

Notice of Overview and Scrutiny Board

Date: Monday, 21 September 2020 at 2.00 pm

Venue: Virtual – via Skype



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 D Mellor

Cllr P Miles

Cllr C Rigby

Cllr T Trent

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 view the live stream of this meeting at the following link:

<https://democracy.bcpCouncil.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?MId=4300>

If you would like any further information on the items to be considered at the meeting please contact: Claire Johnston 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

11 September 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
(anne.brown@bcpccouncil.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**

To confirm and sign as a correct record the minutes of the meetings held on 24 August 2020.

5 - 20

4a. **Action Sheet**

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

21 - 24

5. **Public Speaking**

To receive any public questions, statements or petitions submitted in accordance with the Constitution, which is available to view at the following link:

<https://democracy.bcpccouncil.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CommitteeID=151&Info=1&bcr=1>

The deadline for the submission of a public question is 4 clear working days before the meeting.

The deadline for the submission of a public statement is midday the working day before the meeting.

The deadline for the submission of a petition is 10 working days before the meeting.

6. **Chairman's Update**

For the Board to consider any issues raised by the Chairman which are not

dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

7. Covid-19 Recovery - Community and People

To consider observations on the impact of Covid-19 and prospects for future reset and recovery from invited representatives of community and voluntary organisations including:

- Citizens Advice – Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole
- Community Action Network
- Faithworks Wessex

The following Cabinet Portfolio Holders are also invited to attend the Board meeting for consideration of this item:

- Councillor Lewis Allison, Portfolio Holder for Tourism, Leisure and Communities
- Councillor Vikki Slade, Leader of the Council

The purpose of this scrutiny is to listen to a wide range of stakeholders to gain a greater understanding of the wider effects of Covid-19 and to take into account the views of the external stakeholder in future scrutiny of the impact of Covid-19, in line with the Board's role as enabler of the voice and concerns of the public.

8. Covid 19 Recovery - Community and People Council Response

To consider observations on the impact of Covid-19 and prospects for future reset and recovery on the following issues:

- "Together We Can"
- Community Resilience
- Impact on staff / working from home

The following Cabinet Portfolio Holder is also invited to attend the Board meeting for consideration of this item:

- Councillor Vikki Slade, Leader of the Council

The purpose of this scrutiny is to listen to a wide range of stakeholders to gain a greater understanding of the wider effects of Covid-19 and the impact that this has had on the community and BCP Council Employees.

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

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 24 August 2020 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 L Fear, Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene,
Cllr D Mellor, Cllr P Miles, Cllr T Trent, Cllr L Northover (In place of
Cllr C Rigby) and Cllr K Rampton (In place of Cllr M Iyengar)

25. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Iyengar and Rigby.

26. Substitute Members

Councillor Rampton attended the meeting as substitute for Councillor Iyengar. Councillor Northover attended the meeting as substitute for Councillor Rigby.

27. Declarations of Interests

Councillor Brooke declared an interest in Agenda Item 7 (Emergency Active Travel Plan Programme) as a family member resided in Tatnum Road. Councillor Northover declared an interest in Agenda Item 7 as she resided close to the Cleveland Road bridge proposal. Councillor Miles declared an interest in Agenda Item 7 as a family member resided in Oakdale. Councillor Hadley (Portfolio Holder) declared an interest in Agenda Item 7 as he resided in the area of the Tatnum Road proposal.

28. Confirmation of Minutes

For clarification of the declarations made and recorded in the minutes of the meeting held at 6pm on 10 July 2020 it was noted that Councillor M Greene declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest 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 he and his spouse have an interest in a property in the area.

It was also noted that at the same meeting, Councillor N Greene declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest 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 she and her spouse have an interest in a property in the area.

Subject to the above the minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2020 were approved as a correct record.

29. Action Sheet

The Board noted the Action Sheet circulated with the agenda.

30. Public Speaking

The Board noted that 35 Public Statements and one Petition had been received in respect of Agenda Item 7 (Emergency Active Travel Plan Programme) and that details had been circulated to the Board in a supplement to the agenda and were available on the Council's public website.

