

Notice of Overview and Scrutiny Board

Date: Monday, 20 April 2020 at 2.00 pm

Venue: Skype meeting



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 Maidment

Cllr D Mellor

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 view the live feed from the Skype meeting at:

<https://democracy.bcpCouncil.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=292&MId=4472&Ver=4>

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

Press enquiries should be directed to the Press Office: 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

8 April 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

To confirm and sign as a correct record the minutes of the meetings held at 2.00 pm and 6.00 pm on 10 February and 16 March.

7 - 42

a) Action Sheet

To note and comment on the Board's Action Sheet as required.

43 - 46

5. Public Issues

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 Thursday 9 April 2020.

The deadline for the submission of a statement is 12.00 noon, Friday 17 April 2020.

The deadline for the submission of a petition is 12.00 noon, Friday 17 April 2020.

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. Scrutiny of Capital Investment to Increase Special Educational Needs Capacity

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

Cabinet member invited to attend for this item: Councillor Sandra Moore, Portfolio Holder for Children and Families.

The Cabinet report will be published on Tuesday 14 April 2020 and available to view at the following link:

<https://democracy.bcpccouncil.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=285&MId=3729&Ver=4>

8. Council's Response to the Covid-19 Corona Virus Epidemic

To consider an update from the Chief Executive and relevant Portfolio Holders on the Council's actions in relation to the Corona Virus. Along with verbal updates at the meeting, a Cabinet paper provided by the Chief Executive on this matter will inform this discussion.

This will be published on Tuesday 14 April 2020 and available to view at the following link:

<https://democracy.bcpccouncil.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=285&MId=3729&Ver=4>

The purpose of this scrutiny is to seek assurance that the Council is taking all appropriate actions and to take into account any particular concerns from councillors acting in their community role, in line with the Board's role as enabler of the voice and concerns of the public. The following councillors are invited, along with relevant officers, to attend for this item and provide updates in relation to their service areas:

Councillor Vikki Slade, Leader of the Council
Councillor Sandra Moore, Portfolio Holder for Children and Families
Councillor Lesley Dedman, Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health
Councillor Dr Felicity Rice, Portfolio Holder for Environment and Climate Change
Councillor David Brown, Portfolio Holder for Finance

The Chairmen of the other Overview and Scrutiny Committees of the Council are also invited to attend and participate in this item.

9. Future Meeting Dates 2020/21

To consider the following meeting dates and locations for the 2020/21 municipal year. Meetings are scheduled for 2.00pm and 6.00pm each day.

- 18 May 2020 - Christchurch
- 22 June 2020 - Bournemouth
- 20 July 2020 - Christchurch
- 24 August 2020 - Poole

- 21 September 2020 - Bournemouth
- 19 October 2020 - Christchurch
- 16 November 2020 - Poole
- 7 December 2020 - Bournemouth
- 4 January 2021 - Christchurch
- 1 February 2021 - Poole
- 1 March 2021 - Bournemouth
- 1 April 2021 – Christchurch

Venues or video conferencing are to be confirmed.

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 10 February 2020 at 2.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr P Broadhead – Chairman

Cllr M Haines – Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr S Bartlett, Cllr M F Brooke, Cllr M Earl, Cllr G Farquhar,
Cllr L Fear, Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene, Cllr M Iyengar,
Cllr R Lawton, Cllr R Maidment, Cllr C Rigby and Cllr H Allen (In
place of Cllr M Anderson)

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

108. Apologies

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

109. Substitute Members

Cllr H Allen substituted for Cllr M Anderson.

110. Declarations of Interests

Cllr M Brooke declared the following interests:

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

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

111. Confirmation of Minutes

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

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

112. Action Sheet

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

113. Chairman's Update

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

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

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

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

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

114. Public Speaking

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

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

Statement:

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

115. Business Improvement Districts - BIDS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

116. Scrutiny of Planning Related Cabinet Reports

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

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

Following the discussion it was proposed and then:

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

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

Voting: For: 9; Against: 5

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

117. Scrutiny of Regeneration Related Cabinet Reports

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

118. Scrutiny of Corporate Related Cabinet Reports

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

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

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

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

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

The meeting ended at 6.15 pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 February 2020 at 6.00 pm

Present:-

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

Present: Cllr S Bartlett, Cllr M F Brooke, Cllr M Earl, Cllr G Farquhar,
Cllr L Fear, Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene, Cllr R Lawton,
Cllr R Maidment, Cllr P Miles, Cllr C Rigby, Cllr B Dove (In place of
Cllr M Anderson) and Cllr M White (In place of Cllr M Iyengar)

Also in attendance: Cllr J Edwards

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllr M Anderson and Cllr M Iyengar.

2. Substitute Members

Notification of the following substitute members for this meeting was received from the relevant political group leaders or their nominated representatives:

- Cllr B Dove substituting for Cllr M Anderson
- Cllr M White substituting for Cllr M Iyengar

3. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests or other interests in respect of any items on the agenda.

4. Public Speaking

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

5. Chairman's Update

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and encouraged contributions from Board members and substitutes on the agenda items being considered.

6. Forward Plan

The Chairman introduced a report, a copy of which had been circulated and a copy of which appears as Appendix A to these minutes in the Minute Book. He referred to the following list of items on the Cabinet Forward Plan which the Board had previously agreed to scrutinise at its March meeting:

- Arts and Cultural Development in Bournemouth
- Seascope Group Limited 5 Year Strategic Plan (2020-25)
- Bereavement Services Business Plan – Phase 1
- Options Appraisal for the delivery of Revenue and Benefits Services (moving to 2021)
- Wessex Fields Site Development Strategy

He asked the Board to consider which of the remaining items on the Cabinet Forward Plan for March it wished to scrutinise. The Board agreed to add the following items to its March agenda:

- Street Works Permitting Scheme
- Heathlands SPD
- Unauthorised encampments policy and practice
- Capital investment strategy (non-treasury) 2020 – 2025

The Chairman reported that any further changes to the list of items for March as a result of further changes to the Cabinet Forward Plan would be discussed between him and the Vice Chairman and circulated to the Board by email for comment.

RESOLVED that the Forward Plan attached at Appendix A of the report be updated to reflect the above decisions, and approved.

7. Scrutiny of Corporate Related Cabinet Reports

Organisational Development – Estates and Accommodation Strategy

The Leader of the Council presented the Cabinet report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix F to the Cabinet minutes of 12 February 2020 in the Minute Book.

