

**Full Partnership Meeting - Minutes**

**08<sup>th</sup> April 2010**

**The Church on the Heath, Elvetham Heath**

		<b>Action</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Apologies were received from</b> - Cllr Susan Band, Janet Timmins, Susan Hird, Martin Longhorn, Kari Tourle, Bill Flood, Jean Humphrey, Ouida Grant Sarah Wallis, Sharon Goodchild, Suki Binning, John Pearson, Jean Leigh, Cllr John Kennett, John Harrocks, Amanda Dubarry, Viv Evans	
<b>2</b>	<b>Minutes from previous meeting</b> – agreed subject to amending the last part of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph under item 3, where it says Chris Cornwell from Hart but should say Chris Cornwell from Hartley Wintney Parish. Action – MF to amend.	<b>MF</b>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Children's Partnership</b></p> <p>John Stacey gave a presentation on the new Children's partnership and how it will work. (Please see attached). The following questions were raised after the presentation:</p> <p>Q Will Hampshire be specifically recruiting men in the same way that Surrey have?</p> <p>A There are wider recruitment problems in North Hants as we are competing with other areas, and we are looking at how to attract more social workers to the area.</p> <p>Q From what we've seen in the presentation it seems that Hart partnership seems to focus on older children.</p> <p>A A lot of early intervention work going on for children with additional needs. More work being carried out in children's centres and what we should see locally is a more coordinated approach. The outcomes are aimed at Level 4 children but can be tracked back to before this. We need to show all the different stages and work together.</p> <p>Q Cllr Crookes - We need to be clear about who's doing what so that we will have a productive partnership. Are the overarching objectives synchronised with HCC agreements, do we need to look at any differences at local level?</p> <p>A Yes, teenage pregnancy for example is not so pressing in Hart. Can't address all the issues so need to prioritise locally.</p> <p>Q What is the relationship between 1 partnership and the 3 cluster groups?</p> <p>A There are 3 discreet geographical clusters. It could be argued that there</p>	

	<p>could be 3 separate partnerships but there isn't the capacity between statutory partners for this so 1 partnership will look at Hart as a whole. This overarching partnership will carry out work and have a clear view of Hart data so whatever the determining priorities are there will be 1 Action Plan delivered by the 3 cluster groups. It is critical to ensure that we don't have silos as the priorities emerge.</p>	
KC	As one of the statutory partners when do we need to engage with you on overarching policies?	
A	Letter was misleading and is being addressed. New partnership is still emerging and we're unsure how it will look in the short term there will be some reframing and reshaping as the priorities emerge.	
Q	PCT – Conception of health so should pharmacies be involved in the process?	
A	Yes	
Q	How will you engage with the voluntary sector?	
A	Through the voluntary alliance. We are aware of the need to engage with voluntary sector and will eventually get to involve all the critical groups.	
Q	Where does Hartley Wintney fit in?	
A	Odiham & Hook through Robert Mays school	
KC	Over the next couple of months what level of engagement do you need from us?	
A	1 <sup>st</sup> meeting on 21 <sup>st</sup> April, which will include teachers, from there we need to identify needs and produce a plan, have a dialogue with partners on the work and where they best fit. Determine the initial membership. Identify priorities and draft action plan by end of July. Come back to next LSP meeting in July to give further update.	
JR	It is still difficult to get information and detail about children's centres Could create more clusters. Some Performance Indicators for Hart are quite alarming possibly due to low numbers Service families for example, are transient and it is hard to involve them & challenging	
A	There is a need for more info regarding children's centres.	
<b>4</b>	<p><b>LDF &amp; Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Daryl Phillips (Head of Planning) gave an overview on the LDF and the vision for the district over the next 20 years, notes of which are attached. The following questions were raised:</p>	
Q	Who will the additional housing be for?	
A	This question could be debated for hours. Households are growing anyway so growth is required regardless. Projections show what we need across the country and they look a long way ahead. The Government looks across regions with regard to economic and population needs and the SE plan contains a strategy for growth.	
Q	Do Sentinel get some of these?	

