

CABINET

13 October 2004

Attendance:

Councillors:

Campbell (Chairman) (P)

Beveridge (P)
Collin (P)
Evans
Hiscock (P)

Knasel
Learney (P)
Wagner (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Allgood, Bennetts, Davies and Higgins

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Beckett, Busher, Hammerton, Jackson and Mitchell

TACT: Mr A Rickman and Mr C Gilbert-Wood

330. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Evans and Knasel.

331. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Health reported that the Waste Management Collection trial commencing next week involved collection Round 8.

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

(Report CAB 937 refers)

The Chairman reported that the Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport had recorded his thanks to the Officers for their work in carrying out an extensive consultation project on the proposals.

In response to Members' questions, the Director of Development Services explained that the possibility of incorporating a short cycle lane in the curve of the alignment between Middle Brook Street and North Walls was being evaluated to increase the safety for cyclists accessing North Walls from this point. It was also confirmed that during the experimental period temporary traffic markings would be utilised.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Bennetts commented that he was supportive of the proposals but asked that the issue of north to south access through Winchester for local people be kept under review, as this remained a significant factor in local traffic movements. The Chairman stated that this issue would be kept under review.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the following changes be made on an experimental basis:
 - a) Parchment Street – reversal of one way traffic flow;
 - b) Middle Brook Street – revoke one way traffic flow and remove contraflow cycle lane from North Walls to Cossack Lane;
 - c) St Peter Street – introduce a contra flow cycle lane from North Walls to St Georges Street;
 - d) North Walls – introduce a 'No right turn except for cycles' order into Middle Brook Street;
 - e) Upper Brook Street – no change.
2. That the above recommendations be implemented as soon as practicable and the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to make the Order.

333. WINCHESTER DISTRICT COMMUNITY STRATEGY
(Report CAB 950 refers)

The Chief Executive informed Cabinet that the transport element of the Local Strategic Partnership would now be strengthened as Mr Rufus Boyd, Commercial Director of South West Trains, had agreed to lead the Transport Forum and to provide advice on transport links. Mr Boyd was a Winchester resident who commuted each day to London by train. Cabinet welcomed this appointment.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning stated that he had attended a meeting of the Solent Transport Panel held on 12 October 2004, and this body had agreed to enter into accessibility planning as part of the Local Strategic Partnership.

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

RECOMMENDED:

- 1. THAT COUNCIL ACCEPTS THE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AS A SHARED AGENDA FOR THE DISTRICT AND HAS REGARD TO ITS AIMS WHEN AGREEING THE CITY COUNCIL'S FUTURE STRATEGIES, BUSINESS PLANS AND BUDGETS.**
- 2 THAT COUNCIL ENCOURAGES ALL PARTNERS TO HAVE SIMILAR REGARD TO THE AIMS OF THE COMMUNITY STRATEGY WHEN PREPARING THEIR STRATEGIES, BUSINESS PLANS AND BUDGETS.**

334. **WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL'S CORPORATE STRATEGY: 2005-2008**
(Report CAB 951 refers)

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources commented that she was pleased that the rapid progress being made in commissioning a new Customer Service Centre to provide an improved service to the Council's customers meant that this no longer needed to be included as a specific service priority in the Corporate Strategy.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT COUNCIL ADOPTS THE CORPORATE STRATEGY AS EMBODYING THEIR PRIORITIES FOR THE MEDIUM TERM, AND THAT IT BECOMES A BASIS FOR PREPARING THE BUDGET FOR 2005-2006 ONWARDS, THE 2005-2006 PERFORMANCE PLAN AND THE 2005-2006 DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS PLANS.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet authorises the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader and relevant Cabinet Members, to make any further amendments as necessary to the Draft Strategy prior to its consideration by Council on 3 November 2004, and that a report be submitted direct to Council containing any such additional amendments.

335. **REVENUE BUDGET 2005-2006**

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources reported that Cabinet's target was to achieve a three per cent increase in Council Tax for 2005/06, although this would leave a deficit of approximately £176,000 to be found from savings or reserves. The budget would be presented to Council for a final decision on 24 February 2005. However, the projections indicated a deficit for 2006/07 and beyond that would be difficult to eliminate by Council Tax increases alone. Therefore, to assist Cabinet in future considerations about how this could be dealt with, it was proposed that an additional recommendation be included that requested the Performance Improvement Committees to examine their budgets and identify the 20% of General Fund expenditure which they considered should have the lowest priority. One Member requested that the Performance Improvement Committees be assisted in this task by the provision of information on which elements of their services were statutory and which were discretionary.

