



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF COMMUNITIES BUILDING COMMITTEE
South Stoke Village Hall 19:30 Monday 3rd December 2018**

Members Present:

Chairman Geoff Ward (GW)
 Secretary Maurice Scarratt (MS)
 Members David Kennedy (DK) **[Arrived during 03/12.6.1]**
 Kevin Flynn (KF)
 Bryan Urbick (BU)
 Guests Chris Owens (CO) Architect

Officers Present:

Clerk Laura White (LW)

Public and Press:

Tony Grundy (TG), Roy McMillan (RM), Phil Wortley (PW)

03/12. 1 Apologies for absence.

Shannon Stegman (SS)
 Louise Verrill (LV)
 Sally Woodall (SW)
 Chris Bertrand (CB) – Phil Wortley Standing in

03/12. 2 To receive Declarations of Qualification and Register of Interests forms from any outstanding Members.

None
 Received: Kevin Flynn & Louise Verrill.

03/12. 3 Declaration of Interests by Councillors on any items on the Agenda.

None

03/12. 4 Public Forum - an opportunity for members of the public to express their point of view on any item on the agenda. With the Chairman's permission, a member of the public may express their point of view on specific items of business. Ten minutes are reserved for this.

TG: Acknowledged the work and commitment of the group, and understands it is often not appreciated. Believed this project cannot happen unless the 25 housing development does. GW stated if the housing doesn't go ahead then there will be a hole in the current funding plan.

TG: stated his concerns about the size of the development, the current financial plan, and worries about securing the funding. TG's biggest worry being SS will be left with a big debt over its head for a number years.

BU thanked him for his concerns and stated the SSPC has no intention of taking on any debt.

03/12. 5 To approve minutes of the meeting of 23rd October 2018.

Hold over, no quorate, until DK arrives.

03/12. 6 Village-wide consultation:

03/12. 6.1 Review the event including publicity, set up, attendees etc.



BU: opened the narrative stating whilst he did not attend has predominantly heard positive things about the set up and communication, only one negative comment, being there was not enough publicity about the consultation.

GW: 91 people signed in, although no one from South Bank. Overall a reasonable spread across the other roads in the village. GW asked the committee for any suggestions on what could be better.

MS: Some people struggled to understand the drawings, e.g. which way is North, and complained there was too much to read.

CO: More boards allowing more diagrams / data to be shown side by side could resolve this.

GW: in general terms, did we get the right information up?

KF: Asked for clarification of what was the intention of the consultation?

Discussion on

- 3 Options offered
- Additional options (renovating current hall OR allowing it to fall in to disrepair and have no hall)

[DK Arrives]

- Getting input and buy-in from more of the village, not just current users of the current hall. KF felt 20-25% of village responding was too low, and engagement from more villagers was required and more needs to be done to get a larger percentage of villagers to attend these consultations. BU assured in this sort of data gathering as little as 5% is considered a good level of response.
- Length of time since last consultation.
- State of the current hall and deciding factor in pursuing a new hall.
- Need data to back up the requirement for a larger shop/hall/café such as previous accounts and business plan going forward.

It was stated the purpose/brief of this committee is to pursue the design and build of a new building, and the work regarding the current state of the hall etc fed in to the decision to pursue a new Hall and therefor the creation of this subcommittee.

Some debate regarding the content of the last survey and requirement to build a new hall.

DECISION: PW to take to Amenities Charity request to find out the cost of refurbishing the current village hall and how much extra time this would add to the life of the hall, and hence to provide a justification of the decision to move to a new hall.

CO: A similar village hall in a worse state required £50k work.

03/12. 6.2 Review feedback and specific points of interest.



GW: has produced a summary of the 59/60 forms received. Standing out in the comments, strong support for the building, with only a handful saying they didn't want it. Generally people stating they did not want the new hall, gave the reason of the housing on the Glebe being required to support- build of the new hall. Most people giving strong support for a single building, the majority liking the cranked building. There were also a number of comments acknowledging the amount of work completed so far.

Discussion on comments on the day:

- general feeling, good, negative comments toward height of building.
- the people saying they didn't want the hall, gave reasoned constructive comments, rather than saying just no they didn't want it.
- Lots of comments regarding the height and requesting the building is kept it out of line of sight of the Cross Keys junction.
- People didn't really understand the 9m exclusion covenant, and it needed to be explained.

DECISION: BU & DK to investigate the covenant, and the possibility of removing it.

