

# Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015

## Minutes of the Conservators' ANNUAL OPEN MEETING held at Roehampton Church, Ponsonby Road, Roehampton on Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> June 2015

Conservators: Mr Keith Luck (Chairman)  
Sir Ian Andrews  
Mr Nicholas Evans  
Mr John Cameron  
Mr Derek Frampton  
Mrs Shirley Gillbe  
Ms Prue Whyte  
Dr Ros Taylor

Officers: Mr Simon Lee (Chief Executive)

Auditor: Mr Walter Benzie, ANOVA

96 Levypayers and other members of the general public

The Rev Jim McKinney welcomed everyone to Roehampton Holy Trinity Church and led a short prayer.

The Chairman began by also welcoming everyone to the meeting, including distinguished guests, the Deputy Mayor of Merton, Cllr Pauline Cowper and Consort, Mr Michael Cowper and thanked them for attending. He then invited each of the Conservators, the Chief Executive and the Auditor to introduce themselves to the audience.

### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

### 2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The Minutes of the previous Annual Open Meeting held at St John the Baptist Church Hall, Robin Hood Lane, Kingston Vale on Wednesday 18 June 2014 were approved by the Board and signed by the Chairman.

### 3. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

You can never quite predict what is going to happen in life, but I am not sure I could have said this time last year that I would be standing here today as Chairman of the Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators giving an address for our Annual Open Meeting. Indeed, this time last year I had just taken on the role of President of the Chartered Institute of Management Accountants.

So as you heard in our welcome, five members of the Board were only elected to the position of Conservator in February 2015 and did not take up position until April 2015. It is fair to say that the turn-out for the election was bitterly disappointing, particularly as this was the first time that voters had the opportunity to vote electronically. This is

## Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015

something that the new Board will have to seriously consider for the next election in 2018.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the previous Board members, some of whom stood down prior to the election and others who were unfortunately not re-elected. Some have spent many years giving of their time and commitment to ensure the stewardship of the Commons. John Horrocks spent over 30 years as a Conservator with 3 years as Chairman, David Devons some 21 years as a Conservator with 10 years as Chairman and 3 years as Vice-Chairman and Andrew Simon, 11 years as Conservator with 3 years as Chairman, and both Professor Robin Touquet and Jenny Evanson who served 3 years respectively as Conservators. What is already becoming clear to the new Board members is the complexity and range of issues required in governing these 1140 acres of Common land.

I would also like to thank the new Board for their support in placing me as Chairman of the Conservators for 2015. It is a privilege to hold this position and I am delighted that Shirley Gillbe is Vice-Chairman. Together with other Board members we will strive to continue to consider how any issues put before us benefit the overall Commons.

One of the most challenging and complex issues for the Commons over recent years has been those associated with the former Putney Hospital site. At the end of May last year an Appeal Hearing was heard by Lord Justice Rimer, Lord Justice Patten and Lord Justice Kitchin against the original Judicial Review. On the 9th July 2014, the judgment of the Court of Appeal was given by the three Law Lords who dismissed all the grounds on which the appeal had been raised. Whilst permission to appeal to the Supreme Court was refused, the Claimant decided not to make an application for leave to be heard. Work on the demolition of the hospital and construction of the new school and residential apartments is underway.

I would like to talk for a few minutes about Putney Hospital.

The new Board of Conservators are very aware of the concerns of many local residents over the way the access rights were sold, and also suggestions that the amount received from Wandsworth Borough Council was below what might have been reasonably obtained at the time.

To address these issues, a special Board meeting of the Conservators was held on 11th May. At that meeting the Board agreed to the appointment of a leading firm of charity lawyers, Bates Wells Braithwaite (BWB), to undertake a preliminary review of the sale of the access rights.

I am pleased to be able to report some progress.

As some of you will know, the sale of rights over “designated land” such as at Putney Common, is covered by clauses s117 – s121 of the Charities Act. Although the charity took advice from their lawyer and surveyor at the time in relation to the grant of the easement, whether that advice and the subsequent actions of the charity were compliant with the relevant obligations under the Charities Act is still under review, including whether a formal qualified surveyor’s report was obtained.

The Board has now agreed to commission a surveyor with the relevant experience in advising charities to advise on what they would have considered to be the best terms

## Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015

that could reasonably have been obtained by the charity in return for the grant of the easement, taking into account the facts at the time that the two easements were granted. This advice will cover both the residential element of the development and the school. Finally, the advice will be in the form of a qualified surveyor's report as required by the Charities Act 2011.

