer 2012 in accordance with an agreed schedule of rooms. The refurbishments were intended to be co-ordinated with a renewal programme for PC's and laptops.

2. **Project Objectives**

   To upgrade/replace AV equipment in Timetabled Rooms in order to maintain agreed standards for teaching and learning.
   To provide desktops that are fit for purpose to run the required software for teaching and learning.

3. **Project Data**

   | Start Date: | Easter: 2 April 2012 | Summer: 17 Jun 12 |
   | Finish Date: | Easter: 27 April 2012 | Summer: 21 Sep 12 |

   **Outstanding Issues:**

4. **Cost**

   | Budget: | £250,000 (Easter) | £298,000 (Summer) | £300,000 (increase) |
   | Final Cost: |                        |                        |                  |

   **Comments:**
5. Project Officer (Estate Office) Comments

Quality

Contractor/Supplier performance

Liaison with other professional Service Departments

6. IT Services Comments

Quality

Good quality achieved by GV Multimedia

Contractor/Supplier performance

GV Multimedia performed very well and finished on time with good communication. Nuway Ltd had resourcing issues which affected quality

Liaison with other professional Service Departments

IT Customer Services would like to set up more formal communications with Estate Office. There used to be pre-meetings before SMC met to discuss project proposals. The pre-meetings brought together AV services, Timetabling and Estate Office. IT Customer Services would like these meetings re-instated. It is suggested that refurbishments/equipment replacements in timetabled rooms should be included in the overall timetable for each room
7. User Rep Comments Comments

How has the project benefitted the School/Unit?

Service provided by the Estate Office/IT Services

Any other issues

8. Other Comments/recommendations

Students want more lecture capture facilities
This project was to be co-ordinated with the Estate Office rolling programme of Timetabled Room refurbishments but was not achieved due to timing issues
AV budget now transferred from IT Services and managed by SMC (through Estate Office). However IT Customer Services have stated that this slows down the ordering process and would prefer to handle the issue of orders directly whilst still maintaining overall control by SMC
STUDENT SERVICES CENTRE – ROYAL DERBY HOSPITAL

Main office area

Activity Area

Glazed screen giving borrowed light to office

Computer area

Circulation/social space (underused)
**SPACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  POST OCCUPANCY EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Student Services Centre: Derby Royal Hospital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMC Approval</td>
<td>Mar-12 ES2642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>Hugo Bloch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Services Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Representative</td>
<td>Jonathan Kavanagh - SU  Joanna East - Centre Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/Main Supplier</td>
<td>Derwent Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Project Description**

Provision of a new student services centre to cater for the increased student numbers at the Derby Royal site. Based on the Portland Building model, the new centre will include an activities area, office space for Students' Union staff and student committees and storage space.

2. **Project Objectives**

To provide adequate space for Students’ Union activities
To provide space which reflects the changing needs and requirements of the student community
To provide an opening and welcoming space which complements the learning experience

3. **Project Data**

- **Start Date:** April 2012
- **Finish Date:** September 2012

**Outstanding Issues:**
The new activity area is next to the existing library with a fire door linking the two areas. Problem with noise transmission through this door. Currently being discussed with the NHS Trust’s Fire Officer to seek approval to remove this door

4. **Cost**

- **Budget:** £200,000
- **Final Cost:** £176,000

**Comments:**
5. Project Officer (Estate Office) Comments

Quality

| Quality matches the rest of the building which is relatively new |

Contractor/Supplier performance

| Contracts Manager retired and this caused some communication issues |

Liaison with other professional Service Departments

| Pre contract meeting was held with NHS Trust Head of Estates and Maintenance Officer |

---

6. IT Services Comments

Quality

| |

Contractor/Supplier performance

| |

Liaison with other professional Service Departments

| |
7. User Rep Comments - Joanna East

How has the project benefitted the School/Unit?

