

Public Document Pack



RUSHMOOR BOROUGH COUNCIL

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

*at the Council Offices, Farnborough on
Tuesday, 4th March, 2025 at 7.00 pm*

To:

Cllr Halleh Koohestani (Chairman)
Cllr Nadia Martin (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr S. Trussler (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Leola Card
Cllr P.J. Cullum
Cllr Thomas Day
Cllr C.P. Grattan
Cllr G.B. Lyon
Cllr Bill O'Donovan
Cllr M.J. Tennant
Vacancy

Standing Deputy

Cllr C.W. Card
Cllr S.J. Masterson
Cllr T.W. Mitchell

Cllr Sarah Spall
Cllr Jacqui Vosper
Cllr Ivan Whitmee

Enquiries regarding this agenda should be referred to the Administrator, Adele Taylor, Democratic Services, Tel. (01252) 398831, Email. adele.taylor@rushmoor.gov.uk.

A G E N D A

1. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING – (Pages 1 - 4)

To confirm the Minutes of the Meeting held on 30th January, 2025 (copy attached).

2. APPOINTMENTS –

To note an appointment of a new Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in place of Cllr A.H. Crawford for the remainder of the 2024/25 Municipal Year. The appointment will be made by the Leader of the Labour Group in accordance with Standing Orders and arrangements to secure political balance.

3. CALL-IN - FARNBOROUGH LEISURE CENTRE – (Pages 5 - 94)

In accordance with the provisions set out in the Overview and Scrutiny procedure rules, a request has been received from the following Members to call-in the Cabinet decision as set out in minute No. 65 from the Cabinet meeting on 11th February, 2025:

Cllr Martin Tennant
Cllr Gareth Lyon

Cllr Sue Carter

Cllr Stuart Trussler
Cllr Paul Taylor

Attached for information are:

- an extract of Minute No. 65 from the Cabinet meeting on 11th February, 2025;
- detailed reasons for the call-in; and,
- the Executive Director, Head of Regeneration and Development and Service Manager – Commercial Services and Deputy Head of Operations', Report No. REG2501 that went to Cabinet on 11th February, 2025

4. WORK PLAN – (Pages 95 - 106)

To consider the Work Plan for the 2024/25 Municipal Year (copy attached).

MEETING REPRESENTATION

Members of the public may ask to speak at the meeting on any of the items on the agenda by writing to the Committee Administrator at the Council Offices, Farnborough by 5.00 pm two working days prior to the meeting.

Applications for items to be considered for the next meeting must be received in writing to the Committee Administrator fifteen working days prior to the meeting.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Meeting held on Thursday, 30th January, 2025 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr Halleh Koohestani (Chairman)
Cllr Nadia Martin (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr S. Trussler (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Leola Card
Cllr P.J. Cullum
Cllr Thomas Day
Cllr C.P. Grattan
Cllr G.B. Lyon
Cllr Bill O'Donovan
Cllr M.J. Tennant

Cllr A.H. Crawford joined the meeting online and was therefore unable to vote on any recommendations taken.

26. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meetings held on 12th December, 2024 were agreed as a correct record.

27. FINANCIAL RECOVERY PLAN - UPDATE

The Committee welcomed, the Leader of the Council, Cllr Gareth Williams, who was in attendance with the Executive Head of Finance, Peter Vickers, to provide an update on the current position with the Financial Recovery Plan and the operational arrangements of the Financial Recovery Working Group.

The Committee received a presentation which set out the background to the Financial Recovery Plan with a summary of its aims and targets, and the makeup, working and reporting arrangements of the Financial Recovery Working Group (FRWG). The presentation also set out what had been achieved and the current position.

Members discussed the presentation and raised the following matters:

- **Terms of Reference** – Clarity was requested on what was meant by “To oversee the delivery of the Financial Recovery Plan...” and the definition of “oversee”, as set out in the Terms of Reference (ToR). The opposition questioned whether the operation of the FRWG reflected the ToR and stated that they believed there was an issue with the operation not meeting the ToR. It was noted that it was important to understand if Members attended the

FRWG as observers or to influence the work. In response, the Leader advised that opinions would differ on the level of oversight undertaken and whether the FRWG went into enough detail when overseeing, however, it was important to go with the majority opinion when carrying out the work.

- **Lines of enquiry** – The Committee were advised that around 40 lines of enquiry had been identified, eight had been closed down as would not contribute to savings at this time, 11 larger value items had been assessed and built into the budget, five had been held over to be considered as part of wider service reviews and 17 had been identified as being of smaller value and would be progressed to contribute to future savings. The FRWG had overseen this process, and it was noted that some savings had been achieved.
- **Progress to date** – The Committee reviewed the progress to date on increasing financial capacity. A number of actions had been completed or were underway, these included:
 - A definition of the Minimum Revenue Position, which had been included in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and Treasury Management Strategy
 - Revision of a regular timetable for financial reporting and budget setting and review, including a monthly review process of the Council's balance sheet. Alongside these revisions, improvements had been made to the quality of working papers, documents, and reconciliations through the establishment of new standards for these materials
 - Reviews of treasury operations, capital planning methodology and the management of insurance
 - Spending controls – “No Purchase Order No Spend” and controls on procurement card expenditure
 - Development of financial skills within the Council and a design and consultation process on the structure of the Financial Service through a phased approach. It was noted that Phase 1 had covered the appointment of two senior accountants, and Phase 2 would look at aligning the work with what was required, allowing for some of the technical ownership to be taken away from the Executive Head of Finance. In turn, this would result in a wider knowledge base within the Team.

Mr Vickers had reviewed the progress to date and advised that issues raised around the Treasury Policy being “too loose”, as identified by the CIPFA Report, were being addressed. It was also noted that the financial reporting system had been upgraded to support the work of the Team and to provide improved reporting.

- **Current Position for 2025/26** – The Committee discussed the external audits on the Statements of Accounts between 2020/21 and 2022/23, which had been subject to a national delay and the provisions in place for 2023/24. Legislation had been passed to address the delays through the process of a disclaimer and all outstanding accounts, including 2023/24 had now been signed off. However, as a result, levels of certainty in the Council’s accounting would need to be built back up and the next Statement of Account to be fully signed off by the auditors would be the 2028/29 Statement.

In response to a query regarding the Council’s governance arrangements around financial matters, it was advised that an independent governance review had been undertaken towards the end of 2024 and a report of the findings and recommendations was expected imminently. It was advised that a workshop session would be held with members of the Corporate Governance, Audit and Standards Committee (CGAS) and others, as appropriate, before any recommendations to full Council were made for implementation.

Responding to a question regarding independent representation on the FRWG and CGAS, it was considered that the roles were too different, one to provide an independent opinion on audit, and the other on finance. Therefore, the Council had felt it appropriate to appoint a representative from CIPFA to sit on the FRWG.

The Committee discussed the differences between the previous Budget Strategy Work Group (BSWG) and the FRWG. It was noted that the FRWG had a much tighter schedule dealing with current issues, whereas the BSWG remit had been to oversee the development of the forthcoming budget. It was felt that the current model was more effective and relevant.

