

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

Minutes of the Meeting held on 22 June 2021 at 7.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr N Hedges – Chairman

Cllr L Fear – 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 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 G Farquhar, Cllr A Filer, Cllr D A Flagg, Cllr S Gabriel, Cllr N C Geary, 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 L Lewis, Cllr R Maidment, Cllr S McCormack, Cllr D Mellor, Cllr P Miles, Cllr S Moore, Cllr L Northover, Cllr T O'Neill, Cllr S Phillips, Cllr M Phipps, Cllr K Rampton, Cllr Dr F Rice, Cllr V Ricketts, Cllr C Rigby, Cllr R Rocca, Cllr V Slade, Cllr A M Stribley, Cllr M White, Cllr L Williams and Cllr K Wilson

94. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors H Allen, S Bull, M Cox, B Dion, L-J Evans, M Greene, N Greene, M Le Poidevin, C Matthews, M Robson and T Trent.

Note: Councillor Evans requested that it be reported that she was not attending in person due to current Covid legislation.

95. Declarations of Interests

The following declarations were made:

- Councillor John Beesley made a declaration of interest concerning item 6 on the agenda in respect of a question from a Councillor relating to the Haven Hotel, Sandbanks, Poole. He stated that although he had no direct interest in the planning application for this site, the owners of the Haven Hotel were listed in the Council's Register of Councillor Interests as clients of his consultancy business and as such he believed that he had a pecuniary interest and would leave the meeting at the point that this matter was discussed.
- Councillor Sean Gabriel declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of Item 7a Cabinet 14 April 2021 - Minute No 325 - Management & development of Leisure Centres by virtue of his employment at Leisure Centres in the BCP Council area including

Rossmore Leisure Centre. He did not speak or vote and left the room for consideration of this item.

- Councillor May Haines declared an interest in respect of item 7a Cabinet 14 April 2021 - Minute No 325 - Management & development of Leisure Centres as a member of Everyone Active Leisure Centres

96. Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the Ordinary Council meeting on 23 March 2021 and the Annual Council meeting on 11 May 2021 were confirmed.

97. Announcements and Introductions from the Chairman

The Chairman made the following announcement:

**Death of Former Borough of Poole Councillor Don Collier**

The Chairman reported with sadness, the death of Don Collier former Borough of Poole Councillor. He called on Councillor Stribley to say a few words. She paid tribute to Mr Collier for his service to the Borough Council as a Parkstone Ward Councillor since 1999.

The Council paid tribute to Don Collier with a minute silence.

98. Public Issues

**A – Public Questions**

The Chairman reported that in accordance with the Constitution a public question had been received from Bob Hutchings. Councillors were advised that he was unable to attend the meeting and had asked if the question could be read out on his behalf. The Deputy Head of Democratic Services read out the question as follows and Councillor Mellor, Leader of the Council, was asked to respond.

Public Question from Bob Hutchings

In appropriate circumstances officers' reports to Council/Committees require a ward notification. Can you please agree to amend this practice so that the notification requirement includes parish councils as well as wards?

Reply from Councillor Drew Mellor, Leader of the Council

I would like to thank Mr Hutchings for his question and will ask the Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee if this matter can be referred to the Constitution Review Working Group for initial consideration.

**B – Statements**

There were no statements submitted for this Council meeting.

## **C – Petitions**

There were no petitions submitted for this Council meeting.

### 99. Questions from Councillors

#### **Question from Councillor Mark Howell**

The Haven Hotel is located on a key strategic site serving as a gateway to Poole. The hotel may be “end of life” but the site should remain an attractive focal point with public access, with a high-quality landmark building or as a public park. The administration has advertised widely its intention to use Council borrowing powers for regeneration and to promote tourism. Will it be seriously considering purchasing this site to ensure its use remains emblematic of the ambitions and heritage of Poole, the wider conurbation and the Council?

