

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD

Minutes of the Meeting held on 15 June 2020 at 6.00 pm

Present:-

– Chairman

– Vice-Chairman

Present: Cllr P Broadhead, Cllr M Haines, Cllr M Anderson, Cllr S Bartlett,
Cllr M F Brooke, Cllr M Earl, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr L Fear,
Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene, Cllr M Iyengar, Cllr R Maidment,
Cllr D Mellor, Cllr P Miles and Cllr C Rigby

Also in attendance: Councillor Lewis Allison
Councillor David Brown
Councillor Richard Burton
Councillor Lesley Dedman
Councillor Mark Howell
Councillor Sandra Moore
Councillor Vikki Slade

192. Apologies

No apologies were received for this meeting.

193. Substitute Members

There were no substitute members.

194. Declarations of Interests

Cllr M Brooke declared a local interest in agenda item 3, Scrutiny of Regeneration related Cabinet reports, Bournemouth Town Centre Vision Durley Road Site as he was a member of the Board of the Bournemouth Development Company.

195. Public Speaking

There were no public questions, Statements of petitions for this meeting.

196. Chairman's Update

There were no issues to raise under this item.

197. Scrutiny of Children's Services Related Cabinet Reports

Convert Bournemouth Learning Centre into a School - The Portfolio Holder for Children's Services introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix G to the Cabinet minutes

of 24 June 2020 in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- A Board member commented that there were pleased with the public consultation taking place on this issue. They commented that there were some very good local academy chains supporting local schools and opening new provision, however they urged recognition of that their resources were not inexhaustible.
- The Chairman of the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee asked about the rising number of SEND pupils within the BCP Council area. The Portfolio Holder responded that to some extent the introduction of Education, Health and Care Plans have changed dynamics from the previous system used which may contribute to the numbers. However, BCP Council was not an outlier in this as the number of EHCPs were increasing nationally.
- The Chairman of Children's Services O&S also commented that he was aware that young people were pleased by the prospect of not having to travel so far and coupled with the significant savings this could deliver he was very supportive of the project.

It was further noted that there should be a positive environmental impact through this in terms of the reduction in journeys.

198. Scrutiny of Tourism, Leisure and Communities Related Cabinet Reports

Bistro on the Beach redevelopment– Due to the upcoming planning application for this site Cllr S Bartlett and Cllr T Trent advised that there would not take part in the debate on his item. The Portfolio Holder for Tourism, Leisure and Communities introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix C to the Cabinet minutes of 24 June 2020 in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- The Chairman raised a concern with the options put forward as outlined in the Cabinet report and urged that the options outlined should be realistic in relation to the preferred option presented.
- Councillors commented that this appeared to be a good scheme and they looked forward to seeing the improvements this would bring.
- In response to a question regarding what the proposal was for those who have beach huts on the site the Portfolio Holder confirmed that all had annual lets on the huts and they were looking to try to find them provision elsewhere whenever possible.

Note: There was an error in the report on the proposed savings as outlined in table 2. Officers undertook to correct this error.

Towns Fund - The Portfolio Holder for Tourism, Leisure and Communities introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix E to the Cabinet minutes of 24 June 2020 in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- The Chairman commented that this broadly seemed to be a good news story for the area of Boscombe.
- A Ward Councillor commented that this was very welcome and overdue and that he looked forward to its delivery.

199. Scrutiny of Housing Related Cabinet Reports

Templeman House, Leedham Road and Mooreside Road Bournemouth – Cllr S Bartlett advised that he would not take part in discussions on Templeman House as he was a member of the Planning Committee.

At the request of the Chairman the Portfolio Holder for Housing introduced both of the reports together, a copy of the reports had been circulated and they appear as Appendices H and I to the Cabinet minutes of 24 June 2020 in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- That this looked like an exciting scheme and welcomed the Council embracing Passivhaus standards.
- In response to a question regarding whether there had been consideration given to developing a purpose built care home on the site the Board was advised that South Care was operating with 50 percent voids and therefore they were not able to develop a care home on the site but the option was considered and thought through.
- A Ward member commented that the report should refer to Kinson ward rather than Kinson South.
- A Councillor queried the comment regarding this development being the first socially rented housing scheme in Bournemouth for some time as there had been a development at Duck Lane a few years ago. The Portfolio Holder advised that he was not aware of the previous development and that Mooreside Road was an affordable housing development.

A Councillor commented that the build costs for Mooreside appeared to be very high and asked if the development had attracted any HCA grant. It was noted that the construction costs were mostly due to external factors at the site including a significant slope. The budget proposal for the site was working on a 10 percent contingency. It was noted that the site was partially being funded through right to buy receipts and therefore wasn't eligible for HCA grants. The Right to buy receipts contributed more than an HCA grant would.

