

Cherhill New Village Hall CRTBO Consultation Statement

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Overview
3. Section 21 Consultation
 - 3.1 Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Community Right to Build Order (CRTBO).
 - 3.2 An explanation of how they were consulted
 - 3.3 Summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted
 - 3.4 Description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed order
4. List of Appendices

1. Introduction

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to demonstrate compliance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Part 6, Section 21, which requires a qualifying body to publicise a proposal and consult within the Designated Neighbourhood Area (DNA) and amongst other interested parties.

Section 22 of the legislation specifies that the qualifying body must:

“Publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area:

- (a) Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Community Right to Build Order (CRTBO).
- (b) An explanation of how they were consulted.
- (c) Summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted.
- (d) Description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed order.”

2. Overview

The project team has sought to involve the village community and other stakeholders at all stages of the project's development to keep them up to date with progress and provide opportunities via surveys, presentations, consultation sessions and village events to understand the proposal and contribute to its development. To engage with as wide a range of people as possible, the project team has used a variety of communication and consultation techniques both online, via a dedicated project website and forum, and traditional hard copy including posters, leaflets delivered to homes and articles in local publications. External agencies have also been consulted with their active involvement and advice being sought.

Full details of the consultations undertaken prior to the formal Section 21 consultation are in [Appendix 1](#). This appendix is a chronological narrative which outlines the consultation effort, the feedback received and the actions taken by the project team. The consultation effort culminated in the Section 21 consultation held in early 2018.

3. Section 21 Consultation

In compliance with Section 21 in Part 6 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, a period of public consultation was held between 5th January and 16th February 2018 inclusive.

3.1 Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Community Right to Build Order (CRTBO).

Using the media and methods outlined in Para 3.2 below, the consultation effort was targeted at:

- a. DNA
- b.

Mr Andrew Ainslie (landowner of the proposed site)
Wiltshire Council
Councillor Alan Hill (Wiltshire Councillor – Calne South and Cherhill)
Avebury Parish Council
Berwick Bassett and Winterbourne Monkton Parish Council
Calne Town Council
Calne Without Parish Council
Cherhill Parish Council
Compton Bassett Parish Council
Hilmarton Parish Council
Environment Agency
Wiltshire Fire & Rescue Service
Historic England
Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre
Natural England
Wiltshire Police
Scottish & Southern Energy
Wessex Water
North Wessex Downs AONB
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)

3.2 An explanation of how they were consulted

The consultation period was publicised on the Project website (Appendix...), in the local 'Villages' magazine (Appendix...), through postings on local Facebook pages and through the delivery of an explanatory leaflet (Appendix ...) to every address in the DNA. In each of these media the following were included:

- a. The nature of the CRTBO Proposal
- b. Details of where and when the proposal could be inspected
- c. Details of how to make representations
- d. The date by which those representations had to be received.

The consultation period was also covered in the Wiltshire Gazette and Herald (Appendix...).

Throughout the period of the consultation the following documents were made available to the public:

[Community Right to Build Order \(The Proposal\)](#)
[Archaeology Report](#)
[Area Designation Notice](#)
[Basic Conditions Statement](#)
[Consultation Statement](#)
[Environmental Impact Screening Decision](#)
[Habitat Report – initial](#)
[Habitat Report – update](#)
[Habitat Screening Assessment](#)
[Heritage Report](#)
[Planting Schedule](#)
[Transport Statement](#)

The documents were available for inspection and download on the project website and printed versions of the full set of documents were placed in the following locations:

Cherhill Village Hall
Calne Library
Bank House, Calne (Calne Town Council offices)
Additionally, 6 full sets of printed documents were available to borrow from the project team

The availability of these printed versions was publicised in the leaflet to all the addresses in the DNA, in an article in The Villages Magazine and on Facebook.

A viewing event, advertised by poster ([Appendix...](#)) and in the leaflet delivered to the addresses in the DNA, was held in the existing village hall over the 12th and 13th January 2018. At this event printed versions of all the documents were available to read and the project team were on hand to answer questions. Feedback forms were also available for completion.

A letter ([Appendix.....](#)) containing all the relevant details of the consultation period was also sent to each of the external bodies listed at 3.1b above.

