

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting held on 22 February 2022 at 7.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr N Hedges – Chairman

Cllr T O'Neill – Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr H Allen, Cllr L Allison, Cllr M Anderson, Cllr S C Anderson, Cllr M Andrews, Cllr J Bagwell, Cllr S Baron, Cllr S Bartlett, Cllr J Beesley, Cllr D Borthwick, Cllr P Broadhead, Cllr M F Brooke, Cllr N Brooks, Cllr D Brown, Cllr S Bull, Cllr R Burton, Cllr D Butt, Cllr J J Butt, Cllr E Coope, Cllr M Cox, Cllr M Davies, Cllr L Dedman, Cllr B Dion, Cllr B Dove, Cllr B Dunlop, Cllr M Earl, Cllr J Edwards, Cllr L-J Evans, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr D Farr, Cllr L Fear, Cllr S Gabriel, Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene, Cllr A Hadley, Cllr M Haines, Cllr P R A Hall, Cllr P Hilliard, Cllr M Howell, Cllr M Iyengar, Cllr C Johnson, Cllr T Johnson, Cllr A Jones, Cllr J Kelly, Cllr D Kelsey, Cllr R Lawton, Cllr M Le Poidevin, Cllr R Maidment, Cllr C Matthews, Cllr S McCormack, Cllr D Mellor, Cllr P Miles, Cllr S Moore, Cllr S Phillips, Cllr M Phipps, Cllr K Rampton, Cllr Dr F Rice, Cllr C Rigby, Cllr R Rocca, Cllr M Robson, Cllr V Slade, Cllr A M Stribley, Cllr M White and Cllr L Williams

137. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors D Butler, D Flagg, N Geary, L Lewis, L Northover, T Trent and K Wilson.

Councillors Decent and Filer were not in attendance at the meeting but joined remotely. In accordance with the provisions of the relevant legislation these Councillors were not able to vote.

138. Declarations of Interests

The Chief Executive reported that the following dispensation had been granted to all affected BCP Councillors to enable them to participate fully and vote at this meeting.

A dispensation is granted to all Councillors who are owners, licensees and leaseholders of any beach hut in the BCP area under s 33 (2) (b) of the Localism Act 2011, to allow Councillors to participate and vote on matters relating to beach huts and which may come before Council on 22 February 2022. This dispensation is limited to this meeting only.

The Chief Executive reported that Councillors Mellor and Broadhead have been granted a dispensation in accordance with the relevant legislation by virtue of their directorships on companies.

The following declarations were made:

Councillors M Brooke, N Brooks and B Dunlop

- Councillor M Brooke, N Brooks and B Dunlop declared for transparency purposes an interest as a Board Member of BDC in respect of item 6f – Cabinet 9 February 2022 – Minute No 128 – Budget and Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2022/23

139. Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the Ordinary Council meeting held on 11 January 2022 were confirmed.

140. Announcements and Introductions from the Chairman

Civic Activities

The Chairman took the opportunity to refer to some of the engagements that he had attended since the last Council meeting as detailed below:

- Planting of the Queen's Platinum Jubilee tree at Highcliffe Castle unveiled by the Lord Lieutenant, Mayor of Christchurch, Mayor of Bournemouth and Mayor of Poole.
- High Sheriff's Reception at the Dorset Museum Dorchester where we were introduced to the next High Sheriff, Mrs Sibyl Fine King
- Visit to the ECO PARK Chapelgate
- Visit to the New Earth Recycling Centre at Canford Arena
- Visit to HomeStart South East Dorset at Kinson
- Attended the North Bournemouth Crime Prevention Panel

141. Public Issues

The Chairman advised that a number of public issues had been submitted for the meeting:

A – Public Questions

Public Question from Nancy Curtis

Her Majesty The Queen celebrates her Platinum Jubilee this year, with events to take place in June. Could the Council please advise what plans they have for celebrating this unique event across Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole, and how the community can get involved?

Reply from Councillor Beverley Dunlop, Portfolio Holder for Culture and Vibrant Places

Thank you to Mrs Curtis for her question and her perfect timing because today saw the first BCP press release to get us all in the mood to celebrate

this remarkable occasion of Her Majesty's 70 years on the throne and highlight how residents can get involved.

The 4-day celebration culminates with The Big Lunch on Sunday 5th June, and we are encouraging our residents to get together for street parties. National Thank you Day, where we say thank you to our communities is also being held on the same day and is hoping to break the record for Britain's biggest ever national party as part of the Queen's Jubilee celebrations.

Street parties are a fantastic opportunity to bring people together and say thank you to our neighbours and community after all we've been through over the last two years. It can be a small gathering, or you can go the Full Monty and have trestle tables right down the street, with a bit of entertainment.

We are working with a variety of partners to encourage as many people as possible to join in and try our best to make sure everyone gets the opportunity to enjoy a party. And I encourage our hospitality sector to join in and host parties, too.

What we have done, is made it easy to apply to close your road and we are removing road closure charges for community street parties. But there is a deadline of April 22nd to get your application in.

So, to anyone thinking of organising a party I say go for it, but don't forget your elderly neighbour, the struggling family, or the people you don't normally speak to. Lets all sit down, share some food, mix it up and make new friends.

And finally, to my fellow Councillors I say, you've all got parks so go organise a party!

Public Question from Chrissie Morris Brady (read out by the Deputy Head of Democratic Services)

Why isn't wood being used in new builds? It is sustainable and absorbs carbon. Wooden buildings are proven to have health benefits too.

Students learn better in a wooden building as heartrates lower, and so stress is less. This is the same for homes.

I learnt these facts from 39 Ways To Save The Planet 29 01 22 but I knew before.

Our current building materials contribute 8% of carbon emissions. It has to stop.

Reply from Councillor Philip Broadhead, Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Development, Growth and Regeneration

Most new build development will already incorporate some use of wood within their construction. However, the Building Regulations were also updated at the end of 2021 to ensure that from June 2022, new build development will have to achieve a 30% reduction in carbon emissions on the current standards. Ultimately it is a choice for developers and builders what materials they use but with the forthcoming increase in standards, it is very likely that the use of wood and other sustainable materials will be a key part of the Industry's response to meeting these updated and I think ambitious Building Regulations.

Public Question from Susan Stockwell

The safer cycling corridor from Sandbanks and Lilliput to Sterte and Holes Bay, across Poole High School catchment is currently on hold.

Will this council now restore this route as School Streets, filtering out through traffic at Keyhole Bridge, Bird's Hill and Tatnam Road?

This could allay fears for the future of other traffic calmed roads in Poole, including but not limited to Green Road, Alverton Avenue, Kingston Road, Shaftesbury Road, Danecourt Road, Valley Road, Livingstone Road and others. These are often in place to protect children and young adults walking or cycling to school or college.

Reply from Councillor Mike Greene, Portfolio Holder for Sustainability and Transport

The route from Sandbanks and Lilliput to Sterte and Holes Bay is one of 76 such corridors identified in the Draft Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure plan to be examined for potential interventions over the next decade or so. None of those 76 are "On Hold".

Nor has any part of this route ever been a School Street. School Streets are short closures to motor vehicles during morning drop-off and afternoon pick-up, to improve the conditions immediately outside the school gates, and BCP Council is just in the process of introducing four of these at the moment as trials. Should these trials prove successful, we would look to roll them out to further locations. However, there are no main school entrances on any of the corridor mentioned by Ms Stockwell and it is therefore extremely unlikely that those roads would be considered as potential School Streets.

I would like to reassure Ms Stockwell that the Council carries out regular reviews of road traffic accidents on all BCP roads in line with the current highway legislation. The latest BCP road safety report is available online and it should be noted that no parts of this particular route are identified as Cycle Collision Cluster Sites.

Public Question from Steve Robinson

With the recognition of Age Friendly Communities in the Corporate Strategy we are working with the Lead Member for Communities, forming a partnership in applying to the WHO to become an internationally recognised Age Friendly Community, a benchmark of how the Strategy can be become actionable activities.

Working together, creating opportunities for Older People to remain part of their local community, living healthy and active later lives with knowledge and expertise, gained over many years, celebrated, and shared intergenerationally as they participate in activities that they value and enjoy.

Leader, will you on behalf of the Council, support the application?

Reply from Councillor Drew Mellor, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Finance and Transformation

Thank you, Mr Robinson, for your question.

BCP Council are committed to recognising and valuing local communities as being at the heart of everything they do. Many Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole residents within our communities are in their mid or later life, or perhaps living with some kind of vulnerability which makes everyday life - and feeling that they belong to their local community - just that bit more challenging for them.

We are delighted to work with you at Prama, a local charity, well respected and known for your commitment to local older people. We are also very pleased to support the joint application to WHO to become an Age Friendly Community as part of our Corporate Strategy to help people lead active healthy and independent lives, adding years to life and life to years.

Our strength-based approach to community work means that we embrace an inclusive ethos across all generations including those residents who have valuable experience and lifetime skills to share.

Key features of an age-friendly community include;

- good transport, communication and outdoor spaces,
- volunteering and employment opportunities,
- leisure and community services and, of course,
- health, dignity and social inclusion.

We know that the vision of Prama is for a world where no one is disadvantaged or excluded because of age or infirmity and where every person can enjoy life as they age. Our joint ambition would therefore be to work together towards making this area a place where older people are able to remain a key part of their local community as they live healthy and

active later lives. Older people's knowledge and expertise, gained over many years, will be celebrated, and shared intergenerationally as they participate in the activities that they value and enjoy.

Of course, many of these activities already exist across BCP but need to be more widely known. Our engagement with our Older Population needs to be developed, finding existing strengths - as well as gaps to be filled - and to listen to ideas and suggestions from the residents who have lived experience, and can thus contribute to future strategy.

The short answer to your question, Mr Robinson, is yes, we will give our full support to this application so that we can publicly celebrate our older population and enable them to fully enjoy their retirement years.

Public Question from Conor O'Luby (read out by the Deputy Head of Democratic Services)

Netting over the thatched buildings on Bridge Street, Christchurch have led to the death of several birds, either from stress, dehydration, starvation, or a combination of all these things. This is cruel and unacceptable. Can the Council please explain what they are going to do to prevent any further unnecessary deaths?

Reply from Councillor Philip Broadhead, Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Development Growth and Regeneration

Thank you to Conor O'Luby for his question and for raising his concerns regarding the netting over thatched buildings on Bridge Street. We are currently reviewing the legislative position on this, although would highlight that the Council may not have any control over installation of netting as it appears a matter of how individuals want to maintain their own private property. We understand the concern, however, and have therefore referred the matter to Natural England as the lead for protection on the natural environment, and who may have greater influence on this matter at a national level.

Public Question from Roger West

It is not generally recognised the great debt we all owe to the Indian Army. Their courage particularly in Europe at the beginning of the Great War was of the utmost importance. In Bournemouth you have an opportunity to right this wrong. In November 2014 the Mont Dore Hotel, now Bournemouth Town Hall, was taken over by the Government and became a hospital for Indian Soldiers. Would you agree with me that this fact should be recognised by having a plaque fitted near the entrance?

Reply from Councillor David Kelsey

Thank you for the question, Mr West

The building in question was the Mont Dore hotel but in 1914 it was taken over by the war office to become a hospital for injured soldiers who served with the Indian Army Corps, in 1915 it became a British Military Hospital and in 1916 it accepted ANZAC troops in 1917 it became a convalescence home for British Officers.

As we can see the Building has served many Nationalities and faiths I believe that there is a plaque inside the entrance but I will check and will also look into whether one can be placed outside to commemorate its usage as a military Hospital.

Public Question from Susan Chapman (read out by the Deputy Head of Democratic Services)

Zero Carbon Dorset's vision gives us a chance of heading off the worst of the horror story ahead as small island nations and much of Africa can sadly already testify.

