Ashburton Town Council

Minutes of the Asset Working Group Meeting held on Tuesday 07 July 2026 at 7.00pm, in the Council Chambers of the Town Hall.

Present: Cllrs. Snowsill (Chair), Bovey, Coles, Giles, Searight, Turner and Wood. Graham Tarsky, Sarah Prince, Sally Rhodes, Annie Hill-Smith, Deborah Sterling, Sam Walker and Sophia Young.

In attendance: The Deputy Town Clerk and Admin Assistant. Cllr. Rogers (TDC) and 7 members of the public.

030.26AW APOLOGIES

Cllr. Distin and Alaric Spendlove due to prior commitments.
Cllr. Harper and Pugh due to illness.
The absence of Cllrs. Nutley and Major (TDC) was also noted, although no apologies were received.

Resolution

APPROVED:
Proposed: Cllr. Snowsill
Seconded: Cllr. Giles

031.26AW DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- Cllrs. Snowsill and Giles declared that they are residents local to Miners Close
- Sally Rhodes declared that she has a parking permit for Market Place
- Sarah Prince declared that she is a local resident to Amberley Close

---

032.26AW TO APPROVE THE PREVIOUS MINUTES OF 19TH MAY 2026.

Cllr. Snowsill went through the minutes of the previous meeting.
027.26AW: Cllr. Wood is yet to talk to ACE about the green spaces and asked that this action be carried over to the next meeting.

Resolution

APPROVED:
Proposed: Cllr. Bovey
Seconded: Cllr. Turner

Action

Town Clerks Office to carry forward action 027.26AW to the next meeting's agenda.

033.26AW TO RECEIVE THE TDC RESPONSE TO THE FORMAL REQUEST LETTER REGARDING KINGSBRIDGE LANE CAR PARKS

Cllr. Snowsill presented Teignbridge District Council's (TDC) response to the group. Members agreed that the letter was largely as expected and noted that, while it was not an outright refusal, TDC appear unlikely to transfer any income-generating assets.

Cllr. Turner requested that the Town Council respond, asking TDC to refer the matter to a meeting of the full District Council, which the Ashburton Mayor would then be able to attend.

The group also discussed the possibility of offering to take on additional community assets in exchange for the transfer of the car parks.
Concerns were raised about the condition of existing assets, noting examples such as the collapsed river wall at Cléder Place and the damaged stone wall near Rendells. Questions were asked about whether the Town Council would become responsible for repairing such assets if they were transferred, and how any associated costs would be funded. It was agreed that, as part of the transfer negotiations, the Council should seek to ensure that all assets are transferred in good condition.

Cllr. Rogers (TDC) advised that an item on play park modernisation is due to be considered at the TDC meeting on 28 July. There are 39 play parks included in the programme, six of which are in Ashburton. While TDC does not have sufficient funding to upgrade all 39 sites, the meeting should provide greater clarity on which projects will proceed.

It was proposed that the Town Clerk contact neighbouring town and parish councils to gauge support for a joint open letter to TDC requesting that the proposed transfer of the car parks be considered at a meeting of the full District Council. Once finalised, the letter should be published on the Town Council's Facebook page, with Mel Stride MP tagged in the post to show Ashburton residents that the town council is actively campaigning on their behalf.

Resolution
APPROVED: Town Clerk to contact neighbouring town and parish councils to gauge support for a joint open letter to TDC as detailed above.
Proposed: Cllr. Snowsill
Seconded: Cllr. Wood
All in favour

Actions
Town Clerks Office to contact other local towns to ask if they will sign a joint letter to TDC asking them to consider the car park transfer at a council meeting with elected officials.

034.26AW TO DISCUSS THE ASSET TRANSFER – ESTIMATED COSTS REPORT

Cllr. Snowsill presented an overview of the report (Appendix 1), which had been circulated to the Asset Working Group in advance of the meeting. The report recommends that, should the Town Council take on the key assets of The Recreation Ground, Cléder Place, the play parks and the public toilets, it should budget approximately £100,000 per year. It was noted that these estimates do not include the maintenance of grass verges and other public green spaces, as the grounds maintenance figures relate only to The Recreation Ground and Cléder Place.

The Deputy Clerk advised that an additional £100,000 on the precept would equate to an increase of approximately £1.26 per week for a Band D property, representing an increase of almost 40%.

