



# Whatton and Aslockton Playing Field Trust

The Pavilion, Dark Lane, Whatton-in-the-Vale, Nottinghamshire NG13 9FE

Registered Charity – Number 1135385

E-Mail: [info@wapft.org.uk](mailto:info@wapft.org.uk)

Please reply to: WAPFT, 17, Burton Lane, Whatton-in-the-Vale, Nottinghamshire. NG13 9EQ

Telephone: 01949 851597 – E-Mail: [gregg@grredford.co.uk](mailto:gregg@grredford.co.uk)

---

## MINUTES OF the Meeting of the Whatton and Aslockton Playing Field Committee at the Cranmer Arms, Main Street, Aslockton on the 12<sup>th</sup> April 2016 at 7:30 pm

---

### 1. Members Present and Apologies

- a. Present: Cllr J Brown, P Griffin, Cllr. C Grocock, Cllr. C Haslam, RA Lambourne, T Moxey, G Nerney, Cllr. GR Redford (Chair).
- b. Apologies: There were no apologies

### 2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved by the meeting

### 3. Ground

Richard Lambourne informed the meeting that a gate post holding the main gate was broken and that the gate had to be locked. Simon Daws will replace the post on or about the 13<sup>th</sup> April 2016, he will also replace the post for the adjacent small gate.

### 4. Play Equipment

The Chairman informed the meeting that he had received the Operational Play Equipment Report just before the meeting, but had not had the time to digest it. It will be presented at the next meeting.

### 5. Building project

#### a. Consultation Progress

The meeting discussed the format of the document that would accompany the survey. An incomplete draft had been distributed to members.

It was resolved that an A5 booklet style of document in Black and White, the Chairman informed the meeting that the document should be complete by the end of April and he would undertake to obtain quotes for printing. Tim Moxey asked if it was possible to include just the Plans in colour, the Chairman undertook to investigate the costs.

#### b. Aslockton Parish Council.

Cllr. Haslam raised a number of issue that had arisen from Aslockton Parish Council's last meeting. It was felt that Aslockton Parish Council had misunderstood the purpose of the meeting and some of the content of the presentation. The meeting felt that it would be better if the issues were raised and addressed in writing.

*Subsequent to the meeting an e-mail was received from Cllr. Haslam detailing the points raised by Aslockton Parish Council. The issues were addressed by the Chairman by e-mail on the same day (13<sup>th</sup> April 2016). In the interests of transparency the response is included as an Appendix to these minutes.*

## 6. Finance

### a. Annual Accounts

The Chairman informed the meeting that the Annual Accounts had been distributed to all members.

The meeting was informed that the AGM Notice was included in the Annual Accounts set for the 10<sup>th</sup> May at 7:30 pm – at the Cranmer Arms –the date and venue was confirmed by the Meeting

The Meeting approved the Annual Accounts for the year-ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2016.

## 7. Any Other business

### a. Queen's Birthday Beacon April 21<sup>st</sup> 2016

It was confirmed that the Beacon would be erected and ready for lighting.

## 8. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> May 2016 following the Annual General Meeting.

## APPENDIX

*The following is the reply to issues raised by Aslockton Parish Council as noted in 5b of these Minutes.*

As discussed last night there appears to be a complete misunderstanding of the purpose of the meeting with the Parish Councils and indeed some of the content of presentation.

I thought we had made it clear that the meeting was intended to be a 'Briefing' to bring the Parish Councils up-to-date on the thinking underlying the project.

From what you said last night it appears, that you and your colleagues considered the 'options' discussed during the 'Thinking Process' section as a menu from which a selection could be made. It wasn't, it was intended to demonstrate the extent of work that had been undertaken to arrive at the 'preferred option' and the various alternative strategies that had been examined. We thought we had demonstrated why each of the scenarios examined would not work, clearly that does not appear to have been the case.

Secondly, great significance during the presentation was placed on the importance of the COMMUNITY CONSULTATION. We explained that the Survey was intended to:

1. Quantify the current use of the playing field
2. Test the acceptance (or otherwise) of the preferred approach, including the individual elements of the project and its' potential uses.
3. Quantify the possible future use of the facility and playing field as a whole.
4. Test the impact on other facilities in the two parishes.

