

BOURNEMOUTH, CHRISTCHURCH AND POOLE COUNCIL
COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting held on 09 November 2021 at 7.00 pm

Present:-

Cllr N Hedges – Chairman

Present: Cllr H Allen, 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 R Burton, Cllr D Butler, Cllr D Butt, Cllr J J Butt, Cllr E Coope, Cllr M Cox, Cllr M Davies, Cllr L Dedman, Cllr B Dion, Cllr B Dove, Cllr B Dunlop, Cllr M Earl, Cllr J Edwards, Cllr L-J Evans, Cllr G Farquhar, Cllr D Farr, Cllr L Fear, Cllr D A Flagg, Cllr S Gabriel, Cllr N C Geary, Cllr M Greene, Cllr N Greene, Cllr A Hadley, Cllr M Haines, Cllr P Hilliard, Cllr M Howell, Cllr M Iyengar, Cllr C Johnson, Cllr T Johnson, Cllr J Kelly, Cllr D Kelsey, Cllr R Lawton, Cllr M Le Poidevin, Cllr L Lewis, Cllr S McCormack, Cllr D Mellor, Cllr S Moore, Cllr M Phipps, Cllr K Rampton, Cllr Dr F Rice, Cllr V Ricketts, Cllr C Rigby, Cllr R Rocca, Cllr M Robson, Cllr A M Stribley, Cllr T Trent, Cllr M White, Cllr L Williams and Cllr K Wilson

115. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors N Decent, A Filer, P Hall, A Jones, C Matthews, R Maidment, P Miles, L Northover, T O'Neill (Vice-Chairman), S Phillips and V Slade.

116. Declarations of Interests

The following declaration was made:

- Councillor Mike Brooke declared for transparency purposes an interest as a Board Member of BDC in respect of item 8b – Cabinet 29 September 2021 – Minute No 55 – Accelerating regeneration and investment in the BCP Area.

117. Election of Vice-Chairman of the Council

Nominations were received as follows:

- Councillor Tony O'Neill – proposed by Councillor Dion and seconded by Councillor Stribley.
- Councillor George Farquhar – proposed by Councillor Trent and seconded by Councillor Lewis.

The proposers and seconders outlined their reasons for the above nominations and the nominees' ability to fulfil the role. Councillor Farquhar explained why he should be elected Vice-Chairman. In Councillor O'Neill's absence Councillor Mellor read out a statement prepared by Councillor

O'Neill on why he should fulfil the role. A secret ballot was undertaken in accordance with the Constitution. The Chief Executive reported on the outcome of the ballot as follows:

- Councillor Tony O'Neill 38
- Councillor George Farquhar 27

No abstentions were recorded.

RESOLVED that Councillor Tony O'Neill be elected as Vice-Chairman of the Council until the next Annual Council meeting in May 2022.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Fear for his support and experience in undertaking the role of Vice-Chairman. In response Councillor Fear thanked the Chairman for his comments and highlighted the work the Chairman has undertaken in his role and wished the new Vice-Chairman well. The Chairman also thanked Councillor Farquhar for putting himself forward to fulfil the role of Vice-Chairman.

118. Confirmation of Minutes

The Chairman asked Councillors if they agreed to confirm the minutes of the Ordinary Council meeting held on 14 September 2021.

Councillor Phipps indicated that she would have to abstain from the vote and explained that whilst she did not question the accuracy of the minutes recorded by Democratic Services, she believed that some of the answers given to her question as detailed in those minutes contained falsehoods and were not true. She reported that her question had been about the Lagoon Bounce back Grant Award of £70,000 and the Portfolio Holder had said that she lived close to the proposed Lagoon site. Councillor Phipps reported that she did not live near the site and his response made her appear to be dishonest and have a personal interest which she said she did not. Councillor Phipps also commented on the reference to the scoring made by the Portfolio Holder in his response and felt that he had manipulated wording in his response to twist the truth and as one of the two Members of the Award team he did agree to change the score on the Lagoon. Councillor Phipps confirmed that due to what she believed to be misinformation and perceived falsehoods being the only answer to her question recorded in the minutes she would abstain from the vote.

Councillor McCormack reported that for the same reasons as Councillor Phipps he would also be abstaining as, although the minutes were recorded correctly, he did not believe the information provided in the answer to his question was correct.

Councillor Brown reported that he would be abstaining from the vote on the minutes as he believed that the information provided by the Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability and by the Leader under minute 110 Questions from Councillors on pages 11, 12 and 13 of the minutes regarding the financial resources to tackle the climate emergency and at minute 111 Budget Outturn report on pages 20, 21 and 22 stated by the Leader and the Cabinet Member were not true. He reported that the public had a right to expect that the answers given were accurate and factually correct. He explained that whilst the minutes represent what was stated. He

was not content that in his opinion false information and fake news had become a matter of public record for this Council. He asked that it be minuted, that he disagreed with the statements made at the last Council meeting and would be abstaining on the vote to approve the minutes.

Councillor Mellor, Leader of the Council in response indicated that he had just been challenged on what he had said in the meeting. He explained that the Unity Alliance had cancelled the climate and ecological emergency budget, that £240,000 was taken out of the budget. He suggested that the Section 151 Officer who was in attendance could be the arbiter on who was correct. The Leader confirmed that the administration reinstated this budget and doubled the budget provision and made it permanent. He explained that the accusations were not true.

The Chairman indicated that the purpose of the item was to confirm the acceptance of the minutes of the last Council meeting.

Councillor Howell asked for the Chief Financial Officer to comment on the issues raised relating to the Climate budget and sought clarification on the budget provision for the previous administration compared to the current situation. He indicated that he would be abstaining from the vote for the reasons previously highlighted.

The Chief Executive reported that the purpose of the item in accordance with the Constitution was to confirm the accuracy of the minutes. If there was any challenge on the accuracy of the minutes, it should be undertaken by way of a motion proposed seconded and voted upon. He advised that the vote be taken on the minutes given the wording of the Constitution.

A recorded vote was taken on the confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2021 as follows:

For – 38

Cllr Hazel Allen	Cllr Eddie Coope	Cllr Toby Johnson
Cllr Mark Anderson	Cllr Malcolm Davies	Cllr Jane Kelly
Cllr Sarah Anderson	Cllr Bryan Dion	Cllr David Kelsey
Cllr Julie Bagwell	Cllr Bobbie Dove	Cllr Bob Lawton
Cllr Steve Baron	Cllr Beverley Dunlop	Cllr Drew Mellor
Cllr Stephen Bartlett	Cllr Jackie Edwards	Cllr Karen Rampton
Cllr John Beesley	Cllr Duane Farr	Cllr Roberto Rocca
Cllr Derek Borthwick	Cllr Sean Gabriel	Cllr Ann Stribley
Cllr Philip Broadhead	Cllr Mike Greene	Cllr Mike White
Cllr Nigel Brooks	Cllr Nicola Greene	Cllr Lawrence Williams
Cllr Diana Butler	Cllr May Haines	Cllr Laurence Fear
Cllr Daniel Butt	Cllr Mohan Iyengar	Cllr Nigel Hedges
Cllr Judes Butt	Cllr Cheryl Johnson	

Against – 0

Abstentions – 27

Cllr Lewis Allison	Cllr L-J Evans	Cllr Simon McCormack
Cllr Marcus Andrews	Cllr George Farquhar	Cllr Sandra Moore

Cllr Mike Brooke	Cllr David Flagg	Cllr Margaret Phipps
Cllr David Brown	Cllr Nick Geary	Cllr Felicity Rice
Cllr Simon Bull	Cllr Andy Hadley	Cllr Vanessa Ricketts
Cllr Richard Burton	Cllr Paul Hilliard	Cllr Chris Rigby
Cllr Mike Cox	Cllr Mark Howell	Cllr Mark Robson
Cllr Lesley Dedman	Cllr Marion LePoidevin	Cllr Tony Trent
Cllr Millie Earl	Cllr Lisa Lewis	Cllr Kieron Wilson

The Minutes of the Ordinary Council meeting on 14 September 2021 were confirmed.

119. Announcements and Introductions from the Chairman

The Chairman made the following announcements:

A - Sir John Butterfill

The Chairman reported with sadness on the death of Sir John Butterfill MP. He explained that Sir John had passed away peacefully early on Sunday and he had been ill for some time. The Chairman reported that as many long-standing Members would know, Sir John had served as a Member of Parliament for Bournemouth West from 1983 until his retirement in 2010. He was elected to Parliament for Bournemouth West six times and in Parliament had the distinction as a Back Bench MP of introducing many Acts of Parliament.

Members stood to observe a minute's silence in his memory.

B - Councillor Colin Bungey

The Chairman referred to the recent Memorial Ceremony for Councillor Colin Bungey at The Priory Church. He was first elected to Jumpers Ward in Christchurch in May 1983 and his widow Sue was the current Mayor of Christchurch. Hundreds heard the eulogies and praise for 'a man of decency, integrity, honesty and selflessness' over the years he served as a 'non-Party' Councillor.

C – Civic Activities

The Chairman referred to some of the engagements he had attended since the last Council meeting as detailed below:

- Dorset Scouts Awards ceremony with the Mayor of Bournemouth in Blandford.
- BCHA At Your Service Launch for training people for the hospitality and catering industry.
- Christchurch Town Council rededication service at Christchurch Priory and the launch of the Christchurch Living Advent Calendar at the Kings Arms Christchurch which has seen Christchurch Rotary and BCP Events team working together.
- Visited Bournemouth University with special focus on the new and impressive Poole Gateway Building.
- Opening of New Halls at Arts University Bournemouth.
- Spoke at the launch of the Citizens Advice outreach vehicle.

- the High Sheriff of Dorset's Law Service in Dorchester. He explained that he continued to be honoured to be working on the High Sheriff's Working Group on his Harmony in Dorset project. (On that occasion he had accompanied the Mayor of Poole).
- Attended with the Mayor of Bournemouth the launch of the Bournemouth Arts Festival by the Sea.

