

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting held on 21 March 2023 at 7.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr N Hedges – Chairman

Cllr T O'Neill – Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr H Allen, 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 D Brown, Cllr S Bull, Cllr R Burton, Cllr D Butler, Cllr D Butt, Cllr J J Butt, Cllr E Coope, Cllr M Davies, Cllr N Decent, Cllr L Dedman, Cllr B Dove, Cllr B Dunlop, Cllr M Earl, Cllr J Edwards, Cllr L-J Evans, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr L Fear, Cllr A Filer, Cllr D A Flagg, 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 L Lewis, Cllr A Martin, Cllr S McCormack, Cllr P Miles, Cllr S Moore, Cllr L Northover, Cllr S Phillips, Cllr M Phipps, Cllr K Rampton, Cllr Dr F Rice, Cllr C Rigby, Cllr V Slade, Cllr A M Stribley, Cllr T Trent, Cllr M White, Cllr L Williams and Cllr K Wilson

15. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lewis Allison, Nigel Brooks, Mike Cox, Duane Farr, Rachel Maidment, Chris Matthews, Vanessa Ricketts, Mark Robson and Roberto Rocca.

16. Declarations of Interests

Councillors Lesley Dedman, Paul Hilliard and Simon McCormack declared interests in respect of Agenda Item 8 (Cabinet Minute No. 131 – Transfer of green space assets to Christchurch Town) Minute No. 22 and left the room for the discussion and voting thereon.

Councillor Marcus Andrews declared an interest in respect of Agenda Item 9 (Cabinet Minute No. 133 – BCP FuturePlaces Ltd – Outline Business Case for Poole Civic) Minute No. 23 and Agenda Item 10 (Cabinet Minute No. 134 – BCP FuturePlaces Ltd – Outline Business Cases for Christchurch) Minute No. 24 and remained present.

Councillors Mark Anderson, John Beesley, Mike Brooke, Sean Gabriel, Mark Howell, Sandra Moore, Karen Rampton, Tony Trent and Mike White declared interests in respect of Agenda Item 15 (b) (Notices of Motion in accordance with Procedure Rule 9 – Dorset Pension Fund) Minute No. 29 and remained present.

17. Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2023 were confirmed as a correct record.

18. Announcements and Introductions from the Chairman

The Chair outlined the events he had attended since the previous meeting, including the International Women's Day Community Impact Awards, and the Friends of the Priory 10 year Forward Plan presentation in Christchurch.

In addition, the Chair outlined future events he would be attending and made particular reference to the celebrations taking place for the coronation of King Charles.

The Chair then presented the Armed Forces Covenant- Silver Award 2022 certificate to Councillor David Kelsey as the Armed Forces representative.

At this point in the meeting the Chair brought forward Agenda Item 13 (Non-compliance with the Standards Complaints Process – Determination) and sought requests from the relevant Members to address Council.

19. Non-compliance with Standards Complaints Process - Determination

The Chair advised that the report was for information only and provided the Council with details of those complaints where members have failed to comply with a determination requesting that an apology be made following the informal resolution stage of the complaints process.

Councillors Mark Anderson, Bobbie Dove and Beverly Dunlop addressed the Council submitting their apologies in accordance with the Standards Complaints Process.

Following which the Monitoring Officer advised Council that while this is an information item Standards Committee had indicated when these matters be reported to Council that if any of the subject councillors did make an apology during the course of the meeting prior to this item being heard that those particular councillors sections could be removed from the report.

Councillors were therefore requested to note that paragraphs 9-14 and paragraphs 20-28 of the report should be disregarded.

20. Public Issues

A – Public Questions

Public Question from Dr Martin Rodger

The Council Leader reportedly justifies maximum Council Tax increases pointing to £6.2M cumulative Council Tax savings (1). This £6.2M also appeared in council papers (2) explaining that an extra £10.1M Council Tax income was possible in 2022/23 but without explaining whose decisions enabled this reduction.

This £10.1M in 2022/23 appears to comprise £1.8M enabled by Shadow Authority decisions four years ago, £2.8M and £7.8M from Unity Alliance

decisions, the latter adopted by the current Conservative administration and finally minus, so not a saving, -£2.3M from this administration.

Can this calculation (3) be confirmed as correct? Or can the actual calculation be properly explained?

Response by Councillor Mike Greene, Portfolio Holder for Finance, Net Zero and Transport

It is possible that Dr Rodger has not quite grasped what this statement he refers to in the Budget Report is showing. It demonstrates that over the course of the first seven years of the merged BCP Council, we will have kept £62 million in Council Tax Payers' pockets compared with what would have been the case if we had increased bills to the levels allowed by Government.

