



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

*Minutes of a meeting held on 23 March 2010  
in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fareham*

**Members:**

Councillor        Seán Woodward (Chairman)  
Councillor        Roy Perry (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillor        David Parkinson  
Councillor        Keith House  
Councillor        Tony Briggs  
Councillor        Edward Heron  
Councillor        Alec Samuels  
Councillor        Martin Hatley

**Authority represented:**

Fareham BC  
Hampshire CC  
East Hampshire DC  
Eastleigh BC  
Havant BC  
New Forest DC  
Southampton CC  
Test Valley BC

**Chief Executives:**

Sandy Hopkins  
Bernie Topham  
Richard Jolley (deputising for Peter Grimwood)  
Ian Lycett  
James Strachan (deputising for Andrew Smith)  
Dave Yates  
David Williams  
Kathy Wadsworth  
Brad Roynon  
Roger Tetstall

**Authority represented:**

East Hampshire DC & Havant BC  
Eastleigh BC  
Fareham BC  
Gosport BC  
Hampshire CC  
New Forest DC  
Portsmouth CC  
Portsmouth CC  
Southampton CC  
Test Valley BC

Anne-Marie Mountifield

PUSH Executive Director

**Co-opted, Non-Voting Members**

Cathy Evans  
David Edwards  
Kathy Slack

**Body Represented:**

GOSE  
Homes & Communities Agency  
SEEDA

## 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND CHANGES IN JOINT COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Gerald Vernon-Jackson, Portsmouth City Council.

Apologies for absence were also received from Peter Grimwood, Fareham Borough Council, Andrew Smith, Hampshire County Council, Mike Dorgan, PUSH Business Group and Simon Eden, Winchester City Council.

RESOLVED that the relevant changes to the membership for this meeting be NOTED, as above.

## 2. MINUTES

Councillor Perry advised that the discussion that took place at the last Joint Committee regarding the projected re-growth had not been included in the minutes.

The Chairman advised that the minutes were a record of the decisions taken by the Committee and suggested that the PUSH representations submitted to the South East Regional Select Committee be appended to these minutes.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the PUSH Joint Committee meeting held on 26 January 2010 (attached - [pjc-100126-m](#)) be confirmed and signed as a correct record, subject to the PUSH representations submitted to the South East Regional Select Committee being appended to these minutes.

## 3. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman made announcements regarding the following:-

### (a) SEEDA funding for the Sub Regional Partnership:

The Chairman reminded the Joint Committee that SEEDA was one of PUSH's core funders and PUSH has, in principle a three year funding agreement but this is subject to annual renewal. The Chairman was pleased to announce that the SEEDA Board in late January agreed to fund all Sub Regional Partnership at the 2009/10 level and therefore he confirmed that PUSH funding of £165,000 for 2010/11 had been formally approved."

### (b) Estates Renewal:

There was significant activity in this area and following the award of PUSH growth funding, a number of the estates renewal projects had been reached significant milestones this month:-

- (i) HINKLER PARADE - There was a ceremony on 22nd March at 'The Natterbox' Hinkler Parade, to mark the beginning of works at Hinkler Parade and the start of demolition.

The Estate Regeneration programme is an initiative to renew and regenerate priority neighbourhoods across Southampton. Comprehensive redevelopment is planned to deliver up to 1000 new homes and improved local retail and community facilities over a five-eight year period, with ambition to deliver 4000 new homes over a longer term programme.

- (ii) SOMERSTOWN REGENERATION – The launch was held at the Spinnaker Tower, Gunwharf Quays, and Portsmouth on Wednesday 10 March to showcase the opportunity for investment in the Somerstown regeneration round six PFI project. The event comprised of key note speakers including Cllr Vernon-Jackson, the project team, the architects and the Director of Sommerston Community Group, PATCH (People’s Action Team for Community Harmony)
- (iii) ROWNER REGENERATION - This project received a £2.425m PUSH contribution in 2008/09 and £975k in 2009/10). On 3 March 2010, Jonathan Shaw MP, Regional Minister for the South East and five young Rowner residents were guests of honour to witness the start of the Rowner Regeneration project. The £145 million Rowner Renewal project is set to transform the Precinct and surrounding areas of Rowner over the next seven years.

(i) to (iii) above were three very significant projects regenerating cities and urban areas in South Hampshire.

(c) Memorandum of Understanding signing Ceremony 18 March 2010:

As part of the MAA refresh, an important agreement was signed on Thursday 18 March 2010 by Natural England, the Environment Agency, and the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) and the Government Office for the South East. It will seek to maximise the opportunities for improving the natural environment in the South Hampshire area.

The four parties will work together, with partners, to deliver a shared environmental vision as part of implementing the South Hampshire sub-regional strategy. They have agreed to:-

- A set of principles governing joint working, including the opportunities for a flexible approach, which includes compromises, in the interests of overall environmental benefit;
- Common environmental outcomes and targets based on sound evidence; and
- Agreeing an action plan to deliver the outcomes of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU).

