



Minutes of the Estates Policy Committee Meeting of 05 March 2021

Microsoft Teams

Present: Prof. A. Seery (Chair), Bursar & Director of Strategic Innovation – Secretary to the Committee, Chief Financial Officer (CFO), President of the Graduate Students Union, Prof. J. Parnell, Mr C. O’Connor, Interim Chief Operating Officer, Director of Campus Infrastructure, Prof. C. Casey

In Attendance: **For item 4:** Diarmuid O’Brien, Chief Innovation & Enterprise Officer and Project Sponsor, and David Green, Perkins+Will.

Apologies: Peter Reynolds

Statement of Interest: None declared.

EPC/20-21/017 **Minutes of 04 December 2020 meeting**
The draft minutes of this meeting were sent to Board; in response to feedback provided at Board, minute EPC/20-21/009 has been reworded and the approved minutes of the December 2020 meeting will be brought to the next Board meeting for noting.
The minutes were approved.

EPC/20-21/018 **Matters arising**
TTEC Early Activation space - update (minutes EPC/20-21/009 and EPC/20-21/004 refer)
The project has received the grant of permission from Dublin City Council; the project team expects to receive the official documentation shortly.

Historic Accommodations Buildings project – update (minutes EPC/20-21/009 and EPC/20-21/003 refer)

Rubrics Building: final grant of planning permission has been received.
Chief Stewards House: initial grant of planning permission has been received; no appeals have been lodged, and the final grant of permission is expected shortly.

Note was made of the number of planning permission applications for major capital projects successfully completed by the capital development team during this difficult year – the Committee’s gratitude and appreciation was extended to the Head of Capital Projects & Planning and team.



Section A

EPC/20-21/019 Adaptable Framework of the Trinity East Masterplan

Diarmuid O'Brien, Chief Innovation & Enterprise Officer and Project Sponsor, and David Green, Perkins+Will attended for this item.

Three scenarios were presented: Trinity-led, Trinity-led hybrid, and partner-led. It was noted that the early activation of the site ensures that the site will be a highly-functioning research environment from this early stage. It was noted that within these three scenarios, variations can occur. Quality of place would remain high within each scenario. It was noted that any potential commercial activity on the site would be mission-aligned with and strategically beneficial to the university.

The Chair invited discussion by Committee members and the following points were raised:

- It was noted that 'persevered heritage' on p. 5 should read 'preserved heritage'. A note was provided on consistent use of terminology across the three scenarios, e.g. 'hybrid', 'enterprise', 'work/research'. In response it was noted that nomenclature would be reviewed to ensure consistency.
- A legend to the colour coding of buildings be included alongside the images, for clarity.
- It was noted that sustainability is not specifically referenced in the design principles, and that sustainability is an important aspect of this project.
- The project should future-proof against requirements regarding embodied carbon as well as user carbon which may be expected over the next 3-5 years. In response, reassurance was offered that this aspect has been considered in the work that supports the masterplan, and further detail is available to the Committee if required.
- Development of the site represents an opportunity to improve the biodiversity. In response it was noted that biodiversity is referenced in the main masterplan, and planting forms an element of this project.



- It was confirmed that climate change resilience has been factored into the project, and further detail is available to the Committee if required.
- It was noted that the three different scenarios may result in differences in how the public spaces on the site are available to students. In response it was noted that the square space is protected in all three scenarios; the square has not yet been designed at this point in the project, but reassurance was offered that the square will enhance place-making for students and for those who live and work in the area.
- It was noted that the scale and height of some of the proposed buildings has the potential to create wind funnelling between the buildings; in response reassurance was offered that analyses of wind and sun have been undertaken, and are embedded in the requirements for the design process going forward.
- A one-page summary comparing the three scenarios, and indicative ratios of the academic-commercial split in each scenario should be included in the document.
- A query was raised on whether a masterplan for the whole site would be required for a planning permission application, or whether this can be done area by area as required. In response it was noted that the intention is to have a framework plan generally agreed, and within this framework plan there would be flexibility to design individual buildings and bring them forward for review. Reassurance was offered that the scenarios and the E3RI (E3 Research Institute) have undergone detailed testing to ensure that the planning framework set up could work for these different building types – the ‘Typographies’ section of the circulated document offers further detail.

