

BENTLEY

Ashbourne Reborn – Highways and Public Realm
Derbyshire County Council

Minutes of Meeting

06th February 2024 at 1:30pm – Ashbourne Town Council

Attendees

Cllr Charlotte Cupit (Cllr CC)
Jim Seymour (JS)
Kevin Parkes (KP)
Gary Thompson (GaryT)
Giles Dann (GD)
Laura Simpson (LS)
Anna Paxton (AP)
Kim Dorrington (KD)
Tim Challans (TC)
Sue Bridgett (SB)
Carole Dean (CD)
Ian Marsh (IM)
Ryan Hunt (RH)
Jamie Missenden (JM)
Sue Hunter
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)
Ashbourne Methodist Church (MC)
Aecom (A)
Galliford Try (GT)
Bentley (B)
Bentley (B)

Apologies

Cllr Simon Spencer (Cllr SS)
Jen Riley
Scott Harris

Derbyshire County Council (DCC)
Bentley (B)
Aecom (A)

		Action
1.	Introductions	
1.1.	Welcome & Apologies – As listed above	
1.2.	Declaration of interest – Nothing to declare	
	Action All – To complete the Declaration of interest form and return to the email address provided.	All
2.	Minutes of last meeting and matters arising	
2.1.	A true record of the meeting	
2.2.	Matters Arising	
2.3.	Update of ECI Contract	
	JS – The ECI contractor is not yet formally in contract, because the paperwork needs to go through the Midlands Highways Alliance Framework provider. Every effort is being made to have the contract completed.	



	<p>The immediate Implication of this delay is that we cannot use Galliford Try to tarmac the area on Millennium Square. Gary Thompson (DCC) has resolved this by instructing DCC internal FM Services team to lay the tarmac.</p> <p>JM - assured PCB members that work has not stopped, Galliford Try are still working at risk and are developing the construction phase programme and construction cost.</p>	
2.4.	<p>Street Lighting</p> <p>Aecom is currently developing the fee proposal for detailed design on the Lighting. They have a meeting with DCC/DDDC lighting maintenance officers on 07.02.2024 to review the existing lighting offer and the long-term lighting strategy for the public realm areas and highways.</p> <p>KD – raised a concern that St John Street was not well lit in the evening. This has been due to a street lamp not working or there may be a need to add additional lighting units. He asked that this is also considered as part of the lighting strategy review.</p> <p>Aecom will provide an update at the next PCB meeting.</p>	
2.5.	<p>Hostile Vehicle Mitigation (HVM)</p> <p>GD – A joint effort was proposed by DCC and DDDC to review HVM. A draft brief has been prepared to appoint a specialist to complete a risk assessment and review HVM requirements for Ashbourne Reborn. At the January Programme Board meeting the need to consider a county-wide approach was also discussed. The preferred procurement route is through a Framework as this will be quicker for this project. Once a final brief is agreed, DCC propose to engage a specialist for this project with the method / approach providing a template which can potentially be applied to other locations within Derbyshire.</p> <p>KD – At the Programme Board Meeting, it was queried as to whether this project should fund the specialist work or recommendations on Martyn’s law.</p> <p>GD – It is proposed that the specialist fees be met from the project/programme fees allocated to DCC/DDDC from the Highways and Public Realm project (only budget available). Further consideration would be needed regarding the cost of any measures recommended.</p> <p>LS – Within our current design there is already some design element for bollards etc. that may support HVM. Part of the brief would be to consider existing measures against latest guidance.</p> <p>KD – We have assumed the line of trees will form a natural solution to HVM around the Market Square in the long term . However, until such time that the trees reach maturity, there may be a need to install bollards in the right locations as a solution.</p> <p>DDDC/DCC will provide a further update at the next PCB meeting</p>	
2.6.	<p>National Grid Sub-Station update</p> <p>Gary Thompson met with National Grid to recommend that the proposed sub-station is relocated to near to the Scout Hut (rather than Millennium Square). National Grid have advised that there are no plans at this stage to install a new sub-station.</p> <p>Gary T has forwarded Paul Elliott’s contact details to National Grid with the recommendation that should there be future need for a sub-station then they consider the suggested location within their evaluation.</p>	