#### **Reply from Councillor Philip Broadhead, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Economy and Strategic Planning**

The Haven Hotel is indeed located on a strategic site serving as a gateway to Poole, however it is not for sale and is currently the subject of a live planning application for its future redevelopment. Through our Asset Investment Panel, we consider opportunities to purchase strategic assets where there is a viable business case made to do so, in line with the relevant rules and regulations surrounding Council investments and financing.

Councillor Howell raised a supplementary question asking if the current planning application or series of applications that have been proposed deliver what was a substandard building in terms of the ambitions and quality that one would expect for such a landmark site and therefore that might give reason for the Council to reconsider. Councillor Broadhead in response explained that it was subject to a live planning application at the moment so it would probably be inappropriate for him to comment any further on such an application and that it would likely preclude any ability to try and purchase a site because that would set a dangerous precedent for applications that we do not consider that we would personally like.

Note: In accordance with the declaration of interest made by Councillor Beesley he left the meeting in respect of the above question.

#### **Question from Councillor Marcus Andrews**

We are now getting unauthorised encampments in the BCP Council area: Wallisdown Recreation Ground for example 10 days ago. Without a Travellers Transit Camp this Council's & Dorset Police's ability to deal with these incursions is restricted.

Can the Portfolio Holder, therefore, update Councillors on this Council's progress in identifying a suitable site to secure the opening of a Travellers Transit Camp?

In replying, would the Portfolio Holder agree that to leave the solution of opening & running a Site to private enterprise would be totally the wrong step, being fraught with problems of not only identifying a site, but also its

operation, and that a Travellers Transit Camp needs to be owned & run by this Council?

**Reply from Councillor Philip Broadhead, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Economy and Strategic Planning**

I am aware that there have been recent unauthorised encampments in the BCP Council area and that the formal identification of an alternative stopping place will assist the Council and Police in use of appropriate legislative powers.

In terms of the Council's response, officers have commissioned a Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), which once finished later this year will provide an up to date position on need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in our area. This will explore the requirements for transit sites and temporary stopping place that the Local Plan may then need to address through identification of any sites and related planning policies to determine planning applications.

The Council are therefore not leaving this matter to private enterprise, but rather are looking at this issue at pace. However, any such applications that are submitted outside of the Local Plan process, such as the private application at present, will be determined through due process against the Council's existing policy framework. Any site that has ultimately been through the planning will need to be managed by a relevant site manager that could be by the Council or a suitable alternative provider.

Councillor Andrews raised a supplementary question asking that the relevant Director ensures that additional officer time was found to identify suitable sites as soon as possible. Councillor Broadhead in response confirmed that this work was already underway and would be undertaken through the correct process as part of the assessment and the Local Plan.

**Question from Councillor George Farquhar**

My question relates to questions asked by residents on social media and the comments section of the Bournemouth Echo over the weekend 12/13 June.

It is asked in the spirit of being open and transparent to not only our successes but also our shortfalls and examining how our response to the impact of cars on day visits can be improved in preparation for the summer weekends ahead.

Based on the BCP press release of Monday 14 April where an estimated 400,000 people visited the BCP geography. A number that is greater than the population of BCP.

What % of that 400k estimate is estimated/measured to have actually arrived by car and of those cars what % was the 810 PCNs issued addressed the actual number of cars parked illegally? And what further steps will the Local Authority take to try to limit the impact of the number of cars coming in future weekends?

And why since only one vehicle is reported to have been subject to 'tow-away' what analysis will be applied to discover the principal reasons that 'tow-away' was only used once?

**Reply from Councillor Mohan Iyengar, Cabinet Member for Tourism, Leisure and Culture**

There are a number of questions which I'll take in turn.

