

POLICY AND PROJECT ADVISORY BOARD

Meeting held on Thursday, 12th July, 2018 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr A.R. Newell (Chairman)
Cllr Sophia Choudhary (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr Marina Munro (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr J.B. Canty
Cllr A.H. Crawford
Cllr R.L.G. Dibbs
Cllr Mara Makunura
Cllr M.J. Roberts
Cllr P.F. Rust
Cllr J.E. Woolley

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

5. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 5th June, 2018 were approved and signed by the Chairman. It was requested that a Councillor from Aldershot Park Ward be invited to join the Aldershot Regeneration Group.

Action to be taken	By whom	When
Invite a representative from the Aldershot Park ward to join the Aldershot Regeneration Group	Jill Shuttleworth	July 2018

6. LEISURE FACILITIES AND ASSOCIATED CONTRACTS

The Board received a presentation from the Council's Head of Community and Environmental Services which set out the current leisure offer and potential options for the future. The Board was advised on the sports and leisure facilities across the Borough and was provided with details on the current contracts for Farnborough Leisure Centre, Aldershot Indoor Pools and Aldershot Lido. The outcomes required for future leisure management contracts were to reduce costs, invest in the facilities, increase participation and reduce the risk to the Council. There were a number of areas highlighted which would need to be considered when the Council looked at future leisure provision. The current activities provided had been reviewed and details were available on the number of visits, space occupied to provide the activity and the income and expenditure which would need to be considered to identify the feasibility of activities. Provision of activities from other providers in the Borough

would also need to be considered to identify the demand from users against the current provision.

The Lido Review Working Group, Friends of Aldershot Lido and the Leisure and Youth Policy and Review Panel had carried out some work to develop a vision for the Aldershot Pools Complex and some soft market testing had been carried out in 2017. A conditions survey had also been undertaken and the results were due at the end of July 2018. A number of options had been discussed for the future leisure management contract for Aldershot Lido which included the addition of adventure golf, reduction in pool size and addition of a splash pad. Options for the Aldershot Indoor Pool would be to either retain the current building with improvements or to build a new facility.

There had been some feasibility work carried out on options for the Farnborough Leisure Centre in 2017 and a conditions survey undertaken which was due to be reported on at the end of July 2018. Options available for Farnborough Leisure Centre could include retaining the current building with improvements, refurbishment or to build a new facility. The Leisure Centre was currently located in the Civic Quarter and, following some research, it was suggested that if a new facility was provided, it should remain within the Civic Quarter. A preferred investment partner had been identified for the Civic Quarter and, if approved, would work with the Council to agree concepts, capacity and site specific objectives. The Civic Quarter timetable would need to work with the leisure procurement timetable.

The Farnborough Leisure Centre and Aldershot Pools Complex contracts were due for renewal on 1st February 2019. The Civic Quarter masterplan timetable had been revised and required an extension of the leisure management contract to 31st March 2021. Negotiations were underway with Places for People to extend the contracts. The Board was asked to consider how it could be involved in working on the future leisure provision and contract agreement.

The Board discussed the presentation and there were a number of questions raised on specific areas relating to both Aldershot Pools Complex and Farnborough Leisure Centre. Areas which were suggested that needed to be looked at included:

- Look at leisure facilities in other areas of the country to learn lessons from their experience
- Consider recent leisure facility rebuilds and refurbishments to see which had worked better
- Look at trends nationally and locally to identify demand for activities
- Consider the population increase over next 10-15 years when assessing demand
- Consider some short-term improvements for Aldershot Lido as part of the contract extension including additional car parking and automated ticketing to speed up the entrance process and avoid long queues

The Board **AGREED** that a task and finish group should be established to consider the future leisure facilities provision and contracts. It was agreed that group membership would not be limited to members of the Board and a call would go out to the political groups to put forward nominations. The group would be made up of six members and would be chaired by either the Chairman or one of the Vice-Chairmen

of the Board. The group would report back to the Board when policy decisions were required. Terms of reference would be established to set out the aim of the group and the timescale for delivery.

Action to be taken	By whom	When
Establish a task and finish group to consider the future leisure facilities provision and contract in the Borough	Peter Amies/ Justine Davie	July 2018
Draft terms of reference for the Leisure Facilities and Contracts Task and Finish Group to be agreed	Peter Amies/ Justine Davie	July 2018
Send a request out to the political groups to nominate members for the Leisure Facilities and Contracts Task and Finish Group	Jill Shuttleworth	July 2018

7. **RESPONSE TO THE HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL T19 CONSULTATION**

The Board received a copy of Hampshire County Council's (HCC's) T19 consultation on street lighting, supported passenger transport services and concessionary travel to provide feedback to input into a Council response. HCC proposed to initially save £230,000 per annum by switching off street lights on some residential streets for a minimum of two or more hours per night from April 2019. HCC also proposed changes to the supported passenger transport services and concessionary travel scheme to save a total of £2.1m, of which £650,000 had already been secured. The Board considered each of the proposals individually and made comments to be incorporated into a Council response:

Proposal 1: To switch off street lights for part of the night (two or more hours) on residential streets

- Potential issues if the lights were switched off in areas where there was a night time economy.
- A view from the Police should be sought on the potential effect on anti-social behaviour and burglaries.
- Potential to switch off every other light should be considered.
- Request evidence to be provided on the street areas where the lights switch off could work.

