



## **DRAFT Minutes of the Urchfont Parish Council (UPC) Full Council meeting held in Urchfont Village Hall on Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> August 2022**

**Present:** Councillors: Botham (MB – Chairman), Hollyman (MH - Vice-Chairman), Turner (MT), Bamber (SB), Holt (SH), Moscrop (PM), Rotherford (JR),

**Members of the Public (for all or part of the meeting):** Mr. M Taylor, Ms K Sibley, Mrs N Mitchell, Mr. A Stephens, Mr. P Scarfe, Mr. P Cook, Ms V Bedford

### **A. INTRODUCTION**

- 1. Welcome by the Chairman** – MB welcomed all to the meeting and asked that all input be kept to a minimum in view of the very hot weather. MB also took the opportunity to thank David Stevens, who has recently resigned, for his support, contribution and participation whilst on the Council.
- 2. Apologies** – Councillors Gibb (HG) and Rotherham (PR)
- 3. New Councillor Applications** – BL confirmed that whilst he was aware of three people who are actively considering submission of applications, none had been received to date.

**B. PLANNING** – See Separate Minutes

### **C. AUGUST COUNCIL MEETING**

- 1. Declarations of Interest** – None declared at the meeting.
- 2. Time set aside for Public Participation and External Reports**

**Mr. Taylor** made two points, firstly that Redhorn News articles are becoming far too political which he does not agree with and secondly that the Chair of the Village Hall had not been informed in advance that the Doctors Surgery is on the agenda tonight. BL commented that this subject was raised and minuted at the June meeting and published on the agenda for this meeting.

**Mrs Mitchel** gave an update on defibrillators as follows:

“In 2011 we purchased 4 defibrillators for the Parish and in 2014 acquired a 5<sup>th</sup> for Urchfont outside Urchfont Vehicles Garage to create a better spread through the Village. During this time they have been removed from the cabinets and taken to a casualty but up until now they have never been used.

However, earlier this month, the one at Urchfont Vehicles Ltd Garage was needed for a resident on Townsend. The machine reported that a shock was needed and it was delivered. The patient was immediately revived and taken by ambulance to Great Western Hospital Swindon where he remained for 4 days. He and his family are extremely grateful that the defibrillators are installed in the Parish as in this instance it certainly contributed to saving his life! Due to this they have made a very generous donation to the Urchfont defibrillator Fund. The Defibrillator Group are delighted that the outcome was positive and thank them for their generosity.

We should like to thank the Parish Council for including funds in their annual budget for maintenance items of defibrillator pads and batteries. A spreadsheet was created in 2018 for annual requirements up until 2027/28. The machines themselves are guaranteed for 8yrs so they are now over that period. Hopefully they will continue to perform for several more but we do need additional funds to cover this eventuality. We currently have £2000 in an account within the Parish Trust.

We are now able to hold CPR training, chest compression only, no mouth to mouth so we are holding a demonstration on September 24<sup>th</sup> in the Village Hall at 10am. Further details will be published in September edition of Redhorn News and in posters around the Parish nearer the time. If you would like to take part for the first time one as a refresher will be delighted to see you. You could help save a life.”

Mrs Mitchel was supported in her presentation by the patient in question. Mr. Stephens thanked all those involved in this particular incident which saved his life and praised the group who regularly support and maintain all the defibrillators in the Parish – Nicky Mitchell, Alison Taylor, Anthea Donald and Clare Milanés.

MB stated that UPC will undoubtedly consider additional funding for replacement defibrillators as and when necessary, each costing around £1k.

