

BISHOPSTEIGNTON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES

EXTRAORDINARY FULL COUNCIL VIRTUAL MEETING

HELD 7.00PM TUESDAY 19TH MAY 2020 USING ZOOM

2453 ATTENDANCE

- .01 PRESENT: Cllr. Merritt (Chairman), Cllrs. Benham, Gateshill, Gill, Grimble, Jebson, Lambert, Moore, Nicholson & Parkes (10/11) & Clerk: Mrs. K. Ford
- .02 APOLOGIES: Cllrs. Davey (1/11).
- .03 DOI: None

2454 BISHOPS AVENUE CAR PARK RAILING

The chairman recapped a detailed history of the project and clarified the status and concerns surrounding the works carried out so far. He took the opportunity to thank Councillors. Davey, Lambert and Parkes for their involvement.

Following discussion, the following points were raised:

- The final design has changed significantly since the details in the BNDP and again since the phase II safety audit report was provided however the clerk confirmed the officer at DCC was satisfied with the wall and proposed railing design, which are now in keeping with designs in the vicinity, as well as allowance for pedestrian access points. On consultation Design & Heritage Conservation officers at TDC have not commented, other than their preference for the railing design utilised to be in keeping.
- The railings, as installed by GA Earthworks, are not fit for purpose and have not been supplied as quoted. Specifically, the top rail should be 32mm diameter, as indicated in the contractors drawing.
- The box section inserted into the sockets by GA Earthworks are not deep enough. The full depth, to be measured and confirmed by Cllr. Parkes, should be utilised to increase stability.
- All fixtures and fittings should be galvanised to eliminate rust. This was expected but not supplied.
- The pedestrian gap adjacent to 53 Bishops Avenue should be closed, using a c loop added to the railing. This was not part of the original spec or quote so would be as an additional cost to BPC but was necessary to ensure pedestrian safety by eliminating this route which, due to potential trip hazard, is unsafe underfoot.
- Cllr. Benham wished to address the condition of the tarmac, specifically to assess the unsatisfactory quality of this installation. The clerk advised all members should have a chance to conduct a site visit before this matter is discussed. A matter for consideration on a future agenda.
- Cllr. Nicholson suggested increasing visibility of the rail, for drivers, by attaching some form of reflective material, such as discs or strips. It was agreed this should be considered further at a future AMC meeting, once railing works are completed satisfactorily.
- A member's report is required and from this a detailed specification which can be supplied to the contractor.

It was proposed, seconded, that Cllr. Jebson produces a report, from this the chairman will produce a specification, to be agreed by members before the clerk forwards to the contractor. This was unanimously agreed and therefore RESOLVED.

Cllr. Jebson's members report is shown as appendix A.

The chairman's specification is shown as appendix B.

APPENDIX A – MEMBERS REPORT – Cllr. A. Jebson

The recently installed railings are considered to not meet in full the specification that was agreed with the contractor. In specific terms, whilst the general look of the installation is in line with requirements that it should look like the adjacent railings on Fore Street the delivery has raised a number of questions.

There is a clear specific issue in that the diameter of the tubing element of the railings is 25mm rather than the agreed 32mm diameter. There should be some discussion on this to ensure that the 32mm tubing that is used is of a sufficiently heavy gauge of tubing to provide a degree of safety given that it is a car park boundary.

BISHOPSTEIGNTON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES - continued

EXTRAORDINARY FULL COUNCIL VIRTUAL MEETING - held 19.05.20

There are then three other points in respect of the original requirement:

- that, if necessary, the tubes, both upper and lower, that form the railings, should be welded into place to ensure a firm fit over the length of the installations two parts
- that the posts should go fully into the sockets that have been provided, and which existed at the time of the contract being tendered, meaning that the base of the post must extend down 400mm into the ground. It should be noted that this may mean a complete new set of posts being delivered in order that the current top rail height from the ground is maintained as agreed previously
- that in fitting the posts properly into the ground suitable galvanised, 400mm bolts are used to ensure longevity of the fixings and further add to the strength of the installation

Separate to this there is now a requirement for the contractor to quote so that the lower pedestrian access should be closed off using a 'C' loop from the upper to the lower rail in line with similar fixings on the Fore Street fence.

In further discussion there was a concern that the nature of the installation (which I assume is galvanised materials that have been powder coated black) whilst suitable for a pedestrian fence such as to be found in Fore Street would in fact potentially create both a driver and a potential pedestrian hazard during times of poor visibility, especially as the car park is likely to see cars reversing, particularly in Winter, in low light and rainy conditions.

To address this was proposed that the fence, once the final Acceptance Certificate is issued, should be immediately fitted with a series of reflectors along particularly the upper rail at a relatively high frequency. To support this, the car park signage should warn drivers of the fact that there is a proximity, especially for cars reversing out of the parking bays, to the fence.

Discs are not hugely expensive if we were to weld clips onto the rail and then screwed reflectors onto the clip – reflectors are about £6 for 10 on eBay! Alternatively, a 2.5mm wide reflective strip could simply be fixed onto the rail – hi vis 2.5mtr role of self-adhesive tape is about £10. Just a thought.

We could also consider small speed bumps placed at half distance from the bay to the fence. Not expensive – Screwfix do one for £20 including VAT.

I would suggest that this secondary requirement is completed before any final Safety Case assessment is made.

APPENDIX B – SPECIFICATION OF REMEDIAL WORK REQUIRED – Cllr. H. Merritt

1. The 25mm top rail to be replaced by a 32mm rail as specified in the original drawing.
2. The length of the 100mm x 100mm box section that goes into the sockets in the ground, needs to be 400mm long, galvanised and not just the caps that came with the sockets.
3. The bolts and washers used to fix the posts down should be galvanised not zinc plated as they will rust after a relatively short time.
4. It is considered that the uneven ground levels can be overcome by making steel spacers that match the dimensions of the bottom of the upright posts, not the top of the sockets.
5. The spacers can be fabricated in various thicknesses of steel e.g. 5mm up to 20mm to level the bases of the posts so that the horizontal rails run true.
6. The spacers should be hot dipped galvanised before installation. It is felt this would remedy the problem where posts have been raised by extra tarmac being used around the base using washers.

Finally and not part of the original specification, we would like to extend the railing to fill the gap on the southern end of the car park to boundary of no 53 Bishops Avenue possibly using a 'C Loop' with similar fixings to the Fore Street railings.

THE CHAIRMAN CLOSED THE MEETING AT 7.43PM