QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE CINEMA FOCUS GROUP ON THE PRE-FESIBILITY STUDY

7th February 2018

Responses in red by Ron Inglis

1. The report references the Picture House in Ashford. As this is positioned as an art house / boutique cinema offer, is there any way we can ask ABC if we can gain access to more info on this development:
   It may be appropriate for TTC to contact Ashford Borough Council about the Picturehouse development.

   Timescales The cinema is scheduled to open in December 2018.

   Target audience and drive time target radius No information is available. The venue will have at least one café bar or restaurant, but may have two or more spaces.

   Any forecasting info... how many screens etc... 6 screens are planned.

   This cinema could be in competition with a Tenterden Cinema proposition.... and could very well be counting Tenterden in its catchment population? It is unlikely that Tenterden is an essential component in Picturehouse's forecasts due to the large number of residents in Ashford who will form the majority of their audience.

2. Because of our rural location, is a 15-min drive time radius enough?
   If I want to go to the cinema at the moment (which I do about once a month) my options are Rye (30mins) Hawkhurst (20 mins) and Ashford (20-30mins) - it would be good to see the numbers crunched for a 20/25 min radius... this of course does overlap with Hawkhurst / Ashford suburbs, but the evening offer from Tenterden restaurants and pubs offer could reinforce the appeal.
   The most regular attenders are likely to be within this catchment. It could well be that there will be people beyond the 15-minute boundary who will come to Tenterden in preference to the other towns or because of a particular reason, such as visiting friends, and will visit a cinema in Tenterden. If the restaurants, cafes and bars in Tenterden are sufficiently appealing to people from a wider area then it is likely that they will be happy to travel further than a 15-minute journey to attend the cinema in Tenterden. Demographic data for a wider area could be obtained.

3. The potential development models are very useful... but It would have been great to have seen a recommendation for the 'best fit' model for Tenterden?
   If the Stage 2 investigation is commissioned, each of the four sites will be looked at in detail and the most suitable option for development will be identified.

4. Preliminary assessment of sites and buildings.... (this is one for discussion at the next meeting..) given this preliminary assessment can some of these sites be discounted?

   The architect and quantity surveyor are expecting to examine four sites/buildings and they will assess each one on its merits depending on its suitability as a viable cinema development.

5. On page 21 section 3.5.3 he suggests that a boutique cinema development in Tenterden might interest Kino, to complement Rye and Hawkhurst and ward off competition for audiences. However, I recall him saying at our meeting in December that Kino's policy is now to expand by buying existing established cinemas. My question is whether Ron has any new evidence about Kino's policy or possible interest?
Following the meeting in December I have been in contact with Kino Digital. They have confirmed that they are interested in being involved in discussions about the possibility of Kino participating in a cinema development in Tenterden.

6. It could be argued that there is some double accounting in the table at the top of page 15 with regard to attendances from the outer catchment area, because these are factored down in both columns 3 and 5. I would also question the 15-minute drive time as being too short.
The table does not include double counting. The first line applies only to Tenterden residents. The second line applies only to people outwith the town. The figures aim to provide a realistic assessment of the audience potential for a cinema, with town residents expected to be the most regular attenders. See answer to point 2 above in respect of the 15-minute catchment.

7. There appears to be some discrepancy between the Executive Summary which speaks of attendances of to 80,000, and the main body of the report which quotes an upper limit of 70,000 (4.4.5).
The upper limit of 70,000 admissions is the more appropriate estimate.

8. I cannot understand how Ron has arrived at observation (ii) in para 5.2.8 which implies that the conversion of an existing building would be cheaper than a new build option. Having looked at the Tenterden Club I think this is unlikely, although I have not seen the White Stuff site.
The costs of conversion or new build will be addressed by the architect and QS in Stage 2 but generally I would expect conversion to be less costly.

9. On the same para. (5.2.8), I think it is wrong to start with the perception that *the majority of the budget is likely to come from public funds.* We should keep an open mind on that, but I was hoping that we learn more about the financing of at least some of the examples he quoted. I am assuming that they are going to flesh this out in Phase 2.
Existing cinema operators of local and boutique cinemas are unlikely to pay for the main construction works. Therefore any private company involved in the building works would almost certainly have to be a company which is not already operating a cinema – a new entrant to the cinema business. This can be explored in Stage 2.

10. We do need to begin to give some thought to where the capital will be sourced, and it would be helpful if Ron Inglis could be pressed to provide more information on how this has been tackled elsewhere.
More information can be provided on this in Stage 2 of the report.

END

12 Feb 2018