### 3. Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 8<sup>th</sup> June 2022 (No meeting in July)

**MT had previously commented that his remarks under Item 13 had been misrepresented in the minutes by using the phrase ‘merely an excuse’ in the third paragraph, he had actually said that he did not want to be ‘fobbed off’.**

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
<b>Subject to the above amendment being made, to approve and sign the minutes otherwise unchanged as a true and accurate record of the meeting.</b>	<b>MB</b>	<b>PM</b>	<b>AGREED with one abstention due to not being at the meeting in question.</b>

**4. Action List Status Review and Update Reports from the Minutes of the meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> June 2022** – BL displayed the current listing of outstanding actions on the screen and then reviewed each one. The following were closed: 17/21 – UPEG Terms of Reference; 25/21 Discussion of Wedhampton to Planks Farm Footpath; 2/22 – Plan for planting Farmers Field scrape; 15/21 – Research rules on selling logs; 21/22 – Check on facts re building numbers; 33/22 – Draft and send letter to doctors surgery. All other actions were considered to be ongoing and would be reviewed at future meetings.

### 5. Finance

**a. Financial Statement and Bank Reconciliation as at 31<sup>st</sup> July 2022** – to receive and ratify spend details in June / July

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
<b>To ratify the list of individual payments made during June and July 2022 as shown on the Bank Reconciliation Statement</b>	<b>PM</b>	<b>MB</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

**b. Funding for Redhorn News (Paul Scarfe - Treasurer)** – Mr. Paul Scarfe (Redhorn Magazine Treasurer) made a presentation to Councillors based on the content of the statement attached at Appendix III (Website Version only) but basically seeking a contribution from UPC of £700 to cover 2022 production and distribution costs.

Mr. Scarfe noted the comment made earlier by Mr. Taylor regarding the political nature of some articles, PW added that one of his contributions had been stopped because it was considered political even though it actually reflected factual information published in Wiltshire Council minutes. He also considered that several other articles recently published by Redhorn had been political – he stressed that ALL articles selected for publication should be NON-POLITICAL. MB said that he will write to Redhorn News emphasizing this very important point.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
To approve a 2022 contribution of £700 to Redhorn News	MB	PM	AGREED unanimously

c. **Funding proposal for electronic speed signs** – MH reported that the earlier public meeting to discuss speeding attendees had been asked to rate the potential options to improve the perceived local situation, installation of electronic speed indicators on the B3098 came top of the list. A meeting will be held shortly with the WC Highways Engineer to discuss the best locations for these. SH indicated that he is opposed to signs displaying the speed of cars, these have been shown to encourage some individuals to see just how fast they go and then post pictures on line, he preferred faces or some other picture. PM highlighted the fact that if solar powered signs are going to be installed then these should not be in a shielded location as is the case of the sign on the A342 which no longer works.

JR questioned why more use is not made of mirrors at blind junctions such as at the Blackboard Lane / B3098 junction. PW stated that mirrors are NOT legal and can be dangerous, cyclists and pedestrians can easily be missed in particular.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
To approve a budget not exceeding £4k for electronic speed signs	MH	PM	AGREED unanimously

d. **Request for donation from Wiltshire Citizen's Advice** – the letter from Wilts CAB had been distributed to all councillors with the agenda. BL stressed that the letter was not specifically addressed to UPC and that the Council had made contributions of £100 in the past. SH emphasized that the current cost of living crisis is likely to increase the work of CAB and recommended that UPC does make a contribution of £200..

Proposal	Proposer	Seconder	Resolution
To make a contribution of £200 this year in view of the current financial situation.	SH	MB	AGREED unanimously

## 6. Lead Councillor, Working Groups, Clerk & other written Reports (attached at Appendix I on website version only)

a. **Clerks Report** – no additional comments made

### b. Councillor reports

i. **Highways Report** – MH emphasized that the last survey identified 51 issues for resolution, WC have addressed a large percentage of these, including drains and white lining, and the list is now down to around 20 outstanding.

ii. **Farmers Field** – no additional comments made

iii. **Urchfont Pond** – MB reported that Eric Alquist, a microbiologist is running the pond on a day to day basis in consultation with himself. Mr. Alquist has some good ideas on the way forward to try and minimise or even eradicate the blue-green algae, he intends to give a report at the next meeting.

7. **UPEG** – Mb commented that a lot of effort is being put into planting out wild flower areas, good reaction from the community in general. Malcolm Smith is moving the orchard forward in The Croft, MB made the following proposal in this respect:

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Proposer</b>	<b>Secunder</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
<b>To approve a budget of up to £300 for The Croft project.</b>	<b>MB</b>	<b>SH</b>	<b>AGREED unanimously</b>

It was agreed that MB, SH and MT would visit Bill Donald to discuss the Wedhampton pond, PM to organise the visit.