Proposal 2: To make operational changes to the current public bus and ferry services which Hampshire County Council supports

- As the questions related to specific bus services it was considered it was difficult for the Council to give a view, however it was acknowledged that those passengers using the buses relied on the services currently provided.

Proposal 3: To replace some supported public bus services with alternative forms of community transport, such as Taxishares and Call and Go

- There were some pilot schemes taking place in other areas and it was suggested that the outcomes from the pilot schemes should be considered before any changes implemented.
- Alternative services away from a scheduled service to meet local conditions should be considered.

Proposal 4: To reduce the amount of printed material and make better use of electronic information

- Agreement with the reduction in the amount printed but as long as some printed material was still made available for those without access to online services.

Proposal 5: To reduce the amount of support available to organisations that provide, promote or support transport services

- As there was only £30,000 saving to be made across the County it was the view that there would only be a limited affect in Rushmoor.
- A check online was requested to see which services in Rushmoor would be affected and advise Board if necessary.

Proposal 6: To remove the use of the Older Persons' Bus Pass on Taxishares, Dial-a-Ride and Call and Go services

- The services should only be removed where there was currently a bus service available.
- Consultation with the users should be carried out to identify why they needed the service.
- A pilot impact assessment should be carried out.

The views of the Board would be compiled into a Council response to the consultation and sent to Hampshire County Council before the deadline of 5th August.

Action to be taken	By whom	When
Check online to identify if any Rushmoor organisations that provided, promoted or supported transport services received support and advise the Board if necessary	Ian Harrison	July 2018
Compile a response on behalf of the Council to the HCC T19 consultation incorporating the view of the Board	Ian Harrison	Before 5 August 2018

8. HAMPSHIRE 2050 - A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

The Board received the Executive Director's Report No. ED1801 which set out details on the Hampshire 2050 Commission of Inquiry which would consider evidence and key issues to inform a Vision for Hampshire in 2050. The Commission would engage with a variety of Hampshire stakeholders, consider a range of submitted evidence and develop proposals for the future shape of Hampshire across

a number of strategic themes. The themes and consultation deadlines were: demographic and societal changes - 29th June; economy - 13th July; work skills and lifestyle - 24th August; environmental and quality of place - 12th October; mobile, connectivity and energy - 23rd November; and, rural Hampshire – 21st December. An online questionnaire was available and the survey questions for each theme were

- What do you think might happen in the future?
- How will that affect/impact on what we do?
- How will the County Council and Partners need to react in light of this?

A full report on the findings of the Commission would be presented to Hampshire County Council in the Summer of 2019 and made publicly available.

The Board **NOTED** the Report and agreed that Hampshire 2050 should remain on the work programme and monitored.

9. **WORK PROGRAMME**

Cllr R.L.G. Dibbs was appointed as a Standing Deputy for the Conservative Group for the Progress Group. The Board **NOTED** the Work Programme.

The meeting closed at 9.35 pm.

CLLR A.R. NEWELL (CHAIRMAN)

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Meeting held on Thursday, 19th July, 2018 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr M.D. Smith (Chairman)
Cllr Mrs. D.B. Bedford (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr J.B. Canty (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr T.D. Bridgeman
Cllr M.S. Choudhary
Cllr R.M. Cooper
Cllr K. Dibble
Cllr Veronica Graham-Green
Cllr B. Jones
Cllr Nadia Martin

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr B.A. Thomas

5. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 7th June, 2018 were agreed as a correct record.

6. REVIEW OF REGISTERED PROVIDERS - 2017/18

The Committee welcomed Sue Thornett, Strategy and Enabling Officer, who attended the meeting to give a report on the 2017/18 Review of Registered Providers.

The purpose of the review was to gain a better understanding, build partnership working, review performance and address any issues/problems that might emerge with the registered providers operating within Rushmoor. Members had met initially to determine which providers would be reviewed; once decided, site visits had been organised and information packs requested. When the information had been reviewed, a set of questions were prepared addressing the key issues and the review meetings with the providers arranged. Registered providers that had been reviewed in 2017/18 had been the Mears Group, Accent South, Stonewater Housing and Grainger Trust.

The Committee was given an update on the findings from the reviews. It was noted that, in general, tenants were happy with their homes and the service provided. Following a staff structure review at Stonewater, improvements had been made to frontline customer services. New maintenance contracts and redecorating to improve the appearance of the Mears and Accent South properties was noted at the site visits.

