

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

Minutes of the Meeting held on 28 February 2022 at 2.00 pm

Present:-

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

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

Also in attendance: Cllr H Allen, Cllr M Anderson, Cllr M Iyengar

164. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllr B Dion and Cllr S Gabriel.

Apologies were also received from Portfolio Holders, Cllr M Greene and Cllr K Rampton.

165. Substitute Members

Cllr D Borthwick substituted for Cllr S Gabriel and Cllr N Decent filled the Conservative Group vacancy for this meeting.

166. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

167. Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 31 January 2022 were confirmed as an accurate record.

167.1 **Action Sheet**

The Chairman provided the following updates on the Action Sheet:

- Minute 146 – Item on Play in BCP now added to the Forward Plan. Action completed and removed from action sheet.
- Minute 153 – BCP Surface Water runoff and sewerage overflows. Action added for Portfolio Holder to provide feedback to O&S Board following his meeting with MPs.
- Minute 162 – Chairman has agreed to add flytipping to the Forward Plan, date to be agreed in consultation with Vice Chair.

168. Public Speaking

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

169. Scrutiny of the LTP Capital Programme Cabinet Report

The Service Director, Transport and Engineering, presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each member of the Board and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'A' to these minutes in the Minute Book.

The Service Director and the Transport Improvement Manager addressed points raised by the Board. Many of these related to concerns around ward councillors and local residents accessing information regarding highway works/maintenance programmes, including:

- The report listed structural maintenance works but did not include other works such as road markings/white linings. It was explained that there was a separate, funded programme in place for this type of maintenance within the Neighbourhood Services budget. Members were encouraged to report areas of concern in their wards.
- When would a list of roads for highway maintenance for 2022/23 be available to inform councillors and residents of works in their area? It was explained that this information would be included on the website but did not form part of this strategic report. Works were identified and prioritised using criteria to assess the condition of the roads.
- There was an initial list of roads for 2022/23 and the Board was advised of some of the planned resurfacing works. It was noted that as well as the LTP budget there were other sources of funding available through Government schemes.
- A Board member queried the process for selecting and agreeing the list of roads and asked about the consequences of losing Band 3 status. It was confirmed that to satisfy the incentive requirements for Band 3 the Council was required to publish a three-year rolling programme of highways maintenance. The three year figures were included in the report's appendices and the Council was currently in a good position.
- It would be helpful if the road listings included the ward, particularly as there were often roads with the same name in different areas of BCP.
- Some Board members expressed concern at the state of road markings and white lines in some areas of BCP. These markings were particularly important for pedestrians and cyclists.
- There were mixed views on the effectiveness of the reporting system. Some Board members expressed frustration at the lack of response received. A Board member questioned the efficiency of the process for ranking and undertaking white lining. It was explained that works were assessed and prioritised chiefly on safety grounds and within finite resources, with those of highest safety priority dealt with first, based on information from the Neighbourhood Services inspection team and the public reporting system.

- A Board member asked if there was a list of roads scheduled for white lining and if this could be circulated. The Board was advised that this would have to be followed up with the Director of Environment.

Other issues raised included:

- A Board member asked about the funding for bus facilities referred to in Appendix A. It was explained that this funding supported the continuation of works to provide infrastructure for safer journeys, including raised kerbs, shelters and real time information.
- A Board member felt the level of funding for electric vehicle infrastructure did not reflect the Council's future policy aims. It was explained that this funding was to facilitate the progression of new technology across the network. Major infrastructure would be provided by commercial operation. Further details were subject to commercial sensitivity but it was confirmed that the Council was still in discussions, was open to further interest and had not yet formed a final position.
- Board members highlighted recently publicised concerns about new cycle lane kerbing on Whitelegg Way, including reports that it hindered the passage of emergency vehicles. It was noted that the design was compliant with Department of Transport guidelines and that the emergency services had not raised an issue when consulted.

In response to the issues raised the Chairman agreed to write to the Portfolio Holder for Sustainability and Transport on the following matters:

- Improving access to information for ward councillors and local residents on road works/maintenance programmes
- Whitelegg Way cycle lane kerbing – to outline members' concerns and ask what was being done to address these.

It was also agreed that the Director of Environment be asked through Democratic Services whether there was a list of roads scheduled for white lining which could be made available to Board members.

The Chairman thanked the officers for their attendance and input.

170. Scrutiny of the Development of the Throop Nature Park (Hicks SANG) Cabinet Report

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Place presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each member of the Board and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'B' to these minutes in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder and the Strategic Lead, Greenspace and Conservation, addressed a number of points raised by the Board including:

- Why was it appropriate to call the proposal a nature park when the planning consent was for a SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace)? The term 'nature park' implied something different and may increase concerns for local residents. The Board was advised that 'SANG' was a technical term which did not mean very much to the

public. There were similar examples where the term ‘nature park’ had been applied and its use here reflected the Council’s aspirations for the site.