**ACTION: FC/37/22 – PM**

MB stated that Royston Thomas is coordinating activity to remove the two bushes from the entrance to The Orchard to facilitate better vision for motorists. MT expressed concern with the proposed removal as these bushes are a haven for house sparrows to nest.

<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Proposer</b>	<b>Secunder</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
<b>To approve a budget of up to £250 for the removal of bushes from The Orchard</b>	<b>MB</b>	<b>PM</b>	<b>AGREED, with one abstention</b>

**Post Meeting Note:** Subsequent to the meeting MT asked that the council reconsider the removal of the pyracantha bushes at the entrance to the Orchard because of a serious loss of habitat and source of food for a variety of birds. Councillors have considered Malcolm’s request and as a result the planting scheme will be modified to retain the benefit to wildlife that the bushes provide.

**8. Neighbourhood Plan & Housing Needs Assessment** – See Appendix II (attached on the website version only) MB stated reiterated that the Housing Needs Survey Analysis has now been received and conforms to a statutory 1one size fits all’ Wiltshire Council format. It was completed by 20% of residents. Despite several anomalies in the report, the UPC Working Group is broadly in support of the recommendations as it addresses the current need for 5 affordable homes and provides scope for the future of a further 3 affordable homes. This can be revisited at a later date if necessary. MT stated that whilst WC have understood his response, there response is that it is what it. In response to a question from JR, MB stated that as Council feels that numbers are about right that the neighbourhood plan review will now move forward to the next stage.

**9. Devizes Gateway** – SH stated that based on the Strategic Outline Business Case delivered in 11/21 and accepted by Department of Transport in 6/22 the project has now moved to next stage.

As the SOBC submission was successful through the Restoring Your Railway process, the DfT has indicated that any local funding secured during the development stage will be taken into consideration when deciding whether to build the scheme.

Funding of £400,000 has been provided by DoT to develop the case and that might be submitted in 3/23. The study will be made up of two main elements. The first of these will focus on Devizes Gateway and look at station infrastructure requirements, train services and station transport connections, such as bus services including the Urchfont Community bus and cycle routes. The second element will focus on Westbury station and look at a strategic vision and timetable planning. The proposals meet the council's business plan objective to have well-connected communities.

UPC will need to consider funding once the Gateway Station is approved and he wondered if it might be a suitable place for UPC CIL funds to be used, particularly to improve foot and cycle access to the station.

It is anticipated that construction would begin in 2025 and the new Devizes Gateway station would be operational in 2027. Trains will reach Reading via Pewsey, Hungerford & Newbury.

Elizabeth line trains leave Reading Station approx.. every 10 minutes at peak times and get travellers to the city of London and a lot quicker than before.

**10. Future of Urchfont Doctor’s Surgery** – MB had spoken to the Chair and separately with the Treasurer of the Village Hall who is currently negotiating a rent extension with the Surgery to 2027. In the

circumstances it is not considered appropriate for the Council to write separately to the Surgery at this time, the position will be reviewed with the Village Hall in due course.

**11. Request to locate a memorial seat around Urchfont Pond** – BL had distributed emails on this request to all councillors prior to the meeting. MB stated that the applicant had visited him at his house and was keen that the seat should be located around the Pond. Unconnected to this application, it was noted that Community view had been expressed that no more seats should be located around the Pond as they tended to hinder rather than help community events. It was stressed that colour of the seat may be an issue, the preferred colour being green. It was also noted that the seat should be secured to the ground in some way, others sit on concrete plinths. Discussion concluded with two votes as follows:

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
1. To approve a new seat to be located around Urchfont Pond	MH	None	No Vote Taken
2. To permit a new memorial seat at an agreed location within the Cemetery, on Top Green or in the Recreation Ground	MB	MH	AGREED unanimously

**12. Renewal of application for registration of The Lamb Inn as an Asset of Community Value** – BL explained that UPC had previously made a successful application, the validity of that application has just run out. BL had distributed a copy of the completed 2022 application to all councillors prior to the meeting, in addition he has copies of the required Land Registry titles to submit as part of the new application. No comments were made, consensus indicated the need to submit the application.