The qualified surveyor's report will make it possible for the Board to consider whether the receipt of £350,000 in cash and any other benefits received reflected the best terms that could reasonably have been obtained by the Conservators for the grant of the easement at the time.

The history of the development of the Putney Hospital site and its purchase by Wandsworth Borough Council for a new school and flats, and the earlier proposals by the Wandsworth Primary Care Trust, stretches over many years and is not only lengthy but also complex.

The actions the Board has initiated are well under way but, inevitably, will take some time to complete.

We have put the Charity Commission and our insurers on notice of the investigations being carried out to determine whether or not the charity has suffered a loss by the grant of the easement in 2014.

Moving onto other matters, unlike 2013 and 2014 we were blessed with a much drier winter and this has enabled the maintenance staff to continue with their work implementing the Higher Level Stewardship Heathland Management Plan which is currently in its eighth year. This has included the removal of scrub and trees from Roehampton Ride area, whilst heather was cut in seven different locations. With much of the Commons' heather currently at the mature stage, cutting will continue on a rotational basis in order to help ensure its continued survival.

Maintaining the variety of habitats across the Commons is a primary objective and through our emerging long-term strategic plan, our emphasis must be to reduce the encroachment of secondary woodland. And for that we need your support, but more of that later.

Although sadly last year we had no skylarks nesting on the Plain, through the work of our DEFRA Appointed Conservator Dr Ros Taylor, ably supported by Peter Haldane, Wildlife and Conservation Officer and Angela Evans, PA to the CEO, we've been fortunate in being able to harness the skills and passion of a group of local volunteer experts to start a programme of monitoring the flora and fauna of the Plain. Dr Taylor has produced an excellent report on the monitoring that took place in 2014. Together they also helped us to host the Commons' first ever BioBlitz, an event that proved to be a very successful weekend of activities, engaging the local community to come and learn about the Commons which is home to such an abundance of wildlife. We host our second event next weekend.

Staying with vegetation, we have duties to maintain the Commons trees, particularly those adjacent to busy roads and access routes. We have developed our tree risk management system with a more systematic approach to tree inspections and follow-up work. As a result of the Commons involvement in the current English Woodland Grant Scheme, we have been extremely fortunate in receiving additional grant funding for the

## Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015

thinning of Holly from 30 hectares of the Common's woodland. Arriving at the beginning of February this year, a small team of foresters began work in the woodland opposite Warren Farm and over the course of the following month an area of 4.5 hectares was thinned of Holly.

At Putney Lower Common the woodland clearance work and replanting, funded by Wandsworth Council, as part of the Hospital development have been completed. These works are maintained by the contractor for the first year and any failures will be replaced at their expense. Further works will be necessary over the coming autumn and winter period to restore areas of the Common and layout the new area of Common adjacent to the bowling green.

2014 is the fourth year that Oak Processionary Moth has been managed on Wimbledon and Putney Commons. As with the previous year, the Forestry Commission (FC) took responsibility for carrying out the spraying of the biological pesticide during April and a team of FC funded inspectors were on site towards the end of July. Unfortunately, due to the high demand on FC resources from areas affected by OPM, we were informed at the end of July by the FC that further resources would not be available to assist with the removal of identified OPM nests in 2014.

One of the most important areas of work in 2014 concerned a review of our governance arrangements. In June 2014 the Board approved the appointment of Dorothy Dalton, a specialist consultant in charity governance, to undertake the review. At its December 2014 Board meeting all the Recommendations made in the Governance Review report were agreed. This was on the basis that it would be for the newly Elected Conservators and existing Appointed Conservators to implement those recommendations from April 2015.

Although the Chief Executive will say more about the new arrangements for governing the Commons in his presentation, one of the new Committees that has been approved is focused solely on communications. This is an area where we need to build on the work on public engagement undertaken by the past Board and improve general awareness and understanding of the Commons and the work and issues affecting it.

In addition to the Chief Executive, there are just 20 permanently employed staff. In February 2015, following the retirement of a member of staff, the Board approved a restructuring within the organisation. A position of Chief Operations Manager was created to manage the day-to-day operations of the Commons. A recruitment process is complete and we are now appointing a new member of staff. In addition, it was agreed to create a new post of Head Ranger Putney Lower Common. This has been filled by Bill Rowland who was Senior Keeper and has worked on the Commons for the past 32 years. We are indebted to all the staff for their dedication in maintaining and preserving these open spaces.

