



Meeting Title	Cafe Consultation Workshop
Date	Saturday 2 June 2018
Location	Marble Hill House

Item	Topics	Actions
Walk round with AS	<p><b>Visit to Café area behind Stable Block</b>            AS summarized old plan            MH – This is a group of old historical buildings in a historic relationship            Front elevation – AS noted that of the 5 scenarios to be presented to the group today one includes glazing the Stable Block Arch. Tables would sit around the front and side elevations of the building and not in the Courtyard so as to keep the building between the outdoor seating and local residents in order to minimize sound pollution.</p>	
Introductions Steve McAdam		
Three presentations about the scheme	<p>AS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set context as to why café &amp; shop important for the Marble Hill Revived project as a whole. Specifically:</li> <li>• Importance of sustainable future for the park and the need to offer improved facilities which will meet the needs of both local residents and the wider community</li> <li>• Provided financial summary which is included in the attached presentation</li> <li>• Improvement to bottom line of about £100,000.</li> <li>• Why all this for £100,000 a year? Marble Hill needs investment. With the £4m Parks for People Grant, EH has the opportunity to deliver that investment. EH can't afford to deliver it another way.</li> <li>• AR: numbers for the café – there's a lot of cost running the café, and if EH does not get right level of sales these figures will not work. AS responded by saying that EH are well aware that it will not be possible to deliver these numbers if we do not get the offer right. He noted that EH had gone into great detail with its financial planning including running a number of sensitivity analyses (including for a significant drop in the levels of visitation to the park) and these showed that although the café contribution would decrease, it would still</li> </ul>	

represent an improvement of the bottom line.

JA Head Properties Curator at EH

- We want to talk in terms of broad general contexts today.
- Broad architectural brief to convert / refurbish stable block area to create a vibrant café and retail space
- Original design while complementing Stable Block would be a contrast
- External appearance subsidiary to existing building and should be sympathetic to surrounding listed buildings and listed park landscape.
- EH uses a combination of professional judgement with subjectivity
- It is important to understand the way in which the Stable Block area is significant
- Then look at the changes you are proposing to make and put together a list of the impacts that will take and give them magnitude. These include

*Evidential value – tell you how the building was used*

*Historical value*

*Aesthetic value*

*Communal value – why local people love a building*

*Architectural value*

Conservation Management Plan for Marble Hill's plan of the Stable Block – shows external walls of Stable Block have high significance and date from 19<sup>th</sup> century. This is important and there are also sensitivities surrounding proximity to Grade I listed building and grade II\* historic landscape.

Assessing impacts – EH uses ICOMOS standards. (*Glossary made available for group*)

Members of the public at today's meeting will use these standards to assess a number of options.

DT – Head of Catering for English Heritage

- Recap of objectives for the cafe
- This is a community café. We are well aware that if local resident's don't use it, then EH haven't got a successful business
- We will feature a welcoming refreshing bespoke café for MH. We don't have one model that fits all. We will ensure we have food that local park users want.
- The café needs to be a hub for apprenticeship training which is a key reason for HLF choosing to fund the Marble Hill Revived scheme
- This necessitates a kitchen big enough to provide a training hub for EH use, and Richmond College to come and use to train as well.

- The café will provide financial sustainability to MH

### Explanation of plans

#### Option A (Existing plan – as previously submitted in Planning Application)

- Kitchen plan – 60 covers inside. 80 outside.
- Baking zone,
- Hot meal zone
- Space to deliver training.
- Kiosk for park users

#### Option B

- No extension
- 24 covers.
- External seating 100 covers.
- No seating in courtyard
- No secondary kiosk – this would be done with a mobile unit or ticket booth
- This option is simply not financially viable

#### Option C

54 internal covers

Kitchen which could support 2 apprentices.

Apprenticeship and training is a key element of the funding.

PB – Anyone who uses the park knows for 6 months of the year there is nobody in the café. Those are the numbers EH is dealing with in the winter.