Proposal	Proposer	Seconded	Resolution
To submit the new application	PM	SH	AGREED unanimously

**13. Update on Current Issues not covered by above agenda items**

- i. **Provision of wood for winter fires** – MB reported that Phil Milanes had proposed the provision of fire wood to assist households during the current financial crisis. MB suggested that this could be provided from Farmers Field, although the wood needs to be dry to meet legal requirements. It was agreed that PR should discuss further with Phil.

**ACTION: FC/38/22 - PR**

- ii. **Recreation Ground Shelter** – SB conformed that she is hastening Lee Acton to repair the roof of the shelter as he had agreed to do but with no action to date, MB agreed to speak with Lee.

**ACTION: FC/39/22 - MB**

**14. External Meetings** – None reported

**15. Other Reports from Councillors**

- i. **First Responders** – JR commented that a very effective scheme was adopted where he previously lived in Scotland, but not adopted locally. He had spoken to Nicky Mitchell who had commented that training and administration of such a scheme is onerous and so was not keen to promote locally. PW commented that South West Ambulance Service do have 1<sup>st</sup> responders, it was agreed that JR should investigate further.

**ACTION: FC/40/22 - JR**

- ii. **Speed Watch** – MH reported that he had made contact with Speed Watch coordinators at an event in Corsham, he will now make further contact to try to reestablish the Urchfont group.
- iii. **Metro-counts on B3098** – BL asked PW if he knew anything about the recent set of counters on the B3098 near Ballingers, UPC had not asked for these. PW agreed to investigate.

**ACTION: FC/41/22 – PW**

**16. Items for Future Agenda**

- i. **Review and redistribution of lead councillor roles** – MB & MH will review these in advance of the meeting

**Date of Next Meeting: Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> September 2022 - 7.00pm Village Hall (Conference Room)**

**There being no other business the meeting closed at 9.10pm**

## APPENDIX I TO AUGUST 2022 UPC MINUTES

### a. CLERK'S REPORT

i. **Finance** – Copies of the Financial Summary and Bank Reconciliation at 31<sup>st</sup> July 2022 will be distributed to all councillors prior to the meeting. The accounts are in good order. Due to minor changes in requirements and processes, the internal auditor has asked that Council formally accept spend at future meetings each month.

ii. **Internal and External Audits** – The internal audit has been completed without comment or observation apart from that noted above. The AGAR and supplementary information has now been submitted to the External Auditor (P K F Littlejohn) for review and approval.

iii. **CPRE Best Kept Village Award** – Following judging, Urchfont has come SECOND in the Lawrence Kitching competition this year, the winner was Bratton. Details have been circulated to councillors and will be published in the September issue of Redhorn News.

iv. **Use of Parish Land - Approvals** – I have approved applications as follows in accord with UPC Policy:

- Candles Round the Pond – 26<sup>th</sup> August 2022 with set up on 25<sup>th</sup> and removal on 27<sup>th</sup>
- Primary School Fund raising on Top Green between 3 and 4pm on Fridays during the summer term only in 2022 and 2023

v. **Councillor Vacancies** – There are now two vacancies following the recent resignation with immediate effect of Cllr. David Stevens

### Bob Lunn, Clerk to the Council

### b. Councillor Reports

i. **Highways Report** – The last UPC Highways Survey was completed in June 2022 and submitted to Wiltshire Council (WC) – the full report can be seen on the website under 'Latest News' on the Home Page.

WC have since been busy repairing the surfaces around Top Green, The Orchard and several other roads around the Parish. The lines team have also refreshed the areas missed last time, notably Manor Close, the school yellow zig zags and the B3098 Townsend SLOW sign. We are pleased to say that all these items reduce the number of outstanding issues in our original report, and the many reported blocked drains are scheduled for clearance at the end of August.

