

**BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL**  
**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD**

Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 February 2020 at 2.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr P Broadhead – Chairman  
Cllr M Haines – Vice-Chairman

Present: 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 C Rigby and Cllr H Allen (In  
place of Cllr M Anderson)

Also in attendance: Cllr J Beesley, Cllr D Brown, Cllr B Dove, Cllr M Howell,  
Cllr D Kelsey, Cllr M Phipps, Cllr K Rampton, Cllr V Slade and  
Cllr K Wilson

108. Apologies

Apologies for the meeting were received from Cllr M Anderson and Cllr P Miles.

109. Substitute Members

Cllr H Allen substituted for Cllr M Anderson.

110. Declarations of Interests

Cllr M Brooke declared the following interests:

- For the purpose of transparency that the public statement received for this meeting had been submitted by his spouse.
- A local interest in agenda item 8, Scrutiny of Planning Related Cabinet Reports as he was Chairman of the Broadstone Neighbourhood Forum. He would remain in the meeting, take part in the debate and vote on this item
- A local interest in agenda item 10, Scrutiny of Regeneration Related Cabinet Reports as he was a member of the Board of the Bournemouth Development Company. He would remain in the meeting but would not take part in the debate or vote on this item.

A Councillor welcomed the flowchart on interests included with the agenda.

111. Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 18 December 2019 at 2.00pm and 6.00pm and the meetings held on 13 January 2020 at 4.00pm and 6.00pm were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

A Councillor commented that although the minutes from the meetings held on 13 January were not inaccurate, they did not reflect the overall tone of the debate and questioning.

112. Action Sheet

The action sheet which provided an update on recommendations and actions from the previous meetings was noted.

113. Chairman's Update

The Chairman advised that in future each agenda would include this item as an opportunity to address any issues not specifically included on the agenda.

Order of Business: The Chairman advised that the order of business would be changed to take the Scrutiny of Corporate related Cabinet reports as the last item on the agenda.

Meeting Locations: The Chairman asked the Board members for the input into preferences for meeting locations for the next municipal year. Issues raised included the 'central' location of the Town Hall, the meeting facilities provided by the civic offices and the difficulties with accessibility in the Town Hall. It was agreed to rotate the locations as necessary and to base centrally when possible.

Carter School Capital Project: The Chairman advised that although this was on the Cabinet Forward Plan it predominately sat within the remit of the Children's Services O&S Committee and he would ask them to keep it on their radar but that it would also be useful for a member of the Board to keep a watching brief on the issue especially from a risk aspect. Cllr N Greene agreed to focus on the risk of the financial aspect of the project and Cllr M Brooke would also be happy to report back as a member of the Children's Services O&S Committee.

The Chairman advised Councillors that all contributions from Board members and substitutes were welcome and that they did not need to be subject experts to undertake meaningful scrutiny.

114. Public Speaking

There were no public questions or petitions received. The following public statement was received in relation to the Scrutiny of Planning Related Cabinet Reports from Ms Annette Brooke, member of the Member of the Steering Group of Dorset Equality Group. Ms Brooke was unable to attend

the meeting and the statement was read out on her behalf by the Senior Democratic and Overview and Scrutiny Officer:

Statement:

1. DEG welcomes BCP taking a unified approach to CIL across the three previous separate councils.
2. We broadly support Option 2 which provides opportunities for bids to be submitted to the 'central pot' from community groups in wards with deprivation and needs but perhaps without the level of development experienced in more advantaged wards.
3. However, we do feel it is important that all the processes of allocating CIL accord with fundamental principles of fairness, openness, transparency, accessibility, good community engagement, and strong evidence of community ownership of any proposed project.
4. Selected projects should be financially sustainable, meet the highest environmental standards and equality principles should be applied.

115. Business Improvement Districts - BIDS

The Chairman gave a brief introduction on the function of BIDs and advised that BCP Council was fortunate enough to have three operating within the borough and hopefully a fourth would be established in the near future. The Chairman welcomed the representatives from each of the BIDs and from the Christchurch BID steering group to the meeting and asked if they could each give a brief update on current issues.

