



Paddock Wood Community Centre

OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE¹

Release: Draft 0.5

Date: 10 December 2018

Project Manager:
Jonathan White

Project Executive:
Paddock Wood Community Centre Project Board

¹ This is a live document which is being regularly updated and will become the basis of the final business case once all facts and figures are known



DOCUMENT CONTROL

Author: Jonathan White – Projects and Operations Manager

Revision History

Version	Date	Authors	Comment
0.1	14/09/2016	Jonathan White	Initial draft
0.2	21/09/2016	Jonathan White	Feedback from Nichola and Andy incorporated
0.3	20/01/2017	Jonathan White	Feedback following board meetings and discussions
0.4	03/03/2017	Jonathan White	Feedback from KCC corporate assurance and general update
0.5	13/3/18	Jonathan White	Update throughout including detailed sqm based on RIBA stage 2 designs

Document Sign-Off

Name	Signature (if applicable)	Title	Date of Issue
Project Board			
Full Council			

Document Distribution

Document Distributed To	Date
Project Board	26 Sep 16
Paddock Wood - Full Town Council	



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1 Purpose of Document
- 2 Executive Summary
- 3 Reasons
- 4 Business Options
 - 4.1 Recommended Solution(s)
 - 4.2 Other Options Considered
- 5 Expected Benefits
- 6 Expected Dis-Benefits
- 7 Major Risks
- 8 Cost & Timescale
- 9 Next steps



1 Introduction and background

1.1 Paddock Wood Town Council have been progressing a Community Centre for the past 9 years with considerable work having taken place to prove and define the need, including surveys of community facilities usage and costs, questionnaires and feedback sessions with the public. The community facility being developed is anticipated to be paid for via a number of funding opportunities that will include a loan. Paddock Wood Town Council and Tunbridge Wells Borough Council will work closely together on the facility which is partly required due to the additional housing being proposed for the local area and the lack of community facilities to serve the growing town. It is currently envisaged that once developed, a village hall committee/trust will be setup to run and oversee the facility.

1.2 In order to identify a location for the proposed facility, the Town Council undertook an options analysis (see appendix) with a number of sites being considered across the town. Sites were then slowly discounted based on a number of factors including legal, financial and accessibility issues. A public consultation was then held in early 2016 and locals were consulted on two locations, namely the Wesley Centre and the Memorial Field. The Memorial Field was the preferred option and as it is owned by the Council, also proves more cost effective.

1.3 Paddock Wood has three large developments for housing on the outskirts of the town totalling c1000 dwellings. This along with the current undersupply of community facility space delivers part of the rationale for why a further community centre is required. As part of this the Town Council has secured developer contributions (S106 agreements) totalling up to c£1M towards the new community centre. These funds have mostly been secured based on the memorial field location and could potentially be lost if the site were moved. Agreement would need to be sought from the developers prior to any re-locating of the facility.

1.4 The project has since gone out to tender for the architect with Frankham architects being appointed in 2017 and FFT have been appointed as the QS. RIBA stage 2 has been signed off by the Town Council and work has now started on RIBA stage 3 with sign off for this element expected in January 2019. A number of surveys have taken place including:

- Topographical
- Background noise survey
- Geo-tech (ground conditions)
- Ecology
- Arboriculture
- Drainage
- Highways Pre- Application Advice
- Flood Risk Assessment