1. On the first point, we estimate 400,000 people on the seafront from footfall counters and a canvass of businesses. But a similar calculation can't be done with any accuracy for cars. Transportation has counters on the major highways but no distinction can be made between cars heading to the seafront, residents returning home and others passing through the conurbation en-route to somewhere else. Of those parked illegally, the question is what percent were ticketed? We know 810 Penalty Charge Notices were issued but the number of illegally parked cars across the conurbation can't practically be counted. From the last-but-one weekend there's a growing understanding of where the biggest problems are and the size of the task. From this, we can get a better fix on the coverage of our ticketing for instance. But for practical reasons, any estimate of rogue parking will be centred on the big locations and trouble-spots for targeted action rather than a complete view across every location in BCP.
2. The next question is about how to limit the impact of cars arriving. If the first response is to limit the number of cars, let's keep in mind the importance of the tourism sector and 17,000 jobs locally. Equally, the fact that Covid-19 may have increased the use of cars – albeit temporarily - at the expense of public transport. Furthermore, it's a significant challenge for any local authority to voluntarily shut the major roads into a conurbation because of the statutory duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to operate an efficient highway network. Doing so would negatively impact the lives of most residents. Something I'd hope the questioner himself wouldn't advocate. Once cars are in the conurbation, more can be done. Selective road closures can be considered where there's build up – an indeed this was done in Boscombe and Sandbanks which were seen positively by residents. The learning from those instances may be further deployed over the summer. Once again, practicality will be key so that good intent leads to better outcomes and not worse knock-on effects elsewhere. Ticketing can also be expanded. Although 810 PCNs on weekend 12-13<sup>th</sup> June was already a huge increase on the numbers issued in the busiest days of 2020, there's room to go further. Members will know that the PCN charge is legally capped and there has been debate as to whether it represents a deterrent. The point is noted but ticketing is deployed nationally on a belief that it influences at least a good number of motorists and we shall keep doing so until we have something better. Meanwhile we'll expand it as one of our tactics and lobby Government to increase the charge limit. As a last point, one park and ride is in operation in Kings Park to Boscombe and a second one will become operational

in late July from Poole Civic to Sandbanks. The publicity for both park-and-rides is intended to be raised going forward.

3. Finally, on the towing, one vehicle was towed but five others were readied but didn't happen because the car owner raced back in time. Already this year we've towed nearly 50% of the whole of last year's total, with summer just starting. But the tactic needs care because the civil enforcement officer is required to stay with the mis-parked vehicle until the tow-truck arrives: Time which could have been much better spent in ticketing other vehicles and performing other useful enforcement duties. Nonetheless, tow-capacity will be increased and with the intention to have the signage and vehicles more prominent for a greater deterrent effect.

Finally, the councillor's question – and any councillor's question – is welcomed as part of an open, transparent and constructive dialogue on our summer readiness. A dialogue that invites challenge and builds understanding across the chamber of the moving parts and our ability to control them. In short, a dialogue which is in the best interests of residents, employees, businesses and visitors. This year, the readiness plans have been presented at two all-member seminars and through Overview & Scrutiny Committee. A huge number of questions have been answered via email, in the Leader's Facebook Live, on social media in general and in press releases and media articles. We look forward to a constructive dialogue continuing forward.

Councillor Farquhar raised a supplementary question. He asked how many vehicles on the weekend of 12 and 13 June actually used the park and ride facilities because he had received reports to indicate that the buses running to Boscombe Pier were predominately empty. He asked how many bus tickets were actually sold on that weekend. In response Councillor Iyengar reported that he did not have those figures to hand and suggested for public record to take the issue away. He explained that the spirit of the question was about a greater use of park and ride which he indicated he had covered in the response to the initial question.

100. Recommendations from Cabinet and other Committees

**7a - Cabinet 14 April 2021 - Minute No 325 - Management & development of Leisure Centres**

Councillor Iyengar, Cabinet Member for Tourism, Leisure and Culture, presented the report on the Management & development of Leisure Centres as set out on the agenda and outlined the detail and implications of the recommendations.

