

Pavilion Correspondence – May 2022

Email received

From: Mike Jeans
Sent: 13 May 2022 11:00
To: Pam Mercer <pam.mercer@hook.gov.uk>
Subject: Hook AVM

Firstly, thank you to all of those who worked hard to put on the meeting and to those who presented.

I have a number of questions about the proposal to build a Community Building alongside the new sports pitches at NE Hook.

1. It is recorded in the S106 Agreement with the Developer that a contribution of £250k will be made towards the construction of the Community Building. It is also recorded in the minutes of the Parish Council Meeting of 1/12/2021 that the FSR Committee “previously discussed and agreed that a further £500k of existing Council reserves be used for the project providing a budget of £750k overall”. I can find no record in the published minutes of the FSR Committee of this agreement nor how their deliberations resulted in them believing that the appropriate budget for the project would be only £750k – could you let me know whether this agreement and decision are a matter of public record.
2. In the minutes of the Parish Council meeting of 1/9/2021, it was reported that a design brief would be issued to those architect companies that wished to tender for the project. Can you confirm whether this design brief included a cost budget and whether it was in line with the £750k that had been estimated by the FSR Committee as being appropriate for the build.
3. In the minutes of the Parish Council meeting of 6/10/2021, it was reported that a “Starter Grant” towards the Mens Shed had been received from the National Lottery. Could you confirm whether a plan had already been submitted to the National Lottery for construction of a Mens Shed in Hook, whether an amount of grant to build such a shed had been requested and whether any amount requested was similar to the grant received by the Church Crookham Mens Shed, which appears to be the template for the Hook proposal, of £79k
4. In the minutes of the Parish Council meeting of 1/12/2021, it is recorded in the minutes of the FSR Committee that “The Committee discussed and agreed that a sum of £250k was required to add to the existing pavilion project budget of £750k, as initial indications from the architects were that the budget was too low to deliver the building envisaged. This sum could be raised via precept, or by borrowing some of it from existing Council reserves, which would reduce the demand on precept”. Is it correct, as appears the case, that the 6 shortlisted architects (the shortlist identified in the HPC minutes of 6/10/21) had indicated that a budget of £1million would be required to “deliver the building envisaged” and that the “building envisaged” was the outcome of the design brief given to the architects in the Request for Tender by HPC

5. At the AVM, in response to a question to the architect on the capital cost of the proposed building, it is recorded that an amount of £1.9m would be required to deliver the building outlined. Could you explain:
 - a. How the cost has increased by 90% from the amount outlined at the HPC meeting on 1/12/21. Has the design radically changed from the one(s) proposed by the shortlist of architects or did they dramatically underestimate the cost of delivering their design
 - b. Whether the amount of £1.9m includes any contingency for inflation or changes – when questioned, the architect suggested it would be too difficult to estimate the cost of construction inflation
 - c. Whether the £1.9m includes the construction cost of the Mens Shed and whether it is anticipated/built into the budget that further grants from the National Lottery will be forthcoming
 - d. Whether the £1.9m includes fit-out i.e. furniture, wall/floor coverings, kitchen/bar equipment etc and, if it does not, the cost estimate for these
 - e. Whether the £1.9m includes construction/white-lining of the car parking spaces
6. Of the total net cost (after any grants received from external bodies is taken into account), including construction (of both the pavilion and the Mens Shed) how much will be met from HPC's existing cash reserves – and how much will be left after such usage – and how much/over what period will be levied as a precept on Hook council tax payers
7. What will be the resulting additional precept, by year, on an average, Band D, property
8. As the land and associated S106 monies for its maintenance as well as the contribution the construction of the Community Building will be received by HPC, will HPC be leasing the buildings/pitches to an operator to take on the running and maintenance of both and, if so, has such an operator been identified.
9. Has a business plan been drawn up for the operating costs and revenues of the pavilion and Shed and have discussions been held and/or outline commitments been made with Hook and Odiham Rugby Football Club, who appear to be the party identified as the lead user of the site
10. Is it anticipated that the annual operating costs of the Mens Shed and Pavilion (as well as the sports pitches) will be funded by income from their use or will there be annual net running costs that need to be met by Hook council tax payers
11. In response to a question at the AVM, it was said that the plans would not go ahead without consultation with Hook council tax payers – when is this consultation expected to take place and what form will it take.

12. Have discussions been held with HDC for provisional planning permission for the proposed design and siting of the building(s) and has indicational approval been received if so

Many thanks

Mike Jeans

Response sent

24th June 2022

By email:

Dear Mr Jeans,

Thank you for your recent correspondence sent to the Council, in relation to the community sports pavilion project at NE Hook. Please find below responses from the Council to the questions raised.