3.3 Summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted

Responses were received from both residents of the DNA and external bodies. The responses from the DNA have been compiled into a single document ([Appendix...](#)) which has been redacted to preserve the anonymity of the respondents. The responses from the external bodies have been compiled into [Appendix ...](#). The responses were a mixture of support and concern or opposition. The latter have been summarised and responded to in the next section and, where indicated, used to update the Order. Some, including part of Wiltshire Council's response, pointed out errors inconsistencies or points for clarification which have all been used to update the Order.

The following list summarises the main issues and concerns:

- a. Adequacy of the car parking and possibility of abuse;
- b. The use of the CRTBO process;
- c. Little reference to cycle parking provision;
- d. Suitability of the planned location
- e. Concerns over ecology and habitat conservation ;
- f. Risk of facilitating new housing;
- g. Impact on Cherhill Conservation Area
- h. Impact on Tudor Cottage;
- i. Visual impact of the proposal
- j. Light pollution;
- k. Questioning the need for a new hall;
- l. Noise;
- m. Outsiders;
- n. Traffic congestion in Park Lane ;
- o. Concern over pedestrian access;
- p. Site entrance not in best location;
- q. Proposed hall is too big;
- r. Affordability of a new hall.
- s. Plans for the site of the existing hall

Each of the issues is described in more detail below with links to the respondents who made them. Where the responses have resulted in a change to the order this is also described.

3.4 Description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed order

3.4a Adequacy of the car parking and possibility of abuse

Throughout the various consultation stages, car parking has been a concern and respondents 2, 17, 20 and 23 also raised concerns, whereas respondent 4 was of the view that the new car park would bring a number of benefits to the village. A number of, in some cases conflicting, objectives have been requested by these and other consultees in the past :-

1. To provide sufficient parking for hall users to avoid any temptation to try to park in Park Lane;
2. To provide parking for walkers accessing Cherhill Downs when space is available and so reduce dangerous parking in laybys on the A4;
3. To minimise abuse of the car park.

Respondent 9 also commented on lack of lorry turning in the car park.

Number of parking spaces

The highest number of cars observed parked outside the existing hall is 36. This has been increased by a third for the new hall reflecting its increased capacity. The number of parking positions shown on the drawings is therefore 49, four of which will be marked as for the Disabled. This also conforms to the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan Car Parking Strategy which specifies a maximum parking standard of one space per 5m² of public floor area which equates to a maximum of 55 spaces. The Order has been updated to clarify this.

Car Park Access

The safest way to achieve objective 3 would be to have a gate or barrier on the entrance to the site. The site design will allow such a barrier to be installed in the future if the Village Hall Trustees deem it necessary but there is concern that such a barrier would cause inconvenience to hall users and could cause delays for traffic entering the car park. It is considered that such a solution should be avoided if possible.

In the consultation feedback, respondent 23 offered an interesting idea to split the carpark into two – one freely accessible and the other gated. This is an idea that has been considered in the past, is thought to provide the best compromise and can be achieved with the proposed layout. It is therefore proposed that, on entering the site, the parking area to the right will be open access and the area to the left will be gated. The open area will have 14 spaces (including 2 disabled) and the closed area 35 spaces (also including 2 disabled). The open area will have sufficient space for many hall activities but the hall hirer will be provided with keys to the closed area if they need to open it up. The Order has been updated to clarify this.

Lorry turning

The car park has been designed to comply with standard Wiltshire Council dimensions for parking and access - which would be quite sufficient for normal access and turning for cars and medium sized vehicles such as mini buses, long wheelbase vans, or even medium sized goods vehicles. It is not proposed to use oil for heating. The refuse collection bin area is located adjacent to the main entrance and it would be anticipated that the collection vehicle would directly pick up from there.

3.4b The use of the CRtBO process

Two respondents (20, 23) have criticised the project team for not following the correct process. The project team would like to make clear that we have taken advice from Wiltshire Council at all stages to ensure we are compliant with the legislation and they have confirmed this in their consultation response.

Respondent 7 expressed concern that the CRtBO process results in “circumvention of the planning process, which reduces the ability of residents and others to object, and removes the professional judgement of Planning officers”.

