

Notice of Overview and Scrutiny Board

Date: Monday, 10 February 2020 at 2.00 pm

Venue: HMS Phoebe, Town Hall, Bournemouth BH2 6DY



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

31 January 2020



Available online and
on the Mod.gov app



Maintaining and promoting high standards of conduct

Declaring interests at meetings

Familiarise yourself with the Councillor Code of Conduct which can be found in Part 6 of the Council's Constitution.

Before the meeting, read the agenda and reports to see if the matters to be discussed at the meeting concern your interests

Do any matters being discussed at the meeting relate to your registered interests?

Disclosable Pecuniary Interest

Yes

Declare the nature of the interest

Do NOT participate in the item at the meeting. Do NOT speak or vote on the item EXCEPT where you hold a dispensation

You are advised to leave the room during the debate

Local Interest

Yes

Declare the nature of the interest

Applying the bias and pre-determination tests means you may need to refrain from speaking and voting

You may also need to leave the meeting. Please seek advice from the Monitoring Officer

No

Do you have a personal interest in the matter?

Yes

Consider the bias and pre-determination tests

You may need to refrain from speaking & voting

You may also need to leave the meeting. Please seek advice

No

You can take part in the meeting speak and vote

What are the principles of bias and pre-determination and how do they affect my participation in the meeting?

Bias and predetermination are common law concepts. If they affect you, your participation in the meeting may call into question the decision arrived at on the item.

Bias Test

In all the circumstances, would it lead a fair minded and informed observer to conclude that there was a real possibility or a real danger that the decision maker was biased?

Predetermination Test

At the time of making the decision, did the decision maker have a closed mind?

If a councillor appears to be biased or to have predetermined their decision, they must NOT participate in the meeting.

For more information or advice please contact the Monitoring Officer
(tanya.coulter@bcpcouncil.gov.uk)

Selflessness

Councillors should act solely in terms of the public interest

Integrity

Councillors must avoid placing themselves under any obligation to people or organisations that might try inappropriately to influence them in their work. They should not act or take decisions in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends. They must declare and resolve any interests and relationships

Objectivity

Councillors must act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias

Accountability

Councillors are accountable to the public for their decisions and actions and must submit themselves to the scrutiny necessary to ensure this

Openness

Councillors should act and take decisions in an open and transparent manner. Information should not be withheld from the public unless there are clear and lawful reasons for so doing

Honesty & Integrity

Councillors should act with honesty and integrity and should not place themselves in situations where their honesty and integrity may be questioned

Leadership

Councillors should exhibit these principles in their own behaviour. They should actively promote and robustly support the principles and be willing to challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs

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 requested to declare any interests on items included in this agenda. Please refer to the workflow on the preceding page for guidance.

Declarations received will be reported at the meeting.

4. Confirmation of Minutes

7 - 34

To confirm and sign as a correct record the minutes of the meetings held at 2.00pm and 6.00pm on 18 December 2019 and at 2.00pm and 6.00pm on 13 January 2019.

a) Action Sheet

35 - 40

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

5. Chairman's Update

For the Board to consider any issues raised by the Chairman which are not dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

6. 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 3 February 2020.

The deadline for the submission of a statement is 12.00 noon, Friday 7 February 2020.

The deadline for the submission of a petition is 12.00 noon, Friday 7

February 2020.

7. Business Improvement Districts - BIDS

To hear from the three business improvement districts operating within the BCP Council area. To consider issues raised by the BIDs and how these might be used to bring insight to any future scrutiny.

Representatives of all three BIDS have been invited to attend. The BIDs currently operating are:

- Bournemouth Coastal BID
- Bournemouth Town Centre BID
- Poole BID

There is also a Christchurch BID steering group which is looking to establish a Christchurch BID.

8. Scrutiny of Planning Related Cabinet Reports

To consider the following Planning related reports scheduled for Cabinet consideration on 12 February 2020:

- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) strategic and neighbourhood governance

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 Margaret Phipps, Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning.

The Cabinet report will be published on Tuesday 4 February 2020 and available to view at the following link:

<https://democracy.bcpCouncil.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=285&MId=3726&Ver=4>

9. Scrutiny of Corporate Related Cabinet Reports

To consider the following Corporate related reports scheduled for Cabinet consideration on 12 February 2020:

- Corporate Strategy Delivery Plans

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 4 February 2020 and available to view at the following link:

<https://democracy.bcpCouncil.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=285&MId=3726&Ver=4>

10. Scrutiny of Regeneration Related Cabinet Reports

To consider the following Regeneration related reports scheduled for Cabinet consideration on 12 February 2020:

- Bournemouth Town Centre Vision (TCV) Winter Gardens Site
- York Road

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 Mark Howell, Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture.

The Cabinet report will be published on Tuesday 4 February 2020 and available to view at the following link:

<https://democracy.bcpccouncil.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=285&MId=3726&Ver=4>

In relation to these items of business, it is expected that the associated reports may contain exempt information, if necessary, the Committee is asked to consider the following resolution: -

‘That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs such interest in disclosing the information.’

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.

This page is intentionally left blank

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 18 December 2019 at 2.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr P Broadhead – Chairman

Cllr M Haines – Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr M Anderson, Cllr S Bartlett, Cllr M F Brooke, Cllr M Earl,
Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene, Cllr M Iyengar,
Cllr R Lawton, Cllr C Rigby, Cllr L-J Evans (in place of Cllr P Miles),
Cllr D Farr (in place of Cllr L Fear) and Cllr M Le Poidevin (in place of
Cllr R Maidment)

Also in attendance: Cllr L Allison (Portfolio Holder for Tourism Leisure and Communities)
Cllr D Brown (Portfolio Holder for Finance)
Cllr L Dedman (Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health)
Cllr S Moore (Portfolio Holder for Children and Families)

77. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllr L Fear, Cllr R Maidment and Cllr P Miles.

78. Substitute Members

Notice had been received from the relevant Group Leaders (or nominated representatives) of the following changes in membership for this meeting:

- Cllr D Farr was substituting for Cllr L Fear
- Cllr M Le Poidevin was substituting for Cllr R Maidment
- Cllr L-J Evans was substituting for Cllr P Miles.

79. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest.

Other declarations were made for the purpose of transparency as follows:

- Agenda item on Budget scrutiny of Adult Social Care: Cllr L-J Evans declared that she was a member of the Tricuro Executive Shareholders Group
- Agenda item on Bournemouth International Centre – Short Term Investment Plan: Cllr S Bartlett declared that he was a director of BH Live (Enterprises) Ltd

80. Confirmation of Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 7 October 2019 and the two meetings held on 11 November 2019 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

81. Public Speaking

There were no public questions, statements or petitions submitted to this meeting.

82. Scrutiny of the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) Cabinet Report

The Board considered a report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'E' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book.

