

CABINET

Thursday, 24th February, 2011

Councillor R.F. Spencer (Chairman)

Councillors:	A.S. Bexon	W.H. Golland
	R.J. Nicholson	J.M. Parr
	V.C. Pepper (a)	R.J. Tait
	W.J. Clarke (Observer)(a)	A.J. Gillam (Observer)
	G.E. Withers (Observer)	

Officers in attendance: J Robinson, S M Sale, M Kimberley, K Tansley

83 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor V C Pepper.

84 PROPOSALS FOR KING GEORGE V RECREATION GROUND, ARNOLD

The Gedling Charities Independent Panel had been established by the Borough Council to provide a source of external independent advice on decisions that it would make where the Council acts as trustees to a charitable organisation.

The Council, as trustee, was considering whether it would be in the best interests of the charity known as King George V playing field at Arnold (King George V) to release part of the field from the charitable registration in exchange for another piece of recreation land which would then become subject to the registration as a charity. The land proposed to be substituted was an area of recreation land between George Street and Charles Street in Arnold (George Street).

The Council was very clear and open that the reason for this proposal was the Council, as local authority, would then look to use the land released to build a new leisure centre to replace the existing Arnold Leisure Centre in the town.

The Panel's remit was therefore to consider whether the proposed land swap was in the best interests of the intended beneficiaries of the charity. Details of the Panel's consultation process were included in the report.

It was the view of the Panel that a leisure centre built on King George V would detract from the openness and attractiveness for casual recreation and play on the field.

The Panel considered that George Street was an acceptable replacement for a land swap in terms of land area, facilities, terrain and value. It did however have reservations with respect to its accessibility from the town both on foot and by car and its value as an 'open' area and for these reasons concluded

that the amenity value of George Street was less than the land that would be surrendered at King George V.

The Panel recommended that the proposal for the exchange of land at King George V Recreation Ground and George Street Recreation Ground did not proceed.

During the consultation some members of the public raised the issue as to whether George Street already enjoyed protected status as a charity. The Panel recommended to the Council that it consider whether it should now be protected.

RESOLVED:

By the Cabinet, as Trustee:

1. That the proposal for the exchange of land at King George V Recreation Ground and George Street Recreation Ground does not proceed.
2. That the status of the George Street Recreation Ground be referred to the Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Communities for consideration.

The meeting closed at 6.30pm.