

**WINCHESTER TOWN FORUM****3 March 2005**Attendance:Councillors:

Pearce (Chairman) (P)

Bennetts (P)  
Berry (P)  
Beveridge (P)  
Davies (P)  
de Peyer (P)  
Higgins (P)  
Hiscock (P)  
Love  
Mather (P)

Maynard  
Mitchell (P)  
Nelmes (P)  
Nunn (P)  
Pines (P)  
Rees (P)  
Saunders (P)  
Tait (P)

---

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors Love and Maynard.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 6 January 2005, be approved and adopted.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr Skinner addressed the Forum regarding his concerns at Peter Symond's College recent action in felling 33 trees from their site on the boundary of Bereweek Road. In his opinion, this had had a detrimental effect on the character of the area and Mr Skinner recommended that the Council should be more proactive in protecting important trees in the town.

The Forum thanked Mr Skinner for highlighting the issue and agreed to consider the matter further during its consideration of the "Trees in Winchester" oral report as set out below.

4. **TREES IN WINCHESTER – CONDITION AUDIT**

(Oral Report)

The Acting Director of Development Services explained that a brief for the Winchester District Tree Strategy had been drafted, but that workload pressures on the Landscape Team had meant that work on the Strategy had not yet been progressed. He explained that the Strategy would set out the requirements for an audit based on a risk management approach, but that this would be subject to the availability of resources.

He confirmed that any audit would make use of a wide variety of resources and a Member suggested a possible role for students studying at Sparsholt Agricultural College. The findings of the audit would determine the type and extent of works that would be required, again subject to the availability of resources. The Forum recommended that this work should be focused primarily on the town area, where the effect on the relatively few existing trees and the amount of development pressure was greater than in rural parts of the District.

In response to Mr Skinner's comments concerning the loss of trees at Peter Symond's College, the Forum acknowledged that as there were no Tree Preservation Orders on any of the trees felled, the College had acted legally. However, Members regretted the lack of adequate prior consultation by the College before the action was taken.

It was noted that the Council had the power to instigate an emergency Tree Preservation Order should this be essential and it was agreed that this process should be advertised more widely via the Council's web-site and possibly on the town's noticeboards.

At the conclusion of the debate, Members requested that the Director present a progress report on the Tree Strategy to the next meeting, to be held on 9 June 2005.

RESOLVED:

1. That the Forum note with regret the lack of consultation from Peter Symond's College regarding the felling of trees on its land bordering Bereweke Road.

2. That the Council's ability to serve emergency tree preservation orders be better advertised.

3. That the Director of Development Services be requested to report to the next meeting of the Forum on the progress of the Tree Strategy.

5. **NEIGHBOURHOOD DESIGN STATEMENTS AND LOCAL AREA DESIGN STATEMENTS**  
(Oral Report)

At the previous meeting of the Councillors' Forum, Members requested further information on Design Statements during their consideration of the Town Budget (WTF40 refers).

The Director of Development Services explained that the three types of Design Statements were defined principally by the size of area they covered.

Neighbourhood Design Statements (NDSs) were the town equivalent of Village Design Statements (VDSs), covered large parts of the town and were principally driven by the local community. The Forum had agreed to grant £17,000 in 2004/05 to encourage the development of NDSs and VDSs through the appointment of urban design consultants to assist the local community in drafting statements and towards publication costs. As with all Design Statements, on its completion, it would be considered for adoption by the Council as a Supplementary Planning Document and would then be a material consideration in relevant planning applications. At this stage, only the St Giles Hill area had an adopted NDS, but they were being developed for Fulflood/St Paul's and Teg Down.

Local Area Design Statements (LADS) covered a smaller area and using a total budget of £28,000 for the 2004/05 (in addition to which the town account had granted £10,000) the Council appointed consultants to draft a masterplan. LADS were currently being drafted regarding Chilbolton Avenue and Sleepers Hill in Winchester, at Springvale in Kings Worthy, and at Compton Down. With regard to outstanding applications at Chilbolton Avenue, the Director explained that the LADS would be a consideration at planning appeals, especially once adopted.

Development Briefs related to a smaller area again and sought to provide developers with more detailed design guidance. These would tend to be produced by landowners or developers, with input from consultants acting on behalf of the Council. Despite an available budget of £10,000 in 2004/05, no Development Briefs had yet been bought forward. The Director added that because the area they referred to was small, it was likely that they would accompany a planning application rather than be adopted formally as a Supplementary Planning Document.