The Leader explained that since Cabinet had adopted the principle of a single council hub in November 2019 a BCP Estate High Level Hub Options Analysis had been developed. She summarised the key findings as set out in the report. She emphasised that a single civic centre did not mean that the Council was retreating into one place and she talked about the role of community hubs in providing services to residents.

Following an evaluation exercise of three core options, the recycling and refurbishment of the Bournemouth Town Hall complex was considered the

most appropriate recommendation for the reasons set out in the report. Although the expected net costs of this recommendation were between £20m - £29m, the Leader clarified that this was not as recently reported a proposal to spend £29m. A further report to Cabinet in June 2020 would include the results of a market pre engagement and evaluation process, a proposed project implementation plan, and budget and funding strategy.

The Leader and the Corporate Director of Resources responded to questions from Board members.

The Leader was asked whether any public consultation had been undertaken on the proposals. She explained that there had been no public consultation at this stage, as the report was a high-level options appraisal. However, the information gathered from the community engagement survey on how people wanted to engage with the Council would feed into the development of a customer access strategy. This strategy would help to meet the corporate objective of a 'modern and accessible council'. Decisions on more detailed proposals around service delivery and locations would be subject to further engagement at a later date.

The Leader was asked whether income from the sale of the other core hub sites would be used to fund the preferred option. She explained that the proposed next steps were set out in the report and would be considered alongside the Council's corporate objectives and the duty to provide best value. The Leader referred to a summary of the implementation approach provided in the report, which set out the key milestones for the project. More detailed information on timescales would be available in Summer 2020. Much depended on the outcome of the procurement process.

The Corporate Director responded to a question on whether the net costs in the report included the community hubs. He explained that the net costs were based on a 'per square metre' calculation, which had provided a benchmark when evaluating the three core options. This did not include the community hubs, nor did it purely cover the single civic centre either. It was noted that at each stage of the process decisions would be required on what to spend and when. Many community hubs would already be in Council ownership (e.g. libraries) and associated costs could be met through other means, e.g. the transformation budget.

Board members spoke in support of the recommendations, and it was noted that a similar approach to estates and accommodation had been adopted by other large organisations. The Leader explained that the Council recognised that it needed a strong presence across the BCP area. She acknowledged the points made about dovetailing with the wider estates strategy and the value of engaging with local ward councillors when considering individual hubs. She agreed that the 'reason for recommendations' in the report should be amended to align with recommendation (b).

The Chairman suggested that it would be helpful to establish a Working Group, to understand in more detail the rationale behind the in-principle

decision and the proposed next steps. The work would probably require one to two meetings and the Group would report back to the O&S Board prior to a further report to Cabinet in June 2020. He was happy to be the lead member and welcomed interest from other Board members who would like to take part.

RESOLVED that the O&S Board establish a Working Group on the Estates and Accommodation Strategy as outlined above.

Voting: Unanimous

8. Scrutiny of Budget Related Cabinet Reports

Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget Setting 2020/21

The Portfolio Holder for Housing presented the Cabinet report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix D to the Cabinet minutes of 12 February 2020 in the Minute Book. He summarised the purpose of the report and outlined the key recommendations. He then responded to questions from Board members.

The Portfolio Holder was asked about the viability challenges around the provision of new build social housing, as detailed in paragraph 76 of the report. He confirmed this was high on his agenda and would form part of the development strategy for 2020. The Council had to be financially sensible in balancing viability with how much it was able to build. Officers explained that the amount of subsidy in the HRA to offset costs was a key factor. It was noted that viability would improve if either Homes England grant or right to buy receipts were secured.

The Portfolio Holder provided clarification on how the effect of rent increases on residents was calculated, for example the new build in Turnbull Lane. Officers explained that the rent did not reflect Local Housing Allowance rates as they were today, as the national rent policy had resulted in an annual 1% reduction. The Portfolio Holder was asked about future plans for major projects in the Bournemouth neighbourhood. He explained that there were ambitions for 465 new homes from the HRA over the next 5 years, with over 1,000 homes from the General Fund. Officers reported that as well as identifying sites the Council was scaling up and refocussing resources in readiness for this programme.

The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the recommendation at 2(x) to transfer £2million of neighbourhood HRA funds to the General Fund was a legitimate transaction, as the HRA would benefit from the savings made as a result of the Council's transformation programme. The Corporate Director for Resources responded to concerns from some Board members regarding the lack of detail in paragraph 62 of the report on exactly where the savings would be made, how this would benefit the HRA and local residents, and the associated governance arrangements for this significant level of contribution. He explained that the savings were those identified in the original Cabinet report in November 2019. The organisation

development implementation plan would be subject to scrutiny prior to a final commitment from Cabinet and Council in April 2020. He agreed to discuss further the concerns raised by Board members with the Portfolio Holder and the Section 151 Officer to ensure that clarity and more detailed assurance was provided on this element of the report when the recommendations were presented to the Cabinet on 12 February.

Quarter 3 Budget Monitoring Report

The Portfolio Holder for Finance presented the Cabinet report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix C to the Cabinet minutes of 12 February 2020 in the Minute Book. He summarised the purpose of the report and outlined the key recommendations. He highlighted the most significant change in the forecast for this quarter which was for adult social care and the reasons for this, as set out in paragraph 4. He also referred to the latest in year deficit position of the Dedicated Schools Grant as detailed in paragraphs 52 – 55. He invited Board members to ask questions in tandem with the main budget report which followed.

2020/21 Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan

The Portfolio Holder for Finance presented the Cabinet report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix A to the Cabinet minutes of 12 February 2020 in the Minute Book. He provided an overview of the proposed 2020/21 budget which he presented as a responsible and sustainable budget, and which formed the basis for the proposed council tax. He responded to questions from Board members on both reports.

The Portfolio Holder was asked about the use of the capital receipt generated from the sale of Templeman House to support the Council's investment in transformation, as a Board member understood that there was a plan to turn it into affordable housing. The Portfolio Holder explained that the site of the former care home was surplus to requirements. The Section 151 Officer explained the flexible approach the Council was taking to the use of capital receipts, as set out in paragraphs 70 – 71 of the report. It was subsequently clarified by the Corporate Director for Environment and the Section 151 Officer that there was indeed a current planning consultation in relation to the Housing Revenue Account purchasing the site from the General Fund for general needs and affordable housing. The way in which it was listed in the report was correct, but once a business case had been approved it would appear as a capital investment.