In response to a question, we emphasized that if there appeared to be a material impact on other facilities, we would engage with those other facilities and if they considered the impact material would look at ways of mitigating or eliminating the impact.

We were also at great pains to explain that the Survey was completely neutral in its approach to order to obtain an accurate representation of the Community view.

We also distributed printed copies of the draft survey with the request that if members felt that there were other questions that should be addressed to let us know so that we could include them in the next draft.

We listed the potential sources of funding for information and completeness only.

Finally, in relation to the meeting itself we concluded by reaffirming the importance of the Community Survey and the fact that the results of that survey would drive how and IF the project proceeded. The meeting was never intended to seek approval for the project, because any further detailed work is wholly dependent on the results of the survey. We did expect, however the Parish Councils to 'buy-into' the process of transparency and community involvement and focus.

In relation to the questions you have raised, as discussed last night they are in the main reasonable but largely premature.

### **Cost**

I assume by this you mean the level of cost.

It is important that we understand the realistic magnitude of the potential cost of the project. There is no point assuming that it is going to cost £250,000 if the real cost is twice that! As part of the presentation we detailed the costs of the various elements. But again reiterated that the cost was clearly linked to the size and design of the building and that would be driven by the Community Survey. Again we did say at the meeting that the building costs would be refined once we had the results of the Survey and had started on the process of developing relationships with potential users as part of the Business Plan development. It may also be necessary to reconsider the type of construction and quality of finish. Clearly, it is too early in the process to be definitive about costs.

### **Size**

I'm not sure what is meant by this question. We tried to demonstrate throughout the presentations the reasons for 'settling' on the preferred option. The one central point was the ability to produce additional income streams to provide a sustainable project. Generating those additional income streams requires space.

### **Parish Council Taking Funding out.**

We tried to show all the possible funding sources, the Parish Councils are a potential source. There were a number of funding sources on the list which we are unlikely to use.

### **Demand for additional Facility**

We clearly said at the briefing that the Community Survey was intended, in part to establish if there was demand for the facility. That question cannot be answered until the Survey is complete. If there is no local demand then the project cannot proceed.

### **Cost of Running and Break Even requirements.**

In response to a question on this issue at the meeting we said it was premature. This information will form part of the Business Plan which cannot be started until we have the results of the Survey.

We also said at the meeting that during the Business Plan process we would be developing potential user groups (outside the parishes), service and commercial partners. Obviously, if a coherent, robust and risk assessed Business Plan cannot be developed then the project cannot proceed – this was also emphasized at the meeting.

### **Effect on TCC/Jubilee Hall/Cranmer Arms.**

This was fully addressed at the meeting and forms a large part of the Survey – see the comments on the COMMUNITY CONSULTATION above.

**Liability to finish if build stalls halfway due to any factors (e.g. Finding bring withdrawn in economic climate)**

The project would clearly not proceed without having either irrevocable funding arrangement or cash in place. I cannot think of any circumstance, other than Armageddon where such circumstances would arise. However, there are insurance products that would underwrite such a risk (quite cheaply as the likelihood is so remote as not to be considered a risk).

**Ground limitations on space**

I regret I don't understand the question.

**Not having sufficient information / costs on other options ( e.g. replacing existing building on present footprint)**

We did explain the reasons why and the potential estimated costs involved. As I have said at the head of this e-mail, the presentation was not intended to provide a 'Menu' of alternatives but merely to demonstrate the level of consideration that has been given to arriving at the preferred option. We actually dealt with the 'replacing existing build on present footprint' issue in detail at the meeting. As you know we had a brief discussion last night in respect of the issue of replacing the existing building on a like-for-like and even if we were to secure local funding (primarily from the Parish Councils which is highly unlikely), the increase in Business Rates and Insurance only, with no ability to increase revenue would make the building unsustainable, without substantial additional Revenue funding from the Parish Councils. As you heard from Richard Lambourne last night the controlling bodies of both football and cricket would be unlikely to accept a 'new' sub-standard facility, so we would also be likely to lose the existing 'User Clubs'.

Finally, this and previous committees have spent five years examining the possible scenarios and do not come to the 'preferred option' route without considerable investigation, work and commitment by those involved. You also know through the discussions we have at meetings that we are totally committed to a Community Led and Community Focused facility.