

Letter to Parish Council Sep 2026	2
Owslebury_Recreation_Ground_Website_Statement_Review	3

To Parish Council
From GrOws

10 September 2026

Owslebury Recreation Ground

In line with the terms of reference set by the Parish Council for GrOws, we met to discuss our response to the proposals for the development of the Recreation Ground. There were 9 members of the public. There were no Parish Councillors present.

First of all, we are grateful to the Parish Council for the hard work that has already gone into developing proposals. The sporting facilities were inadequate and needed replacing. We fully support sporting facilities and activities to promote the physical health and mental well-being of all villagers, believing that the resulting local community spirit and sense of belonging will be to the benefit of us all.

Along with the Parish Council we agree that the village green status should be retained. We anticipate it would protect open access to green space and provide possibilities for exercise to people of all ages and stages of life. We believe it would be essential to try and reinstate a footpath and add a cycle path to make access safe. We would expect the speed limit to be reduced to protect all road users on Longwood Road and Baybridge Lane.

We appreciate that the plans are still under discussion, and note that changes have already been made to scale back over-ambitious ideas. We trust that the eventual plans will be proportionate and appropriate to the size of the Recreation Ground and keep it within the means of the village to support it through fund raising and future usage.

We principally kept to the specific remit in point 4.ii within our terms of reference which is to

Promote protection of our local environment and increase its biodiversity.

Our fundamental point is to recommend adhering to the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of 10%. Make it a non-negotiable principle of the scheme, irrespective of the Government's decision about BNG. This would be in line with the Parish Council's declaration of a Climate Emergency. It would acknowledge the imperative we face to address the reality of climate change. Please don't knowingly avoid doing this.

In light of this we seek reassurance that the scheme the Parish Council puts forward (not in order of priority):

Keeps trees

- Mature trees provide valuable shade for human, animal and plant life. Our lived experience in this summer's heatwaves has taught us so. The shady location of the new picnic benches is a case in point.
- It would take decades for any off-set tree planting to gain maturity and replace the shade we would lose, so please don't take that route.
- We advocate further tree and hedge planting on the Longwood Road perimeter.

The pavilion building be a Net zero exemplar

- Take the opportunity to think once more about the building; have a forward back perspective from 2036 or later.
- Build with all the future-proofing tech we currently have available: solar panels, ground source heat pumps, living roof / walls, appropriate materials and building practices to ensure a carbon-neutral building.
- Take pride as innovators to create a building not just fit for sports but also for the entrance to our village and the South Downs National Park.

Question the efficacy of padel courts

- By the time they are commissioned, will the bubble have burst - rendering it an expensive burden?
- Ensure the business plan is transparent and presented for debate in the village. GrOws is particularly interested as the business plan will determine the scale and level of change, potential pollution and disturbance of the site's biodiversity.
- To avoid future 'creep' of biodiversity erosion, we are concerned that if the padel courts go ahead they and the land they're on are not given over to a commercial investor or owner with different values to those of the village. Therefore who exactly would own them is of potential concern.
- We are primarily concerned that if either one (as earlier proposed) or two or any number of padel courts go ahead, they will incur light and noise pollution, and overall increased traffic, notwithstanding reduced need for villagers to travel for sport. Such pollution would violate the village's designated status as 'tranquil' and an area of dark skies. This is not a whimsical concern - noise and light harm wildlife.
- If they go ahead, we would recommend mitigating these concerns to some extent with appropriate screening, roofing, materials and surrounding planting.

To reiterate, we totally agree with making the most of this opportunity. Our concerns are to protect the land and all life that depends on it, including our own.

Review of Statements on the Owslebury Recreation Ground Website

Purpose. This schedule compares statements retained on the revised campaign website with wording newly added to it. It records the Council’s factual position, identifies where the matter has already been answered or evidenced, and suggests an accurate replacement. It distinguishes established facts from predictions, opinions and matters that remain subject to pre-application advice, specialist counsel, technical assessment and future Council decisions.

Further engagement. The Council has already undertaken a residents’ questionnaire, two public presentations, public Pavilion Committee meetings and written questions and answers. At its most recent meeting, it also resolved to hold another village presentation and conduct a further survey once the pre-application response and counsel’s advice have been received, so that residents can comment on an informed and legally deliverable proposal.

