

Notice of Overview and Scrutiny Board



Date: Monday, 11 November 2019 at 5.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Bridge Street, Christchurch BH23 1AZ

Membership:

Chairman:

Cllr P Broadhead

Vice Chairman:

Cllr M Haines

Cllr M Anderson

Cllr S Bartlett

Cllr M F Brooke

Cllr M Earl

Cllr G Farquhar

Cllr L Fear

Cllr M Greene

Cllr N Greene

Cllr M Iyengar

Cllr R Lawton

Cllr R Maidment

Cllr P Miles

Cllr C Rigby

All Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Board are summoned to attend this meeting to consider the items of business set out on the agenda below.

The press and public are welcome to attend.

If you would like any further information on the items to be considered at the meeting please contact: Claire Johnston - 01202 454627 or email claire.johnston@bcpcouncil.gov.uk

Press enquiries should be directed to the Press Office: Tel: 01202 454668 or email press.office@bcpcouncil.gov.uk

This notice and all the papers mentioned within it are available at democracy.bcpCouncil.gov.uk

GRAHAM FARRANT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

1 November 2019



Available online and
on the Mod.gov app



AGENDA

Items to be considered while the meeting is open to the public

1. Apologies

To receive any apologies for absence from Members.

2. Substitute Members

To receive information on any changes in the membership of the Committee.

Note – When a member of a Committee is unable to attend a meeting of a Committee or Sub-Committee, the relevant Political Group Leader (or their nominated representative) may, by notice to the Monitoring Officer (or their nominated representative) prior to the meeting, appoint a substitute member from within the same Political Group. The contact details on the front of this agenda should be used for notifications.

3. Declarations of Interests

Councillors are required to comply with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and the Council's Code of Conduct regarding Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.

Councillors are also required to disclose any other interests where a Councillor is a member of an external body or organisation where that membership involves a position of control or significant influence, including bodies to which the Council has made the appointment in line with the Council's Code of Conduct.

Declarations received will be reported at the meeting.

4. Minutes

5 - 24

To confirm and sign as a correct record the minutes of the meetings held on 23 September and 4 October 2019.

a) Action Sheet

25 - 30

To note and comment on the attached action sheet which tracks decisions, actions and outcomes arising from previous Board meetings.

5. Public Speaking

To receive any public questions, statements or petitions submitted in accordance with the Constitution. Further information on the requirements for submitting these is available to view at the following link:-

<https://democracy.bcpccouncil.gov.uk/documents/s2305/Public%20Items%20-%20Meeting%20Procedure%20Rules.pdf>

The deadline for the submission of public questions is Monday 4 November 2019.

The deadline for the submission of a statement is 12.00 noon, Friday 8 November 2019.

The deadline for the submission of a petition is 12.00 noon, Friday 8 November 2019.

6. Scrutiny of Housing Related Cabinet Reports

To consider the following housing related reports scheduled for Cabinet consideration on 13 November 2019:

- Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Plan

The O&S Board is asked to scrutinise the reports and make recommendations to Cabinet as appropriate.

Cabinet member invited to attend for this item: Councillor Keiron Wilson, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning.

The Cabinet report will be published on Tuesday 5 November 2019 and available to view at the following link:

<https://democracy.bcpccouncil.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=285&MId=3723&Ver=4>

7. Scrutiny of Corporate Cabinet Reports

To consider the following Corporate reports scheduled for Cabinet consideration on 13 November 2019:

- Organisational Design and Transformation Business Case
- Corporate Performance Management Update

The O&S Board is asked to scrutinise the reports and make recommendations to Cabinet as appropriate.

Cabinet member invited to attend for this item: Councillor Vikki Slade, Leader of the Council.

The Cabinet report will be published on Tuesday 5 November 2019 and available to view at the following link:

<https://democracy.bcpccouncil.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=285&MId=3723&Ver=4>

8. Scrutiny of Finance Related Cabinet Reports

To consider the following Finance related Cabinet report scheduled for Cabinet consideration on 13 November 2019:

Budget and Performance Monitoring Report - 2019/20 Quarter 2

The O&S Board is asked to scrutinise the reports and make recommendations to Cabinet as appropriate.

Cabinet member invited to attend for this item: Councillor David Brown, Portfolio Holder for Finance.

The Cabinet report will be published on Tuesday 5 November 2019 and available to view at the following link:
<https://democracy.bcpccouncil.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=285&MId=3723&Ver=4>

9. Forward Plan

31 - 48

To consider and amend the Board's Forward Plan as appropriate and to consider the Cabinet Forward Plan.

10. Future Meeting Dates

To note the future meeting dates arranged for the Board as follows:

The following meetings are planned to begin at 6.00pm, venues tbc:

9 December 2019

13 January 2020

10 February 2020

16 March 2020

20 April 2020

No other items of business can be considered unless the Chairman decides the matter is urgent for reasons that must be specified and recorded in the Minutes.

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 23 September 2019 at 4.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr P Broadhead – Chairman

Cllr M Haines – Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr M Anderson, Cllr M Earl, Cllr L Fear, Cllr N Greene,
Cllr R Lawton, Cllr P Miles, Cllr C Rigby, Cllr B Dove (Reserve) (In
place of Cllr M Iyengar), Cllr R Burton (Reserve) (In place of Cllr M F
Brooke), Cllr L Lewis (Reserve) (In place of Cllr G Farquhar) and
Cllr D Mellor (Reserve) (In place of Cllr M Greene)

Also in Cllr D Brown, Cllr M Howell, Cllr S Moore, Cllr Dr F Rice and
attendance: Cllr L Williams

32. Apologies

The Democratic Services Officer reported that Cllr S Bartlett had replaced Cllr N Brooks on the Board

Apologies were received from Cllr S Bartlett, Cllr M Brooke, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr M Greene, Cllr M Iyengar and Cllrs P Miles and C Rigby for part of the meeting

33. Substitute Members

Notification was received from the relevant group leaders or their nominated representatives of the following substitutes: Cllr R Burton substituted for Cllr M Brooke, Cllr D Mellor substituted for Cllr M Greene, Cllr B Dove substituted for Cllr M Iyengar and Cllr L Lewis substituted for Cllr G Farquhar.

34. Declarations of Interests

None

35. Public Speaking

The Democratic Services Officer advised that no questions, statements or petitions had been received by the required deadline. However, there were a number of requests to speak in relation to the agenda item on 5G.

36. Call for Evidence - 5G Connectivity

The Chairman introduced the item and reminded everyone that the purpose of this session was to hear verbal submissions as part of the call for evidence. There was also an opportunity for any interested parties to make

written submissions on the issue, the closing date for written submissions was 7 October. The Board would then consider the responses to the Call-for evidence further at its meeting in November.