In relation to a query regarding risk and the processes in place for capturing risks before they became an issue, it was noted that the budget, once set, would be translated into the Risk Register. Risks remained the responsibility of the owner and were updated and reviewed monthly. The risks relating to financial matters in particular were also reported to the Cabinet Portfolio Holder and the Cabinet.

The Committee NOTED the update and the Chairman thanked the Leader and Mr Vickers for their presentation and valuable contributions.

28. **WORK PLAN**

The Committee noted the current Work Plan.

It was advised that an additional meeting had been arranged on 4th March, 2025 to undertake some pre decision scrutiny on disposals at Union Yard. Items for the meeting on 27th March would be agreed at the next Progress Group on 6th March.

The meeting closed at 8.49 pm.

CLLR HALLEH KOOHESTANI (CHAIRMAN)

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTE EXTRACT –
FARNBOROUGH LEISURE CENTRE – NEXT STEPS
CABINET, 11 FEBRUARY, 2025

The Cabinet considered Report No. REG2501, which set out the next steps in relation to the provision of a new leisure centre for Farnborough.

The Cabinet was reminded that, in January 2023, the Council had been awarded £20 million of Levelling Up Funding to support the delivery of a Leisure and Cultural Hub in Farnborough. Since that time, a review of the project had shown that estimated costs had increased significantly and it had become clear that a project of that type was no longer affordable for the Council. The project team had engaged with a team of specialist consultants provided by the Government to look at how the project could be adjusted to achieve the most important outcomes for local people whilst being affordable for the Council. The Report set out a revised proposal that would deliver a leisure centre in Farnborough that was both within the time parameters of the Levelling Up funding and affordable for the Council, given its wider financial pressures.

The Cabinet was supportive of the proposed approach and felt that this would deliver an important facility for the Borough.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) the revised approach to providing a leisure centre in Farnborough town centre, as set out in Report No. REG2501, be approved;
- (ii) the proposed facilities mix for the leisure centre, as set out in the Report, be approved;
- (iii) the development procurement approach, to enable the delivery of the project within the Levelling Up Fund timelines, be approved;
- (iv) the commissioning of design work to the end of RIBA Stage 3, planning submission and associated costs of up to £1.35 million be funded by the Levelling Up Fund;
- (v) the use of Levelling Up Fund Capacity Funding Grant (£40,000), towards legal and other project related costs that cannot be drawn down from the Levelling Up Fund, be approved;
- (vi) the overall operator procurement and appointment approach, as set out in the Report, be approved, along with the commencement of the process;
- (vii) the Executive Head of Operations, in consultation with the Healthy Communities & Active Lives Portfolio Holder, be authorised to amend the procurement documentation as required throughout the process, subject to consultation with the Executive Head of Finance on any financial implications;

- (viii) the further extension to the existing agreement with Places Leisure to operate the Aldershot Pools and Lido on the same terms until 31st March, 2027 be approved;
- (ix) it be noted that a detailed viable business case, based on the outcomes of RIBA 3 and the initial stages of the operator procurement, including an appropriate funding strategy supported by robust independent due diligence, would be produced before a decision to move to RIBA Stage 4 of the project was considered by the Cabinet;
- (x) it be noted that, if proceeding beyond RIBA Stage 4, the Council would be accepting the financial risks associated with the funding strategy, including the outcomes of the operator procurement and the risks fully identified, evaluated and scenario tested in the business case; and
- (xi) it be noted that, to progress beyond RIBA Stage 4, the Council would firstly need to resolve its current Medium Term Financial Strategy deficit and, to a high degree of certainty, achieve financial sustainability.

Reasons for the Call-In

I am writing to formally request that the decision made by the Cabinet regarding the provision of a leisure centre in Farnborough (Report No. REG2501) be called in for further examination.

We believe that the decision has been made with insufficient information, and there are significant concerns regarding the lack of public consultation on the revised proposals. Since the last public consultation, the proposals have changed considerably, and the current leisure mix of facilities does not align with the needs and expectations outlined by the residents of the borough during that consultation.

Given these issues, we believe it is essential for the decision to be thoroughly reviewed and reconsidered to ensure that it meets the requirements of our community and is based on a fully informed and transparent process.

We look forward to your confirmation of this call-in request and to participating in any further steps required.

Kind regards,

Martin Tennant

Gareth Lyon

Sue Carter

Stuart Trussler

Paul Taylor

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET

**COUNCILLOR CHRISTINE GUINNESS
PRIDE IN PLACE / NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES
PORTFOLIO HOLDER
COUNCILLOR SOPHIE PORTER
HEALTHY COMMUNITIES & ACTIVE LIVES
PORTFOLIO HOLDER**

11 February 2025

Key Decision? Yes

Report No. REG2501

FARNBOROUGH LEISURE CENTRE – NEXT STEPS

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

In January 2023, the Council was awarded £20m of Levelling Up Funding to support the delivery of a Leisure and Cultural Hub in Farnborough. Design work was undertaken during 2023 and proposals shared with the public in early 2024.

A market tested cost plan was commissioned to ensure the estimated project costs were clear before the decision to move to the next stage of delivery. That work, alongside work by the Council's cost consultant, confirmed that costs had increased significantly, and the Leisure and Cultural Hub Project as designed would be completely unaffordable.

The Council's project team engaged with a team of specialist consultants, known as Delivery Associates, provided by Government to look at how the project could be adjusted to achieve the most important outcomes for local people whilst being affordable for the Council.

This report sets out the outcome of the work undertaken with the support of the Delivery Associates. It proposes a revised project, which would deliver a Leisure Centre in Farnborough, within the time parameters of the Levelling Up Fund and would be affordable for the Council given the Council's wider funding pressures.

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- 1) Agrees the revised approach to providing a Leisure Centre in Farnborough town centre;
- 2) Agrees the facilities mix that is proposed for the new Leisure Centre;
- 3) Agrees the development procurement approach to enable the delivery of the project within the Levelling Up Fund timelines;
- 4) Agrees the commissioning of design work to the end of RIBA Stage 3, planning submission and associated costs of up to £1.35m to be funded by the Levelling Up Fund;
- 5) Agrees the use of Levelling Up Fund Capacity Funding Grant (£40,000) towards legal and other project related costs that cannot be drawn down from the Levelling Up Fund;
- 6) Agrees the overall operator procurement and appointment approach as outlined in this report, and commencement of the process;

