

CORPORATE SERVICES POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Thursday, 31st March, 2016 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 p.m.

Voting Members

Cr. Jacqui Vosper (Chairman)
Cr. D.S. Gladstone (Vice-Chairman)

Cr. D.M.T. Bell
Cr. D.E. Clifford
Cr. Barbara Hurst

Cr. B. Jones

Cr. G.B. Lyon
Cr. P.F. Rust
a Cr. D.M. Welch

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Cr. D.M. Welch.

331. MINUTES –

The Minutes of the meeting held on 12th November, 2016 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

332. LAND CHARGES –

The Panel had invited Diane Milton (Legal Services Manager) and David Caldwell (Local Land Charges Manager) to the meeting to provide an overview of the Local Land Charges function. Members noted the definition of Land Charges “obligations, restrictions or prohibition on a parcel of land that were binding on successive owners”. Members had also been provided with a list of the legislation that covered Local Land Charges and a glossary of jargon that could be referred back to.

The Local Land Charges (LLC) register had been made up of twelve parts and was now an electronic database. This had enabled an automatic search facility that included spatial extent, along with unique property reference numbers (UPRN), which allowed all Council systems to communicate without officer intervention.

The Local Land Charges System environment was described to Members and was split into three areas: back office, front office and market. It was noted that the front office’s Official Local Land Charges Search was in direct competition with personal search companies.

The Panel was informed of the different search forms used; LLC1 and CON29(R) and CON29(O). The LLC1 had been the official certificate of search and it was noted that it had been a statutory request for a local authority to search the LLC register for entries affecting a property and to provide a schedule of registrations and a certificate signed by the ‘proper

officer' stating how many LLC registrations had affected the land. The CON29(R) Required Enquiries form was a non-statutory form that had consisted of an agreed set of questions, which had been created by the Law Society, to be answered by local authorities. The CON29(O) Optional Enquiries form covered a number of areas including public paths and byways, advertisements and parks and countryside. It was heard that the LLC team had worked with a number of other Council departments during the process of preparing responses.

The Panel was shown search fees that were charged by neighbouring authorities, these ranged between £90 – £171.50 as search fees were unregulated and were set by each local authority on a cost recovery basis. It was heard that the annual net should be placed in the LLC reserve so that over a period of three consecutive financial years the total income from charges and recharges should not exceed the total costs of granting access to property records. Members were shown a graph of the LLC income between 2005 – 2014. It highlighted the competition between personal search companies as there had been a drop in income when these companies had started to carry out searches. However, it was noted that the Council's income had started to increase again.

The Panel was advised that regulations had enabled authorities to charge a fee for personal searches of the LLC Register. However, this had been revoked in August, 2010 as the regulations had been found to be incompatible with the Environmental Information Regulations, 2004. This had resulted in a number of legal actions taking place that had aimed to recover fees paid by personal searchers between 2005-2010. It was also noted that the defence had been coordinated through the Local Government Association. The claims had been settled in 2015 by agreement reached through alternative dispute resolution.

It was explained that there were plans for the LLC register to transfer from local authorities to the Land Registry as part of the Infrastructure Act 2015. This would result in the Land Registry providing registration and local search services while local authorities would continue to collect and update information in the register and answer CON29 enquiries. Members noted that preparations for the transfer were underway and this was expected to take effect in late 2017 with the process being completed by 2023.

The Panel **NOTED** the presentation.

333. **MAYORAL COSTS –**

The Head of Democratic and Customer Services, Mr. Andrew Colver, had been invited to the Panel to provide the background to the Mayoralty arrangements and an overview of the change in costs over the years. Members were reminded that the Mayor acted as the Queen's representative in the Borough and the mayoralty had been part of civic life in Rushmoor for 42 years. The primary duties of the Mayor were listed, these included attending functions and religious services and undertaking official openings

and presentations in the Borough and chairing Council meetings. The Panel was informed that the Mayoralty was well supported within the community and the demand for the Mayor's attendance had continued to be high, with the Mayor attending over 300 events per year.

