

**BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL**  
**COUNCIL**

Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 September 2019 at 7.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr D A Flagg – Chairman

Cllr G Farquhar – Vice-Chairman

Present: 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 C R Bungey, Cllr R Burton, Cllr D Butler, Cllr D Butt, Cllr J J Butt, Cllr E Coope, Cllr M Cox, Cllr M Davies, Cllr N Decent, Cllr L Dedman, Cllr B Dion, Cllr B Dove, Cllr B Dunlop, Cllr M Earl, Cllr J Edwards, Cllr L-J Evans, Cllr D Farr, Cllr A Filer, Cllr N C Geary, 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 R Maidment, Cllr C Matthews, Cllr S McCormack, Cllr P Miles, Cllr S Moore, Cllr L Northover, Cllr T O'Neill, Cllr P Parrish, Cllr S Phillips, Cllr M Phipps, 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

17. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors H Allen, L Fear, M Greene, N Hedges, K Rampton, M Robson and R Rocca.

18. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest made on this occasion.

19. Confirmation of Minutes

The Minutes of the Council meeting held on 16 July were confirmed as a correct record and signed. Subject to clarification of the voting relating to Clause 15 of the minutes and Councillor Diana Butler's abstention.

20. Chairman's Announcements and Introduction

**Death of Former Councillor**

The Chairman referred with regret to the recent death of former Borough of Poole Councillor Joanne Tomlin. She was a Broadstone Councillor from May 2015 to September 2016. Joanne had been a member of the Communities and Economy Overview and Scrutiny Committees. Councillors were advised that she had also been a member of the Broadstone, Merley and Bearwood Area Committee. The Chairman called on Councillors Julie Bagwell and Judy Butt who paid tribute to Joanne

Tomlin as a Councillor and a devoted Mother. Councillors stood in silent tribute.

**Statement from Councillor Lisa Lewis**

The Chairman of the Council called on Councillor Lisa Lewis who made the following statement:

"I feel that I would like to give you all an explanation and also an apology for my carelessness on social media.

I have been suspended by the Labour Party for possible breach of rules, pending investigation, in line with standard procedure.

I retweeted the Dorset Eye tweet because I am concerned about the censorship of independent press and media, and the motives behind the recent attacks on the Canary. I don't like the fact that someone will use their celebrity status to spread their own message instead of the truth.

I should have taken more time to read the link to the whole tweet carefully because upon doing so later I realised that it used an invidious tone and language which I would never use personally, and it had unpleasant connotations which goes against my innate belief of treating people with respect and dignity.

When retweeting I did not interpret the article as having anti-Semitic connotations. If I had thought there was a chance it might be seen as such I would never have retweeted it as I find such opinions abhorrent.

I have been shocked and horrified to think that my action has caused offence and also resulted in extra work for our Council's elected representatives. I have learnt a lesson and will be extremely careful in future.

I am really grateful to those of you who've already shown understanding and support - thank you, it means a lot."

21. **Public Issues**

The Chairman advised that 7 public questions, 2 statements and 1 petition had been submitted for the meeting.

**Public Question from Philip Stanley-Watts**

It should be a democratic right for residents to take part in the planning process so why is the objectors letter not within your local planning policies.

**Response by Councillor Margaret Phipps (Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning)**

Thank you for your question. Just to be clear - members of the public can continue to write letters and make comments on planning applications. That has not changed as there is an embedded democratic right for residents to take part in the planning process. However, in revising the Councils constitution, specifically Part 3 on 'Responsibilities for Functions' (not 'local planning policies' as referred to in your question), the Council decided that a number of changes were needed to align the various

approaches from the 3 legacy councils of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole, on how planning applications were referred to planning committee for determination, rather than being determined by a planning officer.

One of those changes was to no longer have a trigger point, as had been the case in Bournemouth, of 10 letters of objection, automatically meaning that a planning application would be referred to the planning committee for determination.

Whilst letters from the public, of objection or support, are welcome, now, just one objection, citing a material planning consideration, submitted via an elected Councillor, can trigger a call to Committee. Please do write in, but also do contact your elected Councillor who is there to help you with your concerns.

When officers or the planning committee make a decision on a planning application it is the planning merits of the scheme that are considered. It is not the volume of objections but the material planning considerations that are important.