The main focus of the Board's questions and discussion was around the measures proposed to address the deficit on the High Needs Block of the Dedicated School Grant (DSG). The key issues of concern were as follows:

- The proposed transfer of £0.2million from early years funding to support the High Needs Block. Board members talked about the detrimental impact this would have on early years providers and their

staff, potentially forcing some to close, and the knock on effect this would have on the Council in having to provide a statutory service by alternative means.

- That although £0.2million may seem a relatively small amount in the context of the overall budget it would have a sizeable impact.
- The outcome of the consultation which was reported to the Schools Forum had not supported the transfer from the early years funding. The Council should be listening and responding to these views.
- It was not clear whether the Council had considered alternative options for sourcing the £0.2million?
- The proposed approval of £1.2million to a Financial Liability Earmarked Reserve to help mitigate the estimated deficit meant that local council tax payers were picking up the cost of something which Central Government should be funding.

A Councillor who was in attendance at the meeting also expressed concerns at the impact on the early years sector.

The Portfolio Holder responded to requests to reconsider the proposed transfer of £0.2million from early years funding. He explained that the proposal was intended to build some resilience within the High Needs Block. He provided some background context to the growing deficit and explained that this would only get worse if the recommendations were not agreed. He explained that early years providers did benefit in some ways from the High Needs Block through special education needs provision. He accepted that the Schools Forum, which he had attended, had not supported the proposal this year, following a lengthy discussion on the different options put forward. Ultimately it was the Council's decision, and although he understood the concerns, if the funding did not come from the early years budget it would need to be found from elsewhere. The Council was required to make difficult decisions to achieve a responsible and sustainable budget.

The Portfolio Holder was asked what the Council was doing to highlight the issue of underfunding of the High Needs Block at a local, regional and national level? He reported that representatives of the Department for Education were visiting the Council in March, when this issue would be raised. It was noted that BCP Council received the lowest percentage of funding (8%) of all councils nationally, due to the funding formula and the way in which it was used. The Leader of the Council confirmed that she and the Chief Executive had raised their concerns at their most recent meeting with the local MPs. The MPs had agreed to take this back to the Government and she would request an update from them shortly.

The Portfolio Holder was asked why he considered the actions of the Shadow Authority in 'plugging the gap' with £2.4 million last year constituted an unsustainable budget, when he was proposing the same course of action this year, without the agreement of the Schools Forum, in order to balance a budget which he was presenting as sustainable. The Portfolio Holder refuted this statement. He clarified that the Schools Forum had agreed a transfer of £1.8million to the High Needs Block, although it

had not supported the transfer of the full £4million. This issue was now awaiting determination by the DfE. He explained that last year the pressures turned out to be greater than anticipated and these were still growing. This was partly due to infrastructure requirements around Education, Health and Care Plans not being in place. The Financial Liability Earmarked Reserve together with the additional sums detailed in the report, and the savings and efficiencies in Children's Services, formed part of the Council's longer term strategy to reduce the High Needs Block deficit and ensure that it did not undermine the overall budget. He anticipated that the Reserve would equate to the forecast deficit which would reduce over time. While a difference in views on the Portfolio Holder's position was maintained, there was general agreement that this was a national issue which the Government needed to address.

The Section 151 Officer clarified that if the £0.2million transfer from early years was not approved and did not come from elsewhere in the DSG, the overall deficit would increase. The financial resilience reserve would need to increase accordingly to address this, and additional funding would therefore have to be found from elsewhere in the budget to cover this.

In response to questions on other areas in the reports the Portfolio Holder and the Section 151 Officer provided the following information:

- The reduction in the base budget revenue contingency was based on a reduction in the levels of uncertainty going forward and a confidence that the current position was unlikely to change significantly before the end of the financial year
- The £240,000 investment to support climate change was the same funding which had been agreed by Council in December 2019 but now formed part of the base budget. The Corporate Director for Environment explained that a number of costed proposals had now been developed including engagement through a citizens assembly.
- It was anticipated that there would be balance of £8.3million in the financial liability reserve by 31 March 2021. It was not expected that this any of this balance would be spent.
- The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Transport confirmed that work was in hand in those areas identified as assumed savings in the MTFP report but listed as not yet started (RAG rated as white)

The decision of Christchurch Town Council to increase its town council precept by 51%, and how this compared with the other council precepts in the Christchurch area was noted.

The Board considered how best to take forward the concerns expressed in its discussion about the national funding formula for the Dedicated Schools Grant, and the impact on the High Needs Block. It was noted that the issue was already being raised at political and senior management level at every opportunity but that additional representation on this matter could not be anything other than helpful.

RESOLVED that the Cabinet be recommended to request that the Leader write to the Minister for Education to express councillors' concerns over the funding formula applied to BCP Council giving rise to the pressure on the Dedicated Schools Grant and the growing deficit to the High Needs Block.

Voting: Unanimous

The meeting ended at 8.20 pm

CHAIRMAN

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 March 2020 at 2.00 pm

Present:-

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

Present: Cllr M Anderson, Cllr S Bartlett, Cllr M F Brooke, Cllr M Earl,
Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr L Fear, Cllr R Lawton, Cllr R Maidment and
Cllr D Farr (in place of Cllr M Iyengar)

Also in attendance: Cllr A Hadley, Cllr M Phipps, Cllr Dr F Rice and Cllr V Slade

127. Apologies

Apologies for Absence were received from Cllr P Broadhead, Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene, Cllr M Iyengar and Cllr P Miles.

128. Substitute Members

Notification of the following substitute members for this meeting was received from the relevant political group leaders or their nominated representatives:

Cllr D Farr for Cllr M Iyengar

129. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests or other interests in respect of any items on the agenda.

130. Action Sheet

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

131. Public Speaking

No notifications of statements, questions or petitions had been received

132. Chairman's Update

The Vice-Chairman (in the chair) explained that a report in relation to the Council's response to the Covid-19 outbreak was being produced for the benefit of Cabinet for its meeting on 18 March 2020 and that a verbal update would be provided to the Board at the 6pm meeting to give an overview the content.

The Vice-Chairman also explained that since the publication of the agenda, the item relating to Car Parking Charges Harmonisation had been withdrawn and Officers would instead be dealing with an inflationary rise in charges under officer delegation. The Car Parking Charges Harmonisation would instead be dealt with at a future meeting.