(copies had been circulated round the table);

- (d) correspondence between PUSH to the Director General, Local Government and Regeneration, Communities and Local Government, had been circulated round the table regarding the Multi Area Agreement refresh process; and
- (e) the Chairman advised that the North of Fareham Strategic Development Area had been granted eco-Town status. Fareham Borough Council had received £200,000 to carry out study work and it was hoped that the Council would be in a good position to receive funding for any infrastructure needed. This was extremely good news as the work was being undertaken anyway.

#### **4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S UPDATE REPORT**

The Committee considered a report, by the PUSH Executive Director, which represented an additional method for PUSH business to be reported to the Joint Committee. The Executive Director's report provided an opportunity for issues which were significant, but did not justify a full report in their own right, to be brought to the attention of the Joint Committee for a decision or for information (copy of report [pjc-100323-r02-amm](#) circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

#### **Part A: MATTERS FOR A DECISION**

(a) PUSH improvement Plan:

RESOLVED that the revised strategic Risk Register be ADOPTED and APPROVED as the method of regular risk reporting to the Joint Committee.

(b) PUSH Communications Strategy:

RESOLVED that the progress to date be NOTED and the commission for an over-arching communications strategy and ongoing work to support the strategy be APPROVED, and authority be DELEGATED to the Executive Director of PUSH to make all the necessary arrangements for this commission.

(c) Delivery Panel update – External Funding:

RESOLVED that the decision of the External Funding panel, that Councillor Kendal be formally co-opted as a member of the Panel, be APPROVED.

## **Part B: MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**

(a) Multi Area Agreement Refresh:

RESOLVED that the information be NOTED. The Executive Director advised members that the CLG had issued a Consultation on Multi-Agreements with Duties. The consultation will run until 9 June 2010, and therefore members were asked to agree that authority be DELEGATED to the PUSH Executive Director to draft a response to be agreed with the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen, prior to submission.

RESOLVED that authority be DELEGATED to the PUSH Executive Director to draft a response to be agreed with the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen prior to submission.

(b) Core Team Staffing:

RESOLVED that the information be NOTED.

### **5. UPDATES FROM THE DELIVERY PANEL CHAIRMEN**

The Joint Committee received an update from the Sustainability and Community Infrastructure Delivery Panel Chairman, who advised that the Panel's meetings were well attended and the Panel was very pro-active. As a result, members were adding items to the agenda. The Wildlife Trust had submitted a bid for funding but progress had been delayed slightly to the start of the next financial year. The Panel supported the bid and a report would be presented to the Joint Committee in June 2010.

He also advised that Inger Hebden had given a presentation on Health planning in Hampshire, which included prioritising health and health care in Hampshire. However, it was surprising to note that a number of Panel members had different priorities to the NHS.

RESOLVED that the information received from the Sustainability and Community Infrastructure Delivery Panel Chairman be NOTED.

### **6. FUTURE JOBS FUND PRESENTATION**

The Joint Committee received a presentation from Denise Vine from Portsmouth City Council and Chloe Atkins from Hampshire County Council regarding the Future Jobs Fund, which was a consortium project for Hampshire, PUSH and the Isle of Wight.

Chloe Atkins advised that the Future Jobs Fund had been announced on 13 May 2009. The consortium bid was submitted on 30 June 2009 and a grant agreement had been awarded on 15 September 2009. She advised that the project had been designed for 18-24 year olds on JSA for six months or more. A number of companies and Local Authorities were working together on the project and progress had moved quickly, with 271 employed and started on the

payroll. 69 people had been recruited and were waiting to start work and 63 positions were currently advertised with Job centre Plus. The total of young people, who had started work, had been recruited or where jobs were being advertised was 403.

Denise Vine introduced some of the consortium partners working on the project. The project would create some 900 jobs by March 2011. Between the Portsmouth, PUSH and Isle of Wight partners, 128 local authority jobs would be created, mainly in Portsmouth, Gosport, Eastleigh and the Isle of Wight. Young people were employed via Portsmouth City Council's temporary register and gifted to host organisations. The types of jobs created included:-

- Homecheck Assistants;
- Heritage Assistants;
- Road Safety Co-ordinators; and
- ICT Assistants.

All of the jobs offered training in induction, health and safety, equalities and diversity, together with accredited training where possible.

All jobs were advertised through Job Centre Plus and young people were matched to the job opportunities. Interviews usually took place within a week, with a minimum contract of six months and a minimum of 25 hours per week. A young person could earn between £120 and £145 per week.

The Challenges faced by the project included:-

- CRB checks;
- References;
- Travel costs;
- Payment transition;
- Assessing benefit entitlements; and
- An over expectation of the calibre of candidates.

Graduates left with some continuous work experience, a reference from their employer, a record of any additional training undertaken, and the opportunity to sign up to Portsmouth City Council's temporary register.

The Chairman suggested that the project be monitored and an update be given after six months or a year to see how it had progressed.

RESOLVED that the information received from Denise Vine from Portsmouth City Council and Chloe Atkins from Hampshire County Council, be NOTED and that the project be monitored and an update be given after six months or a year to see how it had progressed.

## **7. CENTRE FOR CITIES**

The Joint Committee considered a report by the PUSH Executive Director, which reminded members that at its July 2009 meeting, the Joint Committee approved the partnership project with Centre for Cities, based on the proposal approved at that meeting. The report had now been completed. The purpose of the paper was to present the final report and a summary of recommendations and proposed responses (copy of report [pjc-100323-r03-amm](#) circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the Centre for Cities report be RECEIVED; and
- (b) the recommendations contained within the report be NOTED; and
- (c) the summary of proposed responses to the recommendations, including the guidance on how they will be taken forward, be APPROVED.

