

Carwinion Playing Field Trust

Carwinion Road, Mawnan Smith, TR11 5JA
Registered Charity 1173925

Mawnan Junior Playing Field Trust

Behind St Michael's Court, Carwinion Road,
Mawnan Smith, TR11 5JD
Registered Charity 1173926

MINUTES OF AN ONLINE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF BOTH THE OF JUNIOR PLAYING FIELD TRUST & CARWINION PLAYING FIELD TRUST TO BE HELD CONCURRENTLY ON THURSDAY 26TH NOVEMBER ONLINE (VIA ZOOM) AT 7.30PM

Present: Mr G Marsden, (chair), Mr P Bradley, Mr M Faiers, Mr J Gladstone, Mr P Moyle, Mr D Nash, Mr R Sadler & Mrs C Toland

Apologies: Mrs J Whibley

Also Present: Administrator (parish clerk)

106.20 **To receive apologies for absence** - Mrs Whibley

107.20 **To received minutes from the last joint trust meetings on 22nd October 2020**

Mr Moyle objected to the minutes as he felt his comments in item 100.20 were inaccurate and incorrect and 'there were bits missing' – the printed copy he received had lines missing on the end of page 2. The Chair pointed out we are reviewing the minutes for accuracy not adding or reviewing other points, any inaccuracies would be recorded.

Mr Moyle finally agreed that the total figures within the minutes of £3000 was correct.

It was proposed by Mr Sadler, seconded by Mr Bradley and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held 22nd October 2020 now be approved and signed by the Chair at the next appropriate time

on a vote being taken this matter was approved with 1 abstention

108.20 **Progress on the project to upgrade / refurbish the playground equipment**

Mr Marsden explained the concerns being raised – firstly that the information provided for an advert for works was not sufficient and have never been agreed by all members and secondly that repairing/replacing may not meet satisfactory standards.

Mr Sadler agreed that this had gone on too long but that Mr Moyle had eventually managed to get all the prices that he wanted. [These have not been passed to our Administrator.] He restated his opinion a good carpenter could rebuild the structure to factory standard. He felt that there were 'so many hurdles being put in the way' of his proposal to rebuild but it was up to members now to make their minds up'. He then said he would support Mr Moyle should he come up with a fully costed rebuild figure pretty sharpish.

Mr Faiers then said that whilst repairing the structure had been discussed over a long period the similarity in replace or repair costs was such that surely it was best to put up a new structure, it being faster, would definitely meet current legislation and would protect the Trust from any safety concerns. He says that he was originally all for repairing but that the delays in getting information had changed his opinion.

Mr Gladstone thought the issue was now raising tensions between Trust members, which was not healthy, so was leaning toward Mrs Toland's new piece of equipment. It was a fully costed and fully compliant quote and whilst it was not always a good idea to just replace, in this instance a decision this evening needed to be made.

It was noted there was a funding issue in that the Trust would need to make a request to the PC for additional funds but this would also mean that the PC could claim back the VAT on donating the equipment.

Mr Bradley agreed with Mr Gladstone that refurbishing would have been preferable but it is now nearly a year since we initially discussed this issue with little progress and the children remain without its use. It now just needed getting done. He felt that we had sufficient funds and were helping a local company, especially relevant at the moment. He felt that we should go with the suggested new fort as it was within a reasonable budget and with a long term warranty.

Mr Nash questioned if the quote had been upgraded to the required stainless steel fixtures – Mrs Toland assured him that it has and it was clearly stated in the new quote sent out yesterday. Mr Gladstone then asked for the total figure of the quote and if the VAT on this could be claimed back at all. The Administrator confirmed this equipment was being purchased by the parish and donated, so the could be claimed back as normal.

It was proposed by Mr Bradley, seconded by Mr Gladstone and
RESOLVED that we accept the quote from Outdoor Play at £6580 and have the fort completely replaced.

on a vote being taken this matter was accepted with at 5 to 3 majority

NB. There was a request to record names for this vote, however it came after the resolution had been taken and voted on which goes against Parish Council Standing Orders 3s.