120. Public Issues

The Chairman advised that a number of public issues had been submitted for the meeting:

A – Public Questions

Public Question from Susan Stockwell

Does this council consider littering emanating from licensed premises a matter of public nuisance, whether for alcohol licensing or take away licensing?

Reply from Councillor Bobbie Dove, Cabinet Member for Community Safety and Regulatory Services

The prevention of public nuisance is one of the Licensing objectives for all licensed premises, including alcohol sales and late-night refreshments. This would include take-aways operating after 11.00pm and would include litter.

Licensed premises, particularly those operating after 23:00 hours and into the early morning, may affect people living or working in the vicinity of these premises. Therefore, we would expect that the applicant's operating schedule would contain practical steps to prevent potential disturbance to local residents, this would include litter in the immediate vicinity.

In some instances, litter emanating from licensed premises may be as result of failure by businesses to comply with 'duty of care' obligations to make suitable waste collection arrangements. Where this should happen, the Council is piloting a scheme where an enforcement company called WISE will engage with businesses to work alongside the Council and make improvements where necessary. This would include engagement with licensed premises, to ensure that they comply with these obligations. Should they fail to do so, fixed penalty notices can be issued where appropriate.

Public Question from Vicky Spence

How are residents near Culliford Crescent supposed to be able to object about a 5g mast going barely metres from their homes and affecting other homes further up the hill when all have been pretty much isolating since March 2020?

Residents were not informed, and homes are now blighted by an unsightly 18 metre mast towering over them.

I only found the Yellow planning notice after it had been erected and the weblink went to a blank page, the phone number was an old Poole Council number. How are we to find out information when the information supplied is WRONG?

Reply from Councillor Philip Broadhead, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Development, Growth & Regeneration

The 5G mast proposal near Culliford Crescent was subject to the required statutory notification following the submission of the application in June 2021. We need to look further into why residents didn't submit comments to the proposal but all statutory requirements regarding publicity were carried out as they always are. An objection to the application was received from a ward Cllr representing their residents raising issues that were then considered in the assessment of the application.

Unfortunately, due the way the permitted development regime operates, the Council is bound by a strict process within which to determine 5G mast applications, and whilst fully sympathising with the concerns raised in the question, this application was ultimately determined in accordance with the legislation. We are, however, always reviewing how applications are notified and will ensure that any issues raised will be looked at further to ensure the Council's notification procedures remain robust and engaging for residents.

Public Question from Dr David Young

Since 5G masts are sprouting up all over the boroughs, can the BCP council undertake to extend the safety-monitoring of electromagnetic radiation that it is already doing in the Lansdowne area throughout the BCP area, to ensure that no-one is exposed beyond the maximum recommended level for technologies using frequencies over 2 GHz in public spaces, as outlined by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP)?

Reply from Councillor Philip Broadhead, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Development, Growth & Regeneration

5G Masts garnet just sprouting up all over the BCP area, but rather the whole world. Indeed, many other cities and towns of comparable size in this country are now further ahead in the roll-out than we are.

When we launched our own 5G network, we took the stop of monitoring the levels to give assurance to the small number of people who remain worried about this proven technology. These are publicly available and show all levels are not just within the limits, but very obviously so.

We don't have the capacity, funding or indeed the mandate to monitor those of others. However, the useful readings from our own equipment do prove that the levels are minimal and well below the recommended guidelines.

B – Statements

Public Statement from Philip Stanley-Watts

What with the tragic loss of trees and hedgerows at West Parley, just outside the BCP area there needs to be a natural environment heritage protection order within the planning process. This could be like the legislation within the listing process for this Country's built heritage. Then

there are TPOs but is that robust enough within our planning framework for the protection of trees.

Public Statement from Alex McKinstry

I deplore the decision by Bournemouth's charter trustees to recommend the town for city status. Residents have not been formally consulted on this; when the *Echo* suggested, on 9 June, that Bournemouth might apply for city status, the comments beneath that article were overwhelmingly negative. The prospective drawbacks to city status would be very numerous: landlords would start charging city rents; high-rise and high-density development would increase; while Poole and Christchurch would be relegated, potentially, to mere decorative outposts. I hope all councillors will consider these points, therefore, before voting on Item 10 of this evening's agenda.

Public Statement for Tina Cresswell (read out by the Chief Executive in her absence)

The utopian and fanciful 'Big Plan' for ambitious commercial development in the BCP area has set puny and underwhelming targets for carbon emissions, and no target at all to remedy the appalling sewage contamination of BCP beaches. This is at odds with the rosy image of the future as presented in the Big Plan. There is no target for tree planting, home insulation, wind-power, or provision of a community energy system generating low-carbon electricity. BCP please try harder.

C – Petitions

There were no petitions submitted for this meeting.

121. Questions from Councillors

Question from Councillor George Farquhar

As a follow on from the question I asked at Full Council on Tuesday the 5th January I have waited the Constitutionally required six months before being allowed to ask this question of the Leader of the Council.

Following the discussions with the Department for Transport aided by the Member of Parliament for Bournemouth East, will the Council commit to match funding the budgets in the public domain from South Western Railway and Network Rail for the installation and commissioning of the long overdue accessibility lifts at 'Pokesdown for Boscombe Station' in the ward I am proud to represent? If so when? And how much?

Reply from Councillor Mike Greene, Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Transport

This is a subject that has been high on my agenda for a number of years, following the excellent and successful campaign led by Cllr Andy Jones, which resulted in the obligation for lifts at Pokesdown Station to be included as a requirement for the South Western Railways franchise.

Several meetings have been held between the BCP Council leadership, South Western Railways, Network Rail and the MP for Bournemouth East to consider the various options ahead and officers are now working closely in partnership with both those organizations towards anticipated improvements to the Pokesdown Railway Station. It is hoped that these improvements will include not only the fully accessible lifts, but other enhancements too.

Over the last few months, at BCP's request, South Western Railways and Network Rail have been working on a business case that identifies the scope of the project, and the relative funding position for each of them. Technical work is continuing alongside this.

I am delighted to confirm that at the next Cabinet meeting, on November 24th, I will be asking for approval for up to £2.6m from the Futures Fund set up by this Conservative administration to be allocated as a potential BCP contribution. This is to cover the shortfall from partners who themselves have identified, subject to their own internal approvals, that they will contribute a total of £3.1m.

I understand that Cllr Farquhar is new to this, but sure he will be delighted that after so many years of operator delay, it looks like all the work done by his colleague, Cllr Andy Jones is finally close to bearing fruit.

Question from Councillor Eddie Coope

Can the cabinet member explain why the Long Groyne has been secured to prevent access and how secure is it and can the cabinet member tell me what is happening with the future of the Long Groyne.

Reply from Councillor Mark Anderson, Cabinet Member for Environment and Place

I would like to thank Cllr Coope for his question, The upgrade/replacement of the Long Groyne forms part of the current Poole Bay Beach Management Scheme for which we secured £36m funding last year. Initial structural investigations undertaken to help inform condition assessment and design parameters revealed significant voiding within the existing structure. On completion of these investigations, it was deemed appropriate to prevent access along the groyne due to the health and safety risk posed by potential movement or collapse of the structure.

As for any maritime structure like this, erecting safety barriers etc is extremely difficult as it is easily damaged during storm periods. The method adopted was designed and erected in liaison with BCP insurance personal to make sure the balance of security and signage was acceptable. No member of public could access past the gate and associated signage without being fully aware of the risk and it would take significant effort to do so.

At present ground investigations (boreholes etc) are due to start this month to inform design conditions. We are planning to go to tender in March/April 2022 on a design and build contract, with the design phase being undertaken next year and construction starting in Spring 2023. Due to environmental licence constraints, as well as being sensible programming

for marine construction, the build will take place during the summer months, aiming for completion during Autumn 2023.

It is also important to remind Council that we will not be significantly changing the length or alignment of the groyne. It will be more about rebuilding to make structurally sound and increasing height to allow for future sea level rise. It will also bring up to date the understanding of rock stability to ensure an appropriate design for future storm events. There was some consideration for slight adjustment to the angle of the groyne to optimise sediment retention to the west, however this could pose risk via exposing a harsher wave climate to Mudeford Spit and Christchurch Harbour entrance.

Councillor Coope, as a supplementary question, asked if the groyne was as secure as possible. Councillor Mark Anderson confirmed that he can assure Councillor Coope that the groyne was secure.

Question from Councillor Ann Stribley

Residents in the Parkstone/Penn Hill area have recently received a leaflet from Poole Liberal Democrats which purports to be a street survey, but states -

“The Conservative-led Council has recently spent £90,000 on two new mayoral limos.”

Is this statement true?

Reply from Councillor Mike Greene, Cabinet Member for Sustainability and Transport

I have seen the leaflet to which Cllr Stribley refers. It takes the form of a multiple-choice survey and features the names and pictures of three Liberal Democrat councillors. It says “The Conservative-led Council has recently spent £90,000 on two new mayoral limos” and asks residents: “How do you rate this as value for money for Poole tax-payers?” – “Appalling Waste, Poor Value, Good Value or Excellent use of funds”.

It is a shame that the authors did not add a further option, asking residents if they thought it might be: “simply a Liberal Democrat lie”.

When the Conservatives inherited the draft Fleet Replacement Strategy from the previous Liberal-Democrat led Administration a year ago, it was, to say the least, wholly inadequate: planning to replace a tiny fraction of our 600-odd vehicles with their electric equivalents. I am delighted to note that the Strategy **we** approved increased this to around a third of replacements to be with ULEV in the first 3-year phase alone, with an anticipation that this will see a large step up again in the following three years. In addition, we have replaced the diesel used by the non-electric fleet with a fully sustainable alternative drop-in fuel made from Hydrogenated Vegetable Oil. The net result is a predicted reduction in our fleet’s carbon emissions of more than 90%.