It was advised that VIVID, as the largest provider of social housing in the Borough, had historically been dealt with separately. However, going forward, VIVID would be incorporated into the registered providers review process, which would help to ensure a fairer and more consistent process for all providers operating in Rushmoor.

In conclusion, the review process allowed Members and Officers to gain a better understanding of the working arrangements of providers and of issues affecting residents, provided a platform for open conversation and allowed for improved accountability and partnership working.

The Committee was then advised of issues at Alexander House, Aldershot, which was operated by Accent South. The Committee agreed a request from Cllr. A.H. Crawford to join the meeting to draw attention to ongoing concerns related service charges to leaseholders to cover major repair costs from 2015/16 when some emergency repair work was required. It was noted that a number of meetings had been arranged between residents and Accent South but no solution had yet been agreed. The Accent finance department continued to request the outstanding amount from residents. Cllr. Crawford felt that a further review should be undertaken with Accent South to address these concerns.

Action to be taken	By whom	When
Organise a meeting of the Registered Providers Task and Finish Group to discuss the issues raised by Members with Accent South.	Sue Thornett, Strategy and Enabling Officer	September, 2018

The Committee discussed the report and concerns raised. In response to a query, it was noted that, at the beginning of the process, a general email outlining the process and providers to be reviewed was circulated to all Members for comment. Full packs were only sent to Members of the Review Group. Ward Members were consulted if a property was situated within their ward.

The Committee **NOTED** the report and **AGREED** the process for the Registered Providers Task and Finish Group going forward. A programme of meetings would be circulated to Members of the Group shortly.

7. **WASTE CONTRACT UPDATE**

The Committee welcomed Mr. James Duggin, Contracts Manager, who attended the meeting to give an update on the Environmental Services Contract. Mr. Duggin outlined the procurement process for letting the contract, which had commenced in 2015 and was awarded to SERCO in 2017.

The Committee was apprised of the different elements of the contract, which included, grounds maintenance, street cleansing and waste management. The street cleansing element had changed most significantly, the service had gone back to a basic approach with manual operatives cleansing the streets. The Borough had been divided into thirteen zones with an operative allocated to each zone. Operatives had

a barrow and tools to carry out the majority of the work and were supported by mobile teams and mechanical sweepers when necessary. The waste management service had been enhanced, with the service also being provided on certain bank holidays, small WEEE (waste electrical and electronic equipment) collections, a bulky waste scheme and on-board technology providing real time information on the vehicles. Other elements included commercial services to help subsidise the cost of the household service and social value through the employment of apprentices, work with voluntary groups and community champions. Added value through the contract was also highlighted, with SERCO offering extra weed control services, edging up on grassed areas, awareness raising on recyclable materials and a commitment to keep costs in the lower quartile.

Through the on-board technology, realtime information could be viewed for each vehicle. Vehicles could be tracked at all times to assess progress of rounds and an electronic tool was available to log exceptions, such as missed bins by address and road blocks. Vehicles were also fitted with cameras to help keep operatives safe. The data collected from this realtime information was used to monitor performance. Key performance indicators were identified within the contract, these included: the number of missed bins; street cleansing inspection targets; grounds maintenance compliance with specification targets; and, public satisfaction targets. Since the contract had begun a number of inspections had been carried out, missed bin data had been collated and customer satisfaction surveys had taken place – all showed that the SERCO contract had been mobilised effectively and overall standards were good.

The Committee discussed the presentation and raised a number of issues around littering, it was noted that SERCO were keen to engage with schools and colleges but to date had been unsuccessful in engaging with the Sixth Form College where there was reported to be a particular issue with littering. It was suggested that contact could be made with fast food outlets to help address the littering issue from waste fast food packaging across the Borough. In response to a query regarding the community champions, it was advised that there was at least one from each ward and in some cases two. A list of champions would be circulated to Members in September. The monitoring of recyclable waste was raised, this was identified as a Hampshire County Council and Rushmoor Borough Council issue and was not compared within environmental services contracts, all benchmarking was carried out against other similar local authorities.

It was suggested that a task and finish group could be established to consider, in more detail, certain elements of the contract. This would be discussed further at the next meeting of the Progress Group.

8. ALDERSHOT CENTRE FOR HEALTH CAR PARKING - UPDATE

Ms. Kirsty Hosey, Parking Manager, attended the meeting to give an update on the current situation with car parking at Aldershot Centre for Health. It was noted that there had been a number of issues with the car park for many patients and the NHS had approached the Council for support in addressing the issues. It had been agreed

that the Council would operate the car park on behalf of the NHS on a temporary basis from August 2018 whilst a new contractor was appointed.

