MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS

at the

Thirtieth Meeting of the

COUNCIL

of the

IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND MEDICINE

The Thirtieth Meeting of the Council was held in the Council Room, 170, Queen’s Gate at 10:30 a.m. on 16 May 2003, when there were present:

Lord Vincent (Chairman, in the Chair from Minute 10 onwards), Mr. G. Able, Professor J.N.B. Bell, Professor Sir Leszek Borysiewicz, Dr. E. Buttle (Deputy Chairman, in the Chair for Minutes 1 to 9), Mr. B. Gidoomal, Professor M. Green, Professor D. Griffiths, Professor M.P. Hassell, Professor Dame Julia Higgins, Dr. M.P. Knight, Professor F. Leppington, Mr. H.B. Lowe, Sir Alastair Morton, Professor G.H.C. New, Professor J.D. Perkins, Professor R.D. Rawlings, Eur. Ing. A.D. Roche, Dr. B.G. Smith, Dame Rosemary Spencer, Dr. C.L. Vaughan, Dr. D.J. Wilbraham, the Rector, the Deputy Rector and the President of the ICU, together with the Clerk to the Court and Council.

In attendance: the Academic Registrar, the Director of Estates, the Director of Finance, the Director of Human Resources, the Director of Policy and Planning, the Director of ICT, the Pro Rector for Development and Corporate Affairs, the Imperial College Union Observer and the Assistant Clerk to the Court and Council.

Apologies: Mr. P. Gershon, Mr. D.P. Hearn, Professor S.P.F. Hughes, Professor A.B. Kay, Mr. R.J. Margetts, Dame Judith Mayhew, Sir Peter Williams, and the Director of Strategy Development and Communications.

AGENDA

The Deputy Chairman, Dr. Buttle, advised the Council that, for reasons that would become apparent, the Chairman would remain outside the Meeting until the Council had discussed the appointment of his successor. That Item would therefore be taken immediately after consideration of the Minutes of the last Meeting.
MINUTES

Council – 28 March 2003

1. The Minutes of the Twenty-ninth Meeting of the Council, held on 28 March 2003, were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

CHAIRMAN’S BUSINESS

Appointment of a New Chairman

2. Before reporting on the work of the Search Committee the Deputy Chairman invited the Rector to report on the Privy Council’s response to the College’s application for degree-awarding powers, as this had a bearing on the appointment of a new Chairman. The Rector said that the College’s application for degree-awarding powers had now received official approval from the Queen in Council. This was the first critical step towards Imperial becoming an independent University.

3. The Deputy Chairman then reminded Governors that, when the Search Committee had started the process of looking for a successor to Lord Vincent, its aim had been to find a person of sufficient calibre and both national and international standing to take on this important role at Imperial. Lord Vincent was an excellent Chairman and the Committee had wanted to find someone worthy to succeed him, which was in itself a very hard task. Thus far, she said, the Search Committee had been unsuccessful. This was partly because its work had been hampered by the temporary hiatus in its activities during the merger discussions with University College London. In part it was also due to chance, in that the process obviously needed the right person to be available at the right time.

4. Now, however, she continued, as a result of the confirmation that the College would receive degree-awarding powers, an entirely new situation had been created. The College would have to decide whether or not it wished to exercise these powers and transform itself into a university in its own right. If the decision was to pursue the route to independence, the Search Committee’s remit would presumably have to be changed to looking for candidates for two appointments – a Chancellor and a Pro-Chancellor – rather than a single successor for the Chairman. These two appointments would have to be complementary and the Committee felt that it would not be wise to appoint a Chairman now and then seek to add either a Chancellor or a Pro-Chancellor at a later date. The Committee’s advice to the Council was therefore that it should accept that there ought to be an interregnum.

