Website statements in order

No	Website point	Response for the meeting
1	Opening history The opening describes four acres allocated in 1861.	The Award allotted **five** acres. The present measured site is approximately 16,571 m^2, or 4.095 acres.
2	Committee meetings — counsel cost The Council approved £7,500 for legal counsel without three quotations.	Resolution 45/26, point 3, expressly applied Financial Regulation 5.12(i) for specialist legal services. Three competitive quotations were not required for this instruction under that decision. The £7,500 is an authorised maximum, excluding recoverable VAT, within the existing Planning Application Costs budget; it is not an amount already spent. Value for money still matters.
3	Committee meetings — number of questions The website describes 28 questions being put to counsel.	The decision also authorised consolidation of the questions with Bridget North and counsel, within the approved scope and cost limit: resolution 45/26, point 4. We have met and reduced them to a more manageable set; the wording is still being drafted. The original count should not be presented as the final instruction. Consolidation is intended to avoid duplication and unnecessary cost. The accompanying reference to Glebe Field is also a legal enquiry, not an approved exchange.
4	Committee meetings — dogs "for the first time, a request is made to lawfully permanently exclude dogs. Council approved this"	The Council has not adopted a dog ban. It is seeking advice about the existing byelaws and what restrictions, if any, could lawfully be introduced. **There is an ongoing dog-fouling problem, with people using and maintaining the Recreation Ground repeatedly having to clear up dog mess.** That affects everyone's ability to enjoy the ground, particularly children and people playing sport. The website should acknowledge this problem and the reason for seeking advice, while making clear that no ban has been agreed. It could also help by encouraging dog owners to pick up after their dogs.
5	Committee meetings — land and neighbourhood Counsel is being asked to explain the trust and the meaning of neighbourhood.	This makes assumptions about what counsel is being asked before the questions have been finalised. As explained at the meeting, the questions were to be narrowed down and refined before the final instructions were issued. The Council still needs to establish who is entitled to use the ground, what the wording of the 1861 Award means, and who may be charged, for which activities, and whether anyone is entitled to use particular facilities without charge. These are important questions that require specialist legal advice. As our barrister has explained, **village greens are something of an anomaly in English law**. Their legal position can depend on overlapping legislation and the particular ground's history and governing documents. That is why the Council needs specialist legal advice on this ground, rather than relying on general statements about village greens. Seeking clarification does not amount to deciding the answers in advance or changing who benefits from the ground. It is necessary to understand the Council's responsibilities and lawful options before making decisions.

No	Website point	Response for the meeting
6	Committee meetings — proposal An approval heading introduces the pavilion, two padel courts, parking, fencing and access charges.	We approved obtaining advice on the integrated proposal and authorised preparatory work. We did not approve construction or a final operating arrangement. The minutes expressly reserve those decisions until the council has been advised. The report treats padel as essential to the current proposal's financial model because **the income from the courts is intended to support the pavilion's ongoing running and maintenance costs**. The Parish Council cannot absorb those additional costs within its existing budget. Without the income from the padel courts, another reliable source of funding would be needed to cover the pavilion's running and maintenance costs. **The Parish Council cannot absorb those additional costs within its existing budget.** Meeting the pavilion's ongoing costs through the parish precept could require **a huge increase in what residents pay every year, which is not a feasible basis for funding the pavilion**. Any proposal without the padel courts therefore needs to explain how those costs would be met. **Funding construction alone would not make it financially sustainable.**

Website statements continued

No	Website point	Response for the meeting
7	Committee meetings — consultation and spending The request by 109 residents for consultation before further spending was refused; information sessions are offered instead.	The request concerned stopping expenditure until consultation. This established project has an approved budget, and progressing it responsibly requires spending on planning, surveys and legal advice. Halting all spending would prevent the advice needed to answer the legal questions. Previous engagement has taken place, and resolutions 49/26 and 50/26 approve a further presentation AND resident survey after planning feedback and legal advice. That is not a refusal of all consultation.
8	Committee meetings — correction request An approval heading sits above the Council's request for corrections and the campaign's statements about continued publication and consultation.	The Council asked the group to correct factual inaccuracies on its website. **Although some changes were made, further statements were subsequently published which the Council considers inaccurate or misleading.** Making some corrections does not resolve the issue if other inaccuracies are then introduced. Minute 48/26 records approval of **the Council's own response and request for corrections**. It does not record approval of the campaign's website or the commentary published alongside that request. The heading should make this distinction clear, so residents are not given the impression that the Council has endorsed those statements.

