



**Corby TIP Board meeting
Friday 30th September 2022 10am – 12pm
Via Teams**

	<p>Present:</p> <p>Lorna Dodge (<i>Chair</i>), Valerie Finke, Brian Degruchy, Victoria Phillipson, Cllr Brackenbury, Cllr Buckingham, Zara Parker, Helen Willmot, Pat Jones, Simon Phipps, Dan Pickard, Jack Gordon, Mike Newport, Nick Bolton, Rebecca McHugo (<i>Minutes</i>)</p>	
1	<p>Welcome and apologies</p> <p>Apologies received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Rob Bridge- Hilary Chipping- Paul Thompson- Cllr Pengelly – Cllr Buckingham attended as deputy- Tom Pursglove – Zara Parker attended as deputy	LD/RM
2	<p>Minutes from previous meeting</p> <p>The accuracy of the previous meeting minutes from were agreed – no comments were made.</p> <p>One action from the previous meeting for a press release to be added to the website – Val Finke confirmed this action is complete.</p>	LD
3	<p>Highlight Reports on three of the projects</p> <p>VF provided update on the three projects:</p> <p>Accelerated Fund:</p> <p>Continuing to look into the second phase of George Street. The traffic survey is complete but the report on the findings has not yet been received which will hopefully come through soon. Once the report comes back the team can move forward with costings and looking at the timeline which will be reported back to the Board.</p> <p>Town Fund:</p> <p>VF advised that the 6th Form project will be discussed in more detail by PJ under item 4 on the agenda.</p> <p>It was noted that for the combined projects MN will be providing an update under item 5 on the agenda.</p>	VF



	<p>It was also noted that there is a separate agenda item (item 6) for the Multi-use Building paper which VF will be updating on. VF advised that they are still in the engagement process that started at the beginning of September as this was extended for 10 days due to the sad passing of Queen Elizabeth and the area being taken up by the book of condolences.</p> <p>No comments/questions from the Board were noted under this item.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Bedford College verbal update and highlight report on 6th Form College project</p> <p>Earlier this week the key document for the second phase of pricing was sent out. This included over 300 specifications and drawings, up to level 4/5 design stages which makes it easier for the principal contractors to price the work and there is a 5 week timescale for this. There are two 4 hour slots to spend with both principal contractors to go through any questions they've got which will be hosted by the procurement consultant to make sure that everything is done professionally and that information is shared to both contractors to ensure a fair 'playing field'. After the 5 weeks, they will then run through the analysis of the contractors pricing and information they have sent back in which will then go into a formal interview stage and one of the principal contractors will be appointed.</p> <p>PJ advised they are still working on the lease with SP and are in the process of organising a meeting to discuss some of the issues that have been raised by the lawyers.</p> <p>The tender packages have been coming back in for the roofing works. PJ advised that they didn't receive as many as they were hoping for but they are going to ask their procurement consultant to find out why people aren't interested in pricing the roofing package.</p> <p>PJ advised that they have been working on the fire strategies which has meant they have had to change their designs slightly around exiting the building and are now having to keep the concrete stairs at the front. (detailed information in the report circulated by PJ).</p> <p>There are 3 recruitment days set up to be hosted in the Cube, Corby which will be around the recruitment of students. It was also noted that they are about to go into the recruitment phase for staff as well which will begin in January.</p> <p>SP added that on the lease they are just waiting for the college's lawyers to give them a list of what is outstanding ahead of the meeting being set up – PJ confirmed she has asked them to send this through.</p>	<p>PJ</p>



