

PRESTON CANDOVER AND NUTLEY PARISH MEETING

Date: Saturday 23rd January 2016.

Time: 10:00am

Venue: Preston Candover Village Hall

Opening Statements

Mr Ron Darley opened the meeting by welcoming everyone; he then explained that as the Chairman and Vice Chairman from the Parish Council were unable to attend that the Community needed to elect a Chairman for the meeting. Mr Darley explained that he had been the Clerk to Preston Candover & Nutley Parish Council but lived outside of the area, so while he knew the Parish was not aligned to any local view points. Mr Darley was then proposed and seconded for the Chairman role and voted in.

The Chairman then gave a short statement about why the meeting had been called and the legal requirement that if 10 or more residents from the Parish request a Parish Meeting that one is required to be scheduled. Concerns had been raised about the proposed location of the new community store and the purpose of the meeting was for these questions to be answered in a public forum.

A member of the Community asked why questions would not be allowed to be asked at today's meeting but was required in advance; the Chairman explained that this had allowed all groups to research full answers for the meeting; however additional questions may be accepted dependant on time constraints.

Richard Walker from the Community Store Group then spoke and introduced the 8 volunteers who make up the committee, Nevil Wilson, Sarah Saunders, Clare Armstrong, Carolyn Dawney and Lucy Muncey from Preston Candover, along with Jane Ballard from Bradley and Claire Willmott and Alison Ellett from Brown Candover. Richard praised the work done by the team and the previous Chairman Bob Wood over the last two years and introduced the new proposal to extend the Preston Candover Village Hall. Richard explained that a working party has been set up included members of both committees to look at the feasibility of the plans.

Matt Jackson then spoke on behalf of the Preston Candover Village Hall Committee. Matt explained that the Chairman was not able to attend the meeting and as Vice Chairman he had been asked to speak. Matt explained that the trustees of the Village Hall were listed on a handout which was available when everyone had arrived for the meeting. Matt explained that the proposal for extending the Village Hall had been suggested following the concerns raised at the exhibition in September of the plans for a separate building. Matt echoed Richard's hopes that the working party would be able to work together and identify the best solution for the village and broader community.

Questions from the Community

Community Village Store Committee

Subject: Consultation

Q: Why did the Community Store Committee not take the advice of the Parish Council in December 2014 that more work needed to be done to get a clear picture of what the community thoughts were regarding the use of the field? [Feedback during petition door knock](#)

A: We did take the advice of the Parish Council at that meeting and went away to discuss what form that consultation should take. The committee took advice from the architect and planning experts to establish that an exhibition with a follow up feedback form was the most appropriate consultation process. The site plan displayed at the exhibition showed the building located on the field and the feedback form gave residents the opportunity to state any concerns they had on any part of the project including the location.

Q: The Executive summary report from the Exhibition states that 89% of respondents from the Parish are in favour of a Community Store/Post Office. How can you present this to the landowner as overwhelming proof that the Parish supports the Community Store/Post Office being built on the field when there has never been a direct clear question relating to this? [Feedback during petition door knocks](#)

A: We didn't present that figure as overwhelming proof. The figure is referred to as the number of people in the parish who support a Community Store and Post Office. It is broken down into 72% of respondents in the Parish supporting the project as displayed at the exhibition and 17% supporting the progression of a community store in principle but stating concerns. The landowner understood these numbers and the way they were broken down.

Q: Evidence of manipulation relates to the Community Store minutes dated 26th February 2015, the feedback questionnaire to be carefully constructed. Is that the reason why residents did not have a yes/no tick box on the feedback relating to the most important issue of the store being built on the field? [Feedback during petition door knocks](#)

A: There was no manipulation at all. We wanted to word the feedback forms carefully to ensure the results would be meaningful and statistically robust so they could be used to support planning applications and grants. As I said in a previous answer the feedback form gave everyone the opportunity to state any concerns they had. Only 33 out of the 223 respondents from within the Preston Candover & Nutley Parish suggested alternative locations.