The following persons had registered to speak:

- John Hunt (on behalf of Susan Lennon) – West Howe Community Association
- Nick Greenwood
- Charles Ross Illingworth
- David Merefieid
- Anthony Story – Silicon South
- Marios Angelopoulos – Bournemouth University – Computing
- Adrian Dwyer
- Sam Crowe – Director of Public Health Dorset

The speakers spoke on a range of issues both in favour of the roll out of 5G and against it. A number of issues were raised including:

- The apparent lack of accountability regarding the instillation of fibre optics in Bournemouth;
- The development of 5G through weapons technology;
- Secrecy concerning 5G;
- Omissions and inaccuracies in various official reports on 5G;
- Studies evidencing health impacts and concerns in relation to 5G technology;
- Consideration of alternative technologies to 5G;
- Insurance unable to cover illnesses in relation to 5G technology;
- Impact of 5G technology on the environment and wildlife;
- International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines;
- Concern of a rise in cancer and other illnesses, a link to brain and heart tumours, radiation through 5G high frequencies and infertility;
- Out of date and inaccurate health reports being used;
- Request for 5G moratorium from leading scientists and doctors;
- Towns in the UK having adopted 5G moratoria, high profile cities across Europe had also adopted moratoria on 5G;
- Geneva reversed its 5G rollout after people falling ill;
- BCP area was well served in alternatives to 5G such as fibre optics;
- Decision making driven by machines rather than humans;
- Concern that Council's were responding to publicity material and promoting technology above people;
- Public Health England were falling behind in their advice and effects would only become apparent afterwards;
- People should be allowed to consent and take precautionary measures;
- 5G trials were already taking place in cities around the country and BCP Council needed to keep up;
- There were economic and development opportunities through 5G;
- 5G would improve social outcomes and quality of life;

- The divide between the digital and tech sectors would merge together
- The various sectors within BCP were well placed to support 5G technology;
- 5G will change how we share and consume information;
- There were a number of different technologies which will make up 5G;
- New technology would be commissioned and deployed for 5G;
- Technology needed for 5G;
- The amount of information able to be handled by a 5G network;
- Ability to do things not previously possible and tackle new problems;
- Job creation opportunities due to 5G;
- Improvements to the local economy with 5G developments and the need to attract high tech industries to the area;
- The frequency of 5G in the Lansdowne area should be no concern to public health according to the World Health Organisation;

The speakers were asked if they were prepared to answer questions to the Board and the Board asked a number of questions to some of the speakers to clarify some of the points they had made. In response to a question the Director of Public Health Dorset undertook to look into some of the information submitted and provide the Public Health view.

RESOLVED that the verbal representations on 5G be received and that they form part of the submission for the 5G call for evidence to be considered at the Board's meeting on 11 November 2019.

Cllr Rigby arrived at the start of this item and left the meeting at the end of this item.

Cllr Miles arrived at the conclusion of this item.

37. Scrutiny of Environment Related Cabinet Reports

Management of Waste and Cleansing Services in Christchurch from April 2020 – The Portfolio Holder introduced the report and explained that from 1 April 2020 BCP would be responsible for operating these services. An interim solution was proposed at option 3 within the report which would be in place whilst a strategic review of cleansing and waste services across BCP was completed which would be in line with new legislation being introduced in 2023. The Portfolio Holder was asked a number of questions on the report including:

- What the life span of waste collection vehicles in the current fleet was. It was noted that the life of the average vehicle was 7 years. The Poole fleet would be renewed on a rolling cycle. Dorset vehicles were at the end of their life and investment was being sought for this.
- Whether waste was collected from outside the BCP area at the Wilverly Road household recycling centre. The contract for this site was currently managed through the Dorset Waste Partnership and runs until 2024.

- Whether there was a net financial benefit to the proposals. The cost took into account the mixed collection of glass rather than separately but collected separately this would have a higher value.
- What the driver behind the proposals was – environmental or financial. It was explained that it was a balance between environmental impact and financial impact.
- Why such a small step towards harmonisation and why food waste collection was not being implemented in Poole. It was estimated that 25% - 30% of residual waste was food waste. There was a balance between the cost of implementing a food waste collection before the government waste review outcome. It was a pragmatic step to focus on recycling in Christchurch.
- The environmental impact of not separating glass. Less vehicles would be needed for collection and the majority of glass can be withdrawn.
- What the timescale was for a full review of the waste collection service. The government consultation would need to be factored in and with the number of staff and new structures required as well as existing contracts in place it was expected that it would take 2-3 years.
- Whether a single waste collection service was a priority. The Portfolio Holder responded that the environment was at the heart of everything she did. Food waste would be a high priority going forward. However, it was more important to reduce food waste than to collect it.
- Whether green waste collections would be harmonised across BCP. Proposals for the green waste collection were contained in another paper and the cost for this service outlined there. Bournemouth residents were able to have two bins for a reduced price but would be paying more per litre.
- How the proposals in the report would sync with the people strategy. IT was noted that staff would be subject to the pay and grading policies across BCP.

The Board discussed harmonisation arrangements for waste collection and disposal and the existing contracts in place and when harmonisation would be complete. The Board expressed concern that the level of harmonisation presented in papers to date did not go far enough.

38. Scrutiny of Regeneration Related Cabinet reports

Happyland, East Undercliff Promenade – Grant of Lease – The Portfolio Holder introduced the report explaining that this was the outcome of a scheme which was worked up mostly under the previous administration of Bournemouth Borough Council. The current building was structurally supporting the cliff and the building was starting to fail. Options for addressing the problem were outlined and the option preferred was to establish a special purpose vehicle (SPV) by the Meyrick Estate to grant a lease to the nominee of the SPV. The Council would grant a 150 year lease for a small annual rent, this would be conditional upon the grant of planning permission for the site. It was noted that whilst it may have been preferable for the Council to retain control of the site there was not a viable 'inhouse'

option for development. In the following discussion a number of issues were raised by the Board including:

- It being a prime site for development to provide for aspirations for a modern seafront;
- The size of the proposed hotel on the site. A hotel was not necessarily proposed. A building suitable for the site would be sought.
- Whether a lift would be installed. A developer would want to maximise space. A new lift would be required if the walkway was removed.
- There was no reference in the report to the Council's seafront strategy;
- The freeholders and the Council would not necessarily align;
- There appeared to be a lack of consultation with ward Members and also with trade and industry. The Portfolio Holder commented that he was committed to consultation and wanted to be in a position to see business coming through but that the report was presented to him with a decision between two options required.
- The Monitoring Officer confirmed that following external legal advice the options for the Council to approve the plans for the site risked a public procurement challenge.

The Chairman hoped that the Council would do everything possible to ensure a good development on the site and the Portfolio hoped that with future plans there would be extensive consultation.

Lansdowne – The Portfolio Holder introduced the report and explained that this was a long-term project of Bournemouth Borough Council. The Vision for Lansdowne would promote sustainable travel and deliver on a number of different Council priorities. It would create a better flow between Bournemouth train station, the town centre and the seafront.

A Member asked about reprovisioning the public toilets which were submerged at Lansdowne Roundabout. These were not part of the scheme but the Portfolio Holder confirmed that he would like to see more public toilets across the conurbation. However, the toilets at Lansdowne had been out of use for a long time.

A Member commented that the paper was really transformative and the area around Lansdowne was seeing lot of change.

The Chairman asked about the next steps for the scheme and for assurance that the proposals be fast tracked to be delivered by 2021. Overview and Scrutiny Board asked to take an active role in ensuring the development and requested the Cabinet Members speak to colleagues regarding the emerging underground issue.