The Cabinet Member explained that the recommendations related to two specific projects of different sizes one which was at the heavily used Rossmore Leisure Centre namely the resurfacing of the synthetic turf pitch which was intensely used. The smaller investment was at the Two Riversmeet Leisure Centre with the replacement of the existing pitch carpet which would hopefully be undertaken in December 2021. He explained that the funding would be through prudential borrowing and grant funding. The Cabinet Member also added that there were a number of other projects

being planned across the conurbation and he looked forward to bringing them forward ensuring that the Council has a vision of sport for local people. Councillor Mark Anderson seconded the report and welcomed the projects being brought forward.

Councillor Butler explained that she was concerned about recommendation (B) and highlighted that having read the Playing Pitch Strategy 2020-33 – it stated that artificial turf was a higher cost in terms of maintenance and funds required for replacement. She reported that grass pitches were more sustainable environmentally and would require staff to maintain the pitch. Councillor Butler also referred to the life span of a synthetic pitch which she indicated was approximately 10 years and requested that consideration was given to grass pitches as well as artificial turf in the case of the Rossmore Leisure Centre. The Cabinet Member reported on the consultation that was undertaken on both of the projects and that there was support for the project at Rossmore Leisure Centre. He explained that the option of replacement of the grass pitch with the synthetic turf was discussed. He indicated that he was a fan of grass pitches and confirmed that as many grass pitches as possible would be retained. The Cabinet Member explained that there was intense use of the pitch at the Rossmore Leisure Centre and therefore following discussions the artificial pitch was considered the best way forward in terms of durability, number of hours and days that it can be used.

Councillor Howell expressed his concern relating to Covid and the impact that this has had as there had been substantial changes in the way that people exercise and the amount of exercise that they were undertaking. He asked how the Council was going to address such issues as those changes would clearly inform the strategy that would be developed at the next stage of the process. The Cabinet Member in summing up responded to the issues raised by Councillor Howell, he acknowledged that Covid was not going to disappear quickly and highlighted that there would be support for team and contact sports but that there were caveats that the Council would need to factor in due to Covid but the general direction does not need to change.

The recommendations arising from the Cabinet meeting held on 14 April 2021 on the above as set out on the agenda were approved.

Voting: Agreed

Councillor Butler wished to be recorded as voting against recommendation (B)

Note: Councillor Sean Gabriel having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest left the meeting for consideration of the above item and did not speak or vote.

### **7b - Cabinet 14 April 2021 - Minute No 326 - Our Museum: Poole Museum Redevelopment Project**

Councillor Iyengar, Cabinet Member for Tourism, Leisure and Culture, presented the report on the Our Museum: Poole Museum Redevelopment Project as set out on the agenda, outlined the detail and implications of the

recommendations and the funding arrangements. He explained that the project would be transformational with the opportunity for locally themed exhibitions, events, seminars and workshops but also a magnet for most illustrious and prestigious visiting exhibitions and displays. The Cabinet Member outlined the wider benefit for that quarter of Poole, the heritage action zone and proposals to create that area as a cultural quarter. Councillor White seconded the recommendations.

Councillor Hadley welcomed the report, the investment in Poole Museum. and the breadth of appeal. Councillor Howell reiterated that the development was a fantastic project and he hoped that the Council would achieve the full amount of funding to be able to deliver the project. He commented on the terminology used and the naming of areas during the regeneration process in Poole and asked that particular zones were named according to their values and there was consistency with the names.

Councillor Iyengar in summing up agreed the need for clarity around the names for the zoning and how these issues were decided which should resound with people who were invested in the area.

The recommendations arising from the Cabinet meeting held on 14 April 2021 on the above as set out on the agenda were approved.

Voting: Unanimous.

### **7c - Cabinet 14 April 2021 - Minute No 328 - Housing Scheme at Craven Court, Knyveton Road, Bournemouth**

Councillor Lawton, Cabinet Member for Homes, presented the report on the housing scheme at Craven Court, Knyveton Road, Bournemouth as set out on the agenda, outlined the detail and implications of the recommendations and the funding arrangements for the scheme. The Cabinet Member reported that the project would make provision for 24 apartments 10 one-bed and 14 two-bed with passive house standards including very high thermal efficiency and excellent levels of air tightness which would reduce carbon emissions and the reliance on expensive heating systems which could reduce energy bills for residents by approximately 75%. Councillor Rampton seconded the recommendations.

