

GOTHERINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF EXTRAORDINARY MEETING HELD ON 22 JANUARY 2018

Venue: Village Hall, Gotherington.

Present: Chairman Howard Samuels and Cllrs. Rodney Churchill, Lewis Harmer, Ian O'Gorman, Bev Osborne, Eddie McLarnon and Caroline Ryman

Attendees: Clerk/RFO, Jules Owen and 88 members of the public

Minute Ref. Details

22.1.18.1 Chairman opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.
He stated that it had come to his notice that the grant from the PCC was not unconditional as previously specified – if the Church Centre (CC) was not purchased, Gotherington Parish Council (GPC) would have to return the total grant of £21,666.00
No apologies received as all members present.

22.1.18.2 No declarations of interest were received and clerk confirmed meeting was quorate.
Chairman asked if anyone intending recording the proceedings - no-one did.
Chairman handed over to Cllrs. Osborne and McLarnon who gave a comprehensive presentation of the proposed purchase and development of the building presently known as the Church Centre for the use of the local community.

22.1.18.3 There was a long public participation session in which people both for and against the proposed project asked questions and made comments, including the following:

- Did building have a preservation order?

Cllr. Harmer responded, no, did not have preservation order.

- Why could it not be used for a car park?

Cllr. Osborne responded – PC did not own building so would have to purchase it, cost of demolition would be expensive. Would cost to keep façade and would not get any income or money from PCC.

- Concerns around the need for another building to rent out and whether it would take income from Village Hall (VH)
- Concerns with regard to the costs and if the loan and repayments were guaranteed
- Availability of \$106 – when first sod was cut so not guaranteed, only developer would know when that was to be so developer was in control of \$106
- Possibility of a church closing

Resident responded stating a church would only close if there was not a church warden but currently they did each have church wardens so there were no plans to close a church.

Cllr. Osborne stated the parish council was prohibited from supporting the church financially.

- Were there any covenants on the building, would the PC be able to sell it?

Cllr. Osborne confirmed there were no covenants and yes building could be sold.

- Contingency of £8,000.00 seemed small, suggestions it should be double or even £32,000 based on value of contract

Cllr. McLarnon stated contingency of £19,200.00 was included

- Would like to see guarantees from suppliers they would not exceed certain figures

Cllr. McLarnon confirmed PC had a fixed price contract for SOW so contractor would have contingency too for renovation from Project Manager (PM) and Contractors (C).

- What safeguards did PC have to avoid contractor charging for extras?

Cllr. McLarnon stated 5% to be held back for 1 year, so much per month etc. Also SOW would avoid that issue too.

He also confirmed there was a SOW so there should not be any extras.

Cllr. Ryman confirmed the £8,000 contingency would cover that too.

- Concerns that PC Minutes indicated lack of funding to meet current projects without taking on such a huge project.
- Big concern that the same person was responsible for taking bookings for all current village venues. It was felt Village Hall bookings should be managed by a different person due to the conflict of interests.
- Disappointment there would not be a kitchen and was planning permission required? Also health and safety concerns, together with issue of lack of parking were also raised.

Resident replied stating when Old Chapel was used for lunches and services most could not walk to JWPavilion so they used Oxenton as access was better there. They would love to come back to Gotherington.

Cllr. Harmer confirmed the original kitchen would be retained and refitted if budget did not allow for brand new kitchen initially.

- Resident in favour was currently unable to book space in Village Hall for choir of 40 people but CC would be ideal venue and it would benefit the village. Resident felt people would be stimulated to find uses for the building.
- Another resident in favour wished to thank the parish council for all their hard work and stated the extra monthly cost on the precept represent a cup of coffee a month. She stated that if the project did not go ahead, people would ask 'why did we lose this building?'
- Would it devalue the property of the neighbouring properties?

Someone living very near the CC responded stating it would be a dereliction of duty to let the building be lost, they were very fortunate to have it. There was a cross section of the community that would find this building very useful i.e. yoga, baby groups etc., it would be a shame to lose that space in the community.

- Another resident stated he was comfortable all the surveys had been done and looking at all the photographs, the intrinsic character was part of the village to be retained. The investment and uses it would have etc., he was personally very comfortable with it.
- Concerns about cash flow and did councillors really want to take it on or would they resign and then be unable to get parish councillors?
- Resident stated prospective hirers needed to sign-up and agree to book space, make a commitment.
- With regard to parking, resident was unable to drop-off disabled person at VH as it was too busy but at CC it had never been a problem
- If more people used it, where were they going to park? Also, where were builders going to park and put their skips?
- Using all \$106 money - what about all the other projects they were wanting to do in the village?
- Were there any other charitable bodies who could provide money?

Cllr. McLarnon stated once the GPC owned the building they could seek other grants.

Cllr. Osborne said use of \$106 funds was decided by developers.

- Resident stated there were opportunities as to where it could be used.

Cllr. Osborne said it was very prescriptive, after listening to the parish council and developers. For example, £81,000 allocated for new sports facilities but GPC does not have anywhere to put new sports pitches.