“It is recorded in the S106 Agreement with the Developer that a contribution of £250k will be made towards the construction of the Community Building. It is also recorded in the minutes of the Parish Council Meeting of 1/12/2021 that the FSR Committee “previously discussed and agreed that a further £500k of existing Council reserves be used for the project providing a budget of £750k overall”. I can find no record in the published minutes of the FSR Committee of this agreement nor how their deliberations resulted in them believing that the appropriate budget for the project would be only £750k – could you let me know whether this agreement and decision are a matter of public record.”

In the FSR meeting held on 20th September 2021, the FSR committee agreed that S106 money attributable to development at NE Hook, relating to the Community Centre refurbishment should repay the £486k debt to the SANG reserve in order to make the funds available towards the pavilion project.

In any case, it has now been superseded with the decision made at April 2022 Full Council to borrow the sum of £1.9million from the Councils reserves to fund the pavilion project.

“In the minutes of the Parish Council meeting of 1/9/2021, it was reported that a design brief would be issued to those architect companies that wished to tender for the project. Can you confirm whether this design brief included a cost budget and whether it was in line with the £750k that had been estimated by the FSR Committee as being appropriate for the build.”

Yes, a figure of £750k was included in the design brief.

“In the minutes of the Parish Council meeting of 6/10/2021, it was reported that a “Starter Grant” towards the Mens Shed had been received from the National Lottery. Could you confirm whether a plan had already been submitted to the National Lottery for construction of a Mens Shed in Hook, whether an amount of grant to build such a shed had been requested

and whether any amount requested was similar to the grant received by the Church Crookham Mens Shed, which appears to be the template for the Hook proposal, of £79k”

This was a grant application made and received by the Hook Shed, not the Parish Council. The Parish Council has made no approaches to the National Lottery in respect of grant funding for the Shed.

“In the minutes of the Parish Council meeting of 1/12/2021, it is recorded in the minutes of the FSR Committee that “The Committee discussed and agreed that a sum of £250k was required to add to the existing pavilion project budget of £750k, as initial indications from the architects were that the budget was too low to deliver the building envisaged. This sum could be raised via precept, or by borrowing some of it from existing Council reserves, which would reduce the demand on precept”. Is it correct, as appears the case, that the 6 shortlisted architects (the shortlist identified in the HPC minutes of 6/10/21) had indicated that a budget of £1million would be required to “deliver the building envisaged” and that the “building envisaged” was the outcome of the design brief given to the architects in the Request for Tender by HPC”

The Council had a notional design for a building produced, pro bono, by Cllr Kirkham, as he is a registered architect. This building showed a net internal area of 450sqm. This initial idea was provided as part of the tender pack of information to interested architects. All architects who submitted an expression of interest (not just the 6 shortlisted) were of the opinion that a building of that size could not be delivered for £750k. A budget upwards of £1million would be required based on their initial observations – which would have been without the benefit of any knowledge of the issues or constraints of the location for the building.

“At the AVM, in response to a question to the architect on the capital cost of the proposed building, it is recorded that an amount of £1.9m would be required to deliver the building outlined. Could you explain:

How the cost has increased by 90% from the amount outlined at the HPC meeting on 1/12/21. Has the design radically changed from the one(s) proposed by the shortlist of architects or did they dramatically underestimate the cost of delivering their design”

The figure of £750k was an estimate by the Council, at the time, of what they thought a building might cost. Expressions of interest were requested from architect firms based on an initial idea that a building of some 450sqm would be required to provide the accommodation needed. All architects who submitted an expression of interest were contacted and all were of the opinion that a building of that size could not be delivered for anywhere near £750k.

The selection of an architect did not involve the architects putting forward designs and associated costs for those designs for consideration by the Council.

“Whether the amount of £1.9m includes any contingency for inflation or changes – when questioned, the architect suggested it would be too difficult to estimate the cost of construction inflation”

The figure does not include contingency.

“Whether the £1.9m includes the construction cost of the Mens Shed and whether it is anticipated/built into the budget that further grants from the National Lottery will be forthcoming”

This figure does not include the cost of the Hook Shed. Grant applications would fall to Hook Shed to apply for – it is their intention to make applications, however a certain amount of verified information is required before they are able to make applications, such as a draft lease agreement and confirmation of land ownership.

“Whether the £1.9m includes fit-out i.e. furniture, wall/floor coverings, kitchen/bar equipment etc and, if it does not, the cost estimate for these”

Some fit out costs would be met by the rugby club – this includes the kitchen/bar, laundry room, furniture and benches for the changing rooms.

“Whether the £1.9m includes construction/white-lining of the car parking spaces” –

Yes this is included.

“Of the total net cost (after any grants received from external bodies is taken into account), including construction (of both the pavilion and the Mens Shed) how much will be met from HPC’s existing cash reserves – and how much will be left after such usage – and how much/over what period will be levied as a precept on Hook council tax payers. What will be the resulting additional precept, by year, on an average, Band D, property”

As net cost is not yet known and grant applications cannot yet be made, a calculation for the repayment of £1.9million on precept has been calculated. If the full £1.9 million were funded by precept, over the same term that a Public Works Loan would be taken, the effect on precept would be an average addition of £9.79 per year, based on the current precept and tax base, for a period of 30 years, or the equivalent of 18.8 pence per week over the same timescale.

