

CABINET**5 July 2004**Attendance:

Councillors:

Campbell (Chairman) (P)

Beveridge (P)

Collin

Evans (P)

Hiscock (P)

Knasel (P)

Learney (P)

Wagner (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting

Councillors Bennetts, Busher, Davies, Higgins and Verney

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting

Councillors Beckett and Nelmes

49. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Collin.

50. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**Traffic Management – Parchment Street, Winchester

In the public participation of the meeting the following public speakers addressed the meeting regarding traffic issues in the Parchment Street area of Winchester (details under Minute 51).

Mr B Sawter

Ms I Lowe

Ms E Nation

Dr. Khoo

Mr M Rogers

Ms M Lawton

Ms A Sirl

Mr Mirchandani

Mr Shepperd

Ms S Scott

Ms S Walker

Mr R Backhouse

Ms S Foster

Mr J Edwards

Dr J Bain

Mr Player

County Councillor Dickens

51. **TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT – PARCHMENT STREET, WINCHESTER AND SURROUNDING ROADS**

(Report CAB900 refers)

In its consideration of the report, Cabinet took into account the representations made by members of the public during the public participation part of the meeting.

In summary these principally were from residents of Middle Brook Street, Upper Brook Street, Parchment Street and St Peter's Street which were the principal roads to be affected by the proposals.

The main points arising from the public representation were as follows:

- the criteria that would be used to judge the successful outcome of any experimental period;
- the consultation process and period;
- issues regarding police enforcement of traffic restrictions;
- issues relating to access for emergency vehicles and service vehicles, for example refuse collection;
- the need for the Council to take a balanced approach so that the residents of one street were not benefited to the excessive detrimental effect on the residents of another street;
- access issues relating to heavy goods vehicles and access to retail shops;
- the possibility of making certain streets access only;
- the need for a comprehensive approach for North-South and East-West traffic movements across Winchester, rather than looking at individual streets in isolation;
- the need to include provision for cycles in any proposals, and;
- statements on the detrimental effect to residents' amenities due to excessive traffic noise, traffic movements and safety issues.

At the invitation of the Chairman Councillor Bennetts, a Ward Member spoke on this item. In summary he stated that the results of the consultation so far undertaken showed that only 28% of respondees were in favour of a reversal of traffic in Parchment Street with there being more respondees in support of the introduction of weight restrictions. He also requested that the Council take a balanced approach in order that one group of residents were not benefited to the detriment of another. He asked whether width limits could be enforced by the Council's Parking Attendants. He urged that the consultation process should continue as there was as yet insufficient evidence to warrant introduction of the proposals and that a local north-south traffic route should be considered.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins spoke on this item. In summary he stated that there was no easy solution to the problems faced by traffic flows through Winchester. To reduce traffic flows through the streets in question would increase traffic on the one way system by as much as 3000 vehicle movements per day, which would again cause its own problems. He also raised the issue of service vehicles delivering to retail units in St George's Street and the delays that this caused at peak times in Winchester with traffic backing up in the town centre. Any proposals needed to take into consideration the Broadway Friarsgate redevelopment and also the furtherance of Park and Ride facilities.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Davies spoke on this item. In summary he stated that the process of considering traffic restrictions and orders needed further consideration by the Council in order that proper consultation was undertaken and City Councillors had a chance to feed into the process prior to its submission to Cabinet. In this way the decision making process could be better informed.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Verney spoke on this item. In summary he stated that traffic issues should be looked at for the City as a whole. As an alternative he suggested reversing the traffic flow in St Peter's Street which would remove approximately 1/3rd of the traffic movements from Parchment Street and the introduction of a heavy goods vehicle ban on all the smaller north-south streets except for access. He also suggested that a night traffic order banning all traffic from north-south streets between 10pm and 7am, 7 days per week should be considered. The introduction of the Parchment Street Order would lead to approximately 20%

more traffic on the one way system, but again St George's Street represented an arterial route through Winchester and caution should be taken in adding to its traffic flow, especially if congestion would lead to difficulty in access for service vehicles and emergency vehicles.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Hampshire County Councillor Dickens stated in summary that she was concerned at the effects of the proposals on Parchment Street and Middle Brook Street. There were knock on effects from the proposals to the west side of Winchester and she urged more debate and that other options be considered. She added that traffic problems were more pronounced in Winchester due to the absence of an orbital ring road.