Wessex Fields Development Site – The Cabinet Portfolio Holder outlined the recommendations within the Cabinet report and explained the reasons behind the current recommendations and changes to the scheme. It was noted that phase 1.1 of the scheme would be continuing as planned. However, the second party of phase one would stop at the boundary of the

development site at this time and stage 2 would not progress until the use of the site was determined.

The Chairman noted that the Council had a masterplan for the site and challenged the Portfolio Holder as to why the development wouldn't proceed through the site. The Portfolio Holder responded that the Masterplan was aspirational and provided ideas but there was nothing concrete in it in terms of development and other than the hospital there were no solid development plans. There was an opportunity to open up to consultation and to see who comes forward with ideas for the site.

In response to a question the Portfolio Holder confirmed that there was no additional finance required as a result of the paper. A Councillor commented that by not proceeding when the contractor was on site in the summer the works would have a greater financial impact.

Ward Councillors raised concerns with the comments from the Portfolio Holder that he hadn't come across anybody who thought phase 2 of the scheme was a good idea and suggested there were many who considered a northbound junction from the hospital a good idea. The Portfolio Holder commented that they would look at the proposed consultation but that he wouldn't be pushing for the phase 2 flyover. Ward Members felt that the concerns of residents in the ward were not being considered

A Board Member asked if the Portfolio Holder had spoken with the hospital. He noted that he had but conversations had been largely focused on the road through the site.

It was noted that at present there was no funding for phase 2 of the site and it was not a priority for the Cabinet. There was no desire to build the road until there was a sustainable proposal for Employment use.

The Chairman asked about job creation on the site and noted that it was limited to 500 jobs if phase 2 did not proceed. The Portfolio advised that they would be looking at a more sustainable site for further jobs to be created. The Chairman was concerned that sustainability was being used as a reason to do nothing and that job creation had not been given sufficient consideration. The Portfolio Holder commented that the site needed to draw people from the conurbation rather than those coming from some distance away. The Portfolio Holder was confident that the Council would be able to find the right partners for the site.

A Councillor asked about traffic congestion in the area. It was noted that the present plans would not create any further congestion as it didn't join up to another road.

A Councillor commented on the potential reputational risk of building a road to nowhere. The Portfolio Holder commented that he did not believe there was any risk as they fully intended to develop the site. There were also

concern raised regarding backtracking on an approved planning application and running further consultation and the associated costs.

Cllr Lewis left during consideration of this item.

39. Overview and Scrutiny Forward Plan

It was noted that there was a new Cabinet Forward Plan published. The Chair and Vice-Chair would look whether any items should be added to the Board's agenda. The Chairman asked that if any Board member had an item they wished to put on a future agenda they email him with the request.

40. Future Meeting Dates

It was noted that with potentially 15 items going to the next Cabinet meeting it was likely that there would need to be two Overview and Scrutiny Board meetings to cover the issues requiring Scrutiny. These would both start at 10.00am on Friday 4 October and Monday 7 October.

The meeting ended at 8.57 pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 04 October 2019 at 10.00 am

Present:-

Cllr P Broadhead – Chairman

Present: Cllr M Anderson, Cllr S Bartlett, Cllr M F Brooke, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene, Cllr M Iyengar, Cllr R Lawton, Cllr C Rigby, Cllr M Cox (In place of Cllr R Maidment), Cllr T Johnson (In place of Cllr M Earl), Cllr D Kelsey (In place of Cllr L Fear) and Cllr L Williams (In place of Cllr M Haines)

Also in attendance: Cllr L Allison, Cllr C Johnson, Cllr K Rampton and Cllr V Slade

41. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllrs M Haines, M Earl, L Fear, R Maidment and P Miles

42. Substitute Members

Notification had been received from the appropriate group leaders of the following changes in membership for this meeting of the Board:

Cllr L Williams substituted for Cllr M Haines
Cllr T Johnson substituted for Cllr M Earl
Cllr D Kelsey substituted for Cllr L Fear
Cllr M Cox substituted for Cllr R Maidment

43. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest.

Councillors made other declarations for the purpose of transparency in relation to the agenda item on Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), as follows. They remained in the room and spoke and voted on the item:

Cllr M Brooke declared that he was Chairman of Broadstone Neighbourhood Forum.

Cllr M Anderson reported that he was a member of the Queens Park Neighbourhood Forum.

44. Public Speaking

The Board received the following statement presented by a local resident, Susan Chapman:

“Today's Board must scrutinise the upcoming Cabinet Agenda which means public questions should be in by 27th Sept for a matter discussed nearly two weeks later. Please address this democratic handicap. My question for Cabinet queries the word "None" regarding number 30, "Summary of Equality Implications" of the BCP Public Report "Response to Climate Change Emergency". 30 years of global climate inaction will impose huge so-far hidden and disproportionate costs on both poorer members of society as well as subsequent generations. Such inequity needs to be addressed.”

The Chairman on behalf of the Board acknowledged the issue raised by Mrs Chapman in relation to the deadline for submitting public questions. This was considerably earlier than the deadline for submitting statements and petitions. In this instance the deadline had been prior to the publication of the Cabinet reports which were due to be considered by the Board at this meeting. The Board agreed that the deadline should be reviewed through the appropriate channels to promote better public engagement.

RESOLVED that the Audit & Governance Committee be asked to review the deadline for public questions, and take into account the Board's view that there should be a later deadline (which could be the same as that for statements and petitions), to enable members of the public to access reports on the agenda prior to submitting questions.

Voting: Unanimous

The Board was advised that a number of people had responded to the invitation to address the Board about the Community Infrastructure Levy. The Board agreed to hear these representations when the matter was considered at agenda item 6.

45. Scrutiny of Corporate Cabinet Reports

The Chairman introduced the item, the purpose of which was to enable the Board to scrutinise three forthcoming Cabinet reports on corporate related issues. He invited the Leader of the Council to present each of the reports.

Corporate Strategy

The Leader explained that the draft Corporate Strategy set out the Council's longer-term priorities and high level objectives. She reported that it had been subject to stakeholder engagement between 5 August and 6 September 2019. This had included a range of public and partner events across the Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole area and a survey. The Leader of the Opposition had been consulted on the direction of the strategy. It was hoped that the strategy could be adopted by the Council unanimously. She thanked councillors for their engagement individually and in their wards.

The Leader provided a summary of feedback received and some suggestions for improvement which had been incorporated into the revised strategy now circulated. These included:

- Widening the lens of the strategy to acknowledge the importance of working in partnership with the voluntary/third sector and with the local economy.
- Changing the title of the document from 'plan' to 'strategy', as a better reflection of its purpose, with a more detailed plan now being developed.
- The reference to a dynamic 'region' had been changed to dynamic 'places', to recognise that there were individual dynamic areas within Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole.

Once the strategy was adopted the delivery plan would follow, to set out in detail the priorities for each area and how these aligned with the budget to ensure they were delivered.

The Leader of the Opposition confirmed that he had met with the Leader and was in agreement with the priorities and general direction of the strategy. He was glad to see that feedback from the engagement process had been incorporated into the revised document, particularly the points made in relation to the voluntary sector and the local economy. A number of Board members commented positively on the engagement process. The opportunity for the public and councillors to be consulted in the development of the corporate strategy at the beginning of the process was welcomed.