BCP's climate report has strangely not been shared with residents. Yet firefighters on our incinerating home are overdue. BCP's Plans so far are hopelessly inadequate and factual survival information for the public is missing.

Please can BCP ensure the broadcasting of a public information programme enlightening all that the natural world is in crisis and that everyone's effort is needed to prevent the collapse of all living systems?

Reply from Councillor Mike Greene, Portfolio Holder for Sustainability and Transport

BCP Council has a robust Climate Action Plan to achieve Net Zero in its own operations by 2030, and to enable the area as a whole to become Carbon neutral by 2050 at latest. Contrary to Mrs Chapman's assertions, the Annual Report and Climate Action Plan were published last month, extensively challenged, discussed and supported by the Overview and Scrutiny Board in a meeting open to the public, and endorsed by the Cabinet in public too. It is included in today's agenda, and I hope that it will be formally adopted by the Council later this evening.

Through press releases, email bulletins and BH Life Magazine, the Council frequently provides updates and information about Climate Action in what I believe is an appropriate manner.

The Chairman reported that the public questions not dealt with would receive a written response in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

B – Statements

Public Statement from Jamie Dunn, which was read out by Graham Farrant, Chief Executive

Many residents living near to Upton Country Park's perimeter continuously see many users choose not to park in the two car parks available. Instead finding free residential roads and impacting on accessibility for emergency vehicles.

Lowering daily charges to respectable amounts and improved advertising of the yearly £40 charge, will see more vehicles using the main car park. Recent summers tend to be a quarter or half full, which I have evidence of. The main reason is high charges for short periods of time. It's understandable why many park in residential roads.

I kindly request these charges are reviewed.

Public Statement from the Branch Secretary, UNISON which was read out by Graham Farrant, Chief Executive

UNISON calls on the political leadership of the Council to reconsider its political choice not to raise the base rate of Council Tax. The Government assumes this increase when calculating the local government funding settlement figures for councils. These choices make clear investment in staff is not your priority. Expecting staff to do more with less while not investing in the workforce is leaving staff dismayed by your choice not to invest in levelling up wages. Cabinet made budget choices while staff are expected to deliver the Big Plan. The staff need fair pay now, not in 2024.

C – Petitions

There were no petitions submitted for this meeting.

142. Recommendations from Cabinet and other Committees

Item 6a – Cabinet 12 January 2022 – Minute 113 – Council Tax – Tax Base 2022/23

Councillor Mellor, Leader of the Council presented the report on the Tax Base 2022/23 as set out on the agenda and outlined the recommendations. He explained that it was a technical requirement to approve the Tax Base in advance of setting the Council Tax. The recommendations presented a calculation of the tax base for Council tax setting purposes. Councillor Broadhead seconded the proposal.

Voting – Unanimous.

The recommendations arising from the Cabinet on 12 January 2022 as set out on the agenda were carried.

Item 6b - Cabinet 12 January 2022 - Minute No 117 - Climate Action Annual Report 2020/21

Councillor Mike Greene, Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability presented the report on the Climate Action Annual Report 2020/21 and outlined the recommendations as set out on the agenda. He asked the Council to receive the report as an update on activities to address the climate and ecological emergency for the period July 2020 to June 2021. Councillor Greene explained that it had been an unusual year due to the pandemic and also a transitional one. He commented on the budget provision, the approach taken by the previous administration and the reinstatement of funding and increase in budget put in place by the current administration. Councillor Greene referred to the significant disruption the removal on the budget had caused to the creation of a suitably sized team to tackle the problem. Councillors were advised nevertheless that headline figures were encouraging showing the Council's own emissions declining by 11% and area wide emissions reducing by 3.7% for the most recent year available. Councillor Greene suggested caution before celebrating. He explained that the area-wide data was the change from 2017 to 2018 before BCP Council was in existence as a local authority and whilst the true reduction in the Council's own emissions was likely to prove greater than the 11% once contributions from leased out buildings was updated the impact of the pandemic was unknown. Councillor Greene referred to the second recommendation which asked the Council to support the adoption of, ongoing development and delivery of the BCP Council Climate action plan. He explained that it was based on the draft plan agreed by the Council in 2019, which had been tweaked according to emerging guidance primarily from Friends of the Earth and the response to the extensive public engagement which was undertaken early in 2021. Councillors were advised that the plan reflected a shift in priorities the largest possible reduction in emissions for the least possible cost to the Council taxpayer while still recognising the non-financial benefits of some actions. Councillor Greene reported that the actions were divided into five themes with each of them having a cross party portfolio holder support group to help monitor and if necessary to modify the actions to ensure that the overall targets were met. In addition, a rag status has been introduced for each action to assist and increase transparency. Councillor Greene emphasised that this was a comprehensive structured and achievable plan for the Council to reach its twin targets of net zero emissions by 2030 for the Council itself and 2050 at latest for the BCP area as a whole and he urged Council to give the Action Plan its unanimous support. Councillor Mark Anderson in seconding the proposal outlined some of the projects that were being undertaken including the Urban Tree Challenge Fund and the planting of nearly 5000 native trees in several locations across the area, reduction in the distance that waste travels and that a proportion was treated locally, the green wood food waste initiative and that street sweepings continued to be treated and recycled locally, three companies that manage over 94% of the Council's waste had all made zero or negative carbon emission declarations, the Council's Waste Collection vehicles were trialling a new fuel hydro treated vegetable oil (HVO) which was an advanced renewable and sustainable fuel that offers 90% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions.

Councillors in discussing the recommendations raised a number of issues including the proposals for BCP to join the UK 100 Club. Councillor Broadhead explained the purpose of the UK 100 Club which was a network of highly ambitious Local Government Leaders and Councils around the Country which were looking to devise and implement plans for the transition to clean energy but to do it in a way that was ambitious, cost effective and crucially takes the public and businesses with them. Councillor Broadhead outlined the opportunities in joining the UK 100 Club in particular national dialogue with leaders and world leading businesses and industry which were now focussed on climate change because it was the commercially savvy approach to take. He explained that the Club also brings the benefit of sharing knowledge and ideas. Councillor Broadhead highlighted that climate action should permeate through everything that the Council does and across the BCP area. He referred to the ecological aspects and the proposal to be one of the first Council's in the Country to embed biodiversity net gain into everything that the Council does and when adopted would have to be included in each development that comes forward in the future which demonstrates how the Council would be caring about nature. Councillors were informed that the climate and ecological emergency was also being embedded into the development of the Local Plan. Councillor Toby Johnson reported on what he referred to as one of the most generous home insulation grant schemes in the Country which provided the opportunity for residents to make an application for a grant to increase the efficiency of their property to the national average of grade D or if not the highest possible rating. He highlighted the support that this would provide to residents particularly in light of the significant increase in energy costs and the potential savings that could be achieved.

Councillor Slade referred to the approach taken by the previous administration relating to the budget provision. She explained that three weeks prior to the global pandemic the previous administration had taken the decision to pause its political priorities whilst dealing with the pandemic and were then removed from office at a time when clarity had not been provided about the replacement of funding. Councillor Slade reported that about two weeks after the change of administration the funding was restored, and additional funding was found. She highlighted that had that not happened the funding that was paused would have returned. Councillor Slade reported that the Overview and Scrutiny Board welcomed but did not agree with the Plan explaining that they had agreed with the actions but did not agree the climate plan was a plan, the Board felt that it was a list of tasks. Councillor Slade referred to the significant set of recommendations submitted to the Portfolio Holder which were not in time for the Cabinet in doing so she highlighted that the Board felt that it was a surface only list of actions, it was missing a strategy and risk assessment. Councillor Slade reported that the Board had welcomed the excellent appointment of Dr Matthew Montgomery as the Head of Climate and acknowledged that in order for him to do the job well that we should not set out a list of actions that we wanted done but allow him as the expert to determine how the Council took it forward before it came back to the Overview and Scrutiny Board in September. Councillor Slade expressed her disappointment that

no reference had been made to the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Board referred to above.

Councillor Bull thanked the officers for the work undertaken with limited resources who were now part of the expanded team and he welcomed Dr Montgomery. He referred to the reduction in emissions which was welcome, but he was unsure if the increase due to Council employees working from home had been fully accounted for. Councillor Bull emphasised that time was short and referred to the effect of the storm locally the previous week. He commented on the implications of flooding in 50 years due to weather events highlighting how important it was to address the emergency, that whilst welcoming the papers work needs to be done and actions need to be ambitious and transformational. Councillor Felicity emphasised the severity of the situation and in doing so thanked Sue Chapman for her email correspondence including the comments and statements that she has made to full Council. Councillor Rice requested that training be provided for all Councillors on climate change and asked that the Portfolio Holder commit to arranging training. Councillor Hadley indicated that the introduction to the report highlights the recognition that the climate emergency was a human-driven global catastrophe. He highlighted that the target was only eight years away and there had been less than 10% change which was not a lot. He also referred to the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Board and that the papers had remained unchanged he highlighted the difficulties in how Councillors can influence some of the proposals. Councillor Hadley explained that he had been working on climate issue for decades including working with the Borough of Poole and the climate lead officer on various projects. Councillor Hadley emphasised the need to move at pace as the climate was getting more extreme. He welcomed the report which felt was very much a starting point and needed development to achieve the targets. Councillor Burton, for clarity, highlighted page 68 of the agenda pack and the tables referring to units in kilowatt hours he explained that the word watt should start with a capital W.

Councillor Mike Greene in summing up explained that if the Council was to achieve the ambitious emission targets it was necessary to have the support of residents, businesses and other stakeholders and achieve balance. He thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Board for its contributions and explained that the Council was already doing or propose to do almost everything contained in the recommendations apart from including working from home due to current guidelines. He thanked Councillor Toby Johnson for highlighting the home insulation grant which he felt was the most comprehensive and generous in the Country and showed the Council's dedication to both tackling emissions from buildings and protecting the finance of residents. Councillor Mike Greene thanked Councillor Mark Anderson for the reference to the carbon savings being made by the Council's fleet fuel change and the move towards electrifying the fleet. He also commented on the Council's efforts to join the UK 100 Club and his hope that the Council was one of the premier leaders with the aim of bringing forward the area's net zero target. Councillor Greene reported that the area was one of only 11 in the Country and 95 in the world to get an A

rating from the carbon disclosure project which really demonstrated what the Council was achieving. Councillor Greene explained that fighting climate change has to be a team effort, he thanked those working within the portfolio holder support groups and that with the budget provision there was now a fantastic and well-resourced officer team headed up by Dr Montgomery which he thanked for the incredible job they were doing as the Council move forward in achieving net zero targets.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendations arising from the Cabinet meeting on 12 January 2022 as set out on the agenda which were carried as follows:

Voting – Unanimous

Item 6c - Cabinet 9 February 2022 - Minute No 129 - 2021/22 Budget Monitoring Quarter 3

Councillor Mellor, Leader of the Council presented the report on the 2021/22 Budget Monitoring Quarter 3 and outlined the recommendation as set out on the agenda. He explained that the report had been to Overview and Scrutiny Board and Cabinet. In summary he explained that it was a positive update whilst this had been a very challenging year due to one off pressures related to covid the Council was moving towards a balanced better budget position and he was confident in delivering a surplus in year. Councillor Mellor took the opportunity that thank all officers and in particular the Finance Team. Councillor Mellor asked the Council to formally approve the capital virement. Councillor Broadhead seconded the proposals and in doing so echoed Councillor Mellor's comments on the expected surplus.

Councillor Cox indicated that the update was not positive and that it indicated a significant turnaround in the Council's finances. He referred Councillors to paragraph 4 and a reference to a failure to control costs within the Council and a failure to make transformational savings with a £5m write-off of an existing special purpose vehicle which were not positive updates. Councillor Cox referred to paragraph 5 highlighting that the above were all being covered by one-offs and therefore next year would be worse. He indicated that it was for the Cabinet Members to take responsibility for their own budgets, and he felt they clearly were not.

