



Minutes of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) Overview and Scrutiny Committee

*Minutes of a meeting held on 2 November 2010
in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fareham*

Authority represented:

| | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------------|
| Councillors | David Goodall (Chairman) | Eastleigh BC |
| | Vivien Achwal (deputising for Roger Huxstep (Vice- Chairman)) | Winchester CC |
| Councillors | Marjorie Harvey | East Hampshire DC |
| | Keith Evans | Hampshire CC |
| | Gwen Blackett | Havant BC |
| | Adrian Vinson | Southampton CC |
| | Ian Hibberd | Test Valley BC |

Also Present:-

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Peter Grimwood | Chief Executive, Fareham BC |
| Ian Lycett | Chief Executive, Gosport BC |
| Anne-Marie Mountifield | PUSH Executive Director |
| Gloria Ighodaro | PUSH Programme and Information Manager |
| Amanda Douglass | Estate Regeneration Manager, Southampton CC |
| Councillor Mrs Dorothy Denston | East Hampshire DC (Observing) |

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND CHANGES IN OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MEMBERSHIP

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Trevor Cartwright, Fareham Borough Council, Robert Forder, Gosport Borough Council Roger Huxstep, Winchester City Council, Paul Vickers, New Forest District Council and Mike Park.

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the PUSH Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 8 June 2010, be confirmed and signed as a correct record (attached - pos-100608-m), subject to minute 6 being amended to reflect the Committee's discussion that emphasis should be placed on creative industries.

3. Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman advised members of the Fire Evacuation procedures.

4. Declarations of Interest

There were no interests declared at the meeting.

5. Deputations

There were no deputations made at the meeting.

6. Housing and Planning Theme Presentations

Update on Gosport Waterfront and Rowner Renewal Estate Project:

The Committee received presentations from Ian Lycett, Chief Executive of Gosport Borough Council on the Gosport Waterfront and Rowner Renewal Estate Project. He advised the Committee as follows:-

Gosport Waterfront:

Gosport had 26 miles of waterfront, with 5 significant waterfront sites. The Committee was presented with a map of Gosport Waterfront, which outlined the Town Centre and the masterplan area. The Committee was advised that there was a great potential for regeneration and redevelopment of the Town Centre. PUSH had donated £76,000 and Gosport Borough Council had also received other funding for the project. The Committee was advised that Gosport was on a peninsular, and congestion was heavy in the morning and afternoon rush hours.

Gosport Borough Council had started its consultation with residents, 83% of whom were in favour of redevelopment of the area. Gosport had stunning views over the harbour and 2 marinas.

Gosport Borough Council was approaching the final consultation stage in the masterplan to create a vision for, and raise the profile of, Gosport, in order to make it a destination that people wanted to visit. This would be achievable over a fifteen year period.

Four areas in particular would be redeveloped:-

- The gateway from the ferry terminal in Portsmouth to the Town Centre;
- Civic space;
- The Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) modal area; and
- The new Falkland Gardens. This would be made into a feature with bold modern architecture to attract visitors.

The Committee was advised that with regard to Gosport marina, the plan was to retain the fortifications which were fifteenth or sixteenth century. To the north, Gosport Borough Council was looking to develop offices, retail units, a pedestrian route and the BRT. Following the Second World War, the historic squares facing the harbour had been damaged and Gosport Borough Council wanted to reinstate them. Negotiations were taking place to acquire an area in the very north of the area covered by Clarence Yard. This was a deep water site which would be good for employment.

The Committee was advised that Gosport Borough Council had taken the current economic circumstances into account and felt that the project was viable.

In conclusion, Phase 1 of the project would include:-

- public consultation during 2011;
- 415 residential units (40% of which would be affordable);
- 18,400 sq m of retail units / restaurants;
- 11,100 sq m of office space;
- 9,000 sq m employment space;
- A new modal interchange (BRT);
- Enhanced Falkland Gardens;
- A tourist harbour; and
- The creation of 1,950 - 2,000 jobs.

Mr Lycett answered members' questions thereon.

Rowner Renewal Estate Project:

The Committee was advised that this site had been built by the Ministry of Defence (MOD) in the 1960's, adjacent to HMS Sultan, to house naval personnel and their families. Everything on the site, while built in a modern design, had been built inward looking with a view to protecting the wives and children of the servicemen while they were away. The estate deteriorated in the 1980's and the MOD disposed of it. Developers then refurbished the site, rather than demolishing it and private landlords bought the properties to rent. The site had now further deteriorated, and had social problems. Funding had gone into the estate, including a Surestart grant but this had been cut. Gosport Borough

Council was now faced with a dilemma; the estate had panoramic views of the Solent and Portsmouth harbour and units could be purchased for £20,000.

Gosport Borough Council had commissioned a feasibility study which showed that there was no space to demolish the site and there was a huge funding gap. The Council entered into a partnership with Taylor Wimpey and First Wessex.

The Committee was presented with plans of the redevelopment of the estate, which showed the design of the proposed buildings etc.

Mr Lycett concluded by advising the Committee of Gosport Borough Council's vision for the project, which would include

- Up to 700 homes built and occupied;
- A supermarket opened and providing up to 200 jobs for local people;
- Construction skills developed, apprentices qualified and in work;
- A community trust working to enhance the wider neighbourhood; and
- A thriving community where people want to live.

Mr Lycett answered members' questions thereon.

It was AGREED that the information contained in the above presentations be NOTED.

The Chairman thanked Mr Lycett for attending the meeting.