### Cllr Martyn Hollman

ii. **Farmers Field** - Mike McDonald and Martin have identified several trees originally thought to be ash with dieback that are in fact Sycamore. The bark on both trees is very similar during the autumn/winter months, but now they are in full leaf they can be better identified.

As a result, there are approximately 30 less trees that need to be felled, leaving approximately 100 ash trees to be felled and processed. We are still hopeful to have all the ash felled during 2022.

We will be hiring a chipper again during the autumn to clear the growing piles of brush.

We have another new volunteer who has recently moved to Urchfont and is keen to help. He will join us today for the first time.

Martin Follett has also recently been trained and qualified as a tree feller via Oakfrith.

This takes our total number of qualified tree felling FF volunteers to five.

## **Cllr Pete Rotherham**

### **iii. Urchfont Pond**

- Eric Ahlquist (EA) has taken over the role of Pond Keeper. His background and training in microbiology is already proving very useful and enlightening ( see the attached report on the use of Alum in potentially solving the Blue Green Algae problem )
- EA and MB have been investigating new products to the market for both the removal of silt and blue green algae. More to follow at the September meeting.
- The brown / red algae has stopped rising to the surface of the pond – Eric is monitoring this and taking regular water quality measurements for nitrates, phosphates ammonia and PH.
- To reassure residents the water flowing into the pond in front of the duck house is recirculating water – not fresh water.

## **Cllr Mark Botham.**



## APPENDIX II TO UPC AUGUST 2022 MINUTES

### DRAFT PARISH HOUSING NEEDS REPORT JULY 2022

This report is published in full on the Parish Council Website under 'Latest News' on the Home Page.

#### Notes of a meeting to discuss the Draft Housing Needs Report Produced by

#### Wiltshire Council -Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> July 2022

##### Present

Mark Botham

Simon Holt

Martyn Hollyman

Malcolm Turner

#### Key Points

1. All four councillors had reviewed the document prior to the meeting. MT had analysed the report in great detail and took the group through his findings.
2. The survey was undertaken by 20% of the households in the village and is considered by Wiltshire Council to be a good representation of the village's views and statistically relevant.
3. The report only refers to affordable housing
4. A lot of the anomalies identified by the group relate to the way in which the report is compiled and the analytics developed. All the queries identified will be fed back to Wiltshire Council (WC). However, as the report is used nationally the group felt that the feedback from WC would be limited and make no substantive difference.
5. A number of significant differences were highlighted for feedback to the council including:
  - a. The survey asks people to consider houses by type : semi-detached, Detached, bungalow, flat etc. The report classified dwellings by bedroom number.
  - b. Graphs on pages 8 and 9 show different numbers for those not wanting to change their existing home at some point.
  - c. House prices were taken from the whole of the SN10 postcode. However, house prices in Urchfont are considered to be 10% to 20% above the average for the Devizes area.
  - d. The full report back to WC will be made public once it is completed
6. The survey result recommends that 8 dwellings of different sizes should be built in the affordable homes category.
7. All 4 councillors felt that taking into account the experience of the last five years since the Neighbourhood Plan was made and the findings of the report that 8 dwellings made sense and "felt right"
8. The next steps are to send comments back to WC, WC to respond with an updated document which the working group will put forward to UPC for approval at the August UPC meeting and subsequently make public.

**Cllr Mark Botham**

**FEEDBACK ON URCHFONTS PARISH HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY REPORT JULY 2022 SENT TO WILTSHIRE COUNCIL** - As Planning Lead for Urchfont Parish Council (UPC), I have been asked by the Neighbourhood Plan Update Group to comment on the Urchfont Parish Housing Needs Survey Report - July 2022, compiled by Wiltshire Council.

UPC wanted to generate reliable and accurate information on new housing requirement in the parish (including affordable) to inform the Neighbourhood Plan review process.

I understand that the survey is of a standard format that has been approved by central Government and, hence, not targeted specifically to the residents of Urchfont Parish.