31. Chairman's Update

The Chairman welcomed the Board's continuing approach to examining a range of forward looking issues relating to recovery in the post Covid19 period which in the current meeting focussed on review of Transport and Infrastructure.

The Chairman informed the Board that Item 8 on the agenda would be taken ahead of Item 7.

32. Scrutiny of Transport and Infrastructure related Cabinet Reports

The Board noted the significant number of public statements submitted in respect of this item. The Chairman informed the Board that he had agreed to a number of requests to read the statements at the meeting although only one speaker was now able to join the meeting. The Board accordingly heard the statement from Mr. J Challinor presented in his capacity as Chair of the Parkstone Bay Association. All the submitted statements had been made available to the Board ahead of the meeting.

The Portfolio Holder, Councillor Hadley, presented the report for scrutiny by the Board prior to its consideration by Cabinet on 9 September 2020. He described the context in which progress had been made under tranche 1 of the Emergency Active Travel Fund Programme and referred to a schedule of schemes in tranche 2. He explained that the aim of the programme was to introduce, at pace, and in response to the pandemic, temporary and experimental active travel measures which also had the potential to become permanent subject to successful trials.

The Board recognised the beneficial work already undertaken as the BCP Council responded to changing travel patterns and the Board recorded its appreciation of the work already undertaken by Council Officers within the Growth and Infrastructure teams particularly in respect of the success that had been achieved in taking full advantage, within very short timescales, of funding available from Central Government.

Comments from the Overview and Scrutiny Board focussed upon the nature of the Central Government Programme and the view of the Board was that communications about the programme, and particularly about the initial temporary nature of specific schemes, could have been improved.

Members were of the view that local ward councillors should have been consulted earlier on in the process of identifying specific local elements of the programme. This would have created the capacity for ward members to consult openly with local residents; to take a balanced approach within the community and to gather information from residents and from interested groups.

Board members highlighted examples where there had been lack of consultation with local services, such as schools and with local organisations that would have been affected, which had led to insufficient assessment of individual schemes in terms of their impact on particular localities. Failure to communicate in a manner that was accessible to local people was also considered to have contributed to the receipt of considerable negative feedback.

Members were also concerned that information they had received had been provided to them on a privileged basis which they were unable to release publicly. This was considered to be despite the fact that there was time available within the overall programme timetable for a much wider and comprehensive consultation. Members therefore described how they looked forward to increased levels of information going forward supported by improved communications with the public and more open dialogue with ward members. It was considered that this could facilitate achievement of higher quality schemes within the spirit of the overall programme.

The Portfolio Holder responded to the views and concerns of the Overview and Scrutiny Board explaining that the intention of the Department of Transport had been that consultation with the public should have been at a later date but he did underline his commitment to much wider consultation going forward into the second tranche of the programme.

It was

RESOLVED

That the recommendation to Cabinet be that Cabinet

1. note the progress to date regarding the delivery of the Tranche 1 Emergency Active Travel Fund Programme and

2. subject to a successful application for Emergency Active Travel Fund Tranche 2 approves the delegation of decision making regarding the progression of the indicative Tranche 2 Emergency Active Travel Fund Programme to the Director of Growth & Infrastructure in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure and following consultation between the Portfolio Holder and ward councillors and adjacent ward councillors at the earliest possible opportunity

Voting: For – 12; Against – 1; Abstain – 2.

Councillor Farquhar requested that his vote for the resolution be recorded in the Minutes.

It was also

RESOLVED that

The Overview and Scrutiny Board expresses its disappointment at the lack of engagement with ward councillors who were prevented from

onward consultation with their communities. It believes that this democratic deficit significantly increased the concern and confusion which inevitably followed among the public.

Voting: For – 9; Against – 4; Abstain – 2.

Councillor Farquhar requested that his vote against the resolution be recorded in the Minutes.