	<p>KD – it would be useful to understand National Grid future plans for Ashbourne? Gary T confirmed that they have no immediate plans for other sub-station installations.</p> <p>Action Gary T – To confirm with National Grid, what/where their future plans will be in Ashbourne.</p> <p>KD – There is ongoing work going on in Ashbourne Town Centre, whereby telecom providers are installing ducting for future needs. The works along Cokayne Avenue will have a visual impact on the area, especially as the resurfacing works had been completed in the last 6 months. Is it possible to restrict future access once the highways and public realm works has been completed on this project?</p> <p>GT – It is possible to restrict access after the works are completed using Section 58 of the Highway Act. However S58 is not applicable “in emergency situations”, for example a burst water pipe.</p> <p><i>(A section 58 notice under the Highways Act 1980 allows a local authority to protect a street from any planned street works following any major surfacing works.)</i></p>	<p>Gary T</p>
<p>2.7.</p>	<p>Public Realm / Stakeholders Working Group</p> <p>LS - Following the 1st Stakeholders Workshop, RH has put together an action tracker. RH confirmed it had been issued and will resend to those partners who did not seem to have received it. The stakeholders working group is a forum to discuss the future use of any public space under this project, along with work to support related final design recommendations.</p> <p>KD – the working group as end users, commented on the logistical and operational use of public spaces, such as outdoor seating areas / WIFI/ Canopy instead of market stalls</p> <p>Aecom will use the feedback from this group to see how it could influence the design. Consideration is being given to the following key questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the space be used? • What impact does this have on design? • What are the future management arrangements? • what is the cost impact of these management arrangements? <p>LS – another example is Licensing. DDC need to understand and manage the required licensing arrangements for the outdoor space during construction and afterwards.</p> <p>Action RH - Re-issue the tracker Action LS - Arrange follow up meetings to address the actions on the tracker. Action LS – Arrange a re-occurring monthly meeting</p>	<p>RH LS RH</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Millennium Square update</p>	
<p>3.1.</p>	<p>CD – ATC is getting ready for Shrovetide. DCC are to level out Millennium Square, making it safe for Shrovetide.</p> <p>KD – at January’s Programme Board Meeting it was proposed that Millennium Square be managed as part of the main Ashbourne Reborn Highways and Public Realm Project. Noted</p> <p>KD Proposed the Agenda to this PCB meeting is amended as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Welcome/Apologies 	



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising 3. Project and programme update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk • Cost update 4. Design development 5. Shrovetide walk 6. ECI update 7. Comms and Events 8. DHLUC 9. AOB <p>Stage 4 design – Aecom will be completing the S4 detailed designs for Millennium Square. They are awaiting the DWG files from Guy Taylor, which ATC will issue in due course. Aecom will then issue then a fee proposal to DCC for taking on these Stage 4 design duties.</p>	
4.	Design Development	
4.1.	<p>Bridge Parapet Outline Options</p> <p>RH presented the Bridge Parapet Options Report (<i>appended for reference</i>)</p> <p>After considering the options PCB members preferred Option 1 with Option 2 as a VE option. The reasons for selecting these options, include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1 – this is the most aesthetically pleasing but is potentially high risk to the bridge structure. Galliford Try will need to carefully consider the buildability of this option. • Option 2 (as a VE option) – this is a simpler and more cost-effective solution to option 1, but the fixing and maintenance may require more design and construction work. <p>Decision – For Aecom to design Options 1 & 2 (with the view that option 2 is considered as a potential VE solution if necessary)</p> <p>SB - will the EA be consulted? RH - Aecom confirmed they would be consulted as they develop the detailed design, which may influence final design.</p>	
4.2.	<p>C3 Searches update</p> <p>RH - Aecom has reviewed the C3 returns. They have engaged with some utility providers and are chasing those that have yet to respond. DCC has commissioned some of the C4 detail design costs, allowing Aecom to engage with Utility Providers on detailed design discussions.</p> <p>Discussion to date, the GPR survey indicated that some services on St Johns Street and Dig Street are shallower than expected. This means these may conflict (service clashes) in areas where Aecom have proposed loading bays.</p> <p>Aecom will develop a plan marking the locations of trial holes to determine the depth of services and clash potential. Aecom will provide an update at the next PCB meeting.</p> <p>KD – have the road space bookings been logged for the trial holes?</p>	