- Board members asked why the £100k of CIL resources referenced in recommendation (iii) was needed, particularly when SANGs were meant to require less maintenance. The £100k sum would rise with inflation and was needed per annum for 80 years and there were concerns that this may reduce the amount of resource available for other sites? It was explained that the £100k was needed for the maintenance of the site, including car park improvements, electric vehicle charging and ecology surveys. The Board was assured that parks maintenance was not resourced from CIL. The heathland mitigation contribution came as result of new housing development and was ringfenced for the purpose of delivering the SANG.
- Board members asked whether the new ranger to manage this site was a dedicated, full-time post as implied in the report. It was explained that the new ranger would also be supporting other SANGs and heathland projects in BCP. Members felt this should be made clear in the report, to reassure local residents and avoid any misunderstanding about the nature of the project. It was noted that the highest risk assessed was the negative views of stakeholders/local residents.
- Why was £618k needed for implementation when the land was already owned by the Council? An approximate breakdown of costs was provided, including contingency figures and project fees. A Board member challenged these figures and questioned why these costs were not included in the report for transparency.
- A Board member asked whether the £100k of CIL resources in recommendation (iii) was exclusively from the heathland mitigation element. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that it was and gave an undertaking to amend the Cabinet recommendation to reflect this.
- It was noted that the Equalities Impact Assessment accepted that the lack of toilets and lighting would impact on the ability to use the open space.
- It was confirmed that the site had a dual use as pasture and water meadow depending on seasonal conditions.
- It was confirmed that although the site would remain open all hours, the opening times for the car park were conditioned in the planning consent to avoid issues such as anti-social behaviour.
- A Board member felt the rebranding of the site took away from the intended purpose of mitigating the Winter Gardens development. He asked how the Council intended to work with the Parish Council to deliver the project when they were so opposed to it. The Portfolio Holder advised that officers were in discussions with the Parish Council. It was noted that there was also support for the project, as shown in visitor surveys.
- A Board member was concerned that the Decision Impact Assessment was only an interim report and therefore the results of biodiversity surveys were not yet known.

The Chairman thanked the Portfolio Holder and the Strategic Lead for their attendance and contributions.

171. BCP Seafront Strategy Update

The Portfolio Holder for Tourism and Active Health provided a verbal update on the progress of the BCP Seafront Strategy. He explained that the report to O&S Board and Cabinet had been rescheduled for their respective April meetings to allow sufficient time for the explanatory narrative accompanying the strategy to be completed. He provided a brief summary of what the Strategy would contain and reminded the Board that all members had been invited to a seminar on 1 March, to learn about the strategy in more detail and provide feedback.

The Chairman thanked the Portfolio Holder and apologised for any misunderstanding regarding the content of the update.

172. Scrutiny of the Update on Establishing a Multi-Disciplinary Team and a Homeless Health Centre Cabinet Report

The Lead Member for Homelessness presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each member of the Board and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'C' to these minutes in the Minute Book.

As the appendix to the report was deemed to contain exempt information the Board had a discussion on whether or not it was necessary to exclude the press and public when this part of the report was discussed and agreed the following resolution by a majority vote:

**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.**

Paragraph 3 = Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

The Lead Member and officers responded to questions and comments from the Board on the issues raised in the exempt appendix, in particular the different options being put forward to Cabinet for consideration.

At the end of the debate the Board agreed a recommendation to be submitted to the Cabinet meeting on 9 March 2022 when this report would be considered. The Board discussed whether the recommendation could be made public. As the recommendation related to issues of commercial sensitivity within the exempt appendix the majority of the Board agreed that the recommendation should also remain exempt.

173. Forward Plan

The Chairman outlined the Board's Current Forward Plan and invited comments from members.

- Transformation Update, 4 April 2022 – It was suggested that it would be helpful to be given specific examples of how processes will change to make things more efficient. The Chairman asked members to let him know any additional issues they wanted covered to ensure maximum value from this session.
- In response to comments from Board members the Chairman agreed to write to the Portfolio Holder for Tourism and Active Health to ask when the Cabinet report on Leisure Centres was coming forward. He also agreed to follow up in more general terms on the reasons for items being continually delayed on Cabinet Forward Plan.
- Play in BCP, 16 May 2022 – The Chairman agreed to ask that the scope of this item incorporates the potential transfer of play sites to Christchurch Town Council (highlighted by a Board member as being the subject of a report to Cabinet on 25 May 2022).
- The Chairman also agreed to contact Democratic Services on behalf of some members who expressed concern at the finishing times of Council meetings.

174. Future Meeting Dates 2021/22

The Board noted 4 April 2022 as the one remaining meeting date for the Municipal Year 2021/22. Dates for the Municipal Year 2022/23 were also noted.

The meeting ended at 5.25 pm

CHAIRMAN