A Ward Councillor commented on the scheme and felt that it would be a great addition to the Council's housing stock. Whilst welcoming the provision of affordable housing a Councillor raised concerns relating to the budget for the scheme and the cost per unit together with the reference in the report that the cost of development was higher than what would be the market value once it was developed. He asked the Cabinet Member to comment on the value for money of the scheme.

The Cabinet Member in summing up explained that on paper the scheme appeared expensive. He explained that he did not believe that it was that expensive as it was for senior living and was built to passive house standards which were expensive to build with triple glazing, thermal insulations etc. The Cabinet Member highlighted that it was a fantastic addition to the Council's housing stock.



The recommendations arising from the Cabinet meeting held on 14 April 2021 on the above as set out on the agenda were approved.

Voting: Agreed.

Councillor Brown wished to be recorded as abstaining and Councillor Butler wished to be recorded as dissenting from the above decision.

(Councillors J Butt and D Butt were not in the room for the vote on the above decision)

**7d - Standards Committee 20 April 2021 - Minute No 41 - Local Government Association - Model Code of Conduct for Councillors**

Councillor Steve Baron presented the report on the Local Government Association – Model code of Conduct for Councillors as set out on the agenda. Councillor Brooks in seconding the recommendation referred to the Nolan principles of public life. He reported on the changes that had occurred since the establishment of the Nolan principles in terms of social media. Councillor Brooks commented on the role of Councillors in all tiers of local government and that it was vital the system of democracy was well supported. He emphasised that all Councillors can be held accountable and should adopt the behaviour and responsibilities associated with rules. Councillor Brooks reported that the conduct of an individual Councillor affects the reputation of all Councillors and the Council. He further explained that in the application of the code it makes it clear that we were now concerned about areas of communication and interaction which not only included face to face meetings, online or telephone meetings but all forms of communication. Members were advised that building on the Nolan principles the code introduces 15 best practice points that all Councillors should follow. Councillor Brooks reported that the Council’s Monitoring Officer has a statutory responsibility for the implementation of the code.

Councillor Andrews commented on the reasons for the insertion of the word ‘known’ within the recommendation. The proposals for reviewing the code were also raised and it was suggested that the inclusion of the word “known” should be fed back and included in the next iteration when the code was reviewed by the LGA. Councillor Hadley also referred to the need to be cautious in making comments on social media.

Councillor Baron in summing up reported that he would be delighted to see the code adopted.

The recommendations arising from the Standards Committee on 20 April 2021 on the above as set out on the agenda were approved.

Voting: Unanimous.

**7e - Audit and Governance Committee 22 April 2021 - Minute No 81 - Report of the Constitution Review Working Group - Changes to the Constitution**

Councillor John Beesley, Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee presented the report on the changes to the Constitution as set out on the agenda. Councillor Beesley reported that the issue was brought

to the Working Group by the Chair of the Licensing Committee. He explained that the Working Group invited the Chair of the Licensing Committee to set out the principle reasons for making a change to the Constitution. Councillor Beesley reported that the Working Group accepted that a Committee of 15 Councillors was too large to consider specific licensing applications and particularly as meetings involved hearing and consideration of complex, sensitive and often highly emotive issues around applicants for licences. It was accepted that 15 Councillors could potentially be unfair and daunting to an applicant. It was proposed that a process be put in place for the Licensing Sub-Committee to deal with a range of applications. The Working Group supported the expansion of the schedule of application types that could then be considered by the Sub-Committee. Councillor Beesley reported that issues of strategy and policy such as licensing policy and fees and charges would continue to be matters that should be addressed by the Licensing Committee. The proposals put to the Working Group to expand the list of licensing functions that could be discharged by a sub-committee as opposed to having to go to the full Licensing Committee were agreed. This would include applications relating to premises or on land operated by the Council. The Working Group was of the view that the issue should be progressed as a matter of urgency ahead of a wider review of the Constitution and the recommendation was made to the Audit and Governance Committee on 22 April 2021 which was accepted. In conclusion Councillor Beesley moved the recommendation as set out on the agenda which was seconded by Councillor Williams.