- 7) Delegates any decision to amend the procurement documentation as required throughout the process to the Executive Head of Operations in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Healthy Communities & Active Lives and financial implications in consultation with the Executive Head of Finance (S151);
- 8) Approves a further extension to the existing agreement with Places Leisure to operate the Aldershot Pools & Lido on the same terms until 31 March 2027;
- 9) Notes that a detailed viable Business Case based on the outcomes of RIBA 3 and the initial stages of the operator procurement, including an appropriate funding strategy supported by robust independent due diligence, will be produced before a decision to move to RIBA stage 4 of the project is considered by Cabinet;
- 10) Notes that if it is to proceed beyond RIBA Stage 4, the Council will be accepting the financial risks associated with funding strategy, including the outcomes of the operator procurement, and the risks fully identified, evaluated and scenario tested in the business case;
- 11) Notes that in order to progress beyond RIBA stage 4, the Council must first resolve its current MTFS deficit and to a high degree of certainty, achieve financial sustainability.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1. In January 2023, the Council was awarded £20m of Levelling Up Funding to support the delivery of a Leisure and Cultural Hub in Farnborough. In March 2023, Cabinet considered a report (REG2303) which authorised allocation of funding to enable work to commence and confirmed that the Council should enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Government to enable the drawdown of funding.
- 1.2. In October 2023, Cabinet approved the final scope of the project (REG2307) with an indicative project budget of £57.6m for the Leisure and Cultural Hub. The final scope of the project included leisure, library, bespoke cultural facilities and civic offices. Funding approval was agreed to progress design development to RIBA stage 3. Approval was also given to commence the Leisure Operator procurement along with the associated budget.
- 1.3. A further report (REG2402) was received by Cabinet in February 2024, approving a revised funding strategy for the project, commission of a market tested cost plan on conclusion of RIBA 3 and agreeing a pre planning public consultation in March 2024.
- 1.4. The market tested cost plan was commissioned to ensure the estimated project costs were clear before the decision to move to the next stage of delivery. That work, alongside work by the Council's cost consultant, confirmed that costs had increased significantly, and the Leisure and Cultural Hub Project as designed would be unaffordable. Over this same period the Council's challenging future

financial position was set out and in that context, the proposed £20m capital contribution to the project included in the original bid was also no longer possible.

- 1.5. This position was flagged to government and support requested. During the spring and summer of 2024, the Council's project team engaged with a team of specialist consultants provided by Government, known as Delivery Associates, to consider how the project could be adjusted to achieve the most important outcomes for local people whilst being affordable for the Council. A revised project proposal was shared with the Levelling-Up Unit at MHCLG in September.
- 1.6. Government have now confirmed that the proposal can proceed utilising the remaining Levelling Up funding. This report therefore sets out the revised project which would deliver a Leisure Centre in Farnborough within the time parameters of the Levelling Up Fund subject to the Council resolving its current Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) deficit and achieving financial sustainability.

2. DETAILS OF THE NEW PROJECT

Revised Scope of Leisure Facility

- 2.1. Following engagement with both the Delivery Associates and MHCLG officials, initial feasibility work commenced on a revised scheme in September 2024.
- 2.2. The Council engaged Alliance Leisure as industry experts with significant experience of design and construction of leisure facilities across the country to establish a facilities mix that was considered fit for purpose and geared towards commercial viability. The revised exciting proposals set out below are considered to meet the priority local need of a new leisure facility in addressing significant issues with obesity, health inequalities and low activity in both adults and children.

Provision of a new state of the art leisure and wellbeing facility comprising 2 swimming pools (a 25m 6-lane main pool, 10m x 8m learner pool), 100+ station fitness suite, 2 x studios plus a dedicated spin studio, a café and active play for children. The facility mix also includes a power-assisted wellness hub (Innerva suite) which provides a low impact, full-body workout circuit for the older population and people with long-term health conditions who cannot use standard gym equipment. The revised scope also incorporates a changing places facility and the provision of a surface car park.

- 2.3. A key change to the facilities mix previously agreed by the Council is the removal of a Sports Hall provision. Given the financial challenges faced by the Council over the medium term, it is imperative to ensure that the commerciality of the facility is maximised. A review of component parts of the service offer undertaken by Alliance (Exempt Appendix A) highlighted that the provision of a

2 Court Sports Hall was the lowest income generator when compared against other income generating elements.

- 2.4. A Competing Provision Analysis undertaken by Alliance highlights that there are 17 sports hall facilities in the local area that could accommodate activities. This has to be considered against the financial viability of delivering a new leisure facility for Farnborough.
- 2.5. The removal of the Sports Hall provision has allowed for a smaller alternative site within the scope of the Farnborough Civic Quarter to be identified to take forward the project. The proposed new location is to the immediate south of the existing town centre high street on Queensmead car park, directly adjacent to existing public transport nodes which will help to improve access for the local community. The prominence of this revised location will be particularly attractive to leisure operators from a marketing/awareness perspective. The relocation presents the opportunity for the Council to explore alternative uses for the former Leisure Centre site and realise much-needed housing where it is anticipated that up to 250 units could be achieved above commercial uses.
- 2.6. The cultural build elements of the original LUF bid, including gallery spaces and artist studios, have also been removed from the project scope. Access to culture can be provided through flexible use of studio space and the café areas and the Council will continue to work to improve access through its current cultural strategy.
- 2.7. A Benefit/Cost Ratio (BCR) exercise has been undertaken against the scope of the revised scheme and indicates a score in excess of 2. The general rule is that a project should be able to achieve a score in excess of 1 to demonstrate that the outputs outweigh the costs. This is a gateway measure for assessing/approving a project.
- 2.8. Initial design work has been undertaken to confirm that the footprint of the revised facility can be accommodated within the existing constraints of the new plot. Given the intended relocation of the facility to Queensmead, the most practical approach to realising parking provision to meet operator demand is to make use of the recently cleared Pinehurst roundabout site to ensure the car parking demand anticipated by the leisure operator is achievable. From a phasing perspective, the provision of the surface car park will need to be prioritised to accommodate the displacement of car park users from Queensmead car park during the construction phase.
- 2.9. The opportunity to future proof the delivery of a new, fit for purpose decked car park on the Pinehurst plot will be explored as part of the initial design work through the delivery of foundation pads to enable additional capacity to meet residential parking demand from the wider Civic Quarter redevelopment above and beyond the capacity previously afforded by the former decked structure on site.
- 2.10. A revised delivery plan has been established. In summary key milestones are as follows.

Project Stage	Date
Design development to RIBA stage 3	August 2025
Planning submission	September 2025
Cabinet to consider business case and move to RIBA stage 4 – Key Decision Gateway	September 2025
Commence RIBA stage 4 (subject to business case)	October 2025
Planning approval and end RIBA Stage 4 Design & Cost	January 2026
Cabinet approval of final business case – Key Decision Gateway	January 2026
Award of construction contract (Subject to Cabinet approval)	February 2026
Start on Site	Spring 2026
Practical Completion	Autumn 2027
Facility Open	Autumn 2027

2.11. Project Officers met with counterparts at the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) in January 2025 to seek assurances that the project could positively move forward with grant support on the basis of the revised scope. MHCLG wrote to confirm that a project adjustment request (PAR) would not normally be considered until projects reach at least RIBA stage 3 to ensure cost confidence in plans presented. However, given the Council's proposal includes an extension request to March 2028 for outputs, which requires approval via the Spring Budget, it was content for the Council to continue progressing revised project designs to RIBA Stage 3.

Leisure Centre Development - Procurement Approach

2.12. It is proposed that the Council pursue a framework procurement route, utilising the UK Leisure Framework (UKLF) for delivery of the scheme. The Council has utilised this approach to enter into a Framework Access Agreement with Alliance Leisure Services Limited. The initial scope of works covers the appointment of a design team to propose development opportunities associated with a new leisure centre facility.

2.13. The UKLF allows for the direct appointment of a Development Partner for scoping, design, refurbishment, construction and the development of leisure centres, theatres, play facilities, recreation facilities and sports facilities across the UK public sector. Alliance Leisure have been the appointed Development Partner on the UK Leisure Framework since 2017. They have been working in partnership with Local Authorities, Trusts and leisure operators for more than 20 years.

