

LOWER HEYFORD PARISH COUNCIL

VILLAGE HALL RELOCATION COMMITTEE

The Annual Meeting of the Village Hall Relocation Committee of Lower Heyford Parish Council was held on Wednesday 3rd October 2007 in the Village Hall starting at 7.30pm

Present:

Mrs Robin Hepworth	(Retiring Chairman of the Committee) (see Min 2. below)
Mr David Dare	(Vice-Chairman) (see Min 2. below) (LHPC)
Mrs Denise Ball	(LHPC/VHMC)
Mr Anthony Alder	(PFMC/S&S Club)
Mr Jim Cheesman	(Independent)
Mr Laurie Fray	(VHMC)
Mr David Nesbitt	(Mill Lane Residents)
Mr Roger Bowen	(Clerk)

2 members of the public

- 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** The Clerk advised of apologies received from John Varney and from Susan White.
- 2. ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2007/8** The Chairman explained that as she was now the Chairman of the Council, she felt it would be proper to stand down from the Committee and she and the other 2 Members of the Council present elected the Officers as follows and consequently the Vice-Chairman took the Chair, with Robin Hepworth remaining at the table to act as a stand-in member for Paul McLaughlin:
 - a) Chairman - Paul McLaughlin (in his unexpected absence)
 - b) Vice-Chairman - David Dare
- 3. MINUTES** - The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 08Jun06 were agreed and signed by the Chairman.
- 4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES** It was agreed that all matters arising had been included in the Agenda (*and have been indicated by shading*)
- 5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** The Members of the Council noted the reminder that they are required to declare any personal interest, and the nature of that interest, as appropriate during the meeting and DB took the opportunity to declare a personal interest as required by her registered interest of being the Council's representative on the VHMC, which she felt applied throughout the Agenda.
- 6. SALE OF EXISTING VILLAGE HALL** The Clerk briefly summarised the course of events since the last meeting, reporting that after lengthy delay, Corpus Christi College had accepted the Trustees offer of £2,000 to release the covenant (restricting use of land to purpose of a village hall), or so it had been thought, but it had transpired that the covenant was only being varied to permit use by Jehovah's Witnesses and in view of this JWs' Solicitor had advised against going ahead on that basis. Subsequently, JWs had attempted to renegotiate the price downwards to compensate, though ultimately they had decided both to accept the covenant and pay the agreed price, However in the meantime, the Trustees had held talks with another interested party, who wanted to relocate their Montessori Nursery School from London and consequently the Trustees had resolved that it favoured the Nursery School bid, because of the benefit it could bring to the village, and had invited a formal offer, which was awaited. The new prospective purchasers had been asked to increase the cost to cover additional legal costs and in the

event, the Trustees would endeavour to secure some specific benefit for the village by way of reduced school fees or perhaps free places.

7. RELOCATION PROJECT

a) **Public consultation questionnaire** - see Min VHRC 6h/06 - The Meeting received the Clerk's analysis of the 71 responses received and agreed that the results should be considered within their appropriate headings as indicated below:

i) Location [Min 6c(ii)(A)]

ii) Future of present Sports and Social Club building [Min 6c(ii)(B)]

iii) Size of new building [Min 6d(ii)]

iv) Facilities etc [Min 6d(iii)]

v) Appeal ratings in respect of the various anticipated usages [Min 6d(iv)(A)]

vi) Personal usage forecasts [Min 6d(iv)(B)]

b) Finance - The Chairman here agreed with the Clerk's view that until the sale (see Min 6. above) and the price to be paid were assured, it would not be practical for the Committee to make any firm decisions

i) Grant Aid-Trust for Oxfordshire's Environment - see Min 130.2 - It was noted TOE had indicated that the project would be eligible to be considered for financial support in the area of £25,000