Councillor Evans during the response to the question raised a point of order indicated that the information provided did not seem relevant to the response. The Chairman asked for the answer to the question.

In the correct financially prudent way, the Strategy identified all vehicles that would reach end of life during the period and what, *if* replaced like-for-like, the cost would be. It was explained carefully to everyone at the Overview and Scrutiny meeting which discussed the strategy that this did **not** mean that individual purchases would go ahead. Maybe the Liberal Democrats present either did not listen to or did not understand that simple fact; but maybe it's telling too that out of a £31 million strategy which forms a massive step forward in the Council's objective to become Carbon neutral by 2030, they chose to focus all their energy on this one budget line and almost none on the other 99.7%.

Just to confirm to everyone: the line in the Liberal Democrat leaflet which says that "BCP Council has recently spent £90k on two new mayoral limos" is completely false. Was it written knowingly or unknowingly? I know what I think.

Councillor Stribley as a supplementary question asked what action the Portfolio Holder thinks this Council should take regarding Members who were either responsible for or complicit in circulating deliberate untruths. The Chairman advised that he was disinclined to allow the supplementary question. Councillor Wilson, by way of a point of order, asked on what grounds was the supplementary question being disallowed. The Chairman indicated that he did not feel it was pertinent to the original response given by the Portfolio Holder.

Question from Councillor Daniel Butt

Hamworthy is in dire need of a new sea wall along a significant stretch. Can the leader tell me what efforts are underway to find a long-term solution to this problem, which has been brewing for years?

Reply from Councillor Drew Mellor, Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance & Transformation.

My colleague, Cllr Mark Anderson and the Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) team have done significant work in this area to both gain an understanding of the level of defects and to discuss a mitigation strategy with the friends of Hamworthy park. A maintenance report has been completed for these defects along with a priced solution to robustly repair the seawall and path in this popular location.

I thank you for raising this issue with me personally and I am delighted to confirm that post your intervention it is this administrations intention to bring forward a capital programme to rectify this situation, to invest in Hamworthy and to ensure we keep investing in Hamworthy.

Question from Councillor Tony Trent

No doubt other members have received representations on this, albeit that many got caught in BCP Council's "Junk Mail" folder and may not have been read by the intended recipients.

At the November 2020 meeting of BCP Council (with the item debated on 8th December 2020) the council passed a motion relating to fireworks. One of the actions required under the motion was for the Portfolio Holder, which I believe was Cllr. Anderson, to write to the Government urging them to

pass legislation limiting the maximum noise level to 90dB for private fireworks displays. Could I be told what action, if any, has been taken to follow up this request, and to take the concerns expressed further.

The motion also requested that the Portfolio Holder encourage local retailers to stock quieter fireworks, and I would be grateful if it could be confirmed what action has been taken on this.

Finally, the motion called for a public awareness campaign on fireworks, but there does not appear any record of it having been done so far. Can it be confirmed if action has been taken on this, and when it took place.

Reply from Councillor Mark Anderson, Cabinet Member for Environment and Place

I would like to thank Cllr Trent for his question, I received an almost identical question from another Councillor via email last week and as I told her in my response this isn't my portfolio as it's really concerned with Noise and Publicity which are covered by the Enforcement team and Communications, but I investigated it to provide an answer.

The first thing I did was look up the motion and I thought it might be useful to remind members as well: -

The motion states that "This Council resolves: -

(a) to require all public firework displays within the local authority boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event, allowing residents to take precautions for their animals and vulnerable people.

(b) to actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of fireworks on animal welfare and vulnerable people – including the precautions that can be taken to mitigate risks.

(c) to write to the UK Government urging them to introduce legislation to limit the maximum noise level of fireworks to 90dB for those sold to the public for private displays.

(d) to encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock 'quieter' fireworks for public private display."

Interestingly it appears three of the parts of the motion are already carried out, responding to these 3: -

Part a) which is conceivably the only part that is an Environment issue, public fireworks on Council land are advertised anyway and we cannot require those holding displays on private land to publicise (as there is no license or permit requirement). There was only one Fireworks display on council land this November and that was at Poole Quay. This has been promoted as the lead story in all destination consumer emails as well as being included in the council's events weekly email.

Part b) I have been told the council comms team were sending out daily social media posts and email news to residents in the build up to bonfire night and I believe the campaign is linked to the national governments campaign on fireworks. I have several of the infographics that were sent out on this with the earliest one I have seen being dated the 27th of October.

Part d) As part of national campaigning on noise & safety of fireworks, local retailers are already encouraged by our Trading Standards Officers to stock low-noise fireworks whilst they carry out the annual licensing visit to ensure safe storage of pyrotechnics. We have no jurisdiction to require the inclusion of low-noise fireworks by retailers, although TSOs report general acceptance of the desirability to stock them. An on-line check by the TS Manager recently indicated that the vast majority of local retailers do in fact already stock low-noise fireworks. We have also arranged for future licence inspections to include a question on the proportion of sales that relate to low-noise fireworks. Again, we have no jurisdiction to require this info, but feedback from TSOs suggests that retailers are quite cooperative and willing to assist.

So, returning to Part C of the motion where Cllr Trent believed I am required to write to the government requiring a maximum 90db noise level for fireworks, I would like to reiterate I was not specified in the motion and the majority of the requirements are not in my portfolio, in fact no PFH was specified in the motion to do this.

Now specifying 90db as a noise level is I'm afraid meaningless unless a minimum distance is specified, this is an area of physics that comes under the Inverse square law, so if you double the distance, you half in this case the sound.

I did ask Environmental Health about stipulating a 90 decibel (dB) limit and was told that "stipulating a sound pressure level in isolation would not convey a definable or measurable proposal." and for legislation be passed that covered all categories of fireworks, including for home displays, the testing regime would need to be specified.

On further investigation I discovered that this is the testing regime currently stipulated under Regulation 8 of the Fireworks Regulations 2004, which for Category 3 fireworks (outdoor fireworks with spectator safety distances of at least 25m) is set at 120dBA. A sound level meter that measures A-weighted decibels, has a similar sensitivity to sound at different frequencies to the average human ear and is the one most commonly used for measuring loud noise.

I can however confirm that a letter was sent to the government regarding the 90db level, I am not aware of any follow up to the letter although I can confirm that action was already being taken on the other three items and has for a while.

Councillor Trent as a supplementary question asked what the point was of sending a press release on 4 November which would not have appeared in print until 5 November on firework safety and could one of the regular press releases have included an article that was in the wider public interest. Councillor Anderson reported that just because Councillor Trent had received the release on 4 November does not mean that was when it was published. He explained that Communications had sent out earlier publications the earliest that he had seen was on 27 October 2021 whilst highlighting that such information needs to be published in a suitable time period.

Question from Councillor Lewis Allison

In previous months, in response to the ongoing Afghanistan refugee crisis, Local Authorities across the UK have been providing homes and support for refugee families, It's recently been announced that BCP Council will only be taking in one family, why is our commitment so low in comparison to other similar sized councils?

Reply from Councillor Karen Rampton, Cabinet Member for People and Homes

BCP Council are supporting one of the national Bridging Hotels initiated by the Home Office to provide temporary housing for Afghan Refugees. BCP Council has been facilitating a multi-agency effort to support multiple families at the Hotel since 17th September.

The Home Office has provided accommodation at the Hotel, the food, and basic provisions. The Local Authority were asked to mobilise support to the families ensuring they can both access statutory and other relevant services and integrate within the community. This support has been provided from Children's Services, Adult Social Care, Housing, Schools and Education, Primary health care, public health and the voluntary sector. We continue to support many families in this setting.

Some of the multi-agency achievements to date are:

- Children start school on 8th November
- All families are registered with a GP and have been screened for medical needs.
- High percentage of adults have been vaccinated for COVID and Flu
- ESOL classes are in place for adults
- DWP have assisted all families to access Universal Credit and other relevant benefits.
- The DWP work coaches are now proactively working with families to access work and training.
- The community and voluntary sector including Shout Out, the Red Cross, and ICN have played a key role in this effort, providing interpreters, clothing and activities for children.
- Local businesses including JP Morgan and AFC Bournemouth have also offered their support including running weekly football skills with the children.

Prior to these families arriving in the UK all Local Authorities were asked to consider assisting in the efforts to provide long term settled properties for the families. We ran a campaign focussing on private landlords requesting help to deliver this locally. BCP have so far provided one property for a family in October. Another property has since been secured and a family matched to who are due to arrive at the end of November. A further 2 properties have been identified and the details are being provided to the Home Office.

We continue to run our property request campaign on our web page, social media and our landlord newsletter and persist in working on leads for offers of additional accommodation. ICN (International Care Networks) are

commissioned to provide the resettlement support for families who move into this accommodation for up to three years.

BCP Council and our partners are committed to playing our part in this national effort.

Question from Councillor Andy Hadley

With COP26 underway, leaders across the World are discussing urgent actions to mitigate the climate and ecological crisis. This includes the handling of sewage.

I'm grateful that a members seminar was organised so Wessex Water could share their position and plans last month. We were told that they are allowed to discharge up to 10 times a year from any outfall, but this is being significantly exceeded, with 44 events logged at two local sites in 2020.

I am though sorry to learn that our local MPs would not accept changes to regulation, though following the national outcries, the Wessex Water Chief Executive was moved to write to us. Can the Portfolio-holder please briefly advise what particular measures he is now undertaking to accelerate efforts given the Wessex Water plan to 2025 seems mostly just to be monitoring the spread of sewage, that fouls our beaches and regularly shuts down our shell fisheries.

Reply from Councillor Mark Anderson, Cabinet Member for Environment and Place

I would like to thank Cllr Hadley for his question, I would also like to remind the council that we have 8 blue flags and award winning beaches!

The Environment Agency is the regulator of Wessex Water in relation to sewer overflows, although the Council continues to represent the interests of local residents and businesses who remain concerned that the current sewage infrastructure is inadequate for the level of storms and heavy rainfall.