One of the Chief Executive's tasks in his first year has been to start a condition survey of all the properties and the general infrastructure of the estate, as well as the vegetation. It is fair to say that this survey has identified that a lot of work is required to bring assets back to an acceptable condition. As Trustees of a charity this is particularly important if we are to pass the Commons onto the next generation in a condition that is as at least as good as we have enjoyed.

## Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015

Our Grade II\* Listed Windmill, one of the iconic buildings of Wimbledon, is in need of some care and attention. A specialist survey by a well-known local conservation architectural practice has revealed works in the order of £250-350,000. Immediately the Board has agreed £50,000 to halt the ingress of water through the wooden tower. These works are due to take place over the summer period.

The Richardson Evans Memorial Playing Field is a large and aging sports pavilion. It too is in need of investment, particularly the complex mechanical and electrical systems. These rugby and football pitches provide an important facility for many long-established and new clubs. We are also encouraging schools and other organisations to make use of the pitches. At the Rugby 7's tournament in March 2014 some 7,000 boys and girls participated in over 1,100 games of rugby.

Generally there is also a need to instigate a programme of planned maintenance on our staff lodges, particularly their external decoration and introducing planned programmes for updating kitchens and bathrooms.

On the Commons themselves, our footpaths/shared pedestrian and cycle routes and horse rides are all in need investment, this is not about gold-plating things, but ensuring that the major access routes can be used in the winter periods. We have already started trialling loose aggregate materials that will provide a more resilient surface than the previous tarmac scalping.

Through our Keepers and other staff we continue to work with the many and varied constituencies that use the Common. We tried to facilitate the opportunity for our two golf clubs to work more collaboratively, enabling golf to be put on a more sustainable basis. Whilst this has proved difficult, we will continue to support the two Clubs, with the assistance of the Royal Wimbledon.

Dog walkers are probably the largest group who use the Commons for recreation. The majority are excellent and recognise that not everyone is a dog lover. Others sadly do not and create problems for horse riders and golfers. We have produced a new leaflet with the support of local artist Tony Kane to promote awareness of the issues.

Ultimately we all have to share these parcels of public open space land and respect others in their use, achieving that balance is at the heart of our work. But everyone who uses the Common needs to act responsibly so we can all enjoy the sites. Your support and involvement is welcomed, we are arranging some evening sessions to undertake vegetation management at various sites across the Commons on Tuesday evenings during July, please do contact us if you are interested in joining us.

#### **4. THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

The Chief Executive presented his report on the financial accounts.

This is my second Annual Open Meeting and I've now experienced all the seasons on the Common. I recall leaving Cheltenham where I managed all their open spaces and thinking that no park could surpass the glories of Pittville Park and its Pump Room, but Golders Hill Park at Hampstead Heath is an exceptional Victorian Park in London. Leaving Hampstead left me with a similar view, what can surpass the beauties of this relic heathland.

## Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015

Well the Commons are a truly relic piece of rural landscape in London, from the grasslands and heathlands of the Plain, the woodlands and glades, to the meadows of the lower Common, these are a unique and wild place.

My first year has been spent mainly reviewing the condition of the overall asset, by that I include our 16 residential lodges, commercial properties, Grade II\* Listed Windmill and the general infrastructure of the Commons, its paths, fences, gates and of course the most important attribute - its natural vegetation and water courses.

Having got a much greater sense of the challenges facing the organisation I was able, with the support of staff and Conservators, to put forward to the Board in May 2015 a new Risk Register. This sets out a whole range of risks that the Board has to consider, ranging from its governance and finances to operational issues. This is not a document that gathers dust on a shelf, it very much a working document that is at the very heart of the organisation. It is used to promote engagement in all areas of the charity's business enabling us to focus on our priorities.

So to this year's accounts, they have been through a detailed and methodical scrutiny from both the new Finance and Investment Committee and the full Board. In future years, as the new Committees become established, the Audit and Risk Committee will play a greater role in scrutinising the accounts. Our auditors have produced a Management Letter and also have been subject of an audit of their processes, so overall a very thorough approach.