Councillor Mellor in summing up explained that a prudent approach had been taken in respect of financial management. He highlighted that it had been a challenging year, but the net position was a surplus with record investment in services. Councillor Mellor reported on the positive choices taken on the transformation programme and explained that for the first time the Council was looking towards a largely balanced MTFP over five years. He emphasised that it was a prudent and well managed financial performance.

Councillor Rocca arrived at 8.00 pm

The Council then took a vote on the recommendation arising from the Cabinet meeting on 9 February 2022 as set out on the agenda which was carried as follows:

Voting – For – 61, Against – 0, Abstentions – 4

The Chairman reported that the following issues recommended from the Cabinet meeting held on 9 February 2022 related to the budget and therefore Members were reminded that, under Regulation 2 of the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 votes taken at key budget decision meetings must be recorded in the minutes.

Item 6d - Cabinet 9 February 2022 - Minute No 130 - Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget Setting 2022/23

Councillor Karen Rampton, Cabinet Member for People and Homes presented the report on the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget Setting 2022/23 and outlined the recommendations as set out on the agenda.

Councillor Rampton explained that that HRA was a separate account from the General Fund which ring fenced the income and expenditure associated with the Council housing stock in Bournemouth and Poole which consisted of some 9,500 rented properties plus 1,100 leasehold properties and a small number of low-cost ownership properties with a combined rent roll of £45m. Councillor Rampton explained that the report sought approval for the proposed budget, proposals for rent, service charge and other charges to tenants and the plans for expenditure for 2022/23. Councillors were informed that the HRA delivers against a number of corporate objectives including new homes, energy efficiency measures and engagement with residents. Councillor Rampton reported that the income to the HRA could only be spent on services to residents, management of their homes and provision of new homes for future tenants and leaseholders. She explained that it was important that the level of income was maintained and maximised to support the 30-year plan. Councillor Rampton emphasised that new homes were needed and the development of homes within the HRA would help the Council priority to deliver at least 1,000 homes of mixed tenure in the next five years. In addition, Councillors were informed that the strategic objectives of the HRA were outlined at paragraph 73 in the report with the three key areas detailed at paragraph 75 – revenue income, revenue expenditure and capital expenditure. In referring to the recommendations Councillor Rampton indicated that it was proposed that dwelling rents increase by 4.1% which was a formulae of CPI plus 1% which was inline with most other local authorities which was an average increase of less than £4 per week which would only affect some residents as around 68% were in receipt of universal credit or housing benefit which helped with housing costs. Councillors were informed that residents pay service charges for items such as heating, communal power, gardening and cleaning and it was proposed that an increase of 22.6% be applied to charges for

communal heating and power which reflects the increase in energy costs but it was proposed that this was capped to offer protection to residents from energy price increases of 50% plus as residents who receive their power through a communal supply were not protected by the price cap. Councillor Rampton explained that this mitigation does mean a loss to the HRA of approximately £120,000 of income but it does offer residents protection from increasing costs with additional support available to residents through winter fuel payments and the household support fund.

Councillors were informed that as part of the planned maintenance programme the Council would spend up to £15m improving Council homes and the HRA supported several corporate objectives through the provision of new homes, supporting and engaging with residents and making homes more energy efficient. Councillor Rampton reported that £1m additional money had been set aside to kickstart investment in energy efficiency programmes as approved and would deliver work to ensure the Council achieves the most for residents. Councillors were informed that Appendix 6 to the report set out how up to £48m would be spent providing new homes and other major projects with delivery plans for each neighbourhood set out in Appendices 7 and 8 setting out the actions in 2022/23 and subject to future approval of the housing management model these delivery plans would align into one programme. Councillor Rampton thanked all officers involved in compiling such an excellent report and the amount of work that had gone into preparing it and sought approval for the recommendations. Councillor Mellor in seconding the proposals reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Broadhead commented on the projects referenced in Appendix 6 to the report which formed part of the Council house delivery programme and the new CNAS programme. He referred to the Cabbage Patch Car Park Scheme and the Luckham Road scheme which Councillor Broadhead had welcomed the first residents into in the last couple of weeks. He highlighted climate action work and ensuring that these homes were as efficient as possible which was important in view of the rise in energy costs. Councillor Broadhead reported that the Luckham Road development not only complied to passive house standards but also was the very first of the Council's developments that had ground source heat pumps. In addition, he commented on the Princess Road development which was now going through final approval and was a mixed-use development protecting some of the most vulnerable providing plenty of affordable homes and including a hostel element. He reminded Councillors that the Herbert Avenue Scheme had also been approved. Councillor Broadhead thanked the Planning Committee for approval of the scheme for the Hillbourne School Site providing 100% affordable homes.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendations arising from the Cabinet meeting on 9 February 2022 as set out on the agenda which were carried as follows:

For - 65

Cllr Hazel Allen	Cllr Bryan Dion	Cllr David Kelsey
Cllr Lewis Allison	Cllr Bobbie Dove	Cllr Bob Lawton
Cllr Mark Anderson	Cllr Beverley Dunlop	Cllr Marion LePoidevin
Cllr Sarah Anderson	Cllr Millie Earl	Cllr Rachel Maidment
Cllr Marcus Andrews	Cllr Jackie Edwards	Cllr Chris Matthews
Cllr Julie Bagwell	Cllr L-J Evans	Cllr Simon McCormack
Cllr Steve Baron	Cllr George Farquhar	Cllr Drew Mellor
Cllr Stephen Bartlett	Cllr Duane Farr	Cllr Pete Miles
Cllr John Beesley	Cllr Laurence Fear	Cllr Sandra Moore
Cllr Derek Borthwick	Cllr Sean Gabriel	Cllr Susan Phillips
Cllr Philip Broadhead	Cllr Mike Greene	Cllr Margaret Phipps
Cllr Mike Brooke	Cllr Nicola Greene	Cllr Karen Rampton
Cllr Nigel Brooks	Cllr Andy Hadley	Cllr Felicity Rice
Cllr David Brown	Cllr May Haines	Cllr Chris Rigby
Cllr Simon Bull	Cllr Peter Hall	Cllr Mark Robson
Cllr Richard Burton	Cllr Paul Hilliard	Cllr Roberto Rocca
Cllr Daniel Butt	Cllr Mark Howell	Cllr Vikki Slade
Cllr Judes Butt	Cllr Mohan Iyengar	Cllr Mike White
Cllr Eddie Coope	Cllr Cheryl Johnson	Cllr Lawrence Williams
Cllr Mike Cox	Cllr Toby Johnson	Cllr Tony O'Neill
Cllr Malcolm Davies	Cllr Andy Jones	Cllr Nigel Hedges
Cllr Lesley Dedman	Cllr Jane Kelly	

Against - 0

Abstentions - 1

Cllr Ann Stribley		
-------------------	--	--

(Note Councillor Stribley indicated that she had not heard all of the debate as she arrived at 20.03 and therefore abstained from the vote)

Item 6e - Cabinet 9 February 2022 - Minute No 133 - Mainstream Schools and Early Years Funding Formulae 2022/23

Councillor Nicola Greene, Cabinet Member for Council Priorities and Delivery presented the report on the Mainstream Schools and Early Years Funding Formulae and outlined the recommendations as set out on the agenda. She reported that the paper set out the way in which the dedicated schools grant totalling £322m was to be distributed complying with national requirements and local preferences within a prescribed financial framework. Councillors were reminded that the overall funding available comes directly from central government and covers most of the educational sector funding mainstream schools to year 11, special schools and early years settings as well as bespoke educational packages for children with special educational needs and disabilities and some central functions required to support the education sector including admissions. Councillor Greene reported that at first sight an increase in spending of £23m stands out as a significant sum and was welcomed. She explained in recognising that this would have a positive impact in mainstream

schools it needed to be considered in the wider context of the historic and ongoing deficit within the high needs block which was the part of the grant which funds the needs of children and young people with educational health and care packages some of which were very costly. Councillor Greene explained that in making their recommendations the School Forum wanted to support the early years sector recognising the huge positive impact that early diagnosis of a child's additional needs can have for that child and indeed the negative outcome of undiagnosed need later on as a child passes through their school years. The Forum further recognised the pressure which particularly face many of the providers within that sector who were private, voluntary and independent organisations who do not have the ability to cross subsidise with both staffing and expertise. Councillor Greene reported that Members were aware that considerable work was ongoing to address the challenges within the High Needs Block highlighting that BCP Council was not alone in feeling this pressure as it has been a longstanding concern for the sector across the country with Local Government Association continuing to lobby on behalf of Councils.

Councillors were informed that the local approach had been to establish a High Needs Block recovery Board chaired by the Chief Executive with a focus on reducing the deficit and the ongoing pressures, by a variety of means which dovetails with practice improvements and wider sectoral partnership co-production with parents and carers at the heart led by the SEND Improvement Board's Independent Chair. Councillor Greene reported that it draws on the findings of the Appreciative Inquiry which had been referred to Cabinet in the Autumn and links with the SEND Capital Investment approved by Council which was focused on the delivery of high-quality school places for children and young people with additional needs in the heart of BCP Communities. Councillor Greene emphasised that she welcomed the expressions of interest received to develop ways of keeping BCP children within our existing schools and academies limiting the number of those whose needs can only be met by non-local provision. She reported that evaluation was underway on this proposal, and she looked forward to bringing those developments forward in due course.

Councillor Greene thanked the Council's School Finance team, and she expressed her gratitude to the Schools Forum for their forensic understanding of the issues and their determination to ensure that the needs of our children and young people were at the forefront of any decision to do with funding. Councillor White seconded the proposals.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendations arising from the Cabinet meeting on 9 February 2022 as set out on the agenda which was carried as follows:

For – 66

Cllr Hazel Allen	Cllr Bryan Dion	Cllr David Kelsey
Cllr Lewis Allison	Cllr Bobbie Dove	Cllr Bob Lawton
Cllr Mark Anderson	Cllr Beverley Dunlop	Cllr Marion LePoidevin
Cllr Sarah Anderson	Cllr Millie Earl	Cllr Rachel Maidment
Cllr Marcus Andrews	Cllr Jackie Edwards	Cllr Chris Matthews

Cllr Julie Bagwell	Cllr L-J Evans	Cllr Simon McCormack
Cllr Steve Baron	Cllr George Farquhar	Cllr Drew Mellor
Cllr Stephen Bartlett	Cllr Duane Farr	Cllr Pete Miles
Cllr John Beesley	Cllr Laurence Fear	Cllr Sandra Moore
Cllr Derek Borthwick	Cllr Sean Gabriel	Cllr Susan Phillips
Cllr Philip Broadhead	Cllr Mike Greene	Cllr Margaret Phipps
Cllr Mike Brooke	Cllr Nicola Greene	Cllr Karen Rampton
Cllr Nigel Brooks	Cllr Andy Hadley	Cllr Felicity Rice
Cllr David Brown	Cllr May Haines	Cllr Chris Rigby
Cllr Simon Bull	Cllr Peter Hall	Cllr Mark Robson
Cllr Richard Burton	Cllr Paul Hilliard	Cllr Roberto Rocca
Cllr Daniel Butt	Cllr Mark Howell	Cllr Ann Stribley
Cllr Judes Butt	Cllr Mohan Iyengar	Cllr Vikki Slade
Cllr Eddie Coope	Cllr Cheryl Johnson	Cllr Mike White
Cllr Mike Cox	Cllr Toby Johnson	Cllr Lawrence Williams
Cllr Malcolm Davies	Cllr Andy Jones	Cllr Tony O'Neill
Cllr Lesley Dedman	Cllr Jane Kelly	Cllr Nigel Hedges

Against - 0

Abstentions - 0

Item 6f - Cabinet 9 February 2022 - Minute No 128 - Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2022/23

Prior to consideration of the recommendations Councillor Dedman asked the following question

On 25 January the Daily Echo carried an article headed 'Beach hut plan key to BCP Council's budget proposal'. This set out the plan included in the Cabinet papers to set up a company to buy BCP council's beach huts, as part of the 'non-traditional approach' included in the Conservative Administration's budget proposals. The plan is designed to raise £54million for the council, and as the article says, is a keystone of the whole budget.

