
Executive

9th September 2008

Report of the Director of City Strategy, Head of Finance, Head of Civic, Democratic & Legal Services

Community Stadium – Update Report

Summary

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Executive with an update on the progress towards meeting the conditions of a proposed loan to York City Football Club as set out following the meeting of the Executive of 15th July 2008. The proposal for a loan will be considered at Full Council on 25th September 2008 and because of the relatively short timescale between the Executive decision in July, the complexity of the work required, this report does not have some of the key information that will be provided for Council. It is therefore work in progress but also provides the Executive with the opportunity to confirm on the basis of the latest information available, their commitment to offering a loan or recommending a different option.
2. The report also provides information on the case for a community stadium at Annex 1 which sets out potential uses and possible management arrangements.

Background

3. The Staffing and Urgency Committee on 21st May 2008 considered a report recommending a loan to the York City Football Club (YCFC) to enable it to repay its £2.1 million loan from the Football Foundation. The committee approved this proposal in principal subject to a number of conditions being fulfilled.
4. At the meeting of the Executive on the 15th July 2008 a further report was considered and the following recommendations were made subject to a decision by Full Council on 25th September 2008:

That the Council make a loan of £2.1 million to York City Football Club (YCFC), to replace the existing loan of £2.1 million made by the Football Foundation, subject to the conditions set out in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the report and including the following conditions:

- a) Further financial investigation into YCFC, Bootham

Crescent Holdings and JM Packaging that clarifies the ownership structure, number and value of calls on a capital receipt from the sale of Bootham Crescent and the financial position of the parties involved, and confirms that such a loan and interest could be repaid in full from the value of Bootham Crescent.

b) The Council loan to be subject to a charge on the Bootham Crescent ground, such charge taking precedent over all other calls on the asset.

c) Written confirmation to be obtained that the Football Foundation guarantees that YCFC would receive a £2 million Football Stadia Improvement Fund (FSIF) grant, to be applied to the development of a new community stadium.

d) A legal agreement is to be obtained (explained in Annex 2)

e) The interest payable from the loan to be set at a commercial rate which is detailed in Annex 2, reflecting the likely return the Council would achieve if invested on the money markets.

f) The interest to be payable with the balance of the loan at the end of the period projected in June 2012. During this period the interest would be compounded.

g) Confirmation that the final terms of the loan meet the legal requirements set out in paragraph 19 of the report.

5. The Executive also resolved that an update report on the progress towards a community stadium be brought to the Executive meeting on the 9th September 2008.

Update on the latest position

A) Potential funding for a new stadium:

6. The value of Huntington Stadium has been estimated (details are provided in Annex 2) based on a 25% affordable housing contribution, assuming the community benefits of the stadium out-weigh the community benefits of the higher up to 50% affordable housing within existing planning policy. This estimated figure would however have to be reduced by the cost of relocating the of athletics track. (Members previously resolved to contribute £1 million) together with a sum of approximately £400K for the necessary separation of the existing main stand from Courtneys.
7. On the same basis of a 25% affordable housing requirement the value of Bootham Crescent has been estimated (see Annex 2 for information). From this figure the repayment value to CYC would have to be deducted together with other deductions for repayment to shareholders in Bootham Crescent

Holdings (BCH) and to JM Packaging. This would leave a balance available for investment in the new stadium.

8. The required Football Stadium Improvement Grant total is £2 million. The total, when added to the balance available from Bootham Crescent and Huntington Stadium, based on the assumptions above can be seen in Annex 2.
9. The cost of a new stadium is currently estimated to be between £1400 and £2000 per seat at 08/09 prices depending on the specification and the level of additional facilities required. This would put the total cost of a new 6000 seat stadium being built in 2010/11 at between £9.1m and £13m when taking construction inflation into account. The table below summarises the situation in terms of costs of a new stadium. In addition a table containing information about the funding of the stadium can be found in Annex 2.