The Portfolio Holder advised that the Customer Service Centre would in time reduce staffing levels and improve business processes resulting in savings. However, these savings could not yet be fully quantified. In addition, the Council was undertaking detailed reviews in a number of areas, including examining procurement in partnership with Eastleigh Borough Council.

In response to questions, the Portfolio Holder confirmed that the revenue support grant system resulted in the Council losing money for each new property built. This was because Government assumed a higher Council Tax charge than was actually levied by the Council.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That Performance Improvement Committees be asked to bear in mind the financial projections and potential revenue deficit and consider in the forthcoming cycle of meetings:

- a) Proposals for growth and savings, including the relative priorities of proposals;
- b) Proposals for fees and charges;
- c) Balances and forward programmes for reserves.

2. That to assist Cabinet in formulating plans to address the Council's projected deficit from 2006-07 onwards, Performance Improvement Committees be asked to examine the budgets in their areas and identify the 20% of General Fund expenditure (excluding overheads), which they consider should have the lowest priority.

336. **UPDATE ON JOINT WORKING WITH PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS**
(Report CAB952 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the work in hand be noted and continued progress be endorsed.

337. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN – FURTHER PROPOSED CHANGES**
(Report CAB946 refers)

Under the Council's Constitution Access to Information Procedure Rules (Rule 15.1 General Exception), this was a Key Decision, which had not been included in the Forward Plan for this meeting of Cabinet. Under this procedure, the Chairman of the Principal Scrutiny Committee had been informed.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins expressed concern about the deletion of a specific percentage requirement for affordable housing sought at West of Waterlooville MDA. He believed that this would encourage developers to submit a much lower percentage.

In response, the Director of Development Services explained that at the current time, the Council did not consider that it would be able to defend its requirement of a 50% provision of affordable housing. However, that did not mean this percentage would not be included at a later date once further work to establish updated housing requirements had been carried out. In response to further Members' questions, he confirmed that this additional work would be carried out as a matter of urgency as it was likely that the application for the West of Waterlooville MDA would be received shortly.

Members noted that since the production of the report, additional changes in relation to affordable housing provision at West of Waterlooville MDA were proposed as outlined below:

“FPC12.D

Paragraph 12.51 (RD12.29)

The development will be expected to provide affordable housing and other housing to meet any special housing needs that may be identified within the south-east Hampshire area. This Plan seeks 35% affordable housing in development schemes within Winchester District (see Proposal H.5).-However, the MDA will meet a wider sub-regional need, and will contribute to the affordable housing needs of a number of adjacent Local Authorities (Havant Borough Council, Portsmouth City Council, and part of East Hampshire District Council) in addition to parts of this District. The updated housing need survey referred to above concludes that a 50% proportion of affordable housing would be justified in the MDA, and split between rented and shared equity, the proportions to be determined in the light of up to date survey work. The Local Planning Authority will therefore seek a proportion of 50% subsidised affordable homes within the MDA. A specific housing needs survey will be carried out to identify the extent of this sub-regional need and its results will influence the proportion and types of affordable housing sought within the MDA under proposals H5 and NC2(iv). Affordable housing provision will be expected to be fully integrated with the development of market housing and to be dispersed within the development area. Concentrations of large numbers of affordable housing should be avoided in one location.

FPC06.A

Paragraph 6.44

Some affordable homes will also be provided in the West of Waterlooville Major Development Area (MDA) to meet the District's needs. ~~The 2002 District-wide Housing Needs Survey recognises that an additional Survey has also been undertaken for the Waterlooville area, because affordable housing in the MDA will primarily serve the neighbouring local authorities. This A Housing Need Survey was undertaken in 2002 on behalf of Winchester City Council and the neighbouring authorities of Havant Borough Council, East Hampshire District Council and Portsmouth City Council. It concludes that a 50% proportion would be justified in the MDA. The Local Planning Authority will therefore seek a 50% proportion of subsidised affordable homes within the MDA, subject to further analysis of the viability implications for the development of the site of that level of affordable housing provision. This area will, however, meet a wider sub-regional need, and therefore it will contribute to the affordable housing needs of a number of adjacent Local Authorities in addition to this District. It is unlikely to make a significant contribution to meeting the District's needs, and not until the latter part of the Plan period...~~

The Director of Development Services advised that the Environment Agency had been given until 13 October 2004 to comment on the amended Proposals DP.10 and DP.11. He requested that he be granted delegated authority to make any minor amendments required as a result of comments made by the Agency.