This budget plan was by then in the public domain, and of course the newspaper article itself gave the news to any reader of the Echo.

As a Christchurch Borough Councillor, I worked closely with the Associations concerned with the beach huts on Christchurch's estate. I was contacted by one of the chairs of the Beach Hut Association who informed me that the first he knew of the plan was by actually seeing this article in the Echo. He told me that none of the five chairs of the Beach Hut Associations had been informed or consulted. The chairs were naturally concerned and angry both at the news, and at the way they found out about it.

The plan will by its very nature necessitate changes for the beach hut associations, so why was there no communication to these associations about a plan which so closely concerns them?

Reply from Councillor Drew Mellor, Leader of the Council

I would like to thank Councillor Dedman for her question and am grateful for the opportunity to respond in some detail to the issue she raises.

Every budget is underpinned by a number of assumptions about income and expenditure. As we will see in the budget paper later this evening, our assumption is that we need to pay for our council improvement plan to ensure that it is as efficient, productive and accessible as it can be, in order to deliver services for our residents. Rather than making an assumption that we sell assets externally as was proposed in the past, we are instead proposing to bring forward a plan which not only keeps those assets but improves them and sets them to work for all our council taxpayers.

Regarding the use of assets that we are proposing I will take the opportunity to be clear what is proposed and what isn't. It is entirely traditional and business as usual for councils to explore the use of different vehicles to hold and operate its assets as we do successfully through PHP, Aspire, Tricuro, Seascope to name a few. Any income generated is restricted to either investment in new capital assets or investment in our transformation programme which will deliver a 50m a year asset in itself.

Work is underway in drilling into the detail of the plan, but I must clarify something to save everyone's time. It's possible that members of the minority groups will be speculating at length about an extensive and detailed report from KPMG that the administration does not want to be made public. Let me be clear – such a completed report doesn't exist. As part of exploring whether this new plan, our approach to avoid selling our assets, was possible, we undertook a series of workshops which were very much focussed on high level principles and in doing so we received comfort from KPMG, CIPFA and our external auditor, Grant Thornton, that this approach was valid, legitimate and within our accounting rules. If this external comfort hadn't been delivered our highly diligent and professional S151 officer would not have authorised inclusion in this budget paper.

In providing assurance to the residents Councillor Dedman has spoken to, I would like to set out the process which will follow on from this evening. There is much work to do and it will involve a number of stakeholders including the beach hut associations, along with those who are not represented by these groups. A report finalising how we will make this work to the benefit of everyone will be prepared for Cabinet and onwards to Overview and Scrutiny and Council for approval. Prior to this, I'm sure Councillors will be very interested in the proposals and I will work with the Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Board to bring this forward at the earliest opportunity.

So, in summary, there is an assurance from KPMG and CIPFA that this new plan will be possible and financially correct. The detail will come later and we will be working across all parties and stakeholders to flesh out how we can achieve the very best outcome for all.

Councillor Dedman reiterated her question and asked when would the beach hut owners and the Beach Hut Associations be told. As a supplementary question she asked the Leader if he had spoken to the Beach Hut Associations yet. In response Councillor Mellor reported that the Beach Hut Associations would not be told they would be consulted, and it was proposed to bring forward the report in quarter one of the 2022/23 financial year.

Councillor Mellor, Leader of the Council made his budget statement presented the report on the Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2022/23 and outlined the detail of the recommendations as set out on the agenda. In presenting the budget Councillor Mellor thanked the S151 Officer, Adam Richens and his Finance Team for their support and engagement in preparing the budget. He also recognised the debt of gratitude to Officers across the conurbation who work daily to provide the services that residents value. Councillor Broadhead seconded the proposals and reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Cox as the Liberal Democrat representative commented on the Budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan for 2022/23 and in doing so thanked Adam Richens for the time that he provided in assisting him in understanding the complexities of the budget and the risks which lie within in it. He also thanked Mr Richens and the Finance Team for the work undertaken in preparing the budget reports. He outlined his concerns on the budget which had been presented, including the use of reserves even having received additional funding from central government, the approach to financial management, not achieving 70% of transformational saving targets, capitalising on future income and proposals for a reverse equity scheme without consultation and examination by the Overview and Scrutiny Board. Councillor Cox referred to the proposal for the use of Council assets and that Councillors had not had access to any report. Councillor Cox indicated that the Cabinet had failed to take ownership and responsibility for the overspending and that the Cabinet Member responsible for transformation had failed to understand, manage and control the transformation budget indicating that the expected savings would not be achieved. Councillor Cox stressed that there were some good initiatives such as the green futures fund, the commitment to spending what was needed on adult and children's services and providing the food waste collections in Poole. He explained that the opposition would prefer to support a budget which balanced but there were risks with the proposed budget which cannot be reconciled. He called for the budget to be delayed until the facts were provided to Councillors of the risks and they were adequately addressed.

Councillor Cox then proposed the following motion without notice under procedure rule 10.1.4

To refer this matter to a special meeting of Councillor to be held before 11 March 2022

As stated in para 70-80 on page 268-270 of the budget the receipt of proceeds from the sale of the Beach Hut revenues for the next 20 years is fundamental to the Councils 2022-23 budget.

The advice received from KPMG and in particular any conditions or inherent risks identified in respect of this proposal is central to Councillor's ability to evaluate this proposal.

Despite requests to have sight of this report from KPMG from the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and opposition Councillors nothing has been received.

In view of this lack of information and transparency this Council defers any budget decision until all councillors are given copies of all relevant reports into the establishment of the New Special Purpose Vehicle which will pay BCP the relevant proceeds.

The meeting was adjourned at 20:35 – 20:50

The Chief Executive reported that he wanted to check the legality of the process and what the process would be for Members before any debate. He indicated the impact of such a motion being brought forward without advance notice as officers could have worked out what the process would be.

Councillor Cox raised a point of order and indicated that he did submit the motion in advance having cleared it with the Monitoring Officer, the Head of Democratic Services and the S151 Officer. The Chief Executive indicated that the above was not a point of order. The Chairman indicated that notice means in writing 2-3 days before the meeting according to the Monitoring Officer. The Chief Executive explained that it was difficult to make such decisions and get the correct advice in terms of the process. He commented on the KPMG report if it were to be received and advised that there would be a requirement for 5 days notice of a meeting. Members were informed that the schedule was such that the 1 March was the deadline for getting the Council Tax bills prepared and sent out with the 11 March being the statutory deadline that might require an intervention from the Secretary of State. It would be necessary to identify when the Council would receive the report from KPMG and could 5 days notice be provided for the meeting without that report being circulated. The Chief Executive asked Councillors to consider the timescale and that there would be a cost to the Council in terms of delayed issuing of direct debits which cannot be estimated at this stage.

Councillor Cox asked for clarity on whether there was a report in view of comments made by the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive. The Chief Executive explained that there was no report received from KPMG which was finalised. He clarified that his previous comments were if the Council was to receive a finalised report from KPMG.

Councillor Lesley Dedman seconded the motion without notice proposed by Councillor Cox as detailed above. She felt that the proposal to defer was right and outlined the concerns raised by residents who had indicated that the budget as presented was contrary to good financial practice. Councillor Dedman emphasised that residents deserve better than a Council whose budget was built on “shifting sands” and asked how the budget can be considered when the detail had not been seen. She explained that she had challenged the Leader at the Overview and Scrutiny Board on the Beach Hut proposals and he reported that there was not a written business plan.

Councillors considered the motion without notice as detailed above. Councillor Bartlett reported that he liked a lot of the proposed budget including the additional funding for Children’s Services, the Cleaner Greener Safer project and the additional funding for climate change. He explained that he did have concerns about the proposal that underpins the financial strategy of the Council explaining that in principle he had nothing against using assets to grow businesses, but he had concerns about the scale of the proposal. Councillor Bartlett referred to the expected financial benefits but asked was it too good to be true in view of the red flags and warnings from the S151 Officer. He also indicated that when he requested the information that informs the budget he had not been allowed access as it had not been published as a key decision on the Cabinet Forward Plan which would have then given an opportunity to really look at the detail of the proposal. Councillor Bartlett explained that to take a decision of such magnitude without all Councillors being aware of the detail was unreasonable however, he did not want to put the Council through the difficulties outlined with the statutory deadlines in setting the budget and the Council tax.

Councillor Hilliard indicated that Councillors were being asked to approve a budget based on several key assumptions and without sight of key documents that underpin savings projections. He felt that the risk to residents and the Council could not be quantified. Councillor Hilliard referred to the initial transformation report from KPMG which had been presented in a public Cabinet meeting in November 2019 by the previous administration which was based on a Corporate Strategy. He reported that the current administration had not proposed to change the Strategy appreciating the public involvement in preparing it. Council Hilliard emphasised that residents deserved an open and transparent Council where budget schemes and other proposals have had full consultation and engagement. Councillor Hadley indicated that whether a draft report exists there was a need for clear guidance on what the assumptions were based upon and the fact that Councillors had not seen such guidance suggests that it contains further information that should be of concern to both Councillors and residents. He also referred to a response central

government provided to a local MP indicating that Local Authorities should not create companies to circumvent the requirements of the capital framework. Councillor Hadley reported that this was an unconventional poorly conceived approach underpinning the budget and greater clarity was needed for the public as they should not be used as a 'cash cow' creating increased debt and reduced revenue.

Councillor Mellor indicated that the Council had been supported in this matter by KPMG and the model has been referred to CIPFA for consultancy and the external auditor for consideration. He explained that a separate formal report would be brought back to the Council for approval in the first quarter of the 2022/23 financial year following the further due diligence including value for money assessments. Councillor Mellor highlighted that early advice and feedback recognised the reasons for the financial accounting aspects of this proposal. He explained that it was entirely reasonable as an assumption, as all budgets were based on significant assumptions for the purposes of producing a balance budget. Councillor Mellor confirmed that such a completed report that was being requested does not exist but when it does exist it would come through the normal process and at that point there would be consultation with stakeholders and the Overview and Scrutiny process to look at it in detail. In referring to the motion without notice as proposed by Councillor Cox he emphasised that the opposition did not have a plan.

Councillor Mark Howell raised a point of order on the process and order of speakers. The Chairman confirmed that this was a motion without notice.

Councillor Mellor continued and in doing so indicated that an alternative budget had not been submitted by the opposition.

Officers were asked to explain again what would happen if the motion without notice was supported. The Chief Executive indicated that this would depend on the timescale in which the Council could get a report from KPMG, 5 days notice of a meeting would be required if that was done tomorrow the earliest we could hold the meeting would be 3 March 2022 and any budget decision after 1 March 2022 would result in delays to the Council Tax bills being issued which involved a cost and therefore any agreement of this motion would delay the setting of the Council tax. A report from KPMG would need to be checked in terms of content to ensure that exempt information was not being published and then Members would need time to read the document and the available time between 1 – 11 March when the Secretary of State could intervene was very tight. The Monitoring Officer also referred to potential issues with the availability of the Council Chamber which could result in further cost to the Council in renting another venue.