2.14. The UKLF is leisure-specific and allows for Alliance to appoint all professional, design and construction services required for the project from a pre-procured supply chain, with the ability to direct award the construction contract to a

specialist leisure contractor, delivering a turnkey solution. This enables the project to proceed at pace in line with both Cabinet ambition and Levelling Up funding timescales.

- 2.15. Recognising the need to move at pace, Alliance has set out that early contractor engagement is key and recommend making a Direct Award for Principal Contractor based on the best fit for the project. Having listened to the Councils' priorities for delivery of this project, Alliance propose using a Principal Contractor that has extensive experience of delivering leisure schemes and a proven track record of delivering within an affordability envelope. The Council is advised that the proposed contractor has capacity to take on this project and mobilise quickly based on the current programme ensuring delivery within the LUF funding timescales.
- 2.16. This approach has been taken by multiple councils in delivering their Leisure schemes. Alliance advise that the alternative is a Mini-Competition route for the Principal Contractor which would delay commencement by 8 weeks+ and it would have a knock-on effect through the rest of the programme and mean a later start on site date which will increase cost due to inflationary uplift and potentially increased consultancy fees.

Demonstrating Best Value

- 2.17. As the UKLF is a single supplier framework, the below demonstrates how best value is achieved via this route:
 - **Supply Chain Leverage:** The framework has a well-established and pre-procured supply chain developed over many years. With the potential of repeat business, as part of a larger potential pipeline, this keeps contractor costs most competitive, quality high and the ability to quickly overcome challenges. This leverage is powerful and helps the Council get the best results.
 - **Gateway Process:** The pre-construction process is aligned with the RIBA stages. An End of Stage report, inclusive of a value for money assessment, is issued by Alliance for review by the Council and validated independently, prior to approval being given to move to the next stage.
 - **Sub-contractors:** The sub-contractors available through the Framework consists of building contractors, architects, project managers and equipment providers with a proven track record in delivering high quality projects, on time and on budget in both the public and private leisure sectors.
 - **Evaluation:** The Framework has an evaluation procedure for engaging with its architects, contractors, professional teams, and equipment supply chain ensuring that projects meet the standards required.
 - **Design team:** The selection of the design team will be made by Alliance Leisure Services Ltd, thus enabling them to manage the delivery risk for the project and protecting the Council. This route provides the quickest method to progress pre-construction work for the project and shortens the programme providing some mitigation towards inflation risk.
 - **Early contractor engagement** ensures 'buildability' from the outset and avoids unwanted surprises in later stages.

- **Single point of contact:** Alliance manage multiple appointments helping to relieve additional time and resource required by the Council.
- 2.18. On the basis of the above it is recommended that the Council enter into an Access Agreement with Alliance Leisure Services Ltd for the provision of project management, design and professional services required for the completion of RIBA stages 2 & 3 as set out in Exempt Appendix B and proceed with a direct appointment of the Principal Contractor as identified by Alliance Leisure Services Ltd
- 2.19. The Council does not have to pay an access fee for utilising the framework (0.15% of the project value) until entering into a Development Management agreement to deliver the project at the agreed contract sum at the end of RIBA 4, subject to detailed Business Case and Cabinet approval. The access fee will form part of the detailed Business Case setting out project costs.

Alternative options for delivery via the Framework

- 2.20. An alternative option would be to undertake a mini competition route for the Principal Contractor which would delay commencement of RIBA 2 by 8+ weeks. This would have a knock-on effect on the programme and a later start on site date which, Alliance advises, will potentially increase costs due to inflationary uplifts.
- 2.21. The recommended approach outlined above provides greater cost and delivery certainty however this is offset by reduced flexibility and control over design.
- 2.22. Based on lessons learnt from the original unaffordable scheme, a key driver for the proposed approach is cost certainty, budget lead design and speed of delivery.

Alternative Procurement options

- 2.23. An alternative procurement route is Design and Build. This route is often used in the delivery of leisure schemes and was the route utilised for the original, now unaffordable scheme. This approach requires the council to procure and manage the client side team including project management, cost consultants, employers agent and design team. The principal contractor would also be managed directly. This approach has a time and resource implication in procuring and managing the specialist disciplines and does not offer a turnkey solution.
- 2.24. The other option explored was Design, Build, Operate and Maintain (DBOM). This approach appoints an operator to deliver a turnkey solution, with the operator responsible for the design of the new centre, the construction and operation. The project components are procured from the private sector in a single contract with financing independently secured by the Council. Whilst this approach can have a number of benefits - including the operator leading the design process and taking on the risk of lifecycle maintenance for the duration of the contract – it also has a number of disadvantages. These include the

length of contract commitment required (generally at least 25 years), the limited operator market and, importantly in this case, the lengthy procurement process involved. It is estimated that a DBOM would extend the process by at least six months and, with delivery of the project reliant on retention of LUF funding, accelerated delivery is key. A comparison table of the delivery routes is set out at Appendix C.

3. LEISURE OPERATOR PROCUREMENT

- 3.1. The Council is seeking a partner who shares its vision for the proposed new Farnborough Leisure Centre and will operate to optimise participative opportunities and benefits for the local community. As noted above, the new facility will play a significant role in reducing health inequalities, physical and mental, and increasing levels of physical activity.
- 3.2. The partnership and operational management contract will operate on an open book basis. The contract will be based on the Sport England standard format but has been updated to reflect relevant changes since the pandemic relating to change in law, risk and utility benchmarking.
- 3.3. In relation to risk, the Council is seeking a hybrid approach to maintenance. The operator will take full lifecycle responsibility for the new facility, but will only be responsible for routine compliance checks, servicing and day to day response repairs at the Aldershot Pools and Lido. Soft Market testing has advised that Operators would be very reluctant to bid on the basis of accepting the lifecycle costs associated with the Aldershot facility.
- 3.4. The Contract Specification will be adapted from the standard Sport England toolkit and made bespoke for Rushmoor. The key elements of the Specification will include:
 - Produce a balanced programme of activities to maximise participation, engagement, physical activity and reduce health inequalities in the borough.
 - Set an appropriate pricing system to deliver the core outcomes of the contract whilst maintaining commercial viability, including a concessionary pricing structure.
 - Employment of a Health and Wellbeing Officer to establish links with local health and care services and providers to provide pathways into physical exercise and wellbeing activities, particularly for residents with poorer health outcomes.
 - Outreach into the Borough to promote healthier lifestyles among residents and communities that are harder to reach, those who are less likely to access traditional facilities and those who are more likely to experience longer term health inequalities.