133. Forward Plan

The Overview and Scrutiny Specialist updated the Board in relation to the progress of the Estates and Accommodation Working Group that had been established by the Board at its previous meeting. The working Party had now met for the first time and had agreed the scope of its work and its methodology. A further meeting would likely place in April.

The Vice-Chairman advised that the dates included on the forward plan were subject to change depending on the progression of the Corona Virus outbreak, the situation of which was changing daily.

Following a suggestion from the Overview and Scrutiny Specialist, the Board agreed to delegate the addition of any additions/amendments to the Forward Plan to the Chair and Vice-Chair to allow agenda management during this uncertain time, although Board Members would be able to submit suggestions.

Cllr M Anderson requested that an update surrounding the lifts at Pokesdown Station be received at the Board's July meeting.

134. Scrutiny of Environment Related Cabinet Reports

Before the Board considered the following item, it was moved and seconded 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.”

Voting – Unanimous

The Portfolio Holder for Climate Change and Environment 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.

The Overview and Scrutiny Board were requested to consider the proposals to bring the recycling service across the historic Bournemouth area in-house. The Board were advised that the creation of BCP Council and the need for a single revised waste strategy meant that this was an

expedient time to review collection methodology across the conurbation and understand the financial implications of the options put forward.

RECOMMENDED that Cabinet approve Option 2, as set out in the report.

Voting: Unanimous

Note: Following the consideration of this confidential item, members of the public and press were invited back into the meeting.

135. Scrutiny of Transport and Infrastructure related Cabinet Reports

Car Parking Charges Harmonisation

Board Members and members of the public and press were reminded that this report would not be considered at this meeting and would be scheduled for a future meeting.

Streetworks Permitting Scheme

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 'B' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

The Portfolio Holder explained that the proposals were put forward to ensure that the council complied with statutory requirements to have a mechanism for controlling streetworks on the highway in order to reduce congestion and disruption to residents when works were undertaken on the traffic network and would involve the council issuing permits and levying a charge to ensure that the administrative costs were covered. It was anticipated that a minimum of six staff would be needed to administer the scheme, although there was provision for a further three staff members, if required.

The Portfolio Holder explained that all companies that were involved with statutory undertakings had been consulted with and the scheme had been adjusted based on comments received.

The Portfolio Holder and Corporate Director for Regeneration and Economy responded to questions and comments from Board Members.

The Portfolio Holder was asked about the maximum charge being applicable to all roads, which did not seem necessary when taking small residential roads or cul-de-sacs into account. It was explained that there was a historic road layout problem across the conurbation, caused in part by Poole and Bournemouth having been in different counties until the mid-1970's, meaning that the road network did not "join up". There was a recognition that the conurbations network was at capacity and therefore any closure or disruption on one part of the network would have an affect on other routes. The scheme was designed to be inclusive and the Council was required to adopt such a scheme.

The Portfolio Holder was asked about how the scheme would provide an opportunity to improve the current situation, which often found a section of highway being dug up multiple times to undertake different works. It was explained that this scheme would be giving a discount to utility companies that undertook works together, a lead company would take responsibility but would receive a 30% discount as an encouragement to work together with the aim of causing less disruption, although it was acknowledged that this may, on occasion, complicate matters. The flip-side to any complication that it would cause contractors is that the Council would have more control over works, have a greater knowledge of who was responsible and therefore it would be easier to enforce any further remedial works that need to take place in the event that initial remedial works were not up to standard.

The Portfolio Holder was asked about the inspection of roads once works had been undertaken, details of fines that would be issued if works were not completed to standard and discounts for contractors working outside of peak times. It was explained that the report did discuss sensitive routes and highlighted that depending on the nature of the work to be undertaken, it would often not be possible for work to be undertaken outside of peak hours, particularly if located within a residential area. The costs had not been provided as part of this report and therefore the Portfolio Holder would ensure that this information was made available to Board Members after the meeting. The Streetscene team regularly undertook inspections of roads to note and action any defects. It was important that Ward Councillors worked with the streetscene team to allow them to pick up on any defects.

The Portfolio Holder was asked about any provision in the permit scheme that allowed any recourse for the Council to approach a contractor after a certain period of time, should the initial remedial works deteriorate in an unsatisfactory manner. It was explained that this was something that would need to be investigated depending on the nature of the problem.

The Portfolio Holder was asked about the scale of fees that would be applicable and if there was a copy of this available. It was explained that this was not to hand, but could be provided to Board Members after the meeting. It was also explained that the chargeable fee would be dependent on the scale and nature of the works to be carried out.

Cllr G Farquar proposed a motion to add a recommendation (c) to Cabinet which would require works to be inspected immediately after completion and then inspected again, twelve weeks later.

Cllr M Anderson stated that he was broadly supportive of the addition of this recommendation, but that it should be less prescriptive to enable greater flexibility.

The Portfolio Holder was asked whether there would be a need to reconsult with utility companies if the recommendation was accepted by both the Board and Cabinet. It was explained that it would depend on whether or not

there were any significant cost implications as a result of the addition of the recommendation – an answer would be provided at the Cabinet Meeting due to be held on 18 March.

The Portfolio Holder was asked about the scale of fees again and he therefore reiterated his earlier promise that these would be provided to Board Members and that it would be reviewed on an annual basis.

The Chairman thanked Members for their contributions to the discussion and having noted that there was appetite for an additional recommendation for cabinet, asked Board Members if they were content to support this.

Cllr M Anderson stated that he would support Cllr G Farquhar's recommendation on the condition that it was less prescriptive in terms of the originally proposed timescale.

In light of this, The Chairman requested that the Overview and Scrutiny Specialist formed a wording that Members were content to support and it was therefore moved and seconded that the following wording be added to the Cabinet recommendation as recommendation (c):

“the street works permitting scheme be modified to include a clause that requires that any works undertaken are subject to follow up inspection and a requirement to make good the road surface or footway to a sufficient standard, in order to ensure that this standard remains in place for an agreed period of time.”

