



Minutes of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) Joint Committee

*Minutes of a meeting held on 28 January 2008
in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fareham*

Members:

Councillor	Patrick Burridge
Councillor	David Airey
Councillor	Seán Woodward
Councillor	Ken Thornber
Councillor	David Gillett
Councillor	Mel Kendal
Councillor	Gerald Vernon-Jackson
Councillor	Alec Samuels
Councillor	Martin Hatley
Councillor	George Beckett

Authority represented:

East Hampshire DC
Eastleigh BC
Fareham BC
Hampshire CC
Havant BC
New Forest District Council
Portsmouth CC
Southampton CC
Test Valley BC
Winchester CC

Chief Executives (or their Representatives):

Alistair Spiers
Bernie Topham
Alan Davies
Mike Jeffery
Andrew Smith
Sandy Hopkins
Dave Yates
David Williams
Brad Roynon
Roger Tetstall
Simon Eden

Authority represented:

East Hampshire DC
Eastleigh BC
Fareham BC
Gosport Borough Council
Hampshire CC
Havant BC
New Forest DC
Portsmouth CC
Southampton CC
Test Valley BC
Winchester City Council

Also in Attendance:

Cathy Evans
Stuart Jarvis
Richard Longman
Kathy Slack
Martin Tugwell

Body represented:

Government Office for the South East
Hampshire County Council
PUSH Project Director
South-East England Development Agency
South East England Regional Assembly

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Keith House, Eastleigh Borough Council and Will Godfrey, Chief Executive, East Hampshire District Council.

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the PUSH Joint Committee held on 26 November 2007 be confirmed and signed as a correct record (attached - [pic-071126-m](#))

3. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed Andrew Smith, the new Chief Executive of Hampshire County Council, to the meeting.

The Chairman made an announcement regarding the New Growth Point funding for the next 3 years and explained that at the next meeting, the Joint Committee would be looking at how the funding could be allocated.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no interests declared at this meeting.

Matters for decision

5. PUSH JOINT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

The Joint Committee considered a report by the PUSH Project Director, which, updated members on the programme of business to be considered by the Joint Committee during the remainder of the municipal year 2007/08 (report [pic-080128-r07-rlo](#) refers).

The Chairman advised that some elements of the work programme were contingent on the Secretary of State making modifications the South East Plan and consideration of some items might be put back to future months.

He also advised that work was underway to organise the Joint Committee's schedule of meetings for 2008/09, and it was proposed to continue with bi-monthly meetings.

The Overview and Scrutiny Arrangements for the Joint Committee were also being considered, and it was proposed that there would be two scheduled meetings per year, with the first meeting being held on 20 March 2008, at the Civic Offices in Fareham.

RESOLVED that the work programme for the remainder of the municipal year 2007/08, as set out at Appendix A to these minutes, be approved.

6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Joint Committee considered a report by the Monitoring Officer, which, set out the detail of the proposed scheme for consideration by the Joint Committee (report [pjc-080128-r04-bwr](#) refers).

Members were reminded that at the last meeting, they agreed that the scheme of public participation should be based on allowing deputations of up to 10 minutes on matters which came within the terms of reference of the Joint Committee and which were strategic and affected two or more authority areas. The maximum period at each meeting for all such deputations to be made would be 30 minutes and therefore if more than three deputations were received, the time allowed for each would be reduced accordingly.

Members suggested that persons wishing to make a deputation (which might include the presentation of a petition) to the Joint Committee should give at least ten clear days notice, in writing, to the Head of Democratic Services at Fareham Borough Council. This would allow members more time to consider the deputation and carry out the necessary research required.

RESOLVED that the scheme for public participation, set out in the report to the Joint Committee, be approved and adopted, subject to the following amendment:-

That persons wishing to make a deputation to the Joint Committee should give at least ten clear days notice, in writing, to the Head of Democratic Services at Fareham Borough Council. This will be reviewed in six months time by the Joint Committee.

7. RESPONSE TO SEEDA LETTER ABOUT PROPOSED NE WPARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS AND PUSH PROPOSALS FOR BUSINESS ENGAGEMENT

The Joint committee considered a report from Eastleigh Borough Council, which outlined the principles to be set out in response to a letter from SEEDA inviting PUSH to put forward its proposals for sub regional partnership arrangements (report [pjc-080128-r08-bto](#) refers).

RESOLVED that:-

- (i) the principles to be set out in the response to the SEEDA letter concerning sub regional partnership arrangements, be agreed;
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Project Director, following consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen, to finalise the response to SEEDA; and
- (iii) responsibility be delegated to officers to develop business engagement arrangements with the relevant business agencies and the business sector, to be reported upon at the next meeting of the Joint Committee.

