

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

MAPLEDURHAM PLAYING FIELDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 JUNE 2015

Present:

Councillor I Ballsdon	(Chairman)
Councillor E Hopper	
Councillor J Skeats	
Rev K Knee-Robinson	Mapledurham Parish Council
Mr N Stanbrook	Mapledurham Users' Committee

Also in attendance:

Mr R Bentham	Warren & District Residents' Association
Ms K Brown	Escape
Mr J Roach	Caversham & District Residents' Association
Ms L Dyke	Escape
Mr K Macrae	Friends of Mapledurham Playing Fields
Mr D Mander	Caversham Trents Football Club
Mr S Quayle	Solicitor, Legal Services
Ms N Simpson	Committee Administrator
Mr B Stanesby	Parks & Open Spaces Manager

Apologies:

Mr S Ayers	Friends of Mapledurham Playing Fields
Mr S Bolton	Caversham & District Residents' Association
Mr M Payne	Mapledurham Bridge Club

1. MINUTES & MATTERS ARISING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2015 were confirmed as a correct record.

Further to Minute 1 (2) of the last meeting, Ben Stanesby reported that the pile of rubbish at the front of the pavilion had now been cleared and that a new pile of rubbish by the front doors would also be cleared.

Further to Minute 4 (2) of the last meeting, regarding the query about why there had been no inflationary increase in the income from the Tennis Club over the last four years, Ben Stanesby said that this had been overlooked by officers. Nigel Stanbrook explained that the Tennis Club's lease did provide for an inflationary increase every four years, and the Tennis Club had asked the Council for the new rate. Ben Stanesby said that he would check the due date for the change of rate and sort out the issue.

AGREED:

- (1) That the position on these matters be noted;
- (2) That Ben Stanesby sort out the inflationary increase in the income from the Tennis Club lease.

2. HEIGHTS FREE SCHOOL CONSULTATION

Further to Minute 2 of the last meeting, Ben Stanesby submitted a report on the results of the consultation on the location of The Heights Free School undertaken by the Council on behalf of the Education Funding Agency (EFA).

The report stated that a statistical analysis of the results of the consultation had been published, was available on the Council's website, and was set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

The report stated that the consultation had identified Mapledurham Playing Fields (MPF) as the preferred location by nearly half of the respondents, but Ben Stanesby clarified at the meeting that the figures showed it was actually nearer three quarters than half of the respondents who supported the use of MPF. He noted that, of the 2,468 respondents who had indicated they were users of MPF, 53% had identified MPF as their first choice of location for the school.

The Council was yet to consider the results and would not consider the position until an approach was made by the EFA. Ben Stanesby stated that no proposal had yet been received from the EFA and that any proposal would need to be considered by the Council alongside the purpose of the Mapledurham Playing Fields Trust.

Keith Knee-Robinson raised concerns about the distribution of information about the consultation. He said that the consultation should have been targeted to residents of Mapledurham and Reading, as beneficiaries of the Trust, but many people did not receive a letter about the meeting that had been held, nor anything about the consultation. If residents had not used facilities such as Caversham Library, where information about the consultation was available, many of them had not known about the consultation until it was nearly over. These issues had been raised with Councillor Ballsdon, who had contacted Council officers about the missed letters, and the firm who had done the distribution had been supposed to distribute letters to houses that had been missed in the original distribution, but this had not happened. He acknowledged that, in light of the figures reported, the potential missing responses would not have been likely to make a big difference to the results, but said that he was raising the issue because of the principle.

Robin Bentham noted that the roads around the Playing Fields had also been poorly covered by the consultation letter distribution, including Upper Warren Avenue.

AGREED:

- (1) That the report and position be noted;

- (2) That Ben Stanesby feed the concerns expressed about the consultation back to those who had organised it, ask for a response and report it back to the next meeting.

3. MAPLEDURHAM PAVILION MAINTENANCE & REPLACEMENT - UPDATE

Ben Stanesby submitted a report giving an update on the latest progress with the pavilion replacement project for Mapledurham Playing Fields and other maintenance items.