This has been made possible only because of the savings generated by the merger of the three Councils: That merger was supported by the Conservatives, and opposed by the Liberal Democrats, the Poole Peoples' Party and the Christchurch Independents – who made up the vast majority of the so-called Unity Alliance. Had they succeeded in their opposition to LGR, our Council Tax payers would collectively have been £62 million worse off.

Public Question from Jackie Delahunty (Being read by John Sprackling)

The council development advisory company FuturePlaces is tasked with assisting your Big Plan project. Do you believe the working Capital Loan of £8m the council granted FuturePlaces was in the best interest of BCP residents? Surely any fees paid to FuturePlaces for a full business case that subsequently does not progress to completion will result in those funds having to be written off by the council, ultimately risking the funds for essential services for local residents.

Response by Councillor Philip Broadhead, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Development, Growth, Regeneration and Transformation

FuturePlaces is the councils wholly owned regeneration arm and functions in much the same way as the councils other council owned entities.

In order to facilitate its day to day activities the council provides a draw down facility or working capital loan as it is sometimes called, in much the same way that the council department is allocated a budget, the key difference however is that because FuturePlaces operate as a company whose work is tied to regeneration projects where appropriate we can then fully capitalise the cost which would simply not be possible if this work was done by a council department. This then means Mr Chairman that the projects are paying for the work and not the council taxpayers revenue budget.

If projects are not taken forward the cost is either to be absorbed by FuturePlaces other activity or in the last instance covered by the councils revenue budget but remember prior to FuturePlaces creation all regeneration costs were covered by the revenue account. This format saves the revenue account millions of pounds and enables us to get the

best people in the council working on our regeneration place making and making the projects themselves cover that cost.

Furthermore, this facility has enabled FuturePlaces to move more quickly into developing outline business cases on a wider range of projects we want to bring forward at pace, some of which are on the agenda this evening.

Mr Chairman if we did not have FuturePlaces at all we would have two options, either find the millions of pounds from the revenue account to fund the activity in house up front which is what used to happen or stop any activity on council owned land, and it seems pretty straight forward to me what the right answer is. Mr Chairman later on this agenda two liberal democrat candidates looking to stand in the forthcoming elections are asking a similar question albeit dressed up as a statement and implying that the repayment of this draw down facility is a bad thing and somehow backwards. Is it backwards to get our regeneration moving with the full recent support of partners such as homes England, I don't agree. What I do think is backward is wannabe candidates somehow suggesting that you can have your cake and eat it, paying for regeneration from the revenue account without impacting services.

Mr Chairman by getting regeneration done we're working in collaboration with key government partners and reinvesting in the councils strategic assets rather than giving up on them so yes I do believe this arrangement is in the best interests of the residents of the BCP area and we are seeing the fruits of that approach come forward this evening.

Public Question from Jackie Delahunty (Being read by John Sprackling)

In the unlikely event your recent letter dated 3rd March 2023 to Lee Rowley MP has drawn a line under the financial scrutiny of BCP council, there will be a Government External Assurance Review of the council. Can you confirm the debt threshold has increased to £1.344 billion and if so is this not likely to be seen as very high risk, with the most serious outcome being the council is likely to be made insolvent?

Response by Councillor Mike Greene, Portfolio Holder for Finance, Net Zero and Transport

There seems to be some misunderstanding about debt thresholds. While, for example, BCP's self-imposed limit stands at £1.344 bn, its actual level of borrowing is only a third of that – around £500m.

Further, as we confirmed in November, no new borrowing is permitted unless a very strict test is met: namely, it must be supported by a *fully self-financing* business case. This means that there can be no debt taken on if there is any requirement from the Council's general fund to finance it. An example of what is allowed is the £10m borrowed this year to replace part of the Council's vehicle fleet with Zero emissions vehicles, generating a fuel cost saving which more than covers the costs of financing the debt.

If there is any question about the Council's ability to pay its interest and its debt, I would refer Ms Delahunty and others to the Financial Resilience Index of local authorities published by CIPFA, the Chartered Institute of

Public Finance and Accountancy. This compares the key financial risk ratios of councils and shows that BCP's interest payable as a percentage of net revenue expenditure is just about the lowest of all unitary authorities in the country.

So – no: neither our debt held, nor our debt ceiling is seen as high risk, and no, the Council will not become insolvent.

Public Question from John Sprackling

In answer to my Public Question at last week's Cabinet meeting, the Leader informed me that the Council would be seeking an Appropriation of the Beach Road car park for development, subject to public consultation, using this method to set aside the Covenants.

The Association requests that the Appropriation procedure should precede the proposed move of the project to a Full Business Case stage and, in so doing, committing costs estimated at £586k.

This would avoid the potential wasting of Council taxpayers money on an abortive activity.

Please provide this assurance.