Analysis of Feedback

Q: Given the need for our community to continue benefitting from a local shop and post office, what actions must to be taken for the feedback of the consultation exercise to be accepted? [Graeme Casey](#)

Q: Is there any way that the Community Store's consultation data could be analysed by an independent assessor who is an expert in such things and verify that the data has been collated correctly and that the questions were adequately phrased- in order to allay the concerns of some? It

seems that many of the community are very happy with the consultation process and feel that it would be very expensive to the community as a whole to repeat this process with a parish poll which may well give the same result. [Anon](#)

I'll answer these two questions together.

A: Obviously we feel that they can be accepted and also that the exhibition and feedback forms meet the requirements of the planners for the public consultation part of the planning application. We did take professional advice on this.

If by having an independent auditor review the forms and the data transcribed from them in order to give the community and Parish Council confidence in the consultation exercise we are more than happy for this to happen.

Reach of Consultation

Q: Why does the Committee persist in referring to "residents of Preston Candover & Nutley" when the project is the concern (and hope) of the entire Candover Valley? Are the people not living in the former to be excluded from the discussion and eventually from using the beautiful new shop? [Sybil Hampton](#)

A: From shop point of view everyone is indeed equal and we see the whole valley as part of the community and essential to underpinning the financial viability of the store. However, the store would be located in Preston Candover and it is crucial therefore to know what support the residents of Preston Candover would give to the project. The Preston Candover and Nutley Parish Council requested this information at a meeting in December 2014 so they could represent their parishioners accurately in their support or otherwise of the project.

In addition, the committee was already aware that it would need parish specific information for any planning application and that many grant applications ask what parish support there is so it really is very important that our data is parish specific. But please don't feel excluded you are very much a part of the vision.

Further consultation

Q: As there appears to be a certain lack of support for the repositioning of the village shop and post office to the land close to the village hall - would it be possible, indeed desirable, to hold a properly executed referendum or poll of the parish residents' views - i.e. Nutley, Axford and Preston Candover parish and not including those from the wider valley community? Valley community?

A: The results from the exhibition meet the requirements for inclusion in planning applications and for use in grant applications. Whether the Parish would like to hold a further consultation of some kind is for them to decide (and the Parish Council have this question I believe) but it is worth noting that 66% of the Preston Candover and Nutley Parish residents submitted feedback forms following the exhibition. This is equivalent to the number who voted in the last general election in this ward.

Q: Why do people who do not live in Preston Candover think they have a right to tell us we need a village shop built on the only piece of green field we can let children play on and have village functions with the permission of the landowner? A shop anywhere except that field.

A: No one is telling anyone anything. The committee is supporting a project it believes in wholeheartedly and has presented it to the community. As I have already mentioned, we understand that the residents of the village the building will be in should have a say in its location etc. but we believe the community stretches further than those residents and includes the surrounding villages, those who work in the area or visit it. And the commercial success of a store and post office relies on the wider community using it.

In terms of green spaces for village functions and the children to play, the playground and recreation ground and 80% of the field where the shop would be built will be all remain available and Carolyn will comment further on this later.

Subject: Fundraising

Q: How much money have you raised to fund this project? [Feedback during petition door knocks](#)

A: We have received donations of £3,500 and a grant of £2,000 from the Plunkett Foundation. We do not intend to start major fund-raising until we have planning permission and know how much money we need to raise"

Subject: Timescales

Q: As all the preliminary requirements had been successfully completed some time ago, why were the final plans were not immediately sent in? The fact that this did not happen is unacceptable, as the need to get on with the project is pressing from many points of view. Such a strong majority have already voted for the new shop as outlined at earlier meetings, so the hesitation and lack of progress is disturbing to say the least. [Sybil Hampton](#)

Q: I use the current shop regularly and operate on the principle that I will buy what I can in the shop and buy all other items in local supermarkets. My feeling on the benefits and viability of the shop were brought into focus by the recent exhibition. I am very keen that the project should go ahead and succeed. What timescales have been proposed on the project? [Ted Dowson](#)

A: I'll answer the 2 questions together, starting with a recap of what our committee have been doing over the last few months. Since the exhibition we have been addressing the concerns expressed to us in the feedback forms which have meant liaising with consultants and BC departments as well as our architect; as you can see on the boards in the annex the store has been moved closer to the road and reduced in size. For most of November, December and January we have been sidetracked by this meeting.

