

Options for the Future of the Anson Trust

1. Introduction and Objective

1.1. Purpose of Note

The purpose of this note is to summarize the options available to the Anson Trust. It is being written to explain how we have assessed the various proposals. It has been updated following the village meeting and we have taken account of suggestions raised there.

The note is laid out as follows:

1. Introduction
2. Summary of options we have considered
3. The criteria against which we have measured the options
4. For each option a short review of
 - what would be done under that option
 - an assessment against the criteria
 - an initial view on whether the option has to be rejected or can be selected for further review
5. For selected options, a more detailed review of viability
6. A conclusion on the preferred option

1.2. Definitions

We have used the abbreviations:

- ESC for the Ex-Serviceman's Club
- VoWH for the White Horse District Council

On the Institute site are located:

1. The Main Hall (currently closed) plus its kitchen and other facilities
2. The set of facilities used by the ESC (the Small Hall)
3. The car park

1.3. Appendices

In the Appendices are:

Appendix 1	Existing Institute Costs
Appendix 2	Costs of running the Anson Field
Appendix 3	A list of user groups

2. Options Available

There is a wide range of options potentially available. We have reduced them to 7 principal options:

- A. Stay as we are
- B. Wind up the Trust
- C. Redevelop the Institute and leave the Anson Field unchanged
- D. Sell the Institute and develop the Anson Field
- E. Sell the Institute and part of the Anson Field, purchase a new field and develop new facilities
- F. Develop the Hyde Copse Field for housing and improve the Anson Field facilities
- G. Obtain additional sources of funding

3. Criteria for Assessment

In considering each option, we have assessed it against the following criteria:

1. What are the facilities provided initially – and, in particular,
 - are the facilities at least equal to what is currently available?
 - is a large space equivalent to the Main Hall available?
2. What is the affect on people around the Institute and people and passers by in North Street?
3. What is the affect on users of the Anson field 'casual area' facilities and the appearance of the Anson field?
4. Is there enough money for both:
 - the initial capital expenditure for any new building or refurbishment (up-front money)
 - income to sustain the facilities for the foreseeable future – including a sinking fund for future major refurbishment?
5. Are the facilities suitable for the long-term? In particular as village needs change, can we:
 - upgrade the facilities we provide (eg improve pitches; provide practice areas)
 - extend the facilities we provide where we want to (or have to) (eg for additional sports or types of social activity)?

The last two criteria are particularly important as we want to ensure that whatever we do will be sustainable in both financial terms and the ability to change as the village needs change over time.

4. Option Review

4.1. Option A – Stay as we are

Summary of what would happen

In this option, we would continue as we are with:

1. The Main Hall closed
2. The Anson Field as now
3. The Sports and Social Club Building remains in use

Assessment against criteria

Facilities provided:

Facility	Available	Comment
Facilities currently available:		
Sports pitches	Yes	
Social Club	Yes	
Play Area etc	Yes	
ESC	Yes	
Facilities previously available		
Hall (or equivalent)	No	Hall remains closed
Facilities upgrade		
Can we upgrade or change?	No	Limits are space and money

Impact Around the Institute		Comment
Appearance	As now	
Traffic	As now	
New building impact	None	

Impact Around Anson Field		Comment
Pitches	As now	
Building	As now	
Play Area/Casual space	As now	
Impact on Anson neighbours	As now	

Is the Money available?		Comment
Capital cost for Social Club	No	Needed within next 5 – 7 years (see Appendix 2)
Running costs for Institute	No	See Appendix 1
Running costs for Field and Club	No	Anson Trust will run out of subsidy money within next year to 18 months without reserve release

What about the long-term?		
Can facilities be upgraded and extended?	Possibly	Limitations on space; impact on neighbours; lack of funds

The Charity Commission have indicated that they will not release current reserves for running costs as such an approach is not viable in the long term. Even if they did release the reserves, there is only a limited period before this option would run out of money.

Conclusion on Viability

This option is in the long-term:

1. not financially viable
2. incapable of providing the facilities that the village needs

4.2. Option B - Wind up the Trust

Summary of what would happen

In this option we would request the Charity Commission to wind the Trust up on the basis that it is no longer viable in its current form. The Charity Commission has wide powers about what it can do. It would, however, face the same financial problems as we have.