- 1.5 None of the surveys have identified any major issues with the site.
- 1.6 The site is owned freehold by PWTC and a report on title has been prepared which confirms that the land can be developed with no onerous legal impediments.
- 1.7 The project has been out for consultation at each RIBA stage and this will apply to RIBA stage 3 as well with events planning in January 2019. This latest event will look at the internal designs and look and feel of the building while previous consultations have focused on scale, site and outline proposals.
- 1.8 Project governance for the scheme is as follows. The project's day to day activities are overseen by a project group who report in to the project board. The latter consists of three voting members from Paddock Wood Town Council and the Portfolio Holder for Communities and Wellbeing from Tunbridge Wells Borough Council who does not have a vote. All decisions taken by the board will at times require ratification by the Full Town Council. The voting representatives of the Town Council are as follows;
- the Chairman of the Council;
the Chairman of the Estates Committee;
Chairman of the Planning and Environment Committee.
- 1.9 The following sets out the justification factors that support the project:
- 1.10 The Community Centre's funding is largely dependent on the Town Council agreeing to take out a loan to pay for the facilities' capital costs and a decision in principal has been agreed by the Town Council to this effect. In addition, there is the potential for some limited adjacent enabling development which might be done in tandem with Kent Police who have recently put their adjacent site up for disposal. The site could not be used to build the community centre given the additional costs of purchasing the site which are estimated at between £600-£1M. Further information is required from the Police on their intentions for this site, to determine what if anything can be done.
- 1.11 The Town Council benefits from owning and or leasing a few community facilities in the town. Their current offices are based in the Podmore building which is an old sport pavilion. Adjacent to this is St Andrew's Hall, which is a 1970's cement and red brick building in need of significant updating. Lastly they have a long lease on the Day Centre which forms part of the Dowding House complex with the freehold being owned by TWBC.
- 1.12 With funding for services under pressure the proposals could offer the Town Council the opportunity to rationalise some of these facilities in order to deliver efficiencies that would help lower running costs and protect services. The Council cannot move their offices to the new premises due to VAT regulations which would mean that VAT would be payable on the construction costs if they did move their offices here. By bringing facilities and potential anchor tenants (yet to be determined)



together in order to share revenue costs and drive up income generation, the outcome could look to ensure a long term viable and sustainable solution for community services in the heart of Paddock Wood.

- 1.13 The new facility would look to minimise revenue costs through improved building efficiency, income generation and the final proposals will look to provide a flexible facility able to adapt to future needs.
- 1.14 PWTC is anticipated to be the freehold owner of the Community Centre with the potential to rent or lease spaces to other organisations within the building, including the formation of a corporate body (charitable or otherwise), to over see the community elements. In progressing the scheme, the Board are seeking to ensure some of the facility is covered by anchor tenants in order to reduce the financial risk to the Council. The final split of lease vs hourly income has to a degree been finalised with the halls generating hourly charging and the pre-school seeking a lease income. The preferred outcome will see the lease being advertised to ensure that the council meets its best value obligations and a suitable tenant with a strong covenant taking up the offer.



2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 Paddock Wood Town Council are seeking to deliver a Community Centre.

2.2 Following public consultation the location has been decided as the Memorial Fields in Paddock Wood.

2.3 The new facility could complement or replace some of the Councils current ageing building stock.

2.4 The facility will include a mix of leases and hourly income clients.

2.5 Surveys have been undertaken on the site and work is progressing towards RIBA stage 3 design development.

2.6 Consultation has taken place at each RIBA stage to ensure feedback is taken account of.

2.7 The Council cannot move their offices to the new premises due to VAT regulations.

2.8 The Council have agreed to take out a loan as necessary to cover the funding of the building.



3 REASONS

3.1 The Project is consistent with strategic policy across the partners in the following ways:

3.2 TWBC Five Year Plan 2014²

“The Borough Council’s mission for Our Five Year Plan is to be an enabler of change, encouraging economic growth and investment into the Borough whilst ensuring the appropriate infrastructure is in place to support growth and enhance quality of life”. The Paddock Wood Community Centre falls broadly within the ‘Confident Borough’ theme, which identifies that; ‘By 2019, the Borough will have worked alongside Parish and Town Councils and voluntary and community organisations to deliver a range of community facilities and to support them in delivering a range of services and events’. Paddock Wood is identified as a key settlement. The vision document confirming that TWBC is keen to work with partners to develop proposals for housing, retail, employment, tourism and community facilities as well as supporting infrastructure”;

3.3 Paddock Wood Action Plan – March 2008 – “Develop more community facilities including a new Community Centre and swimming pool”.

