



Meeting Summary

Topic	Bath City Supporters' Society – Committee Meeting	
Meeting Date	31 st Jan 2019	
Location	Twerton Park	
Attendees / Role	CB Cheryl Bradley MC Michael Clayton (Chair) KL Ken Loach SS Steve Skinner (Treasurer)	PM Pete McCormack SM Shane Morgan SP Stuart Page ES Emma Sparks (Secretary) MT Marc Thomas
Apologies	PB Paul Brotherton	
Purpose of Meeting	To agree actions / decisions in relation to the governance of the Football Club and Society business.	

No.	Description	Status	Who	Date
1.	Previous Minutes: The November meeting minutes were approved.			
2.	<p>Working Group Update: Redevelopment The Committee is conducting a thorough due diligence exercise, on behalf of the members, to understand the risks, implications and opportunities of the Development Agreement. This meeting was dedicated to this topic due to its relative importance.</p> <p>The Committee congratulated all those involved with the due diligence required to approve the signing of the Development which occurred on the Club EGM on 21st Jan 2019.</p> <p>In preparation for imminent consultations the Committee agreed some principles and topics to focus on.</p> <p>Principles: Proposed changes need to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost neutral • Consensus based • Within the current proposed footprint (although this was subject to debate. Clarification needed). 	<p>Info</p> <p>Info</p> <p>Decision</p>		



No.	Description	Status	Who	Date															
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation feedback to be input to the Redev WG as per current process. <p>Key Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usability of the Bath End • Siting and Specification of Affordable housing over the bar • Scale and scope of the Grandstand. (inc. option to increase footprint to increase capacity) • Concourse options <p>Agreed to raise these topics with the Redev WG and at proposed consultation.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity Nos.: What are the correct capacity numbers? The current 'master plan' slide seems inaccurate. <table border="1" data-bbox="329 884 1068 1056"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Master Plan</th> <th>Current</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bath End</td> <td>300</td> <td>320</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poplar Stand</td> <td>2,000</td> <td>900</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bristol End</td> <td>700</td> <td>1,100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grandstand</td> <td>2,000</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability: Is there a business plan for the new design which indicates that the facilities provide the club with a sustainable financial model? <p>Redevelopment Working Group: The Committee recognised the need to the Society Committee to re-engage properly with this WG. The following agreed to make every effort to attend future Redev WG meetings. MC / JP / KL / SM and to share meeting summaries. Society Committee to review the final plan (pre submission of planning application).</p> <p>Members Vote The Society Committee agree by majority decision not to put the final plan review to a members' vote. Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referendum: The redevelopment doesn't lend itself to a straightforward yes / no referendum style question. The question is not actually "to develop or not to develop" for example. The redevelopment has been an integral part of the business plan since the Big Bath City Bid. 		Master Plan	Current	Bath End	300	320	Poplar Stand	2,000	900	Bristol End	700	1,100	Grandstand	2,000		Decision		
	Master Plan	Current																	
Bath End	300	320																	
Poplar Stand	2,000	900																	
Bristol End	700	1,100																	
Grandstand	2,000																		
	<p>Redevelopment Working Group: The Committee recognised the need to the Society Committee to re-engage properly with this WG. The following agreed to make every effort to attend future Redev WG meetings. MC / JP / KL / SM and to share meeting summaries. Society Committee to review the final plan (pre submission of planning application).</p>	Decision																	
	<p>Members Vote The Society Committee agree by majority decision not to put the final plan review to a members' vote. Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referendum: The redevelopment doesn't lend itself to a straightforward yes / no referendum style question. The question is not actually "to develop or not to develop" for example. The redevelopment has been an integral part of the business plan since the Big Bath City Bid. 	Decision																	



No.	Description	Status	Who	Date
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Due Diligence: The role of the Society Committee in this case is to perform a due diligence exercise, to understand the risks, implications and opportunities of the Redevelopment on behalf of the members. We have been embedded in the Redevelopment WG from the start and we have seconded experts onto the WG to be integral part of the team delivering this exciting project. Such is the importance of this initiative we have made it our primary focus to understand, challenge and support this.• Leadership and Constitution: The Society Committee has been meticulous to ensure we have validated this approach with the Society constitution on all aspects. It is performing the due diligence on behalf of the members – showing the kind of leadership people expect from their elected representatives on the Committee. <p>Supporters' Consultation Agreed to conduct a supporter's consultation organised by the Society (in addition to those already being organised).KL and CB agreed to sort out logistics.</p>	Action		

Date of Next Meeting: 28th Feb 2019