We believe they would plan to set up a successor body on a sound financial basis. Options they would consider could include selling:

1. the Institute site (with or without the ESC as a tenant)
2. the Anson Field

The purchaser would look to maximize the value of their investment through maximum development of the sites.

Any purchaser would minimise the expenditure on replacement facilities by:

1. negotiating with VoWH over the minimum facilities to be provided
2. purchase sufficient land in the area to replace the facilities
3. pass running costs of new facilities to a successor body (the Parish Council or a new charity)

Assessment against criteria

Facilities provided:

Facility	Available	Comment
Facilities currently available:		
Sports pitches	Yes	Somewhere in the village
Social Club	Yes	Somewhere in the village
Play Area etc	Yes	Somewhere in the village
ESC	Yes	
Facilities previously available		
Hall (or equivalent)	Yes	Somewhere in the village
Facilities upgrade		
Can we upgrade or change?	Unable to say	Dependent on others raising money

Impact Around the Institute		Comment
Appearance	Changes limited to what is allowable in conservation area	
Traffic	Increased due to housing	
New building impact	Effect of additional houses	Appearance of car park would be significantly different

Impact Around Anson Field		Comment
Pitches	Expect to move	Somewhere in the village
Building	Expect to move	Somewhere in the village
Play Area/Casual space	If retained, maintained at council expense	
Impact on Anson neighbours	Expect buildings on part, or all, of Field	Possibly in phases

Is the Money available?		
Capital cost for Social Club	Yes	Would be part of planning consent
Running costs for Institute	No	Developer would not expect to cover
Running costs for Field and Club	No	Developer would not expect to cover

What about the long-term?		
Can facilities be upgraded and extended?	Unclear	Dependent on what developer would provide

Our concerns are that:

1. The village would have very limited control over new facilities (developer would expend minimum cost)
2. Village (including facilities users) would have to pay for all running costs for new facilities (including a sinking fund for major refurbishment)
3. New facilities could be located anywhere the developer found
4. We must expect some development on the Anson Field

We note that the next Vale of White Horse (VoWH) structure plan includes a note that the Anson Field site contains a possible 'windfall' location for 90 houses. We take this to mean that VoWH:

1. recognize the possibility of building on the whole field (90 houses would need the entire Anson field)
2. would not rule out this level of development on the Anson Field

See Vale of White Horse Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) document: http://www.whitehorsedc.gov.uk/Planning/Planning_policy/XX_DetailPage-5205.asp

Conclusion

This option would release the successor Trust from the existing financial problems.

We are concerned that it would not be in the best interests of the village as it:

1. would transfer the burden of running replacement facilities to the village
2. could mean the loss of all open space in the centre of the village
3. would mean control was no longer in the hands of people who live in Marcham

4.3. Option C - Redevelop Institute and Leave Field Unchanged

Summary of what would happen

In this option, we would:

1. Get the Institute back into service using our existing capital
2. Leave the Anson Field as now
3. Continue with the Sports and Social Club Building as now

Assessment against criteria

Facilities provided:

Facility	Available	Comment
Facilities currently available:		
Sports pitches	Yes	
Social Club	Yes	
Play Area etc	Yes	
ESC	Yes	
Facilities previously available		
Hall (or equivalent)	Yes	Institute back in use
Facilities upgrade		
Can we upgrade or change?	No	Limited by space available on field

Impact Around the Institute		Comment
Appearance	Largely as now	
Traffic	Increased due to use of hall	Note 10.30 curfew as indication of impact
New building impact	None	

Impact Around Anson Field		Comment
Pitches	As now	
Building	As now	
Play Area/Casual space	As now	
Impact on Anson neighbours	None	

Is the Money available?		
Capital cost of Institute refurbishment?	No	See Appendix 1.
Capital cost for Social Club	No	Needed within next 5 – 7 years
Running costs for Institute	No	Historically, costs have not been covered and there is no sinking fund. The Institute facilities would be no better than they used to be and are unlikely to attract more income.
Running costs for Field and Club	No	Anson Trust will run out of subsidy money within next year to 18 months

What about the long-term?		
Can facilities be upgraded and extended?	No	Limited space; impact on neighbours; lack of funds

Conclusion on Viability

This option is not financially viable and does not meet long-term needs.