Moving forward and irrespective of whether there is an extension to the village hall or a new build the action that will take the most time is fund raising. For many grants there is a small window in which to apply often only occurring annually. So we see fundraising as the major time limiting factor but hope to open a new store next year.

Subject: Site

Q: High priority is for the safety of the school children and congestion caused through parking, has the Community Store Group sought and asked any other land owners in the vicinity if land would be available to build a Community Store/Post Office? If so were other sites considered, where were they and why were they not pursued? [Feedback during petition door knocks](#)

A. 14 other sites were considered and whittled down to 5 (shown in our business plan) and we did approach more than one landowner. They were not pursued because they were off the main road or on agricultural land. To be commercially viable the new store needs to be highly visible and in the centre of the village. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council were in favour of siting the shop near the school and village hall to create a "cluster of amenities"

***Home Field, Opposite Sumner and Hector's Houses
Adjoining (extension to) village hall
Behind old bus shelter – in corner of field
Purefoy Arms outbuildings –
Adjacent to village hall on the southern "field" side***

Q: What guarantee have you given to the Parish about the removal of the Community Store/Post Office if this project fails and that the building would not be sold off or let for another business? [Feedback during petition door knocks](#)

Q: What would happen to the building if the shop failed, especially if there is not any capital or funding to remove the building from the proposed site? Would this be the responsibility of Preston Farm Estates? [Jo Hunt](#)

***A: Again I'll address the 2 questions in a single answer.
Please be rest assured that the rules that govern how a Co-operative Society, which is what CVCS is registered as, are very strict on the use of assets and actually have a "Restriction on their use".
A building owned by the CVCS could not be sold or let to a commercial enterprise only another charity or society governed by the same rules. If no local organisation was willing to take on the building for example then we have made an undertaking to Preston Farms to remove the building and return the site to field. We will gradually build a reserve fund to cover this, but are confident we will never need to use it.***

Subject: Field

Q: I know that there is much genuine and justified concern within the village over the loss of the field for village events. What steps are being taken to deal with these concerns and reach a consensus on the way forward? [Ted Dowson](#)

Q: The new village store footprint expressed as a percentage of the total field plot available would be helpful. A plan view of the store on the plot of land shown with new car parking and village hall and how a fete can be successfully managed within the reduced area would also help. [Adrian Emck](#)

A: Our first proposal showed the building and parking on 21% of the field so it would not have prevented events taking place. Our latest drawings have brought the shop forward - now occupying 14% leaving the rest for recreation.

Q: Is there any truth in the rumour that, if there is a new build community store, there would need to be a necessity for trees to be cut down and that the bonfire would not be possible in the field?
[Felicity Woods](#)

Q: The field is in a protected conservation area; has the Community Store Group sought confirmation from Basingstoke & Deane Tree Officers regarding the removal of any trees? If so, has a budget been included to protect roots of trees and how much has been set aside? [Feedback during petition door knocks](#)

A: The two trees to be removed have been indicated on both site plans. Hampshire Fire and Rescue has given us written assurance that the safe distance from trees, buildings and crops for public bonfires is 18m. The proposed building is x meters away

As part of our pre-planning response Basingstoke and Deane said it may be preferable to remove trees and plant elsewhere to create the "cluster of amenities". The trees trunks would be protected with barriers and special matting used to protect the roots from compaction, included in our budget.

Q: The field is an Area of High Archaeological Potential (AHAP), what research has been done by the Community Store Group regarding this and was Basingstoke & Deane made aware of this when pre-planning was sent in? [Feedback during petition door knocks](#)

A: Thank you for raising this it hadn't come up in our pre-planning but would do in a formal application. So I've been in touch with the County Archaeologist who has reviewed the pre-planning application and response and has given a formal response confirming he does not raise any archaeological issues to the build.

