Statement by MR A.B. HOOPER to Members of the Recreation Ground Trust Board at the meeting being held at the Guildhall, Bath, on Wednesday, 20th January 2010, at 1 p.m.

It is very unfortunate that Mr Blofeld's recent statement about Mr Brownsword's Rugby business operations belatedly moving its mis-use and abuse of Bath citizens' Public Open Space elsewhere appears to have caused more uncertainty than it has solved.

For a newcomer to Bath, Mr Blofeld deserves some credit for having the intelligence to recognise what our Councillors have refused to recognise for at least a decade – that Western Riverside is the ideal site for a stadium in almost every respect, and could be an enormous improvement on the horrific development plans proposed so far at the Rec. It could be an icon for the future without desecrating the historic centre of Bath as a World Heritage City and it could be part of far more sensible transport plans to cope with enormous crowds, pollution and traffic gridlock than exist at present.

What is destroying the credibility of Mr Blofeld's better proposals for Western Riverside is the lack of trust or confidence in our Councillors, and the devious and secretive conduct of the Rec Charity Trustees and the disgraceful incompetence and hypocrisy of the Charity Commission, which even the Charity Tribunal now accepts as unacceptable and can only be remedied by Judicial Review.

It is therefore extremely important that Mr Blofeld, on behalf of Bath Rugby, clarifies what is going on, and what is the truth about this business seeking further leases for their inappropriate commercialisation on Bath citizens' Public Open Space, which has to be stopped one way or another, and where the responsibility now lies with the Club due to the failure of our elected Councillors and Charity Commission.

Only the truth of credible proposals will satisfy Bath citizens and the sooner Mr Blofeld provides this openly, the greater will be his chances of success for Bath Rugby and a recovery of the environmental open Space amenity that is long over-due to residents and their children.

No company can claim to be truly 'charitable' or of community value if it is in fact unfairly and inappropriately exploiting charity assets itself for private gain through un-lawful development or ultra-vires leases which have no proper place on any Company's balance sheet.

For now we wish the "Blofeld Initiative" well – if it is what it is said to be – a move away from what it was clearly intended to be by law – the City centre "GREEN LUNG OF A CITIZENS' RECREATION GROUND which must be available, safe, clean and traffic free, as in other towns and cities almost everywhere.

Until more is known the option of a Judicial Review still remains a likely outcome where it has been highly recommended by the Charity Tribunal, as the Charity's beneficiaries are sick and tired of being dictated to by irresponsible Councillors and a devious Charity Commission to further their own agendas and put our whole City's environmental future at risk in a way that is not only in breach of the purpose of this particular Charity but will put charities and Open Spaces in danger of similar mis-use and abuse across the country as a whole.

We wish Mr Blofeld well if his initiative is what he says it is, but any return to developing the Rec for business exploitation will face the Judicial Review that has now been highly recommended by Counsel, and for which arrangements are in hand to prevent another decade of abuse if it remains necessary.

A.B.Hooper/19.1.10