

# Notes from the MEETING BETWEEN THE EPC PAVILION WORKING PARTY (EPC WP) AND ECSC MEMBERS PLUS ADDITIONAL COUNCILLORS

Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> December in the Pavilion

## Attendees

Alan Green (AG) EPC WP and EPC Vice-Chairman

Alan Williams (AW) EPC WP

Bryan Hammons (BH) ECSC

Chris Nevard (CN) EPC WP

Christine Thomas (CT) EPC

Doug Oughton (DO) ECSC

John Howells (JH) EPC

John Wilkinson (JW) EPC WP

Kevin Cabbage (KC) EPC WP

Ken Holloway (KH) ECSC

Scott Mineikis (SM) EPC Chairman

Gary Daly (GD) ECSC

## 1. Introductions

AW reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives. He commented that the additional funding had caught many people by surprise and now everyone was taking more notice of the project. This meeting would be an opportunity to catch up and hopefully to clear up any misunderstandings. Some actions could be run in parallel to make best use of the project timescale.

It was the wish of everyone that we build a pavilion with the money available. It may be necessary 'to cut the coat to the cloth' but at this stage it was too early to tell.

One issue that needed clarification was the roles of the people from ECSC. Some of the members have volunteered to help EPC with the build stage of the project. This is not a formal arrangement between EPC and ECSC. This will come later when the lease is considered.

## 2. Brief Project History (Alan W)

AW outlined a brief history from inception to the present of the pavilion project.

In 2012 a public meeting was called to judge the feeling of the parish towards replacing the old worn out building. From that meeting a steering committee was formed of volunteers. As matters progressed this committee evolved into the ECSC charity with the specific mandate to operate the new pavilion under the auspices of EPC. EPC would contract and pay for the building.

## 3. Roles and Responsibilities

At AG's suggestion the meeting diverted from the agenda item as there was a fundamental issue that needed to be addressed

He stated that in his opinion the funding proposed for the current building design was insufficient. He estimated that a figure of £970K was more likely than the £684K proposed by ECSC. Some debate ensued on the methodology. of £970,000 against the current ECSC figure of £684,000. There were questions about what elements of the build were missing from the ECSC numbers. He was also concerned that local trades-people have volunteered to support the build by offering their services at favourable rates.

Should the ensuing work not be up to standard any dispute arising could seriously delay further progress.

It was agreed that a Project Board team be set up to analyse true cost/build figures. KH and DO agreed to be on the team with AG and an architect be appointed to assist. **ACTION AG**

EPC may also appoint members as required. Initially the three members would work to get some quick estimates.

and DO AG will share his assumptions and his calculations with KH. **ACTION AG**

It was agreed that initially these three would be able to work quickly. Other members or new teams could be established once the basics were agreed.

4. Design Development/Build Process

Deferred until issues under item 3 are resolved.

5. Financial matters:

- Time restraints on New Homes Bonus Grant of £350,000 & new Unitary Authority risks/unknowns. The requirements of the NHB grant is that it is spent within the year following the award but there is currently a facility to request an extension. **No action required at present.**
- S106 payments' release schedule. JW was confident that the monies from the Manor Farm, Cow lane and High Street developments would be available and this would be confirmed with AVDC.
- Target date for Building Specs etc to be available and QS costed. Pend until the Project Board reports back to this team.
- Preparation of Tender Documents & Tender timetable/target dates. Action Pend until the Project Board reports back to this team.

6. Business Plan (& "due diligence"/impact on community)

KH stated that the business plan submitted would need to change if there was any change to the floor space and function of the space. Discussions took place about the internal space usage but this will need to follow on from the results of item 3. A number of issues were raised by SM and AG and there was some debate about the issues that needed to be addressed. KH stated that the ECSC had some issues that needed to be addressed. AW volunteered to collect the issues from everyone so that they can be assessed. This will be addressed in due course but was not the priority at present. **ACTION AW(deferred)**

7. Communications/Meeting Schedule The notes of all meetings to be shared with EPC and ECSC members. The meeting schedule will be established at a later date.

8. A.O.B. None