Whilst the project team fully respects peoples’ opinions this comment suggests a misunderstanding of the CRtBO process and this presents an opportunity to clarify the situation.

Firstly, nothing is being circumvented. A CRtBO must adhere to national and local planning policy just like a conventional planning application and Wiltshire Council have, in their response to this consultation stage, confirmed that the project is compliant. As a further check an independent Inspector will also be appointed, part of whose remit is to also check for compliance.

Secondly a CRtBO gives more opportunity, not less, to object. A planning application has one opportunity to object whereas a CRtBO has at least two plus a referendum. Most importantly, in almost all cases, a planning application can only be refused if it fails one or more planning policies. Objections raised by the Community that are not based on planning policy have limited effect. In the case of a CRtBO the local Community will have the opportunity through referendum to say whether or not they want the project to go ahead irrespective of planning policy and every vote will hold equal weight. The point of a CRtBO is to give local Communities more say in the planning decisions that affect them, not less.

Finally the Project Team would like to make clear that extensive help has been sought and obtained from a number of members of the Planning Department at various stages of the project and we would like to take this opportunity to thank them for all of their assistance. We have valued and acted upon their professional judgement on numerous occasions.

3.4c Little reference to cycle parking provision

Wiltshire Council’s response included a reference to cycle parking provision. Although 7, covered cycle parking positions are shown on the layout drawing on page 34 there is little other detail provided so an additional sub-section has been added to section 3.7 of the order.

3.4d Suitability of the planned location

Some respondents (11, 15 & 24) outlined their objection to the siting of the new hall in the proposed location citing aesthetic, practical and heritage reasons. The proposed location was not chosen arbitrarily, rather it became clear as the project developed that the proposed location was the only viable one. The proposal sprang from the landowner’s offer to donate a specific parcel of land for the sole purpose of developing a new village hall, but when objections were raised to the use of that site the project team undertook to

consider all viable alternatives throughout the village but, as detailed on the project website, none was found. All the other sites considered had limitations of size, availability or access: the possibility of a land swap was explored – potentially exchanging the donated land for another plot in a different location – but this option was neither attractive to landowners nor practical in terms of generating accessible alternatives.

The proposed location is the only practical option for the site of the new hall as it offers the space and accessibility needed. Recognising the concerns expressed, as the project has developed several features have been designed into the proposal to mitigate any potential adverse effect on immediate neighbours.

The Order has been amended as a result of the public consultation to amplify the reasons for adopting the proposed location and details of the efforts to mitigate any noise effects on immediate neighbours are detailed in a new Section 3.9.

Concerns over ecology and habitat conservation

The consultation feedback has highlighted some ecology concerns regarding the proposed site for the New Village Hall, in particular respondents 11, 20 and 23.

The site area is surrounded by hedgerows to the West and South aspects, and a well established adjacent shelterbelt to the North.

The proposed landscape plan will enhance and improve the shelter and screening of the new building, and create and encourage the development of a more diverse habitat that will be attractive to existing and new flora and fauna as well as a natural setting for the new building.

The existing hedgerows will be managed and maintained and, where specified in the landscape plan, further planting will be carried out to create an effective boundary and screening to the site.

The section of hedge adjacent to the proposed, widened carriageway of Park Lane will be coppiced and possibly, subject to the time of year and equipment available, could be "slipped" to create the necessary clearance for the works required. This will maintain the existing rootstock and, with further planting, will re-establish the cover and hedge with following seasonal regrowth. Slipping is a method that has the advantage of retaining a bigger percentage of established root structure and, carried out with care, develops an improved rate of growth. The method requires trenching to both sides of the hedge and sliding the complete soil and root profile the required distance. Suitable machinery will be on site to facilitate this.

During the building works the contractors will be required to protect and carefully manage the areas within the site that are not directly affected by the construction activity.

It has been highlighted in feedback (Ref. 23) that a dead, Great Crested Newt was sighted within about 60m of the site that required further investigation. This sighting was in 2012 and logged with Wiltshire Wildlife Trust. The sighting is referred to in the submitted Habitat Survey. The County Ecologist has agreed that it is highly unlikely that Great Crested Newts would enter the proposed site due to lack of suitable food source and habitat but nevertheless, following an extensive site survey, it has been agreed that further monitoring will be carried out prior and during construction work with necessary controls put in place if required.

