

Ashbourne Reborn – Highways and Public Realm Derbyshire County Council

Minutes of Meeting

5th March 2024 at 1:30pm – Ashbourne Town Council

Attendees

Cllr Simon Spencer (Cllr SS)
Jim Seymour (JS)
Kevin Parkes (KP)
Gary Thompson (GMT)
Giles Dann (GD)
Laura Simpson (LS)
Anna Paxton
Kim Dorrington
Tim Allen
Sue Bridgett (SB)
Carole Dean (CD)
Ryan Hunt (RH)
Jamie Missenden
James Stuart
Jen Riley
Ranbir Mander

Company

Derbyshire County Council (DCC)
Derbyshire County Council (DCC)
Derbyshire County Council (DCC)
Derbyshire County Council (DCC)
Derbyshire Dales District Council (DDDC)
Derbyshire Dales District Council (DDDC)
Derbyshire Dales District Council (DDDC)
Town Team (TT)
Town Team (TT)
AshCom (AC)
Ashbourne Town Council (ATC)
Aecom (A)
Galliford Try (GT)
Galliford Try (GT)
Bentley (B)
Bentley (B)

Apologies

Sue Hunter
Cllr Charlotte Cupit
Ian Marsh (IM)

Bentley (B)
Derbyshire County Council (DCC)
Ashbourne Methodist Church (MC)

		Action
1.	Introductions	
1.1	Welcome & Apologies – As listed above	
1.2	Declaration of interest – Nothing to declare.	
2.	Minutes of Meeting	
2.1	<p>SB stated that the minutes from last meeting did not accurately reflect the discussion Item 4.3 and should be updated. SB agreed to supply some words, (subsequently provided and set out below) to LS to ensure it can be highlighted at the next Programme Board. The proposed update to the minutes of 6th February should read as follows:</p> <p>4.3 Design Co-ordination and Progression (Guy Taylor Associates) SB – Guy Taylor Associates (GTA) is willing to share the DWG files for Millennium Square and Shrovetide Walk to enable AECOM to move swiftly and cost effectively to Stage 4 design. To do so GTA has sought some form of legal/novation agreement to recognise that their liabilities pass to the new designer. and indicated that there would be charges to cover their admin costs to amend drawings to remove their Intellectual Property.</p> <p>Following discussion with DCC legal team, GTA was asked to seek costings for the work required, which they did through their RIBA representative. These costs seemed high and the process suggested more bureaucratic and onerous than seemed necessary to give them the legal comfort and cost coverage they required.</p> <p>Action RH - to identify which drawings Aecom require to develop the design in order to minimise costs.</p> <p>Action CD / SB/LS/GT - to draft the form of “letter of comfort” with the reassurance GTA required and issue to partners for agreement before forwarding to GTA for review.</p> <p>Quantum of the revised admin charges to be agreed with GTA.</p>	SB/LS

	<p>Please note - In further discussion following the proposals at PCB, GTA was happy for PCB partners to draft a letter confirming removal of design liability/intellectual property rights and transfer of design risk to Aecom and associated costs were reduced to £250, which was agreed for payment.</p>	
2.2	<p>Matters Arising</p>	
2.3	<p>Street Lighting Aecom still do not have access to the asset information required to complete lighting calculations. RH highlighted that some crossings do not meet the Highways standard for illumination, including the crossing outside the Town Hall.</p> <p>Detail design will be progressed as information comes through, including some Highways elements.</p> <p>DCC are now sending through Requests for information. Cllr Spencer suggested considering bulb upgrades. RH reported that some building owners have requested existing mounted lighting to be removed – no wayleaves etc have been agreed and lights have been mounted historically without a formal agreement in place.</p> <p>Cllr Spencer: Internally illuminated signage is banned through local planning policy for shop premises. Action: GD to check whether this is still a current policy.</p> <p>Horse and Jockey Yard is very dark at night currently. KD still concerned about the lighting in St John Street – which has dark spots at night. Cllr Spencer advised the project team to think carefully about the type of lighting proposed, there are some Sodium lights in the town that would benefit from upgrade.</p>	GD
	<p>Hostile Vehicle Mitigation DDDC and DCC have worked together to prepare a scope which has been issued to Jacobs (framework provider) for a proposal to undertake the required risk assessment and prepare recommendations. Both parties want a template that can be rolled out on a call off basis for other sites in Derbyshire as and when required.</p> <p>GD LS and an Emergency Planning colleague met last week with Police consultees who had originally commented on the LBC application in 2023. They believe that their advice at the time of the application stands and it remains a material consideration due to the potential for a runaway vehicle to strike the Market Place, during use for events but also during everyday use. They acknowledge the constraints and uncertainty around Martyn's Law but still advise the project team to give HVM due consideration.</p> <p>Action: Board to be updated on Jacob's fee proposal in April</p>	GD/JS/KP
	<p>Land Ownership DCC still don't have Title details for the unregistered land adjacent to the Town Hall. Need to ensure that work is carried out legitimately on this land. There is a DCC Highways meeting this afternoon to discuss potential appetite to adopt this land. Cllr Spencer highlighted the risks of this approach due to the potential for delay due to legal timeframes and complications but identified that there are potential other options where DCC has previously maintained unregistered sections. GMT stated that DCC are concerned that landowners could come forward and disagree with the standard of the works once completed. If agreed, notices would need to be advertised, to ensure that a landowner has the opportunity to come forward.</p> <p>CD pointed out that there is a further section of unregistered land on Millennium Square which is additional to the land transferred to the Town Council.</p> <p>Anna and Gary have been undertaking a walk around of properties and looked into basements to consider associated risks of construction in the vicinity.</p>	

	<p>ACTION: Cllr Spencer requested a timeline of actions to address the unregistered land issue to follow this meeting. It is to include implementation of notices and associated timeframes to adopt the land should DCC agree to proceed.</p> <p>JS advised that the highest risk is the potential for accidents on this land should DCC take ownership. The process Gary is suggesting is the mitigation for this risk. Gary to feed back after the DCC meeting today to allow an update to Programme Board on Friday.</p> <p>It was agreed by all that DCC officers should move this forward and start the land acquisition process if agreed at today's meeting. There are areas all over town that aren't included in the project for improvement but these are maintainable by the landowners. Noted.</p> <p>RH raised a need to maintain access for businesses to Horse and Jockey Yard, but this would require crossing private land, if accessing from Shawcroft car Park – The land in question is around 30m in length. It was acknowledged that it would be ideal to upgrade the privately owned area at the same time, however, this would need landowner buy-in and is outside the agreed scope / budget. Cllr Spencer advised that the project needed to avoid mission creep – the project team and PCB Members need to clearly define where the responsibilities of this project start and finish.</p> <p>Unfortunately, there was an accident last week – a lady fell in the street, on private land off Dig St. Horse and Jockey Yard has a drainage issue due to gullies being blocked. Can we approach relevant owners to ask if they want to pay to have this re-paved as part of the project?</p> <p>GMT to arrange a meeting with owners to discuss this, KD to attend.</p>	<p>GMT</p> <p>GMT</p>
	<p>Basements and below ground structures Gary inspected some cellars whilst on a walkaround with Anna in Ashbourne.</p> <p>Does the Board want to instruct a structural survey of properties with Cellars?</p> <p>Cllr S – Can't we mitigate against disturbance during the works through design or methodology? The survey would be too costly and take some time due to the number of properties.</p> <p>RH and GT advised that they need to wait for the detailed design to review what mitigation is required. Potentially moving loading bays if required/where possible to prevent damage to properties.</p> <p>RH to supply the pavements design to GT asap.</p> <p>KD: ensure that trial holes are utilised to review areas of concern and inform design and construction approach. Any trial holes will require appropriate reinstatement within the limits of the LBC Conditions on the Market Place. Comms will be required regarding the programme of trial holes once locations are agreed. AP to add to Comms agenda.</p> <p>GMT: It was agreed to continue to take photos of basements to help to understand / record the existing condition.</p>	<p>RH</p> <p>AP</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Stakeholder Working Group</p>	
	<p>The Stakeholder Working Group met last week. LS has set up a fortnightly series of meetings.</p> <p>Highlight: Recommendation by the Stakeholder Working Group: To keep current wayfinding styles in Heritage Styles, LBC was for contemporary street furniture. This was agreed by the PCB</p>	

	<p>Market Stalls – it was assumed at bid stage that it may be appropriate to supply some bespoke stalls for the Market Place. A canopy is now proposed instead of market stalls.</p> <p>With emphasis on what is needed it is proposed that the project will not supply market stalls or the associated storage. A canopy may be installed later once the project is complete. Fitting points for the canopy would need to be discussed with the Conservation Officer, to see if the concept could be future-proofed within the design. However, it may be necessary to design the canopy first to inform the foundation and location of fitting points. and there is a risk that it may not meet evolving expectations.</p> <p>Action: The Archaeological Watching Brief and LBC are affected by digging on the listed surface, so this needs to be limited. GD/LS to facilitate a discussion with the Conservation Officer.</p> <p>Some ducting for wiring is included already in the LBC along with a water point. There is Daisy chain network ducting for the uplighters.</p> <p>It was suggested that one service channel be dug to allow the installation of ducting that could be left for future use – RH confirmed that this would be additional excavation.</p> <p>The idea is to dig strategically where needed, there is no intention to lift the whole surface due to the cost, time and conservation implications. TC – canopy itself may or may not require additional planning permission. (also to be raised with the Conservation Officer). The intention is for the canopy to be seasonal. It will be removed in winter so consideration should be given to what the Market Place looks like when it's not there, as well as storage and maintenance.</p> <p>Concerns have been highlighted by business owners about the loss of car parking on Market Place. The Board want to highlight the type and location of the parking that will remain as part of a Comms exercise. This should also highlight additional parking too. This could be displayed on the website in the form of a Parking infographic.</p> <p>KD advised that more work is required before this can be shared.</p> <p>Cllr Spencer reinforced that this is a key element and a holistic view needs to be taken and shared at the appropriate time.</p>	<p>GD/LS</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Risk Update</p>	
	<p>Bentley have hosted 2 workshops in January and February as referenced in the Risk Update Report in this month's Board Pack. Both workshops were attended by the Contractor who input into the Construction risks.</p> <p>The project team closed preliminary design risks and reviewed and updated current risks. The report summarises the risks that were closed and highlights the highest scoring risks as well as new risks that have been added.</p> <p>Report high risks section: Phasing of construction stage to minimise disruption– KD feels that this is scored high and should be closed off now. JR advised that it will need to be kept open until the final phasing plan and programme is submitted and accepted, this should be in August once the Notice to Proceed is issued and Stage 2 of the construction contract commences.</p> <p>Decision: The Board accepted the updated register</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p>Design Development</p>	
	<p>Cllr Spencer commented that he had recently driven through Poynton and saw that the design had failed here as everything had collapsed.</p>	

	<p>RH discussed the risk of using small element paving similar to Poynton and reassured the Board that Aecom are looking at alternatives to achieve the same effect, but with more longevity.</p> <p>Clr Spencer pointed out that Church Street re-paving scheme designed for vehicle overrun was successful – not broken up. Learn from this.</p> <p>KD: Observation; St Johns Street East resurfacing already showing signs of rutting – visible when it rains. Action: KP to take back to DCC.</p> <p>GMT confirmed that funding would not allow a full reconstruction but the project can seek to replace some binder where needed (if budget allows).</p>	<p>KP</p>
	<p>Aecom have recently issued the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pack of drawings • Highway GA • Drainage • TRO documents • Road markings • WSI Arch • Tree protection report <p>Aecom have issued whatever they can in draft to aid discussion with GT. Aecom requested a meeting with CD to discuss the updated design for Millennium Square and new drawings received from GTA. Action: RH to arrange a meeting to run through this with CD</p> <p>RH requested discussion of footway widths where they conflict with loading bays as part of the next working group meeting. There is a requirement to ensure tolerance of different vehicles and all users, to ensure everyone has sufficient width to move around. Policing the use of the loading bays and educating the shop keepers to prevent customers parking in loading bays/pavements was also discussed.</p> <p>Aecom have raised the question of tactile paving to delineate the pavement on approach to the loading bay. Board happy to not include tactile paving here. KD: AMC are desperate for the drawing for Station Road 2D geometry – RH there is a 3rd party interest here. Aecom are meeting the BSIP team tomorrow. LS has already updated AMC to confirm that it is requested and on the way.</p> <p>Design Freeze:</p> <p>Aecom need confirmation that everyone is happy with the principles of the drawings shared on Monday 4th March. The Bridge Parapet approach has already agreed by Board in February.</p> <p>Deadline for comments on 2D design drawings – next Wednesday (13th) - Working Group meeting.</p> <p>Materials:</p> <p>RH presented material samples. RH keen to highlight to the group the risks associated with different materials – the project team need to know what is available and try to mitigate these risks. There is a spectrum on this. This is also an obvious area for value engineering.</p> <p>Materials should be agreed in principle by the Highway Authority and also meet the aspirations of the original scheme bid.</p> <p>Aecom to bring a report for material choice and should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost envelope for that area • Alternative material if we cannot afford that product 	<p>RH</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>RH</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State how many square metres of this material • Include supply chain risks / opportunities <p>The Board need options presented to show what is available and the implications of cost, wear and tear, ease of use/maintenance etc.</p>	
6.	<p>Shrovetide Walk Update</p> <p>RH met AshCom on site to discuss requirements and constraints. Aecom are finalising their proposal for the completion of the design work. LS to arrange a chat with SB to run through procurement that has or is due to take place to ensure that it is compliant for the purposes of the LUF2 funding.</p> <p>Novating the planning consents – this is mentioned as a reminder to check whether this applies. Do the existing consents for Millennium Square and Shrovetide need to be Novated to DCC or do they need another legal agreement in place between the applicants and DCC as delivery partner.</p> <p>Planning conditions for both consented schemes should be considered and programmed in to ensure that the planning consents are not compromised. It should be noted that Shrovetide Walk planning consent expires in December 2024. A start on site for Shrovetide must commence by this time.</p> <p>Action GMT: This is a risk to the project and should be recorded as such.</p>	<p>LS/SB</p> <p>KP</p> <p>GMT</p>
7.	<p>ECI</p>	
	<p>The initial programme is 63 weeks. This is split into phases starting on St John St, followed by Dig Street and ends in Station Road with works around Millennium Square/Market Place /Victoria Square interspersed.</p> <p>Full closure of Dig Street is being considered.</p> <p>AMC works are delaying a start on Station Road currently. GT would prefer to accelerate this if possible once the AMC programme is fixed and understood. Full closure of St John street is required for buildability – GT are currently reviewing the impact and benefits of this.</p> <p>Events will be written into the contract for GT to work around inc. Christmas (3 weeks), Shrovetide etc. Need to define the Christmas disruption as this could be an issue. The Christmas lights go up from September, they go across streets and require a cherry picker on either side – ATC need to understand how the works will impact this and how they can work around the works.</p> <p>This early programme gives DCC something to discuss with the DCC Network Team. Small businesses in Dig Street have expressed concerns regarding the impact of construction, especially for those already struggling.</p> <p>GT have based logic on keeping pedestrian access to businesses during their working hours and to go across entrances outside of the business hours (may require 12 hour shifts etc). There are areas that are sensitive to this, they will be pragmatic about this to minimise impact, working late nights etc due to residents living above. KD requested a copy of the phasing plan once it is available.</p> <p>Communications to the businesses and community will be critical here when planning working hours for specific areas – DCC/GT to work together on this. This needs to be discussed with the Streetworks Team – standard shifts are 9 hours – need to request flexibility in the timetable. AP also needs to be advised for wider comms.</p>	

	<p>Draft programme has Shrovetide Walk between February 2025 and June 2025 – impacts on Planning Conditions and match funding made up of both Grant monies and private individuals.</p> <p>SB to confirm which items are required and by when. Is it possible that future orders be placed to ensure that this funding is not lost?</p> <p>Compound Locations</p> <p>JS is reviewing the list of locations sent over previously, he doesn't agree with Rob's conclusions.</p> <p>Jim favours Fish Pond Meadows overflow car park for a compound location – this is owned and operated by DDDC and any alterations need to be agreed with the EA. DDDC have highlighted this as a parking alternative during the works to mitigate the loss of parking.</p> <p>This site has been used previously for a compound and requires some improvement work to make it suitable for significant car park use again</p> <p>DDDC would also need to consider where people are being displaced to. Cllr Spencer stated that this site is not fit for parking during the winter months.</p> <p>Other locations considered by GT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shawcroft car park area on the right, issues re Shrovetide here. • Henmore Brook, grassed area floods here. <p>Fishpond Meadows was GT's preference. LS - need to consider with car parking and Estates teams and adjust communications if car parking options are further reduced.</p> <p>ACTION: GD/LS to review options to support the use of this</p> <p>GD suggested another plot of land to consider near to Screwfix.</p>	<p>SB</p> <p>GD/LS</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Comms Update</p>	
	<p>Following discussion at the Comms Group, Anna had updated the comms protocol which has now been circulated for review.</p> <p>AP made initial contact with national representative bodies for Hauliers. DCC has contact lists for local Haulage operators, GMT to obtain this information and share with AP so that comms can be coordinated between Galliford Try, DCC and DDDC as the project progresses.</p> <p>Timing of communications will be dependent on the finalised programme of works. We have the initial programme, but will need to be clear about what can be shared and when so that communication is clear and consistent.</p> <p>Anna and Gary spoke to over 100 business owners on a walk around Ashbourne, in which businesses were encouraged to complete a survey. This would allow us to contact them about ongoing work that might affect them in a way that is compliant with GDPR.</p> <p>Trial Holes and Parking to be prioritised for discussion at the next Communications Meeting.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Cost update</p>	

	<p>KD requested that the Cost Update is moved up the agenda to allow more time to discuss.</p> <p>KP advised that DCC have received an initial price from GT based on the Preliminary Design – at this stage it is still a high-level estimate. There are lots of caveats – E.g. GT have based material prices on current jobs using similar materials in Stoke, they haven't yet obtained quotes from their supply chain. A detailed review of submitted costs and phasing programme was required and was due to be actioned.</p> <p>KD noted that the cost slide states the cost differential is mainly increased ECI fee and prelims and queried why we are paying more for this.</p> <p>Prelims – the budget was based on a 50 week programme. GT's initial programme is 63 weeks. The extended programme increases the cost.</p> <p>KD requested the phasing plan to understand the areas listed in the – DCC to supply to partners.</p> <p>It was noted that some items are missing from the cost plan such as the bridge parapet works.</p> <p>Cllr Spencer stated that he is not seeing as much progress as expected and wanted to see the programme length reduced.</p> <p>KP to confirm the cost of ECI to date once he has reviewed the application just received from GT. The Board want to be satisfied that DCC are getting Value for Money from the ECI process.</p>	<p>KP</p> <p>GMT/KP</p> <p>KP</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>DLUHC Update</p>	
	<p>The next return to DLUHC is due on 26th April. This should reflect all expenditure up to the end of the financial return. LUF grant expenditure has not been as high as expected to date and it will be important to show as much eligible expenditure defrayed as possible before the end of the financial year. LS requires all invoices from DCC as soon as possible but no later than 18th March, which means contractors need to provide invoices to DCC in advance of this.</p> <p>DLUHC have offered to support in discussions of Value Engineering. It is likely that DLUHC will consider any future project request forms more favourably if they are included in this where appropriate. LS has advised that a preliminary review of costs through ECI is underway therefore identifying Value Engineering and potential de-scoping will follow as soon as possible. DLUHC have now formally agreed to an October 2025 completion.</p> <p>This support has been welcomed by AMC in the delivery of the Community hub. LS to issue a holding response with regard to the Highways and Public Realm project.</p>	
<p>11.</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p>	
	<p>Cllr Spencer raised concerns around the current disruption from the BSIP project. The mitigation measures warning motorists of works are too close to Ashbourne to be effective; they should be moved further out to prevent vehicles driving into traffic without warning.</p> <p>Cllr Spencer requested an update on the re-location of the mitigation measures and the route of the diversions.</p> <p>GMT to bring an update back to the next meeting.</p> <p>AP has contacted representatives of the hauliers – how do we bring these work streams together to encourage the companies to take the diversion routes in liaison with the DCC Highways? DCC has contact lists for these Haulage operators, GMT to obtain this information and share with AP. The Town Team could assist with this too.</p> <p>Cllr Spencer advised that the mitigations need to start now to stop the HGVs meeting on Clifton Road, this should be achieved under a TTRO.</p>	<p>GMT</p> <p>GMT/KD</p>

	Date of Next Meeting:	
	13.30 - 2nd April 2024	