Statement Review Schedule

What the website still says	What it now additionally states	Correct factual position	Where already answered or evidenced	Suggested website correction
The land is described throughout as ‘Owslebury Village Green’.	The revised homepage now uses ‘Owslebury Recreation Ground - a registered Village Green’, but the campaign name and FAQ continue to use ‘Owslebury Village Green’ as though that were the site’s official name.	Its established name is Owslebury Recreation Ground. It is also registered as village green VG80, but ‘Owslebury Village Green’ is not its proper historical name.	Historical Report: title, Executive Summary and VG80 records.	Use ‘Owslebury Recreation Ground, which is registered as village green VG80’ throughout.
The land was ‘designated to the village in 1861’ and was previously said to have been given or donated by the owner of Longwood.	The FAQ still says that in 1906 the owner of Longwood ‘gave the green to the village for cricket’.	Incorrect. The 1861 Inclosure Award allotted Plot 42, comprising five acres, to trustees for exercise and recreation by the inhabitants of the Parish and neighbourhood. The historic Longwood or Marwell cricket ground was a separate private ground. The Recreation Ground was not donated by the owner of Longwood in 1906.	Historical Report: 1861 Award; history of Plot 42; distinction between the Recreation Ground and Longwood or Marwell cricket ground.	‘The Recreation Ground originated in the 1861 Inclosure Award, which allotted five acres in trust for exercise and recreation by the inhabitants of the Parish and neighbourhood.’
The site is described as a four-acre space designated in 1861.	The revised website continues to combine the present approximate area with the historic 1861 allocation.	The 1861 Award specified five acres. The present measured site is approximately 16,571 square metres, or 4.095 acres. The historic and present figures should not be conflated.	Historical Report: 1861 Award and present-site measurements.	State separately that the 1861 allotment was five acres and that the present measured site is approximately 4.095 acres.
The Recreation Ground is ‘under threat of permanent loss’.	The revised site describes a change ‘from open green space to a fully developed, commercial sporting hub serving Winchester and the wider region’.	Unsupported and alarmist. There is no proposal to dispose of or develop the whole Recreation Ground. The preliminary combined footprint is approximately 1,574 square metres, about 9.5 per cent of the measured site. The substantial majority remains recreational land. The legal acceptability of the affected area is being referred to counsel.	Historical Report: project description, footprint assessment and Questions for Specialist Counsel.	‘The preliminary scheme would use approximately 9.5 per cent of the measured site for buildings, courts and associated hardstanding, subject to planning and legal advice.’
The Council has lodged a ‘pre-planning application to transform the area’.	The revised site continues to describe the pre-application process in language suggesting that a planning application and final scheme already exist.	A request for pre-application planning advice is not a planning application and does not authorise development. No final design has been adopted and no final decision to construct the scheme has been made.	Written Answers; Historical Report: scope and current project status; Questions 21 to 23; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which explains that pre-application advice is not a planning application and that no final decisions have been made.	‘The Council has sought pre-application planning advice. No planning application has been submitted and no final design or decision to build has been adopted.’
The Council ‘hasn’t published what was in the application’.	The site now says that no plans have been publicly released and	Misleading. Project information, presentations, drawings and written answers have been provided at different	Council presentations and meeting papers; written Q&A; FOI disclosure;	‘Project information and drawings have been shown publicly. The September 2026 Parish

