

Public Document Pack



BOROUGH OF RUSHMOOR

To the Mayor and Members of the Council,

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED to attend a Meeting of the Council to be held at the Council Offices, Farnborough on ***Thursday, 7th December, 2017 at 7.00 pm*** for the transaction of the business set out on the Agenda given below.

A G E N D A

1. MINUTES

To confirm the Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on 5th October, 2017 (copy Minutes attached).

2. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

3. STANDING ORDER 8 - QUESTIONS

To receive any questions by Members submitted in pursuance of Standing Order 8 (3).

4. PETITION - SOUTHWOOD GOLF COURSE

In accordance with the Council's Petition Scheme, a petition containing 2,366 signatures has been submitted opposing the proposed closure of Southwood Golf Course. Under the Scheme, the petition organiser will be given a period of up to ten minutes to present the petition. The Council will then be asked to consider how to respond to the contents of the petition. A copy of the front page of the petition is attached (Annex 1).

5. NOTICE OF MOTION - NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

To consider the following Notice of Motion, which has been submitted by Cr. M.J. Roberts pursuant to Standing Order 9 (1):

"Rushmoor is committed, as a Council, on behalf of its residents to support the founding aims of the NHS.

It is, therefore, very concerned that the Government is focused on, by the backdoor, developing a privatisation through an Accountable Care Organisation US concept which builds on the Sustainable Transformation Programmes for Frimley Health and Hampshire and the IOW concept framework.

RBC declares its full opposition to these moves which have no legal standing and are not in the interests of its wider community.

It will, therefore, determine its policy accordingly in opposition to all such moves."

6. RECOMMENDATION OF THE CABINET

To consider the recommendation of the Cabinet in relation to the following item:

Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/18 – 2020/21 –

To receive a Report from the Cabinet (copy attached – Annex 2), which recommends the approval of the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/18 – 2020/21. The Cabinet Member for Corporate Services (Cr. P.G. Taylor) will introduce this item.

7. QUESTIONS FOR THE CABINET

To receive any questions by Members to Cabinet Members submitted in accordance with the Procedure Note.

8. REPORTS OF CABINET AND COMMITTEES

To receive and ask questions on the Reports of the following Meetings (copy reports attached):

Cabinet

17th October, 2017
14th November, 2017

Committees

Licensing and General Purposes
Development Management

25th September, 2017
8th November, 2017

9. REPORTS OF POLICY AND REVIEW PANELS

To note the Reports of the following meetings of the Policy and Review Panels (copy reports attached):

Corporate Services	21st September, 2017
Joint Leisure and Youth & Environment	7th November, 2017
Corporate Services	9th November, 2017
Borough Services	13th November, 2017
Community	16th November, 2017

A.E. COLVER
Head of Democratic and Customer Services

Council Offices
Farnborough
Hampshire GU14 7JU

Wednesday 29 November 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

BOROUGH OF RUSHMOOR

MEETING OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL held at the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Farnborough on Thursday, 5th October, 2017 at 7.00 pm.

The Worshipful The Mayor (Cllr Sophia Choudhary (Chairman))
The Deputy Mayor (Cllr S.J. Masterson (Vice-Chairman))

Cllr Mrs. D.B. Bedford	Cllr D.M.T. Bell
Cllr T.D. Bridgeman	Cllr J.B. Canty
Cllr Sue Carter	Cllr M.S. Choudhary
Cllr D.E. Clifford	Cllr R. Cooper
Cllr Liz Corps	Cllr A.H. Crawford
Cllr P.I.C. Crerar	Cllr K. Dibble
Cllr Sue Dibble	Cllr R.L.G. Dibbs
Cllr Jennifer Evans	Cllr D.S. Gladstone
Cllr C.P. Grattan	Cllr Barbara Hurst
Cllr B. Jones	Cllr G.B. Lyon
Cllr J.H. Marsh	Cllr Marina Munro
Cllr K.H. Muschamp	Cllr A.R. Newell
Cllr J.J. Preece	Cllr M.J. Roberts
Cllr P.F. Rust	Cllr M.L. Sheehan
Cllr M.D. Smith	Cllr M. Staplehurst
Cllr L.A. Taylor	Cllr P.G. Taylor
Cllr M.J. Tenant	Cllr B.A. Thomas
Cllr Jacqui Vosper	Cllr J.E. Woolley

Honorary Alderman C. Balchin
Honorary Alderman R.J. Debenham
Honorary Alderman R.J. Kimber
Honorary Alderman G.J. Woolger

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr A. Jackman.

Before the meeting was opened, Mr David Betts of the Aldershot Garrison Chaplaincy Team led the meeting in prayers.

26. MINUTES

It was MOVED by Cllr Barbara Hurst; SECONDED by Cllr D.E. Clifford and

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 27th July, 2017 (copy having been circulated previously) be taken as read, approved and signed as a correct record of the proceedings.

27. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (1) The Mayor reported that Merchant Navy Day had been marked at the Council Offices on 1st September, 2017 with a short service which had been led by

the Mayor's Chaplain, followed by the hoisting of the Red Ensign. The event had been attended by representatives of the Merchant Navy, Royal Navy, Royal British Legion and Councillors. The Red Ensign had been flown until the end of Sunday, 3rd September, 2017 which was Merchant Navy Day.

- (2) The Mayor advised that a charity cycle ride had taken place on 3rd September, 2017 around the Borough in aid of her charities. The Mayor expressed her gratitude to her Charity Fundraising Committee, the Rushmoor Cycle Forum and Naya Yuva for organising the event and to all those who had taken part. The event had been well supported and had raised £280 for her charities.
- (3) The Mayor reported that she and the Mayoress had had the honour of attending the Canal Zoners National Service of Remembrance on 10th September, 2017, which had been held at North Camp Methodist Church. The Mayor advised Members that Canal Zoners was an organisation for servicemen and women who had served in the Suez Canal Zone of Egypt in the late 1940s up to and including the Suez Crisis of 1956.
- (4) The Mayor reported that her Charity Golf Tournament had been held at Southwood Golf Course on 15th September, 2017 and had been supported by nineteen teams, including TAG Farnborough Airport, Aldershot Town Football Club, the Gurkha Golf Society, Fluor Ltd, the Meads Shopping Centre, Aspire Defence and the Royal School of Military Engineering. It was anticipated that the event would raise around £2,000 for her charities.
- (5) It was noted that Aldershot and Farnborough's best gardeners had been celebrated at the Rushmoor in Bloom presentation evening held at Princes Hall on 18th September, 2017. Awards had been presented in thirteen different categories, from Best Sports Ground to Best Newcomer. The Best Front Garden award had gone to Mr. Ken Howard of Field Way in Aldershot, the award for Best Sheltered Housing Complex had been won by Shaftesbury Court in Farnborough and the Best Kept Vivid Tenant's Garden had been awarded to Mr. Thomas Rogers of Basing Drive, Aldershot. The Best Community Garden had gone to the residents of Cheyne Way, Farnborough.

The Chairman's Award had been presented to the family of the late Mr. Brian Stephens, who had been a highly regarded supporter of Rushmoor in Bloom over many years and an Officer of the Council. Mr Stephens had won Rushmoor both the Southern England in Bloom Best Large Town/Small City category and the highest accolade of the Winner of National Britain in Bloom, beating many big towns and cities. His colourful, floral legacy remained throughout the Borough for all to see.

The Forum Award had gone to Honorary Alderman Mr. Colin Balchin because of his continued support for Rushmoor in Bloom and the amount of time he volunteered to help judge gardens and school entries. The Mayor's Award had gone to Hart and Rushmoor Wellbeing Centre in Victoria Road, Aldershot.

In the Schools' competition, there had been eight categories ranging from "Squire's Herb Pot" to "Bee Friendly". South Farnborough Infant School had won the Best School Grounds category and the Gardening for the Future category had been won by Henry Tyndale School in Farnborough.

- (6) The Mayor reported that she had attended the annual Battle of Britain Service of Remembrance at North Camp Methodist Church on 17th September. The Mayor had taken the salute at the march past of RAF Association members and representatives from the local Air Training Squadrons.
- (7) The Mayor advised Members of two forthcoming events in aid of the Mayor's Charities, about which further details would soon be available:
 - Christmas Afternoon Tea Party on 8th December 2017 at the Council Offices in Farnborough
 - Charity Ball on Friday, 9th March 2018 with a Bollywood Theme at Princes Hall in Aldershot.

28. STANDING ORDER 8 - QUESTIONS

The Mayor reported that one urgent question had been submitted under Standing Order 8 (3) by Cllr A.H. Crawford.

Cllr Crawford asked, with winter approaching, what arrangements the Council had in place that year to meet its statutory responsibility to provide Severe Weather Emergency Protocol (SWEP) responses in order to prevent deaths of people sleeping rough, given that the Vine Centre had not been asked to provide the Emergency Winter Night shelter at Holy Trinity Church, Aldershot, for which Housing Justice had awarded its Quality Mark for night shelters the previous year.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Health and Housing (Cllr Barbara Hurst) stated that the Council had supported the winter night shelter in Aldershot for the previous four winters in partnership with the Vine Centre, community groups, local churches and the previous year with Hart District Council and Surrey Heath Borough Council. The Severe Weather Emergency Protocol came into force when temperatures reached freezing for three consecutive days.

Members were advised that, in recent months, the Council had taken legal action against several rough sleepers and had supported a 'hub' to address their needs. In 2017, the North Lane Lodge had opened providing nine beds for rough sleepers with drugs and alcohol problems and this accommodation was managed by the Society of St. James. Rushmoor therefore currently had between three and five rough sleepers in Aldershot. The Council continued to work with The Vine Day Centre, which provided a successful 'journey' programme for single homeless people and the Stonham Home Group, which provided assertive outreach in the Borough to engage and support rough sleepers to come in off the street and connect with those who did not have a local connection to the area. The Council was also strongly committed to 'No Second Night Out', which was a Government initiative focused on ending rough sleeping, specifically for those who were new to the streets.

It had been hoped that The Vine Centre would be able to develop a self-funding model to provide this facility going forward, however, this had proved impossible in the current financial situation. The Vine Centre had since changed its operating model and had moved away from working with people that had no desire to engage with its services to a more structured model based on customer engagement, which the Council fully supported.

It was felt that an alternative to the winter night shelter would be to rely on bed and breakfast accommodation. There were currently between three and five rough sleepers in Aldershot. Included in this number were those proving hard to engage and some waiting for specialist provision such as supported accommodation or North Lane Lodge.

Cllr. Hurst advised Members that the previous year, the winter night shelter had opened for 25 nights at a cost of £14,830. In comparison, it was noted that to provide bed and breakfast for 25 nights for five people would cost approximately £7,500, based on a cost of £60 per night. This was likely to be a worse-case scenario as North Lane Lodge and the outreach service were continuing to keep the numbers of rough sleepers low. The cost was therefore more likely to be nearer £3,000 and this could be met from the bed and breakfast budget.

It was noted that Surrey Heath Borough Council would be interested in providing funding for the winter night shelter on the same basis as in 2016 (£4,000). However, Hart District Council, which had contributed £4,000 in 2016 through the Department for Communities and Local Government Single Homelessness Project, would not be contributing in 2017 as it did not have the level of street homelessness needed to support the investment. To fund the winter night shelter in 2017 would cost Rushmoor approximately £11,000, for which there was currently no budget. It was considered that, in view of the reduced number of street homeless, the provision of North Lane Lodge and the lack of funding from Hart District Council, the most cost effective way of meeting statutory requirements under the SWEP would be to use bed and breakfast accommodation.

29. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

The Council was asked to consider two Motions which had been submitted in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 9 (1).

(1) **Universal Credit**

It was MOVED by Cllr Jennifer Evans; SECONDED by Cllr A.H. Crawford – That

“Recent reports by Citizens Advice and the Rowntree Foundation have highlighted problems associated with the roll-out of Universal Credit, which are leading to increases in debt, rent arrears, evictions and families in temporary accommodation.

In view of this, Rushmoor Borough Council calls upon HM Government to pause the implementation of Universal Credit immediately in order to introduce measures to avoid these problems and, in this way, protect our residents from them.”

In introducing the Motion, Cllr Evans stated that she felt that no one was opposed to the idea of simplifying the complicated benefits system and rolling up a number of benefits into one payment. She felt that, in theory, new technology should enable a more flexible and responsive system to be put in place.

Cllr Evans considered that there were a number of delays which had been built into the system. Firstly, new claimants had to wait one week after losing their job before they could apply. Secondly, applications could only be made online and, until an online application had been made, an appointment could not be made with Job Centre Plus to progress a claim. Even if computer literate, and a person had access to the internet, there was another wait that had been built into the system. However, she felt that the big delay, and the one which caused the most problems and anxiety for claimants was that there was a minimum wait of six weeks before the first payment could be made.

Cllr Evans advised that research by Citizens Advice had shown the effects of this on households. Its survey had showed that almost 40% of people waited more than six weeks for their first payment and that over half of claimants had to borrow money whilst waiting for their first payment. The research had also revealed that one quarter of people seeking advice from the CAB about Universal Credit had debt problems. Citizens Advice had called upon the Government to postpone the roll-out until the system was more robust.

Cllr Evans felt that the dangers of this delay for low-income families with no savings to tide them over were obvious. They would not be able to pay their rent on time, and thereby risking eviction. Private landlords, who provided a substantial number of homes in the area, were less likely to be sympathetic than housing associations and were likely to be less willing to rent to tenants on Universal Credit. It was understood that housing associations were worried about rent arrears and a drop in income as Universal Credit was rolled out. Rushmoor had one of the most effective housing benefit teams in the country, but this function would be handed over to staff in job centres and the time waited for payments would jump from a few days to at least six weeks. Cllr Evans posed the question what would families with children do about buying food, heating their homes, providing transport and all the other necessities of life during this minimum of six weeks without any income?

Cllr Evans referred to the fact that the Government had recently announced that claimants could apply for an advance payment, which would be given in the form of a loan, to be repaid, and that repayment would be taken from the first few months of the new payments. In order to get the loan, claimants had to ring a premium phone number, which could cost up to 40p per minute.

Cllr Evans stated that Universal Credit appeared to give more money to some claimants and less to others. The IFS had calculated that £2.7 billion would be cut from the benefit in the long run. Whilst 2.2 million people would gain on average about £1,400 per year, 3.2 million people were likely to lose £1,800 on average. The most likely to lose would be single parents, which was one of the most vulnerable groups in society. Research undertaken by the local CAB as part of a national survey had showed that most said that they could not manage if their benefits were

to be cut by that amount. Cllr Evans drew attention to the important link to the increased number of people suffering from mental health problems if this was the kind of worry and stress they had to put up with.

Cllr Evans further stated that former Welfare Minister, Lord Freud, had admitted that the design failures in Universal Credit were causing one in four low-income tenants to run up rent arrears and risk eviction. Meanwhile, the link between Universal Credit and lack of money for essentials, such as food, was so clear that in areas where the full roll-out had taken place, food bank referral rates were running at more than double the national average.

Cllr Evans stated that her Motion was not proposing that the Government should abandon Universal Credit. However, the Motion was asking that full roll-out should be paused in order for a robust evaluation of the impacts of the new system to be carried out and for any necessary amendments to be made. This was being requested to secure a smooth transition to the new benefit for residents and to avoid unnecessary hardship and homelessness.

In seconding the Motion, Cllr Crawford stated that, in 2016, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Philip Hammond MP, had announced cuts in welfare of £12 billion by 2019/20. The cuts to the work allowances in Universal Credit were now just nine months away for claimants in the Borough. This would focus cuts on families in work much more than those out of work, and would cost them an average of £1,000 per year each. He referred to the deficiencies in the Universal Credit system, which had been outlined by Cllr Evans, which would bring six types of benefit together, including Housing Benefit. Cllr Crawford stated that the current Rushmoor Universal Credit (Live Service) covered 438 single, unemployed jobseekers – some of whom took three or four hours of support to get through the process to obtain their correct payments. He advised that, from July 2018, ten times as many claimants of these six types of benefit in Rushmoor would be using the Universal Credit (Full Service) system, with the complex telephone and online processes that Cllr Evans had outlined. Cllr Crawford was of the opinion that this process would put thousands of residents at risk of rent arrears, debt and hunger. There was no shortage of evidence of the adverse effects of the Universal Credit (Full Service) system, because it had been piloted in other areas, and the outcomes reported to the current Inquiry of the Work and Pensions Committee of the House of Commons.