	<p>RH – confirmed Aecom have made the Road Space Booking for the project, including trial holes. These will be updated once the contractors programme is known.</p>	
<p>4.3. Design Co-ordination and Progression (Guy Taylor)</p>	<p>SB – Guy Taylor is willing to share the DWG files for Millennium Square and Shrovetide Walk but have sought a novation agreement to recognise that their liabilities pass to the new designer and stated there will be charges to amend drawings to remove their Intellectual Property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £1,000 for legal costs to prepare the draft Novation Agreement. • £450 per hour for their legal team to negotiate on the Novation Agreement • Plus cost of £100 per drawing to remove Guy Taylor’s intellectual property <p>Guy Taylor has sought advice from the RIBA and have requested a letter/legal agreement between parties confirming removal of design liability/intellectual property rights and transfer of design risk to Aecom.</p> <p>LS / Gary T – are looking into whether the legal team at DCC can support if required and avoid prohibitive legal costs. However, a simple email confirmation was proposed in the first instance.</p> <p>Action RH - to identify which drawings Aecom require to develop the design in order to minimise costs.</p> <p>Action CD / SB - Ask Guy Taylor to draft the form of letter with the reassurance they require and issue to partners.</p>	<p>RH</p> <p>CD/SB</p>
<p>5. ECI update</p>		
<p>5.1. Potential Compound Locations</p>	<p>JM – RW’s last working day is 12th Feb 2024. He has been handing over to Jim Stuart. JS has reviewed the recommended compound locations provided by DCC and Aecom.</p> <p>JS believes The Airfield location that was proposed at last month’s PCB is not feasible, because it presents challenges getting material to site. JS will undertake his own desktop review and present his recommendations at the next PCB meeting.</p> <p>There is no change to taking an empty retail unit in the town centre as a drop-in centre. Galliford Try’s Public Liaison Officer will also be based there. However, the timing of this will be related to the start on site.</p> <p>KD & IM advised that Alan Matkin has an empty shop in the town centre.</p> <p>Action IM KD / or Tim C – to email Alan Matkin contact to JM and any other potential contacts for vacant business units around Ashbourne Town Centre</p> <p>Next Steps – Once contracts have been signed Galliford Try will contact the shop owner to set up a base in the town centre to commence contract mobilisation.</p>	<p>Town Team & IM</p>
<p>5.2. Contractor’s Programme</p>	<p>JM – the Draft ECI phased programme has been developed by the ECI team and is going through the internal review. Once approved JM will issue it to DCC/Bentley when approved.</p> <p>Progress to date</p>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attended the risk workshop and will be attending the next workshop booked for 12th Feb 2024. • Compound location – JS is doing a secondary desktop study • Parapet review – ECI team are reviewing options <p>Planned activities for next month</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be discussing programme & cost at the next PCB meeting (N.B. these are based on 2D preliminary drawings issued at the last design freeze date). • Will review Earned Value Analysis/ market testing and comparing similar past projects delivered by Galliford Try • Will be developing a monthly cashflow forecast <p>Jim Stuart will be attending then next PCB</p> <p><i>(Earned Value Analysis (EVA) is used to measure and assess the progress and performance of a construction project)</i></p>	
5.3.	<p>Contractor's Cost Review</p> <p>With the programme underway the 1st construction estimates are in progress. They will be ready for internal sign off next week and then will be issued to project team.</p>	
6.	<p>Risk update</p>	
6.1.	<p>A risk workshop took place on 29th January 2024, where the project team and Galliford Try reviewed and updated the Construction related risks that were included in the Risk Register at Funding Bid Stage.</p> <p>A further risk workshop has been arranged Monday 12th February 2024 to update the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Close the Preliminary Design risks (RIBA Stage 3) b. Review the current project risks <p>An updated Project Risk Register will be included in the board pack for next month's PCB.</p>	
7.	<p>Project and Programme update</p>	
7.1.	<p>The Project Status remains Green.</p> <p>Programme – the project programme has been updated to include the contractor's indicative dates (as issued by RW). The construction phase is not on the critical path so there is scope for the dates to move.</p> <p>The next programme milestone is the Stage 4 detailed design and carry out the trial holes to be completed by 29th March 2024.</p>	
7.2.	<p>Cost Position</p> <p>Page 6 of the Board Report refers to the Project Costs.</p> <p>The Stage 3 Cost Plan was updated to include the following changes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a more detailed breakdown of costs as requested by board members. • Changes to Professional Fees include ECI fees and inflation. • Shrovetide Walk – updated design information was issued to Bentley. <p>Action - ML to provide a summary note on the changes of the cost position between the last 2 months (Jan 2024 & Feb 2024).</p>	ML