## **8. PUSH INWARD INVESTMENT SERVICE**

The Joint Committee considered a report by the PUSH Economic Development Director, which sought the Joint Committee's endorsement to the governance and organisational issues set out in the paper (copy of report [pjc-100323-r04-hta](#) circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

The Chairman referred to paragraph 8 of the report, which advised of the establishment of a transitional PUSH Inward Investment Project Board and its membership. He suggested that, in addition to Councillor Hook Chairing the Board, the other elected member should be from Southampton or Eastleigh.

Councillor Perry advised that Hampshire County Council took a keen interest in this matter and questioned whether two Councillors would be sufficient. He indicated his willingness to attend the Board meetings.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the action of the Economic Development Delivery Panel in establishing the governance and organisational issues, as set out in paragraph 8 of the paper be NOTED and ENDORSED; and
- (b) Councillor Roy Perry be appointed as a member of the Project Board.

## **9. HCA PROPOSED LOCAL INVESTMENT PLAN**

The Joint Committee considered a report, by David Williams and Jeff Channing, which outlined a draft of the local Investment Plan, setting out PUSH's strategy relating to the delivery of additional homes and improving communities (copy of report [pjc-100323-r07-dwi-jch](#) circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

The Chairman was concerned about where the boundaries were to be drawn. It appeared that the boundary included the PUSH area and the rest of the New Forest. Councillor Heron stated that it was important that the New Forest District Council was consulted on the area of the District that lies outside of the PUSH boundary. The Chairman suggested that recommendation 2 of the report be amended to include a representative from the New Forest District Council as part of the delegated authority.

The PUSH Executive Director introduced Jeff Channing who presented the report.

Councillor Perry advised that the Centre for Cities seminar, which had been held recently, addressed the fact that good quality housing was needed to attract good quality workers to the area. He felt it was important that PUSH put down markers to revisit the 3.5% growth rate, the 80,000 dwellings proposed and the 40% affordable housing figures.

Councillor Hatley felt that the changing assumptions addressed the future problems rather than the current ones, such as the five year land supply. In the changing assumptions, it needed to say that there is a more imminent problem.

Councillor Samuels agreed with Councillor Perry but was concerned about the tone of the document. He felt that, while he understood it was subject to review, it was too enthusiastic and it should say that it is in accordance with the plan as *it stands now*. He understood that the SDA was already in the South East Plan but PUSH was conducting a feasibility study. The report should say that it is *compatible* with the plan.

Members discussed whether a decision on this matter could be delayed until after the forthcoming election. It was AGREED that this matter should not be delayed. The PUSH Executive Director advised that the intention of the Local Investment plan was to inform dialogue between HCA and the Government for 2010/11 funding. She further advised that the report would come back to the Committee and be fed into the PUSH Business plan.

The Chairman asked who would be consulted on this issue. Mr Channing advised that all statutory agencies would be consulted, such as the Environment Agency.

Julian Lomas advised the Committee that it needed to make a distinction between the next three years or so. Any caveats should be made for the longer term. He suggested that Councillor Samuels' comments on the current South East Plan and SDA feasibility study could be included in the document.

RESOLVED that:-

- (a) the draft Local Investment Plan be NOTED, subject to the inclusion of Councillor Samuels' comments on the current South East Plan and SDA feasibility study; and

- (b) authority be DELEGATED to the PUSH Executive Director, in conjunction with the Chairman, Vice-Chairmen and a representative from the New Forest District Council for the area of the New Forest District that lies outside of the PUSH boundary, to consult on the draft Plan and to finalise the document in the light of consultation and the current work on PUSH's economic strategy.

## **10. DESIGN IN THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT CREATING QUALITY PLACES IN SOUTH HAMPSHIRE**

The Committee considered a report by the Head of Regeneration and Planning Policy, Eastleigh Borough Council, and the Lead Chief Executive, Quality Places Delivery panel, which outlined the work in hand and sought the positive endorsement of the Joint Committee to confirm the commitment of all PUSH authorities to adopting a robust approach to securing good design (copy of report [pjc-100323-r05-pra](#) circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

Councillor Perry stated that what was good design to one person may not be good design to another. He felt it was important that the ease and ability of maintenance of buildings was considered as part of good design and this needed to be written into the policy so that buildings could be sustained.

RESOLVED that:-

1. the progress of the work of the PUSH Quality Place Delivery Panel on design in the built environment be NOTED;
2. the importance of member authorities adopting high standards of design and encourage active engagement with all the strands of work outlined in this report be ENDORSED;
3. officers develop a "Quality Place Design Charter" committing member authorities to the principles of good design, and to be signed by Leaders and Chief Executives; and
4. the funding commitments necessary if this work is to be completed be NOTED.