The Council's legal responsibilities are centred on the work carried out by Environmental Health in classifying Poole Harbour waters for shellfish harvesting, as well as for testing the biological quality of harvested shellfish intended for sale and export. The Council has on occasion been required to serve temporary closure notices on the shellfish harvesting sites, as a result of sewage outflows.

Following such an event in November 2019 when Storm Pablo struck, the Council established the Poole Harbour Sewage Outfall Stakeholder Group. The aim was to influence local infrastructure investment and national policy in relation to the issue of spills arising from storm overflows in the Harbour and its tributaries. This strategic group comprises Wessex Water, the Environment Agency, Public Health England, the Food Standards Agency, the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science, the Southern Inshore Fisheries & Conservation Authority, and BCP Council.

Through this group the Council and other partners continue to influence and encourage Wessex Water to develop their investment strategy in relation to sewer and water treatment infrastructure. The Council does not however

have any regulatory or enforcement powers with regards sewage outflows from Wessex Water.

In 2020 Defra established the Storm Overflows Taskforce, comprising Defra, the EA, Ofwat, Consumer Council for Water, Blueprint for Water and Water UK, which aims to establish proposals to reduce the frequency and volumes of storm overflow spills. The Council wrote to Defra requesting local participation in the Taskforce and received a favourable response advising that an invite will be forthcoming, although this has yet to happen despite a reminder being sent.

The Group also aspires to enable greater information sharing about storm overflow operation and other factors affecting water quality, in order to enable earlier warning where possible. The aspiration is to move away from reactive lab analysis towards dynamic risk assessments providing real-time data for stakeholders and businesses. A small working group, including the Council, CEFAS, SIFCA, and UKHSA, has been formed to develop project proposals to develop innovative data/AI sharing within the Harbour and coastal settings.

It is also worth noting that as parliament is currently debating this, it will be prudent for us to wait until they have finished before we consider what further actions we take.

122. Recommendations from Cabinet and Other Committees

8a – Licensing Committee 16 September 2021 – Minute No 18 – Sex Establishment Policy

The Chairman confirmed that he had allowed 5 minutes for Councillor Judes Butt, Chairman of the Licensing Committee to present the recommendations on this issue.

Councillor Butt, Chairman of the Licensing Committee presented the report on the Sex Establishment Policy as set out on the agenda and outlined the recommendations. Councillor Butt explained that this was the first BCP Council Sex Establishment Policy. She reported on how the Policy had been developed to enable the regulation of the operation of any sex establishment within the BCP conurbation, including the legislative requirements, the comprehensive consultation with all relevant stakeholders at each stage and the chronological journey of the Policy to date. The Chairman highlighted key aspects of the policy including public sector equality issues. On 29 June 2021 there had been an all Member briefing giving Members the opportunity to be informed about the policy raise questions and contribute to the process being followed. The Chairman referred to the last meeting of the Licensing Committee in September which heard questions and statements from the Public and from Councillors. She explained that the Committee had considered these and all the public feedback, dancer responses and the equality impact assessment which was referred to at every Member workshop to ensure a thorough and detailed consideration of all equality impacts. Councillor Butt reported that the equality impact assessment had been signed off by the Equality Assurance Panel a new step to ensure that the Council met its Statutory duties in full. The Chairman reported that the policy

demonstrated the Council's compliance with the Public Sector Equality duty. Councillor Butt explained that the Licensing Committee has comprehensively discussed and interrogated the report and appended policy and had amended and improved it throughout its journey. Members were informed that on 16 September 2021 the Committee agreed the final amendments to the policy which were set out in detail in the report at 8 (a). Councillor Butt referred to the proposal relating to the retention of CCTV footage to amend from 31 to 90 days. However, this was subject to a further amendment agreed by all Members of the Licensing Committee that the retention of CCTV footage should be amended back to 31 days and not 90 days. Councillor Butt explained that the reason for the amendment was although in theory it was a good idea, officers had subsequently received further advice that this change goes against the principles of GDPR and the guidance issued by the Information Commissioners Office (ICO), which states that personal information should be deleted as soon as practical. For domestic users this was 14 days and for commercial users this was 31 days. Members were informed that Officers had spoken to the BCP Council's CCTV manager and the Crime Prevention Officer for Dorset Police and they had both confirmed that they agree that 31 days was reasonable and any longer would breach ICO rules. Members were informed that full assurance can be provided that if any incidents occur at venues, officers would, always download any CCTV images and save a copy for action, this then gives any persons plenty of time to come forward if they so wish. The Chairman reported that the Draft Policy presented today reflects this amendment pending agreement by Council.

Councillor Butt took the opportunity to thank the Licensing Committee Members and Officers for all their efforts and contributions in the creation of this complex policy. In conclusion she reported that the Sex Establishment Policy as agreed by the Licensing Committee sets out a robust framework for making decisions on sex establishments and it provides strict conditions in all venues in order to keep dancers, staff, customers and the public safe. Councillor Julie Bagwell seconded the proposal.

Councillors considered the proposed recommendations and made a number of comments. Councillor Dunlop highlighted that violence against women and girls was an epidemic she outlined the statistics relating to death and rape and access to videos illustrating abuse. She referred to the intolerable level of harassment that girls suffer at school on a daily basis. She reported that the normalisation of the porn culture by the sex industry which dehumanises women as sex objects to be enjoyed by men drives this epidemic. Whether legal or not such activities undermine everything that the Council says about women's equality, safety and values in society. Councillor Dunlop explained that such objectification as practised in sexual entertainment venues was directly linked to sexual and domestic violence and was recognised at an international level by the legally binding United Nations Convention to eliminate discrimination against women which calls upon states to take action against objectification. Councillor Dunlop indicated, not to be confused with the Licensing Act which explicitly excludes sex establishments and requires evidence of undermining, the legislation that applies to Sexual Establishment Venues gives Local Authorities extensive powers. Councillor Dunlop reported that a Council

needs no evidence of anything in order to decide that objectification and exploitation of women does not reflect its values. She explained that the Licensing Committee had the power to say no and the authority to accept the view of the female respondents who told the Committee clearly, 95%, that they were vehemently opposed to these clubs with good reasons based on safety and equality. She further explained that the power of sexual establishment legislation makes it possible to say no location was suitable so with her portfolio hat on she could object to a SEV licence application renewal because she was creating a family identity and such establishments do not fit. She highlighted that the Policy gives required rights to the existing clubs and exempts them from the powers the Council has to use the locality to control them for 5 years – the law indicates that the applicants cannot be treated any differently to existing clubs. She asked due to no limit what was expected to happen when the Council uses locality when dealing with new applicants, she indicated that she could not support the policy.

Councillor Hadley indicated that he was a member of the Licensing Committee but was not a Member of the Working Group that looked in detail at the policy. He referred to the safety of the dancers and comments made by Councillors that they felt unsafe in the vicinity of the venues and was concerned about the removal of the cap on the number of establishments. He indicated that he would be abstaining from supporting the adoption of the policy.

Councillor Moore explained that when the policy was discussed at the Licensing Committee, she submitted a written statement objecting. She acknowledged that the Committee had undertaken a huge amount of work and subsequently approved the policy. However, she highlighted that her initial objections still stand, and she would not be supporting the policy.

Councillor Farquhar thanked Councillor Dunlop for her summing up of the issue. He explained that he was a Member of the Licensing Committee acknowledging that it was within the law but highlighting that this was the wrong message to send from BCP Council and he would be voting against the adoption on any SEV Policy.

Councillor Lewis reported that she had submitted a statement against the policy and endorsed everything that Councillor Dunlop had said.

Councillor Rampton acknowledged the strong views that had been expressed whilst highlighting that the venues were lawful to operate, they were regulated, there has been consultation, there was no apparent evidence of trafficking, coercion or exploitation and no evidence or reports of assaults or violence linked to any of the venues. She emphasised that the Council was compliant with Public Sector Equality duty and she would be supporting the policy.

Councillor Wilson indicated that he had not been directly involved in the development of the policy but based on the statement from Councillor Dunlop he would be voting against the policy. He emphasised that this was not solely on moral grounds as there was other evidence.

Councillor Judes Butt in summing up acknowledged the high passions and accepted that Councillor Dunlop's statement had identified worries. She identified that the Council has to provide for the BCP area, and the Licensing Committee had done its best in the development of the SEV Policy. She was saddened that some Councillors had not been involved in the process but thanked those Councillors who had come forward with their concerns. Councillor Butt reported that the SEV Policy as agreed by the Licensing Committee sets out a robust framework for BCP Council to make decisions on sexual establishments and provides extremely strict conditions which would be applied and was there to keep the dancers, staff, customers and the public safe.

A request for a recorded vote failed.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendations arising from the Licensing Committee on 16 September 2021 as set out on the agenda and the further amendment that the CCTV retention period be amended to 31 days and not 90 days which were carried as follows.

Voting: For – 35, Against – 14, Abstentions – 13

Councillor Farquhar wished to be recorded as voting against the above decision.

8b - Cabinet 29 September 2021 - Minute No 55 - Accelerating regeneration and investment in the BCP Area

Councillor Broadhead, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Development, Growth & Regeneration presented the report on accelerating regeneration and investment in the BCP area as set out in the agenda and outlined the recommendation. Councillor Broadhead referred to the development and identification of approximately 15/16 sites with around £3bn of gross development value of regeneration with a considerable amount concentrated on the rejuvenation of Poole which had been highlighted in the Big Plan. He referred to the Future Places Urban Regeneration Company which was operational with really talented staff and he was proud of the work already being undertaken. The recommendation before the Council sought approval to increase the budget by an additional £3.404m which was a fraction of a percent of the gross development value. Councillor Broadhead reported that costs such as site and ecological surveys were being incurred in the development of the programme. Councillor Mellor seconded the proposal.