“As the land and associated S106 monies for its maintenance as well as the contribution the construction of the Community Building will be received by HPC, will HPC be leasing the buildings/pitches to an operator to take on the running and maintenance of both and, if so, has such an operator been identified”

The ideal operating model for the facility is to lease the building on a fully repairing basis, therefore no funding would be required from the Parish Council for operation/maintenance once built. The Parish Council already utilises similar leases for the Community Centre and Elizabeth Hall (leased to HVHCA) and the Hook Bowls Club (leased to the Bowls Club). As the Council agreed in January 2020 that rugby would be the lead sport use for the site, it is envisaged that the lease holders would be HORFC.

“Has a business plan been drawn up for the operating costs and revenues of the pavilion and Shed and have discussions been held and/or outline commitments been made with Hook and Odiham Rugby Football Club, who appear to be the party identified as the lead user of the site “

Both Hook Shed and the rugby club have produced business plans that were presented to the NEHCP Committee.

“Is it anticipated that the annual operating costs of the Mens Shed and Pavilion (as well as the sports pitches) will be funded by income from their use or will there be annual net running costs that need to be met by Hook council tax payers”

As per above – the ideal situation is that the buildings are self-funded from the income the tenants generate.

“In response to a question at the AVM, it was said that the plans would not go ahead without consultation with Hook council tax payers – when is this consultation expected to take place and what form will it take”

Dates are not yet arranged. It is likely to be in the form of drop in events, as has been utilised in the past eg. Neighbourhood Plan, Community Centre refurbishment etc.

“Have discussions been held with HDC for provisional planning permission for the proposed design and siting of the building(s) and has indicational approval been received if so”

A single informal discussion has been held with HDC.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Dignan

Sarah Dignan
Clerk to the Council

Letter received

17th May 2022

Hook Annual Village Meeting and North East Hook Community Project

Dear Sirs

I would like to express my gratitude for Hook Parish Council's excellent arrangement of the Annual Village Meeting, AVM. It gives residents an excellent appreciation of the many activities currently being undertaken in Hook and also planned for the future.

At this year's meeting I was surprised at how advanced the North East Hook Community Project is. I knew that North East Hook developer's S106 funding had been provided for community use and understood that this was to be for sports facilities, Architect's plans for a pavilion, two rugby pitches and a Shed to promote social inclusion were presented. The pavilion will be operated by Hook and Odiham Rugby Club and contain a bar open to social members and two function rooms bookable by all. The currently estimated £1.9 million cost will be met by the S106 contribution together with a sum from Hook residents by way of a precept over a number of years. Hook Parish Council intend to undertake a public consultation and then if it decides to proceed will submit a full planning application this summer.

Unfortunately but understandable for such a significant project questions had to be curtailed at the AVM due to time constraints. I was left with the following thoughts /questions with respect to the project:

1. Effectively the majority of the project is providing all the facilities required by a rugby club. Whilst I have nothing against rugby, £1.9 million seems a lot to spend for the benefit of a relatively small proportion of the community especially when S106 money is meant to be for the benefit of the whole community. Could the facility not also be of benefit to other sports in Hook?
2. How much of the £1.9 million will be provided by the S106 money and how much by residents? What will the increase in precept to fund this be in the forthcoming years?
3. Will funding By Hook Parish Council be required after build for operation or maintenance of the facility and if so how much?
4. The name Hook and Odiham Rugby Club suggests that the club expects their members and hence the prime beneficiaries will be mainly Hook and Odiham residents. Hence is Odiham Parish Council contributing to the costs and if so by how much?
5. Has the possible effect of the proposed bar on the viability of pubs in Hook and the function rooms on the viability of the Elizabeth Hall and Community Centre been considered?
6. As the concept is so well developed will the public consultation focus on whether the architects design meets the requirements of the Rugby Cub and Shed or more importantly to me whether the project should continue in its current form?
- 7.

I assume that the North East Hook Community Project Committee has considered all these issues and it is unfortunate that time was limited at the AVM and that clarifications and explanations do not appear to be readily available elsewhere.

I currently have an open mind with respect to the project and await the further information described above. However I would strongly urge all Hook residents to take an interest in the project and respond to the consultation when issued. To meet the Parish Council's intended

timescale it should be imminent and hopefully the background information supplied with it will clarify the issues described above.

I am sure the Parish Council read Focus but have simultaneously copied this letter to them.

Yours sincerely

David Lawrence

The Editors, Hook Focus
Emailed to hookfocus@hotmail.com

Response sent

June 2022

Dear Mr Lawrence,

Thank you for your recent correspondence sent to the Council and published in the last addition of Hook Focus, in relation to the community sports pavilion project at NE Hook. Please find below the response from the Council to the questions raised.