8. PUSH SUSTAINABILITY POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Joint Committee considered the report introduced by the Chairman of the Sustainability Working Group, which provided justification for a policy framework for the sub region to ensure that the significant new development that would take place over the next 20 years within the PUSH area was built sustainably (report [pjc-080128-r01-fca](#) refers).

Members expressed concern about the reference to “minimum” density in Paragraph 10 of the report to the Joint Committee. The policies on density needed to be set in an appropriate context emphasising the importance of quality of place and spatial integrity. There were also concerns that the criteria referring to mainline stations and bus routes might not be sufficiently robust.

RESOLVED that:-

- (i) a decision on the report be deferred until the next meeting of the Joint Committee to allow further consideration by officers and by the planning and sustainability Members’ Panel of the issues around density and maintaining quality of place.

9. PUSH AFFORDABLE HOUSING POLICY FRAMEWORK

The Joint Committee considered a report by the Chairman of the Housing Officer group, which provided a justification for and set out a proposed policy framework for the sub region, to ensure a consistent approach to the delivery of affordable housing over the next 20 years within the PUSH area (report [pjc-080128-r02-bco-rjo](#) refers).

Councillor Samuels requested that his concerns regarding the wording of some aspects of the report, in particular, the third bullet point under Paragraph 12 of the report to the Joint Committee, be recorded. He considered the phrase “up to 40%” to be misleading and felt there would be an increased burden on the developer.

RESOLVED that:-

- (i) the approach set out in the report to the Joint Committee be endorsed and supported; and
- (ii) each PUSH partner local authority integrates the Policy Framework, set out in the report to the Joint Committee, into their Local Development Framework, as it relates to the PUSH area, at the earliest opportunity.

10. DEVELOPING A REVISED POLICY ON STRATEGIC GAPS

The Joint Committee considered a report by the Planning Theme Lead, which explained that one of the recommendations of the Panel which conducted the Examination in Public of the draft South East Plan, was to delete the South Hampshire Strategic Gaps Policy SH3. It remained to be seen whether the Government would include this deletion in its Proposed Changes to the draft Plan, but the advice to the Joint Committee was prepared in anticipation of the

(10 contd.)

Government accepting that EiP Panel's recommendation.

The report to the Joint Committee proposed that PUSH should continue to press the case for such a policy. A re-affirmation of the basis of strategic gaps was proposed, culminating in the presentation of a revised list of gaps to the next meeting of the Joint Committee for possible inclusion in PUSH's response to the forthcoming consultation on the Government's proposed changes to the draft Plan (report [pjc-080128-r06-apa](#)).

The following amendments were moved and duly seconded:-

Amendment 1 - Criteria for identifying strategic gaps:

Paragraph 17 – amend 1-3 as follows (new wording is in italics):-

1. where there are separate *significant* settlements which are close together and coalescence is undesirable, or
2. to retain the coherent structure of settlement pattern, *identity or character*, or
3. where *development* would significantly extend the urban framework in the area and seriously alter the balance between developed areas and the surrounding countryside or predominately open or undeveloped land.

Paragraph 18 delete and replace with:-

Identified gaps would normally be expected to conform with Policy CC10b (as proposed by the Panel) but consideration would exceptionally be given to identification of other possible strategic gaps where planning factors justify any such exception.

Paragraph 19 – delete.

Amendment 2 – add additional recommendation relating to local gaps:

5. *That PUSH should continue to argue for the South East Plan to allow for the designation of local gaps in Local Development Documents and, to this end, endorses the approach set out in paragraph 16.*

RESOLVED that

- (i) PUSH should continue to argue for a specific strategic gaps policy for South Hampshire to appear in the South East Plan;
- (ii) the preparation of a revised policy on South Hampshire strategic gaps which could form part of the PUSH response to the Government Proposed Changes to the draft South East Plan be endorsed;

(10 contd.)

- (iii) the preparation of a PUSH policy framework on gaps to guide and provide support to Local Development Documents be endorsed; and
- (iv) the criteria set out in paragraphs 17-20 of the report to the Joint Committee, as amended, which will provide the basis for the identification of the strategic gaps, be endorsed; and
- (v) That PUSH should continue to argue for the South East Plan to allow for the designation of local gaps in Local Development Documents and, to this end, endorses the approach set out in paragraph 16.

Matters for Information

11. PUSH BUSINESS PLAN: PROGRESS REPORT

The Joint Committee received a report by the PUSH Project Director, which outlined the main ingredients and the remaining steps in the process leading to the final version to be considered at the next meeting of the Joint Committee on 18th March (report [pjc-080128-r09-rlo](#) refers).

RESOLVED that:-

- (i) the progress on the Business Plan and the proposed next steps be noted; and
- (ii) the indicative funding contributions from each authority towards PUSH expenditure, subject to approval of the final draft Business Plan at the next meeting, be noted and agreed in principle.

