

PADDOCK WOOD TOWN COUNCIL
The Podmore Building, St Andrews Field, St Andrews Road
Paddock Wood, Kent, TN12 6HT
Telephone: 01892 837373
www.paddockwoodtc.kentparishes.gov.uk

MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF PADDOCK WOOD TOWN COUNCIL ON
Monday 9th December 2019, at the Day Centre, Commercial Road, at 7.45 p.m.

PRESENT: Cllr M Flashman, in the Chair
 Cllrs R. Atkins (TWBC), S. Barrett, D. Boyle, S. Hamilton, (TWBC, KCC) B. Hills, D. Kent, R. Moon, M. Ridger, D. Sargison, E. Thomas, (TWBC), R. Turk, C. Williams

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs N Reay, Clerk
 Mr J White (TWBC), Mr D Morriss, Frankhams
 11 members of the public

Members were advised that the Clerk would be recording the meeting for the purposes of writing minutes.

QUESTIONS FROM RESIDENTS (15 minutes)

The following questions were asked: (the responses from the council are in italics)

Why the meeting was being held in December, as the group (Friends of Memorial Field) were criticised for holding a meeting in December last year?

The (FMF) meeting was held closer to Christmas, on the 18th December, last year. There was no reason to delay the meeting. This was the earliest date available after members had received the report.

Is the Community Centre the most important issue facing Paddock Wood in modern times?
It is an important issue, not necessarily the most important.

Should the documents have been available to the public prior to the meeting?

The documents could not be uploaded onto the website, but there is a note on the website to say if anyone wanted supporting documents to call the office. No one had asked.

Consultation to date is what has formed part of the plans which are under discussion tonight.

Public consultation on RiBA stage 3 would normally be when the application is submitted for planning permission. All documents will be uploaded onto the planning portal at that point. Paper copies are on display at this meeting. The Town Council will look to see if can upload them onto a suitable website in the future.

Given the importance, should the meeting go head as the information was not circulated?

FMF had offered to help leaflet town, not working together. Group is not opposed to community centre.

Chairman has made it clear that the project is building a community centre on the Memorial Field. FMF do not want it on the Memorial Field, therefore opposed to project.

The Working Group are developing a leaflet which will be delivered to all addresses. Also developing a communication strategy.

The group is leading on this and FMF is a member of the group.

What plans and provisions are there to ensure the Community Centre is fit for purpose and meets the needs of the community?

Cannot answer immediately. Have taken a lot of care to date.

C99 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Hamilton advised that she was a member of both Tunbridge Wells Borough Council and Kent County Council.

Cllr Boyle proposed, Cllr Hamilton seconded:

That the architect and project manager should be allowed to speak throughout the meeting without having to suspend standing orders.

CARRIED 12 in favour 1 against.

C100 PADDOCK WOOD COMMUNITY CENTRE

Before the discussion on the RiBA 3 architect's report the following issues were debated:

Can the council confirm that it has taken all legal advice that the debate can take place during "purdah" three days before a national election?

The Clerk advised that both the Deputy Monitoring Officer, and subsequently the Monitoring Officer at Tunbridge Wells Borough Council had been contacted as well as the Advisor at the Kent Association of Local Councils.

Their advice had been forwarded to members the previous week, along with an advice note from the Local Government Association. Whilst the Monitoring Officers stated that it was not a matter for them to advise on, it was a Town Council decision, they did offer some general advice that the ordinary business of the council could proceed during this period.

Cllr Williams proposed: Cllr Thomas seconded:

That the council should continue looking at the RiBA 3 document.

CARRIED 10 in favour (*Cllrs Williams, Thomas, Ridger, Turk, Moon, Boyle, Sargison, Barrett, Hills, Flashman.*) 2 AGAINST (*Cllrs Kent, Hamilton*), ABSTAIN (*Cllr Atkins*)

In September it was resolved that the council would receive the documents 4 weeks prior to the meeting.

Members were sent on the 4th November the Architect's report and all supporting paperwork.

An addendum to the Architect's report was sent out on the 26th November with the corrected report being received on the 29th November. This did not comply with the 4 weeks agreed.

Members discussed whether the council had breached its resolution or whether the amendments were minor enough not to have done so.

Cllr Turk proposed;

That the meeting goes ahead as per the agenda

Cllr Hamilton then proposed the following amendment to the proposal, Cllr Atkins seconded.

"that this was despite the resolution from the 16th September 2019"

Voting on the amendment: 3 in favour, (Cllr Atkins, Hamilton, Hills) 9 against (Cllr Williams, Thomas, Ridger, Kent, Turk, Moon, Boyle, Sargison, Flashman) 1 abstention (Cllr Barrett). The amendment was therefore LOST.

The council then moved to the original proposal which was seconded by Cllr Sargison. CARRIED 9 in favour, 4 against.

The Council has not received the risk register, cost estimate, costs to date – cannot proceed without this information.

The project manager advised that tonight's meeting was solely to look at the designs – there were over 500 pages of information.

All other documents would come to the town council at a later meeting, once the council had confirmed it was happy with the designs.

Concerns were expressed that the costs had increased.

Should look at other locations.

How bound to location?

What are the implications if approve document?

Frankhams were commissioned to design a community centre on the Memorial Field.

More detail to come

What cost implications if changed? Will be additional cost if deviate from contract.

There would be additional costs if on a different site.

Cllr Atkins, proposed, Cllr Kent seconded:

That the meeting should not go ahead as the council has not seen the risk register or final costs.

Voting: 2 in favour, (Cllrs Atkins, Kent) 8 against (Cllrs Williams, Thomas, Ridger, Turk, Moon, Boyle, Sargison, Flashman.) 3 abstain (Cllrs Hills, Barrett, Hamilton) The motion was therefore LOST.