5. The Deputy Chairman then reminded the Council that the Chairman’s second four year term of office was due to end in November 2003. The College’s Statutes stipulated that Governors could not be appointed for more than two terms of four years. The Search Committee had therefore considered whether it could identify an existing member of the Council to be appointed to serve as Chairman during an interregnum and had decided that the person best qualified for such an appointment was Lord Vincent himself. Although this was the ideal solution, the Committee had
questioned, first, whether he could be allowed to remain in office for another year or so and, second, whether he would be prepared to continue. Dr. Buttle had therefore discussed the matter with him and he had reluctantly agreed to do so on the condition that the Search Committee’s recommendation was fully supported by the Council and his continuation in office accorded with the Statutes. With regard to this latter point, the Deputy Chairman reminded the Council that, when it had approved the amendments to the Statutes some three years previously, it was on the basis that the restriction on appointing Governors for two terms of office only would be relaxed slightly by the addition of the word ‘normally’. She was confident that this amendment would be approved by the Privy Council because it had been included in a draft Order in Council that had been seen by the College. In the Search Committee’s view, the College’s current circumstances were sufficiently exceptional to justify making use of this freedom by re-appointing Lord Vincent for a further limited term while the College determined whether it would become a university and decided its future governance structure.

6. Dr. Smith asked if the Search Committee had considered how long the proposed interregnum should last. Dr. Buttle suggested that this should be for a year in the first instance. Dr. Vaughan said that she fully supported the Search Committee’s recommendation. However, as the Committee had had difficulty in identifying a successor to Lord Vincent, she wondered whether it would not be doubly hard to find two people of the calibre required to be appointed as Chancellor and Pro-Chancellor. Dr. Buttle said that the Chancellor’s duties would be largely ceremonial, with the Pro-Chancellor having the more onerous task of taking the Chair of the Council. One of the difficulties in identifying a successor to Lord Vincent had been that his position combined these two roles.

7. The Rector said that the proposed way forward would also allow time for the College to consider what sort of appointment was required. If the College decided to become completely independent, it would need to consider what the most appropriate governance structure for its new status should be and it might not necessarily wish to adopt a traditional model. The Honorary Treasurer, Dr. Knight agreed, saying that the College and the way it was managed had changed significantly since the appointment of Sir Richard Sykes as the Rector. He suggested that the Council should take advantage of this opportunity to review the relationship between the Council and the Executive.

8. Dame Rosemary Spencer supported the recommendation, saying that Lord Vincent had provided exemplary leadership for the Council during a time of significant change for the College. The granting of degree-awarding powers had significant implications and continuity would be vitally important for the College and for the Council. She said that she could not think of a better way to provide this than for Lord Vincent to continue as Chairman. Mr. Able concurred and suggested that it would be appropriate if the appointment of Lord Vincent’s successor were to coincide with the change in the College’s status.

9. Following the Council’s unanimous agreement to the proposal that Lord Vincent should continue in office for the time being, the Chairman was invited to join the Meeting.
MATTERS ARISING

Sale of Cobham Sports Ground (Council Minutes, 28 March 2003, Minute 2)

10. The Director of Estates, Mr. Brooks Wilson, said that the prospective purchaser wished to extend the built area at Cobham and had therefore applied for planning permission for this extension. The purchase was now conditional on the success of this planning application, which was due to be heard in July. Mr. Brooks Wilson believed that the application would be successful and that the sale would proceed shortly thereafter.

Burlington Danes (Council Minutes, 28 March 2003, Minute 4)

11. Mr. Brooks Wilson reminded the Council that an external partner was being sought to develop the Burlington Danes Project. He reported that a proposal had been received from Landbank subject to an exclusivity agreement. This agreement had now expired and would not be renewed. The College and its other external partners in the Project would now have to consider how the Project should be progressed. This would include consideration of Landbank’s proposal and alternative approaches to meeting the Project’s objectives while keeping it off Imperial’s balance sheet. Although other donors were interested in the Project, none had as yet made firm commitments and, even based on the developer’s estimated cost for the Project of £78M and the assumption that the College’s main partner would contribute £35M, there was a funding gap of £43M. Alternative funding mechanisms for the full 18,118m² scheme would therefore have to be considered and a reduced scheme for delivery in the third quarter of 2006 evaluated. Negotiations with the Hammersmith Hospital Special Trustees and with the Hammersmith Hospitals NHS Trust, which had been in abeyance during the period of the exclusivity agreement with Landbank, would also be resumed. Finally, Mr. Brooks Wilson confirmed that, as had been agreed by the Council, further expenditure by the College on the Project had been stopped.