During discussion, the Director confirmed that the Council had or would be contacting all of the relevant groups to advise on the change of Design Statements' status from Supplementary Planning Guidance to Supplementary Planning Documents. He advised that it was likely that the Statements that were already adopted would require updating and would have to go through a further process of public consultation.

A Member suggested that the encouragement of Design Statements could divide communities between those who were willing to sell their land for development and those who wanted to preserve the character of an area. He added the process of drafting a Design Statement might in itself encourage further development.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

6. **COMMUNITY REVENUE GRANTS 2005/06 – KAYAC AND WINNALL ROCK SCHOOL**

(Report WTF48 refers)

Councillor Pines declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item as the Chairman of the Winnall Rock School and left the room during its consideration.

Councillor de Peyer declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in this item as former Trustee of King Alfred Youth Activity Centre (KAYAC). Councillor de Peyer spoke and voted thereon.

The Forum considered a report that updated Members on the grant conditions relating to the provisional awards made to the KAYAC and the Winnall Rock School. Following debate, the recommendations were agreed as set out.

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet be recommended to approve grant awards of £8,112 to King Alfred Youth Activity Centre and £5,000 to the Winnall Rock School.

2. That Cabinet be advised that the release of these grants should be delegated to the Director of Community Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Healthy and Inclusive Communities, subject to speedy and

satisfactory conclusion of the accommodation discussions between the two organisations.

7. **COMMUNITY GRANTS – CAPITAL AWARDS 2005/06**

(Report WTF46 refers)

During debate, the Director of Community Services explained the work of The Colour Factory and the Lido Sports Association and confirmed that they were compatible with the Council's priorities.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet be recommended to approve:

- (a) The following capital grants for 2005/06 from the Town Charge:
  - i) The Colour Factory £5,000
  - ii) Winchester Lido Sports Association £1,500
- (b) The following capital grant commitment for 2006/07 from the Town Charge:
  - i) The Colour Factory £5,000

8. **COMMUNITY REVENUE AWARDS 2005/06 – WINCHESTER LIVE AT HOME SCHEME**

(Report WTF47 refers)

At the previous meeting of the Forum, held 6 January 2005, Members had requested further information regarding the revenue grant application for the Winchester Live at Home Scheme. The report set out details of the Scheme and during debate the Director of Community Services answered questions on the cost efficiency of the Scheme.

At the conclusion of debate, Members agreed to grant the award but wished to highlight to the Scheme that there was no commitment for funding in future years and that the grant should not replace statutory funding by Social Services. It was therefore agreed that the grant should be dependant on a minimum of £2,500 being secured from Social Services.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet be recommended to approve the level of grant award to the Winchester Live at Home Scheme up to a maximum amount of £5,000 subject to the following conditions:

- a) That the grant is for 2005/06 only with no commitment secured at this stage for funding in future years.
- b) That the organisation, working with the Partnership and External Funding Officer, develop a funding strategy for the next three years.
- c) That the grant award conditional on at least £2,500 of funds being secured from Social Services.

9. **PLAY AREAS PROGRAMME OF IMPROVEMENTS**  
(Oral Report)

The Director of Community Services updated the Forum on the progress of the five-year programme of improvements to the town's play areas. He reported that contractors had been selected to provide the Stanmore Play Areas, following public consultation, and that work on the scheme would commence shortly. He added the revised programme of works would be considered by a future meeting of the Forum and then Cabinet.

The Director also explained the staff establishment regarding play area refurbishment and maintenance and explained that details of the revised structure and responsibilities would be published shortly.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

10. **NOTES OF THE PREVIOUS PUBLIC MEETING, HELD ON 1 FEBRUARY 2005, AIR QUALITY ISSUES IN WINCHESTER**

(WTF45 refers)

11. **RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE AT THE MEETING HELD 2 SEPTEMBER 2004**

(Report WTF49 refers)

The Forum discussed the difficulties of chairing the large public meetings to ensure that all of the public in attendance have an equal opportunity to contribute to the debate. It was therefore suggested:

- that speakers should be deterred from reading long statements (but instead be advised to distribute their statements themselves at the start of the meeting),
- that speakers should be reminded that their statements should be relevant to subject under debate,
- and that a time limit for each speaker should be considered.

It was agreed that the "rules of debate" should be explained by the Chairman at the start of each Public Meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the reports be noted.

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 8.50pm.

Chairman