Cllr Crawford stated that Your Homes Newcastle, which managed homes on behalf of Newcastle City Council, was having to help struggling claimants to prevent them becoming homeless. Of the 3,293 Council house tenants in Newcastle in receipt of Universal Credit, 2,532 (or 77%) were in arrears amounting to £1.3 million more than they had been under the previous system.

Similarly, in Southwark, more than 4,000 tenants had moved over to the Universal Credit – Full Service system. Their rent arrears had also increased by £1.3 million. Southwark had reported that this had been caused by the length of time before people started receiving their payments, and particularly the housing element. Typically, people moving over were very often already in rent arrears. They did not have savings that they could call on, and they were having to wait a very long time. Rushmoor processed Housing Benefit claims in a few working days. In Southwark,

however, it was now taking 12-13 weeks for people to get their first payment of Universal Credit.

Cllr Crawford gave an example of one claimant he had dealt with at the Job Club at The Vine Centre who had been unfairly treated and sanctioned under the new Universal Credit system. He was of the opinion that the Universal Credit system, as it was now in the Borough, was inhumane and questioned how much worse it would get after the introduction of the full Universal Credit system in July, 2018. He asked the Council to support the Motion and call upon the Government to introduce measures to avoid these problems being placed on the Borough's residents.

During a debate, attention was drawn to the availability of the advance payment facility and also that arrangements could be made to make payments direct to landlords. It was also mentioned that the Council would continue to scrutinise and improve the local implementation of Universal Credit and helping residents with this. Further comment was also made of the need to understand fully what it was like to have no money and the implications for residents in such a situation.

Following further debate, the Motion was put to the meeting. There voted FOR: 12; AGAINST: 21 and the Motion was **DECLARED LOST**.

(2) Social Value in Procurement

It was MOVED by Cllr J.B. Canty and SECONDED by Cllr A. Newell – That

"This Council:

- Notes the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 which requires local authorities to consider how many services they procure might secure wider social, economic and environmental benefits for an area
- Recognises that embedding Social Value within contracts for goods and services can help drive positive outcomes for residents.

Therefore, this Council will strengthen the role of Social Value in procurement by:

- Giving Social Value greater weighting when scrutinising bids for future contracts in goods and services;
- Including a section on Social Value in the new Procurement Strategy; and
- Developing a Social Value Policy to underpin the new Procurement Strategy."

In introducing the Motion, Cllr Canty stated that he felt procurement was one of the most important responsibilities that a local authority had. Assessing value for money was particularly important at a time when the Council's budget was constrained and assessing the quality of service was crucial for a contract to be delivered effectively. Cllr Canty was of the opinion that ensuring that a contract delivered added value or social value was also vital for delivering positive outcomes for the Borough beyond just the provision of a public service. Social value had

grown in popularity over the past decade because it provided a framework for decision makers to think about whether the services they were going to buy, or the way they were going to buy them, could secure these benefits for their area. It had been enshrined in the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 that local authorities were required to consider how services they procured might secure wider social, economic and environmental benefits to an area. Rushmoor had been using social value in a variety of different ways in its procurement processes since the Act had become law. For example, in the waste management contract that had recently been awarded to Serco, the Council had identified a number of social value benefits that could be realised, such as apprenticeships, work experience and working with charity organisations. As part of its social value commitment, Serco had pledged to provide a minimum of ten one-day work experience placements for young people who were unemployed, a minimum of one day a year for staff to volunteer at local community projects and supporting community groups through the provision of materials and training.

Cllr Canty said that his Motion called for additional steps to strengthen and prioritise the role of social value as a criterion when assessing bids for goods and services. Firstly, the Motion called for greater weighting to be given to social value when scrutinising bids for contracts for goods and services. In practice, this would mean more clearly setting out social value aims as core requirements in specification and contract documents, which could then be referred to as contract requirements. Cllr Canty considered that writing more specific requirements into contract documents would challenge perspective suppliers to offer more in terms of social value. He also felt that it would make delivery and reporting on the implementation of contracts easier, allowing the Council to better demonstrate the social value each new contract was providing.

Cllr Canty stated that, secondly, the Motion called on social value to be embedded in the Council's new Procurement Strategy, which was due to be published in Spring, 2018. The Strategy would set out the Council's approach to the use of competition and how it would procure works, goods and services. He felt that including a section on social value would allow for a greater focus on considering how to structure contracts to reduce barriers to social enterprises and smaller companies from participating in public procurement processes. A suggested remedy could be to break up large contracts into smaller "lots" within each procurement exercise as a way to increase tender opportunities for these companies. Including a section on social value would also allow for greater focus on social outcomes which should be considered in procurement, such as: empowering social enterprises and charities to make an even bigger impact in supporting the most disadvantaged in the community; helping the long-term unemployed to get a foot on the employment ladder; providing disabled people with the opportunity to build their independence and develop new skills; and, increasing the use of local supply chains to support small and medium sized businesses in the Borough.

Cllr Canty considered that putting these principles at the heart of the new Procurement Strategy would highlight the Council's commitment to improving the quality of life for residents.

In respect of the final part of his Motion, Cllr Canty called on the Council to create a Social Value Policy to underpin the Procurement Strategy. Such a policy would allow the Council to set out before the general public what social outcomes were most important to the Council when evaluating tender bids. It would make clear the Council's expectations to potential suppliers and contractors that delivering social value to the community should be at the heart of the service they wished to deliver. It would provide the Council with leverage – where an explicit policy had been created it could also be used in the wording of a contract. Cllr Canty was of the opinion that such a policy could be developed in consultation with the voluntary sector providers and SMEs, to ensure that the Council could include outcomes that were realistic for the capability of those organisations. He felt that embedding social value in the Council's Procurement Strategy and developing a Social Value Policy would be very public statements of intent about the priority the Council gave to delivering social outcomes. Cllr Canty called on Members to support the Motion which sought to build on existing work to embed social value in the procurement process operated by the Council.

In seconding the Motion, Cllr A.J. Newell stated that social value encompassed several priorities of the Council covering environmental, social and economic wellbeing. Cllr Newell also mentioned that the Council already had in place a policy on sustainability as part of procurement and that a Social Value Policy as part of the Council's Procurement Strategy would be a further demonstration of the aims and priorities of the Council and this could be put into practice for future contracts such as the Alpine Ski Centre, Farnborough Leisure Centre and the Lido.

During discussion, Members referred to work by other councils who had gone down this route and that the Council needed to examine best practice elsewhere as part of a more comprehensive consideration of this subject.

It was MOVED by Cllr B. Jones and SECONDED by Cllr Keith Dibble – That the Motion be referred to the Corporate Services Policy and Review Panel for further consideration.

During discussion on the Motion for reference back to the Corporate Services Policy and Review Panel, Members agreed that there were many issues to be examined as part of social value and agreed that the Motion should be referred to the Corporate Services Policy and Review Panel. Others also spoke of whether the Council currently had the resources and expertise to carry out a corporate responsibility protocol. The amendment to refer to the Panel was then put to the meeting. There voted FOR: 14; AGAINST: 20 and the amendment was **DECLARED LOST**.

Following further debate, the original Motion was then put to the meeting. There voted FOR: 32; AGAINST: 0 and the Motion was **DECLARED CARRIED**.

30. QUESTIONS FOR THE CABINET

The Mayor reported that no questions had been submitted for the Cabinet.

31. REPORTS OF CABINET AND COMMITTEES

(1) Cabinet

It was MOVED by Cllr D.E. Clifford; SECONDED by Cllr Barbara Hurst and

RESOLVED: That the Reports of meetings of the Cabinet held on 25th July, 22nd August and 19th September, 2017 be received.

(2) Development Management Committee

It was MOVED by Cllr B.A. Thomas; SECONDED by Cllr J.H. Marsh and

RESOLVED: That the Reports of meetings of the Cabinet held on 19th July, 16th August and 13th September, 2017 be received.

32. REPORTS OF POLICY AND REVIEW PANELS

RESOLVED: That the Reports of the undermentioned meetings of the Policy and Review Panels be received.

POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL	DATE OF MEETING
Leisure and Youth	4th September, 2017
Environment	5th September, 2017
Borough Services	11th September, 2017
Community	14th September, 2017

The meeting closed at 8.35 pm.

change.org

Recipient: Rushmoor Borough Council

Letter: Greetings,

Dear Rushmoor Borough Council,

We, the undersigned, are opposed to the proposed closure of Southwood Golf Course, which has been an integral part of the local community for 40 years. The golf course contributes to a vibrant community for people of all ages and abilities and is an important social hub within the local area. It also attracts visitors from all walks of life who can enjoy a beautiful course and can benefit from flexible, reasonably priced membership and affordable 'pay and play' rates, unavailable elsewhere locally.

We therefore call on Rushmoor Borough Council to reject the proposal to close Southwood Golf Course and designate the area SANG.

This is an important community facility which is well used by members and non-members alike with over 25,000 rounds of golf played every year. It plays a vital part in the health and well-being of its users and a closure would remove from many of those a primary source of physical exercise and social community, without an affordable, local alternative.

Moreover, its closure would not guarantee the space would be used, maintained and enjoyed by as many people who use the Golf Course currently.

Kind Regards,

The petitioners.

This page is intentionally left blank

ANNEX 2**COUNCIL MEETING – 7TH DECEMBER, 2017****AGENDA ITEM NO. 6****MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2017/18 – 2020/21**

A report from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 17th October, 2017.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report follows consideration by Cabinet of the Medium Term Financial Strategy, in report FIN1731. The strategy is reviewed annually in response to internal and external factors such as changing corporate priorities, the prevailing economic conditions, government policy and changes to funding mechanisms.
- 1.2 The Cabinet recommends the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2017/18 – 2020/21 to Council for approval.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 While the Council's revenue position is performing well against the estimates set in the original budget, there remains a longer-term imperative of reducing net service costs, by either reducing costs or increasing income, rather than relying on short-term measures to balance the budget. Delivery against the 8-point plan and effective resourcing of key projects will help the Council to achieve this position, alongside maximising the benefit from reserves. This should allow the Council to build its resilience against the increasing volatility of its funding streams, and to improve its financial stability.
- 2.2 The Strategy provides the framework to deliver a stable and sustainable financial position over the medium-term, to enable the Council to achieve its strategic objectives and to support the preparation of the 2018/19 budget.

3 STRATEGY REVIEW

- 3.1 Cabinet considered the following key areas as part of its review of the financial strategy:
 - 3.1.1 Central Government Funding
In recent years, local government has weathered significant cuts in funding coupled with additional risk and responsibility balanced by some increased flexibility particularly around the level of reliefs, discounts or exemptions awarded. The majority of grants are now provided without being ring-fenced for specific uses, allowing greater flexibility at a local level.

A number of grants have been subsumed into the Council's overall funding level, which continues to reduce in total, with Revenue Support Grant disappearing altogether in 2019/20.

3.1.2 Business Rates Retention Scheme

The current Rates Retention Scheme has introduced major fluctuations in income levels for Rushmoor due to the complexity of the scheme, the significant sums involved, the perverse accounting mechanisms and the requirement to make a provision against successful appeals.

The Chancellor previously announced plans for a 100% Business Rates Retention Scheme with local government retaining all business rates rather than the current system whereby 50% of the rates collected locally are pooled centrally and redistributed back to local authorities.

However, the fall of the Local Government Finance Bill due to the legislative workload created by the UK's decision to leave the European Union mean that elements of the new scheme requiring legislative change will be delayed. Meanwhile, work is continuing on the Fair Funding Review and the expansion of 100% Business Rate pilots.

3.1.3 New Homes Bonus

Reforms to the New Homes Bonus (NHB) introduced for 2017/18, meant a reduction in the number of legacy payments from 6 to 4 by 2018/19 and the introduction of a national baseline for housing growth to sharpen the incentive for councils to deliver more new homes. Further reforms are planned.

3.1.4 The multi-year settlement offer

On 10th March 2016, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government wrote to every local authority in England setting out the conditions for an offer of a multi-year settlement, spanning the four years from 2016/17 to 2019/20.

97% of Councils (including Rushmoor) took up the offer as it provided a level of certainty for Councils regarding their financial position for the period to 2019/20. Councils that chose not to accept the offer are subject to the existing annual process for determining the level of central funding that they will receive and the uncertainty that this will bring.

The period of certainty allowed Councils to take longer-term decision, planning ahead and implementing reforms. However, as we now move into the third year of the offer, the certainty over future funding is vastly reduced and less benefit is derived.

3.1.5 The 2018/19 Local Government Finance Settlement – Technical Consultation paper

On the 14th September 2017, DCLG published a technical consultation paper on the 2018/19 Local Government Finance Settlement, outlining

- the method for distributing NHB and plans for further reform
- proposal for the 2018/19 council tax referendum principles (for Shire

- Districts less than 2% or up to and including £5 whichever is higher)
- the approach to business rates tariffs and top-ups to cancel out the impact of business rates revaluation on local authority income
- the approach to Mayoral Combined Authorities precepts in 2018/19
- the approach to allocating funding where a fire authority transfers from a County Council to a Police and Crime Commissioner

3.1.6 Treasury Management

Cabinet considered a number of treasury management issues including the forecast for interest rates, the expected level of investment holdings and the cost of borrowing over the medium-term and consultation on changes to the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Treasury Management and Prudential Codes of Practice.

In particular, the Cabinet considered the potential for government measures to restrict the ability of Councils to invest in commercial property and the consequential effect on its ability to raise income to offset any future funding gap.

3.1.7 Level of Reserves

Cabinet considered the level of reserves to set aside to support the financial position particularly given the fast pace of change of local government funding, the exposure to risk of fluctuations in business rate income and our reliance on funding streams such as NHB, which could be reduced at short notice. The Council needs to ensure that it has sufficient levels of reserves to cope with such short-term risk whilst it builds up other sources of income and reduces its expenditure.

3.1.8 Other factors

Cabinet considered risks around loss of income and chargeable services, increasing demand for services, the effect of Welfare Reform and other potential legislative changes, the potential impact for local services from budget proposals being considered by Hampshire County Council and the financial implications of the UK's decision to leave the European Union.

4 MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL FORECAST

- The updated Revenue forecast for the period 2017/18 – 2020/21 shows a funding gap of £2.2m over the medium-term. The forecast is based on the estimated outturn position reported to Cabinet in August 2017. After allowing for any significant one-off items of expenditure or income for the current year, the forecast takes into account major changes forecast for the period up to 2020/21. It also contains a number of assumptions such as inflation, pay awards, and increases in both the tax base for Council Tax and the charge for Council Tax.
- This forecast provides a high-level indicator of the direction of travel for the Council's finances over the medium-term and should not be taken as a detailed budget proposal. Cabinet will make recommendations for the 2018/19 budget later in the financial year for consideration by Council in February 2018.

- 4.3 The Council plans to close the revenue funding gap by continuing to deliver against its 8-Point Plan for financial sustainability. The plan includes a range of projects that aim to establish new income streams and reduce costs by more efficient service delivery and better use of Council assets.
- 4.4 The 8-point plan is a fluid one, with new schemes coming forward as current projects are delivered and estimates revised as business cases are developed. The current projections show that the funding gap will largely be achieved over the medium-term but focus needs to be maintained on delivery, particularly if we are to meet the challenging requirement for 2019/20 and beyond.
- 4.5 The Capital Programme for 2017/18 – 2020/21 concentrates on four key areas – asset improvement, invest to save projects, regeneration schemes and support to housing such as Disabled Facility Grants and grants to Registered Social Landlords.
- 4.6 Rushmoor's capital receipts reserve was just £5.9m at the start of 2017/18 and substantial borrowing will be required in the future to meet the ambitious capital programme, while always considering the affordability of borrowing costs within the Council's revenue budget.