- 1. Effectively the majority of the project is providing all the facilities required by a rugby club. Whilst I have nothing against rugby, £1.9 million seems a lot to spend for the benefit of a relatively small proportion of the community especially when S106 money is meant to be for the benefit of the whole community. Could the facility not also be of benefit to other sports in Hook?*

Both the rugby and youth football clubs had an interest in use of the pitches at the NE Hook site and both were sent a written brief by the Parish Council in November 2019, inviting them to bid to be the lead users of the pitches. The bid needed to include a statement in respect of shared use of the site by multiple sports, which was the Council's preference.

The bids were considered, along with verbal representations from both clubs, at the Full Council meeting in January 2020. HUYFC (youth football) stated, in their bid and verbally at the meeting, that sharing was not an option. HORFC (rugby club) included in their presentation consideration of how the pitches/facilities could be used for multi-sport purposes. Following the bid presentations, the Council decided that the rugby club would be the primary users of the pitches.

The work carried out thus far in relation to providing a building to facilitate full use of the outdoor pitches has involved liaising with the rugby club, as lead users of the site. The rugby club initiated discussions early on regarding shared use of the site and have so far opened discussions with the youth football team, Hook Runners, Hook Velo and the cricket club as this will ensure a wider range of sport can be accommodated to make full use of the site, year round.

- 2. How much of the £1.9 million will be provided by the S106 money and how much by residents? What will the increase in precept to fund this be in the forthcoming years?*

Section 106 contribution funding for the building facility is £250,000. Grant funding can only be applied for once a fully costed project is decided. We are currently at the feasibility stage with a more detailed costing expected imminently (at the time of writing). The Council will apply for as much external funding as possible.

The Council holds significant funds in its SANG reserve – money paid by developers for SANG mitigation. The only requirement of this reserve is that it needs to pay for the maintenance of the SANG for 80 years. We are currently some 17 years into this agreement. With projects of substantial cost, it would be quite usual for an authority to look to borrow funds from the Public Works Loan Board, as this Council did to part fund the refurbishment of the Community Centre. The repayments for the loan are then made via raising precept. In this instance, if the Council borrows from its own reserve, it incurs no interest payments and is fully in control of the repayment schedule.

If the full £1.9 million estimated construction cost was funded by precept, over the same term that a Public Works Loan would be taken, the effect on precept would be an average addition of £9.79 per year, based on the current precept and tax base, for a period of 30 years, or the equivalent of 18.8 pence per week, per household, over the same timescale.

- 3. Will funding By Hook Parish Council be required after build for operation or maintenance of the facility and if so how much?*

The ideal operating model for the facility is to lease the building on a fully repairing basis, therefore no funding would be required from the Parish Council for operation/maintenance. The Parish Council already utilises similar leases for the Community Centre and Elizabeth Hall (leased to HVHCA) and the Hook Bowls Club (leased to the Bowls Club).

- 4. The name Hook and Odiham Rugby Club suggests that the club expects their members and hence the prime beneficiaries will be mainly Hook and Odiham residents. Hence is Odiham Parish Council contributing to the costs and if so by how much?*

No contribution has been secured at the current time. An initial discussion was held with Odiham PC – they are unlikely to have finances to make any significant contribution.

- 5. Has the possible effect of the proposed bar on the viability of pubs in Hook and the function rooms on the viability of the Elizabeth Hall and Community Centre been considered?*

Given that the Hook and Odiham Rugby Club will be the primary user of the sports pavilion, it is highly likely that a bar facility will be located within the building. Indeed, it is anticipated that bar takings for food and drink will form the primary basis of their income and that sufficient income will be derived from takings in order to that the cost of continued maintenance of the site will fall to the club rather than the residents. Clearly, there is no intention to pressure visitors and players to make use of club bar, but it is unlikely that they would travel to another pub in the village, post game. As far as the use of the other halls in the village is concerned, at the time of writing, each is operating near full capacity.

- 6. As the concept is so well developed will the public consultation focus on whether the architects design meets the requirements of the Rugby Club and Shed or more importantly to me whether the project should continue in its current form?*

The architect is presently reaching the end of RIBA Stage 2 which will see the initial costings further refined and until the Parish Council are in receipt of refined costings, no decision can be made to instruct the current architect to proceed further. Moreover, at the end of Stage 2, it is intended to hold the public consultation element and this, together with the updated costings, will ensure that the PC is better informed to make any decision to proceed further with the project in its current form. Finally, the building is not a rugby club but a community sports facility.