	<p>Page 7 of the Board Report includes the Spend Profile/Cashflow with the s-curve as requested by PCB members.</p> <p>KD – why is the spend-to-date not tracked on the s-curve? KP – the spend to date is the actual figures of payment defrayed. Whilst the invoices may be issued there is a lag between invoice issued and payment made. The spend to date reflects the monies defrayed.</p>	
7.3.	<p>Project Issues – please refer to the project board papers.</p> <p>Further Project issues were discussed under AOB.</p>	
8.	<p>Communications</p>	
8.1.	<p>AP – since last meeting AP has met with stakeholders and project partners. AP has taken ownership of the Communication Grid developed by Aecom.</p> <p>An action taken at the last Programme Board Meeting was for AP to review and update the Communications Protocol.</p> <p>A Comms Meeting has been arranged on Friday 9th February 2024 for Comms working group to review the existing protocol and agree the suggested changes.</p> <p>The update protocol will provide clarity on comms ownership and responsibilities between partners (DCC/DDDC/Galliford Try).</p> <p>JM – Galliford Try need to be clear on roles and responsibilities for communication to ensure Galliford Try’s Public Liaison Officer (PLO) can support AP in the right way.</p> <p>LS – Confirmed AP’s role is an additional comms resource to the project and should complement the duties that Galliford Try’s PLO will undertake. AP will not be taking on the responsibilities of the PLO.</p> <p>AP met with Kate Harrison to understand the seating arrangements outside business premises and review how we communicate to businesses for this project.</p> <p>Action AP – to liaise with Cllr Spencer regarding communicating with business. <i>(Cllrs S preference is that we approach businesses once, communicating all the changes on the project).</i></p> <p>CD – There is potentially an office/ desk available at the front of the town hall. ATC may be happy for AP to use this room as a Hub, to show presence in the Ashbourne, subject to confirmation with Members.</p> <p>Ian M - who owns the events list, who is operating it and how do people add to it?</p> <p>LS - confirmed it is owned by the comms group following input from partners but has been provided to GT for consideration in the construction plan and is also an agenda item with the working group related to the future use of the public spaces, including through the construction period. Any further event information that partners become aware of should be shared with the Comms Team, who will also share it with the working group.</p>	AP
9.	<p>DLUHC update</p>	



<p>9.1.</p>	<p>LS - Q3 Funding return has been submitted and acknowledged by DLUHC. No queries have been raised as yet.</p> <p>The deadline for the next return (Q4) is 26th April 2024. The project programme and costs need to be firmed up for the submission. Any areas for de-scoping need to be flagged at this return.</p> <p>DLUHC has requested further information for assurance purposes. DDDC is working on this with the S151 officer and CEO.</p> <p>DLUHC provided a further update on support available from them, to address any project barriers. They are setting up a website with a knowledge hub and portal for putting in a request for support.</p> <p>JS – sounds very good but would have been more useful a year ago.</p>	
<p>10.</p>	<p>Any Other Business</p>	
<p>10.1.</p>	<p>2D Geometry and Kerb Lines Design Freeze</p> <p>RH – Aecom would like to freeze the 2D designs which detail the kerb lines and 2D geometry. An approval from PCB, will allow Aecom to share these designs with the wider project team, and will help Galliford Try firm up construction costs. Aecom will email PCB members a design pack for approval.</p> <p>Gary T – what are the design changes? When you circulate the design pack, please can Aecom highlight the changes so that it is easy to identify.</p> <p>Action RH – to email the design pack with changes clearly marked-up on the plans.</p> <p>Action ALL PCB Members – to review the design pack and provide comments and/or confirm approval of design freeze via email return.</p> <p>Action RH – if required Aecom can arrange a Meeting to discuss any comments before freezing the designs.</p> <p>Action Cllr CC - To advise Cllr Spencer of the 2D Geometry and Kerb Lines Design Freeze</p>	<p>RH</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>RH</p> <p>Cllr CC</p>
<p>10.2.</p>	<p>Landownership</p> <p>Gary T – The project includes re-paving of land in front of business along Buxton Road (either side of the Town Hall). However, some of this is not included in the existing land registry information so it is not clear on who owns the land or who maintains it.</p> <p>The risk of, (DCC/DDDC) not owning the land means we cannot necessarily re-pave this area and we will have a mixture of material.</p> <p>If DCC take ownership of this area then we can include it in the project and DCC can ensure it is constructed to adoptable standard.</p> <p>Before DCC consider the options for how they take ownership. DCC need to be clear on whether or not there is appetite to take ownership of the land in front of businesses along Buxton Road and other locations.</p> <p>Action GT - to seek a decision from DCC to confirm whether or not they are willing to adopt the land.</p>	<p>GT</p>
<p>10.3.</p>	<p>Basements and Below-ground Structures</p>	