Cllr. Snowsill reminded the group that the residents' survey indicated limited support for a precept increase above 28% (approximately £70,000). He noted that the Council would need to prepare a budget, with ongoing oversight from the Finance Committee. He also suggested that, if the Council wished to fund the additional assets while limiting the precept increase to

28%, consideration could be given to reducing expenditure in other areas, such as the Community Grants budget.

Cllr. Rogers offered to ask Teignbridge District Council (TDC) whether match funding could be made available to help offset the impact on the precept and advised the Town Clerk to contact Devon Communities Together to explore external funding opportunities.

Members then discussed the potential for future increases in council tax and the combined impact that this, together with any increase in the Town Council precept, could have on Ashburton residents.

To help keep residents informed, Cllr. Turner offered to include information about the estimated £1.26 per week increase in the September/October edition of *Around Ashburton*.

Annie Hill-Smith apologised and left the meeting at 7.30 pm due to a prior commitment.
Cllr. Rogers apologised and left the meeting at 7.45 pm due to a prior commitment.

Actions

- Cllr. Turner to add the information about the potential £1.26 increase to the next issue of Around Ashburton.
- Cllr. Rogers to ask TDC if match funding could be used to offset the precept.

035.26AW TO DISCUSS THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF COMMUNITY ASSETS REPORT – CIC OR CIO

Cllr. Snowsill presented an overview of the report (Appendix 2) which had been circulated to the group in advance. He outlined the advantages and disadvantages of establishing a Community Interest Company (CIC) or a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) and invited members to consider the report's recommendation that the Town Council manage any transferred assets initially, as establishing a CIC or CIO can take several months or, in some cases, several years.

The matter was discussed and the consensus was that taking the assets on initially would allow the Town Council to better understand the associated responsibilities and costs before considering an alternative management structure.

Cllr. Snowsill advised that a residents' association had expressed an interest in taking on the management of Amberley and Old Manor Close. He noted that clarification was required from TDC as to whether these assets could be transferred directly to the residents' associations on the same terms as ATC or whether they would first need to be transferred to Ashburton Town Council.

Sarah Prince, speaking on behalf of the above residents' association, confirmed that the association was in the process of being established for the purposes of managing the assets but was awaiting key information from TDC before it could proceed.

Cllr. Snowsill proposed that the working group recommend to Full Council that any transferred assets should initially be transferred to Ashburton Town Council, with the exception of Amberley and Old Manor Close, which should be transferred directly to the residents' association if TDC confirms that this is possible.

Resolution
APPROVED: AWG to recommend to Full Council that any transferred assets should initially be transferred to Ashburton Town Council with the exception mentioned above.

Proposed: Cllr. Snowsill
Seconded: Cllr. Wood
All in favour

Actions

- Town Clerks Office to confirm with TDC if assets can be transferred directly to resident associations on the same terms as offered to ATC.

036.26AW ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Cllr. Snowsill invited the working group to vote on whether each proposed asset should be recommended to Full Council for transfer. A general discussion followed.

Deborah Sterling noted that, once a Community Interest Company (CIC) or Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) had been established, a wider range of funding opportunities would become available and that the Town Council should not expect to fund the assets indefinitely.

Cllr. Snowsill asked the group to confirm that Cléder Place and The Recreation Ground should be recommended for transfer to the Town Council. No objections were raised.

The following votes were recorded:

Home Park, Minors Close and Westerbrook Play Parks

- For: 9
- Against: 2
- Abstentions: 1

Home Park Grass Verges

- For: 8
- Against: 2
- Abstentions: 2

Public Toilets

Members discussed the future of the public toilets and agreed that there is strong public support for retaining the facility. It was noted that local businesses are also keen for the toilets to remain open, as they are considered an important service for both residents and visitors.

Members commented that many older people and tourists may be less likely to visit the town if public toilets are unavailable. The group agreed that the toilets provide an essential public service and expressed the view that, if the Town Council does not take them on, the facilities are likely to be lost permanently. It was also noted that the loss of public toilets could lead to an increase in public urination and defecation.

The group acknowledged that the current facilities are in a poor state of repair and are expensive to maintain. It was agreed that the issue of charging for the use of the toilets would be considered separately.

Members then voted unanimously in favour of recommending that the Town Council take on responsibility for the public toilets.