Councillors commented on the recommendations including concerns about how the proposed additional resources were being funded, the expectation that future generations would fund such projects and the need to stop and think before approving any further expenditure as the budget was showing a deficit. Councillor Howell indicated that in general he was supportive of the measures in the report. He emphasised the need for proper governance in relation to such matters and proposed the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Rice:

“In the interests of promoting confidence in the governance of the URC amongst the public, developers, investors and future residents

the Council requires one Board position to be offered to one of the opposition groups.”

The Chief Executive reported that any amendment should relate to the content of the report which was considered by Cabinet and from which the recommendation had come from. Councillor Broadhead reported that Councillor Howell was referring, he believed, to a different regeneration report relating to the commissioning business plan which was not part of this recommendation. Councillor Howell indicated that the business plan was referenced in the document. The Chief Executive reported that the matter was appropriate to bring before the Council in another form but to raise at this point in the agenda it was necessary to check that it was referenced in the appropriate report. The Chairman reported that as this reference could not be confirmed at this stage it was not possible to proceed with the above amendment. Councillor Howell indicated that the relevant place in the report was point 46. The Chairman reiterated that it would not be possible to accommodate his amendment as this related to the officer structure

Councillors commented further on the proposals including acknowledging the positive messages for future places, asking where the resources would be funded from. Councillor Mellor, having reserved his right to speak, explained that he was delighted to be involved in this work, he highlighted the calibre of staff that had been attracted to the role, the work being undertaken and the opportunities to invest. He highlighted that the administration would fund for the future and the priorities identified now. The Leader reported that the Council had significant funds and resources at its disposal whilst referring to the lack of understanding of the budget. The Leader reported that the regeneration was exactly what was envisaged in respect of the Big Plan with genuine ambition to move the area forward and putting world class placemaking at the heart of what the Council was doing.

Councillor Broadhead in summing up addressed the issues that had been raised during the debate including the funding. He referred to legacy budget issues from the previous administration and highlighted that the current administration did not want to push pause on the much-needed regeneration. He referred to the suggestion that the administration was not dealing with the financial challenges for the future and asked Councillors to wait for the proposed budget for 2022/23. Councillor Broadhead reported that Councillor Howell's point on governance had been raised and addressed at the Overview and Scrutiny Board in detail and the same proposal had not been supported. He explained that Future Places was different to other external companies which the Council interacts with. Future Places was a purely Council owned entity namely a teckal company which essentially meant that it was another Council function. Due to this structure the main interaction by Members should come through the commissioning plan. He emphasised that more external involvement was needed on the Future Places Board and it would not be appropriate to have further Councillor representation. Councillor Broadhead reported on the continuing cross-party engagement at the commissioning stage.

Councillor Howell asked to respond, the Chairman indicated that there was no provision in the Constitution to speak again on a proposal. Councillor Howell continued to speak. Councillor Nicola Greene raised a point of order and reported that she would like to use the provision that the Councillor be not heard again due to the disrespect that Councillor Howell had shown the entire Chamber. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Judes Butt. In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution the Chairman clarified the following proposal moved by Councillor Nicola Greene and seconded by Councillor Judes Butt

That Councillor Howell be not further heard.

The above motion was immediately put to the vote without discussion and was carried by a majority.

The Chairman confirmed that Councillor Howell would not be able to be heard for the rest of the meeting but indicated that he would like him to remain in the meeting.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendation arising from the Cabinet meeting on 29 September 2021 as set out on the agenda which was carried as follows.

Voting – For - 41, Against - 8, Abstentions 13

8c- Cabinet 29 September 2021 - Minute No 58 - Cleaner, Greener, Safer

Councillor Mark Anderson, Cabinet Member for Environment and Place presented the report on Cleaner, Greener, Safer as set out on the agenda and outlined the recommendation. He explained that this issue had been scrutinised by the Overview and Scrutiny Board and the proposed expenditure recommended by Cabinet. Councillor Nicola Greene seconded the proposal and in doing so highlighted that few things matter more to residents and elected representatives than the condition of local neighbourhoods. She referred to the pride agenda focussed through work under the cleaner, greener, safer banner which looks to recognise and address these issues and the report provided early investment to ensure that a visible difference was made. She explained that it was not the whole of the agenda and much work would follow next year. Councillor Greene reported that the Overview and Scrutiny Board had spent time delving into the detail of the project raising excellent points on how to monitor and improve this work. Councillor Greene thanked officers for the work undertaken to bring the proposals forward and Councillor Haines for her drive and expertise in preparing the Cabinet paper.

Councillors commented on the proposals including whilst supporting the principles of cleaner, greener, safer that there was a disconnect between the ambitions of the initiative and the services being delivered. It was suggested that the Portfolio Holders overseeing the project look at the quality of the service provided. Councillor Hadley welcomed the general thrust of the paper referring to the great comments that he had received on the imaginative planting at Hunger Hill. He outlined his concerns relating to the removal of street furniture to improve flow highlighting that good public seating was important with café seating creating new pinch points. He

asked for assurance that such furniture would be retained where possible and only moved where necessary. Councillor Hadley reported that one of the biggest issues for Poole High Street was incidents of loose pavement bricks which had resulted in injuries to pedestrians with no capital investment to fix the paving. He explained that the area had suffered from the loss of public toilets, and he could see no funding for the refurbishment of these facilities. Councillor Hadley having checked referred to 27 streetlights in Poole High Street that were not working and stressed that the basics were not being done. Councillor Farquhar echoed Councillor Hadley's points referring to amenities in his own ward and that the level of service expected was provided to the residents of BCP. Councillor Rigby commented on the use of glyphosate when weeds were being treated and the associated health issue with using this treatment which has been addressed with the Leader of the Council. He indicated that alternatives would be used when they become more financially available and more affordable. Councillor Rigby referred to point 29 of the report and the procurement of services from a specialist company contracted to supply a spot treatment weed spray which he welcomed as it would minimise usage. Councillor Mike Greene having listened to the debate and read the paper did not believe that the comments made were in anyway contradictory and was grateful for the issues raised by Members. He reported that it was up to all ward councillors to make note of where these deficiencies were taking place and reporting them. Councillor Butler referred to theme 2 and urban greening and in particular the use of shrubs which can be useful for wildlife habitats. She commented on the need for manual workers and suggested that offenders should assist with cleaning graffiti and litter.

Councillor Mark Anderson in summing up explained that the purpose of the paper was to provide funds, that the comments on the tree strategy and the use of shrubs could be considered through a proposed working group to address these issues, that part of the funding in the paper would include the provision of seasonal workers, that he encouraged Councillors to report issues they spot such as defective street lights and referred to an asset management programme that would be undertaken to address the condition of street furniture. Members were informed that it was also proposed that QR codes would be included on benches and bins to enable reporting of any issues eg overflowing bins.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendation arising from the Cabinet meeting on 29 September 2021 as set out on the agenda which was carried by a majority.

8d - Cabinet 29 September 2021 - Minute No 60 - 2021/22 Quarter One Budget Monitoring Report,

Councillor Drew Mellor presented the report on the 2021/22 Quarter One Budget Monitoring report as set out in the agenda and outlined the recommendations. He explained that this was the regular quarterly report, which was considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Board, that he looked forward to the next quarter update in December and the budget cafes. Councillor Mellor reported on the significant work undertaken which was ongoing with material and positive progress. He indicated that predecessor conservative colleagues do have a record of delivery on the management

of the budget as does this administration in delivering a £5m surplus having inherited a £50m deficit from the previous administration and this year would be no exception.

Councillor Mellor then read out the following statement

The Council has the power to enter into the Grant Agreement with Homes England under the general power of competence. However, full Council approval is now required in order to enter into it. Attention should be drawn to the fact that there are extensive provisions with which the Council must comply, including delivery obligations, operational obligations, review, monitoring and reporting obligations, as well as transparency obligations. In addition, there are further provisions concerning circumstances in which Homes England would be entitled to withhold payments and in which the Council would be required to repay grant monies to Homes England. Homes England is unlikely to be prepared to negotiate the terms of the Grant Agreement and so it is a matter for the Council to consider whether to accept the risk of these terms, in particular the clawback provisions, together with the need for the funding. I would therefore propose that Council formally approves authority to enter into the grant agreement with Homes England and in doing so recommendation (E) is altered to read "That Council approves the Capital virements as set out in paragraph 74 and authorises the entering into the Grant Agreement with Homes England."

Councillor Broadhead seconded the proposed recommendations including the amendment as set out by Councillor Mellor detailed above.

Councillor Farquhar asked how many times must we hear the reference to the £50m budget deficit without an answer to how it was filled and where the funding came from.

Councillor Mellor in summing up responded to the above question reporting that the funding came from the Conservative Government delivered at the start of the pandemic and the administration in the change to the financial strategy.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendations arising from the Cabinet meeting on 29 September 2021 together with the following amendment to recommendation (E) That Council approves the Capital virements as set out in paragraph 74 and authorises the entering into the Grant Agreement with Homes England which was carried by a majority.

The meeting was then adjourned from 9.45 – 9.55 pm

Councillor Nick Geary left at 9.45 pm

8e - Cabinet 29 September 2021 - Minute No 63 - BCP Housing Strategy 2021-2026 "Our commitment to our communities

Councillor Bob Lawton presented the report on the BCP Housing Strategy 2021-2026 "Our commitment to our communities" as set out on the agenda and outlined the recommendation. He explained that this Strategy brings together three documents and reported that the Strategy had been developed over a number of months following a long public consultation with a great deal of stakeholder engagement through various sessions.

Members were advised that it was a high-level document which sets out the clear vision with strong leadership for BCP to ensure that housing, planning, economic development and regeneration work together and were integrated to best influence the housing market. Councillor Lawton emphasised that it was a key document that forms partnerships working together, drives shaping and contributes to health and wellbeing within the local population. He set out the vision statement and the five main objectives. Councillor Rampton seconded the proposals and highlighted that good housing was fundamental to good health and wellbeing. She highlighted the impact of the strategy which would run for a five-year period supported by a robust action plan which would help ensure delivery.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendation arising from the Cabinet meeting on 29 September 2021 which was carried unanimously.

