

POLICY AND PROJECT ADVISORY BOARD

Report of the meeting held on Tuesday, 25th March, 2025 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 6.30 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr M.J. Roberts (Chairman)

Cllr Abe Allen
Cllr Lisa Greenway
Cllr Steve Harden
Cllr Rhian Jones
Cllr Halleh Koohestani

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllrs Sue Carter, A.H. Gani, S.J. Masterson, T.W. Mitchell and Ivan Whitmee.

Cllr Thomas Day attended the meeting as a Standing Deputy.

17. CHANGE OF BOARD MEMBERSHIP

The Committee **NOTED** the appointment of Cllr Abe Allen as a member of the Board in place of Cllr Julie Hall for the remainder of the 2024/25 Municipal Year.

18. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Cllr Lisa Greenway be appointed as Vice-Chairman for the remainder of the 2024/25 Municipal Year.

19. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 19th November, 2024 were agreed as a correct record.

20. GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON DEVOLUTION

The Chairman welcomed Mr Alex Shiell, Service Manager – Policy, Strategy and Transformation, who presented the emerging draft return to the Government's consultation on the effect of establishing a Mayoral Combined County Authority (MCCA) to cover the Hampshire and Solent area.

The Board was reminded that this new administration would comprise the areas covered currently by Hampshire County Council and the Southampton, Portsmouth and Isle of Wight unitary authorities.

Members were informed that the consultation had commenced on 7th February and would close on 13th April.

It was confirmed that details of the consultation would be circulated through the Council's usual communications channels to encourage residents, partners and businesses to respond. During discussion on this, the view was expressed by the opposition group that an extension to the deadline for returns should be sought to enable a Borough-wide survey to be carried out to gather residents' views. It was contended that this was vital in light of the County Council elections having been cancelled. This approach was not supported by the Board overall, however, and the majority view was that Councillors would know the feelings of their residents through their normal interactions with them.

As Mr Shiell worked through the consultation contents, the following comments were made by members of the Board:

Governance

- North Hampshire is a long way away from Winchester – we do a lot of cross border work with Surrey and Berkshire
- How do we avoid being a small outlier?
- Mayoral precept – how do we protect our residents from large increases?
- Government confirms that number of constituent members could change from five
- A pictorial version of the proposed structure might help local residents to understand
- Important the differences between local government reorganisation and devolution are made clear to prevent powers is being passed down and not taken away

Economic Development

- Concern expressed over how the Rushmoor area will get a voice – fears that the big cities will swallow up large amounts of funding
- Easier to see the economic benefits in a city area – less obvious elsewhere

Social Outcomes

- Concerns devolved funding from central government for housing and local transport
- Feels like local transport is disconnected from rest of Hampshire
- Why not take the opportunity to build Council houses rather than housing association properties?

- Need to take account of Marmot findings
- Trains in Rushmoor used extensively for commuting

Local Government Services / Local Natural Environment

- There was insufficient time for Members to consider these areas, so Members were urged to get any views to Mr Shiell ahead of the April deadline

21. WORK PLAN

The Board noted the current Work Plan.

The meeting closed at 7.27 pm.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Report of the Meeting held on Thursday, 27th March, 2025 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr Halleh Koohestani (Chairman)
Cllr Nadia Martin (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr S. Trussler (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Leola Card
Cllr P.J. Cullum
Cllr C.P. Grattan
Cllr Bill O'Donovan
Cllr M.J. Tennant

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr Thomas Day, Cllr G.B. Lyon and Cllr Becky Williams

33. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meetings held on 4th March, 2025 were agreed as a correct record.

34. WORK PLAN

The Committee noted the current Work Plan.

During discussions, the following issues were raised:

- Letter to HCC – the Chairman advised that a discussion needed to be had with the Leader of the Council to determine the way forward taking account of the changes relating to Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation.
- Housing and Homelessness Prevention Strategy – the Lead Officer read out an update on the current position with the Strategy and advised that an item regarding this matter would be scheduled for July 2025.
- A request was made for an update from SERCO following the meeting in August 2024. A request would be made to the relevant officer and presented to the Progress Group for consideration.
- The Committee noted that it was considered too early for a report regarding the Climate Change Action Plan and the Young People's Plan as both had only recently be formally agreed by the Cabinet.