5 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The Medium-Term Financial Strategy as set out at Appendix A sets a framework for managing the Council's finances and will support the Council Plan.
- 5.2 The Council has taken significant steps to reduce its cost base whilst protecting front line service delivery and continuing to invest in the future through annually reviewing its priorities and undertaking key invest-to-save and regeneration projects.
- 5.3 The 8-Point Plan will produce significant efficiency savings over the medium term from a combination of service efficiency reviews, procurement savings, invest-to-save projects, new income generation and decisions on the structure of the Council.
- 5.4 However, the Council continues to face significant financial challenges due to reduced central government funding, increased financial volatility, uncertainty and risk over the medium-term. The Council will need to continue to undertake a detailed review of areas where efficiencies can be made in order to realign budgets to meet its priorities and to develop new income streams to support current spending plans.
- 5.5 The Council will need to ensure adequate risk reserves are maintained to provide capacity to invest in service transformation and to mitigation against future shortfalls. The use of reserves is not a long-term solution to funding challenges but does enable the Council to plan and implement service changes over time, whilst providing a buffer against sudden shifts in the Council's income streams. This strategy provides resilience and allows the Council time to approach future funding requirements in a considered,

structured way.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 It is recommended that Council approve the Medium-Term Financial Strategy 2017/18 – 2020/21 as set out in Appendix A.

P.G. TAYLOR
CABINET MEMBER FOR CORPORATE SERVICES

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2017/18 – 2020/21

The Medium Term Financial Strategy is based around five key principles. These are set out below with supporting actions for each principle.

Revenue Expenditure - The Council recognises that it has to target its limited resources to where they are most needed, ensuring good services that represent good value for money. The Council recognises the need to reduce its net revenue expenditure in the face of reduced funding from central government, economic pressures, local demography and increased demand for services.

- The Council will set a balanced budget each year, reflecting its objectives, priorities and commitments.
- The Council will seek to deliver efficiencies, new income streams and cost reductions based on the key elements of its 8-point plan for delivering financial sustainability;



The 8-point plan is a fluid plan, responding to new pressures and adapting to new initiatives so these over-arching headings may change over time.

- There is no presumption that non ring-fenced grants will be spent on the purposes for which they are nominally provided (appropriate business cases to be provided for spending against such grants)
- Regular review of the Council's fees and charges
- The Council will seek to reduce reliance in its revenue budget on uncertain funding streams such as New Homes Bonus.

Capital Expenditure - the Council will only undertake capital investment in support of its priorities and where it supports asset maintenance, invest-to-save schemes or strategic intent (such as regeneration). Capital spending plans, whether funded from internal resources or through borrowing, will be affordable, prudent and sustainable.

- The Council will develop an asset management strategy that seeks to maximise return on existing Council assets, divest itself of low-performing assets and sets out parameters for investment in property to increase income to the Council.
- The Council will set prudential indicators, including borrowing limits, for capital financing through its annual Treasury Management Strategy ensuring any future borrowing is affordable, prudent and sustainable.
- The Council will explore opportunities for borrowing as the need arises such as Public Works Loan Board, European Investment Bank, through the Local Enterprise Partnership, other Local Authorities and the UK's Municipal Bond Agency.
- The Council will seek alternative forms of funding to use of its internal resources where possible, maximising the use of external resources such as s106 contributions and funding from Local Enterprise Partnerships and exploring private sector funding opportunities where available.
- The Council will review the estimated level of Revenue Contributions to Capital annually as part of the budget process, the actual level of contribution being dependent on the outturn position each year. As the Council moves towards borrowing, the contributions to capital may be replaced in the revenue budget by the cost of carrying debt.
- Capital receipts from the sale of assets will be used to meet future corporate priorities rather than be retained for use by the service that has relinquished the asset
- Resources allocated to particular capital projects but subsequently not required are returned to meet future corporate priorities rather than be retained for use by that service
- No new capital schemes are included in the programme without the necessary resources to meet the full capital costs and any on-going Revenue costs being in place.
- All new capital schemes are subject to the bid process for inclusion in the Capital Programme, which requires whole life costing for new bids for the current revised budget and for the upcoming year. Indicative bids are required for future years in order to have a picture of capital spending over the medium term but these later projects will require business cases and further approval as they come forward. New capital schemes brought forward in-year are supported by business

APPENDIX A

cases and reported to CLT and Cabinet in line with current financial regulations.

Reserves - the Council will maintain a reasonable level of usable reserves to enable it to weather the volatility of its funding position and to support invest-to-save schemes as part of its aim to reduce net revenue costs.

- The Council will maintain its General Fund balance between £1 million and £2 million.
- In addition, the Council will maintain other usable reserves (E.g. Stability & Resilience Reserve/Service Improvement Fund) to provide a buffer against fluctuations in income and expenditure and to support invest-to-save schemes. The estimated level of these usable reserves (including the General Fund Balance) at the close of 2017/18 is £5.8 million, which is around 7.2% of the Council's gross expenditure. The Council will aim to maintain a minimum level of reserves at 5% of gross expenditure, while recognising that the figure may go up or down, adjusting to short-term pressures within the revenue budget principally as a result of the operation of the Business Rates Retention Scheme.
- Reserves are not used to meet on-going, unsustainable levels of expenditure but may be used in the short-term in conjunction with plans to reduce net revenue costs over the medium-term
- Regular review of all reserves in order to:
 - Maintain and replenish funds which will be used to mitigate the substantial risks identified over the medium term
 - Maintain reserves to support the provision of major projects, invest-to-save schemes or service reviews in order to support the work of the 8-point plan as referred to above
 - Release those reserves which are no longer required due to changing circumstances
- The Council will annually review the level of earmarked reserves it sets aside to mitigate against known risks or future liabilities, to ensure that the level of those reserves remains appropriate, returning balances no longer required to the General Fund.

Governance and Performance - the Council will monitor the delivery of its financial strategy and performance against savings requirement, adjusting the plans to meet changing demands. This will be achieved by:

- Annual review of key strategies such as Medium Term Financial Strategy and Treasury Management Strategy, with updates to relevant Committees, Policy and Review panels and Cabinet as appropriate

APPENDIX A

- Continuous improvement of governance and project management of key programmes and projects, ensuring benefits of invest-to-save projects are realised.
- Ensuring that the Council's budgets, financial records and accounts are prepared and maintained in line with accounting standards, CIPFA Code of Practice on Local Government Accounting, the CIPFA Prudential code and relevant sections of the Council's Constitution and Financial Regulations.
- Timely budget and performance monitoring arrangements (through budget monitoring and quarterly performance monitoring reports).
- Preparation of financial plans to cover a four-year period, including revenue and capital expenditure, Tax bases and Council Tax Support Scheme.
- Budget guidelines are maintained and reviewed annually by the Council's s151 officer.
- New spending plans are considered only if they make a clear contribution to the Council's objectives and priorities or meet new statutory responsibilities.
- Ensuring proposals for significant projects and changes are set out in an appropriate business case to assess the impact on the Council.

The Council will seek out opportunities to work with partners to maximise outcomes for our residents, explore access to funding and maximise the shared benefits of joint working.

- The Council will explore joint working opportunities or shared services where they add benefit to the Council or its residents with partners including (but not exclusive to):
 - County Council
 - Police
 - Fire and Rescue Authority
 - Other local authorities
 - Local Enterprise Partnership
 - Voluntary and Community sector
 - Private sector
- The Council will seek to maximise the financial benefit and security of any potential devolution deal with government.
- The Council will seek to optimise external funding opportunities to defray cost of services and capital investment or to increase available resources.

This page is intentionally left blank



RUSHMOOR BOROUGH COUNCIL

CABINET

Tuesday, 17th October, 2017 at 7.00 pm
at the Council Offices, Farnborough

Councillor D.E. Clifford, Leader of the Council
Councillor K.H. Muschamp, Deputy Leader and Business, Safety and Regulation
Portfolio Holder

Councillor Barbara Hurst, Health and Housing Portfolio Holder
Councillor G.B. Lyon, Concessions and Community Support Portfolio Holder
Councillor M.L. Sheehan, Leisure and Youth Portfolio Holder
Councillor P.G. Taylor, Corporate Services Portfolio Holder
Councillor M.J. Tennant, Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder

The Cabinet considered the following matters at the above-mentioned meeting. All executive decisions of the Cabinet shall become effective, subject to the call-in procedure, from **31st October, 2017**.

35. MINUTES –

The Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 19th September, 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

36. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2017/18 - 2020/21 –
(Councillor Paul Taylor, Corporate Services Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. FIN1731, which set out the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy and sought endorsement of an updated Strategy for the period 2017/18 to 2020/21. The Report also set out the Medium Term Financial forecast, which had been produced for indicative planning purposes. It was confirmed that final decisions on the overall budget and Council Tax level would be made by the Council in February 2018.

The Cabinet was advised that the Strategy had been reviewed and updated but had remained largely unchanged from the Strategy approved by the Council in October 2016. The Report set out all the risks, assumptions and initiatives that had been

considered in formulating the new Strategy. Members were informed that the existing Strategy had served the Council well in supporting financial planning over the medium term. It had been integral to the Corporate Plan and had supported the 8-Point Plan for the achievement of sustainability.

The Cabinet was informed that, to ensure that a revised Strategy would be relevant to current decision making, it was necessary to consider this in the context of the Medium Term Financial Forecast. The Revenue Forecast showed a projected budget gap of £2.2 million by 2020/21.

In response to a question, it was confirmed that the Council's level of reserves was considered to be adequate at the current time, although it was anticipated that this level was likely to increase later in the financial year.

The Cabinet

- (i) **RECOMMENDED TO THE COUNCIL** that the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy, as set out in Appendix A of Report No. FIN1731, be approved; and
- (ii) **RESOLVED** that the Medium Term Financial Forecast and the principal issues and risks associated with it, as set out in the Report, be noted.

37. COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME AND COUNCIL TAX DISCOUNTS - CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS – (Councillor Gareth Lyon, Concessions and Community Support Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. FIN1730, which set out a proposal to undertake a public consultation in respect of the Council's Council Tax Support Scheme in order to inform any decision to review or amend the Scheme for the 2018/19 financial year. It was also being proposed to carry out a public consultation exercise on potential changes to certain, locally set, Council Tax discounts and exemptions.

Members were reminded that local authorities had been developing their own Council Tax Support Schemes since April 2013. It was confirmed that the current scheme required a minimum contribution by Council Tax payers of 10%, with a savings threshold of £6,000. It was reported that 10% was at the lower end of similar councils' schemes and, for this reason, the majority of the Welfare Reform Task and Finish Group had supported including a range of potential increases to the contribution payable to 12%, 15%, 18%, 20% and 25% in the consultation. In supporting the proposals, Members stressed the importance of encouraging the swift return to use of vacant properties.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) the undertaking of public consultation on the harmonisation elements of the Council's Council Tax Support Scheme, as set out in Report No. FIN1730, be approved;
- (ii) the inclusion in the consultation of a range of potential increases to the contribution payable to 12%, 15%, 18%, 20% and 25% be approved;

- (iii) the Head of Financial Services, in consultation with the Concessions and Community Support Portfolio Holder, be authorised to agree the details of the consultation paper, following discussion with the Welfare Reform Task and Finish Group;
- (iv) the undertaking of a public consultation exercise on options around the level of Council Tax discounts and exemptions, as set out in the Report, be approved;
- (v) the Head of Financial Services, in consultation with the Concessions and Community Support Portfolio Holder, be authorised to agree the details of the consultation paper in respect of Council Tax discounts and exemptions.

38. SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PROCEDURE –

(Councillor Ken Muschamp, Business, Safety and Regulation Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. EHH1731, which set out the Council's proposed new Policy and Procedure for Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults.

Members heard that the proposed Policy complied with the most recent Government guidance in relation to safeguarding matters, Working Together to Safeguard Children and set out the Council's commitment to safeguarding the welfare of children and vulnerable adults.

The Cabinet was supportive of the proposed new Policy and discussed areas including how culture could affect safeguarding procedures, the use of the term 'Honour Based Violence' and usage of the Safety Net website. It was agreed that any reference to 'Honour Based Violence' would be either re-worded or an explanation added that no incidences of violence should be considered to carry any 'honour'.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that the adoption of the Policy and Procedure for Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults, as set out in Appendix 1 of Report No. EHH1731 and amended at the meeting, be approved.

39. FUNDED SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE FOR AIR QUALITY FEASIBILITY STUDY ON THE A331 –

(Councillor Martin Tennant, Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. EHH1729, which set out a request for an income and expenditure supplementary estimate of £50,000 in 2017/18 to undertake a 'Proposal for a Feasibility Study' into measures to improve air quality along the A331.

Members were informed that the feasibility study was required by DEFRA, who would be fully grant funding the whole project. It was confirmed that, on approval of the proposal, further funding would be allocated to undertake the feasibility study itself.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) the additional duties placed on the Council and the deadlines for completion of the key milestones, as set out in Report No. EHH1729, be noted;
- (ii) an income and expenditure supplementary estimate of £50,000 in 2017/18 be approved;
- (iii) noting that further work may also be granted funded by DEFRA, future income and expenditure through the budget monitoring process be approved, with the expectation that expenditure would be kept in line with income; and
- (iv) the approach being taken to this work, as set out on the Report, be approved, noting that the final Plan would require approval by the Cabinet.

40. **PLANNING FOR THE RIGHT HOMES IN THE RIGHT PLACES: CONSULTATION PROPOSALS –**
(Councillor Martin Tenant, Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. PLN1733, which sought agreement to submit comments in response to the Government's 'Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places' consultation.

The Report explained that the consultation had been created as a result of the Government's Housing White Paper earlier in 2017. Proposals in the consultation included setting out a proposed standard methodology for calculating local authorities' housing need. The new methodology would result in Rushmoor's net new homes required per annum dropping compared to the current methodology. Similarly, the net new homes required in both Surrey Heath and Hart would also fall under the new methodology. Whilst it was acknowledged that the current methodology for calculating housing need was in need of reform, it was felt that, given that the Local Plan was at an advanced stage in its preparation and that it plans positively for the delivery of new homes and the regeneration of the town centres, the preparation of the Local Plan should continue. In addition, as the new methodology was at the consultation stage and might change, it was considered appropriate to continue on the basis of the current evidence base. The Council's proposed responses to the consultation were set out in Appendix 1 to the Report.

The Cabinet discussed several elements of the consultation and was keen to ensure that local schools and the Clinical Commissioning Group had full access to this and future consultations.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) the Council make representations on the Right Homes in the Right Places consultation, as set out in Appendix 1 of Report No. PLN1733; and
- (ii) the continuation of the preparation of the Rushmoor Local Plan be approved, with submission to the Planning Inspectorate in early 2018.

41. FARNBOROUGH AIRPORT COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL FUND –
(Councillor Martin Tennant, Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. COMM1719, which sought approval to award a grant from the Farnborough Airport Community Environmental Fund, which had been set up to assist local projects.

The Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder had considered the application by the Community Matters Partnership Project for an award of £3,477 towards the cost of returning an overgrown balancing pond to its original state at Balmoral Pond, Balmoral Drive, Frimley and had recommended that this should be approved. It was confirmed that this application met all of the agreed criteria.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that a grant of £3,477 be awarded from the Farnborough Airport Community Environmental Fund to the Community Matters Partnership Project.

42. VICTORIA ROAD CHAPEL, FARNBOROUGH –
(Councillor Paul Taylor, Corporate Services Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. LEG1715, which set out a request for funding of £44,000 for the construction of a new structural roof and a proposed approach for the future of the Victoria Road Chapel, Farnborough.

