

The following risks have been identified and an appropriate mitigant proposed against each risk. Please note that not every risk can be mitigated but, where possible, we will seek to minimise the risk or, seek to insure. The 'Working Group' will continue to review and update the Parish Council (PC) on any further risks as and when they are identified. The risks identified to date being:

- 1) **Lease** – the cost of the lease over the 30-year term is a nominal £10 per annum rent with inflationary increases on the 10th anniversary thereafter. Given the relatively low base cost for the rent, the impact of high inflationary increases remains minimal. Furthermore, the lease would only remain in place for the full 30 years if the project was able to secure the funding required to develop the site. If it doesn't raise the funding within 5 years of signing the lease, the lease is cancelled. A member of the Working Group has agreed to make a donation to the PC to specifically cover the first 5 years of the lease.

Update – as proposed by the Landlord at the Village Meeting on the 25th February 2021, the lease will include an option to extend the lease for a further period on the proviso the Village is making good use of the facility and wishes to continue to do so.

Should the PC wish to take legal advice on the lease then it will need to appoint its own legal advisor. Given this is a friendly and largely risk-free venture for the PC, we do not see this as being a necessary course of action. The landlord is a local resident who is highly regarded by the community and looking to support the community in the best way they can.

Update – the Working Group through their professional network have now received an offer from Wilson Browne Solicitors to provide a legal review of the lease on a pro-bono basis as part of their Community Investment and public relations. This is excellent news and provides further assurances to the PC.

Update – The Working Group have been challenged that the term of the lease is not adequate. The Working Group have considered this and there are a number of factors which make a longer-term lease impractical at this stage, being:

- The Landlord will not in any event grant a longer lease as there needs to be proven evidence of the use of the facility.
- Cost – a longterm lease (e.g. 99 years) could potentially increase the cost of the rent, or incur an upfront premium and we are keen to keep the ongoing costs to a minimum. With the option to extend we have a similar instrument without the long-term liability at this stage. There are also potential Stamp Duty implications to consider.
- ***It should be emphasised that it is proposed this is a 30-year lease with an option to extend.*** The initial 30 years is within the term of the useful life of the asset before the requirement of a refurbishment or replacement facility.

- The Working Group have funding in place to cover the initial 5-year period of rent. Once the Lease is agreed these funds will be sent to the PC prior to it entering into the lease.
- Unless the funding is secured then there would be no development at the site therefore no need for remedial work to return the site to its previous state. The Working Group therefore do not see there being any risk of a cost to the PC to break the lease after 5 years.
- It is in line with the term of the lease at Ashley.

Update – The Working Group have been challenged that the 5-year break clause in the lease for the PC to raise the funds for the capital costs of the project is too restrictive (e.g.) what if we get to 4 years and 11 months? The Working Group consider that this is a very low risk as we should know within a year or so of the lease being signed, if the funding can be raised or not. Also, we only need to evidence the funds have been raised and not necessarily spent, therefore development can still commence after this period. The working Group felt it was best to have a line in the sand rather than committing the PC to a 30-year lease. The Working Group had already negotiated an increase to this period beyond where the Landlord had originally intended. There is also always the option to return to the landlord at that point and seek an extension via a Deed of Variation.

Update – During the development of Butlers Yard the Developer and the Landlord have agreed that they can use the area planned for the MUGA as an area for storage. The PC have asked the Working Group ensure the lease provides for the insurance of the site to be at the Landlords / Developer (Langton Homes) risk during this relatively short period the PC have entered into any lease.

Update – a concern has been raised that the PC will have a shared access to the site and the liability issues a shared access can cause. This is a very valid point and one which the Working Group have already considered is provided for in the Heads of Terms. To overcome any issues regarding ‘shared access’, the lease will specifically excludes the entrance to the site, instead the PC will be granted a ‘right of access’ over this area under the lease. It will be the Landlords responsibility to ensure the residents can access the site and also for the Landlord to maintain the access to allow for this. We cover this latter point further under points 24 & 27 below.

2) **Initial costs** – there have been no costs incurred to date with all work undertaken so far having been provided ***on the goodwill of the proposed landlord and the Working Group***. The landlord has kindly offered to prepare the lease through his solicitor ***at his cost***. In due course a planning application will be prepared by a member of the Working Group. The cost of submitting the application is limited to the application fee of £231 (the Parish Council benefits from a 50% reduction to half in the usual fee for a ‘change of use’) ***and a member of the Working Party is willing to cover this cost.***

Some contractors require a detailed project appraisal before providing a quote. However, not all do. As we already have one contractor agreeing to provide a quote, we are proposing to use this as a basis for other contractor quotes, if so required. This will hopefully mitigate the need for any costly project appraisals. ***It is important to note***

however that the Working Group will not be committing the PC to any costs without its prior approval, quotations at this stage are primarily to understand the extent grants/donations needed.

