

Notes from the Scrutiny Committee meeting 23 December 2014

Present: Scrutiny committee members, Council Leader, officers, representatives of STCP and the TCP CIC bid, and other councillors.

The Chair explained the reasons for calling in the decision and the matters before the committee for discussion.

Officers introduced the report and the decision before the committee.

Nigel Gibson and Judith Harley outlined the CIC bid and the reasons why this should be accepted, and that a considerable amount of supporting information had been circulated separately after the CEB agenda was published.

Committee members asked and received answers to questions about:

- The risks to the council including:
 - Viability
 - The risks in the Catalyst bid
 - The financial and construction risks in the CIC's building design
 - The legal risks in the CIC bid, that given the difference between their bid and Catalyst's the decision would be referred to the secretary of state who may or may not approve it.
- Alternative leisure facilities and overall provision of leisure facilities including the analysis of need which informed the draft leisure strategy
- The deliverability and viability of community facilities
- Site design, capacity and broad compliance with the council's local development plan.
- Housing density and the proportion of affordable housing
- Equalities impact assessment, impact on protected groups, and alternative provision/mitigation
- The robustness and reliability of CIC's estimates of income from increased usage and expenditure on repairs and redevelopment
- The soundness and comparability of the Bramley Pools model cited by CIC as their model for this social enterprise.

The committee debated the matter and in particular if they had sufficient information about the proposals in the CIC bid and sufficient advice from officers as to the risks and viability of the proposals and the business plan to decide whether there were grounds to refer this back to CEB.

The Chair asked the committee if they wished to refer the decision back to the CEB. This proposal, on being put to the vote, was not carried.

Accordingly the matter is not referred back.