Survey work over the past year has revealed that there is a need to invest in many areas of the Commons if we are to hand them onto future generations in a condition that is fit for purpose. As the Chairman mentioned, that does not mean gold-plating the Commons, but it does require us to ensure that we have met the basic standards in terms of our obligations.

Firstly, a bit of background to our accounts. We operate two funds: an unrestricted fund and a designated fund. The designated fund includes an amount set aside each year for the election, and also the Mill House Fund. This represents the funds remaining from the proceeds of the enforced sale of Mill House. In the past the Mill House fund has been set aside for major capital/restoration schemes. The unrestricted funds are used for our normal charitable activities in terms of expenditure on the day to day operations of the Commons.

If you turn to page 9 of the accounts this provides a helpful financial overview of income and expenditure over the past year. Overall we showed a surplus of £135,063 compared with a deficit of £260,038 the previous year. I'll say a little more about the Levy shortly but in 2014 the Levy was increased by 2.5% generating £990,348.

Total expenditure for the year amounted to just under £1.7million, very similar to 2013/14. We employ 20 staff and overall remuneration represented 52.5% of the budget compared with 60% in 2013/14. As an aside, at Hampstead there is a permanent staff of 130 and budgets in excess of £6million/annum. I feel this warrants mention as Hampstead is just under 800 acres whilst the Commons are 1140 acres managed by just 20 staff and himself. We are indeed fortunate in having such a passionate and flexible team of staff who are committed to the Commons upkeep and maintenance. Many are here this evening and I just want to record my thanks to them. This has been a challenging year in many ways, a new boss and a new ways of doing things, but I have

## Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015

been genuinely impressed with the positive manner in which the staff have embraced change.

If you turn to page 14 I feel it would be helpful to run through the Statement of Financial Activities. Looking first at income our voluntary income rose substantially. This is due to a legacy of £47,500 left by a local resident, Audrey Meenan, for which we are extremely grateful. This has been ring-fenced to restore the REMPF WWI memorial. Legacies are something that we need to develop as a potential source of income in the future.

The activities for generating funds includes the one-off exceptional payment of £350,000 for the easement associated with the former hospital site. Investment income is slightly down on the previous year, but this reflects a change in policy to take just the natural yield from investments rather than drawing down on the capital.

The annual Levy amounts to 56.39% of total income. In 2014, the Conservators increased the Levy marginally although over the previous three years, mindful of the general austerity measures, the Board froze the Levy. As a consequence we have forgone approximately £225,000 of potential Levy income. This is a delicate issue, but with a significant backlog of maintenance works required, our auditors have drawn to our attention their concerns that unless income levels increase to fund future expenditure at a level required to maintain the Commons then surplus funds could be depleted. This therefore represents a risk on our risk register and is something that needs to be addressed over the short term. I'll say a little more about the funds for 2015/16 in my presentation.

In addition to the Levy we have also obtained grants from Higher Level Stewardship and Woodland Management Grant schemes. Again these are areas where we need to consider future funding schemes. There is also a small sum of nearly £6,000 that represents the income derived from the sale of machinery.

So to our expenditure. Overall the main cost centres have remained broadly similar for 2013/14 compared to 2014/15. The only exception to this is Commons security, which was lower in 2015. This is due to two issues, firstly a reduction in the recharge costs for the support costs (the recharge for senior management) that reduced by some £40K this past year, and also a vacancy with the Keeper team for a period.

The area of most significant deviance with 2013/14 is Governance. There are genuine reasons for this increase. Professional fees have increased because of our Governance Review. This has been instrumental in putting forward a structure that will improve proactive public engagement and ensure that there is greater clarity between the trustees' role in governing the Common and the executive's role in managing day-to-day activities of the Commons.

We have also appointed HR consultants to ensure that we get the best advice in terms of the ever-changing world of employment law and health and safety. One issue that required attention is monitoring of Legionella and this has necessitated support from external companies. In addition, we undertook a condition survey of all our built assets, both commercial and residential. From these surveys we have revealed the need for further investment. More of that later.

One of the most significant issues affecting Governance costs is associated with the change in the way the actuaries for the LG Pension Scheme have re-evaluated

## Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015

apportionment of costs. Whereas prior to 2015 we were contributing 25.4% toward staff pensions, this reduced to 15.1% for existing staff contributions from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014. However, like all other local authority pension schemes we have to now make a one-off payment annually towards those still receiving pensionable benefit. That one-off cost is £91,000 in 2014 and this has been included in the Governance cost centre as it would be inappropriate to show it against one of the operational cost centres. You can read more about this on page 26, Note 18.