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. He referred to the recent Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) development workshop, which had provided guidance to councillors on the approach to effective challenge and scrutiny of the MTFP and annual budget setting. Although there was limited time left for scrutiny this year, there would be opportunities for scrutiny to engage earlier in the process in future years. The purpose of this item was to provide the Board with an overview of the latest budget position across the Council, to be followed by more detailed scrutiny of two key areas of pressure which the Board had asked to look at: Children's Services and Adult Social Care. The Chairman asked Portfolio Holders to be prepared to expand if required on the summary information contained in their updates.

Budget Scrutiny – Medium Term Financial Plan Update

The Portfolio Holder for Finance outlined the key areas of focus in the report and its recommendations. He explained that good progress was being made in developing a robust and lawful budget for 2020/21. He highlighted the four main areas for consideration in the update position, as set out in paragraph 6 of the report. He reported that the current administration had inherited an unsustainable budget. The Shadow Authority had not addressed the deficit on the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) funding. The inclusion of the projected funding gap of £9.8million in the budget was not financially sustainable, and the Council was now faced with making difficult decisions in order to set a balanced budget for 2020/21.

The Portfolio Holder and the Section 151 Officer responded to questions on the report:

- Regarding the robustness of projections for the tax base growth for Council Tax, the Section 151 Officer explained that this was considered as part of the budget process. He explained how the projected increase of 0.86% from the growth in residential property numbers over those previously assumed had been calculated.
- The Portfolio Holder was asked if there was a rolling programme to address the net funding gap in future years, particularly in view of

growing pressures on the adult social care budget. He stated that he was confident that funding pressures would be addressed, primarily through the significant efficiencies arising from organisational transformation. He was asked whether the timescales for organisational transformation aligned with key budget milestones and explained that the delivery plan in Spring 2020 would give more indication of timings.

- A Board member asked how the growth in residential property numbers cross referenced with planning policy and housing requirements. The Section 151 Officer reported that this was not a straightforward calculation. It took account of council tax discounts, not just property numbers. The Portfolio Holder explained that the figures were difficult to anticipate as much depended on planning permissions and developers carrying these out.
- The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the assumptions around business rates were based on the Consumer Price Index and inflation was not built in.
- The Portfolio Holder explained that the additional £3million earmarked reserves to meet the cost of redundancies related to Tiers 4 and 5. It had not been included in the reserves before now.
- The Section 151 Officer clarified how the figure of £1535 as a council tax alternative average had been arrived at. He provided an overview of the Council Tax Harmonisation Strategy as set out in section e) in Appendix A of the report.
- There was no indication that the Government intended to reduce DSG High Needs Block funding to zero.
- The High Needs Block funding shortfall was not included in Figure 1 in the report as the DSG was a separate account. However, it did form part of the medium term financial planning process. The Portfolio Holder explained why the DSG was included in the External Auditor's Value for Money judgement.

The Portfolio Holder was asked for further information about the nature of the savings and efficiencies identified in areas other than children's and adult services to assist the Board in considering the report's recommendations. It was noted that the figures had changed since the last MTFP update in October. He explained that these were still a work in progress but would be outlined as part of the budget report in February in accordance with previous practice. It was suggested that Portfolio Holders should be invited to attend the next O&S Board to provide a better understanding of options being considered.

The Portfolio Holder provided further information on the tri annual revaluation of the Pension Fund and how the Council had achieved a resulting funding level of 92%. He was asked about the potential impact of the climate emergency on investments and explained that this was already an issue of discussion for the Dorset Local Government Pension Scheme and the Brunel Pension Partnership. As the Council's representative on these bodies he undertook to act in the overall best interests of its membership, balancing financial best interests with social and environmental responsibility. The Portfolio Holder was asked whether the

budget included provision for additional resources to address the climate emergency. He explained that there was no specific budget at the moment. The Council was doing what it could within existing resources with current Portfolio Holders and staff.

The Section 151 Officer was asked for his view on the Council's reserves. He explained that in his role as a statutory officer he was required to give a full assessment in the February budget report. At present the significant concern was the sustainability of the Council's position in respect of the DSG and the High Needs Block funding deficit. This position would be challenged by the External Auditor and would require further consideration in the preparation of the February budget.

The Portfolio Holder was asked for an assurance that protecting/increasing the Council's reserves would be a future priority. He confirmed that managing reserves effectively and keeping them at a sufficient level was a priority, to be balanced alongside other priorities including the development of a financial strategy to tackle the high needs block funding deficit and over time bring it back to a level where it could pay itself off. It was noted that there were already pressure on the reserves due to local government reorganisation (LGR), transformation and other major activity.

Budget Scrutiny – Children's Services

The Portfolio Holder for Children and Families outlined in more detail the main pressures and additional savings and efficiencies in relation to the 2020/21 budget for Children's Services, as summarised in Appendix A2 of the report. She talked through the most significant service pressures which amounted to £3.9 million in total, highlighting the following areas:

- She provided a detailed breakdown of the numbers of children in care cases and the associated costs. This was a needs-led budget with unavoidable costs. In general costs had increased due to the complexity involved in many of these cases.
- The number of children in care cases in Christchurch was higher than anticipated. This was a one-off situation as a result of LGR.
- There was a need to recruit and retain more local authority foster carers to address the increase in private fostering.
- There was a predicted £817k overspend in school transport costs for children with the Special Educational Needs (SEN). This was due to an increase in the number of entitled pupils.
- There were national and local pressures on the High Needs Block funding.
- There was no additional funding to support the increase in demand and expectations arising from changes to Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP).
- Independent tribunal decisions could result in significant costs for the Council.

- There was an increase in SEN children being excluded from secondary school requiring alternative provision. This was not a good outcome for the children or in terms of costs.
- All these pressures were culminating in aggressive charging by private providers.

The Portfolio Holder reported that there was no simple solution to these problems and that a change of approach was required. She outlined a number of strategies which could be implemented, including a reduction in out of area placements, an increase in specialist provision in mainstream schools to reduce exclusions, and the alignment of tribunal services. It was noted that the recent restructure of the SEND service should result in more effective processes. Improvements were also required to joint commissioning arrangements particularly in relation to health. There was a need to lobby the Government for adequate funding for the High Needs Block if this was not provided in the Local Government Settlement.

The Portfolio Holder and the Service Director for Inclusion and Family Learning responded to questions on the report:

- The Service Director explained why the cost of funding a high needs child was so expensive. These cases were few, but often required a multi-agency package of health, care and educational needs for 52 weeks of the year, which no other organisations could provide due to the complexity of needs. Sometimes this provision could be in place up to the age of 25, by which time these young people would have transferred to Adult Social Care if required.
- It was clarified that the figure of £24million referred to in recent press reports related specifically to the Government's learning disabilities and autism national funding programme.
- The Portfolio Holder was asked about permanent exclusions and reported that the new Ofsted regime may also reduce the numbers.
- The Portfolio Holder was asked whether it was possible to reduce the number of EHCPs and their associated costs without having an impact on outcomes for the children involved. She confirmed that this formed part of the new strategy which was being developed.
- There was now one strategic board for the Virtual School. The Portfolio Holder was unable to say as yet whether the work of the Virtual School had an impact on the budget. It was noted that there was no councillor representation on the board.
- The Portfolio Holder was asked whether there was an opportunity to lobby central Government to take responsibility for the numbers of children in care and segregate the budget. She reported that the number of children in care was currently lower than the national average but higher than similar types of local authorities. There should be better funding overall for local government.

