

**A MEETING OF THE POLICY AND ORGANISATION BOARD  
WAS HELD ON 30 MAY 2022**

Councillors Burgess, Chegwyn, Hylands, Marshall, Pepper, Philpott and Raffaelli

PART II

**9. LEVELLING UP PROCUREMENT**

Consideration was given to a report of the Head of Procurement, and the Assistant Chief Executive requesting that consideration be given to an extension of the current contract that has been awarded to AECOM to include preparing additional work for the Council's Round 2 levelling up bid and the UK Shared Prosperity Fund Investment plan bid.

Members recognised the time pressures associated with the levelling up bid and advised that it was important that Gosport be considered for levelling up funding after missing out in previous rounds.

The Board was advised that there would not be time to bring the bid back to the Board but that a MIB would be provided.

Members welcomed the opportunities that would be given and reiterated the importance of Gosport receiving funding.

It was recognised and agreed that the leaders of the political Groups should be made aware of any bid or additional work.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Board approves the procurement approach as set out within this report to extend the current AECOM contract to include additional work on the Levelling Up Fund Round 2 bid and the UK Shared Prosperity Fund Investment plan bid and delegates authority to the Assistant Chief Executive and Head of Procurement in consultation with the Borough Solicitor and Chairman of the Policy & Organisation Board and Leaders of the opposition to approve any additional works and services in respect of these bids

**10. BEACH ROAD CAR PARK COMMUNITY TRIGGER**

Consideration was given to a report of the Head of Streetscene updating the Board on the progress of the Community Trigger Action Plan for Beach Road Car Park, in respect of actions that the Council is responsible for.

The Board was advised that an update had been requested as a result of the spending of money on speed bumps and of the shrubs planted dying off.

The Board requested information as to whether there was continued Anti-Social Behaviour at the site and questioned the previous decision. It was acknowledged that the option to

close the car park had not been taken up but questioned the costings that had been provided to do so. The suggestion of exit only ramps was proposed as it would be less cost than the closures. Concern was expressed that there was less CCTV coverage now and questioned whether uniformed patrols were still being undertaken.

A Members advised the Board that there was and that the speed bumps in the car park were not part of the Community Trigger but had been installed as part of safety measures to protect users of the splash park.

Members expressed concern that the residents' concerns had not properly been addressed through the actioning of the community trigger. The Board was advised that noise monitoring recording had been offered but declined and that it had been requested that any Anti Social Behaviour be reported to the Police.

Members expressed concern that it was important that the residents' concerns were taken seriously. Members wanted to ensure that the Community Trigger was properly executed and that it was kept under review and the process amended if appropriate. Members hoped that the local residents would be met with to ensure concerns were considered.

Members advised that they wished to see a copy of the community trigger and of its process and to see the policy for Community Triggers.

RESOLVED: That the Board reviews the progress updates outlined in this report and approves the continuation of uniformed operations and discontinuation of improved lighting, CCTV and hedge planting (referred to in paragraphs 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8 of the report).

## **11. ANY OTHER ITEMS**

The Board was advised that there were two additional items for consideration. These items had not been available at the publication of the agenda.

RESOLVED: That in order to progress swiftly, reports regarding assets of Community Value and the Commemorative Bench Seat Policy be considered by the Board.

## **12. COMMEMORATIVE BENCH SEAT POLICY**

Consideration was given to a report by the Head of Streetscene seeking approval for the adoption of the amended Commemorative Bench Seat Policy.

The overall objective of the policy is to retain a consistent approach to the management of the commemorative bench seats in the Borough.

Members expressed how they felt that the previous policy had not been appropriate and that the loss of benches for families was deeply distressing. It was felt that if a commemoration was on a bench, it should remain. Members felt that if a bench was irreparable then it would be time for it to be replaced, however it was felt that benches could last longer than 10 years and there was proof of this on benches already in situ.

Members advised that the handling of commemorative benches should be sensitive to those that were making requests for them as they were requested in sad circumstances.

Members accepted that the placing of flowers and other such commemorations was difficult as they were often left to disintegrate and were unsightly.

It was suggested that investigations be made into the provision of a memory wall to allow all those that wished loved ones to be recognised to do so.

Members recognised that it was a sensitive subject and there was a balance between available memorial space and allowing all those that wished to remember loved ones there to do so.