The Leader responded to questions and comments on the report from members of the Board:

- How would any additional public engagement on the detail of the plan take place? It was explained that no further public engagement was anticipated. It was now the Council's responsibility to develop and adopt the delivery plan, having taken into account the views of the public provided at the formative stage of the process.
- When was the strategy likely to be reviewed, bearing in mind its need to evolve alongside the new council? The Leader explained that although there was no set date for a review, this could be programmed at an appropriate time once the plan had been given the opportunity to achieve some of its aims. She agreed to recommend that the strategy be subject to regular refresh when she presented the report to Cabinet.

The Leader thanked the Policy and Engagement teams for their work. She highlighted the achievement of receiving over 2,000 individual responses, and the positive feedback from people in being able to engage online and through social media.

The Chairman commented on the need to keep up to speed with methods of engagement as they evolved, to make it easier for people to get involved in matters they cared about.

Equality and Diversity Strategy

The Leader explained that the Council was required to have a policy to explain how it met its responsibilities under the Equality Act 2010, including the Public Sector Equality Duty.

The draft Equality and Diversity Policy and Governance Framework at Appendix A replaced all legacy councils' equality and diversity policies and procedures. It was intended to make sure that all key decision changes to Council policy or services had considered and reflected positive and negative equality impacts. The Leader referred to the structure of the internal governance and implementation framework which was designed to ensure that equality and diversity was properly embedded in the Council's activities and decisions, rather than being a tick box exercise.

The Leader drew attention to the following changes which she had requested since the report had been published, partly resulting from feedback she had received from Cllr B Dunlop regarding the use of language:

Amend Part 2: Who the policy applies to – to delete the list on page 2.
Reason: The policy applies to everyone, therefore there is no need to specify particular examples.

Amend Paragraph 5.2, page 2 – 'Dynamic Region' to read 'Dynamic Places'.

Reason: To reflect updated wording in Corporate Strategy.

Amend Paragraph 6.5, page 3 - Add 'Impact Assessments must at least consider but not be limited to the 9 Protected Characteristics as set out in the Equality Act 2010 (to be listed). Other locally appropriate characteristics which are evidenced as suffering inequality.'

Reason: The legislation does not preclude the Council from considering other groups where appropriate, for example, socio-economic groups which do not benefit from automatic rights. It will enable an impact assessment to be made where separate reference is made in reports to any other groups which may be disadvantaged by a proposed decision. The Council will be going above and beyond what it is required to do. It may also help to address inconsistency of language in reports.

Amend Appendix A, Structure Chart – include the Opposition Spokesperson for Equalities in the membership of the Strategy Equality Leadership Group.

Reason: To provide cross party representation and a better councillor/officer ratio.

It was noted that Appendix B of the Cabinet report had been omitted due to an administrative error. The report had been subsequently updated and republished.

The Leader responded to questions and comments on the report from members of the Board:

- Clarity was sought in the terminology used in Paragraph 6.5, as the phrases ‘which are evidenced’ or ‘may be disadvantaged’ could be interpreted differently. The Leader acknowledged the importance of getting the language right and agreed to discuss this with officers and report back to the Board.
- It was noted that the representation on the Employee Equality Champion Implementation Group may need reviewing to include other locally appropriate characteristics.
- There would be an opportunity to monitor how the strategy was being implemented, through annual review by the Audit and Governance Committee.
- The role of the Member Champion in working with officers to embed the principles of the Dorset Armed Forces Covenant in policy and practice was noted. The inclusion of other locally appropriate characteristics in the impact assessment ensured that that potentially disadvantaged groups such as ex armed forces personnel could be represented.

The Leader responded to questions about the credibility and judgement of the political leadership of the Council, in light of the Deputy Leader’s opposition to a Council motion to uphold the 9 protected characteristics and condemn prejudice which was adopted in September 2019, a matter which was now on public record. The Leader explained that serious consideration had been given to referencing specific groups in the policy but on advice this was deemed to be divisive, as the purpose of the legislation was not to single out. She condemned anti semitism along with all forms of hate crime, and did not believe there was an issue with any member of the Council being anti semitic. While their views on the examples given in the definition differed, she did not believe the Deputy Leader was disadvantaging anyone through his personal beliefs, and she would expect him to be taken to task should he demonstrate at any time that he was not upholding Council policy or the duties of the Equality Act.

The Leader of the Opposition welcomed the overall view of the strategy. He thanked the Leader for the changes made in response to her correspondence with Cllr B Dunlop and for her inclusion of the Opposition Spokesperson for Equalities, Cllr A Jones, on the Strategic Equality Leadership Group.

Transforming Cities Fund Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC)

In the absence of the Portfolio Holder for Transport the Leader introduced a report which gave an update on progress of the Department for Transport

(DfT) Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) bid and the development of the Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP).

The Leader explained that in order to meet the bid criteria the Council had worked with Dorset to create a South East Dorset City Region which reached into urban transport corridors beyond the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole area. She thanked Conor Burns, the MP for Bournemouth West, for his work to ensure that the bid was shortlisted when the DfT extended the programme from ten to twelve areas. When the Council was drafting its Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) it had been asked to submit high, medium and low levels of ask. Since then the DfT had reported that the fund was oversubscribed and had asked the shortlisted bids to reduce their low levels of ask. The DfT had also given a clear direction that bids should focus on particular transport corridors and on increasing the use of public transport, specifically buses, cycling and walking. The Leader clarified that the redevelopment of Poole bus station was a project supported by the DfT and had been included in the preferred option for the low level of ask. As there were risks associated in delivering the bus station within the DfT's strict timescale, alternative options for consideration had been included.

The report to Cabinet sought delegated authority for the Portfolio Holder and Senior Officers to submit the final SOBC to the DfT by the deadline of 28 November 2019.

The Leader responded to a number of questions and comments on the report from members of the Board, particularly around changes made since work on the bid commenced. Additional information on technical issues was provided by officers as required.

- Why had the original £150million in the expression of interest reduced to £117million in the business case? It was explained that the DfT had rejected specific items in the original package, including technology-based elements. This had affected the transport corridor projects as these had contained technology-based elements, as well as the more obvious effect on the technology and network management projects. The DfT had indicated over the summer that funding would not be divided equally between bids and that South East Dorset would not receive anything close to its high level figure. In view of this, focus and energy had shifted to the medium and low levels of ask.
- Why was the low level of ask, already at 70% of the anticipated average, now being reduced further? In meeting with the Council in August the DfT was explicit in what it was prepared to consider. The bid was thus revised and those schemes most likely to achieve funding were developed further. It was clarified that figures given in the report were for TCF funding only and did not include Local Transport Plan match funding or developer contributions.
- Officers provided further clarification on the costs associated with the development of the LCWIP and the draft and final SOBCs, as summarised in paragraphs 22 to 26 of the report.