RESOLVED:

1. That in relation to the percentage of affordable housing to be sought at West of Waterlooville MDA, the relevant paragraphs be replaced with paragraphs 12.51 and 6.44 as outlined above.

2. That the changes to proposals DP.10 and DP.11 as set out in Appendix 1 of the report be endorsed as a Further Proposed Change and the Director of Development Services be given delegated authority to make any further necessary minor amendments as a result of any comments received from the Environment Agency on these proposals.

338. **PUSH – PARTNERSHIP FOR URBAN SOUTH HAMPSHIRE**
(Report CAB947 refers)

Under the Council's Constitution Access to Information Procedure Rules (Rule 15.1 General Exception), this was a Key Decision, which had not been included in the Forward Plan for this meeting of Cabinet. Under this procedure, the Chairman of the Principal Scrutiny Committee had been informed.

The Chairman also agreed to accept two appendices which had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline in order to allow their consideration in conjunction with the report.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Allgood expressed concern about the need to ensure that local gaps were retained, particularly those relating to Denmead as a Ward Member. He considered that both strategic and local gaps should be regarded as of great importance.

With regard to Councillor Allgood's comments, the Chairman advised that Cabinet were proposing an additional recommendation to the report which included recognition of the importance of retaining local gaps (new recommendation detailed under Recommendation 2 below).

In his introduction to the report, the Director of Development Services stressed that the Council considered any housing growth should be employment and infrastructure led. Cabinet agreed to the re-phrasing of the first resolution to reflect this point.

In response to questions, the Director of Development Services advised that Winchester Town and the area to the north was included within the "White Area" of the PUSH report. The proposals for this area did not include any significant changes and the Director requested that any comments Members wished to be reported back to SEERA be made to himself or the Chief Executive after the meeting. One Member expressed concern that the comments currently gave the impression that Winchester was mainly a commuter town. The Director of Development Services emphasised that this was not the case and agreed to look at the response further to clarify this point. It was also agreed that an additional recommendation be made that Council be invited to note submissions made to SEERA on behalf of those parts of authorities not considered to be part of the Urban South Hants sub-regions.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE COUNCIL'S CONTINUED MEMBERSHIP OF PUSH BE ENDORSED TO PROVIDE A VOICE FOR THOSE PARTS OF THE DISTRICT WHICH ARE INCLUDED IN THE SUB-REGION DEFINED BY SEERA AS URBAN SOUTH HAMPSHIRE.

2. THAT IN CONTRIBUTING TO PUSH DEBATES ABOUT FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUB-REGION, MEMBERS AND OFFICERS SEEK TO:

- (I) ENSURE THAT ALL COMMUNITIES IN THAT PART OF THE DISTRICT AFFECTED RETAIN THEIR LOCAL IDENTITY;
- (II) PROMOTE THE RETENTION OF LOCAL GAPS BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS;
- (III) PRESS FOR THE APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF DEVELOPMENT AROUND ESTABLISHED COMMUNITIES IN A WAY WHICH WILL ADD TO THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THOSE COMMUNITIES;
- (IV) SECURE INVESTMENT IN INFRASTRUCTURE NECESSARY TO SUPPORT EXISTING AND NEW COMMUNITIES.

3. THAT THE SUBMISSIONS MADE TO SEERA ON BEHALF OF THOSE PARTS OF AUTHORITIES NOT CONSIDERED TO BE PART OF THE URBAN SOUTH HAMPSHIRE SUB-REGIONS BE NOTED.

RESOLVED:

1. That the general thrust of the PUSH report be endorsed but the position be reserved on the growth potential of any sites within the Winchester District to promote economic regeneration of the Southampton and Portsmouth city regions until further information on the needs and potential of the Urban South Hampshire area are clearer. That it be agreed that housing growth cannot be planned until the potential for economic growth and the needs for infrastructure investment are adequately addressed and the capacity of the communities to take additional growth has been adequately examined and consulted on.

