

**Ascot Priory Meeting: Trustees' Informal Consultation of Congregation and Local Residents**

**17 October 2016, 10 a.m., St Gabriel's Meeting Room, Ascot Priory**

Fr Paul McLaren-Cook	Fr Paul introduced the Trustees and the meeting began with a prayer
John Booth (JB)	JB thanked those attending and asked Trustees to introduce themselves individually, saying something about the history of their involvement with the Priory.
The Right Reverend Jonathan Baker (RRJB)	RRJB is Bishop of Fulham, residing in London and with a long personal history at Ascot Priory, with great affection for the charity. Many years ago, he served as Curate of All Saints, Ascot Heath and regularly administered Holy Communion at the care home and visited the sisters at Ascot Priory regularly. Some time after this, he was Principal of Pusey House and brought Oxford University students to Ascot Priory on many occasions. He moved to London in 2013, when he became Bishop of Fulham. RRJB has known Ascot Priory very well for 25 years.
Reverend Peter Antony (RPA)	RPA is a parish priest in Kentish Town. He was an undergraduate and student who has visited Ascot Priory on numerous occasions, attending conferences and retreats at the Priory. He became a Trustee in 2015.
Reverend George Westhaver (RGW)	RGW is Principal of Pusey House and became a Trustee on taking up this position in August 2013. He has led a number of retreats at the Priory and is honoured to be connected.

<p>JB</p>	<p>JB has had connections with Ascot Priory since 1978 when he began to attend Pusey House as an undergraduate at Oxford University. He is Trustee of a number of Anglo Catholic charities, including the Shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham which runs the most popular Anglo Catholic retreat hostel which, he added, had been subsidised by £2m+ of donations and legacies over the last 10 years. He is also a Trustee of St Andrew Holborn, which operates an events business in the premises of a church in London and has considerable experience of the events and hospitality businesses and of charitable trading companies. He is also the Chair of the Board of Finance of the Diocese of Chichester, giving him a good overview of church finances.</p> <p>JB explained that some of the letters the Trustees had received were based on a number of misunderstandings and the Trustees wished to address these before inviting questions.</p> <p>The Trustees have entered into this consultation voluntarily as part of the first stage in considering the sale of the Ascot Priory buildings. It does not constitute the formal notice period required under Section 121 of the Charities Act 2011; it is simply for the Trustees to hear local feedback.</p> <p>JB thanked the congregation and local community for playing a part in the consultation. The Trustees have found it helpful to understand what aspects of the Priory's history and work people value.</p> <p>The Trustees felt that there was a misunderstanding about the process the Trustees are currently engaged in, as well as of the responsibilities of the Trustees under charity law and hoped the Frequently Asked Questions paper (FAQs) had helped to address these misunderstandings.</p> <p>The Trustees began considering the future of the charity when Mother Cecilia died. The Trustees had to consider how the charity would fulfil its objects, and they have been reflecting on the best way forward for several years. The question for the Trustees is what to do with Ascot Priory now that the religious order is no longer in existence there, especially given that the building is expensive to maintain properly and ill-suited to other purposes.</p> <p>The Trustees are sympathetic to the concerns raised by the local community, and there is not one concern expressed that the Trustees have not themselves shared as they have given thought to the future of the Priory.</p> <p>The Trustees wished to make it clear that the Priory is not connected to the care home. The care home is an independent business which simply happens to be a tenant of the Charity. The care home therefore cannot fulfil the objects of the charity.</p> <p>As for any possible conflicts of interest regarding the Trustees and other charities they may be Trustees of, these are declared and handled in line with the Charity's conflict of interest policy, and any conflicts are recorded in the minutes of Trustee meetings.</p> <p>There seems to be a misunderstanding that the Trustees do not know Ascot Priory well. JB hoped that the trustees had been able to reassure those attending that</p>
-----------	---

this is not the case.

JB then opened the meeting explaining that the Trustees would be happy to answer any questions.