- As a fixed price contract, what guarantees were there that figures would not escalate and what if contractor went bust?

Cllr. McLarnon stated GPC have employed a professional Contract Manger, (CM) to manage the costs in the contract.

Cllrs. McLarnon and Osborne confirmed that if the contractor went bust, there was an insurance indemnity policy in place.

Cllr. Ryman stated GPC went out to tenders with detailed Statement of Works (SOW) which came back higher than the budget. The PM went back to SOW and stripped out lines which it was felt could be removed. She asked for amount of original contract to be reconciled back to original budget. Only thing that was not allocated

was any costs for planning which would be covered by contingency.

Cllr. McLarnon confirmed if price went up, other than drains, (below ground) contractor was responsible.

- With regard to foundations – who confirmed they do not need attention?

Cllr. Osborne stated full structural survey confirmed there were no dug foundations at that time of construction and GPC were happy with the response.

- Resident thanked GPC for all the work done but no mention of other grants being obtained?

Cllrs. McLarnon and Osborne stated they were in place but could not apply until GPC owned the building.

- Health and safety issue with only one exit
- Even though GPC was given first option to buy CC, it did not have to buy it?

Cllr. Osborne stated they could not protect the façade of the building and a house could be built on it.

- Clarification as to how TBC would know \$106 would be required for CC?

Cllr. Ryman stated that a developer was required to provide money for various 'pots' in the village i.e. sporting facilities, community buildings, teenagers etc. and GPC asked for one for community building to be for CC.

- Resident thanked the Working Group (WG) for the thorough job and figures produced, it would be a tragedy if it did not go ahead. He would trust the research and fully recommended the project should go ahead, the village needed it.
- Another resident congratulated WG and asked what was best case scenario if all the grants came in?

Cllr. McLarnon stated maybe £9.00 per year as opposed to £12.00 – increase in lettings.

- What was total sum GPC could get in grants?

Cllr. McLarnon said they had not focused on this as GPC had to have funds in place to purchase the building to satisfy the financial regulations

- Young person said it was a key part of the village and it would be a shame to lose it.
- Was GPC happy with the price they have been quoted for the building?

Cllr. Osborne confirmed £50,000.00 was the absolute book, they originally wanted a claw-back facility but they dropped that, they also agreed to stage payments.

- Had GPC obtained a valuation for domestic purposes?
- the building?

Cllr. Osborne responded, no as they wanted to make a charge for that.

Cllr. McLarnon stated that although the village did have an influx of cars due to football, school etc. which was inconvenient, with groups of 10-30 people, he was confident the village could accommodate that number.

- Some 60 years ago David Freeman took out a loan to purchase the Freeman Field, where would the village be if he had not done that? With 50 more houses due to be built everyone had to open their minds – calligraphy, hand bells, board games, darts, cinema club, patchwork, pilates – things to bring the community together, it had to have a sound financial plan but they must look to the future for the vision - £1.00 per month on the precept, it was not about them!

Chairman thanked everyone for their contributions.

22.1.18.4 It was RESOLVED that if Gotherington Parish Council went ahead with the purchase and development of the building presently known as the Church Centre for the use of the local community, it would not opt to tax under the VAT regulations.

Proposed by Cllr. Ryman

Seconded by Cllr. Harmer

Agreed unanimously

It was RESOLVED to seek the approval of the Secretary of State for Communities to apply for a second PWLB loan of £36,625.00 for up to 30 years. In addition, if necessary, Gotherington Parish Council resolved to seek the approval of the Secretary of State for

Communities to apply for a maturity loan to meet an unlikely delay in S106 funding.

Proposed by Cllr. Ryman

Seconded by Cllr. McLarnon

Chairman and Cllr. Harmer were both against increasing the PWLB loan without going back to the village.

It was RESOLVED Gotherington Parish Council would proceed with the purchase and development of the building presently known as the Church Centre for the use of the local community, once the necessary funding had been obtained.

Proposed by Cllr. McLarnon

Seconded by Cllr. Churchill

4 councillors in favour

3 councillors not in favour

Therefore, majority vote for project to proceed

22.1.18.5 It was RESOLVED to accept the 2018/19 budget circulated prior to the meeting which included a precept requirement for 2018/19 of £20,210.00, D band of £40.099 which included £12.95 for PWBL for Church Centre above.

Proposed by: Cllr. Ryman

Seconded by: Chairman

Agreed unanimously

22.1.18.6 Planning Matters:

22.1.18.6a To agree response to Planning Application No. 17/01135/FUL - single storey rear extension at 18 Malleson Road, Gotherington
Dealt with at a previous meeting

22.1.18.6b Members discussed Planning Application No. 18/00015/FUL - The Elms, Manor Lane, Gotherington

All agreed there were concerns and Cllr. McLarnon agreed to write response to be circulated to all councillors prior to clerk submitting to TBC.

Meeting closed: 10.26 pm

Signed

Chairman

Date