The Chairman thanked the public speakers and Councillors for their contributions, and agreed that a holistic view of traffic problems in the City would be beneficial. The Portfolio Holder for Traffic and Access also commented that a key issue to be taken into consideration was the Air Quality Management Area and policies to reduce traffic in the centre of Winchester and remove through traffic. Balanced against policies to discourage car use were those to maintain the economic and retail prosperity of the central core and also to take into account the needs of cyclists and pedestrians.

The Director of Development Services stated that there was a need to take action as 3000 car movements per day on narrow residential streets in the centre of the City was unacceptable. However, the difficulty was finding a solution to ensure that nobody would lose out. In the proposals for the experimental period, it was estimated that there would be a reduction of 1100 cars per day in St Peter's Street; 2900 cars per day in Parchment Street; 366 cars per day in Upper Brook Street, and 640 cars per day in Middle Brook Street. The combined loss from the four residential streets would be 3884 cars per day, but these would be displaced onto the one way system.

He continued that in response to points made by the public speakers and Councillors, to reverse the traffic flow in St Peter's Street would lead to a virtually blind junction from St Peter's Street onto St George's Street. It was further explained that the cycle route planned for St Peter's Street would also be stopped short of this difficult junction. Also with respect to St Peter's Street, to introduce a reverse traffic flow would lead to persons wishing to access Romsey Road from St George's Street having to access the left hand lane within 40 metres of the junction, which would cause congestion and traffic tailbacks.

On the question of enforcement, the police were not in favour of access only orders as it was resource-intensive to enforce and motorists could legitimately access businesses within these streets, which added to problems of enforcement. The Council's Parking Attendants did not have the authority to enforce this type of order and self-enforcement had not proved to be effective in other streets in Winchester.

With regard to the enforcement of service vehicles delivering to retail premises in central Winchester via St George's Street and Jewry Street, the Director of Development Services explained that there were restrictions between 7.30am to 9.30am and 4.30pm to 6pm. These were enforced, and the Department were aware of the problems; however there needed to be a balance between the commercial life of the city centre and the needs of commuters.

The Director of Development Services explained that the maximum length of an experimental traffic regulation order period would be 18 months. Implementation would be affected by the need to alter traffic layouts, alter traffic lighting sequences and the need for a meaningful experimental period in which the results could be analysed and conclusions reached. There would then be a period of advertising of the scheme before the order could be confirmed at the end of the experimental period.

Following further debate on possible alternative solutions, Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That on an experimental basis the reversal of the one way traffic flow take place on Parchment Street, Winchester.
2. That on an experimental basis a contra-flow cycle lane from North Walls to St George's Street be introduced on St Peter's Street.
3. That no change take place in Upper Brook Street.
4. That on an experimental basis at North Walls an advance stop line for cycles be introduced at Middle Brook Street.
5. That in respect of Middle Brook Street that in principle on an experimental basis the reversal of one way traffic flow from Cossack Lane to North Walls and contra-flow cycle lane from North Walls to Cossack Lane take place but it be recognised that further work needs to be done before a final decision is made.
6. That a Middle Brook Street Informal Member Officer Working Group be established with terms of reference to gather information about traffic movements in the Middle Brook Street, Lower Brook Street and Cossack Lane area; to consider the traffic management options for Middle Brook Street (for example, the introduction of a turning circle at the North Walls junction and its cost estimate and to understand issues relating to access for service vehicles);
7. That the Working Group's membership be Councillors Knasel, Busher (Deputy Hammerton), Davies (Deputy de Peyer) and Verney and that Ward Members and representatives of the residents of Middle Brook Street, Upper Brook Street, Parchment Street and St Peter's Street be invited to its public meetings.
8. That the conclusions of the Working Group be reported to the Environment and Access Performance Improvement Committee prior to their consideration by Cabinet.
9. That the effects of the traffic scheme be also referred to the Air Quality Informal Members/Officer Working Group for detailed evaluation as part of the preparation of the AQMA Action Plan in order to ensure that any impact of implementation of the proposals is considered in terms any adverse effect on air quality elsewhere in the town.

10. That the financial implementations of the proposed changes be noted and that this situation be reassessed when the contribution to be obtained towards the scheme from Hampshire County Council is clarified.

11. That the experimental orders referred to in resolutions 1, 2 and 4 above be not made until Cabinet has had the opportunity to consider the further report from the Working Group so that implementation of all proposals in this area can be undertaken at the same time.

52. **MODERNISATION AND IMPROVEMENT PLAN – 2004/2005 FIRST QUARTER MONITOR**
(Report CAB908 refers)

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

That the progress made towards meeting targets be noted.