The working group expressed its disappointment at the limited engagement with the asset transfer process from two of Ashburton's three Teignbridge District Councillors. Members

thanked Cllr. Rogers for attending the first half of the meeting and for his contribution to the discussion.

Resolution
APPROVED: The AWG to recommend to Full Council that the following TDC assets be taken on by the town council: Cléder Place, The Recreation Ground, the public toilets, Home Park, Minors Close and Westabrook Play Parks, Home Park Grass Verges.

Cllr. Snowsill thanked those present and closed the meeting at 20.24

Ashburton Town Council

Action Points Arising from Asset Working Group Meeting held on Tuesday 07 July 2026 at 7.00pm, in the Council Chambers of the Town Hall.

Agenda Item	Actions	Responsible
032.26AW	Town Clerks Office to carry forward action 027.26Aw to the next meeting's agenda.	Town Clerks Office
033.26AW	Town Clerks Office to contact other local towns to ask if they will sign a joint letter to TDC asking them to consider the car park transfer at a council meeting with elected officials.	Town Clerks Office
034.26AW	Cllr. Turner to add the information about the potential £1.26 increase to the next issue of Around Ashburton.	Cllr. Turner
034.26AW	Cllr. Rogers to ask TDC if match funding could be used to offset the precept.	Cllr. Rogers (TDC)
035.26AW	Town Clerks Office to confirm with TDC if assets can be transferred directly to resident associations on the same terms as offered to ATC.	Town Clerks Office

Ashburton Town Council

Appendix 1

Asset Transfer Brief: Estimated Costs of Taking on Play Parks, Recreation Ground and Public Toilets

Overview

This report provides indicative costs associated with the potential transfer of five play parks (including the recreation ground) and the town public toilets from Teignbridge District Council to Ashburton Town Council as part of local government reorganisation. The figures are intended to inform discussion and financial planning and are based on current industry costs and comparison with neighbouring councils. These estimates have not been provided by Teignbridge District Council and should therefore be regarded as indicative only and may be subject to revision following detailed due diligence and receipt of information from TDC.

Background

The proposed transfer could result in Ashburton Town Council assuming responsibility for:

- Five children's play areas: Prigg Meadow (The Rec), Miners Close, Home Park, Cleder Place, Westabrook Avenue;
- The Recreation Ground skate park, MUGA and associated open spaces;
- Public toilets (including daily cleaning and restocking costs)
- Grass cutting and grounds maintenance;
- Trees within the transferred sites;
- Ongoing repairs and maintenance;
- Statutory health and safety inspections.

Benchmarking has been undertaken against published budgets and practices of neighbouring town councils, including Bovey Tracey, Chudleigh, Buckfastleigh and Kingsteignton.

1) Play Areas

Inspections

Annual independent inspections are mandatory and monthly visual inspections by town council staff would also be required throughout the year.

Kingsteignton Town Council uses RoSPA Play Safety to inspect their play equipment annually. RoSPA are widely recognised by insurers and local authorities. We have priced our estimate based on RoSPA's published pricing.

Typical Costs

According to the current RoSPA Play Safety pricing for parish and town councils:

- £83 + VAT per site for up to five pieces of equipment.
- £4 + VAT for each additional item over five.
- Additional charges apply if you require a meeting with the inspector.

- This does not cover the cost of repairing any items that may need it.

Annual Inspection Costs

Using RoSPA's current pricing and assuming an average of 10 pieces of equipment per site:

Item	Cost
5 sites × base inspection (£83)	£415
Additional equipment charges (25 items @ £4)	£100
VAT	£103
Annual inspection budget	**≈ £620**

Other local inspection providers

- The Play Inspection Company Ltd - Based in Poole and covers the South West.
- SouthWest Playground Safety Inspections - Independent South West-based inspector.
- Academic Facilities Services - Devon-based.
- Outdoor Play UK - Newton Abbot based.
- The Play Company - Devon-based manufacturer and installer.