Overall there has been a net income of £60,000 compared to a deficit of £270,000 in 2013/14. The total market value of the Mill House Fund has risen by some £75,000 compared to 2013/14. This reflects the decision to put the funds onto a new Platform which has reduced the management fees, whilst the markets are clearly stronger than in recent years.

Together with the total funds brought forward from 2013/14 we have a total of £2,480,351. This does not mean however that we have £2.4million in cash. If we now turn to page 15 we can look at the overall Balance Sheet for the Commons.

Our first item here is Fixed and Tangible Assets. The £139,977 represents the value of our machinery, plant and equipment. Our current assets include our stock that has been increased to reflect new publications that we sell.

Debtors are those who owed us money as at the end of the year, or money received at the end of the year that had not been banked. There are a couple of significant debts, one was income from the Rosslyn Park Rugby 7s which takes place at the very end of the financial year. A significant element was also VAT that we had not at that point reclaimed.

The Mill House fund increased as stated earlier by just over £75,000. This has been apportioned to take into account, as a purely book keeping exercise, the costs associated with the construction of the new Studio Flat at the REMPF and the restoration of the Commons following the traveller encampment on Putney Heath in late 2013. This amounts to an apportionment of £141,000.

Our Cash in Hand was £970,000, although as you'll see below this does mask £200,000 of creditors. One of most significant issues with the creditors are costs associated with major tree works. All major open spaces have duties when it comes to tree risk management. Over the past year we introduced a tree inspection regime, focusing predominantly around the major roads. This revealed that a number of immediate works were required at the REMPF, Friars Avenue, Putney Heath and Rushmere. This has required £42,000 of unplanned expenditure and will require on-going commitment.

We also undertook works to restore the Commons footpaths and a sum of £22,000 had to be carried forward. Some £48,000 was required to fund the Electoral Reform Services and the work they carried out for the Conservators' election. We recognise that there may be a need to spend more on future elections.

This gives net current assets of £2,340,374.

I just wish to finish with some detailed issues that may arise. Sports income remains down on previous years, but this reflects the loss of the Broncos from the REMPF. We



## **Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015**

hope that the issue of vacant offices will soon be resolved and that our facilities will be used more extensively on weekdays and at weekends.

Training costs have increased, reflecting the need to ensure that staff, our greatest asset, are able to fulfil their roles to the best of their abilities.

Finally, we have a series of plans for the future and I will address these in my presentation.

### **5. QUESTIONS ON THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

#### **1. Tracy Pattison, Putney.**

Why there was an expenditure of £150,000 on the Playing Fields, with an income of only £130,000, with yet more expenditure to be made. What was all the money being spent on as it seemed to be a large expenditure.

The Chief Executive responded that this reflected the loss of the Broncos from the facilities but were currently in negotiation with a local school to use the facilities on a regular basis which would hopefully offset that loss. This was a 7-day a week operation worked by 2.5 staff and the costs compared with other departments, they did provide a value for money. However, the point was noted and the Finance Committee would look into this in more detail.

#### **2. Robin Healy, Wimbledon**

Mr Healy wished to raise two questions relating to the investigation referred to in relation to the granting of the easement to Wandsworth Council. Firstly, what is the potential costs of the exercise may be and what provision is made in the accounts for this expenditure. Secondly, in the event that some loss is discovered, what would happen then.

The Chairman responded that costs were being monitored closely. The Board had committed to the investigation and once a report was received, they would then consider what action, if any, to take.

#### **3. Roger Castle, Wimbledon**

Mr Castle asked if the Mr Nicholas Evans who was now a Conservator, was the same Mr Evans who had brought the legal action against the previous Conservators about the legality of access to the Putney Hospital site, and lost at both the High Court and the Court of Appeal.

Mr Evans confirmed he was the same person.

Mr Castle noted that the two cases had cost the Conservators, or the Levy-payers, some £120,000. He wondered how much the action had cost Mr Evans. Was it £7,500?

Mr Evans confirmed that it had cost some £30/£40,000.