What the website still says	What it now additionally states	Correct factual position	Where already answered or evidenced	Suggested website correction
	that plans had to be obtained through an FOI request.	stages. The September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter itself reproduced both the proposed internal pavilion layout and a site drawing showing the proposed locations of the pavilion, MUGA, parking and padel courts. A restriction on reproducing an architect's copyright drawings is not the same as refusing to show the proposals.	architect correspondence; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, including the internal floor layout and proposed site-location drawing.	Council Newsletter reproduced the pavilion floor plan and a drawing showing the proposed locations of the pavilion, MUGA, parking and padel courts. The architect did not grant the campaign permission to republish its copyright drawings.'
The Council and architects will not allow the group to show residents what is planned.	This is now displayed as a prominent headline: 'The Parish Council and architects will not allow us to show you what they're planning.'	Materially misleading. Radley House's objection concerned republication of its copyright drawings. It did not prohibit residents from viewing or discussing the proposals and is not evidence that the Council is concealing them. The Council also reproduced the proposed pavilion floor layout and site-location plan in its September 2026 village newsletter.	Architect correspondence concerning reproduction of drawings; FOI disclosure; Council presentations; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter.	'The Council has shown the proposals publicly and included plans in its September 2026 newsletter. The plans were also supplied through FOI, although the architect did not grant us permission to republish its copyright drawings.'
The CIL application is treated as evidence of a regional facility for Winchester and surrounding areas.	The revised site quotes the CIL funding language and uses it to describe the project as a regional commercial hub.	Taken out of context. The CIL wording described wider public benefits to support a funding application. It did not change the proposal into a separately conceived regional commercial hub. The primary purpose remains recreation and sport at Owslebury Recreation Ground.	CIL application; January 2026 minutes recording the CIL officer's suggested wording; Historical Report.	Explain that the quoted wording came from a funding application describing potential wider benefits and does not define the planning proposal as a regional commercial hub.
The project is a 'large-scale commercial regional hub'.	The revised website repeats this characterisation in its text and image caption.	This is a characterisation, not an established fact. The scheme has a recreational and community purpose. Charges for padel and other organised activities are intended to support operation and maintenance. That does not itself make the Recreation Ground a commercial regional hub.	Written Answers on funding and operation; CIL application; Historical Report; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which describes a focused village-scale facility rather than a large commercial development.	Describe the scheme as a proposed integrated village sports and community facility, with income-producing elements intended to support its long-term sustainability.
The proposal includes a community café or shop and social events and celebrations.	The revised wording still implies a broad commercial or events use.	The residents' survey identified interest in community facilities, including refreshments or a community shop. These are supporting facilities, not evidence of a separate retail, party or wedding-venue development. Their eventual scope remains subject to design, planning and legal advice.	Residents' questionnaire and published results; written Q&A; project plans; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which describes flexible community space, kitchen and refreshment facilities as part of the pavilion.	'A modest community café or shop was included in response to the residents' survey. Its precise scope remains subject to design, planning and legal advice.'
One full-sized football pitch and two five-a-side pitches are presented as new developed areas.	They remain listed as elements of the 'current proposal' without explaining that the ground is already used in this manner.	Misleading. The Recreation Ground is already used for football. They are not three new permanent built developments occupying additional land.	Existing-use; plans and written Q&A.	The Recreation Ground is already used for cricket and football and that the existing grass pitches are already marked out. The proposal is to formalise and adjust their positions within the site so that they fit safely and effectively alongside the other proposed facilities,.
The Council is spending £7,500 on a barrister to 'find a way through the regulations'.	The September update says the Council is spending £7,500 to determine its powers, charging, the meaning of 'neighbourhood', padel operation, dog exclusion and whether the development will be moved to Glebe Field.	Misleading. The £7,500 is a maximum authorised expenditure, not a new or unbudgeted charge. It will be met from the existing Planning Application Costs budget. Planning is not cost-free: it requires design work, surveys, specialist reports, application fees and, where the land's legal status requires it, specialist legal advice. Counsel is being asked to establish how the proposal may lawfully proceed, not to circumvent regulations. Glebe Field is not the proposed location of the development.	Council budgets from preceding years; September 2026 resolution; Historical Report and Questions for Specialist Counsel; Questions 21 to 23.	'The Council has authorised expenditure of up to £7,500 from its existing Planning Application Costs budget to obtain specialist legal advice on how the 1861 Award and village-green legislation apply, and whether any additional statutory consent is required.'