4.4. Option D - Sell Institute and Develop Anson Field

Summary of what would happen

In this option, we would:

1. Sell the Institute and the adjacent car park
2. Leave the Anson Field as now
3. Upgrade/extend the Sports and Social Club Building to provide some additional facilities and get the building more efficient and cheaper to maintain

Assessment against criteria

Facilities provided:

Facility	Available	Comment
Facilities currently available:		
Sports pitches	Yes	
Social Club	Yes	
Play Area etc	Yes	
ESC	No	Depends on how Institute was developed and what could be offered in new Anson Field facility
Facilities previously available		
Hall (or equivalent)	Limited	Space limitations on the field prevent the building being significantly bigger – but a rebuild might make the facilities being more widely usable and cheaper to run.
Facilities upgrade		
Can we upgrade or change?	No	Limited by space available on field

Impact Around the Institute		Comment
Appearance	Changes limited to what is allowable in conservation area	
Traffic	Increased due to housing	
New building impact	Effect of additional houses	Appearance of car park would be significantly different

Impact Around Anson Field		Comment
Pitches	As now	
Building	As now	Replaced or upgraded – possible bigger footprint
Play Area/Casual space	As now	Small reduction from larger building taking up space
Impact on Anson neighbours	Yes	Disturbance from increased use

Is the Money available?		
Capital cost for Social Club	Yes	Would absorb most (if not all) of money from Institute
Running costs for Field and Club	Unclear	We would have to look at a funding approach that would pay all the running costs of the field and building and also provide a sinking fund for major refurbishment. (see Appendix 2)

What about the long-term?		
Can facilities be upgraded and extended?	No	Limited space; impact on neighbours

We believe that we would be unable to sell the Institute (plus Car Park) unless we were able to convince the Charity Commission that we had a viable long-term plan for the Sports field and club.

Possible development on South Side of Anson Field

We have had indications that some of the property owners on the South side of the Anson Field wish to build houses on their property. They would need access to their property through the Institute. To ensure that we got a benefit from any such development, we would either:

1. sell the Institute at an enhanced value to a developer; or,
2. retain a 'ransom strip' on the Institute boundary

Any such development would provide an extra capital sum and this would allow greater development on the field. However, it would not solve the space and noise problems on the Anson Field

Conclusion on Viability

This option does not meet all our assessment criteria. However, as this option is a possibility, it is considered in more detail in Section 5.

4.5. Option E - Sell Institute and part of the Anson Field, buy new field and build new facilities

Summary of what would happen

In this option, we would:

1. Sell the Institute and the adjacent car park
2. Sell just over half the Anson Field for development (housing) leaving about 3 acres as public open space/play area
3. Buy part of the Hyde Copse field
4. Build new pitches and Building on the Hyde copse location

This option reduces the space available in the centre of the village. There is an overall increase in open space and leisure facilities (7 acres in centre is reduced to about 3½ acres; area on edge of village is 10 acres; net increase is 6 acres). However, that increase is on the edge of the village. This approach returns the Trust to the original position when it was established.

Assessment against criteria

Facilities provided:

Facility	Available	Comment
Facilities currently available:		
Sports pitches	Yes	Improved by greater space and installing better pitches
Social Club	Yes	Improved by new (larger) building
Play Area etc	Yes	Unchanged on Anson field Most of current cricket pitch becomes available
ESC	Possibly	Depends on how Institute was developed and what could be offered in new Community facility
Facilities previously available		
Hall (or equivalent)	Yes	In new building on Hyde Copse field
Facilities upgrade		
Can we upgrade or change?	Yes	Some spare space will be available

Impact Around the Institute		Comment
Appearance	Changes limited to what is allowable in conservation area	
Traffic	Increased due to housing	
New building impact	Effect of additional houses	Appearance of car park would be significantly different

Impact Around Anson Field		Comment	
Pitches	No	Football pitch now housing Some of cricket pitch lost	
Building	No	Replaced by housing	
Play Area/Casual space	Increased	By part of cricket pitch	
Impact on Anson neighbours	Yes	East neighbours	Significant - Houses close to their property
		South neighbours	Limited - Screened
		West and North neighbours	Small - club building changed for housing

Is the Money available?		
Capital cost for Social Club	Yes	Provided that negotiations currently under way are completed satisfactorily
Running costs for Field and Club	Probably	Intention is that major refurbishment/maintenance would be covered by Trust funds. Running costs would be covered by users.

