

**SUMMARY NOTE OF A MEETING BETWEEN CATHERINE HOSIE (CH), LYNZEY PARADISE (LP) AND STEPHEN STACEY ATTENDED ALSO BY ALICIA (WORKING WITH CH) ABOUT THE PROPOSED LEASE OF THE PLAYING FIELD**

**9 OCTOBER 2016**

1. CH noted that, in order to move from one lease to the next, the National Trust might have to give notice of one month as the playing field was inalienable land and the Charity Commission required this formality. She would seek further advice on this point.
2. CH said that 40 years' duration was acceptable in principle but wanted to take advice from her legal colleagues. If in the event a shorter period was preferred by them, CH would be willing to confirm in a side letter that the Trust's intention was to continue the lease for the (or a) longer period.
3. CH indicated that the Trust would be willing to write into the lease the definitions for permitted use given at 4.I-V inclusive in APC's proposal, wanting to know what was planned only for uses outside those listed there. She also remarked that it would be very helpful for the Trust to be aware of particular uses in advance so as to prevent clashes with their own activities. LP said that exchanges of information of this kind would be helpful to both parties as an event put on by one might complement an event put on by the other. It was noted that Jan Tomlin had undertaken to provide details of the Trust's plans for events when they were available, had indeed done so at a recent APC meeting, and continuing this practice would be welcome.
4. CH said that custom and practice is that insurance is provided under the Trust's policy. LP commented that this might not sit well with APC's obligation to tender competitively every three years. CH undertook to reflect on this.
5. LP asked what the Trust's opinion might be in the event that was a wish to put up play equipment on the playing field. CH thought the Trust might be able to approve.
6. LP also asked whether the Trust would object to replacement of the iron railing alongside the path with a barrier that stopped cricket balls hit along the ground from leaving the playing field. CH said it would depend on the type of replacement.
7. LP described the current condition of the pavilion and noted that there had been informal discussion with the shared thought that, funding permitting, the pavilion and the social club could be replaced by a single multi-purpose building available for use by the wider community. She asked whether the Trust might support such an initiative. CH mentioned the Lacock Community Resource Building, which appeared to be a similar proposal, currently at an early stage, which was led by the community and supported by the Trust. CH and LP agreed that the idea was worth discussion and suggested that a meeting be set up for all stakeholders to discuss further.

8. CH had some reservations about the proposed Recital but was reassured to hear that its inclusion was not suggested by APC on the grounds that it felt that the Trust might in the future act in bad faith since APC did not hold such a view. LP made the point that it could be very helpful to have the proposed Recital since it might strengthen a bid for grant funding by describing the history and purpose of the gift to the community. CH said she would look for the original document in which Mr Keiller granted the land, which might by now have been archived. LP said that it might be described as 'Butler's Meadow'. CH thought that, given this discussion, the Recital was generally acceptable and undertook to ask her legal team for advice on the wording.
9. We discussed the rental and did not resist the Trust's proposal of £75/year.
10. CH suggested that a draft of the proposed lease, using a standard form amended as appropriate, be sent to LP, and LP accepted, saying that she would circulate it to APC members.