Response by Councillor Philip Broadhead

The formal appropriation of a council site is an administrative procedure carried out prior to any formal development taking place. In the case of Beach Road, the proposed FuturePlaces project timeline envisages the council advertising its intention to appropriate the residential site in autumn 2023 and the responses received to the advert will inform a second Cabinet report which will seek approval to appropriate the south side for planning purposes prior to a disposal for development.

In reaching a decision Cabinet will be asked to carefully consider an assessment of the objections received and should Cabinet resolve to appropriate prior to granting planning permission then it will proportionate and lawful in those circumstances.

Public Question from Alex McKinstry

On 6 February Cllr Mellor, then leader of this Council, walked out of a meeting of the Corporate and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee midway through being reminded of his need to apologise to that Committee. That in turn was a sanction laid down by the Standards Committee for previous discourtesy. A motion of censure was proposed from the floor, but this was resisted by the Chair, Cllr Lawrence Williams, who said: "I'LL DROP A NOTE." It has since transpired that Cllr Williams did not in fact communicate with Cllr Mellor about his conduct. Why did he not do so?

Response by Councillor Lawrence Williams, Chairman of the Corporate and Community Overview and Scrutiny Committee

At the meeting I had intended to drop a note but on advice, but on advice I was told that this was not for me to pursue but that it should be referred to the Standards Board. Circumstances have subsequently changed and so I took no action.

Thank you.

Public Question from Philip Stanley Watts

Could the cabinet member tell me why the owner of the trx frame has been told to remove his weight training equipment as it should remain on Boscombe seafront as its benefiting many in the local community.

Response by Councillor Jane Kelly, Portfolio Holder for Communities, Health and Leisure

The TRX 360 equipment was originally installed without permission. However, in order to show support for a popular facility we did allow it to remain for a trial period whilst alternative options were considered. We recognise the benefits of TRX training, but this is specialised exercise equipment that is only used for 1 or 2 hours each day, benefitting a relatively small number of customers who pay either per session or monthly.

It is not openly available for public use and has been installed on one of our busiest parts of the beach, obstructing views from the promenade and adjacent restaurant so therefore is not the best place for it to be sited.

The Council is committed to enabling residents and visitors to the beach to participate in sports, exercise and well-ness activities which we have shown by our allowing this piece of equipment to remain in place for approximately one year. We are also committed to developing new opportunities for this type of recreation.

We do however have statutory responsibilities for the management of public open space & beaches, and financial regulations which govern our approach to offering commercial opportunities, which need to be considered.

We are therefore continuing to work with the owner of the business to try to identify a more suitable location for his equipment which can work for both he and the Council, subject to approvals and open market tender. We want him to be able to continue to offer the fitness provision to the clients that he has made relationships with and who clearly wish to continue.

These options potentially include the exciting new developments near Toft Steps Zig Zag, where last year we opened a brand new freely accessible outdoor fitness park and are currently constructing the '[Box Park](#)' to support start-up businesses, creating jobs and economic growth within leisure & tourism in Boscombe. There will also be opportunities in other parts of the beach which are more suitable for fitness equipment to fit in to the surroundings.

I wish all the best for the future of this business and for others who may also offer innovative and health giving opportunities along our fabulous coastline.

Public Question from Adam Sofianos

"Politicians (and the party they stand for) should be accountable for their decisions, good and bad."

Not my words, but those of leader Phil Broadhead, on social media last year.

His predecessor, Cllr Drew Mellor, was directed by the Standards Committee to apologise to this Council, after making "misleading statements" to members and residents, about a critical council matter: the Beach Hut Budget scheme.

Despite attending Full Council since then, Cllr Mellor has failed to apologise.

Does the leader agree that Cllr Mellor should accept the Committee's verdict, and finally apologise tonight, to Council, and by extension to the public?

Response by Councillor Philip Broadhead, Leader of the Council

When a complaint is considered, the Standards Board comes to the conclusion and makes a recommendation, sometimes it's in line with the professional advice of the independent member, sometimes as it happened only a couple of weeks ago it disregards the independent advice and reaches a different recommendation. In the event that the Standards Board requests action from a member it is up to that Member and him or her alone to choose whether or not to go along with that request.

In the case we have heard with Councillor Dedman for example she did not agree with the Standards Boards conclusion on the complaint against her and for that reason felt it would not be appropriate to accede to its request to make an apology.

A further point relates to the motivation of those who make complaints against Members, whilst some Members Mr Chairman myself-included have always chosen not to make those complaints even when there has been an obvious breach other Members and indeed a handful of members of the public, including I am led to believe some present tonight have clearly sought to try and extract political advantage for themselves either as election candidates or their parties in doing so.