2. That the comments already sent to PUSH by the Chief Executive be noted and endorsed and the Chief Executive be granted delegated authority to make any further comments in the light of amendments on the Interim Report received after the Cabinet meeting.

339. **NEIGHBOURHOOD WARDENS – FOLLOW UP REPORT**
(Report CAB 948 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr C Gilbert-Wood representing TACT commented on the report. He stated that although supporting the concept of Neighbourhood Wardens, the funding of the project was fundamentally flawed from the tenants' perspective. Tenants had to pay twice, once through their rent to the Housing Revenue Account and secondly via Council Tax to the General Fund. This was inequitable when compared to the funding of other projects undertaken by the City Council. He stated that he had taken up the issue with the Housing Performance Improvement Committee to look at this discrepancy.

Also at the invitation of the Chairman, Mr A Rickman representing TACT stated that he supported Mr Gilbert-Wood's comments on the division of costs. He added that TACT were concerned that all estates were not going to benefit from the Wardens. He asked that after a three month period whether the estates at Weeke and Winnall could be provided with cover for at least one day per week at no further expense to the Housing Revenue Account. TACT were of the opinion that if this could be done then tenants would not feel excluded and that the day of the week could vary so that the Wardens would be provided with an overall picture of the estate throughout the week.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources and Portfolio Holder for Housing added that the situation on division of costs was currently being reviewed and the issues raised by TACT would be considered.

In considering the extension of the work of the Neighbourhood Wardens into estates other than Highcliffe and Stanmore, Cabinet were conscious of the financial constraints placed on the service by the grading of the post at Scale 4 under job evaluation rather than Scale 3 as had been envisaged when the scheme had been prepared.

Cabinet were of the opinion that in the initial period of the Neighbourhood Wardens establishing their role and the scope of the job it was important that the Team concentrated on Highcliffe and Stanmore as originally envisaged. The Director of Community Services would have operational discretion to look outside these areas if cross-boundary activities made it sensible to do so. When lessons had been learnt from this operational practice, then a report could be submitted to Cabinet to establish a more formal arrangement to pursue cross boundary issues between estates as part of the scheme and whether the team could operate in other estates. This report could be prepared after a number of months of the new scheme being in operation with the comments of TACT, Winchester Town Forum and affected Parish Councils being taken into consideration before the final report was submitted to Cabinet.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the feedback received from consultations conducted be noted.
2. That an additional base budget contribution to the scheme of £16,000 be approved in advance of consideration of the budget, so that a third Warden can be appointed as planned, and that costs be equally divided between the General Fund, Winchester Town Account and the Housing Revenue Account.
3. That after an initial period of operation, a report be submitted to Cabinet to give consideration to establishing a more formal arrangement to pursuing cross boundary issues between estates as part of the scheme and also whether the team could operate in other estates.

340. **MINUTES OF THE WINCHESTER TOWN FORUM**
(Report CAB944 refers)

Cabinet considered the minutes of the meeting of the Winchester Town Forum held 14 September 2004 and the recommendations contained therein. Members noted that the recommendations related to additional costs for Neighbourhood Wardens and had already been considered under Report CAB948 above.

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Winchester Town Forum held 14 September 2004 be received and the recommendations contained therein be noted.

341. **SOUTH DOWNS WAY, MEON VALLEY CROSSING**
(Report CAB941 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the Inquiry's findings be acknowledged with regard to the inadvertent damage which could be caused to the National Nature Reserve's nature conservation interests by horse-riders and cyclists and, therefore advises the Inspectorate that no further objection be made to the published Modifications.

342. **ENMAINMENT OF CRITICAL ORDINARY WATERCOURSES BY THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY**
(Report CAB942 refers)

In response to questions, the Director of Development Services advised that the developers would have to meet the costs of flood risk assessments required for planning applications. However, it was likely the costs of checking the applications would fall to the Council. It was noted that there could be significant financial implications as the number of assessments required would increase as a result of the increased numbers of sections of river being nominated by the Environment Agency as Critical Ordinary Watercourses. Members noted that further reports on matters relating to this and potential staffing issues would be submitted to future Cabinet and Personnel Committees as appropriate.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Director of Development Services formally advises the Environment Agency that the Council does not wish to contract back the management and maintenance of the newly enmained sections of River within the City Council's District and that responsibility for these sections of river will formally be passed to the Environment Agency on 31 March 2005.