53. **CAPITAL OUT-TURN 2003/2004**
(Report CAB881 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Davies, spoke on this item. Under the Housing General Fund heading he asked questions relating to the homeless hostel and the Sussex Street homeless hostel.

In response, the Director of Finance explained that in respect of the homeless hostel, this was not now proceeding, as it had not been possible to produce a viable supported housing project within the Housing Corporation's deadline. However, £500,000 had been allocated in the Capital Programme for the Sussex Street hostel and this was proceeding.

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RECOMMENDED:

THAT COUNCIL APPROVE THE CARRY FORWARD OF CAPITAL FUNDS TOTALLING £1.858 MILLION FROM 2003/2004 TO 2004/2005, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FINANCIAL PROCEDURE RULE 7.8.

54. **AFFORDABLE HOUSING CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2004/2005**
(Report CAB874 refers)

The Portfolio Holder for Housing commented that debt free status of the Council had allowed 59 affordable dwellings to be built in 2003/2004 and a further 140 were in progress. However changes to the Government's financial regime for housing would mean that this number would taper off in future years.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Davies, commented on the sites at Stanmore. He stated that the Urban Capacity Study had identified 4 units to be provided in Stanmore during 2004/2005 but sites were not identified within the report.

In response, the Director of Health and Housing explained that the bidding process through the Housing Corporation for funding which could possibly be 2 years prior to the commencement of a scheme on the ground. With respect to Stanmore, the Urban Capacity Study had identified the Drayton Street scheme but this could be reallocated for the most appropriate scheme following consultation with the Stanmore Steering Group.

In answer to a question made by Councillor Busher, at the invitation of the Chairman, the Director explained that full consultation on schemes took place with the Director of Development Services.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources asked that to ensure financial probity, any scheme that involved a unit costing in excess of £100,000 be also referred to the Director of Finance and the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources before proceeding. Cabinet agreed to this request.

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Housing Corporation Development Programme for 2004/2005 and 2005/2006 be noted.

2. That the table in paragraph 4.3 of the report of projected affordable schemes forms a basis of the Council's affordable housing capital programme for 2004/2005, subject to the capital programme provision not being exceeded or further approvals be obtained.

3. That subject to 4. below, the Director of Health and Housing in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Housing be authorised to substitute suitable alternative affordable housing schemes in the event of delays in the schemes contained in paragraph 4.3.

4. That for schemes where the individual cost of provision of a unit is in excess of £100,000, the Director of Finance and the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources be also consulted on whether a substitute scheme should proceed.

55. **PRIMARY CARE FACILITIES (EAST HANTS LIFT)**

(Report CAB909 refers)

In considering the report, the Director of Community Services was asked to enquire whether the Whiteley area of the District would be included within the project and to clarify whether there was equal voting rights for all partners of the project.

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

1. The terms of the transactions contemplated by the Transaction Document are approved in accordance with the Council's Constitution and the Additional Documents and any ancillary or related documents to which the Council is expressed to be a party are resolved to be approved under section 4 in accordance with the Council's Constitution and that all such documents (with such amendments as may be made and agreed and approved by the action of execution in accordance with these resolutions) and all such ancillary or related documents be executed, delivered and performed on behalf of the Council;

2. Authority be given to any one or more of the following officers

- Stephen Whetnall, City Secretary and Solicitor
- Howard Bone, Assistant City Secretary (Legal)
- Steve Tilbury, Director of Community Services
- Simon Eden, Chief Executive

to approve sign and/or dispatch and/or deliver the Transaction Document, the Additional Documents, all other documents and/or notices to be approved, signed and/or dispatched or delivered by the Council under/or in connection with the documents listed above and, by the act of so doing, to agree and approve any amendments made to such document; and

3. The City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to certify the names and signatures of the authorised signatories set out in paragraph 2 above;

4. The Chairman be authorised to sign the minutes as a correct record of this meeting in advance of the next Cabinet meeting on 27 July 2004.

56. **CHANGES TO COUNCIL CONSTITUTION – PART 3: RESPONSIBILITY FOR FUNCTIONS – SCHEME OF DELEGATION TO OFFICERS**
(Report CAB824 refers)

In its consideration of the proposed changes, Cabinet suggested a number of amendments as set out in the Recommendation below.