ii) Fund raising - see Min 59.2a(iii)/06 - It was noted that since the 2006 Fireworks event, fund raising specifically for the Village Hall Relocation Fund had ceased and that wef the next event, the 01Sep07 Heyford Feast, fund raising had been consolidated by the Parish Council into a perpetual fund which may be drawn upon

c) King George's Field (agreed location)

i) **National Playing Field Association-consent to the erection of a village hall** - see Min VHRC 6c(ii)/06 - The Clerk advised this had been given, provided that the footprint of the building would not affect the recreational use of the Field, that the present building was removed and that the hall contained the necessary recreational facilities

ii) **Location within Field** - see Min VHRC 6d(i)/06 - There was a wide-ranging discussion of this issue, having regard to the following factors:

A) Questionnaire response indicating substantial support for the area of the S&S Club (see Min 7a(i) above)

aa) Vehicular access from Freehold Street - the Clerk would ascertain whether OCC would permit this

B) Questionnaire response showing a small margin in favour of incorporation of the S&S Club into a single facility, with a majority of those in disagreement opting for an extension to the Club - see Min 7a(ii) above)

C) Possibility that the new building might be located on the north side either within the present or an extended Field either close to Valley View or the old sewage works corner (with consequent implications for the existing S&S Club building)

aa) Preferred option - Agreed, in the event of the possibility materialising

bb) Present clubhouse - the Clerk would ascertain whether, if the development was to take place on the north side (see (C) above), the clubhouse would be able to remain and perhaps still be used for the changing facilities?

d) The Building

i) Pinelog Ltd - The Meeting received information concerning The Pine Lodge Village Hall at Little Milton and expressed interest in the possibilities of such a wooden building, with the Clerk being asked to try to ascertain the total cost of Little Milton's project

ii) **Size (interpreted as floor space)** - see Min VHRC 6d(iii)/06 - It was noted that the questionnaire response (see Min 7a(iii) above) had indicated almost equal support for 'about the same' and for 'larger' in comparison with the existing hall

iii) **Facilities** - also see Min VHRC 6d(iii)/06 - It was noted that the questionnaire response (see Min 7a(iv) above), which apart from some minimal negativity, had been categorised as follows, with primary issues raised within each being shown as far as possible:

- A) Rooms within - kitchen, meeting and main/function rooms attracted all of the comments except 1
 - B) Indoor sports and pastimes - badminton and a stage the most popular proposals
 - C) Toddlers/teenagers/in-betweens and OAPs - in-betweens attracted most interest
 - D) Miscellaneous - TV provision was the most popular suggestion of the few which could not be otherwise categorised as above
 - E) External - parking and patio/seating area the only items raised
 - F) Other - some broader comments
- iv) Usage
- A) Categories - It was noted that the questionnaire response (see Min 7a(v) above) had indicated predicted usage as follows in **descending** order: Indoor sports (**dependant upon provision of facilities**); Public meetings (**Parish meetings, OCC/CDC meetings for the wider area etc**); Public entertainment (**Touring theatre companies, CDC arranged events etc**); Meetings (of organisations) (**Parish Council, WI etc**) and Functions (**Private parties, wedding receptions etc**)
 - B) Personal use - It was noted the questionnaire response (see Min 7a(vi) above) had indicated that 50% of respondents would be likely to use the new facility with only 2 stating that they would not and the remainder registering as 'possible' users
 - e) Merger of Village Hall and King George's Field charities - see Min VHRC 6g(i)/06 - It was noted that the Council had been advised of a number of options in this respect by the Charity Commission and had resolved that consideration of these should be deferred pending receipt of guidance from the NPFA and satisfactory progress with the sale (see Min 37.2c); and it was agreed that this business should be conducted by the full Council in view of fundamental questions of ownership involved.

8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING It was agreed that the Clerk would be delegated to call the next meeting as and when appropriate.

The Committee having no further business, the Chairman closed the formal meeting and asked the members of the public whether they had any questions or comments.

There were no questions or comments in this respect and the Chairman closed the meeting at 9.05pm.

..... Chairman