In my opinion when one considers the resulting waste of officer time and so cost to the council taxpayer what seems really a shame is that there is no recourse to challenge that behaviour and ask them to apologise.

The Chairman invited Councillor Dedman to address the Council as Councillor Dedman had been named during the response to the previous question and had indicated to speak.

Councillor Dedman addressed the Council

Thank you Mr Chairman, I wouldn't bring it up normally but I have been named in this discussion about Standards, I would just like to say that the naming is totally incorrect and I did apologise to the Council and in fact the then Leader told me that that was satisfactory. I apologised to everybody on Twitter who had clearly seen the offensive tweet, I apologised for offending people. What I refused to do was apologise to an anonymous complainant, one person who chased me round twitter, and I was also vilified by the Standards Committee and I would like that to be noted.

B – Public Statements

Public Statement from Daniel Parkin

Following an FOI request, BCP officers recently disclosed information relating to FuturePlaces’ “working capital loan”.

This shows that almost half the £8m loan has been taken, with £3.5m already drawn down. This is before work on Full Business Cases has even begun.

The same disclosure also revealed that FuturePlaces has not repaid any of this loan.

Yet the new Leader appears to give the opposite impression. Recently on social media he claimed that FuturePlaces “are already paying it back.”

‘I trust as there is confusion in this matter, that the council will clarify this with the public immediately’.

Public Statement from John Ainsworth (Chair of Churches Together in Poole) [To be read out by the Chief Executive]

CTIP welcomes the firm commitment by Cabinet to reinstate Poole Crematorium as a working crematorium under Option 3. We trust that the installation work will be completed in time so that Poole Crematorium will be operating as a working crematorium by the summer of 2024 as envisaged by the decision of the Cabinet in September 2022.

Public Statement from Adam Sofianos

Tonight, Council is asked to “commit costs” for two FuturePlaces projects. Those costs are over £2m, in addition to £419,000 already committed. These would remain committed regardless of outcome.

FuturePlaces has drawn down almost half its loan already. These plans, plus others coming, may exhaust the £8m facility.

Many residents are concerned about FuturePlaces: whether it has the appropriate governance, scrutiny, transparency, financial responsibility.

And after the Beach Hut Budget, many residents fear another fiscal fiasco.

Surely this is no time to gamble. I ask you to allow an appropriate review of FuturePlaces itself, before these costs are committed.

Public Statement from Julie Redman [To be read out by the Chief Executive]

Councillor Broadhead was asked a question about the Bounce Back Challenge Fund at a Council meeting in November 2022. Councillor Broadhead said “Recent independent analysis of this array of support has been highly positive”.

This was misleading. A FOI request revealed Councillor Broadhead was referring to an internal audit report from 2021.

A summary report of the scheme has just been published showing minimal financial analysis.

Multiple concerns have been raised about the scheme but nobody has checked if Councillor Broadhead and Chris Shephard made the right decisions.

There could be 109 failed projects and £3 million wasted, nobody knows.

21. Audit and Governance Committee 16 February 2023 - Minute No. 182 - Financial Regulations - Annual evolution for 2023/24

Councillor John Beesley, Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee presented the report on the Financial Regulations – Annual evolution for 2023/24 and outlined the recommendations as set out on the agenda.

RESOLVED that the Financial Regulations as shown in Appendix A of the report to the Audit and Governance Committee be approved.

Voting: Unanimous

22. Audit and Governance Committee 16 February 2023 - Minute No. 183 - Review of the Council's Constitution - Recommendations of the Constitution Working Group

Councillor John Beesley, Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee presented the report on the Review of the Council's Constitution – Recommendations of the Constitution Working Group and outlined the recommendations as set out on the agenda.

Comprehensive discussion took place including the following points which were raised:

- concern was expressed with regards to the right of access to documents.
- concern was expressed with regards to the removal of the opportunity for the petitioner to sum up.
- the reduction in the number of statements a member of the public can make per year, bringing inline with the number of questions.
- the importance of encouraging members of the public to be able to attend and engage in multiple ways.
- access to meeting arrangements should be considered following May.
- the legislative provision around the access to documents which takes precedence over the constitution.

