*Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer to the Council: Jennifer Spear*

Tel: 01206 256410 Email: clerk@greatbentleyparishcouncil.co.uk

Website: <https://greatbentleyparishcouncil.co.uk/>

**Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting held on the 05th October 2023 at The Village Hall, Plough Road Great Bentley Colchester CO7 8LG**

Present: Cllr. P. Dennitts (Chair) Cllr. P. Harry (Vice Chair) Cllr. B. Herbert

Cllr. R. Taylor Cllr. K. Plummer

Cllr. J. Jepson Cllr. G. Wright

In attendance: Mrs Jennifer Spear (Clerk) and 0 members of the public.

**Minutes**

**10.172.23 To Receive and approve any Apologies of Absence**

Cllr. J. Wharton and Cllr. F. Edwards sent their apologies these were accepted by the council.

**10.173.23 To Receive any declarations of Interest.**

None declared at this time

**10.174.23 Public Participation session with respect to items on the Agenda and matters of mutual interest (time limited to 15 minutes)**

No public present

**This section of the meeting is closed and will exclude members of the press and public from the meeting (Admissions to meetings Act 1960) due to the confidential matter of Contracts being discussed.**

**10.175.23 To hear a report from Steve Sawyer the on the tender returns.**

Quote 1, (All surfacing), was not in line with the required specifications that the council required therefore this one is not suitable for the requirements of the council.

Quote 2, (CS Mason), provided 2 quotations for the project one of which was in line with the specification with the required quantities included except with a difference in the truck pave dimensions. The second option from CS Mason which has different quantities than requested on the specification, looked at the risk of the single layer of materiel requested of 60ml, and have provided an alternative to this with a 60ml binder and 40ml top course.

Quote 3, (DA Cant), this only had a total price at the end not broken down in to the separate sections except for the bollards, their caveats do clash with the requirements of the turning circles requested which could have been based on an assumed size and extra kerbing (530m) that wasn’t requested in the tender, but this could have been assumed. Its difficult to adjust the quote because the price of the kerbs is not broken down in the quotation.

Steve advised it would be an option to nail the exact specification down and it back to the companies for complete clarification.

DA Cant proposed plannings between the boundary and the road surface, which raises a potential issue of increased maintenance between the boundaries and the edge of the new carriageway if you are simply reusing the road plannings that have come from the road, which is the same issue with the Southside track right now. The unbound material up against the 60ml surface with the rain, it will erode that material, causing potholes which can lead to undercutting of the new surface, stressing it and then causing weakness and eventually potholes in the new surface.

If you follow the metre rule from the boundaries of the properties as specified then the new surface will be extra curvy which will also increase the stress placed on the new surface, so this again does need looking at. If the council use 60ml at an increased thickness, you are removing material, but you are putting more road compliant material down and looking at the cost then the second CS Mason quotation gives a higher specification and value for money, which Steve would recommend over the other quotation.

Cllr. G. Wright asked if the tenders can be re-submitted to these companies and ask them to re-quote and then Cllr. P. Dennitts asked the clerk if the council have met their requirements from a legal standpoint with getting 3 quotations so far. The clerk advised that the council did try to get quotations from as many local companies as possible, and met with 5 on site, 2 did not return quotations and the 3 that did are in the discussion here. However, with one being disregarded it would be good to source a third for the project with the stricter specifications of the project to get as many options as possible.

Cllr. G. Wright did meet with one of the contractors after the levelling work had been carried out, and the contractor conformed that if the track was levelled as well as this then it may be that there will be less preparation work required for the project when it is commenced.

Steve Sawyer pointed out that on the track itself there is a changing orientation all the way along the track which also presents an issue when it comes to laying as some of the surface may have to be removed anyway.

Cllr. G. Wirght asked Steves recommendation about the possible increase of surface water that could affect properties, however if you have a high bank along the green side, cutting away the topsoil on that side with the reinstatement for the opposite side. As you change from a non-porous surface to a porous surface there will be water that runs off the surface rather than soaking in. If it’s cambered towards the green this will reduce that risk as much as possible.

The kerbing only needs to be a boundary rather than along the roadside, Steve suggested an amendment to this that it would be more logical on the concrete section to infill the section between the existing and then put a bitumised barber joint and seal that, rather than have kerbs, with a small upstand which will retain any water tracking underneath what you have just done.

Cllr. J. Jepson proposed that from Steves comments it seems that the 2 contractors that have returned the 2 quotations have fulfilled most of the requirements requested and just need us to go back to them to slightly amend the quotations and ask for these clarifications rather than going out to get a third quotation. He also asked about the area between the surface and the boundary is going to be road plannings which already has bitumen on it, so it has a good compaction so will take a lot of stress.

He said that a legal road width is 3.1m wide but the surface specifications required for this project is 3m wide.

Cllr. K. Plummer stated that there is a considerable difference in the 2 quotes, does Steve believe if the quote from DA Cants removed the extra kerbs, then those two would come in fairly close? Steve replied that he believed so. And with that in mind do the council need to get another quote for comparison knowing that we are already in receipt of these, which was then discussed further by the council. The clerk advised that based on Steves recommendation as our consultant for this project, that these prices are fairly similar, which he again confirmed, and that the council need to qualify the quantities that go with DA Cants quotation and also ask for clarification of any details that do need to be amended from the potential 2 companies then they would be a fair comparison for the council to consider. They are both reputable, local companies with a good history of work in our local area.

Cllr. R. Taylor asked if Steve would be able to put a list together that the council can then send back to the companies to clarify these quotes and is this the correct final specification that the council are in agreement with? Cllr P. Dennitts advised that we know that one part of the design is incorrect and given the price of the quotations, is the specification correct in terms of our budget?

Cllr. G. Wright suggested that once we have the prices and the quantities confirmed and these are correct then the parish council can break down the job into its phasing.

Cllr. P. Dennitts asked what is the 2 differences between CS Masons quotations of a 60ml surface (as requested in our specification) versus 100ml? Steve advised that it will last longer and give a better performance and that 60ml is not a recognised specification but was a result of the parish councils budget for the project and the compacted hard surface underneath from the years of levelling. If you revert to the minimum required specification of a non-adopted road, it should have a 150ml type one (but this isn’t needed because of the tracks hard subbase anyway), a 90ml of base course, 60ml binder and a 40 ml top course. The material in the specification is a commonly used material (SMA) because it is a hard wearing one and a road is only as good as your formation.

Cllr. J. Jepson asked if the council went ahead with the 60ml specification, what are the types of issues for maintenance the council could face and how easy is it to repair? Steve advised that the use of SMA has good integrity of the material on its edge, and unfortunately utilities companies may want to dig it up which will weaken the surface, but they have to reinstate with like for like materials to protect the longevity.

Cllr. R. Taylor asked about the turning circle partway along where the barrier is, will that have more of a tendency to have more stress on it? Steve advised that the specification of the truck pave is a heavy stress (taking a weight of 44 tonnes) it is more durable, and you could strengthen that interface there to add on the truck pave in an unbound material to stop it tracking onto the surface. It needs to be a minimum of 10m-by-10m space for the turning track pattern, so this is another area that needs to be qualified within the quotations.

**10.176.23 To discuss and agree next steps for the Southside Track**

**Resolved** Cllr. G. Wright proposed that with Steves help to clarify the specifications for both quotations, with the quantities with the clerk to be sent back to both companies with the comparisons of both different surface levels (60 ml and 60ml plus 40ml), the turning circles and barriers/ bollards, including the clarification of distance from the property boundaries to the roads, seconded by Cllr. R. Taylor, all in favour.

**Action – Clerk and Steve Sawyer**