Option	a	b	c
Capacity (No of seats)	6,000	6,000	6,000
Cost per Seat (08/09 Prices)	£1,400	£1,750	£2,000
Construction Cost (08/09 Prices)	£8,400,000	£10,500,000	£12,000,000
Construction Inflation factor applied for 10/11 build	8.50%	8.50%	8.50%
Construction Cost 10/11	£9,114,000	£11,392,500	£13,020,000
Land Cost	£0	£0	£0
Estimated Cost	£9,114,000	£11,392,500	£13,020,000
Projected Funding Shortfall	£4,364,000	£6,642,500	£8,270,000

10. The table above shows a shortfall in funding which represents the amount the council will have to contribute to the project funds in order to deliver a community stadium, (for more information please see Annex 2). This shortfall could be funded in a three different ways:
 - Sole use of prudential borrowing,
 - Capital receipts,
 - A combination of the prudential borrowing and capital receipts.
11. The revenue cost of borrowing the full amount of the shortfall is explained further in Annex 2. This revenue cost could be financed from income generated from the ground/football club or could be funded by the Council from revenue (the latter would take the form of a growth item in the appropriate years budget cycle). The council could take a view that the community stadium is a priority

over other calls on revenue if it feels it is a sufficient priority. Potential loss of the FF £2 Million grant could also influence the council's decision to part fund the stadium and this loss would also affect the figures in Annex 2.

12. Capital receipts could be allocated to fund the shortfall. Capital receipts at the Council are limited but following changes in accounting rules up to £4m is available to allocate to new schemes for the 2009/10 budget cycle. A bid for capital funds could be made through the usual mechanism of the Capital Resource Allocation Model process.
13. A combination of the two options above could be used to fund the shortfall. For every £100k of capital receipts used there would be a resultant decrease of revenue budget required of £8.5k. For example applying capital receipts of £1m to the £1400 per seat option would reduce the revenue budget required. Please see Annex 2 for further details.
14. Information is currently being sought from the Deloitte as to the likely income achievable based on that from similar stadia and this will form part of the verbal update to be provided by officers at the meeting on the 9th September.

B) Scope of Deloitte work

15. Following the July Executive meeting Deloitte were re-engaged to work on the following:
 - JMP financial situation – obtain, read and comment on the audited financial statements of JMP for the 12 months ending 30th September 2005, September 2006, 9 months ending June 2007.
 - Financial relationships between the owners of and stakeholders in the Football Club – read the package of agreements and summarise the relationships between JM, JMP, YCFC, York City Supporters Trust, Bootham Crescent Holdings Limited, minority shareholders and the Football Stadia Improvement Fund and identify clauses within the agreements that appear to be of most relevance to CYC
 - Creditor rankings will be summarised in the event of the football club becoming insolvent
16. At the time of writing the report no information had been received on the above work although it is expected this will be available for the meeting on the 9th September where officers will provide a verbal update of the findings.

C) Update on Legal Implications

17. Work is ongoing on the necessary legal work to satisfy the conditions set out from the July Executive. Progress to date is set out in the Legal section below.

Options and Analysis

18. This is an update report and various pieces of key information are not yet available as explained elsewhere in the report. There are however still options

available to Members in making a recommendation to council or in deciding not to refer the subject of a loan to council at all.

19. The council has made the delivery of a community stadium one of its corporate imperatives within the Corporate Strategy 2007 – 2011. The previous report argued that a partnership with YCFC was a paramount consideration in delivering a new stadium. The prime purpose of any loan made to YCFC is therefore to ultimately help to facilitate the stadium by relieving the financial pressures on the club in advance of moving. Clearly the outcome from the July committee, whilst approving the principal of the loan, was focussed on necessary measures to ensure that the council was fully protected in securing any loan against the existing ground and also ensuring that there is sound financial management in both YCFC and the majority shareholder of the ground, JM Packaging. It is this work that Deloitte are working on and which is not available at the time of writing the report.
20. Another important factor in any decision to provide support to YCFC is the protection of the current status of the Football Stadia Improvement Grant which would see their current loan being converted into a grant when work begins on a new stadium. Currently YCFC are unable to meet the conditions of the loan and this could be withdrawn which would mean that the future £2 Million grant would be lost to the project.
21. Whilst Members of the July committee resolved to recommend to council that a loan of £2.1 Million be made to YCFC (subject to stringent conditions) there remains a number of options to achieve the previously desired outcome or an option not to provide support to the football club which would almost certainly mean the end of the council's community stadium aspirations in their current form.
22. The options available to Members are therefore:

Option 1 – Do Nothing - Clearly Members could still decide to do nothing as set out in the previous July report. The implications of this are still as set out in that report namely further investment in the club will be required to pay the ongoing interest to the FF (please see Annex 2). If the football club goes out of business or is run on a less successful basis in terms of its ongoing revenue then a community stadium may not be deliverable without significant council support in terms of both revenue and capital. Clearly without detailed knowledge of any future outcome for the football club under this option it is not possible to predict any likely required council investment to deliver and run a community stadium. The do nothing option would also mean that a grant from the Football Foundation at the levels currently on offer (£2 Million) would almost certainly be lost.

Option 2 – Replace the FF loan - Continue to recommend to Council that the loan be made, provided the conditions set out in the minutes of the July report are satisfied. This option is to make a loan of £2.1 Million up to 2012. For the total cost of the loan, including rolled up interest, please see Annex 2.

Option 3 – Provide a loan to cover interest on the FF loan – During the course of discussions with the council's professional advisors a suggestion was made that instead of replacing the FF loan, a loan could be made by the council to pay the interest only on the outstanding FF loan. This would have the benefit that the total outlay and liability of the council would be less and that the FF would turn their loan into a grant at the same level when the first sod was turned on the new stadium (please see Annex 2 for further information). Clearly if Members were to prefer in principal this approach then more work would need to be done in looking at the advantages and disadvantages of such an approach. As with option 1 the council would need to ensure that such a loan was fully protected against the Bootham Crescent asset and in particular that there is sufficient equity in the ground to pay back both the FF loan and the council loan in the event that YCFC ceased to operate.

Option 4 – The council to buy the freehold of Bootham Crescent – In the July report the possibility of the council buying the freehold of Bootham Crescent and renting it back to YCFC pending the completion of the new stadium was raised. It was pointed out in the report that for such an option to be properly evaluated a considerable amount of work would need to be carried out and that this would put a significant time delay into the decision making process. Members did not resolve in July to investigate further this possibility and no work has therefore subsequently been done on looking at the advantages and disadvantages. Dependant on Members evolving views on the options above it does however remain an option but with the same caveat as in July that it would put a significant further delay into the decision making process. There is of course a third party option to buy the site in place and therefore this third party would need to give approval to the council buying the land. The council's health and safety liabilities would also need to be investigated bearing in mind the age and condition of Bootham Crescent.

Corporate Priorities

23. The provision of a new community stadium for the city is a 'Corporate Imperative in the Corporate Strategy 2007-2011. It is also identified in Active York's 'Sport and Active Leisure Strategy' which was signed up to at the Leisure and Heritage EMAP in June 2005. The facilities section of this strategy was updated in May 2007.

Implications

24. **Financial** – The financial implications have been covered in the main body of the report. Officers are expecting to receive the report from Deloitte on 3rd September and will update Members at the meeting as to the findings of the work.
25. **Legal** –
 - Walker Morris, the council's framework legal consultant have been fully briefed on what is proposed and the risk reduction conditions being sought. Interim

legal advice has now been received on both on the way we might achieve our aims and the likely limitations on any agreements. Advice has also been received of further complicating factors relating to securing the loan against the ground.