- 3) **Capital costs of the development** – it is proposed that these will be 100% funded by grants and charitable donations. No contracts will be entered into with a contractor unless 100% funding has been secured. **No funds** will be therefore required from the PC or residents of Weston by Welland to pay for the development.

Update – it is difficult to assess the full cost of the project at this stage, but an initial view of the Working Group is that it will cost between £80k to £120k dependent on the planning provisions, the facilities required and the equipment installed. However, it is far too early in the project to provide any clear view.

Update – The Working Group in recent weeks have also been looking at VAT on the Project and ongoing Maintenance costs – i.e. can this be reclaimed? The Working Group are making enquiries on behalf of the PC. Our preliminary enquiry suggests that VAT **can be** reclaimed on the development but potentially not for maintenance / non-capitalised costs. These are very early-stage enquiries and the Working Group will complete our due diligence on this in due course including how best to bridge the VAT payments. One potential outcome is that the developer/contractor will pay and reclaim the VAT so that there is no VAT payable by the PC. VAT and timing of the payment, if payable by the PC, will need to be built into our project cash flow and considered within our overall funding requirements. Overall, this looks to be good news and potentially materially reduce the development costs.

- 4) **Development cost over-run** – whilst it is proposed that a contingency will be built into the funding proposal, this will more likely cover minor adjustments to the project, as a fixed price contract will be sought from the contractor, to transfer the risk of cost over-run onto the contractor.
- 5) **Failure of the contractor** – the working group will undertake credit checks against the developer. The developer will also be chosen through a competitive tender basis to help ensure best value for money. Staged payments offer protection, as these are typically not due until after a stage of works has been completed and agreed. In the event a contractor was to fail, the size and nature of the project is not one, we believe, which would prevent a replacement contractor being found to complete the project. The contractor's prior experience with a project of this nature will also be reviewed as part of the tender process. No contractor will be engaged without the approval of the PC.
- 6) **Accountability** – The Working Group is accountable to the PC and will provide periodic updates to the PC as and when they hit an appropriate 'Decision Gate'. Each 'Decision Gate' of the project will allow the PC to decide how it wants to proceed. The first 'Decision Gate' was the appointment of a Working Group by the PC to investigate the potential of the project and this is now the second 'Gate', being the agreement by the PC to sign the Heads of Terms as presented. Further 'Decision Gates' will arise and will

form part of a wider 'Project Plan' which is being developed and updated by the Working Group.

We set out below are the 'Decision Gates' identified to date. It is important to note that some of these 'Decision Gates' will be sequential, and some will overlap or, run in parallel. The 'Decisions Gates identified so far, being:

- a) approval and signing of a formal lease with the landlord;
- b) the planning application prepared by the Working Group;
- c) the final project design and layout proposed by the Working Group;
- d) funding applications prepared by the Working Group;
- e) the contractor appointment and entering into of the project by the PC, with the contractor;
- f) payments to the contractor as stipulated by the stage payments / contract agreed;
- g) sign off the development on practical completion;
- h) agreement to proposed ongoing maintenance and management of the development.

Additional 'Decision Gates' will be reviewed as we progress with project, where there is a responsibility or, commitment that needs to be made on behalf of the PC.

It is important to note that the drafting of the proposed Heads of Terms is the next Decision Gate that requires the approval of the PC. This is due to the fact that whilst this does not commit the PC to enter into a lease, it does need the PC approval as a working document to allow the project to move forward with the intent that it will enter into a lease for the purpose of the proposed project.

Update – given that the Working Group are now at a stage to proceed for planning permission, it has been proposed that the planning application 'decision gate' also be added to the planned extra-ordinary PC meeting on the 11th March 2021. There are a number of reasons why applying now is advantageous:

1. the Planning Applications can be a lengthy process;
2. new residents will have a clear view of the villages plans;
3. the Working Group have secured the funds to cover the costs of seeking planning;
4. with the above funding we can proceed to planning at no cost to the PC;
5. without planning permission, we can't get a detailed design plan together in order to put together project costings and obtain more accurate quotes;
6. without planning permission, and quotes, and a lease in place, we can't apply for funding, as we don't know what we are asking for or, how much or, where.