Procurement process

- 3.5. It is the Council's current view that the contractual arrangements are classified as a service concession contract under the Public Concessions Regulations (2016) and furthermore fall under the scope of the Light Touch Regime services listed under Schedule 3 of the regulations.
- 3.6. Under the new procurement regulations - which will come into force when the Procurement Act 23 goes live on 24th February 2025 - it is the Council's view that the contract will continue to be classified as a concession arrangement and will also continue to be subject to light touch regime exemptions.
- 3.7. The Procurement Act 23 will introduce the new 'Competitive Flexible Procedure' which will enable contracting authorities to design project specific procurement processes to align with project objectives and market norms. As the operator procurement process will commence after the 24 February 2025 it will be subject to the new regulations.
- 3.8. As required by law under the Procurement Act 23 the Council will need to undertake a compliant procurement process to secure a partner operator. No framework agreements exist which would allow the Council to source an operator without undertaking a fully advertised competitive procurement process.
- 3.9. In order to benefit from the flexibilities that will be available under the new regulations, the Council will undertake a procurement process using the competitive flexible procedure. Designing a process under this procedure will allow the introduction of shortlisting, limited dialogue if required, interviews and potential for negotiation.
- 3.10. The first stage of the procurement process will invite suppliers to submit applications via submission of a Procurement Specific Questionnaire. Questionnaire responses will be assessed on a pass / fail and scored basis and will cover legal standing, financial standing, insurance, health & safety and relevant experience. This process will ensure that only operators with sufficient experience and scale will be taken forward to the next stage. It is envisaged that the highest scoring 3-4 applicants would be shortlisted and invited to submit detailed tender submissions.
- 3.11. The tender evaluation strategy will need to be developed but will have a high emphasis on the provision of fixed income to the Council.
- 3.12. As the procurement progresses, the Council will need to develop its approach and delegation is sought for the Executive Head of Operations to develop the procurement documents in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Healthy Communities & Active Lives and financial implications in consultation with the Executive Head of Finance (S151).
- 3.13. Following evaluation of the detailed tenders, the Council will have the option to instigate an award to the preferred bidder and commence the standstill period which must run for a minimum of 8 working days, However, if the Council considers that a better outcome may be reached through improving the tenders

it has received, it may instead enter a final period of negotiation and invite best & final tenders from the highest scoring bidder/s.

- 3.14. Consideration will be given to the composition of the evaluation team, which will include specialist expertise in the key areas associated with service delivery.
- 3.15. An indicative programme for the procurement process outlined above is set out below:

Activity	Timescale
Preliminary Market Engagement	10 th - 28 th March 2025
Issue Tender Notice & Procurement Specific Questionnaire (PSQ)	28 th April 2025
PSQ Deadline	30 th May 2025
PSQ Evaluation Complete & Shortlist Confirmed	13 th June 2025
Issue Invitation to Tender	30 th June 2025
Tender Return Deadline	5 th September 2025
Tender Evaluation Complete	19 th September 2025
Commence Negotiation Stage	29 th September 2025
Best & Final Tender Return Deadline	17 th October 2025
Tender Evaluation Complete	3 rd November 2025
Approval process as part of Business Case update for leisure project at end of RIBA 4	February 2026
Issue Assessment Summary & Contract Award Notice	February 2026
Standstill Period	February 2026
Contract Commencement	TBC

- 3.16. The Council is currently targeting to have awarded the contract to the successful Operator by end February 2026. The Interim Phase of the Contract is then planned to commence shortly after, (date TBC), at which point the Operator will be required to commence delivery of services at the existing Aldershot facilities.
- 3.17. The Council's target date for opening of the new Farnborough facility is Autumn 2027, at which point the contract will enter its Main Phase. The duration of the Interim Phase is dependent upon when the new facility is ready to be opened, but is likely to run for around 12 to 18 months.
- 3.18. The timetable for the operator procurement runs beyond the existing contract with Places Leisure for the operation of the Aldershot facility which ends on 31 March 2025.
- 3.19. A provision in the existing Deed of Variation allows for an extension on the same terms until 30 September 2025. However, to facilitate the operator procurement, as outlined above, Cabinet is recommended to approve a further extension to the existing agreement with Places Leisure on the same terms until 31 March 2027. Whilst in practice, a maximum extension of eighteen months is

likely to be required, the longer time period allows for any delays in delivery of the build project. An appropriate break-clause will be included in the new agreement.

4. PROJECT BUDGET AND FUNDING STRATEGY

- 4.1. As noted above, the Council was successful in securing £20m of Levelling Up funding from Central Government in January 2023. Approximately £1.5m of this grant was utilised to progress design costs associated with the previous Leisure and Cultural Hub project, leaving a residual £18.5m to utilise going forward.
- 4.2. In dialogue with Alliance, the Council has established an anticipated cost envelope of £23.5m based on similar scopes across the country to realise the proposed facilities mix alongside new parking provision on the Pinehurst site (£22.5m towards the Leisure Centre build and £1m towards the car parking provision). Cost certainty, including the requirement for a contingency, will not be known until the project has progressed sufficiently through RIBA Stage 4. MHCLG has confirmed that it is content that the Council can draw down further Levelling Up funding to support the progression of design work through to RIBA Stage 3 when the Council will be in a better position to provide cost confidence. Alliance has advised that the costs associated with RIBA Stage 2 is £490,950 and RIBA Stage 3 £765,975. Alliance is comfortable in the proposed RIBA Stage 3 fees, based on current knowledge of the project and benchmarking against similar schemes. They are required to complete the RIBA Stage 2 work to confirm the RIBA 3 fees once the Principal Contractor is onboarded. In addition to the RIBA 2/3 fees (totalling £1,256,925), there are additional costs associated with a planning application submission that are considered as part of the overall budget recommendation of £1.35m.
- 4.3. In addition to the £18.5m of LUF remaining, a Local Growth Capacity Support Payment of £40,000 will be made by MHCLG on or around 17th February 2025 to help mitigate any immediate delivery issues that the Council is encountering in the delivery of the LUF project. It is proposed that this allocation of grant is utilised as a contingency to cover any unforeseen Council costs associated with the delivery of the project that may fall outside of the qualifying criteria for drawdown of the residual £18.5m of LUF as it progresses through to the conclusion of RIBA Stage 3.
- 4.4. At this stage, there is no requirement for the Council to commit any capital contribution towards the delivery of the project beyond the existing grant funding available.
- 4.5. In order to commit to any Build Contract, the Council must resolve its current MTFS deficit and achieve financial sustainability prior to contractually committing to this project. A detailed Business Case, including an appropriate funding strategy supported by robust independent due diligence, will be produced prior to consideration by Cabinet on conclusion of the RIBA Stage 3 work and updated after conclusion of RIBA Stage 4 and the finalisation of the operator procurement process.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1. Public consultation was undertaken on the previous iteration of the Leisure and Cultural Hub during March 2024. There has been no public engagement since that time in relation to the provision of a Leisure Centre. Further public engagement will coincide with progressing the RIBA Stage 3 design phase during the Summer prior to formal submission of a planning application.

6. IMPLICATIONS (of proposed course of action)

Risks

- 6.1. The Council will be accepting a number of risks in opting to proceed with delivery of this project. These include the usual risks associated with the development and delivery of a capital project of this scale such as site ground conditions, contractor solvency, cost overruns, inflationary increases and associated stakeholder management. As identified in Section 4, while the Council has the residual £18.5m grant funding to employ against the scheme, if it is to proceed beyond RIBA stage 4, it will be accepting the financial risks associated with the funding strategy and the risks fully identified, evaluated and scenario tested in the business case. Whilst there is an understanding of the indicative project cost envelope (£23.5m), cost certainty will not be achieved until conclusion of detailed design work in addition to a firmer understanding of what lies below ground following intrusive surveys.
- 6.2. There is mitigation in place to manage the financial risks through a gateway process. This Cabinet report does not commit the Council to the construction phase. A further report to Cabinet will need to demonstrate that the Business Case is financially sound as a pre-cursor to formally entering into a build contract. Any expenditure up to that point is utilising the Levelling Up fund with the agreement of MHCLG. The Council is not obligated by the Framework Agreement to proceed through to build stage.
- 6.3. A risk register is maintained for the project with the top 10 risks reported to MHCLG as part of the quarterly monitoring return requirement associated with the Levelling Up process. This will continue to be managed and updated throughout project delivery with risks being closed out as the scheme progresses. For reference, the MHCLG risks are attached at Exempt Appendix D.