Sport Centre (Council Minutes, 28 March 2003, Minute 10)

12. Mr. Brooks Wilson said that a design team had been appointed for the Sports Centre Project and that a cost plan was being worked up. This would be put to the Finance Committee and the Project brought to the Council for approval at its next meeting on 11 July.

Spin-out Companies and Contingent Liabilities (Council Minutes, 28 March 2003, Minute 22)

13. The Director of Finance, Mr. Cannon, confirmed that, in the event that a spin-out company failed, there would be no contingent liability for the College.
RECTOR’S BUSINESS

Staff Matters (Paper A)

14. The Rector formally presented Paper A, which was received for information.

Rector’s Report on Health and Safety (Paper B)

15. Introducing Paper B, the Rector said that the management of health and safety was continuing to improve and the College was now developing a culture where the importance of health and safety was recognised as an integral part of the College’s activities. This was due in no small measure to the efforts of the Safety Director, Ian Gillett, the Director of Occupational Health, Dr Alan Swann, and the Chairman of the Health and Safety Council, Professor Hassell. The Rector thanked them, and everyone else involved in safety throughout the College, for their contribution to this improvement. Attached to the Rector’s Report was the Annual Report from the College’s Health and Safety Council, which the Rector commended to the Council. This included accident statistics for the last five years. Although it was important that these were provided, the Rector said that they were difficult to interpret as an increase in reported accidents could be caused by a number of factors, including better reporting. Finally, he noted that the College’s Health and Safety Policy Statement had been amended to take account of the introduction of Faculties and to underline the fact that everyone in the College had a direct responsibility for health and safety.

16. Sir Alastair Morton pointed out that the rate of capital spend in the College had increased greatly in the last two years. Capital works were inherently dangerous and he suggested that the large number of such projects could have contributed to the small increase in accidents noted in the Report. He asked whether it was possible to analyse the accident reports to see how many involved external contractors or were related to capital projects. The Chairman of the Health and Safety Audit Committee, Mr. Roche, said that accidents involving contractors were included in the statistics, but these were relatively few as the College was assiduous in ensuring that contractors abided by its health and safety procedures. Indeed, he said, one contractor had been removed from a project for failing to do so. He believed, though, that it should be possible to extract these figures from the accident statistics.

17. Sir Alastair Morton then remarked that much of the College’s estate was old with many buildings dating from the 1960s or earlier. As the Council had observed in previous meetings, there was a significant backlog of long-term maintenance (LTM) and this could have implications for health and safety in those buildings. He asked if the Health and Safety Council considered this issue. Professor Hassell said that it did, indeed, take an interest in this and especially in what had been termed the maintenance gap. Mr. Roche concurred with this and said that the Health and Safety Audit Committee had received a detailed statement of LTM requirements and how these were prioritised according to their implications for safety. However, a gap analysis was now needed that would compare the College’s capital programme with its LTM requirements. This would identify those areas of concern that were not due to be refurbished or replaced. The College could then decide how to address these so
as to ensure that any outstanding health and safety issues were minimised. Mr. Brooks Wilson said that he could never be completely satisfied that everything was covered. However, he assured the Council that the College had a robust system for ensuring that all LTM items with health and safety implications were prioritised.

18. Mr. Roche said that the Report demonstrated the continuous improvements that had been made by the College in recent years. There were still areas that needed work, which the Report acknowledged. In particular, he said that Portable Appliance Testing (PAT) was still variable across the College and should be addressed. Similarly, following last year’s waste amnesty, which had allowed Departments to dispose of older items of dangerous waste, it would be important to ensure that Departments took account of their responsibilities for waste disposal and did not again build up a backlog of waste material. His Committee and the Health and Safety Council had now developed a strong relationship thanks, in part, to the efforts of Dr. Graham Taylor, who attended both. He hoped that the Chairman of the Health and Safety Council, Professor Hassell, would in the future be able to attend some of the Health and Safety Audit Committee’s meetings to strengthen this liaison further.

