

**Stoughton Community Association (SCA)**  
**Including the Stoughton Community Centre Project (SCCP)**

**Minutes of SCA committee meeting of 21<sup>st</sup> January 2004**  
**at Maureen's House 21.30 – 23.00 hours**

*In attendance:*

<i>Maureen Bell</i>	<i>(MB)</i>	<i>Chair of steering committee</i>
<i>Ian Godfrey</i>	<i>(IG)</i>	<i>Steering committee member, secretary for the meeting.</i>
<i>Cllr Pauline Searle</i>	<i>(PS)</i>	<i>Steering committee member.</i>
<i>Peter Gunner</i>	<i>(PG)</i>	<i>Steering committee member.</i>

*Apologies were made for:*

<i>Nigel Horton</i>	<i>(NH)</i>	<i>Steering committee member.</i>
<i>John Allford</i>	<i>(JA)</i>	<i>Steering committee member.</i>

**To decide how SCA/SCCP should react to Linden Homes latest design for the community centre:**

1. The latest floorplan dated 15<sup>th</sup> January, provided by Ivan Ball of Linden Homes was briefly discussed. In summary of the previous email debate between committee members, it was generally agreed the design was a step back to a shrunken version of JTP's drawing SK-03 RevA, provided September 2003, and that it ignores the majority JTP's critique of SCCP's own floorplan suggestion provided to the developers in October 2003.
2. A number of alternative strategies for how to progress were discussed, a summary of which is provided here:
  - (a) Abandon the project on the basis that Ivan and/or Linden Homes appeared to be not taking matters seriously. It was felt that this was still a last resort as there were alternatives.

PS pointed out that ward councillors would need to continue to fight for a community hall anyway as they had a duty to local residents.
  - (b) PS suggested going public – contact the Surrey Advertiser and/or national press.
  - (c) Write to the developers stating our concerns and ask for a revised design. It was felt this would be a waste of time.
  - (d) SCCP to revise our previous design. PG showed examples of designs used by Basingstoke and explained some alternative internal arrangements. It was felt that the effort involved might waste our time further if the developers were to ignore it or misunderstand it again.

IG suggested, and it was agreed, we really need to talk directly to the developer's architects to avoid Ivan as a middleman, but reminded everyone that Ivan had already refused this request when IG had asked at the Millmead meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> November.

PG said for such a meeting to be successful then everyone should come with open minds and only end when a final design was agreed.

IG said that that an accurate design would need to be agreed at the meeting otherwise what was thought possible at the meeting may turn out not to be so.

PS suggested that Jeremy Smith be invited to chair.

It was agreed that this was our best option and MB should draft an email to Ivan, copy the same people Ivan had sent the design to. MB wanted the mail to be sent by midday Friday latest.

**MB to draft mail.  
Committee to review by mail and MB to send.  
(Copy of mail dated 23<sup>rd</sup> Jan attached)**

**A.O.B.**

- 3. IG asked if anyone had any further news about Linden selling Phase 9, as this may be a reason why Ivan Ball continued to appear disinterested.  
PS replied she had heard that the sale was agreed but not finalised.
- 4. MB reported that if we got a GBC Arts Grants application for the exhibition area in by Monday 26<sup>th</sup> and were granted a sum of money that it would be a major help for future applications to the Arts Council for the glazed atrium entrance, an application we had already had to delay because of the developer's delays.  
MB said she would try to complete the application with information we had, but felt it would be an impossible task without an agreed plan from the developers and an idea of costs.  
PG agreed to supply example costs for lighting, fixtures and fittings for an exhibition area.
- 5. IG asked about the external layout and LEAP and if this might be discussed at the proposed meeting. IG explained that at the meeting at Millmead on the 7<sup>th</sup> Nov '03, the developers had all but won full control over whatever they wanted to do.  
PG pointed out that the open space on which the LEAP and community centre were to be built was supposed to be public open space and therefore constrained to certain rules that the developers or DEPS may not be aware.  
12 acres of public open space plus 45 acres of building land = £45m.  
PG also pointed out that Linden Phase 1 being built 7m into this open space contrary to the original masterplan and approved outline design may contravene proper use of public open space.  
PS agreed to look into this.

**PG to provide details to MB.**

**MB to complete application.**

**PS to investigate.**

Minutes prepared by Secretary of the meeting, Ian Godfrey.

Approval of these minutes was:

Proposed by .....

Seconded by .....

Approved at a meeting held at .....

On .....

## Minutes of SCA committee meeting of 21st January 2004

**From:** Maureen Bell  
**Sent:** Friday, January 23, 2004 1:29 PM  
**To:** Ivan Ball - Linden Homes  
**Cc:** John Davey - DEPS; Carol Humphrey - H of Planning Dept.; Jonathan Dawson -Acre Solicitor; Cllr Fiona White GBC; Cllr Pauline Searle; Cllr Jayne Marks; Jeremy Smith - Laing Homes; Jim J Dennis - Laing Homes  
**Bc:** NH, IG, PG, PS, JA  
**Subject:** SCCP response to letter and drawing sent 16th January 2004

Ivan

Further to SCCP giving you a CD of our worked design on the 24<sup>th</sup> October and the agreement reached at the meeting called by Carol Humphrey on November 7<sup>th</sup>, the drawing you sent on 15<sup>th</sup> January, which clearly is not the work of JTP, is very disappointing and instead of progressing the project, takes it backwards and ignores much of the content of the report given by JTP and provided by yourself on the 27<sup>th</sup> of November. The latest design, a doctored drawing from May 2003, does not have the required facilities previously agreed and accepted, upon which many of the SCCP grant applications are based has effectively lost us 10 months. (*Please see SCCP history of the various layouts following this message*)

So where do we all go from here?