Members were reminded that a fire in July 2016 had destroyed the Chapel's roof. It was reported that the sum of £44,000 would be required to replace the roof and carry out minor masonry repairs to return the building to its pre-fire condition. The Cabinet was informed that the Farnborough Society had expressed an interest in attempting to secure the future use of the building as a columbarium, with a predicted cost of £262,725.00. The Council's preferred option was to allow the Farnborough Society time to raise the required sum for the columbarium project but, if this were to prove unfeasible, the Council would pursue an option to de-consecrate the site and convert the Chapel to a domestic dwelling for letting.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) a variation to the Capital Programme of £44,000 to fund the roof restoration at the Victoria Road Chapel, as set out in Report No. LEG1715, be approved;
- (ii) subject to the Farnborough Society indicating a wish to pursue Option 2, as set out in the Report, and being able to both raise the capital funding to convert the Chapel into a columbarium within two years and establish a legal entity to take a lease, the Solicitor to the Council be authorised to agree the terms and conditions of the lease to transfer a leasehold interest in the Chapel; and
- (iii) in the event that the Farnborough Society indicated that it was not in a position to support Option 2, then the Solicitor of the Council be authorised to apply for the de-consecration of the Chapel and to make a bid in the Capital Programme, subject to viability, to convert the Chapel to a residential use for letting.

NOTE: Cr. Barbara Hurst declared a prejudicial interest in this item in respect of her involvement with the Farnborough Society and, in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, left the meeting during the discussion and voting thereon.

43. **ADDITIONAL ITEM - SALE OF FORMER HIGHWAY LAND AT NORTH TOWN PHASES 1-4 –**

(Councillor Paul Taylor, Corporate Services Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. LEG1716, which sought approval to sell former highway land at Vivid's redevelopment in North Town, Aldershot. The Chairman welcomed Cr. K. Dibble, who had requested to address the Cabinet on this issue.

Cr. Dibble explained that the North Town Ward Councillors had been asked to act as go-betweens by prospective residents whose occupation had been delayed by the legal issues that were ongoing. Cr. Dibble requested that the reasons for the issues occurring should be investigated by the Council and that the Cabinet should do everything possible to expedite the process.

The Report set out the background to the proposal and the progress to date. Vivid had appointed Savills to undertake a valuation of the former highway land. This value would need to be confirmed by the District Valuer before the transfer to Vivid could go ahead. Members were informed that, in addition to Phases 1 – 4 as set out in the Report, some of the former highway land was situated within Phase 6A. Members were supportive of the approach proposed.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that the Solicitor to the Council be authorised to sell the former highways land at North Town Phases 1 – 4 and 6A, shown edged red on the plan at the appendix of Report No. LEG1716, to Vivid on the terms set out in the Report and at a price within a 10% variance of the value determined by the District Valuer.

44. **ADDITIONAL ITEM - COMMERCIAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS –**

(Councillor Paul Taylor, Corporate Services Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. LEG1717, which sought approval for delegated powers to make timely offers on commercial property acquisitions.

The Report set out the parameters within which it was proposed that bids could be made and it was confirmed that, where this action was taken in future, the matter would be reported to the following Cabinet meeting.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that the Solicitor of the Council, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, the Corporate Services Portfolio Holder, the Head of Financial Services and the Chief Executive, be authorised to make offers to acquire commercial properties within the allocated capital budget and with a report following to the subsequent Cabinet meeting, as set out in Report No. LEG1717.

The Meeting closed at 8.01 pm.

D.E. CLIFFORD
LEADER OF THE COUNCIL



RUSHMOOR BOROUGH COUNCIL

CABINET

Tuesday, 14th November, 2017 at 7.00 pm
at the Council Offices, Farnborough

Councillor D.E. Clifford, Leader of the Council
Councillor K.H. Muschamp, Deputy Leader and Business, Safety and Regulation
Portfolio Holder

Councillor Barbara Hurst, Health and Housing Portfolio Holder
Councillor G.B. Lyon, Concessions and Community Support Portfolio Holder
Councillor M.L. Sheehan, Leisure and Youth Portfolio Holder
Councillor P.G. Taylor, Corporate Services Portfolio Holder
Councillor M.J. Tennant, Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder

The Cabinet considered the following matters at the above-mentioned meeting. All executive decisions of the Cabinet shall become effective, subject to the call-in procedure, from **28th November, 2017**.

45. MINUTES –

The Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 17th October, 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

46. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING AND FORECASTING 2017/18 - POSITION AT OCTOBER, 2017 –
(Councillor Paul Taylor, Corporate Services Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. FIN1733, which set out the anticipated financial position for 2017/18, based on the monitoring exercise carried out during October, 2017. Members were informed that savings and efficiencies of around £550,000 had been required for the year and that this target had been achieved following significant reductions in expenditure in relation to the new waste collection, recycling, grounds' maintenance and street cleansing contract and the results of the Mutually Agreed Resignation Scheme (MARS). It was reported that the General Fund forecast showed a projected year-end balance of £1.399 million, just below the mid-point of the range set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy. It was noted that the

medium-term period remained financially challenging and that efforts should be concentrated on moving forward the 8-Point Plan to achieve a sustainable financial future.

The Cabinet NOTED the latest Revenue Budget monitoring position, as set out in Report No. FIN1733.

47. CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING AND FORECASTING 2017/18 - POSITION AT OCTOBER, 2017 –
(Councillor Paul Taylor, Corporate Services Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet received Report No. FIN1734, which provided the latest forecast regarding the Council's Capital Programme for 2017/18, based on the monitoring exercise carried out during October, 2017. The Report advised that the Capital Programme for 2017/18, allowing for slippages from the previous financial year and additional approvals, totalled £36,988,000. It was noted that some projects of major financial significance included in the Programme were the continued construction of the Council's new depot, Aldershot Town Centre Integration and developments in Union Street, Aldershot.

The Cabinet NOTED the latest Capital Programme monitoring position and the Prudential Indicators for 2017/18, as set out in Report No. FIN1734.

48. COUNCIL PLAN SECOND QUARTER 2017/18 PERFORMANCE UPDATE REPORT –
(Councillor David Clifford, Leader of the Council)

The Cabinet received Report No. DMB1704, which set out the Council's performance management monitoring information for the second quarter of the 2017/18 municipal year.

The Cabinet NOTED the progress made towards delivering the Council Plan 2017/18, as set out in Report No. DMB1704.

49. ANNUAL REVIEW OF FEES AND CHARGES –
(Councillor Paul Taylor, Corporate Services Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. FIN1735, which set out a proposed scheme of fees and charges for Council services.

The Cabinet was informed that this was the first time that the Council had reviewed all fees and charges in a single document. It was explained that the document included a description of the methodology applied in each case. The Cabinet considered the document and, in particular, discussed issues around planning and crematorium fees. In relation to parking charges it was considered important to retain the existing parking arrangements and restrictions in relation to Salisbury Road, Farnborough to continue to enable easy access to the pharmacy in that road.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) the adoption of the various methodologies attached in Appendix 1 of Report No. FIN1735 be approved as a basis for uplifting the Council's fees and charges;
- (ii) the continued application of RPIx as the measure of inflation, where an annual inflationary uplift was specified, be approved; and
- (iii) the fees and charges, as set out in Appendix 1 to the Report, be approved for implementation on the applicable dates.

50. **APPLICATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY RATE RELIEF –**

(Councillor Gareth Lyon, Concessions and Community Support Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. FIN1735, which set out details of applications for rate relief from the Lisa May Foundation (Office No.2, Fifth Floor, Arena Business Centre, No. 282 Farnborough Road, Farnborough) and Andover Mind (Nos. 121 – 123 Victoria Road, Aldershot).

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) 20% top-up discretionary relief be awarded to the Lisa May Foundation from 1st September, 2017 to 31st March, 2022; and
- (ii) 10% top-up discretionary relief be awarded to Andover Mind from 1st September, 2017 to 31st March, 2022.

NOTE: Cr. Barbara Hurst declared a prejudicial interest in this item in respect of her involvement with Parity for Disability and its close relationship with the Lisa May Foundation and, in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, left the meeting during the discussion and voting thereon.

Cr. P.G. Taylor declared a personal but non prejudicial interest in this item in respect of his involvement with the Farnborough Christian Outreach and, in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, remained in the meeting during the discussion and voting thereon.

51. **FARNBOROUGH AIRPORT COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL FUND –**

(Councillor Martin Tennant, Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. COMM1720, which sought approval to award a grant from the Farnborough Airport Community Environmental Fund, which had been set up to assist local projects.

The Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder had considered the application by the 1st Crookham Scout Group for an award of £2,400 towards the cost of purchasing and installing a six-section traversing wall within the scout compound. It was confirmed that this application met all of the agreed criteria.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that a grant of £2,400 be awarded from the Farnborough Airport Community Environmental Fund to the 1st Crookham Scout Group.

52. CAR AND CYCLE PARKING STANDARDS - REVIEW OF SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT –

(Councillor Martin Tennant, Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. PLN1734, which set out the Rushmoor Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2017 for approval. Members were informed that public consultation had taken place, commencing on 7th July, 2017 and concluding on 6th September, 2017. The consultation process had attracted sixteen representations and the comments received were summarised in Appendix A to the Report. The draft document had been amended to take account of these representations and the revised document was set out in Appendix B to the Report.

The Cabinet was supportive of the new document and it was confirmed that the resolution of parking issues would remain a high priority for the Council.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) the responses to the consultation on the draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document, as set out in Appendix A to Report No. PLN1734, be noted;
- (ii) the adoption of the Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2017, as set out in Appendix B to the Report, be approved; and
- (iii) the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder, be authorised to make any necessary minor amendments to the Supplementary Planning Document, prior to its publication.

53. VOYAGER HOUSE, APOLLO RISE, FARNBOROUGH - COMPULSORY PURCHASE –

(Councillor Paul Taylor, Corporate Services Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Report No. LEG1719, which sought approval to acquire, either by agreement or by the making of a Compulsory Purchase Order, the land known as Voyager House, Apollo Rise, Southwood Business Park, Farnborough to deliver, in partnership with the North East Hampshire and Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group, an Integrated Care Centre for the Farnborough locality.

The Solicitor to the Council explained that, in making the decision, the Cabinet had to be satisfied that there was a compelling case for an integrated health centre in the public interest and that this involved balancing the need of the Clinical Commissioning Group and the public in having access to the proposed primary health care facility against the rights and plans of the owner for the premises. In considering this and the other matters relating to this proposal, Members were referred to both the statement of reasons for making the order at Appendix 2 of the Report and the late information previously circulated, being letters dated 19th October, 2017 and 10th November, 2017 from Shoosmiths Solicitors and sections 4 and 5 of the Planning Statement and Sequential Test, dated 14th September, 2017, prepared by the Clinical Commissioning Group as part of the planning application,

giving full details of their consideration of the alternative sites. It was noted that, in May 2017, prior to the sale of the premises to the owner in August 2017, the Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group had advised the vendor's agent of their interest in the property and had attempted, unsuccessfully, to establish the identity of the purchaser. It was further noted that subsequent to the owners' acquisition, an approach had been made to acquire the premises but terms had not been agreed, with the owners proceeding with the fit out of the premises and the Clinical Commissioning Group awaiting the outcome of their planning application.

The Cabinet considered the alternative sites set out in section 5 of the Planning Statement and Sequential Test document and was satisfied with the Clinical Commissioning Group's assessment of them against the criteria in section 4 that they were not suitable for provision of the integrated health centre. The Solicitor to the Council confirmed that, following receipt of counsel's advice, that Section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 was the most appropriate power to use, the power in Section 25(4) and Schedule 4, paragraph 27(1) of the National Health Service Act 2006 being unavailable to the Clinical Commissioning Group. It was further confirmed that a change of use of the premises was within the definition of development under the section. The Cabinet was advised that planning permission had been granted on the 9th November, 2017 for the Integrated Health Care Centre on the site.

The Cabinet discussed the proposal and the owners proposed use of the premises for 40 serviced offices and was satisfied that there was a compelling need for an integrated health centre for the Farnborough locality for the reasons set out in the draft Statement of Reasons, including the unsuitability and insufficiency of the existing GP premises stock, the lack of ability to address these deficiencies due to building constraints and tenure and the unsustainable nature of the current primary care provision in the locality where there is a growing need. It was agreed that, following the grant of planning permission, a further attempt to acquire by agreement should be made.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that

- (i) the making of a compulsory purchase order be approved, pursuant to powers under Section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (in accordance with the procedures in the Acquisition of Land Act 1981), for the acquisition of the land known as Voyager House, Apollo Rise, Southwood Business Park, Farnborough shown coloured pink on the draft Compulsory Order map in Appendix 1 ("the Land") to the Report, as the acquisition would facilitate the carrying out of development for the change of use of Voyager House to an integrated health care facility, which development was likely to contribute to the achievement of the improvement of the social well-being of the Council's area ("the Scheme");
- (ii) the draft Statement of Reasons for making the Order be approved and the Solicitor to the Council be authorised to make changes to the Statement;
- (iii) the Solicitor to the Council be authorised to:
 - (a) enter into an agreement for lease with the North East Hampshire and

Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group, conditional upon the acquisition of the Land or confirmation of the Compulsory Purchase Order upon such terms as the Solicitor to the Council agrees in accordance with Section 233(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990;

- (b) subject to the agreement of the Heads of Terms for an agreement for lease between the Council and the North East Hampshire and Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group, take all steps to secure the making, confirmation and implementation of the Compulsory Purchase Order (“the Order”) including the publication and service of all notices and the promotion of the Council’s case at any public inquiry, including but not limited to the steps in (c) to (i) below
 - (c) make any amendments, deletions or additions to the draft Order Map and to prepare the schedules to the Order so as to include and describe all interests in land required to facilitate the carrying out of the Scheme;
 - (d) acquire interests in the Order Land either by agreement or compulsorily including conduct of negotiations and making provision for the payment of compensation;
 - (e) negotiate, agree terms and enter into agreements with interested parties for the withdrawal of objections to the Order making provision for the payment of compensation;
 - (f) in the event that the Order is confirmed by the Secretary of State, execute General Vesting Declaration and / or serve Notices to Treat and Notices of Entry in respect of interests and rights in the Order Land;
 - (g) take all steps in relation to any legal proceedings relating to the Order including defending or settling claims referred to the Lands Tribunal (Lands Chamber of the Upper Tribunal) and / or applications made to the courts and any appeals;
 - (h) retain and / or appoint external professional advisers and consultants to assist in facilitating the promotion, confirmation and implementation of the Order and the settlement of compensation and any other claims or disputes;
 - (i) to procure the conversion and fit out works for the conversion of the Land in accordance with the Scheme and to enter into any agreements in connection therewith; and
- (iv) the continuing efforts to acquire, by agreement, the interests in land needed to facilitate implementation of the Scheme, be noted.

54. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC –**

RESOLVED: That, taking into account the public interest test, the public be excluded from the meeting during the discussion of the under mentioned item to avoid the disclosure of exempt information within the paragraph of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act, 1972 indicated against the item:

Minute No.	Schedule 12A Para. No.	Category
55	3	Information relating to financial or business affairs

THE FOLLOWING ITEM WAS CONSIDERED IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PUBLIC

55. **VOYAGER HOUSE - COMMERCIAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION –**
(Councillor Paul Taylor, Corporate Services Portfolio Holder)

The Cabinet considered Exempt Report No. LEG1718, which sought approval to acquire the freehold of Voyager House, Apollo Rise, Southwood Business Park, Farnborough as a commercial property acquisition to let to the North East Hampshire and Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group to provide an Integrated Care Centre for the Farnborough locality.

The Solicitor to the Council confirmed that, since the Report had been prepared, the North East Hampshire and Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group had confirmed that:

- approval had been received from the Clinical Commissioning Group Delegated Primary Care Commissioning Committee and Governing Body to proceed with the project;
- the level of rent (determined by the costs of the acquisition and fit out) at a 5% return was affordable; and
- they had authority to enter into an agreement for lease.

The Cabinet RESOLVED that, in light of the confirmation of the above information, the drawing down of the overall capital costs of the whole Voyager House project against the £15 million capital programme budget, approved by the Council on 27th July, 2017 for the purposes of investment property acquisition, be approved.

The Meeting closed at 8.09 pm.

D.E. CLIFFORD
LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

LICENSING AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

Meeting held on Monday, 25th September, 2017 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr A. Jackman (Chairman)
Cllr J.E. Woolley (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Liz Corps
Cllr S.J. Masterson
Cllr M.D. Smith
Cllr L.A. Taylor
Cllr Jacqui Vosper

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr Sue Carter, Cllr Sophia Choudhary, Cllr A.H. Crawford and Cllr B. Jones.

14. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 26th June, 2017 were approved and signed by the Vice-Chairman.

15. INTERNAL AUDIT - AUDIT UPDATE

The Committee considered the Audit Manager's Report No. AUD1705 which gave an overview of the work completed by Internal Audit during Quarter 2, an update on progress made with the expected deliverables for Quarters 2 and 3 (as had been approved by the Committee at the previous meeting) and sought endorsement of the work expected to be delivered in Quarter 4.

The Committee was advised that resources within Internal Audit currently remained the same as had been reported to the previous meeting in June 2017. The Audit Manager's post had been advertised and contractors continued to be used to provide assistance for the delivery of the internal audit plan. The resources would further change in Quarter 3, as the Internal Auditor would be commencing maternity leave. It was noted that this post would initially be covered through the use of contractors.

The Committee noted that, in Quarter 2, work had been carried out on Activation Aldershot (Capital Programme), heating payments, card payments, capital projects follow up, transparency code, purchase and sale of property and land and contract letting and tendering. In addition, it was noted that, as a requirement of the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards, an external assessment against the standards was currently in progress. The assessment was being carried out as a peer review with the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Audit Managers' Group. Each of the overall standards was being reviewed and discussed by the Group in order to identify best practice across Hampshire. The findings of the external assessment would be

reported to the Committee in due course highlighting areas in which further work might be required.

It was further noted that, in Quarter 2, Internal Audit would be assisting External Audit with some of the work required around checking IT parameters on the Benefits system, which was required for the annual Housing Benefit return.

The Report set out details of the current status against audits previously agreed to be delivered in Quarter 2 and the additional audit review required.

The work expected to be delivered in Quarters 3 and 4 had been selected from the high risk areas set out in Appendix B to the Report. These were in respect of: HR (HMRC requirements/taxation requirements); Finance (NNDR Billing and Collection); HR (payroll); Finance (FMS and Bank Reconciliation); Finance (Purchase Ledger); Community (Parking machine income follow-up); Finance (Activation Aldershot follow-up); and, Finance (Capital Programme - Depot). The Committee noted that, due to resource limitations and an additional higher risk area having been identified in Quarter 2 for review in 2017/18, it was unclear at this stage if these audits could be completed in 2017/18.

RESOLVED: That

- (i) audit work carried out in Quarter 1 and the update to the expected deliverables in Quarters 2 and 3, as set out in the Audit Manager's Report No. AUD1704, be noted; and
- (ii) the expected deliverables for Quarter 3 be endorsed.

16. ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT

The Committee considered the Solicitor to the Council's Report No. LEG1713 which sought approval of the Council's Annual Governance Statement 2016/17 in light of the adoption by the full Council on 27th July 2017 of a revised Code of Corporate Governance. The Report also sought approval to publish the Annual Governance Statement alongside the Council's Statement of Accounts, which would be considered later at the meeting.

The Committee had considered a draft of the Annual Governance Statement at the meeting on 26th June, 2017, based on a draft Code of Corporate Governance which, at the time, had yet to be adopted by the full Council. This had subsequently taken place on 27th July 2017. The Committee was advised that the Annual Governance Statement had been further amended after the Corporate Leadership Team had undertaken a review of the significant governance issues to be addressed in the forthcoming year. The principal areas of risk were now set out in the Governance Statement under 'Risk Management, the General Data Protection Regulation and the Risk of Non-delivery of Key Projects'. The Review of Policy and Review Panels, the Review of Partnership Working and other items identified in the previous version would be undertaken within service areas but were not considered to be significant governance issues. The revised Annual Governance Statement was set out in full

as an Appendix to the Report. The Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive were both required to sign the Annual Governance Statement.

RESOLVED: That the Annual Governance Statement 2016/17, as set out in the Solicitor to the Council's Report No. LEG1713, be approved for publication with the Council's Statement of Accounts.

17. STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT RESULTS

The Committee considered the Head of Financial Services' Report No. FIN1729, which sought approval for the Council's Statement of Accounts for 2016/17 and set out the findings of the Council's external auditors, Ernst & Young, in carrying out their audit work in relation to the 2016/17 financial year.

The Committee noted that the Statement of Accounts had been prepared in line with CIPFA's Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting¹ for 2016/17 under International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) and in accordance with the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2015. The Statement of Accounts had to be published by 30th September 2017.

The Statement of Accounts consisted of the following sections, all of which were set out in Appendix A to the Report:

- Narrative Statement
- Statement of Responsibilities
- Core Financial Statements - Movement in Reserves, Comprehensive Income and Expenditure, Balance Sheet and Cash Flow
- Notes to the Core Financial Statements - including accounting policies
- Collection Fund and accompanying notes

The Council's Annual Governance Statement, which had been approved earlier at the meeting, would be published alongside the Statement of Accounts.

The Council would be providing a letter of representation to the Auditors as part of the annual audit process. This was an important factor in enabling the Auditor to form his/her opinion as to whether the Statement of Accounts provided a true and fair view of the financial position of the Council. A copy of the text of this letter was set out in Appendix C of the Audit Results Report.

The Chairman then welcomed Ms Justine Thorpe of Ernst & Young who was attending the meeting to present the Audit Results Report 2016/17, which was set out in Appendix B to the Report. Ms Thorpe stated that she anticipated that Ernst & Young would issue an unqualified opinion on the financial statements and that the Council had made proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources. The Auditor had also made some recommendations to strengthen the Council's governance arrangements in relation to the role of the Committee, a review of the Council's risk management framework and the way the Council reviewed the advice received from experts.

The Head of Financial Services and Ms Thorpe then answered Members' questions in respect of land value and buildings on such areas of land.

RESOLVED: That

- (i) the Auditor's Audit Results Report, as set out in the Head of Financial Services' Report No. FIN1729, be noted;
- (ii) the Financial Statements for 2016/17 be approved
- (iii) the letter of representation be approved; and
- (iv) the Chairman be authorised to sign page 15 of the Statement of Accounts 2016/17 to certify the Committee's approval.

18. ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND SOCIAL CARE OMBUDSMAN

The Committee considered the Solicitor to the Council's Report No. LEG1714, which updated the Committee on the annual summary of statistics on the complaints made to the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO).

The Committee noted that the LGO conducted independent, impartial investigations of complaints about service failure and maladministration. Where complaints arose regarding Rushmoor Borough Council, there was a two-stage formal complaints procedure. Only after the completion of these stages, if the complainant was still dissatisfied then they had the option to complain to the Local Government Ombudsman. If the Ombudsman found maladministration causing injustice, then he would make recommendations for a remedy to redress the injustice. The LGO could also recommend changes to policy and practice to address wider systemic failures. The LGO now included 'Social Care' in its name and logo. This was in response to feedback which suggested that the original name acted as a barrier to recognition with the social care sector.

The Committee was advised that, in addition to the 2016/17 annual letter, the LGSCO had provided spreadsheets detailing additional information on the complaints and enquiries received within the period and information on the decisions made in the period. A copy of the spreadsheet was set out in the appendix to the Report.

The Committee was advised that from 5th April 2016 until 20th March 2017 the LGSCO had received a total of seven complaints against the Council. Two of these had been referred back to the Council for local resolution without further action being taken by the Ombudsman. The remaining five complaints had been generated from Environmental Health (1), Planning (3) and Revenues and Benefits (1). The complaints received against the Council had been decided as follows:

- three complaints had been closed after initial enquiries without any investigation having been undertaken.
- the remaining two complaints had not been upheld.

The LGSCO report therefore had concluded that Rushmoor Borough Council had a 0% uphold rate out of seven complaints made against it. The uphold rate was

calculated in relation to the total number of detailed investigations. Members noted that this continued the uphold rate from the previous year and was indicative that the Council's complaints system was working well and that complaints had been properly addressed when they occurred.

RESOLVED: That the Solicitor to the Council's Report No. LEG1714 be noted.

The meeting closed at 7.18 pm.

CLLR A. JACKMAN (CHAIRMAN)

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting held on Wednesday, 8th November, 2017 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr B.A. Thomas (Chairman)
Cllr J.H. Marsh (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Mrs. D.B. Bedford
Cllr D.M.T. Bell
Cllr R. Cooper
Cllr Sue Dibble
Cllr Jennifer Evans
Cllr D.S. Gladstone
Cllr C.P. Grattan
Cllr A.R. Newell

Non-Voting Members

Cllr M.J. Tennant (Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder) (ex officio) attended the meeting.

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr P.I.C. Crerar.

41. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

42. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13th September, 2017 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

43. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED: That

- (i) permission be given to the following applications, as set out in Appendix "A" attached hereto, subject to the conditions, restrictions and prohibitions (if any) mentioned therein:

17/00494/REMPP	(McGrigor Zone D Wellesley, 116 Dwellings);
17/00495/LBC2PP	(McGrigor Zone D Wellesley, Listed

44. ENFORCEMENT AND POSSIBLE UNAUTHORISED DEVELOPMENT

- (i) No. 61A Tongham Road, Aldershot –

RESOLVED: That the decision to take enforcement action by the Head of Planning in accordance with the Council's Scheme of Delegation, more specifically specified in the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1736, be noted.

- (ii) No. 44 Gravel Road, Farnborough –

RESOLVED: That the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1736 be noted with respect to this property.

- (iii) **Grasmere House, No. 33 Cargate Avenue, Aldershot –**

RESOLVED: That the Committee note the Head of Planning's Report

No. PLN1736 (as amended at the meeting in relation to this item).

(iv) **No. 10 Grosvenor Road, Aldershot –**

The Committee considered the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1736 regarding the alleged breach in relation to a change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to massage parlour (Sui Generis – without Class). In the absence of a response to two letters sent to Shanghai Therapy Massage, the organisation had been advised that the matter would be referred to the Committee.

Members were advised that the current use of the premises was acceptable in principle and that an application to continue the present use as a massage parlour would receive a recommendation for the grant of planning permission.

RESOLVED: That no further action be taken in respect of an alleged breach of use at No. 10 Grosvenor Road, Aldershot, as set out in Report No. PLN1736.

45. APPEALS PROGRESS REPORT

The Committee received the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1737 concerning the following appeal decision:

Application No.	Description	Decision
17/00357/REXPD	Against the Council's refusal of Prior Approval for Larger Home Extensions for the erection of a single storey rear extension at No. 33 Cotswold Close, Farnborough	Dismissed

RESOLVED: That the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1737 be noted.

46. PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT) SUMMARY REPORT FOR THE QUARTER JULY - SEPTEMBER 2017

The Committee received the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1738 which provided updates on the Performance Indicators for the Development Management Section of Planning and the overall workload of the Section for the period 1st July to 30th September, 2017.

RESOLVED: That the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1738 be noted.

The meeting closed at 7.55 pm.

CLLR B.A. THOMAS (CHAIRMAN)

Development Management Committee

8th November 2017

Appendix "A"

Application No. **17/00494/REMPP** **12th June 2017**
& Date Valid:

Proposal: APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS: for construction / conversion of existing buildings to provide 116 dwellings (Use Class C3) in Development Zone D (McGrigor), together with associated access, parking and public open space, pursuant to Condition 4 (1 to 21), attached to Outline Planning Permission 12/00958/OUT dated 10th March 2014. at **Zone D - McGrigor Aldershot Urban Extension Alisons Road Aldershot**

Applicant: Grainger (Aldershot) Limited And Secretary Of State For Defence

Conditions: 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason - As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 The permission hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings and documents:

Drawings: AHL.01A; CSL.01B; DML.01A; EB.01 B;
LP.01 A; SE.01 A; SE.02 A;
SL.01 B; SS.01 A; SS.02 A; SS.03 A; PP.01 B;
SB.pe A; P.1.Ex.p A; P.1.Ex.e1 A;
P.1.Ex.e2 A; P.1.Pro.p A; P.1.Pro.e1A;
P.1.Pro.e2 A; P.7-8.Ex.p1 A; P.7-8.Ex.p2 A;
P.7-8.Ex.e1 A; P.7-8.Ex.e2 A; P.7-8.Pro.e1B;
P.7-8.Pro.e2 B; P.7-8.Pro.p1 B;
P.7-8.Pro.p2 B; P.100-104.e1 A; P.100-104.e2 A;
P.100-104.p A; P.105-109.e1 A; P.105-109.e2 A; P.105-109.p A; P.110.e A; P.110.p A; FB-A.e1 A; FB-A.e2 A;
FB-A.e3 A; FB-A.e4 A; FB-A.p1 A; FB-A.p2 A; FB-A.p3 A; FB-B-A.e1 A; FB-B-A.p1 A; FB-B-B.p1 A; FB-B.e1 A;
FB-B.e2 A; FB-B.e3 A; FB-B.p1 A; FB-B.p2 A; FB-B.p3 A; FB-C.e1 A; FB-C.e2 A; FB-C.e3 A; FB-C.e4 A; FB-C.p1 A; FB-C.p2 A; FB-C.p3 A; FB-D.e1 A; FB-D.p1 A; FB-D.p2 A; FB-D.p3 A; FB-E.e A; FB-E.p A; BCS.01 A; GAR.D01.pe A; GAR.S01.pe A; GAR.S02.pe

A; GAR.S03.pe A; GAR.S04.pe A; GAR.T01.pe A; GAR.T02.pe A; GAR.T03.pe A; HT-2B4P.e A; HT-2B4P.p;
HT-2B4P.pA; HT.2B4P_OPT1.e A;
HT.2B4P_OPT2.e A; HT.2B4P_OPT2.p A;
HT.3B.1_OPT1.e A; HT.3B.1_OPT1.p A;
HT.3B.1_OPT2.e A; HT.3B.1_OPT2.p A; HT.3B.5.e A;
HT.3B.5.p A; HT.3B.5P_OPT1.e A; HT.3B.5P_OPT1.p A; HT.3B.5P_OPT2.e A; HT.3B.5P_OPT2.p A; HT.4B.1.e A;
HT.4B.1.p A; HT.5B.1.e A; HT.5B.1.p A; HT.5B.1-A.e A; HT.5B.1-A.p A; P2-5.e1 A; P2-5.e2 A; P2-5.p A;

P12.e A; P12.p A; P.37-38.e A; P.37-38.p A;
P.39-40_41-42.e A; P.39-40_41-42.p A; P.55-56_57-58.e A; P.55-56_57-58.p A; P.86-87.e A; P.86-87.p A;
P.92-94.e A;
P.92-94.p A; P.95-96.e A; P.95-96.p A; P.97-98.e A;
P.97-98.p A; P.99.e A; P.99.p A; 2519-MG-LA-01 P6;
2519-MG-LA-02 P6; 2519-MG-LA-03 P6; 2519-MG-LA-04 P6; 2519-MG-LA-05 P4; 2519-MG-LA-08 P8; 2519-MG-LA-09 P5; 2519-MG-DT-01 P1; 2519-MG-DT-03 P1; 2519-MG-DT-04 P1; 2519-MG-DT-05 P2; 2519-MG-DT-06 P1; GTASHOT_D/GA/01 D; GTASHOT_D/GA/02 D; GTASHOT_D/GA/03C; GTASHOT_D/GA/04D; GTASHOT_D/GA/05E; GTASHOT_D/GA/06D; GTASHOT_D/GA/07D; GTASHOT_D/GA/08D; GTASHOT_D/GA/09C; GTASHOT_D/GA/10C; GTASHOT_D/GA/11C; GTASHOT_D/GA/12A; GTASHOT_D/RD/01C; GTASHOT_D/RD/02; GTASHOT_D/RD/03; GTASHOT_D/RD/04; GTASHOT_D/SK/03D; GTASHOT_D/SU/01D; GTASHOT_D/UT/01D; GTASHOT_D/UT/02D; GTASHOT_D/UT/03D; GTASHOT_D/UT/04D; GTASHOT_D/VT/01A; GTASHOT_D/VT/02B; GTASHOT_D/VT/03B; GTASHOT_D/LG/01 C; GTASHOT_D/LG/02 B; IR.ZGTASHOT.MCGRIGOR.21.1 D; IR.ZGTASHOT.MCGRIGOR.21.2 D; IR.ZGTASHOT.MCGRIGOR.21.5 D; IR.ZGTASHOT.MCGRIGOR.21.3 D; IR.ZGTASHOT.MCGRIGOR.21.4D; and IR.GTASHOT.16A.16E.21.2.