3.4 Completion of this project will result in the following objectives being delivered;

3.4.1 Assured financial viability through partnership working and pooling of resources;

3.4.2 To provide new larger community facilities.

3.4.3 Create the opportunity to deliver joined up services in a central location and to help with revenue savings and protect services;

3.5 To provide a facility which is fit for purpose and demand led for the local community to hire.

3.6 Funding secured towards the community centre via S106 obligations on housing developments in the area totalling c£1M.

² <http://www.tunbridgewells.gov.uk/residents/news/website-news-articles/2014/april/our-five-year-plan>



4 BUSINESS OPTIONS

The following options were considered.

4.1 Recommended Solution

Option 1	Paddock Wood Community Centre joined up approach
Explanation	Community Centre developed on the PWTC owned land (Memorial Field) working in collaboration with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council to finance the delivery and possibly including a small enabling development alongside.
Risks	Reliant on £1.5M loan and c£700k of S106 funds covering the costs of the community asset and partners working well together to bring forward the project.
Benefits	Delivers viable community asset; potentially releases land for the enabling development; minimises any one partners development costs; potential to benefit from preferential taxation issues; delivers one place for residents to access a range of services.
Estimated Costs	Subject to the value of the loan, enabling development and other funding.

4.2 Other Options Considered

Option 2	Do nothing
Explanation	All assets remain as they are and no development takes place
Risks	Some facilities are currently in a poor state with high running costs and would need to be improved.
Benefits	No development costs, partnership risks or other uncertainties.
Estimated Costs	Increasing revenue and capital requirements will be needed to meet the current maintenance of the facilities. Minimal patch up work will continue to be done with longer term implications continuing to grow.

Option 3	Paddock Wood deliver the scheme themselves
Explanation	Community Centre developed and delivered with no input from TWBC.
Risks	PWTC does not have the capacity, skills or know how to deliver the scheme. Possible issues with delivery, procurement and build.
Benefits	PWTC able to take whatever actions they wish to.
Estimated Costs	Dependent on what PWTC wished to deliver.

Option 4	Adopt a different approach
Explanation	Look to other community partners to deliver the facility based on increased demand.
Risks	Partner may not wish to deliver what the town council want and partner may prove to be ineffective. Loss of control.
Benefits	Politically acceptable as no loan required, risks fully born by an external partner.
Estimated Costs	Subject to the partner.



5 EXPECTED BENEFITS

- 5.1 Delivery of the new community centre including additional space to meet current and increasing demand from wider developments in Paddock Wood.
- 5.2 Overall customer satisfaction levels improved across all services.
- 5.3 Centre is financially viable longer term and provides a strong community benefit to the town;
- 5.4 Capital contributions can be sought from a number of areas to ensure the project is viable;
- 5.5 Up front project expertise shared between the partners;
- 5.6 Potential for vacant facilities to be re-used and or disposed off once the Community Centre is complete and services have moved across;
- 5.7 Revenue costs to be affordable to the individual partners who will manage the services, with income generation being maximised to the benefit of the community facility and the services therein;
- 5.8 Local communities book the facility for community purposes and generate an income stream to help cover running costs;
- 5.9 Cost to serve does not rise above the current staffing levels and costs.
- 5.10 Equalities Impact Assessment has been carried out. This is a live document that will be revisited at each stage of the project.
- 5.11 The following table sets out the critical success factors for the project:

Factor	Current	Success factor	Owner
Capital cost	Does not exceed total capital income c£3M	Project delivered within agreed costs	Project Board
Revenue	Detailed figures to be agreed	Revenue costs are sustainable longer term and services are enhanced and protected	Project Board
Revenue income	Subject to who moves in	Income maximised with all profit put back into the facility and or the services	PWTC and or partners
Capital sales	Subject to enabling development	Capital assets disposed off for best consideration	Project Board
Energy efficiency improved	EPC Podmore building rating (est) - G	Look to achieve BREEAM excellent or very good	Project Board



6 POSSIBLE DIS-BENEFITS

6.1 Should services move from current PWTC facilities, then the re-use and or disposal of those facilities in a timely and thought out manner, will be critical in achieving desired financial outcomes.