35. 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
37	3	Information relating to financial or business affairs

36. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Having regard to the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors, the following declarations of interest were made:

Item No.	Member	Interest	Reason
37	Cllr S. Trussler	Personal and non-pecuniary	Director Rushmoor Homes Limited
37	Cllr Ivan Whitmee	Personal and non-pecuniary	Director Rushmoor Homes Limited
37	Cllr Gareth Williams	Personal and non-pecuniary	Director Rushmoor Homes Limited

It was noted that on 27th May, 2021, the Council's Corporate Governance, Audit and Standards Committee had granted dispensations to Members appointed by the Council to the Board of the Rushmoor Development Partnership and as Directors of Rushmoor Homes Limited and therefore Cllrs Trussler, Whitmee and Williams, remained in the meeting for the discussion.

37. UNION YARD, ALDERSHOT - APPROACH TO DISPOSAL OF RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS (SEACOLE PLACE AND BURTON HOUSE)

The Committee welcomed the Leader of the Council - Cllr Gareth Williams, Executive Director - Karen Edwards, Executive Head of Property and Growth - Tim Mills, Executive Head of Finance - Peter Vickers, and Head of Regeneration and Development - Nick Irvine, who were in attendance to support the pre-decision scrutiny to be undertaken on the disposal of residential apartments at Union Yard, Aldershot.

Report No. EDPLACE2501 set out the background to the item, which had been requested by the Committee, to allow them to carry out pre-decision scrutiny on the approach and options for the disposals of 82 apartments in blocks C and D, (now

known as Seacole Place and Burton House) at the Union Yard development in Aldershot.

The Committee were being asked to consider five options, as set out below:

- 1) Disposal to the Council's Housing Company, Rushmoor Homes Limited
- 2) Disposal of individual units to the open market via a local estate agency
- 3) Disposal to a Registered Provider- part social / part private rent or shared ownership
- 4) Disposal for submarket rent for key workers
- 5) Disposal to private investor for private rent

The Chairman requested that the focus of the questions raised during discussion related to any gaps within the report, risks to the Council, and information that might assist the Cabinet in making the final decision.

Due to the nature of the information within the reports, which related to the financial and business affairs of the Council, the Chairman recommended that the item be considered in private.

Following a vote, the Committee agreed unanimously to hold the rest of the meeting in private.

During discussions with officers and representatives from Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH), a commercial property consultant engaged by the Council to assist with the process for disposal, Members were advised of the soft market testing process undertaken by LSH and their recommendations. It was advised that LSH had not gone out to the open market on this occasion and had chosen to approach the most appropriate potential buyers at the time. LSH advised this approach helped to avoid "spoiling" the offer in the wider market, should an open market disposal be required if no offers were received. In response to a query relating to timescales for full market sale, it was noted that this could take in the region of 2-3 months.

In response to a query regarding letting the units before selling them and would an income asset be of more interest to buyers, it was noted that, at this time, it was hard to say if any offers under these circumstances would have been more competitive as this depended on the nature of the investor. It would however, mean more risk for the Council who would continue to incur empty property holding costs during the lettings process which could take some months. In considering a suggested option to offer investors and incentive e.g. potentially buy ten and get eleven units, it was advised by LSH that there was very little interest in acquisition of 'broken asset' where there were multiple small landlords subletting.

In relation to net operating income, it was advised that all parties had presented with costs and had their own view over/under the estimated figures. Some had shown to be more risk averse than others.

In response to a query regarding room for negotiation on the offers, it was advised by LSH that each had been pushed to get the best and final offer. This had resulted in one potential buyer increasing their offer and adding the commercial units into a second offer.

The Committee discussed the financial implications and risks. A view was expressed that a quick decision should not be made if more money could be made for residents over time. In response it was advised that should a sale not be made by August 2025, forecast savings in the budget could not be achieved on interest costs and there would be additional unbudgeted holding costs. Risks related to the Rushmoor Homes Limited (RHL) option were also discussed. It was noted that further information had been requested on the approach to financing of this option, in advance of the Cabinet making their decision on 8th April.

It was agreed that it was important that the financial impacts, which varied between each option, were fully understood by the Cabinet before a decision was made.

In response to a query regarding Corporation Tax, it was advised that RHL would not be in a position to pay any Corporation tax for some time as interest payments would outweigh any income. In response to a question, it was confirmed that the Council were not able to exempt themselves from paying empty property tax.

