

CABINET

19 January 2011

Attendance:

Councillor Learney - *Leader and Portfolio Holder for Transformation and Resources (Chairman) (P)*
Councillor Bell - *Portfolio Holder for High Quality Environment (P)*
Councillor Collin - *Portfolio Holder for Winchester and Surrounds (P)*
Councillor Evans - *Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Rural Areas and Market Towns (P)*
Councillor Hiscock - *Portfolio Holder for Economic Prosperity (P)*
Councillor Thompson *Portfolio Holder for Communities (P)*

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Beckett, Cooper, Godfrey, Higgins and Pearson

Mr A Rickman (TACT)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Coates, Hammerton, Mitchell, Stallard and Tait

Mrs B White (TACT)

1. **MEMBERSHIP OF CABINET COMMITTEES ETC**

The Chairman proposed that an observer from the South Downs National Park Authority be added to the list of standing invitees invited to attend meetings of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee. This was agreed.

RESOLVED:

That an observer from the South Downs National Park Authority be added to the list of standing invitees invited to attend meetings of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meetings held on 24 November and 8 December 2010, less exempt items, be approved and adopted.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr A Rickman, (in his personal capacity rather than on behalf of TACT), drew to Cabinet's attention recent statements by the Secretary of State, Mr Eric Pickles, regarding local authorities being encouraged to reduce car parking charges. He expressed concern about the impact of high car parking charges on local traders and businesses.

The Chairman emphasised that the Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee had recently decided to maintain the majority of car parking charges at the current level (Report CAB2108 below refers). Members had considered the potential impact on traders, but also had regard to traffic management issues, and the requirement to meet the car parking budget shortfall and the impact of the VAT rise.

4. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Learney reported on a recent positive meeting with the Leader of the County Council, where they had discussed proposals for better use of public buildings and future grants to local charitable organisations. In addition, she had highlighted the City Council's concerns regarding the proposed later start time for concessionary travel subsidies, in addition to concerns regarding pavement clearance and the late arrival of roadside grit bins.

5. **GENERAL FUND BUDGET 2011/12 – PROGRESS REPORT**

(Report [CAB2111](#) refers)

The Chairman drew Members' attention to the changes in the budget position since the last update report in November 2010 (Report CAB2078 refers), as outlined in the above Report. The current forecast identified a budget gap of £1.7 million. However, it was anticipated that savings proposals already under consideration would address this and enable a balanced budget to be achieved for 2011/12.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Godfrey and Cooper addressed Cabinet and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Godfrey expressed disappointment that the Report did not contain sufficient detail to enable Principal Scrutiny Committee to give it proper consideration; he requested that further information be provided for their meeting on 24 January 2011. In particular, he queried the progress towards achieving savings in the current year through the recently agreed organisational changes. In addition, he asked if a decision had been made about whether the Council would be collecting green waste in future years and on the level of Members' Allowances.

The Chairman noted comments regarding the desirability of collecting green waste and advised that a decision would be made as budget discussions were progressed. The decision on Members' Allowances was considered under a separate agenda item (Report CAB2106 below refers).

The Head of Finance advised that, following the first two phases of organisational development and other savings identified, the revised estimate for the current financial year indicated that the budget would be balanced. In addition, the organisational changes were estimated to exceed savings targets in annual recurring terms in the next financial year.

The Head of Finance explained that the Report provided a progress update which followed directly from the more detailed explanations outlined in the previous report CAB2078. This previous Report had been submitted to Principal Scrutiny Committee, the Scrutiny Panels and other bodies listed for their comments, and these comments were summarised in the above Report. The Chief Executive suggested that Principal Scrutiny Committee refer to CAB2078 at their meeting.

Councillor Cooper raised concerns that the comments of Social Issues Scrutiny Panel had not been fully reported in the minute extract contained in the Report. In particular, he believed that the Panel had expressed concerns regarding the proposals for the whole Community Safety Team, including the Community Safety Manager. In addition, he requested further information as soon as possible, about the proposals to replace the current grants system with the commissioning process and how this new process would be scrutinised.

The Chairman advised that the Council was working closely with Winchester Area Community Action (WACA) and the County Council regarding future proposed changes to funding for voluntary organisations. The current financial situation meant that it was necessary for the Council to take a more outcome focussed approach to decisions on which organisations it could fund.

The Chief Executive advised that more detail on the commissioning process would be brought forward, which could include consideration of the involvement of scrutiny.

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

RESOLVED:

That the update on the forecast budget position be noted and the results of consultations be considered as part of the deliberations on the budget.