Legal Implications

- 6.4. External legal assistance and budget will be required on various aspects of the project, including property, planning and contractual matters. Work will include

(but is not limited to) reviewing of appointments, carrying out necessary due diligence and drafting contractual agreements. The initial estimate for external legal work to reach RIBA 3 is £20,000-£40,000. The variation in estimate will depend on the complexity of agreements, any issues within the Land Registry title(s) as part of the due diligence and any third-party rights, such as leases/restrictive covenants on the land.

- 6.5. If the project proceeds beyond RIBA 3, a project of this nature and size could need further legal budget of between £50,000 and £150,000 depending on whether there are any third-party rights to consider, resolving any contractual issues, and to minimise legal risk(s) for the Council as far as possible. This is in the context that whenever the Council is working with a third-party supplier or contractor or starting a significant project, there are additional financial and legal risks.
- 6.6. Under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, section 19, "Recreational Facilities", a local authority may provide such recreational facilities as it thinks fit, and this includes indoor facilities, such as sports centres and swimming pools, and outdoor facilities such as sports pitches. This reinforces the social value and contribution of public sport and leisure services to health, wellbeing and to communities.
- 6.7. Building a new leisure centre falls under providing discretionary services of the local authority, which are services that an authority has the power but not a duty to provide. The Council should consider fully the long-term liabilities and risk of maintaining the proposed leisure centre, prior to committing to RIBA Stage 4 work/a building contract. Risk relating to the construction of a leisure centre can be mitigated but not entirely minimised, and contingency funds would need to be made available.
- 6.8. Affordability of the project and any wider legal implications should be clearer once the RIBA Stage 3 work and operator procurement process have been concluded. A detailed business case and independent due diligence will be required for Cabinet before proceeding to RIBA Stage 4 as per paragraph 4.5 above.

Financial Implications

- 6.9. The Council has a £16.152m financial deficit to resolve before any mitigations such as reducing its level of borrowing within its current MTFS. Until this has been resolved and financial sustainability achieved, the Council does not have capacity to take on any further cost or underwrite financial risk of an entirely discretionary nature, such as this project.
- 6.10. Progression of the project to RIBA Stage 4 decision will require the Councils' external auditors Ernst & Young LLP to support the proposal due to the Going Concern matter it has raised in the 2023-24 financial statements audit findings report regarding the council's high level of short borrowing and affordability.

- 6.11. Due to the Council's financial challenge, MHCLG will have to also be consulted to ensure that they will not consider the decision to proceed a matter of Best Value resulting in external scrutiny and potential sanctions.
- 6.12. Where government becomes aware that an authority is exhibiting early indications of potential Best Value failure, (i.e. through the councils auditors or published information) the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government will consider issuing a 'Best Value Notice' to facilitate engagement with that authority and to obtain assurance of the steps it is taking to secure compliance with the Best Value Duty, as required by the Local Government Act 1999.
- 6.13. The Best Value Notice will state the government's concerns with the authority and set clear expectations of the actions needed to assure the government that the authority is making arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised.
- 6.14. In compliance with the Council's constitution and Financial Procedure Rules, Financial Regulation (C7): All new projects and proposals for additional expenditure require the submission of an appropriate business case to ELT, to be prepared in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer. The business case will need to be geared to the significance of the project/additional expenditure in both policy and financial terms. As a minimum, however, it will include the full financial implications of the scheme.
- 6.15. To commit to RIBA Stage 4/Build Contract, a detailed Business Case, including an appropriate funding strategy supported by robust independent due diligence, must be produced prior to consideration by Cabinet on conclusion of the RIBA Stage 3 work and updated after the conclusion of RIBA stage 4 and the finalisation of operator procurement process.
- 6.16. All decisions on borrowing and financing are delegated (Constitution, Part 4 – Financial Procedure Rules - D39) to the Chief Finance Officer, who is required to act in accordance with the CIPFA code
- 6.17. The Council's MTFs will have to be altered to accommodate project costs to RIBA stage 4 that fall outside of the LUF funding and will have to be mitigated by additional cost reductions elsewhere.
- 6.18. Should the project proceed beyond RIBA Stage 4, the business case must include the long-term provision for costs and risks likely to be picked up outside of the operating contract and potential operator shortfalls for the lifetime of the facility.

Resource Implications

- 6.19. An internal Project Team is established with capacity to progress client-side responsibilities associated with the proposals comprising existing establishment roles within the Regeneration and Development Service. There is currently no requirement to bring in external resource to assist with project

delivery. The Council's S151 Officer has indicated that some external support may be required with the preparation of the final business case. Internal legal capacity will need to be established to support the project.

Equalities Impact Implications

- 6.20. The project addresses significant Health and Cultural inequalities. An Equality Impact Assessment will be produced during the next phase of the project and updated as the project progresses. Key stakeholders e.g. Rushmoor Accessibility Action Group will be engaged on the emerging proposals.

7. CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1. The delivery of a new leisure centre for Farnborough is a significant priority for local people and the Council's Cabinet, and it is important that all reasonable actions are taken to ensure the project can be delivered in line with the Levelling Up funding timelines. The focus of the project over the next 6-8 months is to undertake design work at pace in order to firm up a viable and deliverable option for the benefit of local residents. The project must though be affordable for the Council and work during the RIBA 3 process and operator procurement will feed into a business case which will be considered before decisions to proceed further with the project.

LIST OF APPENDICES/ANNEXES:

Exempt Appendix A – Alliance Opportunity Report November 2024
Exempt Appendix B – Alliance Development Proposal January 2025
Appendix C – Delivery Routes Comparison
Exempt Appendix D – MHCLG Risk Register

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Cabinet Report REG2303
Cabinet Report REG2307
Cabinet Report REG2402

CONTACT DETAILS:

Karen Edwards – Executive Director
Karen.edwards@rushmoor.gov.uk

Nick Irvine – Head of Regeneration and Development
Nick.Irvine@rushmoor.gov.uk

David Phillips – Service Manager – Commercial Services & Deputy Head of Operations
David.Phillips@rushmoor.gov.uk

Johanna Cohen – Development Manager
Johanna.Cohen@rushmoor.gov.uk

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Procurement Route Options Comparison – Farnborough Leisure Facility