## **11. REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING 2009/10**

The Joint Committee considered a report by the Treasurer and the PUSH Executive Director, which updated the Joint Committee on progress against the revenue and capital budgets for 2009/10 since the meeting in January, and reflected any anticipated changes in the forecast outturn, and also set out any impacts on the proposed budgets for 2010/11 and 2011/12 as approved by the Joint Committee in January 2010 (copy of report [pjc-100323-r06-jpi-amm](#) circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

RESOLVED that:-

1. the current 2009/10 revenue and capital budget position, together with the forecast outturn for the year be NOTED;
2. the potential impact of the latest forecasts on the proposed budgets for 2010/11 and 2011/12 be NOTED;
3. the carry forward of £10,000 into 2010/11 for the External Funding Delivery Panel be APPROVED;
4. the revised allocation of £1,026,000 to the Somerstown project in the current year, together with the transfer of £714,000 from the project to the uncommitted capital balance be APPROVED; and
5. the revised allocation of £228,000 to the Eastleigh Riverside projects in the current year, together with the transfer of £645,000 from the project to the uncommitted capital balance, be APPROVED.

## 12. SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS FOR THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2010/11

The Joint Committee considered a report by the Committee Services Manager, which asked the Joint Committee to determine its schedule of meeting dates for the municipal year 2010/11 (copy of report [pjc-100325-r01-sco](#) circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

RESOLVED that the following schedule of meeting dates for the municipal year 2010/11 be APPROVED:-

- 23 June 2010 (Annual Meeting to re-appoint members):
- 7 July 2010
- 14 September 2010:
- 9 November 2010:
- 11 January 2011:
- 9 March 2011:

*(The meeting started at 6:00pm and ended at 7:50pm).*

*(NB: The next meeting of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) Joint Committee will be held on **Wednesday, 23 June 2010 at 6:00pm**).*

**APPENDIX A**

**House of Commons South East Regional Committee Call for Evidence: Inquiry into Housing in the South East Submission by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH)**

**Summary**

- The Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) comprises the eleven local authorities which are wholly or partly within the South Hampshire Sub-region. PUSH devised the sub-regional strategy for South Hampshire which was approved largely unchanged by Government as part of the South East Plan. Achieving faster economic growth is one of the sub-regional strategy key objectives.
- The South East Plan's house building target for South Hampshire was calculated to match predicted job growth. However, housing is only one of a package of inventions/measures which are needed to facilitate economic growth.
- PUSH has recently commissioned a review and update of the extensive evidence base that underpins the South Hampshire section of the South East Plan to take account of the impacts of the recession. This will lead to a revised economic development strategy in summer 2010 and could lead to a changed figure for house building provision as a result of changes to the underlying economic growth assumptions. It will provide the basis for PUSH's input to the proposed new Regional Strategy.
- House building ought to be focused on urban regeneration/brownfield sites, but some greenfield development will be necessary, both to provide sufficient quantity overall and to ensure continuity of supply. Concentrating greenfield housebuilding onto a few large developments maximises sustainability and developer contributions.
- The recession means that expectations of future housebuilding are below the trajectories derived from (pre-recession) South East Plan house building targets. This is leading planning inspectors to grant appeals on additional sites, resulting in an oversupply of land and developers cherry-picking the easy-to-develop greenfield sites.
- Housebuilding will only be truly sustainable if accompanied by timely provision of transport and other infrastructure.
- A range of types and tenures of new housing is needed; the precise mix should be set locally. In South Hampshire in the last year around 80 per cent of new homes were one and two bedroom properties; a much greater proportion needs to be larger, family homes.

- In South Hampshire, 9 per cent of all households are on housing waiting lists which underlines the need for affordable housing. There is a greater potential role for intermediate tenures: 4,000 households in South Hampshire are actively looking for intermediate housing.
- A large growth in older person households is predicted, but the indications are that most will, as now, want to remain in their existing homes even if those are family size properties. Changes in the popularity of sheltered housing means that most areas now have an over-supply. New types of housing for older people could provide an alternative for those who need or wish to downsize.
- New homes built today have good energy efficiency: the real challenge is how to retrofit higher energy efficiency into existing properties.
- Houses in multiple occupancy provide affordable homes for people at a particular stage in their lifecycle, but too many in one locality can create problems. The different definitions in planning and housing legislation of 'houses in multiple occupation' creates difficulties.
- Strategic and Local Gaps in South Hampshire achieve similar objectives to Green Belts by maintaining open breaks between settlements. Regrettably, the Government deleted the Strategic Gaps policy from the South East Plan. They do not limit the total amount of housebuilding across the sub-region.
- In South Hampshire, the housebuilding targets in the South East Plan have been met – indeed slightly exceeded – over the last three years.
- Dwellings under construction and new starts have fallen substantially over the last three years, signalling much lower completion figures over the coming years. This reflects falling demand – homes sales down 25 per cent. Thus the South East Plan's housebuilding targets to 2026, may actually take until around 2031 to be realised.
- The advent of the Homes and Communities Agency has fostered greater collaboration, but this could be put at risk if there are significant cuts in public sector funding for housing.

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1. The Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) comprises the eleven local authorities which are wholly or partly within the South Hampshire sub-region plus key external partners. The eleven councils are: Hampshire County Council; Portsmouth and Southampton City Councils; East Hampshire, Eastleigh, Fareham, Gosport, Havant, New Forest, and Test Valley Borough/District Councils and Winchester City Council.
- 1.2. The Partnership was formed in 2003 to work more collaboratively on tackling the economic challenges facing South Hampshire. Achieving faster economic growth was the key objective of the sub-regional strategy which PUSH

submitted to the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) and which was incorporated largely unchanged into the South East Plan.