Members were advised that the Mayor's main adviser was the Chief Executive with further support from his Executive Assistant and the Democratic Support Team. The Mayor was also supported by the Deputy Mayor, who deputised for the Mayor at some events. This gave Deputy Mayors a chance to experience the Mayoralty before their Mayoral year.

A Mayoral allowance was used to cover expenses of the role. On most occasions the Mayor and Deputy Mayor were expected to drive themselves to events and engagements. The Mayor also received a £1,000 allowance for chairing Council meetings. It was noted that this had been a part of a recent review by the Independent Remuneration Panel of Rushmoor's Members Allowances Scheme and the report was expected in the following few weeks.

The Panel was reminded that as part of a service costs review in 2010/11 there had been a restructure of the Mayoral support. It had been seen as important to ensure that the Mayoralty should 'fit for purpose'.

The Panel was informed of the current staffing arrangements, which were provided directly through Democratic and Customer Services and divided between two staff. Their roles had included administrative work, i.e. the Mayor's diary, organising specific events and dealing with the finances. The Macebearer had important ceremonial and security roles to carry out. This post was under review following the retirement of the post holder and this support had the potential to be provided from staff within the Council.

The Panel noted that the Council supported four fundraising events each year, and also organised civic events, e.g. Remembrance Sunday. It was heard that these events took substantial resources to put on but supported the Mayor's chosen charities.

Members were provided with some comparative cost data that had been obtained from other similar authorities, which had shown only a few differences between the budgets.

The Panel was informed that a Mayoral Protocol was in the process of being prepared and aimed to outline the Mayor's roles and responsibilities, what the Council would provide and working and financial arrangements. It was noted that the protocol would provide clarity and guidance and would be included in the induction process for the Mayor elect.

It was concluded that the Mayor had played a large part in shaping the Council's public image and the Mayor regularly received positive feedback and repeat requests. The Council was in a challenging financial position but recognised the value of the Mayoralty. The Mayoralty would continue to

receive support from volunteers and it was believed that the protocol would help to provide clarity.

The Head of Democratic and Customer Services answered questions on a number of issues including the Mayoral Car and condensing support from Members. It was requested that the 'demand' for the Mayor be recorded by staff in the future. It was also agreed that the possibility of providing a Members' badge should be investigated.

The Panel **NOTED** the presentation and requested that the issues raised be examined further.

334. **SYSTEMS THINKING –**

The Panel welcomed Corporate Director, Mr. Ian Harrison, and two members of the Systems Thinking Team, Ms. Lorraine Murray and Ms. Jo Cohen, who had been invited to the meeting to provide a cost-benefit analysis of systems thinking.

Members were reminded of the purpose and ultimate aim of systems thinking. It was noted that the team had carried out a number of service reviews and had provided coaching support to some managers that had enabled them to support other systems thinking reviews and processes.

The Panel was informed of the current staff structure, which consisted of two permanent FTEs and one seconded part-time FTE as well as allocated time from a Corporate Director. The 2015/16 budget totalled £163,920 which was re-charged across the Council using a combined method of actual assignments and general headcount. Members were guided through an indicative cost analysis of the service, this analysis showed a notional daily rate of £255 compared to consultant day-rates for improvement work of £500-£1,400. It was noted that Vanguard had cost the Council £1,000 per day for an assignment and £1,400 per day on a call-off basis plus expenses.

It was noted that Rushmoor's systems thinking reviews had had a number of positive outcomes with many improvements in service areas. Rushmoor had also had visits from other local authorities and businesses. Reviews had also made a large amount of savings across different service areas, for example, £100-120,000 per annum in Benefits; these savings had been achieved through staffing adjustments but had been recurrent and sustainable.

The Panel was given examples of reviews that had been carried out in Personnel, Channel Shift and Parking.

Members heard that the future options for the Systems Thinking team were to have an on-going commitment to the delivery of the 8-Point Plan, supporting the Organisational Development (OD) Programme and to provide general coaching and support and development to all staff at all levels. There

had also been an option for potential developments in the voluntary sector and other bodies supported by the Council.