The report stated that the Council continued to make provision within its Capital programme for a contribution of £100,000 towards the replacement of the pavilion. A small element of this had been spent on enabling studies as reported to previous Committee Meetings. It was noted at the meeting that the £50k from Festival Republic had been received and was in the WADRA account, and that the small element of the £100,000 spent was approximately £5,000.

While a proposal was awaited from the Education Funding Agency (EFA) on the provision of the Heights Free School, the Council believed it was prudent to delay the rebuilding/refurbishment of the pavilion as not doing so risked wasting both public money and funds raised by the fund-raising group. It was hoped that any delay would be short but, given the time period was unknown, a review of the condition of the pavilion was being undertaken by a structural engineer to identify any immediate concerns or items that needed to be carried out to prevent further deterioration in the short term that might impact on the planned refurbishment, and to provide background information for work needed over future years to keep the building operating until refurbishment could be carried out.

In the meantime, works had been ordered for both repairs to the roof over the main building and to the changing room flooring. As a matter of course, officers would be testing for asbestos and removing any suspicious materials found, which was now a routine exercise when undertaking any work within Mapledurham pavilion. Ben Stanesby reported that, since the report had been written, the changing room floor had been tested and repaired. Roofers had also been out to inspect the roof, and it was hoped that the roof would be effective before the autumn season began.

The report stated that it had been acknowledged by the Management Committee that the condition of the pavilion and the need for refurbishment was affecting use. An update on use was tabled at the meeting, which showed that the number of bookings was similar to those in the previous year. Both the Football Club and Tennis Club would like to extend both the extent and duration of their agreements with the Council in relation to use of the building and grounds. Consideration of this was being held back until the timetable for the building replacement had been determined.

It was noted that it was not known exactly when or how a proposal from the EFA was likely to be made, but that there had originally been mention of a July 2015 date and officers expected that the EFA would tell the Council first as it was the

Local Education Authority and was also Trustee for some of the sites. As previously reported, the Council had set up a Heights Sub-Committee to consider any EFA proposals. It was also noted that it was not known where on the site a school would be most likely to be positioned if the Mapledurham Playing Fields site was proposed.

Robin Bentham said that, as there were funds available to go ahead with the pavilion refurbishment, it was disappointing that this issue should get in the way of progressing the refurbishment. If the EFA chose the Mapledurham Playing Fields site for a school proposal, this would be a big set-back, especially since there had been no attempt yet to specify how siting a school on the site would be done.

Ben Stanesby said at the meeting that officers were aware of the breaking up of the asphalt on the basketball court, and that this would be investigated. He also reported that a boroughwide refurbishment of football pitch goal areas had started, but he did not know how long it would be until the Mapledurham pitches were done.

AGREED: That the report and position be noted.

4. MAPLEDURHAM PLAYING FIELDS USERS REPORT

Nigel Stanbrook gave a verbal update as the Representative of Mapledurham Playing Fields Users.

He gave details of communications between himself and the playing fields user groups, noting that the EFA consultation process had involved considerable communication over the last six months. He had attended Rob Wilson MP's stakeholder meeting on 16 January 2015 and from that meeting had been asked to provide information to the EFA for its consultation information pack. He recorded his thanks to the user group members who had responded with the requested information by the deadline and noted the users' subsequent disappointment and irritation that the EFA had decided not to include the details provided in the information pack.

He said that the User Group had declined his suggestion in January 2015 to hold a meeting to discuss the EFA proposals, but noted that, if the EFA wished to consider Mapledurham Playing Fields further, he would call a meeting of users. He noted that, at the moment, matters were on hold pending the EFA's decision.

Nigel Stanbrook noted that, in the information provided, several user groups had detailed the number of years they had been involved with the Playing Fields: Tennis Club and Football Club both 60 years, Bridge Club 30 years, Escape and Toddler Group nearly 20 years and Friends of Mapledurham Playing Fields 16 years. He also noted that many clubs were enjoying an increase and extended use of the area, for example the Football Club, with a continuing increase in numbers playing football increasing the number of pitches required. He said that on 7 June 2015, Caversham Treants had held a very successful and well organised presentation event, and also that they had prepared a ten year development plan.

Daniel Mander gave an update on Caversham Trents Football Club activity, reporting that there had been around 1,100-1,300 people at the presentation day, that seven or eight football teams played at the playing fields on Saturdays and two on Sundays. Training happened at the playing fields from March to October, and each Monday evening they had 3-400 children attending - numbers which had grown from 150 children.