- 1.3. In October 2006, PUSH was selected by Government to be one of 29 “New Growth Points” in England. PUSH is also one of eight “Diamonds for Investment and Growth” identified in the Regional Economic Strategy prepared by the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA).
- 1.4. PUSH has developed a Sub-regional Housing Strategy and is tackling key housing issues on a sub-regional basis in tandem with its constituent local authorities, the Homes and Communities Agency, and other bodies.
- 1.5. The South East Plan envisages 80,000 new homes in South Hampshire 2006-2026 – a rate of housebuilding which is substantially above past plans. Urban regeneration is a major focus for this new development, but up to 16,000 of these new homes are proposed in two Strategic Development Areas (SDAs).
- 1.6. PUSH has recently commissioned a review and update of the extensive evidence base that underpins the South Hampshire section of the South East Plan to take account of the impacts of the recession. This will lead to a revised economic development strategy in summer 2010 and could lead to a changed figure for house building provision as a result of changes to the underlying economic growth assumptions. It will provide the basis for PUSH’s input to the proposed new Regional Strategy.
- 1.7. The above means that PUSH is well placed and qualified to contribute to this Inquiry and is pleased to provide a response to the questions raised by the Committee. The PUSH documents referred to in this submission can be seen at: [www.push.gov.uk](http://www.push.gov.uk)

**2. *How many new houses would be needed to support the economy and social needs of the South East?***

- 2.1 New housing per se will not deliver economic growth; it is only one of a package of measures including skills and training, developing the industrial infrastructure, land and property for businesses, and productivity improvements, that will enable economic growth to occur. (This analysis is based on advice provided by economic consultants to PUSH on the actions needed to increase economic growth.) It is a weakness of Government thinking that too much emphasis is placed on the contribution which housing makes to economic growth, which is reflected in planning policy having traditionally been driven too much by the housing agenda.
- 2.2 The planned provision for housebuilding in South Hampshire reflects what is needed to support economic growth (with the rider above that this is only one of many pre-conditions for economic growth). The target of 80,000 new homes 2006-2026 in South Hampshire (4,000 per year) comprised of two elements: 74,000 new dwellings associated with the forecast 58,600 new jobs over the same period plus a further 6,000 to meet a backlog of unmet housing need. These figures were based on a target of rising economic growth from the 2.75%

per annum in South Hampshire in the early 2000s to 3.5% per annum by 2026. As stated above, PUSH has commissioned work to revisit the underpinning evidence base to take into account the impact of the recession. This will include updating the implications for required levels of new jobs and associated house-building to underpin PUSH's economic objectives.

- 2.3 That level of new housing will only be sustainable if it is developed in step with economic growth, and is supported by the timely provision of transport and other infrastructure. This is necessary to ensure the maintenance of the balance between the three pillars of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental).
- 2.4 It is those three pillars of sustainable development which should be considered when setting housing targets for the region, rather than pursuit of economic growth as the sole objective.

**3. *Where should these houses be built to satisfy housing needs in the most sustainable way?***

- 3.1 The focus and priority should be on urban regeneration and the development of brownfield sites in order to maximise the use of land already in urban use, to help tackle deprivation, and to conserve the natural environment. Where this cannot accommodate all development needs, greenfield sites should be allocated on the edge of existing towns in order to capitalise on existing infrastructure and facilities.
- 3.2 'Windfall sites' have traditionally provided a substantial proportion of house building, particularly in older urban areas. Whilst their precise location cannot be identified in advance in South Hampshire – because, for example, it is not known which owner of a large Victorian villa will make their land available for a higher density replacement housing scheme – the future quantum of such development can be confidently predicted.
- 3.3 Government policy introduced a few years ago presumes against building in an 'allowance' for such windfalls. Until a few years ago, it was an accepted practice that local authorities could include an 'allowance' for such windfall sites in their land supply calculations – a practice tested and supported by planning inspectors. Regrettably, Government policy was changed to presume against such windfall allowances, with the result that local authorities are compelled to allocate additional greenfield land. This in turn can lead to an oversupply of housing overall (against the plan requirements) and/or a lower proportion of brownfield development than would otherwise have been the case. PUSH lobbied against this change, but with no success.
- 3.4 It is also important to recognise the temporal dimension to housing delivery: land which is already in the planning pipeline is available to meet short-medium term needs, but large new sites have lead-in times of 5-10 years. This approach is embodied in the South Hampshire Strategy which focuses development in the first 10 years on brownfield sites and land already has planning permission or is allocated in Local Plans; in the second 10 years, the focus on brownfield sites

remains but complemented by two large Strategic Development Areas of, respectively, up to 6,000 and 10,000 new homes. Each SDA will have a variety of types, sizes and tenures of new housing together with a full range of local facilities and employment opportunities with a high degree of self-containment on a day-to-day basis, but close to and utilising the higher order functions in the town next to which it is located.