Subject: Parking

Q: The size of the building would need 10 parking spaces; the lay-by is usually full during the day where would the rest go that was not on the plan at the exhibition? [Feedback during petition door knocks](#)

A: We have reduced the size of the building so 6 spaces will be sufficient.

Subject: Purpose of project

Q: The value of the shop as a community hub cannot be over-emphasised. Is this factor being considered when looking at the benefits of the shop? [Ted Dowson](#)

A: Yes, very much so. It has always been in the plan to create not only a functional shop and post office but as importantly to create a complete Community Hub to enhance our existing local facilities and increase our social cohesion.

In the business plan we have outlined the ways we see this taking shape.

There will be coffee facilities and a seating area for all passing through the valley, a place to linger and socialise.

We will be drawing on a large number of local volunteers to staff and support the shop. 55 confirmed so far. We will operate a Good Neighbour scheme to visit elderly or more isolated residents, Home Delivery shopping services and a Pick Up and Drop scheme for those that find it difficult to get about, but would benefit from coming to the shop/coffee area.

Hampshire's Age Concern may run their Village Agent Scheme from the hub, offering advice and support to Valley residents.

The shop will be an excellent centre from which to promote and cross sell the products and services of the many local businesses, clubs and societies in the area.

Finally, we aim to finance part of the project with a large local Share Membership Scheme, priced so that all residents are able to be part of the venture and all trading profits being ploughed into local social and charitable projects.

Subject: Financial Viability

Q: Whilst the shop proposal seems the only obvious way to generate any kind of Candover Valley community spirit, it is vital that any proposal is commercially viable i.e. can it survive through thick and thin? So any proposers should be able to put forward a plan which will not only fosters a community atmosphere, but also be based on a business plan which will ensure commercial success so that the shop does survive. Do we have enough support to make sure we will make this proposal a successful way of regenerating the Candover Valley? At the moment it's turning into a Drive-through valley. [Eileen Jamieson](#)

A: We believe we do. Lucy has just outlined the ways the shop would benefit the community. The exhibition showed support for the project of 72% within the parish (90% supports in the wider community) and we have 55 volunteers already signed up which demonstrates people do have a desire and willingness to be part of a community project. In terms of its commercial success, we have been taking advice from the Plunkett Foundation since the beginning of the project. Both they and a small business manager from the Co-Operative Bank have reviewed our business plan and consider the forecasts achievable. According to the Plunkett Foundation Community shops have a 95% long-term success rate (the average success rate for commercial retail business is 47%). With its central and visible location we very much believe it could become the hub of the village and contribute significantly towards fostering the community atmosphere Eileen fears is being lost.

Subject: Working with the Village Hall

Q: Will all the parties, who are present today, agree to compromise any differences they have and proceed together as one community with building the shop/post office as soon as possible? [Annette Walker](#)

A: From the very beginning we talked about options but haven't had much encouragement. But now we have agreed to work together.

Q: Please could you update us on your ideas/ any possible plans/ options on using the Village Hall Annexe as the shop and extending from there- in order to avoid building on the field- is this a viable option for the Village Hall and the Shop Committee to still consider?

A: The CVCS committee have been in constant dialogue with the village hall committee since the formation of CVCS in January 14. A few months ago a member of the village, on neither committee, presented a basic sketch of what the VH would look like with the Annex open as a Shop presenting the idea that the annex be used as the shop. The CVCS committee did not receive the drawings from the VHC and we received no communication from them on what their feelings on the proposal were (we later understood that the committee voted against pursuing the idea); we also without any details or sign of interest from the VHC rejected the annex in the form described in the sketch, and made a counterproposal to the VHC for more space, the store being in the main hall, which was rejected. The annex as a location is described in the business plan. Our concerns are that it is out of the way, tucked behind the VH, in its current state not big enough, proximity to the main hall. We also considered that the loss of the annex would be detrimental to events in the VH. Early in 2014 there were discussions between the 2 committees about various rooms in the VH being utilised as a Store, concluding with the VH expressing concerns that their charitable status would be lost if there was a commercial or profitable enterprise on their premises. After this conclusion discussions continued but focused around the site of a new build as their neighbour and CVCS suggesting we rent some parking spaces from the VH to minimise parking on the field, all was finally rejected by the VH committee in late August 2015. The use of the annex as a shop was also suggested to the VH committee a number of times long before the CVCS committee was formed even before the initial PCNPC survey; as far as we are aware all suggestions were rejected.

