

in the House

Return points with Dixon

Les Choate & Dixon

P.B.

Please return

Noted DMM

Mr Bowles - Action

0832

page 2 -

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD IN MR. P. BOWLES' OFFICE ON MONDAY, 14th NOVEMBER, 1960
AT 3.0 P.M.

Present:

- Mr. P. Bowles ✓
- Mr. G. W. Dixon
- Mr. Choate
- Mr. L. B. Mullett
- Mr. E. R. Haynes (Part-time)
- Mr. J. A. V. Willis (Part-time)
- Mr. D. A. Harrison (Secretary)

11/13

Action By

1. PLANS FOR THE ALTERNATIVE ACCESS ROAD layout were produced by Mr. Choate. Scheme 4 as shown on drawing SW.470/HAL/32 amendment C was approved subject to the following:-

Mr. Dixon
Mr. Choate

Plan submitted and approved
DMM 21/10/60

- (a) Access on to Fermi Avenue to be modified in position and slight curve from end of Road 4.
- (b) Internal road from front of P.L.A. in front of Resident Engineer's offices (Building R.13) to be shown on plan.
- (c) Police box at Fermi Avenue entrance to be single man type only.

Mr. Dixon

Mr. Dixon was asked to prepare the scheme on this basis and let Mr. Bowles have an estimate of cost for the roadworks to the east of the Rutherford Laboratory so that approval for this work could be sought.

Mr. Harrison
Dr. Willis

Mr. Harrison was asked to see Dr. Willis with a view to having the whole of the runway width to the east of the Rutherford Laboratory transferred to the National Institute ownership.

2. NUMBERING OF BUILDINGS. Mr. Bowles said that the Building Committee at present allocated numbers to new buildings. He said, however, that he did not mind who allocated the building numbers so long as they were numbered consecutively. It was left for Mr. Choate and Mr. Harrison to agree a system.

3. ACCOMMODATION FOR QUANTITY SURVEYORS AT N.I.R.N.S. Mr. Bowles said that an exhaustive survey of existing accommodation on the site had been made but there did not appear to be a quick solution to this problem and that the Quantity Surveyors and Southern Works Organisation Architects would have to stay where they were for the present. Mr. Dixon said that he had approached Messrs. Faulkner and Partners and their requirements were 28,000 sq. ft. This appeared to be high, as Mr. Dixon said that his architects would require 6,000 and his engineers 6,000 sq. ft. Mr. Bowles said he favoured the idea of an additional section of Vic Hallam buildings running N/S on the eastern end of existing Building R.20. Mr. Dixon was asked to produce a scheme, estimate and programme for this work to be carried out as soon as possible with a view to extending the existing contract. Mr. Haynes said that he saw no objection to this from the services point of view.

Mr. Dixon

4. FENCING. Mr. Choate produced drawing No. SW/HAL/32/amendment B showing the proposed fence line around the Rutherford Laboratory area. The drawing was marked with letters and the following was agreed:-

- A-B 8'0" chain link fence as existing.
- B-C 4'0" chain link fencing.
- C-D 4'0" chain link fencing.
- D-E 4'0" chain link fencing. (Future 4'0" wall and fence)
- E-F 4'0" chain link fencing.

Mr. Harrison

F-G This length uncertain until Mr. Harrison had spoken to Mr. Snowden on his views on safety fencing around Magnet Room Area. (Mr. Harrison telephone Mr. Snowden on 16th November and Mr. Snowden said that he thought a 4'0" high fence was sufficient.)

Action by

Mr. Dixon

Mr. Dixon said that he would prepare an estimate for this work and also consider the possibility of steel tubes as an alternative to angle iron posts.

It was agreed that lengths of removable fence should be erected opposite site entrance road on the N.W. side of the site to allow access for large vehicles.

5. LANDSCAPING. A letter was produced by Mr. Dixon from a landscaping consultant and the question of fees was discussed. A figure of 1½d per cu. yd. of material to be landscaped was quoted but on a basic quantity of 130,000 cu. yds. this would be approximately £800. Mr. Dixon was asked to offer the consultant a lump sum of £500.

Mr. Dixon

6. NEW OFFICE AND LABORATORY BLOCK. Mr. Dixon tabled three layouts for office and laboratory buildings. It was agreed that there should be no more development adjacent to the existing R.9 and R.1 at present. However, the question of additional buildings attached to R.2 and/or elsewhere was not finalised at the meeting but Mr. Bowles said that he would confer with Mr. Mullett and others and give a directive to Mr. Dixon as to what type, size and position of buildings were required by Saturday, 19th November.

Mr. Bowles

Mr. Mullett

D. A. HARRISON

17th November, 1960.

Circulation:

All present
Mr. J. C. Louth
Mr. M. Snowden
Mr. R. E. Waters