

Minutes of the Community Centre Committee of Aston Clinton Parish Council, held on Monday 10th June, 17:45 at Aston Clinton Parish Meeting Room

Present:

Councillors: -

L Tubb - Chairman

L Ronson

M Mason

R Stewart

K Loxley (Co-opted member)

G Holder (Co-opted member)

Clerk: E Barry (and Community Centre Project manager) (recording)

0 members of the public

19.68 Apologies

Apologies were accepted from Cllr Read.

19.69 Declarations of interest

There were no declarations.

19.70 Election of Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman

MOTION: To agree a chairman for the year to May 2020. Cllr Tubb PROPOSED by Cllr Ronson, SECONDED by K Loxley and AGREED.

MOTION: To agree a vice chairman for the year to May 2020. Cllr Read PROPOSED by Cllr Tubb, SECONDED by Cllr Stewart and AGREED.

19.71 Co-option of new member

Giles Holder had been approached due to his vast experience in construction projects and being local to the village, to assist the Committee with the project and agreed to join the Committee as a non-voting member. The Committee AGREED to Co-opt him on to the Committee.

19.72 Minutes of the last meeting

19.73 Committee members

- Cllr Tub
- Cllr Read
- Cllr Ronson
- Cllr Mason
- Cllr Stewart
- K Loxley (Co-opted member with voting rights)
- G Holder (Co-opted member with non-voting rights)
- Cllr Watton (at the next meeting she is available)

Cllr Tubb reported that Cllr Watton had expressed an interest in joining the Committee but was currently away on holiday. The Committee AGREED that would be a good idea and that she could join at the next available meeting.

MOTION: To agree Committee members as above, PROPOSED by Cllr Ronson, SECONDED by Cllr Mason and AGREED.

19.74 Committee Terms of reference

The draft revised Committee Terms of reference had been circulated and the Committee AGREED to the changes subject to the following minor amendments: Increase of Committee members to 8 as this was such a large project, and the addition of G Holder as a non-voting member.

MOTION: To agree Committee terms of reference, PROPOSED by Cllr Ronson, SECONDED by Cllr Stewart and AGREED.

19.75 Public Participation

There was none.

19.76 Project update

i. PMs report – was as follows:

- Complete Building Control had been appointed to provide the Building Control Services
- The Dawn/Dusk emergent Bat surveys showed that there were no bats roosting in the building
- Planning decision was expected very soon
- Application for final outstanding S106 contribution had been approved (land to south of Aylesbury Road)
- Members of the Committee had met with the M&E consultants and architect to go through the lighting proposals
- The Committee were looking at the tender process
- The project is still on target for an end of October start date
- Temporary accommodation – budget had been approved, suppliers down selected and working on finalising order and quote
- The Committee were welcoming Giles holder as a co-opted member of the Committee and were very grateful for his support

ii. Supplier report

Cllr Tubb read the following report from the Architects:

Hayward Smart Architects.

- Drawing package (including specification) issued to Dawn Lodge Associates to commence tender preparation.
- There may be tweaks and modifications to be accommodated on receipt of M&E packages and client related responses.
- Main Hall image issued with this email.
- AVDC Planning Dept yet to issue Decision Notice.

- CDM Principal Designer to receive of Architects and Structural Engineer's packages today.
- Independent Building Inspector (Complete BuildingControl) appointed and in receipt of Architects and Structural Engineer's packages.
- Key ongoing requirements for us are as follows:-
 1. Decision on Lift (whether platform cabin (electric) - 21 seconds or passenger (hydraulic)- 5 seconds.
 2. Kitchen equipment arrangement from your cafe tenants.
 3. Asbestos survey.
 4. Anti finger traps to doors from Main Hall to Terrace?
 5. Public space hearing loop

CBG Consultants - Are reporting progress as follows:-

We are aiming for 21th June to submit our documents. However, they require the following information requested below.

Mechanical:

1. What requires gas supplies & the gas loads in either m³/hr or KW for the kitchen
2. What requires water supplies in the kitchen
3. What drainage is required in the kitchen
4. The location of the equipment going into each area. (café, servery, large kitchen and small kitchen)
5. What size & ventilation rate does the cooker hood have? And is fresh air provided via the cooker hood?

Electrical:

1. Ground floor and first floor kitchen layouts
2. Kitchen electrical loads and data sheets
3. Preferred café & servery lighting options
4. Is there any preference with the lighting on the first floor staircase
5. The furniture layout, E.g. tills, movable furniture.
6. Details of the van you use during larger events as we require the estimated loads.

