



# MELTON PARISH COUNCIL

---

**IMC(20)38**

## **PAVILION PROJECT**

### **Background and summary**

Members of IMC will recall that, following the agreement at Interim Management Committee (IMC) on 29 April (Minute 20.16), I made a formal request to the East Suffolk planning service for pre-application planning advice in respect of MPC's intention to demolish the existing pavilion building and replace it with a modern structure. I also sought advice as to whether a service access to the new building for light vehicles could be constructed by widening the existing tarmac path that runs from the car park to the apron in front of the pavilion, and whether consent for a temporary storage container on the site would be allowed whilst the demolition and build were being undertaken.

A detailed formal response arrived on 15 May and I forwarded it on to IMC Members on 19 May. It has not yet been formally considered by IMC in a meeting. A copy of that advice accompanies this covering report as paper IMC(20)38a.

The planning officers consider that a new building is likely to enhance the setting of the playing field and improve visual amenity. A like for like replacement in terms of size and scale, provided that the architectural style is in keeping with its surroundings, would be acceptable in principle, subject to the usual *caveats* in terms of the principle being subject to the details being submitted with the full planning application. Similarly the widening of the path is also acceptable, subject to establishing a safe combination of pedestrian and vehicle access. The siting of a shipping container on site for the construction period would be allowed under permitted development rights (Schedule 2, Part 4, Class A Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development (England) Order 2015). Finally the advice contains a list of documents that the Council's architect will need to submit as part of a full application.

This effectively clears the way for the Council to make a final decision in terms of the facilities required and design of the interior of the building to accommodate them. That information, together with my pre-planning request to the planners and their response will form the brief to the architect that the Council decides to appoint.

In line with my previous comments on this, my strong advice is that the Council should appoint a practising architect with full professional indemnity insurance and one who is sufficiently familiar with e.g. the latest requirements for new infection control requirements in the installation of public conveniences.

In terms of the minimum facilities that might be required in a replacement pavilion, Councillor Martin proposed the following in a note drawn up in 2018. This might be a helpful starting point for any discussion.

***Internal***

Toilets – 3 unisex plus 1 disabled wc

Kitchen – with sink(s), units and worktops

Internal storage – for MPC (and fete) items

An open communal area

***External***

Storage – small unit with water tap and large unit for Handyman's equipment

Covered patio area with seats

Additionally the building must be very secure and, as far as possible, vandal proof. It should be designed to last at least 50 years.

**Recommendation**

IMC is recommended to consider and agree a way to finally decide on the facilities that a new pavilion should have. This does need to be done quickly, so that now the Council has agreement in principle from the planners, the project can move to the stage where a brief is provided to an architect to provide initial designs and costings.

William Grosvenor

Clerk and Executive Officer to the Council

11 June 2020