RESOLVED that: -

- (a) **the amendments to the Constitution relating to the Regulatory Committees, as detailed in paragraphs 13(a) to (e) to this report, be approved;**
- (b) **the amendment to Part 4D, Procedure Rule 23.4 (Substitute Members), as detailed in paragraph 15 to this report, be approved;**

- (c) the insertion of paragraph 1.1.2 to Article 1 (Powers and Duties of the Council) and the amendment to Part 4A, Procedure Rule 25.2 (Additional Rights of Access for Councillors), as set out in paragraphs 18 and 19 to this report, be approved;
- (d) no changes be made to the structure or frequency of meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees at this time but this be considered by the Council following the elections in May 2023;
- (e) the dates for the respective Overview and Scrutiny Committees, as set out in paragraph 28 to this report, be agreed for 2023/24, subject to the subsequent review by the Council after the elections;
- (f) the amendments to Part 4D, Procedures Rules 13.4 to 13.27 (Public Questions, Statements and Petitions), as detailed in paragraph 39 to this report, be approved, subject to paragraphs 13.4.9 and 13.5.7 being amended to read:
 - 13.4.9 no member of the public may ask more than three questions on any individual item of business as defined on the agenda of the meeting. Any person submitting multiple questions may not ask their second, or where applicable, third question until other members of the public, if any, have asked their first, or where applicable, second question, subject to the Chair's discretion.
 - 13.5.7 no member of the public may make more than three statements on any individual item of business as defined on the agenda of the meeting. Any person submitting multiple statement may not make their second, or where applicable, third statement until other members of the public , if any, have made their first, or where applicable, second statement, subject to the Chair's discretion;
- (g) the amendments to Part 6, Schedule 1 (Arrangements for dealing with allegations of breach of the Code of Conduct for Councillors), as set out in paragraph 43 to this report, be approved;
- (h) the amendment to Part 4A, Procedure Rule 24.3, (Access to document – Overview and Scrutiny Committees), as set out in paragraph 52 to this report, be approved;
- (i) any necessary and consequential technical and formatting related updates and revisions to the Constitution be made by the Monitoring Officer in accordance with the powers delegated.

Voting: (a) and (b) Nem.Con.
(c) Nem.Con. (1 abstention)
(d) 59:2
(e) 55:7
(f) 33:29 (2 abstentions)
(g) and (i) Unanimous

- (h) 31:31 (2 abstentions) the Chairman used his casting vote in favour and the resolution was therefore carried.

23. Cabinet 8 March 2023 - Minute No. 131 - Transfer of green space assets to Christchurch Town Council

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor N Greene, presented the report on the Transfer of green space assets to Christchurch Town Council and outlined the recommendations as set out on the agenda.

Council was advised that in November 2022 Christchurch Town Council had formally decided to proceed with the transfer of the following three sites:

- Barrack Road Recreation Ground (including play and fitness areas),
- Two Riversmeet Skate Park,
- Waterman's Skate Park

In relation to this Council was informed that formal approval was now required to the agreed terms detailing the financial arrangements and responsibility for the spaces in question.

RESOLVED that Council: -

- (c) **Agrees to transfer these assets at below the 'market' value under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 general disposal consent (England) 2003.**

Voting: Unanimous

Note – resolutions (a), (b) and (d) were resolved matters by the Cabinet.

Councillors Lesley Dedman, Paul Hilliard and Simon McCormack declared interests in this item and left the room for the discussion and voting thereon.

24. Cabinet 8 March 2023 - Minute No. 133 - BCP FuturePlaces Ltd - Outline Business Case for Poole Civic Centre Site

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Philip Broadhead presented the report on the BCP FuturePlaces Ltd – Outline Business Case for Poole Civic Centre Site and outlined the recommendations as set out on the agenda.

Councillor Judes Butt proposed an amendment to the recommendations, amending recommendation (e) and providing the addition of a recommendation (f) as follows: -

- (e) ***agrees that a permanent home will be accommodated within the Poole Civic Centre building, utilising established historic Mayoral rooms within the redeveloped Poole Civic Centre; and***
- (f) ***that a location for the Coroner's Service will be progressed by the Council's Transformation Programme – Assets and Accommodation Workstream.***

The proposer accepted the above amendment and addition which therefore along with recommendation (d) set out on the agenda became the substantive motion.

Comprehensive discussion took place on the item which included the following points being raised:

- frustration by the Poole Charter Trustees in not having a base for the Mayorly
- lack of public consultation

An amendment to recommendation 9(d) was proposed by Councillor David Brown and seconded by Councillor Stephen Bartlett as follows:

Council RESOLVES not to move the project to Full Business Case stage and not to commit costs estimated at £1.061m at this time. Instead to pause this project for further consideration of the Outline Business Case for the former Poole Civic Centre site as set out in Appendix A to this report and further consideration of the potential costs and benefits of the options contained therein, by the next administration of this Council following the forthcoming May 2023 elections.

Meeting adjourned 21:04

[Councillors Anne Filer and Norman Decent left the meeting]

Meeting reconvened 21:20

Comprehensive discussion took place on the proposed amendment during which support was expressed for the deferral to enable more time for the finances and risks to be considered.