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RECOMMENDED:

THAT SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS, THE REVISED VERSION OF THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION TO OFFICERS (INCLUDED WITHIN PART 3 OF THE CONSTITUTION) AS SET OUT IN APPENDIX ONE TO THE REPORT, BE RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL -

1. PART 3 – PAGE 27.8. ADVISING ON THE HIGHWAY ASPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS.

2. PART 3 – PAGE 33.10 AUTHORITY TO EXERCISE THE ~~ANY POWERS TO DEAL WITH~~ IN RELATION TO TAKE AWAY FOOD SHOPS.

57. **CHANGES TO PORTFOLIO HOLDER ROLES – POSSIBLE CHANGES TO DESIGNATION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEES**

(Agenda item)

The City Secretary and Solicitor reported that following the changes to Portfolio Holder roles agreed at Cabinet on 24 June 2004, it has been suggested that some adjustments to the designation and terms of reference of the Performance Improvement Committees be made to follow a similar cross-cutting approach.

The number of Performance Improvement Committees would be the same and their main functions would be substantially similar to the current terms of reference. However, was desirable to consider transfer of responsibility in some areas between the various Performance Improvement Committees and also that the changes be made in time for the next Committee cycle.

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons outlined on the Agenda.

RESOLVED:

That the Leader hold discussions with the Group Leaders and Chairman of Principal Scrutiny Committee with the suggested improvements to the designation and terms of reference of the five Performance Improvement Committees.

58. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Council's Forward Plan for July 2004, be noted.

59. **MINUTES**

The meeting noted that this item had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item onto the agenda, as a matter requiring urgent consideration, because of the need to receive the minutes from its previous meeting held on the 24 June 2004.

(Subsequent to the receiving of the minutes, the City Secretary and Solicitor had received notification that Councillor Wagner's name had been omitted from appointments to the Air Quality Informal Member Officer Working Group under the item of Annual Appointments to Cabinet Committees etc (Report CAB904 refers). This omission was subsequently amended in the minutes.)

The City Secretary and Solicitor also reported that at Council on 30 June 2004 the minute of Cabinet dated 19 May 2004 regarding the Proposed Recycling Pilot - Outstanding Issues (Minute 1478 refers) had been corrected.

It was stated that the Recommendation should have read as follows:

'The representations made by Sparsholt and South Wonston Parish Councils were considered by Cabinet but it was decided that no change to the selected pilot area should be made'.

Cabinet agreed to this correction to the minutes of its meeting held on 19 May 2004.

RESOLVED:

1. That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 24 June 2004 (less exempt minutes) be approved and adopted.
2. That the correction to Cabinet Minute 1478 of the meeting held on the 19 May 2004, as set out above, be approved.

60. **ANNUAL APPOINTMENTS TO EXTERNAL BODIES**

(Report CAB907 refers)

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons outlined in the report.

RESOLVED:

That the following appointments to external bodies listed within the report be made as follows (Deputies shown in brackets):

1. Bishop's Waltham Sports Committee – Councillor Chamberlain (Councillor Goodall)
2. Carroll Youth Centre – Councillors Darbyshire and Tait (Councillor Rees)
3. Central Hampshire Transport Strategy Panel – Councillors Busher, Davies, Knasel, Lipscomb (Bennetts, Jeffs, Verney)
4. Forest of Bere and Eversley Joint Members Working Group – Councillors Beveridge and Pearson

5. Hampshire and Isle of Wight Association of Local Authorities (HIOWA) – Councillors Campbell and Evans
6. Hampshire County Council Annual Meeting with Parish and District Councils regarding Public Transport Issues – Councillor Collin
7. Health for All Committee – Councillors Collin, Hammerton, Quar, Rees and Wagner
8. HIOWA – Hampshire Rural Committee – Councillor Baxter
9. Local Government Association – Councillor Campbell (Councillor Evans)
10. Local Government Association Rural Commission – Councillor Beveridge (Councillor Campbell)
11. Local Government Association Urban Commission – Councillor Knasel (Councillor Collin)
12. National Parking Adjudication Joint Committee – Councillor Knasel
13. Project Integra Management Board – Councillor Wagner (Councillor Evans)
14. Project Integra Policy Review and Scrutiny Committee – Councillor Pearson (Councillor Hutton)
15. Solent Transport Strategy Panel – Councillors Knasel and Chapman (Councillors Allgood and Clohosey)
16. Southeast Employers' Liaison Group – Councillor Learney (Councillor Nelmes)
17. Southeast England Regional Assembly (SEERA) – Councillor Campbell (Councillor Evans)
18. Southampton, Hampshire, Isle of Wight and Portsmouth Arts Forum – Councillor Evans (Councillor Hammerton)
19. Tourism South East – Councillor Evans (Councillor Knasel)
20. Tower Arts Management Committee – Councillor Tait (Councillor Love)
21. Twyford Waterworks – Councillor Sutton (Councillor Wagner)
22. WCC/SERCO Member Liaison Meeting – Councillors Busher, Campbell, Davies, Hiscock, Lipscomb and Wagner
23. WCC/STERIA UK Member Liaison Meeting – Councillors Chamberlain, Davies, Learney and Lipscomb