6. **HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION - STANMORE**
(Report [CAB2093](#) refers)

Councillor Thompson emphasised that Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) were not only occupied by students, and the numbers of other people seeking to live in such accommodation was likely to increase following the Government's proposed changes in Housing Benefit entitlement. The Report

set out proposals for the first step in addressing the various problems highlighted in connection with HMOs.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Godfrey and Higgins addressed Cabinet and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Godfrey in general welcomed the proposals for consultation. However, he believed that the problems highlighted were largely caused by the behaviour of tenants and therefore the licensing of HMOs would not address this, but would add an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy on landlords. He considered that the Council already had adequate powers to address anti-social behaviour etc.

Councillor Thompson responded that the proposals had been requested by Stanmore residents through the community plan process, to address the increasing numbers of HMOs in the area. The proposals were intended to ensure accommodation provided was of an acceptable standard, and not just to address anti-social behaviour problems.

Councillor Higgins emphasised that the Winchester Town Forum had requested that licensing of HMOs be investigated and progressed throughout the town area. In particular, he highlighted the large numbers of HMOs in the Winnall and Highcliffe areas. He also believed that the numbers of people living in HMOs would increase following proposed changes in Housing Benefit entitlement.

Cabinet noted Councillor Higgins's comments and requested that a further Report be submitted to Cabinet to monitor the effect of a licensing scheme, if it was decided following consultation to introduce one in Stanmore. Cabinet also agreed that the decision as to whether a licensing scheme be introduced should be referred to Cabinet.

The Chairman advised that the possibility of using an Article 4 Direction to require planning permission for new HMOs had been examined carefully. However, this alternative was rejected for a number of reasons, including the fact that it would not deal with existing HMOs, the 12 month notification period could lead to a surge in numbers in advance of the scheme taking effect and, once permission was granted, it would not give the Council power to inspect properties to assess standards.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the action being taken in respect of parking, community development and noise nuisance be noted.

2. That consultation be undertaken in relation to an Additional Licensing Scheme for Houses in Multiple Occupation in the Stanmore neighbourhood.

3. That this project be prioritised and the 1Team secondment process be used to identify officer time required and a growth bid of £5,000 be considered as part of the budget process to cover the other consultation costs.

4. That a report on the outcome of the consultation be submitted to a future Cabinet for decision and that, if a decision is made to introduce a Licensing Scheme in Stanmore, Cabinet receive a further Report monitoring its progress to ascertain whether the Scheme should be extended to other areas in due course.

7. **MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES – REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL**
(Report [CAB2106](#) refers)

The Corporate Director (Governance) outlined the proposals of the Independent Remuneration Panel, as contained within the Report.

The Chairman advised that it was not appropriate for Members' Allowances to be increased at a time when Council services were facing efficiency measures and employees were expecting a pay freeze, in addition to uncertainties regarding organisational changes. However, the Panel's recommendations regarding other changes to Allowances entitlement were broadly supported. The extension of travel allowances payments to Shadow Cabinet Members attending Cabinet meetings was also supported, and the Chairman proposed this be extended to Group Leaders. This was agreed.

The Chairman added that it was not proposed to extend membership of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) to Members at the current time, due to financial constraints. In addition, she considered that it was now appropriate for Members to pay for their own Broadband provision, although the Council would continue to offer technical support.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Beckett thanked the Panel for their Report but agreed that an increase in Members' Allowances was not appropriate in the current financial climate. He advised that the Opposition Group might propose further reductions in the allowance level directly to Council. In addition, he did not consider the extension of the LGPS to Councillors was an appropriate measure.

One Member queried how the proposed changes in Scrutiny arrangements (as outlined in Report 2107 below) would be dealt with in terms of possible consequential changes to Members' Allowances. The Corporate Director (Governance) advised that, if significant changes in Members' responsibilities were agreed, the Remuneration Panel would have to be reconvened in 2011/12 to consider the impact on levels of allowances.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL BE THANKED FOR ITS WORK IN PRODUCING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDING THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF ALLOWANCES TO REFLECT THE WORK UNDERTAKEN BY MEMBERS.

2. THAT BECAUSE OF THE CURRENT FINANCIAL SITUATION, THE COUNCIL SHOULD NOT ACCEPT THE PANEL'S RECOMMENDATION TO GENERALLY REVERT TO THE HIGHER ALLOWANCE LEVELS IN THE 2009/10 SCHEME, BEFORE THE COUNCIL MADE A REDUCTION OF 5 % IN 2010/11. ON THIS BASIS THE ALLOWANCE RATES SHOULD GENERALLY BE BASED ON THE 2010/11 RATES, WITH NO USE OF THE NJC INDEX FOR AN INFLATION INCREASE IN 2011/12.