- A number of concerns were put forward and maintained relating to the level of political ownership and influence in the TCF process, through direct contact with the DfT and through engagement with the local MPs. The Leader reported that she had attended a meeting with the two Bournemouth MPs, at which the TCF had been an item on the agenda for discussion. Both MPs had been helpful and supportive, and Conor Burns had offered to take the matter up directly with the Secretary of State for Transport. She had asked officers to prepare a paper to assist him in this process. She explained that there were various difficulties in engaging with the local MPs at this time, some of which previous administrations may not have faced, including the current national and local political pictures. The Board was also reminded of the time pressures involved in progressing the bid since May 2019.
- Differing views were expressed in relation to risk: on the one hand the need to focus on what was realistic and achievable, otherwise there was a risk that the bid would be rejected, and on the other hand the risk of missing out through lack of ambition and not using all the political tools available to maximise the chances of the bid's success.
- Why were there not more projects in Christchurch? The bid reflected the DfT focus on prioritising key transport corridors to the port and airport, to relieve congestion and encourage modal shift.
- The use of Fibre City ducting could have been considered for the technology-based elements, had the DfT not shifted the emphasis of the bid.
- Comment was made about the need to promote the southern region at a national level. The Leader explained the amount of positive work which was being done in representing the Council at national and regional levels. The Council did not lack ambition and continued to discuss all levels of ask in the bid, but it was prepared with alternative options for the low level of ask if this was what the DfT awarded.
- Were there any links with the Dorset Industrial Strategy, particularly around infrastructure? It was explained that the TCF was a short-term programme with specific parameters, whereas the Industrial Strategy was a long term plan, covering a wider area and different ambitions. The Industrial Strategy included elements which the TCF had specifically excluded, such as light rail and rail connectivity.
- Did the Council's priorities match those of the DfT, regardless of funding? The TCF was designed to achieve modal shift, which was a long-standing priority for local councils in the area. The options put forward in the Council's bid were those which would have the most impact on modal shift, in terms of delivering outcomes for people in getting to and travelling along the main transport corridors.
- On what basis had the focus of some of the interventions and costs changed from those in the original expression of interest, which had been deliberately spread over a number of projects to maximise modal shift – for example, what was the justification for the significant increase in funding for the Poole to Ferndown transport

corridor and the Poole Bus Station transport hub at a time when the Council was being asked to reduce its overall bid? It was explained that the DfT's shift in focus away from technology-based interventions had resulted in the reappraisal and ranking of projects in accordance with the Green Book treasury process. The outcome of the Poole to Ferndown transport corridor appraisal, which featured high levels of housing and employment, had ranked it the highest and most deliverable project in this part of the schedule. Consideration had also been given to where there was alternative funding available, for instance LTP funding could be used for the Wallisdown corridor. The bid had to focus on what was deliverable within the programme's strict three-year timescale. Previous work on the Poole Bus Station project meant that it was more ready to go than other projects.

- What additional measures was the Council looking at alongside the TCF funding to ensure that modal shift was fully realised? It was explained that the Council was working with its partners, including the bus companies, to discuss ways in which the Council could support them to be more efficient, and to provide incentives for change. This included ways in which to support the use of electric buses and cars, bicycles and mobility scooters. The Council was also due to undertake a review of car parking across Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole.

RESOLVED that Cabinet be asked to reconsider the 'low ask' alternatives to ensure that the final ask genuinely contains the projects which will lead to the most effective modal shift for the conurbation.

Voting: For - 9, Against – 0, Abstentions – 5

46. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The Board received a representation from Cllr D Farr, a ward councillor who had submitted a request to scrutinise the current use of the BCP Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The CIL was a charge on new developments which could be used by the Council for community improvements. Cllr Farr explained that this funding was meant to be available for local groups to apply for, but currently no applications were being accepted by the Council. He referred to a request for a defibrillator to be purchased for the local community in his ward. He asked that the CIL funding be unlocked as soon as possible so that it could be used as intended, for the benefit of residents.

The following residents and community groups also addressed the Board with their views on the issue:

Mark Elkins, Co-ordinator, Springbourne and East Cliff Residents Meetings, explained that local residents wished to use some of their unused CIL money of £69,000 to fund a dedicated street warden to address crime and anti-social behaviour in the ward. The ward suffered from some of the

highest crime figures in the area according to police records, and there were individuals living in the ward with high levels of multiple needs who required specialist support. The request for this much needed resource was supported by all three ward councillors and Operation Galaxy.

Graham Whitehall, Treasurer, Dorset Lake Residents Association, explained that a previous application by local residents to have a village sign had been refused. It was hoped that this could be redressed by using CIL funding but nothing had been progressed to date.

Chris Allenby, Trustee, Treasurer and Membership Secretary, Poole Quays Forum, spoke about the nature of the forum and its role in being the voice of the community. He explained that many parts of the area were of high density, including the Twin Sails area which was earmarked in the Local Plan for 2,500 additional dwellings (an increase of 31%) at a rate of zero CIL. He cited a number of major developments in the area which had achieved planning permission and then reported that they were unviable. He spoke about not being able to tap into the overall neighbourhood CIL pot to proceed with the Maypole Square project, and highlighted that the Broadstone Neighbourhood Forum was in a similar position. He asked that a more transparent and fairer CIL arrangement be put in place.

John Sprackling, President - Branksome Park and Canford Cliffs District Residents Association, spoke about the need for more control over how CIL was spent. He referred to the huge amount of development and associated CIL collected in his local area, but appreciated the position of other areas with less development. There was a need to address speeding in his area and CIL could be used to undertake a traffic survey to support this.

Cllr M Anderson read out a statement on behalf of the Queens Park Neighbourhood Forum, which opposed any proposal to remove the percentage of CIL from local application. The forum was a valuable way of engaging the community in planning matters. The 15% of CIL available to the community was not much, but it did provide an incentive for people to get involved constructively in their local area, for example the forum was currently looking to improve access to Queens Park. The CIL neighbourhood provision needed to be retained. Cllr Anderson also referred to a CIL application to improve toilets in Moordown Community Centre which had been held up since before the local government elections in May.

The Chairman explained that the main purpose of the item was to consider how the immediate situation could be addressed in view of the representations received. A report on the future arrangements for CIL was due to be submitted to Cabinet in January 2020. The Board may wish to consider asking Cabinet to either bring forward this report or put in place interim arrangements in line with those previously applied.

The Monitoring Officer updated the Board on the current position. She explained that there were a number of legacy bids submitted prior to April 2019 which were awaiting allocation, especially in the Bournemouth area.

Legally the allocation panel had been unable to convene during the LGR period as its membership included councillors. Officers were aware of the need to review CIL arrangements for the new BCP Council, but this had not yet been progressed. There had been no political involvement or decision to defer CIL, and officers accepted responsibility for the current situation. She had been working with colleagues in Communities and Planning Policy to clarify the amounts involved and to put options in place to resume allocations as soon as possible. Subject to legal confirmation it was anticipated that the arrangements prior to LGR could continue until the new CIL arrangements for BCP Council were agreed.