ARM Associates

Have issued first draft drawing package, with a few remaining drawings and specifications to follow shortly. HSA are in the process of reviewing and integrating where necessary.

Andy Miles has also reported the following in addition:-

We have not had an intrusive ground investigation undertaken, and in order for a Contractor to send soil from excavations to landfill they will need chemical analysis of a few samples undertaken. Hence, we can either arrange this now and have some trial pits dug and samples taken or we ask the Contractor to do it. The issue with getting the Contractor to do it is that it may delay the start of digging foundations.

Thames water for making connections to the existing sewers, these will require input from the Contractor but we can start the process.

iii. BAT survey report for sign off

MOTION: To approve sign off of BAT survey report, PROPOSED by Cllr Ronson, SECONDED by Cllr Stewart and AGREED.

19.77 Budgets –

Cllr Tubb suggested this item was deferred to the next meeting as there was a lot to get through and the Committee would need time to discuss these items properly. The Committee AGREED to this.

i. S106

ii. Cash Flow

iii. Temporary Accommodation

19.78 Quotes

i. Image of vaulted ceiling –

The working party at a meeting with the Architect had agreed that this would be a useful addition and the Chairman and Clerk authorised the spend, under the authority of Aston Clinton Parish Council financial regulations 4. BUDGETARY CONTROL AND AUTHORITY TO SPEND 4.1. whereby the Clerk, in conjunction with Chairman of Council or Chairman of the appropriate committee, can authorise spends of up to up to £500.

MOTION: to approve at a cost of £500, PROPOSED by Cllr Stewart, SECONDED by Cllr Mason and AGREED.

ii. Asbestos Surveys

Cllr Tubb read out the following recommendations for the Asbestos survey:
A full access demolition survey is required prior to the demolition works as you know. This is an intrusive, destructive survey and we are unable to carry them out if a property is occupied or if it's going to continue in use following the survey. Here are the options with comments:

1 – Wait until the site has been fully vacated and undertake a full access demolition survey.

This is the most straightforward option but may have an effect on the project programme if asbestos containing materials (ACMs) are identified and there's limited time between vacating and demolition.

2 – Carry out a preliminary survey, a management survey along with intrusive inspections where possible, and then return once the site has been vacated to complete the intrusive inspections and provide a demolition survey.

This would give information on any accessible ACMs which can be factored into the programme.

There still may be concealed items that wouldn't be discovered until the full access survey.

Would require 2 visits so higher cost.

The first survey would still need to be done while the property is unoccupied.

The Committee AGREED that the second option was the preferred option, being less disruptive to Business as Usual for the café and children’s soft play. Further quotes would be sourced for the next meeting. **ACTION: Cllr Ronson and Cllr Mason to source further quotes**

MOTION: To approve commissioning of survey ahead of demolition, PROPOSED by Cllr Mason, SECONDED by Cllr Ronson and AGREED as a two stage survey.

MOTION: To approve a quote to perform the survey, deferred to next meeting for further quotes.

19.79 Invoices for Payment

Invoices for payment under £5,000

Supplier	Amount	Any comments
1. CBG	£2,500.65 ex VAT	Design and development & part technical design and production

MOTION: To approve payment of invoices under £5,000, PROPOSED by Cllr Stewart, SECONDED by Cllr Read and AGREED.

Invoices for payment over £5,000

Supplier	Amount	Any comments
1. Hayward Smart	£20,000 Ex VAT	Interim fee account for working drawing in April
2. Hayward Smart	£10,500 Ex VAT	Interim fee account for working drawing in May + 3D image of interior
3. A R Miles Associates	£6,500	February – April fee for design development

MOTION: To recommend payment of invoices over £5,000, PROPOSED by Cllr Mason, SECONDED by Cllr Stewart and AGREED.

19.80 Design changes and decisions

i. Vertical shaft riser –

The Clerk, reported that the following design change request had been made by CBG:

We need to incorporate a vertical electrical shaft (riser) to service the first floor. This is best located centrally and needs to be accessible. Jak and I have been looking at this and have attached ground and first floor GA plans with the proposed riser’s location added and cloud highlighted. This solution relies on a 90 degree turn as the cables transition from ground to first floor within the suspended ceiling. This will result in 0.5sq.m taken from the Cafe and the smaller meeting room. – Further After reviewing the containment that is required on the first floor. The riser can reduce to 600mm x 300mm but this will limited the future capacity of the containment to the first floor.