Suggested Annual Revenue Budget for 5 play parks

If we add the predicted annual inspection costs to other predicted annual costs (based on published information from other local parish and town council), this suggests an annual budget of:

Item	Annual Budget
Independent annual inspections	£700
Weekly/monthly operational checks (staff time)	£1,000
Minor repairs (chains, bearings, seats, signs, bolts)	£2,000
Surfacing repairs	£1,500
Tree and vegetation management (around equipment)	£1,000
Contingency for vandalism and unexpected defects	£2,000
Total annual revenue provision	**£8,000–£10,000**

2) Grounds Maintenance (Parks, Open Spaces and Trees)

Allowances should be made for:

- Grass cutting;
- Hedge trimming;
- Weed control;
- Litter collection;
- Bin emptying;
- Minor repairs and maintenance.

Bovey Tracey town council currently budgets:

- Grounds maintenance contract: £16,000
- Recreation grounds/open spaces: £6,000
- Tree works: £4,500
- Fuel for grounds vehicle: £1,200

Total Bovey Tracey annual parks maintenance budget ≈ £27,000–£30,000.

Trees

Ownership of transferred sites would normally include responsibility for all trees within the site boundaries, including perimeter trees.
Provision should be made for:

- Professional tree surveys;
- Routine maintenance;
- Emergency works following storms or disease.
- making dangerous trees safe;
- overhanging branches;
- subsidence claims;

Most councils undertake a Tree Risk Survey every 2–3 years at a typical cost of £1,500–£3,000 for all sites. From this survey there may be recommended tree works, some years might be only £2k; another year one diseased beech could cost £10k.

Equipment (only applicable If we bring the maintenance in-house)

Equipment	Approx Cost
Ride-on mower	£12,000–£20,000
Pedestrian mower	£1,500
Strimmer and hedge cutter	£1,500
Trailer	£2,000
Hand tools	£1,000
Storage container/building	£10,000
Grounds vehicle/pick-up	£20,000–£35,000
Initial investment	**£50,000–£71,000**

As initial capital investment could exceed £50,000, contracting out grounds' maintenance is likely to represent the most cost-effective option in the short to medium term.

Suggested Annual Revenue Budget for Parks, Open Spaces and Trees

With five play parks plus recreation ground and grass areas at Cleder Place, we would expect Ashburton to need:

Item	Annual Cost
Grass cutting contract	£15,000–£25,000
Litter picking and bins	£2,000–£4,000
Weed control	£1,000–£2,000
Hedge cutting	£1,000–£3,000
Minor repairs	£2,000–£5,000
Tree surveys and works	£5,000–£10,000
Total annual revenue cost	**£26,000 –£50,000**

3) Public Toilets

The annual cost of operating public toilets typically includes:

- Daily cleaning;
- Opening and closing the building;
- Replenishing toilet rolls and soap;
- Sanitary waste collection;
- Utilities;
- Reactive repairs and vandalism.

Bovey Tracey town council currently budgets:

- Station Road toilets: £12,000
- Recreation Ground toilets: £6,000

Bovey Tracey total annual toilet budget = £18,000.

Public Toilet Maintenance Options

Rather than employing dedicated staff, many councils contract out cleaning and servicing.

Cleaning Contractor
Daily cleaning, replenishment of toilet rolls and soap, and reporting faults.

Local companies include:

- Ninja Cleaners SW (Paignton)
- The Really Useful Cleaning Company (Totnes)
- Flo's Super Clean Cleaning Services Ltd (Torquay)
- Chameleon Property & Laundry Ltd (South Hams)

Estimated annual cost: £7,000–£12,000 per year

Sanitary Waste Collection
Usually monthly or fortnightly.

Potential providers include:

- EMS Waste Services
- Coastal Recycling
- Devon Contract Waste Ltd
- SSR Waste Ltd

Estimated annual cost: £500–£1,000 per year

Consumables
Can either be supplied by the cleaner or purchased directly.

Local supplier:

- Washroom Hub

Annual budget:

- Toilet roll: £800–1,500
- Soap: £300–600

- Bin liners and cleaning products: £400–1,000

Repairs and Reactive Maintenance
Allow: £2,000–5,000 per annum

Caretaker Role

An option worth considering is whether Ashburton could combine public toilet management with a wider caretaker role, covering:

- Opening and closing toilets
- Play inspections.
- Litter bins.
- Minor repairs.
- Locking parks.

which is a model increasingly adopted by town councils and can provide better value than several separate contracts.

Automation

Alternatively, the town council could consider installing automated opening and closing the toilet block and charging a small fee for users to visit which would cover some of the running costs.

