

## **Public Statements for the Cabinet – 7 March 2018**

### Statement from Cllr Lucy Grieve, Portland Town Council in relation to Brackenbury Infant School on the Quarterly Assets Management Report

Various indices and reports show the severe levels of deprivation in Underhill. The proposed community hub directly addresses the need for services this level of deprivation creates. Portland Town Council's bid offers the County Council a cost-effective solution for delivery of services and the provision of Early Help and over time should help relieve pressure on social services. The timing as well as the nature of Cabinet's decision are both critical for Portland Town Council: please announce today either your final decision or whether you are 'minded to' accept this bid.

### Statement from Cllr Ray Nowak, Chairman of Portland Town Council in relation to Brackenbury Infant School on the Quarterly Assets Management Report

As councillors, be it County or Town, we should be saying how can we strengthen the community glue, help the Voluntary sector to be more effective, so they flourish.

We have not asked that you give us the school, but we do appreciate that our offer is less than the commercial value of the site.

We had hoped that today you could have agreed our bid, but clearly there is still a bit of work to do to convince you of the financial sense of our proposals, and the potential community gain.

### Statement from Mr Brian Bradley, Tenant Farmers Association representative, in relation to the County Farms Estate Management Plan Update

Having considered the contents of the papers against the TFAs policy on County farms, I have to record my objection to the recommendations contained within the paper.

Whilst I can understand the local authority's ongoing requirement for additional capital receipts I disagree, fundamentally, with the approach taken here. The paper seeks to suggest that all that is happening is that the local authority is identifying six further Holdings as "non-core". However there is no assessment as to how these have been selected, no criteria that we can judge. It seems to me that the only criteria that has been used is expediency given that you have identified those holdings that are likely to be available for disposal most quickly in view of their tenancy termination dates. Just because they are more readily available for potential disposal does not make them non-core. We reject the assessment that these six holdings are non-core.

Secondly, there is no analysis of how the Council has assessed best value. Again we acknowledge that the local authority may believe it needs to increase capital disposals but it must only do so if it is assured that it is achieving best value from those disposals. There is nothing in the paperwork which provides any level of assessment of best value and therefore on that ground we object to the sale of these six Holdings.

I suggest that rather than making a decision on Wednesday that this matter comes back to the liaison panel with further information about the criteria for selection and the assessment of best value before returning to Cabinet.