The Bat Consultancy have carried out a further survey to the site and confirmed the existing habitat is of an agricultural pasture and if maintained as cropped grassland will resist any short term habitation that will be a problem to the proposed works.

Once the Landscape plan and work has been completed, it is likely to encourage a more diverse habitat with an enhanced variety of Fauna & Flora than presently exists.

Risk of facilitating new housing

Respondents 25 raised the concern that building a new village hall on the site could lead to more housing development behind it. This topic has been discussed many times and this presents an opportunity to repeat the response to this question received by email from the Spatial Planning Team at Wiltshire Council. The reference to blue site is the land for the proposed new hall and the yellow site is the land behind it :-

"You can never say that a site will never be developed but the development of a village hall on the blue site will not make it any more likely that the yellow site will be developed for housing. Refer to policies 1 and 2 of the Core Strategy – Cherhill is designated as a 'small village' and it is expected that only a limited amount of development would come forward as infill sites; infill is described in the Core Strategy as the filling of a small gap within the village that is only large enough for not more than a few dwellings, generally only one dwelling. The yellow site could not be described as infill development and therefore would not be in accordance with the Core Strategy.

Exceptions to this approach would be considered if they came via the neighbourhood plan process and if you wanted to, you could authorise small scale housing development for community benefit via the CRTBO route. However, if your proposal for the CRTBO is a new village hall only, this would not lead to housing development on adjoining land as it would not be in accordance with the Core Strategy."

Impact on Cherhill Conservation Area

The proposed location for the new hall lies outside the Cherhill Conservation Area but the site borders the Area immediately to the west and the proposed widening of Park Lane, together with any alteration to the hedgerow on the western border of the site, would affect the Area. This situation has been cited by respondents (Numbers 11, 13, 14 & 15) as a reason to oppose the project.

From the outset the project team have been keenly aware of the sensitivity of the proposed site and this is in no way diminished by the location of the site outside of the Conservation Area. As indicated above, great effort has been made to mitigate any impact on the area, including the Conservation Area itself.

The Cherhill Conservation Area Statement (December 1999) states:

"Conservation Area designation does not preclude the possibility of new development, but this should be designed to enhance or preserve the character or appearance of the area."

and consistent with the Statement, dwellings have been built and altered in Park Lane since it was adopted. The project team believes that the efforts already outlined above in dealing with Location and Visual Impact demonstrate the project's commitment to enhancing and preserving the appearance of the area, despite the new building not being directly subject to the Conservation Area restrictions.

The elements of the project which do directly affect the Conservation Area – the widening of Park Lane from the A4 to the site entrance and improvements to the hedgerow – are not felt to have any adverse effect. The road widening is a functional adjustment to an existing feature which will not affect the character or appearance of the area. The proposed enhancement of the hedgerow through coppicing and re-stocking, as outlined in the Planting Schedule, will preserve and improve the feature whilst softening the boundary.

Impact on Tudor Cottage

Respondent number 11 has expressed concern about the impact the development will have on Tudor Cottage, one of the oldest buildings in the village. This matter was considered by the Heritage Consultant as described in the Heritage Statement and it was found that the development would make a “neutral contribution to their (Tudor Cottage and Chalkstones) settings and significance”. Moreover when a planning application, submitted in 2010, to develop a small building in the grounds of Tudor Cottage, situated between Tudor Cottage and the proposed site, was turned down at appeal, the appeal Inspector did agree with Wiltshire Planning that “the proposal would not harm the setting of the listed building (Tudor Cottage)”.

Visual Impact

Several respondents (Numbers 7, 11, 15, 24, 25 & CPRE) suggested that a consequence of the building’s proposed location would be negative impact on the view from the elevated terrain immediately to the south. This concern had been considered but investigations were expanded to review the effect on viewing points from all directions towards the site. Section 4.3 of the Order details the thorough investigations undertaken and concludes:

“...the site for the new Village Hall has a wide zone of visual influence, however the physical backdrop and close relationship to the village’s built up limits will ensure that it will be assimilated as a logical built addition to the mix of man-made and natural features that already combine in this area. Indeed, the new building has been designed to echo its rural fringe location and wider agricultural setting.”