Yours sincerely,

Hook Parish Council

Email received – statement not question so no response required

From: Christine Randall

Sent: 20 May 2022 13:29

To: Jane Worlock <jane.worlock@hook.gov.uk>; Rob Cowell <rob.cowell@hook.gov.uk>; Sarah Dignan <clerk@hook.gov.uk>

Subject: NE Hook Community Project Committee

Councillor Dr Worlock,

I am writing to you regarding rumours circulating around Hook about the use of the NE Hook planning gains for non exclusive community use.

I negotiated the S106 agreement for NE Hook and know the spirit of the original agreement and the legal implications.

The Hook Parish part of the agreement consists of:

£160,000 for sports pitch maintenance

£250,000 for a community building.

£382,000 for improvements to the Community Centre.

2 senior sports pitches and 1 junior sports pitch.

The S106 monies or land cannot be used for anything other than the intended and legally agreed purpose. The pavilion, intended as a simple building used by anyone using the pitches or members of the community, cannot be given over to a single use. That residents can join and come in is simply not acceptable under the letter of the law.

The sports pitches cannot be used as single use, they are a community asset and legally cannot be designated for one purpose only.

£250,000 is therefore the budget for the sports pavilion and the ongoing costs are covered by the maintenance contribution.

kind regards

Christine Randall

Email received

From: Jules

Sent: 24 May 2022 11:19

To: Pam Mercer <pam.mercer@hook.gov.uk>

Subject: Follow-up question after Annual Village Meeting

Thank you for hosting the AVM just recently.

Some great subjects presented this year.

On the topic of the new sports pavilion at North-East Hook unfortunately, answers to some important questions could not be provided and we were invited to submit additional questions. Hence my email.

I would appreciate an idea by when I can expect answers – and also would appreciate this Q&A being included within the formal AVM minutes/residents update.

I understand S106 contributions for NE Hook amounted to £250k for a community building to provide facilities alongside new sports pitches, to be used by various sports activities. We were advised at the AVM we are now looking at the development of a pavilion costing £1.9 MILLION that would be leased by Hook & Odiham Rugby Club, specifically designed with rugby as the main sport and with a 'club membership fee' to be able to use the facilities. Other sports were mentioned as being able to use the facilities – but from the dialogue used and the presentations made, rugby was clearly promoted as the 'lead' sport to benefit from the pavilion.

- What was the time-line for the change from 'simple' sports pavilion to the current expected deliverable
- Who proposed this change in approach and when and why
- Who from HPC approved this change
- What other sports are being considered to be able to use the pavilion
- How will the sports/social 'membership' (mentioned at the AVM) process work

From reading recently published HPC meeting minutes, we find out that the funding of this pavilion is likely to be made from SANG reserves.

- Is this a valid use of SANG funds
- If this amount of money is available 'to spend', why aren't Hook residents consulted since we might perhaps prefer to explore using such an amount of money to progress the much talked about and widely supported 'regeneration of the centre of Hook'.

Public insight and opinion: we were told at the AVM that public consultation would be undertaken

- When will this start and what end-date is anticipated
- Who will lead the consultation
- What form will it take

- How is it possible that the project is as far forward as it is without residents involvement?

NEHCPC was formed at the end of 2021

- Who has participated on the committee (and its predecessor Sports Working Group) and for what periods?
- Agendas and minutes from meetings of this committee seem to be largely missing/not-yet published. This is worrying and contributes to a feeling of residents not able to be involved/informed.
- Can residents apply to be part of this committee?

Costs to-date

- How much has been spent on this project in total to-date

Lease of the pavilion by 'sports club' – currently HAORC

- How much will they pay for the lease for the facility
- How long is the lease
- What happens if HAORC decide they cannot make the facility viable
- What is the contingency plan if the facility can't be used by any non-council body/club

Presentation at the AVM

- How did HPC expect to have this topic presented as it was WITHOUT full and comprehensive preparation for inevitable questions.
- No next steps were presented, what are those next steps planned

Thank-you for accepting my questions and I look forward to hearing back in the near future.

Response sent

24th June 2022

By email:

Dear Ms Abrahams,

Thank you for your recent correspondence sent to the Council, in relation to the community sports pavilion project at NE Hook. Please find below responses from the Council to the questions raised.

"I understand S106 contributions for NE Hook amounted to £250k for a community building to provide facilities alongside new sports pitches, to be used by various sports activities. We were advised at the AVM we are now looking at the development of a pavilion costing £1.9 MILLION that would be leased by Hook & Odiham Rugby Club, specifically designed with rugby as the main sport and with a 'club membership fee' to be able to use the facilities. Other

sports were mentioned as being able to use the facilities – but from the dialogue used and the presentations made, rugby was clearly promoted as the ‘lead’ sport to benefit from the pavilion.”

Both the rugby and youth football clubs had an interest in use of the pitches at the NE Hook site and both were sent a written brief by the Parish Council in November 2019 to bid for use of the pitches. The bid needed to include a statement in respect of shared use of the site, which was the Council’s preference.

