

## RUSHMOOR STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP

---

Notes of a meeting held on Thursday, 10th March, 2005 at the Rushmoor Borough Council Offices at 4.00 pm.

Present:

<b>Aldershot Garrison</b>		Colonel Stephen Oxlade MBE (Vice-Chairman) Garrison Commander
<b>Basingstoke Canal Authority</b>		Mr Leigh Thornton Director
<b>Blackwater Valley and Hart Primary Care Trust</b>	a	Mr Olufemi Oduneye Director of Public Health
<b>Enterprise First</b>		Mr John Mitchell Chief Executive
<b>Farnborough College of Technology</b>	a	Mrs Christine Davis Principal
<b>Guildford Diocese</b>		Reverend Father Keith Hodges
<b>Hampshire County Council</b>	a	County Councillor Tim Knight Executive Member for Community Development and Regeneration
<b>North East Hampshire Police Division</b>		Inspector Antonia Weeks
<b>North Hampshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry</b>		Mr John Harrocks Chief Executive
<b>Pavilion Housing Association</b>		Mr Owen Ingram Chief Executive
<b>Rushmoor Borough Council</b>		Councillor Peter Moyle (Chairman) Deputy Leader  Mr Andrew Lloyd Chief Executive
<b>Rushmoor Citizens' Advice Bureaux</b>		Ms Alex Hughes District Manager

**Rushmoor Voluntary Services**

Ms Sally Saunderson  
Chief Executive

**Parity for Disability**

a Ms Alison Cooper

In attendance:

**Hampshire County Council**

Mr Terry Rath  
Education Department

**Rushmoor Borough Council**

Councillor Roland Dibbs  
Cabinet Member for Environment

Mr Andrew Colver  
Head of Democratic Services

Mr Les Murrell  
Strategy Co-ordinator (Sustainability),  
Democratic Services

Mr Tim Richings  
Principal Planning Officer

Mrs Kathy Flatt  
Democratic Support Officer, Democratic  
Services

Apologies for absence had been received from County Councillor Tim Knight, County Councillor Rod Baulk, Mr Olufemi Oduneye (Blackwater Valley and Hart Primary Care Trust), Mrs Christine Davis (Farnborough College of Technology), Superintendent Joe Apps (North East Hampshire Police Division), Ms Alison Cooper (Parity for Disability) and Mr David Hobbs (Government Office for the South East).

**1. NOTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING –**

The Partnership confirmed the notes of the meeting held on 12th January, 2005.

**2. IMPLEMENTING THE CHILDREN ACT, 2004 IN HAMPSHIRE – SECOND CONSULTATION PAPER –**

Terry Rath introduced the second consultation paper which had been prepared by Hampshire County Council on the implementation of the Children Act, 2004 and circulated to all members of the Partnership. The Children Act, 2004 introduced new duties on a range of public services to co-operate in the planning and delivery of services to improve the outcomes for all children and to reduce the risk of poor outcomes for vulnerable and disadvantaged children. These new duties were in the key areas of: physical and mental health and emotional well-being; protection from harm and neglect; education, training and recreation; contribution towards society; and, social/economic well-being.

In October, 2004, statutory partners in Hampshire had been consulted on the arrangements for implementing these new duties. The proposals in the current consultation paper had been informed by suggestions and comments from the

statutory partners and draft guidance issued by central government in December 2004 and January 2005. Comments on the proposals were sought by 30th April, 2005.

In introducing the consultation paper, Mr Rath explained that the following partners had to be involved in the new duties:-

- The Children's Services Authority
- District Councils
- Primary Care Trusts
- Strategic Health Authority
- Connexions
- Youth Offending Team
- Probation
- Police
- Learning and Skills Council

The following partners should be involved:-

- Schools
- GPs
- Participation with young people, families and carers
- Voluntary Organisations
- All others who delivered services to children or represented their interests

It was noted that, under the duty to co-operate, partners would need to agree on:

- a child centred vision for services – that improved outcomes
- shared needs analysis and priorities
- joint commissioning
- integrated local services and co-location
- pooled budgets
- joint processes and information sharing
- development of better prevention services and earlier intervention

It was the intention that this would be achieved by: engagement between partners and with children and their families at local and County level, involving Members, managers and practitioners; annual performance assessment of HCC services and a three year cycle of inspections for all partners – using 120 to 300 indicators; and, an Annual Children's Services Plan (the first by April 2006).

