

## **OVING PAVILION**

### **LOCATION AND DESIGN GROUP MEETING NO. 3**

**7<sup>th</sup> Nov 2007**

#### **ACTION NOTE**

##### **Present**

Jack Peeters (chairman), Elaine Conway, Kit Couper, Frank Bennet, Stuart Taylor, Paul Waldron, Jan Waldron, Philip Shuffill, Julian Bamford.

##### **Apologies**

Steve Baker, Paul Brett

##### **Note of previous meeting**

Agreed apart from wording under General Matters relating to a number of residents questioning the chairmanship of the group. Jack will ensure the notes are amended and the correct version is published in the newsletter and on the website etc.

##### **Location of Pavilion within the recreation ground**

Having agreed a paper at the last meeting about factors affecting the location of the pavilion, we had each attempted between meetings, to apply these factors to nine possible sites in order to compare them. The object was to agree a site, or sites, which could then be the subject of further consultation with villagers. We discussed all nine possibilities and a tenth one added by Paul Waldron. After considerable deliberation we agreed to consider in further detail at our next meeting, five of the possible sites. There were thus five sites which we agreed were clearly unsuitable for the reasons mentioned below. All ten sites are illustrated on Plan LD1 which, it was hoped, could be published with these notes.

The unsuitable sites, with our reasons, are:

- Site 1 High cost of services (electricity, water, sewage, vehicle access etc)  
Obtrusive appearance in the middle of the open area  
Likelihood of damage from footballs  
Inconvenient location for pedestrian users.  
Inconvenient for users of tennis and courts
  
- Site 5 Obtrusive appearance blocking views into the recreation ground.  
Too close to neighbouring houses  
Cost and difficulty of replacing car park in a convenient location
  
- Site 6 Obtrusive appearance blocking views into the recreation ground

Too close to neighbouring houses  
Loss of valuable trees  
Likelihood of damage from footballs

Site 9 High cost and difficulty of achieving good vehicle access  
Distance from car parking  
Inconvenient for users of tennis courts  
Need to relocate football practice area and floodlights

Site 10 Same drawbacks as site 9 but worse  
Need to relocate cricket nets

In order to give further consideration to all the other sites we agreed that some “ball park” costings would be required as follows.

Cost of relocating play area if necessary. Paul Waldron would follow this up.  
Cost of relocating tennis courts if necessary. Jack Peeters would find out.  
Cost of getting disabled and service vehicle access to each of the remaining five sites.  
Cost of getting other services (electricity, water, sewage) to the other five sites.  
Jack will ask Paul Brett if he can help with the last two categories

The group re-iterated its willingness to carefully consider any feedback from villagers reading these notes.

We agreed to share out the task of taking notes at future meetings.

Our next meeting is at Ground Farm Barn at 8 pm on Tue 27<sup>th</sup> Nov.