

## FRIENDS OF BEALINGS PLAYING FIELD

### MINUTES OF THE PROJECT TEAM MEETING MONDAY 3<sup>RD</sup> JULY 2006 AT BEALINGS VILLAGE HALL

#### **PRESENT**

Julian Haywood-Smith (JHS) (Acting Chairman), Jenny Shaw (JS) (Project Leader), Margaret Wilson (MW), Roger Roseboom (RR) Jim Newbold (JN), Charles Barrington (CB), Rick Kerry (RK) Malcolm Watson (MXW), Ferial Evans (FE) (Note taker).

#### **1. APOLOGIES**

Eric Barnett (EB) Keith Beaumont (KB), Sally Johnson (SJ)

#### **2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING 5<sup>th</sup> June 2006**

These were accepted as a correct record.

#### **3. PLANNING APPLICATION**

##### **3.1. Concerns from neighbours**

JS reported that SCDC had received 3 letters in reaction to the plans. JS had not been able to see the letters as the file was not available. However the planning office was able to advise the nature of the concerns as potential nuisance from low lighting and BBQ facilities and also removal of trees. At the suggestion of the planning office a letter responding to the concerns has been sent. The content of the letter was agreed with Roger Roseboom. Refer copy of letter is attached.

##### **3.2. Status of Application**

JS advised that the planning officer has subsequently advised that one of the letters from nearest neighbours was being treated as an objection and the application would therefore go before the committee. JS thought that the committee meets around the 20<sup>th</sup> month but this had not been confirmed in time for this meeting. JS was asked to seek copies of the letters again and check on the date when the application is going to committee. **Action: JS**

The meeting decided not to send anyone to speak at the planning committee.

#### **4. VILLAGE HALL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

##### **4.1. Record Change of Name of the Project**

RR advised that the VHMC had approved the renaming of the Playingfield to the John Belstead Playingfield. He confirmed that Jill Ganzoni has given her approval. RR also advised that Lord Belstead had at one time been Chairman of Suffolk ACRE and felt that this would be a helpful point in the BIFFA funding bid (see *item 6*).

## **4.2. Little Bealings Representative on VHMC**

FE explained why LBPC has yet to appoint a Trustee representative to the VHMC. LBPC wished to seek guidance from SCDC on the conflict of interest rules. SCDC has responded stating that an appointed Trustee could be seen by the electorate to influence the council on any decision it takes in the interests of the Village Hall or the playing field. This would constitute a prejudicial interest, in which case, the Trustee must declare this and leave the meeting. RR pointed out that the Charity Deeds of VHMC state clearly that the objective is purely for the benefit of the area without prejudice or distinction. Therefore, there is seemingly not a conflict of interest. To assist with the resolution of this matter RR provided FE with a copy of the Trust Deed for use by the Clerk to LB Parish Clerk.

## **4.3. Floodlighting**

RR reported that the VHMC had discussed the matter of ducting for future floodlighting and had determined that this will not be included in the implementation. JS also advised the design team has taken account of his decision and has also agreed at its meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> June that low lighting is not needed for the BBQ area. Both changes have been applied to the design plan.

## **4.4. Playingfield Bank Account**

RR reported that the VHMC is in the process of setting up the new bank account for the project. The signatories will be JN and RR. JS will be appointed as an Officer at the next VHMC meeting and thus, become the third signatory to the account.

## **5. FINANCE**

### **5.1. Invoices Received**

JS confirmed that an invoice for Stage 1 had been received from Giles Hill and is with GBPC for processing. The invoice total is £3378.12 which covers fixed fee of £3375 (less £500) plus VAT. The £500 ex VAT has been held over to cover works yet to be completed.

### **5.2. Status of Funds Held by GBPC**

JS advised that the statement of funds raised included in the project costs paper needs confirmation – and she awaits confirmation of the funds held by GBPC. EB had advised JS that the GB Parish Clerk is working on this and he believes that the original starting figure assumed to be £4000 is likely to be closer to £3000. Once the figures are clarified it is expected that the remaining funds will be transferred to the new VHMC Playingfield account.

### **5.3 Funds Held by LBPC**

The meeting was advised that Peter Bellfield's Locality Budget contribution of £1500 has now been received by LBPC which is now holding a total of £2000 for the project. It was agreed that arrangements should be made to transfer the monies to the VHMC Playingfield account as soon as the account is active.

#### **5.4. Local Fundraising - June 11<sup>th</sup>**

MXW reported a healthy profit.

- Fun on the Field - £842.25
- Sponsorship for Bike Ride – £683 and there is more to come.

The meeting congratulated MXW on the success of the event. MXW stressed it was a great team effort.

It was agreed that JS would record a total of £1500 in the funds register until such time as the full figures are confirmed.

Cheques received are to be paid into GBPC account and transferred when the new VHMC account is active. Cash is currently held at GB Post Office pending transfer to the VHMC Playingfield account.