The Chairman of the Licensing Committee explained that there was an absolute right for Sub-Committees to consider all matters with the exception of those outlined by the Chairman of the Audit and Governance Committee. She was grateful that her arguments put forward to the Working Group and the Audit and Governance Committee were accepted. She requested that as stated the revised arrangements for the Licensing Committee within Part 3 Rule 3 of the Constitution as set out in Appendix 1 of the report Audit and Governance Committee be approved and adopted.

The recommendation arising from the Audit and Governance Committee on 22 April 2021 on the above as set out on the agenda was approved.

Voting: Unanimous

101. Senior Management Appointments

The Leader of the Council presented a report, which invited the Council to approve the structure for Tier 2 posts and to approve new appointments to Chief Officers posts in accordance with the Council's Constitution and statutory requirements, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'A' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

The Leader of the Council moved the recommendations set out in the report and in doing so outlined the proposed changes in the management structure following two Corporate Directors Bill Cotton and Jan Thurgood leaving the authority. He reported on the recruitment process and successful appointments to the new roles. Members were informed that the

recruitment process included panel interviews with cross-party membership and each panel was unanimous in support for the candidates appointed.

The Leader of the Council took the opportunity to thank Jan Thurgood, Corporate Director Adult Social Care who was due to retire from the Council at the end of June 2021 for her service to the Council. He reported that she was a wonderful servant to Local Government through a very distinguished career very much focussed on the most vulnerable people children and adults in our society. The Leader of the Council explained that she delivered a safe landing as the legacy Councils transitioned into BCP Council and was committed to spending those extra years of her career to make sure that she left that safe landing for the service. She provided impeccable service to BCP Council and the Borough of Poole and provided wise counsel and calm leadership and would be missed. The Leader of the Council placed on record his personal thanks to Jan and on behalf of the Council thanked her for her service and commitment.

Councillor Broadhead seconded the recommendations and in doing so highlighted other appointments as detailed in the report which compliments a different management team leading the Council going forward.

Councillor Dedman, echoed the words of the Leader in his praise for the service provided by Jan Thurgood. She referred to paragraph 5 of the report which indicated that we must reduce costs where we can. Councillor Dedman highlighted that reducing costs must not mean any reduction in services to vulnerable residents. She supported the centre of excellence that the Council had been working towards since the start of BCP and to continue to expand work with all the Council's partners. She emphasised that any cost reduction or staff reorganisation must not reduce any services to vulnerable residents.

Councillor Mellor in summing up explained that the proposal was about efficiency of cost which has to be the Council's aspiration but the ambition for outcomes can supersede that. He also commented on the level of investment in adult social care by the administration which had included an extra £13.5m in the last budget together with other service investments.

**RESOLVED that in accordance with Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 the Council confirms the appointment of the following individuals into post;**

- **Chief Operations Officer – Kate Ryan**
- **Director of Adult Social Services – David Vitty**
- **Director for Commissioning – Phil Hornsby**

Voting: Unanimous

102. Notice of Motions in accordance with Procedure Rule 12

The following motion submitted in accordance with Procedure Rule 12 of the Meeting Procedure Rules was moved by Councillor Richard Burton and seconded by Councillor David Brown who reserved his right to speak later in the debate:-

**“In August 2020 the Government proposed reforms to the current ‘Standard Method’ formula used to determine housing demand in each local authority. This formula seemingly dictates a house building target on BCP, which many people feel is unrealistic and puts undue pressure on our infrastructure, open spaces, Green Belt, and town centres. This figure uses out of date, 2014, population growth data and takes no account of the unique circumstances that BCP has.**