I also want to point out that other changes have been made to the constitution that broaden the types of applications that can be referred to committee by officers or councillors. For example, householder applications are now included, and often these may only affect one or two people, and it may not be possible to obtain 10 letters to submit to the Council. Also, there has been an extension to the length of time given to members to request that an application be determined by committee - to 30 days.

But again, I stress that the Council welcome comments from the public on planning applications and in that respect those democratic rights have not changed.

### **Public Question from Sarah Ward**

Under the hospital plans a single A&E and Maternity unit at RBH will serve 750k people from the conurbation catchment area, and west Hampshire.

In addition, 245 acute beds will be cut, there is not enough funding or staff for new 'integrated community services' supposed to reduce demand for acute care, there are acute vacancies and a NHS recruitment and retention crisis.

Can the Council confirm that issues regarding the ability of the newly planned services to meet anticipated capacity will be fully risk assessed with clear solutions for managing demand which cannot be safely or adequately met?

### **Response by Councillor Lesley Dedman (Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health)**

I would like to thank you for your question about planning for local health services. The statutory responsibility for planning health services does not lie with the Council but with the NHS. The Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group is best placed to respond to the issues raised in this Public Question. Questions can be raised with the Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group by

contacting the Dorset CCG Customer Care Team. Information on how to contact the team is available on [www.dorsetccg.nhs.uk](http://www.dorsetccg.nhs.uk)

**Public Question read out by Emma Lang (on behalf of David Fairhall)**

The only assessment of the hospital plans is described as ‘lacking in power’ and ‘not fit for purpose’ by the clinician panel selected by DCCG.

Focus on ‘additional’, not total, journey time, ignored patients facing the longest journeys, and most maternity and child emergencies were excluded as they do not get to hospital by ambulance.

Later review of the tiny sample of 34 from the 3,400 patients facing longer journeys over 4 months, showed 8 had died, or were misdiagnosed.

These are huge changes to Dorset NHS services. How will the Council ensure a proper risk assessment is carried out?

**Response by Councillor Lesley Dedman (Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health)**

Thank you for your question about plans for local NHS services.

The issues raised by the question have been subject to judgements in the High and Appeal Courts and to a referral to the Secretary of State from the former Dorset County Council (which was supported by the former Borough of Poole). The outcome of the Referral to the Secretary of State is still pending. In the light of the above, it is not appropriate for Council to make comment on the issues raised in this question.

The responsibility for carrying out risk assessments relating to significant changes in local health services lies with the NHS. Questions related to risk assessment can be raised with the Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group by contacting the Dorset CCG Customer Care Team. Information on how to contact the team is available on [www.dorsetccg.nhs.uk](http://www.dorsetccg.nhs.uk)

**Public Question from Emma Lang**

BCP Council's Climate Emergency statement pledges ‘*to make BCP Council and its operations carbon neutral by [2030](#), and work with the wider community to look at how early the BCP region can be made carbon neutral ahead of the UK target of [2050](#)*’

The hospital plans, which end A&E admissions at Poole and most elective care at RBH, will see 200,000 patients and their visitors having to cross the conurbation for care. These journeys will increase carbon emissions and impact on respiratory health.

Could the Council explain in detail how their carbon-neutral target sits alongside the hospital plans?

**Public Question from Sue Aitkenhead**

The hospital plans mean extra journeys across the conurbation for 200,000 patients and their visitors.

Both hospitals offer emergency and elective care now. Poole will stop A&E admissions over 38 thousand last year, and RBH will stop elective operations – over 74 thousand last year.

Although this adds up to 113,000 we actually have new evidence since I submitted the question that over 200,000 thousand people will have to cross the conurbation to access care with the impact on the environment.

Bournemouth is already the third most congested location in the UK. Yellow Buses say the conurbation: “will grind to a complete standstill unless urgent action is taken to tackle congestion.”

How will Council prevent gridlock and offset environmental costs?

**Response by Councillor Andy Hadley (Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure – the following responds to questions from Emma Lang and Sue Aitkenhead)**

I would like to start for transparency I work for the Clinical Commissioning Group and I am responding to this question as Transport Portfolio Holder for BCP.

I would like to thank both Emma and Sue for their questions, and if I may, to answer them together.

Both questions relate to over 100,000 and you’ve now said 200,000 patients and their visitors crossing the conurbation to access services that are currently split between the two hospitals, however there has been some specialisation between the two of them for as long as I can remember.

In respect of Maternity, the balance of existing births in the East of the county is that more are born to Bournemouth and Christchurch parents, than from Poole and Purbeck parents, so net travel overall should reduce.