Procurement Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
Design and Build	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get to a fixed price but this can be after changes to specified scheme • More flexibility for change throughout the development process • Able to involve operator in design • Operational procurement can progress alongside capital scheme • Risk transfer to operator (for lifecycle maintenance on a new build) • Operator contract likely to be 10 +5 years maximum • Operational delivery ‘controlled’ through a specification • Ability to select (from those who tender) the specialist facility development team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost to any subsequent variations in scheme • Potential cost creep due to changes • Timescale for procuring all specialist disciplines
Design, Build, Operate and Maintain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost certainty, based on specified design • Cost certainty may be beneficial in the context of limited capital • Operator part of consortium so would be involved in the in design • Risk transfer to operator (for lifecycle maintenance on a new build) • Long term operational contract- minimum 25 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less flexibility to change design as scheme progresses; if changes are made there is likely to be significant cost • Long term operational contract- minimum 25 years • Timescale for procuring the DBOM consortium • Less choice over the specialist team procured- come as a consortium

Procurement Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational delivery 'controlled' through a specification, but harder to remove the operator if there is concern, due to longer contract term 	
UK Leisure Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get to a fixed price but this can be after changes to specified scheme • More flexibility for change • Able to involve operator in design • Operational procurement can progress alongside capital scheme • Significantly faster procurement route as through a Framework where all suppliers have already been tested • Operational delivery 'controlled' through a specification • Ability to select (from the Framework) the specialist facility development team • Working with Alliance 'buys' you some project management time on a project which obviously helps to manage cost, timescales, appointments etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost to any subsequent variations in scheme • Potential cost creep due to changes • Cost of using the Alliance Framework • Sometimes Alliance suggest facility mix options which do not reflect the core needs assessment – this needs to be managed. If additional more commercial elements are needed this is fine, but schemes should focus priority on delivering the identified facility needs.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PLAN

The purpose of the work plan is to plan, manage and co-ordinate the ongoing activity and progress of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It will be updated regularly and presented to each meeting of the Committee. It will include issues that are currently being actioned as well as those that will be subject to future work.

The Committees Terms of Reference are as follows:

- to perform all overview and scrutiny functions on behalf of the Council;
- to appoint such formal sub-committees and informal task and finish groups as it considers necessary to assist it in discharging its functions;
- to prepare and approve the overview and scrutiny work programme so as to ensure that the Committee's time is effectively and efficiently utilised;
- to undertake investigations into such matters relating to the Council's functions and powers as:
 - (1) may be referred by the Council, Committees, the Cabinet, or the Leader; or
 - (2) the Committee may consider appropriate; or
 - (3) have been referred to the Committee pursuant to the "call-in" procedure set out in the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules in Part 4 of this Constitution. (These can be decisions taken by the Cabinet, a Cabinet Member, key decisions taken by an officer or under joint arrangements).
- to monitor and review the performance of the Council and services against relevant performance indicators and adopted plans;

- to review and/or scrutinise decisions proposed to be made (pre-decision scrutiny) or actions taken in connection with the discharge of any of the Council's functions;
- to review existing policy and strategy with a view to securing continuous improvement in the way in which the Council's functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness;
- to make reports and/or recommendations to the full Council and/or the Cabinet in connection with the discharge of any functions;
- to review and/or scrutinise any matter affecting the area or its inhabitants;
- to discuss initiatives put forward for consideration by individual members of the Committee and any relevant 'call-for-action' in accordance with the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules set out in Part 4 of this Constitution; and
- to consider petitions referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in accordance with provisions set out in the Petition Scheme set out in Part 4 of this Constitution.

(A) ISSUES CURRENTLY BEING PROGRESSED BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE TASK AND FINISH GROUPS

ISSUE (PURPOSE OF REVIEW)	TASK AND FINISH GROUP (MEMBERSHIP 2024/25)	CURRENT WORK
<p>To monitor the performance and activities of Registered Providers working in the Borough.</p>	<p>Cllrs Gaynor Austin, Halleh Koohestani (Chair), S.J. Masterson, Bill O’Donovan and M.D. Smith.</p>	<p>At the meeting on 18 December, the Group updated the terms or reference to reflect the new Council priorities. Vivid and Metropolitan Thames Valley would be invited to review meetings between Jan- May 2025. Other RPs operating in the borough would have Social Housing Regulator and Housing Ombudsman reports collated and be asked to complete the standard questionnaire used at the review meetings.</p> <p>The next meeting of the Group was scheduled for 26 February, 2025, with VIVID, however VIVID were now unable to attend on this date and a new date would be advised in due course.</p>
<p>To review the Council Tax Support Scheme</p>	<p>Cllrs P.J. Cullum, C.P. Grattan, Lisa Greenway, M.J. Roberts and Stuart Trussler (Vice-Chair)</p>	<p>At its meeting on 16 October, members noted the information presented by officers on the performance of the current CTS scheme as well as the Council Tax and Business Rates collection data.</p> <p>Members asked to be taken through some examples of Exceptional Hardship payments and Discretionary Housing Payments at the next meeting. They also expected to be able to make a recommendation to Cabinet about the scheme for 25/26.</p>

ISSUE (PURPOSE OF REVIEW)	TASK AND FINISH GROUP (MEMBERSHIP 2024/25)	CURRENT WORK
		<p>On 4 December, following careful analysis of the CTS scheme, by the Group, they proposed that Cabinet should make recommendations to the Council, that the scheme remain unchanged for 25/26.</p> <p>A report was presented to the Cabinet at its meeting on 14 January, setting out the Group's recommendations. The Cabinet then further recommended that the Council approve that the current scheme continued with annual uplifts, as set out in the Report, the Exceptional Hardship relief fund remained the same and any minor changes, in accordance with annual uprating as applied by the DWP, were made.</p> <p>The Council would consider the recommendations at its meeting on 27 February, 2025.</p>
<p>To consider further the economical and environmental impacts of Farnborough Airport on the Borough.</p>	<p>Cllrs Craig Card, A.H. Crawford, P.J. Cullum, Halleh Koohestani (Chair), G.B. Lyon and Bill O'Donovan with Cllr Jules Crossley (Policy, Climate & Sustainability Portfolio Holder) as an invitee as required.</p>	<p>Reached out to officers and will provide an update when available.</p>

(B) OTHER ISSUES CURRENTLY BEING PROGRESSED BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

ISSUE	CURRENT WORK
Arts and Culture	<p>At its November 2023 meeting the Committee were apprised of the work being undertaken in conjunction with the Hampshire Cultural Trust and Arts Council England on arts and cultural activity on the Borough. A further meeting would be held on this item in 6-12 months.</p> <p>Following a review of the work at the Progress Group, it was felt that the work of the cultural compacts would sit better with the Policy and Project Advisory Board. Officers would arrange for this to be picked up by the Board.</p>
Asset Management	<p>At its meeting in January 2024, the Committee received a presentation detailing progress on the Asset Management Strategy and future delivery, and a review of the portfolio and principles of disposal in light of the budget.</p> <p>A watching briefing would be maintained on progress during the 2024/25 Municipal Year.</p> <p>The meeting on 4th March, 2025, would address asset disposal specifically related to the Union Yard development</p>
Cabinet Champions	<p>The two Cabinet Champions attended the meeting in March 2024, to provide a report on their work and activities during 2023/24. The work of both Champions was noted and the recommended priorities for 2024/25 endorsed.</p> <p>Written Reports on activities during 2024/25 would be provided to the meeting on 27 March for the consideration by the Committee.</p>

