

# Public Document Pack

## THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Monday, 19 July 2021

Attendance:

Councillors  
Brook (Chairperson)

Lumby  
Becker  
Cook  
Craske  
Ferguson

Horrill  
Power  
Weir  
Williams

[Video and audio recording](#)

---

1. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR MUNICIPAL YEAR 2021/22**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Lumby be appointed Vice-Chairperson for the 2021/22 Municipal Year.

2. **APOLOGIES AND DEPUTY MEMBERS**

There were no apologies.

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Councillor Lumby declared a non-pecuniary interest concerning items upon the agenda that may be related to his role as a County Councillor.

4. **CHAIRPERSON'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

5. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE 11 MARCH 2021**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on the 11<sup>th</sup> March 2021 be approved and adopted.

6. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr Patrick Davies addressed the meeting regarding the agenda item: "Central Winchester Regeneration – Strategic Outline Business Case". Mr Davies questioned the role and effectiveness of the Scrutiny Committee as part of the

overall decision-making process for this item. Mr Davies felt that holding this meeting so close to the Cabinet meeting on the 21<sup>st</sup> of July made meaningful scrutiny difficult. Mr Davies gave two examples of issues of concern within the report. These were the importance of the provision of a new bus station and the on-site archaeology. Regarding the latter point, he referred members to a recent newspaper article concerning the views of Professor Martin Biddle.

Mr David Light, Chair of Tenants & Council Together (TACT) spoke regarding the agenda item "Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Outturn 20/21". Mr Light advised that at a recent meeting with officers regarding the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget that whilst this was in a good position, he believed that COVID-19 had impacted the delivery of some services. Mr Light also referred to other specific matters related to land in Harestock Road and the council's Estates and Property Services teams. Finally, Mr Light advised that whilst TACT did support affordable housing schemes across the district, priority should be for additional council housing wherever possible. Mr Botham agreed to discuss these points with Mr Light following the meeting.

The Chairperson thanked Mr Davies and Mr Light for their contributions.

## 7. **CENTRAL WINCHESTER REGENERATION – STRATEGIC OUTLINE BUSINESS CASE**

Scrutiny report reference SC049  
Cabinet report reference CAB3303

The Head of Programme: Central Winchester Regeneration introduced the report and provided members with a presentation that covered the following aspects of the project; the business case, the strategic outline case, the delivery options long list, Kings Walk and the next steps.

The Committee proceeded to ask questions and debate the application in detail and in summary, the following matters were raised.

Project Risks and Mitigations:

- the identified risk relating to potential legal challenge and the council's mitigation plans
- the measures to mitigate developers delay and incentives to encourage drawdown of sites
- the identified risk relating to "Pushback from the neighbouring landlords"
- the risk of future development partners altering the planned phasing
- how the council manages the two roles of Local Planning Authority (LPA) and Landowner

Costs and Expenditure:

- the management of project costs including consultancy expenditure
- availability of external funding sources
- the adequacy of the budget for works at Kings Walk
- whether there was a breakdown of consultancy expenditure?

## Member and Public Engagement

- future member involvement in developing project “red lines” and the potential future involvement of full council
- the plans for future public engagement

## Physical aspects of the regeneration

- the archaeology of the site and associated issues such as soil samples and the formation of the archaeology group
- facilities for families within the regeneration site
- the provision of a new bus station and the options regarding the wider bus infrastructure
- the impact on the night-time economy
- the cultural/heritage experience within the plans
- how to reduce cases of anti-social behaviour
- whether officers were aware of any plans for the St Clements surgery site?
- The expiry dates for Kings Walk leases

## Project Management

- how would the council measure progress against plans and established success criteria?
- the merits of the proposed development agreement approach
- whether the requirements within the Supplementary Planning Document could be met within the existing red lines?
- how could sustainability be given greater weighting in partner selection?
- the possibility of specialist developers being utilised underneath the main development partner.

These points were responded to by the Cabinet Member for Housing and Asset Management, officers, and representatives from Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL) accordingly.

The committee agreed to move into exempt session to consider the exempt appendix to the report before returning to open session to debate the report further and to agree the recommendations as set out below.

## RESOLVED:

The Committee agreed the following comments be passed to Cabinet.

1. The committee wished to emphasise the following aspects of the project:
  - That the archaeological elements were significant and should be at its core, Members recommended the archaeological group be reconvened by autumn 2021
  - The wider cultural offer should be at the heart of the project and ensure that the family offering is kept in mind

2. The committee supported the formation of a cross-party advisory group and that the following issues could form part of its work plan:

- Understanding the “red lines” and supporting development of the outline business case
- Reviewing expenditure on external fees and understanding likely future costs to deliver the project

3. That scrutiny committee be given opportunity to review progress of the project, particularly

- Review the overall governance of the project
- Scrutiny to be conducted in a timelier manner for future cabinet papers.
- Understand how separation of duties with developer and planning would be maintained

and that full council be given an opportunity to consider the matter in due course

## 8. **APPOINTMENTS OF EXTERNAL BODIES RELATED TO SCRUTINY**

Report ref SC046

RESOLVED:

That the following appointments be made to the external bodies listed below:

- i. Portsmouth City Council – Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel: Councillor Bentote (deputy: Councillor Read).
- ii. Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) – Scrutiny Champions Network: Councillor Brook.
- iii. Partnership for South Hampshire overview and scrutiny committee: Councillor Bentote (deputy: Councillor Horrill).

At approximately 10.30pm and considering the remaining business on the agenda, members agreed that the meeting should be adjourned and that officers would seek to find a suitable date in August that the Committee could reconvene. If this was not possible then all outstanding agenda items would be moved to the committee’s next regular meeting on the 9<sup>th</sup> September 2021.

RESOLVED:

That the meeting be adjourned, and the outstanding items of business be deferred to either an additional meeting in August or the next scheduled meeting on 9 September 2021.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and concluded at 10.40 pm

Chairperson

This page is intentionally left blank