8f - Cabinet 29 September 2021 - Minute No 64 - Council New build Housing & Acquisition Strategy (CNHAS), 2021-2026

Councillor Bob Lawton presented the report on the Council New build Housing & Acquisition Strategy (CNHAS), 2021-2026 as set out on the agenda and outlined the recommendations. He referred to the Council's house building programme over the next five years. CNHAS would sustain BCP Council's direct delivery of quality homes on its own land and would help support its communities and response to growth priorities. Councillor Lawton in referring to the building programme over the next five years reported that this would ensure a diverse set of homes were developed as identified in the BCP Housing Strategy. He explained the latest evidence around housing provision for young people, older residents, couples and families and those most vulnerable needing support. CNHAS would deliver at least 65% affordable homes as a mix across the next five-year programme not the statutory 40%. Members were informed that this would vary by scheme as they were built some would be 100% affordable and some less. Councillor Lawton reported that the programme in 2022 was expected to deliver 85% affordable housing, with expected minimum standards for the housing and a diversity of house types. Councillor Lawton explained that it would reduce the burden placed on BCP Council for the use of temporary accommodation for those who were homeless. He referred to the purchase of properties under the previous Bournemouth Borough Council the purpose of the scheme was to house homeless people which reduced the burden placed on the Council to accommodate homeless people. Councillor Lawton highlighted the Council's ambitious house building programme to enable people to get into the housing market.

Councillor Broadhead in seconding the proposals took the opportunity to thank Councillor Lawton for his leadership in this area. He emphasised that it was nothing new for Local Authorities to provide housing but what was new was the scale of the programme which was in addition to the Council's aspirations for the regeneration agenda which was about placemaking and the homes agenda which was about people with a long-term plan for the future. Councillor Broadhead also commented on the acquisition element of the strategy and the previous work through Seascope Homes and Property Limited. In particular he referred to the final approval of the

Princess Road scheme which was a fantastic example of what a Council led project should be.

Councillors commented on the proposals including seeking clarification on the progress with the Herbert Avenue scheme for homeless families, thanking Councillor Lawton for his commitment and dedication as a Cabinet Member, that both of the housing strategies rely heavily upon references to the Local Plan which was currently being developed and to the Government's standard method of calculating housing totals. Councillor Brooke further explained that the Local Plan Working Group was looking closely at the standard method and it would appear that the Council may be able to apply exceptional circumstances and provide a situation whereby it would be looking at a lower housing figure as a whole over the Plan period. He reported that it would therefore potentially be difficult if the two housing strategies continued to refer to the standard method and suggested that the housing strategies could be modified to accommodate what may happen with the Local Plan on that issue. Councillor Brooke also asked for consistency on the comments between the Local Plan and the strategies in particular relating to dates. Councillor Hadley echoed the comments made about Councillor Lawton and his dedication. He highlighted his concerns about affordable housing but was pleased to see retention of properties for rent for various schemes and plans for properties to have a high sustainability standard. Councillor Hadley urged consideration of the provision of open space, play space and green space. Councillor Phipps, in supporting the comments made by Councillor Brooke, asked if the Portfolio Holder could explain when the Council goes out on the issues and options consultation for the Local Plan, and it was decided the Council goes for exceptional circumstances and does not opt for the 2,700 homes per annum how this would be dealt with in this strategy and the previous document. Councillor Brown asked about the proportions of affordable housing and market homes within this Strategy.

Councillor Lawton in summing up reported the latest on the Herbert Avenue Scheme that tenders had been received and were being evaluated. He explained that he shared the concerns relating to the housing figures for the Local Plan and the differentials between the Plan and the Strategies, but he felt that there was sufficient flexibility within the policies for them to be adjusted to ensure that they were all aligned. In response to the issue raised on open space Councillor Lawton indicated that he agreed that as much open space should be retained as feasible and possible but there was an increasing population in the BCP area. He highlighted that there was a need to balance the need for accommodation with the need for open space. Councillor Lawton reported that the statutory requirement for affordable housing was 40% the paper proposed an average of 65% affordable housing and was dependent on the feasibility of each scheme and in 2022 it was expected that 85% of all units built would be affordable.

Councillor Lawton took the opportunity to thank the Officers for the development of the Housing Strategy and the CNHAS Strategy. He also reported that it had been an honour, a privilege and a pleasure to be the Portfolio Holder for Housing for Bournemouth and BCP Councils and he was glad that he was leaving an excellent legacy.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendations arising from the Cabinet meeting on 29 September 2021 which were carried unanimously.

8g - Standards Committee 5 October 2021 - Minute No 16 - Local Government Association - Revision to Model Code of Conduct for Councillors

Councillor Daniel Butt, Chairman of the Standards Committee presented the report on the Local Government Association – Revision to Model Code of Conduct for Councillors as set out on the agenda. He reported that following Council's adoption of the code of conduct in June this year the Council received notification from the Local Government Association outlining a series of amendments to their model code which the Standards Committee considered at its meeting on 5 October 2021. Councillor Butt reported that the changes made were set out in the agenda pack. The Committee supported these changes subject to a number of alterations which were set out on the agenda. He took the opportunity to thank Councillors for attending the training sessions on the new code of conduct and that he had been advised that 82% of Councillors had already attended the training. He explained that further dates would be offered to those Councillors who had not completed or undertaken the training. Councillor Butt outlined the recommendations as set out on the agenda. Councillor Borthwick seconded the proposals.

Councillor Andrews explained that the new code tidied up some typographical errors but did not give any particular extra powers if a Councillor was found to have contravened its provisions. He highlighted that the Committee could not suspend a Councillor, but the Committee can ask them to apologise, and they may refuse. Councillor Andrews reported that the Councillor needs to be reported to the Group Leaders who do have powers to suspend a Councillor from their group membership or demote a Councillor who holds an SRA.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendations arising from the Standards Committee meeting on 5 October 2021 which were carried as follows.

Voting: For – 63, Against – 1, Abstentions - 0

8h - Cabinet 27 October 2021 - Minute No 72 - Estates and Accommodation Retention of Poole Civic Space

Prior to consideration of the recommendation Councillor Diana Butler asked the following question:

Having asked the previous administration a similar question in September 2020 – I ask the current administration: When will the residents of Poole be given a Public Consultation on the future of the listed Poole Civic Centre building?

Reply from Councillor Drew Mellor, Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance & Transformation

Councillor Butler thank you for your question and for your continued interest and passion for this hugely important building for Poole.

As per the paper before us this evening I am delighted to once again confirm my personal and our administration's position in relation to retaining this building for future generations. What is not and will not be on the table while I am leader of this council is any disposal. A clear difference to the position of the Liberal Democrat led Unity Alliance who had marked this site for disposal.

As you will see from the later paper tonight, the current expectation is that the listed part of the site will be retained by the mayoralty, the charter trustees and a new anchor tenant being the coroner. In relation to the wider site we have asked our emerging URC team, Future Places, to explore options and a large part of their ethos, and the ethos of any successful regeneration, is to put the community at the heart of it and to that end a key piece of work that will be forthcoming is something called "the big conversation" which will be a powerful community engagement and consultation exercise. So, the community won't just have the opportunity to comment on this site but also the wider conurbation as we bring forward regeneration across BCP.

Councillor Mellor, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance and Transformation presented the report on the Estates and Accommodation Retention of Poole Civic Space and outlined the recommendation relating to the approval of the budget set out in Appendix 2 of the report. Councillor Mellor reported that he was committed to retaining the Civic Centre for this and future generations and the desire that the Community would not only benefit from this asset, but that community use would be integral to the Council's Plans going forward. He confirmed that the building would be used by the Mayoralty and the Charter Trustees and the intention was for the Coroner to be the anchor tenant. He thanked Members and officers for their work in developing the proposals. Councillor Mark Anderson seconded the proposals.

Councillors commented on the proposals including concerns expressed about the proposed changes to what was a listed building such as fire escapes, the impact on other elements of the building, that there had been no comments from the Conservation Officer, that the plans provided related to April 2021 when the Charter Trustees had discussed a September 2021 plan illustrating a layout of the vertical slice and a different positioning of the fire escapes. Councillor Le Poidevin indicated that of all the possible uses of the vertical slice the inclusion of the Coroners Court was appropriate. She indicated that the facilities set aside for the mayoralty were adequate but raised concerns about the start date for works of May next year. She emphasised that no work should affect the Mayor Making ceremony. In addition, she asked that the Cattistock Room and the Council Chamber were available for Mayoral and Community use and that nothing would hinder pre-booked events. Councillor Trent asked about the proposed arrangements for temporary accommodation for the Poole Charter Trustees and declared an interest as it would be the first six months of his mayoralty. He suggested that the Old Branksome Town Hall could be an option and asked if any progress had been made. Councillor Hadley indicated that the Unity Alliance had not decided to dispose of the building but accepted that the Town Hall would be the civic offices for BCP Council and for Poole Civic

Centre an alternative use was needed but that plan had not been made. He expressed his concern about how reports were considered through the democratic process from Overview and Scrutiny Board, Cabinet and onto Council without modification. He indicated that he had raised in the Overview and Scrutiny Board and Cabinet concerns about the sustainability of the proposals for the vertical slice including insulation, the state of the windows, uncertainty around the use of electricity generated on site, and heat pumps and none of this has been included in the paper. Councillor Bagwell highlighted the provision of parking for those accessing the building and in particular those stakeholders using the Coroner's Court.

Councillor Mark Anderson reported that he had been round the Civic Offices with the Coroner and relevant Officers looking at the work that would be undertaken and raised a number of questions including relating to fire escapes and the state of the building. He advised that he was informed that all necessary works would be carried out correctly. In respect of the issue raised by Councillor Le Poidevin on use of rooms Councillor Anderson reported appropriate arrangements would be in place. Councillor Anderson reported that Councillor Hadley was right, and the heating and insulation of the building needed to be looked at and he would talk to his colleagues on this issue.