6.1.1 Project to review wider facility costs as required.

6.2 Running costs of the new facility are higher due to unforeseen issues.

6.2.1 Ensure design development looks to minimise running costs.

6.3 Insufficient funding is generated from community use to cover the necessary costs leading to increased subsidy.

6.3.1 Seek to secure anchor tenants to lower revenue risks.

6.4 Community does not accept the centre, leading to low utilisation rates and no additional services are attracted to the facility.

6.4.1 Consult with the community to ensure what is built is what is required.

6.5 Increased traffic flow to the area adding to traffic issues.

6.5.1 Work with Kent Highway Services to secure S278 works and minimise any traffic disruption



7 MAJOR RISKS

Risk	Countermeasure
Capital costs exceed available funding	Value engineering will take place to ensure scheme is viable. Healthy contingency to ensure no overspends.
Revenue costs in the new facility exceed sustainable levels	Look to keep revenue costs down through prioritising measures which make the facility financially viable
Legal and lease agreements cannot be resolved	Agree clear heads of terms at the outset and enter into agreements for lease prior to contract
Lack of buy-in from partners	Partners to sign agreements for lease as the basis for moving forward.
Limitations re income generation from external partners	Seek out potential users to ensure a baseline of community users will use the centre once opened
Project fails to progress leading to increasing revenue costs and an eventual loss of community facilities as older buildings fail and close	Ensure PWTC and partners are committed to delivery and work with stakeholders to build support for the project.
S106 payments are not made in time	Ensure that PWTC has recourse to short term funding options to cover any stop gap in S106 payments.
Capital from TWBC is subject to conditions	Early engagement with TWBC to ensure those conditions are not onerous and can be supported.

See appendices for full risk register.



8 COST & TIMESCALE

Capital Funding

- 8.1 PWTC currently has funds set aside for the project to assist with the initial steps of delivering this project. TWBC will ensure the project has the necessary project managers and expertise in place to rapidly move the project forward while having direct access to a wide range of TWBC resources such as frameworks and legal advice.
- 8.2 The following table sets out the proposed capital contributions and costs based on costs known to date and for a facility of circa 777sqm³ build.

CAPITAL COSTS	£(000)	CAPITAL FUNDING	£(000)
Build costs	2,337	PWTC loan	1,500
Architect fees	126	TWBC	400 ⁴
Furniture, Fit Out & Equipment	75	S106 Mascall Ct Farm	385
PM Fees	TWBC	S106 Mascall Farm	317
QS	23	PWTC funds	240 ⁵
Archaeology	0	Other	TBC
Surveys / other	44		
Contingency	198		
VAT ⁶	0		
Total capital costs, estimated	2,802	Total funding	2,842

Project is currently showing a £40k surplus this could be absorbed into the contingency

- 8.3 See appendices for a cash flow forecast.
- 8.4 In progressing the scheme it will be vital to secure the funding from TWBC up front and or prior to securing the contract to build with the developer.
- 8.5 The project is proceeding on the basis that two of the S106 funding agreements will be drawn down during the construction of the facility. The Mascall Court Farm development has planning and construction is currently underway. Payment is due on occupation of the first unit and therefore the funding is considered low risk. Mascall Farm has planning and payment is due on the occupation of the 65 unit. On that basis the funding has been pushed back on thee timeline and the risk on this income is considered medium to low. There is a further S106 income stream from Church Farm development however no account has been taken of this one given that planning has yet to be agreed on the site and current housing supply is unlikely to warrant further housing within the period of the community centre being constructed. As and when these funds do come forward PWTC will be able to use