Laurence Butcher	Mr Butcher is part of the congregation and of the support group. Mr Butcher was perplexed why lawyers were present. They had not invited the support group's lawyers as they felt that this would not be appropriate for a community meeting.
JB	JB explained that the Charity's lawyers were present to provide answers to any legal questions which might be raised by those attending.
Comment from the floor	<p>This lady explained that the time of the meeting was difficult for a number of people in the community. Monday morning at 10am was a time that many interested parties would have difficulty attending.</p> <p>The FAQs were provided late, would the consultation period be extended to take consideration of this?</p> <p>The Alpha course that uses the facilities at St Michael's at Ascot Priory is valued.</p> <p>Others in the community would like to have attended this meeting, however, the trustees only provided notice on Friday afternoon.</p>
Comment from the floor	It is arguable that having the care home on site and the charity subsidising this would be funding a charitable need. The commentator also questioned why solicitors were present.
Comment from the floor	<p>It was asked whether the meeting would be minuted, and it was confirmed by the Trustees that the Charity's solicitors would be doing this.</p> <p>Questions were raised over the legal process, and the requirements of section 121 of the Charities Act 2011.</p>
RRJB	<p>In response to a number of previous points –</p> <p>The Trustees had already extended the notice period considerably in response to the Support Group's earlier request. This is an informal consultation.</p> <p>The Trustees released the FAQs last week towards the end of the period of consultation so as to provide a response to as many of the points raised by the consultation process as possible. JB also noted that the support group's lawyers had sent a far larger bundle of documents the day after the FAQs had been sent out, giving the Trustees little time to take these into account.</p> <p>This meeting did not represent the end of the consultation period, but would inform the next stages.</p>

Sarah Rowley CRS (SR)	<p>In response to an earlier question, SR explained the legal requirements under Section 121 of the Charities Act 2011.</p> <p>Under the provisions of the Charities Act, the Trustees must give notice and invite representations from interested parties if/when a decision is made to sell the Priory buildings. This consultation is not the statutory notice required under section 121.</p> <p>The Charity Commission is required to sanction any sale of Ascot Priory. However, the Trustees have ultimate responsibility and a duty to decide on the ongoing management of Ascot Priory and what is in the best interests of the charity's beneficiaries.</p>
Cllr Isabel Mattick	<p>A relative of someone who has resided at the care home, a local councillor, and a director of the support group, Ms Mattick stated that the Trustees must have a meeting under the public notice requirement. Ms Mattick stated that this meeting was at short notice, was supposed to be for just the congregation and not the local community, and that the Trustees should be required to give further notice. Ms Mattick asked for another meeting to be called.</p>
JB	<p>JB explained that the Trustees are not obliged to call a meeting other than under section 121 of the Charities Act 2011, and they had called this and a previous meeting through courtesy to update and consult the congregation. The Trustee later decided to open the meeting to the wider community, rather than just the congregation, because of interest in the consultation. Unfortunately, there appears to have been confusion; the Trustees gave Fr Paul notice of the meeting previously and it does not appear that the meeting has been co-ordinated as they intended.</p> <p>JB commented that it was difficult to hold a meeting at a time convenient to everyone, but was reassured by numbers attending that the time was not inconvenient.</p>
General comments from the floor	<p>A number of people could not get the time off to attend the meeting. Notice of a further meeting should be required and there were general requests for another congregational meeting.</p>
Fr Paul	<p>Fr Paul explained that he understood this to be a congregational meeting and that it was only clarified to him on Friday that the meeting was open to the local community.</p>
Comment from the floor from Sebastian's Charity, a local charity to Ascot	<p>It is felt that Ascot Priory could have other purposes and could be very beneficial to the local community. The charity should maintain the Priory buildings for the reason they were gifted.</p>
JB	<p>JB explained that the charity was not a commercial enterprise, and it must act</p>

	within its charitable objects.
Cllr Peter Hayes	Councillor Hayes explained that the lack of notice for the meeting meant that he was representing a local resident who had asked that he attend on their behalf. Councillor Hayes asked whether and how the trustees had served notice on the local Council, Bracknell Council.
JB	JB said that he did not know by what means the Clerk had communicated with them but confirmed that Bracknell Forest Council and Wingfield Parish Council were aware of the consultation.
Jackie Lovell, Jamie Down	Ms Lovell said she is now comfortable walking around the grounds of Ascot Priory. The local churches are well attended, and there is potential for Ascot Priory to receive grants from local charities.  Ms Lovell explained that she understood the building could not be self-sufficient.  Ms Lovell also explained that a community asset order might be made over Ascot Priory. She explained that the Trustees needed to try harder. She asserted that Ascot was the second largest parish in the country.
Comment from the floor	The commentator is a manager of an events company and she felt strongly that there were more opportunities for educational use of Ascot Priory. Local schools could hold PTA meetings there for example; her son is at Cheapside School and she feels that it would be a possibility to hold school meetings at Ascot Priory. This lady felt that there were a number of opportunities to generate income.
Laurence Butcher	Mr Butcher stated that Ascot Priory is financially sound with net assets of £1.5m.  The question was raised as to how hundreds of thousands of pounds had been spent on professional fees and advice on how to dispose of Ascot Priory.  Mr Butcher felt that the FAQs contained no more than 'convenient statements'.
RRJB	RRJB wished to make it clear that until recently, absolutely no money had been spent on investigating a possible sale of Ascot Priory. Fees had been accumulated due to standard clerking and administrative fees (which the current Trustees had addressed and managed to reduce), and also in seeking advice on the maintenance of Ascot Priory, expanding the nursing home, and growing the retreat business.  Fees were always necessary to investigate maintenance, reconstruction and refurbishment of Ascot Priory's buildings.  The Trustees take their duties very seriously. RRJB said that accusations made in correspondence were untrue and unfair, and that some of the allegations made against the Trustees were wrong and deliberately misleading.