Nigel Stanbrook noted that there had been so many people at the presentation day that the car parking provision had been inadequate and people had had to park on the playing fields and in Hewett Avenue, and he circulated some photographs of the parked cars.

Nigel Stanbrook said that the Tennis Club was another example of development of playing facilities at the playing fields. He noted that, as reported previously, £60k had been invested in the club, £38k from a Sport England grant.

He said that the user groups wished for the continuation of the pavilion facilities and they were disappointed that the refurbishment/replacement of the pavilion kept being discussed but had not yet happened. They felt that the Council should commit to commencing the works and provide the users with what they had been promised.

Ben Stanesby said that all involved would like to be able to get on with the refurbishment of the pavilion and that, if the Heights School issue had not arisen, processes such as tendering for work on the pavilion would have been progressed further and work might even have started.

Ben Stanesby said that he had been requested to obtain information from users outlining their current needs and future requirements for facilities at the pavilion, and that he had expected the information, given by users to Nigel Stanbrook to assist with the EFA consultation process, to be forwarded to him. Nigel Stanbrook said that in his view it was he as users representative on the Management Committee who should obtain information from the users as to current and future requirements. A meeting at which he would have discussed matters with Ben had unfortunately not taken place and he was prepared to arrange another meeting.

As to the information Nigel Stanbrook had obtained from the users in connection with the EFA consultation process, he clarified that this information had been sought separately from the Management Committee. He said that he thought that the Management Committee had expressly stated that they wished to have nothing to do with this information obtained for the EFA. In consequence he felt there was no basis for such information being forwarded to the Management Committee either directly or via Ben Stanesby.

AGREED:

- (1) That the report and position be noted;
- (2) That Ben Stanesby and Nigel Stanbrook arrange to meet to discuss the information needed by officers from users and how best to obtain it.

5. FORMAT OF THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Keith Knee-Robinson had requested that the Committee discuss a way forward to constitute the membership of the Mapledurham Playing Fields Management Committee such that it would be seen to be more of a democratic body that could make independent recommendations to the Council. He had said that if the Committee consisted of an equal number of Councillors to user representatives then this might go some way to achieve that aim.

At the meeting, Keith Knee-Robinson said that the Management Committee consisted of five members with a limited definition as to who they should represent. For example, one had to be from Mapledurham Parish Council. As the existing Committee consisted of three Reading Councillors (who were therefore also Trustees), a Mapledurham Parish Councillor and a User Representative, any discussion about planning or other issues that could raise the question of conflict of interest or predetermination for the Councillors could result in the Management Committee having no views or recommendations to forward to the Trustee to consider, as three out of the five representatives could be conflicted or predetermined. This had been the case with the recent consultation and could be the case if there were EFA proposals regarding Mapledurham Playing Fields. This seemed to negate any vestige of the advisory role the Committee might have.

He therefore suggested that the Committee was reconfigured so that, for example, it had half Councillors and half independent members such as those from user groups, Mapledurham Parish Council etc. This could negate the conflict of interest problems in discussion and allow the Committee to make recommendations to the Trustee, for it to take or discard.

Steven Quayle gave legal advice on the powers and duties of the Management Committee, noting that its role was confined to the day-to-day workings of the playing fields, only able to take decisions about letting charges, repairs and maintenance, which is what the Council as Trustee had set it up to do. Any decisions about the future of the playing fields were up to the Trustee, with the involvement of the Charity Commission. He stated, however, that there was no reason why the Committee could not make recommendations to the Trustee. The membership of the Committee was five members, three of which were currently Councillors who were democratically elected. If the membership was changed to a 50/50 split between Councillors and other members, this reconstituted Committee would not be more democratic, as the other representatives were appointed rather than elected. He also noted that 4 out of 5 of the committee members were from public bodies and that if the committee make-up was changed to 50/50, those who were appointed would not have the same public accountability as those from public bodies. He said that all individual members of the Committee could submit their own independent recommendations to the Trustee.

He said that, unless there was a major problem with the working of the Management Committee, he could not see that the Council as Trustee would want to change the format of the Committee, as it had obviously been considered when

the Trust was set up in 1985 by the Charity Commission that the format would work.