Councillor Howell commented on the availability of a report and that he had been denied access to the report. He indicated that the members of the Overview and Scrutiny Board were entitled to documents that had been used in the decision-making process by Portfolio Holders unless the Leader makes a decision to refuse because the documents were in draft. He

suggested that such a draft document from KPMG existed but felt there would be qualifications until the final report was published. Councillor Howell indicated that he could not draw any other conclusion than the report was deliberately being held in draft so that it was not released.

Councillor Brown supported the deferral as Councillors were being asked to make a key Council decision when only a limited number of Councillors were aware of the full supporting information, advice and any qualifications regarding the strategy. He highlighted that the Council was living beyond its means and expenditure was higher than permanent sources of income emphasising that it was critical to get the decision right in view of the long term implications. Councillor Brown in referring to the obligations of all Councillors in approving the budget and setting the Council tax suggested moving to the reserve date. Councillor Allison asked for clarification on what documents had actually been used by KPMG in the assurances that the administration has used to form the beach hut aspect of the budget as presented. Councillor Phipps emphasised that the budget was based on risks and assumptions with huge future debt proposed and Councillors needed to see the evidence to enable them to make an informed decision.

Councillor Nicola Greene referred to comments made by the proposer and felt that moving this motion without notice shows a disrespect to the Chairman, officers and fellow members and that there was no reason why the motion could not have been submitted earlier. Councillor Howell raised a point of order. Councillor Mike Greene raised a point of order indicating that the Constitution was clear on what has to be stated during a point of order and it was not sufficient to shout the words point of order and start speaking. Councillor Mike Greene asked the Chair to clarify how this meeting should proceed. The Chairman allowed Councillor Howell to continue as it related to a previous speech where his name was mentioned. Councillor Howell reported that he had been accused of opposing for opposing sake which was not true, and that Councillors needed to hold the administration to account and scrutinise them. Councillor Nicola Greene clarified that she was not in particular making a point at Councillor Howell for his opposition it was a general point and to oppose was a state of mind and a personal decision that sits with any member.

Councillor Slade asked if it was possible for the Section 151 Officer to clarify what information requested by Councillor Allison had been provided. She understood the issues that had been raised in respect of any deferral and commented on resources whilst asking why would Councillors be put under pressure to make decisions tonight when over £50m was at stake for a project that we do not yet know was legal and whilst having had assurances from the Leader all Councillors and resident were not permitted to know. Councillor Slade raised her concerns regarding the inconsistency in the availability of information to all Councillors and that the KPMG report should have been available prior to the Council meeting so that if Members asked it could be provided. She also commented on the timing of the submission of the motion without notice from Councillor Cox and the associated reasons having been provided with advice from Officers.

Councillor Cox in summing up on his motion without notice highlighted the increasing risks which were evident from the Section 151 Officers report and were not normal. He explained that he fully appreciated the timing issues, but numerous requests had been made for the documents and they had not been provided. Councillor Cox outlined the reasons why he had not submitted an alternative budget due to the level of risk.

Councillor Mellor advised that there had been a clear explanation of the documents that exist which included a series of workshop sessions with Grant Thornton and that work had then been reviewed by CIPFA and the external auditors with the papers before the Council clearly saying that this was in line with the accounting procedures. He reported that when there was a completed report with full due diligence this would be considered in quarter one of the 2022/23 financial year. The Section 151 Officer Adam Richens reported that this was a non-traditional approach and with such an approach a high level of due diligence was required. The due diligence was being undertaken based on a draft report and must be absolutely watertight and sound as part of due process. Councillors were advised that once the report was finalised that it would then be used to support the report going to Cabinet in June and Council in July when actually the formal decision would be made. The Section 151 Officer reported that the budget and the financial plan were based on a series of assumptions based on the income and expenditure of the Council and the requirement was that they balance. He explained that the beach hut project was a key assumption used in the presentation of a balanced budget and that in the Section 25 report at Appendix 3 the S151 Officer clearly articulates the risk associated with the proposals and if it was not endorsed by Council in July the consequences the Council would have to take to rectify that position. He emphasised as part of normal financial management arrangements it was necessary to monitor the budget making sure that the Council continues to have a balance for the year.

The Council then took a vote on the motion without notice proposed by Councillor Cox and seconded by Councillor Dedman as detailed in bold type above which was lost as follows:

For – 26

Cllr Lewis Allison	Cllr Millie Earl	Cllr Simon McCormack
Cllr Marcus Andrews	Cllr L-J Evans	Cllr Pete Miles
Cllr Stephen Bartlett	Cllr George Farquhar	Cllr Sandra Moore
Cllr Mike Brooke	Cllr Andy Hadley	Cllr Margaret Phipps
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Paul Hilliard	Cllr Felicity Rice
Cllr Simon Bull	Cllr Mark Howell	Cllr Chris Rigby
Cllr Richard Burton	Cllr Marion LePoidevin	Cllr Mark Robson
Cllr Mike Cox	Cllr Rachel Maidment	Cllr Vikki Slade
Cllr Lesley Dedman	Cllr Chris Matthews	

Against – 40

Cllr Hazel Allen	Cllr Bobbie Dove	Cllr Jane Kelly
Cllr Mark Anderson	Cllr Beverley Dunlop	Cllr David Kelsey
Cllr Sarah Anderson	Cllr Jackie Edwards	Cllr Bob Lawton
Cllr Julie Bagwell	Cllr Duane Farr	Cllr Drew Mellor
Cllr Steve Baron	Cllr Laurence Fear	Cllr Susan Phillips
Cllr John Beesley	Cllr Sean Gabriel	Cllr Karen Rampton
Cllr Derek Borthwick	Cllr Mike Greene	Cllr Roberto Rocca
Cllr Philip Broadhead	Cllr Nicola Greene	Cllr Ann Stribley
Cllr Nigel Brooks	Cllr May Haines	Cllr Mike White
Cllr Daniel Butt	Cllr Peter Hall	Cllr Lawrence Williams
Cllr Judes Butt	Cllr Mohan Iyengar	Cllr Tony O'Neill
Cllr Eddie Coope	Cllr Cheryl Johnson	Cllr Nigel Hedges
Cllr Malcolm Davies	Cllr Toby Johnson	
Cllr Bryan Dion	Cllr Andy Jones	

Abstentions – 0

The Council continued to debate the original recommendations.

Councillor Mike Brooke indicated that there were items in the budget that he would be happy to support were it not for the fact that it was predicated on several very high-risk processes as well as being unsustainable. He explained that the 2021/22 and 2022/23 budgets had depended on the financial resilience of reserves for support of £66m which significantly reduced the Council's future financial flexibility and resilience. Councillor Brooke reported that the 2023/34 budget would have to address a £28m funding gap and commented on the approach being proposed and the expected level of debt which would reach £836m by 2027 while barely increasing earmarked reserves. He continued by explaining that by end of March 2023 there would be insufficient earmarked reserves to tackle the continually increasing overspend in the high needs block. Councillor Brooke indicated that should the Government fail to extend the current arrangements beyond that date then the Council could face a section 114 notice and all that such a notice entails. He also referred to other elements that were dependent upon the Government doing the right thing such as retaining the flexible use of capital receipts so that the transformation programme can be funded. Councillor Brooke reported that with costs spiralling and savings dwindling resulting in the programme being reprofiled and pushed back there was no confidence that the requisite £50m savings would materialise. Councillor Brooke commented on the beach hut project, that there was a strong possibility that pay equalisation would not be cost neutral and with inflation predicted to rise to over 7.5% and interest rates likely to continue to rise all of these issues would impact negatively on the budget. Council Brooke proposed the following amendment to the recommendations in agenda item 6(f) by adding an additional item as follows:

“(F) that budget monitoring reports are brought to every Overview and Scrutiny Board meeting”

He explained that this would increase the level of budget monitoring and respond to the concerns expressed in the section 25 report. The above amendment was seconded by Councillor Slade.

Councillor Broadhead sought clarification from the Monitoring Officer on whether the Council could instruct the Overview and Scrutiny Board to include an issue on its agenda. The Monitoring Officer explained that Council can request that the Overview and Scrutiny Board look at various issues, but it cannot dictate what the Board considers on its Forward Plan because the purpose of the Board was to be independent and to present a balance to the Executive.

Councillors commented on the proposed amendment including the monitoring of the budget by the Overview and Scrutiny Board on a quarterly basis, that the Board should not have any agenda items imposed upon it but should determine its own agenda and the lack of alternative budget from the opposition.

Following a point of order, the Chairman asked Councillor Mike Greene if he could address the amendment.

Councillor Slade explained that there was a good reason why there was not an alternative budget because of the issues with the proposed budget. She commented on the amendment and indicated it would be appropriate to ask the Chairman of the Board to consider monitoring the budget at each meeting as it was not safe to wait for a quarterly update on the budget.

Councillor Howell reported that the budget was predicated on successful transformation, but Councillors had not received any evidence that it would be achieved as indications were that it was behind schedule and over budget. He expressed his comments on the transformation to date.

Councillor Dunlop raised a point of order and indicated that all Members should speak to the amendment. Councillor Howell apologised. Councillor Cox indicated that all the amendment does was to enable more scrutiny of the budget on a monthly basis which he suggested would support the Cabinet to do a better job. Councillor Brown reinforced the benefits of the amendment in enabling the Overview and Scrutiny Board to focus on risks enabling all Councillors to discharge their responsibilities on the budget in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

Councillor Brooke in summing up on his amendment highlighted that the budget required more scrutiny particularly in view of the lack of certainty on capital and funding coming into the Council. He expressed his disappointment about the comments from the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Board. Councillor Bartlett for the purpose of personal clarification reported that he had not indicated that he wanted less scrutiny, highlighting that the Board was receptive to issues raised but it was independent and sets its own agenda and did not require a vote at full council for further scrutiny to be undertaken.

The Council then took a vote on the amendment proposed by Councillor Brooke and seconded by Councillor Slade as detailed in bold type above which was lost as follows:

For – 19

Cllr Lewis Allison	Cllr Lesley Dedman	Cllr Simon McCormack
Cllr Marcus Andrews	Cllr Millie Earl	Cllr Sandra Moore
Cllr Mike Brooke	Cllr Paul Hilliard	Cllr Margaret Phipps
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Mark Howell	Cllr Mark Robson
Cllr Simon Bull	Cllr Marion LePoidevin	Cllr Vikki Slade
Cllr Richard Burton	Cllr Rachel Maidment	
Cllr Mike Cox	Cllr Chris Matthews	

Against – 42

Cllr Hazel Allen	Cllr Bryan Dion	Cllr Andy Jones
Cllr Mark Anderson	Cllr Bobbie Dove	Cllr Jane Kelly
Cllr Sarah Anderson	Cllr Beverley Dunlop	Cllr David Kelsey
Cllr Julie Bagwell	Cllr Jackie Edwards	Cllr Bob Lawton
Cllr Steve Baron	Cllr Duane Farr	Cllr Drew Mellor
Cllr Stephen Bartlett	Cllr Laurence Fear	Cllr Susan Phillips
Cllr John Beesley	Cllr Sean Gabriel	Cllr Karen Rampton
Cllr Derek Borthwick	Cllr Mike Greene	Cllr Chris Rigby
Cllr Philip Broadhead	Cllr Nicola Greene	Cllr Roberto Rocca
Cllr Nigel Brooks	Cllr May Haines	Cllr Ann Stribley
Cllr Daniel Butt	Cllr Peter Hall	Cllr Mike White
Cllr Judes Butt	Cllr Mohan Iyengar	Cllr Lawrence Williams
Cllr Eddie Coope	Cllr Cheryl Johnson	Cllr Tony O'Neill
Cllr Malcolm Davies	Cllr Toby Johnson	Cllr Nigel Hedges

Abstentions – 5

Cllr L-J Evans	Cllr Andy Hadley	Cllr Felicity Rice
Cllr George Farquhar	Cllr Pete Miles	

Councillor Le Poidevin commented on the budget as a whole and indicated that she could not support it for a number of reasons. She outlined the implications and responsibilities not just to current taxpayers but future generations due to the potential debt and borrowing implications. Councillor Le Poidevin emphasised that a debt was not solved by borrowing more. She commented on the proposals relating to the beach huts and the timing for seeking the necessary approval which she indicated should have been undertaken in the development of the budget for 2022/23 to assist in formulating policies and information should be made available to Councillors to consider before approving the budget.

