Appendix B – Application Appraisals

SHAFTESBURY TOWN COUNCIL – MAMPITTS GREEN S106 APPLICATION APPRAISAL

Parameter	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Does the proposal fit the policy	\boxtimes			The provision of community hall, play equipment, landscaped areas, car parking meets the
for which planning obligation				requirements for which the planning obligation was established.
was established				
				The application for s106 funding refers to relevant local plan and neighbourhood plan policies for
				the provision of community facilities in Shaftesbury.
Is there evidence of planning	\boxtimes			The proposal requires planning permission as the nature of the intended uses is classed as
permissions sought/received				development and will materially change the current land use. Planning application
				P/FUL/2023/06670 was submitted by Shaftesbury Town Council on 15 November 2023 and is
				currently under determination. A recommendation for approval is proposed to be considered by
				the Northern Area Planning Committee.
Is there evidence of meeting	\boxtimes			The total project cost estimate is £889,132. The total amount requested from S106 funds is
additional funding				£834,400, which represents approximately 94% of the total budget. The application demonstrates
requirements				that additional funding of $\pm 45,000$ will be provided through the Town Council's Strategic Plan.
				However, this leaves a shortfall of £9,732. Shaftesbury TC have advised that earmarked reserves
				can be accessed if relied upon.
				The next section addresses the accuracy of project cost which may lead to pressure/need to obtain
				further funding.

Parameter	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Does the proposal provide	\boxtimes	\boxtimes		Total project cost is £889,132 and is based on a BCIS cost estimate undertaken by an architect. The
verifiable and realistic costing				cost has been calculated on the proposed floorspace of the project. No actual building contractor cost estimates have been provided to inform the proposal.
				The proposal indicates that actual costs will be known post tender process, most likely via a fixed priced contract based on the available budget.
				The contingency budget for the project stands at £40,000 and covers design, construction, and employers risk elements. The town council anticipate fewer unforeseen costs due to the newbuild nature of the proposal.
				Within the overall cost estimate is an inflation budget of £15,174, this is considered low and represents less than 2% of the total cost. This cost appears to be based on the BCIS forecast for Quarter 2 2024 – linked to the date commencement is intended to occur. This estimate doesn't factor in any delay to the commencement date and cost changes through the 6–8-months delivery phase, though some of these risks will be mitigated if a fixed price contract is agreed.
				a value engineering exercise may be required when the actual costs are known.

Parameter	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Is the delivery timescale realistic and achievable?				The application expects a start date of March 2024. This seems to be an optimistic and unrealistic start date given that the land remains in the ownership of Persimmon Homes and will require time to transfer. The completion date is Autumn 2024; however, it is unclear if this applies to the whole project including landscaping and work on the natural play elements. If this is intended to be the date for full project completion, it is considered unrealistic and unachievable, notwithstanding the matter of land transfer delay.
Is there evidence of mechanisms for project management (suitably qualified personnel etc.)				The town council have employed a project support consultant to provide support services to help guide them. The consultant has experience of successfully delivering similar community facility proposals, including Pavilion in the Park at Poundbury. The Town Clerk will act as a liaison officer with the architect who will be acting as project administrator as part of the JCT (Joint Contracts Tribunal) process.
Is there evidence of insurance coverage				The application states that a JCT (Joint Contracts Tribunal) would be drawn up which will include contractor insurance documentation.

Parameter	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Is there evidence of viability &	\boxtimes	\boxtimes		The proposal explores three options for operating the community hub building. The feasibility of
long-term management				each option has been guided by the project support consultant. Options explored are:
capacity				
				1. Volunteer run hub
				2. Outsource to a hospitality/leisure operator sharing expenditure with the town council.
				3. Lease to social enterprise café sharing the expenditure with the town council.
				The operating options have been calculated based on the set-up of the Poundbury Pavilion in the
				Park operation which involves cafe and room hire. Reliance on this single example as a benchmark
				raises concern given the differences in location and context of Poundbury and Shaftesbury.
				The structure of the hub set-up, i.e. the choice of which option to pursue has not been determined
				in the application. It is proposed that a full business plan will be developed in association with the
				most sustainable option if funding is awarded.
				The first floor of the building is proposed for use as a shared working space, with surplus income
				from the commercial hire of that area will be used to offset the cost of your support services what
				area planned to run from the building. The aim is to partner with a social enterprise which operates
				shared workspaces. No evidence of partnership engagement has been provided.
				A generous six-month rent-free period for the café at start-up is proposed. Consideration should be
				given to a reduced rent for the first six months to encourage community collaborators and
				stakeholders and provide some income while allowing the café to become established.
				The town council will have an active role in managing the hub in the short and long term. The café
				operator is expected to manage the facility on a day-to-day basis. The town council's external
				landscape contractor team will maintain and manage the open space areas as part of their work
				schedule.

Parameter	Yes	No	NA	Comments
				 Indicative income & expenditure figures are provided, proposing two tier hire charges. This arrangement could impact on the viability in the short term. Consideration should be given to introducing such an arrangement once income/expenditure levels are more established and known. Some issues regarding the operating model options: The Volunteer run option shows no income from the café. No costs for cleaning included. Hospitality Operator option – lettings income shown as going to Shaftesbury Town Council, but the running costs should be split 50/50 if run by an operator. The Social Enterprise Café option includes income for Employment Grant Support, however there is no guarantee of receiving a grant and no evidence submitted to show how/when a grant would be applied for. It takes half the costs of running the hub but would only be running the café area. Consideration should be given to extending the café operation to five days a week. Possibly include weekends to maximize income from the community space and café when run by social enterprise will go directly to Shaftesbury Town Council. It should be a requirement that this is
Is there evidence of mechanisms for monitoring				ringfenced for the future running and maintenance of the Hub. If successful, a detailed project plan is proposed which will set out a schedule of works for the contractors as developed by the project administrator. Information regarding the delivery of the
project outcomes				project is to be reported to Shaftesbury Town Council on a quarterly basis. The proposal doesn't explain how the long-term operation of the facility will be monitored and reported. For example, usage, booking data, and testimonies.