No	Website point	Response for the meeting
9	What is happening — clearance Tree and hedge clearance is described as damaging the site to make way for the scheme.	The published minutes record the reason for the entrance works. On 12 January 2026, minute 30/25, councillors identified overgrown trees to the right of the entrance that needed removing to improve sightlines when entering and leaving the ground, and requested three quotations. On 9 February 2026, minute 41/25, the Committee unanimously accepted Quote 2. The February minutes also record arrangements for a spring tidy-up with the greenkeeper; the 9 March minutes confirm that the Clerk and Councillors North and Simmons had met the greenkeeper about this. The clearance took place in March 2026. Describing the work simply as clearing vegetation to make way for the development omits the recorded entrance-safety and maintenance reasons.
10	What is happening — pre-application The website describes a pre-planning application and says its contents have not been published.	Seeking pre-application advice is a perfectly normal and sensible step, and forms part of the Council's due diligence before deciding whether to submit a full planning application. The Council is still awaiting the planning authority's reply, no response has yet been received to publish.
11	What is happening — regional facility CIL funding language about Winchester and surrounding areas is used to describe a commercial regional sports development.	This point has already been addressed in our earlier response. The CIL application was an initial attempt to explore funding for the project, and its wording explained the potential wider public benefits. The January minutes also record that the CIL officer recommended including those benefits in the application. The purpose remains to provide sustainable sports and community facilities for Owslebury. Visiting teams and some users from surrounding communities would help support those facilities. References to being self-funding mean generating income to meet running and maintenance costs, with any surplus intended to be reinvested in community sport. Continuing to present that funding language as evidence of an approved regional commercial sports centre is misleading. It takes an early funding application out of context and treats it as a final decision about the development.
12	What is happening — pitches and effects The proposal list includes football pitches; the impact list predicts loss of space, traffic, noise, lighting and effects on village facilities.	The Recreation Ground **already** accommodates football and cricket. These pitches are marked out on grass, remain unfenced, and there is no proposal to fence them. Listing them as part of the project does not mean creating additional enclosed facilities or removing that space from general recreational use. Any concerns about additional traffic, noise, lighting or effects on other village facilities should identify the particular proposed change said to cause them. They should not be presented as consequences of football pitches that already exist.

Building scale and remaining statements

No	Website point	Response for the meeting
13	What is happening — ownership and costs The site questions ownership, maintenance and possible financial exposure for residents.	These arrangements **have already been explained** in the Council's responses and minutes, including the work to establish a charity to manage the sporting facilities. The Recreation Ground remains owned by the Parish Council. The intention is for income generated by the facilities to support their running and maintenance costs, with any surplus reinvested in community sport. Funding and operating arrangements are still being developed, but that does not mean no explanation has been given. The website should acknowledge the arrangements already described and identify any specific outstanding question. A possible future cost to residents should not be presented as an agreed increase in the precept.
14	Scale of buildings — publication The section first says plans were not publicly released, then acknowledges newsletter publication and copyright restrictions.	The proposed pavilion layout and site plan were published in the September 2026 Parish Council newsletter. Residents can therefore see those proposals. Restrictions on reproducing the architect's drawings are a separate issue and should not be presented as meaning the plans are unavailable to the public.
15	Scale of buildings — entire scheme The entire 1,574 m^2 scheme is compared with the old pavilion alone to produce a roughly 23-fold figure.	The whole proposed scheme would cover approximately **three times the area of the former buildings and existing hardstanding combined, not 23 times**. The 23-times figure compares everything proposed with just the old pavilion, leaving out the former Scout hut and the existing hardstanding. The old pavilion and Scout hut together covered approximately **265 m^2**: 93 m^2 for the pavilion and 172 m^2 for the Scout hut. The new pavilion would cover **216 m^2**, so **the new building would be 49 m^2 smaller than the two former buildings combined**. Adding the existing 254 m^2 of hardstanding gives a previous total of **519 m^2**. The proposed total of **1,574 m^2** is approximately three times that area and includes the new pavilion, two padel courts, a multi-use games area and associated hard surfaces.

No	Website point	Response for the meeting
16	Our vision — smaller replacement A similar-sized replacement pavilion is advocated as meeting local needs and avoiding the scheme's drawbacks.	**The proposed replacement building is already smaller than the two former buildings combined.** Its footprint is **216 m^2**, compared with **265 m^2** for the old pavilion and Scout hut together—a reduction of **49 m^2**. Calls for a smaller replacement overlook the Scout hut that also stood on the site. This is a sports pavilion intended to support football and cricket. It needs suitable changing facilities for male and female players, showers, male and female toilets, accessible facilities for disabled users, equipment storage and enough space for people to move safely around the building. The design also needs to take account of **The FA and Football Foundation guidance and the England and Wales Cricket Board's safeguarding guidance**, including players' privacy, appropriate changing arrangements for adults and children, and protecting changing areas from public access and view. Simply describing a smaller replacement as "meeting local needs" does not explain how it would accommodate those sporting requirements. **Any smaller alternative would need to demonstrate how it could still provide these facilities safely and properly.**