The bids were considered, along with verbal representations from both clubs, at the Council meeting in January 2020. HUYFC (youth football) stated, in their bid and verbally at the meeting that sharing was not an option. HORFC (rugby club) included in their presentation, consideration of how the pitches/facilities could be jointly used. Following the bid presentations, the Council decided that rugby would be the lead use for the site.

“What was the time-line for the change from ‘simple’ sports pavilion to the current expected deliverable. Who proposed this change in approach and when and why. Who from HPC approved this change.”

The Parish Council agreed to providing an ancillary facility for the sports pitches at NE Hook when it agreed the S106 funding. There is no mention in the S106 agreement of a “simple” sports pavilion, it is described as a “community building – meaning a sports pavilion and changing rooms” and land for 36 parking spaces. The original bid for S106 funding was made 9 years ago in 2013 – two Councils previous to the current sitting Council - and whilst the original bid and funding provided cannot be altered, each new sitting Council would expect to review projects underway and carry them forward in the most appropriate format.

“What other sports are being considered to be able to use the pavilion”

The rugby club are already in discussions with youth football, Hook Runners, the cricket club and Hook Velo.

“How will the sports/social ‘membership’ (mentioned at the AVM) process work”

This is yet to be determined.

“From reading recently published HPC meeting minutes, we find out that the funding of this pavilion is likely to be made from SANG reserves. Is this a valid use of SANG funds?”

Funds would be borrowed from the SANG reserve and paid back in a timely fashion. This principle has been discussed with the Council’s auditor and given the cash reserves the Council has, was agreed that this would be a sensible approach, rather than taking formal borrowing, which would attract interest payments.

“If this amount of money is available ‘to spend’, why aren’t Hook residents consulted since we might perhaps prefer to explore using such an amount of money to progress the much talked about and widely supported ‘regeneration of the centre of Hook’.”

As above, it would be borrowed. The pavilion is a current project, requiring funding. The regeneration of the centre of Hook is not at the current time a realisable project (nor can it be completed solely under Parish Council remit). Any regeneration would require a major commercial company to invest in Hook and they would want to see a financial return. Such a company would look to form a partnership with either the District Council or the County Council as it would require a body having Compulsory Purchase Powers and perhaps sources of significant regeneration grants. This is not simply a Parish Council matter albeit

the Council can seek to promote and encourage, through our limited influences, and as a 'Policy' to start the ball rolling, at an appropriate time, the Council has the "Masterplan" contained in the Neighbourhood Plan.

"Public insight and opinion: we were told at the AVM that public consultation would be undertaken – When will this start and what end-date is anticipated; Who will lead the consultation; What form will it take; How is it possible that the project is as far forward as it is without residents involvement?"

Public consultation is yet to be finalised but will be fully publicised once agreed. The Council has a mandate, indeed an obligation, having agreed a S106 legal agreement, to build a facility. Until the Council had established what that facility might look like and critically what the likely cost was, there was not enough detailed information to engage residents in meaningful discussion.

"NEHCPC was formed at the end of 2021 - Who has participated on the committee (and its predecessor Sports Working Group) and for what periods?"

Current Committee – appointed 4th May 2022 – Cllrs Worlock, Orchard, Cowell, V Nabbs, Kinge, Tomlinson, Myall, Kirkham, Terrey and Morrison. Co-opted members – HORFC – A Komrower and D Ross, Hook Shed – S Dignum and M Heywood

Previous Committee – Formed December 2021 – May 2022 – Cllrs Cowell, V Nabbs, Kinge, Tomlinson, Morrison, Terrey, Orchard and Kirkham. Co-opted members – HORFC – A Komrower and D Ross, Hook Shed – S Dignum and M Heywood

Sports Working Group – May 21 – Dec 21 – Cllrs Cowell, V Nabbs, Kinge, Orchard and Kirkham. HORFC - A Komrower. Hook Shed - S Dignum.

"Agendas and minutes from meetings of this committee seem to be largely missing/not-yet published. This is worrying and contributes to a feeling of residents not able to be involved/informed."

Publishing is now up to date. There were sync issues with the current website and it has required substantial upgrade work (now completed) to fix the issues. Agendas are replaced each time a new meeting is advertised, they are not kept on the website for archive purposes.

"Can residents apply to be part of this committee?"

No – co-option to a committee as a non-councillor member is based on bringing specific knowledge or expertise to the work of that committee. All Committee meetings are open to the public to attend and use can be made of the public participation section of the meeting to address the committee.

"Costs to-date - How much has been spent on this project in total to-date"

£12,159.25 is showing in the Council accounts for this project.

"Lease of the pavilion by 'sports club' – currently HAORC; How much will they pay for the lease for the facility? How long is the lease? What happens if HAORC decide they cannot make the facility viable? What is the contingency plan if the facility can't be used by any non-council body/club?"

Exact lease conditions have not yet been determined but the Council has existing leases for the other buildings it owns, which are likely to form a basis for a lease for the pavilion.

