



MOUSEHOLD HEATH CONSERVATORS

12.15 p.m. – 1.50 p.m.

1 October 2010

Present: Councillors Bradford (chair) and Brociek-Coulton, Mr M.Bryant and Mr C.Southgate

Apologies: Councillor S.Little, Mr M. Davies and Mr D.Cannon

1. VISIT TO LOCAL COMPANY TO LOOK AT MODULE FOR FOUNTAIN GROUND CHANGING ROOM

Members and officers visited the premises of a local company, to be known as 'Company A', to look at an unused demonstration sports changing room module that had become available

2. NEW FACILITY FOR FOUNTAIN GROUND CHANGING ROOM

Anne Napier, planning team leader attended the beginning of the meeting to give informal advice on planning procedure. She said whatever facility the committee decided on would need to be submitted as a planning application. Chris Bennett, conservation and design officer would be providing advice before the application was submitted.

Gary Bagge, principal technical officer said the conservation and design officer may stipulate that the new facility features a pitched roof as opposed to the preferred flat roof design which would add several thousand pounds to the existing quote.

The principal technical officer explained how he had been working with 3 commercial companies, named as 'Companies A, B and C' for the purposes of the meeting, in order to retain their anonymity. He said if the proposed facility was to be designed and built from scratch, any interested companies would need to be contacted for comparable quotes as per procurement regulations. The council would be unable to contact 'Company A' solely.

The principal technical officer asked the committee to consider if they would prefer a facility built to Football Foundation (FF) specifications.

The chair confirmed that funds for the facility were available in the capital fund and were included in the remit and gift of the Mousehold Heath Conservators within normal council parameters.

The principal technical officer said the best option would be to opt for a company who would deal with the complete process including the planning and building control applications, method statements and installation so the contract would be with a single party. Once negotiations had been entered into, the interested suppliers would be informed that as the project would be subject to planning risk, the application would be at their own risk. Should it fail then the council would not reimburse the cost of any fees. He said he would oversee the installation of the facility, any health and safety issues and engage with the arboricultural officers. If the building was looked after then he was confident it could be maintained for 20 to 30 years.

The principal technical officer said 'Company B' had quoted £38,000 for a Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliant module plus approximately £5,000 for delivery and crane installation.

In response to a question from the chair, the principal technical officer confirmed that 'Company A' had quoted £25,000 for the module seen that morning and there would be extra costs for additional facilities required. The principal technical officer expressed concern that as the existing module used a domestic sized cylinder, it would not have the capacity to deliver the hot water required and said he would be seeking a second opinion from council engineers. The diameters of the module were 3.4 metres wide by 12.2 metres long.

The principal technical officer circulated 2 drawings that had been submitted by 'Company C' detailing examples of FF approved and non FF approved modules. The cost of a 2 team, DDA compliant, FF approved facility which measured 3.6 metres wide by 18 metres long could potentially be £100,500. There would be an additional cost of a possible £15,000 if a pitched roof was required.

The principal technical officer said the companies he had spoken to so far were happy that the existing site could accommodate the roll track for a crane and there would be no need to create or widen any entrances nor remove barriers.

The sports development officer said although the module seen that morning at 'Company A' was not fully FF compliant, Gavin Lemmon from the FF had said that he was happy with the level of facilities it provided. However, the application to the FA for the grant of £20,000 would need to be based on a building that reached their specifications. If the Conservators did not opt for this module there was a strong likelihood the FF would purchase it to place at the Football Development Centre in Bowthorpe.

The sports development officer said if the Conservators wished to apply for the grant, the council would need to go to tender before an application could be made which could take weeks to process. This would be a risk as the funding of £20,000 was not guaranteed and it was not possible to claim for retrospective grants.

The principal technical officer said 'Company A' had entered into an agreement to supply buildings to a large national company. The structure seen that morning was under guarantee for a year and providing that any damage was not maliciously caused, the warranty included fixtures, fittings and services. After a year, the maintenance would be covered by the council's own contractor.

Members discussed the viability and the options of providing an additional module to the facility to be used for office space and discussed the possibility of it being used by the Mousehold Heath wardens or as a small meeting room.

RESOLVED to:-

- (1) ask the principal technical officer to:-
 - (a) contact 'Company A' to negotiate the cost of a facility upgraded to FF specifications for a response within a 2 week period, and ask that they include the following improvements to the module seen that morning:-
 - 4 showers on each team side rather than the existing 2;
 - 2 toilets on each team side rather than the existing 1;
 - addition of DDA compliant shower and toilet facilities;
 - provide separate cost for additional 36 square metre area linked to module for possible office space to be able to accommodate 12 people;
 - (b) simultaneously invite 'Company A' and other interested companies to submit tender applications over a 4 week period;
 - (c) obtain a quote for 'cost in use' from Norse, the council's contractor for future maintenance costs for the unit;
 - (d) speak to the council's conservation and design officer with regard to the preference of a flat roofed facility;
 - (e) liaise with the Chair once a draft specification is prepared and more information is available.
- (2) ask the sports development officer to enquire with the FF if they have a set specification for the module or flexibility in the criteria;
- (3) refer the matter to the next meeting of the Mousehold Heath Management Sub-Group for final consideration.

CHAIR