### **6. PROJECT COSTINGS/MAJOR GRANT FUNDING**

#### **6.1. First Estimate – Details issued by email on June 29<sup>th</sup>**

JS issued paper copy of email attachment showing initial quote.

<b>Aspect of Cost</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Playingfield (including prof. fees)	Capital	£162k	Standard rate VAT
Annexe (including prof. fees)	Capital	£26k	Building at zero VAT
Contingency & Inflation allowance	Capital	£23k	
Project & Grant Admin	Revenue	£5k	Standard rate VAT
Running Costs (3 years covered)	Revenue	£8k	Additional Costs

There was concern about the extent of these costs. JS explained that 2 other quotes are being sought but stressed that in her view the costs are realistic enough for early grant enquiries.

Several individual items were queried but JHS felt that for the purpose of this meeting the team should concentrate on the big numbers.

#### **Operating Costs**

CB warned that there must be no confusion with annual running costs which are beside the general point, but there should be an estimate for five years running costs. JS advised that Big Lottery allows for applicants to request revenue grants for running costs alongside capital grants. All such costs must be shown as part of the business plan which is a requirement of major grant applications.

#### **Annexe Costs**

On the matter of the Annexe, JS stressed that the estimates have been prepared without the assistance of a professional architect. However she had taken advice from a number of sources and had been advised that these costs might escalate further as there is a possibility that we may be required to replace the cesspit. JS stressed that this has not been allowed for in the Annexe build costs – this would come out of the contingency allowance which must be added.

#### **Playingfield Costs**

JHS referred to the playingfield costs in the costing document and asked whether there is anything that was superfluous. The meeting went through the items in detail. CB wondered whether too high a proportion was being spent on 5-12 age group and suggested that some of the apparatus could be added in time.

JS reminded the meeting that the play equipment was considered first priority at the open meeting in November and that the total cost is much better value for money than say for example the Playford play area.

JS suggested that if we are looking for a reduction in cost we could consider excluding the paths which account for a large element of the cost and make the field look like a park. The meeting felt that the paths are required and that they must be hardwearing and sustainable. JHS also said that the design team has suggested that the path route be changed slightly to make it a full circuit with no end points.

After much discussion about this first quote it was agreed that we should aim to keep the capital costs of the Playingfield project to £150k including VAT. It was agreed that JS should discuss options for achieving cost reduction with Giles Hill - including ideas as follows:

- Postponing some equipment to a later phase – e.g. Trim trail equipment
- Better value solutions for “retaining wall” in the Toddler area.

**Action: JS**

It was also agreed that grant applications will need to show an allowance for contingency and that professional fees for the implementation project would be covered by local fundraising as they have done in Stage 1.

## **6.2. Project Phasing Options**

RR then stated that he envisaged that the proposed Annexe would come in a later stage of development. He indicated that this would mean that there would be a period of sharing toilet facilities with the Village Hall. CB indicated that the Environmental Health might need to know this. If there is an Officers report, JHS requested that FBPF should have a copy of this. It was stressed that the extension is on the planning application. JHS felt that in order to retain rights of planning consent, work on the Annexe would need to be started in about 3 years time. The meeting agreed this to be an appropriate course of action and agreed to focus on the Playingfield aspects as the first phase.

## **6.3. Fundraising Targets**

RR tabled a paper on the fund raising schedule for Capital grants. The timetable shown is dependent on when we receive planning consent.

Responsibilities in table below:

<b>Grant Body</b>	<b>Target Capital</b>	<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>BIG Lottery (Reaching Communities)</b>	~£50k	“Thru the gate”	15/072006	<b>RR</b>
		Full application	Autumn 2006	<b>RR/JN/CB/JS</b>
<b>BIFFAWARD (i.e.Landfill Trust)</b>	~£50k	Meet Suffolk Acre	7/2006	<b>JS/RR</b>
		Submit Application	9/2006	<b>RR/JN/CB/JS</b>
<b>SCDC Funds</b>	~£10k	Community Grant	30/09/2006	<b>JS</b>
	~£1k	Playspace Fund	09/2006	<b>JS</b>
	~£2k	Sports Fund	09/2006	<b>JS</b>
<b>Other funds including Suffolk Environment Trust</b>	~£30k	Establish terms	Early 08/2006	<b>JN/RR</b>
		Apply for grants	Post Lottery?	<b>JN/RR</b>
<b>Village Residents &amp; Local businesses</b>	~£20k	Issue Sales Pack	Early 09/2006	<b>RR/JN</b>
<b>Max Possible Total</b>	<b>£163k</b>			

Given that we already have a pledge of £35,000 from the John Belstead there is excellent scope for achieving our target of remaining £115k capital required for the first phase.

RR reminded everyone to send names for special approach to individuals and also businesses to approach. **Action: ALL**

#### **6.4. Supporting Documents For Full Grant Applications**

Assuming we clear the first hurdle of the Lottery, there are 2 key supporting documents to be prepared before the full grant applications may be submitted: JS tabled the BIG Lottery description of the Business Plan the production of which is the responsibility of the Funding Committee. RR as chairman of the funding committee agreed to have the business plan ready by mid August for review by the Funding committee.