It was concluded that systems thinking had been in Rushmoor for over ten years and had made significant sustainable service improvements during that time. The Council's own internal team had been established for over five years and this team had been integral to the delivery of elements of both the 8-Point Plan and OD Programme.

The Panel **NOTED** the presentation.

335. **WORK PROGRAMME –**

The Panel **NOTED** the current Work Programme and **AGREED** to hold a workshop at the beginning of the next Municipal Year to create a programme of work for 2016/17.

The meeting closed at 9.47 pm.

JACQUI M. VOSPER
CHAIRMAN

LEISURE AND YOUTH POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Monday, 4th April, 2016 at the West End Centre, Aldershot at 7.00 p.m.

Voting Members

Cr. Liz Corps (Chairman)
Cr. Mrs. D.B. Bedford (Vice-Chairman)

Cr. T.D. Bridgeman
Cr. P.I.C. Crerar
Cr. K. Dibble

Cr. J.H. Marsh

Cr. A.R. Newell
Cr. M. Staplehurst
Cr. B.A. Thomas

336. MINUTES –

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 1st February, 2016 were agreed as a correct record.

337. WEST END CENTRE –

The Panel welcomed Mr. Barney Jeavons, Arts Centre Director at the West End Centre, who had been invited to give a presentation on the working arrangements and activities of the Centre and the wider Hampshire Cultural Trust.

Mr. Jeavons introduced the presentation with an overview of the Cultural Trust set up by Hampshire County Council and Winchester City Council in 2014. The Trust supported 26 arts and museum attractions across the county and delivered county wide outreach programmes that brought culture to local communities. The Trust worked with young people and targeted audiences from diverse backgrounds in all areas including visual arts, literature and local history.

The Panel noted that the West End Centre had celebrated its 40th birthday in September 2015 and still attracted many up and coming and established musicians and comedians, showcased contemporary theatre groups similar to those seen at the Edinburgh Fringe Festival and hosted monthly exhibitions of both local and national artists and a special open exhibition at Christmas. The Centre also ran a number of classes and workshops including stained glass, drama, sewing, beginners Nepali and ukulele; through these classes and workshops the Centre engaged with the community and became a hub for local people. In addition, special events were held such as the Summer Westival, a beer festival and Parent Action Group (PAG) days. During the Westival large parts of the Centre were grassed, a beer tent erected indoors and artificial fires set up to create

ambience to complement the live music, acts and activities which took place over the weekend. The PAG days were standalone events open only to families with children with special needs.

The West End Centre had a very strong culture ensuring that all customers were friends and that everyone was treated equally. The Panel were shown a number of testimonials from volunteers, artists and customers who showed their appreciation for the welcome/help/opportunities given to them by the staff and volunteers at the West End Centre. Mr. Jeavons stated that, ingrained in the Centre's ethos and its staff and volunteers was the need to "want to help everyone that walked through the door".

The Centre also had an outreach programme, working with community groups in the local area. Crafty Culture was a group of white and Nepali women who came together to create craft items and a local scout group had created a willow war horse to commemorate World War 1. The Centre was always willing to get involved with outreach projects and would find artists to fulfil the requirement of any project.

The Panel noted that core funding had remained consistent over recent years at around £150,000. Income and expenditure, however, were increasing, partly due to the appointment of an Arts Development Officer. It was also advised that a number of improvements had been made to the facility, which included the resurfacing of the car park, new theatre chairs and the redevelopment of storage rooms to creative studios. It was noted however, that some more work needed to be done in relation to updating the ladies toilets, bar furniture and lighting, the office area and storage facilities. The Centre was also committed to increasing funding streams alongside the Trust and planned to work on creating more sponsorship and commissioning opportunities going forward.

In response to a query on budgets, it was advised that Rushmoor's contribution had reduced from £20,000 to £15,000 when the Trust had been established, due to the new charitable status and no longer having to pay business rates. In respect of any works or improvements to the facility carried out by Hampshire County Council, Mr. Jeavons had found that contributing toward the cost had ensured quicker turn around and, in some cases, higher standards of work.