Rushmoor Voluntary Services and Citizens Advice Rushmoor - Service Level Agreements	Recommendations were made to the Cabinet following the meetings in October and December, 2024. The recommendations, in particular, asked the Cabinet to consider multi year funding agreements and rent relief levels for both organisations. The outcomes from the Cabinet meetings resolved that the recommendations would be considered as part of the budget setting process.
---	---

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

WORKFLOW – June 2024- March 2025

DATE	ITEMS
13th June 2024	Registered Providers T&F Annual Report Housing and Homelessness Prevention Strategy
1st August 2024	SERCO
12th September 2024	Financial Matters/CIPFA Report
19th September 2024	Police and Community Safety
24th October 2024	Rushmoor Voluntary Services - Annual SLA Report – Donna Bone
<i>18th November 2024</i>	<i>All Member Seminar to provide an update on Union Yard</i>
<i>20th November 2024</i>	<i>Risk Management Briefing for CGAS Committee (open to all)</i>
28 November 2024	Leader Priorities – GW Risk Register Review – GW/RS
12th December 2024	Citizens' Advice - Annual SLA Report – Calum Stewart
<i>8th January 2025 (Informal meeting)</i>	<i>Online meeting to discuss items to be included in a letter to Hampshire County Council</i>
30th January 2025	Financial Recovery Plan – Review – Invited GW & PV
<i>4th March 2025 (Additional Meeting)</i>	<i>Appointment – replacement for Alex Crawford Call-In – Farnborough Leisure Centre – Next Steps</i>
<i>13th March 2025 (Additional Meeting)</i>	<i>Union Yard Disposals Update – KE/NI/TM</i>
27th March 2025	Champions Annual Report (x2) - (Written reports for approval)
Potential Future Items for the Committee in 2024/25	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Highways issues (condition of roads, speeding and road safety issues) – HCC – letter being prepared 2. Housing and Homelessness Prevention Strategy (Session 2) 3. Climate Change Action Plan – New Strategy being agreed in March 2025 – consider again in 2025/26 4. Community and Youth Engagement – Incorporated into the Young People's Plan approved in Jan 2025. Need to wait a while before reviewing at Scrutiny – 2025/26 5. Stagecoach

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Progress Meetings 2024/25

Membership: Cllr Leola Card, P.J. Cullum, Thomas Day, Halleh Koohestani (Chair), Nadia Martin (Vice Chair), Bill O'Donovan and Stuart Trussler (Vice Chair)

Click [here](#) to view the latest Action Tracker

(Please refresh the page when opening to ensure the latest version is available)

DATE	ITEM	NOTES
02.07.2024	SERCO – scoping of item for 1 August	Annual report will be finalised – a summary of the report will be presented at the meeting Areas of concern include, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - grass cutting changes and impacts (rewilding) - Waste Management – what are the %'s and how can we improve? Consider national changes due in 2027 - Focus on key services provided - how can we improve? / cost / effectiveness / performance against KPI's - Renewal of contract - Benchmarking against other councils
	Housing and Homelessness Prevention Strategy – request to Cabinet to review the strategy (June 13 meeting)	Important to review the data requested at the meeting prior to making a decision on a review of the strategy by the Cabinet. Data will provide context to those carrying out a review to determine if the strategy is achievable/objectives realistic. Cabinet Member minded to review anyway, is it better to wait until any changes have been made? Could offer engagement services from the Committee as part of the review.

Last Updated 24/02/2025

	<p>Police and Community Safety - September 19 meeting</p> <p>Future items for consideration</p>	<p>ACTION – follow up on request for data – AT/ZP</p> <p>ACTION – data request – how long are people in temp accommodation? How do we move people from temp to permanent accommodation?</p> <p>Produce list of asks for the Chief Inspector and Community Safety Team at next PG meeting.</p> <p>A list has been added to the Potential items above.</p>
02.09.2024	<p>Financial Matters / CIPFA Report (12 September)</p> <p>Police and Community Safety (19 September)</p> <p>Work Plan</p>	<p>Simon Allsop of CIPFA will be attending online to talk through the recent CIPFA Report. Request for a clear understanding of the recommendations within the report. Establish what OSC can do to provide effective scrutiny, best practice/key lines of enquiry etc. What lessons have we learnt? Update on current position of the Council in response to the report.</p> <p>Areas to cover at the meeting included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - General overview of Community Safety - Report back from the Joint Crime and Disorder Overview and Scrutiny Committee - What's gone well - Top 5 thing for GC/DL - CPO teams - Challenges - What can be done better - Cops and Coffee - 101/online SLAs - Boundary areas <p>Members prioritised the work plan as set out above.</p>

03.10.2024	Financial Matters/CIPFA Report	Made some recommendations that would be included in the report to Cabinet on 15 October. The Financial Recovery Action Plan would be reviewed in the New Year, pencilled in for 30 January, Leader and PV invited.
	Police and Community Safety	ACTION – add request for Gillian Cox to attend the Community Engagement T&F to the Action Tracker
	RVS and CA Annual SLA Reports	Ensure copies of the SLA agreements are shared with Members in advance and ask attendees to provide an executive summary with their reports. Pencilled in for the Dec meeting – TBC.
	24 October Meeting	Risk Register – general feel, how mitigating, how managed. Look at critical ones (red) and any emerging risks. Establish where the “real” risks are... Leaders Priorities – invite the Leader to share his priorities for the future.
	HCC – Engagement Process	Set up a remote meeting with all Members of the Committee to consider items for inclusion in a letter to HCC to start the process of engagement with them. Write to all Members in advance of the meeting to ensure all HCC related issues are captured for consideration in the discussion.
	Stagecoach	ACTION - Share minutes of the last meeting at which Stagecoach were present.
18.11.2024	RVS	Report to Cabinet with recommendations – 26 November ACTION - share report and dairy appointment with the Chair
	Risk Register	Date of training rescheduled to 25 November – ACTION - share slides in advance with Members
	Leader’s Priorities	Suggested to request questions in advance of the meeting for the Leader to prepare responses
	Union Yard	Keep a watching brief on the current situation and consider whether a separate item is required on Union Yard following the briefing.

08.01.2025	Leaders Priorities	Noted
	Risk Register Review	Noted
	Citizens Advice Rushmoor – SLA Report	Noted that the report with the recommendations would be considered at the meeting on 14 January.
	Financial Recovery Plan	Following a discussion on the appropriateness of this item, it was felt important to consider the effectiveness of the Plan and governance arrangements in a public setting.
	Cultural Compacts	Following consideration of the scope of this item it was felt that it would be best place with PPAB to help develop engagement and participation with the wider community.
	March 2025 meeting	Requirement for a pre scrutiny item on Union Yard disposals. It was advised that Cabinet had an item scheduled on this matter in February (11 th) and a meeting may need to be scheduled prior to this to allow the Committee the chance to look at it in advance of that meeting. Consideration would be given to some suitable dates following a conversation with KE/TM.
	Additional Items	Union Yard Project Review – to be held when the project had been completed Re-organisation/Devolution business case
06.03.2025	Meeting on 4th March	Call-in – Farnborough Leisure Centre – Next Steps
	Meeting on 13th March	Union Yard Disposals
	Meeting on 27th March	Annual Champion’s Reports

This page is intentionally left blank