



## **Partnership for Urban South Hampshire**

Office of the Executive Leader, Fareham Borough Council,  
Civic Offices, Civic Way, FAREHAM, Hampshire PO16 7PU  
T: 01329 824752 M: 07803 222845 F: 01329 824354  
email: [swoodward@fareham.gov.uk](mailto:swoodward@fareham.gov.uk)

### **Response to consultation on “Policy Statement on Regional Strategies and Guidance on the establishment of Leaders’ Boards”**

#### **1. DRAFT POLICY STATEMENT ON REGIONAL STRATEGIES**

1.1 Do you consider that the scope of the Policy Statement enables regional flexibility while providing sufficient certainty and consistency about how new Regional Strategies should be prepared? Do you wish to suggest any improvements?

**Yes**            **Comment:** No comments to make

1.2 Do you agree with the scope of Regional Strategies set out at Paragraph 3.4? Do you have any suggestions as to how this can be improved further?

**Yes**            **Comment** No comments to make

1.3 Do you agree with the sub-regional approach at Paragraph 3.6. If not, what do you think needs to be improved?

**Yes**            **Comment** PUSH welcome’s the reference to Multi-Area Agreements in the first sub-paragraph on identifying sub-regions. We also consider that RRAs should have regard to sub-regions with New Growth Point designations when identifying sub-regions to be included with their Regional Strategy

1.4 Is the policy framework at Paragraphs 4.8 and 4.9 on the content of Regional Strategies appropriate to ensure Regional Strategies focus on the key priorities for the region?

**Yes**            **Comment** PUSH considers that the references to sub-regions in the policy framework could be strengthened. We also consider that the policy framework is weak on matters relating to creating quality places and sustainable, well-functioning communities. One reference to access to culture, media and sport is certainly insufficient. This aspect needs strengthening.

In addition, we consider that in this section, and more generally, the document needs to be clearer about what it means by the term “communities”: are they geographical communities, communities of interest, self identified or determined in some other way?

Contd./....

**Together shaping the future of South Hampshire**

1.5 Is there a need for more detail in the policy on how responsible regional authorities should decide on the priorities for their Regional Strategy? If yes, what should this detail comprise?

**No**                    **Comment** No comments to make

1.6 Is the policy on the project planning and the preparation of a Project Plan appropriate? If not, how can it be improved?

**Yes**                    **Comment** No comments to make

1.7 Is the policy on Statements of Policies on Community Involvement at Paragraph 5.17 appropriate? If not, how can it be improved?

**Yes**                    **Comment** No comments to make

1.8 Is the policy framework on the role of Sustainability Appraisals and the appraisal of issues and options in relation to the Regional Strategy process appropriate?

**Yes**                    **Comment** No comments to make

1.9 Is the policy framework to guide the Examination in Public process appropriate?

**Yes**                    **Comment** No comments to make

1.10 Appendix A describes the broad stages of the Regional Strategy revision process. Does this provide the appropriate level of detail to guide responsible regional authorities in preparing their Strategies? If not, how can it be improved?

**Yes**                    **Comment** No comments to make

1.11 Paragraph 5.49 sets out the key expectations of Implementation Plans. Are these appropriate and do they provide sufficient clarity?

**Yes**                    **Comment** However, with reference to paragraph 5.53, it is unrealistic to expect that RRAs will be able to forecast availability of funding for implementation over years in advance.

1.12 Paragraph 5.60 sets out the broad policy for the preparation of annual monitoring reports. Is this appropriate and does it provide sufficient clarity?

**Yes**                    **Comment** PUSH considers that Annual Monitoring Reports should do more than be informed by the issues raised in the sustainability appraisal and should in fact report on progress towards addressing those issues.

1.13 Paragraph 6.1 set out the approach to the preparation of documents to support the Regional Strategy. Does this make it clear how documents should relate to the Regional Strategy?

**Yes**                    **Comment** No comments to make

Contd./....

**2. DRAFT REGULATIONS**

2.1 Do you have any comments on the proposed scope and detail of the proposed regulations set out at Annex 2?

**Yes**            **Comment** PUSH considers that sub-regional partnerships such as PUSH should be included within the definition of "specific consultation bodies" in the regulations.

**3. ESTABLISHMENT OF LEADERS' BOARDS: DRAFT GUIDANCE ON THE PREPARATION OF SCHEMES**

3.1 Do you agree with the range of considerations under each of the three broad criteria that the Secretary of State will take into account when considering schemes for the establishment and operation of a Leaders' Board, as set out in the guidance at Annex 3? If not, how should they be changed?

**Yes**            **Comment** No comments to make

**4. SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF REGIONAL STRATEGIES: DRAFT SUPPLEMENT TO "A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO THE STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT DIRECTIVE"**

4.1 Do you support the approach proposed for the new guidance at Annex 4, taking the Practical Guide as the main document with a supplement on Sustainability Appraisal?

**Yes**            **Comment** No comments to make

4.2 Do you think that the Practical Guide and the supplement together provide enough guidance to undertake Sustainability Appraisal that are compliant with legislation and meet the Regional Strategy's objective of promoting sustainable development?

**Yes**            **Comment** No comments to make

Yours faithfully

Cllr Seán Woodward  
Chairman (Partnership for Urban South Hampshire)