**Bournemouth Town Centre BID** – The Chair and Manager of the BID attended the meeting and updated the Board on the three main themes for the BID going forward for the next year arising from the AGM in November. The issues raised were rough sleeping, anti-social behaviour and aggressive begging; reform of business rates and the general problems facing the high street. A number of issues were raised in the ensuing discussion including:

- Business rates were a national issue but it was important to analyse these areas to see which could fall within some degree of local control. In the Town Centre approximately 80% of the retail offering were national chains which made it susceptible to decisions taken at a national level.
- The BID Chairman commented that he was pleased to see work on the Town Centre Vision being taken forward. There was an issue of oversupply of retail space in Bournemouth. Town Centres would not be able to remain the same as they were now, but consideration need to be given to how change could be influenced.
- Parking was also noted as an issue – in particular short-term parking for an hour.
- The BID confirmed that instances of begging and rough sleeping had increased significantly in the town centre over the past year.
- The BID confirmed that footfall in the town centre in 2019 was down on 2019 but up on 2017.
- Clear planning policy for the town centre was vital moving forward and there appeared to be a slowing of planning application decisions.

Clarity was needed from Planners when changes were requested to planning applications. Further residential development in the town centre was needed and would help increase footfall.

- Concerns were expressed about aggressive begging which appeared to be on the increase. It was noted that this was a police issue. There was concern that the police presence in the town centre had decreased but others felt that this hadn't been an issue and questioned what other factors had impacted the increase in begging and rough sleeping. A Councillor noted that CSAS officer presence seemed to have decreased and that the Council had not been effective in this area.
- In response to the issues raised about parking a Councillor suggested that the car parking rates should be harmonised across the BCP area.
- A Councillor questioned the service provision for rough sleeping, and it was commented that something wasn't working in this regard.
- In response to some of the issues raised a Councillor advised that homelessness had decreased by 26 percent from November 2019 to January 2020. The Chief Executive confirmed that there had not been a change in the Council's policy on this over the last year.

**Poole Town Centre BID** – The business manager and a representative from the BID board outlined the major issues for the BID in Poole. The issues on the high street in general were manifest in Poole. The high street had suffered from underinvestment over many years. The last time there was any substantial investment was in 1983. Unrealistic rents were also a significant factor, with landlords willing to let properties sit empty and no incentives for them to let them out. Unfortunately, this was another issue that the BID had very little influence over. Issues concerning rough sleeping and begging were increasingly becoming an issue in Poole. It was noted that the impact of austerity had made this an issue up and down the country. The bus station and antisocial behaviour that took place in that area was also a significant issue. It was felt that the vision and plan for the town centre needed to get back on track. A number of issues were raised in the subsequent discussion including:

- The national picture of the underfunding of services was a significant issue and the impact had been felt in many areas.
- It was noted that the previous potential cinema development was outside the Council's control.
- It was noted that the CCTV control centre would report incidents to the police, but they were unable to react. There was concern that funding was significantly affecting rural police forces such as Dorset.
- The BID was asked if it would be good to bring in more local retailers to the town centre. The BID manager reflected that independents wouldn't want to come onto the high street in its current state and they would face significant barriers.
- Petty theft from shops was an issue and a lot of this type of crime went unreported.
- It was suggested that the Council could help with closing some of the cut throughs around the bus station which would help improve security in the area. However, a Councillor commented that the bus

station was owned by three different organisation and only the canopy was owned by BCP.

- A Councillor suggested that the O&S Board should work more closely with the BIDs on issues affecting the towns in future.

**Bournemouth Coastal BID** – The Chairman of the BID explained the slightly different focus of the Coastal BID which covered several different areas across Bournemouth including; Southbourne, Boscombe and Westbourne. The Board was advised that support was needed from the Council and there also need to be greater awareness of the work the BID did. Twenty percent of BID members were hotels with slightly different issues to the two Town Centre BIDs. Occupancy across hotels had remained broadly flat over the last three years but there were issues with guest experiences, particularly with aggressive begging in Bournemouth. There were also issues with drugs being brought into hotels and there was concern that policing was not addressing this issue. It was noted that there was a partnership in place with Community Safety Accredited Scheme Officers in Boscombe and the incidences of Anti-Social Behaviour there had improved. Other areas of concern raised including lighting issues at the seafront and issues concerning planning concerning planning consents. Further issues were raised by the Board including:

- That there needed to be better resourcing for police dealing with anti-social behaviour, with better targeted enforcement. It was noted that the Council and BID were happy to support partnership working in this area. However, the CSAS officers could not leave their ‘zone’ in Boscombe. The BID was looking at similar options for the East Cliff.
- The Coastal BID had supported Westbourne and Southbourne villages and even though these areas were not immune to the issues outlined for the town centres both areas were currently doing well.