The Board was advised that the previous policy had been presented as if there had been no policy for benches in place and that coupled with a large number of requests outstanding for benches.

Members debated the restriction of 10 years on benches and it was felt that it was difficult to set a time limit as to when benches would reach the end of their useful lives.

Concern was also expressed about how bench holders may not be contactable by the Council and the difficulties this may present.

Members felt that 10 years was not sufficient time for a bench to be in situ and maintained, the Board was advised that the previous policy did not state that the bench would be removed after 10 years, but that it not be maintained and replaced after this point should it be deemed faulty.

The Board was advised that the Friends of Stokes Bay had suggested there was the levels of benches at the beach was too many. Some Members felt that it was not for the Friends of Stokes Bay to determine how many benches were at the beach.

Members advised that all residents of the Borough benefited from and requested benches at the beaches, not just those in Anglesey and Alverstoke.

Members felt it was important that that local groups were consulted on such proposals as they were a vital part of the community.

**RESOLVED:** That the Board approves the amended Commemorative Bench Seat Policy and continue to provide delegated authority to the Head of Streetscene in conjunction with the Chairman of the Policy and Organisation Board to:-

- 1 Cease the provision of bench seats where sites are deemed exhausted or unsuitable.
- 2 Determine fees based on supply, installation and maintenance costs each financial year.
- 3 Manage the service provision in accordance with the policy.

### **13. ASSETS OF COMMUNITY VALUE**

Consideration was given to a report of the Borough Solicitor requesting that consideration be given an application received to register the former Criterion, Forton Road, the Junction Tavern, Whitworth Road and The Queen's Hotel, as an Asset of Community Value.

A Member advised that they had viewed inside the Criterion and to their surprise many of the original features still remained.

There had been a large impressive theatre and cinema in the building previously. It was an important valuable building and a heritage asset.

The Board was advised that it was an early 20<sup>th</sup> Century Building and later been converted to a bingo hall, which had operated until 2020. The Board was advised that a recent inspection had indicated that the building was in surprisingly good condition and that the original balcony remained, along with the original staircase, floor, light fittings and port holes.

The building looked not to have any water damage and had been bought recently for £400,000. It was acknowledged that the site was a difficult one, and was in effect a traffic island which would make residential development difficult.

The Board was advised that an application to make the building an asset of Community value would provide some breathing space for it, to allow further options to be considered as the Borough was crying out for arts provision.

The Board was advised that it was important to recognise heritage sites and that it would be a lost opportunity should another valuable heritage asset be lost.

The Board was advised that status as an Asset of Community Value did not mean that the Council could purchase the building, but allowed for a 6 week period for community groups to declare an interest in the building and establish proposals for it.

The Council would not be eligible to be an interested party in the building as an asset of community value.

Members welcomed the proposal and hoped that a collaborative approach to protecting the building would be taken.

Member were advised that Assets of Community Value were introduced as part of the Localism Act and that the recommendation was that the Board gave consideration as to whether or not to accept the proposal.

Members felt the venue could be utilised as an arts venue, and that there had been some interest from the St Vincent Cinema.

It was reiterated that making the building an ACV would not save it, merely allow interested parties to express interest in it and it was acknowledged that conversations would need to take place with the owner.

The Board was advised that the Queens Hotel had been managed by the same person since 1983 and it was now believed that the owners of the building wished to sell it. It was acknowledged that the building was dated but the value of the building as a community asset should not go unnoticed and members recognised that the application, if approved, would provide some breathing space.

Policy and Organisation Board  
30 May 2022

Members were advised that the Junction Tavern had previously been designated as an asset of Community Value previously and that this was to reinstate it as one.

The Board was advised that any change of use of planning application for any of the proposals would be for the Regulatory Board to consider.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Board designate The Criterion, Forton Road, Junction Tavern in Leesland Road, and the Queens Hotel in Queen's Road as Assets of Community Value

**CHAIRMAN**

Concluded at 8.20 pm

**A MEETING OF THE POLICY AND ORGANISATION BOARD  
WAS HELD ON 13 JULY 2022**

Councillors Burgess, Chegwyn, Hylands, Marshall, Pepper, Philpott and Raffaelli

PART II MINUTES

**20. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 4 (LTP4) CONSULTATION GBC RESPONSE**

Consideration was given to a report of the Traffic and Transport Manager setting out details of Hampshire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) consultation and the Borough Council's formal response.