- All potential parties have been written to explaining what is proposed and seeking an indication as to whether they are happy to proceed. As yet no confirmatory response has been received.

a) Instruction of Legal Advisors – Advice Received

Interim advice has been received as to how we might structure the agreements a summary of which is as follows:-

- What might be referred to as the partnership aspect of the arrangements, i.e. the commitment to partnership to develop a community stadium, is in practical terms only likely to consist of a Memorandum of Understanding between the parties at this stage due to the lack of detail underlying the project.
- The fact that the suggested security for the loan is in fact owned by another company, BCH, albeit 75% owned by YCFC, gives rise to a risk that, in the event of insolvency of BCH within two years, a liquidator of BCH might seek to challenge that transaction as a transaction at an undervalue.
- Please see Annex 2.
- It is noted that the FF loan agreement provides for interest to be paid annually in February. The council is advised to seek clarity (detailed in Annex 2). Further clarification on this is currently being sought from YCFC.
- It is suggested that CYC clarify the basis on which the Rugby club occupy Huntington stadium. Further information is being sought from the council's property team.
- On a more general level the Commercial Partner advising had some trouble recognising the benefits of what he felt was a rather convoluted approach, over a simpler alternative of lending to cover the interest payments themselves or part thereof. Such an approach would obviate the need for any agreement between CYC and the FF and reduce the council's exposure.

b) Next stage of the process

- Drafting and negotiating the necessary agreements will commence but, to date this is on hold until indication from the parties that they are willing to proceed has been received. It is suggested that there is likely to be little incentive for the FF to enter into an undertaking, and incur legal fees in the process. However, no substantive response has yet been received other than confirmation that they have handed our letter to their lawyers.

c) Communication With Other Parties

- The council has written to the FF, Rugby Club and YCFC summarising the proposals and explaining the process going forward. As well as seeking to establish formal channels for any subsequent negotiations we have also sought to establish the parties willingness to sign up to the proposed scheme.

26. **Human Resources** – There are no implications

27. **Equalities** – There are no implications

28. **Crime and Disorder** – There are no implications

29. **Information Technology** – There are no implications

30. **Property** –

Risk Management

31. There are a number of risks which were set out in the previous reports on 21st May 2008 and 15th July 2008. These are repeated here and updated as appropriate:

a) The land values of Bootham Crescent and Huntington Stadium may vary and these assets form the basis of the future capital to finance the new stadium. The value of Bootham Stadium may be insufficient to cover the repayment of the loan advance (please see Annex 2)

b) The value of the ground in the report is based on 25% affordable housing. This level of Affordable Housing is less than the Council's current policy of up to 50% affordable housing and would require a decision by the Council that the community benefits of a community stadium would out-weigh the community benefits of the higher level of Affordable Housing.

c) Neither Bootham Crescent nor Huntington Stadium has planning permission for anything other than their existing use.

d) If the Council decide not to make a loan then the Football Foundation may, at any point, request for their loan to be repaid.

e) To ensure that CYC get the full loan and the rolled up interest back, the Bootham Crescent site may have to be sold and this could therefore lead to the closure of the football club.

f) No alternative site has yet been identified to build the new community stadium and any such site would require planning permission for a stadium

g) Because of the length of time to deliver a new stadium the associated

build costs may vary

h) Design issues may occur

i) The stadium would be delivered in partnership with YCFC and York Knights Rugby League Club and difficulties may be encountered in working in partnership

j) The scope, funding and workings of the future stadium management need to be agreed and formalised

k) Please see Annex 2

l) No business model has been created which will allow a full assessment of the cost of a new community stadium to be compared with currently identified assets and also the projected ongoing revenue costs of a new stadium to be compared with projected income.

m) The fact that the suggested security for the loan is in fact owned by another company, BCH, albeit 75% owned by YCFC, gives rise to a risk that, in the event of insolvency of BCH within two years, a liquidator of BCH might seek to challenge that transaction as a transaction at an undervalue.

n) The £2 Million loan from the FF is not converted into a £2 Million grant towards the community stadium.