Mr Castle commented that it was normal in such cases that the losing party paid the other side's costs. He confirmed that the basis on which the action had been taken,

## **Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015**

supported by a great many residents, was that the contribution to the costs of the Conservators would be limited. The payment of £7,500 was the amount the judge considered it appropriate for him to pay towards the costs of the Conservators.

Mr Castle also wondered what with employing lawyers and surveyors to dispute the price the previous Conservators achieved - what was this going to cost? He was beginning to think that there was some vendetta being waged against the previous Conservators.

The Chairman commented again that costs were being closely monitored.

### **6. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S PRESENTATION**

The Chief Executive gave a short presentation highlighting the operations issues currently affecting the Commons.

#### **1. Caroline Stephenson, Wimbledon**

Mrs Stephenson commented that during the holly clearance a lot of heavy machinery had been on site and had appeared to cause damage with its tracks.

The Chief Executive responded that this was specialist equipment and he had been concerned that they would cause more damage than they actually had, particularly as the work was done in the middle of winter. But although the tracks had left marks, it had not dug in to the ground too badly. The areas that had been managed in previous years had recovered very well and he was confident that the area cleared over this past winter would similarly recover.

In response to a question about using horses instead of equipment, he commented that this was something that had, and still was, being considered.

#### **2. Mr Richard Hunt, Southfields**

Mr Hunt asked on what grounds did the Conservators think they could renege on the easement contract, how much money were the Conservators going to spend on doing this and were they sure the other party would pay up. Finally, how much profit did they think this would bring in?

The Chairman responded that he had said all he wished to say on the matter. The Conservators would see where the process took them and would address any issues that may arise once the surveyor's report was received.

Mr Hunt commented that this was not really a satisfactory answer. The question was whether the Conservators would get any return from carrying out this investigation.

#### **3. Mr Richard Simon, Parkside**

Mr Simon asked what was the purpose of commissioning this latest report on the easement. Even if a different surveyor reached a different conclusion to the previous one, was there any possibility of re-opening the contract with Wandsworth - he considered this unlikely. He asked if the purpose was to pursue some sort of claim against the previous Conservators. He thought the prospects of that being successful

## Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015

were very slim. What was the purpose of commissioning the report, at a cost to the Levy-payers and, if it was to pursue some sort of vendetta against the former Conservators, he considered this to be unworthy and irresponsible. The elected Conservators need to be reminded that they have not been elected to pursue personal or narrow interests which were not in the interests of the Commons or the Levy-payers and that the expenditure on fruitless litigation was a misapplication of funds which Levy-payers would be concerned about.

The Chairman thanked Mr Simon for his observations and commented that he did not wish to speculate on what may or may not happen. The Conservators were acting on matters that had been brought to their attention and considered that they were only acting in the best interest of the charity.

### **4. Mr Brian Rutherford, Putney**

Mr Rutherford commented that Page 4 of the report suggested that the Trustees had adopted the 6 principles [Nolan Principles], presumably as part of their governance review and the 6<sup>th</sup> principle is Open and Accountable. The one thing that might settle the whole question as to whether the Trustees had acted appropriately, is whether or not the Trustees had a valuation saying that the easement was worth one pound. If not, the previous question as to whether or not Nicholas Evans should be accountable to the Conservators for £120,000 would pale into insignificance compared to the potential commercial value. In the interests of openness and accountability, was the valuation obtained as required under the Charities Act. Yes or No.

The Chairman commented that that was what was currently being looked into.

Mr Evans commented that the Conservators had not been able to establish whether or not a valuation had been obtained and had not seen one. It was not available in the Office, nor from solicitors and the previous surveyors had been asked for a copy. There is mention of a report but it is in an e-mail. This is why a proper investigation was being undertaken.

Mr Rutherford went on to ask whether, in the event we don't know whether there is a valuation, did the Trustees accept that a valuation should have been obtained.

The Chairman commented that the requirements of the Charities Act were quite clear on that matter.

### **5. Jonathan Calloway**

Mr Calloway asked when the investigations were concluded, would it be made public in the spirit of openness to Levy-payers.

The Chairman commented that it was the intention of the Conservators to make the results public when investigation was concluded. The Conservators would be as open and transparent as possible.

Mr Cameron commented that there would be a report to the Charity Commission and he personally could not see why it should not be made public.

## Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators – June 2015

The Chairman thanked the members of the public for attending. He closed the meeting at 9.15 pm.

*P. A. Whyte*