- 7) **Ongoing repairs and maintenance** – a precept charge is currently paid by the residents to the PC as part of the annual Council Tax charge. During the 20/21 financial year end the PC proposed an **unrelated** increase in this charge which we anticipate, within the 21/22 PC budget, is likely to create an ongoing surplus. Therefore, any need for an increase to cover the maintenance of the site is likely to be modest if anything at all. Indeed, the proposed design of the MUGA is that it its useful life should last beyond the

life of the lease with minimal ongoing maintenance. This will be fully costed by the Working Group and brought before the PC for prior approval.

After this period, should the PC / Village at the time consider the MUGA to remain a useful and integral part of the village, the incumbents can look to refurbish or replace, by means of a similar fund-raising process. If they chose not to maintain the site or seek an extension to the lease, it will be for the landlord to decide what to do with it. In the meantime, the village will hopefully have enjoyed 25 to 30 years of an excellent sports and recreation facility. Dependent on demand we will also look at extending the facilities to other villages or sports groups in the area for a small booking fee. They can either buy slots as a group, village or, on an individual basis.

Update – with the addition of the 10 new properties at Butlers Yard, this will also provide the PC with an option to maintain the Precept at the current agreed rate and gain addition revenue for this development as a sinking fund.

- 8) **Site liability post lease expiry** – should the lease not be extended, the ownership of the MUGA will fall to the landlord but so will the liability for the demolition and clean-up of the site. The landlord will also be liable for any environmental risks associated with the site prior to the PC taking full control of the site.

Update – the Working Group are planning to investigate insurance cover in the unlikely event contamination is caused the PC during its time as tenant.

- 9) **Couldn't the CP come up with a better idea to spend the funding?** – That would depend on whether or not a funder would be willing to support the project. We have seen from other villages & projects, funders such as the Lottery Commission or Sports England, tend to only support projects that improve the health and fitness or environment of the village. It would also need to benefit the whole village which this project does.

- 10) **Why develop a MUGA?** – There are many reasons namely:

- a) According to the NHS recent report, <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/obesity/> 1 in 4 adults are considered to be obese. Indeed, nearly 50% of the population is considered to be overweight. This increases pressure on the NHS in terms of increasing numbers of patients with diabetes, cancer and heart conditions, all of which can be reduced through exercise. Early reports indicate this is also a contributing factor to Covid-19 deaths or severe illness.
- b) With the population increasing, there is a rising demand for spaces at local gyms and this may well be increased further with the impact of Covid-19 on the fitness industry causes more gyms to close. As a result, the cost increase of gym membership is too expensive for many. An example Harborough Leisure Centre costs £25 - £40 per month for adult membership and pre-covid had limited slots available, particularly at peak times on a pay as you go basis – it can require up to 7-10 days booking in advance.
- c) The village has for a number of years sought to have an outside space for the village to meet and for children to play.

- d) Other projects such as a village hall have extremely high costs for development, higher ongoing maintenance costs (e.g. heating, water, light etc) and limited health or environmental benefits. That is, however, not to rule this out in the future should a suitable site be made available.
- e) Such an amenity will increase the attraction of new and younger families to the village, therefore adding value to the overall offering of the village and help support its future.
- f) The UK generally lacks access to sports & recreational facilities by comparison to our European counterparts, where it is highly common for local communities such as Weston by Welland to have access to sports and recreational facilities within their village. Schools are continuing to come under pressure to give up sports fields to accommodate more classrooms or to sell to developers to raise funds for spending elsewhere.
- g) Its location adjacent to the pub and also a new housing development seeking to attract families will hopefully provide passive security and also easy access to no doubt a welcome beverage and sustenance after exercise, right on its doorstep. In turn this helps a local and valued business in the community.

11) **Who will use it?** The 'Working Group' are keen to ensure the site can be accessed and used by all ages, 365 days a year. The focus will be on sports to suit both individuals and small groups sports such as basketball, football through to tennis and possibly even outdoor fitness classes. With plans also incorporating an open space to meet and socialise together with play equipment for younger children, we are looking to offer something for everyone. We will also seek to engage with the residents to seek their views on sports and facilities contained within the site however, we will largely be restricted by project & maintenance costs (for example certain surfaces suit certain sports and the surface costs vary considerably).