Recommendations

32. Members are asked to consider the following recommendations:

a) To confirm the recommendation of the previous Executive on 15th July 2008 that a recommendation be made to full Council to carry out Option 2 above subject to the conditions set out in that report being fully satisfied.

OR as an alternative

b) Recommend to full council that either option 3 or option 4 be carried out subject to any necessary work to ensure that either option could be supported, and recognising the delay this may put into any decision making process.

Contact Details

Authors:
Bill Woolley
Director of City Strategy
01904 551330

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:
Bill Woolley
Director of City Strategy
01904 551330

Sian Hansom
Head of Finance
01904 551745

Sian Hansom
Head of Finance
01904 551745

Quentin Baker
Head of Civic, Democratic &
Legal Services
01904 551004

Quentin Baker
Head of Civic, Democratic & Legal Services
01904 551004

Chief Officer's name
Title

Report Approved



Date 8/9/08

Specialist Implications Officer(s) List information for all

Implication ie Financial

Name **Ross Brown**

Title **Corporate Accountant**

Tel No.

Implication ie Legal

Name **Quentin Baker**

Title **Head of Legal Services**

Tel No.

Wards Affected: List wards or tick box to indicate all

All tick

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

- Community Stadium Report to Staffing and Urgency Committee 21st May 2008
- Staffing and Urgency Committee Minutes 21st May 2008
- Deloitte report on community stadium for CYC 20th June 2008
- A letter received from Walker Morris dated 27th June 2008 (Issues in relation to a proposed loan
- Active York's Sport and Leisure Strategy
- Executive Report 15th July 2008

Annexes

Annex 1 – The Case for a Community Stadium

Annex 2 – Confidential Annex

The Case for a Community Stadium

1. What do we mean by “Community Stadium”? There is no standard definition of the term. It is applied to a wide variety of new stadia across the country each very different in terms of its specification, management, and level of community involvement.
2. We therefore need to define the term for ourselves and to be clear from the outset on the characteristics that we want to see in a community stadium for York.
3. The starting point might be that the stadium should:
 - Be for all the people of York
 - Be an icon for the city: a source of pride, promoting community cohesion
 - Promote the success of the city’s professional clubs and the profile of the city
 - Engage the community in both its design and its business plans in order to ensure its long-term sustainability
 - Inspire people of York to be participants
 - Offer a high quality experience for spectators
 - Generate business activity to ensure financial viability and contribute to the wider economy of the city
 - Contribute to the objectives of the Community Strategy and particularly the targets in the LAA, notably:
 - Adult participation in active lifestyles
 - Adult participation in sport
 - Young people’s participation in PE and sport
 - Young people’s participation in positive activities
4. The City’s Sport & Active Leisure Strategy provides a template, stating that, Both York City and York Knights urgently need a modern professional stadium that meets league and safety standards and can attract investors, players and spectators. This facility must cater for the full sports development continuum. It must be accessible by the community as a training and participation venue and as the route to excellence. This venue must be viewed by the professional clubs and the community at large as a citywide, multi-sport facility.

The stadium, its uses and facilities:

5. The Council as planning authority and potentially as a stakeholder in the stadium is strongly placed to ensure the development of a stadium with the

above characteristics and to deliver the best possible benefits for local people. At the same time it is important to recognise the realities of how the stadium will be funded and brought forward and how this in turn will shape the fundamental nature of the facility. A significant funder will be the Football Foundation and the facility therefore must be designed to accommodate the players, spectators and sponsors of professional football. Taking account also of the needs of rugby league this means a stadium operating professional sport all year round with the following key features:

- A high quality grass pitch that can be used for professional football and rugby league 52 weeks of the year. (NB even a high quality grass pitch will not sustain usage of more than 3 matches per week (2 during winter months - in terms of pitch access the professional clubs will take priority)
 - Facilities for the media, including television transmission
 - Executive facilities for match days and other events
 - Catering for spectators for match days
 - Retail outlets for York City and York City Knights
 - Team and club facilities including offices
 - Match day facilities including team and referee's changing rooms
 - Covered spectator seating which must have a capacity and design that is compliant with the requirements of the Football League
 - Accommodation for around 6,000 spectators. (The Football League's Membership criteria require a minimum capacity of 5,000 with at least 2,000 seats). Given that recently completed stadia cost between £1,400 and £2,000 per seat, available funding is not going to build the kind of 20,000 + seater stadia seen elsewhere in the country with large stands capable of accommodating a wide range of other facilities.
6. At the same time the new stadium can be designed to accommodate a range of other users. The Council, other community groups, residents, and Active York have identified demand for leisure facilities that could be considered in the planning of a community stadium, either as part of the stadium structure and operation itself or as an associated development. These include:
- Indoor sports hall space: The city has a deficit equating to 24 badminton courts.
 - Good quality community grass pitches: Active York's playing pitch audit has identified the need for additional grass playing pitches and more specifically good quality, well drained pitches to cater for the high level of demand that York's thriving football and rugby development is generating.
 - A hockey development facility. Hockey participation rates in York are higher than the national average, York's players are keen and able to grow and compete at a regional level and beyond. For the development of hockey in the city there is a need for at least one water-based synthetic pitch (or any surface which supersedes this). This should on the same site as a sand based facility to provide for all levels of competition and training. For this to be sustainable

this must become the home of competitive hockey and hockey development in the city and must have the backing of England Hockey.

- A venue for schools sports competitions and competition finals: Schools have extensive sports facilities but few are of competition standard and none has any spectator facilities. The level of performance for school sports is being raised by the appointment of a Competition Manager to oversee the school sports competition structures. Access to the stadium for finals and competition events would raise the profile and level of performance of school sport.
- A centre for sports development: A high profile home for the development of sport in the city would include a venue for community clubs to meet, coach development and training rooms, fitness rooms for sports science and physical training, offices for sports administration and club support.
- Fully accessible fitness facilities: Whilst there is no identified demand for further commercial gyms in the city, it is clear that fully accessible facilities catering for all abilities are needed to inspire increased participation in active lifestyles. A wide range of types of activities and opportunities are needed including studios for classes, a venue for lead walks, trim trails, etc.
- Community swimming facilities: There is a demand for an additional 6 x 25m lanes of pool space in the city and the council has stated a desire to provide this in the city centre.
- A larger outdoor concert venue. The Barbican is limited by its 1,500 seats. There may be a niche for a venue accommodating up to 6,000.

Possible Models:

7. There are many possible models for the configuration and management of a stadium. The nature of the stadium and the particular needs that it could meet will be strongly shaped by the site that is ultimately chosen and the community in which it is placed. Two possible illustrations are given below.

City centre:

8. A site in the city centre with its obvious advantages in terms of transport links would also bring particular opportunities for partnership arrangements with a distinct type of community. Here a stadium could be designed particularly to meet the sporting and recreational needs of people who work in the centre. City centre employees will want facilities that are available before and after work as well as at lunchtime which they can access on foot. Such a stadium could be developed with:
 - community rooms suitable for fitness classes
 - an accessible gym and studio space with corporate memberships, squash courts and possibly a city centre community pool
9. This model could engage business partners. Additionally a community use agreement would ensure school and community access to facilities and the right to have community events (such as the “Big Sing”) in the stadium. Developers’ contributions could be channelled into the development of additional sport and fitness facilities.

10. Additional commercial uses available for community use could be envisaged such as conference and exhibition space.
11. Management arrangements would depend on the level of financial investment by the different partners in the development.

