

POLICY AND PROJECT ADVISORY BOARD

Meeting held on Wednesday, 22nd January, 2020 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr J.B. Canty (Chairman)
Cllr Sophia Choudhary (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr P.I.C. Crerar (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Gaynor Austin
Cllr P.J. Cullum
Cllr J.H. Marsh
Cllr Sophie Porter
Cllr M.J. Roberts
Cllr C.J. Stewart

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr Prabesh KC and Cllr T.W. Mitchell.

22. APPOINTMENT

NOTED: That Cllr J.H. Marsh had been appointed as a member of the Policy and Project Advisory Board for the remainder of the 2019/20 municipal year.

23. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 20th November, 2019 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

24. HEATHROW SOUTHERN RAIL LINK SUPPORT

The Board received the Head of Economy, Planning and Strategic Housing's Report No. EPSH2006 which provided an update on the Southern Access to Heathrow Programme and the potential implications for Rushmoor and the wider M3 corridor. In November 2019 the Government published guidance on the Southern Access to Heathrow strategic objectives which explained that the purpose of the programme was to make getting to Heathrow Airport quicker and easier for millions of travellers across the south of England. The guidance identified that it expected interventions to be delivered in phases over a period of time which Government was not expecting to be completed prior to 2030.

There were four options being promoted as part of the Strategic Transport Links to Heathrow which were in the public domain, these were:

- Heathrow Southern Rail – opportunity for train services operating on a 30-minute frequency between Farnborough and Heathrow Airport.

- Hounslow to Heathrow New Rail Link – new rail line to Heathrow which would include a new station serving Bedfont
- Staines Light Rail – new transport link from Staines-upon-Thames to Heathrow as a stand-alone light rail
- Windsor Link Railway – rail link from Slough to London Waterloo via Windsor with a spur from Windsor to Staines which could provide potential for direct rail services between Farnborough and Aldershot

It was acknowledged that there was limited information on the detail of the proposals and there were a number of other options which were not currently in the public domain. With this in mind, a potential formal response to the Transport Secretary, which set out the Council’s concerns, was put for to the Board for consideration. The response highlighted the Council’s support for the Strategic Transport Links to Heathrow programme, the Council’s support for direct connectivity from at least one of the Borough’s mainline railways stations to Heathrow and the concern that Government would not expect proposals to be in place prior to 2030.

The Board discussed the report and proposed response. There was some concern regarding the lack of information in the public domain for the options, and therefore it was felt that the Council should not show support for any particular scheme in the response at this stage. It was also proposed that the response should include more emphasis on the environmental benefits. It was agreed that the Chair and Ian Mawer, Principal Planning Officer, would reflect on the comments made by the Board and submit them to the Leader of the Council and the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Economy to consider and agree the response. A copy of the response would be shared with the Board by email.

Action to be taken	By Whom	When
Discuss the Board’s comments with the Leader of the Council and the Portfolio Holder in order for a response to be made by the Council to the Transport Secretary	Ian Mawer/ Jonathan Canty	14th February, 2020
A copy of the response be sent to Members of the Board	Ian Mawer	14th February, 2020

25. DELIVERING REGENERATION

The Board received a presentation on the approach to communicating the Regenerating Rushmoor Programme. Communication of the regeneration of Aldershot and Farnborough town centres was divided between the Council and Snapdragon Consultancy. Snapdragon Consultancy were employed by the Rushmoor Development Partnership to lead on communication and engagement for Union Street, the Civic Quarter and Parsons Barracks. A communications plan had been developed which covered all the key projects within the Regenerating Rushmoor Programme. The current focus had been on Aldershot which had included articles in Arena in September and December, two editions of the Aldershot Town Centre Newsletter and updates on the website. Other activities included email newsletters, artwork on hoardings, Small Business Saturday, Heart of Farnborough

meetings and meetings were being arranged for residents on the Civic Quarter engagement.

There had been a variety of social media activities on regeneration since the start of December which included 12 posts on the Rushmoor Borough Council Facebook page and 13 posts on the Aldershot Town Centre page. There had also been a number of tweets from both the Rushmoor Borough Council and Aldershot Town Centre accounts. Instagram and LinkedIn were also being used and activity was increasing. Public engagement events had been held at Princes Hall and the Wellington Centre which had been well attended, views were being sought online up to 9th February.

Over the next six months there would continue to be a focus on Union Street and place branding for Aldershot. Initial engagement would be carried out on the Farnborough Civic Quarter with communications on the hoardings and demolition of Farnborough Community Centre. Work would continue to build on the current approach, which would include more videos and social media activity with greater online engagement including Facebook Live. There would also be non-digital engagement including regular town centre newsletters.