Board members commented on the current and future arrangements for CIL. There was consensus among members that interim arrangements to allocate CIL, if possible based on preceding councils' arrangements, needed to be put in place as soon as possible. The Chairman reported that he had spoken with the Leader who was looking to push through a solution. The following main points were raised in discussion:

- The impact of CIL funded projects in making a real difference to the local community.
- There was a need to confirm arrangements for allocating CIL not only for the preceding councils, but also for the Shadow Authority period and for the new BCP Council until the new arrangements were agreed.
- The points raised in the representations needed to be addressed when considering future arrangements to ensure that the system was fair and transparent, and provided mitigation to those most affected by development, so that no area affected ended up with a zero rate.
- There was a role for O&S in influencing the development of future arrangements at an early opportunity. The Chairman reported that the Leader was in broad agreement with this principle.
- Future arrangements should make clear the type of projects CIL money could and couldn't be used (e.g. capital / revenue).
- Key to CIL was its speed and responsiveness, made easier by the small amounts of money involved, and being community driven in nature.
- Each ward had its own issues and pressures to address.
- Not all wards had neighbourhood forums or residents associations, so it was important to retain the involvement of ward councillors in future arrangements
- The impact of development was not always limited to ward level and could affect the wider community. It was noted that the remaining percentage of CIL (75-85%) was allocated by the Council to address the needs of the wider community as a whole.
- It was suggested that future arrangements consider allocating a percentage of CIL to addressing inequalities in outdoor play areas, where currently only 2 sites were classed as accessible to disabled children

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that there was no time limit to use the CIL monies awaiting allocation. She had been advised that the figures for the outstanding neighbourhood portion for the preceding councils were £400,000 for Bournemouth, £60,000 for Christchurch and £50,000 for Poole. She agreed to seek clarification on the position regarding the heathland mitigation contribution.

The Chairman thanked Cllr D Farr for highlighting the issue. He thanked the local residents who had attended to speak on behalf of their communities.

RESOLVED that:

- (a) Interim arrangements be brought forward as a matter of urgency to access the current CIL fund;**
- (b) Cabinet commits to work closely with the Overview and Scrutiny Board as future arrangements are developed on this issue.**

Voting: Unanimous

47. Scrutiny of Regeneration Related Cabinet Reports

The Board was advised that reports on York Road Car Park and Heart of Poole Regeneration Scheme originally scheduled for Cabinet consideration on 9 October 2019 had taken off the Cabinet agenda after the publication of the Board's agenda.

48. Overview and Scrutiny Forward Plan

As the previous agenda item had been withdrawn the Chairman suggested that the Board to use the time remaining in the meeting to consider items for inclusion its agenda for November.

The Board agreed to consider the following Cabinet reports (with approximate timings noted):

- Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Plan – To consider and approve homelessness and rough sleeping action plan (Up to 1 hour)
- Smart Places Strategy - To seek approval to develop a business case and options and to continue with the LEP project to develop a pilot in Lansdowne (30 mins)
- Organisational Design and Transformation Business Case - To consider and approve the recommended option for the future design of the Council and the associated High Level Business Case. (Up to 1 hour)

- Budget and Performance Monitoring Report - 2019/20 Quarter 2 - To receive the second quarter (July to September) budget and performance monitoring report. (30 minutes)
- Corporate Performance Management Update - To provide a quarterly update on corporate performance based on a suite of key performance indicators, and target outcomes. (30 minutes)
- Community Engagement Strategy (Up to 1 hour)

The Board agreed that no value would be added in scrutinising the reports on the adoption of Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset Waste Plan and Minerals Sites Plan, as both documents had been through the formal Inspection stage with limited opportunity to make changes at this stage.

The Board was mindful that the two Cabinet reports on York Road and Heart of Poole due to be considered by the O&S Board might be rescheduled for the November Cabinet. The Board had also previously agreed to consider further the issue of 5G at its next meeting on 11 November and the date for this had already been notified to those interested in participating.

The Board was advised that the current date of the Cabinet meeting on 13 November could change, which may impact on the date of the O&S Board.

In view of number of items and amount of time likely to be spent on them, the Chairman asked the Board whether it would prefer to hold one daytime meeting or split business across two evening sessions. Views differed, as some members were unable to attend in the day due to work and while others had family commitments in the evening. The Chairman agreed to discuss it further with the Vice Chairman and confirm arrangements as soon as possible.

The Chairman asked Board members to email him with suggestions for future scrutiny items. For reference it was agreed to circulate the priorities for future scrutiny which had been signed off the Shadow Authority O&S Committee.

The meeting ended at 1.55 pm

CHAIRMAN

ACTION SHEET – BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
Actions arising from Board meeting: 8 July 2019				
17	Princess Road	The Portfolio Holder agreed to provide further detail to the Board on the re-provision of facilities for 60 people with complex needs, including emergency family hostel accommodation as outlined in paragraph 6 of the report. Actioned - Information provided by Director of Housing	To fully respond to a query raised by the O&S Board.	
Actions arising from Board meeting: 9 September 2019				
30	Scrutiny of finance related reports - Budget Monitoring Report - 2019/20 Quarter 1	A Member requested further clarification on the staffing budget at Two Rivers Meet Leisure Centre. Outcome TBC	To provide context to the budget pressure.	
Actions Arising from Board meeting: 23 September 2019				
36	5G Connectivity	That the verbal representations on 5G form part of the submission for the 5G call for evidence to be considered at the Board's meeting on 11 November 2019. Actioned – Issues included within report to 11 November Board meeting.	To ensure all submissions are reflected in the report to the O&S Board in relation to 5G.	

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
Actions arising from Board meeting: 4 October 2019				
44	Public Issues	<p>The Audit & Governance Committee be asked to review the deadline for public questions, and take into account the Board's view that there should be a later deadline (which could be the same as that for statements and petitions), to enable members of the public to access reports on the agenda prior to submitting questions.</p> <p>Actioned - Item has been included on A&G Committee list for Constitution Issues Working Group.</p>	To ensure that members of the public had appropriate opportunity to submit questions following publication of reports.	
45	Scrutiny of Corporate related Cabinet reports	<p>Corporate Strategy: The leader undertook to recommend regular refresh of strategy when she presents the report at the Cabinet meeting</p> <p>Outcome TBC</p>	To provide a comprehensive response to the queries raised by the Board.	
		<p>Equality & Diversity Strategy: Clarity was sought in the terminology used in Paragraph 6.5, as the phrases 'which are evidenced' or 'may be disadvantaged' could be interpreted differently. The Leader acknowledged the importance of getting the language right and agreed to discuss this with officers and report back to the Board.</p> <p>Outcome TBC</p>	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
		<p>Transforming Cities Fund: Cabinet be asked to reconsider the 'low ask' alternatives to ensure that the final ask genuinely contains the projects which will lead to the most effective modal shift for the conurbation.</p> <p>Actioned: Request made at the Cabinet meeting held on 9 October</p>	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	In relation to this the Leader advised that this would be delegated to the PH and SD to look at req already gone to Directors.
46	Community Infrastructure Levy	<p>To recommend to Cabinet that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Interim arrangements be brought forward as a matter of urgency to access the current CIL fund; (b) Cabinet commits to work closely with the Overview and Scrutiny Board as future arrangements are developed on this issue. <p>Outcome: to be reported to Cabinet in November</p>	To ensure that the issue can progress quickly, and that O&S Board is involved in its development.	
48	O&S Forward Plan	<p>The Chairman asked Board members to email him with suggestions for future scrutiny items. It was agreed to circulate the priorities for future scrutiny which had been signed off the Shadow Authority O&S Committee.</p> <p>Actioned: Priorities from Shadow O&S circulated to Board Members</p>	To aid the development of the O&S Board's Forward Plan.	

