

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

Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 May 2021 at 2.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr S Bartlett – Chairman  
Cllr V Slade – Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr T O'Neill, Cllr L Allison, Cllr M Cox, Cllr L Dedman, Cllr B Dion,  
Cllr M Earl, Cllr J Edwards, Cllr L Fear, Cllr M Howell, Cllr D Kelsey,  
Cllr C Rigby, Cllr D Borthwick (In place of Cllr S Gabriel) and  
Cllr A M Stribley (In place of Cllr D Farr)

Also in attendance: Councillor Mohan Iyengar  
Councillor Philip Broadhead  
Councillor Michael Brooke  
Councillor Hazel Allen  
Councillor Drew Mellor  
Councillor Robert Lawton

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllr D Farr and Cllr S Gabriel.

2. Substitute Members

Cllr D Borthwick substituted for Cllr D Farr and Cllr A Stribley substituted for Cllr S Gabriel.

3. Election of Chairman

A nomination was proposed and seconded for Cllr S Bartlett for Chairman for the 2021/22.

It was then **RESOLVED** that **Cllr S Bartlett be appointed Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Board for the remainder of the 2020/21 municipal year.**

Voting: Unanimous

4. Election of Vice-Chairman

Nominations were received and seconded for Cllr T O'Neill and for Cllr V Slade for Vice Chairman.

The nominations having been received a secret ballot was conducted to decide the Vice-Chairman of the Board. Cllr T O'Neill received 7 votes and Cllr V Slade received 7 votes with 1 abstention.

The Chairman used his casting vote for Cllr V Slade

It was then **RESOLVED** that **Cllr V Slade be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Board for the 2021/22 municipal year.**

The Chairman welcomed Cllr V Slade as Vice-Chairman and thanked Cllr T O'Neill for all his work as Vice-Chairman over the past seven months.

5. Declarations of Interests

None were received.

6. Confirmation of Minutes

Minutes of meetings held on 22 March and 1 April were approved as a correct record.

6.1 **Action Sheet**

The Chairman highlighted the points on the action sheet which had not yet been confirmed as completed. The following points on outstanding actions were agreed:

- That the item at 178 should have a potential meeting date included on the Forward Plan.
- That the information received from the Portfolio Holder for Tourism, Leisure and Culture in respect of item 180 should be appended to the minutes for clarity and that this item could be removed as an outstanding item from the action sheet
- That information had been received by Cllr M Cox in relation to the other item at 180 and that this item could be removed from the action sheet.

7. Public Speaking

There were no public statements, petitions or questions.

8. Update from the Local Plan Working Group

The Chairman of the Local Plan Working Group introduced the report a copy of which had been circulated to all Board members and which appears as Appendix 'A' to these minutes in the Minute Book. The Chairman of the group highlighted some of the key points raised in the report including the actions for moving forward which had been agreed by the group and the substantive recommendation which the Board was asked to consider. The Board was advised that the first meeting of the Group considered urban potential to meet the shortfall of 9000 units from the housing target, the second meeting looked at increasing density, including heights of buildings and concentrating smaller units on plots of land. The last meeting had looked at the areas in the greenbelt which had potential for development. The points considered in the following discussion included:

- The Board was advised of the options open to the Council to move the Local Plan Forward. After extensive debate the Working Group had concluded that it was essential to move forward with consultation on the Green Belt and had looked at how best to consult on the options with the public.
- A Working Group member noted that there were many different views expressed in the working group and the member training last week on planning stressed how difficult it was to move forward with the greenbelt.
- A Councillor expressed the view that the green belt was precious and needed to be protected and they wouldn't want to see anything taken forward on the green belt.
- It was noted that the consultation would allow time to consider what may come forward in terms of prior approval and consideration of retail space and office space would be essential.
- That the Working Group was a sounding board only and the approval process for the Local Plan would be going through Cabinet and Council as normal.
- A Councillor commented that there was a significant difference between one district centre and another. Relevance and weighting should be given to appropriately sized district centres. Consideration should also be given to the security of sustainable public transport routes in future, as well as proximity to local schools.
- That people living in urban areas may welcome development in green belt areas which may be able to relieve the pressure on highly populated areas and transport congestion.