19. Moving on, Mr. Roche welcomed the graphical representation of the accident rate per 1000 staff and students at risk, which had been included with this Report for the first time. This was, he said, a far more meaningful measure than the number of accidents reported, and he hoped that it would now be made available every year. Finally, he reminded Governors that, two years ago, the College had introduced a departmental auditing process. This had proved to be very successful and was serving to identify and share best practice across the College. It was, he said, important that this good work was continued and built upon in the coming years.

20. Mr. Gidoomal asked whether the Disabilities Discrimination Act would impose any additional responsibilities on the College and, if so, whether these were being addressed. Mr. Brooks Wilson said that the College was spending £1M this year to meet these requirements, although it would not be fully compliant because of the difficulties of making the necessary adjustments to Grade I and II listed buildings. In these cases the College would be applying for waivers.

21. Mr. Lowe noted that the biggest increase in accidents related to exposure to harmful substances and he asked whether this was because the definition of what constituted a harmful substance was being widened. Mr. Roche confirmed this, saying that there were an increasing number of products listed. This, combined with improved reporting, would inevitably lead to a larger rise in this area. Closing the discussion, the Chairman expressed the Council’s gratitude to all those in the College involved in ensuring the successful implementation of health and safety.

Resolved: That the Health and Safety Policy Statement, as set out in Paper B, be approved.
Oral Reports

22. The Rector said that Imperial had been included in the top three in a number of the recently published league tables, copies of which were available for information. This was further evidence that Imperial was classed alongside Oxford and Cambridge by the national press. It was clear that prospective students used such tables when deciding to which universities they would apply. Thus, whatever one thought of them, they were undoubtedly important.

COLLEGE RESPONSE TO THE GOVERNMENT WHITE PAPER (PAPER C)

23. Introducing Paper C, the Director of Policy and Planning, Dr. Eastwood, reminded members of the Council that the College’s draft response to the White Paper had been circulated to them prior to its submission to the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). He thanked Governors for their comments on the draft, which had been incorporated in the final version. Moving on, he said that the College had concentrated on the Government’s proposals for research in its response. Imperial was probably unique within the sector for supporting these proposals, and in particular promoting the idea that concentrating research into a few institutions would improve multi-disciplinary and cutting edge research. Many other universities were trying to argue that research needed to be spread across the country on the grounds that the presence of universities conducting research would assist in local regeneration. The counter-argument to this was that the best research needed to be international rather than region-specific.

24. The middle-ranking universities were also concerned that the Government’s proposals served to isolate them. The new universities had a clear remit from the White Paper to widen participation. There were a large number of institutions for whom this was not appropriate or desirable, but which now felt they would be denied access to significant levels of research funding. To put this into context, Dr. Eastwood noted that only £20M of research funding was being redirected to the best universities to fund 6* Departments. This compared to £280M that had been removed from the Teaching grant to support further widening participation measures.

25. Continuing, Dr. Eastwood said that the Government had now published its proposals for the role of the Access Regulator through an Office for Fair Access (OFFA). Although the College would be responding to these separately, the proposals were more reasonable than had originally been suggested in the White Paper. However, it was still the intention that institutions would have to meet targets, which they would have to set themselves. These were the worst kind. They would have to be challenging, and, because institutions set them themselves, they would have little excuse for not meeting them. Dr. Eastwood then said he was confident that the College would be able to meet reasonable targets since it was already very close to its HEFCE benchmark for access. Imperial also had a number of programmes in place to increase access and these could be expanded.

26. The Rector said that the College could not reduce its entry standards and that it was therefore more fruitful for it to try and improve science teaching in schools so that
more people were encouraged to study science and technology at university. The College already had a number of schemes and initiatives in this area upon which it could build. He reminded the Council that its INSPIRE Scheme had been launched last year by the Prime Minister. This Scheme, which had been part-funded by GlaxoSmithKline, provided for post-doctoral researchers to spend 50% of their time conducting research in the College and the other 50% teaching science in local schools. It had been a great success and had been welcomed by both the schools and the researchers. However, obtaining further funding for it was proving difficult. The Research Councils were reluctant to support it because the staff were not concentrating full-time on research, while the DfES would not provide funding because they were not devoted full-time to teaching - all this despite the explicit backing given to the Scheme by the Prime Minister.