- 3.5 Such a concentration of new development into a few very large developments maximises the sustainability of new greenfield development, as well as maximising the funds from national/regional agencies and from developer contributions towards affordable housing, improved transport and other infrastructure.

**4. What types and tenure of new houses should be built? How many need to be 'affordable'?**

- 4.1 A range of types and tenures of new housing is needed; within that overall ethos, each area should be able to determine the precise proportions depending on local demographics and the nature of the existing housing stock.

- 4.2 The South Hampshire Sub Regional Housing Strategy approved by PUSH in 2007 shows that on the basis of housing registers, the highest volume of need is for smaller 1 or 2 bedroom properties. However, there is an increasing pressure for more larger family homes which is again evidenced from the housing registers, and the length of time these larger households remain on the waiting list for one of these properties to become available. PUSH is also concerned to provide the right accommodation to attract higher income and skilled households to South Hampshire to drive economic growth.

- 4.3 Thus PUSH's Sub Regional Housing Strategy intends that new housing over the next 20 years will be in the following proportions:-

- 24% to be 1 bed properties
- 29% to be 2 bed properties
- 33% to be 3 bed properties
- 11% to be 4 bed properties

- 4.4 Demand for affordable housing in South Hampshire remains high, with numbers on most housing registers seeing a year on year increase. This is a trend which has been replicated across the South East region. In South Hampshire as a whole nearly 9% of all households are on housing waiting lists. (This need is predominantly for larger family houses). This pattern is likely to continue as newly forming households struggle to access housing because of tighter mortgage conditions and uncertain job prospects. This may also be exacerbated if private landlords start to sell properties (to sustain their core businesses) and thus reduce the number of properties available for private rental.

- 4.5 South Hampshire continues to have a growing need for affordable homes. Grant availability for the future is likely to be difficult. Innovative ways need to be

devised to maximise the use of the (no doubt) reducing availability of public funding for affordable housing delivery. This could include a greater direct public sector involvement in the delivery and management of affordable housing in partnership with private sector companies and other partners and agencies. Similarly, a greater role for intermediate tenures should be encouraged. Expansion of the private rented sector and more shared ownership opportunity (or rather, a simplification of the bureaucracy of the opportunities which currently exist) should be encouraged in order to allow a wider range of opportunity for people to meet their own housing need rather than reliance on public sector support.

- 4.6 Intermediate housing (homes provided at below open market prices or rents but above social rents - typically low cost home ownership products) is important to provide homes for those in employment. It thus assists economic development. The numbers actively looking for intermediate housing in South Hampshire (4,000 households) has been consistent over the last two years. Access to this type of product has been affected by the lack of availability and higher costs of mortgages. Just five lenders are offering shared ownership mortgages at the end of 2009 and all of these require a deposit of 10% or more.

**5. *Is housing provided for older people in the South East fit for purpose?***

- 7.1 The ageing population in South Hampshire means that the vast majority of household growth will be single person households of which over 50% will be pensioners. However, many older people now, and in the future, will choose to remain where they have lived since earlier in life i.e. properties not designed specifically for older people. The desire to live independently in these homes places high demand on resources for care and adaptations for properties. In parallel to this local authorities have seen changes in the popularity of sheltered housing with most areas having an oversupply of sheltered housing. Reconfiguring this resource is a challenge.
- 7.2 There needs to be a joined-up approach within the public sector to the ageing of the population which, for example, links social and care services to rural transport provision to health provision as well as housing services. Even with the latter, it is not all about new build and ensuring that standards like LifeTime Homes are applied where economic to do so. (They will become mandatory with the introduction of higher levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes through the Building Regulations in the near future).
- 7.3 It is as much about creating a new type of housing product; maybe in a bespoke community in an accessible and welcoming part of town which is attractive to the elderly population and so might entice them out of their under-occupied large house and so keep the housing market moving. The key, however, is that this issue cannot be addressed by simply stipulating that new housing should conform to certain building or space standards. Nor can it be addressed by considering housing (whether new build or improving the existing elderly housing stock) in isolation from the other care and support services. Local authorities also need to consider the role of extra care housing in their strategies for providing older people with housing.

**6. Should all new homes meet the necessary energy efficiency requirements?**

- 6.1 New homes built today and in the recent past are many times more energy efficient than houses built only 10 years ago. Those requirements are due to become ever stricter and more rigorous as increasing levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes are mandated through the Building Regulations up to 2016 when all new dwellings are required to be built to zero carbon standards. This is an extremely challenging target but one to which cost-effective solutions will undoubtedly be found as the requirements will be enshrined in regulation and so must be complied with.
- 6.2 New build however, represents only a small increment on to the existing stock. The bulk of the housing stock in 20 years time is already in existence. The real issue therefore, and one which is more difficult to address, is how to ensure that the existing stock is upgraded to higher standards of energy efficiency. Allied to that is the need to educate citizens in the reasons for needing to reduce energy consumption in all aspects of their lives.
- 6.3 In terms of new build, therefore, the policies are in place to achieve the desired objectives. Attention should be focused instead on how to improve the energy efficiency of the existing stock and improving people's behaviour and practices in the use of energy.