33. Covid-19 Recovery - Transport and Infrastructure

Regional Development Manager of South Western Trains, Andrew Ardley, described the measures and processes being adopted across the rail network in response to the Coronavirus pandemic. He set out the enhanced regime of train and station cleaning being undertaken and outlined measures being taken to educate customers and to promote good practice. It was explained that the rail service was currently operating under the terms of an Emergency Measures Agreement prescribed by Central Government although the Agreement was expected to be reviewed in September 2020.

In practice this was all reported to be happening within the context of significant changes in travel patterns with considerable reduction in passenger numbers.

Initiatives being pursued going forward included exploration of new opportunities for flexible ticketing and improved facilities for customers in trains and at stations. Examples included improvements in toilets and other facilities on stations and better provision for cycles and storage and carriage of luggage.

There was a recognition of the benefits of working in partnership with BCP Council to identify and assess likely changes in future travel patterns and to develop an appropriate response. This could potentially encompass provision of facilities available in stations and a better understanding of the way in which passengers travel to the station for onward rail travel. There was agreement that the Council was very well placed to have a role in gathering customer and user information from the local public.

The following responses were provided in response to questions raised by members of the Overview and Scrutiny Board:

Assurances were provided that a wide range of flexible ticketing options were being examined and prepared for submission through to Central Government regulators.

The concerns of local people around visitors travelling on trains and arriving in the area without wearing face coverings had already been highlighted and the Board was assured that everything possible within the powers of the rail operators was being done to enforce compliance with regulations including the involvement of the Police and the Transport Police who were the only bodies authorised to take punitive enforcement action.

In relation to Pokesdown station, complex options for station development and improvement continued to be developed and discussions were ongoing.

The Chair of BH Active Travel, Jason Falconer, described his organisation's ongoing dialogue with BCP Council at Councillor and at Officer level and there was enthusiasm expressed for working with the Council on the provision of clear communication for the public on available alternative

travel options. A number of positive initiatives were in place across the BCP Council area including, for example, the 'Beryl Bikes' scheme and reducing vehicle use in areas such as town centres and in beach areas was expressed as a continuing priority.

The Board once again recognised the beneficial work already undertaken as the BCP Council responded to changing travel patterns and the Board recorded its appreciation of the work already undertaken by Council Officers within the Growth and Infrastructure teams particularly in respect of the success that had been achieved in taking full advantage, within very short timescales, of funding available from Central Government.

The Operations Director of GoSW Busses, David Lee-Kong, reported a similar slump in numbers of bus passengers and described the continuing impact and effect of Central Government's comments early in the pandemic which encouraged avoidance of public transport. Although this message was no longer being promoted, targeted messages were still required to counter-balance these early messages and to bring passengers back into the network.

Support provided by the Council and its Officers was welcomed and grants from Central Government had enabled the maintenance of, an albeit much reduced, service for local key workers. From September, however, it was hoped to be able to return to 100% of network mileage although with each vehicle running at 50% of capacity in order to maintain social distancing. Provision of the school bus service routes would also be fully introduced with extra capacity should it prove to be required.

The Managing Director of Yellow Busses, David Squire, described the impact upon Yellow Busses services and provided the Board with further detail about the risk assessment approach across the bus service sector and the improvements that had resulted from it. Once again, services were being increased from September with considerable effort being focussed on communicating with the public.

Against this background, the Board noted with concern the reported level of abuse directed against bus staff particularly on the subject of wearing of face coverings and the efforts being made to address this were noted.

The following responses were provided in response to questions raised by members of the Overview and Scrutiny Board:

It was confirmed that bus companies were continuing to look at alternative types of bus (electric busses for example) and that some trials were taking place, although not presently within the BCP Council area. Further development was likely to be dependent on return to a sound financial situation post pandemic and when there was, once again, financial capacity for development.

Assurances were provided about the measures being taken to provide a safe working environment for staff with current risk being identified and addressed. Individual employees were integral to the process as well as the close involvement of Trade Unions.

In response to questions about routes and fares it was explained that fares could not be increased during the pandemic period as the companies continued to operate under the Emergency Agreement. This was also regulated under national policy although some initiatives were being pursued. Examples included working with the Councils to obtain funding to help integrate bus routes into large new housing developments. Bus

companies also anticipated the need to respond to the changing patterns of passenger travel resulting from the changes generally to the economic and wider employment situation within the BCP area.