	<p>Gary T – It is likely that some businesses will have below ground basements/cellars. For example on St Johns Street there is a level difference between the footpath and the rear of the buildings which may indicate a cellar beneath the shop.</p> <p>The work requirements under this project means we will be using heavy construction machinery i.e. when resurfacing. Use of heavy construction machinery is likely to cause vibration which may cause structural damage to the below ground structures (basements/cellars).</p> <p>To avoid the risk of a potential claim from businesses owners, (that our work has caused structural damage to their basements/cellars), DCC is seeking permission to scope a proposal detailing what investigative work is required to complete a pre-condition survey of the buildings. This could otherwise become a construction risk and cause project delays.</p> <p>Discussions confirmed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early engagement with business owners is needed, to establish the presence and extent of below ground structures. • Permission from business owners will be needed to undertake a photographic pre-condition survey. • If businesses do not permit access, then DCC/DDDC/Galliford Try need to consider the risk it will cause to the project? <p>KD – has already shared a stakeholder contact list of all businesses in the project area with Gary T. DCC can use this as the first steps to making contact.</p> <p>Action Cllr CC – to update Cllr Spencer on this project issue Action Gary T – to make contact with business to determine whether they have a cellar or basement. Action RM – to add this to issue to the project issue log.</p>	<p>Cllr CC Gary T RM</p>
<p>10.4. Traffic Survey Count</p>	<p>KD – At January 2024 Ashbourne Reborn Programme Board Meeting, Cllr Peter Dobbs queried the Traffic Count numbers within the minutes of 09th January 2024 PCB meeting.</p> <p>Cllr Dobbs advised the vehicle count was significantly lower than previous information reviewed by DDDC. He would like to know:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When was the traffic count survey undertaken? 2. What was the exact count? <p>Action RH – Aecom to re-check and respond to Cllr Dobbs questions</p> <p>PCB members agreed that it would be beneficial to review the results of the survey completed by DDDC.</p> <p>Action LS - to source any related traffic survey data from DDDC Environmental Health and share with project team.</p>	<p>RH LS</p>
<p>10.5. AOB by Town Team (KD)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TTRO - The current TTRO for BSIP project and housing development, has significantly reduced the number of HGVs travelling along Dig Street. It demonstrates this is working. The TT would like to see something similar during the construction phase of this project 2. Material Choices – the town team would like to see material pallets to understand the recommendations that are being made for the project. 	



BENTLEY

	<p>3. Former Loading Bays – how do we discourage drivers from running over the footpaths that were formerly loading bays?</p> <p>RH – Accepting there will be some overrun on footpaths, Aecom has taken a two-pronged design approach;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Use of material to clearly demark footpath and loading bay boundaries2. Use of protected materials on surfaces of known loading areas <p>Gary T – DCC is also considering the long-term maintenance of loading bays, so will be commenting on material choices and reviewing the construction build-up to ensure it can withstand the load of overrun.</p>	
10.6.	Date of Next Meeting – 5th March 2024 at 1:30pm at ATC	

