

**Minutes of the Facilities Committee of Aston Clinton Parish Council, held on
21st March 2018 at 7.00pm
at Aston Clinton Parish Meeting Room**

Present:

Councillors: -

C Read (Chairman)

L Ronson

S Howard

L Tubb

P Wyatt

Clerks: G Merry

Members of the Public: Approx. 40

18.018 Apologies:

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Mason.

18.019 Declarations of Interest:

Cllr Howard declared an interest in items 18.024 iv.

18.020 To Approve the Minutes of the Facilities Committee held 27th February 2018.

The minutes were proposed by Cllr Ronson, seconded by Cllr Howard, agreed and signed.

18.021 Public Participation: Cllr Read invited comments not necessarily re. matters on this agenda

- Re. the football club's proposal to move their pitch to the east of the tennis courts, with associated infrastructure, it was suggested that council voting on this on 4/4/18 was not long enough for proper consideration to have been given. Cllr Read responded that extending the timeframe was not necessary. The council had the information it needed to make its decision. It was however, taking on-board all views that had been expressed. He stated that the council has been considering options for the club for some time and this was all in the minutes of meetings which are published.
- It was felt that as the football club had presented to the council in February for 30 minutes, the public should get 30 minutes to comment. Cllr Read responded that the public would get 30 minutes and that council is listening to all the points made and it must also respond without bias. He felt that the points raised in objection to the proposal would not change significantly but would just be more of them. Cllr Tubb stated that the council is an elected body and as such, makes decisions for the park/village all the time. Over time there have been many proposals on which the council has listened and then made decisions. These are all publicly notified and recorded in the minutes.
- It was stated that several people have properties on the border of the park and the council had failed to consult with them. Cllr Read responded that the Council is aware of how the residents feel.
- It was stated that a greater majority of people stood to lose green space than stood to gain from the proposal.
- It was stated that the football club should make a presentation to the public and outline its business case. Mr Middleton of ACFC responded that the club has only asked for agreement in principle. Only then will it be able to fine-tune the details. If approval was given, there would still be opportunities for public comment. Cllr Read advised that if approval is not given, the proposal goes no further. If it is given, much of the infrastructure would require planning permission and that would be another stage for comment/objection.
- The Neighbourhood Plan was shown by a member of the public who quoted Policy L1: -

To conserve and enhance the leisure facilities in Aston Clinton Park, improvements and extensions to existing sports and recreation facilities that increase opportunities for local people to participate in leisure, recreation, play and or associated social activities will be supported provided that: They will not result in significant harm to neighbouring residential properties by way of noise, light spillage and unsociable hours; proposals should result in net gains in bio-diversity. After introducing the NHP policy to the meeting she went on to comment that in her view, the FC proposals would directly contravene this policy.

- A map was shown from the NHP, indicating that this area of the park should have its views protected. It was asked how this proposal is not therefore in direct conflict with the NHP. Cllr Read explained that the map shown was not a definitive one and is from the Landscape Report which is part of the evidence from which the policies are produced. It is the policies that govern the NHP. The committee looks at all the evidence to produce the plan but does not have to accept any view or report as binding in any way.
- It was stated there would be additional noise and light pollution at unsociable hours. Cllr Read responded that the club would continue to play at the times it does now, and the only difference would be the floodlights at evening games.
- It was stated that the floodlights would be significantly different from those currently used by the tennis club.
- It was stated that the proposal would remove green space enjoyed by dog walkers, families, walkers and children.
- It was asked why this area was preferable to others. Cllr Read explained that the Meadow area had been considered and rejected as that did conflict with the NHP. The current playing area would not be large enough for the proposed project.
- The clerk explained the timeframe for the decision was necessary as there was a funding deadline of July, to apply for significant funding for the new community centre. Uncertainty over the football club's plans was holding up planning for that project, so a decision was needed.
- It was enquired whether the groundwork would be started soon after approval and if so, would planning permission for the other infrastructure be applied for whilst the groundwork was underway. Cllr Read advised that ground works would only begin once formal planning permission was received.
- Cllr Tubb stated that the agreement would be for the football club to lease the land on a formal lease, the terms of which would need to be agreed by the full council. The club would be required to comply with the terms of the lease. Mr Middleton explained that the club would only be able to obtain architectural drawings and apply for funding, once approval was given.
- It was requested that the council do a full assessment of natural habitats in that area, or there may be a risk of being sued. Cllr Read responded that the council is aware of the habitats in the area.
- It was stated that the Park is not a football ground and should not be changed. Cllr Read stated that all views will be taken on-board and encouraged people to email their views to the clerk.
- It was stated that parks promote a healthy community and as such should be welcoming to all. The council was asked to look at the demographics of who uses the park relative to the amount of people who play football. It was felt that families, dog walkers etc would not use the park as much and the foul language associated with football would also put people off. Cllr Read acknowledge this but stated that dog walkers also do not look after the park. He reiterated that the council will listen to all views expressed.