Having read through the Survey Report with its summary and recommendations, I have a number of questions and concerns about the methodology and analysis of the survey results. I have summarised these below:

**1. Clarity of survey focus** The title of the survey is "Urchfont Parish Housing Needs Survey", however, the survey introduction states that survey was carried out to establish if there is **"a proven need for affordable housing in the parish"**. For those unfamiliar with the survey and its aims, the introduction should make it clearer that the survey is in two parts:

Part 1 pulls together the demographics and opinions of existing residents.

Part 2 covers the aspirations of certain households to either remain in the village in different accommodation or to move into affordable or social housing if they qualify to do so. This should not be confused with a proven 'need'.

**2. Base of respondents** The number of households in the parish (560) was taken from the 2011 census. This information is obviously 11 years out of date.

Between 2011 and 2022 an additional 41 houses have been built, this takes the total to 601. This information would not have been difficult to source from Council data and alters the response rate (117 responses) from your 21% to 19% assuming that only one survey is completed per household.

However, having asked some villagers if they participated, it has become clear that some households completed multiple surveys. It is therefore inaccurate to use the term 'households' when referring to responses. By allowing more than one survey per household, not only are the results biased towards those with strong views, the base number of households participating in the survey is effectively decreased.

**3. Survey distribution and methodology** The survey was only available online which has created a bias towards those respondents who are comfortable with this methodology. The opinions of respondents who would have been happy to complete a paper survey have not been included.

**4. Report structure** For those unfamiliar with the questionnaire, it would have been helpful if the questions had been included as an Appendix, as well as a heading for every chart. In addition, where bases were very low, the number of respondents should have been given rather than as a % as the latter is very misleading.

**5. Part 1 - Number of new houses 'supported' by existing residents (chart 6, 7a and 7b)** It should be re-iterated that the results shown in these charts are purely the opinion of those existing residents who answered the survey. Care should be taken using the word 'supported' when this is a small sample and not representative of the views of the whole village.

The scale on the X axis of Chart 6 does not give a true reflection of the results. In my view, each column should reflect the same number of houses i.e. 1-10, 11-20, 21-30 etc. By presenting the data in the way you have, it appears that many more respondents support 11-20 homes than 1-10. This is not the case - in fact they are within 1% of each other. The column for 'no houses' should be put at the left hand end of the X axis - not at the far right.

The results shown in Chart 7a and b (the type of affordable houses supported) are also confusing. Respondents were allowed to give multiple answers. However, as these were not ranked it is not possible to ascertain the true preference.

**6. Part 2 – Households Requiring (Affordable) Accommodation in Urchfont** Only 13 respondents completed this section, therefore the results should not have been expressed as % - the base number of responses for each chart should have been given. Giving a 'median gross income' and 'median savings level' of these individuals is totally meaningless.

As 4 of these respondents already owned their own homes and one refused to supply financial information, the base for the affordable housing conclusion is only 8 households.

You concluded that these 8 households 'would require public assistance' to achieve their required housing. Were these respondents asked if they are actively seeking alternative accommodation or do the results merely reflect an aspiration to move whilst not being able to afford to do so? A case in point is the fact that one 'affordable property' was for sale in Manor Farmyard, Urchfont for the requisite 6 months earlier this year but was unsold as no eligible buyers came forward.

According to your summary, the 2011 Census states that 62 social homes were recorded, representing 13% of the total housing. This equates to a total of 477 households in the village. However, you have already stated that there were 560 households in 2011 - why is there a discrepancy of 83 dwellings? There also appears to be some confusion regarding the number of social homes in the village - perhaps you can confirm?

According to the report summary, there are 5 households currently on Wiltshire Council's housing register. Assuming that these households have proven eligibility, this information provides the most useful piece of data supplied in the report, reflecting genuine housing 'need'.

**7. Conclusions** There are a number of factors in the design of the survey and analysis of the results which lead me to question the validity of the results and cast doubt on its usefulness to inform the Urchfont Neighbourhood Plan review.