Locals are thinking about a small café for the community.

This is a training facility which necessitates an architectural change. We have always said we don't know why this has to be so big – sounds different from what we have been told.

AS – Going forward, even if we do not proceed with Option A, we will need a kitchen somewhere in between the size of where we were before and what was proposed previously because we need to have an element of apprenticeship training within the café to satisfy HLF and BIG Lottery.

#### Option D (the Love Marble Hill proposal designed by Martin Habel)

MH outlined his scheme:

I approached the problem to find a reconciled scheme to meet the needs of EH and campaigners. There are ways you can handle impacts on the wall. I have said there are other problems – e.g. odour from kitchen, noise and the fact that existing walls act as sound mirrors. We had same arguments

for Richmond Riverside. It will destroy ambience of the private garden. Food spills off the table and local wildlife will come to eat – it is not good for natural life. Turned problem on its head and said why not reverse this and have within the space of the coach house itself. I interviewed quite a few park café managers. They said winters are horrendous, business drops right off. EH need money – Summer events are a peak. If you have a building more flexible in its use it can generate more income over the year. Have made provision so that the cricket club/football matches can use the cafe, you can do small hires, small business seminars. If you have a space that can subdivide you can generate money throughout the year. I recognise question of apprenticeships which take space. If you look at the bigger plan, use of space for ecology, education, children's trails, you could have an establishment structure for EH which offered apprenticeship not simply in catering but on a wider context (management etc)

You put out of use a valuable hard surface for staff parking. Why lose it? We know from traffic studies that was a real bone of contention. Leave the rear along, exclude the public, you have moved sound/odour source away. I felt there were lost opportunities with the proposal because EH has a story to tell, much bigger story how Thames was tamed, wildlife has survived, how use of riverbanks over the centuries has changed. A story to tell based in shop and reading area which becomes a heart of Twickenham. Twickenham has been poor relation but has a mix of urban history, nature and art. I have included shop to get footfall – can have a drink at café or have a meeting room. Below you can create a split level and confine within the arms of the rear existing coach house. This could be the hub for an ecology story. You could also use costumed role play. This is at the heart and could make the whole thing sing. We all know there was a long list and hope it is all history.

AS it has been really useful way to move forward. Final option builds on MH plan.

MH park could be a flagship in the way it accomplishes other schemes

PD: I feel whole thing is flawed I don't think it is as effective as having a café over by the car park at the 1 O'Clock club. I think café should be there not here and this should be offices.

DT: EH has looked very carefully at the location of the café. Whilst there may be some demand in the vicinity of the One O'Clock club, there are a number of reasons for the café needing to stay in the Stables/Coach House:

- There is an established café offer in the Stables already – why move it?
- EH anticipates that around 40% of its café turnover will

come from people visiting Marble Hill specifically for the house and formal gardens. The café therefore needs to be close to the house in order to capitalise on this business.

- The level of business which could be driven from the area around the One-O’Clock club alone is very small in comparison.

### Option E

- This is basically Option D with a couple of tweaks incorporated in order to minimise the impact on the historically significant elements of the building fabric. Can still have two apprentices.
- Retail moves into the Stable Block.
- No kiosk so a mobile unit or in ticket hut.
- Not at design stage yet.
- Glazed walls and doors.