It was confirmed that the council was only discussing the content of the architect's report and the risk register and costs would be discussed at a subsequent meeting.

The Chairman introduced the architect, Mr David Morrise who wrote the report explaining why the building was designed the way it was, how it works on the site as well as all the issues associated with the site.

- The building identifies in 3 parts – office, preschool & community areas
- Has been designed to be as ~~S~~ future proof as possible
- Has a steel frame as it is easier to re-configure the internal layout in the future if required?
- Designed to be an inclusive building
- Energy efficient with solar panels and water harvesting
- There is enough parking.

Members asked the following:

Could the building take a second storey?

The soil could take a second storey, but it has not been designed to do so, as it is not thought likely that permission would be given to build higher than the current plans. To

build the foundations suitable for a second storey would involve 8 x the current amount of concrete. This would increase the costs substantially.

The building has a steel frame – would it reduce the costs if a supportive pile was included in the middle of the building?

The building already has a number of steel supports.

Would it be an advantage to have a BREMM rating?

Should the council wish to have the building assessed for BREMM it would already achieve a Very Good rating. At present the council has the benefits without the costs.

How do the acoustics work with the hall in three sections?

Will be a degree of compromise – will be different functions for the different size halls

The Rainwater and solar panels are only generating 10% the energy offset –

The building only needs 10% to offset which is a capacity of 55m², however the building has 120m².

The council want the building to be efficient.

Solar panels could be put across the whole roof, but there needs to be a cost/benefit.

Secure by Design – the architect has a letter from Kent Police with recommendations for the Secured by Design element. They have not recommended CCTV

Concern that the access from the café to the outside terrace is past the toilets.

The café must be able to serve both the inside and outside of the building and is at the heart of the building.

There are no changing rooms.

The rooms are flexible and that would be a management issue – the storage areas alongside the hall could be used for changing space.

Concerns about the amount of storage.

The storage areas need to be safe to use – the council could take the view that some of the office space could be used for more storage. The Board was asked to ensure there was enough storage for the required number of tables and chairs.

Were there baby changing facilities in the male toilets?

Not specifically but they could be included.

What is the life span of the awnings?

25 years. They are designed to be retractable for safety reasons. Can be Teflon coated to help with cleaning. The architect had proposed yellow for the canopy. However, a decision did not have to be made immediately. The colour could be made a condition of the Planning Permission. The contractor will be asked for samples for the council to choose from.

Would the cable routes have enough capacity for future proofing the building?

There will be 25% spare and will be positioned to be as future proof as possible.

Was a pitched roof discussed?

The building was designed to be as low as possible on the site. There is a nominal pitch for drainage purposes.

Would it make sense to have all the toilets in one place? Could be moved but having them in separate locations could reduce congestion at busy times.

The project manager advised that changes could be made during RiBA 4, however it would be more expensive to make changes during that stage.

Why was no sprinkler system included?

It could come on when not needed and damage the building. As the building is single storey it is considered low risk. Costs are prohibitive. The purpose of a sprinkler system is to protect life and buildings. It would take 2 1/2 minutes to evacuate the building. Also, the materials used will be fire retardant so unlikely to be an issue.

Is the cladding material fire retardant? It has been tested to comply with British and European Standards.

Is the supply to the kitchen duel supply?

Yes, electricity and gas.

Access to and from the kitchen?

Kitchen is a large domestic kitchen, not a full hot food kitchen.

Why is the council providing a pre-school, it is not the remit of the council to provide education?

The purpose of the pre-school is to provide an anchor tenant. A pre-school would be of benefit to the community. The Town Council already provides a premises for a pre-school.

Parking and access – concerned that spaces may not be large enough, Congestion at peak times.

This would be a management issue – the Hall Management Committee would need to ensure bookings were staggered.

The pre-school would need to provide a travel plan.

Trees – should have a picture of the tree, which is being removed, not the one that is being retained.

Children would need to access the pre-school via the classrooms, also there is a door from the pre-school into the corridor of the community centre.

The children will enter and leave the pre-school via the terrace, not through the community centre door, that will be a “formal” entrance.

The door onto the corridor is an access for fire-fighters only.

(The chairman advised that under Standing Orders the meeting should close at 10.45 pm.)

Cllr Moon proposed, Cllr Atkins seconded:

That the meeting should be extended until 11 pm.

CARRIED 6 in favour, 5 against, 2 abstained

The following issues were also raised:

There were three options regarding contractor parking during the construction phase – it was agreed that this could be approved at a later stage.

Will there be a height barrier on the car park? If the council so required.

What about footballs against the glass? The glass will be laminated and as impact resistant as possible.

Queried the comments regarding the use of the cricket wicket
Will there be allocated car parking? Can have a car parking strategy in future if required.
Paragraph 3.1 on public consultation was disputed
The location of the energy centre by the gate.
No kitchen in pre-school – not required

Cllr Moon proposed, Cllr Thomas seconded:

The Council APPROVES the Frankham RiBA Stage 3 report with final agreement of all RiBA stage 3 elements being subject to full Business Case, Risk Register and Programme including costs and an agreed way forward being confirmed by Paddock Wood Town Council at a future meeting, date of which to be agreed. (14th January 2020 was available)

CARRIED: 9 in favour (Cllrs Williams, Thomas, Ridger, Turk, Boyle, Sargison, Hills, Flashman, Moon) 3 against (Cllrs Hamilton, Atkins, Kent) 1 abstained (Cllr Barrett)

C101 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on Monday 16th December 2019 at 7.45 pm in the Day Centre, Commercial road, Paddock Wood.

The meeting closed at 11 pm

CHAIRMAN