A recorded vote on the item was requested and upon receiving the required support the amendment as set out above was put to the vote as follows:

For: 33

J Bagwell	S Bartlett	M Brooke
D Brown	S Bull	R Burton
D Butler	D Butt	J Butt
L Dedman	M Earl	J Edwards
L-J Evans	G Farquhar	D Flagg
A Hadley	P Hilliard	M Howell
M Iyengar	A Jones	M Le Poidevin
L Lewis	A Martin	S McCormack
P Miles	S Moore	L Northover
M Phipps	Dr F Rice	C Rigby
V Slade	T Trent	K Wilson

Against: 27

H Allen	M Anderson	S Anderson
S Baron	J Beesley	D Borthwick
P Broadhead	E Coope	M Davies
B Dove	B Dunlop	L Fear
S Gabriel	M Greene	N Greene
M Haines	C Johnson	T Johnson
J Kelly	D Kelsey	B Lawton
S Philips	K Rampton	M White
L Williams	T O'Neill (VC)	N Hedges (C)

Abstentions: 2

M Andrews	A Stribley	
-----------	------------	--

- (d) resolves not to move the project to Full Business Case stage and not to commit costs estimated at £1.061m at this time. Instead to pause this project for further consideration of the Outline Business Case for the former Poole Civic Centre site as set out in Appendix A to this report and further consideration of the potential costs and benefits of the options contained therein, by the next administration of this Council following the forthcoming May 2023 elections.
- (e) agrees that a permanent home will be accommodated within the Poole Civic Centre building, utilising established historic Mayoral rooms within the redeveloped Poole Civic Centre; and
- (f) that a location for the Coroner's Service will be progressed by the Council's Transformation Programme – Assets and Accommodation Workstream.

Note – resolutions (a) to (c) were resolved matters by the Cabinet.

Councillor Marcus Andrews declared an interest in this item and refrained from voting thereon.

25. Cabinet 8 March 2023 - Minute No 134 - BCP FuturePlaces Ltd - Outline Business Cases for Christchurch Civic Centre Site

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Philip Broadhead presented the report on the BCP FuturePlaces Ltd – Outline Business Cases for Christchurch Civic Centre Site and outlined the recommendations as set out on the agenda.

An amendment to the recommendation was proposed by Councillor Andy Martin and seconded by Councillor Margaret Phipps as follows:

It is RECOMMENDED that, in the light of the local elections in May 2023 and the FuturePlaces review currently being carried out by Lord Kerslake, COUNCIL: -

- (d) defers the decision to move the project to Full Business Case stage and commit costs estimated at £969k to the Council meeting scheduled for 11 July 2023.**

The proposer to the amendment set out the reasons for the proposed amendment.

A recorded vote on the item was requested and upon receiving the required support the amendment as set out above was put to the vote as follows:

For: 34

J Bagwell	S Baron	S Bartlett
M Brooke	D Brown	S Bull
R Burton	D Butler	D Butt
J Butt	L Dedman	M Earl
J Edwards	L-J Evans	G Farquhar
D Flagg	A Hadley	P Hilliard
M Howell	M Iyengar	A Jones
M Le Poidevin	L Lewis	A Martin
S McCormack	P Miles	S Moore
L Northover	M Phipps	Dr F Rice
C Rigby	V Slade	T Trent
K Wilson		

Against: 26

H Allen	M Anderson	S Anderson
J Beesley	D Borthwick	P Broadhead
E Coope	M Davies	B Dove
B Dunlop	L Fear	S Gabriel
M Greene	N Greene	C Johnson
T Johnson	J Kelly	D Kelsey
B Lawton	S Phillips	K Rampton
A Stribley	M White	L Williams
T O'Neill (VC)	N Hedges (C)	

Abstentions: 2

M Andrews	M Haines	
-----------	----------	--

RESOLVED that Council: -

- (d) defers the decision to move the project to Full Business Case stage and commit costs estimated at £969k to the Council meeting scheduled for 11 July 2023.**

Note – resolutions (a) to (c) were resolved matters by the Cabinet.

Councillor Marcus Andrews declared an interest in this item and refrained from voting thereon.

[Councillors Beverly Dunlop and Pete Miles left the meeting at 22:30]

26. Cabinet 8 March 2023 - Minute No 139 - Maintaining the momentum - PRS Housing scheme at Surrey Road, Bournemouth

Councillor Philip Broadhead, Leader of the Council presented the report on the PRS Housing scheme at Surrey Road, Bournemouth and outlined the recommendations as set out on the agenda.

Comprehensive discussion took place on the item which included the following points being raised:

- concern was expressed with regards to the cost of the scheme
- the question was raised as to whether the council should be building social housing not houses for public rent
- the requirement to provide houses for all

[Councillors Mark Anderson, Sarah Anderson and Cheryl Johnson left the meeting at 22:41]

In response to the concerns expressed the following points were raised:

- there is a need for private rented
- the landlord is the council
- the scheme provides local homes for local people

Upon being put to the vote the resolution fell with voting 25 For and 26 Against with 6 abstentions.