27. Dame Rosemary Spencer asked if an analysis had been done of the benefit to the UK economy of institutions such as Imperial, both in terms of the nation’s investment in research and the value of Imperial graduates to UK industry. Quite apart from this, she said, Imperial’s international reputation was also of great value to the UK’s standing overseas. The Rector replied that these measures were already used to judge Imperial’s performance. For example, the College received the largest amount of industrial funding for research of any UK university by a considerable margin.

28. Professor Bell noted that the Conservative Party had announced its intention to remove tuition fees and asked what impact this might have. The Rector said that this would have a minimal effect on the College’s financial position. The proposed increase in fees to £3,000 per annum would only come fully into effect in 2011 and would then generate an additional £12M for Imperial. When set against an annual budget, which would, by then, be in excess of £500M, this was relatively insignificant. The Rector also commented that it was strange for the Conservatives, a Party that advocated free market economics, to be heading in the opposite direction on this one issue.

29. Dr. Vaughan said that she had recently been to two Committee of University Chairmen (CUC) conferences and had been surprised by the degree of antagonism towards Imperial from other universities. Much of this was, she said, based on ill-informed views about the College. Dr. Eastwood said that it was a common misconception that, because Imperial received a large amount of research funding, it was therefore wealthy. In reality Imperial lost money on the majority of the research it conducted. The Chairman said that he too had attended these CUC conferences and had not experienced any antagonism. Rather, he said, other universities were worried about their own financial positions and looked enviously at the College’s success.

30. Sir Alastair Morton advised against complacency with regard to OFFA. Although the proposals seemed reasonable at present, once a regulator was in place, the Government had a history of increasing the degree of regulation. In his view, OFFA was likely to become more, rather than less, prescriptive over time. Mr. Gidoomal agreed and stressed that, whatever the Government said at present, Imperial would have to ensure that it was doing all it could to encourage access so that it was above criticism. To this end, he suggested that it would be useful for members of the Council to have a position paper setting out all Imperial’s activities in this area so that
they could defend its position at external meetings. Dr. Eastwood said that the College’s various initiatives would be detailed in its Annual Operating Statement to HEFCE, which would be provided for the Council in July.

ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE (PAPER D)

31. In the absence of the Chairman of the Athletics Committee, Mr. David Elleray, Professor Rawlings introduced Paper D. The Committee’s previous Chairman, Dr. Knight, had been concerned that it had been dealing too much with the minutiae of the College’s sports facilities rather than looking at them strategically. Before leaving the Committee he had therefore instigated a change to its terms of reference to give it the more strategic focus needed. This was, said Professor Rawlings, the Committee’s first year of operation under its new remit, while work at the operational level was now monitored by the Central Sport & Leisure Committee. As part of these changes, the latter had also created a new sub-committee to deal with health and safety in sport. This group had already been active and had considered two specific incidents, one involving the Union’s Underwater Club and the other a Students’ Union minibus.

32. Moving on, Professor Rawlings reminded the Council that the Harlington Trust had been established in 1989 to use the money received from gravel extraction at the Harlington playing fields. Since then the Trust had been authorised to spend up to £50K a year in support of student sporting and welfare activities. However, because current rates of interest were so low, the Trust was no longer receiving sufficient investment income to support this level of expenditure. The Trustees had therefore decided to reduce their total grants to £30K a year. Although this appeared to be a significant reduction, Professor Rawlings confirmed that this would still be sufficient to support all of the better quality applications which they received.

33. Finally, Professor Rawlings noted that the College, at present, had very few sports scholarships and none in rowing, at which Imperial was outstanding. It had been decided therefore to offer a limited number of rowing scholarships of £5,000 per annum from 2003-04. This would eventually have an annual cost of about £50K and initial funding was being provided by the College. An external sponsor would be sought to support the scholarships in the longer term.