The concern was recognised early in the project and the project team have absorbed its importance both as concerned residents themselves and also from extensive consultation in the community as the project has developed. Ensuring that the design is sympathetic to its setting has been fundamental to the project and the work undertaken to achieve this is covered in detail in Section 4 of the Order. The project team are confident that the visual impact of the design has been assessed fully and the findings in Section 4.3.14 reflect this. Furthermore, the aggregate effect of the design and the mitigation measures outlined below led several respondents (1, 6, 16, 18) specifically to express their approval.

In terms of mitigation, several features have been incorporated into the design specifically to address concerns about visual impact and these include:

- A curved roof topped by a cultivated growing surface
- Use of the ‘bowled’ topography to enable the building to nestle into the site
- A planting schedule for trees and shrubs
- Wild flower meadow
- New hedgerows to the east and south
- A reinforced natural surface for the car park.

Light pollution

Several respondents (9,11,15) at this and previous consultation stages have expressed concern about light pollution from the site. Park Lane near the A4 is not one of the darker parts of the village as it receives light from the street lighting along the A4. One street light is located on the southern boundary of the site

Light from the building itself will be minimised in two ways :-

- The main windows will face East, away from existing housing.
- The much smaller windows on the West face will be partially covered by a timber rain screen.

The car park lighting.

The car park will benefit to some extent from spilled light from the A4 street light. Further, minimal lighting will be required. Wiltshire council has published Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01:2011 on its website and we would be looking to meet or exceed the requirements for its environment zone E2 (rural surrounding) in designing a lighting scheme using luminaires designed to minimise light spill into unwanted areas.

The order has been updated with these details.

Questioning the need for a new hall

Respondents 2,17 and 20 questioned the need for a new village hall. Other respondents 3, 8, 14, 22 have been equally clear that, in their view, a new hall is needed, a view supported by many others at earlier consultation stages. Section 1.4 of the Order lists the reasons for proposing a new hall and these have not changed. The current hall continues to receive enquiries from prospective new users and many have to be turned down. Parking and access to the existing hall for the disabled is as good as the current site allows but is below modern expectations and the car parking problem for the existing hall has no other solution.

The project team feel that the need for a new hall has been demonstrated and has wide support including from this formal consultation stage.

Noise

Several respondents have mentioned noise as a concern and Wiltshire Council have asked for more detail to be provided in the Order on noise. This has been done. See new section 3.9.

Outsiders

Respondents 17 and 24 have expressed concern that the New Village Hall will encourage use by outsiders to the village.

The Village Hall Trustees have always welcomed folk from outside the village and would hope to continue to do so. Some of the neighbouring, smaller villages do not have the space or numbers to make classes viable and by sharing our facilities with those from outside Cherhill we reduce travel distances and enable Cherhill to provide a broader and higher quality programme of classes and events to our own community.

At the same time the Trustees recognise that for some types of party, for example, hiring to people not known to the Trustees or without family in the village can occasionally cause problems. To manage such situations the Trustees for the existing hall have a system of

booking that identifies any potential concerns over the use of the premises, and are able to refuse any booking that might create a serious or adverse effect on the neighbouring village properties, together with a robust booking system that requires a paid deposit. In addition there are clear guidelines as regards hours, licensing, noise, and unsocial behavior and this has provided an effective control over recent years with any complaints mainly focused on the restricted access and parking issues in The Street.

The new Village Hall premises will have the same management structure as defined by the Charity Commission and it is not intended to change the use of the facility other than provide a modern fully equipped hall that offers many benefits and advantages to the existing users. Importantly it will encourage new groups to make use of the hall, which will provide a wider social inclusion of people from the village but also promote a wide range of activities for the benefit of the community and surrounding villages.

The existing hall has served the village of Cherhill well since its inception and modernisation in 1978. The aspirations of the Trustees at that time were the same as for this proposed scheme i.e. to provide a modern, clean, safe environment incorporating efficient and up to date design, with energy saving technology and the flexibility to encourage a more varied use by the community at large for the next generation.