### Summary:

	Plan A	Plan B	Plan C	Plan D	Plan E	Plan D & E Retail Only
	Full year	Full year	Full year	Full year	Full year	Full year
<b>Design Options</b>						
Visitor Numbers	845,120	845,120	845,120	845,120	845,120	845,120
Conversion	17.6%	13.0%	15.5%	16.0%	16.0%	2.0%
Transactions	148,910	109,866	130,994	135,219	135,219	16,902
Average Transaction Value (inc. VAT)	£4.00	£3.35	£3.75	£3.75	£3.75	£5.40
Gross Profit %	70.0%	65.0%	67.0%	68.0%	68.0%	52.0%
Internal Covers	60	24	54	60	60	0
External Covers	80	100	100	100	100	0
<b>Income</b>						
Sales	506,928	313,235	418,066	431,550	431,550	77,677
Gross Profit	354,850	203,603	280,104	293,454	293,454	40,392
Total Income	354,850	203,603	280,104	293,454	293,454	40,392
Cost of Sales	152,078	109,632	137,962	138,096	138,096	37,285
COS %	30%	35%	33%	32%	32%	48%
<b>Direct Expenses</b>						
Wages	188,786	112,200	126,500	135,000	135,000	22,500
Other Staff Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vehicle costs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operating costs	13,792	7,470	9,970	11,578	11,578	1,500
Total Direct Expenses	202,578	119,670	136,470	146,578	146,578	24,000
Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Net Contribution	152,272	83,933	143,634	146,876	146,876	16,392
Direct Wage Ratio	37.2%	35.8%	30.3%	31.3%	31.3%	29.0%
Net Contribution %	30.0%	26.8%	34.4%	34.0%	34.0%	21.1%
SPH	£ 0.60	£ 0.37	£ 0.49	£ 0.51	£ 0.51	£ 0.09

Drop between plan A and plans D and E – we can close down some areas and this reflects this.

Plan C B and E we have a bottom line contribution from the café of c. £145,000 which is not too far from the contribution which would have been provided under the original plan.

AR: Noted that Option D would be cheaper to build than

	<p>Option A</p> <p>DT all of options would be cheaper than Option A.</p> <p>JJ – Will EH be managing the café or will it be an external company running it? – DT we will be running this as an in house concern.</p> <p>AR: Asked for clarification that this contribution did not include any catering for events like weddings and is based on closing by 6pm and opening 10am with possible kiosk opening for dog walkers.</p> <p>DT: EH – the figures exclude any income from Weddings or similar events. To clarify, EH will not be using the café in this way as we want to minimise the impact on residents (which is why we are prepared to commit to daytime opening hours) Furthermore, a flexible space would not appeal to potential wedding clients anyway.</p>	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

SM	<p>Scoring</p> <p>Introducing criteria</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="416 304 1046 909"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Topic Area</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Heritage Impact</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Food offer &amp; Training</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Financial Performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Build Cost</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>Look &amp; Feel (Exterior)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6</td> <td>Layouts (Interior)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td>Impact on Neighbours</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>Impact on Park Users / Visitors</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9</td> <td>Other</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>Other</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Are there any other topics – group to inform if missing</p> <p><b>Additional criteria:</b></p> <p>Trees</p> <p>Traffic and parking</p> <p>Flexible use (for community) – it was agreed that this could be incorporated into the Interior layout category and scored accordingly.</p> <p>15 minutes –</p> <p>Groups requested to evaluate weighting for initial categories</p>		Topic Area	1	Heritage Impact	2	Food offer & Training	3	Financial Performance	4	Build Cost	5	Look & Feel (Exterior)	6	Layouts (Interior)	7	Impact on Neighbours	8	Impact on Park Users / Visitors	9	Other	10	Other	
	Topic Area																							
1	Heritage Impact																							
2	Food offer & Training																							
3	Financial Performance																							
4	Build Cost																							
5	Look & Feel (Exterior)																							
6	Layouts (Interior)																							
7	Impact on Neighbours																							
8	Impact on Park Users / Visitors																							
9	Other																							
10	Other																							
Feedback	<p>Weightings as follows, one for each table group. It was agreed that we would take an average as our actual weighting. This is highlighted in bold:</p> <p>Financial performance 3 4 4 4 <b>(3.75)</b></p> <p>Build costs 4 3 3 4 <b>(3.5)</b></p> <p>Look and feel 4 4 4 4 <b>(4)</b></p> <p>Layout 3 3 2 3 <b>(2.75)</b></p> <p>Impact on neighbours 4 3 4 4 <b>(3.75)</b></p> <p>Impact on park users 3 3 4 4 <b>(3.5)</b></p> <p>Trees 2 2 4 2 <b>(2.5)</b></p> <p>Traffic and parking 2 4 4 4 <b>(3.5)</b></p>																							

Scores

Comments: Change as little as you possibly can.

