

**Supporter Alliance meeting**  
**Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> January 2021**  
**6:30pm via zoom**

Present:

Rich Rendall – Chairman of the Alliance  
Scott Priestnall – Owner and Chairman of YTFC  
Paul Hadlow – G&W  
Sharon Swain - DSA  
Simon Woodland - DSA  
John Oakes - GT  
Adam - GT  
Marilyn Cottle – Junior Glovers  
Sara Bradley – Community Trust  
Guest – Mark Kelly (Social Media supporter group)  
Kirstie Baker – Club Secretary

Apologies:

Rob Newport – Cary Glovers

RR opened the meeting.

RR reminded the group about sensitivity of the meetings. Meetings are not to be recorded and request that all wait for the minutes to be produced and agreed before being published.

RR wishes all those affected by the pandemic get well soon and wish well for the season.

RR mentioned the fans that we lost over the last few months. Condolences sent to all family members that we have lost. Especially for Chris White who we lost in December.

Approval of previous minutes and agreed.

Land sale update

SP gave an overview and update.

SP has spoken with the GT on numerous occasions since they triggered the ACV. SP has a follow up call with the Council on Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> to establish if the deal is still viable for the Club now that the ACV has been activated.

SP explained that there are Club's submitting hardship claims, we are not one of those as we have solutions and that there are others offers which can be explored.

SP will be addressing the Alliance Committee before further announcements and with updates for actions moving forward.

SP provided to the Alliance group, by email, a list of questions from the GT and asked the Committee to give their views on how this should be processed.

SP gave an overview of dealings with, and the relationship, with the GT since December. In the initial meeting with the GT SP understood that the Board were for in agreement with the Council proposal therefore was surprised when the ACV was triggered as the GT has not indicated this.

SP was further surprised with the demands of the GT via social media when he had been open to discuss as had done previously, as well as the recent demands of answering a list of questions that are not relevant to the ACV.

SP has requested 3 questions from the GT that have yet to be answered. SP requires these questions to be responded too before he responses to the GT recent demands.

The questions SP requires answers too are below so the situation can be clarified:

Who is SP apparently selling the Club/Land to as no local investor has come forward, nor been referred to SP as claimed by the GT.

Where has info come from?

Who told the GT that the Club had funds to see through the next 6 months?

JO to respond on behalf of the GT. JO commented that it would be wrong to speak on behalf of BO as BO is the individual who has raised the questions; however, JO will report back to BO for a response and agrees to have open direct form of communication with SP rather than so publicly. JO confirmed that GT meetings are now recorded, however the one between SP and GT was not therefore can not clarify some areas SP asked, he can though agree that there was positivity over the deal with the Council. JO confirmed the triggering of the ACV was because there was a shift in the Board making the decisions rather than the members of the GT. The GT wanted time to consider the deal and ask questions which is why the ACV was triggered to allow for more time. The members have raised questions in relation to the deal which resulted in the list of questions received by BO to SP. JO believed that in response to SP question regarding selling of the club/land to someone else, - various individuals being put forward from the GT to SP to discuss investments. SP stated that no one has been recommended to him to discuss. If there is anyone that has spoken to the GT then SP would welcome the contact and willing to discuss. To date none have come forward or presented to SP.

As a result, the ACV has been triggered, despite the GT initially stating that they wouldn't and appeared to be supporting the Council deal. SP explained that the ACV could have serious financial implications on the Club, due to the timing and the delay it causes, resulting in other actions needing to be considered.

Adam – outlined the GT process that they have gone through from once the deal was announced and the decision to trigger the ACV agree was due to the time frame and lack of information. The GT will look to lift this if their members are satisfied with the deal. SP doesn't think this can be lifted. The decision to invoke the ACV was not to stop the deal.

The current position for the Club as a result of the ACV SP now spending time dealing with cash flow issue rather than the future, which is now on hold.

SP explained the value of land is to develop houses, accommodation, hotel, commercial revenues outside of football to safeguard the club football. This is now in jeopardy. The hotel and convenience store would provide funds for the club and this would allow the Club to compete, we don't have enough to compete. There is now a shortfall each month and action is needed to safeguard the Club and staff and in a responsible way.

SP asked for AOB / thoughts –

RR – Hopes everyone can get together on this, we all want and need the funds.

SS – agrees that the Council deal is a good project for the club.

MC – asked if the plan is similar to York City - SP agreed is aware of other Clubs set ups and agreed that York is a good project. Eastleigh has a good set up. Woking going through similar criteria. There are still covenants on the YRFC land. If we can get rental income then there will be a revenue income, can double some parts of our revenue, then build accommodation for players which can cost £80K plus per season.

MK – questioned that if the Club is financially struggling how have the Club been able to bring players recently. SP explained that these players are all part of the budget set at the start of the season therefore accounted for.

MK – once activated can the ACV be lifted at any stage? SP – doesn't think it is possible.

Adam – if deal doesn't go through then would the Club be in hardship? Is club financially secure? SP – It will be in trouble, we can predict costs and revenue, and loss. Cash would be available for January, with potential cash flow issues for the remainder of the season. Had a break even plan in place, but now looking at a £250K loss/£40K a month loss due to no fans. The Players are within the budget set.

PH – it is in the fans interest to have council backing rather than elsewhere as local. Club needs money between now and when that's signed which is a concern. With the ACV triggered, which seems to be have been done in a panic, it seems a missed opportunity.

MK – if housing where will people park on a match. SP – there is a plan for that, car park management plan for local business with parking on site and locally.

JO from BO – the artist who designed the Badger drawings would like to design a memorial. SP agreed can be explored and to discuss an appropriate location.

SS – regarding planning, can SP talk to DSA as parking is a requirement for the disabled supporters as they can't attend fixtures otherwise. SP – agreed.

RR – suggestion that recognition of ex-players at each game. SP – suggested with the TV changes that this channel could be used and for RR to discuss with MR.

SP - All groups need to contribute to the club. All groups carried out a great deal of work last year to support morale and cash flow. This inclusion to continue, and other groups can be included in the Alliance in the future. RR – agree to invite other supporter groups to future meetings.

RR closed the meeting at 8:15pm.

Next meeting – TBC

Actions taken:

RR to discuss recognition of Ex-players with MR.

RR to invite additional supporter group to the next meeting.