<p>A</p> <p>Q</p> <p>A</p> <p>Q</p> <p>A</p> <p>Q</p> <p>A</p> <p>Q</p> <p>A</p>	<p>SE plan says 30-40% should be affordable housing, the calculation used to reach these figures is another matter. There are specific policies for housing need and it's not all about new people coming in but also to do with our own specific needs, we don't necessarily want to change our characteristics.</p> <p>Paul Doughty (FTC) Fleet Vision – County have been working on an access plan and the exhibition for this has been postponed until June, how will you coordinate the 2 areas?</p> <p>We are looking at the strategy not the details. We are aware of HCCs broader details but the finer details will come out over time. We will need to work together to produce the strategy.</p> <p>Some infrastructure won't be provided in Hart, how are we working with other districts re hospitals for example?</p> <p>Funding bids are submitted to Government for wider infrastructure issues. These need to be coordinated and conversations are taking place in order for us all to see the wider picture.</p> <p>Under the Western corridor extension to Blackwater Valley, Winchfield has been identified for possible development but N Warnborough has been excluded. Can this be looked at again?</p> <p>Not under current plan context but we need to wait and see what the situation is after the elections, there may be a change to how the housing numbers are reached. Winchfield is just one of the options and will have to be weighed up against other options and although it is on the table for discussion it is not a commitment.</p> <p>Infrastructure – what about utilities provided by private sector? Getting water in and out for example how does planning fit in?</p> <p>Water authorities have a legal obligation to bring water in but not to get foul water out. Finding out how they will get foul water out is part of the process and needs to be part of the equation. Developers are also keen to see if utilities can be supplied.</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>Older Person's Wellbeing Event MF gave a brief update on the event held on 2<sup>nd</sup> Feb 2010, and the information and actions that have come from it. Full report attached.</p>	
<p>6</p> <p>GB</p>	<p>Cllr Crookes asked Geoff Bonner to update partners on what HDC are doing:</p> <p>We are looking at how we carry out partnership working. Undergoing an internal restructure, would like more immediate involvement with partners and to revitalise our input. Make it less about meeting and talking and more about meeting and doing things. This will be discussed more with the LSP Management team and now seems a good time to think about change. Over the next 2 -3 months we need to think about the effort we put in and getting as much out of the partnership as possible.</p>	

## **Updates from Priority Partnerships:-**

**I. Greening Hart Partnership** – Cllr Crookes- An enormous volume of work has come from other sources, such as the work Daryl is doing on the LDF. Valuable information is coming from the evidence process. Now looking at separating the inward looking work the Council is doing (which has already produced results by adapting council services) from the work partners are doing. The one thing that would have the most impact would be for residents to make their homes more energy efficient. Heat Seekers project ongoing, working with Sentinel to produce a clear plan on how to help residents to do this and deliver something. Also need to encourage residents to use different modes of transport.

**II. Affordable Housing Partnership** – Martine Fullbrook (MF) – the partnership is still working on updating its action plan, unfortunately the last meeting was cancelled because Kari was on leave (possible issues with emails getting through)

Chris Griffin requested that it be recorded that many of the group were unhappy that this meeting was cancelled and that the deputy Chairman should have stepped in.

Cllr Crookes added that he was keen to clarify the need for affordable housing. A lot of work was done on the housing needs survey. This needs to be challenged on a localised basis to establish where affordable housing is actually needed and who for.

**III. Safer Hart Community Safety Partnership** – Cl Jackson (SJ) Meeting scheduled for the 9<sup>th</sup> to agree action plan, further update will follow after that. Last Community Safety project was “Street Watch”, now looking for appropriate streets in the district to launch schemes.

**IV. A Beacon of Good Health** – No update available for this meeting.

**V. Economic Prosperity Group** – Tim Colman (TC) December meeting cancelled due to bad weather. Since then it has been very difficult to reschedule the meeting because there has been no admin support available. TC raised his concerns that the group may now have been lost. GB apologised for lack of support and reassured TC that support would be provided in future.

**VI. A Sustainable and Accessible Transport System** – Issue on partnership getting things moving. Useful meeting with Cheryl & John Ward, bringing Hart & Rushmoor together. HCC providing additional management support. Brief is to get more liaison going with the LSP and identify local transport needs. Fleet Town Access plan looking at improved pedestrian and cycle access into and around the town. Hoping to be able to report more at a later date. Chris Cornwell has already been doing work on behalf of parishes, i.e yellabus etc.

John Pearson asked about engaging with railways re parking. GB – dialogue has been ongoing for several years. There are plans to increase parking at

	<p>Fleet and Winchfield but this requires huge investment and will have wait until other priorities have been met. HDC supports the ideas that South West Trains have put forward but it depends on priorities, the more that is spent on parking the less will be spent on schools, leisure etc. . JP – Infrastructure needs more parking, so could 106 money be used? GB – could be looked into again as part of whole infrastructure debate. TC suggested generating income by making better use of some Council owned car parks - will talk to GB separately about specific sites.</p> <p><b>VII. Children &amp; Young People’s Partnership – see item 3.</b></p> <p>Cllr Crookes requested that for future meetings updates should be brief with just one or two big items on the agenda.</p>	
7	<p><b>AOB</b> Reminder of dates for LSP Management Team meetings:</p> <p><b>Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> May 2010 - 10.00 – 12.00</b>  <b>Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> June 2010 - 10.00 – 12.00</b>  <b>Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> September 2010 - 10.00 – 12.00</b>  <b>Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> November 2010 -10.00 – 12.00</b></p> <p>All to be held at the Civic Offices in CR 2</p>	

**Next Meeting:  
Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> July 2010 @ 10 am  
Council Chamber, HDC**