Councillor Allen felt that the Leader and the administration were putting people at the heart of the budget including identifying lead members for wellbeing and mental health, communities and levelling up as well as homelessness. She focussed on some of the key projects including the

initiatives for the homeless and the provision of wrap around support undertaken in conjunction with partners.

Councillor White as the Portfolio Holder for Children and Young People welcomed the budget which reinforced the Council's Corporate commitment to making Children's Services a top priority with a £12.3m budget this year an increase of 18%. He indicated that over the last two years the budget had increased by 35%. Members were advised of the three key areas namely staffing costs associated with meeting the significant increase in referrals following the pandemic, meeting an increase in numbers of young people needing higher cost settings and meeting increased SEND transportation costs following an increase in the number of education health and care plans.

Councillor Stribley left at 22.08

Councillor Dedman reported that the ambition for residents in Christchurch and across the conurbation was for a Council run on sound finances, that delivered services from a solid and stable basis and with a budget that people can understand. She highlighted that the Council should be run for the benefit of residents whilst highlighting the potential impact on the Council of the proposed budget.

Councillor Hadley acknowledged that there were elements in the budget such as homelessness and children's services that needed to be funded but it was the method being used including the slowness in which benefits from the transformation programme were being released, extending the life of the transformation programme and the work for external management consultants who were reaping the benefits. He emphasised that Council taxpayers' money needed to be safeguarded whilst highlighting the potential long-term implications for public assets.

Councillor Mark Anderson welcomed the budget and outlined various projects including the opening of the Poole toilets and the Poole Park Railway, investment in road maintenance and pothole repairs and ensuring that streetlights were maintained and protected. He highlighted that as part of the commitment to the ecological emergency and biodiversity the Council had applied for and received a grant of £224,000 which would be used to run a nature recovery programme transforming numerous parks into wildlife rich sites and creating species resilience. Councillor Anderson also referred to engagement with communities and encouraging participation in the initiative. He commented on the investment in the commercial waste team which would allow the Council to reduce the reliance on agency staff as well as starting to improve and increase the Council's Commercial waste operation to meet the Council's aspirations and the Government's Environment Bill. Members were informed of the investment in the new Waste Strategy and the continuation of gully cleansing and road sweeping in Christchurch which was missing pre LGR.

Councillor Howell commented on the transformation programme stating that it was behind schedule and over budget. He referred to a number of departments being in crisis and the pressure being put on officers by the administration because it changed the strategy for transformation by deciding to reduce the number of officers before making technical improvements. He emphasised that there was no indication that transformation was going to be successful. Council Howell referred to the flexible use of capital receipts legislation which may not be renewed in March which would create a funding gap of £54m. He proposed the following amendment

“add (E) that the administration urgently develops a Plan B in the event the government cancels or amends the Flexible Use of Capital Receipts regulations leaving a hole up to £54 million in the 2022/23 budget”

The above amendment was seconded by Councillor Allison who pointed out to Members that it was exactly the same wording proposed at the Overview and Scrutiny Board and Cabinet chose to ignore the recommendation passed by the Board.

Councillors commented on the proposed amendment including Councillor Mellor highlighting that if assumptions change then the budget would change. He also explained that there was a lack of fiscal understanding to suggest that there was a £54m risk in the 2022/23 budget and therefore the wording of the amendment was wrong. Councillor Mellor explained that across the Council alternatives were being developed and he had complete confidence in the way the budget had been prepared. He reported that the recommendation passed at the Overview and Scrutiny Board was discussed and the Cabinet took the view that it was business as usual. Councillor Broadhead reported that the Cabinet had disagreed with the recommendation from the Board and explained the implications of the amendment whilst highlighting the constant analysis of all risks. He also commented on the tone of the debate and lack of comment on the content of the budget and that no alternative ideas had been submitted. Councillor Brown suggested that this may be due to the amount of concern about the risk in the proposed budget. In commenting on the amendment, he suggested that the Government may change the rules even if the regulations relating to the flexible use of capital receipts were extended which would impact on the budget. Councillor Moore expressed her concern about use of reserves and the risks concerning the high needs block and the potential for the Council to be the subject of a Section 114 Notice. Councillor Bartlett asked for details of how the risk would be mitigated.

Councillor Howell in summing up explained that it was clear from the section 25 report that there would need to be a review in the event that the Government do not continue with the Regulations and outlined the potential impact for the Council if there was a £54m funding gap.

The Council then took a vote on the amendment proposed by Councillor Howell and seconded by Councillor Allison as detailed in bold type above which was lost as follows:

For – 26

Cllr Lewis Allison	Cllr Millie Earl	Cllr Simon McCormack
Cllr Marcus Andrews	Cllr L-J Evans	Cllr Pete Miles
Cllr Stephen Bartlett	Cllr George Farquhar	Cllr Sandra Moore
Cllr Mike Brooke	Cllr Andy Hadley	Cllr Margaret Phipps
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Paul Hilliard	Cllr Felicity Rice
Cllr Simon Bull	Cllr Mark Howell	Cllr Chris Rigby
Cllr Richard Burton	Cllr Marion LePoidevin	Cllr Mark Robson
Cllr Mike Cox	Cllr Rachel Maidment	Cllr Vikki Slade
Cllr Lesley Dedman	Cllr Chris Matthews	

Against – 39

Cllr Hazel Allen	Cllr Bryan Dion	Cllr Toby Johnson
Cllr Mark Anderson	Cllr Bobbie Dove	Cllr Andy Jones
Cllr Sarah Anderson	Cllr Beverley Dunlop	Cllr Jane Kelly
Cllr Julie Bagwell	Cllr Jackie Edwards	Cllr David Kelsey
Cllr Steve Baron	Cllr Duane Farr	Cllr Bob Lawton
Cllr John Beesley	Cllr Laurence Fear	Cllr Drew Mellor
Cllr Derek Borthwick	Cllr Sean Gabriel	Cllr Susan Phillips
Cllr Philip Broadhead	Cllr Mike Greene	Cllr Karen Rampton
Cllr Nigel Brooks	Cllr Nicola Greene	Cllr Roberto Rocca
Cllr Daniel Butt	Cllr May Haines	Cllr Mike White
Cllr Judes Butt	Cllr Peter Hall	Cllr Lawrence Williams
Cllr Eddie Coope	Cllr Mohan Iyengar	Cllr Tony O'Neill
Cllr Malcolm Davies	Cllr Cheryl Johnson	Cllr Nigel Hedges

Abstentions – 0

Councillor Dunlop reported that she takes her duty and responsibilities relating to the budget seriously. She advised of the development and initiatives within the cultural budget. In referring to the Big Plan she commented on the three core values, Children, Community and Culture. Councillor Dunlop emphasised that culture has a positive impact it has the power to be life changing for many especially, those in deprived areas, minority groups, those with chaotic lives and backgrounds, those with special needs, the elderly and children. Councillor Dunlop explained that the budget included funds to develop new festivals including a new Christmas maritime event for Poole, support for public art and festival coast live which delivered so much to so many using mainly local talent. Members were also advised of the direct allocation for the development of community arts and that culture participation that has the power to add the most value to the lives of the most marginalised. Councillor Dunlop indicated that her role as Portfolio Holder was to connect people through culture in a way that improves their wellbeing, and the role of the Council was to enable those connections to a wide range of cultural activities.

Councillor Fear outlined how the budget had been developed putting the needs of residents at the core of everything the Council does. He highlighted how the budget would deliver on the wellbeing for residents including investment in two new mental health worker posts teaming up with the nationally recognised charity MIND, delivering on the Carers Strategy and teaming up with Carers UK. In conclusion he highlighted the increased investment in services across the Council.

Councillor Moore referred to the £12m funding for Children's Services which was welcome and much needed to improve the service. However, she was concerned about the cap on Children's Services of 2.99% for the future and given the obvious need for improvement she questioned the restriction on growth and referred to the report on the potential funding gap over the next five years. Councillor Moore reiterated that this was an unconventional budget full of risks. She stressed that she wanted to improve Children's Services, but this needed to be balanced against the level of risk involved in approving the proposed budget.

Councillor Phipps referred to LGR the expected level of savings and financial position. She indicated that the administration had failed to control expenditure with the section 25 report setting out the true situation. Councillor Phipps reported that the focus should be on the provision of services and operating within its means not to gamble or speculate exposing the Council to risk. Councillor Allison expressed his concern relating to the number of warnings and risk identified within the report highlighting the impact of the administrations financial approach. He emphasised that there were many elements of the budget which he could support but it could be so much more, and one issue was the reduction in funding by the Government and the opportunity to lobby on the loss of resources.

Councillor Brown referred to previous comments emphasising that borrowing was up, the debt ceiling was up, and interest payments were also up. He could not support the budget as it was overspending on its in-year service budgets and under achieving on its transformation savings. He commented on the 5 year Medium Term Financial Plan and the approach to borrowing and debt.

Councillor Toby Johnson reported on the investment in the equalities budget to deal with issues and ensure that residents know that their Council would approach them on a level playing field. He focussed on the budget providing an opportunity for levelling up to be at the core. Councillor Kelsey as Chairman of the Planning welcomed the additional funding for the planning service which would support the harmonisation of planning, backlog clearing and sustained performance improvements. He also touched on the opportunity to work effectively with Future Places.

Councillor Rigby acknowledged that there were good elements of the budget, and he welcomed the additional investment in green funds with the hope that this would increase as the Council reached the net zero deadlines. However, he was concerned that the budget was built on

borrowing and future generations would be paying for it therefore the risk outweighed the benefit. Councillor McCormack and Hilliard as previously indicated highlighted the impact of the budget presented and the need to act in the interest of residents. Councillor Hilliard welcomed the investment in Adults and Children's Services and the development of the Carers Strategy. He emphasised that the Adult Social Care precept should have been taken last year and additionally Children's services needed extra investment last year to bring about positive decisive change not a year later.

Councillor Mike Greene emphasised the impact of the previous administration pausing the £240,000 allocated for climate change whilst highlighting the approach to climate action taken by the current administration to ensure that there was appropriate investment. Councillors were informed of the difference that the investment makes including forming a hard-hitting cohesive and dynamic team of up to 14 under its own Head of Service. Councillor Greene explained that the major role of the team would be to look for projects which can contribute on a large scale to the Council's fight against climate change. This links to the first ever green futures fund of £20m available for capital projects with the current administration ensuring that it was well spent on projects which either produce a positive return to the Council taxpayer or would lower emissions at a suitably low pound per tonne of carbon cost ratio. Councillor Greene explained that the budget put climate action at the heart of what the Council does and scales up the potential to act and was an absolute game changer.

Councillor Bartlett referred to Government Policy and reduction in funding which had forced the Council into Local Government Reorganisation and to find ways of raising additional resources to pay for services. He indicated that there were limited choices whilst welcoming new ideas and business principles being applied to Local Government. He emphasised that he had confidence in the Financial Officers and was sure that they would manage the potential risks and that any issues would be reported to Council for consideration.

Councillor Evans indicated that she supported the essential investments proposed for Adults and Children's Services but had huge concerns about the risks and assumption in the budget.