As Members were supportive of the additional recommendation, the chairman moved to the vote on the substantive item, having inserted Recommendation (c) and it was:

RECOMMENDED that

- (a) Cabinet approve the conditions to be applied to the BCP Council Street Works Permit Scheme, as described in the attached document, Appendix 2.**
- (b) Cabinet delegate authority to the Director of Legal and Democratic Services to make the necessary Legal Order to bring the permit scheme into operation.**
- (c) the street works permitting scheme be modified to include a clause that requires that any works undertaken are subject to follow up inspection and a requirement to make good the road surface or footway to a sufficient standard, in order to ensure that this standard remains in place for an agreed period of time.**

Voting: Unanimous

136. Scrutiny of Planning Related Cabinet Reports

Heathlands SPD

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 'C' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

The Portfolio Holder explained that the Supplementary Planning Document had been out to consultation in February and it was essential that the council maintained a planning framework for mitigating the impact of development on the Dorset Heathlands from within a 5km range and that the existing document was due to expire on 31 March 2020, which therefore meant that this document needed to be adopted and ready to come into force from 1 April 2020. She further explained that the document had been prepared jointly with Dorset Council and would be applicable for a five-year period.

The Document focussed on two main strategies, one in relation to SAMMs (Strategic Access Management and Monitoring) and the other in relation to HIPs (Heathland Infrastructure Projects). It was estimated that this document would assist the council in generating approximately £1.42M. The strategies would enable both councils to grant planning permissions for new homes within the 5km buffer, hence its importance.

The Portfolio Holder and Corporate Director for Regeneration and Economy responded to questions and comments from Board Members.

The Corporate Director explained that there would be a need to be flexible when looking at C2 use applications and each application would need to be taken on its merits. There had been no changes in regard to how this aspect would work from the existing document that was currently in force. There was a general awareness.

The Portfolio Holder responded to a comment in relation to enforcement issues. She explained that she was aware that these had been some enforcement issues in areas surrounding heathland and these needed to be addressed by the Planning Enforcement Team. Feedback received in relation to climate action plan stated that these amendments were minor in nature and improved the clarity of the SPD. Further comments made in relation to aspiring to extend the heathland would be taken on board, but it was not anticipated actually doing this would be an easy task.

The Portfolio Holder was asked a question about the reasoning for a cap on fees. It was explained that having a cap in place enabled developers to have a certainty as to what they would need to pay for issues to be mitigated.

The Portfolio Holder was asked a question about differing of opinions between experts and how this might affect outcomes. It was explained that whenever applications came forward, there was a list of statutory

consultees that had to be consulted with and that Natural England was one of these, much weight was given to the Natural England point of view when determining a planning application

The Portfolio Holder was asked about the delayed response from Meyrick Estates. It was explained that the response had initially been sent to an email address that was no longer in use and by the time it came to light that this had happened, the consultation period had closed, but it was felt that as it had been sent on time, it should be included.

The Chairman thanked Members for their contributions to the discussion and had noted that there had potentially been two recommendations put forward.

Cllr S Bartlett stated that he did not feel that the issues raised as part of the discussion were suitable to include as additional recommendations. He added that all planning applications needed to comply with SPDs and that the issues raised would be better dealt with in a local plan, particularly the issue related to amenity space. He concluded by stating that the document before members was a definitive planning document to be used to make planning decisions and whilst he understood the spirit behind the issues that had been raised, this document was not the appropriate place for them to be included within.

The Portfolio Holder added that this was a joint document with Dorset Council and any amendments would need to be approved by them too.

The Chairman thanked Cllr S Bartlett and the Portfolio Holder for their comments and explained to the Board that she would take the comments forward to Cabinet to take on board.

RECOMMENDED that:

- (a) Cabinet recommends that Council adopts the Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2025 Supplementary Planning Document; and**
- (b) any minor changes to the consultation document are delegated to the Director of Growth and Infrastructure in liaison with the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning.**

Voting: Unanimous

137. Future Meeting Dates 2019/20

The meeting date was noted – venue to be confirmed

138. Future Meeting Dates 2020/21

Venues had now been assigned to each meeting and would rotate as per current arrangements, this could change as time progresses.

The meeting ended at 3.38 pm

CHAIRMAN

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 March 2020 at 6.00 pm

Present:-

– Chairman

– Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr M Haines (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Cllr M Anderson, Cllr S Bartlett, Cllr M F Brooke, Cllr M Earl, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr L Fear, Cllr M Iyengar, Cllr R Lawton, Cllr R Maidment, Cllr P Miles, Cllr C Rigby, Cllr S C Anderson (In place of Cllr M Greene), Cllr D Mellor (In place of Cllr P Broadhead) and Cllr J Edwards (In place of Cllr N Greene)

Also in attendance: Cllr L Allison, Cllr D Brown, Cllr L Dedman, Cllr A Hadley and Cllr V Slade

139. Apologies

Apologies were received from the Chairman – Cllr P Broadhead, Cllr N Greene, Cllr M Greene; Cllr M Iyengar and Cllr P Miles.

140. Substitute Members

Notification of the following substitute members for this meeting was received from the relevant political group leaders or their nominated representatives:

- Cllr D Mellor for Cllr P Broadhead, Cllr J Edwards for Cllr N Greene and Cllr S Anderson for M Greene.

141. Declarations of Interests

Cllr M Brooke declared a local interest in agenda Item 7, Scrutiny of Finance Related Cabinet Reports, Capital Investment Strategy (Non-Treasury) as he was a Board Member of the Bournemouth Development Company which was referenced within the report.

Cllr S Bartlett and Cllr J Edwards declared local interests in agenda item 6, Scrutiny of Regeneration Related Cabinet reports, Arts and Cultural Development in Bournemouth, as they were directors of BH Live Enterprises, which was referenced within the report.

142. Public Speaking

None received

143. Chairman's Update

The Chairman welcomed all members and substitute members to the board and reminded everyone that scrutiny was most effective with full participation.

The Vice-Chairman advised that she had agreed to add an urgent item of business to the agenda on the Coronavirus outbreak due to its imminent importance. The latest government advice permitted the meeting to go ahead. The Chief Executive confirmed that government advice related to stopping social contact and as this was a work meeting it would count as essential travel in terms of conducting ongoing business of the Council.

The Board was advised that if the appropriate Officer or Cabinet member was not in attendance and there were issues raised by the Board for which an immediate response could not be provided this would be addressed prior to the Cabinet meeting on 18 March.