As the regeneration programme developed the communications plan would also evolve. The communications team would work alongside the regeneration team and with a number of other bodies to maintain effective communications with a wide range of stakeholders.

The Board discussed the communication plan and the methods of communication used. There were discussions regarding engagement with the Nepali community, identifying residents preferred method of engagement and increasing the number of email subscribers. The Board was advised that, as part of the ICE Programme, there would be a Customer Relationship Management System which would ask residents if they agreed to other Council services accessing their contact details which would increase the number on the email database. It was proposed that a peer review or sharing of best practice would be useful to see how communications was addressed in other areas. It was also agreed that a Frequently Asked Questions document be compiled to address questions that were raised on a regular basis.

The Board received information on how the Regenerating Rushmoor Programme could be part of the response to the climate emergency. There were a number of issues raised which would need to be considered as part of the regeneration programme in relation to climate change including sustainable design, heating and power, sustainable transport, green and open spaces and recycling/reuse of materials. It was proposed that a task and finish group was established to complement the Climate Change Working Group to review what was currently going on, look at options regarding ambition against cost and deliverability and to shape a policy approach to feed into the next stage of master planning. Nominations for representatives to sit on the Climate Emergency Regeneration Policy Task and Finish Group would be sought from political parties.

Action to be taken	By whom	When
Investigate options for a potential peer review or health check on communications work	Colin Eckworth/ Gill Chisnall	March 2020
Compile a FAQ document for residents to answer questions asked on a regularly basis	Karen Edwards/ Gill Chisnall	March 2020
Seek nominations for the Climate Emergency Regeneration Policy Task and Finish Group from political parties	Jill Shuttleworth/ Justine Davie	February 2020

26. RUSHMOOR OPERATIONAL PARKING POLICY

This item was withdrawn.

27. INDEX OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATION

The Board received a summary of the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2019 data which summarised the areas of multiple deprivation in Rushmoor. The Head of Democracy, Strategy and Partnerships presented the data and the Board were asked to consider the areas which the Council should focus to address the issues identified in the data.

In 2007 and 2010 the IMD data identified North Town, Mayfield and Heron Wood as areas in Rushmoor in the 20% most deprived in the country. The Council's Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy 2009-2014 aimed to ensure there were no areas in Rushmoor in this category by 2013. The Council's Community Development team led a partnership approach to neighbourhood improvement and cohesion work to address the deprivation issues. Despite the additional partnership work the 2019 IMD data identified parts of Cherrywood, Aldershot Park and Wellington ward as being in the 20% most deprived in the country.

The IMD 2019 data was released in September 2019, it was highlighted that the data was a snapshot and not particularly up to date in some categories; the data was mainly from 2015 and 2016 with some from the 2011 census. Rushmoor was a very diverse Borough with some areas in the least deprived category and some in the most deprived. Other sources of evidence had been examined to obtain a clearer picture of the data and gather more up to date figures where possible.

Additional data on income had been gathered from Citizens Advice, which was more up to date, and compared to the IMD data, showed there was some correlation in the results. Income deprivation affecting older people showed 12 areas in the 10% most deprived areas in England. It was highlighted that the number of adults receiving Pension Credit was part of the calculation and it was possible that a significant number of pension age Nepali residents who were not eligible for a state pension could be receiving Pension Credit. Other data sources examined related to employment, skills and training, education, health and disability, crime, barriers to housing and services and living environment.

In examining the data it was clear that there were complex issues affecting the data which needed further examination. Work would need to be carried out with partner organisations, particularly on health, education and crime issues, to gain a better understanding of the data and how to best address it. The assessment of the IMD data and supporting evidence would be completed and presented to partner organisations. The priorities would need to be considered and an action plan developed which would require support from the Council, partners and local communities.

The Board discussed the information received and agreed that more work was required to better understand the data. The Board was advised that a report on the crime data would be presented to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee which would be shared with Board members. It was suggested that a working group was set up to look at the data in further detail and provide an input into the development of the deprivation strategy and action plan. It was agreed that once the scoping work had been complete the working group could be established. Board members were asked to provide any additional input on the deprivation priorities by email to the Head of Democracy, Strategy and Partnerships.

Action to be taken	By Whom	When
Circulate the Overview and Scrutiny Committee report on crime data to Board members	Justine Davie	February 2020
Establish a working group as required to input into the preparation of the deprivation strategy and action plan once the scoping work had been complete	Andrew Colver	June 2020
Provide input on priorities for the Council arising from the IMD 2019 data to andrew.colver@rushmoor.gov.uk	All PPAB members	February 2020

28. WORK PROGRAMME

The Board **NOTED** the work programme. It was highlighted that the Hampshire County Council Library Service consultation would be discussed at the next Progress Group meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.35 pm.

CLLR J.B. CANTY (CHAIRMAN)