18.022 Project Updates

- i **Park View Repairs:** Cllr Tubb had met with a resident of Park View who had agreed in principle to the proposed maintenance agreement. However, he had stated that the residents may not

agree to it unless the road surface was first repaired. Cllr Howard stated that the road surface has not got worse for 10 years. It was also stated that the neighbouring farmer, also a resident of Park View, regularly drives his tractor over it. Cllr Tubb suggested the committee meet with the residents and it was agreed the clerk would invite them to attend the April Facilities meeting.

- ii **Tennis Club Toilets:** Cllr Tubb had met with the chairman of the tennis club who although was interested in shared use of toilets with the football club, had suggested building a temporary toilet block in the recess on the north side of the Bowls Club fence, using the manhole behind the council office as a drain. Cllr Read stated this manhole is not a soil drain and would not be suitable. The tennis club plan to play every evening from April throughout the summer. Various options were discussed, and it was agreed to organise a meeting with the Bowls club to see what shared use arrangements could be made.
- iii **Youth Club:** It had been suggested that the hand wash basin in the Churchill Hall may not meet regulations. It was agreed however, that the inspector had been satisfied providing a sign was put up stating the small sink was hand wash only, and this had been done. The clerk presented 2 quotes for the youth club door. There had not been time to find 3, as many suppliers do not provide comprehensive enough products. The clerk advised that this would be acceptable as a thorough quoting process had just been undertaken for the new café door and this was broadly similar. The options were discussed, and it was agreed to engage supplier 2 on the list, as they would provide a bespoke product.

MOTION: to agree a supplier for the youth club door as above PROPOSED by Cllr Ronson SECONDED by Cllr Wyatt and AGREED.

18.023 Grounds Maintenance:

- i **Dog Walkers in the Park:** there had not yet been time to contact the dog warden re. enforcement and it was agreed to carry this matter forward to the next meeting
MOTION: Deferred

18.024 Sports and Recreation:

- i **Astonbury – Sound/Stage Quotes:** Cllr Tubb had sent the same specification to 3 suppliers and had received 3 quotes. Although 1 quote was missing, Cllr Tubb was able to give the quote verbally and the clerk advised that this was acceptable, providing the written quote was received before the supplier was engaged. Cllr Tubb recommended retaining the supplier from last year as he had provided an excellent service and the quality of the others was not known.
MOTION: to agree to retain the Sound/Stage provider from last year's Astonbury, PROPOSED by Cllr Wyatt SECONDED by Cllr Howard and AGREED on provision of the written quote.
- ii **S106 Allocations:** Cllrs Tubb and Read reported from their meeting with AVDCs S106 Officer, who had explained that several years ago AVDC had done an audit of leisure provision in Aylesbury Vale and had drawn up a spreadsheet of shortfall in provision. Only items that met this shortfall were permitted for S106 funding and AVDC would be wary of appeals by developers, who may state that requested items did not meet local need. There was a possibility of the parish council being able to approach developers directly though.
 - 14/00426/AOP: Land of Brook Street and Aylesbury Road - £113,636 (Charles Church): it was agreed that as this development was already built and the S106 contract likely to be in place, it would not be possible to negotiate anything with this developer. It was agreed to recommend assigning this sum to be banked for a possible future land purchase.