144. Scrutiny of Regeneration Related Cabinet Reports

Wessex Fields Site Development Strategy – The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture was not available for questions. The Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix B to the Cabinet minutes of 18 March 2020 in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder advised that there were both positive and negative themes outlined. The Council were now looking at viable options to take those key themes forward. A number of points were raised by the Board including:

- A Councillor commented that he was present at one of the events, which was well attended, and he thought it was a great way to reach out to the public. The officers at the public event provided information on the transfer from one plan to another. The focus of the events was not on transportation but on other areas such as environment, affordable housing and the hospital provided plans for a 'living lab'.
- Key worker housing and access to the roads. A Councillor commented that 300 key worker homes would require significant infrastructure to access the site. The Portfolio Holder advised that the consultation process was very much around land use. Discussions with the hospital were ongoing about access to the site for staff and ambulances. Access requirements would be part of the future development.
- A Councillor asked about the Administration's view of the development following the positive feedback from the survey. The Board was advised that the outcome of the public events showed differing opinions around the access road, there was a need to look at sustainable transport for the whole area, for example a foot and cycle bridge to Christchurch to improve access. The Cabinet's view had not changed since previously presented.
- Further issues were raised within the ward concerning traffic and routes around that area and the impact that any development would have. A Councillor commented that more people were in favour of the road transport scheme than against it, 30% vs 25%.

- A Board member asked how the outcome of the recent consultation compared to the previous consultation. The original issues were from people responding to the planning consent for the previous scheme. The Portfolio Holder advised that an acceptable scheme needed to be drawn up from the outcome of the most recent consultation. With regards to transport the specific measures outlined in the report, Deansleigh access road, was supported by 6 percent and not supported by 12 percent.
- Further queries were raised regarding a pass around the underpass to access but there was now a need to work up how the desired land use would be supported by a transport scheme, which reflected the views of residents.
- In response to a question the Board was advised that a 'living lab' was a concept from Bournemouth University biological engineering and biological science related to health and social care.
- In response to a question regarding what was meant by key workers the Portfolio Holder explained that these would be places for rent, which would be affordable to those keeping the care economy going and also to young teachers and other public sector staff.
- A Councillor commented that more transport items were linked to the negative outcomes from the consultation than the positive outcomes. Feedback from the charts was not in relation to what transport system should be followed through. Transport development was crucial and needed to be looked at along with the various themes. It was important to listen and evaluate all comments in order to come to the best possible solution.
- The original purpose for the land was employment based. The Board questioned whether anything needed to be changed in terms of adding housing to the development. There would need to be employment use on the land but the funding would not be jeopardized by the proposals.

Chair summarised that whilst the consultation did not talk about the transport scheme this did need to be taken into consideration as part of the scheme. Therefore, it was difficult for the Board to make any further comment other than the Board was broadly in support of the recommendation but with the caveat that it hasn't seen the transportation aspect of the scheme in order to provide an entire picture.

Arts and Culture Development in BCP Council - In the absence of the Portfolio Holder the Corporate Director for Regeneration and Economy presented the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'C' to the Cabinet minutes of 18 March 2020 in the Minute Book. The Board was advised that the conference outlined in the report would be postponed due to Corona Virus measures. Small increase in budget agreed for additional officers to support the arts agenda. Arts Council acknowledged that budgets are being protected. In the ensuing discussion the points raised by the Board included:

- Whether this was the right project to be taking forward at the current time, in light of the conference being postponed and what may take

place over the next six months. It was noted that the Council would be looking overall at recruitment and related issues in the coming months.

- A question was asked about whether the position of Chairman of the Cultural Collective would be a remunerated position. It was noted that this was due be discussed at the conference will it be remunerated. The Leader commented that this had been discussed and if it was someone who was paid this would come out of the Cultural Collective£150k budget. The overall value in having a paid Chairman needed to be considered. There would be a paid member of staff to facilitate and support the Board. Discussions had looked at whether to advertise nationally for someone with a high public profile – who would be unlikely to provide time for free. The decision on how it would be taken forward would be taken in conjunction with arts council and other groups. There were some concerns raised as to how much of the funding would be used for officers.
- A Councillor commented that they were impressed with the take up for the conference and it was disappointing that it had to be postponed. Pausing FDEs, long established events group. Working through temporary events notices – link on Council for community groups to contact regarding liability, arrangements – reach out to groups to help liaise on community events. The members of staff that part of the £150k would pay for would support development of community arts and culture. However, it was noted with Covid-19 issues places like the Light House may require further support. It was acknowledged that arts and culture in the community was vital. In terms of support for community events the Safety Advisory Group within the tourism and events team were able to assist in the running of events and concerns with safety issues.
- Anti-Social Behaviour – A Councillor asked how the invested money has affected ASB and how things have improved. Delivery plans included clear measures of success and a paper in April would include a framework of how performance measures will be set. The Leader agreed that it would be reasonable to report back in a years' time, to provide evidence that the proposed funding represented good value for money.
- It was acknowledged that there was often a struggle to engage disadvantaged communities in arts and culture, which needed to be inclusive to reap rewards. There was an aim to ensure that everyone is engaged not just those who would be normally. There was a concern that the cultural enquiry didn't have all the people you may expect and there were a lot of people for whom this wouldn't feel inclusive. It needed to include a broad range of culture.
- The Board discussed the role libraries played in cultural services. A Councillor commented that literature is culture, huge literary legacy in the area. Literature and libraries should be part of the cultural collective.
- It was noted that a three-year standstill settlement for organisations such as the Light House had been agreed which would help in future planning for organisations. They were tied to service level agreements which would tie up the services delivered into the funding provided.

The Vice-Chairman highlighted the impact of current situation for the Light House, which was an important cultural asset for the area. It was discussed that funds were to be given on the understanding that they would be able to

continue events through other means as they were reliant on grant funding through Council.

RESOLVED: That an update report be provided to the Board in 12 months' time, to provide an overview of how effective the strategy has been in meeting its aims; and for this report to include as measures of effectiveness an assessment of how the strategy has assisted in tackling anti-social behaviour and in engaging with harder to reach groups in our communities.

145. Scrutiny of Finance Related Cabinet Reports

Capital Investment Strategy (non-treasury) – The Portfolio Holder for Finance introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'F' to the Cabinet minutes of 18 March 2020 in the Minute Book. The Board was advised that the strategy updated the legacy assets, including a financial appraisal at appendix B to the report. A key issue in asking Cabinet to approve the strategy was aligning with current corporate strategy. In the ensuing discussion several points were raised, including:

A Councillor suggested that paragraph 2.3.3 of the appendix should be removed. The Portfolio Holder responded that there was a need to make sure the portfolio was diversified. There would need to be a business case and due diligence for any change with a view to risk.

It was noted that BCP Council had inherited a number of investments through the preceding authorities and bringing them together within one strategy helped to provide a more balanced picture of the overall portfolio of the Council. At present there were certain investments in the portfolio which skewed the overall picture.