343. **PROPOSED TIMETABLE OF MEETINGS 2005/06**

(Report CAB945 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Allgood requested that the Special Meeting of Council provisionally arranged for 29 June 2005 include the Annual Scrutiny Report as an item of business. This was agreed.

Councillor Allgood also mentioned that the Licensing and Regulation Committee scheduled for 4 October 2005 clashed with the Conservative Party Conference and requested that the meeting be moved. The City Secretary and Solicitor advised that normally only major meetings were moved to avoid party conferences. In addition, the requirements under the new Licensing Act 2003 were likely to result in changes to the dates and composition of this Committee, with some dates possibly being reserved for Licensing Sub-Committee meetings which would involve fewer Members. The detailed arrangements would be considered by the Licensing and Regulation Committee shortly.

In response to questions, the City Secretary and Solicitor advised that the Local Government Association Conference was scheduled to be held between 5 and 8 July 2005 and consequently did not clash with any major meetings.

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

RESOLVED:

That the timetable of meetings for 2005-06 be approved as outlined in the report and amended above.

344. **WINCHESTER AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT AREA (AQMA) – DECISIONS ARISING FROM AIR QUALITY MEMBER/OFFICER WORKING GROUP**
(Report CAB954 refers)

Under the Council's Constitution Access to Information Procedure Rules (Rule 15.1 General Exception), this was a Key Decision, which had not been included in the Forward Plan for this meeting of Cabinet. Under this procedure, the Chairman of the Principal Scrutiny Committee had been informed.

One Member commented that the County Council should be reminded that a significant number of the measures proposed would have to be funded by them as the relevant Highways Authority. This was noted in addition to the need for a further report to Cabinet once the full costs of the programme of actions had been calculated.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the current position with regard to the development of the Air Quality Action Plan be noted.

2. That the actions developed by the Air Quality Action Plan Working Group, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report, be endorsed.

3. That the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to apply to the Secretary of State for the adoption of vehicle emission testing powers under the Road Traffic (Vehicle Emissions) (Fixed Penalty) (England) Regulations 2002.

345. **MINOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION**

(Report CAB955 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Allgood requested that the name of one of the bodies under Schedule 2A of the Members' Allowances Scheme be amended to "Elected Member Scrutiny Network" (by deleting the word "West") to reflect its changing composition. This was agreed.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE MINOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION AS SET OUT IN APPENDIX 1 TO THE REPORT AND AMENDED ABOVE BE APPROVED.

346. **BAA SOUTHAMPTON AIRPORT PREFERRED ROUTEINGS TRIAL APRIL – SEPTEMBER 2004**

(Report CAB956 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Bennetts and Higgins spoke regarding this item. Councillor Bennetts raised a particular concern that the aileron flaps fitted to some of the planes using this airport generated a lot of noise when planes were landing. In addition he queried whether any assessment of military aircraft noise had been undertaken. He agreed with the suggestions in the report that an officer sub-group was required to consider the various technical issues and that the membership of the Southampton Airport Consultative Committee be reviewed.

Councillor Higgins advised that he had received many representations from residents of his Ward with regard to noise from aircraft, particularly under Phase 2 of the trial. He considered that the problems related to the height at which aircraft flew over Winchester and requested that the airport be asked to ensure planes flew over the city at the highest possible level.

The Director of Health and Housing advised that the largest number of complaints were received during Phase 2 of the trial which was a return to existing arrangements, probably due to the increased publicity.

Cabinet agreed that the Council should seek to obtain increased Member representation on the Southampton Airport Consultative Committee, particularly as there was likely to be an increase in air traffic from the airport over future years. In addition, it was noted that the airport could be encouraged to hold a stakeholder event in Winchester.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the preferred outcome of the routeings trial be noted, insofar as complaints made to the City Council are concerned.

2. That written representation be made to BAA Southampton based on section 5 of the report.

347. **BUY BACK OF FORMER HRA LAND AT HIGHCLIFFE AND STANMORE – APPENDICES 1 AND 2**

(Report Appendices 1 and 2 of Report CAB949 refers)

Cabinet noted that Appendices 1 and 2 contained previous reports and minutes of Cabinet and Principal Scrutiny Committee in relation to proposals to buy back the former HRA land which Council had deferred for consideration of further information by Cabinet. The matter would then be referred for decision at Council on 3 November 2004.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Davies and Higgins spoke about this item. Councillor Davies queried why the report CAB949 was itself exempt. He considered that the information relating to the history of events should be made public. Councillor Higgins stated that he supported the recommendations as set out in the report.

