

Over Haddon Village Hall Management Committee Development Sub-group **Minutes of Open Meeting on 18/1/09 at the Village Hall**

Attendees from Sub-committee: Dick Foxon (RF), Martin Chresta(MC), David Head(DH), Clyde Frith, Roger Truscott, Stephen Miller, Marion Ambler, Tricia Gillies

Attendees from Public: list available from RF on request.

Apologies received from Steve Pope.

For details of all presentations see attached copy of PowerPoint document.

1) Introduction

MC introduced the reason for the meeting to update everyone on progress and next actions following confirmation of the Big Lottery Fund (BLF) grant. He detailed the people on the sub-committee and their relevant experience and qualifications that have been used to project manage the scheme to date.

2) Project Details and Timescales

RF discussed the project line to date, this commenced in 2006 and included:

- list of current maintenance issues
- Wish List of desires
- meeting with ProHelp and supply of initial architect costs FOC
- Sustainable Development Fund Grant for initial research
- Investigation of initial BLF grants
- Jan 2007- first subcommittee meeting to discuss three options (do nothing, maintain, redevelop)
- Resident survey (120 replies, 81% say redevelop)
- Apr 2007 BLF Stage 1 application
- December 2007 Stage 1 accepted, progress to Stage 2
- April 2008- Professional Team of Architect, QS, CDM Coordinator appointed
- £17K of £24K allowance for professional fees spent
- Planning Consent received on 15/8/08
- Stage 2 application made and positive reply received in December

Highlights of the above had been made available to those interested in 'The Voice' newsletter, flyers and Open meetings

RF then gave details of the budgeted figures for the project, the grant funding offered to date and the current deficit. He explained other funders approached and outstanding offers e.g. Garfield Weston Foundation who had to date offered to help, but had not committed to a figure.

DH explained the contractual process we intended to pursue to proceed through the tender stage, including:

- formalizing the Project team of professionals, including ourselves as the employer

- short listing prospective contractors by analysing H&S and performance data
- Credit checks on shortlisted contractors prior to tender to limit to 3-5 contractors
- QS to produce invitation to tender letter
- Architect to produce fully detailed drawings and bill of materials so contractors can quote based on a guaranteed maximum price
- Team analysis of tenders to check price, compliance etc
- Post tender meetings with leading contractors to check details
- Ensure insurance cover is in place to protect us against the contractor going bust
- Aim for contractor award by December.
- Architect to lead contract through 6-12 month Defects Liability Period

Questions

Q - Frank Parker – thanked in general for information given, but queried what contingency was included in the £534K budget?

A – DH advised 7.2% that was felt sufficient based on detailed design being produced.

Q – Frank Parker – asked whether BLF experience was used in selection of successful contractor?

A – DH/RF – as BLF are main financier they are involved in contractor selection. It was believed they were mainly influenced by price, but there would be some ability for client to appeal if concerned e.g. if one low price and rest far higher etc.

Q – Peter Saunders – from personal experience in Builders Merchant industry many contractors are currently going bust and many community projects were in danger. How would we ensure against this?

A – DH explained our intention of requesting a Bond in place prior to start of contract. This would be in the order of 10% and would ensure that along with unpaid work in progress (WIP) that if the contractor went bust enough money would be available to finish off with a replacement contractor.

Q – Keith Butler pointed out that many private developers were not insisting on Bonds, hence the problems mentioned in previous question, but questioned the ability of contractors to get Bonds in the current climate?

A – DH advised this was commonplace in the construction industry and confirmed that failure to establish a bond through a reputable insurer would leave OHVHC no option but to drop that contractor.

Q – Carol Jones asked what were the opportunities to delay the contract bearing in mind the current economic problems?

A – RF advised that to meet the BLF requirements we needed to start the tender process by May 2009 and start on site in Dec 09.

Action - It was suggested we should negotiate with BLF to find their thoughts on the current situation or stretch the dates.

Q – Bob Osborn – asked if the Bond was our requirement or from BLF?

A – DH advised requirement was from OHVHC and re-iterated we would stall if no bond.

Q – Frank Parker – what would happen if the tenders were not within budget?

A – DH/RF advised we would not proceed further and would be able to charge the professional fees incurred to the 5% allowance from BLF. This has been confirmed in writing and means OHVHC would not be out of pocket.

Q – Keith Renshaw – could we share knowledge/contractors with Parwich Village Hall Committee who also have a BLF grant?

A – RF- this was felt to be useful, initial contact had already been made and was to be pursued.

Q – Helen Head – were other similarly funded projects already in progress that we could investigate?

A – RF believed not as this was first round of community project funding.

Q – Michael Hall – pointed out there was still a substantial shortfall. How were we to cover this?

A – RF – until the project was tendered we were unsure as to what is the actual shortfall, if any. We had many other smaller grants we could chase and some benefactors had come forward e.g. supplier for sanitary ware. Biggest open offer was still from Garfield Weston Foundation who had said they would help once shortfall known.

Q – Pat Thurlby – questioned the availability of grant funding for repairs now? Also pointed out Youlgrave have been successful!

A – RF – estimate for maintenance work required to Hall at present approx £40K, but this would leave many items in a poor condition. RF searches for funding on a regular basis, but finds it is more project based e.g. new toilets – we have too many issues! Youlgrave have benefited from aggregate or landfill levies; these are not available in Over Haddon as we are too far away from quarries and do not suffer heavy lorries.

Q – Bob Osborn – wants to be sure that if proceeding cannot be 100% guaranteed that we have a maintenance option. He does not want to take a risk and questioned the security of a bond.

A – RF – confirmed also that the trustees couldn't take a personal risk so we would need to be confident to proceed.

Q – Tim Thaw pointed out that material prices would probably be in decline and asked how payments would be made to the contractor?

A – DH explained procedure of monthly valuations by contractor based on work and materials used and carried out. The QS checks and certifies these prior to the architect raising a certificate for payment. We would then pay (via BLF) in agreed period of time. It is within our interest to agree as long a payment period as possible along with biggest retention possible to strengthen our position if a contractor went bust.

Suzie Mensforth confirmed to the audience that retentions etc were common practice. RF confirmed that we need to abide also by the BLF standard contract details, which would include these.

Q – Keith Butler – was concerned with all these retentions, bonds, guaranteed maximum prices and extended payment periods that the price would rise?

A – DH felt that in the current market they would not have a great effect, but were possible.

Q – Bob Osborn – asked for details of the project professionals and their costs?

A – DH – Armson Derwent Shaw were QS, Adrian Russell Architect and Alan Hudson CDM Coordinator. All had supplied quotes for construction phase and would be made to understand these figures would be fixed.

The only other unknown costs were those for searches etc.

Closure

Carol Parsons gave her thanks at this stage for the work carried out by the development sub committee.

Frank Parker agreed but asked for the committee to improve communication.

Susie Mensforth felt that communication had been good and had no issues.

RF reminded everyone of the communication methods used, especially those to keep the Parish Council informed.

The meeting was then closed by Martin Chresta who thanked everyone for their input.

SM 20/1/09.