

Public consultation for the Herne Community Hall

Summary

302 responses were received*

43 chose option 1 - Do Nothing

18 chose option 2 - Refurbish

26 chose option 3 - Extend

193 chose option 4 - Rebuild

22 were not included in final figures - 12 of these were photocopies of existing responses.

Question 2 related to the facilities people might like in an extended or new build hall.

Many people asked for better kitchen and toilet facilities. Somewhere to meet for coffee was also very popular. There was less interest in public computers although public Wi-Fi received more votes. The tables in section 2.1 have the full results for question 2.

**Since the interim results were published a further 3 photocopies were discovered further reducing the total for option 1 to 40 (this would increase the number not included to 25).*

To avoid confusion and as the final result is clearly favouring option 4 - Rebuild, I have not amended the published figures above other than to include 2 responses that had come in via email and discovered during the checking and review stage of the consultation.

1. Method

The consultant wrote the initial questionnaire including some advantages and disadvantages of each option and the four options were then listed.

On Question 1 people were asked to select the option they thought best suited the needs of the people of Herne and Broomfield in the long term.

Question 2 asked what sort of facilities people would be looking for if the outcome of the consultation was that the hall should be extended or rebuilt, there were some initial suggestions based on hall facilities elsewhere and then space for people to add their own ideas.

This questionnaire was approved by the Hall Committee and then tested at the first open day. People were asked if they thought the advantages and disadvantages were clear and balanced and also whether they would add or change any of the suggested facilities.

Herne Community Hall public consultation report -2012

A number of the forms were completed at the open day and from some of the comments made on the day the questionnaire was refined and then issued in the Parish Newsletter that is delivered to all households in the parish.

The residents that the consultant spoke to agreed that the advantages and disadvantages were clear and balanced and that the facility suggestions were appropriate however several people mentioned the need or desire for a stage and additional storage so the last suggested facility on the list was removed to make space, (more accessible parish office) and replaced with these two suggestions.

The returned forms were each given a unique ID and the data was input onto a spreadsheet. Where people made additional suggestions for building related facilities they were given an additional column in the spreadsheet (marked green), suggestions made relating to the use of the building afterwards (such as clubs) were added as comments.

There were a number of forms that were clearly photocopies of other forms so the ID numbers for these were linked as were any that were clearly from the same people. Photocopied forms were not included in the final figures.

Some forms did not have a clear single choice so these were not counted, but their comments and facility choices are included. These responses are on the second tab of the results spreadsheet.

1.1 - Distribution

A copy of the form was put in the winter 2011 parish newsletter, which goes to every household in the parish. A two-week return date was put on this to encourage people to respond more quickly. A FREEPOST address was available.

Copies were held at the parish office and local groups and potential users were also asked for their views.

To appeal to people who prefer to work online a Facebook page was set up and an online survey via Survey Monkey was also available.

Visits were offered to local groups and both the WI and Strode Park took up this offer. The parish council hall committee offered to meet with residents of St Martins View (the road leading to the hall). This was not taken up.

The Consultation closed on 31 March 2012.

1.2 - Open Days

Two open days were held. The Craft, Cakes & Consultation was held on Sunday 9 October 2011 and Consultation Day 2 and Table Top sale was on Saturday 14th January. The open days were combined with the craft, cake and a tabletop sale in order to encourage more people to visit.

2 - Results

302 responses were received.

The results for Question 1 were:

43** chose option 1 - Do Nothing
18 chose option 2 - Refurbish
26 chose option 3 - Extend
193 chose option 4 - Rebuild

***See notes in summary*

2.1 - Question 2

Since two of the options on the questionnaire would afford the opportunity to improve the hall facilities (Extend or Rebuild) a second question was included in order to get an initial view of the type of facilities parishioners would like in their community hall, if the public chose to extend or rebuild.

In either of these options part of the subsequent work will be to seek costs relating to either of these options.

It is impossible to obtain costs without knowing what facilities might be important to the people of the parish. The responses to this question can now be included in this research.