12) **How will I be able to use it?** – the 'Working Group' are looking at a range of options from manual records, to an online or text booking system, through to allocated hours by sport or by gender / age group. This is likely to change dependent on the demographic of the village and IT advancements at any given time and those who are making best use of it. That is however, not to rule out a combination of solutions that best meet the needs of all residents.

13) **It won't get used** – the 'Working Group' are looking at developing ways in which to promote and develop its use. This might be from running exercise classes through to social media promotion, village events, coaching and mini challenges as well as birthday party activities. We are also looking at options of being able to hire equipment such as tennis racquets, balls (various types) etc.

14) **I wouldn't use it** – this development is for the benefit of the village and therefore the Working Group will undertake a public consultation process. We have already sought feedback from a sample group of c30 households, where c93% were in full support of the facility and 7% broadly in support provided the provision of facilities was wide enough for all ages etc. We also need to consider the future residents of the village to ensure the village offers the facilities required by a wide demographic of residents. By

getting behind this project so more and more people will see the benefits of having such a facility on their doorstep and the working group will continue to be creative in encouraging its use. Whilst it might not be exactly what an individual might want, it will nonetheless add to the attractiveness of living in Weston by Welland and that must be a good thing for everyone!

- 15) **It could get too busy from outside bookings** – we suspect not, other than perhaps residents of Sutton Bassett and Welham. But great, at least it's getting used and bringing revenue for use elsewhere in the village. However, we will monitor the use and be carefully to ensure priority is given to residents of Weston by Welland.
- 16) **There is already play equipment at the pub** – we will take this into consideration to seek to compliment what is already on offer however, these are heavily used by the patrons of the pub and as a private business can only open for the use by patrons of the pub. Dependent on the requirements of the village we will look at options / combinations, such as outdoor exercise or complimentary play equipment. The focus for this allocated area of the development however, is for those who might not use the MUGA such as very young children and those just wanting to socialise etc.
- 17) **How will the site be kept secure?** – As part of the development plan will be a review of costs for keeping the site secure. Whilst not indefensible to those who really wanted to cause damage, we can at least look at prevention such as gates, fencing and CCTV. We are however mindful that the latter comes with GDPR compliance, cost and management issues that need to be taken into consideration. This needs to be balanced against providing adequate escape routes and also the site being practically accessible by all residents.
- 18) **It will be used as a pub car park** – the Working Group have this before them. It can however be prevented through good signage and gates.
- 19) **It will attract gangs of youths and associated antisocial problems** – whilst not unprotected by anti-social behaviour, this is a rural location and therefore thankfully relatively unaffected by such issues. Nonetheless, with the above security measures, a booking system and also taking advice from the local police, we see such matters as being isolated and manageable. Any person misusing or damaging the facility will be prosecuted and / or bared from using. Where an outside party is using the facility, we can consider if a security deposit is appropriate.
- 20) **Noise** – we are looking at natural sound barriers, such as trees and hedging however, the location is to the extremity of the village and we see this as no more than perhaps would already be evident from the pub garden. The MUGA itself is currently planned to be located to the rear of the site at the furthest from the village. Parking will be to the front. Furthermore, it will only be open during hours of day light. Reminders to respect the local residents can also be displayed.

Update – this issue was further debated at the Open Meeting and it was agreed that the Working Group would look to mitigate this and any direct infringement on residents

being overlooked via natural screening. Whilst the position of the site is such that it offers excellent views, the orientation of seating and screening etc can help provide privacy.

- 21) **Environmental impact** – we will seek advice from both the local authority and also Graham Garratt who is an environmental planning expert. The current site already has hard standing over much of the area that requires a solid base and any surplus together with the metal posts will be removed by the landlord at their expense. Overall, the environmental impact in that regard should be minimal, if not an improvement. We will also be looking at natural screening and wildlife habitat improvements. We will include waste bins within the design and near to the entrance to allow for council collection.

Update – as part of the planning and development process the Working Group will be looking at mitigating or preventing any material impact on the water run off at the site into the existing drainage system. However, it is not envisaged that there will be any additional run off given that the area is already predominantly hard standing, the MUGA etc is not under cover and therefore collecting additional rainwater. Indeed, the Working Group will be looking for the project to improve or have a net neutral impact on the environment and flood management within the development.

- 22) **Environmental hazards** – we will make appropriate enquiries regarding the use of pesticides from DEFRA / the HSE in the locality and where necessary, work with the landlord to ensure the site is closed for a short period time to allow for the hazard from spraying to have passed. We have made enquires with the landlord to confirm no hazardous materials have been stored on site in the past.