What the website still says	What it now additionally states	Correct factual position	Where already answered or evidenced	Suggested website correction
The planning budget is described as £27,000 and an extraordinary amount being spent without consultation or a village mandate.	The revised site presents the £7,500 counsel limit as a further expense arising from the dispute.	The revised website presents the £7,500 counsel limit as a new or additional expense. In fact, the expenditure will be met from the Council's existing Planning Application Costs budget, which has been built up over several years. Counsel's advice is required to establish the lawful route for progressing the proposal before further planning expenditure and decisions are undertaken; it is not an expense caused by owsleburygreen.com or as they refer to the present "dispute".	Annual budgets and Council minutes; Financial Regulations; September 2026 resolution; planning-cost records.	'The Council has accumulated an earmarked Planning Application Costs budget over several years. Up to £7,500 of that existing budget has been authorised for specialist counsel.'
Meaningful engagement has been postponed and spending is proceeding without consultation or a mandate.	The website continues to call for a public exhibition and further village-wide engagement without acknowledging the Council's latest resolutions.	Misleading and now out of date. Engagement has included a residents' questionnaire, two public presentations, regular public Pavilion Committee meetings and written questions and answers. At its most recent meeting, the Council resolved to hold another village presentation and undertake a further survey once the pre-application response and counsel's advice have been received. That sequencing enables residents to comment on an informed and legally deliverable proposal.	Residents' questionnaire and results; presentation records; Pavilion Committee minutes; written Q&A; September 2026 Council resolutions; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which records the 2022 village-wide consultation, the January and September 2025 presentations, monthly public meetings and planned further community information events after pre-application feedback.	'The Council has previously undertaken a questionnaire, public presentations and public committee meetings. It has resolved to hold a further village presentation and survey after receiving the pre-application response and counsel's advice.'
Counsel is being asked whether the Council may move the development to Glebe Field.	This is newly included in the September update as though relocation is an active proposal.	Incorrect. There is no adopted proposal to relocate the development to Glebe Field. Glebe Field has been identified only as a possible replacement-land or alternative legal-route issue if counsel considers it relevant. If counsel confirms that the scheme may lawfully proceed on VG80, no exchange proposal may be needed.	Historical Report: questions concerning Commons Act 2006 routes and alternatives; Glebe Field conveyance.	Remove this statement or say: 'Counsel may be asked whether any replacement-land process is relevant; there is no current proposal to move the development to Glebe Field.'
The proposal will cause the irreversible loss of open public space.	The revised website continues to present loss of the whole green as an expected consequence.	Overstated. A defined part of the site would contain improved sporting and supporting facilities, but there is no proposal to remove public recreational status from the whole ground. The extent of interference and the lawful route are matters for counsel.	Historical Report: footprint, better-enjoyment issue and Questions for Specialist Counsel; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which states that the facilities are proposed around the former pavilion, current parking area and former Scout hut, with the rest of the field remaining open.	State the measured proposed footprint and acknowledge that the majority of the Recreation Ground remains available for recreation.
Most mature trees will be felled.	The wording has changed from the earlier claim that all mature trees would be felled, but still asserts that "most" will be removed.	Unsupported as written. The project concerns identified trees affected by the proposed layout; it does not establish that most mature trees across the Recreation Ground will be removed. Any removal remains subject to relevant arboricultural, ecological and planning requirements.	Tree and ecological work; current plans; written Q&A; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, including the site drawing identifying the particular existing trees affected by the current proposal.	Identify the specific trees proposed for removal and avoid claiming that 'most mature trees' will be felled unless supported by the tree survey.
Ownership and the maintenance model are unclear.	The revised site continues to ask for clarification of funding, ownership, management, maintenance and sustainability.	Already answered in principle. The Recreation Ground remains owned by the Parish Council. The intended model is Council ownership with an appropriately controlled Sports Club lease or management arrangement under the developing memorandum of understanding. Padel income is intended to support	Written Answers on ownership, funding and management; Historical Report; draft memorandum of understanding; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, including the funding section and Sports Club	'The Council will retain ownership. It is developing a controlled lease or management arrangement with the Sports Club, with padel income intended to support operation and maintenance.'