A Councillor commented that the net yield and profits percentages, as set out in Appendix 2, were far too low and therefore not worth taking the risk on the investments. The Board was advised that all investments would be scrutinised by the Section 151 officer who was content with this low risk strategy. The strategy aimed to find the right balance which could be reviewed periodically if not performing appropriately.

It was confirmed that Mallard Road retail park was not making a loss. The business plan was for a £1.8m surplus but it returned a £1.6m surplus. It was partly a long term investment in terms of property value. Original cost included fees.

The Board discussed the principle of investing within the BCP Council area. The Portfolio Holder noted that there was additional socioeconomic value if investing within area but by exception would look outside of the area if it would provide a particularly identified environmental benefit. However, there were plenty of investment opportunities within the local area.

Some of the Board members commented that the triple bottom line and proposal to invest within the area was limiting and showed a lack of ambition. The Portfolio Holder suggested that the strategy would ensure the best outcome for people of the area.

A Councillor asked about the Council's Declaration of a climate change emergency and how an environmental impact would work for each case.

The Board was informed that it would challenge the Council to look at the sustainable angle of investments and work with organisations to ensure that they become more environmentally sustainable but would be considered on a case by case basis to consider.

RECOMMENDED: That Cabinet amend paragraph 2.3.3 of Appendix A –‘Capital Investment Strategy (Non-Treasury) 2020-2025’ to remove all text following the end of the first sentence ‘In making an investment decision, the Council will take a balanced portfolio approach’.

Voting: For: 9, Against: 1, 3 abstentions Cllr G Farquhar asked for his abstention to be recorded.

146. Scrutiny of Leisure and Communities related Cabinet Reports

Developing a Harmonised Approach to Tackling Street Based Anti-Social Behaviour – The Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Communities introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix ‘F’ to the Cabinet minutes of 18 March 2020 in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder informed the Board that a review had been recently undertaken and the report presented the findings. It was noted that given the present situation the proposed consultation as outlined in the report will begin in the way as set out in the paper.

- In response to a question the Portfolio Holder advised that the suggested consultation was to allow for the whole area to be dealt with in the same way. The PSPO would be consulted on prior to coming back to Cabinet for a decision. It was confirmed that the administration was not abandoning PSPOs and these would continue to be in use by the Council.
- A Councillor commented that they supported the CSAS officers in Boscombe and welcomed the increases of officers in Poole and Bournemouth. It was suggested that at least another one for Poole and one for Bournemouth were required. It was noted that there were many other areas of the conurbation which would benefit from the presence of CSAS officers. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that he would like to have as many officers in the area as possible and would review the impact that these extra officers had and would continue to monitor the situation in future.
- In response to a question it was confirmed that the CSAS officers wore body cameras and would continue to do so.
- The Board questioned the reasoning behind the suggested removal of a number of the points within the PSPO. The Portfolio Holder did not believe these were providing anything additional to the other points listed in helping to improve the situation.
- The Board asked about the deployment of CSAS officers and their ability to be more agile in terms of where they could be deployed based upon evidence that they are required there for a period of time.
- The area in which CSAS officers operated needed to be designated by the Chief Constable based on evidence of antisocial behaviour. If there

was evidence of other areas needing them the Council would need to work with Dorset Police to get those areas designated.

- Impact on more vulnerable members of society – A Councillor commented that they were pleased to see co-ordinated approach with other agencies taking into account mental health; working on interconnected problems and resolving these issues.
- In response to a question it was confirmed that Bournemouth and Poole had different approaches to anti-social behaviour and there was a need to harmonise across the area. Officers in Poole have a different way of working. A Councillor expressed concern that the Poole PSPO was being watered down and there was evidence base to say the PSPO in Poole had worked. The PSPO issue would be going out to public consultation.

The Chairman summarised that the Board was supportive of this overall and wanted things to start moving on this. However there was concern regarding the removal of b,c,d,e as these were shown to work. A Councillor commented that there was an evidence base that this enabled interaction which helped the most vulnerable in society.

RECOMMENDED: That Cabinet be recommended to amend paragraph 25 of the Cabinet report, in order that the final sentence reads:

‘It is proposed that specifically, consultation is undertaken with a view to removing clauses b) to c) but that clauses a),d), e), f) and g) would remain in force’;

and that consultation on the variation of the Public Spaces Protection Order, as outlined at recommendation 2 of the Cabinet report, is undertaken on the basis of this amendment.

Voting: For: 8, Against: 5

Cllr G Farqhaur asked for his vote against the recommendation to be recorded.

147. Update on the Impact of the Corona Virus

The Assistant Director of Public Health Dorset, the Leader of the Council and the Portfolio Holder for Health and Adult Social Care as well as the Chief Executive all provided updates to the Board. The Leader advised that she had taken part in a conference call with the MHCLG at lunchtime to provide an update. However following the Prime Minister’s announcement the staying at home procedures which had been discussed at the management team meeting had already changed from the government update at lunchtime. The Boar was advised that legal changes were expected tomorrow allowing for Council meetings to be varied to allow for remote engagement and the requirement to hold an annual Council would be suspended. The finance team were working on support for businesses, looking at rules around the hardship fund. There were also a number of sub-groups working on particular areas of concern. The Council would need to take a lead on community resilience and was setting up steering

group in next 24 hours to co-ordinate and take forward support. Non-essential travel had been stopped and events were being cancelled. There would be an assessment undertaken of what Council meetings were necessary and what could be done in a different.

The Cabinet meeting on Wednesday and the Health and Wellbeing Board next Thursday were still due to take place. If the Board had questions which could not be responded to this evening then answers would be supplied at either the Cabinet meeting or Health and Wellbeing Board.

The Assistant Director for Public Health provided an update on the official advise against going to large venues, events and travel. The recommendations on self-isolating were outlined. Up to this point public health was receiving updates on all cases within BCP although this was now expected to cease, and only particularly significant cases would now be reported. Locally published figures of 5 cases for the BCP area were all linked to overseas travel. London was ahead in terms of community transmission. The situation was no longer business as usual, there was a need to do things differently and respond differently.

The Chief Executive commented on the Council's emergency response and planning. There were tactical groups meeting within the BCP area – which included Public Health, HR and Communications representation.