In answer to a question regarding threats, Mr. Jeavons advised that the staff and volunteers were what made the venue a success, when for example, a good volunteer moved on the gap left could be hard to fill. The relationship with the Princes Hall was positive and the two venues kept in regular contact.

The Panel discussed the ticket pricing and the contract arrangements with artists. Mr. Jeavons advised that the Centre tried to keep the prices affordable and ran some children's events free to allow access for all. The most expensive ticket recently had been for a musician at £26.00; this event

had sold out and comedy acts also tended to sell out. It was also reported that the artist could receive up to 70% of the ticket income for an event.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Jeavons for his presentation.

338. **WORK PROGRAMME –**

The Panel **NOTED** the current work programme, and were advised that the next meeting would be a tour of the Army sports facilities.

The meeting closed at 8.01 p.m.

CR. LIZ CORPS
CHAIRMAN

ENVIRONMENT POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Tuesday, 5th April, 2016 at Council Offices,
Farnborough at 7.00 p.m.

Voting Members:

Cr. D.E. Clifford (Chairman)
Cr. Sophia Choudhary (Vice Chairman)

Cr. M.S. Choudhary
Cr. Sue Dibble
Cr. D.S. Gladstone

Cr. G.B. Lyon

Cr. J.J. Preece
Cr. L.A. Taylor
Cr. D.M. Welch

339. MINUTES –

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 26th January, 2016 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

340. HOUSEHOLD WASTE RECYCLING CENTRES – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION –

The Panel considered the Head of Community and Environment Services' Report No. COMM1606 on a response to a consultation by Hampshire County Council on proposed changes to the Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRC) service. The County Council was looking to save £1.55 million from the HWRC service and was seeking views of service users, members of the public and other interested parties on options ranging from changing operating hours and days to possible site closures.

There were two HWRCs in the Rushmoor area, Eelmoor Road in Farnborough and Ivy Road in Aldershot. The Farnborough site was the fifth highest used site in the county and the Aldershot site was a lower used site. There were plans to provide a replacement for the Ivy Road site as part of the Wellesley development in the proposed commercial area on Ordnance Road.

The consultation requested responses to questions relating to reducing operating hours and days, partially close one or more HWRC site and to fully close one or more HWRC sites. A proposed response to the questionnaire was circulated to the Panel for discussion. The possible impact on service users, the local environment and the Council were highlighted in the report which included a possible increase in flytipping, a greater demand at remaining sites, added pressure on sites following housing growth and a potential increase in the amount of kerbside waste collected.

The Panel discussed the Report and there was concern expressed about the potential loss of the HWRC in Aldershot as it had lower usage than the Farnborough site. It was highlighted that the demand at Aldershot would

increase significantly as the number of households increased on the Wellesley development. Therefore it was considered important that the Ivy Road site was not closed until the new Aldershot site was opened. It was agreed that the preferred option would be to propose a change in opening hours to contribute to the savings rather than the closure of either Rushmoor site. It was preferred that the sites opened later and closed later if the opening hours were reduced. It was also suggested that the County Council should explore cross-county working with Surrey County Council to identify potential joint initiatives.

The Panel **AGREED** that its comments would be incorporated within the Rushmoor response to the Hampshire County Council HWRC consultation and the final version recommended to Cabinet for approval.

341. **ALDERSHOT TOWN CENTRE TASK AND FINISH GROUP –**

The Panel received a presentation on the current position with Aldershot and plans for the future. Mr. Andrew Lloyd, Chief Executive, provided a strategic overview on the way forward for Aldershot. The Panel was advised that work was being undertaken at an officer level on the regeneration project to ensure there was cohesion to take all projects forward. A group had undertaken some work to provide a model to encourage properties into a fund to drive investment in the town. Members were briefed on a report on the Fragmented Ownership Group which focussed on working with towns with various owners. It offered a potentially good solution for Aldershot.

