

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

Minutes of the Meeting held on 20 July 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 D Mellor, Cllr C Rigby and Cllr T Trent

Also in attendance: Councillor David Brown  
Councillor Lesley Dedman  
Councillor Andy Hadley  
Councillor Mark Howell  
Councillor Sandra Moore  
Councillor Lisa Northover  
Councillor Margaret Phipps  
Councillor Vikki Slade  
Councillor Lawrence Williams  
Councillor Kieron Wilson

12. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllr P Miles.

13. Substitute Members

There were no substitute members.

14. Declarations of Interests

- Cllr M Anderson, M Brooke, M Haines, M Iyengar declared local interests for the purpose of transparency in agenda item 9, Scrutiny of Planning Related Cabinet Reports – Adoption of Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), as they were involved in local neighbourhood forums.
- Cllr S Bartlett declared a local interest in agenda item 12, Scrutiny of the Report on the impact of Covid-19 on the Leisure and Cultural Services in Bournemouth as he was a director of BH Live Enterprises. He would not take part in the discussion in voting on this item.
- Cllr M Greene and Cllr N Greene declared Disclosable Pecuniary Interests in agenda item 8, Scrutiny of Transport and Infrastructure Related Cabinet Reports, Traffic Regulation Orders – Advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders for the Lansdowne Programme as the owned property in the area.
- Cllr M Anderson, M Earle and M Haines declared, in relation to agenda item 12 Scrutiny of the Report on the impact of Covid-19 on the Leisure

and Cultural Services in Bournemouth and Poole, for the purpose of transparency that they were members of leisure facilities which were the subject of the reports (it was noted that the monitoring officer would provide advice on these interests when this item was considered).

15. Public Speaking

There were no public questions, statements of petitions for this meeting.

16. Chairman's Update

There were no further updates to provide at this meeting.

17. Forward Plan

**RESOLVED: That the Chairman and Vice-Chairman continue to review the Board's Forward plan and agree the items for consideration for the next and future meetings.**

18. Scrutiny of Finance Related Cabinet Reports

**2019/20 Outturn Report** - The Portfolio Holder for Finance introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix C to the Cabinet minutes of 29 July 2020 in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- The Overspend in Children's Services which was related to SEND and Transport costs for additional children. The Portfolio Holder advised that the movement between Q3 and the outturn was very small. SEND transport was a major area of pressure but what this was as an overall percentage of the budget would need to be confirmed. This overall trend was being addressed by increasing the number of SEND places.
- The Investment Portfolio and the return on the property portfolio and how these were performing. It was noted that the performance of investments had changed considerably between last year and this year due to the impact of the pandemic. Tenants in the retail and business premises owned by the Council had been closed down. Last year investments had performed reasonably well but there would be a significant impact this year,
- There was a query raised regarding the difference in costs for the Housing Revenue account between Bournemouth and Poole. It was noted that both were managed differently, Bournemouth was run in-house and it appeared there was variation in what costs were apportioned to the management of social housing. It needed to be ascertained whether there was a real difference in management costs or if this was a byproduct of the way in which the calculations were made.
- What the impact of the Covid pandemic was on the forecasts outlined in the report, in particular how this had affected the revenue from car parking. It was noted that this was one of the areas most significantly impacted by the lockdown measures. There had been a number of discussions on forecasts and the issues within Regeneration and Economy. However, a lot of the impacts were unanticipated. Reduced

trading at the end of the financial year had affected the outturn for the directorate.

- It was noted that the adjustments and corrections to the legacy budgets would be a one-off benefit. These had been worked on throughout the year, but it was only at the end of the year that this could be realised. It was confirmed that there were a number of 'one offs' during the first year of BCP.

A query was raised regarding a reduction in Capital spend in relation to the programme of cliff stabilisation. The Portfolio Holder advised that he would need to respond to particular aspects of the Capital Programme outside of the meeting. There had been significant changes to the budget throughout the financial year but the figures provided in the report were close to quarter 3. An Officer confirmed that the terms of this aspect of the Capital Programme were outlined in appendix 6 and were still included for the current financial year.