A discussion was held on placemaking and the impacts of having empty commercial units within the site, if commercial units were empty, would residential units let easily and vice versa? The Committee expressed the view that it was important to ensure placemaking remained at the heart of the decision-making process for this asset. In response, the Leader confirmed that placemaking would be considered in the round, alongside risks, housing issues and financial implications. It was noted that the organisation submitting one of the offers had imposed some restrictions on commercial use on another acquisition and was proposing that final consent remained with them on some uses. In relation to the mix of end users the committee recognised it was important to understand that compromises may need to be made to allow the units to be let both commercially and residentially.

In response to a query regarding commercial income, it was noted that the amounts identified in the budget were not substantial for 2025/26, this was due to rent free periods for potential leases.

RESOLVED that:

The Committee had understood the complex and balanced nature of the decision and requested that Cabinet consider the points raised during the Committee's discussions as part of making their decision.

The Chairman thanked everyone for the contribution to the meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.23 pm.

POLICY AND PROJECT ADVISORY BOARD

Report of the meeting held on Tuesday, 10th June, 2025 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr Abe Allen (Chairman)

Cllr A. Adeola
Cllr Lisa Greenway
Cllr Rhian Jones
Cllr Halleh Koohestani
Cllr T.W. Mitchell
Cllr M.J. Roberts
Cllr Ivan Whitmee

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllrs Peace Essien Igodifo, Mara Makunura and M.D. Smith.

Cllr S.J. Masterson attended the meeting as a Standing Deputy.

1. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Cllr Lisa Greenway be appointed as Vice-Chairman for the 2025/26 Municipal Year.

2. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 25th March, 2025 were agreed as a correct record.

3. LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION - APPROACH TO PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND INVOLVEMENT

The Board welcomed Mrs Karen Edwards, Executive Director and Alex Shiell, Service Manager – Policy, Strategy and Transformation, who provided an update on recent work that had been undertaken in relation to Local Government Reorganisation (LGR).

The Board was advised that this was a fast-moving area with the position developing on a daily basis. It was confirmed that twelve of the fifteen Councils in the Hampshire and Solent area continued to work together, through the KPMG Programme, towards the submission deadline of 26th September, 2025. Currently, Chief Executives met on a weekly basis and Council Leaders every fortnight. Funding to support the work totalled £542,000 across Hampshire and Leaders were currently discussing individual allocations. Members were informed that a Ministerial Statement on LGR had been released on 3rd June and this had provided further

detail in many areas. The Board was informed that the item today was specifically about the approach around public engagement and involvement in relation to LGR. As this needed to be done before the submission date of 26th September, this was now a priority task.

Regarding public engagement, it was acknowledged that this was a confusing picture for residents, with a number of options within the preferred approach. It was likely that Hampshire County Council would be consulting with residents at the same time as the 'KPMG' authorities and this would present a completely different approach. The proposed engagement approach was:

- Group led engagement from the twelve Councils remaining in the 'KPMG Group' – all favouring the four unitary option
- Basingstoke, Hart and Rushmoor – Leaders have agreed to joint additional engagement around whether there was support for the establishment of a Unitary Council based on combined geography, a Northern Hampshire authority
- Rushmoor led engagement to be scoped – to establish what is important to local residents

In discussing the content of the presentation, the Board raised the following points:

- Parishing – should Rushmoor form town and/or parish councils ahead of LGR implementation? Agreed it was complex and difficult to determine without an indication of what the additional costs would be of forming. Council could consider a site visit to a Council currently operating with parish councils? Agreed that further investigation into the viability of parishing should be undertaken.
- How to engage with those excluded from consultation 'drop-ins'? Would home visits be provided?
- Agreed that sample size appeared too small.
- Agreed that colleges/young people should be a high priority.

In summarising the Board's feedback on this matter, the Chairman made the following points:

- Sample size should be increased and Board would like to see cost analysis behind that
- Should be drop-ins in town centre locations, including North Camp
- Analyse gaps whilst doing engagement to add specific approach to deal with them, to be reviewed regularly

- Particularly target young people, schools, colleges and Garrison – should be balanced group with provision for those with limited access
- Make it clear what the impact is so residents understand what they are being asked about
- Provide simplified visuals for those with learning difficulties

The Chairman thanked Mrs Edwards and Mr Shiell for their input.