Email received

From: Barry and Janet Deller

Sent: 26 May 2022 10:17

To: Sarah Dignan <clerk@hook.gov.uk>

Subject: Correspondence post Annual Village Meeting - NEHPC Meeting 30th May 2022

Dear Sarah,

I wish to place on record my current thinking on the NEHCP and to have this correspondence considered under Item 22.61 of Hook Parish Council's North East Hook Community Project Committee meeting on Monday 30th May 2022 and the full Council meeting on 1st June 2022. I will be attending both meetings.

The Annual Village Meeting on Wednesday 11th May 2022 received an excellent presentation from the proposed Pavilion architect (Alexander Design). The subsequent questions from parishioners raised a number of major concerns about this project. Cllr Fergus Kirkham (chairing the AVM) gave an assurance to the meeting that all these comments would be fed back to the Council. Can I please be assured that his/your report on the AVM will indeed be tabled at both the NEHCP meeting and Full Council next week.

We spoke on the phone on 18th May 2022 following the AVM to discuss matters relating to the proposed Pavilion including publication of the minutes of Full Council meeting held on 6th April which were only correctly positioned on the Council website at 3pm on the 18th May 2022. In the course of our conversation I requested that you ascertain the current legal position on the holding of a local referendum/parish poll which, to my understanding, are contained within part 3, schedule 12, paragraph 18, sub-paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Local Government Act of 1972. You agreed to establish that this legal provision is still in place. It would be helpful if this information is available in advance of next week's meetings. –

At the AVM I asked a specific question about the build cost of the proposed pavilion and then I asked for the following assurances from the Parish Council:

- 1 That a timetable and details of the proposed public consultation on this project be produced as a matter of urgency
- 2 That the Parish Council give an undertaking that full and meaningful public consultation would take place in advance of any decision to proceed with this project.

In our conversation on 18th May I agreed with you that land and Section 106 funding had been made available for playing field provision at NE Hook and following the consideration of proposals that rugby had been selected as the core sports provision at this site. None of this is in dispute. What I, and from conversations with other residents, need to be convinced about is the scale and cost of the proposed development and the additional charges anticipated to be placed on parish precept payers at a time of a cost-of-living crisis and a likely recession.

To aid residents' understanding of this multi-million pound project can the Council please provide the following information:

1 A breakdown of the membership of Hook and Odiham RFC to show on a percentage basis the split between Hook residents and members from outside the parish precept area.

2. The bids for external funding that are currently being made towards the capital costs of the proposed buildings at NE Hook including requests to Sports England, Rugby Football Union, other national and local bodies supporting sports development, Hart District Council, Hampshire County Council, Odiham Parish Council and other relevant bodies.

3 The options that have been considered for a range of sizes and budgets for the provision for this site ranging from a single storey building providing changing facilities and associated playing storage requirements through to a gold standard two-storey sports pavilion as envisaged by Alexander Design. At the moment my impression is the Council is focussing on a gold standard provision whereas prudential decision making should include a range of options including affordability.

I look forward to the Council's consideration of these points and answers to my questions.

Regards

Barry Deller

Hook Parish resident

Response sent

24th June 2022

By email:

Dear Mr Deller,

Thank you for your recent correspondence sent to the Council, in relation to the community sports pavilion project at NE Hook. Please find below responses from the Council to the questions raised.

“We spoke on the phone on 18th May 2022 following the AVM to discuss matters relating to the proposed Pavilion including publication of the minutes of Full Council meeting held on 6th April which were only correctly positioned on the Council website at 3pm on the 18th May 2022. In the course of our conversation I requested that you ascertain the current legal position on the holding of a local referendum/parish poll which, to my understanding, are contained within part 3, schedule 12, paragraph 18, sub-paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Local Government Act of 1972. You agreed to establish that this legal provision is still in place. It would be helpful if this information is available in advance of next week's meetings.”

This information has been ascertained and a subsequent conversation has confirmed this.

“At the AVM I asked a specific question about the build cost of the proposed pavilion and then I asked for the following assurances from the Parish Council:

1 That a timetable and details of the proposed public consultation on this project be produced as a matter of urgency.

2 That the Parish Council give an undertaking that full and meaningful public consultation would take place in advance of any decision to proceed with this project.”

Public consultation is yet to be finalised but will be fully publicised once agreed. The Council has a mandate, indeed an obligation, having agreed a S106 legal agreement, to build a facility. Until the Council had established what that facility might look like and critically what the likely cost was, there was not enough detailed information to engage residents in meaningful discussion.

"In our conversation on 18th May I agreed with you that land and Section 106 funding had been made available for playing field provision at NE Hook and following the consideration of proposals that rugby had been selected as the core sports provision at this site. None of this is in dispute. What I, and from conversations with other residents, need to be convinced about is the scale and cost of the proposed development and the additional charges anticipated to be placed on parish precept payers at a time of a cost-of-living crisis and a likely recession.