Q: I think that it seems a waste to build a new building when the Village Hall is currently under used and has parking. Are the Committees exploring the opportunity of locating a Village Shop within the Hall or extending the Village Hall to accommodate a shop? [Anon](#)

A: As you have heard today, we are currently working together to assess the viability of the suggested extension of the village hall

Q: Has the Community Store Group formally requested a meeting with the Village Hall Committee to discuss any potential extension to the hall to incorporate the Community Store/Post Office and leave the field as a recreation area for the parish? If not why was this not investigated? [Feedback during petition door knock](#)

A: See answers above

Q: Given that the Village Hall is a charitable organisation whose very purpose is to serve the Community of Preston Candover, can you assure us that the Committees will discuss this fully and explain fully to the Community if the proposition of shared usage is not viable, on what grounds is it is not viable so that we have a clear understanding that it is absolutely **necessary** for a new building to be erected on green land? [Karen and Eric Doweck, Fee Peisely, Jo and Ian Lilley, Naomi Dickenson, Sabrina Gurling](#)

A: See answers above

Q: Village shops are easy to lose and once they disappear they are sadly missed. Having lived in a local village where this happened we know this first hand. As we all know Preston Candover is at risk of losing its village shop and viable proposals have been developed for its replacement. We were disappointed to be asked to sign a petition to object to these proposals without being offered a viable alternative. However we do accept people have different views and concerns. Surely our focus should be on working together to make the shop a reality.

A: See answers above

Q: Has the CSC engaged in discussion with the VHC?

A: See answers above

Subject: CVCS Committee Members

Q: Are there any Parish Councillors or close members of their family involved or have been involved with the project? [Feedback during petition door knocks](#)

A: No there aren't.

Parish Council

Q: In view of the unprecedented high response rate to the consultation by the Candover Valley Community Store group, and the overwhelming 93% support for the proposals of which 89% came from within the boundary of the Parish Council, why is the Preston Candover and Nutley Parish Council not wholeheartedly supporting the progress of the project in tandem with the Community Store group when they are nominated to represent the views of the local electorate?

A: The Parish Council should remain impartial in any project of this type

Q: Once the final position and design of the planned Community Shop is decided, is it the intention of the Parish Council to commission an independent Feedback during petition door knock (including a sketch plan/map) of parishioners to assess support for the proposal within the Parish?

A: the Parish Council hopes that the alternative plan for the extension to the Village Hall will alleviate the need for the Poll but it waits to hear the outcome of the meeting on 23rd January

Q: There has been talk of a Parish Poll being demanded by some of the parishioners. If it were to be demanded, what would be the cost to the Parish and who would pay for it?

A: A postal Ballot would be the most cost effective and efficient method of collating the Community view, this would cost £900 - £1,200. This cost would be met from the Parish Council budget.

Q: What is the role of the Preston Candover Parish Council (PCPC) in this matter? What consents are required of it?

A: The Parish Council are given the opportunity to make comment on all planning applications, as are any members of the community; this would be the Council's only involvement with the project.

Q: Does the PCPC support the CSC's proposals for a new build CS? If not, why not, and what amendments have been proposed by PCPC?

A: The Parish Council have no opinion on the project until they understand the Community view of the plans, at which point they will follow the public opinion.

Q: Has the PCPC considered the location the CS in the VH? If not, why not? If it has, is it in favour of such use? If not, why not?

A: The Parish Council are not involved with the plans as this is being discussed between the Community Store Group and the Village Hall Committee.