Some facilities such as disabled toilets and induction loop system (mentioned as 'loop line' below) would be subject to the Disability Discrimination Act on an extension or new build.

It is important to recognise that the consultant contributed the original suggestions as a way to stimulate further ideas. If voted on, further ideas suggested by the public would likely receive a large number of votes too. Therefore a low number on the additional suggestions does not mean it has low interest from the public.

Better kitchen facilities	218
Dancing and entertainment facilities	156
Baby Changing Facilities	145
Public computer(s)	88
Play area	95
Sports and gymnasium facilities	82
Disabled WC facilities and access	200
Bigger car park	156
Public wireless internet access	102
Meeting place to have coffee	190
Stage	109
More storage	103

Additional suggestions from the public

Wheelchair friendly board games	2
Secluded/private area for breast feeding mothers	1
Parish Council Office	28*
Smaller rooms for smaller groups/additional room	11
Amateur Dramatic Facilities	1
Loop line for the deaf	1
Lounge (like Littlebourne)	2
Outside patio/garden area	3
Shower	1
Treatment room for hire for private therapists	1
Better toilet facilities	4
Good lighting in hall and car park	1
Serving hatch	1
Solar panels	1

*This option was included in the original test questionnaire and would have been 'voted' on during the first open day. On the main questionnaire this option had been removed to make space for suggestions made at the open day however it was also included in the suggestions box on a number of responses.

Appendix 1

Comments have been typed verbatim. Some spelling and grammar has been corrected to enable easier reading.

1. You the parish council know best what can be afforded. I feel you should go as far as you can afford to, but not to the detriment of other services
2. It would have been helpful if a provisional costing for each option was provided
3. Why not buy the Upper Red Lion that could accommodate all the above and more
4. Keep the price down these are austere times!
5. Keep historic building
6. A stage attracts more 'bookings' and double to provide storage space (entertainment will follow), parish lunch club, drop in centre for residents who are 'in between' jobs
7. Don't do nothing. What will happen is. Noise, disruption, allotments being tarmac it's in the wrong place and should never been bought
8. Over 50's meetings, Modern WI, availability for private hire
9. Depending on costs, I prefer the most cost effective option which is probably re-build
10. When rebuilding it could be built on the old allotments. Thus keeping all activities going in the old hall until the new one is finished, this way time no limit.
11. Wine and wisdom nights - quizzes

12. A stage that is movable
13. Improve heating and replace windows by installing double glazing thereby keeping hall warmer and sound proofing
14. Public computers and Wi-Fi is never used at Hoath
15. Adult education classes e.g. cookery, childcare etc, children's drop in Arts and Crafts days, Dance classes - Ballroom, Salsa
16. Quiz nights, bingo, karate, Aikido, Pilates, yoga classes, art shows
17. Could run farmers market for local producers
18. Lounge like Littlebourne
19. However, impossible to chose between any of the options as no economic or financial information included to even make a ball-park guesstimate - what's the cost refurb. compared to new build?
20. Could be warmer and cosier
21. Pilates classes
22. Table tennis table
23. Exercise class and coffee mornings
24. It is currently cold and unwelcoming, could be greatly improved
25. More youth club facilities. Audio visual equipment for films etc
26. Car park light, electric clock
27. Speak to NCT to hold nearly new baby sales on premises every few months. No venue in this area.
28. Perhaps keep old hall so keep current users and rebuild elsewhere on plot
29. Snooker table, Beavers, Toddler group
30. Weekend activities for those who work. Art club/classes/exhibitions, music clubs, Zumba, quiz nights
31. Seating minimum 150 also smaller room 30-40 seating. Needs a good caretaker and cleaner
32. Adequate soundproofing!
33. Quite worried about having computer facilities, what about insurance?
34. Youth clubs etc could keep kids off the streets
35. Over 90's club!
36. Removable/storable raised platform stage. If a new build - the initial cost and time could be offset by contact with other parishes/villages who have had halls built, however wide afield, to gain copies of their plans/drawings, views and experiences.
37. Over 90's club!!
38. The existing building should be retained - in time of recession and economic hardship it is irresponsible of parish council to squander money which could/will increase council tax rates for the future.
39. Proper parish poll/referendum should be held. This building is in a conservation area. Allotments should be retained.
40. A complete waste of money. A totally unsuitable site in the wrong place. At a time of economic difficulty this is unnecessary.
41. Bar
42. Computer courses for the elderly person.
43. Different court or pitch lines on the floor i.e. tennis, badminton, football, rugby and possibly a net. Equipment such as: tables, sponge and tennis balls, chairs etc
44. Daytime activities for older people. Adult education classes, especially craft or computing. Farmers Market