4. POTENTIAL FUTURE CHANGES TO INTEGRATED CARE BOARDS

The Board welcomed Mrs Karen Edwards, Executive Director, who provided an update on potential future changes to Integrated Care Boards.

The Board was reminded that the current arrangements had seen the establishment of the Frimley Health and Integrated Care System (ICS), which was a partnership of NHS and local government organisations working together to join up health and care services to improve the health and wellbeing of local residents. In April 2025, NHS England had informed Chief Executive Officers of local Integrated Care Boards (ICB) that ICBs need to reduce running costs by 50 per cent. Members were informed that Frimley ICB was the Board that covered the Rushmoor area and that the ICB was an important part of the ICS. It was explained that, with Frimley being one of the smallest ICBs, there was an expectation of a merger being required. Alongside the cost reductions, a refreshment of the role of ICBs had been developed. In a letter to partners, the Chair of the Frimley ICB set out that work should commence of the establishment of four South East ICBs instead of the current six. Seemed likely that the Rushmoor area would be part of an ICB that covered the whole of the Hampshire and Solent Strategic Authority area. It was confirmed that the Council would await formal engagement from both Frimley ICB and Hampshire and Isle of Wight ICB.

In discussing this matter, Members were reassured that Frimley Park Hospital would continue to serve Rushmoor residents, as before, but services were likely to be commissioned in a different way.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Edwards for her update.

5. PATHWAYS TO WORK CONSULTATION

The Board welcomed Cllr Jules Crossley, Policy, Performance & Sustainability Portfolio Holder, who had been invited to attend to present this item.

The Board was advised that a consultation on the Pathways to Work Green Paper was currently underway. The proposed Pathways to Work changes would affect working-age adults in terms of a number of changes to benefits receivable. The Council was in the process of consulting with benefit recipients and had received 40 responses at that point. Of the 40 respondents, 80% had expected negative impacts from the proposed changes. Members were informed that a Pathways to Work Working Group had been set up and this group would look in detail at the survey responses and would discuss the contents of the Council's response to the Green

Paper consultation. It had been agreed that the Council would send a letter to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions. Key points to be included in the letter would include:

- Lack of planning and forethought - the way the Green Paper was delivered has caused unnecessary anxiety
- The DWP must be reformed before any changes to benefits are introduced
- Employment and Training programme for young people needs to be embedded before benefit changes are made
- An Impact Assessment should have been commissioned and published before the Green Paper was released
- Personal Independence Payment is not a means-tested or a work-related benefit. Current proposals risk removing all support from those who don't score 4 points on any one component.
- Poverty: Risk of people being pushed into poverty
- NHS waiting lists has contributed to the number of people who can't work
- Impact on carers: If the person they care for loses PIP, they will no longer qualify for Carer's Allowance
- Right to Try: A positive is that it will give people receiving health and disability benefits more freedom to attempt work without fear of losing their benefits.
- The lack of detail needs to be addressed in the White Paper, including clarification on the proposed new National Insurance scheme
- Increased pressure and impact on local authorities and support organisations

The letter would ask for a number of changes to the proposals, including:

- Keep PIP and UC uplift separate. PIP shouldn't be used to push people into work
- Reform the DWP before making any changes
- Publish a full Impact Assessment before the White Paper, with transitional support in place
- Set out investment and reform plans for health services, including mental health, before changes happen
- Put people's welfare before cost-cutting

It was also noted that the Council would need to rethink its Young People's Plan and put all programmes into place before the benefits were removed.

The Board discussed this and made the following comments:

- Council should copy Aldershot MP, Alex Baker and the Swansea West MP into response
- Could the Council create more jobs to offer to people affected by these changes?
- Would be good to help with training and interview techniques
- Should Council encourage employers to offer more part-time positions, due to them tending to lead to better mental health outcomes?
- Ensure Rushmoor Accessibility Group fully engaged with process

The Chairman thanked Cllr Crossley for her report.

NOTE:

Under the Council's Code of Conduct for Councillors, all Members are required to disclose relevant Interests in any matter to be considered at the meeting. Where the matter directly relates to a Member's Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Registrable Interest, that Member must not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must not remain in the room unless they have been granted a dispensation (see note below). If the matter directly relates to 'Non-Registrable Interests', the Member's participation in the meeting will depend on the nature of the matter and whether it directly relates or affects their financial interest or well-being or that of a relative, friend or close associate, applying the tests set out in the Code.