The Portfolio Holder was asked about the £1.9 million assumed savings and efficiencies and whether these might put services at risk. She stated that more detailed information on savings and efficiencies would be

available in the next budget update. She explained that the work around harmonisation and restructuring of services was ongoing. She had received assurance from the Corporate Director of Children's Services that the savings were deliverable. She assured the Board that the significant restructuring of the MASH (multi agency safeguarding hub) had been driven by more efficient ways of working rather than saving money.

The Board was generally supportive of the proposal to implement a council tax discount policy for BCP care experienced young people up until the age of 25, with effect from 1 April 2020. The Portfolio Holder responded to questions about the details of the policy and the criteria applied in assessing applications. The Service Director responded to a concern about some of the definitions and qualifying criteria used in the policy. In terms of context he explained that the threshold for young people to be placed in care was very high, and usually had longstanding and lifelong consequences for them. There was sufficient evidence that children in care could experience poor outcomes. It was suggested that the rationale for the policy should be made clearer so that all residents understood why the discount was being introduced.

Budget Scrutiny – Adult Social Care

The Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health outlined in more detail the main pressures and additional savings and efficiencies in relation to the 2020/21 budget for Adult Social Care, as summarised in Appendix A1 of the report. She provided a comprehensive summary of the services currently provided by the Council, and highlighted the following areas:

- The budget for adult social care made it difficult to be ambitious, Nationally the UK spent less on adult social care than the majority of Western Europe.
- Many young people with high levels of need transferred from children's services to adult social care services and this put pressure on the budget.
- The increase in the cost of care and support was a major budget pressure. The rise in costs was attributed to a number of factors, including an increase in staffing costs, and changes in local market conditions such as the loss of smaller providers.
- Predecessor councils had taken positive steps to develop the market by building and acquisitioning their own residential care provision.
- There was more demand for care packages for people with long term conditions, and an increase in life expectancy.

The Portfolio Holder outlined the opportunities for BCP Council to make efficiencies. She highlighted the issue of recruiting suitable staff. She talked about plans to harmonise the adult social care charging policy and introduce a 'one front door' proposal as part of organisational transformation. She reported that much of the Better Care Fund allocation had been absorbed by inflationary pressures.

The Portfolio Holder was asked if there were plans to build more Council owned care homes. She explained that firstly the Council had to establish what was required in terms of client needs and then design services accordingly. The Corporate Director of Adult Social Care reported that a needs analysis was being undertaken with health colleagues over the first six months of 2020, the results of which would be used to develop a strategy. This would be subject to scrutiny by the Health and Adult Social Care O&S Committee.

The Portfolio Holder talked about the ability to see the overall picture across BCP Council and the opportunity to include adult social care within the context of the developing Local Plan. There was consensus on the need to work with colleagues in strategic planning and housing to ensure that the care needs of the population were accommodated.

The Corporate Director responded to a question about the availability of live data to benchmark with local authority neighbours. She explained that while this information could be looked at with robustness for Bournemouth and Poole there were caveats in terms of how returns were completed, how data was used and how this translated into the local market.

The Portfolio Holder was asked whether there was a delivery plan for the savings identified in the report. Without a sufficient level of detail, it was not considered possible at this stage to be assured that the savings were robust and deliverable. It was explained that there were many threads to this work. The results of the organisational design work was a major focus and would be considered by the Health and Adult Social Care O&S Committee.

Reference was made to the Local Government Association cross party groups, which included Community Well Being, and the need for stronger BCP executive representation on these.

The Chairman on behalf of the Board thanked the Portfolio Holders for their updates. In conclusion the Board, while noting that the Local Government Settlement had yet to be announced and that a full risk assessment in relation to the budget would be provided in the February, agreed that more detailed information on budget work to date should be provided by Portfolio Holders at its next meeting in January.

RESOLVED that Cabinet Portfolio Holders be requested to provide further detail on budget work and risk analysis on the savings identified to date in figure 1 of the MTFP report to Cabinet of 20 December, to the Overview and Scrutiny Board in January, and prior to the budget being presented.

Voting: For – 9, Against – 6

83. Scrutiny of Regeneration Cabinet Reports - Budget related

Bournemouth International Centre Short Term Investment Plan

The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture presented the report to the Board, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'F' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder referred to the recommendations in the report and welcomed any questions or comments from members of the Board.

- The Portfolio Holder was asked for further detail on the two options for the Purbeck Hall vertical extension. The Head of Leisure, as lead officer for the BIC development, explained that details of the remodelling programme including the level of investment required had been developed in consultation with a specialist consultant following the initial Cabinet report in July 2019. The identification and prioritisation of projects had been tested with BH Live and specialist officers.
- The Portfolio Holder responded to questions on the borrowing arrangements and the level of interest rate. The Head of Leisure confirmed that the income from BH Live supported the overall budget enabling the Council to borrow and invest in its assets.
- A Board member questioned the use of borrowing to fund maintenance, the cost of which should be covered by the operation. The Portfolio Holder stressed that the focus of the report was on investment.
- It was clarified that the lifespan of the works on the Purbeck Hall vertical extension was 25 years. This lifespan, and the costs and works timetable listed in Table 3 of the report related to Option 2, the more expensive and preferred option.
- The Portfolio Holder was asked whether the short-term investment would enable the BIC to host the larger political party conferences. He spoke about the difficulties in competing with other venues such as Manchester in attracting these bookings.
- A Board member commented on the huge amount of investment proposed compared to the figures given for other venues in paragraph 6 of the report. The Portfolio Holder explained that the figure for the BIC reflected the significant scale of the works and previous underinvestment.
- The Portfolio Holder confirmed that reference to climate emergency would be included in future reports.
- The Portfolio Holder was asked what impact the two options for the Purbeck vertical extension had on the key objectives for the remodelling. He explained that Option 2 was the preferred option because it provided more space, and this offered more scope for different configurations and the flexibility to run things concurrently.
- Board members commented on the ambition of Option 2 and that it would result in much needed improvements to the café area. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the proposal would significantly increase the number of covers.
- The Portfolio explained that the order of projects listed in Table 3 gave priority to those projects which would have the highest impact

while being mindful not to affect events which had already been booked in.