COLLEGE ENTRANCE PROJECT (PAPER E)

34. The Deputy Rector, Professor Bearman, presented Paper E and reminded the Council that, when Dr. Tanaka had given his generous donation to fund the new Business School, it had been recognised that this was an opportunity to provide a main entrance on Exhibition Road worthy of the College. The Project Team for the Tanaka Business School had therefore been asked to create a design for the main entrance to provide a general reception and information area and an exhibition space in keeping with the College’s status as a world-class institution. Their proposals, which Professor Bearman presented to the Council by way of a computer animation, would cost £1.1M. The Finance Committee had considered the proposed Project, which was included in the Capital Plan, and had recommended it to the Council for approval.
Resolved: That the capital expenditure of £1.1M on the new College Entrance and associated works, as set out in Paper E, be approved.

PADDINGTON HEALTH CAMPUS (PAPER F)

35. Professor Green presented Paper F and reminded the Council that Imperial had, in 2000, agreed to participate in a proposed development scheme at Paddington, which involved rebuilding the Victorian premises of St Mary’s Hospital and moving the Royal Brompton & Harefield Hospitals (RBHH) to the St Mary’s site. The move of the RBHH meant that the NHLI Division and certain other Imperial College research facilities would have to be relocated to new space close to the St Mary’s Research Building. Imperial’s agreement to the scheme had been on the basis of the national agreement between the Department of Health and the HEFCE, which required that the initiating party - in this case the NHS - paid the costs of relocating its partner - in this instance the College. At the time, the then Rector had written to the NHS to say that the College’s financial contribution to the relocation would have to be limited to the revenue from the sale of College premises. The College had also confirmed that it would prefer a separate building adjacent to the existing St Mary’s Research Building and that an independent procurement route for this building was preferable to an integrated PFI with the NHS. Last year the College had commissioned a space and cost report for the College’s building. The NHS share of these costs had been identified as £59M, with the College agreeing in principle to fund some limited expansion space at a cost of £8M (at 2002 prices).

36. The College had now been informed of a proposal by the NHS to introduce major changes to the Paddington scheme. As a result of these, the space provided for Imperial would be embedded in a much larger NHS building. Furthermore, completion of this building would be in 2013, some three years after the opening of the new RBHH. It was clear, he said, that the proposed timing of the move was unacceptable to the College, the NHLI Division and the Royal Brompton Hospital since it was vital to the work of all three that the Division and the RBHH were able to move into their new premises at the same time. The proposed change would also have significant implications for procurement, although these were more complex. In essence, he said, it would be well nigh impossible for the College to pursue a separate procurement process if its space was to be part of a larger building.

37. Although it was clear that the NHS were determined to press ahead with the development, there was a significant funding gap. Current estimates put the cost of the whole scheme at £900M, while the NHS had so far identified funding of £400M only. Despite this, the NHS intended to go to OJEC advertisement stage by July 2003. Although the College believed the proposed timescale was unrealistic, if the NHS did press ahead, the College would need to be a part of this process to ensure its interests were properly represented.

38. Dr. Eastwood, who was involved in the discussions with the NHS on funding and procurement, said that the revised scheme would require the College to arrange a complex PFI scheme in conjunction with two NHS Trusts. It had therefore been
agreed that, before the Project could proceed, there would need to be a binding Heads of Agreement between all the interested parties. Professor Sir Leszek Borysiewicz supported him, saying that, although there was a substantial funding gap, the proposals had ministerial backing and the NHS was determined that the Project should proceed. Because the work of the Faculty of Medicine on the Royal Brompton and St Mary’s Campuses was closely aligned with the work of the associated hospitals, it was essential that the College was involved in this development.

39. Mr. Gidoomal asked whether the Project also had the support of the Greater London Authority (GLA). Professor Borysiewicz said that the GLA saw the development as a major opportunity for job creation. However, he expected that there would be further debate on the merits of concentrating this amount of expertise and resource in the Capital.

40. Professor Leppington asked what the College would be committing itself to if it agreed to the revised scheme proposed by the NHS. Professor Green replied that the financial commitment lay largely with the NHS. The College would be giving up its premises at Dovehouse Street and its leases on the St. Mary’s and the Royal Brompton Campuses. There was also a commitment to provide funding of £8M for expansion space, as well as the costs of moving to the new premises and providing equipment.