Following the discussion, the Board agreed that it should be:

**RECOMMENDED to the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Economy and Strategic Planning and the Planning Policy Team to include all potential sites within the identified BCP Greenbelt as part of the public consultation and that these sites should be qualified with some factual information on the constraints of the sites but without further commentary from the Council.**

Voting: Unanimous

9. Scrutiny of Proposed Regeneration Vehicle Options Appraisal Cabinet Report

The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration, Economy and Strategic Planning introduced report, a copy of which had been circulated to each member of the Board and a copy of which can be found at Appendix 'B' to these minutes in the Minutes Book. The Portfolio Holder outlined the key points within the report and responded to questions and comments from the Board including:

- There was a need for flexibility in the body to ensure it would give the best advice to the Council. Which would require people in a fulltime

role rather than inhouse officers pulled in different directions with their time dedicated to other issues.

- This needed to be a beacon for area and would require someone to lead the team who could inspire investors, Councillors, and other stake holders. The Portfolio Holder commented that within the function being created there is the option for direct delivery or joint ventures, and it was recognised that it was important to ensure the right people were in place.
- A Councillor commented that the staff should not be seconded from the Council but should move permanently to work with the company.
- It was suggested that the recommendation within the report could be expanded to include consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Board.
- In response to a query the Chief Financial Officer confirmed that the £1.75 million outlined in the report was already in the Council's budget and Medium-Term Financial Plan for the three years of that plan.
- The Board noted that there was nothing included with the report with regards to the impact on climate change.
- The Chairman noted that there were many issues which would need to be agreed by Council and governance arrangements needed to be determined. The Portfolio Holder advised that issues could be brought back to the Overview and Scrutiny Board.
- Whether consideration had been given to one of the Council's existing vehicles being extended to save on costs and where the URC would sit in relation to the other Council companies. It was noted that this would be 100 percent Council owned company and would serve as an intelligent client for a lot of Council regeneration issues. The URC was not reliant on any external resource and funding would be coming directly from the Council, there was no intention that any property ownership would be moving into the company.
- In response to an enquiry the Leader of the Council confirmed that the business case would be able to come back to the O&S Board in future.
- The Portfolio Holder advised that he BDC sites were in the BDC masterplan and only non-BDC sites would be considered to be taken forward. Master planning in the area was important but there was a need to focus on deliverability from the beginning.
- The Chief Executive advised in response to a question that this was the coming together of a business plan. The recommendations set out where the Council wants to be. In the next two to three weeks all information should be available to allow a decision about the company. However the bigger and more important decisions were about the individual sites to be taken forward.

Chairman summarised the recommendations within the Cabinet report advised that the Board had not raised any concerns with regards to these. The Chairman commented that the O&S Board could expect continued involvement as this progressed.

The meeting adjourned for a comfort break at 3:36 pm and resumed at 3:50 pm.

10. Scrutiny of Homes Related Cabinet Reports

**Establishing a Multi-Disciplinary Team and Homeless Health Centre –**

The Portfolio Holder for Homes introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated to each member of the Board and a copy of which can be found at Appendix 'C' to these minutes in the minutes book. The Portfolio Holder was accompanied by the Lead Member for Homelessness to present the report. In the subsequent discussion the issues which were raised by the Board included:

- Part of the purpose of the scheme was to provide a vehicle which could help homeless people get settled into housing and get back into work. It would provide a point for homeless people to access primary care resources.
- That it was a community project including joint working with partners from health and voluntary organisations.
- This was something which the area really needed but there were concerns raised as to whether there would be anything to prevent people from accessing the hub, such as problems with drug use or addiction. The service would be available to access by anyone who needed the assistance. As with any service there was a need to manage peoples' time. Service users would be encouraged to make appointments.
- There would be a welcome service for initial access and to help people decide which services they needed but it may not be possible to see a clinician immediately. However, it was anticipated that the service would be as flexible as possible.
- A Board member raised a concern regarding the large unfunded pressure of £100k per year and asked whether options such as a special purpose vehicle or specialist charity to house this service within.
- The Lead member for homelessness confirmed that they were looking into options surrounding this. The flat rental would also provide some income.
- In response to a question it was confirmed that the hub would not cater only to rough sleepers but also to those who were vulnerably housed or further currently contracted by Council – adversely effected in order to fund the running of the centre.
- There were some concerns raised that the hub would attract rough sleepers to a particular area. It wasn't considered that it would, but it was also felt that it may speed up the process for reconnecting to the area.
- A Member requested that local police stations and the 101 service should be made aware of this provision and know how to direct people to it Ensure local police stations and 101 system actually know about this provision.

Board members requested to raise some issues pertaining to the confidential appendix to the report, it was therefore:

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

Cllr A Stribley left the meeting at 4:16pm.

- The meeting moved into non-public session -

-

The Board discussed a number of issues relating to the exempt information contained within the appendix including issues regarding the negotiations on the price, actions in order to achieve best value and the length of term for repayment.

- The Meeting resumed into public session -

The Chairman summarised the debate and noted the Board's overall support for the proposals and thanked the Councillors and Officers for presenting the report and responding to questions.

11. Request for Scrutiny from a Member of the Public

The Chairman introduced the item and advised the Board that a request for scrutiny of the policy regarding the use of disabled buggies at Queen's Park Golf Course had been made by Cllr D Borthwick, although the request was made in his capacity as a member of the public and not as a councillor. The Board was being asked to consider whether the issue should join the Board's Forward Plan. The Board were asked to consider a report on the issue a copy of which had been circulated to Board members and a copy of which was appended at 'D' to these minutes in the minute book.

The Portfolio Holder noted some of the factors which the O&S Board may have wanted to take into consideration. This included the different types of uses within the park and the test of reasonableness of the practice being alluded to as being deemed unsafe.

Cllr D Borthwick outlined his reasons for bringing the request for scrutiny forward. The Chairman reminded members that this was purely an issue to consider whether it should be added to FP. The Chairman advised that Board that a petition had been submitted on this issue and was being considered by the Chief Operations Officer. It was noted that one of the options in response to the petition would be to refer it to a scrutiny body.

It was noted that an equalities assessment had been undertaken. There was some concern as to whether this was fit for purpose and had been applied correctly in this case and was suggested that it may be an issue for the Audit and Governance committee to consider.

It was suggested that it would be best to allow the petitions route already underway to continue and not to include the issue on the Forward Plan at this point.

**RESOLVED that the issue is not included on the Board's Forward Plan at the present time as it was already being considered as part of the Council's petition scheme and to allow this process to be completed.**

Voting: nem con

12. Forward Plan

The Chairman presented the current Forward Plan to the Board. The Chairman asked Board Members for their comments and input on any of the items.

There was an issue raised around the item to cover the Poole Quay revitalisation / regeneration, including how that space could be upgraded to modern usage and the standards of other tourism places. It was suggested that there may be a paper coming to Cabinet in June on Poole Quay which may be related. It was noted that this would be looked into and the scope of this issue developed further to decide the best way forward for the Board.

The Chairman outlined the list of potential items for pre-Cabinet decision scrutiny for the next meeting and asked the Board if they had any comments or thoughts on which items should be taken Forward.

A Councillor requested that the Public Spaces Protection Order should be included on the Forward Plan for the next meeting.

There were no further comments on the Forward Plan. The Chairman advised that he would consider further which reports should be included with the Vice-Chairman and Officers.

The meeting ended at 5.01 pm

CHAIRMAN