The Portfolio Holder was asked why the consultation on the proposals had not been listed in the report. He explained that details had been provided in the previous report to Cabinet in July. It was suggested that this information should have been included in the current report, in view of the level of investment being sought and the public interest. It was noted that there had been no consultation with ward councillors or tourism partners. The Head of Leisure reported that a commercial decision such as this was primarily a matter between the Council and BH Live with support from specialist advisors and would not normally be subject to wider community consultation. He assured the Board that there would be engagement with key stakeholders as part of the longer-term reimagining of the BIC. The Head of Construction and Facilities Management responded to a question about the external advice received. She explained the role of ICW as specialist consultants in their field. ICW had held workshops and discussions with former and potential clients to identify what was required for the BIC to retain its place in the market in the short to medium term.

In conclusion the Board supported investment in the BIC but questioned the need to commit to the figure of £4.7million for short term remodelling at this stage, prior to the longer-term vision for the BIC being determined. The Portfolio Holder stressed that only £1.8 million of this figure would be committed in advance of the longer-term development options study. He stated that not approving the £4.7million at this stage may have an impact on tendering costs and event bookings.

RESOLVED that Cabinet be recommended to:

- 1) Delete recommendation a of the report;**
- 2) Amend recommendation b to read:**
‘Approves the use of up to £1.8m of Prudential Borrowing at assumed interest rate of 5.5% over 25 years’.

Voting: For – 11, Against – 4

Winter Gardens – including exempt information – It was noted that this report was no longer on the agenda for the Cabinet meeting on 20 December 2019.

The meeting ended at 5.45 pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 18 December 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr P Broadhead – Chairman

Cllr M Haines – Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr M Anderson, Cllr S Bartlett, Cllr M Earl, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr M Iyengar, Cllr R Lawton, Cllr P Miles, Cllr C Rigby, Cllr R Burton (In place of Cllr M F Brooke), Cllr J J Butt (In place of Cllr N Greene), Cllr D Kelsey (In place of Cllr M Greene), Cllr M Le Poidevin (In place of Cllr R Maidment) and Cllr J Kelly (In place of Cllr L Fear)

Also in attendance: Cllr L Allison, Cllr M Howell, Cllr M Phipps and Cllr V Slade

84. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllr M Brooke, Cllr L Fear, Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene and Cllr R Maidment

85. Substitute Members

Notice had been received from the relevant Group Leaders (or nominated representatives) of the following changes in membership for this meeting:

- Cllr R Burton was substituting for Cllr M Brooke
- Cllr J Kelly was substituting for Cllr L Fear
- Cllr D Kelsey was substituting for Cllr M Greene
- Cllr J Butt was substituting for Cllr N Greene
- Cllr M Le Poidevin was substituting for Cllr R Maidment

86. Declarations of Interests

No declarations of interest were made in relation to any items on the agenda.

87. Public Speaking

There were no public questions, statements or petitions submitted to this meeting.

88. Forward Plan

The Chairman set out that the level of work coming through Cabinet would probably continue to necessitate the Overview and Scrutiny Board having two meetings each month and it was currently proposed that there would be one meeting in the afternoon followed by the originally scheduled evening meeting which would allow for substitutions and provide more flexibility.

The Board discussed the Cabinet Forward Plan items it wished to consider at the next meeting. The Board were advised that some items were likely to be postponed from the January Cabinet meeting. The Board agreed that further scrutiny was required for the following items:

- Smart Places Programme
- Fleet Replacement Funding Strategy
- BH Coastal Lottery
- Approval of Fixed Penalty Notices Policy for Environmental Crimes and associated pilot scheme for litter enforcement in Bournemouth Town Centre
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) strategic and neighbourhood governance

There was some debate concerning the report on Leisure Centre Management and whether this should be included for scrutiny at this stage or when the final report was taken to Cabinet. The Chief Executive suggested that the Board may wish to receive further information and an opportunity to contribute once the review had been established. The Board agreed to place this as an item on its Forward Plan.

89. Scrutiny of Planning related Cabinet Reports

Poole Harbour Recreation Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) –

The Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning was asked to introduce the report which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'J' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder outlined the aims of the report and recommendations. It was explained that this was a joint report with Dorset Council as the Poole Harbour area covered both local authorities and any changes would need authorisation from both Councils.

- The Board asked a number of questions to the Portfolio Holder including:
- How the SPD would be integrated with the new local plan. that it was The Portfolio Holder advised supplementary to it and would hold full weight in planning decisions.
- Whether the proposal to establish the Dorset Heathlands and Poole Harbour Advisory Group by extending the existing arrangements for Dorset Heathlands would ensure that the previous work of the Dorset Heathlands Advisory Group would continue and be integrated into the new group. It was confirmed that it would, and that the new group was an extension of the previous group to cover the harbour, as many of the same officers and partners would be involved;
- A discrepancy between a figure used in the report and a figure contained within the SPD was pointed out. The Head of Planning advised that the SPD had the correct figure and the Cabinet report would be amended.

90. Scrutiny of Regeneration related Cabinet Reports

Poole Regeneration – The Chairman asked the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture to introduce the report a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'A' to the Cabinet minutes of 20

December in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder outlined the aims of the report and recommendations. The report outlined high-level consideration of the work required to develop a Masterplan for the sustainable regeneration of Poole's Town Centre including possible options for the level crossing. The Board raised a number of issues with the Portfolio Holder including:

- Whether there was any evidence from network rail regarding the safety of the level crossing and whether there had been any funding from network rail confirmed. The Portfolio Holder advised that there were issues of confidentiality around any discussions which had taken place with network rail regarding this and also that the Portfolio Holder for Transport would be the best person to respond to this issue. Whilst moving the Poole Railway Station would make sense in a perfect world there were constraints to this including whether funding would be available and currently this issue was at a very early stage of consideration.
- The report included lots of high-level options but there were deliverability issues. The level crossing was an interesting start point for integration within the plan and also if the crossing was a danger what Network Rail would be doing to resolve the issue. The strategy was to ensure that Poole would be a vibrant and successful place into the future. There were possibilities of accessing the future high streets fund and network rail contributions.
- The geographic scope of the report covered a very large area. The Portfolio Holder responded that the Heart of Poole Project was artificially confined to a small area as only areas under Council control were included but this was an opportunity to consider wider options. Poole needed to become more attractive to investment and the masterplan would help to show this along with marketing and forging links with developers.
- A Councillor asked if there were parallel plans being developed for moving the railway station which would take many years and whether an incremental approach would be undertaken. The Portfolio Holder reiterated that the primary purpose was not moving the railway station, but it was something that would be factored in if the option became available. It was confirmed by the Service Director that the project team had been thinking in terms of a phased approach;
- The Chairman queried whether Poole could wait 5-10 years for something which could potentially be great but also may not happen. It was noted that there would be a rounded approach addressing the big picture as well as a more granular approach which would consider interventions along the high street. Plans and projects would become more evident over the coming months.
- The Board expressed concern that the work already undertaken on the Heart of Poole Project would be lost and action was needed now. The Portfolio Holder advised that the report explained how the money from the Heart of Poole would be used. The Service Director advised that the team would be working hard to ensure that the best parts of what had already been done would be utilised as possible.
- In response to a question the Portfolio Holder explained that Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPOs) were needed as an option on the table as a

bargaining chip and to follow through if necessary as not all areas identified for regeneration were owned by the Council. Some Councillors expressed concern at this due to previous experiences with CPOs. Following the Boards discussions, it was:

Resolved that:

- 1) Cabinet be recommended to build on existing work already done in the development of a revised Masterplan for Poole Town Centre;**
- 2) the revised Masterplan for Poole Town Centre be received by the O&S Board for scrutiny, once developed, and prior to wider consultation on the Masterplan;**

Voting: Unanimous

- 3) The Acquisition and Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) Strategy be received by the O&S Board for scrutiny, once developed.**

Voting: For: 14, Against:0, 1 Abstention

The meeting adjourned at 7.31pm and resumed at 7.36pm.

