

New Broadford School and Community Hub Working Group (NBS&CHWG)

(aka Broadford stakeholder group)

Minutes – meeting 9, Microsoft Teams, 22 June 2022 4pm

Attendees	Initials
Highland Councillor	
John Finlayson	JF
Ruraidh Stewart	RS
Stakeholders	
Stephen Atkins, Head Teacher	SA
Keith Nicolson, Representing Kate Forbes MSP	KN
Hamish Fraser, B & S Community Council	HF
Shirley Grant, BSCC	SG
Malcolm Henry, BSCC- Project Manager	MH
Neil Hope, BSCC	NH
Nicholas Kelly, FC	NK
Angus MacPhie, BHC	AM
Doreen MacPhie, BHC	DM
Highland Council Officials	
Robert Campbell, Estate Strategy Manager	RC
Dorothy Gibb, Principal Estates Officer	DG
Brian MacLeod, Architectural Technician	BM
Jenny MacRae, Estates Co-Ordinator	JMR
External Officials	
Finlay Black, Robertson Construction- Operational Manager	FB
Mark Boyle, WSP – Project Management Team	MB
Kate Kelly, WSP – Senior Project Manager	KK
Sarah Kirk, WSP – Project Team	SK
Phill McCaherty - HI	PMcC
Apologies	
Gordon Bell – Kate Forbes MSP	GB
Anthony Davies - BHC	AD
Don Esson- Area Education Manager (West)	DE
Iain MacIvor – LSHA	IM
Drew Millar – Councillor	DM
Calum Munro - Councillor	CM
Norma Morrison – BSCC/Parent Council	NM
Gordon Stewart – Education Liaison Officer	GS

Abbreviations:

B&S Community Council – Broadford and Strath Community Council
 BSCC – Broadford and Strath Community Company
 BHC – Broadford Hall Committee
 Cllr – Councillor, The Highland Council
 FC – Football Club
 HIE – Highlands and Islands Enterprise
 HLH – Highlife Highland
 LSHA – Lochalsh and Skye Housing Association
 MSP – Member of the Scottish Parliament
 NBS&CHWG – New Broadford School and Community Hub Working Group
 PC – Broadford Primary School Parent Council

Item	Discussion and comment	Action
1.	<p>Welcome and apologies</p> <p>Apologies: As above</p>	
2.	<p>Minutes and actions from last meeting</p> <p>Action – Meeting arranged for week beginning 27 June with THC, Sport Scotland and HLH to progress funding options</p>	
3.	<p>Project and design overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation – Update by RC • RC commented that pitch size may be restricted to 7 A-Side due to ground available on site. • BM – 7 A-Side will fit but the topography of the site needs to be considered. It's a tight space and may require a lot of cut and fill to achieve a level surface. Have been able to fit in a 65m x 45m pitch which includes 3 m run off and considers floodlighting. • NK – Is ground closer to the road included? • BM – Full size pitch will not fit on site. Closer to the road may impact on the suds pond and site may also need a lot of hardcore infill. • RC – 65m x 45m size complies with Sport Scotland. • MB – Expanding the pitch size may have implications – lighting closer to properties, neighbour complaints, proximity to properties and planning may impose restricted use hours. • AM – Previously, I have offered use of my ground that backs on to the site. Would consider a proposal from THC. • BM – 7- A -side pitch should be achievable and have the option to approach AM if more ground is required. Who is designing the community pavilion? • RC – Sport Scotland have standard plans. MH has provided accommodation schedule. May be that community take the pavilion forward as a separate project. • BM – if pavilion is to be included on site plan, will require plans for planning. Can leave to show as a space set aside for pavilion. • RC – THC will be seen as the lead applicant, and we may include the pavilion and lease to community group. Sport Scotland, Island Fund and Capital Regeneration Fund, THC will be the applicants. • SG – Majority of funding THC will take the lead and community group will provide the information. • NK – Can we have an onsite meeting with BM and AM to discuss the potential extra space from AM. • BM – Yes will arrange this • AM – site meeting would be very useful. • DG – Slope on site. Mindful that costs could rise significantly depending on amount of cut and fill required. • FB – Watercourse runs through the site and may need a culvert. Topography may be against us but will work round it. • SG – Can the old building be used for infill? • BM – May have a lot of asbestos but may be possible. • FB – Need site investigations completed first. Different ground conditions on the site. • MH – Is the extra ground at the road included in the topography? Would be good to know if it is. • BM – Will check but sure it is. MB – Background works continuing. Working on concept design but approx 5 – 7 weeks away from this. 	BM

Item	Discussion and comment	Action
	<p>Next steps will be to engage with stakeholders and user groups, ensure correct storage, location of toilets, catering facilities are right and library in best location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DG – Met with staff at school and discussed their room needs Room data sheets and accommodation schedules being finalised and will be discussed fully with all user groups when ready. • SA – important to design play spaces that could be impacted by weather direction. Didn't realise how important this can be until recently carrying out playground duty in the rain. Took part in Carbon Conscious Workshop and topics discussed, gave a broader insight into what we should be trying to achieve in our immediate surroundings, to reduce our carbon usage. • SS – When will library and service point staff be consulted on their requirements moving to the new school? • DG – Areas have been set aside for library and service point staff. Further discussions in due course on shelving and fixtures. Room data sheet not drawn up yet for the library and service point. • SS – I'm concerned we won't be consulted in time, and it will be all last minute. Important that access for the community is appropriate. 	
4.	<p>Funders update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JF – Funding for Broadford is through LEIP and confirmed as no 2 priority on the Capital Programme. Capital Programme is to be reviewed and communications are due to go out to Stakeholder Groups next week. There may be some challenging decisions to make in the future. LEIP funding gives a degree of stability for this project. Realistically, costs have increased by 50%. • RC – We carry on with the project as normal. LEIP gives a degree of re-assurance as funding is from SG. • FB – Materials increasing monthly. Hope it starts to settle in time and we get back to a degree of normality. • DG – Trying to deliver projects efficiently and with flexibility as possible. 	
5.	<p>Update on recent meeting with SG Ministers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings have taken place with SG ministers, and all give their full support to this project. • JF – Couldn't foresee where we are now but uplift funding from SG ongoing. Keep moving forward as we are doing. 	
6.	<p>Community update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SG – appointing consultant to progress Business Plan, funding applications is nearly complete. Will advise group on appointment in due course. • Submitted an Expression of Interest form to Capital Regeneration Fund. Possibly a bit early but interest noted. • Community wish school garden to be retained – green space. 	
7.	<p>AOCB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NH – Community desire to keep the school garden at the old school site. • SA – Seconded by me and several pupils and parents. Students from London have been impressed with the number of Palmate Newts that are living in the pond. Although the newts are not endangered or specifically protected, we wish to retain the garden area as a green space. 	

Item	Discussion and comment	Action
8.	Date of next meeting Stakeholder meeting 29 September 2022 4pm – Microsoft Teams Interim meetings can be called at short notice over the summer holidays if required.	