Following consultation, it was agreed that the car park would be incorporated into the Council's current Off Street Parking Order and the Council was currently in the process of implementing a pay and display system on the site. New signage would be installed and existing pay and display machines replaced with five Council owned machines. Payment for tickets would be in coins only and the existing charging structure would remain, with blue badge holders parking for free.

It was noted that there would be no period for vehicles to park for free, although, the free drop off facility would remain in place. The Council's Civil Enforcement Officers would patrol the public and staff car parks to ensure all customers and staff were parking correctly and penalty charge notices would be issued to those not complying with the new parking controls.

The Committee discussed the new arrangements and in response to a query regarding the free 15 minute period of parking, which had been available under the old scheme, it was advised that it had not been possible to retain this option with the pay and display machines that were being used. Members felt it was important to advertise clearly the changes to the free period and the blue badge holders on the notices that would be erected in the car park. It was noted that the scheme would be reviewed in three months' time.

9. **WORK PLAN**

The Committee noted the current work plan and a request was made to discuss how the Council deals with the issue of travellers at a meeting of the Progress Group.

The meeting closed at 9.14 pm.

CLLR M.D. SMITH (CHAIRMAN)

POLICY AND PROJECT ADVISORY BOARD

Meeting held on Thursday, 30th August, 2018 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr A.R. Newell (Chairman)
Cllr Sophia Choudhary (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr Marina Munro (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr J.B. Canty
Cllr A.H. Crawford
Cllr P.I.C. Crerar
Cllr R.L.G. Dibbs
Cllr Mara Makunura
Cllr M.J. Roberts
Cllr P.F. Rust
Cllr J.E. Woolley

10. **DEVELOPING THE BUSINESS CASE FOR A LOCAL HOUSING COMPANY - STRATEGIC, ECONOMIC AND COMMERCIAL CASE**

The Board considered the Executive Director (Customers, Digital and Rushmoor 2020) Report No. ED1803 which set out the Strategic Case, Economic Case and Commercial Case for a proposal to set up a local housing company and provided information on the business case process up to the point where a preferred option was chosen and the commercial case was made. If the Board was content with the first three cases, then the Financial Case and Management Case would be considered by the Board at a future meeting. The comments and views of the Board would be presented to the Cabinet when a decision to recommend the Council to set up a housing company would be considered.

The Board was reminded that the Council Plan set out a priority to establish a local housing company as a vehicle to participate directly in the provision of housing. It was envisaged that the proposed housing company would provide homes for private market rent, which would improve the supply and quality of housing in this sector, and also enable other housing tenures either directly or in partnership. A draft business case had been prepared using the HM Treasury Green Book five case model, which evaluated whether a business case could be made for continuing with a project considering five key areas:

- the strategic case - the case for change;
- the economic case – the options for delivery, public value;
- the commercial case – the legal requirements, commercial considerations and risk analysis;
- the financial case – funding and financial viability; and
- the management case – delivering successfully.

Members were advised that the business case had been reviewed by the Council's legal advisors, Freeths, who had confirmed that the Council's proposal to set up a housing company was within its powers and Freeths had also provided tax and VAT advice.

The Strategic Case considered the establishment of a new housing delivery vehicle as a mechanism to help improve quality and choice in the Borough's housing offer. This would link into the Council's regeneration priorities and with the wider priorities of meeting housing need contained in the Housing and Homelessness Strategy and the Council's need to achieve financial sustainability and develop new revenue streams to support its ongoing service delivery (Rushmoor 2020). There was also widespread agreement that the long term undersupply of housing had created unaffordable house prices and rents, with a quarter of young adults still living with their parents and long waiting lists for social housing. It was estimated that the country needed 225,000 to 275,000 or more new homes per year to keep up with population growth and to tackle years of undersupply.

The Report gave details of housing need within Rushmoor and the current situation with regard to the private rented sector, affordable housing and temporary accommodation. It was also noted that the Council had a small portfolio of property assets. The Council wanted to make best use of this portfolio to meet its policy objectives, including its objective to achieve financial sustainability.

The Board Members were asked to give their views on whether there was a strong case for establishing a housing company; whether the housing company should include a mix of types and tenures of housing or, for example, focus predominantly on higher income generating options such as the private rented sector, and finally whether the company should operate predominantly within Rushmoor or across a broader area such as the Council's Strategic Housing Market.

During discussion on these issues, the comment was made that the business case decision had used out of date data on the private market and requested more up-to-date data evidence of demand. There was general agreement that there was a strong strategic case for establishing a housing company. Whilst most Members were content with the proposed approach to mix of tenures, the opinion was also expressed that the housing company should focus on where the market was failing (i.e. social housing) and not the broad mix which was being suggested. It was further suggested that the housing company model in Bournemouth should be investigated, whereby the company was intervening in private sector rented housing and also influencing social rented accommodation, where it was felt there was the greatest need in Rushmoor and would offer more flexibility. A view was expressed that there should be the ability to cross-subsidise in order to make the company viable. In respect of where the housing company should operate, Members were of the opinion that this should predominantly be within Rushmoor, although should be open to operating within economic areas.