The health reconfiguration in Dorset is driven by an aim from the NHS as you’ve heard to increase the 24 hour x 7 day quality of care, to manage current and future staffing shortfalls and the burgeoning demands for care, especially for our increasingly aging population. This involves not only specialising care in the two acute hospitals, but also moving some care out to community based hub settings.

The Hospital changes are subject to approval from the Local Planning Authority and from us in order to gain approval it would be up to them to fully mitigate against the transport impacts their plans would have on other users. We are working through the transport implications of the hospitals plans with them, and with other partners like the bus companies. We have also been working with the CCG on options for non-emergency transport through a Transport Reference Group

The Hospital travel plans do include measures to persuade people (Staff, patients and visitors) to move to other transport options than the private car, but neither the Local Authority, nor the NHS Trusts can force the change, we can only create the conditions to help people choose more sustainable travel options. As more people awaken to the Climate Crisis, it is down to all of us to modify our journey choices.

There is an intent in the NHS plans to treat more of the simpler care locally (ie in GP practices or community hubs around the county), or indeed in peoples own homes so Poole Hospital, which is in a significantly more sustainable location, will potentially see a decreasing workload, but patients especially in the more rural areas, for simpler care needs, will have far less distance to travel.

I haven't seen the modelling on this, but for the urban area, unfortunately, the community Hubs have been chosen by the CCG to be on the Acute Hospital sites (rather than for example the Community Hospitals Alderney, Kings Park or other community sites).

Because of the choice of Major Urgent at RBH and Planned Care at Poole, many departments are switching, so certainly for a period, many staff will on balance have more extended commuting distances. This will of course settle over time.

Both hospitals, as public authorities have Carbon Reduction targets to meet, and programmes of works to undertake including for travel.

To return to the questions

From Sue : How will Council prevent gridlock and offset environmental costs?

From Emma : Could the Council explain in detail how their carbon-neutral target sits alongside the hospital plans?

The Unity Alliance have challenged the car-centric designs for Wessex Fields, and the likely induced traffic at the Royal Bournemouth Hospital site. The specialisation and centralisation of services does transfer costs for journeys from the Hospitals to individuals, and to the local authority for providing infrastructure to attempt to prevent gridlock and reduce carbon emissions.

We will work with the NHS organisations, and with the public across the conurbation to try to mitigate these changes. It can happen. In Central London, over 50% of peak rush-hour journeys are now undertaken by push bike. In European cities, the vast majority of people use public transport or active travel options. We are bidding to government for Transforming Cities Funding to help on this journey, and we will need to get bolder.

BCP Council need to make significant investment in integrated public transport, and quality space for walking and cycling, but we need businesses and the public to also change their attitude to the car, which can be a great enabler, but also brings congestion, lack of exercise, poor air quality and social isolation, all determinants of bad health.

The Council's Climate and Ecological Emergency Declaration commits us to 'Work with partners, businesses and the wider community to investigate, make recommendations and to set a target for how early the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole region can be made carbon neutral, ahead of the UK target of 2050.'

We will need very active support from Public Health colleagues, from the Hospital Trusts and from many other organisations to achieve this, but most of all help from concerned people like you, and from the public at large.

**Public Question from Lisa Weir**

DCCG admit ‘significant clinical risk’ is attached to the plans to end A&E, Maternity and Paediatrics at Poole.

The Appeal Court Judges accepted that longer travel time would increase risk to 396 ambulance patients a year, but didn’t know that this number excluded most maternity & child emergencies, who don’t arrive by ambulance.

Under the plans, all Dorset mums delivering under 32 weeks would need to get to RBH. DCCG’s Equality Impact Analysis says longer travel time in labour, birth & child emergency is a ‘significant risk’.

How will Council ensure they meet the Poole plan commitment to ‘improve health’?

**Response from Councillor Lesley Dedman (Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health)**

Thank you for your question about planning for local health services.

The issues raised have been subject to judgements made in the High and Appeal Courts and have been raised also in a Referral to the Secretary of State made by the former Dorset County Council (supported by the former Borough of Poole). The outcome of the Referral to the Secretary of State is pending. In this context, it is not appropriate for the Council to comment on these issues.