Councillor Farquhar requested his vote against the recommendation be recorded.

27. Audit and Governance Committee 9 March 2023 - Minute No 190 - Review of the Constitution

Councillor John Beesley, Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee presented the report on the Review of the Council's Constitution and outlined the recommendations as set out on the agenda.

Council thanked Members of the Audit and Governance Committee for their thorough work on this.

RESOLVED that: -

- (a) **the amendments in the Constitution identified in option 2 and Appendix 2 as set out in item 6 of the agenda of Audit and Governance Committee dated 9 March 2023 be adopted subject to:**
- i. **the replacement of paragraph 2.2.8 as below but in relation to sub-paragraph (f) of that replacement paragraph either option 1 or option 2;**
 - ii. **the addition of a new paragraph 2.7 as below; and**

- iii. further amending part of the wording of paragraph 2.5.2 b) as below.

The wording of those further changes being as follows:

- i. Add replacement 2.2.8 with (f) being either as option 1 or option 2:

2.2.8 applications where there have been 20 or more representations from third parties provided that to count toward that number, a representation must:

- (a) identify on the representation that it has come from a residence which is believed by the case officer (at the time of deciding whether the matter needs to go to Planning Committee) to be within one mile of any point measured from the relevant application site red line boundary;
- (b) be received by the Council within the initial or any subsequent representation period as identified on the posted planning site notice relating to that application or any other related representation period provided by the Council if no planning site notice is posted;
- (c) identify one or more issues that the case officer considers to be of material planning relevance to the application to which it relates;
- (d) not have been withdrawn by the person making the representation prior to the time of deciding whether the matter needs to go to Planning Committee;
- (e) be contrary to the intended case officer recommendation; and

Option 1 (no change from current restriction in the Constitution):

- (f) not come from the same residence;

Option 2 (scope for further multiple representations from the same household to count toward 20 representation total)

- (f) provided that any additional representation from the same residence may be counted if in the opinion of the relevant senior planning officer in consultation with the Chair of Planning it raises any different relevant material planning issues to those already contained in other representations from that residence;

- ii. And new 2.7 as follows:

2.7 For the avoidance of doubt, for the purposes of the 20 representation process identified in 2.2.8 above, a representation that identifies more than one name on it (including a petition) shall only be counted as one representation in calculating whether the 20 representation trigger has been reached.

iii. **Amend part of wording to 2.5.2 b) as follows:**

2.5.2 b) ... is received no later than 4pm on the seventh calendar day after”

(b) any necessary and consequential technical and formatting related updates and revisions to the Constitution be made by the Monitoring Officer in accordance with the powers delegated.

Voting: Nem.Con (1 abstention)

[Councillors Hazel Allen, Eddie Coope and Marion Le Poidevin left the meeting at 23:13]

28. Questions from Councillors

Question from Councillor L J Evans

“In December 2022 BCP Council overwhelmingly agreed to work towards becoming a White Ribbon Accredited organisation.

Please may I ask what progress has been made so far and what our next steps are?”

Response by the Leader of the Council, Councillor P Broadhead

We have made contact with the White Ribbon organisation to establish the criteria and process to seek the accreditation we approved. Our next steps are to identify a dedicated contact and coordinator to take this forward and also to identify male ambassadors within the organisation.

There is a financial commitment but this can be met within the Corporate Equalities budget so will not present a barrier.

[Councillor Bobbie Dove left the meeting at 23:15]

Question from Councillor A Jones

Following the recent site meeting, could the Cabinet Member confirm whether protective wands will be installed along the length of the cycle lanes in Christchurch Rd and if so when this work will take place given the ongoing frustration with the volume of illegal parking in this area?

Response by the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Net Zero and Transport, Councillor M Greene

Following the site meeting, which only took place a couple of weeks ago, I asked officers to investigate the practicalities and cost of segregating the mandatory part of the Christchurch Road cycle lane with wands. That review is currently taking place and the results, which I expect will come over the next few weeks, will be shared with ward members so they can feed into what action might be taken.

[Councillor Lisa Lewis left the meeting at 23:16]

Question from Councillor J Bagwell

Can the Leader please explain to this chamber why an historic piece of street furniture was allowed to be removed by property developers, as "in

the way of their development" this being a large cast, road sign which carried the ancient Poole Crest and Emblem stating , 'Welcome to the Historic Borough of Poole' Twinned with Cherbourg, this situated on the Blandford Road.