SCCP have discussed the current unsatisfactory situation and concludes that unless we, Laing and Linden Homes and most importantly, your architects, are prepared to urgently have yet one more face to face meeting, when we all come to the table with open minds, there is no future for our project.

Had SCCP not been delayed in this way, we could by now have arranged significant funding - the Arts Council are very interested in supporting a commission for the suggested glazed atrium entrance, an application is going in for funding the lighting, fixtures and fittings for the exhibition area on the first floor, but, without final building designs and costings, applications for the funding of major capital expenditure are not possible.

Planning application cannot be made until such time as the following have been agreed:

- The design and size of the glazed porch
- The type and size of lift/lift platform
- The internal layout and need for fire escape
- Size of overhang

If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to call me by telephone, as you know, we have always responded quickly with any information you have requested.

I look forward to your proposals to quickly and satisfactorily move this project forward.

Maureen

### ***History of Progress of Plans for SCCP***

1. May 02 - Northmead meeting - drawings were provided for that
2. May 02 - 1<sup>st</sup> Design brief to developers, addendum June 02, comments June 03.
3. Plan 1: **Oct/Nov 2002** JTP drawing - given to us at the 5<sup>th</sup> November 2002 meeting' Post House/Holiday Inn - GIA 382, GEA 448, GIA/GEA=85%
4. Plan 2: **Jan 03** STAG drawing- the 'one with the curved front' produced by Maureen and Peter
5. Plan 3: **May 03** JTP drawing SK-03 - based on April JTP sketch and also based STAG drawing – GIA 405, GEA 488, GIA/GEA=83%
6. Plan 4: **Sep 03** Ivan sketch, JTP drawing SK-03 revA Sep 03 - the first attempt to reduce to GEA of 390 sqm.
7. Plan 5: **Oct 03** SCCP's drawing - GIA 324+walls, GEA 390, GIA/GEA=83%
8. Plan 6: **Jan 04** Ivan's sketch - a shrunken version of Plan 3, GIA 326+walls, GEA 390, GIA/GEA=84%

JTP produced a 14 point critique of the SCCP drawing in November 2003 compared with their own drawings (Apr & Sep 03). Very little of this has been noted in Ivan's current proposal and the same mistakes exist and further ignored our requirement for a cafeteria, the exhibition space and more storage. The size of the kitchen has been increased at the expense of storage.

JTP Critique :

1. JTP say SCCP's design is more suitable, with male and female toilets on both levels, including baby change - Ivan's has two female on lower, no female on top.
2. SCCP has dumb waiter - Ivan has omitted. (see also point 11)
3. JTP says SCCP's design is more desirable, with cafeteria in lobby - Ivan does not mention this but retains the hatch from kitchen. It is not clear if Ivan understands SCCP's brief. (see also point 7)
4. JTP notes SCCP's design has doors to each of the 3 flexi-rooms - Ivan's does not. (see also point 13)
5. JTP says SCCP's design is more desirable, with an area of office space of 25sqm - Ivan's is 19sqm.
6. SCCP drawing has secure storage in office - Ivan's does not.
7. JTP says a café is not allowed if the staircase is to be used as a fire escape - Ivan has not noted this, or has omitted the café. If no café, why hatch? Why no fire escape and/or new stair design
8. JTP say SCCP's toilets are small but meet size regulations (as do Ivan's). JTP say SCCP's toilets lack equipment, though arguably equipment is same as JTP's and Ivan's drawings. JTP says MIP toilet doors must open outwards - this is not noted by Ivan.
9. JTP say's SCCP's storage space appears inadequate. SCCP's has 20sqm compared with Ivan's 15sqm. (SCCP has 4.8sqm of storage next to kitchen, which Ivan's does not, see also point 12.)
10. JTP questions the advisability of a platform lift and say a more robust lift would take up more room. SCCP's platform lift has a total area (both floors) of 4.5 sqm compared with Ivan's 7.7sqm.
11. JTP say the area specified in SCCP's design for the dumb waiter is too small (0.4sqm per floor).
12. JTP advise the size of SCCP's kitchen is too small (stating it's reduced by additional access points to the flexi-rooms - point 4, which is not true. The size is reduced by the extra storage). The kitchen is 17sqm in JTP's Sept design, 11.9 in SCCP's design and 19.5 is Ivan's design. SCCP's design has 4.8sqm of storage, which neither JTP nor Ivan's' design has. If you remove SCCP's storage then all designs have roughly same size kitchens and same size storage, 16.7sqm and 15sqm respectively.
13. JTP believe SCCP's design removes the flexibility of the ground floor space. *SCCP were never sure what was meant by this, as we also strive for flexibility.*
14. JTP believe that a glass porch is out of character. SCCP responded we understood concerns and were expecting alternative suggestions which met the requirement of more light into the cafeteria lobby and exhibition landing areas.

-----  
Maureen dh Bell  
Chair of SCCP  
270 Grange Road  
Stoughton  
Guildford  
Surrey GU2 9QZ  
tel 01483 233 937  
fax 01483 23 78 23