91. Scrutiny of Tourism and Communities related Cabinet Reports

Community Engagement Strategy – The Chairman asked the Portfolio Holder to outline the report, which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'A' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder answered a number of questions put to him by the Board including:

- Whether there would be further consultation on the Strategy once it was produced. It was confirmed that there was.
- The Portfolio Holder was asked to consider what was best practice from across the country and what information the preceding authorities already had. A Board Member suggested that the Council also needed to be mindful that Area Forums could be successful but not always. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that best practice would be looked at when forming the final document but that this needed to be based on local communities.
- Board members expressed concern that there seemed to be a plan to consult different communities but without anything to consult on and that the preceding Council's would have had data from previous resident satisfaction surveys. It was suggested that a strategy should be created first, prior to public consultation. The Portfolio Holder advised that a finalised strategy would be developed within the year and that it was important to be starting from somewhere completely new.
- A Board member commented that there would always be winners and losers depending upon personal opinions which influenced whether people felt they had been listened to and questioned whether the Portfolio Holder was realistic in trying to achieve something different. The

Portfolio Holder reiterated that this was a new Council with new services and things were being run differently to previous Councils. There was concern from some Board members that the work of the preceding councils was not being utilised in the development of the new strategy it was therefore:

Resolved that Cabinet be recommended to build on known good practice and insight gathered by preceding authorities in the development of a Community Engagement Strategy.

Voting: For: 13, Against 0, 2 Abstentions

Super Hut Development, Fisherman's Walk: The Portfolio Holder for Tourism, Leisure and Communities was asked to introduce the report which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'A' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book. The following discussions raised a number of points including:

- That there was limited land available for the development of the super huts and that the cost of them to the average resident was prohibitive. The Portfolio Holder responded that all beach huts were luxury items and inaccessible to many. However, in terms of the goal of the project, to raise capital, he considered the project to be good;
- Other beach hut owners were often upset by new developments and asked what steps had been taken to ensure care for existing tenants. No tenants would be losing their beach hut, but the existing huts would be physically moved. All huts would retain a sea view. The super hut business model was already well established and demand for the new huts would be high.
- In response to a question the Portfolio Holder advised that the new huts were not for overnight use but were slightly larger than standard huts. It was not possible to have overnight huts in this location due to regulations requiring a minimum height above sea level.
- A Board member suggested that the hut design should work in harmony with nature and suggested that perhaps the huts could have green roofs. The Portfolio Holder welcomed this suggestion and that sustainability would be considered for all decisions.

The Board discussed whether the Council would be able to retain a hut so it could be used for charitable purposes to directly benefit those residents who were unable to afford to buy a super hut. The Board then:

Resolved that Cabinet be recommended to retain one of the proposed super huts for use by the Council for good causes and charitable purposes.

Voting: Unanimous

92. Scrutiny of Corporate related Cabinet Reports

The Local Industrial Strategy for Dorset – The Leader of the Council was asked to introduce the report which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'D' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book. The Board was advised that this was a joint strategy and had been signed off in the preceding week by Dorset Council's Cabinet. The Board raised a number of queries concerning the report including:

- The Chairman commented that as one of two equal players in the strategy BCP Council should have a great deal of influence and question the four areas included within the strategy. The Leader explained that there could only be a maximum of four areas included and there were areas within BCP and areas within Dorset which had some synergy. The Leader advised that the strategy was a culmination of work across both authorities and there were three drivers, which aligned to the Councils priorities, of wellbeing, natural environment and investment. The Leader advised the Board that the influence BCP in terms of what was included within the strategy was appropriate.
- A Member referred to a paragraph within the report concerning unlocking cultural assets and suggested that this should be included as a theme within the new Local Plan.
- A Member asked about the inclusion of Dorset as the natural home for creative and culture as opposed to somewhere else. The Board was advised that the creative and cultural element would include the Arts University, the digital sector along with the smart places development. There was a strong emphasis around Poole Harbour. The Leader advised that in developing the strategy for submission now the Council wanted to be one of the first from phase 3 to submit.
- A Board Member highlighted the importance of engaging with the local MPs. The Leader responded that she completely agreed and that she wanted to build on the existing base and maintain the strength of the existing local economy including the financial sector.

Smart Place Pilot (Lansdowne) – The Leader of the Council was asked to introduce the report which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'A' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book. It was noted that this was the culmination of a long journey began by Bournemouth Council. The Board was advised that there would be continuous monitoring for the pilot and that the results would be made publicly available. The following points were raised within the ensuing discussion:

- In response to a question it was confirmed that there would be no impact on trees from the Lansdowne Project and it was hoped that future projects would be able to learn from Lansdown in order to minimise any impact on trees.
- A Board Member questioned what was being done in terms of continuous monitoring of electromagnetic field (EMF) emissions from the 5G trial networks to ensure compliance with Public Health England (ICNIRP) guidelines as requested by the Overview and Scrutiny Board. It was confirmed that information from the monitoring would be placed on

the website so that there could be regular up to date information available.

- The Board had previously agreed to monitor this and the Chairman agreed that he would consider how best this could be achieved. It was noted that as soon as the technology goes in the information would become available.

In response to a question it was confirmed that most of the equipment would not require planning permission and these would start to be put in place whilst planning permission was sought for those part of the tech which did. It was noted that the 5G roll out in Brighton was blocked due to planning considerations rather than any other issues.

93. Future Meeting Dates

The current proposal for future meeting dates was noted.

The meeting ended at 9.14 pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 13 January 2020 at 4.00 pm

Present:-

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

Present: 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 R Lawton and Cllr R Maidment

Also in attendance: Cllr L Allison, Cllr D Brown, Cllr L Dedman, Cllr A Hadley,
Cllr M Howell, Cllr S Moore, Cllr M Phipps, Cllr Dr F Rice and
Cllr V Slade

94. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllrs M Iyengar, P Miles and C Rigby.

95. Substitute Members

Notice had been received from the relevant Group Leaders (or nominated representatives) of the following changes in membership for this meeting:

Cllr L Northover substituting for Cllr C Rigby
Cllr M White substituting for Cllr M Iyengar

96. Declarations of Interests

None

97. Public Speaking

No public statements or petitions were received.