3. THAT THE INDIVIDUAL ALLOWANCES FOR 2011/12 BE AS SET OUT BELOW:

(I) THAT THE BASIC ALLOWANCE FROM 2011/12 BE PAYABLE AT £5,580.

(II) THAT THE SRA FOR LEADER FROM 2011/12 BE PAYABLE AT £16,734 (BAND 1).

(III) THAT THE SRA FOR THE DEPUTY LEADER WITH PORTFOLIO FROM 2011/12 BE PAYABLE AT £9,129 (BAND 2).

(IV) THAT THE SRA FOR THE DEPUTY LEADER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO (SHOULD THE POST RE-EMERGE) FROM 2011/12 BE PAYABLE AT £7,605 (BAND 3).

(V) THAT THE SRA FOR THE CABINET MEMBERS WITH PORTFOLIO FROM 2011/12 BE PAYABLE AT £7,605 (BAND 3).

(VI) THAT THE SRA FOR THE FOLLOWING CHAIRMANSHIPS BE PAYABLE FROM 2011/12 AT £7,605 (BAND 3):

A) CHAIRMAN OF PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

B) CHAIRMAN OF PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

C) LEADER OF PRINCIPAL OPPOSITION GROUP

(VII) THAT THE SRA FOR THE FOLLOWING CHAIRMANSHIPS BE PAYABLE FROM 2011/12 AT £3,042 (BAND 4)

- A) CHAIRMAN OF PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**
- B) CHAIRMAN OF LICENSING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE**

(VIII) THAT THE SRA FOR THE FOLLOWING BE PAYABLE FROM 2011/12 AT £2,280 (BAND 5)

- A) CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL**
- B) OTHER OPPOSITION GROUP LEADERS**
- C) CHAIRMAN OF SCRUTINY PANELS**
- D) VICE CHAIRMAN PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE**

(IX) THAT FOR ANY 'OTHER OPPOSITION GROUP LEADER' TO QUALIFY FOR AN SRA (BAND 5) THE GROUP MUST HAVE AT LEAST FIVE MEMBERS.

(X) THAT THE SRA FOR THE FOLLOWING BE PAYABLE FROM 2011/12 AT £1,521 (BAND 6)

- A) CHAIRMAN OF WINCHESTER TOWN FORUM**
- B) CHAIRMEN OF TASK & FINISH &/OR AD HOC WORKING GROUPS/PANELS WITH SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**
- C) GROUP MANAGERS**

(XI) THAT FOR A 'GROUP MANAGER' TO QUALIFY FOR AN SRA (BAND 6) THE GROUP MUST HAVE AT LEAST 19 MEMBERS.

(XII) THAT A SRA BE NOT PAID TO THE ORDINARY MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE.

2. THAT THE LEVEL OF THE ORDINARY CO-OPTEE'S ALLOWANCES FOR 2011/12 SHOULD BE £240 AND FOR THE CHAIRMAN OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE AT A RATE EQUIVALENT TO BAND 4 - £3,042.

(XIII) THAT THE COUNCIL CONTINUE TO PAY THE HMRC MILEAGE RATES FOR THE MILEAGE ALLOWANCES AND

CONTINUE TO BE "SUBJECT TO MOST EFFECTIVE MODE OF TRANSPORT FOR REASONABLE NEEDS OF MEMBER".

(XIV) THAT THE SCOPE AND LEVELS OF OTHER TRAVEL ALLOWANCES AND REIMBURSEMENT SHOULD REMAIN UNCHANGED.

(XV) THAT THE TRAVEL ALLOWANCES' SCHEME BE MAINTAINED FOR MEMBERS ATTENDING APPROVED DUTIES WITHIN THE CITY COUNCIL AREA AND THAT IT BE EXTENDED TO INCLUDE SHADOW CABINET MEMBERS (PRINCIPAL OPPOSITION GROUP) AND OTHER GROUP LEADERS (OF A GROUP OF AT LEAST TWO MEMBERS) WHEN THEY ARE ATTENDING CABINET MEETINGS AND WHEN ATTENDING INTERNAL MEETINGS WHEN INVITED BY A MEMBER OF CMT OR A HEAD OF TEAM.

(XVI) THAT THE SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE FOR ATTENDING APPROVED DUTIES WITHIN THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT BE ABOLISHED.