Mr. David Phillips, Town Centre and Cultural Manager, updated the Panel on the current issues:

- **Aldershot Town Centre Prospectus** - had been published in January which included development of the Galleries, Union Street East, the Railway and Bus Station and the Magistrates Court and Police Station.
- **Homeless** - a press release had been issued to show what action was being taken to address the homelessness issue in the town. Planters were being placed in some empty shop doorways and hoardings and shutters were being put up on others to try to prevent homeless individuals locating there.
- **Marks and Spencer Unit** – a general discount store would be leasing the unit from Marks and Spencer and likely to move into the unit in the summer.
- **The Galleries** – the owner, Threadneedle, was close to finalising a deal with a development company to provide a mixed-use development with leisure/retail on the ground floor with residential above.
- **The Empire and The Palace** – both premises had been leased for fifteen years, The Empire was operating as a banqueting suite and The Palace had been opened as a nightclub.

- **Wellesley Development** – the development was progressing well and residents had started to move into properties in December 2015. Building on Phase II was due to start in May 2016.
- **Public Realm Improvements** – improvements had been made to Barrack Road, Court Road and Union Street.
- **Shop Front Improvements** – a fund of £200,000 had been made available for businesses to apply for up to £10,000 for shop front improvements. To date nine businesses had received funding and two composite schemes were being developed.
- **Business Improvement District** – Aldershot was being taken forward to create an Aldershot Business Improvement District.

The Panel expressed concern about the continuing issues with street homeless in Aldershot. The Panel was advised that The Vine was working daily with the homeless residents to try to engage with them and identify what help they needed to take them off the street. The Council's Homelessness Officers had also been working with The Vine. It was proposed that discussions should also be held with the Probation Service to see if there were any links with those currently homeless in Aldershot. It was confirmed that addressing the issue was considered to be a high priority for the Council and the approach sought was to balance the need for timely enforcement with actions to support those willing to engage.

The Panel **NOTED** the presentation.

342. **FARNBOROUGH TOWN CENTRE TASK AND FINISH GROUP –**

The Panel received a presentation on the current position with developments in Farnborough and work going forward. Mr. Andrew Lloyd, Chief Executive, advised the Panel that the Civic Quarter Masterplan, which had been adopted in June 2015, was being progressed. The Masterplan set out the framework for the site which currently housed the Leisure Centre, old Police Station, Library, Westmead House, Community Centre and also included the Sulzers roundabout. Negotiations were taking place with the Homes and Communities Agency and the Police and Crime Commissioner to enable the site to be developed as a whole.

An update was provided on other developments in Farnborough.

- **Kingsmead** – the Multiplex Cinema had opened and Prezzo was occupying one of the restaurant units, KPI were in negotiations for two other units to be occupied by restaurants.
- **Queensmead** – St. Modwen was selling to a new owner but a requirement for recladding the properties in Queensmead would be included in the sale.

- **Princesmead** – the extension was underway to provide new retail units to be occupied by Decathlon and Smyths Toys.
- **Firgrove Parade** – the Premier Inn and Beefeater restaurant were opening soon and development plans were in place for replacement shops and flats fronting Victoria Road.
- **Ham and Blackbird site** – an application for 62 dwellings with community, arts and food/drink facilities had been refused and an appeal hearing held, the decision from the Planning Inspector had not yet been received.
- **Pyramid House/PC World site redevelopment** – the original developer had gone bankrupt but a new developer was due to take over; the redevelopment plan was to demolish the existing buildings and build five bulky goods retail units and improve access to and from the town centre.
- **Thomson House** – permission had been granted for conversion and extension to provide 145 apartments with amenity deck and parking.
- **Farnborough Business Park** – permission had been granted for four office buildings totalling nearly 30,000 sqm with parking, the first phases was completed and part would be occupied by Time Inc.

The Panel **NOTED** the presentation.

343. **WORK PROGRAMME** –

The Panel **NOTED** the current work programme.

The Meeting closed at 9.00 p.m.

D.E. CLIFFORD
CHAIRMAN