The Chairman of the Board thanked the representatives of the travel infrastructure companies for their helpful insights and informative presentations. The Board welcomed the positive approaches towards planning for recovery during the post Covis19 period.

The meeting ended at Time Not Specified

CHAIRMAN

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 24 August 2020 at 6.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr M Haines – Vice-Chairman (in the Chair)

Present: Cllr M Anderson, Cllr S Bartlett, Cllr M F Brooke, Cllr B Dove,
Cllr M Earl, Cllr L-J Evans, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr L Fear,
Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene, Cllr D Mellor, Cllr K Rampton,
Cllr C Rigby and Cllr T Trent

Also in attendance: Councillor Vikki Slade
Councillor Andy Hadley
Councillor Margaret Phipps
Councillor Dr Felicity Rice
Councillor Diana Butler

33. Apologies

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

34. Substitute Members

The following substitute members had been confirmed by the Group Leaders or their nominated representatives: Cllrs B Dove and K Rampton were substituting for Cllrs P Broadhead and M Iyengar respectively and Cllr L-J Evans was substituting for Cllr P Miles.

35. Declarations of Interests

Cllrs M Greene and N Greene declared a pecuniary interest in the item on the agenda relating to the Public Spaces Protection Order as they had an interest in a company that part owned a business with a property in Poole High Street and therefore declared that they would not take part in the discussion nor the vote on this item.

Other such interests which Members wished to declare

Cllr S Bartlett declared a local interest in the item on BH Live due to his appointment as a director of BH Enterprises Ltd, but did not feel that he was pre-determined or biased on the subject and would therefore continue to take part in the discussion.

Cllr M Greene declared that he was a part of the working group that had developed the Parking Standards SPD and as such would make a representation to the board, but would not take part in further discussion.

36. Public Speaking

No public issues were raised at the meeting.

37. Community Safety Partnership Report

The Leader of the Council presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'A' to these Minutes in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- The report referred to a specific domestic abuse helpline, but this was not easy to find on the council's website. The Leader of the Council explained that there had been some work recently undertaken on the website, which had caused some issues where pages had been moved around. Nonetheless, she agreed that it was important that the helpline be more visible to those who may need it and would feed this back to the web team.
- A Board member commented that the council needed to prioritise anti-social behaviour hotspots by providing appropriate levels of streetlighting, keeping areas visible through other means and the expansion of the CSAS officer scheme. The Leader advised that general neighbourhood issues were not for the Community Safety Partnership to deal with, as they took a more strategic role, but was instead for different areas of the council to manage to ensure that harm was reduced. She added the CSP dealt with multi-agency matters, where as the council's responsibility was to deal with internal matters. The Leader further explained that the CSAS officer scheme had been expanded already and that there were ambitions to expand even further, but the Council needed to work with the resources that it had available to it.
- A Board Member stated that she felt it was important that there were clear and established protocols which set out responsibilities of functions and that it was imperative that the Council worked with multiple agencies to do this and co-ordinate with them effectively in ASB hotspots. The Leader explained that the closure of alleyways in areas with well known problems, including the bus station in Poole had been successful in reducing ASB issues. Other measures had unfortunately been delayed due to Covid-19. Officers were also in the process of building relationships with neighbourhood policing teams and ward councillors to identify hotspots.
- A Board member stated that she was pleased to see reference to West Hill within the report and questioned what would be done to move the issues forward during the establishment of the proposed Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy and whether or not the O&S Board would be involved in this work, or if it would be dealt with elsewhere. The Leader explained that the Crime and Disorder Strategy would be considered by the cabinet in due course, likely to be in the next six months. She added that the work of the CSP had been paused to focus on work relating to Covid and was about 3-6 months behind as a result. Furthermore, the CSP was led by the

police and whilst the council were a partner, they had to be led by the police during the production of the plan, but all strategies would have the opportunity to be considered by the O&S Board as the decision to adopt would need to be taken by the Cabinet. There was good progress being made in regard to the problems experienced in the West Hill area and dedicated staff were now based there to assist in resolving the ongoing issues.