The meeting adjourned from 23:00 to 23:19

Councillor Julie Bagwell left at 23:00

Councillor Brooks reported on the need for improvements in our high streets and district centres. He highlighted that it was about what residents, businesses and retailers need in support and that he had led a district centre action planning process with the Council's economic development team which was a vital project in supporting the business community. Councillor Brooks touched on the decision taken by Cabinet to support businesses getting back on their feet with pilot centres in Broadstone, Kinson and Highcliffe shortly due to receive Government funding. The

funding would provide the opportunity to promote the centres, make improvements and arrange events with the most valuable element being all the relevant stakeholders coming together. Councillor Brooks reported that this work would be rolled out across the conurbation.

Councillor Maidment reiterated previous comments stating that whilst supporting many elements of the budget raised concerns about the fundamental method of funding the budget through increased borrowing which would result in significant debt for future generations.

Councillor Kelly in fully supporting the budget highlighted that it demonstrated full commitment to the communities the Council serves with the freezing of the Council tax base rate helping all residents to manage the increasing cost of living. She indicated that allocating additional resources to adults and children social care would be welcomed by the many residents who rely on these services daily. Councillor Kelly reported that the health and wellbeing of residents was considered and provided for in all areas of the budget but the proposed growth in the community's budget was the most exciting which would enable the delivery of the Council's strength-based community development work on the ground and in priority areas encouraging everyone to be involved in decision making. She touched on the initiatives that had already started and the benefits for communities to encourage residents to live active healthy and independent lives with appropriate engagement.

Councillor Iyengar referred to the missed opportunity by the opposition to submit an alternative budget and commented on lobbying Government on funding emphasising that this was actively undertaken including through the Local Government Association and Local MPs. Councillor Iyengar reported on the projects within his portfolio including summer readiness, the Seafront Strategy, Tourism with a big campaign coming up to welcome tourists including residents, Public Health with the link to the CCG as it becomes the Integrated Care System, what the Council was doing to modernise and expand leisure centres and the Council's outdoor health and wellbeing offer.

Councillor Rampton highlighted the £12.1m investment in adult social care and the additional investment which would allow the Council to keep pace with growth, demand and uplift costs to providers. She explained there was a demographic growth in learning disabilities and mental health services with a growth in demand for care packages for people with long-term conditions. Members were informed that home care packages had increased by approximately a third pre-covid and there was a greater complexity of need and therefore the budget supported the Council's most vulnerable residents.

Councillor Nicole Greene highlighted the lack of understanding of how the Council operates across a wide spectrum of services including some delivered to the most vulnerable residents and in doing so outlined some of the key services. She highlighted that what matters to residents was the service which was delivered and that it was accountable through the

democratic process and that all need to understand the complexity and the risk.

Councillor Broadhead responded to some of the issues raised during debate including that the Council would be retaining its assets and the level of investment in the most vulnerable residents. He also highlighted that freezing Council tax keeps money in residents' pockets.

Councillor Mellor in summing up outlined the key elements of the budget as presented including the freeze in council tax, the investments in the pride agenda, making BCP cleaner, greener and safer, increases in earmarked reserves and moves to the most balanced five year medium term financial plan with long term financial sustainability, maintains the Council's position with one of lowest debt levels amongst its peers, stops the fire sale of assets and maintains and enhances assets for future generations. Councillor Mellor explained that the financial plan was transformation to deliver £1 billion of savings to the taxpayer over the next 20 years and was not a plan that saddles our children with debt but delivers assets into the future alongside a streamlined world-class Council.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendations (A) - (E) including the Council Tax Resolution and Council Tax levels for 2022/23 proposed by Councillor Mellor and seconded by Councillor Broadhead which were carried as follows:

For – 39

Cllr Hazel Allen	Cllr Bryan Dion	Cllr Toby Johnson
Cllr Mark Anderson	Cllr Bobbie Dove	Cllr Andy Jones
Cllr Sarah Anderson	Cllr Beverley Dunlop	Cllr Jane Kelly
Cllr Steve Baron	Cllr Jackie Edwards	Cllr David Kelsey
Cllr Stephen Bartlett	Cllr Duane Farr	Cllr Bob Lawton
Cllr John Beesley	Cllr Laurence Fear	Cllr Drew Mellor
Cllr Derek Borthwick	Cllr Sean Gabriel	Cllr Susan Phillips
Cllr Philip Broadhead	Cllr Mike Greene	Cllr Karen Rampton
Cllr Nigel Brooks	Cllr Nicola Greene	Cllr Roberto Rocca
Cllr Daniel Butt	Cllr May Haines	Cllr Mike White
Cllr Judes Butt	Cllr Peter Hall	Cllr Lawrence Williams
Cllr Eddie Coope	Cllr Mohan Iyengar	Cllr Tony O'Neill
Cllr Malcolm Davies	Cllr Cheryl Johnson	Cllr Nigel Hedges

Against – 19

Cllr Lewis Allison	Cllr Millie Earl	Cllr Rachel Maidment
Cllr Marcus Andrews	Cllr George Farquhar	Cllr Chris Matthews
Cllr Mike Brooke	Cllr Andy Hadley	Cllr Simon McCormack
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Paul Hilliard	Cllr Sandra Moore
Cllr Richard Burton	Cllr Mark Howell	Cllr Margaret Phipps
Cllr Mike Cox	Cllr Marion LePoidevin	Cllr Vikki Slade
Cllr Lesley Dedman		

Abstentions – 6

Cllr Simon Bull	Cllr Pete Miles	Cllr Chris Rigby
Cllr L-J Evans	Cllr Felicity Rice	Cllr Mark Robson

Councillor Allen left at 23:43

Councillor Rocca left at 23:44

Councillor Cheryl Johnson left at 23:46

Item 6g - Overview and Scrutiny Board 31 January 2022 - Motion referred from Council

Councillor Mike Greene, Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Transport reported that the motion as set out on the agenda submitted by Councillor Chris Rigby had been referred back to the Council by the Overview and Scrutiny Board who felt that they did not have capacity within its forward plan to be able to carry out the research that would be needed. Councillor Greene emphasised that nor did any officers within the relevant department and therefore the motion was ready for debate.

Councillor Rigby, having brought forward the motion, indicated that it was not asking for hours of officer time or considerable research to be undertaken all it was asking for was for BCP Council to add its voice to an increasing number of cities and local authorities around the world to speak as one demanding a just transition away from fossil fuels to renewable energy. Councillor Rigby explained that this would mean working towards removing fossil fuels from everyone's lives and transitioning the workers in the oil and gas industry who have a great skill set to more sustainable employment which was needed to prevent the climate crisis. Councillor Rigby reported that burning fossil fuels was responsible for around 80% of the carbon dioxide emissions since the industrial revolution, with the fossil fuel non-proliferation treaty seeking to end exploration of oil, gas and coal production and phase it out in a fair and equal manner with a commitment to 100% renewable energy globally and to develop new economic measures to support the transition. Councillor Rigby stressed that this was an opportunity to lead the way on making green commitments. Councillor Bull in seconding the motion indicated that it was a logical step to follow on from the climate and ecological emergency declaration and the work reported on earlier in the meeting therefore the Council should take the lead.

Councillor Mike Greene reported that he supported the direction and underlying will of the motion whilst highlighting that the research required to fully understand the implications of the moratorium would be immense and on receiving the referral back from the Overview and Scrutiny Board, he could see that would be far beyond the resources for whichever part of the Council might be tasked with commissioning it. Councillor Greene highlighted items 5, 8 and 11 of the motion and emphasised that he did not have the evidence to support it. He referred to the shift in demand for gas which had almost doubled domestic fuel bills and stressed the potential impact of a reduction in fossil fuel availability to bills and industries and which could force millions into fuel poverty whilst not predicting that this

would happen, he had no evidence on the impact. Councillor Greene indicated that the Overview and Scrutiny Board was correct to recognise the capacity issues on the potential research needed and that such research was an issue suitable at a national and international level.

Councillor Slade in referring to the motion explained that what was being asked was for the Portfolio Holder to write to the Government and the remainder was to note. She referred to the approved budget whereby the administration wanted to invest in the green futures fund and indicated that the motion provided that opportunity and yet the administration was putting obstacles in the way. Councillor Hadley emphasised that the market in fossil fuels was already unstable and that it was not being innovative or leading to ignore how we migrate with speed away from fossil fuels. He highlighted the lobbying from the industry to remain with fossil fuels and the need to use our voice as a Council and pressure the Government to transition away from fossil fuel whilst highlighting renewable energies were delivering and were much cheaper.

Councillor Rigby in summing up commented on the Governments maximum extraction policy on fossil fuels with recent announcements from the Chancellor for more investment into new fossil fuels. He asked if the administration wanted to see oil riggs coming back offshore in Poole Bay because that was where the maximum extraction policy was heading.

Councillor May Haines left prior to the recorded vote.

In accordance with the Constitution a recorded vote was taken on the motion, as set out on the agenda, proposed by Councillor Rigby and seconded by Councillor Bull which was lost as follows:

For – 25

Cllr Lewis Allison	Cllr Millie Earl	Cllr Chris Matthews
Cllr Marcus Andrews	Cllr L-J Evans	Cllr Simon McCormack
Cllr Stephen Bartlett	Cllr George Farquhar	Cllr Pete Miles
Cllr Mike Brooke	Cllr Andy Hadley	Cllr Sandra Moore
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Paul Hilliard	Cllr Felicity Rice
Cllr Simon Bull	Cllr Mark Howell	Cllr Chris Rigby
Cllr Richard Burton	Cllr Marion LePoidevin	Cllr Mark Robson
Cllr Mike Cox	Cllr Rachel Maidment	Cllr Vikki Slade
Cllr Lesley Dedman		

For – 34

Cllr Mark Anderson	Cllr Bobbie Dove	Cllr Andy Jones
Cllr Sarah Anderson	Cllr Beverley Dunlop	Cllr Jane Kelly
Cllr Steve Baron	Cllr Jackie Edwards	Cllr David Kelsey
Cllr John Beesley	Cllr Duane Farr	Cllr Bob Lawton
Cllr Derek Borthwick	Cllr Laurence Fear	Cllr Drew Mellor
Cllr Philip Broadhead	Cllr Sean Gabriel	Cllr Susan Phillips
Cllr Nigel Brooks	Cllr Mike Greene	Cllr Karen Rampton
Cllr Daniel Butt	Cllr Nicola Greene	Cllr Mike White

Cllr Judes Butt	Cllr Peter Hall	Cllr Lawrence Williams
Cllr Eddie Coope	Cllr Mohan Iyengar	Cllr Tony O'Neill
Cllr Malcolm Davies	Cllr Toby Johnson	Cllr Nigel Hedges
Cllr Bryan Dion		

Abstentions – 1

Cllr Margaret Phipps		
----------------------	--	--

143. Non-compliance with Standards Complaints Process Decision

Councillors were circulated with a copy of the report for information on the above which appears as Appendix 'A' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

The report indicated that in order for this complaint to be drawn to a close it had been necessary to report that the subject councillor had not complied with the findings of the Standards Committee complaints process.

The Chairman reported that the process for dealing with complaints under the Member Code of Conduct was set out in the BCP Council Constitution to which all Councillors have signed up. Standards Committee has delegated authority from Council to implement this process. This report was to bring to Council's attention that a Councillor has not complied with a decision made by the Chair of Standards in consultation, under the process. He explained that the report was before the Council for information only and not for debate.

144. Notices of Motion in accordance with Procedure Rule 9

Set out on the agenda was a motion proposed by Councillor L-J Evans and seconded by Councillor Dedman on becoming a Marmot Community.

The Chairman reported that Councillor Evans had notified that she wished to seek the Council's consent to alter the wording of the motion in accordance with procedure 13.12 of Part 4D of the Constitution as follows:

“That BCP Council takes the opportunity provided by the Government’s Levelling Up paper ~~to work to explore~~ becoming a Marmot Community.”

Council agreed to the above altered motion.