MOTION: To agree to suggested location of vertical shaft riser, PROPOSED by Cllr Stewart, SECONDED by Cllr Ronson and AGREED.

ii. Lift specification

The following lift options had been circulated to the Committee for research and decision:

The more economic lift would be a “cabin platform lift”. This installation does not require a lift pit or lift overrun and is driven by an electric motor. The lift car can take up to 5 people (400kgs). It’s speed however is 0.15m/s , so 21 secs to travel. The more standard lift would be a “passenger lift”. This installation is hydraulic and requires a 1.4m deep lift pit and 1.2m lift overrun at first floor. It is hydraulic so therefore quicker. It can take up to 5 people (400kgs) and has a speed of 0.65m/s , so 5 secs to travel. Both lift specifications have the same size lift car (and fit out specification capability). The hydraulic lift is dearer (approx. £30,000 +VAT + Installation + Formation of a water tight lift pit). The Cabin platform lift is approx. £25,000 +VAT + Installation).

Cllr’s Ronson and Tubb had researched the options and both were recommending the cabin lift over the hydraulic mainly due to reliability factors. Cllr Ronson and visited a number of sites where either a hydraulic or cabin platform lift was in operation and the cabin lift had proved for all as the more reliable one. G Holder stated that it was important to ensure that it was from a good manufacturer.

MOTION: To agree a lift specification, PROPOSED by Cllr Stewart, SECONDED by K Loxley and AGREED to the Cabin platform lift.

iii. AV proposals –

the AV proposals had been circulated to the Committee along with budget costings of around £26k. This would be reviewed once the main contractor was selected, if the budget wouldn’t stretch to everything, items on the list could be reduced or modified. Also, further grant funding may be sought for this.

MOTION: To agree AV proposals PROPOSED by K Loxley, SECONDED by Cllr Mason and AGREED.

iv. Hearing Loop requirements –

Cllr Stewart had been tasked with researching into hearing loops and played a video to the Committee explaining how they worked. She went on to explain that there were a number of potential issues with any solution adopted unfortunately including room leakage. Cllr Stewart suggested the following to be taken into consideration:

- Must comply with Part M of the Building Regulations
- Portable units for the meeting rooms on the 1st floor
- Need to look at what the rooms are being used for
- Issues around the dividing of the main hall with the partition
- Ideally lay room loop in the floor in a Zig zag pattern

It was AGREED that the M&E should provide the Committee was options for agreement at the next meeting.

MOTION: To agree hearing loop requirement, was referred to the next meeting.

19.81 Design details – fixtures and fittings-

MOTION: to agree design details, PROPOSED by Cllr Ronson, SECONDED by Cllr Mason and AGREED.

Item	comments	Comments latest	Committee Decision	Meeting Decision date
Sustainability approach	Air source heat or gas?	CBG will give us some costs compared to the gas boiler route But preference for Gas boiler approach Following meeting with CBG and Architect on 16 th May (see notes) Gas boiler	Gas boiler with provision for future proof addition of Air source (therefore big enough cable to be run)	10 th June Agenda
- Entrance/foyer	Discussed at meeting with CBG where the group and Greg developed this idea	Aston Clinton Lighting Design options for decision – between option 1 and option 2 (as per example images provided by CBG)	Option 2	10 th June Agenda
- First floor staircase	CBG ask - Is there any preference with the lighting on the first floor staircase		Pendant light feature TBD. Cllr Mason to provide options	10 th June Agenda
- Meeting rooms	Lighting control options: 1. Have scene setting by the three doors into the meeting rooms that are linked to the partitions contactors. This would mean that when each partition wall is closed the lighting would work independent from eachother, and when the partition walls are open the lighting would work as one system. 2. Have simple switching resulting in the lights needing to be manually switched on when the partitions are open. The three rooms will be dependant from eachother unless the switch is operated. Option 1 is around £1500 more than option 2.		Option 1 – with GH recommending to go for better option for tender with the ability to value engineer after if needed	10 th June Agenda
Main Hall to Terrace door	Architect requests decision on whether we want anti finger traps		Agreed to anti finger traps	10 th June Agenda

19.82 Tender Process

The working party had discussed the proposed tender process drawn up the the QS and had felt there were a number of changes that needed to be made with it. The Clerk recommended a meeting with the QS to discuss in full which was AGREED to.

ACTION: Clerk to set up a meeting.

19.83 Temporary Accommodation – update

K Loxley presented the temporary accommodation timeline and it was AGREED that things had since this was last discussed and K Loxley AGREED to revise the document and re-circulate.

19.84 Date of next meeting

No date was set.

.....Signed:

Date:.....