The Board then considered the economic case for a housing company. It was noted that the economic case identified and evaluated a long list of options for delivering housing that would contribute to the improvement of the overall quality and choice in

the Borough's housing offer and assessed them against the policy objectives for the project. The following objectives had been identified for setting up a housing company:

- provide a mechanism for holding existing residential properties
- provide a mechanism for creating a future residential property portfolio by development/acquisition
- provide a mechanism that allowed income generation and trading
- make the best use of the Council's existing property assets to meet housing needs and create an income stream
- initially to provide quality homes for market rent, and contribute to improvements in the condition in the sector of the stock
- address difficulties in affordable housing delivery through registered providers of social housing
- help address the need for temporary accommodation and the Council's desire to deliver differently
- give the Council control over types of housing, rents, tenures and returns to the Council.

It was felt that a housing company could support and assist with meeting these aspirations.

The following options had been identified as potentially enabling the Council to meet the objectives and the benefits, burdens and risks for each option were examined in the Report:

- do nothing
- hold and develop a limited portfolio in the General Fund
- re-open the Housing Revenue Account
- site by site disposal with development agreements
- wholly owned company
- other corporate structures
- investment partner/joint venture with the private sector, other public sector or registered providers of social housing

The Board was advised that an officer project team had assessed the long-list options to meet the critical success factors for the housing company and a table summarising this was set out in the Report. The analysis had identified that a wholly owned company provided the best fit against policy objectives. The remainder of the business case therefore focused on the housing company being established as a wholly owned company.

During discussion on whether Members were satisfied that a wide enough range of options had been considered and whether they were comfortable with the business case conclusion that a wholly owned company would be the best option, one Member expressed the view that his preference was for a community interest company in order that the company could feed back into more community schemes. This view aside, Members broadly welcomed the view that a wholly owned company would be the best option to provide the opportunity for other options, such as a joint

venture, to be used too. Members were also generally of the opinion that a wide enough range of options had been considered. However, one Member did mention that co-operatives and community land trusts had not been looked at. It was also suggested that the Sustainable Communities Act should be investigated for what this might enable the Council to do.

The Board then considered the commercial case for the preferred option of a wholly owned company. It was noted that the Council had the powers to:

- set up a wholly owned company under the Localism Act 2011
- fund a wholly owned company under the Local Government Act 1988; and
- transfer land and property to a wholly owned company under the Local Government Act 1972.

The commercial case outlined the procurement and commercial aspects of the preferred option, together with a risk analysis. A company limited by shares was the most common corporate vehicle used in England for profit distributing bodies. The Council would be able to participate in the company by way of share equity as well as loan debt, subject to entering into formal lending documentation. The company would be set up under the Companies Act 2006. The Council would hold 100% of shares in the company and would have full ownership allowing the Council to retain control of the selection of properties, standards of properties, allocations and rents. It was noted that a clear governance structure would be required to enable the Council to have control of the strategic direction of the company while allowing the directors of the company discretion to carry out effective operational management. A shareholder agreement would be needed to set out the parameters within which the company must operate and to clarify the extent of control by the Council. This would include such things as what powers were reserved to the Council as shareholder, the business planning process and board meeting requirements.

To meet the needs identified in the strategic case and the economic case, the key objectives of the company would be:

- to take a transfer of existing residential properties owned and let by the Council
- to develop/acquire property to assemble a residential property portfolio that might contain a range of tenures
- to provide quality homes for rent in the private rented market to meet housing need, and create a revenue stream
- to remain financially viable
- to assist the Council in meeting requirements for affordable housing and temporary accommodation where a company was the best means of achieving the required outcomes
- to provide an efficient landlord service including housing management and maintenance
- to maintain its properties to a standard that met tenants' reasonable expectations and protects the Council's investment in the company.

The Report set out the requirements for establishing a housing company, including company documentation and operational documents. The housing company would

also need to provide housing management and property maintenance services to its tenants. Initially it was likely that this would be undertaken through agents (some registered providers would undertake this role on a commercial basis) and through the use of some Council staff. Costs for Council staff would need to be recharged in a transparent way having regard to state aid rules. It was noted that tenants of the housing company would be granted Assured Shorthold Tenancies, except in the case of any supported housing schemes that would be let on licences. In some circumstances, it might be appropriate to offer homes on a shared ownership basis.

The Report also advised regarding Stamp Duty Land Tax, Corporation Tax, VAT and Council Tax. It was also noted that the housing company would be required to follow the Public Contracts Regulations 2015. However, as a wholly owned subsidiary of the Council, the housing company would not be subject to the EU procurement regime. Issues for decision in these circumstances would include lettings, management and maintenance, administrative, legal and accounting services. It was further noted that appropriate adaptation and revision might be required when the UK achieved Brexit on 29th March 2019.