What about the long-term?		
Can facilities be upgraded and extended?	Yes	Space available; few immediate neighbours

Or concerns about this approach are:

1. Sales values and purchase costs of new field (see Appendix 3)
2. Getting planning permission for housing on the Anson Field
3. Ensuring that club running costs are covered

Conclusion on Viability

This option is viable as it:

1. Improves village facilities
2. Is capable of expansion and change as the needs of the village change

This option is considered further in Section 5.

4.6. Develop the Hyde Copse Field for housing and improve the Anson Field facilities

Summary of what would happen

In this option:

1. The Anson Trust would sell the Institute and the adjacent car park
2. The various parties (including the planning authority) would agree a deal with the current owner of Hyde Copse that:
 - Allows the owner to sell 5 acres for development
 - Passes a lump sum to a new Trust (not the Anson Trust) – in exchange for village support on planning permission
3. The new Trust would work with the Anson Trust to
 - Build a new building on the Anson Field
 - Provide a lump sum that would provide part of the income to maintain the facilities

Assessment against criteria

Facilities provided:

Facility	Available	Comment
Facilities currently available:		
Sports pitches	Yes	At current size and location
Social Club	Yes	Improved by new (larger) building on single site
Play Area etc	Yes	Possibly slightly reduced in size by new club building
ESC	Possibly	Depends on how Institute was developed and what could be offered in new Community facility
Facilities previously available		
Hall (or equivalent)	Yes	In new building
Facilities upgrade		
Can we upgrade or change?	No	There will be virtually no space left on the Anson Field

Impact Around Anson Field		Comment
Pitches	Yes	No change
Building	Yes	Replaced by new building (possibly bigger)
Play Area/Casual space	No	
Impact on Anson neighbours	Yes	Neighbours would be impacted by greater noise from use of Anson Field facilities

Is the Money available?		
Capital cost for Social Club	Probably	Subject to negotiation
Running costs for Field and Club	Probably	Issue is size of any endowment

What about the long-term?		
Can facilities be upgraded and extended?	No	Limited space; impact on neighbours

Our main concerns about this approach is that we would have to convince the owners of Hyde Copse that it is in their interests to sell the Hyde Copse field on this basis. Going down this route does not maximize the value of their land and we can't see why they would take this route.

Other concerns are:

1. The transfer of money (through a Section 106 is needed to obtain benefit from this option). It is difficult to see how we could transfer planning gain to the Trust – it might be necessary to involve other parties (like a Council) to be the beneficiary of the planning gain.
2. Getting planning permission (without which the deal falls through)
3. Ensuring that club running costs are covered
4. The limited expansion on the Anson Field

We also note that this option could be seen as a 'cop out' for the Anson Trust. It eliminates our financial problems – but does not provide additional facilities for the village.

Conclusion on Viability

This option does not provide any new facilities for the village. In particular, it does not provide a replacement for the Institute. This option suffers from the same restrictions as all developments on the Anson Field.

This option is financially viable as it:

1. maintains village facilities
2. minimizes impact on the village

We do not consider that this option is practicable.

4.7. Option G - Obtain additional sources of funding

What types of funding do we need?

We require additional sources of funding in 2 categories:

1. Capital (one-off expenditure) to bring existing facilities up to standard or build new facilities
2. Income to ensure that all running costs are covered (they are currently subsidised by the Anson Trust)

It is the Trust's intention to have an endowment fund large enough to generate income to provide a sinking fund that would cover major refurbishment and maintenance expenditure. If the Trust does not have such an endowment fund, the income would have to be provided from elsewhere.

Sources of Funds

Our own assets provide a source of capital (from the sale of the assets) and an income from investments. Apart from this, the key sources of funding are:

1. Grant funding
2. A subsidy from the Parish
3. Usage fees
4. Fundraising (through a share issue or by donation)
5. Gifts in kind (such as people helping)

Fund Raising through Grants

We have tried seeking grants in the past (eg WREN) but have been unsuccessful. We believe this to be due to:

1. us being a private trust, and
2. Marcham not being a priority area, and
3. our need for large grants for the major work we need to carry out

We do not believe that seeking grants will prove successful in raising the capital sums we require.

There are few sources of direct grant funding for running costs.

Parish Subsidy

In calculating what we might raise from the village through the Parish Council, we note that there are about 1,600 voters. A payment of £10/year (about £20/house) would generate about £16,000 p.a. – about half the village precept. Clearly, this route would be unable to provide the large capital sums we require.