³ Sufficient for a hall with 300 seats

⁴ Subject to confirmation with TWBC on the Wesley Centre and Day Centre position

⁵ Based on accounts ending 16/17

⁶ No VAT costs have been allowed for based on VAT advice taken that subject to PWTC agreeing to transfer the facility to a village hall committee (charity) upon completion and receiving no income from it, no VAT is payable on the build costs. Elysian Associated VAT advice can be given on request.



these funds to offset the loan repayment costs as they will have forward funded the delivery of the community centre.

- 8.6 PWTC will be required to take out a loan from the Public Works Loan Board as part of the delivery of the facility. In order to do so it will require to evidence consultation which to date it has done showing how the precept payment will need to rise by £3.70/dwelling (based on band D) to cover these costs. Repayment costs over 50 years at current rates (3%) would be £58,111.72 per annum. In reality the precept from the new builds will also cover the payments (see revenue) however the increase in the precept position assumes a worst-case scenario.
- 8.7 PWTC will be seeking a grant from TWBC of £400k, there are currently conditions attached to this investment and PWTC will work with TWBC to ensure these conditions are acceptable.

Revenue costs

Interim period

- 8.8 All services will be responsible for covering their own interim service provision revenue costs and PWTC already has a £50k allowance within the existing precept for the community centre.

Future period

- 8.9 The following tables set out how the future operational element of the Community Centre could be setup.
- 8.10 With areas yet to be fully determined the exact cost sharing has yet to be agreed and the following figures are given purely as an indicative based on 737sqm facility.

User	SQM	% of facility
Community Halls inc stores	304	41
Pre-school	201	28
Office & meeting rooms	70	9.5
Kitchen	20	2.5
Shared areas ⁷	142	19
Total	737	100

- 8.11 Allowing for shared areas where costs will be borne by several partners, the funding percentage will be as follows.

User	% of facility costs
Community Halls inc stores	57
Pre-school	28
Office & meeting rooms	13
Kitchen	2
Shared areas ⁸	0
Total	100

⁷ Toilets, lobby, corridors etc...

⁸ Toilets, lobby, corridors etc...



8.12 The following table will set out the facility revenue costs once designs have been finalised and plant and equipment is know. Figures will look to be agreed and will reflect what is deemed to be the worst-case scenario. Figures will be based on current comparable costs per SQM or actual costs taken from comparable facilities with a premium of minimum c20%.

Community Centre facility revenue costs	Total est revenue cost	External service re-charge	PWTC revenue costs
Cleaning Materials and Domestic Supplies			
Repairs, Maintenance and Running Costs			
Rates			
Refuse			
Electricity (sub meters to be installed)			
Gas (sub meters to be installed)			
Water (sub meters to be installed)			
Security			
Insurance			
Grounds			
Administration charge			
Miscellaneous			
Sinking fund			
Other			
Total	73,700⁹		

8.13 The delivery of the c1000 homes will result in PWTC precept rising by £152,000/annum. Assuming that only Mascalls Court Farm and Mascall Farm are delivered then the precept will rise by £104,159 per annum. These amounts could be used to offset the loan and any subsidy if any is required for the community centre.

8.14 A village hall committee will be setup during the build period of the facility to ensure that a minimum 12 year lease can be entered into and this would then avoid PWTC paying the VAT on the construction costs. During those 12 years PWTC would not be allowed to take any income from the community centre. This setup will also mean that the facility will be able to claim an 80% discount on business rates with a further 20% discretionary reduction. The proposals have yet to be firmed up on how the operational element of the facility will be run and whether it will be staffed by volunteers and or a paid employee, this will be updated in due course. If a paid member of staff were taken on to actively manage the facility and drive business then the room booking income would be adjusted upward to take account of this business development potential which currently assumes word of mouth and little to no marketing.