During discussion, Members were broadly supportive of the objectives for the housing company. The view was expressed that the purpose for the company should be to enable housing need to be addressed and that the company could restrict or prioritise dwellings to local people or people with a local connection. Members were content to move on to the consideration of the financial and management cases for a housing company at a future meeting.

The views and recommendations of the Board would be reported to the Cabinet for consideration on either 16th October or 13th November and for recommendation to the Council on 6th December 2018 for the setting up of the housing company.

The meeting closed at 8.55 pm.

CLLR A.R. NEWELL (CHAIRMAN)

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Meeting held on Thursday, 13th September, 2018 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr M.D. Smith (Chairman)
Cllr J.B. Canty (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr T.D. Bridgeman
Cllr M.S. Choudhary
Cllr R.M. Cooper
Cllr K. Dibble
Cllr Veronica Graham-Green
Cllr B. Jones
Cllr Nadia Martin
Cllr B.A. Thomas

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr Mrs. D.B. Bedford

10. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 19th July, 2018 were agreed as a correct record.

11. PERFORMANCE MONITORING QUARTER 1 2018/19

The Committee received a presentation from Mr. Jon Rundle, Strategy, Performance and Partnership Manager, on the Quarter 1 Performance Monitoring.

The Quarterly Monitoring Report provided information on how well the Council was performing, and allowed Members and Officers to identify issues on an ongoing basis. It was reported that at the end of Quarter 1, 85.2% of the actions were “green”, 14.8% “amber” and 0% were “red”. The Committee was apprised of the actions being taken on those that were “amber” and noted the reasons why certain projects were not on track to be achieved within the timescales set.

A project relating to the CCTV service and how it would be shaped going forward was raised as “amber”. The current service was provided in partnership with Hart District Council and was due to undergo a review of the current systems capabilities and likely needs for future proofing as part of the procurement process for a new maintenance contract. The Committee was advised that Hart had updated their cameras during the current contract but Rushmoor had taken the decision to continue with the existing cameras. This situation had made the procurement process for a new maintenance contract more complex and there was a slight delay. A meeting was scheduled for the following week to consider this matter. The Committee was concerned that the Council had taken the decision not to

upgrade the cameras at the same time as Hart and requested that an update be given to explain the reasons behind the decision.

Action to be taken	By Whom	When
To provide an update on the reasons behind the decision to not upgrade the CCTV cameras within Rushmoor at the same time as the ones in Hart.	Carrie Ryan, Community Safety Manager	October, 2018

Since the last meeting, when the Committee had considered Quarterly Performance Monitoring, it was noted that a number of new measures had been added to the report. These related mainly to the SERCO contract and included data on service satisfaction, street cleansing, in particular missed bin collections and fixed penalty notices. Homelessness, walk in customers and staff absence data was also being included. The Committee also noted that data on the Council's savings requirements had been recorded as part of the information provided. The Committee discussed the savings requirement data and requested that more information on income generation, in particular that generated from property investment, should be added to the work plan.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Rundle for his presentation and welcomed Carrie Ryan, Community Safety Manager and Inspector Phil Mayne of Hampshire Police who were in attendance to provide a background to the crime and disorder figures held within the Quarterly Performance Monitoring Report.

The Committee was advised that there had been a continual decrease in crime rates over the past two years of about 1% despite all the "red" categories shown on the data provided within the report. Figures were skewed as crimes, such as burglaries, could take place over one to two nights; then the offenders would move to a different location or be caught, causing a peak in the figures in a short space of time. Historic crimes such as rapes and domestic abuse could also disrupt the figures as they were logged on the day they were reported and not backdated to the event itself. The Committee discussed rape crimes and noted that teens/young people were more inclined to report rapes than they had in the past. The rapes being reported were not stranger rapes, but often related to young people being too drunk or under the influence and not in the right mind to consent to acts of a sexual nature.

The Committee discussed drug crimes and the actions the Police were taking to address these issues. Operation Fortress was a dedicated team of police officers in Rushmoor working with the Thames Valley and Guildford Police to target known people and vehicles associated with drugs. The aims of the operation were to make Rushmoor a hostile place for dealers and to work with users to deter them from housing transient drug dealers to try to eradicate the problem as a whole. The main drugs being dealt in Rushmoor were cannabis, spice, heroine and cocaine.

A discussion was held around the reluctance of people to call 101, the non-emergency Police phone number. It was noted that it took a considerable length of time to report a problem via 101, which put people off. Inspector Mayne responded by stressing the importance of using the 101 number, as this helped build a picture of crimes and can help identify hotspots and gain intelligence to tackle issues effectively.