We doubt whether the village would accept a major increase in the Parish precept (which would need to be guaranteed for many years) in order to cover all the running costs of the existing or new facilities. The Parish Council might contribute to specific work – as they do now with the play area and grass cutting. Such contributions would help provide running income.

Usage Fees

An increase in fee rates (eg hourly rental) could reduce usage so might not generate more income – we have already been told of this possibility by the sports groups. A better approach is to generate more fees by having additional user groups.

Usage fees cannot be high enough to help with the large capital sums. They can help with running costs.

Fundraising and Gifts in Kind

With the need to raise large capital sums and raise them quickly, fundraising is not practicable. We are also extremely doubtful as to whether individuals would contribute to the Anson Trust as it is currently established.

The best use of fund raising (through donations, grants or other means) is for individual clubs and organizations to raise their own individual funds. The benefit of this fundraising to a Community Centre or sports field would come through usage fees which contribute to income. The benefit for the village as a whole is the activities of these clubs and groups.

If the village can raise money through a share issue or community fundraising, we suggest it is used either:

1. to support clubs and groups; or,
2. to provide the 'seed money' for a public interest company to run any new facilities – the Anson Trust feel very strongly that any new facilities should be run by users and not the Trust.

Similarly 'Gifts in Kind' are also best used to:

1. support individual clubs and groups
2. the running of the facilities

Conclusion on Viability

Fund raising is not a viable approach for the main capital funds.

Fund raising (in various forms) is essential for increasing usage and hence providing income from that source. That income would help with running costs.

5. Detailed Review of Options

5.1. Options not Rejected Already

The two options that have not been rejected are:

Option D - Sell the Institute and develop the Anson Field

Option E - Sell Institute and part of the Anson Field, buy new field and build new facilities

Below, we look at each of these options in more detail.

5.2. Option D - Sell the Institute and develop the Anson Field

Initial Cost Summary

The costs below are based on upgrading the existing SSSC. Without providing extra facilities, the costs are estimated as follows:

	£
Sale of Institute	400,000
Upgrade Building on Anson Field (see Appendix 2)	100,000
Improve pitches to allow more use	20,000
Legals etc	20,000
Cost Total	140,000
Money remaining to go to capital to maintain facilities (endowment)	260,000
Money available in existing endowment	200,000
Total endowment left	460,000

The income from this fund (about £9,000 p.a. in real terms) would provide a sinking fund that would be used for future major maintenance.

Replacement Facilities

If we wished to replace the existing building to provide a village hall is difficult to estimate without a detailed set of facilities. However, we suggest that those thinking of this option should work on then basis of around £500,000. That cost is based on the estimates for the Hyde Copse facilities. The cost on the Anson Field would be lower as there is less space and, therefore, less ability to build.

Any new facilities are likely to occupy a greater ground space and would, therefore, reduce the available field space. Overall, a significant extension of facilities is not practicable. Effectively, any extension would reduce space available for users of pitches or open space in order to provide facilities for users of the buildings.

Running Costs

With the sinking fund and the income from commercial letting, running costs could be (more or less) covered without additional usage. A running cost business plan is, therefore, not needed with this option.

However, we wish to attract additional usage as doing so would go some way to meeting our objectives of maximizing the benefit to the village. To attract more users, we would have to reconstitute the management of the SSSC and the field so that:

1. they were properly accountable
2. the village saw them as providing facilities that could be used more widely rather than just by the present users

Outcome from this option

In terms of facilities, this option does not:

1. significantly improve village facilities – one of the objectives of what we are trying to achieve
2. properly replace the Institute Hall – leaving Marcham without a central meeting place

On the facilities provided:

1. the SSC facilities would be the same as now (refurbishment would make them more attractive)
2. SSSC space would be limited as now (eg it might be difficult to offer space to the ESC)
3. no additional pitch or other field space would be available – limiting the scope for new users
4. the facilities cannot be expanded
5. the limitations on usage (eg on pitches) continue
6. additional use would disturb the neighbours around the field (we have already had complaints about noise)

Concerns about this option

We have major concerns over whether:

1. an enlarged club with more activity on the field would cause so much disturbance that the neighbours would object and, by doing so, effectively make the facilities unusable
2. the limited size of the cricket pitch limits its long-term attractiveness
3. the state of the football field limits its long-term attractiveness
4. there would be enough income (including a sinking fund) to support the facilities
5. the phasing of development would create significant difficulties for current users while building was in progress (and we can see no way of overcoming this conflict)
6. there is very limited scope for new activities or to accommodate change to meet social trends or changing village demands

