

## Hanslope PC – Section 106 Working Group — 4/8/25

### MINUTES

Present:

Cllr R Wallond

Cllr A Flatley

M Basson

J Gregory

G Merry (recording)

Apologies: Cllr R Simpkins, A Johnson.

#### **1. Findings and report from the Open Day.**

The Open Day on 5/7/25 had been very successful and over 70 comments were collected. RW had processed these through Co-pilot and the analysis was circulated. Build Option 2 was the most favoured. Option 1 was not favoured and Option 3 although popular was considered non-viable.

#### **2. Discuss priorities and what is feasible/popular/unpopular**

The analysis of the data, produced the Top 10 most popular requirements and these were discussed: -

*(Ranked by popularity in the survey responses )*

1. Café / Coffee Shop with Indoor Seating
2. Indoor Sports Hall / Multi-sport Court (badminton, basketball, etc.)
3. Expanded and Improved Parking
4. Public Toilet Facilities (accessible and open during peak times)
5. Full Disabled Access (lift, dropped curbs, step-free routes)
6. Flexible Community Rooms (for workshops, meetings, foodbank/fridge)
7. Outdoor Amenities (BBQ areas, picnic spots, lit pathways around the Rec)
8. Gym / Fitness Room (including potential sports-therapy spaces)
9. Dedicated Storage for Clubs' Equipment (e.g. Hanslope Hornets)
10. Additional Small Courts (padel, pickleball)

The layout of Option 2 will require some amending e.g. the seating area needs to face the Rec. Ground and the cafe should be sited at the outdoor gym end. Storage for the football and cricket clubs needs to be added in, although it may be possible to build another hut closer to the MUGA for this, to maximise community centre space. Parking is the biggest issue but there are no easy answers, as the PC does not own any more land adjacent to the Rec. The 2 Bloor car parks will need to be utilised on match days and people will be encouraged to walk. The upper story/viewing area was favoured along with an upper story hireable space.

#### **3. Discuss football requirements, including implications of licensing**

In addition to upgraded and extended changing facilities, the football club had requested a licensed bar for pre- and post-match hospitality. GM outlined the management and security issues with this and suggested 3 options:

1. No bar – café only
2. A bar with limited licensed hours for football matches only. To be close contracted and monitored for compliance, behaviour, noise etc.
3. A fully licensed bar available for events, including evening events.

It was agreed Option 2 would be best and temporary licenses may be applied for on top of that. It was agreed the café/bar would be subject to a formal tendering process and will require its manager to double as a building manager. The USP will be community, supportiveness, activities and sport but not regular evening events. It will close on most days at 5pm and the bar and café areas will be separate. Dogs will be allowed, in order to maximise income from dog walkers. The manager will be required to take over space bookings.

GM shared her experience of the type of lease that could work, whereby a low monthly rent was charged but also an additional turnover rent. This way, the tenant was not out of pocket during the leaner winter months and continued trading was supported. RW and JG will also share examples of tendering processes, contacts and documents.

#### **4. Discuss funding**

GM had circulated the funding report again and still felt approx. £1 million could be raised. It is likely that Option 2 will cost more than this and the idea of engaging a professional fundraiser was discussed. JG advised that if a funding application is too 'polished' i.e. appearing to have covered everything without engagement with the funding bodies, it is less likely to be successful. Pre-app advice and engagement is usually more successful, as it gives an opportunity to discuss what funders want and how this can work with local needs. JG gave examples of organisations and how this could be approached e.g. by setting up site visits in the first instance. JG is now working as a consultant, setting up large-scale sports projects, including fundraising. AF and RW asked him if he would consider working on this project in a professional capacity, providing this was all transparent. JG would be interested, at least for the initial stages and can set aside a day/half day from September, if mandated to do so by the PC. GM advised there was no legal reason why this couldn't happen and agreed to put it on the September PC agenda.

The Public Art S106 was discussed and GM advised this can only be accessed via MKCC's S106 officers. She agreed to approach them about this.

Feoffee charity may be approached to help pay for the temporary accommodation.

#### **5. Timeline for build and practicalities/cost of temporary accommodation.**

Summer 2026 was aspirational but it could well be summer 2027.

**6. Moving towards an outline spec. for the PC for Sept. meeting (and architect).**

The following were agreed and will be sent to the architect for his consideration: -

Option 2 with modifications:-

- Café on the north-eastern side, with indoor and outdoor seating, with view of the Rec.
- Separate bar inside (possibly upstairs)
- Indoor sports hall / Multi-sport court (badminton, basketball, etc.)
- Public toilet facilities (accessible and open during peak times)
- Full disabled access (lift, dropped curbs, step-free routes)
- Flexible hireable space(s), for workshops, meetings, classes and potentially public art installation. Possibly upstairs.
- Consider parking. Need to not lose space but can any be gained?
- Dedicated storage for clubs' equipment (HFC and HCC)

**ACTIONS:**

RW – refine the Spec to then send to architect, set up conversation with Castlethorpe PC.

GM – approach MKCC Public Art Officers, send spec to RW then update the architect with timeframes, decision-making etc, put fundraiser role on PC agenda.

HH/AF – look into sizes and dimensions for sports requirements.

ALL consider how best to consult with the Village Hall.

*GM: 06/08/25*