

Councillor Motion: To research Management Company future role

There is a growing movement within the country that Management companies are not great for communities and their pockets. This has been highlighted by the Competition and Mergers Authority (CMAS). Their housebuilding market study, final report recommends mandatory adoption by Parishes.

Motion: I propose a request for some officer time to bring forward a paper on whether this is feasible for Tithebarn (T) and potentially Westclyst (W).

Negatives: The precept will probably have to go up, which is a difficult sell to the whole Parish but there may be a way to do this without an increase to the precept.

If the precept did have to go up there is a concern that this could lead to reputational damage to Broadclyst Parish Council (BPC).

There may be infrastructure the Parish is unused to managing but as Cranbrook has found a way to manage this, it can't be insurmountable.

Positives: The residents of Tithebarn would feel more community connection with Broadclyst Parish and a more cohesive community could be built.

It would save the residents money at a time of a cost-of-living crisis, which is biting the less well off the most.

Many of the public open spaces across the parish are maintained by BPC and this would align T&W with other areas. Tithebarn and Westclyst will both become significant population centres and contributors to the precept within the Parish with an eventual planned size of over 1500 dwellings each by the end of the decade. This will be approximately 70 or 75% of the Parish. The precept of Tithebarn and Westclyst will be subsidising other areas of the Parish in the future if the parish pays for the maintenance of public open space at Broadclyst but not at T and W.

There is a growing movement within the country that Management companies are not great for communities and their pockets. The documents attached recommends mandatory adoption by Parishes. An informal comment from Barratts is that they don't think management companies will exist in the longer term. Therefore, whilst the parish still has the opportunity to benefit from the "slush fund" of £33000 it would be advantageous for the Parish to be in at the beginning.

Given the evident failure of the privatised "Estate Management" system as currently (un) governed by a lack of consumer protection legislation, highlighted by the CMA'S Housebuilding market study final report, we could find that 75-80% of the entire population of Broadclyst parish lives in (a) very poorly managed estate(s).

Residents could be exposed to significant increases in management fees with current legislation limiting avenues for redress. BPC does not operate at-profit and would reduce Tithebarn and Westclyst residents' exposure to unexpected

- We recommend that the UK, Scottish, and Welsh governments each implement common adoptable standards for public amenities on new housing estates.

Recommendation 1.2: Mandatory adoption

- We recommend that the UK, Scottish, and Welsh governments each implement mandatory adoption of public amenities on new housing estates (outside of minor, well-defined exceptions).

Providing greater protection to households living under private management arrangements

Recommendation 1.3: Enhanced consumer protection measures

- We recommend that the UK government, in consultation with the Scottish and Welsh Governments, introduce enhanced consumer protection measures, underpinned by a robust enforcement regime, for households living under private management arrangements.

Recommendation 1.4: Prohibition of new embedded management arrangements

- We recommend that the UK, Scottish, and Welsh governments each prohibit the establishment of new embedded management arrangements.

Recommendation 1.5: Guidance for residents' management companies

changes in bills. This would reduce inequality across the parish and be a positive example of BPC complying with the **Public Sector Equality Duty**.

Possible growth in reputation through taking on greater responsibility for the whole area.

At the moment the developers are still selling houses, so have a vested interest in the area, but the sales office won't be here for ever...Third-party management companies are run for-profit and attract significant cost overheads which are passed on to residents. Barratt David Wilson has suggested this could mean Tithebarn residents paying double the cost that a non-profit public body would need to charge.

A large portion of the public open space at Tithebarn forms part of the Clyst Valley Regional Park and effective maintenance would be beneficial for the wider parish, not just Tithebarn residents. For example, Minerva Park has significant historical value with evidence of neolithic occupation. It also has significant wildlife potential with visits from beavers and is habitat for rare water voles. Also the public open spaces at Tithebarn include sports pitches and an all-weather pitch. Similarly, at Westclyst, the public open space includes a skate park and play areas. We should at least look at the costs and benefits of taking on all these assets at T and W.

There are approved plans for a shared use trail to link Broadclyst Station to Mosshayne Lane and provide a direct link to the Tithebarn public spaces and beyond. This will give greater access to Tithebarn assets for other residents of the Parish. (Currently EDDC is looking to manage the park as their 106 obligations are discussed) but as with Station Road Country Park plans this would likely attract a greater amount of voluntary support from the community. There is more potential for social engagement with the Park with residents helping to make it a very special place.

Currently, for Tithebarn, Michelmores LLP holds a first-year management fee that was collected from residents on completion as a form of slush fund. If a serious intention for BPC to manage the public open space is made before the transfer to third parties, it would likely make accessing this much easier. Probably much the same applies at Westclyst where much of the public open space is still in the hands of the developers (or the parish already).

The charges by management companies include considerable sums for collection, administration and staffing costs (as well as their profit) which would not apply if BPC took on management of the land and assets. Hence it is much cheaper for the residents if the Parish take on the role instead the Man Co. I understand that the parish may need more staff but those costs can be included.

Relative to a lot of development Tithebarn and Westclyst are quite high-end, well built, very nice, peaceful places to live. Everyone wants that to continue, and I am sure that the BPC would want to have leadership in helping Tithebarn and Westclyst become a jewel in the crown, rather than forgo that leadership and maybe Tithebarn becomes a thorn in their side...

There is agreement from the developer consortium for BPC to investigate if they want to take over maintenance of Tithebarn and some confidential documents that support our case for savings have been sent to the clerk. There is more information in this document about Tithebarn, but the concept applies very much to Westclyst too.

A nice community needs a nice place to live. Firstport may well manage Tithebarn very well, but if they don't in 5 or 10 years from now hindsight might painfully show opportunity missed.

Cllr Paula Fernley
26.08.2024