One public question was submitted by Mr John Sprackling. This was received after the published deadline for questions, with the Chairman's consent it was agreed that the question would be put during consideration of the relevant section of the Budget Scrutiny item. The question referred to item 40 of the report, attached at Appendix 'A' to these minutes and was put as follows:

Is this is related to Note 12 of the Accounts for Seascope South Ltd for the year to 31 March 2019 posted on the Companies House website on 27/12/19 which reads...

12. Directors & Employees The Company does not employ any staff direct but seconds labour from the BCP Council. Total seconded labour costs for the year were £175,000 (2018: £196,000).

The number of staff as a full-time equivalent were:

	2019	2018
Operations	2.3	2.9
Administrative	0.0	0.0
Total	2.3	2.9

98. Budget Scrutiny

The Chief Executive made a statement advising the Board that some issues were still under negotiation and therefore needed to be treated as non-public at this time.

The Chairman reminded the Board of its decision at the last meeting to request further detail and a risk analysis of the savings and efficiencies identified. An outline of this information had been circulated to the Board prior to the meeting. The Portfolio Holder for Finance introduced the report and advised that the numbers in the current report and that provided to the Board in December would not match as changes to savings had been made in the intervening period. The Portfolio Holder also thanked the finance team for providing the breakdown of the savings information.

Assumed savings - A member of the Board questioned the deliverability of savings which were amber rated and commented that they would have preferred more detail in order to be assured that the savings were deliverable. The Portfolio Holder advised that the report format was historical in terms of the level of detail and the other Cabinet members were in attendance to provide more detail if required. It was noted that the Amber ratings could encompass a wide spectrum and were an indication that action was ongoing but not yet completed.

In response to a question the Portfolio Holder advised that he felt the figures within the report were currently the best that could be prudently provided and were sufficient to deliver required savings and provide a balanced budget.

The Board noted that LGR forecast savings of approximately £44m and the current savings were significantly less than this. The Portfolio Holder advised that BCP had driven out savings of approximately £19.5m from the current year and further detailed savings were contained within the report. A similar number would be driven through transformation savings.

In response to a question the Portfolio Holder gave assurance that the figures provided to the meeting were in line with those already reported within previous papers, it was noted that transformation savings would form part of the 2021/22 budget.

Resources – The leader advised that the amber at line 2 referred to duplicate contracts which were due to finish at the end of the year and minor staffing changes.

Children's – The Portfolio Holder provided the Board with further detail on the staffing savings which was at amber, this included savings from residual Dorset County Council Posts and service redesigns. The Board questioned the difference between the savings figure provided in December and the current figures, it was explained that the December figure reflected budget pressures from preceding councils which didn't materialise. In response to a question on the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant the Portfolio Holder advised that it didn't fall within this process but would be considered by the Schools Forum that week. Work was also ongoing with the Department for Education to address this.

Adult Social Care – In response to a question the Portfolio Holder for Adult Social Care advised that the detail of line 9 would be considered further at the Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee the following week. Board members were invited to attend. With regards to line 15 which was at amber the Board was advised that this was in relation to savings generated by advisors to support self funders. It was noted that item 22 referred to joining up current catering teams to work through one central point. It was noted that fees and charges were currently at amber a public consultation was required.

A Board member enquired about the wording of line 23. The Corporate Director explained that there were currently two different ways of delivering this service but that she would look at the wording used to make sure this was consistent. In response to a question it was noted that the transformation savings identified were based on tried and tested methods from other local authorities and represented a mid-point in terms of what might be achieved. In response to a question the Portfolio Holder advised that whilst the service based impact would be looked at elsewhere the service user experience would not be reduced.

In response to the Board's enquiries it was suggested that further detail on the identified savings could be taken through the Health and Adult Social Care O&S Committee.

Regeneration and Economy – The relevant Portfolio Holders outlined the lines within the report which were rated as amber. In response to a question on line 25 it was noted that this was specifically on school bus routes for the current academic year and that service users had been consulted. In relation to a question concerning line 36 it was noted that a small amount was though harmonising and that the Portfolio Holder was confident that the changes in charges would keep up with the planned budget. A member questioned the savings identified against the adventure golf for the current year. It was noted that as the facility had only operated for half of the current year the assumed income from the facility needed to be adjusted. In response to a question it was noted that the beach hut income was due to

an increase across all areas but that full harmonisation across beach huts was still being scoped out.

Environment and Communities – The Corporate Director responded to the public questioned as outlined in the above minute advised that the saving was from the in-house Bournemouth maintenance team being employed to deliver across a larger estate and gaining efficiencies of scale. In relation to line 37 a Board member questioned how the identified savings were being made. It was noted that the savings related to the management of the services and not the services themselves. The Board commented on the fee alignment for the green waste service when different services were being provided. Others commented that this issue had been decided and further discussion was not relevant to the budget scrutiny.

The Chairman concluded the meeting and thanked the Portfolio Holders for responding to the Board's queries on their budget areas.

The meeting ended at 5.32 pm

CHAIRMAN

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 13 January 2020 at 6.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr P Broadhead – Chairman

Cllr M Haines – Vice-Chairman

Present: 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 and Cllr C Rigby

Also in attendance: Cllr L Allison, Cllr Dr F Rice and Cllr V Slade

99. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllr P Miles.

100. Substitute Members

There were no substitute members.

101. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations interest received.

102. Public Speaking

There were no public statements, questions or petitions submitted to the meeting.

103. Forward Plan

The Chairman informed the Board of the items on the current Cabinet Forward Plan and put forward those items he considered the Board should scrutinise at its next meeting.

The Board agreed that the following items as suggested by the Chairman be included on the O&S Board agenda for February:

- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) strategic and neighbourhood governance
- Budget and MTFP
- Bereavement Services
- HRA
- Organisational Design Estates Strategy – previously agreed
- Seascope Group Ltd Strategic Plan

- Winter Gardens – previously agreed
- York Road – previously agreed

A concern was raised that the CIL item would need a significant amount of time and therefore maybe some of the other items should be reconsidered. The Chairman did not feel this would be necessary.

The Chairman also suggested that representatives from the three BIDs within the BCP area be invited to the next O&S Board Meeting to provide the Board with a foreshadow on emerging issues.

The Chairman advised the Board that when the O&S function was established it was agreed to have a review after the first year. This would take place in July; a timetable would be drawn up and further information would follow.

The Chairman raised a concern regarding a proposal to limit public questions to only items on the meetings agenda. The Chairman felt that this would constrict public engagement and felt that O&S in particular should be exempt from this. The Board debated this issue and there was general agreement with the Chairman. The Board therefore,

RECOMMENDED that:

‘the Audit & Governance Committee ensure that the key principle of engaging the public through Overview and Scrutiny, as outlined in the Constitution, can continue to be met; that public questions may be received by the O&S Board and O&S Committees on any issue within the remit of that O&S body and are not restricted to items already listed on the agenda for that meeting.’

The Chairman also advised the Board of his intention for the Board to commission a working group and this is something which would be progressed in the coming weeks.