The planning of local health services is the responsibility of the NHS. Questions related to the issues raised in the question should be directed to the Dorset Clinical Commissioning Group by contacting the Dorset CCG Customer Care Team. Information on how to contact the team is available on [www.dorsetccg.nhs.uk](http://www.dorsetccg.nhs.uk)

**Public Question from Roger West**

I am a war baby whose family suffered greatly during the war. Three of our family homes were destroyed, two with me in them. In one I was woken to find glass all over my bed and in the other we were in the cellar. Would the Council provide the support for a fund to have a war memorial with names on it. I would be willing to contribute to such a fund and I’m sure I would not be alone. One patron could be Tobias Ellwood MP with his distinguished military record. The cost to the Council would be negligible.

(Note the question read out varied from the above submitted)

**Response by Councillor Vikki Slade (Leader of the Council)**

Thank you for your suggestion which I am very interested in. The BCP area had significant activity in the second world war and as well as losing large numbers in military conflict, there will have been many affected at home and at work through bombings, accidents and other related incidents. We know that some of these victims have recognition within their own communities but it does seem fitting that we look at a wider memorial.

I have asked our Armed Forces Champion to work with officers to scope out a potential memorial and how it might be funded. I will be happy to approach our MPs for their thoughts and thank you for your offer to make a personal contribution.

**Public Question from Philip Stanley-Watts**

What with the sandbanks ferry out of service and lack of infrastructure can BCP Council as an enabling authority consider a water bus service.

**Response by Councillor Andy Hadley (Portfolio Holder for Transport and Infrastructure)**

Thank you Philip for your question. I will answer it in regard to the specifics of the Sandbanks crossing, and also the wider prospects for water buses.

The sandbanks ferry is privately run operation, under an act of parliament of 1927, and responsible to the Poole Harbour Commissioners for the service to the public. The impact on residents on both sides of the harbour, and on the tourists this year has been really regrettable, and concerns have been raised about maintenance and the likelihood of further problems.

In terms of alternatives meanwhile, the local bus operator is maintaining a service between Bournemouth and Swanage that still links Sandbanks Pavilion and the Shell Bay ferry terminal. At present a temporary timetable is in place until November.

I am told that the Poole Quay to Swanage ferries have been very popular this Summer, and that a private water taxi has also been running for businesses at South Haven.

The Bournemouth and Sandbanks Ferry Company are confident that the service will be resumed by the end of October but if the ferry remains out of action beyond this date, the temporary bus timetable can be extended nearer the time, running services up to half-hourly between Bournemouth Station and Swanage.

The council have been working actively with partners including Dorset Council and the Poole Harbour Commissioners, to respond to a community effort to get the water bus service running, and to have this as a contingency against future failure. This is ongoing, but subject to significant regulation.

If a suitable temporary passenger ferry was provided between Sandbanks and Shell Bay then the bus company would most likely operate separate buses to the terminals only and not persist with the lengthy diversion. Clearly this would have to be properly coordinated.

The Bournemouth-Swanage Ferry Company have indicated that a replacement Ferry is likely to be planned for 2030 subject to sufficient reserves being available.

I have been involved previously in attempts to consider water buses for wider use across the area, and it is certainly a resource that we do not make full use of. To run a year around service along our coastline without a sheltered place to dock in Bournemouth or Boscombe would be challenging, and I believe that Mr Stanley-Watts was previously involved in



discussions on this, but ferries do frequently run during the summer between Swanage Pier and Poole Quay, and it would be great to get them running to Boscombe and Bournemouth Piers again.

Christchurch harbour has a regular summertime ferry from Tuckton to Mudeford Beach, and across the mouth of the Run in more sheltered water, I can remember when the Run crossing was by rowing boat, as still operates in Weymouth.

We will certainly be keen to look again at enabling Water Taxis as part of our transport infrastructure, working with partners, but this would need to be under the jurisdiction of the relevant authorities, Poole Harbour Commissioners the Coastguard and the Marine Maritime Organisation.

**Public Statement from Susan Chapman**

Former chief scientist Professor Sir David King is the latest academic to warn of depression over the unexpectedly faster pace of climate change. He calls for collective action. Our local MP at surgery on Friday depressingly failed to recognise the need for immediate decarbonisation at speed and scale nor seemed to respond to YouthStrike4Climate when humanity's carbon budget is all but spent & our war on failing Mother Nature is accelerating.

There is an online governmental petition to revoke the (criminally unscientific) 2015 Infrastructure Act which requires our government to maximise fossil fuel extraction. Please sign and circulate it.