(XVII) THAT SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES AND REIMBURSEMENTS SHOULD REMAIN AT THE 2010/11 RATES BUT OTHERWISE REMAIN UNCHANGED FOR MEMBERS ATTENDING APPROVED DUTIES OUTSIDE THE AUTHORITY'S AREA.

(XVIII) THAT THERE BE NO CHANGES TO THE SCOPE OF THE DEPENDANTS' CARERS ALLOWANCE (DCA) BUT THAT THE MAXIMUM RATE FOR 2011/12 BE £8.08 (THE SAME AS FOR 2010/11).

(XIX) THAT THE PANEL'S RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THE COUNCIL RETAIN THE RIGHT TO DETERMINE IF MEMBERS CAN JOIN THE LGPS BE NOT AGREED AT THIS TIME, DUE TO THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION.

(XX) THAT THE FOLLOWING INDICES BE USED FOR INDEXATION PURPOSES FOR THE ALLOWANCES SCHEME:

- A) THE BASIC AND SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCES, CO-OPTEE'S ALLOWANCES, DEPENDANT CARERS ALLOWANCE AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES BE INDEXED TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT STAFF ANNUAL PERCENTAGE INCREASE, AS AGREED BY THE NATIONAL JOINT COUNCILS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT STAFF SERVICE.
- B) TRAVEL ALLOWANCES - INDEXED TO THE HMRC RATES.

C) IN VIEW OF THE EMPLOYERS' STATED POSITION THAT THERE WILL BE NO STAFF PAY INCREASE FOR 2010/11 AND 2011/12, THE NJC INDEX SHOULD NOT BE APPLIED FOR THE 2011/12 MUNICIPAL YEAR.

(XXI) THAT, IN THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION AND HAVING REGARD TO THE FACT THAT PERSONAL BROADBAND USE IS NOW WIDESPREAD, THE COUNCIL'S PROCESSES FOR REIMBURSING CLAIMS FOR BROADBAND PROVISION ON A CASE-BY-CASE BE DISCONTINUED FROM THE 2011/12 MUNICIPAL YEAR, ALTHOUGH TECHNICAL IT SUPPORT WILL CONTINUE TO BE PROVIDED.

(XXII) THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL WITH REGARD TO NON PAYMENT OF THE PARISH BASIC ALLOWANCE AND ADMINISTRATION OF A PARISH MEMBERS TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES, BE NOTED.

3. THAT THE BASE BUDGET FOR MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES FOR 2011/12 ONWARDS BE REDUCED BY £6,000 TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE DISCONTINUANCE OF EXPENSES CLAIMS FOR BROADBAND PROVISION.

RESOLVED:

That a report be submitted direct to Council which sets out the full Members Allowances Scheme for approval, incorporating all decisions arising from the above.

8. REVIEW OF COUNCIL OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS
(Report [CAB2107](#) refers)

Under the Council's Constitution Access to Information Procedure Rules (Rule 15.1 – General Exception), this was a key decision which was included in the Forward Plan for a later meeting. Under this procedure, the Chairman of Principal Scrutiny Committee had been informed. It had been possible to bring the Report forward to enable all Members to have an earlier input into its proposals, prior to the formal changes being considered by Council in April 2011.

The Chief Executive emphasised that the changes were proposed in order to improve the Council's scrutiny arrangements and not in order to achieve savings. It was anticipated that the overall number of scrutiny type meetings would remain broadly the same. The aim would be to agree a programme of Informal Scrutiny Group meetings at the start of the Municipal Year, although the potential to set up additional Groups to consider emerging issues would be retained.

The Chairman thanked the Council's Improvement, Partnerships and Scrutiny Manager for her work in contributing to the proposals.

During the public participation period, Mr A Rickman (TACT) addressed Cabinet and expressed disappointment that TACT had not been consulted on the Report's proposals prior to its publication.

The Chief Executive explained that the Report set out proposals for discussion with Members and it was open to TACT to submit their comments prior to proposals being formally adopted by Council. In addition, he emphasised that one of the aims of the proposals was to increase the involvement of TACT, particularly through the suggested Cabinet (Housing) Committee.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Godfrey, Pearson and Higgins addressed Cabinet and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Godfrey generally supported the proposals, in particular the focus on undertaking scrutiny through Informal Scrutiny Groups (ISGs). However, he emphasised that it was important that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had responsibility and control over its own agenda, and that this was not dictated by Cabinet or officers. He also thought that the number of Committee meetings proposed might not be sufficient for it to fulfil its role adequately and raised concern about the level of administrative support available to service ISGs.