Example Cost Model

Item	**Capital Cost**
Automated locking system	£4,000
Contactless payment entry	£15,000
CCTV system, cloud storage and maintenance	£3,000
Signage and electrical works	£3,000
Total capital cost	**£25,000**

Potential income
Assuming: open 365 days/year and £0.20 per use
Projected income:

- 100 visits/day: £7,300/year
- 150 visits/day: £10,950/year
- 200 visits/day: £14,600/year

The financial case for charging depends heavily on visitor numbers. If the toilets are used mainly by tourists and visitors, charging 20p could potentially offset a substantial proportion of the running costs. If usage is modest, the payback period may be long.

Suggested Annual Revenue Budget for Ashburton Toilets (free use, no automation)

Item	Annual Cost
Daily cleaning and locking	£6,000–£8,000
Consumables	£1,000–£2,000
Utilities	£1,500–£2,500
Sanitary waste	£500–£1,000
Repairs and contingency	£2,000–£4,000
Recommended budget	**£12,000–£17,000**

Recommended Annual Revenue Budget

Service	Estimated Annual Cost
Grounds maintenance	£15,000–£25,000
Play area inspections	£700–£850
Playground repairs	£3,000–£5,000
Tree surveys and works	£5,000–£10,000
Public toilets	£12,000–£17,000
Contingency and miscellaneous maintenance	£5,000–£10,000
Total Recommended Annual Budget	**£41,000 – £68,000**

Longer-Term Asset Replacement

The greatest financial liability is likely to arise from future replacement of play equipment and associated surfacing. The replacement value of five play parks may exceed £500,000. To avoid significant one-off costs in future years, it is recommended that the Council establishes an annual capital reserve.

This reserve would avoid large one-off capital requests when major equipment reaches the end of its life. The council could look into forming a CIO to manage some assets which could then apply for grants or other funding (see separate document on advantages / disadvantages of forming a CIO or CIC).

Recommended annual contribution: £20,000–£30,000

Conclusions

Members are advised that:

1. The ongoing annual revenue cost of maintaining five play parks, recreation grounds and public toilets is likely to be in the region of **£40,000–£70,000 per annum**.
2. A longer-term asset replacement reserve of **£20,000–£30,000 per annum** should be established to fund future replacement of play equipment and major infrastructure.
3. Prior to any transfer, the Council should seek:
    - Detailed schedules of assets;
    - Land Registry title plans;
    - Existing tree surveys;
    - Maintenance histories;
    - Utility costs;
    - Records of previous expenditure;
    - Details of any known defects or liabilities.
4. The Council should strongly seek adequate financial support from Teignbridge District Council or a way to fund transferred assets (such as income from town carparks or CIL) to ensure that they are sustainable and do not place an unreasonable burden on local taxpayers.

Ashburton Town Council

Appendix 2

Future Management of Community Assets Following Local Government Reorganisation

Overview

As part of local government reorganisation, Ashburton Town Council may have the opportunity to acquire assets currently owned by Teignbridge District Council. The assets under discussion include:

- Public toilets
- Play parks
- The Recreation Ground (Rec)
- Some community open spaces

If Ashburton Town Council gains ownership of these assets should their day-to-day management remain with the Council or be delegated to a separate organisation, such as a Community Interest Company (CIC) or a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO).

Option 1: Direct Management by Ashburton Town Council

Under this option, the Council owns and manages the facilities directly.

Suitable for

- Public toilets.
- Play parks.
- The Recreation Ground
- Open spaces and green areas

Advantages

- Full democratic accountability through elected councillors.
- Decisions are made openly and transparently.
- Clear lines of responsibility for residents.
- Existing financial and governance procedures already exist.
- No need to establish and administer a separate organisation.
- No duplication of insurance, accounting or regulatory requirements.
- Assets and liabilities remain under direct Council control.
- The Council can employ contractors or staff as required.

Disadvantages

- The Council carries all operational and financial risks.
- Limited access to charitable grants.
- Increased officer and member workload – volunteers would be needed!

Option 2: Management by a Community Interest Company (CIC)

Under this arrangement, the Council would retain ownership but lease or licence the facilities to a CIC, which would manage them on the Council's behalf.

Suitable for

- Community enterprises.
- Commercial facilities.
- Markets and events.
- Assets with significant trading opportunities.

Suitability for toilets, parks and recreation grounds

Limited.