Documents: Planning Statement (Savills, June 2017); Design & Access Statement Revision A (Thrive Architects, May 2017); Heritage Statement Revision D (October 2017); Affordable Housing Development Zone Strategy and Reserved Matters Statement (Grainger, June 2017); Noise Assessment (WYG, February 2017); Lighting Assessment (WYG, February 2017); Phase I

Desk Study ref: LP1076 (Leap Environmental Ltd., 15th January 2016); Phase II Site Investigation Report ref: LP001207 (Leap Environmental Ltd., Issue 3 26th October 2017); Construction Traffic Management Plan - Revision A (Mayer Brown, June 2017); Construction Environmental Management Plan (Mayer Brown, June 2017); Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Watching Brief ref: 79182.06 (Wessex Archaeology, February 2017); Arboricultural Development Statement ref: CBA9016 v2, (CBA Trees, May 2017); Phase 1 & Phase 2 Bat Survey (Lindsay Carrington Ecological Services, May 2016); Bat Tree Survey (Lindsay Carrington Ecological Services, November 2016); Landscape Management Plan ref: 2519-MG-RE-01-P7 (Allen Pyke Associates, May 2017); and Building 17B - Stable Block - Recording Document Rev B.

Reason - To ensure the development is implemented in accordance with the permission granted.

- 3 A schedule of the materials (including samples where required by the Local Planning Authority) to be used for the external surfaces of the dwellings hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, before the relevant part of the development to which they relate is commenced (excluding preparatory ground works), and this condition shall apply notwithstanding any indications to these matters which have been given in this application. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the relevant part of the development.*

Reason - To ensure satisfactory external appearance for the development and to safeguard the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of adjoining heritage assets.

- 4 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, drawings detailing the amalgamation of the two ground floor affordable rented units in Block B identified on drawings GRAIN151116 FB-B.P1 A, GRAIN151116 FB-B.A.P1 A and GRAIN151116 FB-B.B.P1 A to create one bespoke accessible three-bedroom wheelchair unit, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include layout plans and any associated external alterations to the elevations and access to the

building, together with a timescale for implementation agreed in consultation with the Housing Strategy and Enabling Manager. The unit shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and the timescales as agreed, unless the Local Planning Authority confirms in writing that there is no identified need for the bespoke unit. In this event, the development shall be implemented in accordance with approved drawing GRAIN151116 FB-B.P1 A *

Reason - To provide wheelchair accessible affordable housing in response to an identified local need, in accordance with the provisions of the Wellesley Affordable Housing Strategy.

- 5 Prior to first occupation of those dwellings fronting Hospital Road and Hope Grants Lane (as identified in the Noise Assessment Report WYG, February 2017); details of the proposed glazing and ventilation strategy, with a sound reduction between Rw 31 - Rw 36 dB with windows closed and other means of ventilation provided, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and thereafter retained in accordance with the approved details.*

Reason - To safeguard future occupiers of the development against noise disturbance.

- 6 The development shall be carried out in accordance with the methodology and recommendations contained within the Arboricultural Development Statement ref: CBA9016 v2, (CBA Trees, May 2017). Prior to first occupation of the development, a completion report shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to demonstrate satisfactory compliance with the tree protection measures outlined in the ADS hereby approved.*

Reason - To safeguard existing and replacement trees within the site, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and biodiversity.

- 7 Construction or demolition work of any sort within the area covered by the application shall only take place between the hours of 0800-1800 on Monday to Fridays and 0800-1300 on Saturdays. No work at all shall take place on Sundays and Bank or Statutory Holidays.

Reason - To protect the amenities of

neighbouring residential properties and to prevent adverse impact on traffic and parking conditions in the vicinity.

- 8 The residents' and visitors' parking spaces (including life time homes and wheelchair housing bays) shall be laid out and allocated in accordance with details provided on drawing PP.01 B (Parking Plan) hereby approved, prior to first occupation of the development to which they relate, and shall be used only for the parking of vehicles ancillary and incidental to the residential use of the McGrigor Development Zone.*

Reason - To ensure the provision and availability of adequate off-street parking and to safeguard residential amenity.

- 9 The cycle parking spaces shown on the approved plans shall be provided prior to the first occupation of any part of the development to which they relate and kept available at all times thereafter for the parking of bicycles. *

Reason - To ensure that a sufficient level of cycle parking is available for the development to meet its operational needs and in the interests of highway safety.

- 10 All wild birds and their nests are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). If any trees are to be removed or structures demolished during the bird breeding season (March-September inclusive) they should first be inspected by an experienced ecologist and the development should be carried out in accordance with the methodology and recommendations contained within the Arboricultural Development Statement ref: CBA9016 v2, (CBA Trees, May 2017) hereby approved, to ensure that no active nests are present. If an active nest is discovered it shall be left in situ until the young have fledged.

Reason - To prevent harm to breeding birds

- 11 The development hereby approved shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the methodology and recommendations contained within the Written Scheme of Investigation for an Archaeological Watching Brief (Wessex Archaeology - ref: 79182.06, February 2017).

Reason - To secure the protection of archaeological assets if they are discovered.

12 The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the Construction Environmental Management Plan (Mayer Brown, June 2017) hereby approved.

Reason - In order to safeguard local environmental conditions and wildlife during the construction of the development.

13 The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan REV A (Mayer Brown, June 2017) hereby approved.

Reason - To prevent any adverse impact on traffic and parking conditions and highway safety in the vicinity of the site.

14 The proposed refuse and recycling storage for the development shall be provided in accordance with the details shown on the approved drawings prior to the first occupation of any part of the development to which they relate, and shall be retained thereafter for the life of the development.*

Reason - To safeguard the amenities and character of the area and to meet the functional needs of the development.

Application No. 17/00495/LBC2PP
& Date Valid:

13th June 2017

Proposal: LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: for internal and external alterations, (including demolition of Stable Block (Building 17B) and rear additions to Cambridge House (Building 17A) and St Michaels House (Building 18A), to facilitate the conversion of Cambridge House and St Michaels House to provide 3 dwellings as part of a scheme for 116 dwellings (Use Class C3) in Development Zone D (McGrigor). (PLEASE SEE APPLICATION REFERENCE 17/00494/REMP FOR DRAWINGS AND DOCUMENTS) at **Zone D - McGrigor Aldershot Urban Extension Alisons Road Aldershot**

Applicant: Grainger (Aldershot) Limited And Secretary Of State For D...

Conditions: 1 The consent hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings and documents:

Drawings: AHL.01 A; CSL.01 B; DML.01 A; EB.01 B; LP.01 A; SE.01 A; SE.02 A; SL.01 B; SS.01 A; SS.02 A; SS.03 A; PP.01 B; SB.pe A; P.1.Ex.p A; P.1.Ex.e1 A; P.1.Ex.e2 A; P.1.Pro.p A; P.1.Pro.e1 A; P.1.Pro.e2 A; P.7-8.Ex.p1 A; P.7-8.Ex.p2 A; P.7-8.Ex.e1 A; P.7-8.Ex.e2 A; P.7-8.Pro.e1 B; P.7-8.Pro.e2 B; P.7-8.Pro.p1 B; P.7-8.Pro.p2B; P.100-104.e1A; P.100-104.e2 A; P.100-104.p A; P.105-109.e1 A; P.105-109.e2 A; P.105-109.p A; P.110.e A; P.110.p A; FB-A.e1 A; FB-A.e2 A; FB-A.e3 A; FB-A.e4 A; FB-A-p1 A; FB-A-p2 A; FB-A-p3 A; FB-B-A.e1 A; FB-B-A.p1 A; FB-B-B.p1 A; FB-B.e1 A; FB-B.e2 A; FB-B.e3 A; FB-B.p1 A; FB-B.p2 A; FB-B.p3 A; FB-C.e1 A; FB-C.e2 A; FB-C.e3 A; FB-C.e4 A; FB-C.p1 A; FB-C.p2 A; FB-C.p3 A; FB-D.e1 A; FB-D.p1 A; FB-D.p2 A; FB-D.p3 A; FB-E.e A; FB-E.p A; BCS.01 A; GAR.D01.peA; GAR.S01.peA; GAR.S02.peA; GAR.S03.p eA; GAR.S04.peA; GAR.T01.peA; GAR.T02.peA; GAR.T03.p eA; HT-2B4P.eA; HT2B4P.p; HT-2B4P.pA; HT.2B4P_OP T1.eA; HT.2B4P_OPT2.eA; HT.2B4P_OPT2.pA; HT.3B.1_OPT1.eA; HT.3B.1_OPT1.pA; HT.3B.1_OPT2.eA;

HT.3B.1_OPT2.pA;HT.3B.5.eA;HT.3B.5.pA;HT.3B.5P_O
PT1.eA;HT.3B.5P_OPT1.pA; HT.3B.5P_OPT2.e A;
HT.3B.5P_OPT2.p A; HT.4B.1.e A; HT.4B.1.p A;
HT.5B.1.e A; HT.5B.1.p A; HT.5B.1-A.e A; HT.5B.1-A.p
A; P2-5.e1 A; P2-5.e2 A; P2-5.p A; P12.e A; P12.p A;
P.37-38.e A; P.37-38.p A; P.39- 40_41-42.e A;
P.39-40_41-42.p A; P.55-56_57-58.eA;P.55-56_57-58.p
A; P.86-87.e A; P.86-87.p A; P.92-94.e A;P.92-94.p A;
P.95-96.e A; P.95-96.p A; P.97-98.e A; P.97-98.p A;
P.99.e A; P.99.p A; 2519-MG-LA-01 P6; 2519-MG-
LA-02 P6; 2519-MG-LA-03 P6; 2519-MG-LA- 04 P6;
2519-MG-LA-05 P4; 2519-MG-LA-08 P8; 2519-MG-
LA-09 P5; 2519-MG-DT-01 P1; 2519-MG-DT-03 P1;
2519-MG-DT-04 P1; 2519-MG-DT-05 P2; 2519-MG-
DT-06 P1; GTASHOT_D/GA/01 D; GTASHOT_D/GA/02
D;GTASHOT_D/GA/03C;GTASHOT_D/GA/04D;
GTASHOT_D/GA/05E;GTASHOT_D/GA/06D;
GTASHOT_D/GA/07D;GTASHOT_D/GA/08D;
GTASHOT_D/GA/09C;GTASHOT_D/GA/10C;
GTASHOT_D/GA/11C;GTASHOT_D/GA/12A;
GTASHOT_D/RD/01C;GTASHOT_D/RD/02;
GTASHOT_D/RD/03;GTASHOT_D/RD/04;
GTASHOT_D/SK/03D;GTASHOT_D/SU/01D;
GTASHOT_D/UT/01D;GTASHOT_D/UT/02D;
GTASHOT_D/UT/03D;GTASHOT_D/UT/04D;
GTASHOT_D/VT/01A;GTASHOT_D/VT/02B;
GTASHOT_D/VT/03B;GTASHOT_D/LG/01C;

GTASHOT_D/LG/02 B;
IR.ZGTASHOT.MCGRIGOR.21.1 D;
IR.ZGTASHOT.MCGRIGOR.21.2 D;
IR.ZGTASHOT.MCGRIGOR.21.5 D;
IR.ZGTASHOT.MCGRIGOR.21.3 D;
IR.ZGTASHOT.MCGRIGOR.21.4D; and
IR.GTASHOT.16A.16E.21.2.

Documents: Planning Statement (Savills, June 2017); Design & Access Statement Revision A (Thrive Architects, May 2017); Heritage Statement Revision D (October 2017); and, Building 17B - Stable Block - Recording Document Rev B.

Reason - To ensure the works are implemented in accordance with the consent granted.

- 2 No demolition works herby approved shall commence until a Demolition Method Statement (including methodology to protect existing structures) is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The demolition works shall be carried out

strictly in accordance with the approved strategy.

Reason: To safeguard the special architectural and historic character of the buildings.

- 3 The Building Recording Document submitted with the application for Stable Block Building 17B shall be made available through the relevant public archive prior to the commencement of the demolition hereby approved, in accordance with Section 9.0 of the Conservation Plan and Heritage Strategy (December 2012) approved under planning permission 12/00958/OUT dated 10/03/2014.

Reason - To record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets to be lost.

- 4 No works other than the demolition of Building 17B Stable Block hereby approved shall commence until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
- (i) A detailed written Schedule of External and Internal Works. The schedule shall refer to approved and supplementary plans and shall include method statements where appropriate;
 - (ii) Detailed drawings and methodology of proposed internal partitions and any proposed building insulation, demonstrating how the original internal fabric and features of the building would be affected, such as existing doors, windows and reveals, floorboards/coverings, walls, ceilings, cornices, picture rails, skirtings and other decorative features;
 - (iii) Details (drawings and/or samples where appropriate) of new internal and external materials and features, including plasterwork and decorative features, internal doors, joinery, flooring, roof tiles, ridge tiles, other roof coverings, stonework, external doors and windows, brick types (including extent of re-use of bricks), brick bond, mortar mix, pointing method, flashing, and exterior metal work, including external balconies/balustrades;
 - (iv) Typical large scale detailed drawings (1:5 and/or 1:20), including vertical and horizontal cross-sections through openings, of new windows and external doors,

including materials, finishes, head, sill, lintels and depth of reveal;

(v) Methodology (drawings where appropriate) for the refurbishment of retained windows and doors, including any required modifications (e.g. for thermal or sound attenuation purposes);

(vi) Details of proposed/refurbished external services and fixtures, including rainwater goods, soil stacks, flues, vents and ductwork where applicable.

This condition shall apply notwithstanding any indication as to these matters that have been given in the current application and the works shall be carried out and thereafter retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In the interests of preserving the special architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings.*

5 No works to clean or repoint external brickwork or stonework of any retained listed building shall be undertaken until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(i) Details of the extent of cleaning and repointing proposed;

(ii) Details of proposed cleaning method together with a sample area of brickwork/stonework has been prepared on site and inspected by the Local Planning Authority;

(iii) A sample panel/s not less than 1 metre square to show the proposed mortar composition and colour, and the method of pointing, has been prepared on site and inspected by the Local Planning Authority.

The sample panels/areas shall be photographed (or otherwise identified for comparison as work proceeds) prior to works commencing and the works shall thereafter be carried out to match the approved samples.

Reason - To ensure that the character, appearance and integrity of the listed buildings is not prejudiced, thereby preserving their special architectural and historic interest.*

- 6 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason - As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Application No.
& Date Valid:

17/00744/REVPP

5th September 2017

Proposal:

MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENTS to development approved under planning permission 16/00451/FULPP dated 16/08/2016 (for erection of 1 x studio flat, 2 x one bedroom flats and 1 x two bedroom flat with associated car parking,) to create a new parapet wall in the boundary with number 8 Queens Road, to add a dormer on the East elevation to create the required headroom for the approved stairs, to add six additional high-level roof-lights on the second floor to give more light to the property and one additional roof-light to provide a light tunnel to serve flat 3 of the first floor and amendments to internal layout of flats

at 10 Queens Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6DN

Applicant:

Mr & Mrs A & K Sahni

Conditions:

- 1 The permission hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings - BR-04 REV F, BR-05 REV E, BR-06 REV E, BR-07 REV E, BR-08 REV F, BR-09 REV D and BR-16.

Reason - To ensure the development is implemented in accordance with the permission granted

- 2 The development shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the details that were approved under reference 17/00012/CONDPP on 19/5/2017, pursuant to conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 13 of planning permission 16/00451/FULPP.

Reason - To ensure a satisfactory form of development.