200. Scrutiny of Regeneration Related Cabinet Reports

Bournemouth Town Centre Vision Durley Road Site - The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Culture introduced the report, a copy of which had been circulated and which appears as Appendix F to the Cabinet minutes of 24 June 2020 in the Minute Book. A number of issues were raised by the Board in the subsequent discussion, including:

- The Board raised as an issue that it was not the time to be removing car parking from the town centre following the covid-19 crisis when own centre business needed all possible help to recover
- A Board Member asked about the extension of the option date and what would happen if this was not agreed. The Portfolio Holder advised that it was just practically acceptable to extend the option agreement. Regarding backing out of the scheme this was not an option as the Council supported the scheme. The extension was just to ensure greater flexibility. The Director advised that if it wasn't approved things were slightly more constrained in terms of construction on the site.
- A Councillor raised a concern that the path of BDC developing this site was not the most appropriate course of action at this time. It was noted that there was a section 106 payment agreed, the land value was outlined, and the potential profit was outlined in the non-public papers. Developer profit should be between 12-16 percent of development value. The Council would expect to receive half of the expected value which would be approximately £1 – 1.2 million pounds. If a private sector developer was asked to develop the site the Council would receive bids in excess of the £1.2 million expected at present. It was noted that the Council was required by law to extract best value for the Council Taxpayer and it was suggested that the recommendations within the Cabinet report would not do this. Morgan Sindall has an interest in maximising its profit and therefore the Council's profit. There was a history of sites across the conurbation that were not being delivered by the private sector which was why BDC was created in the first place.
- A Councillor commented that the decision to go ahead with this development was bad for a multitude of small businesses, parents, NHS patients and residents. The overall car parking policy was to replace parking spaces lost on those sites being developed but this was not happening on this site. The Portfolio Holder noted that at present there was an oversupply of car parking in Bournemouth. There was a plan in place for how parking spaces would be rearranged with permit holders. There was a number of car parks closer to the town centre than Durley Road and Winter Gardens would be back in use as well. The Portfolio Holder noted that whilst he had been in post, he had not received a single objection from a member of public or business in relation to the scheme. The S106 agreement would be very beneficial in improving the local highway in the area. Morgan Sindall has an interest in maximising. It was also noted that Bournemouth Borough Council did not have to go ahead with submitting the appeal for Planning, the previous representative on the Board approved the decision to go forward for appeal.
- A ward Councillor advised that in paragraph 19 there was an additional sentence in a version which she reviewed. It was requested that Cabinet note this additional sentence and take it into consideration when considering this report.
- Further concerns were raised concerning the impact of the loss of car parking spaces for local residents, including those who do not have a vehicle themselves and the impact on local roads.
- A Councillor noted that it was in Morgan Sindall's interest for the value to go down and the construction costs to increase. The Councillor

expressed his opinion that if the decision was not changed and the site put out to tender then that decision would be ultra vires. The Portfolio Holder advised that the structure was set up to benefit both sides and Morgan Sindell were not in a position to gain the system.

- The BDC representative noted that the motion was an attempt to break the contract between the Council and BDC and that there would be a significant cost to the Council from this.
- A Councillor commented on the amount of land banking within the BDC area and noted that the private developer way had been tried and, in many cases, had not worked. The BDC was set up by the Council to drive development forward and it didn't appear to be a good decision to not use them and go to the private sector.

RECOMMENDED that Cabinet does not agree Recommendations a, b, c, e or g as outlined in the report and that it amends recommendation d as follows:

“In line with the legal requirement under Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 to achieve best value for the Council Taxpayer, Cabinet offers a 150 year lease on the land for sale in the open market. Potential bidders must recognize they will be required to implement the planning permission already granted on the site including payments in accordance with the S106 agreement in place.”

Voting: For: 9, Against: 4, 2 Abstentions

Cllr G Farquhar asked to be recorded as voting against the decision.

Advisory Note: A Ward Councillor requested that paragraph 19 of the report be amended to read as follows:

“This development is located within the Westbourne & West Cliff Ward. The Ward Councillors have been consulted and recognise that this site falls within the BDC option agreement. Having now obtained a planning consent it is necessary for BDC to follow the process and seek the necessary approvals as outlined in this Cabinet report. The Ward Councillors share the concerns raised by local residents during the planning consultation process relating in particular to the loss of car parking provision.”

201. Forward Plan

The Board noted the existing Forward Plan. A Councillor requested that an item on Tricuro be added to the Forward Plan. It was also noted that the Board needed to fulfil its role under the crime and disorder function and would be receiving a report on this issue shortly. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman would update the Forward plan in consultation with officers.

202. Future Meeting Dates 2020/21

He dates for future meetings were noted.

The meeting ended at 8.29 pm

CHAIRMAN