**Public Statement from Morag Morrison (the following statement was read out by the Chief Executive on Morag's behalf)**

I am a resident of Boscombe & Pokesdown Ward + Chair of Boscombe Forum. I hold a Blue Badge & am concerned that there are insufficient on street disabled parking bays in area.

There are 3 disabled parking bays adjacent to the shared space which are usually occupied by taxis or cars without Blue Badge.

The recent expansion of Blue Badges for hidden disabilities will put more pressure on existing spaces.

As Chair of Boscombe Forum I would wish to contribute to any future assessment of amenities in area & happy for Forum to help in a public consultation.

**Petition (detail of petition and no of signatories read out by the Chief Executive on behalf of the petitioners)**

The number of short-term house rentals to large groups has grown substantially in the last few years in the Poole area. These residential properties are now being used for commercial leisure accommodation as opposed to their intended and designed purpose - to house local families and to contribute to a safe, stable and integrated community.

A recent web search for "house to rent, sleeping 10 or more" showed 63 properties available in Poole. The same search for Bournemouth showed 286 & Christchurch 152 and this is only a small selection.

Many of these properties are offering accommodation for 20 or more people. With 2-day minimal rentals this can mean there is the possibility of up to 3000 different people living in a house in a year with all the risks that entails.

Local residents report:

Antisocial behaviour & noise at all times of day or night.

Verbal threats.

Broken glass & litter in neighbours gardens and on the roads surrounding the properties.

Commercial size waste bins located at residential properties, used as a central collection point for party house rental companies. Very disruptive and noisy especially on a Sunday morning.

A group of 20 people will generally add 6 to 10 vehicles to the road for parking with many additional vehicle movements, slamming car doors, loud voices on arrival and general disturbance that brings many associated issues & risks.

Activities in the gardens increase with guests BBQing, engaging in games and playing loud music, often late into the night.

To date the Environmental Health & Planning Departments have been ineffective at addressing this issue. Noise abatement orders have been obtained by Poole Council against properties, owners & agents but no further enforcement action taken, or fines issued.

Residents blighted by these rentals have been told that there is nothing more the Council can do but this is not correct.

The Planning environment has changed since Poole Council last looked at the issue in 2015.

Other Councils see this as a Material change away from the C3 Dwellinghouse use and have taken Enforcement Action on Planning grounds. Importantly these enforcement actions have been upheld by Planning Inspectors, most recently in January this year. We ask that BCP Council now does the same.

We have provided details of 4 councils in England that have successfully taken action against short-term rental properties in the last two years and, importantly, the reasons why Planning Inspectors have upheld their decisions.

We believe that any property in BCP area offered for short term let for more than 6 people doesn't comply with the C3 Use Class, and therefore should need to seek Planning Permission for change of use before being allowed to operate.

If such properties are required to go through the Planning process their use can be tested against the local policies in relation to impact on neighbours, living conditions, parking arrangements and whether they add to or remove from the local housing stock.

At the moment, a Party House can be opened beside any of us and we are told that nothing can be done.

This has to stop, please?

We ask the BCP Councillors to give the Enforcement Teams the direction and resources necessary to take action to solve this problem once and for all across our area.

There were 215 signatures on the petition.

**RESOLVED that the Petition be referred to the relevant Director for discussion with the appropriate Portfolio Holder.**

22. Record of Decisions of Cabinet and minutes of other Committees

The Committee Minutes for the last cycle of meetings were received.

Voting: Agreed

The recommendations arising from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11 September 2019 were then considered and approved:-

**Minute No. 31                                      Boscombe & Pokesdown Neighbourhood  
Plan Decision Statement**

The Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning presented the report and proposed approval as set out.

In response to a question the Portfolio Holder explained the level of consultation undertaken and the process for the referendum.

A Ward Councillor wished to record her thanks and appreciation to the Community in respect of the above neighbourhood plan.

Voting: Unanimous.

**Minute No. 32                                      Local Development Scheme – BCP Local  
Plan**

The Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning presented the report and proposed approval as set out.

A Councillor referred to the Poole Local Plan which had only recently been adopted at the end of 2018. The Portfolio Holder reported that the focus would be on the development of the new plan.

Voting: Unanimous.

**Minute No. 38                                      Implementation of pay and reward  
strategy**

The Leader of the Council presented the report and proposed that the allocation of £2.1m funding for additional internal capacity and external support for delivering the pay and reward strategy be approved.

Voting: Unanimous.

