



MINUTES OF the Meeting of the Whatton and Aslockton Playing Field Committee at the Cranmer Arms, Main Street, Aslockton on TUESDAY 17th April 2018 at 7:30pm

Members Present and Apologies

Present: Cllr C Grocock, P Brown, Cllr J Brown, R Lambourne, G Nerney, Cllr J Morris, Cllr C Haslam

Apologies: R Crawford, P Griffin, C Edwardson, T Moxey

1. Members Present and Apologies

As above

2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Accepted as true reflection of March's meeting

Matters arising:

Play Area Inspections:

Action – (outstanding from Feb & Mch meeting) CE to check if there any play inspection regulations guidelines online

Insurance – S Ashmore has had no response from our insurance company re playground inspections or ROSPA requirements – **SA - Will chase for May meeting**

Severn Trent – damaged pipe / large water bills – CH mentioned CE was speaking to STWA but no update on when the pipe can be fixed.

CH to follow up with CE on his action above

RL to write to STWA to advise of new billing address (as correspondence above) & that WAPFC to be billed directly for this utility. Also to obtain claim form to STWA to reclaim overbilled water usage when fixed.

Insurance – S Ashmore has had no response from our insurance company re playground inspections or ROSPA requirements – **SA - Will chase for May meeting**

3. Pavilion and Playing Field Project

CG had circulated playground designs and it was agreed that further work was needed before progressing with local consultation:

Action (outstanding from Feb & Mch meeting) – TM to update design for play area for the next meeting and arrange a meeting with Proludic before July 2018

The group will discuss next steps re Community / School consultation following update of the design.

**Action – RL to try and confirm if there is any forthcoming support from Josh Scully / Jo Fish
Chris G / P Brown provided response from Roger Betts:-**

Thank you for your note, I have not heard anything from Richard or Paul since my site visit in January or subsequent e mails, so it would be prudent to recap on matters if I may?

1. I really do take your point to potentially focus on the pavilion as a priority, however, as discussed with Richard & Paul on my visit this will be the most incredibly difficult aspect to obtain significant levels of grant funding for.
2. I'm unaware as to whether the Football and Cricket clubs contacted their respective NGB's (Notts CB & Notts FA), as I advised, to discuss the plans and gauge any realistic likelihood of obtaining any future capital funding? In addition to the large fund up to £500K the FA now have their Facilities Small Capital Grants Scheme up to £10K but a pre-application discussion is still required with Notts FA.
3. I also sent through some information through re the Community Asset Fund to see whether your Trust would qualify in some way for that fund and again I'm not sure whether this was followed up?

As discussed with Richard & Paul there is the Reaching Communities Lottery Fund that will grant up to £100K for community buildings, however as a limited-access two-sports facility in a relatively affluent area, you will be ineligible to apply unless you radically alter the user remit of the building. I also understand you would have significant community competition from the two village halls in this respect.

Just as a guide the average success rate with this fund is pretty low at around 20%.

I understand that there may be some funds that have been 'promised' from impending Section 106/Infrastructure Levy Charges however I will be really honest with you Chris that apart from these funds, plus those I identified in my previous e mails, I could not ethically or morally justify setting up a deal with you to go for the pavilion funding because I am not aware of any 'significant' funds that are likely to be available for the sports pavilion development, unless the answers to points 2 & 3 above come back extremely positively from the NGB's.

Our way of working is very straightforward, we will undertake any realistic bid on a 'no win no fee' basis up to £10K. We will be open and honest to advise on whether a project is 'realistic' and stands a better than 80% chance of success. With such bids we always offer a rewrite should the bid be unsuccessful, based on the feedback from the funder. We would be happy to work with any of the groups or either of the parish councils on this basis. Our fee is £1000 + VAT for each bid and we always advise maximising each bid close to that £10K limit.

Anything over £10K is undertaken by mutual agreement and is wholly dependent on the complexity of the bid and the time & travel involved. With the notoriously low success rates we do not undertake such bids on a 'no win no fee basis'. We agree an upfront fee based on our estimation of the time and potential costs involved. We would then take a lower pro-rata percentage upon success to account for what was paid out upfront.

If organisations wish to write their own bids and have them checked we also offer a lower cost bid-checking service. We will create a report as to the strength of the bid and give advice as to where the bid can be strengthened. Again the cost of this would depend on the size and complexity of the bid.

Success on any bid cannot be guaranteed.

R Betts

Based on this response WAPFC discussed whether we should take a vote on how the S106 funds are applied for in light of the existing grant applications that had already been applied for.

R Lambourne stated he would not be involved with the project any further, if a proportion of the S106 monies was not applied for the pavilion project replacement. He thought we would stand a better chance in getting the smaller £10k grants (X3 APC, WPC, WAPFC) for the play equipment then use the majority of the S106 monies for the pavilion.

After a discussion it was agreed to postpone any further vote on this for now but we need to keep in view applications have been made on agreements of previous meetings for half towards the play equipment.

4. Meeting of the WAPFT Trustee

There Parish Council members present reported that the Trustee had agreed to the committee's approach around the 3/4 current options for the pavilion project and the need to seek external support from consultants.

5. Finance

The accounts were discussed –

S Ashmore brought along full year end accounts covering to 2018 & explained that we made a £310 los based on invoices to date but perhaps some are missing. By next meeting SA hopes to have a better understanding of what to charge each club for usage & establish if we are in profit or if prices need reviewing.

The issue of the scale of the respective costs charged between the sports clubs and the WAPFT was raised – **ACTION [carried over from last meeting] SA to collate information from G Redford and previous payment records by end June 2018 and then do a full financial review with C Grocock and C Haslam in preparation for forthcoming year.**

6. Fundraising

RL and PB reported that they had met with Roger Betts from ICS and that unfortunately a pavilion building of the scale previously proposed would be very difficult to get funding for (see response above).

RL – agreed to contact Notts CC for funding options & draft a letter to send by May meeting which covers all National Governing Bodies (inc Notts FA)

JB confirmed only 7 houses at Aslacr have been signed for & only 4 occupied. We are some way off the 25 occupancy.

CG – contacting Rushcliffe Community Fund for options along with BIFFA (by June meeting)

CG has spoken with RBC around flexibility in current funding allocations within the Abbey Lane 106/CIL & we should start to apply soon as other parishes / groups will be doing so as well.

Action – CG to chase (again) date on LIS bid with County Council

PB – to look at Community (£1-15k) & Asset Fund (£15-50k) grants by May meeting.

J Morris agreed to speak to Bottesford committee & establish how they are doing their pavilion overhaul

7. AOB

-Request from a team at Elston to play on a Saturday for 12 months whilst they sorted out their ground access. To be discussed at next meeting with R Crawford to establish if Greyhounds & the field can accommodate 2 Saturday games

A further request from a team to play on one Tuesday evening was agreed but they subsequently declined as pitch had not been cut for some weeks & pitch unplayable. This is due to bad weather RL informs.

-Consideration for AGM – For June meeting (to be confirmed at May meeting)

-Necessity for appointing a single point of control for playing field to liaise with clubs, arrange maintenance, run weekly checks including pavilion by creating a position of Ground Manager. This individual should be impartial & not be linked to any of the sports clubs who play there (May meeting agenda)

-Tree taken down adjacent to bungalow, saplings have self seeded & may need clearing. Also another tree by the swing has possibly died & needs taking down. **J Morris to report to Mike on WPC & RL agreed to photograph issue to show at May meeting.**

21st May 2018 – Date of next meeting