Overall, a good facility and allowed two Admin Teams to be brought together who were originally in two separate buildings

Service provided by the Estate Office/IT Services

Had to work hard to get responses from Estates
Some items to be done retrospectively have not been followed through

Any other issues

No mechanical ventilation - only high level openable windows. Data logging taking place to check ventilation and air flow
Shape of floor plan means that one working area has no natural light and cannot see reception desk
Additional radiators now installed
Room numbering needs changing

8. Other Comments/recommendations

Problems of noise from the Activity Area are causing disturbance to the Library. This is being resolved by removing connecting door and sealing up (subject to Fire Officer approval)
**SPACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE  POST OCCUPANCY EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Engineering Laboratory improvements in utilisation: L3 and L4 Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMC Approval</td>
<td>Jun-12 E2688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>Kevin Strauther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Services Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Representative</td>
<td>Douglas Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor/Main Supplier</td>
<td>Derwent Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Project Description**

   Improvements in utilisation of laboratory space in L3 and L4 Buildings

2. **Project Objectives**

   - To improve lab facilities for staff and researchers
   - To improve space utilisation through change of use of space

3. **Project Data**

   - Start Date: 23 July 2012
   - Finish Date: 30 Nov 2012

   Outstanding Issues:

   - None

4. **Cost**

   - Budget: £361,000
   - Final Cost: £372,000

   **Comments:**

   Faculty paid for an additional 3 phase supply
5. Project Officer (Estate Office) Comments

Quality  Project Officer considers the project to be of a good standard

Contractor/Supplier performance
Contractor performed well. Had a positive attitude and was willing to be flexible. Good safety attitude.

Liaison with other professional Service Departments

6. IT Services Comments

Quality

Contractor/Supplier performance

Liaison with other professional Service Departments
7. User Rep Comments Comments

How has the project benefitted the School/Unit?

| Improved facilities and some health and safety issues resolved |

Service provided by the Estate Office/IT Services

| The Project Officer was very good. DB has good relationship with Estate Office. The project management arrangements worked well. DB wrote the SMC submission which was endorsed by Estate Office and used as tender documents. DB managed day to day matters on site while the Estate Office Project Officer dealt with finance and overview. Arrangements worked very well. |

Any other issues

| Engineering Faculty stripped out areas (including electrics) in readiness for contractor which helped speed up the process and save money. Some problems did arise but had sufficient budget to deal with these. Eg two main distribution boards were replaced which eliminated H & S issues. Biggest problem was dealing with Mach-Aire who caused two months delay in finishing due to installation of fume cupboards ("obstructive and not forthcoming") |

8. Other Comments/recommendations

| Good submission to SMC by Engineering. Well developed case and particulars of scheme explained in some detail. Work on site supervised by Engineering Faculty No defects identified at end of defects liability period (6 months) Associate Dean presented proposals to SMC but had been well briefed by DB |
ADDITIVES RESEARCH GROUP LABORATORIES

Existing spaces (A3-A7) prior to conversion
ADDITIVES RESEARCH GROUP LABORATORIES
### Project Title
Engineering Laboratory alterations and improvements: L3 Building

### SMC Approval
| Start Date: 2 July 2012 | ES2689 |

### Project Officer
Kevin Strauther

### IT Services Officer
Paul Antcliff

### User Representative
Faculty Technical Manager

### Contractor/Main Supplier
B&M Installations

### Consultants

### 1. Project Description
Creation of Additives Research Group laboratories in L3 Building

### 2. Project Objectives
To create 318 sq m of laboratory space to house the Additives Manufacturing Research Group which is moving to Nottingham from Loughborough University

### 3. Project Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date: 2 July 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finish Date: 9 Jan 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outstanding Issues:
None

### 4. Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget: £484,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Cost: £425,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:
5. Project Officer (Estate Office) Comments

**Quality**
Project Officer considers the project to be of a good standard

**Contractor/Supplier performance**
Contractor and subcontractors worked well but electrical subcontractor had to be brought into line
Client has no issues with the contractor who they have used before. Good standard of workmanship. Some issues unforeseen when stripping out but were able to cope

**Liaison with other professional Service Departments**

6. IT Services Comments

**Quality**

**Contractor/Supplier performance**

**Liaison with other professional Service Departments**
7. User Rep Comments

How has the project benefitted the School/Unit?

Vastly improved research capability in this field. Nottingham University is now the UK centre for Additives research and Rapid Prototyping. Prof Hague is very happy with the facilities.

Service provided by the Estate Office/IT Services

Very good relationship with the Estate Office and consult prior to submission in order to agree on scope of works and method statement

Any other issues

8. Other Comments/recommendations

Good submission to SMC by Engineering. Well developed case and particulars of scheme explained in some detail.

SMC is an essential part of the monitoring and management of the use of space and needs to vet applications for additions/changes of space. Submission of proposals and their format are defined as part of the submission requirements.