Councillor Nicola Greene raised concern and sought clarification on the how the item on Project Admiral Leasehold Considerations and Acquisition

Proposals had been dealt with at the Cabinet on 11 September 2019 in particular the exclusion of the press and public. She highlighted an extract from the minutes of the Cabinet which referred to "...discussion regarding the buy back of properties ..." and requested that all Councillors should be advised of the issues raised and the process for dealing with such items. The Leader of the Council confirmed that this issue would be dealt with at the next meeting of the Cabinet and councillors advised accordingly.

23. Review of the Political Balance of the Council and changes in Committee Membership

The Leader of the Council presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Councillor and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'A' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Council were asked to:

- consider the revised political balance and the allocation of seats on Committees;
- note a change to one of the Conservative Group representatives on the Dorset Police and Crime Panel; and
- note a change to the membership of the Planning Committee.

The Leader of the Council in moving the recommendations sought approval for Councillor Stephen Bartlett to be appointed to serve on the Overview and Scrutiny Board as Councillor Nigel Brooks had confirmed that he no longer wished to serve on that body.

**RESOLVED that:-**

- (a) **the revised political balance of the Council as set out in the report be agreed and that Councillor Stephen Bartlett replace Councillor Nigel Brooks on the Overview and Scrutiny Board;**
- (b) **it be noted that Councillor Mohan Iyengar will replace Councillor Mark Anderson as a representative on the Dorset Police and Crime Panel; and**
- (c) **it be noted that Councillor Beverley Dunlop will replace Councillor Laurence Fear on the Planning Committee.**

Voting: Unanimous

24. Notice of Motions in accordance with Procedure Rule 13

The Council was advised that the following motion had been proposed by Councillor N Greene, seconded by Councillor M Haines in accordance with Procedure Rule 13.

**That this Council unanimously, unequivocally and explicitly condemns prejudice and intolerance in all forms. We uphold, as is our moral and legal duty, the 9 protected characteristics of the 2010 Equality Act of age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, sex and religion or belief. There is no place in this Council, be it members or officers, for**

**prejudice, discrimination or bigotry of any kind. To further demonstrate our commitment this Council adopts the widely and internationally adopted IHRA definition of antisemitism.**

An amendment was proposed by Councillor Mark Howell

**That the last sentence regarding adoption of the IHRA definition be deleted.**

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Dr Felicity Rice.

Councillors debated and had a comprehensive discussion on the amendment.

A recorded vote was requested in accordance with Procedure Rule 16.2 of the Constitution.

Upon being put to the recorded vote the amendment fell with voting:

For

Cllr L-J Evans

Cllr Mark Howell

Cllr Dr Felicity Rice

Against

Cllr Lewis Allison

Cllr Mark Anderson

Cllr Sarah Anderson

Cllr Marcus Andrews

Cllr Julie Bagwell

Cllr Steve Baron

Cllr Stephen Bartlett

Cllr John Beesley

Cllr Derek Borthwick

Cllr Philip Broadhead

Cllr Mike Brooke

Cllr Nigel Brooks

Cllr David Brown

Cllr Simon Bull

Cllr Colin Bungey

Cllr Richard Burton

Cllr Diana Butler

Cllr Daniel Butt

Cllr Judy Butt

Cllr Eddie Coope

Cllr Mike Cox

Cllr Malcolm Davies

Cllr Norman Decent

Cllr Lesley Dedman

Cllr Bryan Dion

Cllr Bobbie Dove

Cllr Beverly Dunlop

Cllr Millie Earl

Cllr Jackie Edwards

Cllr Duane Farr

Cllr Anne Filer

Cllr David Flagg

Cllr Nick Geary

Cllr Nicola Greene

Cllr May Haines

Cllr Peter Hall

Cllr Paul Hilliard

Cllr Mohan Iyengar

Cllr Cheryl Johnson

Cllr Toby Johnson

Cllr Andy Jones

Cllr Jane Kelly

Cllr David Kelsey

Cllr Bob Lawton

Cllr Marion Le Poidevin

Cllr Lisa Lewis

Cllr Rachel Maidment

Cllr Chris Matthews

Cllr Sandra Moore

Cllr Lisa Northover

Cllr Tony O'Neill

Cllr Pete Parrish

Cllr Susan Phillips

Cllr Margaret Phipps

Cllr Chris Rigby

Cllr Vikki Slade

Cllr Ann Stribley

Cllr Mike White

Cllr Lawrence Williams

Cllr Kieron Wilson

Abstentions

Cllr George Farquhar

Cllr Andy Hadley

Cllr Simon McCormack

Cllr Pete Miles

Cllr Tony Trent

Voting: For – 3, Against – 60; Abstentions – 5

The original motion as set out above was put to the recorded vote and carried with voting:

For

Cllr Lewis Allison	Cllr Mark Anderson	Cllr Sarah Anderson
Cllr Marcus Andrews	Cllr Julie Bagwell	Cllr Steve Baron
Cllr Stephen Bartlett	Cllr John Beesley	Cllr Derek Borthwick
Cllr Philip Broadhead	Cllr Mike Brooke	Cllr Nigel Brooks
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Simon Bull	Cllr Colin Bungey
Cllr Richard Burton	Cllr Diana Butler	Cllr Daniel Butt
Cllr Judy Butt	Cllr Eddie Coope	Cllr Mike Cox
Cllr Malcolm Davies	Cllr Norman Decent	Cllr Lesley Dedman
Cllr Bryan Dion	Cllr Bobbie Dove	Cllr Beverly Dunlop
Cllr Millie Earl	Cllr Jackie Edwards	Cllr L-J Evans
Cllr George Farquhar	Cllr Duane Farr	Cllr Anne Filer
Cllr David Flagg	Cllr Nick Geary	Cllr Nicola Greene
Cllr Andy Hadley	Cllr May Haines	Cllr Peter Hall
Cllr Paul Hilliard	Cllr Mohan Iyengar	Cllr Cheryl Johnson
Cllr Toby Johnson	Cllr Andy Jones	Cllr Jane Kelly
Cllr David Kelsey	Cllr Bob Lawton	Cllr Marion Le Poidevin
Cllr Lisa Lewis	Cllr Rachel Maidment	Cllr Chris Matthews
Cllr Simon McCormack	Cllr Pete Miles	Cllr Sandra Moore
Cllr Lisa Northover	Cllr Tony O'Neill	Cllr Pete Parrish
Cllr Susan Phillips	Cllr Margaret Phipps	Cllr Dr Felicity Rice
Cllr Chris Rigby	Cllr Vikki Slade	Cllr Ann Stribley
Cllr Tony Trent	Cllr Mike White	Cllr Lawrence Williams
Cllr Kieron Wilson		

Against

Cllr Mark Howell

Abstentions

None

Voting: For – 67; Against – 1; Abstentions – 0

25. Questions from Councillors

**Question from Councillor Beverley Dunlop**

Given the significance of the motion before council tonight and its purpose to eliminate any form of prejudice or discrimination from BCP, as Equality and Diversity Champion could the leader please advise what steps she is taking to ensure the policies of this council uphold the 9 protected characteristics (specified in the motion) as defined in the 2010 Equality Act in order to safeguard the rights of those groups as defined within that Act?

**Response by Councillor Vikki Slade (Leader of the Council)**

I can confirm that the preceding councils all had Equalities and Diversity policies and that we have prioritised a new policy for BCP, which we had intended to bring before cabinet last week. We decided to postpone this to strengthen the wording and it will be coming before cabinet in October.

The policy will clearly state that the Council will not tolerate any form of unjust, unfair or unlawful discrimination by or towards any of its staff, contractors or partners including those who deliver services on our behalf. The Council's commitments to equality & diversity will be embedded in BCPs Corporate Strategy which is coming to full Council for approval in November, which has been subject to wide stakeholder engagement over the summer.

The suggested groups within the framework are as identified within the Equality Act 2010. The idea is the opposite of singling out one above the other or of any being more of a priority than any other. The rationale is that by identifying with the Protected Characteristics under the Act that it is fully inclusive.

A BCP Council equality impact assessment process is in place and shortly all BCP equality impact assessments will be published on the BCP Council website.

The implementation of an Equality & Diversity action plan and an internal Equality & Diversity Governance framework ensures there is a clear route for escalation of issues and that activities set out in the action plan are delivered.

**Supplementary Question from Councillor Beverley Dunlop**

Referred to the content of reports that were submitted to Cabinet that did not include the appropriate protected characteristics.

**Response by Councillor Vikki Slade (Leader of the Council)**

Councillor Slade referred to the need to build a framework and address a full understanding of the legislation. She offered to meet with Councillor Dunlop to discuss further.

The meeting ended at 9.10 pm

CHAIRMAN