These facilities generally require ongoing maintenance rather than commercial operation, and a CIC may add unnecessary complexity.

Advantages

- Separate legal entity with limited liability.
- Ability to trade and generate income.
- Flexibility to employ staff and enter contracts.
- Opportunity to involve community members and volunteers.
- The Council can retain strategic oversight through service agreements.

Disadvantages

- Additional administration and governance.
- Annual reporting requirements to Companies House.
- Some grant funders favour charities rather than CICs.
- Potential duplication of accounting, insurance and governance costs.
- Reduced democratic accountability.
- The interests of the CIC may not always align perfectly with those of the Council.

Can councillors be directors?

Councillors may serve as directors, but they must act in the interests of the CIC and manage conflicts of interest carefully.

Option 3: Management by a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO)

Under this model, the Council retains ownership and grants a lease or management agreement to a CIO responsible for operating the facilities.

Suitable for

- Community centres.
- Heritage buildings.
- Museums.
- Environmental projects.
- Facilities capable of attracting external grant funding.

Suitability for toilets, parks and recreation grounds

Moderate.

A CIO may be appropriate where there is significant potential to secure grants for biodiversity projects, play equipment, sports facilities or environmental improvements. However, it introduces additional complexity and governance requirements.

Advantages

- Separate legal entity with limited liability.
- Access to charitable grants and trusts.
- Eligibility for Gift Aid and charitable tax reliefs.
- Ability to attract volunteers and donations.
- Strong public confidence and reputation.
- Independent board members can bring additional expertise.

Disadvantages

- The organisation must operate exclusively for charitable purposes.
- Charity law restricts some commercial activities.
- Additional administration and regulatory requirements.
- Trustees must act solely in the interests of the charity.
- Potential conflicts where councillors are also trustees.
- Some reduction in direct democratic accountability.

Can councillors be trustees?

Councillors may act as trustees, although good governance would suggest a mixture of councillors and independent trustees. Trustees must always act in the interests of the charity rather than the Council.

Comparison

Factor	Council Management	CIC	CIO
Council retains ownership	Yes	Yes	Yes
Democratic accountability	High	Medium	Medium
Commercial flexibility	Moderate	High	Limited
Access to charitable grants	Limited	Moderate	High
Additional administration	Low	Medium	Medium
Ability to involve volunteers	Moderate	High	High
Suitable for toilets and parks	High	Low	Medium
Public perception	High	Medium	High

Governance

Councillors may legally serve as directors of a CIC or trustees of a CIO.

However, this creates dual responsibilities and potential conflicts of interest. Good practice would be:

- A mixed board of councillors and independent members.
- Formal service level agreements with the Council.
- Regular reporting to the Council.
- Clear financial arrangements and performance measures.
- Retention of ownership by Ashburton Town Council.

Overall Assessment

For public toilets, play parks and recreation grounds, direct management by Ashburton Town Council remains the simplest and most accountable model.

Creating a separate organisation would introduce additional administration and governance without necessarily reducing costs.

A Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO) could be considered if:

- Significant external grant funding opportunities become available;
- A large volunteer base is established;
- Sports, biodiversity or community development projects are envisaged; or
- A larger portfolio of community facilities is transferred in the future.

A Community Interest Company (CIC) appears less suited to the types of assets currently under consideration, as these facilities are not primarily commercial enterprises.

Recommendation

A CIO is generally more suitable than a CIC for community facilities and open spaces because charitable status provides access to grants and public trust, whereas a CIC tends to be more appropriate for trading enterprises. Public conveniences, playgrounds and recreation grounds are also services that residents generally expect their elected council to provide and oversee.

There is also a fourth option that deserves consideration and which many larger parish councils use: a charitable trust or CIO specifically for parks and recreation, while the Council continues to run public conveniences directly. That hybrid model could allow grant funding for play equipment, biodiversity and sports facilities without introducing a separate body to manage the less glamorous but essential services such as toilets. That may ultimately prove the most practical arrangement if Ashburton acquires a substantial portfolio from TDC.

Taking into account the above data the preferred approach would be to, short term, acquire and manage the assets directly through Ashburton Town Council. Longer term, if additional facilities are acquired, or substantial external funding opportunities arise, consider establishing a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIC) to manage specific facilities under lease from the Council, while ownership remains with Ashburton Town Council.