

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 18 December 2019 at 6.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr P Broadhead – Chairman

Cllr M Haines – Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr M Anderson, Cllr S Bartlett, Cllr M Earl, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr M Iyengar, Cllr R Lawton, Cllr P Miles, Cllr C Rigby, Cllr R Burton (In place of Cllr M F Brooke), Cllr J J Butt (In place of Cllr N Greene), Cllr D Kelsey (In place of Cllr M Greene), Cllr M Le Poidevin (In place of Cllr R Maidment) and Cllr J Kelly (In place of Cllr L Fear)

Also in attendance: Cllr L Allison, Cllr M Howell, Cllr M Phipps and Cllr V Slade

84. Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllr M Brooke, Cllr L Fear, Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene and Cllr R Maidment

85. Substitute Members

Notice had been received from the relevant Group Leaders (or nominated representatives) of the following changes in membership for this meeting:

- Cllr R Burton was substituting for Cllr M Brooke
- Cllr J Kelly was substituting for Cllr L Fear
- Cllr D Kelsey was substituting for Cllr M Greene
- Cllr J Butt was substituting for Cllr N Greene
- Cllr M Le Poidevin was substituting for Cllr R Maidment

86. Declarations of Interests

No declarations of interest were made in relation to any items on the agenda.

87. Public Speaking

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

88. Forward Plan

The Chairman set out that the level of work coming through Cabinet would probably continue to necessitate the Overview and Scrutiny Board having two meetings each month and it was currently proposed that there would be one meeting in the afternoon followed by the originally scheduled evening meeting which would allow for substitutions and provide more flexibility.

The Board discussed the Cabinet Forward Plan items it wished to consider at the next meeting. The Board were advised that some items were likely to be postponed from the January Cabinet meeting. The Board agreed that further scrutiny was required for the following items:

- Smart Places Programme
- Fleet Replacement Funding Strategy
- BH Coastal Lottery
- Approval of Fixed Penalty Notices Policy for Environmental Crimes and associated pilot scheme for litter enforcement in Bournemouth Town Centre
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) strategic and neighbourhood governance

There was some debate concerning the report on Leisure Centre Management and whether this should be included for scrutiny at this stage or when the final report was taken to Cabinet. The Chief Executive suggested that the Board may wish to receive further information and an opportunity to contribute once the review had been established. The Board agreed to place this as an item on its Forward Plan.

89. Scrutiny of Planning related Cabinet Reports

Poole Harbour Recreation Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) –

The Portfolio Holder for Strategic Planning was asked to introduce the report which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'J' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder outlined the aims of the report and recommendations. It was explained that this was a joint report with Dorset Council as the Poole Harbour area covered both local authorities and any changes would need authorisation from both Councils.

- The Board asked a number of questions to the Portfolio Holder including:
- How the SPD would be integrated with the new local plan. that it was The Portfolio Holder advised supplementary to it and would hold full weight in planning decisions.
- Whether the proposal to establish the Dorset Heathlands and Poole Harbour Advisory Group by extending the existing arrangements for Dorset Heathlands would ensure that the previous work of the Dorset Heathlands Advisory Group would continue and be integrated into the new group. It was confirmed that it would, and that the new group was an extension of the previous group to cover the harbour, as many of the same officers and partners would be involved;
- A discrepancy between a figure used in the report and a figure contained within the SPD was pointed out. The Head of Planning advised that the SPD had the correct figure and the Cabinet report would be amended.

90. Scrutiny of Regeneration related Cabinet Reports

Poole Regeneration – The Chairman asked the Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture to introduce the report a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'A' to the Cabinet minutes of 20

December in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder outlined the aims of the report and recommendations. The report outlined high-level consideration of the work required to develop a Masterplan for the sustainable regeneration of Poole's Town Centre including possible options for the level crossing. The Board raised a number of issues with the Portfolio Holder including:

- Whether there was any evidence from network rail regarding the safety of the level crossing and whether there had been any funding from network rail confirmed. The Portfolio Holder advised that there were issues of confidentiality around any discussions which had taken place with network rail regarding this and also that the Portfolio Holder for Transport would be the best person to respond to this issue. Whilst moving the Poole Railway Station would make sense in a perfect world there were constraints to this including whether funding would be available and currently this issue was at a very early stage of consideration.
- The report included lots of high-level options but there were deliverability issues. The level crossing was an interesting start point for integration within the plan and also if the crossing was a danger what Network Rail would be doing to resolve the issue. The strategy was to ensure that Poole would be a vibrant and successful place into the future. There were possibilities of accessing the future high streets fund and network rail contributions.
- The geographic scope of the report covered a very large area. The Portfolio Holder responded that the Heart of Poole Project was artificially confined to a small area as only areas under Council control were included but this was an opportunity to consider wider options. Poole needed to become more attractive to investment and the masterplan would help to show this along with marketing and forging links with developers.
- A Councillor asked if there were parallel plans being developed for moving the railway station which would take many years and whether an incremental approach would be undertaken. The Portfolio Holder reiterated that the primary purpose was not moving the railway station, but it was something that would be factored in if the option became available. It was confirmed by the Service Director that the project team had been thinking in terms of a phased approach;
- The Chairman queried whether Poole could wait 5-10 years for something which could potentially be great but also may not happen. It was noted that there would be a rounded approach addressing the big picture as well as a more granular approach which would consider interventions along the high street. Plans and projects would become more evident over the coming months.
- The Board expressed concern that the work already undertaken on the Heart of Poole Project would be lost and action was needed now. The Portfolio Holder advised that the report explained how the money from the Heart of Poole would be used. The Service Director advised that the team would be working hard to ensure that the best parts of what had already been done would be utilised as possible.
- In response to a question the Portfolio Holder explained that Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPOs) were needed as an option on the table as a

bargaining chip and to follow through if necessary as not all areas identified for regeneration were owned by the Council. Some Councillors expressed concern at this due to previous experiences with CPOs. Following the Boards discussions, it was:

Resolved that:

- 1) Cabinet be recommended to build on existing work already done in the development of a revised Masterplan for Poole Town Centre;**
- 2) the revised Masterplan for Poole Town Centre be received by the O&S Board for scrutiny, once developed, and prior to wider consultation on the Masterplan;**

Voting: Unanimous

- 3) The Acquisition and Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) Strategy be received by the O&S Board for scrutiny, once developed.**

Voting: For: 14, Against:0, 1 Abstention

The meeting adjourned at 7.31pm and resumed at 7.36pm.

91. Scrutiny of Tourism and Communities related Cabinet Reports

Community Engagement Strategy – The Chairman asked the Portfolio Holder to outline the report, which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'A' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book. The Portfolio Holder answered a number of questions put to him by the Board including:

- Whether there would be further consultation on the Strategy once it was produced. It was confirmed that there was.
- The Portfolio Holder was asked to consider what was best practice from across the country and what information the preceding authorities already had. A Board Member suggested that the Council also needed to be mindful that Area Forums could be successful but not always. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that best practice would be looked at when forming the final document but that this needed to be based on local communities.
- Board members expressed concern that there seemed to be a plan to consult different communities but without anything to consult on and that the preceding Council's would have had data from previous resident satisfaction surveys. It was suggested that a strategy should be created first, prior to public consultation. The Portfolio Holder advised that a finalised strategy would be developed within the year and that it was important to be starting from somewhere completely new.
- A Board member commented that there would always be winners and losers depending upon personal opinions which influenced whether people felt they had been listened to and questioned whether the Portfolio Holder was realistic in trying to achieve something different. The

Portfolio Holder reiterated that this was a new Council with new services and things were being run differently to previous Councils. There was concern from some Board members that the work of the preceding councils was not being utilised in the development of the new strategy it was therefore:

Resolved that Cabinet be recommended to build on known good practice and insight gathered by preceding authorities in the development of a Community Engagement Strategy.