104. Scrutiny of Corporate Related Cabinet Reports

Smart Place Programme - The Chairman asked the Leader to introduce the report a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'A' to the Cabinet minutes of 15 January in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder outlined the aims of the report and recommendations. A number of points were raised by the Board in the ensuing questioning including:

- The impact of the smart place programme throughout the conurbation. The Leader advised that BCP were in talks with the companies providing super-fast fibre and they were keen to expand to the whole of the conurbation. Issues concerning transport would only work when looking at the full corridor across the area.

- Opportunities for businesses. It was noted that these were critical to the operating model. If, in order to fulfil the digital operating model, it needed to be developed in house there may be opportunities which were missed. The Leader advised that this paper is about the need for an investment plan to explore the different opportunities. Some part of the plan would be best delivered in house whilst others would be best delivered by partners within the sector in order to achieve the best possible outcomes.
- A Councillor questioned the need for accuracy to £400k in the figures when the total investment over 15 years was over £1bn. It was noted that the commitment to the investment plan did not commit to output and there was a significant benefit which would outweigh the cost; whilst noting the point on the point on the necessity of accuracy. The commitment from the plan was just over £250k. The figures had already been submitted to the Local Enterprise Partnership and gone through the first stage and due to go before the full board on 28 January. The issues raised with the figures would be looked into and the leader would provide a response by email.
- A Councillor asked about income streams, it was noted that there would be a full exploration of this within the investment plan but there was commercial sensitivity around what could be included within the paper.
- Concerning whether the project was likely to be approved the Leader advised that the LEP were looking to fund 7 or 8 projects and were required to spend remaining funds by March 2021. Other projects were becoming undeliverable and therefore the chances of the project getting funding were considered to be fairly good. Alternative options would be considered if funding from the LEP was not secured.

A Councillor commented that the only investment required to progress the project at this stage was £20k and the O&S Board should absolutely be supporting it and whether there was anything more the Board could do to support it. It was agreed that the Chairman should write to the LEP on behalf of the Board supporting the project. It was suggested that BCP was both the physical and digital gateway to the area. This aspect of the Local Industrial Strategy should be included in the letter.

105. Scrutiny of Leisure and Communities Related Cabinet Reports

BH Coastal Lottery Small Grant Scheme Criteria and Proposal to Extend BH Coastal Lottery Across BCP - The Chairman asked the Portfolio Holder for Tourism Leisure and Communities to introduce the report a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'D' to the Cabinet minutes of 15 January in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder outlined the aims of the report and recommendations. A number of points were raised by the Board in the ensuing questioning including:

- That funding for smaller amounts for local charities was difficult to come by and welcomed the expansion. The scheme would be open to Charities from March this year;
- A Councillor had received a letter raising concerns that the Council was encouraging gambling and questioned how the risk of potential gambling addiction would be mitigated and what safeguarding measures were in

place. It was reported that underage gambling would be difficult as a bank account was required, and age had to be verified in order to buy tickets. People in general would buy 1-2 tickets per week and then had to wait for the results from the draw. Due to the fact there was no instant gratification the risks of gambling addiction were minimal. Although any user could self-refer for a refusal to sell further tickets. The scheme was also required to make a donation to gambling addiction charities.

- A Councillor commented that it was great that people could choose where the funding was going and was a form of charitable donation.
- In response to a question about how the funding for good causes would be split once the scheme was expanded geographically the Board was advised that the BCP wide scheme would start from zero as the previous funding pot would be fully distributed first.
- Councillors asked about studies of gambling addiction in relation to the Bournemouth Lottery. It was explained that there wasn't any known but previous research had taken place when establishing the lottery. This could be circulated by email if Councillors wanted it. If there was a significant increase in the quantity of tickets an individual was buying, they would be contacted by the company running the lottery.

Pilot scheme for the use of fixed penalty notices for relevant environmental enforcement issues and associated policy -

The Chairman asked the Portfolio Holder for Tourism Leisure and Communities to introduce the report a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'E' to the Cabinet minutes of 15 January in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder outlined the aims of the report and recommendations. A number of points were raised by the Board in the ensuing questioning including:

- Whether the beachfront would be included within this scheme. It was noted that there was no motivation for specific targets or unnecessary fines. It was important that the beachfront would be included and it was one of the worst areas. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that he had confidence in Council Officers ability to be impartial and neutral in delivering the scheme.
- There was a perception that the previous scheme was extremely harsh but there was no profit involved for Bournemouth.
- A Councillor asked how the amount for the fines was arrived at and the Board was advised that there were benchmarked and were inline with other areas.
- In response to a question it was explained that the Community Safety Accreditation Scheme officers would provide statements as evidence as part of their general role.
- The Board asked about restrictions of the scheme on those who were homeless and about action taken being proportionate. It was noted that there would need to be discretion in the issuing of notices.
- A Councillor asked about how the success of the project would be measured. It was noted that it was difficult to gauge how much litter was actually dropped in the area and public perception would be a better indication of the scheme's effectiveness.

- The Board was informed that Dorset Police were aware of the pilot scheme and the communications strategy for ensuring that the public were aware of the project was being considered.

The Chairman thanked the Portfolio Holder for attending and responding to the issues raised on his reports.

106. Scrutiny of Environment Related Cabinet Reports

The Chairman asked the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Climate Change to introduce the report a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'B' to the Cabinet minutes of 15 January in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder outlined the report. A number of points were raised by the Board in the ensuing questioning including:

- The Board asked for information on what was included within the £4m of funding. It was explained that this excluded Christchurch's fleet for which separate funds had been identified. It included 140 vehicles in total including highways vehicles;
- The Board asked about the considerations given regarding more sustainable vehicles versus the cost of replacement vehicles. The Portfolio Holder commented that the first priority was reducing the amount of waste produced and therefore reducing the need for vehicle use. The current investment from government in electric vehicles was not sufficient and they were therefore still very expensive, 2 to 3 times the price of normal vehicles and BCP did not have the budget available.
- Unfortunately much of the fleet needed replacement in order to continue services over the next few years. Availability of electric vehicles was also an issue.
- A Councillor asked about how much BCP was prepared to spend in monetary terms and in carbon terms. The Portfolio Holder commented that she was looking at a way to value the environmental and economic issues.
- In response to a question the Service Director advised that the Dorset contracts would be coming back in-house to BCP in April and services would be continuing as they were. The fleet would be moving to a sustainable fleet over a period of time to meet the Council's carbon-neutral ambitions;
- The Board raised concerns regarding the lack of detail within the report regarding the vehicle replacement. It was noted that in a previous version of the report these were included but a corporate decision was taken to remove this information as it was a lot of data and would be meaningless to most. The Corporate Director undertook to provide the details of the schedule of vehicles to Cabinet and O&S Board. The Board were concerned that it did not have the level of detail needed to scrutinise properly and that Cabinet did not have all the information available.
- A Councillor raised further concerns about the lack of a long-term fleet strategy along with this report and was disappointed that the two issues had not been brought together. The current necessity for fleet

replacement would target environmental credentials as all cars coming in would improve the current baseline.