**7. What are the consequences of the increased number of multiple occupancy of houses in the South East?**

- 7.1 Houses in multiple occupation provide affordable homes although often of a poorer quality. They satisfy those who need economical accommodation at a certain stage in their life cycle. They can also be important in preventing these people from falling back on reliance on the public sector to house them. However, because of this, they do create their own unique problems, especially where there is a preponderance of houses in multiple occupation in a particular geographical area, for example studentification or a concentration of anti-social behaviour.
- 7.2 Policy makers need to be aware of, and learn the lessons from, elsewhere to avoid an over-dominance of houses in multiple occupation in any particular area in order to dilute and manage the problems which can accompany them. The tools available to local authorities to address this lie in both planning policy and enforcement and in licensing. Currently the definition of 'houses in multiple occupation' under planning and housing legislation is different and this creates problems. Local authorities would like to see a common definition of this term.

**8. How is this affected by the enforcement of greenbelt area?**

- 8.1 There is no Greenbelt in South Hampshire; rather, designated Strategic and Local Gaps have existed for over 20 years in the sub-region. These have played a very important role in shaping the pattern of new development; they have kept settlements separate and maintained their individual character.

Despite the opposition of PUSH and contrary to the recommendations of the Panel which conducted the Examination-in-Public of the South East Plan, the Government regrettably deleted the Strategic Gaps policy from the Plan.

8.2 Neither Greenbelt nor Gap policies adversely affect the delivery of housing. They merely seek to influence its location and steer development towards existing settlements. In South Hampshire, the 80,000 new homes proposed in the South East Plan can readily be delivered without the need to build within any of the Gaps.

**9. What effect does this have on the ageing housing stock in historic areas?**

PUSH has no direct knowledge or experience from which to offer a response to this question.

**10. Are the new houses being built creating 'sustainable communities', covering issues including affordability, eco-ratings, mix of housing types, and whether adequate social and environmental infrastructure is being provided?**

10.1 The majority (81%) of homes built in South Hampshire during 2008/9 were one and two bedroom properties, an increase on the previous year (74%). 1,240 (net) affordable dwellings were completed in 2008/9 this represents 31% of all completions – an increase of one third since 2007/8. The majority (88%) of these homes were smaller one and two bedroom units. This percentage substantially exceeds the maximum 53% which South Hampshire authorities would like to see built (see paragraph 4.3 above): too few larger, family-sized properties are being built.

10.2 With regard to new homes meeting the requirements of the code for sustainable homes PUSH has now agreed a sub regional approach (Policy Framework) to apply progressively higher standards to the construction of new homes to achieve code level 6 by 2016 in line with the Governments target. However it should be noted that many consents are already in the “pipeline” without such requirements as a condition of planning consent. However the expectation is that all social housing will meet the higher standards in any event as a condition of HCA funding and that in other such cases developers may choose to move to the higher standards for marketing reasons. With regard to the PUSH Policy Framework this is now being applied within Core Strategies in individual PUSH Authorities. Early indications are that this is being accepted as sound practice with 2 Inspector reports (Southampton CC and New Forest DC) now being published with the policies being accepted within those Core Strategies. One further issue yet to be properly tested is the financial viability of new development post recession with such sustainable construction policies being applied and over the next 6 years the extent and cost of such requirements will increase. This may have a negative effect on the supply of new development and some developers may resist the requirements on grounds of affordability.

10.2 A similar viability issue affects social infrastructure. Although the process of developing LDFs with a clearer approach to infrastructure needs is now being pursued and the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy will enable a much more effective funding mechanism to achieve appropriate levels of social infrastructure, it remains to be seen whether these requirements will actually be affordable without a negative impact on viability and supply of new homes in a post recession environment.

**11. *Why are we failing to meet targets for completion of new houses?***

11.1 In South Hampshire we are meeting the targets! (Assuming the targets being referred to are those in the South East Plan). During 2006-2009 – the first three years of the South East Plan period - housing completions were 3% above the Plan's target for South Hampshire.

11.2 One of the reasons why there is local pressure to resist new housebuilding - thus putting the achievement of targets at risk – is that all too often it is not accompanied by the full range of necessary new infrastructure. The result is that new development places additional pressure on already stretched local infrastructure and facilities.

**12. What impact will the recession have on the provision of housing, and the associated infrastructure, in the South East?**

12.1 Housing markets in South Hampshire have been affected by the downturn in the national economy and housing market. The negative impacts of this may have peaked but problems remain:

- Prices across South Hampshire have fallen by up to 13% over the year since Quarter Two 2008. House price falls are amplified in reductions in land values and this impacts on the viability development.
- The number of home sales in South Hampshire has fallen by 25%.
- The volume of property transactions reached their lowest point in Quarter 1 of 2009. House sales fell to less than one third of volumes in the 'normal' market. It is far from certain that sales will recover to the levels associated with the decade to mid 2007.
- The private rented market has seen an increase in the availability of rental properties and this has placed a downward pressure on rents. Demand has increased as households come out of the mortgage market.
- Repossession amongst home owners peaked in 2008. Possession orders fell 15% and 24% in Portsmouth and Southampton County Court areas.

12.2 Despite the recession, completions in 2008/9 in South Hampshire were slightly up (by 4%) from the previous year. However, dwellings under construction and new starts have fallen substantially over the last three years, which suggests that completion figures for the next few years will be reduced significantly.