- 3 The parking spaces shown on the approved plans shall be provided before the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and used only for the parking of vehicles ancillary and incidental to the residential use. These spaces shall be kept available at all times for parking and shall not be used for the storage of caravans, boats or trailers.

Reason - To safeguard residential amenity and ensure the provision and availability of adequate off-street parking.

- 4 All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the buildings or the practical completion of the development, whichever is the sooner.

Reason -To ensure the development makes an adequate contribution to visual amenity.

- 5 Construction or demolition work of any sort within the area covered by the application shall only take place between the hours of 0800-1800 on Monday to Fridays and 0800-1300 on Saturdays. No work at all shall take place on Sundays and Bank or Statutory Holidays.

Reason - To protect the amenities of neighbouring residential properties and to prevent adverse impact on traffic and parking conditions in the vicinity.

Application No. 17/00787/COUPP
& Date Valid:

19th September 2017

Proposal: Installation of secure bin and covered cycle store outbuildings; and change of use of existing offices (Use Class B1) to community healthcare resources hub (Use Class D1) for healthcare delivery for Farnborough at **Voyager House 2 Apollo Rise Farnborough Hampshire**

Applicant: North East Hampshire & Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group

Conditions: 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason - As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 Unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the permission hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings - PWP Architects Drawing Nos.5900 1000, - 1001 Rev.B, -1100 Rev.A (incorporating Design & Access Statement), -1101, -1105, -1106, -1107, -1300 Rev.A & -1301; Planning Statement and Site Photographs.

Reason - To ensure the development is implemented in accordance with the permission granted.

3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order, 1987, (or any other Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) the land and/or building(s) shall be used only for the purposes of a community healthcare facility and for no other purpose, including any other purpose within Class D1, without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - Having regard to the specific nature and circumstances of the proposed use and to ensure that

the implications for the amenities of the area and highway safety and convenience can be appropriately considered by the Local Planning Authority in the event that any other form of use falling within Use Class D1 is contemplated in the future.

- 4 The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until details for the specific provision for servicing (including by ambulances and passenger transport vehicles) and refuse collection has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, Furthermore, the development hereby approved shall not be occupied until disabled parking spaces, secure bicycle parking and facilities for servicing have been provided, marked-out etc in accordance with the approved plans. These facilities shall be thereafter retained solely for their identified purposes, and to be used by the occupiers of, and visitors to, the development as appropriate to their function.

Reason - To ensure the provision and retention of adequate parking and other vehicular facilities at the site to reflect the nature of the use hereby permitted in the interests of the safety and convenience of highway users.

CORPORATE SERVICES POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Thursday, 21st September, 2017 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr Jacqui Vosper (Chairman)
Cllr M.S. Choudhary (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr J.B. Canty
Cllr D.M.T. Bell
Cllr D.S. Gladstone
Cllr P.F. Rust
Cllr J.E. Woolley

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr R.L.G. Dibbs and Cllr B. Jones.

8. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 29th June, 2017 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

9. GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATIONS

The Panel welcomed Diane Milton, Legal Services Manager, who gave a presentation on data protection, in particular the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) 2016 which come into effect on 25th May, 2018. The presentation covered the following:

- Service Responsibilities
- Training
- Retention of Personal Data
- Role of Data Protection Officer
- Recent fines levied by the Information Commissioner's Office
- General Data Protection Regulations 2016
 - Steps being taken before effective implementation date
 - Rights of Individuals
 - Legal Basis for Processing
 - Privacy by Design
 - Contracts with Data Processors
 - Future Penalties

The Panel noted that Heads of Service were responsible for compliance with data protection legislation within their own service areas and that a cross-service working group had recently been set up to begin work on implementation of the necessary

changes to comply with the new GDPR, including revisions to the Corporate Risk Register, in-depth training for the Data Protection Officer as well as resource implications.

The Panel asked that updates and/or training for all Councillors should be provided on their obligations under current and new data protection legislation. The Panel agreed that data protection would be considered annually as part of the Panel's Work Programme.

The Panel thanked Diane Milton for her detailed presentation and **NOTED** the update.

10. **WORK PROGRAMME**

The Panel considered the updated list of items for the work programme for 2017/18. In addition to including a regular update on data protection, it was also noted that an update was due in 2018 on the Better Procurement Project.

The Panel noted that the meeting scheduled for 18th January, 2018 could potentially be used for a budget seminar for all Councillors.

Members were invited to put forward further potential items for the work programme which would be considered at the next mid-cycle meeting on 23rd October, 2017.

The Panel **NOTED** the work programme for 2017/18.

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm.

CLLR JACQUI VOSPER (CHAIRMAN)

JOINT MEETING OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND LEISURE AND YOUTH POLICY AND REVIEW PANELS

Meeting held on Tuesday, 7th November, 2017 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr Mrs. D.B. Bedford (Chairman)
Cllr D.S. Gladstone (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr T.D. Bridgeman
Cllr J.B. Canty
Cllr Sue Carter
Cllr Liz Corps
Cllr P.I.C. Crerar
Cllr K. Dibble
Cllr Sue Dibble
Cllr C.P. Grattan
Cllr A. Jackman
Cllr J.H. Marsh
Cllr Marina Munro
Cllr J.J. Preece
Cllr L.A. Taylor

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr Sophia Choudhary.

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Cllr Mrs. D.B. Bedford be appointed Chairman for the joint meeting of the Environment and Leisure and Youth Policy and Review Panels.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Cllr. D.S. Gladstone be appointed Vice-Chairman for the joint meeting of the Environment and Leisure and Youth Policy and Review Panels.

3. SOUTHWOOD GOLF COURSE - CONSULTATION

The Joint Panel meeting considered the options for the future of Southwood Golf Course following the completion of the recent consultation. The Joint Panel was asked to make a recommendation to the Cabinet which was scheduled to consider the issue on Tuesday 12th December, 2017. The Cabinet Members for Leisure and Youth (Cllr M.L. Sheehan) and Environment and Service Delivery (Cllr M.J. Tennant) were in attendance.

The consultation had been carried out due to a requirement for the Council to identify additional Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to continue to deliver the regeneration of the Borough's town centres and meet housing needs. The purpose of the consultation was to seek views on the option of converting Southwood Golf Course into new natural open parkland which would become SANG and allow for around 2,500 new homes to be built in the Borough.

The Joint Panel received a presentation from the Head of Community and Environmental Services which provided information on the SANG requirement and options in Rushmoor, the background to Southwood Golf Course, results of the consultation process and options for the way forward.

SANG was required as the whole of Rushmoor Borough was located within 5km of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (SPA). European law required housing developers to provide or contribute towards SANG as an alternative for recreational activities to encourage visitors away from the SPA. Current SANG had diminished with only 23 dwellings left in Rushmoor at the end August 2017. The housing need in Rushmoor from 2014-2032 required a minimum of 7,850 new dwellings. To date 836 had been completed with a further 4,897 permissions granted with SANG allocation. The Wellesley Woodland SANG had been ringfenced for the 3,850 properties in the Wellesley development. To deliver the housing numbers identified in the Local Plan, SANG was required for up to 3,000 new homes.

The Council had already explored alternative options for the provision of SANG for the Borough including Ball Hill in Farnborough and Farnham Quarry but neither were viable due to landowner aspirations and Natural England requirements. There were emerging options at Bramshot and Hawley Park Farm, Blandford House and Tongham Pools and the Council was also exploring with Natural England whether there was any residual surplus SANG at Wellesley. None of these sites were within Council ownership and therefore could not be guaranteed.

Due to the difficulties in identifying other potential SANG in Rushmoor the Cabinet had considered the possibility of converting the Southwood Golf Course into natural open parkland to include walking, cycling, fitness trails and natural play structures. The tender for the Golf Course was due for renewal in Spring 2019 and it currently cost the Council £40,000 per annum. The Council recognised the social, sporting and health benefits the Golf Course provided and that 25,000 rounds per annum rounds of golf were played by casual players, season ticket holders, club members and societies. There were alternative golf courses within a ten mile radius which generally accepted new members and casual players but it was noted that these were more expensive. Southwood Golf Course had the benefit of being flat and easy to get around for those with mobility health issues.

The consultation was carried out to help inform any decision made on the future of the Golf Course and the provision of SANG. The consultation had taken place throughout August and September and had been widely promoted through the web, social media, leaflet drops, press releases, static displays and meetings. The consultation had generated 2,413 responses. Overall, 39% were in favour of closing the Golf Course to provide natural parkland and 61% in favour of keeping it open.

However, from known Rushmoor residents, 50.6% were in favour of closing the Golf Course and turning it into parkland and 49.4% wanted to keep the Golf Course open. If the Golf Course was to close, of 1,330 respondents, 42% indicated they would give up playing golf, 29% would play less often and 29% would play at another course. Details were provided on what respondents would like to see if a new natural parkland was created which included walking and dog walking, cycle paths and natural trails as well as keeping a Golf Course. Comments from those wanting to close the Golf Course included the need for more parkland, parkland would benefit more people than the Golf Course and that it would allow more housing. Comments from respondents wanting to keep the course open included that it was affordable, there was already plenty of open space, health benefits and it was the best public course in the area.

A petition has also been received signed by 2,366 petitioners from Save Our Southwood Campaign Team. The petition accepted the need for additional housing but believed there were other ways of achieving the housing targets and the Council had enough SANG provision to meet requirements up to 2032 in the absence of Southwood Golf Course. The petition would be presented to the Council on 7th December, 2017.

The options proposed for consideration by the Joint Panel to recommend to Cabinet were:

- Close Southwood Golf Course to provide guaranteed SANG to support the regeneration of the town centres particularly Aldershot, provide additional Borough wide housing and provide open parkland available for everyone to use for walking, cycling and informal recreation.
- Explore the feasibility of providing a self funding nine hole golf course and the release of sufficient SANG to enable the regeneration of the Aldershot Town Centre and housing development to the south of the Borough.
- Retain Southwood Golf Course and continue to look for alternative SANG, recognising this could either prevent, limit or slow the regeneration of Aldershot Town Centre and housing development to the south of the Borough.

The Joint Panel requested that the Cabinet Members in attendance were available to answer questions only and should not be invited to make any representation.

The Joint Panel received representation from Helen Perry who was in favour of keeping Southwood Golf Course open primarily from an educational improvement perspective. Ms. Perry was of the opinion that the Golf Course should stay open in its full capacity. However, if it needed to be a smaller course to enable some housing there were some viable options. Ms. Perry suggested that the whole area should be a sports/leisure area which could include the Golf Course, cricket club and football club and provide space for sports science and health and well being facilities in line with higher and further education. The Council could work with local colleges to develop a sports academy to provide sport and environmental facilities for young people. Local schools could also make use of the Golf Course facilities for sports

education and environmental studies. The Council needed to consider the needs of young people and ensure there was future provision of facilities.

In response to questions Ms. Perry confirmed that the proposal was for access to facilities for the two further education colleges and three secondary schools to be able to provide outdoor education. It was also suggested that there could be a compromise to enable some of the Golf Course to remain open and use the rest for educational purposes. The Golf Course needed ambition to promote facilities to youths in the area and smart, creative and ambitious people needed to be employed to achieve success. There was also the opportunity to provide the educational facilities as open parkland. Ms. Perry asked if the Council had considered using some of the football stadium land in the Borough for SANG as there was a lot of provision for football in the area.

The Joint Panel received representation from Mike Bartley on behalf of David Scott who had been unable to attend the meeting in person. Mr. Scott was a wounded military veteran who had taken up golf as part of his rehabilitation. Southwood Golf Course had been the only course in the area willing to provide support through coaching, reduced green fees and a golf buggy which ultimately enabled Mr. Scott to take part in the Invictus Games and go on to win a gold medal in golf. Southwood Golf Course was a well suited course for disabled people. The Golf Course had also played a significant role in building Mr. Scott's confidence through the social aspect and interaction with other players.

The Joint Panel then received representations from Mike Bartley, Keith Ledgerwood and Barry Gilmore who spoke on behalf of the Golf Course users, families and local residents who wished to see the course remain open. The closure of the Golf Course to provide SANG to protect three types of bird was believed to be unnecessary as it was felt there was no evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of the mitigation. The provision of SANG to dissuade people from walking on the SPAs was felt to be inadequate. There was already lots of natural green spaces in the Borough but only one accessible, affordable pay and play golf course. The Golf Course provided a social hub for people of all ages but in particular provided a healthy social community environment for senior citizens. Young people could also play at a very reasonable cost and without the limitations associated with private clubs. Southwood Golf Course also provided a good quality course that was virtually level and accessible by golfers who would otherwise struggle on a hilly course.

The statements made by the Council were questioned relating to a number of issues. The £40,000 subsidy was felt to be a false saving as it was believed that most of the subsidy was for rates which would not be generated if the land was converted to SANG. The figures for rounds of golf played was believed to be 30,000 in the year to September 2017, which benefited more than just the 175 members. The fact that the course was not economically viable was disputed as annual revenue was estimated at between £400,000 and £500,000; it was highlighted that this was a speculative figure, as Mack Trading figures had not been accessed. There was disagreement that golf was in decline with a recent England Golf Impact Report showing that there was a significant demand for golf in Rushmoor. The purpose and priority to improve the quality of local people's lives would be achieved by keeping the Golf Course open for those people that played golf.

The housing figures required for SANG and the SANG already available were raised. It was suggested that the SANG required for 7,848 dwellings to 2032 could be met from the 5,531 already allocated and identified and from SANG that would become available from the Blandford House development and Bramshot Farm. It was proposed that the standard occupancy rate applied by Natural England of 2.4 people per home was high as the planned homes were predominantly one or two bedroom homes and a lower occupancy rate of 2 could be proposed. If the occupancy rate was lowered the mitigation would be for 2,645 homes which would be sufficient to exceed the requirement by 328 homes. In addition, recent Government consultation could reduce the overall housing requirement by more than 2,500 homes. It was proposed that the Council should wait until after the outcome of the Government consultation in April 2018 before making any decision to close the Golf Course.

The parameters used to set out the catchment areas for SANG were then questioned. It was requested that the Council discussed with Natural England some flexibility in the application of the SANG catchment area and the formula applied to hectares per person.

There was disagreement with the statement about there being a number of alternative courses where golfers could turn up and play without being members. The other courses in the area either: would not let non-members play at a weekend; were prohibitively expensive in comparison to Southwood; had limited or zero availability for membership; or, were hilly and long and not suitable for those with a disability or more senior, less mobile golfers. In the survey 42% of respondents said they would give up golf if the course closed which would not fit with the Council's corporate policy to improve the quality of local people's lives and promote health and wellbeing.

Those representing the users of the Golf Course read out two letters of support from charities that had benefited from fund raising through society matches and other fund raising events. Southwood golfers had raised approaching £500,000 for charities. The Golf Course was seen as a valuable local recreational asset by the charities and societies which brought revenue not only to the course but also to the local area and many were repeat visitors.

The Joint Panel raised a number of questions in response to the representations made. It was asked whether a 9-hole course would be a viable solution and would be accepted by the golfers. It was felt that a 9-hole course was not a viable solution and would be far less patronised by members. Those representing the users were of the view that there was no requirement to make the course into a 9-hole course as there was sufficient SANG elsewhere in the Borough and the Council should influence Natural England to apply some flexibility in the SANG requirement. It was also suggested that there could be a way of providing SANG and retaining the Golf Course in its current form by sharing the land and providing a public right of way.

Some members of the Joint Panel questioned the need to rush to make the decision. There were a number of issues that still needed to be considered before making a final decision on closing the Golf Course. It was suggested that the time should be used to lobby Government to amend the SANG legislation take into account urban

areas such as Rushmoor. Government assistance could also be sought to combine Hart, Surrey Heath and Rushmoor as one housing market area.

The Cabinet Member for Environment highlighted that there had been a number of SANG options explored before looking at Southwood Golf Course. The closure of the Golf Course was not an easy option to consider but there were no other options available. There was an urgent need to secure housing for the Borough, and he explained that there were currently 1,200 families on the waiting list for affordable housing and 100 families in temporary accommodation. Assurance was given that every effort would be made to lobby Government over the coming years to make SANG legislation more appropriate. Discussions had already been held with the local MP, Leo Docherty, to show that the SANG provisions were not suitable for an area like Rushmoor.