	<p>SP asked when the 5 week timescale for the contractors started? PJ confirmed this started on Tuesday morning (27/09).</p> <p>LD asked PJ to update her when they are starting to promote for the jobs so they can add them on to the jobs section on the Love Corby website.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Update on Town Centre to Train Station and Smart & Connected Corby</p> <p>MN provided update.</p> <p>Summary of progress since last meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concept design of Corby Station Link completed. - Cost estimate completed and submitted to NNC for review. - Business case completed and submitted to DLUHC, currently awaiting a decision. - CCTV Survey of drainage systems complete. - Services of WSP extended allowing scheme development to continue with the below. - Commencement of Topo Survey anticipated to be completed shortly. - Traffic survey of road users complete, now setting up meeting with NNC officer to confirm scope of traffic modelling. - Commencement of works to identify suitable locations for Connected Corby Sensors and engagement with preferred supplier. - Issue of briefs to commence arboriculture tree surveys and accessibility of station steps. - Public engagement materials prepared and event ending 10/10/22. <p>The public engagement exercise was programmed to take place between 02/09 – 30/09 and due to the sad passing of Queen Elizabeth II, this has since been extended to 10/10. This event has included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distribution of tri-fold leaflets around the local area. - Leaflets being left at Corby Train Station and Local Garage on Elizabeth Street Roundabout. - Press and Social media notifications and articles. - Erection of information signs on Oakley Road and Elizabeth Street Roundabout. - Information posters installed in advertisement boards within the Town Centre. - Displays board permanently erected within the Cube in Corby between 02/09 – 10/10. - Attendance at the display by NNC and WSP on 5th, 13th, 21st and 29th Sept between 10am – 4pm. <p>To date there have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 46 people have attended the staffed events over the 4 days we were there. 	<p>MN</p>



- 43 comment cards received.
- 152 online comments.
- 10 emails received with comments.

The key comments from people to date are:

- The cost of the scheme is expensive and could be used to fix pot holes.
- There is already a cycle route on the southern side of Oakley Road.
- Existing and future safety concerns about the entry/exit between Oakley Road and East Avenue.
- Better to spend money improving the surface regularity of the existing footway (safety concern from several mobility scooter users)
- Will e-scooter users be able to use the cycleway and can they be prevented from leaving scooters in the footway.

Early lessons learnt from the event:

The teams under selling of the 'public engagement' – Significant feedback was received at the staffed events saying that before the design was completed there should have been some engagement with the public and the local community.

Once it was explained that the 'public engagement event' as exactly that and no firm design has been undertaken and a further 'consultation' exercise would be carried out later, those providing the feedback became more receptive and engaged.

It was noted that it may be beneficial that this strategy is clearly explained and positively promoted in future events.

Understanding of costs – It seemed that the public assumed the costs of the scheme were purely the construction of the new pedestrian and cycleway improvements. It was not clearly understood that the scheme costs included the reconstruction of Elizabeth Street and the carriageway narrowing works to Oakley Road and other associated works such as drainage.

It was noted that it may be beneficial if consideration is given to providing a high-level breakdown of costs for future events.

Next steps:

- Analyse the feedback from the engagement event and prepare a report summarising responses and recommendations.
- Complete the topographical survey and update the concept plans.
- Complete the site identification of the sensors.
- Complete the traffic modelling with the NNC highways team.
- Seek the views of the scheme from the NNC highways team.
- Complete the accessibility assessment of the Station Car Park steps.
- Complete the arboriculture survey of trees along the route.
- Submit the updated design to the Road Safety Audit team for their comments.
- Following the comments from the Road Safety Audit team we will prepare a brief for the next stage of the design.



	<p>Cllr Brackenbury added a comment to thank MN for a very clear run through of this project.</p> <p>RH added thanks to MN and VF for their efforts with regards to the engagement that's taken place.</p> <p>RH queried with MN whether there was any feedback that came back in terms of loss of parking? MN advised that the loss of parking was mentioned. There are 7/8 houses that front Oakley Road either side of the East Avenue. MN advised that they spoke to two of the residents of those properties and explained that they do have ideas on how we can retain the parking. The resident was very understanding and supportive of the scheme but very concerned about the loss of her parking. MN advised that it wasn't as big of an issue as perceived in the press compared to other feedback provided however it is an issue and it has been recognised.</p> <p>RH queried whether there would be scope to delay any of the pending surveys until after the consultation finishes? MN advised that they have been very mindful of not predetermine anything so the surveys that have been commissioned are gathering data that would still be of use to the Authority should the scheme not go ahead.</p> <p>JG queried whether the earlier proposal to have some of the Connected Corby sensors within the pedestrianised town centre is still the case? MN confirmed that as far as he is aware that is still in the brief to identify footfall, points of entry etc.</p> <p>Cllr Buckingham raised a comment regarding the Corby Rail Link and what's going to happen within the station to make it more accessible and the route around that pushchairs/mobility scooters etc will have to take if the connectivity by the stairs isn't done and why has this been missed out of the consultation? MN advised that ideally the link would come from the town centre to the steps and some accessible steps would be put into the station car park to the train station however looking at the historical information discussed when the steps were designed it's a concern as to whether or not we can do that within the remit of the scheme and it's unclear as to what the extent of putting in a set of accessible steps and ramps would mean in terms of land safety impact on the private property. MN added that once the assessment has been done if putting in the accessible steps/ramps is deemed not acceptable the fallback position they have is to look at how we can improve the pedestrian connectivity from the bottom of the steps, along Oakley Road and around on to Station Road.</p> <p>Cllr Brackenbury added that he supports what Cllr Buckingham has raised above around accessibility to the Rail Link and suggested that when these matters come up to contact Cllr Buckingham offline for her advice.</p>	
6	Multi-use Building Options paper	VF