Traffic congestion in Park Lane

Through this (respondents 2,15,20,23,24) and previous consultation exercises traffic has been raised as a concern particularly as Park Lane is not wide enough for cars to pass in both directions as there are no passing points other than residents' drive entrances.

It is recognised that the junction with the A4 is a bottleneck and can cause problems if a vehicle wants to turn into Park Lane at the same time as one is emerging. Hence the scheme includes for widening the junction and the first 50m of Park Lane up to the site entrance to remove this constriction. Respondents 10 and 14 felt that this would be a significant benefit to the village.

Park Lane has been described by various respondents as either the busiest road in Cherhill or the quietest. The truth lies somewhere in between. As expected the peak usage times for Park Lane are at typical going to work and coming home times, times when the Hall will not normally be in use.

A typical weekday, daytime event in the current Village Hall will attract 5 to 10 cars and there are typically one or two such events each day. In future we do not see classes or events getting much bigger but having two halls will allow more classes or events to be held. Car numbers in the future are unlikely to exceed 10 to 20 for the majority of classes. Some of the evening events can be bigger – WI meetings, Scouts, Beavers, Cubs, etc with 10 to 20 cars now rising to 15 to 30 in the future but these take place at times of day when other traffic is reduced. These movement numbers are doubled when we consider actual journeys, i.e. coming to and leaving from the hall, but as these are at least an hour apart we can say that at certain, mostly otherwise quiet, times of day movement rates will increase by at most 40 cars per hour for a few hours in the day but more typically less than half this.

Respondent 15 suggested that at peak times, between one event finishing and the next starting, these numbers would double to 80 vehicles within an hour. This does not reflect the normal pattern of usage and the Village Hall Trustees would ensure that bookings do not result in one major event starting straight after another has just finished.

A significant difference that Park Lane has over other lanes in the village is that it takes the traffic to and from Upper Farm. This is a mixed arable and dairy farm. In a typical day (outside of harvest) there will be two to three commercial vehicle (lorries or vans) and four tractor trips using Park lane. During harvest there will be more tractor movements.

Even when the hall is in use the nett effect on traffic flow will be assisted by the proposed widening scheme and even more so when it is not in use.

To put all of this into context a comparison has been made with studies into the capacities of rural roads. The Transport Research Laboratory has carried out studies of rural roads. TRRL Working Paper TSN 29R examined the capacity of single track roads and established that the capacity of such roads typically lies in the range 100-300 vehicles per hour (including an allowance of approximately 15% heavy goods vehicles), depending on the size and frequency of passing opportunities. The capacity of the widened section will be significantly higher. Even with the addition of a new Village Hall, traffic flows will not get anywhere near even the lower end of this range.

The Order has been updated to clarify this.

Concern over pedestrian access

Respondents 9 and 23 and Wiltshire Council have commented on pedestrian access and potential hazards associated with it.

As described in section 3.7, the proposed design and layout has been carefully considered in order to provide a 'level access' from all of the car parking area to the entrance doors, and then in to all parts of the new building, thereby allowing disabled users to access all parts of the building. This would be a significant improvement over the existing village hall that has a fairly steep ramp up from the road.

All parts of the proposed new building and its access would be designed to comply with Part M of the Building Regulations and would have dedicated disabled parking spaces and wheelchair access. This would be a significant improvement over the existing facilities.

The CPRE's response included the suggestion that signposts be erected around the village to direct walkers to the new hall. As a principle the Parish Council has tended to resist the proliferation of street furniture and the project team believes that the local community will have no difficulty in finding the new hall.

Changes have been made to the Order to provide more detail of what is proposed.

Site entrance not in best location

Respondent 9 has suggested that the location chosen for the entrance is simply the easiest rather than best. There is only one potential alternative to park Lane – the existing farm track coming off the A4 before the 40 mph zone starts. This has been ruled out mainly due to cost, estimated at £250,000 (caused by significant difference in levels between this location and the site), but also because it would require more land and because it is doubtful whether we could get Highways approval, Park Lane being their preferred option.