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
Actions arising from Board meeting: 7 October 2019				
55	Scrutiny of Housing Related Cabinet Reports - Discretionary Licensing	<p>It was recommended to Cabinet that prior to the consultation period associated with Discretionary Licensing further information on the success of targeted enforcement be considered by Cabinet to determine whether Discretionary Licensing is necessary.</p> <p>Actioned: Request made at the Cabinet meeting held on 9 October.</p>	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	Recommendation not approved by Cabinet
56	BCP Council Strategic Car Parking Review	<p>It was recommended to Cabinet that the Steering Group that considers the BCP Council Strategic Car Parking Strategy include a member of the Overview and Scrutiny Board.</p> <p>Actioned: Request made to Cabinet at its meeting on 9 October</p>	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	TBD
57	Scrutiny of Environment & Climate Change related Cabinet reports Revised Policy for Unauthorised Encampments	<p>To suggest to Cabinet an amendment to the recommendation included within the report, as follows:</p> <p>It is recommended that Cabinet establish a cross-party member working group, as outlined in para 27, to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. expedite actions as a matter of urgency in anticipation of incursions for summer 2020, 2. consider the alignment of policies and procedures across the council area and report back to Cabinet. <p>Actioned: Recommendation made to Cabinet at its meeting on 9 October</p>	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	Recommendation agreed by Cabinet

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
	Response to Climate Change Emergency	<p>That an additional recommendation is set out in the report under (a) iv that the Council produce an annual Green Credentials Report, which may be considered by Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny to monitor the Council's performance against targets in this respect.</p> <p>Actioned: <i>Recommendation made to Cabinet at its meeting on 9 October</i></p>	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	Recommendation agreed by Cabinet

This page is intentionally left blank

Forward Plan – BCP Overview and Scrutiny Board

Updated 31 October 2019

31

	Subject and background	Anticipated benefits and value to be added by O&S engagement	How will the scrutiny be done?	Lead Officer / Cabinet Portfolio Holder
	Meeting Date – 11 November 2019			
1	5G Connectivity To consider the submissions both verbal and written made in relation to the call for evidence on 5G connectivity.	To allow the Board to gain an understanding of the issues and views in relation to 5G. Evidence received will assist the Board in determining whether further work is required by O&S in this respect and the scope of this work.	TBC	Lindsay Marshall Overview and Scrutiny Specialist
2	Scrutiny of Cabinet Items Scrutiny of the following 13 November Cabinet reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Plan • Organisational Design and Transformation Business Case • Corporate Performance Management Update • Budget and Performance Monitoring Report 2019/20 Q2 	To enable the Board to consider proposed Cabinet decisions and to make recommendations to Cabinet as appropriate.	Scrutiny of Cabinet reports and invitations to Cabinet Portfolio Holders to respond to questions.	Councillor Keiron Wilson, Portfolio Holder for Housing Cllr Vikki Slade, Leader Councillor David Brown, Portfolio Holder for Finance
	Meeting Date - 9 December 2019			
3	Scrutiny of Cabinet Items Specific items will be determined dependent upon the Cabinet Forward Plan.	To enable the Board to consider proposed Cabinet decisions and to make recommendations to Cabinet as appropriate.	Scrutiny of Cabinet reports and invitations to Cabinet Portfolio Holders to respond to questions.	TBC dependent upon items

	Subject and background	Anticipated benefits and value to be added by O&S engagement	How will the scrutiny be done?	Lead Officer / Cabinet Portfolio Holder
4	Budget Scrutiny To consider a draft budget proposal based on the expected settlement from central government.	To enable the Board to scrutinise the budget at an earlier stage within the budget setting process prior to the finalised budget being presented to O&S January		Councillor David Brown, Portfolio Holder for Finance (all)
	Meeting Date – 13 January 2020			
5	Scrutiny of Cabinet Items Specific items will be determined dependent upon the Cabinet Forward Plan.	To enable the Board to consider proposed Cabinet decisions and to make recommendations to Cabinet as appropriate.	Scrutiny of Cabinet reports and invitations to Cabinet Portfolio Holders to respond to questions.	TBC dependent upon items

	Subject and background	Anticipated benefits and value to be added by O&S engagement	How will the scrutiny be done?	Lead Officer / Cabinet Portfolio Holder
Commissioned Work Work commissioned by the Board (for example task and finish groups and working groups) is listed below: Note – to provide sufficient resource for effective scrutiny, one item of commissioned work will run at a time. Further commissioned work can commence upon completion of previous work.				
6	5G Connectivity	To allow the Board to gain an understanding of the level of public interest and the breadth of views in relation to 5G Connectivity.	Call for Evidence in September and October followed by consideration of evidence in November.	Lindsay Marshall Overview and Scrutiny Specialist
Items to be programmed The following items have been identified by the Overview and Scrutiny Board as requiring further scrutiny. Dates are TBC.				
7	Pokesdown Station Lifts The Board considered this issue in July 2019 and agreed to monitor the progress and scrutinise further as required.	To allow the Board to retain an oversight of the issue and respond to any arising issues.	TBC	Councillor Andy Hadley, Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure
8	Pay and Reward Strategy The Board considered this issue prior to a Cabinet decision in September 2019. The Board requested that they have an opportunity for further scrutiny prior to Cabinet agreeing the final Strategy.	To enable the Board to test, challenge and contribute to the development of the Strategy.	Scrutiny of Cabinet report and invitation to Cabinet Portfolio Holder to respond to questions.	Councillor Vikki Slade, Leader of the Council/ Matti Raudsepp, Director of Organisational Development.
9	Green Credentials An annual report on the Council's progress to assess our performance against targets in respect of climate change.	To enable the Board to retain oversight of the Council's performance against climate change targets and make regular recommendations as required.	Annual Report to O&S	Councillor Felicity Rice, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Climate Change

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET FORWARD PLAN

1 NOVEMBER 2019 TO 29 FEBRUARY 2020

(PUBLICATION DATE – 24 October 2019)



