
RUSHMOOR STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

Notes of a meeting held on Tuesday, 4th October 2005 at the Rushmoor Borough Council Offices at 4.00 pm.

Present:

Aldershot Garrison	Colonel Nigel Josling OBE Garrison Commander
Basingstoke Canal Authority	(representative to be appointed)
Blackwater Valley and Hart Primary Care Trust	Dr Olufemi Oduneye Director of Public Health
Enterprise First	Mr John Mitchell (Vice-Chairman) Chief Executive
Farnborough College of Technology	Mrs Christine Davis Principal
Guildford Diocese	Reverend Father Keith Hodges
Hampshire County Council	a County Councillor Roy Perry Executive Member for Community Development County Councillor Rod Baulk
North East Hampshire Police Division	Superintendent Joe Apps
North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Mr John Harrocks Chief Executive
Pavilion Housing Association	Mr Pat Shelley Operations Director
Rushmoor Borough Council	Councillor Peter Moyle (Chairman) Leader Mr Andrew Lloyd Chief Executive
Rushmoor Citizens' Advice Bureaux	Ms Alex Hughes District Manager

Rushmoor Voluntary Services a Ms Sally Saunderson
Chief Executive

Parity for Disability a Ms Alison Cooper

In attendance:

Hampshire County Council Mr Terry Rath
Education Office

Rushmoor Borough Council Miss Annie Denton
Partnership Officer

Mrs Kathy Flatt
Democratic Services Officer

Mr Les Murrell
Strategies Co-ordinator (Sustainability)

Mr Tim Richings
Principal Planning Officer

Apologies for absence had been received on behalf of County Councillor Roy Perry (Hampshire County Council), Inspector Steve Wallace (North East Hampshire Police Community Safety Team), Ms Sally Saunderson (Rushmoor Voluntary Services), Ms Alison Cooper (Parity for Disability), ADO Paul Cater (Hampshire Fire and Rescue Services), Mr David Hobbs (Government Office for the South East) and Mr Andrew Colver (Rushmoor Borough Council).

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN –

Councillor Peter Moyle was elected Chairman of the Partnership.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN –

Mr John Mitchell was elected Vice-Chairman of the Partnership.

3. NOTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING –

The Partnership confirmed the notes of the meeting held on 14th July, 2005, following the addition of Mr Terry Rath (Hampshire County Council) to those present.

4. RUSHMOOR HOUSING MARKET ASSESSMENT –

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Christopher Cobbold, Director of DTZ Piedad Consulting, who had been invited to give an overview of the Rushmoor Housing Market Assessment.

Mr Cobbold was of the opinion that housing policy was a key means by which the long-term future of Rushmoor and the Blackwater Valley could be affected. By means of background, Mr Cobbold explained that the Blackwater Valley had a population of 300,000, which made the area bigger than Milton Keynes and Norwich. Substantially an urban area, the Blackwater Valley had a single housing market and single labour market with commuting patterns concentrated in the Blackwater Valley area. Over the previous 15-20 years, the key factor that had integrated the area of

the Blackwater Valley had been its economic success. The area had 150,000 jobs and the Partnership was advised that output growth had been faster than the south-east, Hampshire and Surrey. The Blackwater Valley was an area of high employment and high wages, with wages higher than Hampshire and the south-east as a whole.

Rushmoor was situated at the heart of the Blackwater Valley and had grown rapidly since 1996, at a faster rate than the south-east as a whole. The average resident's wages were below the south-east average and productivity in Rushmoor was lower than the Blackwater Valley and the south-east as a whole. Rushmoor had a large population with smaller dwellings and had a larger than average household. There was a pattern of disadvantage in Rushmoor with areas of deprivation, less skilled residents than other areas of Hampshire and Surrey and with a relative weakness in education attainment (particularly at secondary school level).

Mr Cobbold explained that the current position had arisen out of the historic stock of housing in the Borough. There was a high proportion of older, smaller dwellings which were therefore more affordable to purchase. This attracted first-time buyers and lower income purchasers into the area – an in-migration of lower income groups. It could be said that this had a knock-on effect on schools, town centres and neighbourhoods with the effect of deterring high-income groups from purchasing properties in the area and fostering an out-migration of households who wanted (and were able to afford) more space. New developments reflected the predominant current demand which reinforced the bias of housing stock to smaller, cheaper properties in Rushmoor and up-market housing in surrounding areas in the Blackwater Valley.

The high proportion of social housing dwellings (more than in surrounding areas) in Rushmoor made it less attractive for tenants to pursue the right to buy. There was a greater chance of getting social housing in Rushmoor, which encouraged low income households to register for housing in the Borough. This resulted in longer waiting lists and potentially more demand. Rushmoor was a lower cost area for the development of social housing and, therefore, led to more being developed.