Mr Moyle stated his concern regarding reclaiming VAT; that one person could not claim another's VAT back and that this could be construed as a criminal act. [See attached official advice which confirms the VAT reclaiming is indeed lawful.]

109.20

Request from the Pre-School for ongoing financial support & assistance

The Administrator had made the request for financial information from the preschool which had been circulated along with their 2019 accounts. Most of the income is achieved through grants, which includes the government voucher scheme, and this has been adversely affected. They needed support during these times to ensure costs are covered.

Mr Bradley said when last he visited the preschool, his impression was everyone was working in an honest, trustworthy and above-board manner and this was pre-covid. He felt that we should support them as they are a valuable parish asset and are doing a very good job in challenging times and we should not ask too much about their accounts.

Mr Nash didn't think a single month bank statement was any use – he wanted to postpone the preschools request until detailed figures were seen in case more support than suspended rental deferment was necessary for them to survive.

Mr Sadler said we discussed at the last meeting to give a 50% reduction on rent, pending details on their financial position. He said it was not within the Trust remit to offer grant assistance- they could only decide about the rent – the PC are the only ones who can offer grants.

Mr Gladstone asked if we could see any budget forecast that the preschool may be working to, just to confirm that they are not in such financial straits as to be looking to close in the near future. Mr Marsden suggested asking the preschool treasurer to attend the next meeting to explain what the issues were. Mrs Toland asked what the difference was between the MCA, who were given £4000 to support them with no questions, and the preschool who are being made to justify a £600 request?

It was proposed by Mr Nash, seconded by Mr Bradley and

RESOLVED that a decision be deferred until a request for additional information (last year's accounts, this year's accounts to date, an amended budget plan and projected figures for this year) is fulfilled.

on a vote being taken this matter was approved unanimously

A subsequent request that the Chair of Trustees or treasurer from the preschool sit in on the Trust Zoom meeting in late January and explain it/ take their questions before making a decision was to be made at the same time.

Winter Works. Mr Sadler then raised the list of winter works from the minutes of 22nd October, outside of the agenda. The Administrator said that she had contacted Bob Sanders with the list but had yet to receive a response; Mr Moyle said that given the toilets are closed Evie should be asked to undertake them.

Mrs Toland said that there are parents who are quite willing to voluntarily undertake some of these works – could the works list be split and the parish pick up those works not fulfilled by a parents working party, managed by Mrs Toland. Mr Marsden requested she go through the list and work out what items they would be capable of doing and the list should then be reviewed at the January PC meeting.

Mr Sadler highlighted the fencing repair and felt that this needed to be looked at and quotes/ estimates sought. He felt this needed concrete posts, cemented into the ground with the wood fencing affixed to them along with a replacement gate & gatepost. It should run the length of the St Michael boundary – he felt that the mature hedging was a more effective fence solution. He was willing to go up with a contractor to get estimates. It was agreed the Administrator would draft a specification to get two more quotes and have these ready for the January PC meeting.

Mrs Toland asked if it would now be OK to go ahead with the removal of the fencing around the sensory garden/ fort area as previously agreed since it had failed and was of no real use. It was agreed she could do this with suitable voluntary assistance.

Meeting ended at 8.45pm

Re: item 108.20 (final paragraph) – information on position to reclaim VAT

Local authorities and similar bodies (VAT Notice 749)

Decide which activities are business or non-business for VAT purposes if you're a local authority or other public body.

Published 26 June 2018

Last updated 18 March 2019 — [see all updates](#)

From: [HM Revenue & Customs](#)

You should note that:

- we treat a facility as being owned by a local authority if it's the sole managing trustee, but not if it's sole custodian trustee only
- allowing someone to use the facility in return for non-monetary payment is a business activity

10.4 Using your funds to finance building works to a facility that you do not own

If you:

- use your own funds to carry out work to the facility and give the work away to the owners of the facility (for example, a voluntary group) and receive nothing in return then you are not making a supply for VAT purposes
- receive anything in return from either the owners or a third party, then what you receive is likely to be consideration for the supply of the work to the owners, and the supply will normally be a business supply and you must charge VAT at the appropriate rate