Christchurch BID Steering Group – The O&S Board also welcomed a consultant working with the Steering group which was representative of a cross section of business throughout Christchurch. A draft business plan was being produced in approximately April in order to lead into the BID going to ballot in August following consultation with town centre businesses.

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture responded to a number of issues raised in the preceding discussion including the plans for Poole Town Centre regeneration. The Chairman thanked all parties for attending.

#### 116. Scrutiny of Planning Related Cabinet Reports

The Chairman invited the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning to introduce a Cabinet report on the Community Infrastructure Levy(CIL) Strategic and Neighbourhood Governance, a copy of which had been circulated and appears as Appendix D to the Cabinet minutes of 12 February 2020 in the Minute Book. During the course of discussion the following points were raised:

- That the idea of redistribution was inline with the aim of the neighbourhood portion of CIL (NCIL). Across the country NCIL was being used in a number of different ways in different areas. The pooling system had been in operation and was working well. It was noted that people impacted by development in one area would use facilities developed in other areas.
- A Councillor asked about the areas in which CIL was zero rated. It was noted that there was not consistency across BCP. In these cases those areas would also have access to the CIL pooled funds
- The need to engage with communities and loosing the link with local communities through the pooling method was questioned. Community groups from all areas were able to bid into the pot.
- The public perception of where investment was made and how CIL was distributed and the overall image of the conurbation. An example was given of the impact of the accessible playparks which had been developed.
- A question was raised regarding areas creating town or parish Councils in order to retain CIL funds if they are not distributed in a fair way. It was also note that the significant housing targets which needed to be delivered could only be accommodated through significant town centre development. The purpose of CIL was to mitigate the impact of development on the local infrastructure.
- The non NCIL portion of CIL already went to a central fund and just 15 to 20 percent was retained locally but not necessarily immediately in front of the development. Wards could work with neighbouring wards to pool the funds.
- There was issues raised around what was considered local or a neighbourhood and whether these areas were on a ward basis.
- A Councillor suggested that the pooling method seemed to enhance community engagement but questioned if there were safeguards which could be employed to ensure that no areas were disadvantaged. It was confirmed that this could be factored into the set up of the distribution mechanism. The set up would be consulted upon.
- It was noted that lots of areas did not have community groups and that these would be disadvantaged. It was noted that ward Councillors should work with community groups but where there were none this should not be a barrier to ward councillors submitting bids.
- Some Board members suggested that some form of hybrid between the two options outlined for pooling or distribution by ward may be a possible solution between the two.

Following the discussion it was proposed and then:

**RESOLVED that: Cabinet be recommended to amend recommendation ‘d’ of the report to the following:**

**‘Recognising the opportunity for wards to pool resources if they wish to, to agree that option 1 as set out in this report will be introduced and replace the legacy CIL Neighbourhood Portion arrangements in Bournemouth and Poole on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2020. The legacy arrangements will remain in place until they are superseded on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2020’**

Voting: For: 9; Against: 5

Cllr Farquhar asked to be recorded as voting against the motion.