In response to the comments made by Councillor Davies, the City Secretary and Solicitor advised that the report contained legal advice which he would not wish to be made public. However, he agreed that the comments from the external auditor on the proposals could be made public as outlined in the minutes below:

“ Following our conversation (a meeting with the Chief Executive and the Director of Finance on various audit issues) and our review of the draft report prepared for the Cabinet meeting scheduled on 13 October, I am able to confirm that, on the basis of the information that has come to my attention, I am not minded to take any action at this stage. Please note that in the event of any relevant and additional information that comes to my attention it may be that there is a need for me to change my position and investigate.

Clearly there are lessons for the Council to learn from the events that have led to this transaction being contemplated. In addition the situation also suggests that fuller risk assessments should be completed when land transactions of this nature are being contemplated in future.”

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

RESOLVED:

That subject to discussions under exempt business on this report, Cabinet is minded to agree that Council should approve a supplementary estimate of £511,000 for the re-purchase of the former HRA land at Fivefields Road and Thurmond Crescent from Eastleigh Housing Association.

348. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

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

349. **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>
350	Buy Back for Former HRA) Land at Highcliffe and Stanmore	Any instructions to counsel and) any opinion of counsel (whether) or not in connection with any) proceedings) and any advice) received, information obtained) or action to be taken in) connection with:-) (a) any legal proceedings by) or against the authority, or) (b) the determination of any) matter affecting the authority,) (whether, in either case,) proceedings have been) commenced or are in) contemplation). (Para 12 to) Schedule 12A refers).
351	Provision of Financial Services to South East Employers) Information relating to a) particular employee, former) employee or applicant to) become an employee of, or a) particular office-holder, former) office-holder or applicant to) become an office-holder under) the authority. (Para 1 to) Schedule 12A refers).) Information relating to the) financial or business affairs of) any particular person (other) than the authority). (Para 7) Schedule 12A refers).))))

-) 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).
-)
-) Information relating to any
-) consultations or negotiations, or
-) contemplated consultations or
-) negotiations, in connection with
-) any labour relations matter
-) arising between the authority or
-) a Minister of the Crown and
-) employees of, or office-holders
-) under, the authority. (Para 11
-) to Schedule 12A refers).

350. **BUY BACK OF FORMER HRA LAND AT HIGHCLIFFE AND STANMORE**
(Report CAB949 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Davies and Higgins spoke regarding this item. Councillor Davies expressed concern that Ward Members had not been properly consulted regarding the Thurmond Crescent proposals at the time and believed that to have done so would have avoided many of the subsequent difficulties. He requested that the section of the report outlining the history of proposals at Thurmond Crescent should be made public (paragraphs 3.1 to 3.9). Councillor Higgins stated that he believed the Council should agree to buy back land in Fivefields Road, Highcliffe irrespective of its decision regarding land in Stanmore.

In response to the comments made by Councillor Davies, the Chief Executive confirmed that the Council had learnt lessons from the events that took place and had agreed a change of approach to minimise the risk in future projects.

Following further discussion about the content of the report and what should be considered exempt, it was agreed that the majority of the report, with the exception of the sections containing legal advice (principally paragraphs 4.1 to 4.13), could be made open to the public. It was agreed that the amended report be circulated with the Council agenda for its meeting on 3 November 2004.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT A SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE OF £511,000 BE APPROVED FOR THE RE-PURCHASE OF FORMER HRA LAND AT FIVEFIELDS ROAD AND THURMOND CRESCENT FROM EASTLEIGH HOUSING ASSOCIATION.

RESOLVED:

That a further report be circulated direct to Council making a distinction between open and exempt information as outlined above.

351. **PROVISION OF FINANCE SERVICES TO SOUTH EAST EMPLOYERS**
(Report CAB940 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the extension to the contract to supply finance and IT support services to South East Employers for two years with effect from 1 October 2004 be approved.

The meeting commenced at 9.00am and concluded at 12.20pm

Chairman