Comment from the floor	The charity's accounts, which were signed off by JB and RRJB, said that Ascot Priory is a 'going concern'. This commentator felt that Ascot Priory was a self-funding institution, it always has been and always will be.
JB	<p>JB confirmed that 'going concern' is a technical accounting term and was not in this context a description of the long term future of Ascot Priory.</p> <p>Ascot Priory had accumulated a deficit over the last eleven years of over £200,000 which would have been significantly higher but for a substantial legacy. There are unrestricted funds of only £160,000 remaining at the last year end, and the endowment fund of £1.5m, as referred to by Mr Butcher, is restricted and cannot be expended without Charity Commission permission and in any case, the income from it is vital to the running of the Priory</p>
Comment from the floor	<p>This commentator asked if it would be possible to raise funds for Ascot Priory, and offered her services to help raise these funds.</p> <p>She feels that Ascot Priory is a very special place and she feels that it should be kept as a legacy for future generations.</p> <p>Her community has raised a lot of money in the past, and a £200,000 deficit does not sound like a lot to her.</p> <p>Would it be possible for the Trustees to set another meeting for further matters to be discussed?</p> <p>The local people have not known about this process, and they would like to understand the reasoning of the Trustees by considering the minutes of their meetings.</p>
JB	<p>JB thanked the commentator for her input.</p> <p>JB confirmed that he would consult with the other Trustees about a further meeting. He understood the depth of feeling of the local community, and confirmed that he and the other Trustees have been through the same emotions.</p> <p>While considering the options for Ascot Priory, it would not have been appropriate to share the Trustees' deliberations publicly. The Trustee did not want to cause unnecessary concerns.</p>
SR	<p>SR confirmed that under charity law, Trustee board minutes are generally not disclosed, and that meetings of Trustees are closed meetings. To disclose board minutes could be problematic as some of the information within them could be legally privileged or confidential and a decision to disclose the minutes would hinder future full and frank discussion at board level.</p> <p>Charities with a large voting membership may have general meetings, and the minutes from those meetings are generally made available to the membership. This is not the case here.</p>

RRJB	<p>This meeting does not represent a 'last chance saloon'. The local community and the Trustees have not finished their conversations.</p> <p>The Trustees have no intention of having the site razed to the ground. This was a grave misunderstanding that had been put about.</p>
Comment from the floor	<p>This commentator felt that the care home was worth saving, as it has received an outstanding grading.</p>
RRJB	<p>RRJB explained that the Trustees had explored the development of the care home and of course wish to carefully consider the future of it and its residents.</p> <p>During his response, RRJB was asked whether the Trustees would consider the views of the care home, and RRJB said that of course they would. He was then asked does the care home generate income for the charity, to which RRJB replied that it does as the charity is its landlord.</p>
David Tanner, proprietor of the care home and tenant of the Charity	<p>Mr Tanner explained that a conversation had happened between himself and the Trustees which he felt might have been the catalyst for the conversation that the Trustees were having with the congregation and local community.</p> <p>Mr Tanner confirmed that the proposition he had put to the Trustees had indeed asked for an expansion in the care home's operation, which he felt was necessary. However, he had been wrong in his forecasts given that the care home had now been awarded an outstanding grading, which is rare in this country. This had been achieved without the further expansion.</p> <p>Mr Tanner felt that the Trustees and he needed to continue their conversation and that there were lots of options for the Ascot Priory site.</p>
RGW	<p>RGW confirmed that the long term lease over a greater part of the site proposed by the care home would not have been viable for the charity. It would have meant losing the building in which the meeting was being held, meaning the loss of that asset for the retreat business. The proposal from the Tanners would not have made a secure future for the charity and did not include any increase in the rent to be paid from the care home to the charity.</p>
David Tanner	<p>Mr Tanner confirmed that he and the Trustees had negotiated Heads of Terms in 2015, however they needed to talk further and discuss whether there was another option to demolishing St Gabriel's.</p>
Comment from the floor	<p>This commentator confirmed that she would be happy to actively help in securing the future of Ascot Priory. It was confirmed by the floor that a marketing plan had been collated and put to the Trustees.</p>
JB	<p>JB confirmed that the market for retreats was saturated so that the growth assumptions in this plan were unrealistic. The Trustees were having to be realistic about the future of Ascot Priory.</p>