JC we were a little worried about the toilets – there are plenty of ways to address that but it needs to be considered.

AS agreed - that is the biggest negative impact on park users in this scheme.

Final scheme settled on by the group – scheme E

	Scheme		Heritage Impact	Food offer & Training	Financial Performance	Build Cost	Look & Feel (Exterior)	Layouts (Interior)	Impact on Neighbours	Impact on Park Users / Visitors	Trees	Traffic/Parking		Total score
A	Original Scheme	Score: 1 - 5	2	10	8	5	3	5	2	7	2	3		
		Weighting	4	2.75	3.75	2.5	4	2.75	3.75	3.5	2.5	3.5		
		Adjusted score	8	27.5	30	12.5	12	13.75	7.5	24.5	5	10.5		151.25
B	Fit within stable's southern block - no extension	Score: 1 - 5	12	6	4	13	13	6	15	6	14	12		
		Weighting	4	2.75	3.75	2.5	4	2.75	3.75	3.5	2.5	3.5		
		Adjusted score	48	16.5	15	32.5	52	16.5	56.25	21	35	42		334.75
C	Fit within stable's southern block - small extension	Score: 1 - 5	7	9	9	11	5	8	6	7	11	10		
		Weighting	4	2.75	3.75	2.5	4	2.75	3.75	3.5	2.5	3.5		
		Adjusted score	28	24.75	33.75	27.5	20	22	22.5	24.5	27.5	35		265.5
D	Fit within full stable block with glazed extension and use of archway	Score: 1 - 5	9	9	11	9	12	9	11	12	12	10		
		Weighting	4	2.75	3.75	2.5	4	2.75	3.75	3.5	2.5	3.5		
		Adjusted score	36	24.75	41.25	22.5	48	24.75	41.25	42	30	35		345.5
E	Fit within full stable block with glazed extension but archway left as it stands	Score: 1 - 5	10	9	11	9	12	10	11	11	12	10		
		Weighting	4	2.75	3.75	2.5	4	2.75	3.75	3.5	2.5	3.5		
		Adjusted score	40	24.75	41.25	22.5	48	27.5	41.25	38.5	30	35		348.75

Next Steps

AS: Although this workshop has resulted in a resounding low score for original scheme, AS noted that EH has not (as yet) taken scheme off the table. EH has committed to looking at different options which we have now done, and to getting local people's input into the process (which was the purpose of this exercise). EH will now take the feedback from this very useful and constructive workshop and discuss our next steps internally. We will communicate the outcome to people later in the summer.

This will happen before EH puts in a planning application.

SH ask that EH bears in mind the venue should have style, chic beauty. The restaurant at the Chelsea Physic Gardens was mentioned. Restaurants with those elements are the restaurants that are successful. What it looks like and what people want are important.

AS the reason DT is passionate about the catering in the Marble Hill Revived project is because it enables us to take our catering to the next level.

AR If you did adopt D/E there is a £400,000 capital saving. What would that be spent on?

AS The delay to this project has meant that any savings are likely to be offset by increases in costs due to inflation. .

PB – don't go into a closed compartment and come out with something awful. What has happened in this room has been really positive. It would be a bad move and if that could not be conveyed to the people above. There would be much positive support even if HLF won't give you help, we would lobby. We could turn our campaigning around to support you and lobby HLF. It is the people's voice that says this thing and there is always a solution to be got.



	<p>AS – Thankyou - we will be making that point with HLF in our discussions with them.</p> <p>AS closed the meeting by thanking everyone for their time and constructive approach. He reassured all attendees that EH really is listening and taking local opinions on board, and views this workshop as an important part of that process.</p>	