24. Winchester Allotment Holders Society – Councillor Hutton (Councillor Berry)
25. Winchester District Joint Consultative Committee – Portfolio Holders and Councillors Davies and Lipscomb
26. Winchester Highway and Transport Advisory Panel – Councillors Busher, Clohosey, Davies, Knasel, Lipscomb and Verney (Councillors de Peyer, Hammerton, Jeffs and Wagner)
27. Winchester Housing Group – Councillors Maynard and Rees
28. Winchester Housing Needs Group – Councillors Love and Saunders
29. Winchester Housing Trust – Councillor Bennetts (Councillor Tait as observer)
30. Winchester Indoor Sports Association (Lido Sports Club) – Councillor Sutton
31. Winchester Road Safety Council – Councillor Knasel (Councillor Pearson)

Ad hoc appointments to outside bodies

1. Age Concern – Councillor Collin (Councillor Cooper)
2. Bishop's Waltham Citizens Advice Bureau – Councillor Busher
3. Fareham Police and Community Liaison Group – Councillor Hoare
4. Havant Citizens Advice Bureau – Councillor Allgood
5. Relate – Councillor Love
6. Southampton University Court – Councillors Davies and Sutton
7. Trinity Centre Management Committee – Councillors Hiscock and Love
8. Whiteley Community Association – Councillor Watts
9. Winchester City Centre Management Limited – Councillor Knasel
10. Winchester Welfare Charities – Councillors Davies and Mitchell

61. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
63 & 64	Buy back of former HRA land at Highcliffe and Stanmore	The amount of any expenditure proposed to be incurred by the authority under any particular contract for the acquisition of property or the supply of goods or services. (Para 8 to Schedule 12A refers).
62	Exempt minutes of the previous meeting held 24 June 2004 – cash collection contract	Any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services. (Para 9 to Schedule 12A refers).

62. **EXEMPT MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minutes of the previous meeting held 24 June 2004 relating to cash collection contract be approved and adopted.

63. **BUY BACK OF FORMER HRA LAND AT HIGHCLIFFE AND STANMORE**
(Report CAB901 refers)

Cabinet considered a report which recommended the buy back of former HRA land at Highcliffe and Stanmore (detail in Exempt Minute).

The meeting commenced at 9.00am and concluded at 12.20pm.

EXEMPT MINUTE – NOT FOR PUBLICATION**CABINET****5 July 2004****64. BUY BACK OF FORMER HRA LAND AT HIGHCLIFFE AND STANMORE**
(Report CAB901 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Davies spoke on this item. He questioned why the Council was intending to possibly approve a supplementary estimate of £511,000 to buy back a potentially sterile site when the Council had alternate priorities, which would be more appropriate for the spending of this money.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins, also spoke on this item. He asked that the repurchased land be properly maintained to prevent it from becoming misused.

In response, the Portfolio Holder for Housing stated that the buy back was in accordance with the partnership approach to the project with the Eastleigh Housing Association and would protect the Council's reputation for further transactions. Although the time limit in the legal agreement for the transfer had expired, this had been because the Association had continued to seek a suitable development proposal satisfactory to the Council. This had not been possible. It was also confirmed that the Council's cost in this matter had been covered by the interest accruing on the sum whilst it had been deposited with the City Council.

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons set out above and outlined in the report.

RECOMMENDED:

THAT COUNCIL BE REQUESTED TO APPROVE A SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE OF £511,000, SUBJECT TO THE MATTER NOT BEING CALLED IN BY PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, FOR THE REPURCHASE OF THE FORMER HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) LAND AT FIVEFIELDS ROAD AND THURMOND CRESCENT FROM EASTLEIGH HOUSING ASSOCIATION.

COUNCIL, ON 21 JULY 2004 REMOVED THE EXEMPT STATUS OF THIS MINUTE AND THE REFERRED REPORT.

Chairman