In response to queries regarding the issues in the town centres around street drinking and antisocial behaviour, it was noted that the majority of the street drinkers were currently in prison. It was also advised that most of the street drinkers weren't homeless and chose to drink on the streets due to the fear of losing their accommodation. In respect of begging, the individuals operating in the town centres were passive and could not be prosecuted under the Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO). The Police used allegations of fraud (a crime with a higher punishment than a PSPO) as a way of targeting these individuals who were giving the impression that they were homeless.

A request was made for statistics on first time offenders, and measures taken to prevent them from re-offending. It was noted that there were courses available including victim awareness to help change mind sets. The Integrated Offender Management (IOM) Team dealt with regular offenders.

It was agreed that Ms Ryan would look at different ways to display the information in the Performance Monitoring Report, these would be shared at a future meeting of the Progress Group. It was also agreed that the Committee would consider the Crime and Disorder data again when reviewing the Quarter 3 Report.

The Chairman thanked Ms Ryan and Inspector Mayne and then welcomed Cllr Paul Taylor, Customer Experience and Improvement Portfolio Holder and Phillip Roberts, IT Systems Administrator who were in attendance to address the status of the Digital Strategy which appeared as amber in some areas in the Quarter 1 Report.

The Digital Strategy had been adopted on 20th April, 2017 and set out how the Council would seize opportunities to do things better by increasing the digital offer to customers, ensuring that the Council was fit and streamlined for the future. It was noted that the Council had established a group to look in more detail at the Digital Strategy and a work programme was in place. Currently a number of areas were being addressed, these included a web portal for business rates, new ways of working were being scoped as a result of Citizens' Advice Rushmoor co-locating in the building and the development of a cloud strategy.

An area that was showing "amber" was General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR); it was noted that to meet the Regulations' criteria, all elected members had to switch to using a Rushmoor email account and this was to be completed by Monday 17th September, 2018. Two training sessions for Members on GDPR were scheduled for 21st November, 2018 and 14th January, 2019. All Members were being asked to attend a session.

In response to a query regarding Windows 10 and the migration from Windows 7, it was noted that Windows 7 would no longer be supported from 14th January, 2020. A subscription model was available to upgrade as you go although there were cost implications of taking this offer up. It was felt a good option to consider going forward. In the meantime, the IT Service needed to ensure the domain was up to date to allow for migration to Windows 10 when necessary.

With regard to the modern.gov committee administration application, it was noted that a further roll out of the system with support for Members would take place in October.

12. APPOINTMENTS TO TASK AND FINISH GROUPS

- (1) The appointments to the Welfare Reform Task and Finish Group for the 2018/19 Municipal Year were agreed as Cllrs M.D. Smith, Mrs D.B. Bedford, J.B. Canty, Veronica Graham-Green, Jennifer Evans and M.J. Roberts.
- (2) The appointments to the SERCO Task and Finish Group for the 2018/19 Municipal Year were agreed as Cllrs M.D, Smith, Mrs D.B. Bedford, J.B. Canty, Veronica Graham-Green, K. Dibble and C.P. Grattan.

It was noted that a briefing paper on Universal Credit would be circulated to Members. Universal Credit was a significant and complex issue which could generate an increase in case work for local elected Members.

13. WORK PLAN

The current work plan was noted.

Parking at the Aldershot Centre for Health and Property Investment would be considered at the next meeting of the Progress Group.

The meeting closed at 8.59 pm.

CLLR M.D. SMITH (CHAIRMAN)

POLICY AND PROJECT ADVISORY BOARD

Meeting held on Wednesday, 19th September, 2018 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr Sophia Choudhary (Vice-Chairman) (In the Chair)
Cllr Marina Munro (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr J.B. Canty
Cllr A.H. Crawford
Cllr P.I.C. Crerar
Cllr R.L.G. Dibbs
Cllr Mara Makunura
Cllr M.J. Roberts
Cllr P.F. Rust

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr A.R. Newell and Cllr J.E. Woolley.

11. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings held on 12th July and 30th August, 2018 were approved and signed by the Vice-Chairman. There was a request that the data on the national trends for leisure use, discussed at the 12th July meeting, be circulated to Board members.

Action to be taken	By whom	When
Circulate information on national leisure trends to Board members	Justine Davie	October 2018

12. DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALDERSHOT TOWN CENTRE STRATEGY

The Board considered the Executive Director (Customers, Digital and Rushmoor 2020) Report No. ED1805 which set out a number of options for the Board to consider regarding the development of a town centre strategy. It was proposed that the strategy should aim to maintain the vibrancy of the town centre during the period of regeneration works and ensure the sustained health of the town centre in the longer term.

The production of a retail plan for Aldershot Town Centre had been identified as a Council priority as part of the 2018/19 Council Plan. Informal advice had been sought from external consultants, Cushman & Wakefield and CBRE, and the key themes from the discussions included:

- To consider other uses for the town centre as well as retail;
- To contract the town centre and diversify use; and,
- To agree Aldershot's unique selling point.