Obstacles on this option

The obstacles we would have to overcome this option are:

1. Obtain permission to:
 - Vary the Section 106 on the existing Institute Car Park (it is currently required to improve the Institute and would have to be altered to allow improvement to the SSSC)
 - Develop the Institute site without replacing the facilities (particularly the Hall)
2. Ensure that there was no risk of the increased usage giving rise to an imposition of a curfew (like the 10.30 curfew on the existing Institute)
3. Resolve the ESC lease
4. Convince the Charity Commission that:
 - reducing the scope of the facilities provided by the Anson Trust was a sound option
 - new facilities were sustainable
 - we were not subsidising bodies improperly (the SSSC and ESC are not charities are answerable to no-one but themselves)

Conclusion on this option

Overall, we conclude that this option is likely to be financially viable.

However, this option:

1. has significant obstacles that must be overcome to deliver
2. provides fewer facilities than have been provided in the past
3. has no scope for expansion
4. may provide facilities that, in practice, unusable because of the affect on neighbours

In our view, this option should only be contemplated if no other option is possible and we get clear confirmation of village, local authority and Charity Commission support.

5.3. Option E - Sell Institute and part of the Anson Field, buy new field and build new facilities

Outcomes of this option

The deliverables from this option are:

1. On the Anson Field, 3½ acres of open space which could be used:
2. Pitches on the Hyde Copse site for Cricket and Football to more modern standards
3. A Community Centre of a size and facilities to be agreed
4. Spare space on the Hyde Copse site – providing scope for expansion

With the new facilities well away from the bulk of the village (and screened from nearby housing) we would not expect any limitations on use of buildings or pitches.

This option clearly meets all our assessment criteria in terms of deliverables.

Initial Cost Summary

Approximate budgets for development on Hyde Copse are as follows:

	£
Sale of Anson Field and Insitute	2,400,000
Purchase of Land on Hyde Copse	800,000
New Building	750,000
Pitches	120,000
Access, site preparation	80,000
Legals etc	100,000
Cost Total	1,850,000
Money remaining to go to capital to maintain facilities (endowment)	550,000
Money available in existing endowment	200,000
Total endowment left	750,000

That endowment would provide an income which we estimate at £15,000 p.a. in real terms. Such an income would be the basis of the Sinking Fund to maintain the building and thus ensure long-term viability.

Demand for these facilities

The issue about assessing demand for these facilities is simply that we cannot assess demand until we know what facilities will be there. In Appendix 3, there is a list of potential users that we know of who might be attracted if we could offer higher quality buildings than those currently available.

What we cannot do is identify with certainty new users who would make use of the building and other facilities. The draft running budget in Appendix 4 assumes that we would be able to generate 24 hours/week of lettable usage.

Running Cost Budget

In preparing the budgets, we have assumed that:

1. All Anson Field users would move and would pay for sports facilities at the current rates
2. The ESC would not provide income from a lease in the same way as they do in the Institute

We would be looking to trading income to cover:

1. Operating costs such as:
 - Utilities
 - Janitorial facilities
 - Insurance, rates etc
2. Basic maintenance in the building (including minor painting and repairs)
3. Pitch and outfield mowing

The income would come from the profits of:

1. Letting and usage for village sport and social activities
2. Commercial letting (we expect to provide facilities for Little Angels)

Bar and Event Income

The Income from the Bar and other events is not included in this budget. It is assumed that these profits will be used to:

1. Maintain the bar and internal fixtures and fittings
2. Pay for entertainment and other licences
3. Pay for Sky (or similar) facilities
4. Develop new facilities (such as Youth facilities)

We are expecting that the new facilities would be run by the users to generate the necessary profit which would be used both to

1. provide the income needed to run the facilities
2. develop the user's interests (eg provide equipment for their sports)

The Anson Trust would not want to run these facilities. We believe that they are best run by the users. A draft running cost budget is in Appendix 4.

