Questions Raised at the Public Meeting

The questions have been grouped together under topics – not by author. All questions have been made anonymous as to their source. Following the request at the meeting, we refer to a 'Community Group' proposal.

Background and Options Paper

Question	Response
There is no context or background information provided. For villagers that have only moved in to the vicinity recently, this would be very helpful and should form part of any consultation paper that follows this paper. Could a short summary be provided by an independent party?	 The history part was kept to a minimum because we felt we should look forwards rather than back. The MadNews archive is a good independent source for those seeking history. Other than answering all the questions put to us regarding clarifying the consultation paper, we are not expecting to produce a further documents setting out options at the moment. We are keeping a record of all questions asked (and our response) plus other documents – you are welcome to look at this record. We would be happy if an independent third party was able to write a short summary. We would be delighted to help someone prepare a summary provided they were completely independent (eg of the Anson Trust, Tenants, Users, other landowners and people directly affected by the various options)
The village needs revival of its basic facilities. It needs a shop, a post office, an improved village hall or adequate central meeting point. We argue that the current recreation facilities are adequate for a village of this size. Villagers should be consulted on whether they actually want an all singing, all dancing sports facility or whether they would actually prefer a refurbished hall on the current site (this could be two storey so not to increase its footprint) and the maintenance of the field as is otherwise.	 As it says in the document, we are looking to provide initially equivalents of what we do already – not significant enhancements. However, we believe that it is sensible to build in the potential for growth and change as we expect that the needs of the village will change over the years.

The options paper does not reflect anywhere a holistic look at how any of these options might affect the village as a whole. For example, if significant additional housing was built the environmental impact (traffic, noise) not just on the neighbours adjacent but on everyone living here. In addition, have the Trust considered the impact of additional families moving into the area on demand within the school and pre school and the fact that the school is already struggling with demand for places? Have they considered that a developer may be required to contribute to any expansion needed?	 We are looking to deliver the Trust' charitable objectives in line with our legal obligations. These topics go outside that brief and the questions would be better addressed to another body – probably one of the Councils that serve Marcham. We expect that discussion of consequential impacts will form part of the planning permission discussions. We will not be seeking planning permission, the developer will be. We do not have the skills necessary to see a planning process through – nor do we have the money. From the Trust, we will be checking that developers have paid appropriate attention to planning issues and will only agree to work with a developer where they appear to have a though understanding of the local environment and a realistic expectation of obtaining planning permission. If planning permission to build on the field is not given, the advantages of selling the field are greatly reduced – and the option that requires planning permission for houses on the field is not financially feasible. You would have to talk to planning experts about how the planning process would generate money to resolve issues like the school (eg through section 106 agreements).
If 50 houses are built, there will not be room in the school.	See above regarding planning permission
The speaker has seen various changes causing Marcham to implode. He thinks Marcham could not cope with extra houses. He realises the trusts job is almost impossible but the village infrastructure cannot cope with more houses.	 If the development does go ahead we are talking about approx. 50 new homes in a village with a population of 2,000. It is difficult to see the village imploding because of this. Detailed discussion of impact would be part of the planning process – see above
Although there are a number of options discussed in the paper, it does not feel balanced. Planning information included is somewhat misleading and the paper is strongly biased towards Anson's Trusts preferred option. Would the Anson Trust consult on its preferred option and if so can they give a timescale for doing this?	 Unfortunately the logic leads you to a set of conclusions. That is a consequence of the logic – not of lack of balance. We have been trying to get people to discuss the future for some time (see MADNews over the last few years). We will continue to consult In terms of timescales, we have a few months – though we do not have a 'final' date by which a decision must be made. That timescale is driven by financial considerations.

An independent survey of whether villagers would support the building of houses on all or part of the Anson field would be useful as part of the consultation. The group feels strongly that planning permission would be unlikely to be granted if there is strong antipathy to the proposals, regardless of how the land became available.	 We are doubtful that a survey would be useful as we can't see how the questions that properly consider all the factors can be phrased. In particular, it is very difficult to phrase questions around the financial position of the Trust. The Directors have ultimately the duty to adhere to Charity (and other) law. We cannot relinquish that duty by hiding behind a survey (the legal guidance over this is on the MADNews website) See above regarding planning permission
Surveys are only as good as the questions.	We agree
Supporter of Community Group proposal: Concerning the Community Group proposal can a whole village survey be taken?	 If you carry out a survey, the village needs to have read and understood the proposal to answer.

Figures in the Options Paper

Question	Response
The group that considered this paper are not convinced by some of the detail on building costs. For example, the figure of £500k for the rebuild of a village hall facility on the Anson field seems unnecessarily high and more detail would be needed in a consultation paper.	 We can go over the detail of where this came from – most was based on an independent estimate. We do have to be careful that we don't underestimate costs as doing that could lead to an incomplete and inadequate building that is expensive to run.
Expected revenue from the new facility on the Anson field or elsewhere seems optimistic. We consider that the hall is likely to run at more like 60% occupancy for the majority of the time.	 The current position is that the trust's expenditure exceeds its income and cannot continue for much longer (12-18 months) without radical action. Our favoured proposal would generate enough money to do the following: Buy the land we need and pay the cost of legal and professional fees; Build a new facility and lay down the new sports fields; Provide a long-term endowment to secure the position of the trust. The exact numbers are commercially sensitive at the moment but are comfortably into the millions and are split roughly 1/3, 1/3 and 1/3 between each category above."