Councillor Mellor in summing up reported that he had also raised concerns on the sustainability of the building. He highlighted that he was committed to the consultation via future places work and protecting the listed part of the building. In respect of the comment made by Councillor Butler concerning the plans he had emailed her earlier with a response from the relevant officer. The Leader referred to the arrangements for Mayor making and gave an assurance that this event was planned, and any works would start after that. He reported that some discussions were ongoing relating to the use of other venues by the Charter Trustees and that can be shared with the Mayor and Charter Trustees. The Leader indicated that the only difference in the paper was that the administration was not proposing to sell the building removing the word "disposal" and he was aware of the previous Leaders position. He agreed with the comments on parking and that there needed to be a solution.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendation arising from the Cabinet meeting on 27 October 2021 which was carried by a majority. Councillor Farquhar wished to be recorded as voting against the above decision.

8i - Cabinet 27 October 2021 - Minute No 73 - Futures Fund - Allocation for the Installation of a Core Gigabit Fibre Network

Councillor Broadhead, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Development, Growth & Regeneration presented the report on the Futures Fund – Allocation for the Installation of a Core Gigabit Fibre Network and outlined the recommendations

Councillor Cheryl Johnson left the meeting.

Councillor Broadhead reported that he was delighted that this was one of the first applications from the Futures Fund which was designed for both

capital and infrastructure projects. He explained that the proposal was to use £5m of the Futures Fund to create a 70.5 km core giga fibre network and referred to potential operational savings for the Council. Councillor Broadhead referred to the timing of the project which would enable the fibre to be laid when the roads were already being dug up for the transforming travel initiative. The report highlighted the first phase of the project with fibre optics but not all the other benefits that would be part of future phases. He also commented on the smart place and transformation programme, the additional savings in service areas, that other public sector and voluntary organisations could use this network in the future, the acceleration for the role of 5G and a whole host of other applications. Councillor Broadhead reported that phase one provided a clear case for cost savings and that was the purpose of the recommendations. Councillor Mellor seconded the proposals.

Councillors commented on the proposals including the financial implications of the Futures Fund which should not be used for short term vanity projects which do little or have no benefit for the residents of BCP, that the technology was out of date and that it was unacceptable expenditure. Councillor Hadley explained that this was a scheme that was fixing yesterday's problem. He reported that he was grateful to the Smart Places team for trying to delve deeper into the technical detail. Councillor Hadley reported that we were increasingly moving towards cloud-based use and the idea of a fibre network was outdated and therefore this investment was a difficult issue as he felt that the paper did not detail the financial implications adequately whilst there were some good elements there were enormous uncertainties and risks. Councillor Bartlett supported Councillor Hadley whilst he would like to support the paper, he had three concerns on the technology, that the costs were not clear for the total system and how the project was funded namely spending money from savings that had not yet been achieved. Councillor Brown raised questions on the financial stability of the project. Councillor Earl highlighted the importance of where the resources were being funded from and the proposal that they were paid back over 54 years. She also highlighted the potential views of residents on the project, the funding arrangements and whether this was a good use of resources for now and future generations.

Councillor Mellor, having reserved his right to speak, indicated that there was may be a lack of understanding on what the Futures Fund was and an explanation may be needed. He reported that it was not a normal business case proposition and explained that the Council wanted to deliver a world class location for the future and as such there were certain requirements. Councillor Mellor explained that the Council needs to go first, and this was the infrastructure that we need to provide to make BCP outstanding. Councillor Mellor reported on the Smarter Cities model and the ambition to transform the Council into the most exemplar authority in the country in terms of the ability to deliver modern services that improve lives and were cost effective whilst making year on year savings. The proposal was to invest a small fraction of those savings into this project.

Councillor Broadhead in summing up, explained that the Futures Fund was different highlighting that opportunities would be unlocked. He reported that the beauty of the Futures Fund was while we were digging up the road the

fibre can be laid which was investing in our future now. This was an infrastructure investment to access the cloud.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendations arising from the Cabinet meeting on 27 October 2021 which were carried by a majority.

Councillor Farquhar wished to be recorded as voting against the above decision.

8J - Cabinet 27 October 2021 - Minute No 76 - Children's Services Capital Programme

Councillor Nicola Greene, Cabinet Member for Council Priorities and Delivery presented the report on the Children's Services Capital Programme as set out on the agenda and outlined the recommendations. She explained that the report covered the progress of the Children's Services Capital Programme and set out the picture across the conurbation. Councillor Greene highlighted that the intention was to use the funds to provide the very best facilities for our children and young people in which they can enjoy and thrive. Members were informed that the focus for the future was in providing places for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). Councillor Greene reported on the ongoing focus of the written statement of action and the inquiry into inclusion which has been reported to Cabinet, Children's Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Council. Councillor Greene highlighted that the administration made a commitment to invest in these priorities by allocating an additional £10m to the regular types of Government Grants which the Council receives. She explained that further work was underway on the analysis of the needs of the current cohort of children and young people which informs spend. Councillor Greene reported that the decision taken by Cabinet under delegated authority agreed to bring forward a SEND Strategy as part of the wider children's services capital programme for Council to approve in February 2022. Councillor Greene referred Members to the recommendations before the Council which sought approval to pause the project to create a satellite for Winchelsea School at Somerford Primary School and the reason for that was that the original decision came before the visit of Ofsted in the Summer and therefore it was appropriate that the Council optimise resources in the light of the work which was following on from that inspection. Councillor Greene reported that she was very grateful to both the schools and the governors for their patience and absolute engagement in the process while we come up with the best solution which suits the requirements of the schools and the wider community. Councillor White seconded the proposals.

Councillors commented on the proposals including Councillor Flagg who reported that he had attended a meeting with senior teaching staff and a member of the Board of Governors who voiced their concern with regards to the process so far. He highlighted that we all know the difficulty that schools were under financially and their concern was that they had invested time and resources into the proposal. Councillor Flagg indicated that whilst he fully supported the recommendations in terms of the proposal, he would like to think that this Council would support the school over the next 12

months or so because of the financial input that they had already made to the Winchelsea School moving to Somerford Primary School.

Councillor Nicola Greene in summing up responded to Councillor Flagg and thanked him for his engagement and to Councillor McCormack for the open dialogue. She indicated that the point about the time resource was correct and this was about moving forward and achieving the best solution for the school and the wider community. Councillor Greene gave her commitment that she was pushing this project forward as quickly as possible

The Council then took a vote on the recommendations arising from the Cabinet meeting on 27 October 2021 which were carried by a majority.

8k - Cabinet 27 October 2021 - Minute No 81 - Acceptance and allocation of the Household Support Fund

Councillor Nicola Greene, Cabinet Member for Council Priorities and Delivery presented the report on the acceptance and allocation of the household support fund as set out on the agenda and outlined the recommendations. Councillor Greene reported on the approval sought to accept £2.56m on behalf of BCP communities from the Government. She explained that Government had allocated this sum to BCP Council under the Household Support Fund which followed on from last year's winter grant. Councillor Greene explained that the scope of this grant was considerably wider and at least 50% of the grant must be spent on families with children. The expectation was that the household support fund would be spent on families in most need and in particular on food, energy and water bills. It can also be used flexibly by households on related items eg assistance with school uniforms as parents were still dealing with some of the employment issues that had arisen from the pandemic. Councillor Greene reported that there was an expectation that the Council starts providing support from 6 October 2021 namely prior to half term until 31 March 2022. This was a significant improvement on last year's piecemeal allocation which allows households some certainty through the school holidays. Councillor Greene reported that the proposed model replicates the arrangements put in place last year and the very targeted approach aiming to reach those most in need but with a considerably increased allowance of £30 per child per school holiday week to be delivered by a flexible voucher. It was acknowledged that schools were at the frontline of identifying the families most in need largely but not exclusively on the basis of free school meals eligibility. Councillor Greene highlighted that Children's Centres and other organisations reach out into those communities in particular around pre-school children. Citizen's advice offer work with families in need who often have difficulties through food and fuel poverty. Members were advised that the Dorset Community Foundation reach elsewhere with its well-established grant giving function. Councillor Greene referred to the Access to Food Partnership setup under the previous administration which was well established highly regarded and received contributions from across the conurbation harnessing a wonderful community response and there was a further £60,000 to support their activities including food banks, community fridges and pantries. Robust and ongoing monitoring would ensure that those most in need were being reached with a budget provision for communications and Councillor Greene

encouraged all members to spread the message in their own wards. Councillor Kelly seconded the proposals and in doing so welcomed the Government Grant whilst highlighting that it was well documented that the Council always puts its communities at the heart of everything it does. Councillor Kelly indicated that there would be challenges to be faced by residents in the coming winter months and she outlined the key factors.

Councillor Earl indicated that she should declare an interest as she runs a community food project and works for Bournemouth Food Bank. She indicated that this funding had come from a Government that was struggling to justify cutting the £20 uplift on universal credit. She was pleased that this grant had been allocated but this was not the end for residents who were experiencing extreme poverty and in particular food insecurity. Councillor Jude Butt sought clarification on providing links on how the process would be put in place so that residents could be advised appropriately. Councillor Hadley highlighted the national shame of food poverty and that it was surprising that the allocation of funds to the Access to Food Partnership was so small. He also acknowledged the considerable support provided by volunteers in comparison to funding provided and asked if further funding could be provided. Councillor Brown referred to the recommendations and reported that the financial summary was in paragraph 26 and not paragraph 25.

