

APPENDIX E:

Response, dated 7 February 2018, by the applicant to the letter of 11 December 2017 from the Dymchurch Parish clerk.

Faint header text at the top of the page, possibly containing a title or page number.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30
31	32	33	34	35
36	37	38	39	40
41	42	43	44	45
46	47	48	49	50
51	52	53	54	55
56	57	58	59	60
61	62	63	64	65
66	67	68	69	70
71	72	73	74	75
76	77	78	79	80
81	82	83	84	85
86	87	88	89	90
91	92	93	94	95
96	97	98	99	100

Vertical text or markings on the left margin of the page.

Beswick, Kate - GT EPE

From: Friends Of Dymchurch Rec <friendsofdymchurchrec@gmail.com>
Sent: 07 February 2018 08:51
To: Beswick, Kate - GT EPE
Subject: Ref PROW/KB/vga673/10jan18
Attachments: Village Green application..docx

Dear Ms Beswick ,

Please find attached our response to your letter of 10th January 2018.

Yours Sincerely ,

 ana Coker

Main body of the document containing several paragraphs of text. The text is extremely faint and illegible due to low contrast and scan quality. The layout appears to be a standard letter or report format with multiple lines of text.



Kate Beswick
Public Protection
Invicta House
County Hall
Maidstone ME14 1XX

Dear Ms Beswick,

Thank you for your letter of 10th January, I apologise for my delayed response, I have just returned to the UK from an overseas trip.

We have given careful consideration to the responses provided by the Parish Clerk and the supporting documentation and evidence included in the appendixes.

Our comments to the items the Clerk wished to clarify are as follows –

Item 1.

'The recreation ground was gifted to the parish council in 1929 and was taken on under the condition it would be so administered as to be self-supporting. The recreation ground has never been self-supporting and the parish council has been researching options that could make it viable'

If the recreation ground has never been self-supporting, we cannot understand why this is now of significant relevance to the current situation.

Item 2.

'The pavilion was built also on the understanding it would not be a burden to the rate payer. For this reason the cricket club undertook general maintenance, but the cricket club has now vacated the pavilion and the parish council has been left with a decaying structure.'

It is not a realistic expectation for any public owned property to not be a burden to the rate payer. As the cricket club were only responsible for general maintenance, the burden of responsibility for the safety and upkeep of the building falls to the owners, the parish council, they have failed to properly manage this and have not invested enough in the property to insure its continued use. We have not had sight of a contractual agreement between the parish council and cricket club pertaining to this matter.

As the pavilion was erected after the land commenced use for recreational purposes, we question what relevance this information has? The land is used for recreational purposes with or without a pavilion.

Item 3.

The parish council engaged a professional bid writer in 2013 to write a business plan , development brief and make applications to funding bodies. Applications were made to Kent County Cricket Board, Kent FA, SDC, Roger de Haan, Sport England/Big Lottery. The bids were not successful but the amounts applied for are identified at Appendix 11'.

The evidence supplied to support this is very poor quality. The single sheet included, details a proposed meeting and estimates of available funding. It does not detail what was applied for and why the bids were rejected. There are no details provided that relate to any of the rejected bids. Many other local authorities have been successful in their applications and we have conducted considerable research into this and met with funding associations to better understand their criteria. Sports funding bodies do not provide funding for new council offices to be included in recreational facilities.

There is also evidence on file that a Dymchurch Sports Association was formed in 1996 with the main objective to apply for grants and other funding , specifically from the National Lottery to totally upgrade and provide new facilities at the recreation ground, but the application was not successful.'

The evidence amounts to a single sheet of correspondence between the association and the headmaster of the primary school, it implies the association was about to conduct a needs survey but gives no evidence of this. The evidence provided does not detail why the bids were rejected by the funding bodies.

We do not see the relevance of the documents supplied by the Clerk in appendix 11 and 12.

Item 4.

'With reference to the survey Mrs Coker initiated, the council can give no credence to the results. Only two people who responded had the courtesy to provide their names and addresses that can be cross referenced with the electoral register to identify they are parishioners.'

The purpose of the survey was to gather the information required by funding bodies in the initial stage of the funding application process. We cannot support claims that the community have a desire for certain facilities if we have not first consulted them. Funding bodies do not require responses to be cross referenced with the electoral register. It appears the Clerk fails to understand the process and indeed the purpose of the survey.

Members of the parish did not fail to have the courtesy to provide their names and addresses, we did not request this information as it was not required.

Clerk's Summary.

'The parish council is an elected body, with discretionary powers and rights laid down by Parliament to represent their communities and provide services for them . There are approximately 4000 residents in the parish and once the parish council has consulted with all its parishioners, via an options paper, and is satisfied all households have had the opportunity to comment on all parish council assets and acquisitions, the council will act in accordance to parishioner's wishes.'

The questions relating to the recreation ground in the proposed options paper are currently as follows –

'Question 4

Would you support the construction of ten houses on the recreation ground as a means of financing the construction of a new pavilion

YES/NO'

'Question 5

What would you do with the present pavilion ? (Please place in order of preference)

DEMOLISH IT

Or SUPPORT EFFORTS IN THE VILLAGE TO RAISE THE HUGE SUM NEEDED TO RENOVATE IT

Or USE THE FINANCE FROM RECREATION GROUND HOUSING DEVELOPMENT TO BUILD A NEW PAVILION'

These options are focused on the pavilion as are the parish council. Our recreation ground is used for many recreational purposes and has been for over 90 years. With or without a pavilion we believe this land is still eligible for Village green status.

The Clerk has stated , *'The parish council has no pre-determined view on any option, it will be guided by its parishioner's views.'* , however the parish council have voted to set aside £15,000 in the council budget to defend this application in court, should we be successful, this action was taken without consultation with the parishioners. The parish council have also instructed consultants to prepare plans for a potential housing development at the recreation ground, at the rate payers cost, before consultation with the parishioners.

In Summary, we do not believe the evidence and documentation provided by the Clerk are relevant to the application.

Yours Sincerely ,

Ms Deana Coker

Friends of Dymchurch Rec

1 Mill Road

Dymchurch

TN290NY.