Appendix 1 – Existing Institute Costs

In this Appendix, we set out:

1. The capital costs of the refurbishment necessary to get the Institute in use
2. The income needed to run the Institute

Capital Costs

Our current estimates of the costs to get the Institute back into use are as follows:

Item	Cost (£)
Access to the building (DDA compliance)	15,000
Electrics	8,500
Internal Flooring	7,000
Kitchen	9,000
Toilets (Sanitaryware changes and smarten up)	1,500
Doors & Joinery	3,000
Decoration	9,000
External Maintenance	6,000
General Clearance	1,000
Install false ceiling (thermal and acoustic insulation)	16,000
Total	76,000
VAT @ 17.5%	13,300
Total Expenditure	89,300

These estimates have been prepared by Ian Gresham Construction Services – details of the figures can be made available.

This does not include any expenditure on:

1. Improvement to the existing facilities (apart from changes to reduce heating costs)
2. Survey and removal of asbestos
3. Deterioration that has arisen since the hall was closed
4. Work required to obtain the certificates need to operate the hall (noting that regulations may have changed since the hall was previously open)
5. External refurbishment such as:
 - Re-pointing
 - Roof repairs (or replacement)
 - Gutters etc
 - Maintaining the Lions and their supports

We believe, therefore, that the specific items listed above are a significant under-estimate of the total costs of getting the hall reopened.

We note that, had there been a proper Sinking Fund, the bill for repairs would have been paid for from the accumulated balance on this fund.

Running Costs

Based on historic evidence, we believe that the Institute requires a subsidy to cover the difference between the:

1. income from users
2. running costs (on the assumption that the lease with the ESC requires no subsidy).

In addition to the running cost we need to have the Sinking Fund so that refurbishments like that outlined above can be repeated as the building ages. We estimate this at around 2% of the replacement cost of the building. For the Institute, this would mean an income of £20,000 p.a.

We, therefore, require a total income of in excess of £20,000 p.a. This could come from:

1. a capital sum of more than £1,000,000 (we would have at most £100,000 after refurbishment of the building), or;
2. a subsidy from the Parish Council of over £20,000 – not far short of the current village precept
3. letting fees increase (though we are doubtful about this because any increase in fees would reduce usage – so might not generate more income)
4. an increase in the income from the ESC lease

Appendix 2 – Anson Field Costs

Current Facilities

Over the last 2 years (2007 and 2008) there has been limited subsidy for the field. The income from Little Angels has cut the overall subsidy to around £1,000 p.a..

However:

1. This year's expenditure (2009) will be higher (and the deficit greater) mainly due to:
 - Increase grass-cutting cost
 - Extra maintenance – partly from vandalism and partly from the increasing age of the building
2. The SSSC building will need major refurbishment over the next 5 – 7 years. The amount will depend on what is done but we would anticipate that it could be £100,000 – we should expect to repeat such expenditure at intervals (say 10 – 25 years depending on the type of refurbishment). The expenditure would cover matters like:
 - Refurbished kitchens
 - Replaced toilets
 - Upgraded sewage facilities
 - Energy saving (to cut the utility bills)
 - Vandal resistance
 - Painting and decorating
 - Protection against subsidence
3. The facilities provide for Little Angels will need replacement in the same time period of 5 – 7 years if we are to retain their income. The expenditure on replacement facilities is very substantial and is unlikely to be justified by the letting income stream. We must, therefore, expect that the income from Little Angels will stop in the medium term.

Together we estimate that £8,000 to £9,000 (including a sinking fund for replacement/refurbishment) is required as an ongoing subsidy for the field and the building – though this will increase without the profit from the Little Angels letting.

We have obtained an estimate for replacing the SSSC (not refurbishment). The estimate for a replacement is £550,000 to £625,000.

Appendix 3 – Local User Groups

Local User Groups

The list of possible users of the facilities is set out below. These users are listed on the basis that they operate (or have operated) in the village recently and good quality new facilities might attract them.

Group	Adult/ Youth	Existing or Previous User		Comments
		Institute	SSSC/Field	
Marcham Players	Adult	Yes		Currently use the Church and Private premises
Marcham Society	Adult	Yes		Currently meet in Church
Marcham Bridge Group	Adult			
Marcham W.I.	Adult			Currently meet at Denman
Marcham PTA (and School Governors)	Adult			
Marcham Cricket Club	Adult		Yes	
Marcham Football Club	Adult		Yes	
Marcham Tennis Club	Adult			
Marcham Sports and Social Club	Adult		Yes	Including bar more widely available – particularly in evenings when other activities on
Marcham Ex-Serviceman's Club	Adult	Yes		
Marcham Parish Council	Adult			
Marcham Senior Citizens	Adult			
Men's Café	Adult	Yes	Yes	Monthly breakfast
Café	Adult	Yes	Yes	Every Wednesday
Anson Trust	Adult	Yes		
Friday Club	Youth			
Youth Club	Youth	Yes		
Guides	Youth		Yes	
Brownies	Youth		Yes	
Rainbows	Youth			
Beavers	Youth			Currently outside village
Cubs	Youth		Yes	
Mother & Toddlers	Youth	Yes		
Pre-school Play Group	Youth	Yes		
Band Practice	Youth		Yes	
Summer Holiday Club	Youth		Yes	
Community Shop	Adult			
Youth Sports Teams	Youth			inadequate space in existing facilities
Badminton	Both			
Aunt Sally	Adult			
Keep fit	Both			Currently in school twice/week