Village Hall

Q: Would there be anyone from the village hall committee who can explain the reason for submitting a planning application for the building of a shop onto the right hand side of the Village Hall without any consultation to the village? And why this was done without any consultation to the shop committee? [Anon](#)

A: Having seen the exhibition in the Village Hall last September, these plans were discussed by the trustees and committee in October. Our initial concerns were that the plans suggested the removal of trees next to the hall and that the planned size and position of the new shop may impact on the future of traditional events being held on the field. As a registered charity, the Village Hall relies on such events for fundraising, to ensure the ongoing maintenance and its continued running as a community amenity.

When we became aware that some Parishioners had raised a petition objecting to building on the field and expressing their wishes to preserve the green space in the village, we discussed as a committee how best to offer a compromise. We had no doubt that the community needed to maintain a convenience store and rural Post Office. We therefore agreed to explore an alternative siting on land owned by the Village Hall and the possibility of a purpose built extension to the hall which could be offered for the exclusive use of the CVSC and a new shop.

At this stage, a first draft of plans was drawn up to demonstrate what an extension could look like, where it could be positioned and what size was potentially possible. These plans were submitted as a pre-planning application for further feedback and advice, to satisfy the Village Hall trustees that such a project was feasible.

At the same time details of our discussions, intentions and copies of the plans were shared with the shop committee; which has led to the formation of a joint sub-committee between both parties to explore this opportunity. This group has already met this month and are working together positively to assess the suitability of such a plan. These plans are currently on display in the annexe

next door. If we jointly agree that the opportunity is viable, then further accord would be sought from the community before proceeding.

Q: The plans for a Community Store to replace the present village shop (which has been considering closure) has been widely known about and deeply researched for nearly 2 years; its proposals were exhibited in the village hall in September. These received broad endorsement from more than 80% of those responding to a questionnaire circulated to all households in our village catchment area. Why at this very late stage, is our Village Hall Committee now proposing that any new store should be sited as an extension of the Hall? Are they seeking to negotiate a partnership between our Village Hall and the Community Store Project? Or are they seeking to set aside all Community Store Project's very imaginative, hard, practical and convincing work, and to begin again from scratch?

[Adrian House](#)

A: As I have already mentioned, the Village Hall committee expressed concerns regarding the proposed position of a new shop. We agreed that we did not want to set-aside the hard work of the shop committee over the last two years, in completing copious research and building their business case. However, we also felt that we couldn't simply ignore the objections to the proposed site. So we agreed upon a course of action intended to offer an alternative or compromise that we hoped would be mutually beneficial to all concerned.

In answer to the second part of the question, we fully intend to work with the CVSC to resolve the issues at hand, namely to ensure the continuation of a community shop and rural Post Office service and to satisfy the objections of Parishioners to secure the continuation of community events on the green space. Ideally, our plan is to offer a site suitable to all concerned parties to help bring the CVSC's efforts to fruition.

Should the building of an extension to the Village Hall be agreeable and the project and all building work completed, the trustees do not intend to be involved in the management or day to day running of the shop. At this point, the feeling is very much that we would act more in the capacity of a landlord, offering use of the extension exclusively to the CVSC, whilst remaining responsible for the maintenance or any repairs necessary to the building much as we are with the existing building.

Q: Will all the parties, who are present today, agree to compromise any differences they have and proceed together as one community with building the shop/post office as soon as possible? [Annette Walker](#)

A: As I hope we have already demonstrated, the trustees and committee of the Village Hall are already working to reach a compromise and agree that subject to approval from the community, the provision of a new community store and Post Office should proceed as soon as practically possible.

Q: Does the Village Hall Committee (VHC) support the CSC's proposals for a new build CS? If not, why not?

A: Hopefully, we may have already answered much of this question, but obviously there are various plans on the table and our most recent ideas are on display in the annexe next door, all of

which would require building work. As I have said, our only concern was as to the initial planned position of the new shop and we hope the alternatives will be more acceptable to all. But ultimately, we support the fact that a new shop needs to be found, provided or built for the community.