The second consultation paper covered the areas of performance indicators, vision, how the duty to co-operate should be developed locally, potential to deliver services to clusters of schools within district council boundaries and planning. Local strategic partnerships were being asked to consider the following issues:

- Was the LSP the most appropriate existing partnership forum to support developments and to reflect local issues?
- If so, how should the work of other partnerships be included (eg PCT Local Implementation Teams dealing with the National Service Framework for Children and Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships)?
- How best could all partners be engaged, including schools and GPs?

- All partners would require local information in order to 'co-operate'

During discussion, views were expressed regarding structures and co-ordination, operational difficulties, the need to engage all partners and the plethora of meetings.

Action/Decision	Who	When
Members of the Partnership were requested to send any comments on the consultation paper to Andrew Colver which could be co-ordinated into a submission if appropriate.	All	27/4/05

### 3. SOUTH EAST PLAN –

The Panel received a presentation from Andrew Lloyd on the draft South East Plan. A copy of the executive summary of the draft Plan had been circulated to all members of the Partnership. Councillor Roland Dibbs (Cabinet Member for Environment at Rushmoor Borough Council) also attended the meeting to provide input as the Council's representative on the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA).

Andrew Lloyd advised members that the South East Plan was a statutory document which had been developed by the SEERA under the Planning Act, 2004. The Strategy was a 20-year regional framework for land use and development, which established a policy framework for local authorities to follow. It set clear priorities and had a major focus on implementation and delivery. There was a strong sub-regional element, including the Western Corridor/Blackwater Valley, and would be led by local authorities.

Consultation on the Draft South East Plan (Part 1) would run until 15th April, 2005 and consultation on district level housing proposals (Part 2) was due to start in July, 2005. The complete final draft plan would be submitted to Government in November, 2005.

The aim of the Plan was that, by 2026, a better blend could be achieved in the region by:

- reducing social deprivation
- sustaining economic growth and wealth creation
- stabilising and then beginning to reduce resource consumption
- improvement management of the environment
- evolving more sustainable individual lifestyles and collective development patterns

The Partnership was advised that growth was a major issue for the Plan. Focus was on housing growth, but consideration would need to be given to economic growth, infrastructure and social needs. Assuming that the economy grew by 3% per year (slightly less than in 1986-2001), it was possible that the South East would have more jobs than workers. This might change if jobs transferred overseas (eg call centres); productivity increased more than forecast and/or the available workforce increased. Current projections showed a population increase in the region of around 900,000 by 2027. It was felt that new homes were needed in order to cater for:

- a growing population within the region
- a growing economy that needed workers
- a net flow of people into the region
- the need for more affordable homes
- the shortage of 29,000 homes (2001 Census)
- rising homelessness

The draft Plan set out three potential scales of housing growth for the region, as follows:-

- (a) 25,500 new homes per annum (Regional Planning Guidance 9 minus 10% and average rate of building 1999-2004); or
- (b) 28,000 new homes per annum (Regional Planning Guidance 9 and the building rate in 2004); or
- (c) 32,000 new homes per annum (Regional Planning Guidance plus 15%, reflecting forecasts of demand and migration).

Two options were included in the Draft Plan:

- continuing the current plan – regeneration in South and East, some growth in the Western Corridor/Blackwater Valley, plus three major growth areas; or
- sharper focus – stronger emphasis on coastal regeneration and economic growth areas in the Western Corridor/Blackwater Valley.

The pros and cons of both options were explained and it was emphasised that housing was not the only issue to be considered in the Plan. Other key issues covered included: infrastructure; transport; social deprivation; natural resources and climate change; core regional strategies; and, sub-regional policies (including the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley Sub-Region).

Action/Decision	Who	When
Members of the Partnership were requested to send any comments on the consultation paper to Andrew Colver.	All	15/4/05

#### 4. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – THE RUSHMOOR PLAN 2006-16 –

Tim Richings gave a presentation on the Rushmoor Plan 2006-16 (Rushmoor's Local Development Framework). It was explained that the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004 had brought about the most significant shake-up of the British planning system since 1947. County structure plans were no longer part of the system. Regional Plans would now provide strategic guidance. Local Plans had been replaced by 'Local Development Frameworks'.

Work had commenced on the Rushmoor Plan and background investigations had included: economic assessment; housing needs update; urban housing potential study; and a retail assessment study. Issues and options papers had been published for consultation and comments had been invited by 15th April, 2005.

