

Things to Change / Modify in latest plan.

### **Annotations in BLUE below and on Business Plan**

#### Section 5.1

Pitch Layout should have reference to ability and willingness to mark out the grass area to accommodate any sport / activity that can take place on an area of this size. **Included**

#### Section 5.3

Again should include note that any sport that is requested and can reasonably be accommodated will be catered for. **Included**

#### Section 5.4

MUGA is to be 36 X 36 but completed in two stages of 18 X 36, although it might be good practice to complete the ground works and sub base for the whole thing in the first phase. **Included**

#### Section 5.7

How will the bar facility after matches be licenced? **VWHDC offer various forms of licensing depending on the frequency of opening. The CIO will need to decide the appropriate form before the bar opens, but that is almost 3 years away, so need not be decided now. Both the existing Village Hall and the Drayton Football Club have existing licences for their respective bars**

#### Section 6

Clarification on what is considered a profit sharing bar means? The model currently used at the Village Hall puts far more in the pocket of the operator than into hall funds. There are also questions over the legality of this operation, are licences obtained? **It will be up to the CIO to agree any bar operations. The Business Plan is a cost and risk minimisation model. Profit sharing means that risk about staffing and stock is transferred to the contractor – the Pavilion does not therefore have to run a pay/pay NI, sick and holiday pay etc., nor cover or account for any stock shortages**

#### Section 9.1

These build costs appear to be based on estimates given by SWA architects, perhaps quotations from suitable builders should be sought to check validity? **The next step is to ask SWA to engage a Quantity Surveyor to verify the cost estimates (which are based on a per square meter standard price). This will cost money, so should be undertaken only when the PC has possession of the building site. Given that building will not start for 2 years any builder's quote would be unreliable. There is a 10% contingency built into the current estimates.**

#### Table 6

Again these figures need to be reassessed to ensure current accuracy. **See comments above**

#### Section 9.4

Drayton based sports clubs should not be expected to pay commercial rates for use of indoor facilities. **Drayton Football Club currently pays £145 p.a. in rates. The rates assessment will depend on what type of organisation and what activities actually run at the Pavilion. A modest sum for rates is assumed in the Business Case**

#### Section 9.5

To provide the best possible grass playing surface there are times when the grass will need to be cut as often as twice per week, with other grass maintenance commitments around the village 11.7k per year seems very optimistic. **See new annotations arising from a discussion at Finance Committee, A cut of 30x p.a. is assumed – as recommended by the FA/done at present on existing pitch.**

#### Section 10

Although at some stage there will probably be a link between the Pavilion and the Village Hall, it is unclear why village hall representatives are included in the business case for the pavilion. **The list of people is indicative and not complete. It would be useful at the outset if the Business Case were supported by the Village Hall Management Committee.**

If we are including a representative of the football club why is there no one from Table Tennis? **Did not have a name, but now added, and for Cricket too. Other sports reps (such as basket ball) can also be added from Pat's list from the Oct school consultation, and letters of support sought from them**

Personal summaries for all representatives should be complete. **They will be, and letters of support included. The PC needs to agree the Business Case first, since that is what they are being asked to support**

Other things that I feel require clarification include;

Currently the school conducts its sporting activities on the school premises, the County Council is required to maintain the school playing field, including mowing and marking of football pitch and running track according to the season, and will there be any support for the new PC owned facilities if and when the school use them? **The School could be charged if the CIO wish to do so**

Have the storage units been included in the costing's? **Yes**

When did we decide to contract out maintenance rather than investing in equipment and expanding the Village Caretaker Role? **Not yet decided. The Business Case is a minimal staffing/minimal risk model. If the CIO decide that a staffed model with own equipment is cost effective then they can adopt this. At present the PC uses grass contractors and a caretaker also on contract.**

When are we going to officially link VH and pavilion so that we can tidy up the operation? **Once the Business Case is agreed, the PWLB loan approved and the land is in PC ownership, a CIO can be**

registered with the Charity Commission (stage 1). This is scheduled for Spring 2018 (takes 3 months to register). The existing Village Hall Charity can then merge into the new CIO (Stage 2) , but that needs the agreement of their Trustees and is more complex, since there are various assets and liabilities to transfer too. Legal advice has been sought and costed for stage 1 (about £500). THE VHMC may need their own legal advice and costs covered for stage 2, and that will take through 2018 into 2019, I would expect.

When are we going to start planning the future of the current football club building? **A meeting with Drayton Football Club is now being arranged for November to discuss this**

We were always told that the sports pitch area would be ready to accept a playing surface at time of handover from Millers, yet we are now looking at 250k for drainage before any seeding can take place. This does not sound ready for playing surface to me. **Millers s106 contribution pays for the drainage and grass seeding, which was costed by their consultants for VWHDC.**

Given the recent history of the Football Club, is it going to be viable when the new facilities are ready for use? It only survives now on the profit raised by what appears to be an unlicensed bar and grants from the PC. Both of which will stop when the new facilities are ready for use. **Drayton FC has a licensed bar. They are heavily subsidized by the PC and the VHMC and an agreement needs to be reached on how all the teams required in Drayton (adult/junior/female) can be supported. That is neither financially nor practically viable unless village football is based at Walnut Meadow**

Given the closure rate for village pubs will the Red Lion and the Wheat sheaf still be open by the time new sports facility is ready? However there is growth in the sports bar and micro pub sectors, are we going to be able to plug the gap if it arises? **The PC will need to wait and see what happens to the pubs. The village is due to grow by a third, so they may be more viable in future than now. For the Sports Facilities Business Case it cannot be assumed that a bar can substitute for existing pubs. VAT on the capital spend (£200k+) could be assessed by HMR&C if the CIO sets out to compete with local businesses. For the PWLB loan, the PC needs to show public support. Would this be forthcoming if the Business Case sets out to compete with the two village pubs? There was no support at the Oct School public consultation for a large scale bar operation at the pavilion.**

I have concerns over the internal layout of the “dry side” of the pavilion; I think that an external door to the kitchen and bar area is required, and that this should be assessable to delivery vehicles. I am also unsure about the design of the office because of the external door it seems that the useable space is being compromised. **The final interior layout is still to be decided. It needs to be flexible, but to take more account of café/bar deliveries than at present. The removal of the first aid room will help in providing better access, but the issue needs to be put back to the architects to resolve.**