**Even if our planners achieve these government targets there is a growing risk that, once gained, developers fail to progress their applications to achieve completed homes and there are no incentives to help with this problem in the planning White Paper.**

**While there is an obvious need for more housing within BCP, and we would acknowledge the hard work that Officers and the Working Group are doing in this area, we would like the assurance that the correct number and type of homes are being planned for and actually built.**

**This Council therefore resolves to:**

- **Call on the Portfolio Holder to make the case to Government to use more recent data in their calculations, rather than the outdated 2014 numbers.**
- **Call on the Portfolio Holder to write to our MPs and to the Secretary of State, to propose an amendment to the Planning Paper, to call on sites to be completed not just commenced, adding incentives and sanctions to developers to encourage them to complete homes on sites with planning permissions.**
- **Ask the Planning Officers to proceed with haste with the Strategic Housing Market Needs Assessment, to enable us to work with our neighbouring authorities in a timely manner to fulfil any unmet needs.”**

Notification has been received that the motion is also supported by Councillors Vikki Slade, Sandra Moore, Tony Trent, George Farquhar, Mike Brooke, Marion Le Poidevin, Marcus Andrews and Lisa Lewis.

Councillor Burton in presenting the motion reported that the aim was to provide the correct number and type of houses for residents. He explained that currently the number of houses was imposed on the Council and it was necessary to ensure that the number being built was correct. He explained that at present it was based on a standard method using 2014 numbers of population growth with an addition of an arbitrary uplift to make up for the historic shortfall in numbers. He highlighted that there had been changes since 2014 and that there was little consideration for the special nature of the BCP Council area. Councillor Burton explained that the imposed number put extreme pressure on the green belt, other open spaces and the character of towns in the area but did not ensure that the correct number of houses would be built. He explained that the ONS had questioned the use of the 2014 data with 2018 data showing substantial differences. Councillor Burton referred to the Government’s Planning Practice Guidance on housing which indicates that an alternative approach can be used if the Council can justify diverting from the standard method. Members were

informed that if the standard method was used, the Council risk forcing unnecessary homes on the population primarily built on what was green belt land. Councillor Burton explained that when developers were granted planning permission there was no urgency placed on them to deliver the completed houses and the recent planning system white paper does not address this issue. Members were informed that the relevant Government Committee had indicated that there was a need to speed up the delivery of housing. However, the problem of build out rates needs to be tackled. The Council at present had no control on when these houses were delivered and the council tax income that could be spent on infrastructure and services which would benefit residents.

Councillor Broadhead supported the motion and highlighted the serious challenges that the Council has with the formulation of a Local Plan and the issues with the current standard methodology which had been well rehearsed as the Government was very insistent that the Council had to use this method. He highlighted that the Council had previously written to the Secretary of State. Councillor Broadhead announced that in the last month he had again written to the Secretary of State to do exactly what the motion was asking to do, highlighting the challenges of the standard methodology and to urge the Government to use more recent data in their calculations. Councillor Broadhead proposed an amendment which he had circulated to all Members of the Council as detailed below and referred to the additional work that the Council would be doing to try and tackle this point with the Government going forward. He highlighted the piece of work being undertaken by the Planning Team looking at some of the demographic inaccuracies and difficulties with the standard methodology.

**This Council therefore resolves to:**

- **Acknowledge that the Portfolio Holder has written to the Secretary of State, once again making the case to Government to use more recent data in their calculations, rather than the outdated 2014 numbers, along with urging greater work to recognise sites to be completed not just commenced.**
- **Ask the Planning Officers to continue to proceed with haste with the Strategic Housing Market Needs Assessment, to enable us to work with our neighbouring authorities in a timely manner to fulfil any unmet needs.**
- **Call on the Portfolio Holder to go even further, and further write to the Secretary of State once the workstream around challenging the demographic assumptions embedded in the 2014 projections as a result of the recent Statistics Authority findings in respect of a complaint to the ONS is complete.**

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Richard Burton.