12. PUSH PROJECTS: PROGRESS REPORT

The Joint Committee received a report by the PUSH Project Director, which provided a brief summary of progress on each of the projects currently being carried out by or on behalf of PUSH. It also offered a forecast of outturn expenditure (report [pjc-080128-r10-rlo](#) refers).

RESOLVED that the progress report to the Joint Committee, and its Appendix, be noted.

13. STRONGER COMMUNITIES THROUGH CULTURE: THE LIVING PLACES PARTNERSHIP

The Joint Committee received a report by the Chairman of the Culture Theme Group, which updated members on the national "Living Places" Partnership between Government and national cultural agencies and report on its implications for PUSH (report [pjc-080128-r03-sed](#) refers).

(13 contd.)

RESOLVED that national recognition for PUSH be welcomed and the work in hand to respond to the opportunities this offers, be noted.

(The meeting started at 6:05pm and ended at 7:30pm)

APPENDIX A

PUSH JOINT COMMITTEE: DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME 2007/8 - APPENDIX

The tables below set out the draft programme of business and reports to be brought to meetings of the Joint Committee in the remainder of the 2007/08 municipal year.

Each table indicates the theme under which items arise, denoting the Officer Working Group responsible for submitting advice on the issues brought to the Joint Committee. They distinguish between matters requiring decisions and those to be received for information only. The Lead Officer presenting papers and/or oral advice to the Joint Committee is named in the final column.

There is one scheduled meeting remaining in 2007/08. Dates for meetings in the 2008/09 municipal year will be confirmed once individual councils have set their own meetings cycles.

This work programme will be reviewed on a rolling basis for each meeting of the Joint Committee.

APPENDIX A

18th March 2008				
Item	Theme	Matters for Decision	Matters for Information	Lead Officer & Authority
1.	PUSH Development		PUSH Multi Area Agreement: to receive a progress report on the negotiation of the PUSH MAA	Brad Roynon, Chairman, PUSH Working Group
2.			PUSH Projects: to receive a progress report on PUSH projects, including estimated final outturn expenditure on New Growth Point funded schemes	Richard Longman, PUSH Project Director
3.		PUSH Business Plan: to receive a report and recommendations on the final draft Business Plan, including funding priorities and budget		Richard Longman, PUSH Project Director
4.		PUSH Working Arrangements: to receive a report and recommendations on advisory and thematic working arrangements to support the work of the Joint Committee and the delivery of PUSH activity		Brad Roynon, Chairman, PUSH Working Group Richard Longman, PUSH Project Director

18th March 2008				
Item	Theme	Matters for Decision	Matters for Information	Lead Officer & Authority
5.	Economic Development	Performance Management & Monitoring: to receive a report and recommendations on arrangements for monitoring delivery of the PUSH Economic Strategy		Bernie Topham, Chair, Economic Development Group Stuart Roberts, Chairman, Planning Officers Group
6.	Planning	South East Plan: to receive a report and recommendations on PUSH's response to consultation on the Secretary of State's proposed modifications to the draft South East Plan (subject to the timing of publication of the Modifications)		Stuart Roberts, Chairman, Planning Officers Group
7.			Waterfront Strategy: to receive a report on key findings from SEEDA's Waterfront Study and the policy implications for PUSH	Stuart Roberts, Chairman, PUSH Planning Officers Group
8.		Green Infrastructure: to receive a report and recommendations on a Green Infrastructure Strategy for PUSH		Stuart Roberts, Chairman, Planning Officers Group
9.		Integrated Water Management: to receive a report and recommendations arising from the IWM Study		Stuart Roberts, Chairman, Planning Officers Group

18th March 2008				
Item	Theme	Matters for Decision	Matters for Information	Lead Officer & Authority
10.		Strategic Flood Risk Assessment: to receive a report and recommendations on the outcomes of the SFRA study and the implications for distribution of new housing in South Hampshire.		Stuart Roberts, Hampshire County Council
11.	Infrastructure		Strategic Development Area Feasibility Studies: To receive a report on the outcomes of studies examining the access and delivery issues relating to the N Fareham and NNE Hedge End SDAs.	Stuart Jarvis, Transport Lead Officer, PUSH Working Group
12.	Sustainability	Energy Services: to receive a report and recommendations on the outcomes of research and proposals for future work relating to renewable and low-carbon energy and the potential for a sub-regional energy services company		Frank Campbell, Chairman, Sustainability Theme Group

18th March 2008				
Item	Theme	Matters for Decision	Matters for Information	Lead Officer & Authority
13.	Transport	Strategic Access Studies: to receive a report and recommendations on the outcome of three strategic transport access studies and priorities for improving transport systems in South Hampshire		Stuart Jarvis, Transport Lead Officer, PUSH Working Group