The Board was advised that the County Council no longer saw the LTP3 as fit for purpose so were making transport plans for the next 20 years.

It was advised that to achieve the aspirations of the plan would be a great challenge.

The Board was advised that bus patronage had not returned to its previous level following the pandemic and that new routes would be unlikely unless patronage number increased. Buses were no longer carrying no passengers, but numbers were still down and there were outreach areas such as Priddys Hard, Royal Clarence that needed a service.

It was acknowledged that conversations had taken place with the First Bus and pressure would need to be maintained to ensure subsidised services such as 11 continued.

Members recognised that some previous bus users were still working from home and that many with the option of using a car had chosen to continue to do so.

A Members requested an update on the instillation of Electric Vehicle Charging points, the Board was advised that this would be investigated and reported back. Members recognised the change to electric vehicles was going to prove to be a challenge for those without off street parking. Members recognised that petrol cars would cease to be sold in 2030 and that the infrastructure surrounding this was significant.

Members recognised that the consultation period had been extended, and that it had been an odd time to hold the consultation over the election period.

Members also acknowledged that there was no bus service to Brockhurst Gate anymore and that there was a risk that Gosport could be left with just Eclipse buses. It was acknowledged that these were successful, but only if you lived in close proximity to them.

It was acknowledged that there needed to be a drive not to use cars, but the services available had to be convenient for this to happen.

Members recognised that the proposed plan was important but stressed the importance of action being taken rather than simply discussions being held. It was also recognised that working from home was actually the most environmentally friendly way to reduce carbon emissions.

RESOLVED THAT:

- i) The Council Supports and welcomes the LTP4 in order to improve transport within Hampshire.
- i) Delegates authority to the Traffic and Transport manager to submit the contents of this report and Appended LTP4 Response Form as the Borough Council's formal response to Hampshire County Council's LTP4 Consultation.

**21. CCTV MAINTENANCE CONTRACT EXTENSION**

Consideration was given to a report of the Head of Corporate Policy and Community Safety seeking approval to extend the CCTV Maintenance Contract for an additional 12 months.

Members were advised that the service provided by the contractors was good and that this was a sensible step within the existing contract.

RESOLVED: That the Board approves the extension of the CCTV Maintenance Contract for an additional 12 months to apply from December 2022 until December 2023.

**22. WORK OF CLIMATE CHANGE BOARD TASK & FINISH GROUP ON BOARD PAPER USAGE**

Consideration was given to a report of the Head of Corporate Policy and Community Safety reporting back to the Board on the activities of the Task & Finish group on Board paper usage, which was established by the Climate Change Board.

The Board was advised that it was hoped in the long term that the proposal could be an opt in choice rather than an opt out.

Members recognised that there had been a reduction in paper as a result of the reduction in the number of Councillors and the number of Boards and accepted that the Council would never be completely paper free.

Members recognised that there were some Councillors who would prefer paper agendas and that large documents led to a lot of screen time.

Members requested clarification as to what exactly was being saved in terms of carbon by opting out of paper agendas.

In addition a Member requested confirmation that they could access their annotated notes on agendas, as they disappeared. It was accepted that they could be, but also that any saved annotations would fall under the remit of a subject access request if one was made.

Members were advised that the paper used was not recycled, but was FSC certified.

RESOLVED: That the Board notes the issues and approach considered by the Task & Finish Group on Board paper usage, as set out in this report, and gives delegated authority to the Borough Solicitor and Monitoring Officer to:

- i) alter and formalise processes as required to allow Members to opt out of receiving paper copies of Board papers;
- ii) procure any training required on an ongoing basis to support Members in using Modern.Gov to access Board papers.

### **23. ANY OTHER ITEMS**

There were none.

### **24. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED: That the press and public be excluded from the meeting as under Paragraph no. 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act: The report contains details of the financial affairs of the Council and a third party at a time when contract documents are not finally concluded. Completion of the contract could be prejudiced if this information was made public, which may have an adverse impact on the contract arrangements to the detriment of the Council's social housing residents. Therefore, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

### **25. CHESTER COURT (PHASE 1) CONTRACT AWARD APPROVAL**

Consideration was given to an exempt report of the Head of Housing to inform members of the results of the tender process to procure improvement works to the Housing Revenue Account assets at Chester Court, Jamaica Place, Gosport.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations in the report be approved.

**CHAIRMAN**

Concluded at 7.03 pm