

Southborough Hub Inception Meeting

Minutes of meeting held on 4th November 2013 at Southborough Town Council Offices

Present:

Cllr Peter Oakford (PO) – STC (Chairman)
 Cllr Nick Blackwell (NB) - STC
 Cllr Jacqui Jedrejewski (JJ) - STC
 Cllr Jacki Prance (JP) - STC
 Cllr Glenn Lester (GL) - STC
 Jonathan MacDonald (JM) - TWBC
 David Candlin (DC) - TWBC
 Bartholomew Wren (BW) - TWBC
 Jonathan White (JW) - KCC
 Rebecca Anderson (RA) - KCC
 Helen Hays (HH) - AMUP
 Anthony Benson (AB) - AMUP
 Chris Bearman (CB) – AMUP
 Duncan Thomas (DT) – Knight Frank

No apologies for absence.

1. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising	Action By
<p>PO opened the meeting thanking partners for their attendance. The minutes of the inception meeting on 04.09.2013 were agreed, and all actions concluded.</p>	
2. Feedback from stakeholder meetings	
<p>AMUP delivered a presentation which covered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A review of consultations 2) Understanding of site context and key principles 3) Options evolution 4) Public exhibition <p>AB provided a review of the project stage 2 stakeholder meetings (content provided in AMUP presentation, circulated for confidential reference separately).</p> <p>These included meetings with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ridgeway Football Club - This identified that improved changing facilities are a priority need. The football club understand that they could be sharing a facility with others in the future. - Upz and Downs – This identified that Upz and Downz has very specific requirements, they do not anticipate being able to co-locate in a shared facility. - School of Dance & Southborough Forum – This identified that these groups consider that the RVH is an important but inflexible space. They do not object to re-provision, and raised concerns regarding the management and marketing of the current building. - SEAM – This reinforced SEAM’s views about the historic and cultural significance of the RVH and its flexibility constraints. 	

<p>SEAM's preference is for refurbishment and enlargement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Friends of RVH / lamps / Wicked, Captive8 / Theatre Trust – These groups also shared concerns regarding management arrangements, and consider that more could be done to promote and operate the RVH. They consider the RVH is an appropriate size, they favour retention over redevelopment. A quality facility is a common aspiration. 	
<p>3. Presentation of options</p>	
<p>AB confirmed his view that the site could provide a higher capacity of residential development than is in the draft TWBC Site Allocations policy. He explained AMUP's understanding of the site context including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - constraints - key features - layout of replacement land uses including parking <p>AB confirmed that site ownership boundaries have informed some of the options; all landowners however, have not yet been approached.</p> <p>CB presented the options (as outlined in the AMUP presentation). PO asked about the retention of the RVH in the context of the options presented to the public. CB confirmed that it is the location of the use which is preferable. PO stated that any future community facility needs to be a flexible space, not solely a theatre; other uses need to be accommodated too. JJ also expressed concern about the RVH redevelopment question. HH advised that this is a subsequent consideration which should be subject to detailed feasibility.</p> <p>JP commented that car parking needs to be accommodated fully into the new scheme. CB confirmed that 66 spaces can be accommodated in the options presented; more spaces could be designed into the scheme.</p> <p>JJ suggested that the inclusion of Tesco and Lloyds bank owned land is an issue for public exhibition. Ownership dependencies need to be considered and explained to the public.</p> <p>PO concluded that the public need to understand that this is an early consideration of options. HH agreed, confirming that she is keen for respondents to engage on the principles of the options presented, particularly the locations of the uses and massing. GL suggested that it is important to show the proposals within the context of the remaining green space.</p> <p>RA asked what will happen to Upz and Downz? HH concluded that the Ridgeway building is old and beyond what many would consider viable. JW suggested that Upz and Downs could take a new lease in a replacement building if sufficiently flexible. RA was concerned that Upz and Downs could be designed out of any replacement development. AB concluded that the organisation did not see how their needs could be accommodated on the site. JW expressed concern that appropriate phasing to any redevelopment is carefully considered to allow time for Upz and Downs to find new premises.</p> <p>JW concluded that the proposals do not currently deal with traffic impacts. HH suggested that it will be for the planning application to address this</p>	

<p>matter. JJ wished that the matter is given earlier consideration as some residents will raise this concern.</p> <p>JW asked what the s278 and s106 costs will be? DC confirmed that these will be negotiated through the planning process.</p>	
<p>4. Viability advice update</p>	
<p>DT provided a summary of commercial and delivery issues (powerpoint slides are part of AMUP presentation). Summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The value of the site will be maximised by having traditional family housing on the site (3-4 bed homes). Significant flatted development would not be appropriate. - A small element of A3 retail or compatible uses should be delivered to provide an active frontage; this could include a public sector occupant. - Yew Tree Road Car Park is narrow, and is constrained in terms of development potential. - Retention vs. replacement of the RVH, financial appraisals will seek to compare options. - Gaining any significant retail investment from a national retailer could be challenging given market conditions. Independent retailers may be more successful. - Detailed viability modelling will follow the stakeholder event, as this may lead to further refinement of the options. 	<p>DT to undertake viability appraisal.</p>
<p>5. Arrangements for the stakeholder workshop</p>	
<p>AB confirmed that A1 consultation boards will include information relating to, scene setting / site context, a presentation of options, a board inviting comments and a board providing information on the next steps. A feedback form and end date for the consultation is to be agreed.</p> <p>JJ suggested that feedback should be independent of the partners (including STC), and requests that all responses are forwarded to AMUP London office. This is confirmed by AMUP.</p> <p>HH confirmed that AB and PB will run the event. As the materials will be self explanatory, there will not be any need for additional staffing.</p> <p>AB confirmed that the venue for the event will now be the main hall of the RVH.</p>	<p>AUMP to prepare event materials.</p>
<p>6. Next steps and timetable update</p>	
<p>HH confirmed in accordance with the updated AMUP timetable, that the project is on-track.</p>	
<p>7. Date of next project meeting</p>	
<p>To be confirmed following the meeting.</p>	<p>BW to liaise with partners and confirm meeting date.</p>

8. AOB	
<p>JW requested feedback on draft communications plan. BW agreed to circulate with a draft copy of the meeting minutes.</p>	<p>BW to circulate.</p>
<p>BW sought confirmation on the distribution of a letter of invitation to businesses along the London Road, PO was supportive. It was agreed that the letter should be sent on AMUP template.</p>	<p>BW to distribute prior to stakeholder workshop.</p>