- Responding to a Board member's suggestion that the Board established a body for considering how this type of strategy would be looked at in the future, the Vice-Chairman stated that she felt this would be a discussion most suitable for another occasion.
- A Board member commented that in his opinion, the local ASB team were positive when dealing with issues as and when they arose, and that he hoped there may even be a reduction when children returned to school due to the structure that they would return to. He added that in his view it was important to prevent issues rather than react with a heavy-handed approach. He added that he would like to see the return of Safer Neighbourhood Teams as they had previously worked very well. The Leader explained that the measure of success would be evident when the delivery plan was available and that it was important that the fine line between ASB teams and the police was acknowledged. She added that Safer Neighbourhood Teams had become Neighbourhood Policing Teams and that the council was working with partners to ensure a consistent approach that was fit for purpose was applied across the conurbation.

In summing up the discussion, the vice-chairman highlighted that she had not identified any specific recommendations from the discussion, but felt that some comments should be taken on board.

38. Scrutiny of the Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPO)

The Leader of the Council presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'B' to these Minutes in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- A Board member queried the results of the consultation, specifically the removal of clauses b-e, and stated that the proposals seemed to contradict some of the results of the responses received. She added that she felt it had been an odd time to undertake such a consultation and could not understand the rationale behind removing the clauses before further consulting on a conurbation-wide PSPO because it was not clear from the consultation that had already happened in relation to the Holes Bay and Poole Town Centre PSPO, what people really thought about it. She therefore proposed that the clauses that were due to be removed be retained for the consultation across the conurbation, which was duly seconded.

In discussing the proposed amendment there were a variety of opinions and a number of issues were raised by Board Members, including:

- There was a mandate for the consultation to go ahead as planned, as the figures were balanced. Additionally, it would be counter-productive to issue fines to those already in poverty and the removal of clauses b-e was appropriate.
- The PSPO in its current form was prejudicial to those in need and could put the Council at risk of challenge via Judicial Review.
- There was an evidence base to support the use of PSPO's and that the current one had been successful in its operation as it's purpose was to prevent issues and the proof was that since its introduction only three fixed penalty notices had been issued.
- A member had conducted a walk around Bournemouth Town Centre after lockdown measures had been eased and made a note of his observations. He added that while he did have sympathy with those less fortunate, there was clearly an issue with the town centre and the measures currently weren't working stating that residents, visitors and businesses were becoming fed up with these issues and he would therefore support the amendment as proposed.
- Dealing with issues in a heavy-handed way was not always the best approach and more sympathy should be shown as everyone was generally within a few pay checks away from poverty.
- Intervention was the best solution rather than enforcement and this would involve working more closely with external agencies.

The Board took a vote on the motion and it was:

RECOMMENDED that no changes should be made to the existing Poole Town Centre and Holes Bay PSPO and that its existing clauses (a-g) be included as part of the BCP wide Public Spaces Protection Order consultation.

Voting: For – 7 Against – 6

Cllrs G Farquhar and C Rigby requested that their votes against the motion be recorded in the minutes.

Cllrs M Greene and N Greene did not vote due to their declared interest.

39. Scrutiny of Transport and Infrastructure related Cabinet Reports

The Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'C' to these Minutes in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- A Board member questioned the priorities for cyclists versus vehicles exiting, entering side roads along Wallisdown Road and stated that she was also eager to see the plans relating to junction improvements at Ringwood Road and Sea View Road and hoped

that Ward Councillors would be involved at the earliest available opportunity. The Portfolio Holder explained that the “treatment” of the sideroads would be continuous pavement. He added that Ward Councillors would be involved at an early stage.

- A Board member commented that it would be useful to have video briefings, as was suggested at the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Board by another Board member.
- A Board member stated that he welcomed the scheme and requested that continuous pavements were implemented correctly and reminded the portfolio holder that visibility splays at junctions needed to be appropriate for the safety of all users.
- A Board member stated that he was hopeful that no increase in congestion or journey times would be caused by the Wallisdown Road scheme. The Portfolio Holder stated that there was some discussion about the possible closure of some sideroads that contributed to the congestion of the area and Ward Councillors would be included as part of these.
- A Board member stated that it was encouraging to hear the ambition to involve ward councillors in future discussions, but he would also like to see neighbouring ward councillors involved too.