12.3 Broader market estimates are that it could take until 2016 for the market to recover the ground lost during the recession. There is likely to be a 'lost 5 years' in terms of housing delivery meaning that housing targets set in the South East Plan which were originally intended to be achieved by 2026 will actually take until around 2031 to achieve. In so far as housing delivery is concerned this makes the emerging Regional Strategy something of an academic exercise as any higher targets over those currently set have little, if any, likelihood of being delivered. Certainly the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit (NHPAU) housing ranges which the South East England Partnership Board are required to test through the Regional Strategy preparation process bear no relation to what it will actually be possible to deliver over the next 20 years or so. More specific and quantified impacts of the recession on economic physical development "trajectories" in South Hampshire will be available following the outcome of the review of the evidence base and strategy referred to above.

12.4 Where sites are not being developed, this is often because of low demand or builders being unable to achieve a satisfactory profit margin rather than any intrinsic site constraint or shortcoming. The recession is similarly reducing the number of planning permissions being sought by developers.

- 12.5 One consequence of this is housebuilding is below the trajectory which each authority is required to produce based on its South East Plan housebuilding target. Government guidance (written in pre-recession buoyant housing markets) is that where future housebuilding is below trajectory additional housing should be made available by bringing additional forward sites.
- 12.6 In a situation of low demand, increasingly the focus on supply will not help and is an inappropriate action. Yet many planning inspectors feel that given the Government guidance they have no choice other than to grant appeals for such additional land. The result is an excess of land supply, giving developers the option of progressing the easy-to-develop Greenfield sites and leaving the more difficult to develop brownfield sites. PUSH asks the Select Committee to explore this issue and press Government to update its guidance to reflect current recession circumstances.
- 12.7 In terms of infrastructure, the South East Implementation Plan already indicates that there is an infrastructure deficit which needs to be addressed before the new development proposed in the South East Plan takes place. With the decreases in government funding which appear to be on the cards regardless of whichever political party is in Government in the future, things look bleak in terms of the delivery of new infrastructure, particularly when allied to a construction and development sector slowly emerging from a period of significant recession. The Community Infrastructure Levy and Tax Increment Financing may well prove able to bridge some of the gap but, as yet, they are unproven.
- 12.8 PUSH remains firm in its view that development must not proceed without appropriate provision being made for the infrastructure necessary to serve it - meaning that any absence of funding for infrastructure delivery will impact adversely on housing delivery.

**12. *What are the social and economic consequences of a shortage in housing supply in the South East?***

- 13.1 The social consequences are enormous. As less and less market housing is provided, more call is made on subsidised affordable housing. However, a large proportion of affordable housing is now provided on the back of market housing schemes, so as a consequence, less affordable housing is provided. Whilst public funding through the Homes and Communities Agency has sustained levels of affordable housing delivery over the past 18 months to 2 years, this will reduce drastically as Government funding of the agency reduces.
- 13.2 This has knock-on effects in terms of overcrowding and homelessness and creates demand for social housing and homelessness, and consequent further problems for those already most disadvantaged in society.
- 13.3 The economic consequences are equally serious as firms cannot prosper and expand to any real degree in the absence of a pool of labour. If housing is not provided locally to house that labour pool (or to encourage people to move to where new jobs are being created) those firms will look to relocate elsewhere in

the world where skilled labour is available (and probably at a lower cost) which all further exacerbates the impacts on the most disadvantaged groups in society.

13.4 Housing is a basic human necessity and if it is not provided at the right time and place and at a price people can afford and are willing to pay then the consequences are massive and widespread for the region.

**13. What are the roles of regional bodies, such as the Government Office for the South East and the Homes and Communities Agency, in providing housing in the South East?**

14.1 The Government Office for the South East has little, if any, real role in terms of providing housing in the South East. The Homes and Communities Agency has made a big difference over the past 18 months and will continue to have some influence in future but its impact will be much reduced as its budgets are likewise. All of which is a great concern in the absence of any proposed alternative of distributing public funding for affordable housing delivery. The Single Conversation between PUSH and the HCA will be critical to ensuring that PUSH priorities for funding are recognised by the HCA.

**14. Are the governance and partnership relationships between central government, regional agencies, local government, neighbouring regions and the private sector working effectively to deliver housing in the South East?**

15.1 The establishment of the Homes and Communities Agency has made a big difference in terms of fostering collaborative working across the region. It may have a fairly narrow remit but it seems able to see the big picture and its "single conversation" should be a way forward for housing delivery.

15.2 The risk is that public sector funding cuts will undo the good work that has been done by the Agency over the past 12 months and the various partners will revert to their silos and single issue considerations. All the joint working in the world will not have any impact on housing delivery if it is not backed by the necessary level and continuity of funding to facilitate that delivery and someone to drive it forward.

15.3 PUSH considers it to be very important that strategic land-use planning reflects functional economic areas (which in most cases are largely the same as housing market areas). This is to ensure that perverse effects are not created by administrative boundaries. How this is achieved can and should) vary from area to area according to local circumstances: in South Hampshire, the recognition of the need to work across functional economic areas on issues such as economic development, regeneration and strategic planning was the key driver behind the formation of PUSH.