Members in considering the amendment referred to the available data through the 2021 Census data, lobbying MPs to compel developers to complete residential schemes, the timescale for developments to be started and completed and a proposal that if this was not achieved full council tax would be payable on every home that was incomplete. Councillor Phipps welcomed the challenge on the figures. She highlighted that if the

Government was not supportive that the Council should look for exceptional circumstances. Councillor Phipps advised that the NPPF indicates this can be done by justifying an alternative approach and the starting point was for a housing needs assessment based on realistic assumptions which would underpin the Local Plan. Councillor Slade focussed on the incentives and penalties that she would like the Portfolio Holder to continue to stress with the Government which needs to be worked on. She encouraged all Members to read the select Committee report. Councillor Slade referred to the option of a tax on green field development and additional measures to support Council's buying empty homes in its area. She explained that the Centre for Policy Studies had recently written that planning permissions need to move from being an option to develop to a contract filled and that was a good point to make to MPs and the Secretary of State next time Councillor Broadhead has the opportunity for discussion. Councillor Farquhar reported that he could not support the amendment as he felt that the original motion calls upon the Council to alert the Government on allowing developers to continue without sanction or incentives to fulfil their commitments and continue a model of land banking or property banking. Councillors commented on one of the key issues for developments to commence which was ensuring the infrastructure and investment matches. A Councillor asked if the amendment had an impact on the 15,000 homes that were due to be delivered over the next five years which was a rate of 3,000 per year. The impact of the restructure of local economies and where people choose to live in view of recent events was highlighted which may affect this issue. Councillor Brooks referred to the position in Christchurch relating to the number of developments with consent, but which had not yet commenced. He referred to a presentation that he had recently attended regarding the Christchurch urban extension and the opportunity to work with developers.

Councillor Brown sought clarification on the second bullet point in the amendment and the need to ensure that the housing targets were correct and to consider the impact on all services.

Councillor Broadhead in summing up clarified that he had rolled up the issue about the completed and not just commenced development sites into one bullet point and gave further assurance that when he writes the second letter shortly, he would reiterate that point. He confirmed that the current housing figures that the Council was working towards on the standard method was around 2700. He highlighted that this was about a fair and balanced representation of the actual need the Council has for house building in the future. He emphasised his two-pronged approach to challenge the 2014 figures that were not representative of the current position and secondly in recognition that the Government was wedded to those figures to challenge the actual figures within the 2014 standard methodology and make sure that they fairly represent the demographic in the BCP area. Finally, the Portfolio Holder reported on the Council's responsibility to prepare a full and balanced Local Plan. Councillor Burton had no further comments to add.

Councillors were asked to vote on the motion as amended and detailed below which was carried

**This Council therefore resolves to:**

- **Acknowledge that the Portfolio Holder has written to the Secretary of State, once again making the case to Government to use more recent data in their calculations, rather than the outdated 2014 numbers, along with urging greater work to recognise sites to be completed not just commenced.**
- **Ask the Planning Officers to continue to proceed with haste with the Strategic Housing Market Needs Assessment, to enable us to work with our neighbouring authorities in a timely manner to fulfil any unmet needs.**
- **Call on the Portfolio Holder to go even further, and further write to the Secretary of State once the workstream around challenging the demographic assumptions embedded in the 2014 projections as a result of the recent Statistics Authority findings in respect of a complaint to the ONS is complete.**

Councillor Farquhar wished to be recorded as voting against the motion as amended.

Voting: Agreed

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

The Chairman reported that there had been no urgent decisions taken by the Chief Executive in accordance with the Constitution.

The Chairman reported on the date of the next meeting of the Council. He explained that there was a proposal which had been raised with Group Leaders and unaligned members to defer the next Council meeting which was scheduled for 13 July 2021 to 14 September 2021.

The above proposal was agreed by a majority of the Councillors present.

Councillor Rocca arrived at 19.17

Councillors D Butt, J Butt and Bagwell left at 20:31

The meeting ended at 8.47 pm

CHAIRMAN