There was a clear consensus that any plan developed would need to look beyond a retail plan to a wider town centre strategy. The Board was advised on two documents which provided guidance on reshaping town centres, the Local Government Association handbook entitled 'Revitalising town centres' and 'The Grimsey Review 2'. Suggested potential activities that could be focussed on included parking incentives, access, cleanliness, anti-social behaviour, retail offer, markets and events.

The Board discussed the development of a town centre strategy and put forward some recommendations to be considered. It was the general view that it was important to maintain a vibrant events programme to encourage footfall. There was also strong support to build on the town's heritage and cultural offer. The success of the Aldershot Games Hub was also seen to be important to draw in new talent and new residents to the town. It was proposed that the provision of free WiFi in the town centre should also be considered. Other proposals included proactive community engagement, food stalls, a soft play area and events for visitors to watch/take part. It was suggested that lessons should be learned from other town centres which had been transformed including Preston, Rotherham and Altrincham. The retailers and businesses in the town centre would be contacted to obtain their views on the issue.

It was recognised that some of the large units which were currently empty were not attractive to many retailers. It was suggested that a model similar to the Aldershot Enterprise Centre could be operated in the town centre to provide an opportunity for smaller businesses to occupy part of a larger unit. Discussions could be held with Enterprise First to identify the demand from businesses.

The Board commented on the high rent and high rates which were a deterrent to smaller independent businesses. During the transition period it was suggested that rents should be reduced and rates should be subsidised. The cost of parking and whether there would be sufficient parking with the loss of the High Street Multi-Storey car park was also highlighted. A parking capacity survey was suggested.

There was some concern expressed regarding the roles of the various groups relating to the regeneration work including the Aldershot/Farnborough Regeneration Groups which had not yet met, Local Plan Group, Regeneration Steering Group and Rushmoor Development Partnership. It was requested that the areas of responsibility be made clearer to ensure there was no overlap and duplication or work.

The comments from the Board would be incorporated into the development of the draft Aldershot Town Centre Strategy to be submitted to the Cabinet for approval and budget allocation.

13. FIRE AND RESCUE COMBINED AUTHORITY CONSULTATION

The Board discussed the Hampshire Fire and Rescue Authority and Isle of Wight Council's consultation on the proposed creation of a new Combined Fire Authority for Hampshire, Isle of Wight, Portsmouth and Southampton. The purpose of the proposal was to enable:

- simpler governance arrangements;
- financial efficiency;
- greater operational efficiency, effectiveness and public safety;
- greater pooling of skills and knowledge; and,
- greater contribution towards national scale incidents.

The Board discussed the consultation and was broadly supportive of the proposal as long as there would be no detriment to the local fire service provision. It was recognised that the benefits would mainly be achieved in the changes to the governance and administration arrangements. A response to the consultation would be prepared from the Council, from the Operational Services Portfolio Holder.

Action to be taken	By whom	When
Prepare a response to the consultation on the proposed creation of a new Combined Fire Authority for Hampshire, Isle of Wight, Portsmouth and Southampton to include the comments from the Board.	Ian Harrison/ Justine Davie	19 October 2018

14. RUSHMOOR 2020 MODERNISATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME - APPOINTMENT OF TASK AND FINISH GROUP

The Board received the Executive Director's (Customers, Digital and Rushmoor 2020) Report No. ED1804 which set out the terms of reference for the Rushmoor 2020 Modernisation and Improvement Task and Finish Group and the proposed membership. The role of the Task and Finish Group would be to help shape projects and policies associated with the Rushmoor 2020 Modernisation and Improvement Programme. The proposed key areas for the Task and Finish Group to develop were the vision and priorities, customer experience, digital council and communications. There was an IESE workshop scheduled for the 10th October and the members of the Task and Finish Group would be invited to attend.

The Members nominated to join the Task and Finish Group were Cllrs A.R. Newell, A.H. Crawford, K. Dibble, J.B. Canty and Veronica Graham-Green. There was one further vacancy for a Conservative Group Member. The Board discussed whether the core membership should include the Portfolio Holder or whether they should attend as an observer, by invitation only, this matter would need to be agreed. The same issue was raised regarding the Aldershot Regeneration Group and the Farnborough Regeneration Group, it was questioned whether the Portfolio holder should be included in the membership or whether they should attend as an observer, by invitation only.

RESOLVED: That the following members be appointed to serve on the Rushmoor 2020 Modernisation and Improvement Programme Task and Finish Group for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

Chairman	Cllr A.R. Newell
Conservative Group	Cllr J.B. Canty Cllr Veronica Graham-Green Cllr J.H. Marsh
Labour Group	Cllr A.H. Crawford Cllr K. Dibble

15. **WORK PROGRAMME**

The Board **NOTED** the Work Programme.

The meeting closed at 8.40 pm.

CLLR SOPHIA CHOUDHARY (VICE-CHAIRMAN)