Update – potentially as part of any planning approval for the project or indeed through the development process, site soil samples might need to be undertaken to establish any evidence of contamination. The Working Group will make further investigations in due course.

Update – potential environmental impact of the fire at the site last year. As mentioned above the costs of environmental studies will be looked into once we know the requirements of the planners. Potentially these can be included in our overall project costs and covered by the project funding.

Update - *the Working Group wish to emphasise that the Heads of Terms, and in turn the eventually the lease, provide for that any environmental issues caused by the Landlord are at the Landlords risk and responsibility to resolve.*

- 23) **Have you got planning permission?** – not yet but we have made provisional enquires from a local planning expert who considers the likelihood of planning being approved to be high. In the event we are declined then we will consider other options. We are also aware that developments in the village have tended to require archaeological investigations which can be expensive and lengthy. We will know more through the planning process and stipulations. However, this is highly unlikely for this type of development as there will be no deep footings or trenches and the new adjacent

development unearth no matters of archaeological interest. ***Once again, the Working Group have been able to secure the funding to undertake the planning application at no cost to the PC thanks to a kind donation for this purpose.***

- 24) **Safe Access** – as part of the planning process we are looking at options to ensure safe access for all ages. This may include the extension of a path adjacent to the new development and we will also be speaking to Langton Homes to see if they can assist in this regard. We will also work with the local authority to seek their views to help mitigate the risk. This may include the requirement for a ‘children at play’ sign in the locality together with the other road safety measures the village is taking. We will need to also consider if children need to be accompanied by an adult and we will seek advice in this regard.

Update – The Working Group have been challenged that given access will still be required by the Landlord for passage of farm vehicles (see point 27 below) for the purpose of accessing the adjoining field, that this would not allow for a safe environment. The Working Group have this before them as part of the project and will be taking advice from the planners and ROSPA in this regard. This may require a separate pedestrian access. This will be investigated through the planning and development process.

Update – the Working Group have been challenged that the development of this type of facility requires two access / escape routes – The Working Group have made preliminary enquires with ROSPA and the initial view is that this only relates to enclosed areas such as the MUGA. Most MUGA designs include 2 access / escape points. The Working Group will continue to seek advice and guidance from ROSPA throughout project and seek to mitigate risks wherever possible.

- 25) **Increased traffic** – given that the vast majority of users will be within the village or the immediate locality, we see this as a minimal in terms of an overall increase. Parking will be available for a limited number of cars and parking restrictions can be made apparent on any booking system or confirmation.

Update - At the Open Meeting on the 25th February 2021, a concern was raised concerning the potential for cars to further build up on Green Lane to use the site. The Working Group will review this further to ensure we consider this potential when reviewing the booking system and also signage at the site.

- 26) **Access to services** – we have reviewed the local plans and there will be no need to re-route any services. There will be natural drainage within the scheme development and adequate access into the site for emergency services.

Update – see above under point 21 ‘Environment Impact’ re site drainage considerations.

- 27) **Access for farm vehicles** – the landlord will require access to his field via the main entrance and the plan has allowed for this. This is not expected to be frequent given

that it will only be for the occasions they need to access that particular field – all hay / straw and machinery currently at the site will be relocated elsewhere so the site is cleared ready for development.

Update – see above under point 24 ‘Safe Access - re consideration for separate pedestrian access.

Update – a question has been raised regarding the access to the site. It should be noted that the proposed lease specifically excludes area directly accessing the site. Instead, it is proposed under the lease & Heads of Terms that the PC will be granted a ‘right of access’ – see point 1 above.

Update – a question has been raised regarding the maintenance of the entrance when farm vehicles will be accessing the site. It should be noted that this is likely to be limited number of journeys and the Working Group will consider what the most appropriate surface will be to allow for joint access by cars and farm vehicles. Any damage caused by access of the farm vehicles will be a matter of discussion with the Landlord at the time and where necessary an insurance claim.

28) **Insurance** – whilst the site will be advertised to be used ‘at the risk of the individuals’ however this does not mitigate the owner (in this case the PC) from liability due to negligence, the PC will need to have appropriate third-party public liability and damage insurance cover and periodic maintenance checks. This will be fully costed as part of the ongoing costs. As an example, Ashley PC advise their facility increased their insurance premium by a modest £100 – we will need to investigate this further to understand the cover provided.