It would seem that the planning department allowed this sign to be removed, with no consideration of the historic heritage value to Hamworthy/Poole and the continuing twinning link with Cherbourg, or any reference to ward Cllrs regarding it's arbitrary removal.

May we also be advised as to where this BCP Council asset is now and why the request by myself and my fellow ward Cllr Dan Butt to reinstate this historic ' street furniture' asset has been refused by the Chief Executive.

The residents of Poole would also like their Civic Regalia back in Poole and not locked up in a cupboard in Bournemouth Town Hall.

These belong to the people of Poole, not Bournemouth and should be kept in Poole.

When will these be returned and when will the Mayor of Poole have a permanent home like the Mayors of Bournemouth and Christchurch who enjoy their individual Civic Office Homes in their own home towns.

Response by the Leader of the Council, Councillor P Broadhead

The sign was removed as part of the legal agreement to enable the redevelopment of 556, 558 and 560 Blandford Road. It was located too close to a new pedestrian access into the site.

The planning department had considered the impact of this. The conditions require the developer to arrange the relocation of the sign at its own expense and requires it to contact the Council to arrange this. The developer hasn't done this yet as the development is currently in progress.

Regarding the Poole Mayoralty, the future location of the Poole Mayoralty is being considered as part of the ongoing accommodation project. Councillors and Charter Trustees will be fully engaged in those discussions as we move towards any decision.

Question from Councillor L J Evans

"Serious allegations have been made both in the press and to all Councillors about one of our key BCP Council Officers.

Please could you assure us how BCP Council is committed to upholding the highest standards of honesty and integrity within its recruitment processes and explain when a proper performance management process will be put in place?"

Response by the Leader of the Council

"I would like to assure you that BCP Council is committed and working hard to uphold the high standards of performance management in our recruitment process.

One of the key aims in our effort to transform BCP Council into a modern, accessible, and accountable council is to get that ability to deliver key

services to our communities and that depends upon our ability to acquire and retain the right people with the right balance of behaviours and skills.

Although clearly this has become more challenging with the national and local shortage of candidates with the right competencies and experience in many professions, we have recognised that we need to change how we acquire, invest, develop and retain our current workforce, and also align this closely to a talent management framework which underpins high standards of both behaviour and performance.

To achieve this we have developed a three-year programme of improvement which has clear outputs and includes revising our recruitment processes and creating a sustained performance culture. There is a tremendous amount of activity underpinning this and I actually have a list of activities and developments both over the last 12 months and the coming 12 months which I have in writing but in the interest of the late hour I will provide this in writing to Councillor Evans after the meeting if Councillor Evans finds this acceptable. However just to reiterate we are completely committed to delivering high levels of integrity into these processes and we always investigate any allegations or complaints thoroughly.

[Councillors Julie Bagwell, Steve Baron, Daniel Butt and Judes Butt left the meeting at 23:22]

29. Notices of Motion in accordance with Procedure Rule 9

A – Debate Not Hate

The following motion was submitted in accordance with Procedure Rule 9 of the Meeting Procedure Rules and was moved by Councillor L-J Evans and seconded by Councillor T Trent:

It is a privilege and responsibility to be elected to public office, something which anyone should feel safe and proud to enter into. However, increasing levels of public intimidation and toxicity of debate aimed at and between local politicians is having a real impact on democracy. We need to see concrete action to protect current councillors and ensure potential future councillors feel safe to stand for election.

‘We therefore call upon all BCP Councillors to demonstrate their commitment to tackling this issue by signing the Local Government Authority’s “Debate Not Hate” campaign statement, and for the Chairman to sign the statement on behalf of the Council as a whole.’

Comprehensive discussion took place on the motion with all Councillors speaking in support of and emphasising the importance of “Debate Not Hate”.

RESOLVED that Council supports the motion.

Voting: Unanimous

[Councillors David Flagg and Margaret Phipps left the meeting at 23:50]

B – Dorset Pension Fund

The following motion was submitted in accordance with Procedural Rule 9 of the Meeting Procedure Rules and was moved by Councillor F Rice and seconded by Councillor C Rigby:

‘This motion requests that BCP council asks the Dorset Pension Fund Committee to move all remaining energy investments in the pension fund to sustainable energy investments by the end of 2024.’

Voting: Nem.Con

Councillors Mark Anderson, John Beesley, Mike Brooke, Sean Gabriel, Mark Howell, Sandra Moore, Karen Rampton, Tony Trent and Mike White declared interests in respect of this item.

[Councillor Andy Jones left the meeting at 00:18]

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

The Chief Executive advised of an urgent decision taken in respect of the acceptance of the Household Support Fund 4 – to accept the £5,306,734 allocated by the Department for Work and Pensions under the current Household Support Fund (HSF).

The meeting ended at 0.20 am

CHAIRMAN