Parameter	Yes	No	NA	Comments
(i) Town or Parish Council, & their endorsement	\boxtimes			There is evidence of approval from Shaftesbury Town Council at a full council meeting on Tuesday 19 September 2023, demonstrating support for the submission of s106 application.
(ii) others	\boxtimes			In addition to the formal support shown by the town council, the proposal has extensive and recent evidence of community engagement stretching back to 2021 with over 4,000 leaflets distributed to SP7 8** postcodes seeking public opinion of community needs. More recently in September 2023, two pop-up events were held for the community to review the draft plans using feedback from earlier consultation.

MAMPITTS LANE COMMUNITY LAND TRUST (CIO) – MAMPITTS GREEN S106 APPRAISAL

Parameter	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Does the proposal fit the policy for which planning obligation was established				The provision of community hall, play equipment, landscaped areas, car parking meets the requirements for which the planning obligation was established.
Is there evidence of planning permissions sought/received				The proposal requires planning permission as the nature of the intended uses is classed as development and will materially change the current land use. Planning application P/FUL/2023/05314 was submitted by Mampitts CLT on 13 th September 2023 and is currently under determination. A recommendation for approval is proposed to be considered by the Northern Area Planning Committee.
Is there evidence of meeting additional funding requirements				The total project cost estimate of £882,338 is soundly based on recent quotations and estimates from building contractors. In addition, the proposal requests a contingency reserve sum of £100,000 (11.3% of the overall project cost, to address potential inflation and cost escalation. The project cost alone is more than the current available budget by approximately £48,000. With the requested contingency, the proposal is overbudget by £148,000. The project is entirely reliant on s106 funding to build and maintain the proposal. There are no other sources of funding identified, e.g. grant funding, donations, fundraising. The proposal expects the overspend and contingency to be met by future s106 payment not yet due from development at Wincombe Lane (Barrett Homes). There is no certainty of this payment and therefore cannot be relied upon at this time.

Parameter	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Does the proposal provide verifiable and realistic costing				A detailed and comprehensive Project Budget Costs spreadsheet supports the application. This provides estimates for all expenditure based on up-to-date quotes from local builders and suppliers. Also included are costs incurred by the Trustees to date.
				Separately, the proposal includes details of the operation of the community building. The costs are based on estimates from other village and community facilities including Stourpaine and Motcombe. This comparison demonstrates anticipated costs of £9,000 per year.
				The proposal provides no evidence of anticipated income other than detailing indicative hire rates, and benchmark income from other community halls. It excludes details of cost or projected income from the café which is not a feature of the benchmarked facilities. This lack of information provides limited assurance that the proposal is financially sustainable.
				Notwithstanding this, the proposal relies on several volunteer roles undertaken by trustees of the CLT. The proposal provides limited detail of the governance of the CLT including constitution. There is no suitable guarantee that positions will remain free of cost should trustees' positions change. Should these roles become paid positions, the annual anticipated costs will be significantly higher.
				The proposal relies on a surplus generated from hall and events field hire to help pay for future maintenance of the hall. Higher running costs and/or lower than predicted revenue would result in a reduced surplus and possible shortfall of funds to support the maintenance of the building. There is no demonstration of this potential scenario.

Parameter	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Is the delivery timescale realistic and achievable?				The project intends to start in earnest on confirmation of the successful nomination and indicates completion of the hall and play area by the end of 2024. Given that the land currently remains in control of Persimmon Homes, and planning permission if granted would trigger other preliminary works, this timeframe is considered unachievable and unrealistic.
Is there evidence of mechanisms for project management (suitably qualified personnel etc.) Is there evidence of insurance coverage				The project will be managed by trustees of the Community Land Trust with an RIBA Client Advisor overseeing the design and delivery stages.
Is there evidence of viability & long-term management capacity				The proposal does not provide any supporting documentation to detail the governance of the CLT including evidence of bank accounts and articles of association etc. Instead, the proposal focuses on the recent change in charitable status from CIO to CIC with a web link to the charities commission provided. The proposal is reliant on income from hiring out of the internal and external spaces. The application makes a passing mention of the possibility of organising car boot sales or events to increase income, but no further detail is set out within the options considered. The only proposed paid position is for a booking clerk, who would receive £100 per month (£1,200 pa) this cost appears low and unrealistic for the level of responsibility that is expected. The operation proposes using a cashless system; however, this could disadvantage some member so the public and prevent them from being able to use the hall. Overall, there is a general lack of detail to support the long-term viability of the project.

Parameter	Yes	No	NA	Comments
Is there evidence of mechanisms for monitoring project outcomes				The proposal indicates that trustees will liaise closely with DC officers to inform of progress prior to the release of funding, but there is no indication or detail how the project will be monitored in the long-term, for instance the preparation and sharing of reports setting out performance including details of bookings, testimonies etc.
(i) Town or Parish Council, & their endorsement				The latest proposal has not been shared or considered formally by Shaftesbury Town Council and therefore does not have their endorsement.
(ii) others				No further public engagement has occurred since 2021 when public engagements events were arranged outside of the local convenience store on Mampitts Lane. The proposal has the backing of a petition circulated in 2020. This has not been updated or revisited.
				Despite the efforts early on to engage with the community, there doesn't appear to have been any community fundraising to support the project and the budget position. Likewise, there doesn't appear to have been any recent community engagement to demonstrate continued support for the updated proposals.
				No supporting evidence has been provided to show endorsement from local community groups.