The Joint Panel acknowledged the requirement for affordable housing in the Borough and was keen to ensure any developments provided an appropriate amount of affordable and social housing. The Joint Panel was advised that the Council was able to influence the amount of social housing built as this was set out in the Local Plan and that local residents were offered accommodation in the social housing available. However, the Council had no influence over properties sold on the open market. Developers would have to provide a strong case to show that a development was not viable to provide social housing, and the case would be independently audited. If the independent audit showed the development to be viable the developer would be required to provide social housing.

Following a debate on the options open to the Council, it was proposed:

"That the decision regarding the future of the Southwood Golf Course be deferred for twelve months while all other options be pursued to include:

- Lobbying Government;
- Seeking special dispensation for the area of Rushmoor in the way it is treated for SANG land; and,
- Examination of alternative SANG provision to provide the necessary mitigation for housing development in Rushmoor."

After further discussion, the vote was taken with 8 voting for the proposal and 6 voting against. Therefore the proposal set out above was agreed for recommendation to Cabinet.

The meeting closed at 10.02 pm.

CLLR MRS. D.B. BEDFORD (CHAIRMAN)

CORPORATE SERVICES POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Thursday, 9th November, 2017 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr Jacqui Vosper (Chairman)

Cllr J.B. Canty
Cllr D.M.T. Bell
Cllr D.S. Gladstone
Cllr B. Jones
Cllr P.F. Rust

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr M.S. Choudhary, Cllr R.L.G. Dibbs and Cllr J.E. Woolley.

11. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 21st September, 2017 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

12. IMPACT OF UNIVERSAL CREDIT FOR RUSHMOOR

The Panel welcomed Dawn Menzies-Kelly, Revenues and Benefits Manager, who gave a presentation on the 'Impact of Universal Credit for Rushmoor'. The presentation covered the following:

- Background
- What is Universal Credit?
- Current timetable
- Impact on residents
- Impact on Rushmoor staff
- Planning
- Issues

The Panel noted that, currently, the only Rushmoor residents who were required to claim Universal Credit were single, unemployed job seekers, totalling 250. However, it was acknowledged that this number would increase markedly over the following years, with the housing benefit caseload reducing in comparison.

The Panel was reminded that Rushmoor's Housing Benefit team was assessed as the best in the country and that the impact of Universal Credit on them was under constant review.

The Panel observed that those residents without access to the internet would be disadvantaged by Universal Credit as registration and claims were all done online. It

was explained that the Council and the Citizens Advice Bureau would continue to work together to assist residents in this regard.

The Panel thanked Dawn Menzies-Kelly for her detailed presentation and **NOTED** the update.

13. DIGITAL STRATEGY

The Panel welcomed Ian Harrison, Corporate Director, Nick Harding, Head of ICT and Facilities Services, and Phil Roberts, IT Project Manager, who gave a presentation on 'Customer & Digital Strategy 2017-2020 Update', which had been endorsed by the Council in May 2017. The presentation covered the following:

- Context, ambitions and vision
- Customer insight
- 2017 highlights and new waste contract demonstration
- Members' IT, Digital Inclusion Taskforce and Cloud strategy
- Priorities for 2018/19
- Challenges
- Summary and questions

The Panel thanked Ian Harrison, Nick Harding and Phil Roberts for their detailed presentation and **NOTED** the update.

14. BUILDING SECURITY / EVACUATION PLANS

The Panel welcomed Roger Sanders, Corporate Health & Safety Adviser, and Alastair Murdoch, Facilities Team Leader, who gave a presentation on the 'Council Offices Emergency Evacuation Plans'. The presentation covered the following:

- Threat to Rushmoor
- Previous Plans
- What has changed?
- Current threats
- Fire risk assessment
- Role of Councillors
- Other arrangements

The Panel thanked Roger Sanders and Alastair Murdoch for their detailed presentation and **NOTED** the update.

15. WORK PROGRAMME

The Panel confirmed that the meeting scheduled for 18th January, 2018 would not be required as a Panel meeting and was to be used for a budget seminar for all Councillors.

The Panel was advised that the work programme would be reviewed in March 2018, following the publication of the Council Plan 2018/19.

The Panel **NOTED** the updated work programme for 2017/18.

The meeting closed at 9.40 pm.

CLLR JACQUI VOSPER (CHAIRMAN)

BOROUGH SERVICES POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Monday, 13th November, 2017 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr A.R. Newell (Chairman)
Cllr R.L.G. Dibbs (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr T.D. Bridgeman
Cllr Liz Corps
Cllr A.H. Crawford
Cllr S.J. Masterson
Cllr Marina Munro
Cllr B.A. Thomas

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr M. Staplehurst.

12. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 11th September, 2017 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

13. FIRE SAFETY ISSUES IN RUSHMOOR

The Chairman welcomed guests and Members to the meeting and explained that the meeting had been arranged to examine in more detail the Motion that had been submitted by Cllr J.J. Preece to the Council in July, 2017. The Council had agreed that the Motion should be referred to the Borough Services Policy and Review Panel. The element of the Motion to be considered was as follows:

“Hampshire Fire and Rescue Authority to ensure the HFRS is fully funded and resourced to keep the residents of Rushmoor safe, including having all the necessary trained personnel, equipment and procedures in place so that fires at all levels of the tallest residential buildings can be tackled effectively.”

In attendance were:

- Neil Odin – Chief Officer Elect Hampshire Fire and Rescue Authority
- Rob Cole – Head of Community Safety Hampshire Fire and Rescue Authority
- Gary Jackson – Fire Brigade Union
- Ryan Thurman – Group Commander (North Hampshire Group) Hampshire Fire and Rescue Authority
- Robert Mills – Regional Housing Director, Accent Housing
- Neil Cox – Director of Asset Management, Accent Housing
- Hilary Smith – Private Sector Housing Manager, Rushmoor Borough Council

Mr. Odin stated that the fire at Grenfell Tower in London had been unprecedented, and it was thought that a number of elements had contributed to the disaster, including the cladding and internal maintenance controls. It was reported that several fires had occurred in high-rise buildings in the past, but never on the scale of Grenfell.

The Panel noted the fire at Shirley Towers, Southampton where two firefighters had died in 2010. Since the events at Shirley Towers, the Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service (HFRS) had invested heavily in advanced firefighting equipment. This, combined with well-maintained housing stock and well trained fire fighters, ensured the best possible level of protection for residents. HFRS, as the enforcing authority, had the ability to restrict use of any building that was deemed unsafe.

Mr. Cole advised that all high-rise buildings should be built/converted to a certain standard and areas should be compartmentalised to hold fires inside proportioned areas. The responsible person/owner of a building was responsible for ensuring the building was safe and up to standard. The Fire Service audited buildings and had the power to enforce restrictions where necessary. Site specific operational support plans were available for residential buildings above 18 meters and each included risk information. The information was available on all fire vehicles and crews regularly visited the blocks to check water supplies and dry risers and familiarise themselves with the buildings.

The Panel was informed of the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Local Resilience Forum (HIOW LRF), a group consisting of representatives from the emergency services, local authorities and other organisations who potentially may be involved in an emergency. Post Grenfell Tower, a decision had been made by the HIOW LRF to assess each of the 272 high-rise buildings in Hampshire, five of which were located in Rushmoor. All cladding had been tested to determine if it was Aluminium Composite Material (ACM) which had been present at Grenfell Tower. It was noted that the cladding on the cladded buildings in Rushmoor was not ACM.

Public reassurance was also an area of concern after the events at Grenfell Tower. The HFRS had used social media to reach large numbers of people to offer reassurance and advice on fire safety. "Safe and Well" visits had also been organised for concerned individuals. At these visits residents were given advice on fire safety and how to prevent fires occurring. In addition, fire stations in locations near to high-rise blocks were opened to the public. Rushmoor Fire Service had also visited the two main high-rise blocks in the area (Alexander House and Stafford House), to offer reassurance to residents.

It was noted that five buildings in total had been inspected in Rushmoor, and letters of minor deficiencies had been sent to the properties' owners. Alexander House and Stafford House had been inspected twice and all five buildings were now up to the standards required by HFRS.

Mr. Mills of Accent Housing then gave an overview from its perspective as owners of Alexander and Stafford Houses. The Panel noted that Accent owned 22,000 properties across the country, 460 of which were in Rushmoor. Alexander and Stafford Houses were two of the tallest tower buildings in their portfolio.

Since the events at Grenfell, Accent had undertaken to carry out independent surveys of the buildings; these included independent testing of the cladding and insulation, a building survey to determine fire integrity, fire risk assessments and a tenancy audit. These measures had all been taken in addition to the HFRS requirements. Communication with residents in the blocks had also been a priority for Accent to keep everyone informed of the approach being taken. Reassurance visits had also been made to some individuals. The findings from the experts had identified 85 areas of work, which included fire stopping, fire doors, fire alarm panel conflicts and fire evacuation policies. It was estimated that the works had cost in the region of £75,000, all of which would be met by Accent. The fire evacuation policy evaluation had reinforced the "stay put" policy and Accent had ensured that the policy was consistent in both blocks. Signage had been updated and letters had been sent to all residents to advise of the "stay put" policy, copies of which would be shared with Members. It was noted that all safety measures would be reviewed in light of any recommendations from the Grenfell Tower inquiry. With regard to communal areas, it was noted that Accent took a zero tolerance approach to items left in these areas and ensured that all communal areas were clear of clutter and if issues of anti social behaviour within the buildings were reported then action would be taken.

The Panel discussed the presentations and asked a number of questions. It was advised that the "stay put" policy would be considered as part of the Grenfell Tower inquiry, however residential high-rise buildings were designed with the "stay put" policy in mind. It was reported that six fires had occurred since the Grenfell Tower disaster in high-rise buildings and all residents, unless affected by smoke, had stayed in their flats and the fires had stay contained within the compartment in which they had started.

In regard to the fact that Alexander and Stafford Houses were both built as commercial buildings, the Panel was reassured that the conversions met all standards of building control. A discussion was held on the complexities of planning regulations and how the HFRS could be more involved as a statutory consultee on fire safety matters. It was noted that the Fire Service would lobby the Government on this once the inquiry was complete.

In response to a question relating to communication with the large Nepalese community in the Borough, some of which were illiterate in their own language, it was advised that the fire service worked closely with partner agencies on these issues and had produced pictorial information and Nepalese language videos to convey the importance of fire safety. It was noted that a pre-recorded Nepalese message was being trialled by the Police whilst an interpreter was located. It was hoped that this option could be rolled out to all emergency services in due course. It was also advised that a bid had been submitted to the Police and Crime Commissioner for funding for a Nepalese speaking liaison officer. The Fire Service was also keen to work with ward councillors to ensure the messages of fire safety were widely spread across the Borough.

A discussion was held around fire fighting equipment and its capabilities. It was reported that the equipment available to the London Fire Brigade was not as cutting

edge as that used in Hampshire and, as far as high reaching equipment was concerned, it was noted that HFRS had access to the highest reaching equipment as well as aerial appliances. The advice for internal equipment such as fire extinguisher and dry risers was that they should only be operated by trained personnel and smoke detectors should be fitted in each individual flat as well as the communal areas. In regard to sprinkler systems, it was noted that all new builds should be fitted with a system and the Fire Service was lobbying to ensure all existing buildings over 30 metres high were retro fitted with sprinkler systems going forward. In response to a query it was advised that inspections on high-rise (18 metres and above) buildings were carried out every 1-3 years and the schedule for each building was risk based.

The Panel discussed the issues around supporting fire services across the borders and the implications if a major fire were to break out in Rushmoor and the crew had been dispatched across the border. It was advised that the primary assumption was that there would not be two major fires at any one time, however, a skeleton crew would always be available in the Borough with the option to get support from other services across the country to assist if required. In addition, it was advised that, during the Farnborough Airshow, the HFRS ensured that the Rushmoor service was backfilled to allow for enough fire fighters in the event of a major event.

In response to a query regarding commercial buildings, it was advised that these were probably one of the safest elements as people were awake and alert and could raise the alarm at an early stage. In the case of hospitals and airports, it was reported that staff were highly trained to deal with such incidents.

The Panel discussed developers/housing managers locally who may be seen to be “cutting corners” it was felt that the Fire Service should be informed of any such issues.

In conclusion it was agreed that the Panel felt satisfied that the Fire Service within Rushmoor operated at a high level and was well equipped to deal with fire safety matters. Enormous pressure had been put on the Fire Service since the events at Grenfell Tower and it was felt that locally the response had been unprecedented, professional and carried out in a timely manner. Members of the Panel felt reassured by the professional presentations and approaches described.

The Chairman thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

14. WORK PROGRAMME

The Panel noted the current work programme.

A request was made to invite the Stonham Group to attend the meeting on 22nd January, 2018.

The meeting closed at 8.55 pm.

CLLR A.R. NEWELL (CHAIRMAN)

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMUNITY POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Thursday, 16th November, 2017 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr M.D. Smith (Chairman)

Cllr M.S. Choudhary
Cllr R. Cooper
Cllr J.H. Marsh
Cllr Marina Munro
Cllr M.J. Roberts
Cllr P.F. Rust

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr S.J. Masterson and Cllr J.J. Preece.

11. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 14th September, 2017 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

12. LOCAL AIR QUALITY AND HEALTH

The Panel welcomed Colin Alborough, Environmental Health Manager, and Richard Ward, Environment and Airport Monitoring Officer, who introduced a Briefing Note on Local Air Quality and Health and gave a presentation on Air Quality in Rushmoor. The following issues were addressed:

- Definition of air pollution
- Air quality in Rushmoor
 - Historical background
 - Current issues
 - Links between air quality and health
 - Rushmoor Borough Council's responsibilities
 - Monitoring
 - Regulatory framework
- New UK NO₂ Plan
 - Current work programmes / feasibility studies

The Panel noted that the Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) process placed an obligation on local authorities to regularly review and assess air quality in their areas, and to determine whether air quality objectives were being achieved. For Rushmoor, the main pollutant of concern was nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), with the current focus being emissions from road traffic along the Blackwater Valley Relief Road (A331).

The Panel was advised that a Government-funded feasibility study was being undertaken jointly by RBC, Guildford and Surrey Heath, as well as Hampshire and Surrey County Councils, to investigate measures to improve the air quality along the A331 in as short a time as possible. The Panel noted that local monitoring of NO₂ indicated that air quality would be within the new acceptable limits by 2023 without any further preventative measures being implemented.

The Panel **NOTED** the presentation and requested an update at a meeting in early 2018.

13. HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL - MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY AND TRANSFORMATION TO 2019 SAVINGS PROPOSALS

The Panel welcomed Qamer Yasin, Head of Environmental Health and Housing, and Peter Amies, Head of Community and Environmental Services, who introduced Report No. EHH1733 and gave a presentation setting out the elements of Hampshire County Council's (HCC) Transformation Programme 2019, which could have future impacts on areas of service covered by the remit of the Community Policy and Review Panel. The Panel noted the need for HCC to make savings and efficiencies of around £140 million by 2019/20 in response to the grant reduction from Central Government.

The Report and presentation covered the following areas:

- Background and context
- Detailed savings proposals
- Issues within the Panel's remit:
 - Dial a Ride
 - Community transport eg minibuses for community groups
 - Disabled Facilities Grant
 - Housing, health and wellbeing
 - Social inclusion i.e. housing options
 - Grant funding to voluntary agencies

During the discussion, the Panel was advised that a number of meetings had already taken place with HCC representatives to explore options and to encourage collaborative working to achieve the proposed savings. It was noted that, in some areas, RBC Officers were still awaiting further details from HCC.

The Panel **NOTED** the Report and presentation and **ENDORSED** the proposal to invite representatives from Hampshire County Council to attend a future meeting of the Panel.

14. WORK PROGRAMME

The Panel noted the updated work programme for the 2017/18 Municipal Year.

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm.

CLLR M.D. SMITH (CHAIRMAN)

This page is intentionally left blank