Mr Cobbold advised that thought needed to be given to where the Borough wanted to be in terms of economy, equity and the environment. It was his belief that housing policy was central to all three areas. The key housing issues to be examined included how much needed to be developed, what balance was needed to be achieved between market housing and subsidised housing and what size and type of new dwellings were required. There had been a trend over the last five years towards one and two bedroom housing provision. It was felt that the type of housing should depend on market demand, nature and location of the site and long term policy objectives in terms of economic development, town centre regeneration, social cohesion and sustainability. There was a need to maintain variety and choice within the Borough. It was also considered that it would be good for Rushmoor if more of the people who worked in the Borough actually lived in the Borough, principally through the provision of larger family housing. That would have benefits in terms of town centre regeneration (town centre offer) and would play a part in the process of helping to improve educational attainment in the area.

In conclusion, Mr Cobbold was of the opinion that housing choice was a strategic decision because of the links to economic and social strategies and quality of life issues. Long-term housing policy was probably going to be the key means by which influence could be brought to bear on what sort of place Rushmoor would be in the future.

During discussion, views were expressed about the important links between housing and skills mis-match and educational attainment in the Borough. A good social mix would give rise to benefits for all sectors of the community, although the Partnership was cautioned about assuming there was a link between social/economic background and educational performance. It was also felt that smaller properties did not necessarily indicate poverty.

The Partnership was advised that the housing market assessment would be used to develop and draft Local Development Framework policies, on which the Partnership would be consulted over the coming months. Copies of the final Housing Market Assessment report were available from Mr Tim Richings, Principal Planning Officer, Planning Services at Rushmoor Borough Council.

Mr Cobbold was thanked for his interesting and informative presentation.

Action/Decision	Who	When
The Partnership noted the presentation.	All	---

5. HAMPSHIRE LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT –

Mr Andrew Lloyd gave an update on the current situation with regard to the Hampshire Local Area Agreement (LAA). The Hampshire Strategic Partnership would have a key role in ensuring that the LAA supported the Hampshire Community Strategy and in turn those of the 11 Local Strategic Partnerships across the County. Hampshire County Council would be the financially accountable body for the LAA. The Partnership noted that the overall governance arrangements for the LAA had been developed and included:

- **Hampshire Strategic Partnership Steering Group** – to oversee the governance arrangements for the LAA, scrutinise the LAA and agree the LAA on behalf of the broad partnership.
- **LAA Member Board** – to be the local accountable and decision making body for the delivery of the LAA objectives.
- **LAA Executive (Officer)** – to agree the project plan and oversee the preparation of the LAA, ensure cross-block linkages, manage performance relating to LAA outcomes.
- **Block Sponsors** – to secure high level agreement with partners in the relevant elements of the LAA.
- **Block Project Lead Officers** - to develop the block element of the LAA in accordance with the Project Plan and process guide to be agreed by the Executive.
- **LAA Co-ordinating Team** – to ensure that the overall LAA process is managed to the satisfaction of partners.

Based on feedback received from a pre-consultation event, an initial list of cross-cutting priority areas for action had been drafted, including:

- Address substance misuse (drugs and alcohol)
- Improve educational achievement

- Promote inclusive leisure and cultural opportunities and positive activity for young people
- Improve the co-ordination of transport and access to services across the County
- Delivering first class support for business and planning for workforce development needs across Hampshire
- Improve access to housing and accommodation
- Tackle crime and anti-social behaviour
- Promote and improve the safety, health and wellbeing of all residents in Hampshire, with a particular focus on reducing smoking and obesity and promoting physical activity
- Empower local people to have a greater voice and influence over local decision making and the delivery of services
- Establish a Hampshire Observatory
- Protect Hampshire's natural resources

A consultation paper had been issued on the draft framework, headline outcomes and cross-cutting priority areas for action which had been identified, with feedback having been requested by 29th October, 2005. It was the intention that feedback would be used by the LAA Executive to agree a more focused number of outcomes that would be the subject of further consultation in October before detailed discussion with the Government Office for the South East in November/December. The LAA would take effect from 1st April, 2006.

The Partnership was advised that further updates would be given at future meetings.

Action/Decision	Who	When
The Partnership noted the update.	All	---

6. DELIVERING THE COMMUNITY STRATEGY –

(1) Partnership Steering Group -

Action/Decision	Who	When
The Partnership noted the minutes of the meeting of the Steering Group held on 22nd September, 2005 and the proposed actions.	All	---

(2) Basingstoke Canal Towpath Project –

The Partnership was advised on progress with regard to the re-laying of the Basingstoke Canal towpath. It was hoped that works would be completed by the end of October, 2005 to be followed by an official re-opening ceremony.

(3) **Stakeholder Conference 2006 –**

The Partnership noted that the stakeholder conference would take place on 15th February 2006 at Farnborough 6th Form College. The aim of the conference programme would be to raise awareness about the RSP, showcase work which had been undertaken, engage partners in the way forward and provide networking opportunities.

7. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING –**

It was noted that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday, 15th November, 2005 at 4.00 pm at Rushmoor Borough Council, Council Offices, Farnborough.

The meeting closed at 5.15 pm.