Fr Patrick	<p>Fr Patrick is RRJB's successor as the Curate of Ascot Heath. He explained that he had only heard about the meeting on Friday. He remarked that he felt there was a lack of trust in the room.</p> <p>The consultation period and process may have been conducted according to the law, however he felt that further transparency would be necessary, and that perhaps this would need to be addressed as soon as possible.</p> <p>Fr Patrick confirmed that he was relatively new to the Parish. However, in this time he had felt very welcome at Ascot Priory and viewed the appointment of the current Warden as helpful, welcoming moderate not "lacy" Catholics to the site. Fr Patrick felt that a breakdown of the figures would be helpful to the consultation process.</p>
RRJB	<p>RRJB confirmed that the Priory's accounts are published on the Charity Commission website. RRJB quoted from the 2016 management forecast confirming that there is an anticipated income of £38,000 from the retreat business however the costs of running this, including salaries and direct retreat costs, would amount to £44,000.</p> <p>The Trustees are currently also budgeting £150,000 for the maintenance of the Priory in this financial year, and the deficit was budgeted to be around £100,000 on current projections.</p>
Comment from the floor	<p>This commentator explained that the greater awareness of the existence of the Priory was thanks to the Warden and Trustees' positive attitudes.</p>
RRJB	<p>RRJB thanked the commentator and explained that it was good to hear a positive attitude. The commentator replied that over the last 20 years, some residents had not realised that the Ascot Priory was there.</p>
Fifth generation visitor to Ascot Priory	<p>This commentator asked about the scaffolding that had been present at Ascot Priory for over a year, explaining that there had been very little work in her opinion to the buildings during this time.</p> <p>She then asked about the potential cost of remedial works being c£700,000, as quoted in the FAQs, wondering if there were other options.</p>
JB	<p>Confirmed that the Trustees have spent several years considering the expense of maintenance and refurbishment of the Priory together with various options for generating income with the objects of the Charity.</p>

RPA	<p>RPA explained that it was clear that there was little trust in the room. He felt that communication had been a problem, and that both the Trustees and the local community had been at fault there.</p> <p>He felt that there had been a fair amount of stirring of the issues, and of mis-information being spread.</p> <p>He explained that there were two simple facts.</p> <p>1. No decision had been made about the future of Ascot Priory and that when a decision is made it must be in line with the charitable objects of the charity. The Trustees are in the process of looking at other options.</p> <p>2. The Priory is not self-funding. The Trustees wish to find a positive future for a place they all have great regard and affection for and they have considered a number of models. However, the finances are nowhere near as rosy as perhaps is being portrayed to the local community.</p> <p>It is clear that trust needs to be built between the Trustees, the congregation and the local community.</p> <p>The Trustees wish to secure the future of the charity for the next 30-40 years, and RPA was not sure about the reason for the scaffolding which the last commentator mentioned, however it is difficult to discuss matters in this detail, when the real consideration is the quite significant issue of the whole future of Ascot Priory.</p> <p>RPA confirmed that the estimate for refurbishment was £735,000</p>
Comment from the floor	<p>This commentator felt that previous Trustees had not cared for the fabric of the building, and had ignored requests for work to be done.</p> <p>The feeling is that Father Ursell neglected the buildings, and that it is the ultimate responsibility of the Trustees to maintain the asset that is Ascot Priory.</p>
JB	<p>JB agreed that there had been a period of neglect of the buildings.</p>
Andrew Rajic	<p>Mr Rajic has lived in the area for 42 years. He is a history officer, working in heritage in the area.</p> <p>He had visited Ascot Priory for the first time recently as he had always thought that he had not been welcome. He asked that Ascot Priory be open to the local community and that another meeting be held in the future as others who wished to attend this meeting could not come.</p>
Further comment from the floor	<p>This local resident confirmed that he had worshipped at Ascot Priory for three years, and that he had taken Holy Communion at the care home.</p> <p>He asked also about the scaffolding that had appeared at Ascot Priory. He asked what work had been done, and whether this had been done to the correct standard. He then asked if a surveyor had been employed to look at this work.</p>