IN RELATION TO THIS ITEM:

On 10th June, 2025, the Council's Interim Monitoring Officer and Corporate Manager – Legal Services granted dispensations to Cllr Jules Crossley and Lisa Greenway to present at this item despite each having a declarable interest.

6. APPOINTMENTS 2025/26

(1) Progress Group

RESOLVED: That the following members be appointed to serve on the Policy and Project Advisory Board Progress Group for the 2025/26 Municipal Year:

PPAB Chairman	Cllr Abe Allen
PPAB Vice-Chairman	Cllr Lisa Greenway
Labour Group (1)	Cllr Ivan Whitmee
Other Groups (2)	Cllrs T.W. Mitchell plus one Conservative vacancy

(2) Elections Group

RESOLVED: That the following members be appointed to serve on the Elections Group for the 2025/26 Municipal Year:

PPAB Chairman	Cllr Abe Allen
Cabinet Member with responsibility for Electoral Issues	Cllr Sophie Porter
Chairman or Vice-Chairman of Corporate Governance, Audit and Standards Committee	To be advised
Labour Group (1)	Cllr Gaynor Austin
Conservative Group (2)	Cllrs Steve Harden and G.B. Lyon
Liberal Democrat Group (1)	Cllr C.W. Card

7. **WORK PLAN**

The Board noted the current Work Plan.

It was agreed that the Work Plan would be discussed in detail at the next Progress Group meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.01 pm.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Report of the meeting held on Thursday, 12th June, 2025 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr Halleh Koohestani (Chairman)
Cllr Nadia Martin (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr M.J. Tennant (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Abe Allen
Cllr Leola Card
Cllr Thomas Day
Cllr Steve Harden
Cllr G.B. Lyon
Cllr Bill O'Donovan
Cllr Becky Williams

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr S. Trussler.

Cllr Mara Makunura attended the meeting as a Standing Deputy.

1. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Cllrs. Nadia Martin and M.J. Tennant be appointed as Vice-Chairmen of the Committee for the 2025/26 Municipal Year.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 27th March, 2025 were agreed as a correct record.

3. REGISTERED PROVIDERS TASK AND FINISH GROUP - ANNUAL REPORT 2024/25

The Committee welcomed Mrs Zoe Paine, Strategy and Enabling Manager, who was in attendance to provide the Annual Report on the work of the Registered Providers Task and Finish Group during the 2024/25 Municipal Year. Cllr Keith Dibble, Housing and Planning Portfolio Holder was also in attendance to answer Members questions.

Mrs Paine, advised on the purpose, membership, terms of reference and process of the Group. It was noted that the Terms of Reference had been amended to fit with the new Council priorities and Registered Providers (RPs) that had not been invited to meet with the Group had been asked to complete a questionnaire online, only three had completed this.

It was noted that the three invited RPs had been, Metropolitan Thames Valley Housing Association (MTVHA), A2 Dominion and VIVID. Engaging with the largest provider of social housing in the area, VIVID, had been challenging, with them refusing to meet with the Group, but offering an all Member seminar instead. It was felt that the level of engagement achieved in a seminar would not be the same as achieved in a smaller meeting with appropriate representatives from the housing association. It was noted that Managing Director, Ian Harrison, would be meeting with VIVID's Chief Executive, Mark Perry, later in June, and part of the agenda for the meeting would be to discuss engagement with the RP Group. In the cases on A2 Dominion and MTVHA, less senior members of staff had been sent to the meeting than in previous years, resulting in more operational conversations rather than the desired strategic discussions.

During the discussion, a number of comments/suggestions were made, these included:

- establish a timetable that allowed more RPs to be seen more frequently – see those performing well, not just those that are not performing
- explore the use of communications channels to raise awareness of issues raised/poor performance – “name and shame”
- explore the option of working with the local MP to improve engagement
- RPs should be responding to all councillors equally
- address the work flow/process of the Task and Finish Group before calling out RPs on performance – important to retain good relationships
- establish what we want the RPs to be doing in the Borough, by being more strategic and time efficient
- establish a scoring system to rate RPs
- work with the Task and Finish Group to revise the questionnaire to ensure relevance – currently very long and could be reason why response rates were low
- work with neighbours linked through Local Government Reorganisation to strengthen voices and raise issues wider
- review how we work internally
- improve engagement on the wider community benefits/assets – open spaces, parking areas, playgrounds, community buildings etc.

