

# LEISURE AND YOUTH POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Monday, 9th November, 2015 at the Council Offices,  
Farnborough 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  
a Cr. M. Staplehurst  
Cr. B.A. Thomas

An apology for absence was submitted on behalf of Cr. M. Staplehurst.

## 205. **MINUTES –**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 7th September, 2015 were agreed as a correct record.

## 206. **PRINCES HALL -**

The Chairman welcomed Mr. David Phillips, Town Centre and Cultural Manager, who had been invited to the meeting to give a presentation on the Princes Hall Annual Report 2014/15 and an overview of the future opportunities and potential developments at the site.

Mr. Phillips reported on events held at the Princes Hall during 2014/15, and advised that, for the first time ever, over 1,000 events had been held at the theatre. This figure comprised 407 promotions, such as 56 professional shows, 39 performances of the Pantomime and 232 Youth Theatre sessions, and 639 hirings, including 85 concerts and shows, 318 business meetings and 90 dance classes. It was explained that whilst “hirings” were risk free, a fixed fee was paid by the hirer for use of the room, profit on promoted events was dependent on ticket sales. It was noted that the Youth Theatre sessions had increased from four sessions a week in 2010/11 to seven per week in 2014/15, which were attended by over 100 young people.

It was advised that the number of professional shows and their attendance figures had remained consistent over the past few years; data showed there were 50-60 shows on average a year, attended by around 20,000 people. Increases to ticketing prices, in the past twelve months, had resulted in an increase in gross box office figures and profit on professional

shows. The Panel was informed of the ten most profitable professional shows, these included shows by comedians Lee Mack and Jason Manford, Sing A Long A Frozen, Psychic Sally, That'll be the Day and Milkshake Live! It was noted that if a show ran for more than one night/performance profits increased, as set up costs were reduced.

Mr. Phillips reported on the data collected from performances of the Pantomime. It was noted that attendance figures had remained between 17,000 and 19,000 per year over the last six years, with Snow White and Peter Pan being two of the most popular Pantomimes. Gross box office figures had risen steadily over the years, with takings in excess of £250,000 in 2014/15, resulting in a profit of £123,000 (a £3,329 profit per show). When benchmarked with ten other venues in England, it was noted that the Princes Hall ranked fourth on profit per pantomime performance, beaten only by three venues with significantly larger seating capacities.

It was noted that, compared with thirteen other civic theatres in England, the Princes Hall ranked top on average percentage of tickets sold per professional show, (including the Pantomime). 39% of all Princes Hall's tickets were now sold online, (fifth out of twelve venues), the installation of a new ticketing system, "Spektrix", enabled a target figure to be set of 50% by 2017.

It was advised that income from the Tichbourne and Princes suites had reduced since 2006/07 but income from the main auditorium had almost tripled. It was a priority to address the fall in hiring income of the ground floor suites or find alternative uses for them

The Panel was informed of the budget for the Princes Hall and noted that the venue had operated at a subsidy of £3.05 per person in 2014/15. It was also noted that some capital works had been carried out, in particular replacement flooring at £15,000, a replacement stage extension at £12,000 and installation of wi-fi throughout the building. It was explained that the subsidy of nearly £400,000 for the Princes Hall was very competitive compared to that of other local theatres.

In response to a query regarding the jump in the number of events by 18%, it was advised that one regular booking of 100 meetings, ie. Slimming World, would make a huge difference to the number of hirings, increasing the figures considerably.

It was noted that SNAP discos had once had attendance figures of 500-600 young people but had dipped about 18 months ago to 200 – 250. A relaunch had taken place making the disco cheaper to put on and attendance had increased to 300+. It was noted that the Police were no longer involved in SNAP.

The Panel discussed the parking facilities near the Princes Hall, and was assured that the demolition of the Warburg Car Park had not had a detrimental effect on attendance at the venue. However there were some

issues with the Westgate/Morrisons car park, and staff aimed to divert theatre goers to the High Street Car Park at all times.

A discussion was then held on the future of the Princes Hall. A number of areas needed to be considered to ensure a sustainable future for the facility, these included, income from the suites, the staffing structure, booking fees, secondary spend, competition from other venues in the town centre and the long term use of the building. The Westgate site had been identified as a key site in the Aldershot Prospectus; the site included the Princes Hall, Police Station and Magistrates Courts as well as the Westgate development. Possible developments for the Princes Hall included an enhanced ground floor area, which could include a café area and space for office co-location opportunities and flexible meeting rooms.

The Panel discussed the two venues in the town, which may have an impact on the Princes Hall, The Empire and The Palace. It was noted that The Empire had a capacity of 1,600 but required a lot of work and the view from the seating at the top was obscured; it was thought that the plan would be to have an auditorium on the ground floor and a restaurant with a place for worship on the upper level. It was advised that work was currently taking place on The Palace and the property still held a licence to operate as a nightclub. The future plans were still unclear.

In response to a query, it was advised that the Council would continue to monitor the site adjacent to The Empire, which currently housed Gala Bingo and a car wash facility.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Phillips for his presentation.

#### 207. **WORK PROGRAMME –**

The Panel **NOTED** the current work programme and were advised that a presentation on the Playground Review and an update on the Lido Review would be given at the next meeting

The meeting closed at 8.00 p.m.

CR. LIZ CORPS  
CHAIRMAN

-----

# ENVIRONMENT POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Tuesday, 10th November, 2015 at the 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  
a Cr. D.M. Welch

An apology for absence was submitted by Cr. D.M. Welch.

## 208. **MINUTES –**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 8th September, 2015 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

## 209. **MARKETS –**

The Panel received a presentation from Mr. John Trusler, Principal Engineer, on progress with the Farnborough and Aldershot markets. The Panel also welcomed Mr. Peter Amies, Head of Community and Environment to the meeting.

Mr. Trusler explained that, in December, 2014, the Cabinet had approved a review of the operating arrangements for the existing markets and car boot sales in Rushmoor. In January 2015, Cabinet had considered the outcomes of the review and supported the recommendations that the Council should bring the operation of the markets and car boot sales 'in-house'.

Subsequently, during January and February of 2015, a small team of Officers from a range of services across the Council had developed the new business. Mr. Trusler reported that, although timelines had been tight and this had been a new way of working for the team, all deadlines had been met and in February, 2015 a new Market Manager, Claire Farrow, had been appointed. Mr. Trusler reported that the Farnborough Tuesday market had successfully opened on 3rd March, 2015, which was thriving and very popular. In May, 2015 the Farnborough Sunday market had commenced and the Panel was informed that, whilst small in comparison to the Tuesday market, it was proving popular with the public. In June, 2015 the Saturday market had commenced in Aldershot, and had played a role in supporting the VE Day celebrations. In August the official opening of the Aldershot market had taken place, in conjunction with celebrating the opening of the new look town centre. Finally, the Aldershot Thursday market was continuing to grow in popularity with both the traders and the public.

It was also reported that the Farnborough car boot sale was very popular with both buyers and sellers and a new pre-booking system had reduced queuing for sellers. Aldershot car boot had struggled to regain momentum, but had shown significant improvement in recent weeks.

With regard to the budget position, Mr. Trusler informed that Panel that the budget targets for the year of £295,000 would be achieved and would potentially provide a net additional sum of £97,000 after taking into account current operating costs and the lost income from the previous markets provider. The weekday markets were performing well, the weekend markets were still in development but continuing to grow. The Farnborough car boot was highly successful, with some changes having been made which had been well received. The Aldershot car boot was improving but would require some additional development. However, it was highlighted that the main aim had been to improve the vibrancy of the town centres.

The Panel suggested other ideas for themed markets, greater use of the gazebos, promotional ideas and the possibility of extending the operating hours for the Farnborough market. Mr. Trusler reported that future plans would include additional themed markets as well as the expansion of the Aldershot market. Other plans included the introduction of arts and crafts, the concentrated growth of the Aldershot car boot, a review of fees and charges and the introduction of new smart technology for issuing receipts and recording transactions.

The Panel congratulated Mr. Trusler on the success of the project and **NOTED** the presentation.

## 210. **ALDERSHOT REGENERATION – ALDERSHOT TOWN CENTRE PROSPECTUS CONSULTATION -**

The Panel welcomed Ms. Louise Mansfield from Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners to the meeting to present the draft Aldershot Town Centre Prospectus, along with Mr. Keith Holland, Head of Planning.

Ms. Mansfield explained that the Aldershot Prospectus set out the Council's strategy for regeneration of the town centre. The document had been prepared following input from local stakeholders and the community and had been designed to draw on Aldershot's key assets, such as its history, changing demographics, current investment programmes, good rail and road connections and beautiful landscape setting. The Prospectus had been based on viable investment and development options and would also act as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), meaning it would be a material planning consideration for future planning applications in the town centre.

There were six key themes to the vision for the town centre:

1. Revitalisation of the town centre – the Council would welcome new retailers, support specialist retailers that provide an

alternative offer to other centres and seek to bring homes, leisure and office uses into the centre to support shops.

2. Town Centre Living – would be promoted to meet the need for new homes from young professionals wishing to move to the area due to the relatively affordable homes. The properties would cater for young people starting out, families and older people wishing to downsize.
3. A family-friendly town centre – the Council would seek to enhance this with additional activities such as town centre leisure facilities and town centre spaces.
4. An improved cultural offer – the Council was reviewing opportunities such as the transformation of the Princes Hall and the extension of the successful events programme in the town.
5. Investing in streets and spaces – following on from the Activation Aldershot programme, further investment priorities had been identified to create a central public space for Aldershot and to improve entrances into the town centre.
6. Affirming the Victorian heritage – the Council would commit to maintaining and enhancing the town's Victorian heritage and buildings in order to complement new buildings in the town centre.

The Prospectus set out a detailed Masterplan for the key development and refurbishment opportunities in the town. Sites identified included the Galleries site, the Union Street group of buildings, the Rail Station area, and the area around Princes Hall, including the refurbishment of the theatre.

It was reported that from 30th September, wider consultation had been taking place on the Prospectus which was due to end on 11th November, 2015. It was reported that a number of themes had emerged in the feedback received so far which focussed on:

- the lack of shops/major quality retailers in the town, including the need for a large 'anchor' store;
- rents being too high;
- parking fees;
- redevelopment of the Galleries should be a priority;
- support for the redevelopment of Princes Hall and the Police Station as well as the railway station;
- strong support for recognising the Victorian heritage.

The Aldershot Town Centre Prospectus SPD contained a series of projects that would shape the centre over the next fifteen to twenty years and beyond. It was intended to be visionary, yet flexible to ensure that it could meet changes in circumstances, especially economic and property related.

With regard to making it happen, it was highlighted that town centres were challenging development environments, particularly so with the gradual decline in retail. Arguably, many town centres were undergoing a revolution rather than evolution. This applied more so to Aldershot town centre where some sites were particularly complex.

It was stressed, that the Council's ownership in the key areas was limited and the Council was therefore not in a position to deliver the proposals set out in the Prospectus alone. However, there was a strong case for considerable strategic intervention by the Council to achieve the aims of the Masterplan. The Panel was assured that the Council would use its powers and resources in a proactive way where necessary to enable development and investment in the town through de-risking opportunities, for example site assembly and securing SANGs (Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space) and funding. It was also proposed that the Council could look at the acquisition of strategic interests in the town. However, it was acknowledged that there was unlikely to be a 'one size fits all' mechanism for projects with delivery and funding mechanisms being provided by the public sector, private sector and public/private partnerships.

The Panel discussed the Prospectus and, overall was very enthusiastic about the ideas in the document. The Panel discussed the viability of the projects and highlighted the pressing need to attract retailers in order to ensure that the town centre would be an attractive destination for residents of the Wellesley development. The Panel was informed that the document would be used as a marketing tool to help encourage investment.

Following discussion on the major issues raised in the Prospectus the Panel **RECOMMENDED** that:

1. The old Aldershot Town Hall was a significant building which deserved priority to emphasise its role in the development of Aldershot.
2. Good quality family living in the town centre was vital (including good quality new builds and conversions).
3. Princes Hall – its location was supported but its size and capacity should be expanded.
4. The principle of having a good town square was endorsed but the Panel wanted to see a well-defined and well-framed town square irrespective of its location.
5. The emphasis on the town's Victorian heritage and architecture was endorsed and it was felt that this should have prominence in the document and should be promoted, protected, enhanced and preserved.

6. Redundant sites on Windsor Way should be linked more to the Railway Station development in the document.
7. A Heritage Trail was considered an excellent idea and should be referenced in the document. It was suggested that this could be enhanced through the use of good public art (not forgetting the military).
8. the wording of the 'Making it Happen' section should be reviewed to emphasise the Council's role in working with private landowners.

It was explained that the Panel's recommendations, together with feedback from the wider consultation would be incorporated into the proposed Aldershot Town Centre Prospectus Supplementary Planning Document. The document would be presented to Cabinet for consideration in due course.

The Panel **NOTED** the presentation and **ENDORSED** the submission of the proposed Supplementary Planning Document and its recommendation to the Cabinet.

The Meeting closed at 9.10 p.m.

D.E. CLIFFORD  
CHAIRMAN

-----



# CORPORATE SERVICES POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Thursday, 12th November, 2015 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  
a Cr. Barbara Hurst

Cr. B. Jones

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

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Cr. Barbara Hurst.

## 211. **MINUTES –**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 4th June, 2015 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

## 212. **COUNCIL WEBSITE –**

The Panel had invited the Corporate Communications Manager, Ms. Gill Chisnall, and the Website Manager, Mr. Paul Cowell, to the meeting to discuss the progress of the Council's new website since it had been launched in 2012. It was explained that while the website had only been live for three years, work had begun on the development of the improved website in 2010.

Prior to the launch of the new website, customers had found it difficult to understand the old site and often experienced technical issues. There had been a reduction in the number of pages and the developed site had also allowed staff to update their service pages. As well as improving the design and management, staff had started to ensure that the content of the website was more customer focused.

Members heard that regular improvements had been made and were shown a number of the developed pages. Customers had been given the ability to look up more information, including their bin collection dates and polling stations. The main improvements had included software updates and the ability to view the website easily on mobile devices. The introduction of feedback forms had been important in the development process as it enabled customer views to be collected. The improvements had resulted in a 50% increase in users.

The Panel had been provided with data that showed how the customers used and accessed the Council's website. It was noted that 57% of the website traffic came out of hours, when the offices were closed. It was also heard that in 2012, 87% of website visits had been made on a desktop computer, whereas 2015 statistics showed this had reduced to 46%, while the remaining percentage of visits had been made on tablets or mobile devices. The common popular pages included rubbish and recycling, council tax, job opportunities and parking, however, there had been seasonal popular pages where the number of visits had spiked at different times throughout the year, for example, fireworks, elections and the Lido.

It was explained that there had been a focus on the development of the elections pages during 2015, there had been a live update feed during the count and there had also been an increase in the promotion of the elections pages through social media. Social media had also been used to promote other Council news and events.

A facility had been developed that enabled staff to see what customers did when they visited the website, although, it had also been felt necessary to find out the reason the customers had visited. Feedback had been received from the Society of IT Management (SOCITM), customers, staff and councillors. SOCITM had completed a number of tasks and scenarios during their review and assessed mobile and desktop use. As a result, Rushmoor's website had been rated three out of four stars. The Council had been offered some suggestions on how the website would be improved, for example, the removal of outdated phrases, 'do it online' or 'report it', and think 'mobile first' on all pages.

Members were informed that, during the second quarter of 2015/16, customers of the website had completed 736 'did you find what you were looking for?' forms. It had been shown that 81% of those customers had found what they were looking for, 6% had not and 13% had made a specific request for a service.

Ms. Chisnall then made reference to Channel Shift and the intention to increase online transactions. However, it was noted that most customers had visited the website for information. Members heard that there was a need for a new 'platform' to progress with Channel Shift, that would allow customers to have their own council account; 'my account'. It was intended that this feature would enable customers to self-serve and track their requests. It was explained that there had been work to embed this into the current website, although the current website design had made this a challenging task.

The Panel was provided with examples of current website trends in local government that were similar to the national "gov.uk" website, although it was stated that there was an intention to find out what customers wanted from the website before any changes were made.

The Panel made the following recommendations for consideration in the development of the Council's website:

- Re-introduce the ability to submit petitions online;
- Enable customers to 'CC' their local councillor(s) when completing online forms or making service requests.

The Panel **NOTED** the presentation and requested the officers to assess the issues raised by the Panel.

## 213. **FINANCIAL UPDATE/TREASURY MANAGEMENT –**

The Head of Financial Services, Ms. Amanda Fahey, had been invited to the meeting to provide the Panel with an update on treasury management. The presentation outlined the current economic background and the UK's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) data. Members were updated on the Council's current financial position and were informed of some key financial issues, these included the Autumn Statement and the predicted financial cuts, the possible devolution deal and the financial implications of this, the uncertainty around the new homes bonus and future changes to the business rates scheme.

The Panel was reminded that treasury management was underpinned by the adoption of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's code of practice. It was noted that three treasury management updates were provided to the Licensing and General Purposes Committee each year. Members heard that while Arlingclose Limited had provided advice to Rushmoor, all investment decisions had been made by the Council's Treasury Team. It was noted that the Team also made the decisions regarding the Council's pooled funds that were managed by external fund managers. The Panel was then briefed on the current situation of the Council's pooled funds and provided with a summary of deposit and investment activity during the six month period to 30th September, 2015.

Members noted the internal investment credit score, of which the aim had been A- or higher for average credit rating and an average credit score of 7 or lower. It was explained that the credit score had been good and explained that this had been due to solid counterparties.

Ms. Fahey concluded that, whilst 2015/16 had been challenging for the Council, the estimated interest receipts were £849,000 which was an increase on previous estimates for the year. The Panel was informed that the Council had started to look ahead and was considering the possibility of becoming a 'borrowing' authority. However, this would be dependent on the level of investment and the ability to attract external funding.

The Panel **NOTED** the update.

## 214. PERFORMANCE REPORTING –

The Panel welcomed the Strategy, Performance and Partnerships Manager, Mr. Jon Rundle, to the meeting who had been asked to provide a presentation on the Council's approach to performance reporting. A copy of the Strategic and Performance Management Updates from the second quarter of 2015/16 had been distributed prior to the meeting. An overview of the approach allowed the Panel to assess whether any issues should be scrutinised in more depth at a future meeting of the Panel.

Members were reminded of the Council's purpose, 'working with others to improve the quality of people's lives', and heard how the 8-Point Plan and Organisational Development Programme was influencing the sustainability of the organisation.

The Strategic Planning Process 2015-2018 was explained to the Panel through a diagram. It was noted that this process was a continuous loop and had begun with horizon scanning, followed by a number of tasks including budget projections, finalising business plans, finalising the budget, agreeing the Corporate Strategy and finishing with performance monitoring and public feedback.

Following discussions with the Cabinet and other Members, the Panel was advised that improvements to the corporate planning process had been pursued. For example, it was suggested that there would be an increase in the work with Members, a focus on priorities and allocating resources where they had been needed most and an introduction of more opportunities to feed in resident and customer consultation. Improvements had also been made to the monitoring documents, which had started to include an overview of the budget.

The Panel were informed of the key elements for the Corporate Plan and quarterly monitoring reports that had been presented to Cabinet during 2015/16. It was explained that broader issues relating to the local community had continued to be included, such as population, crime, education, economy and health. The document had started to include more emphasis on the 8-Point Plan and Organisational Development. There was also a focus on key priorities under the five themes; people and communities, prosperity, place, leadership, good value services.

It was heard that feedback on the monitoring documents had been positive and Members agreed that it was a sophisticated report.

The Panel **NOTED** the presentation and **ENDORSED** the approach to performance monitoring.

215. **CUSTOMER SERVICES MEMBER REVIEW GROUP –**

Members received a copy of the minutes from the Customer Services Member Review Group meeting that had taken place on 17th June, 2015.

The Panel **NOTED** the minutes of the meeting.

216. **WORK PROGRAMME –**

The Panel **NOTED** the current Work Programme.

The meeting closed at 9.00 pm.

JACQUI M. VOSPER  
CHAIRMAN

-----

# BOROUGH SERVICES POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Meeting held on Monday, 16th November, 2015 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 p.m.

## **Voting Members**

Cr. Barbara Hurst (Chairman)  
Cr. A.R. Newell (Vice-Chairman)

Cr. T.D. Bridgeman  
Cr. D.E. Clifford  
Cr. A.M. Ferrier

Cr. C.P. Grattan

Cr. S.J. Masterson  
Cr. M.J. Roberts  
Cr. D.M. Welch

## 217. **MINUTES –**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 14th September, 2015 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

## 218. **COMMUNITY SAFETY – SAFER NORTH HAMPSHIRE –**

The Panel welcomed Ms. Caroline Ryan, Community Safety Manager, and Ms. Karen Evans, Domestic Abuse Officer, who gave an update and presentation to the Panel on the community safety activities and priorities for the Safer North Hampshire Partnership area (copy of presentation circulated with the agenda).

Ms. Ryan introduced the presentation with an overview of recent developments within the Safer North Hampshire Partnership and confirmed that the Partnership had become an approved City & Guilds Centre for Restorative Practice. The Panel endorsed the new designation and, in response to a question, it was explained that the initiative was targeted at rehabilitating young offenders aged up to 22 through reconciliation with victims where all parties were willing to participate. The process involved a court-like set up, managed by volunteers, aimed at achieving understanding and empathy.

The Panel noted the headlines arising from the latest Strategic Assessment of current and emerging community safety trends. However, changes had been made to crime recording, which meant that comparisons with previous data were uncertain in many crime categories, e.g. violent crime where multiple individuals were involved. As part of the changes, there were now 19 categories of anti-social behaviour for recording purposes. These related to personal, environmental and community impacts.

The priority community safety issues for Rushmoor included tackling anti-social behaviour and street drinking in parts of Aldershot, and alcohol related violent crime associated with the night-time economy in Aldershot town centre. Across the wider partnership area, the priorities also included the need to address issues related to substance misuse, and vulnerabilities, which included the “Prevent” programme, hate crime, child exploitation and domestic abuse.

The Panel explored current activities and progress on the local issues in further detail. On substance misuse, Members welcomed news that new legislation was expected to be introduced which would prohibit premises such as the Skunkworks shop in Aldershot from selling psychoactive substances. In the meantime, it was noted that the Partnership would be seeking a further closure of the business on the grounds of anti-social behaviour impacts, which appeared to have increased since it had reopened. Linked to this, it was suggested for future consideration, that businesses which benefitted from the night-time economy could contribute to the costs of policing and remedying the associated impacts, possibly through the use of fixed penalty notices.

In discussing the topic of radicalisation, it was noted that strategic planning and activities for the area were co-ordinated through the Strategic Prevent Board for Hampshire, which had clear communication links and reporting lines with colleges. The Panel asked about links with local mosques, imams and community leaders and it was confirmed that the local police had connections with religious leaders. However, a lot of work was focused on families who had been identified as high risk for radicalisation. At the national level, the Home Office had enabled initiatives whereby individuals who had been radicalised in the past were involved in education and awareness campaigns.

Ms. Evans presented an update on domestic and child exploitation crime including current data and activities co-ordinated by the Domestic Abuse Forum (as set out in the presentation slides). The Panel welcomed and endorsed recent initiatives carried out in schools and communities and the improved recording of domestic crimes. It was noted that new legislation for dealing with coercive control was expected in December.

Further to a question about the project carried out with the military community on domestic crime awareness, it was clarified that the impetus for the work had been to break down barriers to reporting domestic crime, as reporting levels within this community were much lower than might be expected for the total population figure. Reporting of domestic crime was also low amongst the Nepali community, and measures were being taken to address this through initiatives that focussed on education and raising awareness. It was acknowledged that there were cultural differences, and a Member asked about levels of domestic crime for Nepal. It was agreed that this would be forwarded after the meeting, and acknowledged that definitions for recording purposes would vary between countries and cultures.

With reference to both domestic and child exploitation crime, including FMG (Female Genital Mutilation), the Panel noted that the key challenge was finding a way to surface the issues with groups and individuals, particularly those that were hard to reach. Measures were being taken to work with young people through schools and role-play events, and to work with GPs on reporting safeguarding issues.

In concluding, the Panel thanked Ms Ryan and Ms Evans for their presentation and emphasised the importance of maintaining up-to-date and informed evidence and information, which clearly demonstrated the need for continued funding for community safety priorities for North Hampshire.

The Panel **NOTED** the presentation and **AGREED** that an update would be brought back the following year, enabling a comparison of data from this year and emerging trends.

219. **WORK PROGRAMME –**

The Panel noted the current work programme.

The Meeting closed at 8.40 p.m.

BARBARA HURST  
CHAIRMAN



# COMMUNITY POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 19th November, 2015 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

## **Voting Members**

Cr. M.D. Smith (Chairman)  
Cr. M.S. Choudhary (Vice-Chairman)

Cr. Sophia Choudhary  
Cr. R. Cooper  
Cr. Liz Corps

Cr. Jennifer Evans

Cr. S.J. Masterson  
Cr. M.J. Roberts  
Cr. P.F. Rust

## 220. **MINUTES –**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 17th September, 2015 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

## 221. **NORTH EAST HAMPSHIRE AND FARNHAM CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP – VANGUARD PROGRAMME –**

The Panel welcomed Ms. Sally Bannister to the meeting. Ms. Bannister was the North East Hampshire and Farnham Vanguard Programme Lead and had been invited to the meeting to provide an overview of the Group's Vanguard Programme.

Ms. Bannister advised the Panel that the North East Hampshire and Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group, together with health and social care partners, had been awarded Vanguard status by NHS England. This would involve plans for moving services away from hospitals and into the community and to bring together elements of health and social care so that services could be provided quicker. This could happen because Vanguard status brought with it expert guidance and national resources to provide support and flexibility to bring about the aims of the Programme. Essentially, it could be said that the Programme provided a "turbo boost" to what had already been agreed that should happen to ensure that people were supported to be happy and healthy at home for as long as possible.

It was noted that Vanguard was a partnership of clinicians and service managers from:

- NHS North East Hampshire and Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group
- primary care
- Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust (which ran Frimley Park Hospital)

- Surrey and Borders Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (mental health services)
- Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust (community services)
- Virgin Care (community services)
- Hampshire County Council (social care)
- Surrey County Council (social care)
- South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust
- North Hampshire Urgent Care (out-of-hours GP service)
- voluntary sector

The Vanguard programme would also work with patients and the public to help shape, develop and continually improve the way services were provided by designing services with the local community, thereby helping people to look after themselves. It would also enable staff to provide high quality joined up care by making sure that funding and organisational boundaries did not hinder progress.

Ms. Bannister referred to the structure of the partnership, which comprised a Chief Executives Group of the key partnership members and working groups for each of the following work streams, details of which were also outlined:

- design group
- prevention and self-care
- integrated hubs and enhanced out of hospital care
- a new model of care for people with acute needs
- supporting the development of primary care to operate at scale
- design and deliver a new commissioning model
- determining the organisational arrangements through which providers work as one
- understanding the needs of local people and the outcomes they seek
- effective co-production, engagement and communications
- access to electronic records for patients and care professionals
- redesigning the workforce and ensuring behavioural change
- evaluating the impact of the changes
- estates

During discussion, Members raised questions regarding the impact of the Government's Spending Review, patients' electronic records and the sharing of such information, the timescale for the Vanguard Programme, costs, outcomes and priorities,

On behalf of the Panel, the Chairman thanked Ms. Bannister for her informative presentation and it was **AGREED** that a clinician, Dr. Andy Whitfield, Chairman and Clinical Lead for the North East Hampshire and Farnham Clinical Commissioning Group, would be invited to attend a future meeting to provide an update on the Vanguard Programme's work and the impact on services.

## 222. WELFARE REFORM UPDATE –

The Panel welcomed Mr. Ian Harrison, Corporate Director, who had been invited to the meeting to give an update on the latest position on Welfare Reform both nationally and locally.

Mr. Harrison referred to the current political landscape, post General Election, and the continuation of the Welfare Reform programme, including an acceleration and extension of some elements. In the Queen's Speech, the Government had pledged to remove a further £12 billion from the Welfare Bill whilst mainly protecting pensioner welfare. It was known that Welfare Reform would play its part in the creation of a "budget surplus" by 2019/20. The specific measures which had been announced were:

- four year freeze on most working age benefits
- reduction in the benefit cap from £26,000 to £20,000 (£23,000 in London)
- 18-21 year olds not automatically entitled to help with housing costs
- most welfare support restricted to two children
- programme of broad based reduction in tax credit awards
- introduction of a National Living Wage for 25+ age (£7.20 rising to £9.00 per hour by 2020)
- £800 million additional Discretionary Housing Payment funding for five years for local authorities.

The July 2015 budget had only set out around £17 billion of the £37 billion required to achieve the surplus in 2019/20. The remaining £20 billion would be announced in the Autumn Spending Review.

Mr. Harrison referred to an Ipsos MORI poll that had been carried out in September, 2015 to gather information on people's views on austerity measures. In addition, Mr. Harrison briefed Members on research by the Resolution Foundation on spending within the welfare budget, where it was stated that, by 2020, working-age adult welfare was set to fall to its lowest level since 1979; spending on children would be back to its 2002 level; while pensioner spend would fall to its immediate pre-crisis level. It was also advised that pensioner spend reduction was being driven by increasing the State Pension to 66 by 2020. In respect of the focus of welfare spending, it was noted that pensioner benefits accounted for 45% of total welfare spending immediately pre-crisis, but were set to account for 52% by the end of the decade. In contrast, tax credit and child benefit spending would fall from 21% to 17% of the total. It was further noted that, by 2020/21, the share of Government spending flowing to older people and health could reach 43%, which was its highest level since comparable records had begun in the 1990s. In contrast, it was forecast that the share allocated to education and economic affairs would reach a new low of 19%.

In respect of the situation in Rushmoor, Mr. Harrison advised Members that, overall since March 2013, there had been a 6.3% decrease in the

Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit caseload. The eligible population levels had increased over the years from 2009 to 2014 from 71,300 to 76,374 with the Benefits caseload as a percentage of the population increasing from 8.5% in 2009 to 10% in 2014. It was also noted that, between the period of November 2008 and May 2015, Rushmoor had seen the largest increase (46%) in Housing Benefit claimants across the whole of Great Britain. In respect of Job Seekers' Allowance, Rushmoor had seen a decrease in the past year of 160 (21%) claimants and of 625 (51%) in the past two years. It was noted that the August 2015 figure was 0.8% lower than the national figure and 0.1% lower than the South East figure. It was further noted that the number of Employment and Support Allowance claimants had increased in Rushmoor since the Allowance had been created in November 2008, although this figure was relatively low.

Mr. Harrison displayed maps of the Borough which showed the indices of multiple deprivation in 2010 and 2015 which demonstrated a general shift in areas towards being more deprived, although contrasted with some pockets of improvement, indicating the changing picture of the Borough.

The Panel was then briefed on the national caseload for Universal Credit. The age range of claimants was shown, together with the caseload figures for the nearest authorities who currently processed Universal Credit. It was noted that Rushmoor would be in the tranche of authorities to start dealing with Universal Credit from December 2015 to April 2016, with Rushmoor expecting to see its first claimants in February 2016.

The Panel noted that, in April 2015, there had been 500 people in the Borough who would be affected by the benefit changes relating to additional bedroom restrictions. However, by October 2015 this number had reduced by 154 as these residents were no longer affected due to a change in their circumstances. Members were advised that there were currently 24 Benefit capped cases in Rushmoor. Continued engagement was taking place with residents affected to support them through joint working by Housing Services at Rushmoor and other organisations.

In respect of Discretionary Housing Payments, the Panel was advised that the total fund for 2015/16 was £125,516. It was noted that 72% of Discretionary Housing Payments had been awarded to support people affected by the social sector size criteria (additional bedroom restriction).

In respect of Council Tax collection rates, it was noted that, for 2014/15, the collection rate had been 98.2% which compared extremely well to other areas in the UK.

The Panel was reminded about the provisions of the Council Tax Benefit Scheme and the local Council Tax Support Scheme. Members were advised that Council Tax support spending had continued to drop and that caseload work had also reduced by 16.1% over the period from March 2013 to June 2015. Details were given of award data for the Council Tax Scheme, how the Scheme operated across Hampshire and how this compared to Rushmoor's immediate neighbours and to Rushmoor's audit family.

Rushmoor's Council Tax Support Scheme had performed well but was currently under review and subject to consultation on various options for change. Responses would be considered by the Welfare Reform Task and Finish Group for submission to the Cabinet for consideration and recommendation to the full Council on 27th January, 2016.

In conclusion, Mr. Harrison advised that the Government's intent and mandate was to continue to deliver welfare reform through a complex and wide-ranging programme. Locally, the Council had some different and difficult issues with welfare and income generally. Housing demand versus supply and costs supporting rent in the private sector remained a challenge. Mr Harrison reported the Task and Finish Group's view was that changes needed to be made, but it was important that the genuinely vulnerable should continue to be protected.

During discussion, Members raised questions regarding the Council Tax Benefit Scheme, the Council Tax collection rate, indices of multiple deprivation and the changing local demography. Members expressed great satisfaction that Rushmoor was the best local authority in England for processing benefit claims and extended their appreciation and congratulations to the department responsible for this achievement.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Harrison for his comprehensive and informative presentation. The Panel **NOTED** the update.

223. **WORK PROGRAMME –**

The Panel **NOTED** the work programme and work schedule.

The Meeting closed at 8.41 p.m.

M.D. SMITH  
CHAIRMAN

-----