Councillor Nicola Greene in summing up indicated that she had referred to paragraphs 25 and 26 and with Members' permission requested that for the record the minutes refer to paragraph 26. She reported that she was surprised in some respects on how the funding had been received. She highlighted that it was a significant fund which was targeted, flexible and aimed at BCP communities and we have doubled the amount that had previously been available to families with children via the national free school meals allocation to £30 per child per week of school holidays. In terms of Councillor Hadley's comment on the grant to the Access to Food Partnership being small Councillor Greene explained that the allocation was based on experience from last year and there was contingency to allow for flexibility. She referred to the immense support that food banks and community fridges were receiving and therefore £60,000 was proportionate to that. Councillor Greene highlighted that there would be an ongoing review and appropriate comms provided with a report back via Children's Overview and Scrutiny Committee as appropriate.

The Council then took a vote on the recommendations arising from the Cabinet meeting on 27 October 2021 subject to the reference to paragraph 26 which were carried unanimously.

123. Review of the political balance of the Council, the allocation of seats on Committees to each Political Group, appointment of Councillors to Committees and appointments to Outside bodies

The Leader of the Council presented a report on the above, 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 recommendations were seconded by Councillor Broadhead.

The Council was asked to consider and approve the review of the political balance of the Council, the allocation of seats on Committees to each Political Group, appointment of Councillors to Committees and appointments to Outside bodies following Councillors Steve Baron, Nigel Brooks, Daniel Butt and Toby Johnson joining the Conservative Group.

Councillors commented on the implications of the proposals. Councillor Burton referred to the changes to the Children's Services O&S Committee and thanked Councillors for their work whilst welcoming new Councillors to the Committee which he highlighted was non-political.

Councillor Broadhead referred to the allocation of seats where a group has the majority of seats on the Council which he indicated was consistent with relevant legislation.

Councillor Farquhar raised a point of order as he took offence to the frivolity of political point scoring, the reference to the two by elections and how they had occurred, and he invited the Member to retract his remark. Councillor Broadhead clarified his comment.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the revised political balance of the Council, as set out in Table 1 of this report be approved;**
- (b) the allocation of seats to each political group, as set out in Table 2, be approved;**
- (c) the appointment of Councillors to Committees and Boards, taking account of the membership as detailed in Table 3, be approved;**
- (d) the allocation of seats to each political group on the outside bodies as detailed in Table 4 be approved and the Group Leaders advise the proper officer of their representatives; and**
- (e) Subject to (c) and (d) above the Council approves the appointment of unaligned Members to Committees, Boards and Outside bodies as follows:**

Planning Committee – Councillor Stephen Bartlett

Licensing Committee – Councillor Julie Bagwell

Overview and Scrutiny Board – Councillor Stephen Bartlett

**Health and Adult Social Care Overview and Scrutiny Committee
– Councillor Diana Butler**

**Lower Central Gardens Trust Board – Councillor Stephen
Bartlett**

Voting: carried by a majority.

124. City Status Application Request from the Charter Trustees for Bournemouth

The Chairman reminded Members to consider the statement made by Mr McKinstry earlier in the meeting on this issue

Councillor Kelsey presented a report, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member on the city status application request from the Charter Trustees for Bournemouth a copy of which appears as Appendix 'B' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

Councillor Broadhead in seconding the recommendation outlined the process whilst highlighting that there was no proposal to submit a Council wide bid. The proposal was to receive the decisions from the three towns and passport upwards as appropriate. He explained that it was not the role of the Council, in his view, to consider the decisions that have been taken. He reported that Christchurch Town Councillors and Poole Charter Trustees had said no but the Bournemouth Charter Trustees had agreed to the submission of a bid. Councillor Broadhead reported that the city status was a name, and the application process did not require any intensive resource or extra funding.

The Government had announced that Her Majesty The Queen would award new Civic Honours in recognition of her Platinum Jubilee. This had resulted in a competition for places to be awarded city status.

In recognition of this opportunity the Leader wrote to the Mayors of Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch to ask whether they would want their area to bid for City Status and also sought views from the parish councils. The Charter Trustees for Bournemouth indicated that they would like to take up this opportunity.

Applications for city status must be submitted by an upper tier local authority, so in this case the application would need to be submitted by BCP Council on behalf of the Charter Trustees for Bournemouth.

Councillors commented on the proposals including expressing the views of Christchurch Town Council and all the Parish Councils in the area who had voted against submitting a bid for city status, the impact on the dynamics of BCP Council if one town becomes a city and the implication for cross boundary wards and residents. Councillor Hadley reported that he disagreed with the sentiments in the Leader's letter where Dorchester has a Town Council with delegated powers as the formation of BCP Council left only the ceremonial and historical vestiges of the Towns by the Charter Trustees it did not leave the Towns with sovereign powers as previously described. He emphasised that having merged Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole the implications of one town gaining city status by default demotes the other two towns precisely the outcome which Christchurch residents overwhelmingly rejected and those of Bournemouth and Poole were not asked. He referred to the statement from Alex McKinstry indicating that the residents of Bournemouth had not been consulted on the proposal. Councillor Hadley also reported that many people had moved to the area to get away from cities. He referred to the pressure that staff were under in supporting the transformation programme and the submission of a city status bid was a diversion of effort which was not needed. Councillor Stribley clarified the position on boundaries. Councillor Farr highlighted the opportunity to support the decision taken by the Charter Trustees. Councillor Mike Greene indicated that he was not in favour of Bournemouth bidding for city status in his role as a Charter Trustees but as a BCP Councillor he believed that each of the Towns should have the right to

adjust what was their civic status. He highlighted that when BCP Council was set up it was agreed that the Civic Status should remain with the constituent towns. Councillor Phipps expressed her surprise that this had gone down to the Mayors, highlighting that only the Mayor of Christchurch was originally asked until it was pointed out that there were Parish Councils which the Mayor of Christchurch did not represent. Councillor Phipps highlighted that surely residents should know the benefits or disbenefits of city status and what it means to be a city. She felt that this had not been undertaken in the right way. Councillor Rigby referred to the Bournemouth Charter Trustees debate on the issue and at the end of it having been unsure he chose to vote for the bid to be submitted. He referred to his recent experience in staying in Stirling, which was a city he outlined the benefits, and that everyone took pride in their location and that was what he wanted to see for Bournemouth to become a green city for the future.

Councillor Kelsey in summing up responded to the issues raised and highlighted that in his opinion Bournemouth deserves to be a city.

RESOLVED that Council approve the submission of an application for city status on behalf of the town of Bournemouth and delegate the submission of the bid to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader.

Voting: For – 37, Against – 8, Abstentions – 16

Councillor Farquhar wished to be recorded as abstaining from the decision.

Councillor Andrews left at 11.30 pm

Councillor Bagwell left at 11.35 pm

Councillor Howell left at 11.50 pm

125. Chief Officer Appointments for BCP Council

The Leader of the Council presented a report on Chief Officer Appointments for BCP Council, a copy of which had been circulated to each Member and a copy of which appears as Appendix 'C' to these Minutes in the Minute Book.

This report invited the Council to approve new appointments to Chief Officer posts in accordance with the Council's Constitution and statutory requirements.

Councillor Mellor reported that Kate Ryan, Chief Operations Officer who had been a fantastic servant for Borough of Poole Council for a number of years, had delivered a safe landing in her role for BCP Council and in her current role would be leaving the Council. He highlighted that Kate had been an exemplar officer and congratulated her on her new role as Chief Executive at New Forest District Council. He formally wished to place on record the thanks of the Chamber to Kate for her service to both Borough of Poole Council and BCP Council.

Members were advised of the recruitment process and the calibre of the candidates for both the Chief Operations Officer and Corporate Director of Children's Services. Councillor Mellor reported that the Panel was able to unanimously agree cross party with the preferred candidates for both roles

that were selected. He also highlighted that the report included a recommendation for Kelly Ansell to act up in the position of Chief Operations Officer until Jess Gibbons can commence her employment. Councillor Nicola Greene seconded the recommendations and in doing so thanked Councillors Moore, Bartlett and Slade for their contribution to the recruitment process.

Councillor Evans referred to senior officers leaving the Council. She indicated that there had been comments on the calibre of candidates and asked if any members of the recruitment panel would comment on the number of candidates and why this was such a small amount for a large authority.

Councillor Wilson reported that he was involved in the early part of the process and felt that the calibre of candidates was very good. He wanted to place on record his thanks to Kate Ryan as he had started very inexperienced in his role as a portfolio holder, and he felt that she had not only made him a better portfolio holder but also a better person. He referred to personal issues that he had been dealing with which Kate had supported him with.

Councillor Moore reported that she was a member of the interview panel for the Director of Children's Services, and she was happy to support the appointment of Cathi who was experienced and well qualified. In addition, she felt it would be good for everyone to have a permanent Director. Councillor Hadley echoed the comments from the Leader and other Members about Kate Ryan who would be an enormous loss to the authority, and he wished her well. He also reported that he was no relation, that he was aware of, to Cathi Hadley.

Councillor Mellor in summing up referred to the reference made to senior officers leaving the Council. He emphasised that the staff movement in and out of the authority was normal. Councillor Mellor reported that there were 16 people on the long list for the Chief Operations Officer reduced to 6 and 4 were interviewed which was a normal process.

RESOLVED that Council approve the following appointments in accordance with the requirements of the BCP Constitution:-

- **Cathi Hadley is appointed to the post of Corporate Director of Children's Services.**
- **Jess Gibbons is appointed as Chief Operations Officer.**
- **Kelly Ansell, Director of Communities is appointed to act up in the position of Chief Operations Officer until Jess Gibbons can commence her employment with BCP Council.**

Voting: Unanimous

126. Notice of Motions in accordance with Procedure Rule 12

There were no motions submitted for this meeting.

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

There were no urgent decisions taken that were required to be reported.

Date of the Next Council meeting

RESOLVED that the next Council meeting scheduled for 4 January 2022 be rescheduled and held on 11 January 2022 at 7 pm

Voting: Agreed

Note - it was acknowledged that this will require the Standards Committee scheduled on 11 January 2022 at 6 pm to be rearranged to an alternative date which the Chairman has already acknowledged.

The meeting ended at 11.59 pm

CHAIRMAN