117. Scrutiny of Regeneration Related Cabinet Reports

**Bournemouth Town Centre Vision (TCV) Winter Gardens Site:** The Chairman invited the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture to introduce the Cabinet report, a copy of which had been circulated and appears as Appendix L to the Cabinet minutes of 12 February 2020 in the Minute Book. During the course of discussion, the following points were raised:

- There was general support noted for the recommendations in the report but there were several issues raised regarding a number of the figures within the report particularly in relation to the loan from Morgan Sindall. It was noted that the loan rate was originally agreed when the OJEU process to select a partner was undertaken several years ago. The loan note rate was a bid back item and done in a competitive environment. It was noted that the initial sums needed to progress a project, “Advanced Sums”, were also financed by way of a loan from Morgan Sindall. The repayment of this loan was dependent on the type of financing structure employed to undertake the construction phase.
- It was suggested that with the increase in the construction budget there was scope to renegotiate interest payments and that the issue of the interest rate for the advanced payment needed to be addressed further. The Portfolio undertook to look into the issue and respond.
- In relation to section 15 of the report the Portfolio Holder responded to questioning on the finance arrangements that these were the options required in order to ensure that the funding needs of the scheme were met.
- It was noted that the opportunity for the Council to purchase a car park was important for the town centre and would be a strategic investment, giving control over parking charges for the site.
- A Councillor questioned whether the land value was prior to or post planning permission. The Corporate Director confirmed that the land value was determined at point of transfer with the benefit of planning permission. He also suggested that if any Councillor wished to find out more about the Bournemouth Development Company, he would be happy to provide that information. It was noted that the full scheme would be considered by Full Council.

**York Road:** The Chairman invited the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture to introduce the Cabinet report, a copy of which had been circulated and appears as Appendix M to the Cabinet minutes of 12 February 2020 in the Minute Book. During the course of discussion, the following points were raised:

It was noted that the development on Cotlands Road was mixed use, employment and residential. The report proposed that the two car parks at

York Road would be incorporated into the BDC options agreement to facilitate comprehensive development in this part of town

- A Councillor questioned why two car parks were being included within the development. It was noted that the space was needed to replace the existing Cotlands Road car parking, which was a planning requirement. The two car parks were next to each other and therefore presented opportunities to enhance the development potential on the Cotlands Road Site.
- A Board member asked about the option of car park ownership and why they were being transferred to BDC. There was a question as to whether the Council had the expertise or capacity to deliver this in-house. The Corporate Director in consultation with the portfolio holder having considered the various options, felt that BDC was better placed to resource, fund and implement the pre-construction activities necessary to ensure the delivery of the new multi storey car park on York Road in line with the Cotlands development timeline.
- It was noted that the Council and Morgan Sindall would work together to oversee the development through the BDC platform.
- A Councillor questioned whether there was anything within the options agreement with BDC that allowed car parks already in the agreement could be taken out. It was noted that there was the ability to review the schemes which were originally included ensure that they were being delivered in accordance with the contractual arrangements and that if they were not then due consideration could be given as to whether sited should be removed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5.00pm and resumed at 5.30pm.

118. Scrutiny of Corporate Related Cabinet Reports

The Chairman invited the Leader of the Council to introduce a Cabinet report on the Corporate Strategy Delivery Plans, a copy of which had been circulated and a copy of which appears as Appendix G to the Cabinet minutes of 12 February 2020 in the Minute Book.

The report asked the Cabinet to approve the delivery plans and support the development of a Corporate Performance Framework to provide a mechanism for monitoring progress and ensuring accountability for delivery. The Leader highlighted that the Corporate Strategy and delivery plans were aligned to the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals, something the Council intended to publicise more over the next 18 months. The report outlined how the delivery plans had been developed. It explained in more detail how the key objectives in the Corporate Strategy would be delivered and measured. She drew attention to the additional delivery plan which set out how the Council would achieve its commitment to be a modern, accessible and accountable council.

The delivery plans were intended to be a smart, living document and they included tangible timescales, for example on Climate Emergency. Paragraphs 13 and 14 of the report explained how the delivery plans would be used to measure success, starting from 1 April 2020. The Leader



explained that all delivery plan actions had been costed within the overall budget. The financial implications of any additional recommendations would need to be assessed before a response was provided. She thanked the lead officers and their teams for their work.

Members of the Board commended the delivery plans, commenting on the smart objectives, how well the document was put together, and how the integration with the UN Sustainable Development Goals was raising the profile of BCP Council and putting it on the map. The Leader was asked about the creation of 'Town Teams' as part of delivering the Dynamic Places objective. She explained that this reflected feedback from local residents and was intended to recognise, maintain and enhance the three towns and individual communities which existed with the BCP Council area.

The meeting ended at 6.15 pm

CHAIRMAN