<b>Supporting Document</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1. Business Plan</b>	mid 08/2006	<b>RR (Funding Committee)</b>
<b>2. Options Appraisal</b>	Mid 08/2006	<b>JS (Design Team)</b>

See attachment 2 for list of content topics for Business Plan.

On the matter of the Options appraisal – JHS advised that options considered could include the options discussed at this meeting.

#### **6.5. Letters of Support**

Actions were agreed as follows:

<b>Source</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>GB PCC.</b>	Mid 08/2006	<b>CB,</b>
<b>Bealings School:</b>	Mid 08/2006	<b>JHS</b>
<b>LB PCC</b>	Mid 08/2006	<b>RR (via Geoff Bills)</b>

### **7. LOCAL FUNDRAISING – NEXT STEPS**

MXW reported that plans are well in hand for:

- Curry and Quiz Night on **22<sup>nd</sup> September** (not 2<sup>nd</sup> as stated in Benefice Magazine)
- Casino and Promises Auction on **18<sup>th</sup> November**.

MXW has secured an excellent curry cook for the first event and for the second, casino croupiers who would give their services free.

He confirmed that Mr Fletcher had agreed to be auctioneer.

MXW asked the team for more promises.

MXW is also receptive to ideas for more fundraising events. RR suggested a theatre group that tours village halls. He would contact them.

### **8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

None

#### **NEXT MEETING:**

TUESDAY 12<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER  
8.00PM AT VILLAGE HALL

## **ATTACHMENT 1: TEXT OF LETTER TO PLANNING OFFICER**

Oak Mount  
Martlesham  
Road  
Little Bealings  
Woodbridge  
Suffolk  
IP13 6LX

☎: (01473) 622130  
1<sup>st</sup> July 2006

Ms. M. Coupe,  
Development and Policy,  
Suffolk Coastal District Council,  
Melton Hill,  
Woodbridge,  
IP12 1AU

Dear Ms. Coupe,

**Re: Application reference: C/06/1020  
Playingfield and Village Hall (Little Bealings)**

Further to our telephone conversation on Friday morning 1<sup>st</sup> July. Thank you for the information regarding concerns raised by nearest neighbours and other interested parties. I can confirm, as project leader for the refurbishment of the playingfield, that the project team takes any concerns about the plans very seriously. Indeed, we have held several consultative open meetings in order to reach the proposed design now under consideration.

I have discussed the issues raised with Roger Roseboom, Chairman of the Bealings Village Hall Trustees, and we hope that the following responses help to allay the concerns raised:

### **1. Low Lighting**

The project's design team met on 22<sup>nd</sup> June to discuss detailed costings and decided that there is no need for permanent low lighting. We came to this conclusion, since it is our intention that the paved area is intended for use on outdoor community events which would normally occur when there is sufficient natural light. I have today asked our agent to reissue the plans to your office showing that we have removed the low lighting.

### **2. BBQ's**

I can also confirm that we may have given the wrong impression regarding BBQ facilities – it was never our intention to have permanent BBQ facilities on site rather we intended to reflect that BBQs may be used when part of an organised event accepted by the bookings secretary. Again the reference to BBQ facilities will be removed from the revised plans being sent by our agent.

### **3. Trees**

Trees are a key element of our design. Indeed, I think you will see that we have added a lot more trees around the site. We are happy to work with Suffolk Coastal's Landscape officer on this matter.

If hope the above is self explanatory but if you have any more issues please feel free to call me on 01473 622130.

Yours sincerely

CJP Shaw (Mrs)  
Project Leader

cc: Giles Hill, Land and Sculpture Design Partnership  
Roger Roseboom, Chairman, Bealings Village Hall Trustees  
Margaret Wilson, Bookings Secretary, Bealings Village Hall

## **ATTACHMENT 2: BUSINESS PLAN CONTENTS**

Overview of business plan contents is (summarised from Big Lottery guideline is given in following table:

<b>Organisation</b>	Aims, History , Area (and people) we serve How our organisation and the project is funded Finances - include budgets together where the details of where money will come from
<b>People</b>	Committee members, staff and volunteers – including skills and experience
<b>Work</b>	Services provided and who benefits
<b>Plans for future</b>	Projects, including how they will be managed, staffed, marketed and financed. Showing difference from how we do these now. Other inclusions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analysis of needs survey</li><li>• Approach to Funding</li><li>• Cashflow Forecast to prove you will have funds to pay bills</li><li>• Timeline of key tasks and activities of the project</li><li>• Approach to monitoring and reviewing plan and who will be responsible for this.</li><li>• Planning consent etc</li><li>• Evidence of 3 estimates</li><li>• Letter confirming assumption re VAT for project costs</li><li>• Letters of support</li><li>• On-going operational costs and sustainability</li><li>• Risk Analysis of new project and details of the assumptions you made when planning and how you will react if things do not go according to plan</li><li>• Analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses Opportunities and Threats and how we will respond to these</li></ul>