⁹ Based on new build revenue costs of £100/sqm (excludes staff)



Income generation

8.15 The building partnership will pro-actively seek out opportunities to generate income for the Community Centre and the new facility provides an ideal platform for income generation through appropriate and flexible spaces which can be offered to a wide range of public, private and 3rd sector organisations. Several discussions have taken place with potential pre-school users showing a strong demand for this element.

8.16 The development provides an opportunity to create and offer a range of rooms/service desks which will also generate income through flexible bookings for small to medium sized organisations.

8.17 Based on average facility revenue costs, the following table sets out indicative income generation.

Community Centre – overall income position¹⁰	Year 1 (£)	Year 2 (£)	Year 3 (£)
Community room Hire	15,000	20,000	25,000
Kitchen hire	2,000	3,000	4,000
Meeting room	3,000	4,000	5,000
Other income	60,000	60,000	60,000
Total	80,000	87,000	94,000

8.18 The build contract will not be entered into until agreements for lease have been entered into (where applicable) with the various partners to ensure that PWTC's position is protected going forward.

Timeline

8.19 Timeline can be seen within the draft RIBA stage 3 report from Frankhams.

¹⁰ The full Business Case will set out income generation over a 10 year period.



Appendix 1- Sites considered (excludes Wesley Centre and Memorial Field done later)

Option	Road Access	Pedestrian Access	Relationships	Capacity of Site	Ownership	Impact
1.Putlands	Situated on a busy country road. Existing car parking fully used. Athletic Track will make car parking worse. Heavy school traffic	Good pedestrian access from everywhere 15 min brisk walk from centre of P W. Suspected most would use cars.	Near to Mascals school on existing Sports Centre site. Near to the edge of the Mascals Court Farm Development. Adjacent to housing	Would mean the loss of at least one playing pitch. Would have the capacity but would mean loss of open space	Owned by PWTC but with possible restrictive covenants	Over development of the site. There is already a Sports centre, Bowling Club ,rugger and football pitches as well as an Athletic track
2.Green Lane Persimmons Site	The site is situated on the junction of two busy country roads with feeder traffic approaching on other country roads. Is subject to heavy school traffic	Good access from all parts of the Town by footpaths and cut troughs. A good 15 mins walk from the centre of Town ,many would use cars	Near to Mascals School adjacent to Putlands Sports centre. Currently no Housing within 200 metres	Green Field site, in reality the Hub could be built anywhere on the site	Presently in private ownership but developer does have options on the land	Loss of farming land but this has already been allocated for housing.
3.Elm Tree	By country roads in all directions. Several junctions to be negotiated	No foot paths within a mile of the site. Would mean walking on roads with a national speed limit. 99% would use a car	Sparsely populated near to Elmtree Pub. Site is currently being used as a playing field and is the home ground to a local football team	Subject to the loss of a playing pitch there is lots of capacity	Wholly owned by PWTC	Loss of playing pitch in a known food risk area
4.Church Farm	By country roads and town centre . new housing will increase traffic in the area.	Walkable from town centre, but most would go by car.	Suggested site has only 2 dwellings near but is on the edge of a stream that is know to flood	Green Field site, in reality the Hub could be built anywhere on the site	Presently in private ownership but developer does have options on the land	Loss of farming land but this has already been allocated for housing .
5.Green lane (existing playing fields)	Access via country roads and residential area	Good pedestrian access from everywhere 15 min brisk walk from centre of P W. Suspected most would use cars.	On the edge of a residential area , possible objections due to noise traffic	Subject to the loss of a playing pitch there is capacity, a build would be possible at the Church Road end of the site which would minimise residential impact , this would also mean no loss of playing pitch	Wholly owned by PWTC	If the church Road end were chosen then there would be the loss of an open green space. If the pitch end was chosen then it would mean the loss of a pitch