The Chairman thanked Members and the Portfolio Holder for their contributions and reiterated the importance of engaging with ward councillors.

40. Scrutiny of Planning Related Cabinet Reports

The Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'D' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Cllr M Greene had been a part of the working group that was referred to in the report and made a representation to the board, details included:

- This was a well-balanced document that set out requirements for parking that was appropriate for the location and type of property that developers could refer to.
- There should no longer be a requirement to ensure that there were parking facilities for residential developments within the town centre.
- Roads in the area were heavily congested with on-street parking and there was a strong desire to avoid the displacement of parking issues.
- The document contained a section that would only be applicable once changes were made to the Traffic Regulation Order process.
- It was hoped that the proposed zoned approach would be welcomed and that during consultation if the public raised queries into the proposed zones needing adjusting, then these views would be taken into account and the appropriate adjustments made.

A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- A Board member commented that he was impressed with the proposed document, although the overriding issue would be the management of parking displacement throughout the zoning and that he hoped the consultation period would assist. He added that he felt it should be mandatory, rather than at the discretion of officers, for developers to provide a full parking assessment where developments did not conform to the document. The Portfolio Holder stated that there was a whole raft of solutions to counter parking issues in the proposed zones, which would ensure that the system would work.
- A board member felt the document to be comprehensive, but did have concerns about the recent changes to planning laws and how this might affect the requirements of the document. He also queried the wording around Paragraph 30 of the document. The Portfolio Holder stated the wording referred to in Paragraph 30 was an error and would be corrected. She also explained that parking issues would be considered under highway matters and this would also be applicable to prior approvals.
- The Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure stated that one of the mechanisms built into this document was encouraging the use of car clubs to reduce the number of vehicles on the road.

The Chairman thanked the Portfolio Holders and Board Members for their input.

41. Scrutiny of Environment Related Cabinet Reports

The Environment and Climate Change presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'E' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

The Chairman welcomed Cllr D Butler to the meeting to make a representation to the Board, details included:

- Cllr Butler felt that existing system of bins that was used in Poole i.e. colours and sizes would be most appropriate going forward based on need.
- Made suggestions of how existing bins could be utilised and /or redistributed across the conurbation.
- She felt that the charges relating to garden waste bins were at risk of becoming too high to the point where residents no longer felt it to be a cost-effective option.

A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- A Board member stated that he was disappointed in the proposed removal of WEEE collections from the service and would prefer for it to continue. He added that the Council should look at replacing the

180 litre bins in Poole with 140 litre bins. The Portfolio Holder advised that she understood concerns about the removal of WEEE collections, but that the scheme was not performing to a standard that officers were satisfied with. Instead, work would be undertaken to promote WEEE collection points. Additionally, some legislative changes were due to be made which would transfer responsibility for recycling of such goods to manufacturers.

- A Board member questioned the cost of replacement of different bins and indeed the rationale for doing so and stated that it was important to ensure fairness across the board. The Portfolio Holder advised that she didn't have figures to hand on the cost of fully coloured bins over black bins with coloured lids but needed to ensure that the waste service was efficiently run. She added that there was a move nationally to have one bin colour with a different coloured lid depending on purpose. If residents in Bournemouth wished to keep 140 litre bins it was their right to do so, but there would be no difference in cost.
- A Board Member stated that she felt there to be an inequity of service across the garden waste scheme and that she felt the increase in price to be extraordinary. The Portfolio Holder advised that the cost of £55 was for a replacement bin, not for the cost of the green waste service itself.

A Board member declared that he wished to propose a motion that would seek to review CCTV footage if residents claimed damage was caused by the Council and if proven, the council replace bin free of charge. Additionally, he wished for Officers to investigate the cost of repairing lids rather than replacing entire bins. This motion was duly seconded by Cllr G Farquhar.