Steven Quayle explained the difference for Councillors between having a conflict of interest and predetermination. He explained that, if a Councillor wished to “nail their colours to the mast” in favour of a certain view, they could do that, but they would then be “predetermined” on that matter, but they would not necessarily have a conflict of interest. Legal advice given to Councillors was usually to say nothing about their views on a matter before having all the relevant information on the matter so that they could make a decision in light of all the facts and evidence. Courts had recently shown that they understood that Councillors could have a predisposed view on a matter but could still make a decision on it, as long as they were not predetermined.

He concluded by saying that a proposal for changing the format or numbers for membership of the Management Committee could be put forward to the Council, but he expected that the Council as Trustee would not support a change, and the Charity Commission would also have to agree to any proposed change. It was noted that the Committee itself could not agree any change to its own format.

Nigel Stanbrook noted that the three members appointed by the Council to the Committee did not all have to be Councillors. The Ward Councillor had to be involved, but the others could be independent people. He suggested that, for example, one of the Councillors could be replaced by a representative from the Residents' Association, and this could give more balance and allow the views of the local community to be more fairly represented.

Councillor Skeats said that the Management Committee had worked well with three Councillors for a long time and there had not been problems expressed with the format previously. It seemed that the complexity of the current situation with the possible proposals for a school and Councillors' different responsibilities in different arenas had caused the recent concerns, including an unprecedented call for Councillors to resign. She noted that she was not clear how the Users Representative was chosen.

Nigel Stanbrook said that his concerns were not to do with individual Councillors, but on a matter of principle. Ben Stanesby said that the Users Representative was supposed to be reappointed every three years, and this was something that officers should probably have organised. Nigel Stanbrook suggested that he could organise this himself, seeing if anyone else from the User Groups wished to be the representative in his place. Councillor Hopper said that one should not be able to organise one's own appointment or election.

Councillor Hopper noted that, if the membership of the Committee were changed to include a new person instead of a Councillor, unless that person was elected, there would be a reduction in democratic accountability. He also said that he could not see the Trustee agreeing to a change where it did not have a majority on the Committee, just in case the Committee made, for example, odd decisions on hire charges.

Nigel Stanbrook and Keith Knee-Robinson expressed the view that they thought that the Committee was only advisory to the Trustee.

Councillor Ballsdon noted that, if Keith Knee-Robinson or Nigel Stanbrook wanted to take forward the issue of the format and membership of the Management Committee further, they could submit a question to the Policy Committee, and then the Administration could consider any request to change the format of the Management Committee.

AGREED: That the position be noted.

6. OTHER BUSINESS - FIREWORK DISPLAY - 27 JUNE 2015

Ben Stanesby reported that he had been contacted by the organisers of a private firework display which had been due to be held on 27 June 2015 at Caversham Golf Club. The Golf Club had not been able to accommodate the display at short notice and so, as the organisers had been let down, officers were proposing to allow a four minute private firework display at 10.00pm at Mapledurham Playing Fields and, instead of charging a fee, to accept the organisers' offer of providing a firework display at one of the future fund-raising events for the pavilion.

There would be no damage to the pitches and officers were suggesting that the organisers be required to distribute in advance a note to all the houses on the perimeter of the playing fields to warn them of the display.

AGREED: That the proposal to allow the firework display at the Playing Fields on 27 June 2015 be endorsed.

7. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

AGREED: That the next meeting be held at 6.30pm on Tuesday 15 September 2015 at the Pavilion.

(The meeting started at 6.30pm and finished at 8.03pm)

READING BOROUGH COUNCIL

MAPLEDURHAM PLAYING FIELDS MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15 SEPTEMBER 2015

Present:

Councillor I Ballsdon	(Chairman)
Councillor E Hopper	
Councillor J Skeats	
Rev K Knee-Robinson	Mapledurham Parish Council
Mr N Stanbrook	Mapledurham Users' Committee

Also in attendance:

Mr S Ayers	Friends of Mapledurham Playing Fields
Mr R Bale	CARPS (Catchment Area Residents' Preferred Site)
Mr R Bentham	Warren & District Residents' Association
Mr C Brooks	Head of Legal & Democratic Services
Ms K Brown	Escape
Mr M Corbett	Mapledurham Playing Fields Action Group
Mr D Mander	Caversham Trents Football Club
Mr J Mehmet	Member of the Public
Ms E Miles	Warren & District Residents' Association
Mr L Pople	Caversham & District Residents' Association
Ms N Simpson	Committee Administrator
Mr B Stanesby	Leisure & Recreation Manager

Apologies:

Mr K Macrae	Friends of Mapledurham Playing Fields
Mr S Bolton	Caversham & District Residents' Association

1. MINUTES & MATTERS ARISING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2015 were confirmed as a correct record, subject to:

- a) Amendment of the second paragraph of Minute 2 to refer to an amount of £5,000 being reported as spent from the £100,000 from the Council capital programme;
- b) Replacement of the two final paragraphs of Minute 4 with the following two paragraphs:

"Ben Stanesby said that he had been requested to obtain information from users outlining their current needs and future requirements for facilities at the pavilion, and that he had expected the information, given by users to

Nigel Stanbrook to assist with the EFA consultation process, to be forwarded to him. Nigel Stanbrook said that in his view it was he as users representative on the Management Committee who should obtain information from the users as to current and future requirements. A meeting at which he would have discussed matters with Ben had unfortunately not taken place and he was prepared to arrange another meeting.

As to the information Nigel Stanbrook had obtained from the users in connection with the EFA consultation process, he clarified that this information had been sought separately from the Management Committee. He said that he thought that the Management Committee had expressly stated that they wished to have nothing to do with this information obtained for the EFA. In consequence he felt there was no basis for such information being forwarded to the Management Committee either directly or via Ben Stanesby."

Further to Minute 1 (2) of the last meeting, Ben Stanesby reported that the inflationary increase in the income from the Tennis Club reflected what was in the lease.

Further to Minute 4 (2) of the last meeting, it was reported that Ben Stanesby and Nigel Stanbrook had met to discuss what information was needed from users regarding their requirements for facilities and it had been decided that no further information was required until there were further developments, at which point the position could be reconsidered.

Further to Minute 6 of the last meeting, regarding the firework display on 27 June 2015, Councillor Hopper reported that the local Neighbourhood Action Group had asked about the display and he had explained that the Management Committee had approved it. The Group had felt the display had been too loud and Councillor Hopper had submitted a noise complaint on their behalf. It was noted that the leaflet distribution carried out by the organisers of the display to inform local residents had not been adequate, and that if a free display was to be carried out at a future fundraising event, as offered, leaflets warning residents about the fireworks should be distributed more widely.

AGREED: That the position on these matters be noted.

2. MAPLEDURHAM PAVILION MAINTENANCE & REPLACEMENT & HEIGHTS FREE SCHOOL UPDATE

Ben Stanesby submitted a report giving an update on the latest progress with the pavilion replacement project for Mapledurham Playing Fields and other maintenance items, as well as the latest position on the provision of the Heights Free School. The report had appended details of lettings at the pavilion for 2015-16, giving details of the hirers and numbers of sessions, compared with the same periods in 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15.

The report stated that the Council had allocated £100,000 from Section 106 monies to the re-provision of the changing facilities at the pavilion, of which £14,605 had been spent over the last four years towards the replacement of the pavilion. The report listed the date, supplier, description and value of each of the individual amounts of expenditure making up the £14,605 total.

Ben Stanesby reported at the meeting that a Freedom of Information Act request had been received regarding the £14,605 spend, and he tabled the request and the response, which gave further details of the spend, setting out a more detailed description of the works undertaken and also listing work received at no charge or funded from other sources. He also tabled a response to a query regarding why consideration of the extension of the extent and duration of the Football Club and Tennis Club agreements with the Council in relation to use of the pavilion and grounds was being held back until the timetable for the building replacement had been determined.

The report stated that, while the Education Funding Agency (EFA) had written to Rob Wilson MP stating that it would be pursuing Mapledurham Playing Fields for the permanent home of the Heights Free School and this had been reported in the local press, a proposal had not yet been received by the Council and the Council believed it was prudent to delay the rebuilding/refurbishment of the pavilion. Until a proposal had been received, the Council was not in a position to consider what action should be taken.