Respondent 23 has suggested moving the location of the entrance nearer to the A4 junction to reduce the length of widened road and consequently the risk of people parking in the widened lane. The following sketch has been provided :-

Traffic in Park Lane has always been treated as an important consideration in part because it has been a recurring theme in the various consultation stages. For those reasons the services of a transport consultant were employed and advice was sought from Wiltshire

Council Highways department. Both offered the same advice - that the existing entrance opposite the location to Oldbury Fields was the best. It is a safe distance from the A4 junction and minimises the chance of car headlights shining into the homes opposite at night. Having received the above suggestion Wiltshire Council Highways Department were consulted once more and the following email was received:-

"Having considered the below I am minded to adhere to the professional highway advice in terms of access location. 15m from a main junction is not acceptable and would encourage conflicting vehicle movements in very close proximity to a priority junction. Though I note the gentleman's suggestion that a footpath will encourage on street parking it is my opinion that the best way to accommodate visitors parking is within the site so every effort should be made to make sure that parking meets the required standards.

If you are minded to accommodate other resident's comments it may be possible to consider an access slightly further south than from the one proposed but it should be located at a minimum distance of 33m from the junction."

The entrance could be moved a little further South but that is unlikely to make any difference to the chance of people parking in the road and as mentioned above runs the risk of car headlights affecting the house opposite. The concerns about parking in Park Lane are taken seriously and the following steps are proposed:-

- Make at least part of the on-site parking permanently accessible;
- Investigate the introduction of yellow lines. This can only be done once the road has been widened but the challenges of getting yellow lines are well recognised. A fall-back position would be to have white lines which although not enforceable have been shown in other parts of the village to be a deterrent;
- Include signage to deter on street parking.

The Order has been updated to reflect the first of these. The other two points will be developed as the project progresses.

Proposed hall is too big

Respondents 7, 13, 23 and 24 felt that the proposed hall is too large for the village. In fact the dimensions of the proposed new main hall (key number 3 on page 34) is just 2.3m longer and 950mm wider than the existing main hall and the proposed new small hall (key number 4 on page 34) is the same width but 4.2m longer than the current small room.

The large overhanging green roof shown on the landscape and site plan drawings gives the appearance of a much larger building than it actually is - the roof overhangs by almost 3.0m on the east and west elevations to provide shading.

The overall external dimensions of the new Hall building are larger than the existing hall. The additional spaces are all resulting from feedback at earlier consultation stages where the need for plenty of storage space, proper changing facilities for the Theatre group and other users and more toilets were requested by many consultees.

The proposed plan form has been very carefully designed with a minimum of circulation space to keep the overall size of the building down, thereby reducing both the external impact and cost.

Affordability of a new village hall

In common with regular planning applications there is no requirement within the Community Right to Build Order (CRtBO) procedure to discuss funding of the project (see Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Part 6, Section 22). Wiltshire Council have also confirmed that the scope of the latest Consultation Document satisfies the CRtBO requirements and this is supported by reference to other CRtB Orders which have received approval elsewhere in the country and do not consider either build costs or funding.

Nevertheless, several correspondents (ref 7,9,12,17,20,21,23 and 24) have asked how the new village hall will be financed and this is clearly important to the Cherhill community as a whole. The following sets out to explain the current thinking. There is no intention to commit spending on construction before a path to full funding of the project has been identified.

Operating Costs

The existing village hall has been operated by the Trustees on a financially sound footing for many years. Hall hire fees are competitive with similar facilities in our neighbourhood and it is expected that this will remain the case with the new hall. There is little doubt that a modern building with adequate parking will prove even more attractive than the existing hall, successful though that is.

As noted elsewhere, potential users of the existing hall have fairly frequently been turned away due to overbooking. The provision of a useable second smaller room within the new building which can be hired by a wide range of users is expected to enhance total annual income.

Annual operating costs of the new hall are anticipated to be comparable with the existing hall. Its substantially more energy efficient building and heating system will result in savings, but these will be offset by potentially higher maintenance costs for the bigger grounds and cleaning requirements. Unfortunately, the net income from the existing PV panels will necessarily be lost since the Renewable Obligation registration cannot be transferred.