35

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Action Plan	Consider and approve homelessness and rough sleeping action plan	Yes	Cabinet 13 Nov 2019	All Wards	Housing agencies and voluntary sector agencies	July – October 2019	Lorraine Mealings	Open
Consultation on draft School Admissions Policies	Approval to consult on proposed admissions arrangements for maintained schools	No	Cabinet 13 Nov 2019	All Wards	Statutory consultation following approval to proceed		Neil Goddard	Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Corporate Parenting Strategy	To approve the BCP Corporate Parenting Strategy	Yes	Cabinet 13 Nov 2019	All Wards	Childrens Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Prior to decision	Judith Ramsden	Open
Organisational Design and Transformation Business Case	To consider and approve the recommended option for the future design of the Council and the associated High Level Business Case	Yes	Cabinet 13 Nov 2019	All Wards	Internally with staff and councillors and externally with partner organisations	July – October 2019	Julian Osgathorpe	Open
Budget and Performance Monitoring Report - 2019/20 Quarter 2	To receive the second quarter (July to September) budget and performance monitoring report.	No	Cabinet 13 Nov 2019	All Wards			Adam Richens	Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Corporate Performance Management Update	To provide a quarterly update on corporate performance based on a suite of key performance indicators, and target outcomes.	No	Cabinet 13 Nov 2019				Matti Raudsepp	Open
Adoption of Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset Waste Plan	To consider a report requesting that Cabinet recommends to Council that the “main modifications” recommended by the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State be accepted and the Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset Waste Plan be adopted.	Yes	Cabinet 13 Nov 2019 Council 17 Dec 2019	All Wards	The document has been the subject of successive rounds of public consultation during its production and has been considered at an independent Examination.	N/A	Julian McLaughlin	Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Adoption of Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset Mineral Sites Plan	To consider a report requesting that Cabinet recommends to Council that the “main modifications” recommended by the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State be accepted and the Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset Mineral Sites Plan be adopted.	Yes	Cabinet 13 Nov 2019 Council 17 Dec 2019	All Wards	The document has been the subject of successive rounds of public consultation during its production and has been considered at an independent Examination.	N/A	Julian McLaughlin	Open
Smart Places Programme	To seek approval for the continuation of work by Officers in developing the smart places programme.	Yes	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	All Wards	Consultation required to be considered as part of the business case options	Consultation following approval to develop a business case and options	Chris Shephard	Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Family Support and Early Help Strategy - including Youth Services	Approval of Family Support and Early Help Strategy – to include Youth Services	Yes	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	All Wards	Childrens Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Prior to decision	Judith Ramsden	Open
Fleet replacement funding strategy	Consideration and approval of future fleet replacement strategy	Yes	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	All Wards			Kate Langdown	Open
Community Engagement Strategy	Seek approval for the development of a Community Engagement Strategy for BCP Council and subsequent public consultation.	No	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019		Cabinet, Corporate Management Group, Health & Wellbeing Board, Public Health, Directors Strategy Group.	Internal consultation September to November 2019; External consultation (subject to approval) January to March 2020.	Kelly Ansell	Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Bereavement Services Business Plan - Phase 1	To approve phase 1 of a business plan for BCP Bereavement Services	Yes	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	All Wards	Funeral Directors	July - October	Andy McDonald	Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Adult Social Care Charging	The Council is required to harmonise its policies on charging for Adult Social Services prior to April 2021. Cabinet will need to authorise the launch of the public consultation (in December 2019) on a proposed BCP Council policy and then approve the resultant policy in June/ July 2020.	Yes	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	All Wards	A report has been made to Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny to set up a Members working group who will scrutinise the consultation and resultant policy. Extensive public consultation and consultation with user groups and interest groups across BCP will take place early in 2020 as approved by Cabinet.	Public Consultation in Jan/Feb 2020 for 6-8 weeks.		Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
BCP Funded Arts & Culture Organisations	Demonstrating their combined value (including visitor and economic impact data) and proposing SLAs and funding arrangements for 2020/21 and beyond.	Yes	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	All Wards	Approval is required at Cabinet upon the terms to be consulted on with Statutory Undertakers.	Consultation on approved terms will take place over the statutory 8 week period.		Open
Dorset Local Industrial Strategy	To provide an endorsement in principle to the emerging Dorset Local Industrial Strategy.	No	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	All Wards	N/A	N/A	Chris Shephard	Open
Mudford Sandbank Beach Cafe	Approval to build new replacement cafe	Yes	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	East Southbourne & Tuckton			Bill Cotton	Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Medium Term Financial Plan Update Report	To receive the Medium Term Financial Plan Update Report, including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of the Chancellors 2019 Budget Statement Progress towards delivering a balanced budget for 2020/21 Details of a fundamental review of earmarked and unearmarked reserves 	No	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	All Wards			Adam Richens	Open
Traffic Regulation Orders and other Highways Orders	To consider any requests to go out to consultation on Traffic Regulation Orders and other Orders of a similar nature, and requests for approvals.	No	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	All Wards	Public consultation as required by legislation	In accordance with relevant legislation	Julian McLaughlin	Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Medium Term Financial Plan Update	To receive the Medium Term Financial Plan Update Report including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress towards delivering a balanced budget for 2020/21 • Review or Earmarked Reserves • Impact of Chancellors 2019 Budget Statement • Consider a new Council Tax Discount for Care Experienced Young People 	Yes	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	All Wards	Corporate Management Board Corporate Parenting Panel	Prior to the date Cabinet papers are despatched.	Adam Richens	Open
Bournemouth International Centre Short-term Investment Plan	To make recommendations regarding short to medium term investments.	Yes	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019	Bournemouth Central				Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Sandbanks Neighbourhood Forum - application and Neighbourhood Area designation	Sandbanks Neighbourhood Forum - application and Neighbourhood Area designation.	No	Cabinet 11 Dec 2019		Individuals who live, work or carry out business within the proposed neighbourhood plan area.	Publish and consult on the forum application and area designation for statutory period of 6 weeks.	Rebecca Landman	Open
Review of Leisure Centre Management	To seek approval to proceed with a review of future management arrangements.	No	Cabinet 15 Jan 2020	All Wards				Open
Taxbase Report	To receive the 2020/21 Council Tax Taxbase	Yes	Cabinet 15 Jan 2020	All Wards	Corporate Management Board	December 2019	Adam Richens	Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) strategic and neighbourhood governance	Consideration of options for governance relating to the Community Infrastructure Levy and make any decisions and/or recommendations to Council as required	Yes	Cabinet 15 Jan 2020 Council 18 Feb 2020	All Wards				Open
Traffic Regulation Orders and other Highways Orders	To consider any requests to go out to consultation on Traffic Regulation Orders and other Orders of a similar nature, and requests for approvals.	No	Cabinet 15 Jan 2020	All Wards	Public consultation as required by legislation	In accordance with relevant legislation	Julian McLaughlin	Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
2020/2021 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan Update Report	To receive an update on the Budget and the Medium-Term Financial Plan, including:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2020/21 Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2020/21 Budget Proposal 2020/21 Council Tax Resolution 	No	Cabinet 12 Feb 2020	All Wards			Adam Richens	Open
Traffic Regulation Orders and other Highways Orders	To consider any requests to go out to consultation on Traffic Regulation Orders and other Orders of a similar nature, and requests for approvals.	No	Cabinet 12 Feb 2020	All Wards	Public consultation as required by legislation	In accordance with relevant legislation	Julian McLaughlin	Open

What is the subject?	What is the purpose of the issue?	Is this a Key Decision?	Decision Maker and Due Date	Wards	Who are the key stakeholders to be consulted before the decision is made?	What is the consultation process and period	Officer writing the report	Is the report likely to be considered in private (i.e., it contains confidential or exempt information)?
Community Governance Review - Throop and Holdenhurst	To consider the report of the Task and Finish Group following the public consultation on the draft recommendations and make final recommendations to Council.	No	Cabinet 18 Mar 2020 Council 31 Mar 2020	Muscliff & Strouden Park			Richard Jones	Open
Options appraisal for the delivery of Revenue and Benefit Services	Determine the future operational structure for the delivery of Revenue and Benefit Services.	Yes	Cabinet 18 Mar 2020 Council 12 May 2020	All Wards	CMB Stour Valley & Poole Partnership (SVPP) Joint Committee Dorset Area Unitary Council	Prior to the date Cabinet papers are despatched	Adam Richens	Open