A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- The Chairman requested that the officer present provided clarity on the costs and/or impact to the council in the event that the motion passed. It was confirmed that the replacement of lids was already an adopted standard where practical, although this was not always possible due to the fact that some bins were over 20 years old. He added that crews were honest in terms of breakages and any such occurrence would be logged, although generally it would be attributed to the overloading of bins.
- A Board member stated that he had concerns in relation to charges for replacement bins and that there was no line within the financial implications section that accounted for lost bins. He added that it seemed unreasonable to ask residents to fund bin replacements on worn out bins, which, in his opinion, should be at the cost of the Council and he further questioned why residents should always be responsible for costs. Adding to points already raised he commented that the CCTV on refuse vehicles was not always operational and that charges for replacements should be covered by the service charge, unless obvious evidence of negligence. The Portfolio Holder

advised that where residents were charged for replacement bins, it would encourage them to be responsible for them, but added that Officers had certain levels of discretion for issuing replacement bins.

- A Board member stated that he felt it may be necessary to clarify in the report who bins were owned by. He added that some of the bins in Bournemouth were very old and that there could be a temptation for bins to be broken and therefore wished to ascertain if replacement waste bins were chargeable. The Portfolio Holder advised that where a bin broke and was replaced at a cost to the resident, it became their property, not the Council's, this did not apply to the green bin service. She did acknowledge the point made in relation to the temptation of bin breakages and stated that this was something that would need to be closely monitored.

Having discussed the motion in great detail, the Board took a vote and the motion was LOST

Voting: For – 7

Against – 7

Abstentions – 1

As the vote was split, the Chairman used her casting vote and the motion was therefore not taken forward.

A Board member declared that he wished to propose a motion that would ensure that residents would not be charged for replacement of, or repairs to waste containers in the event that they had been broken or gone missing through no fault of their own unless the container was owned outright by the resident. This motion was duly seconded by Cllr M Anderson

A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- A Board member requested the number of bins damaged annually and the cost related to this. Officers did not have these figures available but would provide them at a later date
- A Board member sought clarification in relation to the ownership of bins. The proposer of the motion clarified that if the bin was in the ownership of the resident, any damaged caused would need to be remedied by them, not the Council.

Having discussed the motion and there being no further comments or queries, the Board took a vote and the motion was CARRIED

Voting: For – 10

Against – 4

Abstentions – 1

A number of additional issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- A Board member raised three questions:
 1. Is the intention to replace the garden waste bins in time for the new season. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that this was the case.

2. What was the evidence base for the removal of free food waste liners from the service. The Portfolio Holder advised that when the liners were introduced, the food waste recycling process was very different to how it was now and that the centrifugal system currently employed at the facility automatically removed any plastic-like material, including the bags, meaning they were now surplus to requirements.
 3. The increase in size of refuse bins seems counter-productive, what is the predicted effect of increasing the size of bins. The Portfolio Holder advised that it was to do with the operational effectiveness of bringing three services together and that only bins that were being replaced would see an increased size, this was not a full rollout. The council also had a responsibility to ensure that it was prepared for any changes that might come forward in relation to waste policy over the course of the next ten years. No extensive modelling had been done due to time limitations.
- A Board Member sought clarity in relation to discounts for certain residents for the green waste service. The Portfolio Holder advised that this was being considered as part of a different harmonisation project but was unsure if will continue into next year.

The Chairman requested that once details of access to leisure known, that they be circulated to Board members.

RECOMMENDED that residents should not be charged for replacement of, or repairs to waste containers in the event that they have been broken or have gone missing through no fault of their own unless the container is owned outright by the resident.

Voting: For – 10

Against – 1

Abstentions – 4

42. Scrutiny of Corporate Related Cabinet Reports

The Leader of the Council presented a report relating to corporate performance, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'F' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

There were no questions, comments or debate in relation to this item.