NOTING: the covenant being put on the green space on the Glebe, and not to try to challenge the covenant on the Recreation Ground if it is of a similar type.

Detailed discussion regarding the source of funding shown at the consultation and likelihood of securing said funding.

DK: proposed working out how much funding was realistically achievable and then designing a hall / shop in line with the funding potentially available, rather than Design and try to securing the funding for that design.

Discussion on availability of funding.

DECISION: To consider what sort of hall & shop could be built for £850k (£600k Glebe Development; £200k grants; £50k Villagers / Donations). Costing to include, full build and landscaping, including any movement of the current play equipment. Approved (GW, BU, DK, KF) [MS felt value too high still]

To Engage Mr P White, regarding cost savings on designs.

03/12. 6.3

Review outcomes and consider any actions.

DECISION: To publish redacted feedback form comments to show the villagers Agreed, Unanimous (LW to redact.)

Most negative comments were regarding Height and staggered roof line.

CO: stated this is a provisional design, and people commenting about things which are still subject to change. The consultation was specifically to show proposed floor plans, but to get perspective a building & roof were added. Drawings tend to make buildings look bigger.



GW: Feedback, from a number of villagers etc. regarding giving help time will be picking up those offers from Julie McKay, re: fundraising, and Phil White, re: design.

MS: shared concerns regarding car parking. MS has a concern re the vehicular access and if there needs to be a car park next to the village hall.

Discussion on the 2/3 of the Glebe not to be built on and the requirement to have landscaping and possibly fencing, due to South Stoke being in an AONB, and to stop people parking on the Glebe other than during predetermined events.

DECISION: to put an article in the Village Newsletter, to discuss and include details of the latest status of the consultation etc.

03/12. 7

Update on Requirements and to consider any subsequent actions:

03/12. 7.1

The Shop.

BU: a number of feedback comments on “Why is there a café?”

GW: should have probably started with less tables and chairs in the displayed drawings. The shop has got a business plan on the current status of the shop, where they want it to go and where the Café fits.

DECISION: to ask Mick Woodall to provide a statement/business plan for the café.

No Changes to Shop requirements.

03/12. 7.2

Amenities Charity, including environmental impact and reducing running costs.

PW provided feedback from the Amenities Charity:

Reiterated the support of the Shop and hall. Single cranked building is marginally favoured, but some liked the separate buildings. In the one building design, concerned about the height. Want the 9m covenant to be challenged to reduce the impact on the play area. Seating to take in the evening sun. If the final design is two buildings, Amenities Charity insists on the hall being in the bottom corner and the two buildings being completely separate, so separate activities can be kept separate.

Concerns regarding costs of two separate buildings specifically items such as utilities.

03/12. 7.3

Parish Council.

NONE



03/12. 8 Update on Housing Development plans: consider any impact on the Community Building project and consider any actions.

BU: Have sought Heads of Terms from a Solicitor, and have had advice. There was a quasi draft from the diocese. (payment before building, 2/3 of the Glebe is kept in perpetuity by the village etc) these are red line items, which if they change it would have to come to the Parish Council to be agreed. This is between the PC, Developer and Diocese.

03/12. 9 Budget

03/12. 9.1 Review the overall budget, consider plans and actions.

GW: the budget overall spend at the moment is funds to pay the architect, etc.

KF suggested looking for some grants for design, not only to help with the design phase, but also to give the committee some credibility of applying and securing grants. **KF to investigate.**

03/12. 10 Village Fund raising: review progress, consider plans and actions.

GW: not aware of anything so far.

Current fundraising: £2k from airplane and Zumba event , £1k from shop activities.

03/12. 11 Grant Applications: review progress: consider plans and actions.

KF: important to understand where we are on usage stats for the current hall. Would be interesting to track usage. Need to consider offering the hall to villagers at a super reduced rate to get more people in and increase the usage statistics.

03/12. 12 Publicity: need for volunteers, consider actions.

Tracy Lasan to be approached to help with this.

03/12. 13 Matters for future discussion.

RM: concerned about the timescale of where the process is now → planning application.

There needs to be a joint application with the developer approx. April 2019.

CO: if there is another consultation with 4 different designs. April is probably not achievable.

DK: We probably have enough information now to go to planning application.

KF: The access road.

03/12. 14 To confirm the date and time of the next meeting.

Thursday 10th January 7:30 – LW to Book.

Meeting Closed At: 21:37