What the website still says	What it now additionally states	Correct factual position	Where already answered or evidenced	Suggested website correction
		ongoing operation and maintenance. Detailed agreements follow once the lawful route is established.	CIO governance and reinvestment proposals.	
The development will diminish the village hall and pub.	This remains listed as an expected impact.	Speculation presented without supporting evidence. The proposed facilities have different primary purposes and are intended to support users of the Recreation Ground.	Written Q&A on proposed uses; residents' survey; project brief.	Present this as the group's concern and not as an established consequence.
The scheme will increase the precept and impose additional costs on parishioners.	The revised website continues to present increased precept tax and charges as an expected financial impact.	Not established. Funding and operating arrangements are still being developed. The financial model is intended to use padel income to help make the sports facilities sustainable. The £7,500 counsel limit comes from an existing earmarked budget. A future precept increase should not be presented as decided fact.	Written Answers on funding; CIL application; financial model; annual budgets; Historical Report; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which explains the intended mix of grants, CIL, sponsorship, donations, fundraising and income generation.	State that the funding and operating model remains under development and that no particular precept increase has been decided.
The new pavilion is around four times the size of the former pavilion.	The revised site states that the former pavilion was about 69 square metres, the new pavilion is 216 square metres and the canopy is 61 square metres.	This requires precise wording. The proposed enclosed pavilion at 216 square metres is approximately 3.1 times the former 69-square-metre pavilion. If the separate 61-square-metre canopy is included, the total covered footprint is approximately 277 square metres, or four times the former pavilion.	1968 pavilion drawings; architect's current area schedule; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which reproduces the internal floor layout and explains that it was shaped by Sport England, ECB and FA guidance on changing, accessibility, storage and community facilities.	'The proposed enclosed pavilion is about 3.1 times the former pavilion. Including the separate canopy, the covered footprint is approximately four times the former building.'
The entire scheme is roughly twenty-three times the footprint of the old pavilion.	The revised website now explains that this includes the padel courts, MUGA and new hardstanding, but uses the comparison to emphasise the scale of the pavilion project.	The arithmetic is close but the comparison is not like-for-like. It compares the former pavilion building alone with the whole proposed scheme, including courts, MUGA and hardstanding. It does not mean that the new pavilion is 23 times larger. The whole preliminary scheme represents about 9.5 per cent of the current site.	1968 drawings; architect's 1,574-square-metre combined figure; Historical Report.	Use separate like-for-like figures for the old and proposed pavilion and state the whole-scheme footprint as a percentage of the Recreation Ground. TO BE GATHERED
A similar-sized replacement pavilion would meet the village's needs.	The group continues to promote a modern pavilion of similar size and scale as the appropriate solution.	This is the group's preferred alternative, not an established fact. A replacement must address current accessibility, changing, toilet, safeguarding, sporting, operational and long-term sustainability requirements.	Residents' survey; project brief; accessibility and sporting requirements; CIL application; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which explains the governing-body standards and records that earlier proposals were scaled back into a more focused village-scale scheme.	Present this expressly as the group's preferred option rather than as the only necessary or appropriate solution.
The current proposals conflict with the regulations.	The FAQ retains this as a heading and then lists matters said to require legal representation.	Premature conclusion. The purpose of obtaining counsel's advice is to determine whether and how the proposal can lawfully be delivered. The website cannot properly present illegality or regulatory conflict as already established.	Historical Report: legal analysis and Questions for Specialist Counsel; Questions 21 to 23.	Change the heading to: 'What legal questions does the proposal raise?'
The drawings are artistic impressions and are not drawn to scale.	This remains in the FAQ.	Incorrect or materially incomplete. Some presentation images may be illustrative, but the architect confirmed that the project drawings themselves were produced to scale. Copyright restrictions do not make them unscaled.	Architect correspondence and scaled drawings.	'Some presentation images are illustrative; the architect's plans are drawn to scale.'
A yew tree has been 'chopped	The FAQ now labels this 'Harm	A Council decision was made to remove an identified	Council decision and tree-	State the decision and known facts neutrally,

