

**THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL
TAIN 3-18 CAMPUS STAKEHOLDER GROUP
Minutes of Meeting No. 7 held on
Tuesday 15th February 2022 at 7 PM
Via Microsoft Teams**

Attendees:	<p><u>Highland Council Members</u> Fiona Robertson, Chair Derek Louden Alasdair Rhind</p> <p><u>School Representatives</u> Eileen Henderson, Head Teacher, Craighill Mark Jones, Head Teacher, Tain RA Jane MacKay, Head Teacher, Knockbreck Clare Whiteford, Head Teacher, St Duthus</p> <p><u>Parent Council Representatives</u> Morven Fioretti Lorna MacIver Alan Mohan Kirsteen Reekie Chris Ross Karin Wood</p> <p><u>Community Representatives</u> George Amos, Tain Community Council Charlie Morrison Graham Nutt, Tain Youth Cafe</p> <p><u>Highland Council Officials</u> Robert Campbell, Estate Strategy Manager Callum Sinclair, Estates Officer</p> <p><u>High Life Highland</u> Rob Parkes, Youth Worker June Robertson, Senior Resources Librarian</p> <p><u>Kier Construction</u> Neil Armstrong, Pre-Construction Manager Jeff Hedley, Senior Project Manager Michael Robertson, Programme Manager</p>	<p>FR DL AR</p> <p>EH MJ JM CW</p> <p>MF LM AM KR CR KW</p> <p>GA CM GN</p> <p>RC CS</p> <p>RP JR</p> <p>NA JH MR</p>
-------------------	--	---

	<p><u>Stallan-Brand</u> Alan Garland, Associate Ian Harper, Associate</p> <p><u>WSP</u> Mark Boyle, Project Manager</p>	<p>AG IH</p> <p>MB</p>
Apologies:	Lindsey McNaughton, Derek Martin, Gordon Stewart	
Minute:	Callum Sinclair	
ITEM	DISCUSSION/COMMENT	ACTION
1	WELCOME	
1.1	Fiona Robertson welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2	MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING	
2.1	RC: Confirmed that the report on the capital programme had been approved by Highland Council on 9 th December and that the budget for several projects, including Tain, had been increased.	
2.2	RP: A positive meeting had taken place with Keir to discuss apprenticeships.	
2.3	JH: Confirmed that regular meetings with MJ had been arranged to discuss educational links with the project. He would also take forward the action to involve Gaelic Medium and ASN pupils.	JH
2.4	RC: Advised that Gordon Stewart has recently been appointed as the new Education Advisor to work on major capital projects such as this.	
3	SWIMMING POOL	
3.1	RC: Presentation explaining the background, the capital and revenue funding arrangements for the Campus project through the Learning Estate Investment Programme, and the comparative high-level capital and revenue costs of a new swimming pool or retaining the existing Community Complex as a stand-alone building.	
3.2	DL: Was disappointed that the presentation did not take on board the matters discussed recently, options for raising capital funding had been ignored, and comparative High Life Highland operating costs were not included. A new pool was on the long list of potential capital projects included in the report to Council in December; although no capital funding was approved, a funding package could be pulled together. Council officers needed to engage and support this approach.	
3.3	RC: Advised that he had followed up on the actions agreed at the meeting with Members. The presentation set out the current position, with high level costs at this stage, and could be used to	

	discuss the next steps. He would be happy to work on a full business case and explore funding opportunities going forward if that was the agreed Council position, and he was regularly involved in funding bids for potential capital projects, such as the current Tain Campus.	
3.4	FR: The presentation summed up the current position with regard to the capital programme and the funding available, but would ask for Donna Manson, Chief Executive, and Councillor Margaret Davidson, Leader of the Council, to attend a meeting of the Stakeholder Group in the next few weeks.	
3.5	CR: Asked if 2024 would be the earliest start date if funding were identified for a new pool? RC: A separate design process and planning application would be required, and it had been assumed for the purposes of the presentation that construction work would not commence before the Campus building project had been completed.	
3.6	CR: Asked if leaving the Community Complex building on the current site would affect the proposed housing development. RC: The Housing Development team are planning to develop the site in a phased manner, so not immediately but probably in the longer term.	
3.7	RP: Asked what the estimated capital cost of building the pool at the same time as the Campus building would have been. RC: This hasn't been calculated but would arrange for an estimate to be prepared.	RC
3.8	KS: Had missed part of the presentation and asked what the cost of bringing the existing building up to modern standards would be. RC: Explained that an additional cost of around £1.5M to upgrade the building had been assumed, based on a 10-year lifespan.	
4	PROGRESS UPDATE	
4.1	RC: The planning process is ongoing and work packages are out to the market for pricing.	
4.2	RC: The overall capital budget for the project had been increased to £46.783M as part of the report approved by Council in December.	
5	DESIGN & CONTRACTOR UPDATE	
5.1	MR: Provided more details on the work packages out to tender. There had been a reasonably good response so far from contractors but more awaited. Most returns should be back by early to mid-March which would allow a firm tender figure to be reported.	
5.2	MR: Kier are continuing to develop the detailed construction programme.	

5.3	MR: Lyndsay McNaughton is progressing the community development side of the project.	
5.4	AG: Advised that the planning process was progressing well and that the statutory consultee comments had generally been positive so far.	
5.5	DL: Have local contractors been involved with the work package costings? MR: Confirmed the local supply chain had been involved where appropriate, but the size and nature of some of the work packages meant that this was not always possible.	
5.6	DL: Asked if it was possible to add an after-school club room in the new campus? IH: Would investigate the possibility and liaise with the project team.	IH/RC
5.7	AR: Had received comments that people can't understand the plans online and asked why there wasn't a drop in consultation in Tain. CS: Stated that unfortunately the consultation events had to be held online due to restrictions in place at that time. Leaflet drops, and other publicity, had taken place to raise awareness. AG: Advised that all the statutory requirements had been followed, and indeed exceeded.	
5.8	CR: Advised that face-to-face Parent Council meetings will be taking place going forward and that the project team was welcome to attend. RC: Agreed to send project team contacts to CR .	RC
5.9	CR: Asked how the construction traffic would be managed to avoid disruption at Craighill. MR: Explained that avoid peak periods at the school would be avoided, and that a construction traffic management plan would be in place.	
6	TRANSITION	
6.1	RC: Derek Martin and Gordon Stewart would be working together on this going forward.	
7	NAMING OF THE NEW CAMPUS	
7.1	RC: Derek Martin and Gordon Stewart would be working with other Education officers on this going forward.	
8	LIBRARY UPDATE	
8.1	RC: Meeting with Members required to agree the next steps.	RC
9	NEXT STEPS	
9.1	RC: Ensure key actions are picked up quickly.	RC
9.2	DL: Will raise the swimming pool issue at the Council meeting on 10 th March if necessary.	

10	AOCB	
10.1	<p>CR: Asked RC to share his presentation on the swimming pool.</p> <p>RC: It will be uploaded to the Council website along with the minutes.</p>	RC
10.2	<p>The next meeting will be held on either 1st March or 9th March 7pm via Microsoft Teams; FR to confirm once she has spoken to Chief Executive.</p> <p><u>Subsequently confirmed as 1st March.</u></p>	