The project team thanked the Committee for their feedback. The Chair thanked the project team, who then left the meeting.

The Chair opened the item to comment from Committee members.

The importance of sustainability was reiterated.

It was noted as important that Trinity East is considered as an element of the entire university estate when considering opportunities for investment in the estate. For example, the quantum of building on the Trinity East site should be considered within the context of future space requirements related to renovation of the existing estate.



It was noted that some of the images in this document are conceptual, and may not reflect what will be put forward in planning permission applications.

It was proposed that Trinity East be a standing item on the Estates Policy Committee agenda; given the timescale of the project, it is important that this Committee have oversight of the project and ensure it is developed in harmony with the existing estate.

In response to queries, it was clarified that Estates Policy Committee is being asked to approve the document circulated and to consider estates-related issues only. The Board will decide on the next steps for the Trinity East project.

The item was provisionally approved, subject to the document being revised to include:

- A clear statement on sustainability and a description of the sustainability aspect in the framework.
- Clear colour-coding in the images of buildings, with a legend of colours used.
- A one-page summary comparing the three proposed scenarios.

Action

**EPC/20-
21/019/001**

The document should be revised to include:

- A clear statement on sustainability and a description of the sustainability aspect in the framework.
- Clear colour-coding in the images of buildings, with a legend of colours used.
- A one-page summary comparing the three proposed scenarios.

**EPC/20-
21/019/002**

Trinity East to be a standing item on the Estates Policy Committee agenda.



Section B – no items

Section C

EPC/20-21/020

Pre-Draft Submission: Dublin City Development Plan

The Director of Campus Infrastructure presented a summary of Trinity's submission to Dublin City Council (DCC) regarding their draft City Development Plan 2022-28, and requested the Committee's feedback.

The Committee complimented the work done to date on this item, and expressed support. Some feedback was offered:

- Flexibility on use of buildings, particularly on the historic campus, was noted as important, to ensure that no one area of campus is disadvantaged relative to another.
- It was noted that there is an opportunity in the submission for Trinity to voice an opinion on developments in the city around the campus e.g. in terms of green space.
- Seeking input on user experience was noted as valuable.
- Parts of the wider campus do not fall within the remit of DCC; it was proposed that Trinity's submission to DCC contain a note outlining that Trinity would expect any development of these areas of campus to be commensurate with that on the main campus.
- It was noted that the relationship with DCC is important for the development of the estate. It was noted as important that consistency be achieved in interactions with the various Dublin councils regarding their development plans.
- It was noted that TU Dublin could be referenced in the document as well as Dublin City University; TU Dublin's campuses also comprise a mix of older and newer buildings.

The Committee were requested to note the contents of the circulated papers and the next steps.

Indicative timeline:

DCC's Chief Executive will issue a report on submissions made – likely mid-April 2021.

Director of Campus Infrastructure will give an update at the June 2021 meeting of Estates Policy Committee.

Draft Dublin City Development Plan 2022-28 on public display – likely November 2021.



Action

**EPC/20-
21/020/001**

Updates to be provided to Estates Policy Committee at the meeting of 04 June 2021 and the Committee will review Trinity's response to the draft Dublin City Development Plan 2022-28 in advance of it being submitted later this year.

EPC/20-21/021

Finance Committee decisions relevant to Estates Policy Committee

Noted.

EPC/20-21/022

Dates for next meeting

04 June 2021. The Chair expressed gratitude to the external member Ciarán O'Connor for taking the time to contribute to the Committee.

EPC/20-21/023

AOB

The Bursar provided an update on the external membership of Estates Policy Committee. Board requested that an internal monitor be appointed to the Trinity East project. Following a procurement process, Andrew Grainger was approved by Board for this role. To ensure the full independence of the Monitor, Mr Grainger is required to step down from Estates Policy Committee. The Committee noted their sincere thanks to Mr Grainger for all his work and the insights he has provided to the Committee.

As a result of Mr Grainger stepping down, a second external member will need to be appointed. It was recommended that an external member with experience of the UK university system be sought.

The Chair thanked the Committee members for their time today and closed the meeting.