

Appendix C - Summary of Listing Process for Assets of Community Value

Tally Ho Community Pub, Newtown, Hungerford

Guidance for the “Assets of Community Value” Group in determining applications for nomination on the West Berkshire Council List of Assets of Community Value.

<p>A1. Is the nominating organisation an eligible body to nominate? The types of organisations eligible for making a nomination are currently defined in Regulation 5 of the Assets of Community Value (England) Regulations 2012 as below:</p> <p>(a) a parish council; (b) an unincorporated body— (i) whose members include at least 21 individuals, and (ii) which does not distribute any surplus it makes to its members; (c) a charity; (d) a company limited by guarantee which does not distribute any surplus it makes to its members; (e) an industrial and provident society which does not distribute any surplus it makes to its members; or (f) a community interest company</p>	<p>Evidence that the nominator is eligible to make a community nomination could include Articles of Association, Constitutions, Terms of Reference, etc., relevant to the type of body</p> <p>Unincorporated Body - Approved</p>
<p>A2. Does the nominating body have a local connection to the asset nominated? “Local Connection” is defined in detail in Regulation 4 of the Assets of Community Value (England) regulations 2012</p>	<p>Evidence for this could include relevant documents and maps</p> <p>Yes. All signatures to the unincorporated body live in Newtown, Hungerford.</p>
<p>A3. Does the nomination include the required information about the asset? This is set out in Regulation 6 of the Assets of Community Value (England) Regulations 2012 as follows:</p>	<p>The nomination form will be checked to ensure the required data is supplied</p> <p>Yes all information supplied. Plan of asset and owner details all provided.</p>

<p>(a) a description of the nominated land including its proposed boundaries;</p> <p>(b) a statement of all the information which the nominator has with regard to—</p> <p>(i) the names of current occupants of the land, and</p> <p>(ii) the names and current or last-known addresses of all those holding a freehold or leasehold estate in the land;</p>	
<p>A4 Is the nominated asset outside of one of the categories that cannot be assets of community value as set out in Schedule 1 of the assets of Community Value (England) Regulations 2012, as summarised as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A residence together with land connected with that residence 2. Land in respect of which a site licence is required under Part 1 of the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 3. Operational land as defined in section 263 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990(c). 	<p>Evidence of current and recent usage of the asset will be checked against known information including Planning history.</p> <p>No</p>
<p>IF “YES” TO ALL OF PART A MOVE TO STEP B</p> <p>IF “NO” TO ONE OR MORE OF PART A, INFORM NOMINATOR THAT NOMINATION IS INELIGIBLE</p>	
<p>STEP B - ESTABLISHING THE NONANCILLARY USE THAT THE APPLICATION IS BASED ON</p>	
<p>B1. Is the current or recent usage which is the subject of the nomination an actual and non ancillary usage?</p>	<p>Evidence of actual/recent usage- eg numbers of people making use of the facility; session rotas for local groups, calendars, usage history etc.</p> <p>NOTE 1: A working definition of “recent past” is “within the past three years”</p> <p>Was a public house approximately 12 months ago.</p>

	NOTE 2. A working definition of “non ancillary” is that the usage is not providing necessary support (eg cleaning) to the primary activities carried out in the asset, but is itself a primary, additional or complementary use	
If the current or recent usage that is the subject of the nomination is actual and non-ancillary, go to STEP C If not, PLACE ON LIST OF UNSUCCESSFUL NOMINATIONS		
STEP C - Determining whether the usage furthers social wellbeing or social interests	Note- nominations for “recent uses”, evidence will need to relate to the working definition set out above.	
Criteria	Evidence	Weighting
C1. Who benefits from the use? Does it meet the social interests of the community as a whole and not simply the users/customers of the specific service? Who will lose if the usage ceases?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies/approach of organisation using the asset • Numbers of users/members/customers • Testimonials of Service provided/ outcomes • Accessibility of asset (eg DDA compliance) • Equalities impact • Number of volunteer hours drawn in by the facility • Positive impacts on health and wellbeing • Positive impact on local natural environment and wildlife • Positive impact on cultural, sporting or recreational activities • Involvement in the community in running/managing it 	25% 25% awarded
C2. What aspect of the usage delivers a social outcome in the Council’s Policy and Budget framework?	<p>What services has the asset delivered to the community?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are these services referred to in the following? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Sustainable 	25% 25% awarded

	<p>Community Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Council Strategy o Local Development Framework o Local Transport Plan o Joint Strategic Needs Assessment o Plans relating to cultural, sporting and recreational interests o Other plans/policies 	
<p>C3. Why is the usage seen as having social value in the context of the community on whose behalf the application is being made?</p>	<p>Impacts on community pride, cohesion and sense of place- eg hosting community-wide events</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution of the usage to the specific community - eg to helping accessibility of services in that community • Positive impact on sustainable living • Positive impact on specific local communities and areas of need • Rural/urban differential impacts 	<p>25%</p> <p>24% awarded</p>
<p>C4. How strongly does the local community feel about the usage as furthering their social interests?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence supplied by local stakeholders to support the nomination requesting surveys, petitions etc • Evidence of soundness of process for gathering community feedback and views. • Reference to and evidence from Parish Plan/Community Plan or other local document as to the importance of this asset locally 	<p>25%</p> <p>25% awarded</p>

	• Evidence from Local Ward Members	
If the above meets a minimum scoring of 55%, go to Step D		
STEP D - Realism of future usage		
D. Is it realistic to think (for “current” uses) there will continue to be social use of the building or other land or (for “recent” uses) that it is realistic to think that there will be community use again within the next five years?		
D1. Has the building/land-take/space/legal requirement for this usage changed significantly since its initial use so that the asset is not fit for purpose?	Evidence could include changes to service requirements as shown in national trends as well as market testing and planning history	
IF NO to D1 above, PLACE ON LIST OF ASSETS OF COMMUNITY VALUE		
IF YES to D1 above, go to D2		
D2. Could the asset be made fit for purpose practically and within reasonable resource requirements and within timescales?	Outline Business Plans, survey reports, advice from Property Services, market intelligence; status and progress of proposals for taking over/managing the asset in future;	
IF YES to D2 above, PLACE ON LIST OF ASSETS OF COMMUNITY VALUE		
IF NO to D2 above, PLACE ON LIST OF UNSUCCESSFUL NOMINATIONS		
Decision made by Group	28 January 2013	
Date decision made	28 January 2013	
Date entered onto Decision Register	29 January 2013	
Date entered onto GIS		