This was the most serious public health threat experienced by all and there was therefore no external support available. It was important to identify the correct role which Councillors could play in this situation. The Council would look at which services could be maintained which could be reigned back on. There would be a major impact and therefore the budget would need to change significantly. There would be a paper taken to the Cabinet meeting on Wednesday, identifying immediate budget issues. Other actions which were being taken included: cancelling events, looking into the hardship fund business rates rebilling and working with social care providers. However, the Emergency Planning in place was strong but there would be an impact on services. There was a need to look at Council governance arrangements and put something in place for decision making and scrutiny. It was expected that staff absence would have an impact on services.

The Portfolio Holder for Health and Adult Social Care confirmed that Tricuro was putting resilience measures into place. Those staff who can work from home were working from home, but others needed to go out into the community. The Board was advised that there would be people not known to the Council and it was felt that Councillors often did know about those who need help within their community.

In response to a question about timescales the Assistant Director of Public Health advised that the Chief Medical Officer had suggested a 10 – 12 week peak. Dependent upon control measures and suppression of the peak. The US President suggested an outbreak in the US until July or August.

A Councillor asked about schools remaining open but being told to socially distance and how this could be done. There was specific guidance for the education sector and there will be a time when schools need to close, However, this would mean that the NHS and care sector lose a significant proportion of their workforce. There was also the role schools had in feeding children and additional support. Schools were making preparations to create space to help children learn from home.

Schools were being asked to be sensitive to the issue of vulnerable children and siblings or children of those who were vulnerable, especially with regards to absences and issuing fines. (Not BCP fines). The Board also asked about maintain contact arrangements for children in care.

In response to a question about the BCP website not having a banner headline it was confirmed that the Communications team were already looking into this.

A Councillor asked about how do we interact with work colleagues and loved ones. The Government statement was that we needed to be living our lives in a different way and avoiding unnecessary travel and social environments.

It was important that the public was directed to reliable sources of information. The Gov.uk website had all information and the NHS website has medical information.

Work was taking place in terms of the Council's role in community support and it was hoped to have something in place by the end of the week. The Leader advised that an update would be sent to Councillors Will send update to members. Issues would need to be shared with community groups and fed back in a controlled way. Want Council to work as one team on the issues which need action and look to all support in this. Work was also ongoing in terms of business continuity and staff absences.

In terms of community resilience, a councillor commented that it would be helpful to know where to signpost people so that the response was properly co-ordinated and efforts were not duplicated. Communications would be made to the public and to staff. Everyone was advised to try to steer people to official advice and help stop misinformation.

The meeting ended at 9.09 pm

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

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: 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 Action: Response to be received	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. Action: Response to be received	To enable O&S views to be taken into account by Cabinet when making decisions.	
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.	

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
Actions Arising from Board Meeting: 10 February 2020 – 2.00pm				
	Chairman's Update	<p>Meeting venues – the Board agreed to circulate between venues as appropriate taking account of likely public interest in items on the agenda, and otherwise meet in Bournemouth as the more central location.</p> <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>	<p>To ensure the Committee venue is, if necessary, appropriate to the Agenda.</p> <p>To enable continued overview and scrutiny during this project and if felt necessary, a report back to O&S Board.</p>	
Actions Arising from Board Meeting: 16 March 2020 – 2.00pm				
	Forward Plan	<p>1 – To provide flexibility in the planning of the next meeting, authority delegated to chair and vice to plan agenda items for next meeting.</p> <p>2 - Board to ask representatives of SW Rail to attend and provide an update on the situation regarding Pokesdown Lift by July 2020.</p> <p>Action: TBA</p>	To inform future meetings of the Board	

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
	Street Works Permitting Scheme	The Overview and Scrutiny Board resolved that Cabinet be recommended to modify the street works permitting scheme to include a clause requiring that any works undertaken are subject to follow up inspection and a requirement to make good the road surface or footway to a sufficient standard, in order to ensure that this standard remains in place for an agreed period of time. Actioned: Recommendation reported to Cabinet at its meeting on 18 March 2020	To enable the Overview and Scrutiny Board's views to be taken into account when Cabinet considers this issue	Not accepted by Cabinet – see cabinet minutes of 20 March for reasons.
	Future meeting dates and venues	Agreed to the venues for future meeting dates as published on the agenda, and to being flexible with venues and meeting dates as appropriate in light of the changing situation regarding covid-19. Actioned: Venues and dates added as a standing item to all future agendas.	To ensure oversight by the Board of appropriate venues and dates to ensure the business of the Board is conducted effectively.	
Actions Arising from Board Meeting: 16 March 2020 – 6.00pm				
	Arts and Culture Development in BCP Council	Advisory passed to Cabinet - also an action for listing on the O&S forward plan The Overview and Scrutiny Board requested that an update report be provided to the Board in 12 months, to provide an overview of how effective the strategy has been in meeting its aims; and for this report to include as measures of effectiveness an assessment of how the strategy has assisted in tackling anti-social behaviour and in engaging with harder to reach groups in our communities.	To ensure that the Board maintains an overview as the project progresses	Cabinet added the following resolution: We bring a review back in 12 months which looks at how the work is delivering against the Corporate Plans and Delivery Plans.

Minute number	Item	Action* *Items remain until action completed.	Benefit	Outcome
		Actioned: Added to the Board's Forward Plan and reported to Cabinet on 20 March 2020		
	Capital Investment Strategy	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Board resolved that Cabinet be recommend to amend paragraph 2.3.3 of Appendix A –‘Capital Investment Strategy (Non-Treasury) 2020-2025’ to remove all text following the end of the first sentence ‘In making an investment decision, the Council will take a balanced portfolio approach’</p> <p>Actioned: Recommendation reported to Cabinet at its meeting on 18 March 2020</p>	To enable the Overview and Scrutiny Board's views to be taken into account when Cabinet considers this issue.	Not accepted – see cabinet minutes of 20 April 2020 for reasons.
	Street based antisocial behaviour	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Board resolved that Cabinet be recommended to amend paragraph 25 of the Cabinet report, in order that the final sentence reads:</p> <p>‘It is proposed that specifically, consultation is undertaken with a view to removing clauses b) to c) but that clauses a),d), e), f) and g) would remain in force’;</p> <p>and that consultation on the variation of the Public Spaces Protection Order, as outlined at recommendation 2 of the Cabinet report, is undertaken on the basis of this amendment.</p> <p>Actioned: Recommendation reported to Cabinet at its meeting on 18 March 2020</p>	To enable the Overview and Scrutiny Board's views to be taken into account when Cabinet considers this issue.	Not accepted – see cabinet minutes of 20 April 2020 for reasons.