45. Daytime social activities for older people
46. The upper red lion should be considered as a community hub
47. Farmers market in car park on Saturdays or inside hall during bad weather.
The hall should be run in a business like manner and be self-supporting, not a drain on ratepayer.
48. We both agree go the "whole hog". Build for the future. Perhaps in two phases.
49. A building to be proud of - not a poky, old, cold shack!
50. I suggest you return the land for use as allotments. The area is too residential for a community centre.
51. Sell it, should not have been bought without consulting the parish
52. Didn't need another community centre
53. Bicycle racks. Security cameras to stop any vandalism
54. Depends on the age of my children
55. Return the proposed site to its former use as allotments
56. If building a new toilet area, surely baby changing facilities would be mandatory together with disabled facilities
57. As many of the above as can be afforded!
58. Hall user
59. The parish plan of 2004 is now well out of date. We are now in economic recession. The catholic hall was purchased in secret with no public consultation and I believe should be left alone until grants and funding are made public knowledge
60. Pop in parlour
61. Keep fit
62. There is room for a extension car park on the old allotments, and a little space at the back of the hall for small extension on the hall
63. Allotments should stay, hall should be used for local benefit and advertised as so!
64. Stage if the hall is large enough
65. Whilst it will be a long time coming to fruition I think the rebuild would be the best option. Perhaps the plans could facilitate the use of the old hall whilst part of the new build could be constructed on the adjoining and to keep current users from moving elsewhere. For my part I would like to see one or two (if possible) committee size rooms, say to accommodate 12-15 people, for the use of small groups for such things as adult education classes. The area is well serviced by public transport with a good sized car park. I discussed this with Cllr. John (Nicholson?) on Sunday afternoon. I am a firm believer in 'community' and would be happy to assist with leaflets - but NOT cake making! Please keep me informed of any progress. I am also interested to hear if any grants are available from Canterbury Council or KCC for such a project with the 'wider society' of David Cameron being one of his pledges. All the new facilities suggested would of course be beneficial to such an important building for the whole of our area.
66. A stage and a sound system. Toilets with multiple cubicles
67. In an ideal world D would be the option but how would it be paid for I imagine a large portion would come from an increase in Parish Rates which could be a burden for some parishioners. I would imagine some grants would be available. What is the future for the existing Church Hall? It is a pity you

purchased a building, which requires so much expenditure to bring it up to a satisfactory standard.

68. Cinema/TV area

69. an outside play area similar to the one at Whitstable castle and not just the usual play area. We are willing to help

70. Surely any 'improvement plans" MUST include Disabled Access/Ramps and Toilet facilities in line with DDA requirements on public access to public buildings? Also I hope that local residents have approved increased access across their private unmade road, or are finances already set aside for this? And will the other local residents who use the car park for their overnight parking be disadvantaged by an increase in hall use in the evenings?

71. Any Facilities required for dog training classes to continue.

72. Not a facility but I would like to comment - why is it just "Herne" Community Centre? What about "Broomfield"? As the property was purchased by Herne and Broomfield Parish Council then surely Broomfield should be included. As a resident of Broomfield, I feel rather excluded, as it is not included in the title.

73. CCTV camera outside. Telephone (for emergencies) or alarm system. Sprinkler system. Perhaps tall hedges/evergreen trees for the benefit of residents' privacy and sound filtration.