Q: Has the VHC considered the location of the CS in the VH? If not, why not? If it has, is it in favour of such use? If not, why not? On what basis would the VHC be in favour? Has the CSC engaged in discussion with the VHC?

A: The short answer is yes. During the early stages of the CVSC's research, their subsequent feasibility study and business case, we offered the use of the annexe next door and that offer was discussed between both parties. At that time there were a number of sites under consideration but the potential use of the annexe was not taken any further at that time.

(It should be noted at this point that following the meeting, several parishioners advised that they were present at that particular meeting and wanted it noted that both the Village Hall committee and the CVCS jointly agreed that the annexe was not suitable as a retail premises for a number of reasons.)

As you have already heard, we are currently engaged with the CVSC about a purpose-built alternative as an extension to the hall.

Q: What is the composition of the VHC? What is its relationship to the PCPC? Are members of the VHC appointed by the PCPC, elected or self-appointed?

A: The Village Hall committee is comprised of members of the community, the vast majority of whom have signed to be trustees and are therefore responsible for the building, the land, it's finances and maintenance. They are primarily volunteers and new members are always more than welcome to join. Our declaration of trust requires that new members should be proposed/sponsored by an existing member and subsequently elected by vote by the existing members. The one exception to this rule is the Vicar of Preston Candover who our declaration states is automatically deemed a trustee upon taking up his office with the church.

We have no formal relationship with the Parish Council as such, although they often donate to the annual New Year's drinks event held in the Village Hall. Traditionally, a Parish Councillor has tended to sit as a trustee or committee member for the Village Hall, although this is not a requirement of our declaration of trust. Currently, we have two members of the Parish Council who sit on the committee. A full list of trustees and committee members is available by the double doors.

Other Questions

Q: Whilst we understand that the meeting has to be kept in order and in line with recognised procedural protocol - if there are comments/arguments made by the key groups how do those statements get challenged or supported?

A: I think if there are questions and the meeting is going well and is not over time then I don't have an issue with additional questions

Q: Will all questions submitted as requested in the notice of meeting be available at the meeting?

A: A copy should be available as you entered the meeting

Q: Will, with the consent of the Chairman of the meeting, supplemental questions by parishioners is permitted at the meeting? [If, as indicated in the notice of meeting, the meeting is a meeting of parishioners, and therefore not of the PCPC or of the VHC, there seems no valid reason why parishioners should not ask questions at the meeting.]

A: I think if there are questions and the meeting is going well and is not over time then I don't have an issue with additional questions

Q: Will minutes of the meeting be recorded and published? If so, by whom?

A: Wendy Simson will record minutes and there will be a list at the back of the hall for those who wish to get a copy via email to give their contact details

Q: It would be useful for those unfamiliar with the PCPC, the VHC and the CSC to have a list of their memberships provided at the meeting.

A: A list of the names of all those involved with the Preston Candover Village Hall Committee, Community Store Group and Preston Candover & Nutley Parish Council was available as you entered the meeting

Q: How did the petitioners choose which households to visit? And did they have the site plan with them to demonstrate the proposed area to be occupied by the shop? Anon

A: Basingstoke & Deane provided a map of the boundary area and relevant information required for the petition. The feedback questionnaire from the exhibition was ambiguous. The purpose of the petition was to submit to the Parish Council at their November meeting how many residents who are opposed to building on the field, which is leased from the landowner for recreational use for the community. The petitioners tried to visit as many households in the parish as possible in the short time scale available to them.

As the meeting was ahead of time the Chairman asked the community if there were any further questions. A concern was raised about the use of the annex to the village hall being used for the shop and it was felt that this option had not been fully explored. It was asked that the working party look at this option as well as building the extension.

The Chairman then asked the community if they would like to have a short break to look at the plans for the extension so that a vote could be held to give the working party permission to investigate this option. Following a short break the meeting resumed and a vote gave the majority to the working party reviewing the viability of these new plans and if so holding a further exhibition to again seek the community view.

The Chairman thanked all parties for attending the meeting and brought it to a close.