As part of a regeneration of an existing sports site:

12. A stadium developed on or along side an existing sports venue would have the advantage of an existing sports foundation and would strongly link the new venue to the existing sports community. Such a site would allow the stadium to sit along side training pitches, to incorporate outward facing community changing and ancillary facilities, and to be an integral part of sports development in the city. The particular associated facilities would depend on the site chosen but they could include:
 - changing rooms
 - fitness training facilities
 - teaching and coaching rooms
13. This type of facility would put the stadium at the heart of community sport. Professional and amateur community players could be playing and training on the same facilities and community clubs may be able to bring in small amounts of external funding to enhance the existing facilities. Depending on location it may be possible for sports section 106 funding from residential developments to be spent on the additional facilities that would complement the stadium. This is likely to be around £250k.

Athletics Facilities

14. It can be assumed that the plans for development of a community stadium will require the relocation of the athletics provision at Huntington stadium, either to make way for a re-development at Huntington Stadium itself or consequent on the disposal of Huntington Stadium following the relocation of the York Knights to a new stadium. It will be essential to re-provide and relocate the athletics facilities. We currently have the only synthetic running track in North Yorkshire. It is used by City of York Athletics Club for three training sessions per week and hosts around 30 events per year. Replacement of the track, with small spectator stand, field events, jumps facilities and equipment will cost at least £1.5m. This assumes that it will be co-located with other sports facilities which will include changing and parking facilities. A venue which meets the needs of the club and other athletics users will be required. A possible location could be the new Heslington East campus.

Stadium Management

15. A clear feature of any community stadium is that in order to achieve the wide range of benefits, to balance the needs of the various stakeholders, and to

ensure financial viability, it will be essential that the stadium is managed by an independent entity. This is most likely to be a management company ownership of which will be in proportion to investment in the stadium. Since there is no potential for the operation of the stadium to be subsidised it will be essential that a company is established capable of taking an entrepreneurial approach. This in turn will strongly influence the range of activities to be accommodated within the stadium.

16. A variety of approaches have been taken across the country to how ownership of the stadium is vested and how management is organised depending on the level of capital investment by the respective partners. Almost all, however, involve the creation of a management company of some sort.
17. There will be choices for the Council in terms of its involvement in the operation of a new stadium assuming it takes a financial stake. Some authorities have taken an active role in the management company of the stadium; others have simply leased the stadium out. It should be noted that local authorities have had widely different levels of involvement in the funding of stadia up to providing 100% funding.
18. There will be a number of potential mechanisms for ensuring the delivery of the community benefits ultimately specified for the stadium including:
 - Any agreements relating to transfer of the land on which the stadium is built e.g. a lease
 - A section 106 agreement
 - The memorandum and articles of association of any management company created
 - Any stake in and/or Involvement in the governance of any management company
 - An ad hoc management agreement if appropriate

Design of the Stadium

19. There will be potential to incorporate issues of wider policy interested into the stadium notably a high environmental specification. This is not an area that has seen particular innovation in this country although the new Colchester stadium has included rainwater harvesting in the irrigation of the pitch, translucent sheets in the stand walls to maximise the use of natural light, insulated panels to minimise heat loss and high efficiency boilers. There are more innovative examples on the continent, notably the Freiburg stadium with its 100kW solar plant.

Future Reference Group

20. To progress the development of the community stadium a reference group should be established. This group would:

- Oversee the development of a strategic financial and management plan that will deliver a community stadium and associated facilities
 - Develop a business plan for the operation of the stadium
 - Develop proposals for a management model to operate the stadium
 - Ensure that key sections of the community are consulted where necessary and that community access is a consideration throughout
 - Commission key pieces of work appropriate to the planning process and receive the reports from such work to inform decisions
 - Present to the Council a proposal for the delivery and management of the facility
21. The composition of this group will in part depend on the location chosen for the stadium and therefore the communities of interest to be represented. It would be chaired by the Council and would be likely to include:
- The principal users: York City and York Knights
 - The wider sports community: Active York
 - The landowner
 - Other potential users eg. the business community
 - Other investors
 - Potential the athletics club depending on the solution to be adopted for athletics