

**Minutes of the Community, Environment and Partnerships Committee meeting held on Wednesday, 16 December 2020 in Virtual Meeting - Zoom Webinar, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council at 6.30 pm**

**Members of the Community, Environment and Partnerships Committee in attendance:** Councillor P Gaskell (Chair), Councillor K Carruthers (Vice-Chair), Councillor J Cousens, Councillor R Hickling, Councillor T Jones, Councillor C Kinnear, Councillor S Mahaffey, Councillor C Regan, Councillor K Taylor, Councillor I Tilbury and Councillor J Vaux

**29/20 Apologies for absence and substitutions**

Councillor Still was replaced by Councillor Edwards.

**30/20 Declarations of interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**31/20 Urgent matters**

There were no urgent matters.

**32/20 Minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2020**

The minutes of the meeting held on the 21 October 2020 were confirmed as a correct record.

**33/20 Modernising our Hospitals and Health Services - Presentation by Hampshire Together**

The Head of Borough Development and Implementation introduced the briefing note which explained that the Government had awarded Hampshire Hospitals Foundation Trust funding in order to develop a business case for a new hospital to serve north and mid-Hampshire. He further advised that the Hampshire Together partnership had been formed to take this work forward.

The Chair then welcomed Shirlene Oh, Matt Nisbet, Elliot Nichols and John Boyman from Hampshire Together to the meeting who then gave a presentation to the Committee.

The Committee discussed the presentation and made the following comments:

- It was important that there was a joined up approach with the Manydown development. The partnership advised that they had been and would continue to work closely with the council to align the programme with the Councils vision.
- The work was positive but it was felt that a number of GP surgeries within the borough were in the wrong place for example not easy to access via public

transport and questioned whether any work had been carried out to resolve the issue. The partnership responded that the Clinical Commissioning Group had carried out a review and that they were aware that some locations had particular issues but that they would like to hear any further feedback that members had received from residents. The programme didn't contain any capital funding for GP estate but it was an issue that they were reviewing.

- Suggested that a representative from CCG would attend the meeting in January to discuss primary care but advised that this would be confirmed after the meeting
- Queried whether the consultation period would be extended due to Covid-19. The partnership advised that initial public engagement took place in the summer and worked well.
- In response to questions, the partnership advised that they were planning services not buildings and that centralising some services improved the quality of the care that people received and their outcomes.
- It was important to continue to have local cancer services available and concern was expressed that Basingstoke would lose valued services. The Partnership advised that the intention was to have a cancer treatment centre as part of the new acute hospital.
- Mental health was integral to physical health and questioned whether there would be any consultation on how mental health services would run. The partnership explained that it was out of the scope of the project but there had been conversations regarding the provision of services in the proposed options.
- Some members felt that the remote services in place worked well and suited those who usually had to travel to other areas outside of the borough for treatment.
- It was raised that there needed to be a mix of how residents could access services such as online or in person as a lot of elderly residents struggled with digital services and there was also a need to actually be seen in person for some conditions.

**Resolved:** The Committee thanks the Hampshire Together partnership for their presentation.

#### 34/20 **Update Briefing Note - Ice Rink**

The Chair introduced the report which provided the Committee with an update on the Ice Rink.

The Chair advised the Committee that due to an error, the report had been incorrectly classified as exempt under item 4 when it should have been classified under item 3 (commercially sensitive).

The Chair invited Sally Cashman to address the Committee, her comments included:

- The Basingstoke Bison played in the National Ice Hockey League, the leagues current plan was to run a 16 week season from the end of January. Therefore, any work to refurbish the rink could not begin until the end of May.
- If the repair work took between 6 and 8 months, the earliest that the rink could reopen is January 2022.
- Basingstoke Junior Ice Hockey Club would not be accepted to compete in the national league structure for the 21/22 season as it would have insufficient ice time to complete the majority of its fixtures.
- Many of its members were part of Regional and National Elite pathways and would have to leave to join other clubs in order to continue in those pathways. If the players were lost, the 5 junior teams would be uncompetitive and not financially viable leading to the club having to fold, ending 30 years of youth development in Basingstoke. There were also not enough spaces at the nearest teams to absorb all the 120 members the majority would leave the sport.
- The loss of ice would also affect survival of the 5 recreational hockey teams and 4 synchronized skating teams who currently trained at the rink, they had also taken many years to grow and develop to the numbers that they had now.
- Without continuity of ice, over 30 years of ice sport development in Basingstoke would end.
- Would the Council support and discuss with Planet Ice the building of a short-term temporary rink such as the one Planet Ice installed for Slough Borough Council when the Council refurbished Slough Ice rink.

The Chair invited Heath Rhodes to address the Committee, his comments included:

- Questioned whether the Committee were aware of the Scope of Works documents submitted to the Council on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2020.
- A request for a funding contribution on the works had also been submitted to the Council on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2020.
- The timeframes for each element of the renovation in the Scope of Works and the overall duration that the full scope of works would take was sent to the Council on 20<sup>th</sup> November/2020.
- The quote from Ice-Tech was sent in July 2020 with options on the same scope of work and an estimate and a further document from IPW dated 19/08/2020 offering various funding options as well as a figure on two types of

new build had been circulated

- The rink was currently functional for another ice hockey season.

Officers responded to the questions raised and explained that building a temporary rink had been considered and discounted previously on the basis that Planet Ice had a temporary rink available to be redeployed but it was now unavailable.

The Officers also advised that the other reports mentioned were in draft form and therefore could not be shared.

In response to a supplementary question, The Interim Executive Director of Borough development advised that the Ice Users forum had written to all members of CEP with an indicative proposal for a smaller temporary rink similar to that used in Slough but that the Council needed to receive more information to allow the issue to be discussed further with the Committee and Portfolio Holder.

The Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Property advised that on the 7<sup>th</sup> December he had met virtually with Planet Ice and Standard Securities and discussed their proposal detailed in the confidential report. He further advised that they had also talked about a temporary rink similar to the Slough option but there was a question as to how viable it would be.

A question was asked in relation to a smaller temporary rink and whether potential sites should be reconsidered. The Interim Executive Director of Brough Development advised that they would need to respond after the meeting.

The committee resolved that, due to the confidential nature of the information to be discussed, the committee passed a resolution that, by virtue of paragraphs 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting.

On resumption of the meeting the Chair confirmed that members had discussed the confidential report at length.

**Resolved:** The Committee notes the report.

## 35/20 **Community Environment and Partnerships work programme**

The Chair introduced the work programme and gave a brief overview of the items that would be included on the agenda for the upcoming meetings.

The Chair then read out an update on the football club and advised that this would be circulated to the Committee after the meeting.

In response to a work programme suggestion form submitted by Councillor K Taylor and raised at the previous meeting the Chair read out a detailed statement from the Portfolio Holder which advised that she had recommended that the work required to calculate the numbers requested be undertaken in February and brought back to committee in March 2021, as an update once the Christmas and New Year period

had passed.

Councillor Taylor expressed disappointment that she had put forward a request to review the section of the policy for its credibility with residents, its efficiency and effectiveness and it had not been received. She further stated that she would like it to form part of the work programme as she had raised specific points that needed to be addressed and she felt that she had been prevented from putting a motion to Council instead.

Councillor Taylor advised that she wanted the Committee to undertake a review of the policy and how it worked for the residents and that in her submitted form she had set out the information and data that the Committee would require in order to undertake the review and requested the portfolio holder's attendance at the meeting.

Some members felt that the response may have been misinterpreted as the statement seemed to have been produced as an update and not an end report.

The Chair requested that a report on the matter be considered at a future Committee meeting.

The Chair advised that he would fill out a work programme suggestion form on rural policing.

In relation to the task and finish groups, members suggested that the CCG task and finish group be reframed and that Officers had approached the portfolio holder for an update on when the recycling task and finish group could continue but they had not yet received a response.

The meeting ended at 9.44 pm.

**Chairman**