What the website still says	What it now additionally states	Correct factual position	Where already answered or evidenced	Suggested website correction
down’, which could be considered harmful.	done’.	tree in connection with management of the site. Describing this as ‘harm done’ is the group’s opinion and does not establish unlawful or environmentally harmful action.	management records; written answers concerning the trees.	separating them from the group’s opinion about environmental harm.
Mature trees were scheduled for removal with less than twelve hours’ notice and without necessary consultations or ecological impacts being established.	This remains in the FAQ under ‘What is causing the most concern’.	Incorrect as a categorical assertion. The Council made a decision it was entitled to make and undertook the checks required at that stage. The proposed works were subsequently stopped following intervention by protesters. Further arboricultural and ecological work forms part of the developing project.	Council minutes; contractor and tree records; written answers.	Replace the allegation with a neutral chronology of the Council’s decision, checks undertaken, notice given and postponement of the works.
The site will be hedged off along Longwood Road, causing loss of access and making the post box inaccessible.	This is now included in the FAQ as an expected result of the proposal.	Misleading and unsupported. Landscaping or hedge proposals do not amount to enclosing the whole Recreation Ground. The Council is not proposing to prevent public access to the ground or make the post box inaccessible. Final access and landscaping remain subject to design and planning.	Current plans; written answers on access; Historical Report; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which states that the rest of the field will remain open for sport, recreation, walking and community activities.	Remove the asserted loss of access and state any identified landscaping proposal accurately, together with the retained access points.
It is unclear whether the playing pitches will be fenced off or whether constant use will prevent villagers accessing the green.	This is newly or more prominently stated in the FAQ.	There is no proposal to fence off the existing cricket and football playing fields from public access. The padel courts and MUGA require their own sport-specific enclosures, but that is not the same as fencing off the Recreation Ground or its grass pitches. No proposal says that the grass pitches will be in constant exclusive use or that villagers will be prevented from accessing the ground.	Current plans; written answers on public access and enclosures; existing use; Historical Report; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which expressly answers that local residents will not lose access and that the rest of the field will remain open.	‘The padel courts and MUGA would have sport-specific enclosures. The Council is not proposing to fence off the Recreation Ground or the existing grass playing fields, and public access will remain.’
The pavilion was completed in 1908.	This remains in the FAQ’s account of the site’s history.	The original records reviewed for the Historical Report indicate that the Recreation Ground pavilion was commissioned in 1909. An older secondary account appears to have confused the chronology.	Historical Report: sporting chronology and original records.	Correct the date to 1909 and remove the associated claim that the ground was donated in 1906.
Traffic will increase significantly because the facility is intended for Winchester and the region.	This remains in the FAQ as a predicted consequence.	Prediction presented as fact. The scale and effect of any increase must be established through transport and highways evidence. Visiting teams already form part of established cricket and football use. The CIL funding language does not establish a regional sports-centre use.	Pre-application and planning evidence; access proposals; CIL application; Historical Report; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which explains that the proposal supports existing activities and that traffic and parking will continue to be assessed.	Present increased traffic as a concern requiring assessment rather than as an established significant effect.
The Recreation Ground will become a Hampshire-wide sports centre.	The FAQ continues to contrast open space with a dedicated Hampshire-wide sports centre.	Incorrect characterisation. There is no proposal for a Hampshire-wide sports centre. References to Winchester and surrounding areas in the CIL material described potential wider benefits for funding purposes.	CIL application and associated minutes; Historical Report.	Remove ‘Hampshire-wide sports centre’ and describe the actual proposed facilities.
Padel noise will resonate throughout the village.	This remains in the FAQ, including reference to the sound of the ball being hit.	Unsupported as a factual conclusion. Noise was considered during the architect’s feasibility work and assessed as negligible in that context. Any planning application can be supported by professional acoustic evidence and mitigation if required.	Written Q&A concerning padel noise; architect’s feasibility work; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, which explains the recreational and income-supporting purpose of the padel courts.	Present noise as an issue to be assessed rather than claiming it will resonate throughout the village.
Light pollution will be significant	This remains in the FAQ and	Not established. Lighting must be designed and	Written Q&A on lighting; project design	‘The effect of any proposed lighting will require

What the website still says	What it now additionally states	Correct factual position	Where already answered or evidenced	Suggested website correction
and detrimental to villagers and wildlife.	impact list.	assessed against the National Park's Dark Night Skies requirements. Significant detriment cannot properly be asserted before the lighting design and technical assessment are completed.	requirements; planning-stage assessment.	assessment against the National Park's Dark Night Skies requirements.'
It is unclear who will fund construction, maintenance and ongoing management.	This remains in the FAQ despite the Council's answers on the intended model.	Already answered in principle. The Council will retain ownership; the Sports Club is intended to occupy or manage under a controlled agreement; and padel revenue is intended to contribute to maintenance and long-term sustainability. Detailed agreements follow once the lawful route is known.	Written Answers on ownership, management and funding; memorandum of understanding; Historical Report; September 2026 Parish Council Newsletter, including its sections on project finance and modernising the Sports Club as a CIO.	Acknowledge the intended ownership, management and funding model, while stating that detailed agreements remain to be finalised.
The proposed access compromises the safety of walkers, runners, horse riders, cyclists and other road users.	The FAQ presents this as an established consequence of the Baybridge Lane access and Longwood Road conditions.	An unproven conclusion. The proposal involves improving access and parking arrangements. Highway safety, visibility and traffic effects require professional assessment through the planning process; they have not been established as inherently unsafe.	Access plans; pre-application process; future highways evidence.	Present road safety as a concern requiring highways assessment, not as a concluded fact.

Principal corrections requested. The website should correct the account of the 1861 Award; stop describing the Recreation Ground as donated land; make clear that the Council is not proposing to fence off the grass pitches or prevent public access; remove the suggestion that development is being moved to Glebe Field; distinguish copyright restrictions from concealment; compare pavilion and whole-scheme areas on a like-for-like basis; and accurately describe both the existing planning budget and the Council's resolved programme of further engagement.