VF presented the Multi-use Building Options paper previously circulated to the Board.

To progress to the next stage of the Multi-use Building development, a way forward needs to be approved for this project. VF advised they have looked into 2 different site options with the third being the rejection of both.

VF advised that they spoke with both NNC's internal legal team and an external legal team, the Assets team, the Planning team and commissioned a building surveyor for advice. On the external legal advice they were advised that both sites comply with the principals of the EU UK trade and subsidy control act providing certain steps were undertaken. They did point out that the more poignant point would be the value for money obligations and the significant factor would be the cost and the usability of the site.

It was noted that the Assets team pointed out that due to Option 1 being in NNC's ownership it would provide more certainty and therefore a reduction in risk.

The Building Surveyor discussed the pro's and con's of both sites (detailed in the report circulated).

VF highlighted the most poignant feedback provided for both sites.

It was noted that in terms of the refurbishment side of things, Option 1 would stay within budget however Option 2 would not fall outside of the budget due to external works that would need to be undertaken.

The Planning advisor said that both sites would be good for the area but did note that Option 2 is situated close to residential accommodation and strongly advised early engagement with development management and environmental health.

There is also an option 3, which is to reject both sites but this would potentially result in the multi-use building project being put at risk and the £1.5m allocation of the Town Fund being withdrawn by DLUHC. Therefore, it is considered not a viable option to consider.

VF advised that as set out on the scoring system in the report and the information available at this time, Option 1 would be the preferred option. This is due to the initial costs of the refurbishment. NNC's Property Surveyor has also concluded a potential lower risk to the financial outlays and on going costs if Option 1 is the chosen option. Our specialist legal advice has noted the significance of the Value for Money, this will form part of the feasibility study on the chosen site in the next stage.

VF asked Board for comments/queries:



	<p>Cllr Buckingham and HW both raised concerns around the disabled access if Option 1 is the chosen site. VF advised that there is a disabled lift in the building and that if this is the chosen option, there will be a reconfiguration of the ground floor to make it a more open area.</p> <p>SP advised that he doesn't feel that the paper fully addresses both options and feels that there are some unanswered questions around the pro's and con's of each site that the Board need to consider in order to make an informed decision.</p> <p>JG added that he feels that the pro's and con's list for each option needs reviewing and an agreed set of financial terms on both sites would be useful.</p> <p>JG queried with VF what has to happen by the end of the 3 month extension if this is approved? VF advised they would have to do a full feasibility study and have a full business case written. Both of which take time due to the procurement process.</p> <p>HW queried whether there is an option to commission the feasibility study to include both sites? VF advised that if we were to do a feasibility study on two different buildings it would incur two different costs and we don't have the funds to do this.</p> <p>PJ added that as somebody independent to this they have sought independent advice from a surveyor and advised that she thinks this adds weight to the argument because it is completely independent and there is no invested interest from that person.</p> <p>LD advised that the next step would be to have a conversation without SP and JG present for the Board to put their opinion forward in terms of the next steps and agree the options to be progressed.</p> <p>SP and JG left the meeting.</p> <p>Following a discussion regarding the pros and cons of both of the options a vote was taken and it was agreed that Option 1 be progressed.</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>Communication</p> <p>LD advised that there has been lots of comms following the engagement over the last 6 weeks.</p>	<p>LD</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>The 3 month extension on the multi-use building will be put forward if the Board doesn't have any objections – Approved, no objections were raised from the Board.</p> <p>LD asked Board if anyone has an issue with the meeting minutes being uploaded to the website? Approved, no objections were raised from the Board.</p>	<p>LD</p>



9	Date of next meeting: Friday 11 th November 2022.	

DRAFT