The report stated that, as indicated at the last Management Committee meeting, a structural surveyor had undertaken an assessment of the building and this had been reported to the Council's Property Services Team. From this assessment, a schedule of works would be developed to maintain the building. This would include options for both short term maintenance and actions to be taken should there be a prolonged period before the future of the pavilion was determined.

At the last Management Committee meeting, concern had been raised that the Heights consultation had not reached all potential beneficiaries of the Trust. The report gave details of the process of the consultation and what action had been taken when a number of residents had contacted the Council and Councillors to say that they had not received their consultation letter.

Members of the Committee said that they had been aware that some of the £100k had been spent on the planning application, but they had thought that all the other architecture work had been carried out for free by Shaun Tanner and they had not realised that there had been further expenditure from the £100k. Ben Stanesby said that the work charged to the capital budget for the pavilion replacement had been reported through the Council's reporting processes, but not through the Management Committee, which he acknowledged would have been helpful, but he said that there had been no intention to mislead. It was explained that, whilst Shaun Tanner had offered his services pro bono, the fees paid to Day Tanner Partnership had been for the costs experienced by the Partnership in undertaking the work.

Councillor Ballsdon queried whether the expenditure had been checked by legal services as appropriate spend from Section 106 monies. Ben Stanesby explained that this sort of expenditure was typical of that on work involved in capital schemes, as it was working towards having a capital asset at the end of the process, but said that he could get the expenditure checked to ensure that it was appropriate.

Ben Stanesby reported that he would be meeting with the Property Services Team in the next month to discuss the plan of action for short and long term maintenance for the pavilion. He noted that the costs of any repair work would be met from revenue funding, as had been the cost of the structural survey. He said that the results of the survey and the plan of action would be brought back to the Management Committee.

Councillor Ballsdon said that the Management Committee would like reassurance from the Trustee that the facilities would be maintained to a reasonable standard whilst awaiting the EFA proposal.

It was noted that the report proposed that, when the Council had received substantive information from the EFA, users of the pavilion should be updated and in initial discussions at the meeting it was suggested that Ben Stanesby could meet with Nigel Stanbrook to come up with a proposal to bring to the Management Committee on how to report the information to users. However, Chris Brooks explained that, although the EFA had confirmed its intentions in the letter to Rob Wilson, a formal proposal had not yet been received by the Council. When a proposal was received, it would be submitted to him or to the Chief Valuer as advisers to the Heights Sub-Committee. As the Council was having to keep a separation between Council officers because of their roles in advising different parts of the Council with different responsibilities, it was likely that the information would not be available for other Council officers such as Ben Stanesby until it had been properly considered by the Sub-Committee; it was possible that the proposal might not be deemed acceptable. He said that there would be meetings of the Heights Sub-Committee and that these would be public meetings.

The meeting discussed the Heights consultation, with members of the Committee expressing disappointment at the way the consultation letters had not reached all the intended residents, both within and outside the borough. The report stated that one of the distributors employed to distribute the letters had not delivered as comprehensively as he should have and the company had revisited the missing roads, but it was noted that this did not seem to have happened. The delivery coverage of properties in Mapledurham Parish by Council staff had also not been fully effective, partly because of unfamiliarity with property and road names, although notices had been put up on noticeboards to try and mitigate this problem. It was also reported that residents in Bugs Bottom had found whole batches of undelivered flyers and a significant number of residents across the affected area had not received the letter. It was noted that it was very disappointing that the distribution for such an important consultation had not been as thorough as it could have been and it was suggested that the Committee should recommend to the

Council that for any future consultations, especially outside the Borough, Royal Mail should be used.

Ben Stanesby referred to the tabled response to the query about why consideration of the extension of the extent and duration of the Football Club and Tennis Club agreements with the Council in relation to use of the pavilion and grounds was being held back until the timetable for the building replacement had been determined. He explained that there were a number of possible models for managing the pavilion after refurbishment or replacement, including possibly the Football Club, WADRA or MPFAG managing the pavilion as a community facility. In light of this, it was not considered sensible to extend hire or lease arrangements which could conclude at different times, or to subdivide the building further, so that any organisation involved in managing the pavilion in the future would not have to deal with more complex arrangements which could reduce the options available.