- The Board questioned whether different options had been modelled, including high tech vehicles and lease/hire options, as there was no detail contained within the report.
- Concerns were raised again on the lack of detail forthcoming from the report and Portfolio Holder and questioned whether Cabinet had the information it needed to take a decision. Others noted that funding for this had already been approved and the detail was not required, and officers needed to be able to proceed. The Portfolio Holder suggested that the O&S Board could have asked for more information prior to the meeting.

It was moved and seconded that a recommendation be made that the recommendations at 'a' and 'b' in the Cabinet paper should not be discussed but should come back to Cabinet in a separate paper.

Voting: For 2, Against 10, 2 abstentions

There was further discussion about the most appropriate course of action given the Board's dissatisfaction with the information contained within the Cabinet paper. It was agreed that the Board would not make a formal recommendation but that the Chairman should share the general views of the Board with the Cabinet.

107. Future Meeting Dates

The Chairman confirmed that there was likely to be O&S Board meetings at both 2.00pm and 6.00pm on 10 February. The dates for the meetings in March and April were under discussion.

The meeting ended at 8.29 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: 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. Actioned – detail included within report considered by the Board at its meeting in November	To provide context to the budget pressure.	
Actions arising from Board meeting: 4 October 2019				
45	Scrutiny of Corporate related Cabinet reports	Corporate Strategy: The leader undertook to recommend regular refresh of strategy when she presents the report at the Cabinet meeting	To provide a comprehensive response to the queries raised by the Board.	Not recorded within the Cabinet minutes
		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. Response to be received	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	
46	Community Infrastructure Levy	To recommend to Cabinet 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.	To ensure that the issue can progress quickly, and that O&S Board is involved in its development.	Cabinet responded to the recommendations - CIL report on the Cabinet agenda for February

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
		Actioned: Reported to the Cabinet at its meeting in November		
Actions arising from Board meeting: 7 October 2019				
56	Scrutiny of Transport Related Cabinet Reports – BCP Car Parking Strategy	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. Actioned: Request made to Cabinet at its meeting on 9 October	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	Steering group is yet to be established
Actions Arising from Board Meeting: 11 November 2019 – 2.00pm				
65	Call for Evidence – 5G Connectivity	The Overview and Scrutiny Board resolved: a) That Cabinet be asked to consider equitable ways to involve the public more in the consultation around the planning implications of the implementation of 5G technology, particularly with regard to the siting of masts. b) That if Cabinet is minded to approve the deployment by the Council of 5G connectivity as part of the Lansdowne Digital Pilot continuous monitoring takes place to ensure that the levels of radio wave emissions fall within the internationally recognised limits, and the findings be reported back to the Overview and Scrutiny Board. c) That the Board agrees that all information submitted in its call for evidence in relation to 5G connectivity be passed to Public Health England to consider for inclusion in future reviews.	To enable O&S views following the outcome of the 5G call for evidence.	Recommendations accepted by the Cabinet at its meetings in December and January A response has been received from Public Health that "having reviewed the evidence submitted by the public, we conclude that there is nothing new that would cause PHE to

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
		<p>d) That a framework be established for feedback to be provided to the Council in relation to the call for evidence information passed to Public Health England.</p> <p>Actioned: a) the recommendations were included within Cabinet reports b) continuous monitoring will take place – item on Forward Plan to decide how to deal with this issue c) All information was passed to Public Health d) See response from Public Health England.</p>		revise its current position.”
Actions Arising from Board Meeting: 18 December 2019 – 2.00pm				
82	Scrutiny of the Medium Term Financial Plan Update Report	<p>Cabinet Portfolio Holders be requested to provide further detail on budget work and risk analysis on the savings identified to date in figure 1 of the MTFP report to Cabinet of 20 December, to the Overview and Scrutiny Board in January.</p> <p>Actioned: Savings report presented in January</p>	To enable further informed scrutiny prior to the final budget being presented to Cabinet.	Request accepted. Portfolio Holders responded to questions from the Board at its meeting in January.
83	Scrutiny of Bournemouth International Centre Short Term Investment Plan	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Board recommended that Cabinet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Delete recommendation a of the report; 2) Amend recommendation b to read: <p>‘Approves the use of up to £1.8m of Prudential Borrowing at assumed interest rate of 5.5% over 25 years’.</p>	To enable O&S Board’s views to be taken into consideration by Cabinet when making its decision	Recommendations not accepted

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
		Actioned: Recommendations presented to Cabinet at its meeting on 20 December		
Actions Arising from Board Meeting: 18 December 2019 – 6.00pm				
90	Scrutiny of Regeneration Related Cabinet Reports – Poole Regeneration	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Board resolved that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Cabinet be recommended to build on existing work already done in the development of a revised Masterplan for Poole Town Centre; 2) the revised Masterplan for Poole Town Centre be received by the O&S Board for scrutiny, once developed, and prior to wider consultation on the Masterplan; 3) the Acquisition and Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) Strategy be received by the O&S Board for scrutiny, once developed. <p>Actioned: Recommendations reported to Cabinet at its meeting on 20 December</p>	To enable O&S Board's views to be taken into consideration by Cabinet when making its decision	Recommendations adopted by Cabinet
91	Scrutiny of Tourism and Communities Related Cabinet Reports - Community Engagement Strategy	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Board resolved that Cabinet be recommended to build on known good practice and insight gathered by preceding authorities in the development of a Community Engagement Strategy.</p> <p>Actioned: Recommendations reported to Cabinet at its meeting on 20 December</p>	To enable O&S Board's views to be taken into consideration by Cabinet when making its decision	Recommendations not adopted

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
		Fisherman's Walk Super Hut Development The Overview and Scrutiny Board resolved that Cabinet be recommended to retain one of the proposed super huts for use by the Council for good causes and charitable purposes. Actioned: Recommendations reported to Cabinet at its meeting on 20 December	To enable O&S Board's views to be taken into consideration by Cabinet when making its decision	Cabinet supported the principle of the recommendations and would look further into the issues raised.
Actions Arising from Board Meeting: 13 January 2020 – 6.00pm				
	Forward Plan	The Audit & Governance Committee be recommended to ensure that the key principle of engaging the public through Overview and Scrutiny, as outlined in the Constitution, can continue to be met; that public questions may be received by the O&S Board and O&S Committees on any issue within the remit of that O&S body are not restricted to items already listed on the agenda for that meeting.' Actioned: Reported to the Audit and Governance Committee on 23 January – response TBD	To enable O&S Board's views to be taken into consideration by the Audit and Governance Committee when it considers this issue.	
	Scrutiny of Corporate Related Cabinet Reports - Smart Places Programme	The Board agreed that the O&S Board Chairman would write a letter of support to the LEP on behalf of the O&S Board outlining its support for the Smart Places Programme.		