RRJB	<p>RRJB confirmed that the scaffolding had been put up to look at potential sources of damp, which of course required investigative action.</p> <p>RRJB had been up the scaffolding himself, and had looked at the historic neglect of the property. Surveyors had been employed, and it was those fees which had contributed to the figures mentioned previously.</p> <p>The Trustees commented that if it were just a case of preserving Ascot Priory as it is, then it might not be a problem on the scale the charity is currently facing. However, with historic buildings, repair bills will grow. The question is: does this maintenance need to be done by the Charity, or could another company or organisation take on the building to better effect?</p>
Comments from the floor	<p>This lady asked that everyone communicate and be more open and that everyone in this room should work together.</p>
Comment from the floor	<p>Ascot Priory had not just been a care home, in the past it had also been a school. There were different options that the community had not seen at work recently.</p> <p>A working party could be set up, to review school use and other options.</p> <p>Had the Trustees not already made up their mind, as they had previously mentioned 'mothballing' the church when the Chaplain retired?</p>
JB	<p>There had been confusion created by the advice provided by CP Law. There was also confusion about what would happen when Fr Paul retired, JB mentioned that the church might have to be 'mothballed' because of the expense of providing chaplaincy, however this was not a foregone conclusion.</p>
Comment from the floor	<p>When would the Trustees come back on the decision for Ascot Priory? It was felt by the community that there had been no surveyor or regular maintenance to keep the fabric of the property, and that RRJB was somehow responsible for this.</p>
RRJB	<p>RRJB confirmed that he became a trustee of Ascot Priory on the retirement of Fr Ursell in 2012, on Fr Ursell's 70th birthday. RRJB was not responsible for there having been no maintenance of Ascot Priory during Fr Ursell's time; He had not been a trustee prior to 2012. He was a co-opted trustee (as Principal of Pusey House) from 2012-3 and had become an elected trustee on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2013.</p>

<p>Daughter of a resident of the care home</p>	<p>This commentator feels that the care home is excellent, but knows that this is not part of the Charity.</p> <p>As a surveyor, this commentator recognised that professional fees are a necessary evil in order to maintain a good programme of maintenance of historic buildings. She went on to confirm that the trustees have a great asset, and with a long term lease to the care home, it may be that it is worth spending the money to secure the future of the care home.</p> <p>The trustees were asked to speak to David Tanner again about the future of the care home, and not to get rid of an asset which helps its residents.</p>
<p>RGW</p>	<p>RGW commented that it was frustrating being told that one's reasons for acting in a certain way are motivated by the exact opposite of one's motivation.</p> <p>The delay in this voluntary public consultation was to ensure the Trustees had properly deliberated on the future of Ascot Priory.</p> <p>The intention was not to jeopardise the future of the care home, and it was not through a lack of care for the residents, but to ensure that the Trustees did not undermine the confidence in the care home itself. The previous commentator, the daughter of a resident, agreed with this point.</p>
<p>JB</p>	<p>JB returned to the point that if the care home is to take over more of the land at Ascot Priory as it had proposed, then there would be less income for the Charity's own objects.</p>
<p>Cllr Isabel Mattick</p>	<p>Asserted that Ascot Priory is a listed building (Grade 2) and there is a question over the future of the burial ground of the sisters.</p>
<p>JB</p>	<p>JB confirmed that the status of the burial ground is very much a consideration of the Trustees, and that the Trustees have sought legal advice on this. This was not something that the board of Trustees would take a view on lightly. The burial ground is of course part of the Trustees' consideration.</p>
<p>RPA</p>	<p>RPA confirmed that it is important that the burial ground is maintained, and that the Trustees were agreed that the particular character of Ascot Priory must be preserved.</p>
<p>RRJB</p>	<p>RRJB confirmed that no decision has been made. The future of the Priory is the reason for this consultation. RRJB commented about "festival churches" in the Church of England, commenting that Ascot Priory is not and never has been a parish church. Ascot Priory is a Chapel of Ease that has so far continued worship after its original worshipping community ceased.</p> <p>Ascot Priory is a listed building, and as such there is no chance of demolishing the buildings. It was misleading to suggest this. The Trustees will consider what use is appropriate. This is not the only place in England where a building has outlived</p>