Option	Road Access	Pedestrian Access	Relationships	Capacity of site	Ownership	Impact
6. St Andrews Field	Accessed by country roads and through the centre of Town , new housing will increase the traffic	Near to the centre of town with good pedestrian access.	Surrounded by housing but the size of the site would allow a build 100 metres away from the nearest dwelling	Large site capable of taking a building and associated car parking	Wholly owned by PWTC. Possible restrictive covenants on the site	Possible noise for adjacent dwelling and increased traffic. Loss of an open space, affect annual fete
7. Hop Pocket	Access via a B road at the very edge of town	Good access near to the centre of Town	Nearest dwelling is 150 metres away. Next to industrial site with associated traffic	Small site not capable of having on site car parking	In private hands currently for sale with building permission	Little impact
8. Nursery Road	Access via a B road at the very edge of town and one very narrow residential road	Good access near to the centre of Town	Next to industrial site with associated traffic. At the end of a very narrow residential road	Large site but in a flood plain zone 2/3	Ownership unknown	On residents due to the awkwardness of access and egress and noise
9. Memorial Field	Access via a B Road or residential road	Good access near to the centre of Town	Surrounded by housing but the size of the site would allow a build 100 metres away from the nearest dwelling if it was so wished	Large site capable of taking a building and associated car parking	Wholly owned by PWTC. Possible restrictive covenants on the site	Possible loss of cricket pitch or tennis courts depends where build was. Noise impact on dwellings depending on where build was
10. Badsell Road	Access via B road	No footpaths for half a mile to site A long walk for most residents	Half the site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt . Near to one dwelling	Large site capable of taking a building and associated car parking	Wholly owned by PWTC. Metropolitan Green Belt for ½ site	Loss of green land



Proposed Paddock Wood Community Centre/Hall

Summary of advantages and disadvantages from Paddock Wood Town Council consultation event

Option	New development on Memorial site	Redevelopment on Wesley Centre site
ACCESS	<p>Located on main road and bus route</p> <p>Walkable from much of the town, may need pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>Existing car parking, with a variety of parking options using two vehicle entrances.</p> <p>More traffic likely on main road and parking in local streets.</p>	<p>Central location on high street</p> <p>Walking distance from main town car parks so no need to build parking.</p> <p>Little or no onsite parking with this option plan.</p> <p>More traffic likely in centre and parking in local streets.</p>
RELATIONSHIPS	<p>Few adjoining residents, probably less impact from intensified use.</p> <p>Loss of some green space.</p> <p>Bespoke new building to meet local needs.</p>	<p>Many adjoining residents impacted by intensified use.</p> <p>Impact on one of the towns' oldest buildings.</p> <p>Constrained site and design will need to work around parts of existing building.</p>
CAPACITY	<p>Good space for larger community groups</p> <p>Large flexible site with options for future growth with town developments.</p> <p>Large space for outdoor activities and events, extending existing recreational use.</p> <p>Options to make better use of the little-used tennis courts and pavilion?</p>	<p>Good space for small community groups</p> <p>Restricted site with little scope for expansion. Little/no outdoor space.</p>



OWNERSHIP	Owned by Paddock Wood TC, so more money available for buildings and facilities.	Owned by Tunbridge Wells BC, PW town pays for the lease.
DELIVARABILITY	Allows for enabling development if needed.	Reliant on loan and section 106 development funding



