

Minutes of BUSCA Trustees' meeting on Tuesday 12th November 2019 in the library at 7.45

1. **Apologies:** Brian Tetley, Chris Bates, Craig Johnson, Ceri Fairbrother, Sue Rodgers, Val Gillings
2. **Present:** Betty Turner, Diane Byrnes, Ann Higgins, Ted Rodgers, David Rodgers, Frances Thompson, Judith Rodgers, Lin Web, Mike Collins, Diane Thorpe, Helen Sadler, Steven Crossley, Nick Thomas, Ginnie Willcocks, Alan Willcocks. Nicola Noble

3. Report on communications with Humphrey Perkins re Community Centre use

Judith, David and Ceri went to see the Head of HPS and the business manager Judith Malcolm on 11th October having been summoned to discuss a "Service Level Agreement" between HPS and BUSCA.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the dedicated storage spaces used by BUSCA and to propose a £1,000 annual fee for the maintenance of these spaces.

In discussions about what spaces we were told i) that the bar could no longer store drinks of any kind other than in the bar itself (involving removal of the big storage cabinet and the ice maker and the relocation of the big fridge) ii) we must lose most of the BUSCA kitchen cupboards iii) we needed to identify what areas the Panto is actually using.

We were invited to "negotiate" the figure of £1,000 and come back with "an offer".

Discussions within BUSCA arising from this ultimatum: i) The bar team (licensees David, Mike and Ted) have concluded that it is not feasible to carry on running the bar under these terms. They had already been questioning whether running a bar is a viable concern anyway because there are so few bar bookings coming from HPS now. They therefore decided to cease their involvement but offer the role to others in BUSCA.

NB it will still be possible to run simple bars in the foyer offering red and white wine, juice, bottled beer, water and coke. The HPHS premises is allowed 12 Temporary Event Notices per year. This facility could be used for Panto events etc.

ii) The Events team decided, as a consequence partly of the bar decision, to stop running ballroom dances. They had already questioned the viability of running dances. The Christmas Dance will be the last. Again, if someone wishes to take over, that is fine. BUSCA therefore has no need of space or equipment in the kitchen.

iii) having located what areas are needed and available as storage for the Panto Group, that group have decided to offer £50 per year for the cupboard that holds the teckie equipment and joint use of the space behind the bar. This figure builds in the recognition that HPHS uses the dimmer rack and cabling supplied by Panto Group (at a cost of £6,000 +) , the black stage curtains and their rails supplied by Panto Group and numerous lanterns.

No offers have so far been received to take over the bar or run the dances.

David, Ceri and Judith will be meeting HPS heads later in November. We will report the outcome.

4. Brief summary of where we are at with the Community Hub

The reasons for refusal of the planning application P/18/0608/2 have been circulated to trustees and members of BUSCA.

Alan and Ted held a post refusal meeting with the architect and surveyor to the project. The advice received was to engage with a planning consultant at Aspbury planning. The consultant provided an appraisal of the position which was read out to the trustees including a schedule of costs for options. The advice and costs were discussed. (see appendix 1)

The work that has been done so far by the New Community Hub group has cost approx. £18,000 and there is £10,000 left in the designated Community Hub account.

5. Discussion of the possible options for Trustee response to 2.

The options:

- i) Accept the refusal and walk away from the project
- ii) Re-engage consultants, redraft application and resubmit (NB consultants' fees)
- iii) Go straight to the Planning Inspectorate and present a case with help from a planning consultant
- iv) Resubmit and then go to appeal if the resubmission is refused

A vote was taken on the proposal to proceed with a confidential vote for our next course of action (proposed by Frances and seconded by Betty Turner): 12 in favour; 3 against; 1 abstention

Our next course of action:

Nick: proposed we accept refusal and walk away. Seconded by Frances

Amendment proposed by Ted and seconded by Diane: This meeting requests the New Community Building Group to engage with Aspbury Planning Consultants to facilitate a meeting with Barrow Parish Council to discuss the outcome of the refusal of the planning application P/18/0608/2 by BUSCA for land at Fishpool Way.

Confidential vote on the amendment: 10 in favour; 5 against; 1 abstention. The amendment is carried. We will therefore not vote on Nick's proposal.

6. Engaging with the Parish Council

Alan and Ted will deal with the mechanics of this.

7. Date of next Trustees' meeting: Tues 10th December in the Parish Council Office at 7.00

Appendix 1

Consultant advice as presented to BUSCA trustees

"I've had a look at the application and supporting information and given the status of the Neighbourhood Plan and not having the Parish support; and a split community, I feel that any chance of success at Appeal would be very slim.

The better chance of success is to work with the Parish Council and get them on side and resubmit the application. I would suggest that we be involved to head up any meeting with the Parish Council and BUSCA to see if we can find a compromise. The PC has identified a need for a village hall but I am unsure why they would object to this location and I can only guess that is due to money. Whilst protected by the Green Space policy the use would provide community benefits so I can only assume that there is a more political reason for this not to be supported and it would be of benefit to understand this.

I wouldn't advise going to appeal with the technical issues present as it just gives more weight to tip the balance against a refusal. However you could resubmit the application under the 'free go' and address the technical reasons for refusal. We could provide a planning statement to make an argument that it should be supported in light of the need for a Village Hall having been identified and assess it against the Sustainable Development opportunities then if its refused again it would just be the policy position to address at Appeal. (we would also address the objections submitted as part of the statement). If going to Appeal I would advise to opt for a Hearing so that the issues are discussed around the table. This will require a written statement and attendance at the hearing (1 day).

Charnwood are nervous of the ball strike as they find themselves in a battle! <https://www.leicestermercury.co.uk/news/leicester-news/who-pay-20k-net-stop-3292264>. I have worked on a similar issue in North East Derbyshire and had to provide an assessment. I would suggest contact Lobosport for a fee proposal as you will need something similar if you resubmit or appeal. (report attached for reference).

I would suggest that for our services the fees would likely be (as a guide)

Mediate a meeting with the Parish Council - **£800 + VAT** and travel at 0.60 pence per mile

Prepare Planning Statement (addressing refusal) - **£2000 +VAT**

Prepare written Appeal Statement and attendance at the Hearing – suggested budget (dependent on matters to address) **£3000-£4000 + VAT**.

Should you wish to discuss the matters raised please do contact me.

Regards

Denise Knipe

Principal Planner