Councillor Evans presented the altered motion explaining that whilst BCP was a wonderful place it had marked disparities between areas from the highly affluent to some of the most deprived in England. She explained that life expectancy was no longer increasing but had actually started to fall and this was much more apparent in lower income areas. In addition, Councillor Evans highlighted that there had been a decrease in the proportion of our lives that we can expect to live in good health with poorer people disproportionately affected. Councillor Evans explained that action to

reduce health inequality was not only morally correct but also benefits society as a whole. Members were informed that reducing illness results in economic gains and reduced pressures on services. Councillor Evans referred to the work of Sir Michael Marmot and the report he published in February 2020 which showed how health inequalities were driven by the so-called social determinants of health which included how children spend their early years, education, adequate housing, access to healthy environments and good jobs. She explained that after a decade of austerity the 10 year review showed that while there had been progress in some areas inequalities were actually widening and life expectancy was stalling. Members were reminded that the Government had just published its levelling up white paper which provided a real opportunity to improve health and reduce inequalities in BCP. Councillor Evans reported that one way to do this was by becoming a Marmot Community which was a region working across sectors to achieve six common goals as follows:

1. Give every child the best start in life
2. Enable everyone to maximise their capabilities and have control over their lives
3. Create fair employment and good work for all
4. Ensure a healthy standard of living
5. Create and develop healthy and sustainable places and communities
6. The prevention of ill health

Councillor Evans reported that Councils who were given the status of a Marmot Community were those that provided evidence that the above principles were upheld through local policy and decision making and that improving health and reducing inequalities were at the centre of everything that they do. She highlighted that it would take work, time and investment but that BCP Council was up to the challenge. Councillor Dedman in seconding the motion provided background information on Professor Marmot and his work which was focussed on improving the health and life chances of people all over the world.

Councillor Toby Johnson proposed the following amendment seconded by Councillor Judes Butt:

“That BCP Council takes the opportunity provided by the Government’s Levelling Up paper to ~~work to become a Marmot Community~~ uphold the six principles of the Marmot report by continuing to grow our commitment to the Levelling Up ‘missions’ set out in the recent Government White Paper and the 14 Levelling Up Goals.”

Councillor Johnson explained that he wholeheartedly supported the six principles set out in Professor Marmot’s report and hoped that all Members believed in them strongly. He explained the reason for the amendment was the lack of a suitable metrics by which any level of success could be

recorded or measured. Members were informed that Marmot city was the latest term used which may raise potential concerns with some members. Councillor Johnson reported that three quarters of Health and Wellbeing Boards had Marmot principles at their centre and BCP was already one of them. He explained that this was why the amendment proposed to link with the Government led missions as set out in the Levelling Up White Paper. He explained that the amendment had not been changed in view of the altered motion and that there was already a draft report that gives an in-depth look at health inequality within BCP with the research team and in particular in Public Health taking into account the Marmot principles. Councillor Johnson emphasised that the original and altered motion although well intentioned was not needed as the work was already being done. He highlighted that health inequality was referenced in the report considered by Cabinet in January. Councillor Butt seconded the amendment and indicated that she would have expected a detailed report to explain and illustrate why it was prudent and necessary for the Council to support the motion, as the principles were required minimums which the Council was already doing and why the Council should join the Marmot branding when the principles were enshrined in the Council's own policies.

Councillor Hadley commented on the amendment and highlighted the benefit of a network of other regions that the Council could compare with and monitor progress. He emphasised that it would be useful within levelling up that the Council was taking account particularly of public health and social needs as the previous paper was about economic benefits and working with the private sector. Councillor Hadley hoped that that Council exceeds the principles in its own levelling up actions.

Councillor Johnson in summing up provided assurance that health inequalities would be at the forefront in light of the number of members who had raised it as a concern at a previous Member seminar.

Councillor Evans in summing up explained that Councillor Johnson had discussed his concerns with the motion and the reasons for suggesting the amendment and that he believed that the Council was already working under the principles. She addressed the concerns at working with the Institute of Health Equity emphasising that it was essential that Council have clear policies and strategies to enable them to achieve their vision. Councillor Evans reported that working with the Institute of Health Equity would be considered a great investment and remove some of the burden of work from the Council's overstretched officers and the Institute's work would be complementary to the levelling up agenda not in opposition to it. Councillor Evans provided further detail on the Institute including the support that they provided. Members were informed that the financial commitment was in the region of £100,000 for an initial cost. Councillor Evans touched on the partnership working with Public Health England and the Dorset Integrated Care System who she was sure supported the original motion and other partners including the police, fire, schools, the business community and voluntary sectors. Councillor Evans emphasised that this was not just about commitment but about action including

accountability, strategy, showing effective leadership and pooling resources learning and expertise.

The Council then voted on the amendment moved by Councillor Toby Johnson and seconded by Councillor Judes Butt as detailed in bold type above which was carried.

Voting – For - 37, Against – 25, Abstentions - 0

The Council then voted on the following substantive motion which was carried unanimously

“That BCP Council takes the opportunity provided by the Government’s Levelling Up paper to uphold the six principles of the Marmot report by continuing to grow our commitment to the Levelling Up ‘missions’ set out in the recent Government White Paper and the 14 Levelling Up Goals.”

Councillor Mike Greene under procedure rule 9.15 proposed that the meeting was now adjourned. The Monitoring Officer advised that if the meeting was adjourned it had not closed and would stay open until another date which would mean that the budget has not been agreed. Councillor Mike Greene then withdrew his proposal.

145. Questions from Councillors

The Chairman advised that there were now only two questions to deal with.

Councillor Mark Anderson proposed that the answers to the questions be provided in writing. The Chairman indicated that there was a request to hear the responses, so he asked that they be dealt with.

Question from Councillor Margaret Phipps

Both I and a resident asked questions at Council on 14th September last year about why a deliverability score had been increased facilitating £70,000 being given to a speculative lagoon project in Hurn, as bounce back grant, when the lagoon does not exist.

You replied to me: “The team were quite clear that this proposed grant, which was to fund a planning application, which already had match funding, was clearly deliverable.”

You replied to the resident:

“The Council’s ED team in their screening of the grant applications prior to the judging panel, saw that the grant request was actually only to bring the scheme to submitted planning application stage

By specific invitation you attended a Hurn Parish Council Meeting on 11th October. Present were Hurn Parish Councillors, my co-Ward Cllr. Vanessa Ricketts and a room full of Hurn residents.

One resident asked - is the money time limited? You replied – the money is to be spent by the end of March 2022. “The developer seemed very serious, I will be surprised if it is not a good application”.

The perception and understanding of every single person I have spoken to, public and Councillors, is that taxpayers bounce back grant money was given to this non-existent operation to fund a planning application, by the due date – the end of March 2022. I now have in writing from the BCP Economic Development Team that this is not the case, and the money was only for phase one - to fund feasibility, landscaping and architectural studies and meetings relating to these. Therefore the £70,000 went straight into a planning consultant’s pocket to deliver a few reports, not a submitted application as you said.

Can the Portfolio Holder explain why he said in public on numerous occasions that the score was changed, and grant money was awarded, to fund a planning application by the deliverable date - when it wasn’t. In fact, it was to pay a planning consultant for a few reports for a speculative development proposal. Why did he mislead, this Council, Hurn Parish Council and residents?

Reply from Councillor Philip Broadhead, Deputy Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Development, Growth and Regeneration

This question has already been answered at the Audit and Governance Committee and previously versions at Full Council. At all stages to be clear, the government guidance and local scheme was followed completely. The recipients of this grant are delivering on what they proposed to deliver, and full monitoring is taking place in line with the conditions of the grant award.

Councillor Phipps indicated that that the above response did not answer the question she asked, and she reiterated the question and previous comments made relating to the delivery of the application. Councillor Broadhead in response explained that his answer was brief because the Audit and Governance Committee had considered this issue in detail as well as numerous other questions that had been asked on both the specific scheme and the bounce-back challenge fund, which was an innovative way the Council was able to help the whole area bounce back after giving grants to help businesses survive. He emphasised that as he pointed out in his original answer every single scheme that had come forward was assessed against a criteria put forward and he had confirmed from the officers that the criteria put forward was being met and was being monitored.

Question from Councillor David Brown

It is now a year since this Council debated and agreed significant changes to BCP Taxi Licensing Policy to align policy across the three towns. This new policy has now been implemented and has no doubt had some impact on the taxi trade across Poole, Christchurch and Bournemouth.

Could the Chair of Licensing Committee and/or the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety and Regulatory Services, please advise what mechanisms have been put in place to allow the taxi trade to feed back their views and experiences of these changes?

Further, could they advise what processes are in place to review the policy to allow any necessary amendments to ensure that the implementation addresses the needs and concerns of the taxi trade at this difficult time for the taxi industry?

Reply from Councillor Judes Butt, Chairman of the Licensing Committee

I thank the Councillor for his questions, I am happy to answer both.

The first, to advise the Councillor of the mechanisms in place to assist feedback from the Taxi trade re the new BCP Taxi policies.

BCP Taxi and Private Hire Policies were implemented on 21st June 2021. The Taxi trade are commended for how well they have adapted to these new policies.

Our BCP Licensing Manager is the Council's direct operational contact for all taxi trade representatives, via email, text, telephone, teams and letter and also on a face to face basis via pre LGR established quarterly taxi trade meetings.

The Taxi Trade wished these meetings to be face to face during Covid, so they have not met since 2021, safety of our officers being paramount during this time. However, all other communication platforms remained in place during Covid, in order to receive feedback and for the trade to be advised and supported. Now Covid is hopefully mitigated by vaccination, meetings were reconvened face to face this February.

Your second question – to advise on processes in place to review policy, allowing any necessary amendments, to ensure that implementation addresses needs and concerns of the taxi trade

Feedback from the February Trade Meeting re monitoring new Taxi Policies, will be heard by the Licensing Committee this March 10th, by way of a substantive report from our Licensing Manager. I have invited taxi trade reps to attend, to share their contributions re the evaluation of the policies.

I kindly remind the Councillor that all Taxi Policies have separate working documents for Drivers, Vehicles and Operators and can be amended at any time to correct errors, inconsistencies, clarify guidance and statutory changes.

Taxi Policies were unanimously supported on 4th February 2021 by the Licensing Committee and as the Licencing Chair I added and confirmed, and I quote from the minutes of that meeting;

“that the Taxi and Private Hire Policies for 2021 –2025 would remain on the Forward Plan for monitoring...”

Our new Taxi Policies require effective interaction with the Taxi trade and the public per se, re accessing and communicating the work and operation of our Taxi policies and the full suite of Licensing policies and their applications.

Therefore, the BCP’s Transformation Programme presents a valuable opportunity to improve how our licensing services are delivered and our licensing team is currently working hard on service redesign with our transformation team.

We aim to streamline processes and provide more information to support applicants going forward. We need information about Licensing to be an easily accessible portal and we’ll continue to develop our public engagement methods as we transform the service.

To conclude, the Licensing Committee, with their remit to create and deliver effective policies for taxis and all Taxi drivers and operators, remain on message to ensure that the ongoing implementation addresses the needs and concerns of the Taxi Trade.

Councillor Brown asked that previously at Borough of Poole Council Councillors used to meet with the taxi trade. He asked if the Chair could look at this as well as allowing the taxi trade to make representations at the next meeting and permitting a two-way discussion with the taxi trade and Licensing Committee Members on their concerns, views and to get their input into any future review. Councillor Butt indicated that she would give that her consideration.

146. Urgent Decisions taken by the Chief Executive in accordance with the Constitution

The Chairman reported there were no urgent decisions to be reported.

The Chief Executive reported apologies from Councillor Vanessa Ricketts which had been missing earlier in the meeting.

The meeting ended at 0.35 am

CHAIRMAN