Appendix 2 – Cashflow

Paddock Wood Town Council																	
Forecast project cashflow																	
Month	Milestone	Construction	Contingency	Architect	Other	Q0 (2%)	Loose fitting and equipment	Surveys / other	total costs	PWTC	TWBC (TBC)	0106 - Mascalts Court Farm - on 1st occ - June 19	0106 - Mascalts Farm - Berkleys - 67 occ rmt dwt	Loan	Total income	Monthly cash flows	Balance at period end
	Spend to date	- 2,337,816	- 198,120	- 126,410	- 12,000	- 22,680	- 75,000	- 31,500	- 2,803,526	240,000	400,000	384,750	317,034	1,500,000	2,841,784		
Jan-18				- 25,533				- 14,000	- 39,533	100,000					100,000	60,467	60,467
Feb-18									-						-	-	60,467
Mar-18									-						-	-	60,467
Apr-18									-	40,000					40,000	40,000	100,467
May-18									-						-	-	100,467
Jun-18									-						-	-	100,467
Jul-18									-						-	-	100,467
Aug-18	RIBA stage 2 concept design					- 2,041			- 2,041						-	- 2,041	98,426
Sep-18									-						-	-	98,426
Oct-18									-						-	-	98,426
Nov-18									-						-	-	98,426
Dec-18	RIBA stage 3 devel design done			- 28,006	- 2,500	- 2,268		- 17,500	- 50,274						-	- 50,274	48,153
Jan-19									-						-	-	48,153
Feb-19									-						-	-	48,153
Mar-19									-						-	-	48,153
Apr-19									-	50,000					50,000	50,000	98,153
May-19									-						-	-	98,153
Jun-19	RIBA stage 4 tech design done			- 39,687		- 5,670			- 45,357			384,750			384,750	339,393	437,546
Jul-19	Tender								-						-	-	437,546
Aug-19	Tender								-						-	-	437,546
Sep-19	Tender			- 1,000					- 1,000						-	- 1,000	436,546
Oct-19	Contract determination								-		400,000				400,000	400,000	836,546
Nov-19	Contract determination								-						-	-	836,546
Dec-19	Construction	- 111,046	- 9,411						- 120,457						-	- 120,457	716,089
Jan-20		- 133,256	- 11,293						- 144,549						-	- 144,549	571,540
Feb-20		- 155,465	- 13,175						- 168,640					500,000	500,000	331,360	902,900
Mar-20		- 177,674	- 15,057						- 192,731						-	- 192,731	710,169
Apr-20		- 199,883	- 16,939						- 216,823	50,000					50,000	- 166,823	543,347
May-20		- 222,093	- 18,821						- 240,914					500,000	500,000	259,086	802,433
Jun-20		- 222,093	- 18,821		- 8,500				- 249,414						-	- 249,414	553,019
Jul-20		- 222,093	- 18,821	- 25,967		- 9,072			- 275,953						-	- 275,953	277,066
Aug-20		- 199,883	- 16,939						- 216,823					500,000	500,000	283,177	560,244
Sep-20		- 177,674	- 15,057						- 192,731						-	- 192,731	367,513
Oct-20		- 155,465	- 13,175						- 168,640						-	- 168,640	198,873
Nov-20		- 133,256	- 11,293						- 144,549						-	- 144,549	54,324
Dec-20		- 69,628	- 5,846						- 75,474						-	- 75,474	299,084
Jan-21	PC of build	- 44,419	- 3,764						- 48,183				317,034		317,034	244,760	250,902
Feb-21	Fit out			- 7,218		- 3,629	- 37,500		- 48,347						-	- 48,347	202,555
Mar-21	Fit out						- 37,500		- 37,500						-	- 37,500	165,055
Apr-21	Opening								-						-	-	165,055
May-21									-						-	-	
Jun-21									-						-	-	
Jul-21									-						-	-	
Aug-21									-						-	-	
Sep-21									-						-	-	
Oct-21									-						-	-	
Nov-21									-						-	-	
Dec-21									-						-	-	
Jan-22	Defect liability period	- 116,891	- 9,906						- 126,797						-	- 126,797	38,258
Feb-22	Evaluation								-						-	-	38,258
Total		- 2,337,816	- 198,120	- 126,410	- 12,000	- 22,680	- 75,000	- 31,500	- 2,803,526	240,000	400,000	384,750	317,034	1,500,000	2,841,784		38,258