Voting: For: 13, Against 0, 2 Abstentions

Super Hut Development, Fisherman's Walk: The Portfolio Holder for Tourism, Leisure and Communities was asked to introduce the report which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'A' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book. The following discussions raised a number of points including:

- That there was limited land available for the development of the super huts and that the cost of them to the average resident was prohibitive. The Portfolio Holder responded that all beach huts were luxury items and inaccessible to many. However, in terms of the goal of the project, to raise capital, he considered the project to be good;
- Other beach hut owners were often upset by new developments and asked what steps had been taken to ensure care for existing tenants. No tenants would be losing their beach hut, but the existing huts would be physically moved. All huts would retain a sea view. The super hut business model was already well established and demand for the new huts would be high.
- In response to a question the Portfolio Holder advised that the new huts were not for overnight use but were slightly larger than standard huts. It was not possible to have overnight huts in this location due to regulations requiring a minimum height above sea level.
- A Board member suggested that the hut design should work in harmony with nature and suggested that perhaps the huts could have green roofs. The Portfolio Holder welcomed this suggestion and that sustainability would be considered for all decisions.

The Board discussed whether the Council would be able to retain a hut so it could be used for charitable purposes to directly benefit those residents who were unable to afford to buy a super hut. The Board then:

Resolved that Cabinet be recommended to retain one of the proposed super huts for use by the Council for good causes and charitable purposes.

Voting: Unanimous

92. Scrutiny of Corporate related Cabinet Reports

The Local Industrial Strategy for Dorset – The Leader of the Council was asked to introduce the report which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'D' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book. The Board was advised that this was a joint strategy and had been signed off in the preceding week by Dorset Council's Cabinet. The Board raised a number of queries concerning the report including:

- The Chairman commented that as one of two equal players in the strategy BCP Council should have a great deal of influence and question the four areas included within the strategy. The Leader explained that there could only be a maximum of four areas included and there were areas within BCP and areas within Dorset which had some synergy. The Leader advised that the strategy was a culmination of work across both authorities and there were three drivers, which aligned to the Councils priorities, of wellbeing, natural environment and investment. The Leader advised the Board that the influence BCP in terms of what was included within the strategy was appropriate.
- A Member referred to a paragraph within the report concerning unlocking cultural assets and suggested that this should be included as a theme within the new Local Plan.
- A Member asked about the inclusion of Dorset as the natural home for creative and culture as opposed to somewhere else. The Board was advised that the creative and cultural element would include the Arts University, the digital sector along with the smart places development. There was a strong emphasis around Poole Harbour. The Leader advised that in developing the strategy for submission now the Council wanted to be one of the first from phase 3 to submit.
- A Board Member highlighted the importance of engaging with the local MPs. The Leader responded that she completely agreed and that she wanted to build on the existing base and maintain the strength of the existing local economy including the financial sector.

Smart Place Pilot (Lansdowne) – The Leader of the Council was asked to introduce the report which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix 'A' to the Cabinet minutes of 20 December in the Minute Book. It was noted that this was the culmination of a long journey began by Bournemouth Council. The Board was advised that there would be continuous monitoring for the pilot and that the results would be made publicly available. The following points were raised within the ensuing discussion:

- In response to a question it was confirmed that there would be no impact on trees from the Lansdowne Project and it was hoped that future projects would be able to learn from Lansdown in order to minimise any impact on trees.
- A Board Member questioned what was being done in terms of continuous monitoring of electromagnetic field (EMF) emissions from the 5G trial networks to ensure compliance with Public Health England (ICNIRP) guidelines as requested by the Overview and Scrutiny Board. It was confirmed that information from the monitoring would be placed on

the website so that there could be regular up to date information available.

- The Board had previously agreed to monitor this and the Chairman agreed that he would consider how best this could be achieved. It was noted that as soon as the technology goes in the information would become available.

In response to a question it was confirmed that most of the equipment would not require planning permission and these would start to be put in place whilst planning permission was sought for those part of the tech which did. It was noted that the 5G roll out in Brighton was blocked due to planning considerations rather than any other issues.

93. Future Meeting Dates

The current proposal for future meeting dates was noted.

The meeting ended at 9.14 pm

CHAIRMAN