Group	Adult/ Youth	Existing or Previous User		Comments
		Institute	SSSC/Field	
Arts	Adult			
Dance	Adult		Yes	Recently closed
Dace	Youth		Yes	Recently closed
Parties	Adult			
Parties	Youth			
Elections	Adult			
Little Angels	Adult			If design allows
Other Commercial letting	Adult			If design allows
Church	Both	Yes		
Pilates	Adult			
Kickboxing	Youth		Yes	
After School Club	Youth		Yes	

Other Uses

One of the functions that the 17 community centres in Oxford carried out was as a Civil Emergency centre. To this end there were stores of emergency blankets as bedding and adequate facilities for large scale catering similar in capacity to the institute and toilets. Given the recent flooding, there is a role for a building of this type in Marcham. We may not need to hold stocks as these could be supplied within the village but we should expect to have a village emergency plan to evacuate people affected by a civil emergency and volunteers to form a team. To do this effectively, a central location is required with proper cooking and other facilities.

Appendix 4 - Draft Annual Running Budget

	£	Comments
Income from Existing Users		
Institute		No existing users would come into the new facilities on their current arrangements
Sports Field and SSSC		
Parish Council		No income as Council would be maintaining the retained Area on the Anson Field
Band	792	Estimate based on 2009 usage of 6 hours per month @ £11 per hour
Café	1,045	38 x 2.5 hours @£11 per hour
Cricket Club	420	28 members @ £15 per member
Cubs	360	24 members @ £15 per member
Dance	418	Estimate (38 weeks @ £11 per hour)
Football Club	450	30 members @ £15 per member*1
Holiday Club	200	Estimate as for 2009
Little Angels	6,780	Annual Rent (paid Quarterly)
Men's Café	264	12 x 2 hours @ £11 per hour
Parties/General Hire	300	Estimate based on 2009 (excl. Election Hire)
SSSC	2,140	Fixed amount
Total Income from Existing Users	13,169	
Income from New Users		
Daytime	6,336	2 hours/day 6 days /week at £11/hour
Evening	6,336	2 hours/day 6 days /week at £11/hour
Total Income from New Users	12,672	
Total Income	25,841	

Note that the Institute (with its limited facilities) took £3,000 to £3,500 in bookings in the final years it was open.

Running Costs

Insurance	3,600	Sum of Institute and SSSC Insurance
FMC - Salaries	10,000	Based on current levels - significantly increased because of increased Hall usage
Grass Cutting	5,000	Scaled from present costs due to increased area
Safety Checks/Serviceing:		
Fire Extinguisher Checks	200	Based on current costs
Electrical Checks	200	Based on current costs
Boiler Service	200	Based on current costs
Repairs & Maintenance	1,000	Major maintenance from Anson Trust endowment - this covers minor works
Utilities:		
Rates	220	
Water	700	Sum of Institute and SSSC water bills
Cess Pit	200	or attachment to main drains
Electricity	3,500	Sum of current SSSC and Institute Electricity and Oil Bills (assumes that increased usage would be offset by greater efficiency)
Supplies	500	Janitorial supplies
Refuse	1,000	Based on current costs
Contingency		
Little Angels Utility Recovery	-1,000	Current lease means that they pay for their electricity
Cost Total	25,320	
Net Income	521	

Assumptions

- 1 Bar income would be additional to the above
- 2 The sports field users would do the specialist maintenance (eg on the cricket square) as now

The gap we have to fill from new demand is the £12,000 to £13,000 of bookings from new users. We believe that this gap can be filled through fees from both private and commercial users if the building as (and other facilities) are properly designed. This design should include the ability to run sports and social events (in the building) in parallel.