In response, the Portfolio Holder advised that, together with the Leader of the Council and the Managing Director, he would be meeting with the top five social housing providers in the Borough to talk through the relationship with the Council and the importance of establishing good working relationships to help provide an acceptable service for residents. He also suggested gathering data from the Ombudsman, via Freedom of Information requests, to be armed with evidence based data to challenge performance at an executive level. In response to the suggestion to review internal working methods, Cllr Dibble felt that things had changes significantly since the Group was first established and that this would be a good starting point for any changes.

In summary, the Chair noted that the situation with RPs had changed significantly and suggested that the Group consider its Terms of Reference and question the best

use of time to achieve strategic discussion with relevant RP partners. Consideration would also be given to the makeup of the Group and the option to widen the membership.

ACTION

What	Whom	When
The Chairman to write to the Managing Director to express the disappointment of the Committee in relation to the lack of engagement from Registered Providers, in particular VIVID, on a strategic level with the RP Group.	Cllr Halleh Koohestani	24 June 2025

The Chairman thanked Cllr Dibble and Mrs Paine for their time and contributions to the meeting.

4. APPOINTMENTS 2025/26

RESOLVED: That the following Members be appointed to serve on the following Groups for the 2025/26 Municipal Year:

(1) Overview and Scrutiny Progress Group

Chairman	Cllr Halleh Koohestani
Vice-Chairman	Cllr Nadia Martin
Vice-Chairman	Cllr M.J. Tennant
Labour Group	Cllr Thomas Day
	Cllr Bill O'Donovan
Conservative Group	Cllr G.B. Lyon
Liberal Democrat	Cllr Leola Card

(2) Council Tax Support Task and Finish Group

Labour Group	Cllr C.P. Grattan
	Cllr Halleh Koohestani
	Cllr M.J. Roberts
Conservative Group	Cllr P.J. Cullum
	Cllr S. Trussler

(3) Farnborough Airport Task and Finish Group

Chairmen	Cllr Halleh Koohestani
Labour Group	Cllr Abe Allen
*	Cllr Bill O'Donovan
Conservative Group	Cllr P.J. Cullum
	Cllr G.B. Lyon
Liberal Democrat	Cllr C. Card

*Cllr Jules Crossley would be invited to the meeting as and when appropriate

It was noted that any meetings of the Farnborough Airport Task and Finish Group, which was tasked to look at the environmental and economic impacts of the airport, would be adjourned until the outstanding planning application had been determined.

(4) Review of Registered Providers Task and Finish Group

Chairman	Cllr Halleh Koohestani
Labour Group	Cllr Gaynor Austin
	Cllr Bill O'Donovan
Conservative Group	Cllr S.J Masterson
	Cllr M.D. Smith

5. WORK PLAN

The Committee noted the current Work Plan and the proposed items for the July and September meetings. In July, Ms Paine would provide a report on the Housing and Homelessness Prevention Strategy and in September, the Police and Community Safety Team would be in attendance.

The Committee considered the Council Delivery Plan 2025/26 and the Council Plan, Performance and Risk Register Quarterly Update and Year End 2024/25 Cabinet Report and identified a number of items for consideration, these included:

- Leisure Centre
- Finance
- Communications Strategy
 - Community Engagement
 - Youth Engagement
 - How we consult?
 - Transparency of the Council – decision making and communications
- Environmental Services –
 - SERCO
 - Walk this Waste Pilot
- Community Safety
- Economic Development
 - Town Centre development (town square funding)
 - support for businesses
- Local Government Reorganisation
- Social Housing - allocation process

At the meeting of the Progress Group on 17th June, a discussion would be held on how to take these items forward and the potential of focussing items to sit within the five priority areas identified in the Delivery Plan.

In addition, it was suggested that, the Cabinet Champion reports could again be considered outside a meeting in the form of a written report from each Champion and that the voluntary sector organisations, Citizens' Advice Rushmoor and Rushmoor Voluntary Services should not be required to attend during the 2025/26 Municipal Year.

The meeting closed at 8.30 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank