

CORPORATE SERVICES POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

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

Voting Members

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

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

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

8. MINUTES

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

9. GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

10. **WORK PROGRAMME**

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

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

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

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

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm.

CLLR JACQUI VOSPER (CHAIRMAN)

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

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

Voting Members

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

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

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

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

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

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

3. SOUTHWOOD GOLF COURSE - CONSULTATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The meeting closed at 10.02 pm.

CLLR MRS. D.B. BEDFORD (CHAIRMAN)

CORPORATE SERVICES POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

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

Voting Members

Cllr Jacqui Vosper (Chairman)

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

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

11. MINUTES

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

12. IMPACT OF UNIVERSAL CREDIT FOR RUSHMOOR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

13. **DIGITAL STRATEGY**

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

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

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

14. **BUILDING SECURITY / EVACUATION PLANS**

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

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

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

15. **WORK PROGRAMME**

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

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

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

The meeting closed at 9.40 pm.

CLLR JACQUI VOSPER (CHAIRMAN)

BOROUGH SERVICES POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

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

Voting Members

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

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

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

12. MINUTES

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

13. FIRE SAFETY ISSUES IN RUSHMOOR

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

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

In attendance were:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Chairman thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

14. **WORK PROGRAMME**

The Panel noted the current work programme.

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

The meeting closed at 8.55 pm.

CLLR A.R. NEWELL (CHAIRMAN)

This page is intentionally left blank

COMMUNITY POLICY AND REVIEW PANEL

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

Voting Members

Cllr M.D. Smith (Chairman)

Cllr M.S. Choudhary

Cllr R. Cooper

Cllr J.H. Marsh

Cllr Marina Munro

Cllr M.J. Roberts

Cllr P.F. Rust

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

11. MINUTES

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

12. LOCAL AIR QUALITY AND HEALTH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Report and presentation covered the following areas:

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

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

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

14. **WORK PROGRAMME**

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

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm.

CLLR M.D. SMITH (CHAIRMAN)
