

## Ashbourne Reborn – Highways and Public Realm Derbyshire County Council

### Minutes of Meeting

1<sup>st</sup> October 2024 at 1:30pm – Century Hall, Ashbourne Methodist Church

#### Attendees

Cllr Simon Spencer (Cllr SS) (Chair)  
Cllr Charlotte Cupit (Cllr CC)  
Jim Seymour (JS)  
Kevin Parkes (KP)  
Giles Dann (GD)  
Laura Simpson (LS)  
Anna Paxton (AP)  
Carole Dean (CD)  
Chris Webster (CW)  
Sue Bridgett (SB)  
Ian Marsh (IM)  
Scott Harris (SH)  
Jamie Missenden (JM)  
Kirsty Antcliffe (KA)  
Jake Hargreaves (JH)  
Cat Astley (CA)  
Matt Allanson (MA)  
David Lynch  
James Overton (JO)

#### Organisation

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)  
Ashbourne Town Council (TC)  
Town Team (TT)  
AshCom (AC)  
Ashbourne Methodist Church (AMC)  
Aecom (A)  
Galliford Try (GT)  
Galliford Try (GT)  
Galliford Try (GT)  
Jacobs (J)  
Arcadis (Ar)  
Arcadis (Ar)  
Arcadis (Ar)

#### Apologies

Kim Dorrington (KD)  
Tim Challans (TC)  
Lee Hassan (LH)  
David Hooton (DH)  
Ryan Murphy (RM)  
Gary Thompson (GMT)

Town Team (TT)  
Town Team (TT)  
Jacobs (J)  
Aecom (A)  
Galliford Try (GT)  
Derbyshire County Council (DCC)

		Action
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introductions</b>	
1.1	<b>Welcome &amp; Apologies</b> – As listed above.	
1.2	<b>Declaration of Interest</b> No additional interests declared. The Board was reminded of the importance of raising any conflicts of interest at future PCB meetings.	<b>All</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes of Meeting and Matters Arising</b>	
2.1	Previous minutes accepted as a true and accurate record.	
2.2	<b>Land Adoption</b> The Executive Director Report is currently with DCC's legal team who are making comments. It is expected that this will be returned allowing for Chris Henning to sign off on Wednesday.	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Finances</b>	
3.1	As it stands the project is £1.26 million over budget but this is being actively reduced with the proposed solutions circulated prior to the meeting. Even with the introduction of all viable value engineering suggestions as outlined, a further reduction of circa £190k must be found.	
3.2	The process for value engineering the design will continue in a meeting tomorrow to seek to understand the detail of the identified options and any further potential areas to bring the project back within budget.	
3.3	CW queried about the risk within the construction budget being part of GT's costs. However, MA reassured the board that this is standard procedure and perceived to be best practice.	

3.4	MA is recommending that the ulticolour is not used to save £72k. He suggested that the change in user behaviour will still be driven by the narrowing of the roads in the absence of the change in surfacing material. This would also help to manage the risk of the low likelihood of utility companies replacing like for like surface course leading to a patchwork quilt effect over time. Even in the case of matching like for like surface course, inconsistent aging of materials would not give the aesthetic impression desired. CW and GD felt value engineering this element out should be a last resort and that a gateway treatment would need to be proposed if this course of action were to be taken.	
3.5	The full closure of St John Street would lead to a financial saving of circa £350k, generating a time saving of 7 weeks on the programme with St John Street itself being shortened by 12 weeks from 31 to 19 weeks. During this time, service and pedestrian access can be maintained for businesses.	
3.5.1	Safety during the construction period will also be made easier to ensure through the St John Street closure.	
3.5.2.	The process for the decision to commit to the full closure of St John Street has been laid out and will be presented to the Programme Board within a package of deliverable cost saving options but relies on careful co-ordination of all required works on the network by DCC.PCB agreed this option unanimously.	
3.5.3	Cllr SS reiterated the need to develop the options for different diversion scenarios throughout the construction phase of the scheme.	
3.6	Further rescoping is still going to be required to bring the project back within budget.	
3.6.1.	JH agreed to investigate savings on Dig Street, but it is felt that this is unlikely to generate significant additional savings.	
3.6.2	To avoid requiring multiple project adjustments with MHCLG, LS noted that we must remain within a tolerance of 30% of the previously agreed outputs.	
3.6.3	A project adjustment request will still be required for agreement to move funding between financial years because the change required exceeds set thresholds. However, this is being actively managed through liaison between DDDC and contacts at MHCLG and is anticipated to be low risk.	
3.6.4	The further work on value engineering will seek to ensure the areas for rescoping remain within the 30% tolerance for changes in outputs. The goal will be to deliver as close as possible to the original vision through lower cost interventions to give a similar result to what was initially proposed. These re-scopings could occur throughout the project area. This approach was agreed by the PCB.	
3.6.5	The week commencing the 21 <sup>st</sup> October is the Local Government Conference Week which will mean Cllr SS will not be available to attend Programme Board. However, it was difficult to change the date of the Programme Board as it would also feed into a meeting of DDDC Community and Environment Committee proposed to be held on 24 <sup>th</sup> October, and required to enable final approval of the submission of any Project Adjustment Request, as this would alter the agreement between MHCLG and DDDC as the accountable body.	
3.6.6	Papers for the next C&E meeting must go 8 days in advance of the meeting but it is felt that given circumstances it may be possible to send papers to follow the agenda. LS is to confirm the dates of the meetings to support the Programme governance (To note C&E meeting now confirmed on 29 October, a week after Programme Board).	
3.6.7	The critical path will be at risk if the decision to proceed is not confirmed to support submission of the quarterly monitoring return and consistent information within a Project Adjustment Request by the current MHCLG monitoring deadline of 1 <sup>st</sup> November.	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Project and Programme Updates</b>	
4.1	<b>Aecom Deliverables</b> Aecom assured the PCB that their deliverable package will be arriving today or tomorrow at the latest. Aecom are to issue the final construction pack by 25 October for everything they are currently commissioned to do.	<b>SH</b>
4.2	<b>Shrovetide Walk</b> This discussion is to follow on from the delivery of Aecom's package. LS, GD and SB are to discuss the status of Shrovetide Walk following the PCB meeting.	<b>LS/GD/SB</b>
4.3	<b>Millennium Square</b> Insurance is being sought as there is a need to cover the unregistered land between the highway and Town Council land should someone claim ownership in the future. A solicitor from DDDC had provided further advice. The planning application has been submitted for the Victorian Lighting column.	

4.4	<b>Hostile Vehicle Mitigation</b> Thornton Tomasetti has issued a first draft with comments being delivered last week. An updated version is to be expected on the 8 <sup>th</sup> October following DDDC and DCC review. Road safety works have been checked in conjunction, with no major risks anticipated.	
4.5	<b>Henmore Bridge</b> The EA permit has now been granted allowing for works to commence on the 21 <sup>st</sup> October. Additionally, DDDC has received the EA permit for the compound.	
<b>5</b>	<b>Traffic management</b>	
5.1	There will be a local and a wider diversion plan courtesy of GT liaising with DCC. Cllr SS has requested to be invited to these discussions.	<b>JH</b>
5.2	There is a concern that work will be taking place during the summer season, but it was reiterated that a change in project completion date would increase the risk associated with approaching MHCLG for further extensions. The full closure of St John Street would not start straight away.	
5.3	The first section of works in Dig Street will commence the first week of January with the St John Street closure planned 9 weeks later after the Shrovetide Game on the 5 <sup>th</sup> March. GT will start in earnest from the 6 <sup>th</sup> allowing for Christmas Lights to be up until the 5 <sup>th</sup> January.	
<b>6</b>	<b>ECI Inputs</b>	
6.1	<b>In Town Site</b> This will be reassessed following the rescoping exercise.	
<b>7</b>	<b>Risk</b>	
7.1	<b>Risk Update</b> Risk has continued to be managed with shifts in a positive direction because of the EA permits being granted which was previously identified as a Top 5 risk. JO is updating the Risk Register to circulate with the client team prior to the next PCB. This will also feed into the MHCLG quarterly submission on the 1 <sup>st</sup> November.	<b>JO</b>
7.2	<b>Environment Agency Delays</b> There is nothing outstanding with the Environment Agency regarding permits. DDDC is to meet with the EA to discuss Shrovetide Walk but a design is required for this. Confirmation over what is deemed to be a material start is also to be sought through DDDC planning officers. Once a full design is proposed, the planners and the EA will need to review the entirety of the scheme as well as the material start information.	<b>DDDC</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Design Development</b>	
8.1	<b>Market Place Paving Strategy</b> GD shared the plan for the Market Place paving strategy setting out the techniques used on the indicated areas: Orange - Fix and replace as required (footway and access road). Green – Fix and replace as required and full grout. Blue - New limestone setts with blocks saved for re-use (see yellow) Yellow - Infill with saved limestone setts - tree pits, channel strips and roadside parking bay	
8.2	<b>EqIA</b> GD informed the board that the District Council had received contact from disabled users regarding the provision of disabled parking provision within the scheme design on and near the Market Place, as well as 2 local councillors, and consider it to be insufficient. The area identified for a disabled bay(s) is towards the bottom of the Market Place due to this being the most level area allowing for easier access when alighting vehicles. There is already provision for one disabled bay in this location, but the proposal is to increase this to two spaces. Cllr SS queried this approach and expressed the concern that disabled spaces are often under-utilised. PCB voted to retain the Market Place parking as per the current plan	
8.3	<b>Market Place Drainage Update</b> Aecom is preparing their proposal. The Fish and Chip shop owner has been engaged in this process and historic knowledge shared by DDDC for consideration. Aecom and	<b>SH</b>

	the partners want to make sure this opportunity to improve the drainage for the area is not lost.	
8.4	<p><b>Material Choices – Gateways, Crossings and Kerbing</b></p> <p>It has been decided that the conservation kerbing will be specified to make cost savings subject to a sample being agreed by the DDDC Conservation Officer.</p> <p>It is felt that the desired impact of the Gateways will be hard to achieve as any significant strip could be misinterpreted as a crossing. Aecom is currently presenting a metre strip with no drop kerb.</p> <p>LS proposed an alternative suggesting 'SLOW' text across a patch of red high friction surfacing on the road.</p> <p>There is not enough room on the footway for signage which rules this out as a potential solution.</p> <p>This will be reviewed further once there is greater cost clarity.</p>	
<b>9</b>	<b>Communications Update</b>	
9.1	<p><b>Public Engagement Timings</b></p> <p>It was agreed that the public engagement session should take place on 3<sup>rd</sup> December after earlier dates of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> November were tabled. This is to enable sufficient lead in time for preparation of presentation materials and details of the works to be finalised.</p> <p>SH has confirmed that the visuals will be ready for that date.</p> <p>There is a need to check if Councillor Hughes and wider partners across the Programme are content with this date.</p> <p>Drop-In sessions will be planned around the main engagement session.</p>	<b>AP to co-ordinate preparations</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>MHCLG Update</b>	
10.1	The submission deadline for the next quarterly update to MHCLG is 1 <sup>st</sup> November 2024. The requirements for what will feed into this have been previously outlined in these minutes.	
<b>11</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
11.1	<p><b>Date of the Next Meeting</b></p> <p>The next meeting will take place on the 5<sup>th</sup> November. This will take place in Ashbourne Town Hall council chamber.</p>	