To aid residents' understanding of this multi-million pound project can the Council please provide the following information:

A breakdown of the membership of Hook and Odiham RFC to show on a percentage basis the split between Hook residents and members from outside the parish precept area."

Membership, both playing and social, is 46% Hook residents, with the remainder coming from surrounding areas – Odiham, Tadley, Rotherwick and Hartley Wintney.

"The bids for external funding that are currently being made towards the capital costs of the proposed buildings at NE Hook including requests to Sports England, Rugby Football Union, other national and local bodies supporting sports development, Hart District Council, Hampshire County Council, Odiham Parish Council and other relevant bodies."

Grant funding can only be applied for once a fully costed project is determined. We are currently at the feasibility stage with an estimated project cost. The Council will apply for as much external funding as possible once all the information required to make grant applications is available.

"The options that have been considered for a range of sizes and budgets for the provision for this site ranging from a single storey building providing changing facilities and associated playing storage requirements through to a gold standard two-storey sports pavilion as envisaged by Alexander Design. At the moment my impression is the Council is focussing on a gold standard provision whereas prudential decision making should include a range of options including affordability."

The options considered by the architect are detailed in the business case document. This draft is being considered at the NEHCP meeting on Monday 27th June. The S106 agreement the Council entered into obliges the Council to provide a "community building – meaning a sports pavilion and changing rooms" and land for 36 parking spaces.

Yours sincerely,

Sarah Dignan

Sarah Dignan
Clerk to the Council

30th May 2022 – NEHCP Committee meeting Public Speaking Session – Questions raised

Please note this is recorded in the minutes of the meeting, available on the HPC website.

Mr Barry Deller:

1) Looking at the available drawings/plans of the sports pitches, the boundaries appear to be very close to the A30. Has the Council consulted with HCC and their insurers in respect of this as it would appear that there is considerable risk of rugby balls going onto the A30, which would cause a hazard for drivers.

AK commented that the issue of rugby balls ending up on the A30 had been discussed when looking at the pitch layouts, but that rugby balls travel less distance than a football would. The rugby posts are set further into the pitches and kicks to goal tend to not travel a large distance beyond the posts. The Clerk confirmed that neither HCC nor insurers had been contacted about this issue at the current time.

2) Can it be confirmed if the co-opted members of the committee have speaking rights and/or voting rights?

The Clerk confirmed that currently, co-opted Members have both speaking and voting rights.

Mr Ben Craddock:

1) Has the Council looked properly at car parking for the facility, as from the plans, it would seem insufficient if there were 4 teams playing simultaneously, which could generate 60+ vehicles on site?

Cllr Orchard responded that car parking was under consideration – both formal tarmac area parking and informal gravel area parking. Capacity may be an issue but overall, the site should be able to provide a reasonable level of parking. The envisaged usage of the facility would see access by different user groups at different times of the day, which would stagger parking requirements. Cllr Orchard confirmed that parking standards were discussed with Hart District Council and he would cover this further in his subsequent report to the meeting.

2) Has there been consideration of licences in terms of use, for example, social use, weddings, functions etc.?

The Chairman responded that this would be covered briefly in her update, later in the meeting.

Ms Megan Andrews:

1) As the resident who lives directly opposite what will become the entrance to the pavilion site, there are some concerns about the proximity of the pavilion building to the houses and concern about vehicles leaving the facility. Croudace sold potential buyers the idea that the pavilion would be a low usage, single storey building, set much further into the pitch site than the artist's impression currently shows.

Cllr Orchard commented that the brief given to the architect was for feasibility of a building to be sustainable and provide optimum usage of the site/pitches. In doing this the architect looked at various options for siting of the pavilion within the area and this is the optimum location. Cllr Kirkham further commented that there are constraints on the site such as access to sewerage, drainage, ground inclines and declines and all this had to be taken into consideration when looking at a proposed building and mitigating the constraints comes with a significant cost.

Cllr Orchard further explained that the architect was working through RIBA Stage 2, which would develop proposals to the point of producing material for public consultation.

Cllr Kirkham clarified that the standard RIBA form of contract was split into multiple stages. Stage 1 concerned feasibility and Stage 2 concerned consultation, moving to a preferred option by the end of that stage.

Mr Terry Wegg:

1) As a representative from Hook Runners, what has happened regarding shared usage with other sports groups as this is the first I have heard of the project?

Adam Komrower explained that he had been in discussion with Hook Runners regarding usage of the site and the rugby club are looking at integration with several other local sports groups. The site provides an excellent opportunity for multi-usage, and this would be fully explored to ensure as wide a use as possible for sporting activities for residents.

Julia Abrahams:

1) I had a question regarding public consultation.

The Chairman responded that this would be covered briefly in her update, later in the meeting.