The Partnership was advised of the following key features of the Borough:

- 90,000 residents (2004)
- 36,000 homes
- average price of homes sold in the fourth quarter of 2004 - £185,000 (just below national average and 19% lower than South East average)
- existing housing stock dominated by 3 or more bedroom houses
- 11% of households in unsuitable housing (unfit or in need of major repair, overcrowding or family unable to live together)
- 40% of unsuitable housing in registered social landlord homes
- 44% of housing owner-occupied
- high demand for small and affordable homes
- strong employment in professional/managerial jobs (particularly in aerospace, defence, high-tech and telecommunications sectors)
- over-supply of offices (strong demand for light industrial space)
- some existing factories and offices were outdated and in need of replacement
- high levels of commuting
- complex pattern of travel movements within Rushmoor and surrounding areas
- high car ownership/usage
- use of public transport low
- surrounding countryside, particularly Military Training Estate, of high nature conservation value (may impact rates of future house building)

It was considered that there was a need for balance between economic growth, improving the quality of life and conserving the environment. A key issue for the Borough was the future roles of Aldershot and Farnborough town centres, in view of the significant loss of local spending to centres such as Camberley, Guildford and Reading.

Key employment issues were:

- there were many local jobs, but local residents were not always qualified to take them, resulting in commuting
- lower paid workers could have difficulty in finding work where they relied on public transport
- Rushmoor residents were less well paid than people working in Rushmoor
- Aldershot and Farnborough provided different sorts of employment – Farnborough had more offices, Aldershot had more industrial/warehousing.

There was a need to address the issues of retaining existing businesses, supporting emerging industries and the need for a balanced economy.

With regard to housing, the following were key issues to be considered:

- Lack of affordable housing and small homes
- Housing Needs Update – 490 shortfall in affordable homes each year
- Greatest need was for one and two-bedroom homes
- Housing Potential Study – estimated a capacity of 2,455 new homes up to 2016 from ‘unidentified’ and ‘windfall’ sites
- Housing Potential Study also identified sixteen potential housing sites.

Consideration would need to be given to other key areas, such as the problems of road congestion and low public transport use and the environment - qualities which made an area attractive also constrained its growth. The options papers also examined affordable housing, housing mix, character and design, transport and employment.

It was noted that consultation would conclude on 15th April on the issues and options papers. Consultation on the preferred option would take place in September, 2005 and the submission of the final draft plans would be made to the Government Office for the South East in February, 2006. There would be an examination of the plans in September, 2006 with adoption (and a binding Inspector's Report) in February, 2007.

Action/Decision	Who	When
The Partnership noted the presentation and update on the Rushmoor Plan.	---	---

## 5. 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 9th February, 2005.	---	---

### (2) Project Updates –

The Partnership noted that future projects would include work, in conjunction with the Rushmoor Community Safety Partnership, on reducing anti-social behaviour in the Borough.

The Partnership was also advised that resources had been identified which would enable the Partnership to undertake some 'quick hits', environmental projects around the Borough. In particular, it had been suggested that refurbishment works could be undertaken on parts of the Basingstoke Canal towpath. Work could also include an interpretation board with reference to the input from the Partnership.

Plans were also being drafted for a high profile solar energy project. Such a project would provide an educational and environmental resource and was likely to receive 50% Government grant aid funding.

Members were asked to submit any suggestions for quick hit, environmental projects to Andrew Colver, which would then be considered by the Partnership Steering Group.

Action/Decision	Who	When
The Partnership noted the project updates and members were requested to submit any suggestions for environmental, quick hit projects to Andrew Colver for consideration by the Partnership Steering Group.	All	---

**(3) Resourcing the Partnership –**

Andrew Colver advised the Partnership that contributions of £5,000 each had been agreed by the Police, Pavilion Housing Association and Rushmoor Borough Council. Funding of £12,000 per annum for two years had also been agreed by Hampshire County Council. Further resources were understood to be forthcoming. It had therefore been agreed to progress the appointment of a Partnership Officer. There would be funding left over which it was proposed could be used, together with grant aiding and resources from other sources, for the environmental, 'quick hit' projects outlined above under 'Project Updates'.

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

**6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING –**

Wednesday, 27th April 2005 at 4.00 pm at the Rushmoor Borough Council Offices.

The meeting closed at 5.35 pm.

-----