Paul Antcliff comment:
However the need to deliver projects with short lead-in times (eg when dealing with external sponsors) does not always fit with the SMC meeting schedule (SMC meets every 3 months). Need to be more flexible in meeting dates.

SMC approval process

Once project proposals have been submitted, these are often presented at the SMC meeting by the Associate Dean who may not be familiar with the details of the scheme. It may be better to also invite the author of the scheme submission paper to answer any detailed or technical questions.
B60-62 LAB CONVERSION – CENTRE FOR BIOMOLECULAR SCIENCES

B60 Laboratory

Specialist piped gases

Store Room

External gas bottle store
### Project Title
Centre for Biomolecular Sciences Lab Refurbishment

### SMC Approval
June/Nov 12

### Project Objectives
To relocate Electrical Engineering (Laser facility) and space occupied by Pharmacy (Blood product separation) which will release rooms B60, B61 and B62 for CRG use (gas fermentation facility and general manipulation of organisms)

### 1. Project Description
To convert B60, B61 and B62 in the CBS Building to provide accommodation for the Clostridia Research Group

### 2. Project Objectives
To relocate Electrical Engineering (Laser facility) and space occupied by Pharmacy (Blood product separation) which will release rooms B60, B61 and B62 for CRG use (gas fermentation facility and general manipulation of organisms)

### 3. Project Data
- Start Date: 30 Oct 2012
- Final Design: Dec 2012
- Finish Date: End Jan 2013
- Outstanding Issues:

### 4. Cost
- Budget: £130,000
- £145,000 (increase)
- Final Cost:

Comments: "last minute project" slightly over cost. CBS contributed to shortfall

---

**SPACE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE POST OCCUPANCY EVALUATION**

**Project Title**: Centre for Biomolecular Sciences Lab Refurbishment

**SMC Approval**: June/Nov 12

**Project Objectives**: To relocate Electrical Engineering (Laser facility) and space occupied by Pharmacy (Blood product separation) which will release rooms B60, B61 and B62 for CRG use (gas fermentation facility and general manipulation of organisms)

**1. Project Description**: To convert B60, B61 and B62 in the CBS Building to provide accommodation for the Clostridia Research Group

**2. Project Objectives**: To relocate Electrical Engineering (Laser facility) and space occupied by Pharmacy (Blood product separation) which will release rooms B60, B61 and B62 for CRG use (gas fermentation facility and general manipulation of organisms)

**3. Project Data**: Start Date: 30 Oct 2012, Final Design: Dec 2012, Finish Date: End Jan 2013, Outstanding Issues:

**4. Cost**: Budget: £130,000, £145,000 (increase)

Comments: "last minute project" slightly over cost. CBS contributed to shortfall
5. Project Officer (Estate Office) Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were some complicated issues but these eventually got resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome: good laboratory facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original request did not reflect what was actually needed - took a long time to get this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor/Supplier performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some issues with the construction of the external gas bottle store and how this would be done: not clear in the brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall contractor did a good job and accommodated the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab gas specialist used: Sanber Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. IT Services Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor/Supplier performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liaison with other professional Service Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liaison with other professional Service Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
7. User Rep Comments

How has the project benefitted the School/Unit?

User client is very happy with the outcome of the project and facilities provided which have created the country’s first biomolecular science gas fermentation laboratory, helping to secure crucial funding and doctoral studentship positions.

Service provided by the Estate Office/Consultant/Contractor

Liaison with Estate Office was poor - difficulty in obtaining information
Estate Office dealt with the relocation of Electrical Engineering and Pharmacy

Consultant, Tom Burton: good user client liaison
Main contractor performed well: easy to work with and kept areas clean

Any other issues

There were difficulties with the location of the gas cylinder store. Aesthetics of the building and landscaping were important and this limited options for location of the store
Some delay in getting the gases in
Underbench cupboards were missed off the Lab furniture specification
Some problems with LEV due to end user attempting last minute changes

8. Other Comments/recommendations

The CBS technician dealt with most issues as user client representative.

Didn't have any complaints from users
Recommendations:
CBS to develop proforma/checklist to inform initial brief
Early review of proposals needed with Estate Office prior to SMC submission
Ensure single point of contact with end user
Develop model for dealing with LEV and gases in a complicated lab arrangement