41. Dr. Knight said that a significant risk from the new proposals was that the College would no longer be in charge of its own project, but would rather be part of a much larger PFI scheme. Dr. Eastwood agreed, noting that the NHS would want to employ designers used to producing hospitals, but that they would not necessarily have expertise in the design and procurement of research laboratories to the standard required by the College. However, this problem was recognised by all parties and he believed that the risks could be mitigated through careful management. Professor Green said that there was a greater risk that the NHS might go ahead without the College, which would have serious consequences for the Faculty of Medicine.

42. The Rector remarked that there was also a risk that the sale of Dovehouse Street might not realise sufficient capital to fund the College’s part of the Project. Professor Green acknowledged that the value of this site was, to an extent, dependent on what the NHS chose to do with its own buildings there. For this reason, it had been suggested that the College should agree a price for the site with the NHS, who would then be responsible for selling the building and realising that value. Professor Green went on to assure the Council that the NHS was working closely with the College on the development of the Project and its funding. The NHS had agreed to part-fund the College’s professional fees and, indeed, had paid for the costs incurred by the College thus far.

43. Concluding the discussion, the Chairman drew attention to the recommendation in the Paper that the Council should delegate to the Vacation Powers Committee the power to make decisions on its behalf where these could not be deferred to the next Council Meeting. As Professor Green and Professor Sir Leszek Borysiewicz had pointed out, the NHS was keen to move quickly on this development and it was likely that the College would have to respond to proposals at short notice. It would, of course, be
preferable for the Council to make any decisions, but it had to be recognised that the timescale for response might make this impossible. However, he assured Governors that, if such a situation arose, the Vacation Powers Committee would only act if it was imperative that decisions were not postponed until the Council’s next scheduled meeting.

Resolved: That the Vacation Powers Committee, in conjunction with the Deputy Chairman and the Principal of the Faculty of Medicine, be given delegated authority on behalf of the Council to consider and make decisions on any proposal relating to the Paddington Health Campus, the resolution of which cannot be deferred until either of the Council’s next two Meetings.

58, PRINCE’S GATE (PAPER G)

44. Mr. Brooks Wilson introduced Paper G, saying that the College had purchased the freehold of 58, Prince’s Gate in 1997 and now had the opportunity to make use of the property for its own activities. However, in order to do so the College had to serve legal notices to quit on the current tenants, the Libyan Arab Finance Company (LAFICO) and Huron University, who had indicated that they intended to claim new tenancies in the County Court in 2003. Professor Bell welcomed the College’s proposal to make use of this building, which would, he thought, be ideal for decanting space.

Resolved: (i) That the premises at 58, Prince’s Gate are required to be used by the College for its own use;

(ii) That all appropriate steps should be taken to recover possession of the premises;

(iii) That funding is available for any necessary works to ensure occupation; and,

(iv) That the College’s legal advisers be authorized to proffer at any Court hearing that the College opposes the grant of a new tenancy of 58, Prince's Gate and gives an undertaking that within three months of achieving vacant possession it will occupy the building.

REPORT FROM THE FINANCE COMMITTEE (PAPER H)

45. The Honorary Treasurer, Dr. Knight, introduced Paper H, which was received for information.
FINANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT (PAPER I)

46. The Director of Finance, Mr. Cannon, introduced Paper I. Although this showed little change from the previous Finance Management Report, this was because the College was currently conducting its annual Planning Round. He expected that the forecasts for 2002-03 would be amended following this exercise.

47. Dr. Wilbraham remarked that the contribution to overheads from research projects was lower than the budget level of income for the first eight months and that this was a cause for concern. Mr. Cannon agreed, but said that this was being pursued by the Faculties during their Planning Round meetings with their Departments.

CLERK’S BUSINESS

Revisions to the University of London’s Statutes (Paper J)

48. The Clerk introduced Paper J, saying that the University’s Ordinances required the University to obtain the consent of at least two-thirds of College governing bodies to any proposed revisions to its Statutes.

Resolved: That the Council of Imperial College, hereby consents to the making of the new Statutes by the Council of the University of London as proposed by the Council and as set out in the document headed ‘Revisions to the Statutes’ (March 2003).