Update on Hinkler Parade Renewal Project:

The Committee received a presentation from Amanda Douglass from Southampton City Council on the Hinkler Parade Renewal Project. She advised the Committee that this was a pilot project, with 13 projects now underway. The information contained in the presentation was as follows:-

Estate Regeneration Aims and Programme:

Estate Regeneration Vision - Southampton City council (SCC) wanted to create successful communities on its estates where people would want to live in the future. SCC communities would be comprised of people of different ages and backgrounds, where work was normal for all who were able to. Homes and public spaces would be designed to provide safe and secure environments and local people would take an active involvement in ensuring the success of the community.

The Hinkler Parade Pilot Project would include a development agreement, 106 new homes, 43 affordable, remainder for sale, 5 new retail units, community facilities; and Phase 1 completion in December 2010, with the total scheme being complete in the Autumn of 2012.

The aim was to provide new Council homes for good Council tenants. This would involve the redevelopment of disused land / underused garage sites; building 53 new council homes- Code Level 4 and designing and building an

agreement with the contractor. It was hoped that the first residents would occupy the new homes in December and Phase 1 sites would be complete in March 2011, with Phase 2 being complete in March 2012.

Ms Douglass advised the Committee of where SCC was currently with regard to estate regeneration. It was delivering up to 300 new homes and local facilities. The developer selection process was underway and the proposed start date on site was Spring 2011, by developer agreement.

Phase 3 included 12 sites with SCC Cabinet approval to develop. SCC was currently undertaking feasibility / option appraisal work. 13 projects were now underway, with a value of between £55million and £75million. There would be 460 new homes, with community facilities and retail units, employment and training opportunities and socio-economic sub groups. A feasibility study was being undertaken on the next phase, which included 12 sites SCC was taking a long term strategic planning approach to the project.

Hinkler Parade - Progress:

The development agreement had been signed in February 2010. The work had been started on the site in March 2010. The show home and sales had already been opened in September 2010. Retail units and the first phase homes would be completed in December 2010, with the second phase homes and community facility completed in December 2011. Phase 3 new homes were planned to be completed in the Autumn of 2012.

Localism and Community Empowerment:

The project would include the provision of community facilities provided, with community support being provided from 1 large space. A Residents Association, function room, library and housing services would also be included. Retail units would be modern, based upon residents' wishes. Residents had advised that they wished to see the following included in the project:-

- A Co-op store;
- A pharmacy;
- A hairdressers; and
- A take away.

TPY/ PYL Investment Outcomes:

These included a partnership agreement which would act as a catalyst for a Localism approach for the regeneration of Hinkler Parade. This meant local ownership of local shops and facilities, investment in community facilities and partnership with residents association, income producing assets for future regeneration and a long term socio-economic regeneration outcome as well as investment.

Employment and training had been created, with 13 local people employed (this was 25% of the total workforce), including a Community Liaison Officer. Employment and training had been secured by Section 106 funding.

Stakeholder Groups were co-ordinating work on other major developments in Thornhill. Schools and colleges were being visited and sub-groups had been set up to deliver long term socio-economic aims.

It was AGREED that the information contained in the presentation be NOTED.

Ms Douglass answered members' questions thereon.

The Chairman thanked Ms Douglass for attending the meeting.

7. Executive Director's Report

The Committee considered a report by the PUSH Executive Director, which represented an additional method for PUSH business to be reported to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and provided an overview of key PUSH developments since the Overview and Scrutiny meeting held in June 2010 and which were not covered in other items in the agenda (copy of report pos-101102-r01-amm circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

A member queried the Solent Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) map, which she had seen on the internet and asked if it was correct? The Executive Director confirmed that the map was prepared by BIS and did not correspond with the map contained in the proposal submitted on 6 September 2010,

It was proposed and duly seconded that the PUSH Joint Committee be advised of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's view that the Isle of White Council should be invited to join PUSH.

It was AGREED that:-

- (a) the PUSH Executive Director's report NOTED: and
- (b) the PUSH Joint Committee be advised that it is the PUSH Overview and Scrutiny Committee's view that the Isle of White Council should be invited to join PUSH.

8. PUSH Performance Mid-Year report - 2010/11

The Committee considered a report by the PUSH Executive Director, which provided an initial mid-year summary of PUSH's performance for 2010/2011 against the previously agreed key strategic outcomes using an exception based approach as the basis for performance management (copy of report pos-101102-r02-amm circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

It was AGREED that:-

- (a) the latest performance information (for the mid 2010/2011 financial year) for the measures previously adopted by the Joint Committee, be NOTED; and

- (b) the need to develop a new performance framework, which focuses more on outcome base measures and delivery targets, to be locally determined, be NOTED.

9. Capital and Revenue Budget Monitoring 2010/11

The Committee considered a report by the PUSH Executive Director, which updated members on expenditure against agreed programmes for 2010/11 (copy of report pos-101102-r03-cwi-amm circulated with the agenda and appended to the signed minutes).

It was AGREED that:-

- (a) the revised capital and revenue budgets for 2010/11, as set out in the report, be NOTED, following confirmation of the New Growth Point capital funding position;
- (b) the current performance against the capital and revenue programmes in the current year be NOTED;
- (c) it be NOTED; that proposals for allocating the remaining balance of capital New Growth Point funds in 2010/11 will be presented to the Joint Committee by January 2011.

The Executive Director advised the Committee that the next scheduled meeting was to be held on Tuesday, 14 December 2010 to consider the proposed budget for 2011/12. However, it was unlikely that the budget would be ready for consideration at that time and she sought the Committee's views on whether the December meeting would be required.

Members agreed that the meeting should be postponed until January 2011. The Committee Services Manager undertook to canvass members for convenient dates.

It was AGREED that the meeting scheduled for 14 December 2010 be cancelled and a further meeting be arranged for January 2011 with a date to be confirmed as soon as possible.

(The meeting started at 6:15pm and ended at 8:25pm).

(NB: The next meeting of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be held in January 2011 (date to be confirmed).