The existing hall is, and the new hall will be, owned and managed by Cherhill Village Hall Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO), registration number 1164373. The CIO is completely independent of the Parish Council and has no call on the precept, Council taxes or any other local taxation for support. This is not expected to change

Occasional fund-raising events have historically been held in the village hall to supplement other forms of annual income and it is hoped these will continue. Examples include auctions, plant sales and donations following the Theatre Group performances.

Capital Cost

The project team have commissioned a professional quantity surveyor to estimate the cost of building the new village hall project; this has been based on a detailed analysis of the current design.

The total project cost is estimated to be £1.4million. This may be itemised as follows:

•Building and internal services	£983k
•Car park and Landscaping	£134k
•Park Lane roadworks	£44k
•Services	£219k

These figures are the best available at this stage, and the following remarks must be noted:

- Detail design may change some assumptions

- Costs are likely to rise with general inflation
- Building costs, especially materials, can vary widely depending on local, national or even international supply vs demand
- Value engineering may identify the potential for more cost-effective construction methods
- The project team are keen to choose sustainable design and build methods where possible, but these can also affect build cost.

There is no doubt that raising this sum will be a challenge for our community. However many other similar size communities have successfully funded village hall projects in recent years and Cherhill with its successful and vigorous village hall organisation is up to that challenge.

We have a several advantages before we start:

- ↳ 40 years' experience at the existing hall demonstrates that there is consistent high demand for the facilities at competitive hire price levels.
- ↳ Once the new hall is operational the Trustees will sell the existing hall and site. The exact value is unknown but is expected to be approximately £1/4 million. This will be treated as a significant "community contribution" and will be pitched to potential grant funders as such. A bridging loan may be raised, contributing to new build costs, using the existing site value as collateral; such a loan would only be envisaged once sufficient funding has been secured to ensure project completion.
- ↳ The land for the new hall has been generously gifted by the Ainslie family. Apart from the resultant significant saving in project cost, the value of the land will also be treated as a "community contribution" when seeking grant funding from outside bodies.
- ↳ A successful outcome of the CRtBO process and referendum will strongly demonstrate community support for and involvement in the project, vital when pitching for grant funding.
- ↳ Cherhill village has a long history of charitable giving at community events and activities. Although the proceeds from such events can contribute only a small proportion of the total project cost, it will be important to demonstrate continuing community support during the fund-raising period.

Sources of funding

Reaching the current stage of the project has required substantial funding. This money has been successfully raised primarily from national Government sources (£49k) plus grants from the local Area Board (£5k) and donations from existing village hall activities (£10k) The project currently has no debt.

The bulk of the capital cost of the project is expected to be raised from grant funding from a wide range of bodies. Earlier research into availability of these funds revealed that applications will be entertained only after planning permission has been received; grant providers do not wish to commit funds to unconsented projects. Receipt of our Community Right to Build Order would become the equivalent of "planning permission" with the added advantage of demonstrable community involvement and support for the project.

If the CRtB Order is approved the project group will launch a major campaign of grant applications. A substantial number of charities and similar funding organisations have terms of reference which include supporting community projects and village halls in

particular. The group is keen to hear of potential sources of grant funding, but those which have already been identified include:

- National Lottery (various sub-sources)
- Other Lotteries
- Community First and their contacts
- Landfill Community Fund
- Bernard Sunley Charitable Foundation
- Village Halls Consortium and their contacts
- Village Hall Association and their contacts
- Trust House Charitable Foundation
- Garfield Weston Foundation
- ACRE (loans)
- Charity Bank (loans)

Existing Site

The current village hall occupies a site in the centre of the village. Concern has been expressed to the project team about plans for the current site if the new hall is built.

The current hall and the site on which it stands are owned by Cherhill Village Hall Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO). Once a new hall has been built and is in use by the CIO the old hall, and the site on which it stands, will no longer be needed. As the current site represents an asset of considerable value it is expected that it will be sold and the proceeds used in the financing of the new hall. The market value of the site is difficult to assess as it will depend on conditions in the property market when it is offered for sale. Similarly the use to which the site will be put cannot be guaranteed, but given its domestic location in the centre of the village it seems highly likely that it will be developed for housing. Once the site changes hands any change of use or development will be subject to the normal planning process.