Ex-Serviceman's Club

Question	Response
What is the time scale for the Ex Servicemens lease?	The existing lease expires at the end of 2010.
Could the Anson Trust Directors confirm or otherwise whether the Ex-Servicemen are seeking to renew the lease on the Institute? Clearly this will have a significant effect on possible available options.	 We are about to start discussions with the ESC over the lease. We don't think it would be appropriate to say too much while those discussions are starting. As it stands, the rent does not cover the running costs of the institute and early indications are the that the ESC will want to stay in the building
What is the state of the Ex-Serviceman's Club lease?	 Renewal of this lease is covered by both the lease and the appropriate statutes. The ESC has certain rights to demand that the lease be renewed and to renegotiate lease terms.

External Fundraising

Question	Response
Regarding the Fundraising through Grants on page 13 of the document, have the Trustees had time to explore the wealth of information regarding funding that is available? What funding options apart from WREN have they considered in depth - in particular, how does the current Southern Oxfordshire LEADER programme view any involvement with developing a community based project especially since capital projects are being considered? The Trust believes that previous applications have been unsuccessful for 3 listed reasons - are these the definitive reasons given by the Grant awarding bodies or assumptions? How many Trustees are willing to devote themselves to grant applications and could this be an area where villagers could form a Working Party with the Trustees?	 We don't have a lot of written history over this. Many of the turn-downs came from our being unrealistic about the various criteria. There have also been a number of phone calls and meetings with the various bodies. We can go through our understanding of what the various grant bodies are likely to provide. We would be delighted to help anyone looking at grants and we can organise some of us to help.

Trust Structure and Finances

Question	Response
What is the purpose of the Anson Trust?	A copy of the Trust scheme is attached – that contains our objectives
Is there an 'in perpetuity' clause covering the use of the Anson Field?	 No – see scheme approved by the charity commissioners (copy is attached separately).
What has been the reaction to developments on the Anson Field in the past?	 We have already had complaints about noise on the field – caused by both 'formal' use and casual play. Our plan to install a 'play' wall' was stopped (in part) by concerns over disruption to neighbours.
Does the diocese hold the title to the land?	• Yes – we are in the course of the legal process to resolve this
What is the status of the field?	• The trust exists to provide facilities, not just to own the field.
Anson sisters wanted to leave the land in perpetuity.	 The field is not in perpetuity. The Charity Commission has been approached and is aware of the proposals. The trust has been allowed to spend some of its capital. The new scheme replaced the old scheme A copy of the scheme is attached
Who are the directors?	Directors introduced themselves.
Directors are not answering the questions.	• The questions are being answered where possible. The school will be part of the planning consent. It is not for the trust to consider.

Detail of What the Trust is Proposing

Question	Response
Can we provide better maps of what the Trust owns and what is to be done with the Anson Field and on any new development?	• Yes – we will provide these as soon as we have prepared them (but we can't afford to produce very accurate plans)
What is stop further building on the Anson Field?	 We will be looking to 'lock-up' the Anson Field's future as much as we are allowed to (possibly a long lease to the Parish Council)

Alternative Proposals

Question	Response
JA requested: Please don't call it JA's proposal.	Title amended to Community Group
Is it possible to set up a Friends of Anson Trust organisation? They feel the field should be kept.	 We would like to thank the author of the Community Group proposal. The trust has seen the Community Group proposal. The trust is willing to work with the village on it but time is urgent. The trust cannot stop pursuing it's own options but will help look at Community Group proposal's proposal in parallel. The group looking at Community Group proposal's proposal needs to work quickly.
Should the trust consider progressing on Community Group proposal's proposal now?	 The trust needs to consider the proposal when it is firmer. Time is a big problem.
Community Group proposal's proposal is not detailed. The Parish Council was asked if it would underwrite the trust.	The Parish Council need numbers to look at funding
Can the village undertake ownership of the field as has another village?	 Please give the name of the other village to the trust so they can enquire. We are happy to pass on any contacts we have got
How does one join Community Group proposal's group?	The proposal to be added to MAD news web site. It needs hard work to make it work.

Other Matters

Question	Response
Do we have any connection with the work being done in Hyde Copse?	 No – any questions should be addressed to the owner of the land.
Their children grew up in the village and used the field. They have strong memories of playing there and feel it should be kept as it is.	 Half the existing area would be retained – including virtually all the area used as 'casual' play area. This area would actually be increased in size as the cricket pitch would no longer be located on the Anson Field. There is an overall increase in open space and leisure facilities (7 acres in centre is reduced to about 3½ acres; area on edge of village is 10 acres; net increase is 6 acres).
She supports the trust directors. The trust has given a great deal of thought to the various options. Has the Community Group proposal been considered by the trust?	 Yes. We felt it was inappropriate for us to make such a proposal as it relies on others arranging the provision of finance We have only considered options that it can manage from its own resources. Being made by others, this proposal allows us to 'go outside the box'
On a proposal, 60 houses has been mentioned. How do we know this will not be exceeded? How do we know the rest of the field will not be sold?	 To limit houses, the trust would only sell enough land to accept a certain amount. There are clear planning rules including rural limits. JH confirmed this limitation exists. To ensure long term stability of the remainder of the field, the trust would consider leasing the land to the council for (say) 50 years.
Comment by Jane Hanna	 JH group met to discuss the trust's options. There is now another option on the table. JH wants to go back to the group to consider these. Her group would not make proposals but would survey Marcham.
Can the trust answer some questions from EN's list?	These questions will be answered later (and are included in this document). The trust need to consider and answer the questions collectively.

Next Meeting

Question	Response
Timing, can we have another meeting in a month.	These questions and answers will appear in MAD news.
	There are no plans for another meeting date.