	the religious community.
Trustee of St John's the Baptist Charity	This commentator asked whether it is an economic reality that the trustees of a charity, under charity land law, must maximise the purchase price for the good of the charity's beneficiaries.
JB	Confirmed that the Trustees would look at other considerations apart from just a sale price, as part of the discussions. The property will not necessarily go to the highest bidder.
Comment from the floor	It was asked whether a decision had been made about the future of Ascot Priory. The commentator quoted from the consultation document provided on the charity's website which stated that the trustees had decided to sell Ascot Priory.
RRJB	RRJB confirmed that the Trustees' deliberations since 2012 had led them to the conclusion that Ascot Priory might need to be sold. This has led them to this public consultation, with a view to sharing these thoughts with the wider community.  Their action was not decisive, and a decision had not been made. The Trustees will look at all the options put forward to them as part of this public consultation.
Comment from the floor	It was felt that the Trustees had been acting in a "lukewarm" way towards the future of Ascot Priory.
JB	JB confirmed that the Trustees are considering the options, and that they would be delighted if the excellent care home could be maintained on site.
Comments from the floor	Perhaps it might be possible for a new trust to be created to invest the freehold of Ascot Priory?  Could part of the land be sold?

JB	JB confirmed that some correspondents had suggested that other parts of the property be sold and that the trustees had looked in the past at selling parcels of the land owned by Ascot Priory, but are not exploring this option at the moment because of the consultation with the local community. Consideration would continue to be given to other options including those raised in the consultation exercise.
Laurence Butcher	Why had the Trustees only received one quote for the refurbishment work needed to maintain Ascot Priory? It was then raised as to what level of surplus was necessary for the charity to continue to operate Ascot Priory? There is an asset of £1.5 million, would this asset be approved for expenditure by the Charity Commission? How much would need to be raised externally? It was posed what would “good” look like to the trustees? Mr Butcher said that whatever it was, the local community would “go get it”.
RPA	It must be borne in mind that the Trustees are not only there primarily to consider the financial viability of the Ascot Priory building, their aim is to further the Charity’s purposes for the benefit of its beneficiaries.
Comments from the floor	You cannot have one without the other.  A lady felt that the Ascot Priory buildings and the charity’s beneficiaries go hand in hand.
RRJB	It must be remembered that if the proposal is to spend the permanent endowment of the Ascot Priory charity, this reduces the total of the endowment, meaning that the income from the capital would fall. The income from the permanent endowment at present is c£40,000 per year, and if the permanent endowment is spent this would significantly reduce the charity’s income in the future.
Fr Paul	Fr Paul is reluctant to comment as he is an employee of the Trustees.  He felt it is important that the life of the Priory is maintained, and that there is a lot of goodwill in the room.  He felt it would be a good idea if the Trustees sat down with a group of interested parties and talk about the possibilities for the future of Ascot Priory in the form of a round table discussion.
Comment from the floor	Did any of the Trustees live locally?  The Trustees collectively confirmed that none of them lived locally and so the respondent asked if someone from the local community could be involved in the decision making process for Ascot Priory.  The Trustees confirmed that until very recently one of the Trustees lived locally, but had retired.

<p>Paul Jackson, local resident and musician</p>	<p>It was his view that there are seeds of viability for the future of Ascot Priory, following these discussions.</p> <p>He confirmed that he was not a legal expert, but there seemed to be ways of succeeding and that perhaps steps should be taken to look at this process from the beginning.</p> <p>There was high land value in this area (Ascot), and so demand for green peaceful places is high. It was important that the Priory was not sold simply for cash.</p> <p>Under the governing document, which is understood to be the scheme, it states that the property cannot be sold, nor can the Trustees vary the clause stating this. The Trustees must also spend the income of the charity maintaining the property.</p> <p>Mr Jackson asked for there to be further meetings and dialogue between the Trustees and the local community. There was a need for transparency and to understand the Charity Commission's correspondence with the Trustees.</p>
<p>The Trustees</p>	<p>The Trustees confirmed that they had been in consultation with the Charity Commission about varying the governing document of the charity.</p>
<p>Parish Councillor</p>	<p>As a Parish Councillor this commentator was cynical of most consultation processes, particularly in terms of planning permission.</p> <p>He would be keen to hear more, and for there to be another meeting. If a decision has not been made, perhaps the Trustees would meet with local people who are interested in the future of Ascot Priory. The local community wish to have a say in a decision which is more than purely a yes or no answer.</p> <p>It is requested that there is a further period of interaction.</p>
<p>RRJB</p>	<p>Closed the meeting with a prayer. The meeting ended at 11.45 am</p>