Some of those present at the meeting said that they did not think that dealing with changes in lease arrangements would be a problem and expressed concern that not having long term leases was causing problems for some of the Clubs in obtaining funding from some sources. It was also noted that the users were keen that the refurbishment of the pavilion should be progressed as there had been numerous previous delays and there was frustration that the EFA proposal was now delaying things even further and that money was having to be spent on maintenance of the pavilion in the meantime. It was suggested that if the Trustee was not aware of the problems of the Clubs in relation to leases and funding, any EFA proposal considered in isolation could be seen as more attractive than it should be.

Others present at the meeting said that it seemed logical to wait and see what the EFA proposal involved to prevent potential problems in the future. It was also noted that any funding body was likely to want to know the outcome of the EFA proposal if their funding was linked to use of the pavilion or playing fields. Councillor Ballsdon explained that if the Council were to carry on without waiting for the EFA proposal, it would be likely to be criticised for spending money one way if the proposal from the EFA then meant that the money could have been spent in a different way and the money spent turned out to be wasted money. The view was also expressed that, although it was possible to manage changes in leasehold interests, it was not straightforward.

It was suggested that, so that the Heights Sub-Committee, which was now acting as the Trustee, was fully informed on all aspects of Mapledurham Pavilion & Playing Fields and not just the EFA proposal, Ben Stanesby should write a detailed report to the Sub-Committee setting out:

- The present state of the pavilion and playing fields, its history and what had happened so far
- The money spent on the pavilion
- The desire from users to have the pavilion refurbished
- The desire from the Football Club and Tennis Club to have leases extended
- The concern about the delay caused by the EFA proposal

It was noted that the Sub-Committee would not meet until the EFA proposal had been received.

AGREED:

- (1) That the report and position be noted;
- (2) That Ben Stanesby get the works charged to the capital budget checked to ensure that they were appropriate expenditure from the £100k allocation of Section 106 monies;
- (3) That the Management Committee ask the Trustee to ensure that the pavilion and playing fields were maintained to a reasonable standard whilst awaiting the outcome of the EFA proposal;
- (4) That the Management Committee recommend to the Council that, for any future consultations, especially outside the Borough, Royal Mail should be used to ensure delivery of consultation letters;
- (5) That Ben Stanesby submit a report to the Heights Sub-Committee giving details of the situation on the Mapledurham Pavilion and Playing Fields as set out above.

3. MAPLEDURHAM PLAYING FIELDS USERS REPORT

Nigel Stanbrook gave a verbal update as the Representative of Mapledurham Playing Fields Users, explaining what he had reported back to the users from the last Management Committee meeting.

Steve Ayers reported that the Friends of Mapledurham Playing Fields had found enough money to replace the dead trees in the orchard. Around £600 had been raised from selling the "different" Christmas trees at Caversham Court and the Group would be seeing if the company who had been involved in planting the original trees wanted to contribute.

Nigel Stanbrook said that he had noticed from the expenditure that there were a number of extra keys to the pavilion created and asked what the policy was on keys. Ben Stanesby said that he had investigated this and that some extra sets of keys had been made for regular users where more than one person might need to unlock the pavilion and for the person doing legionella testing. He said that there could be problems where groups did not return keys and that, because of experience with pavilions generally, officers were investigating the possibility of using "hotel room" type key cards, or combination locks, which could be changed regularly and cheaply and would allow better management of access to buildings. He said that he would report back to the next meeting.

It was also reported that people were still leaving doors open at the pavilion and it was suggested that signs should be put on the doors reminding people to shut and lock the doors.

AGREED:

- (1) That the report and positions be noted;
- (2) That Steve Ayers speak to Caroline Jenkins to arrange replacement of the dead trees in the orchard at the playing fields;
- (3) That Ben Stanesby submit a report to the next meeting giving an update on plans for managing access to the pavilion;
- (4) That Ben Stanesby ensure that signs were placed on doors at the pavilion reminding people to shut and lock the doors.

4. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

AGREED: That the next meeting be held at 6.30pm on Tuesday 19 January 2016 at the Pavilion.

(The meeting started at 6.30pm and finished at 8.20pm)