19. Scrutiny of Transport and Infrastructure Related Cabinet Reports

**Traffic Regulation Orders – Advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders for the Lansdowne Programme** - The Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix J to the Cabinet minutes of 29 July 2020 in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- There were significant changes and trade-offs to be made within the Lansdowne Programme. The new pedestrianised plaza at the Lansdowne Roundabout end appeared now not to be happening with bus movements meaning the full transformation would not be possible but the scheme was delivering the downside of increased car travel times.
- It was noted that the original bid was for £18million but the scheme had only received £8million worth of investment from the Local Enterprise Partnership it therefore necessitated changes to the initial proposals. It was also noted that some issues with the scheme were not highlighted early enough in the process. There would still be a fully pedestrianised area at fire station square, but the bus hub would be within the area.
- Further concerns were raised about the impact that would be had on car journeys and what the most recent modelling of this had shown. It was noted that the potential impact on car journeys was approximately 9 minutes. A Councillor suggested that the scheme should not proceed as it was currently presented with continuing bus traffic through the area. A Portfolio holder advised that buses would only be able to use fewer polluting vehicles on routes through the area. It was also noted that when the bid for the scheme was first put in there were a number of issues which had not been considered and BCP were trying to get the scheme into a sustainable position from that which was inherited from the preceding Council.
- Other Board members supported the scheme and in particular ensuring that buses were able to run easily and efficiently through the area and felt that the while scheme provided the right balance. It was noted that if

there was a dispute with the bus companies this could contribute to a significant delay to the scheme. There would be no more buses on the route than currently.

- A Councillor questioned the situation with regards to using the funding for the scheme. It was noted that the deadline for use of the LEP funding was 2021.

**RECOMMENDED:** That, in light of the significant changes to the proposed scheme, that Cabinet seriously consider whether the benefits of the revised scheme outweigh the negatives, particularly around the implications to vehicle traffic and car travel times.

Voting: For: 8, Against: 4

Two Board members had declared a DPI for this item and therefore did not take part in the vote.

20. Scrutiny of Planning Related Cabinet Reports

**Adoption of Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)** - The Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix D to the Cabinet minutes of 29 July 2020 in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- A Councillor suggested that Neighbourhood Forums should be specifically listed in Appendix 3. The Portfolio Holder agreed that this should be the case.
- It was suggested that the process outlined in the flowchart at paragraph 3.5 should include the call-in process for Councillors. It was noted that the Audit and Governance Committee had recently looked at this process.
- It was noted that with the Covid situation the use of more digital technology was required in the planning engagement process
- In appendix 1 to the report paragraph 2.11 the reference to Christchurch needed to be changed to Poole.
- A Board member commented that there appeared to be a worsening of contact with the Planning Department, it was noted that everyone was doing their best under these difficult circumstances but Councillors should contact the Head of Planning if they were unable to get hold of anybody.

A Councillor commented that digital access should be used to engage a wider range of residents and target the most appropriate people with regards to particular planning applications.

21. Scrutiny of Housing Related Cabinet Reports

**Housing Scheme at Cabbage Patch St Stephens Road Bournemouth** - The Portfolio Holder for [Housing](#) introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix G to the Cabinet minutes of 29 July 2020 in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- A Councillor raised concerns regarding the costs of the unit builds for the properties. It was noted that these were being built to Passivhaus standards which would necessitate an increase on the build costs. It was noted that the land value that was used was in line with the normal process used for such developments.
- It was suggested that with Planning permission obtained for the site, the site should be sold off to the private sector at market value to ensure better value for money for the Council. The receipt from this could then be used to buy other properties to be used for social rent. This would be an improvement even if it was decided to make an offset for Passivhaus standards. The scheme in question represented a disadvantage to the Council Tax-payer and was not good for those on the housing waiting list as more homes could be obtained at a reduced cost from that outlined in the report. Another Councillor argued that buying and converting properties was not always economical
- It was noted that the location was accessible for the whole of the BCP area and it was therefore suggested that no parking should be provided at the site which may allow for additional units on the site.
- A Councillor commented that the site was deemed suitable for small housing units and should be looked at for further sites across the area.
- Another councillor commented that putting further units onto a small site didn't necessarily serve the local community and that this site provided homes suitable for the modern age whilst meeting carbon standards and getting people off of the housing register.

22. Future Meeting Dates 2020/21

The dates for future meetings of the Board were noted.

23. Exclusion of Press and Public

**RESOLVED 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.**

24. Scrutiny of the Cabinet Report on Impact of Covid-19 on Leisure and Cultural services in Bournemouth and Cabinet Report on Impact of Covid-19 on Leisure Services in Poole

This item was restricted by virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

The monitoring officer advised the Board that for the purposes of participating in the item, a membership with one or more of the bodies referred to in the reports would not be considered a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and preclude a Councillor from taking part.

**Bournemouth** - The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as a non-public Appendix to the Cabinet minutes of 29 July 2020 in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion. The Board were concerned that further information was needed in order for them to make a decision.

**Poole** - The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as a non-public Appendix to the Cabinet minutes of 29 July 2020 in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion.

**RESOVLED: This Board believes that there is currently insufficient information available to support this paper and therefore the Scrutiny Board will set up an immediate member working party to consider all options open to the Council in how it can support its leisure offer both in relation to BH Live and leisure provision across BCP as a whole.**

Voting: For: 8; Against 6

Cllr G Farquhar asked for his vote against the resolution to be recorded.

The meeting ended at 9.43 pm

CHAIRMAN