Update – see under point 1 ‘Lease’ re landlord insurance risk and point 8 ‘Site liability post lease expiry’ re investigating potential for environmental insurance cover.

29) **Use by disabled** – we have this at the forefront of our minds both in terms of being able to access the MUGA with a wheelchair but also in terms of ramps elsewhere on site and also disabled parking. The initial draft plan includes spaces for 3 disabled parking bays.

Update – at the Open Meeting the Working Group were asked to ensure any play equipment installed could be used by the disabled and not just in terms of accessing the area. Given that such equipment is available on the market this seems a very sensible way forward and will be taken forward by the Working Group to cost out. Indeed, it should also be noted that such a provision is likely only to add to the strength of our application for project funding.

30) **How well qualified is the Working Group to undertake such a project?** – whilst this is not a major development project that demands a high level of project management skills, the Working Group has been pulled together with some prior knowledge of development, project management, finance and planning.

31) **How can I get involved?** - As a Working Group we are more than open to anyone joining the project at any point who feels they can add value and in particular we are keen to hear from anyone with building, legal (particularly property or contract law) or, anyone with IT skills. We are also keen to hear from anyone who can assist or, support our fund-raising efforts – anyone with experience with grants, commercial contacts or, connections with wealthy entrepreneurs who may be interested in sponsorship or making a philanthropic donation. Finally, a really positive, ‘can do’ attitude is always welcomed.

32) **Will it be floodlit?** – there is no intention for this to be flood lit for a number of reasons being:

- a) Cost of installation
- b) Cost of maintenance
- c) Cost of electricity
- d) Environmental light pollution
- e) Noise abatement, by restricting the hours of use.

Update – at the Open Meeting on the 25th February, a concern was raised that planning may not necessarily prevent longer term the use of flood lighting – Any change would need to be approved by the PC who would need to take into consideration the requirements of the village the time.

Update –

33) **Why do this through the PC and not a separate Community Group Charity?** – The Working Group did consider this option however, at this stage, have not pursued for the following reasons:

- a) The Landlord has requested the PC be a named party on the lease. There are a number of reasons for this namely:
 - i) the PC has been established longer and therefore a better counterparty to enter into a lease with;
 - ii) The landlord wishes the site, and therefore in turn, the lease to have a more direct link with the wider requirements and controls of the village and **has expressly requested the PC be the tenant** – a possible option is to establish a “friends of WbW” and have a sub-lease approved by the Landlord. The only advantage we can see at this point is it opening up more options for funding and possibly ring-fencing risk;
- b) establishing a new charity would require additional administrative burden such as regulatory and financial reporting, new banking and mandate arrangements, a separate committee that might potentially be unanswerable to the PC. The PC already has this infrastructure in place;
- c) as far as we can establish, at this stage, there is no benefit gained that would not otherwise be accessible to the PC e.g. funding & VAT rebates on the development etc;
- d) there is an argument that a charity might ring-fence the risks however, overall, the Working Group does not see that this out-weighs the advantages of taking this through a PC;

- e) it is unlikely the charity would be able to access the precept to help maintain the site;
- f) establishing a separate charity may mean we have to offer the facility to a wider community and not just the village. If not, then we may have to do this in order to be able to raise funds to maintain the facility;
- g) as far as we can establish, there are very few examples of this being done in villages elsewhere except, we understand where PC have been in disagreement with the wishes of the village or, the PC is dysfunctional and under the control of a local borough council, or they are seeking to fund the project through a specific community fund which requires a separate charitable entity;
- h) ***It is important to note that the Working Group has not ruled this out as an option and is in communication with a member of the community who has experience of Community Groups to establish the wider benefits.***

34) **Could the village Spitfire Fund be used towards the project?** – for those villagers who are not aware, this is a fund established around the time of WWII that continues to have c.£500 to £1,000 at its disposal for the spending on improving the village. The Working Group are in discussions with its Trustees and at this point in time we have left it with them to consider if this project is something they would like to contribute towards.

It is likely the charitable trust restrictions placed on the use of this fund will need to be focused on being utilised for something that can be tangibly identified within the development such as benching, landscaping or a specific piece of equipment, rather than being wrapped up within the overall cost of the development. The Working Group are very grateful to the Trustees for agreeing to work with us in this regard and very much hope there is a mutual benefit.

Any other questions? We very much welcome any questions you may have, as these will only help the success of the project. It will ensure we think of as many matters arising as we can and find appropriate mitigants or solutions.