

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Meeting held on Thursday, 5th February, 2026 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr Halleh Koohestani (Chair)
Cllr Thomas Day (Vice-Chair)
Cllr M.J. Tennant (Vice-Chair)

Cllr Leola Card
Cllr G.B. Lyon
Cllr Nadia Martin
Cllr Bill O'Donovan
Cllr M.J. Roberts
Cllr S. Trussler

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr C.P. Grattan and Cllr Steve Harden.

Cllr Mara Makunura attended the meeting as a Standing Deputy.

26. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meetings held on 11th December, 2025 were agreed as a correct record.

It was also agreed that an update would be provided on the recommendations made at the December meeting on the Walk this Waste Pilot and changes to the new Housing Oversight Group Terms of Reference, at the meeting to be held on 24th February, 2026.

27. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED: That, taking into account the public interest test, the public be excluded from the meeting during the discussion of the under mentioned items to avoid the disclosure of exempt information within the paragraph of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act, 1972 indicated against the item:

Minute Nos.	Schedule 12A Para. No.	Category
28 & 29	3	Information relating to financial or business affairs

28. **FARNBOROUGH LEISURE CENTRE - LEISURE OPERATOR PROCUREMENT**

The Committee carried out pre-decision scrutiny on the procurement and approval of an operator for the Aldershot Pools and Lido, Alpine Snowsports Centre and the proposed new Farnborough Leisure Centre prior to consideration by the Cabinet at its meeting on 10th February, 2026.

Report No. OS2603 set out the outcome of the Leisure Operator procurement process which commenced in June 2025 and was assessed to take account of both quality (60%) and cost (40%). Operators had the option to bid on two different lots, a standard concession contract or an agency agreement.

The Committee were provided with some background information to the preferred operator, noting their purpose and values, health and wellbeing programme, investment throughout the contract term, the added social and environmental value, and financial deliverability and sustainability. Members were also apprised of a number of risks, and the mitigations in place to address these.

During discussions the Committee asked a number of questions:

- Can we guarantee that costs won't be put on residents through membership fees – it was noted that the preferred bidder had proposed a pricing model to ensure equity of access and commercial performance. Price increases would be aligned to industry best practice, benchmarked annually against Sport England, comparators, and user feedback. Prices would be reported to the Council for agreement annually.
- What were the implications of targets not being met – it was noted that the Council would retain an agreed minimum financial return that was guaranteed.
- What were the financial implications of a mechanical or plant failure at the Lido – it was advised that responsibility for maintenance of the lido plant would remain with the Council.
- Car parking capacity at the Aldershot Pools and Lido – this was an ongoing issue and was discussed as part of the process. It was noted that additional parking had been made available in recent years with a new lido overflow at the rear of the grounds (100 spaces), utilising a small area of Aldershot Park (up to 100 spaces) and on rare occasions the Crematorium car park (up to 50 spaces) for use in busy periods.
- Due diligence, in particular holding to account over promises of social value at procurement stage – it was noted that provision would be included in the contract terms to cover areas such as social value.
- Procurement process costs – it was noted that the Council had a contract with Portsmouth Council who carried out procurement work with the Council's officers.
- Community outreach – some target areas had been identified, in particular those areas of multiple deprivation, however, it was noted that these were negotiable.

The Committee also discussed rebuilding relationships with clubs, in particular the swimming and synchronised swimming clubs. It was advised that the project team had been in contact with key stakeholders, including these clubs, during the process.

ACTIONS:

What	By Whom	When
Confirm any penalties for contract failure by the operator?	David Phillips – Deputy Head of Operations	ASAP
Confirm whether the Council should ask the preferred operator for a performance bond?	David Phillips – Deputy Head of Operations	ASAP
Confirm that appropriate balance sheet checks had been undertaken for the preferred operator?	David Phillips – Deputy Head of Operations	ASAP

29. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Having regard to the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors, the following declarations of interest were made:

Item No.	Member	Interest	Reason
30	Cllr S. Trussler	Personal and non-pecuniary	Director Rushmoor Homes Limited
30	Cllr Gareth Williams	Personal and non-pecuniary	Director Rushmoor Homes Limited

The Committee agreed that the Directors of RHL could remain and participate in the meeting in line with the previous dispensation provided by the Council's Corporate Governance, Audit and Standards Committee, in May 2021, who had granted dispensations to Members appointed by the Council to the Board of the Rushmoor Development Partnership and as Directors of Rushmoor Homes Limited.

30. UNION YARD, ALDERSHOT - DISPOSAL OF BLOCKS C & D

The Committee considered the decision made by the Cabinet at its meeting on 15 December, 2025, to dispose of Blocks C & D at Union Yard, Aldershot to Vivid Housing.

It was noted that since the Cabinet meeting in December, some key dependencies had changed, and it had been confirmed that Vivid's Board decision would now take place in mid-February. The Committee were given the opportunity to speak with Chris Hodgkinson of Lambert Smith Hampton (Investment Management) (LSH) regarding their recent soft market testing on the value of Blocks C & D. Mr Hodgkinson advised that six companies had come forward with offers all of which were under the value being offered by Vivid Housing, therefore, LSH's recommendation was to pursue the sale with Vivid Housing.

The Committee discussed the financial implications of selling to Vivid Housing against the alternative options set out in Exempt Report No. REG2502 and were advised that whilst red book valuations were used as a benchmark a property's actual sale value was that value the market was willing to pay at the time. It was also noted that soft market testing was, in general, a true reflection of value, however, on occasion off market sales could result in over valuation as well as under valuation. Members asked and received responses to a number of questions regarding the detail of the sale.

The Committee also discussed selling the properties individually on the open market and shared views on the difference in income this could provide. In response to a query, it was noted that selling the properties in a piecemeal way, which could take between 14-21 months, would result in additional costs whilst sales were still progressing when compared to a single sale of both blocks. Although the total capital receipt achieved from individual disposals could be higher once all were sold this would need to be 'netted off' against the additional holding costs and was considered a higher risk compared to the immediate benefit of a larger single capital receipt

Executive Director, Karen Edwards advised that Option 4(a), as set out in Exempt Report No. REG2502, had been the original preferred option for disposal on the units back in April 2025. That offer had been withdrawn and the current offer from Vivid Housing was the quickest to progress in line with the Council's Financial Recovery Programme and help minimise further costs associated with holding onto the property for a longer period. In addition, it was noted that the mix of properties and restrictions on the commercial units had also been adjusted as part of the negotiations. With regards to nomination rights, it was noted that affordable housing nominations would sit with the Council's current arrangements and would help address the number of residents currently on the housing list, whereas shared ownership would be managed through Vivid Housing.

In response to a query regarding Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB), and Vivid's perceived inaction on these matters, it was advised that meetings were being held at a strategic level to address such concerns in a timely and effective manner going forward. Members were made aware that 18 units were already occupied by Vivid tenants and no issues of ASB had been reported to date.

The Committee noted the financial implications of not taking forward the current sale to Vivid Housing and what that could mean for the Council going forward.

The Committee had raised and discussed relevant points on both a financial and social level but had no specific recommendations to make to the Cabinet.

The meeting closed at 9.08 pm.

CLLR HALLEH KOOHESTANI (CHAIR)