- The survey is of opinion and aspiration vs fact
- Households had the opportunity to complete multiple surveys while others were excluded by virtue of the survey methodology
- There appear to be inconsistencies and inaccuracies in some of the data and the charts
- A legitimate affordable housing need could not be proven by virtue of the very low base of responses in Part 2 and insufficient / unpublished qualifying data.

At the beginning of the report, in the Parish Summary, it is stated that "an impetus of new development could positively benefit the parish and reinforce the viability of existing services". However there is no evidence or data to prove that a further eight subsidised rented / shared ownership / discount market homes in the village would support this statement.

With over 1000 residents in Urchfont and a development of 13 new homes shortly to be built at Hales Farm, there are already more than enough people in the village to ensure the viability of the facilities providing that residents are willing to use them or be involved.

**Cllr Malcolm Turner - Planning Lead Urchfont Parish Council 25/7/22**

## APPENDIX III TO UPC AUGUST 2022 MINUTES

### REDHORN NEWS- INFORMATION FOR URCHFONT PARISH COUNCILLORS (08/08/2022)

Management Committee

Rev. Richard Curtis, Joan Barnett (Editor and Advertising), Paul Scarffe (Treasurer/Advertising) Brian Taylor (Photographs), Michael Dolan (Overall Distribution Manager), Louise Woolley (Distribution Coordinator for Marden, Chirton and Conock, Wilsford and Patney).

History: Redhorn Team of Churches set up in 1990, led by the Rector, Ivor Hughes - he lived in Urchfont Rectory and led the Management Committee of The Redhorn Church Magazine. The original ecclesiastical parish was Urchfont with Stert but the new Team then included Chirton and Conock, Marden, Patney and Wilsford.

After a few years the team producing News and Views ( a magazine for Urchfont) asked if they could join with the Redhorn News because a lot of information for the residents of Urchfont was in both magazines. Initially, this approach was refused. A few years later the situation changed when Urchfont Parish Council and News and Views both requested that a new magazine should be produced. The Parish Council wanted to attain the status of being a higher-level Parish Council. This necessitated all residents receiving regular reports of the Council's meetings, activities etc. Councillors then agreed to pay 500 annual subscriptions so that every household in Urchfont, Wedhampton and Lydeaway would receive a 'free' monthly copy, delivered by the existing Church Magazine distributors. All other Individual subscribers or Parish Councils to pay at the same rate. This system still remains - the present annual subscription remains at £6 and Urchfont still receive 550 monthly copies. Chirton and Conock Parish Council and Wilsford are the only others to pay a lump sum subscription. The other villages collect from individuals who wish to subscribe (this is much easier to organise in the smaller parishes.

When the Redhorn News came into existence of ceased being solely being 'the church magazine', becoming a magazine for all members of the communities who live in the parishes already mentioned.

It was also agreed that Urchfont's Annual Subscription would be paid in the following way:

The Parish Council - 6 months

The Scarecrow Festival - 4 months

The Community Bus - 2 months

This system remained in place until the Covid 19 Pandemic arrived and led to a severe impact on fund raising etc. In 2020, there were two editions which were solely online, and questions were raised about financing future editions, fund raising, distribution etc. The status quo has more or less been restored but there are some issues which still need addressing if the magazine's future is more certain, not the least being finance and I am here to request further funding from your Parish Council to help to ensure this.

A few other pieces of information to be aware of:

1. The magazine has always been run as none-profit making by a Team of volunteers. No one, including all members of the Management Committee are paid. Any profit is used to improve the magazine, doing such things

as purchasing software to improve the quality of having more colour photographs etc.

Pre-pandemic some UPC members suggested all copies be online. Extensive research continues to show this to be very unpopular. 172 individual online subscribers out of a total of 920. Only 11 requested just an online copy- adopting a new system would cause some distribution problems.

Urchfont's current contribution for the year currently stands at £900.

Last year's average printing cost for the 12 editions was just under £670 a month. The latest two editions for a 36-page magazine cost £606 to print (Sarum Graphics, Salisbury).

The last UPC payment in 2021 was £1375.

---

Predicted minimum shortfall £600 - 700.

---

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to update you on the current situation.

Paul Scarffe

Treasurer of Redhorn Ne