43. Forward Plan

The Vice-Chairman presented the forward plan, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'G' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- A Board Member stated that, in his opinion, some items seemed to be an inefficient use of the Board's time, referring to the previous item, and suggested that a different process for the planning of the Board's forward plan be explored.
- A Board Member stated that he sympathised with the previous speaker's point of view, he felt that the current process was fine.
- A Board Member agreed and explained that the board was not aware of the content of each report until the agenda was published and, on this occasion, there had been no discussion, but he was content with the existing process.

RESOLVED that the forward plan be noted.

44. Future Meeting Dates 2020/21

The dates for future meetings of the Board were noted.

45. 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.

46. Feedback from the Working Group on BH Live / Leisure Services

Cllrs D Mellor, G Farquhar and S Bartlett provided a brief update from the working group.

47. Scrutiny of the Cabinet Report on the Disposal of Broadwaters, Wick Lane

The Board considered the confidential report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member.

The meeting ended at 9.42 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: 10 February 2020 – 2.00pm				
113	Chairman's Update	<p>Carter Expansion Project Update – the Board noted that this item recorded on the Cabinet Forward Plan was not selected for scrutiny but had a financial element within it. The Board agreed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To recommend that the Children's O&S Committee should maintain an overview of this matter; 2. That Councillors Mike Brooke and Nicola Greene be agreed by the Board as members who will maintain an informal overview of this matter in relation to the financial aspects of the project, and to report back to the O&S Board as required. <p>Action: TBC</p>	To enable continued overview and scrutiny during this project and if felt necessary, a report back to O&S Board.	
Actions Arising from Board Meeting: 16 March 2020 – 2.00pm				
133	Forward Plan	<p>Board to ask representatives of SW Rail to attend and provide an update on the situation regarding Pokesdown Lift by July 2020.</p> <p>Actioned: SWR representatives attended the meeting held on 24 August 2020</p>	To inform future meetings of the Board	
Actions Arising from Board Meeting: 20 April 2020 – 2.00pm				
-	Future meetings	That the Chairman, along with the Chairmen of both O&S Committees and Democratic Services, will maintain a review of issues relating to Covid-19 which may require scrutiny and any resulting need for an		

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
		<p>additional meeting of the Board that is not in accordance with the current published timetable of meetings for the Board. In discussing this Board members indicated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the need to work closely with the Chief Executive on this to avoid diverting officers from critical workload; a possible need for a meeting when lockdown ends; the need to maintain close communications between all three O&S Chairmen, and Chairmen with their own Committees. <p>Actioned – Ongoing but initial period of restrictions due to Covid-19 has ended. Other committees have resumed meetings. No longer required to remain on action sheet.</p>		
Actions Arising from Board Meeting: 24 August 2020 – 2.00pm				
32	Scrutiny of Transport and Infrastructure Related Cabinet Reports	<p>Recommended to Cabinet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> note the progress to date regarding the delivery of the Tranche 1 Emergency Active Travel Fund Programme and subject to a successful application for Emergency Active Travel Fund Tranche 2 approves the delegation of decision making regarding the progression of the indicative Tranche 2 Emergency Active Travel Fund Programme to the Director of Growth & Infrastructure in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure and following consultation between the Portfolio Holder and ward councillors and adjacent ward councillors at the earliest possible opportunity 	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	See Cabinet minutes for response to the recommendation

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
		Actioned: Reported to the Cabinet meeting on 9 September		
Actions Arising from Board Meeting: 24 August 2020 – 6.00pm				
38	Scrutiny of the Public Spaces Protection Orders	Recommended to Cabinet: that no changes should be made to the existing Poole Town Centre and Holes Bay PSPO and that its existing clauses (a-g) be included as part of the BCP wide Public Spaces Protection Order consultation. Actioned: Reported to the Cabinet meeting on 9 September	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	See Cabinet minutes for the response to the recommendation
41	Scrutiny of Environment Related Cabinet Reports	Recommended to Cabinet: That residents should not be charged for replacement of, or repairs to waste containers in the event that they have been broken or have gone missing through no fault of their own unless the container is owned outright by the resident. Actioned: Reported to the Cabinet meeting on 9 September	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	See Cabinet minutes for the response to the recommendation

This page is intentionally left blank