The Chief Executive acknowledged that it was important for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to have responsibility for setting its own agenda, although he highlighted this would inevitably be influenced by proposed Cabinet decisions. The Corporate Director (Governance) explained that both the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Audit Committee would be appointed along political balance lines. Careful consideration would be given as to whether it was appropriate for individual ISGs to have administrative support from within the Democratic Services Team, or from within the relevant Council Team, depending on the subject matter.

Councillor Pearson also generally welcomed the proposals, although he expressed some concern about the increase in workload for Cabinet Members. He also queried whether membership of ISGs could only include those Members from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee? He also pointed out that whilst the appendix included a summary of advantages/disadvantages compared to the old system, a similar analysis was not included for the new proposals.

The Chairman advised that membership of ISGs would not be restricted to membership of Overview and Scrutiny Committee and it was anticipated vacancies would be advertised through the Group Leader system. The formal membership of Cabinet Committees would have to be restricted to Cabinet members only, although it was anticipated other named Members would be invited to participate in meetings, similar to the arrangements currently adopted by the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee.

Councillor Higgins believed that the proposals would necessitate an increase in the size of Committees. He also considered that the current number of ISGs was underestimated in the Report and requested that these meetings continue to be publicised to all Councillors once established. He requested that members of Cabinet Committees be nominated on a permanent basis to enable continuity.

The Chairman noted the comments regarding the size of committees, but emphasised that it was important that committees were not too large, as this had implications for facilitating proper debate at meetings. She anticipated that the Informal Cabinet Policy Panels would be led by the relevant Portfolio Holder, with other Member nominations made through the Group Leaders, as before.

The Chief Executive acknowledged that it was important that the establishment of ISGs was advertised to all Members. In addition, he confirmed that guidelines about the number of ISGs operating at any one time would be considered.

One Member queried how scrutiny of Community Safety would be dealt with, as this was a statutory requirement. The Corporate Director (Governance) explained that it was proposed that all such scrutiny functions, including scrutiny of Council partnership arrangements, would be undertaken initially by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It would then be for that Committee to decide whether it would be appropriate to establish an ISG to undertake scrutiny and review in more depth.

In general, Cabinet noted that the exact details of the proposals were not set out at this stage, but could be developed following discussions outlined above and at Principal Scrutiny Committee.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the proposed new approach for the Council's Overview and Scrutiny arrangements as set out in the Report be supported.
2. That a further report be prepared to take account of the recommendations from Cabinet and Principal Scrutiny Committee with relevant changes to the Council's Constitution for consideration by Council in April 2011.

9. **ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CONTRACT – STAGE 2 INTER AUTHORITY AGREEMENT**

(Report [CAB2082](#) 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. Under this procedure, the Chairman of Principal Scrutiny Committee had been informed. In addition, Cabinet noted that the Report would also be considered by Principal Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 24 January 2011.

The Chairman emphasised the positive working relationship between the Council and East Hampshire District Council, which had enabled the proposed contract arrangements to be agreed.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That delegated authority be given to the Head of Legal Services to agree the detailed wording and enter into Stage 2 of the Inter Authority Agreement, in accordance with the principles set out in the Report.
2. That the cost allocation principles in Appendix 1 of the Report be agreed.
3. That the inclusion of sewage treatment maintenance works within the services delivered by the in-house Streetcare team be approved.
4. That details of the establishment of the client team and establishment of the in house Streetcare team be included within the proposed report to Personnel Committee on 28 February 2011 on the proposed Phase 3 organisational development.

10. **MINUTES OF CABINET (TRAFFIC & PARKING) COMMITTEE HELD 1 DECEMBER 2010**

(Report [CAB2108](#) refers)

Cabinet received the minutes of the Cabinet (Traffic & Parking) Committee held 1 December 2010 (attached as Appendix A to these minutes).

RESOLVED:

- That the minutes of the Cabinet (Traffic & Parking) Committee held 1 December 2010 be received.

11. **MINUTES OF CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE HELD 6 DECEMBER 2010**
(Report [CAB2109](#) refers)

Cabinet received the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee held 6 December 2010 (attached as Appendix B to these minutes). It was noted that item 3 – Local Development Framework Update – had already been considered by Council at its meeting on 12 January 2011.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee held 6 December 2010 be received.

12. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Forward Plan for January 2011, be noted.

13. **DECISIONS TAKEN BY PORTFOLIO HOLDERS UNDER THEIR DELEGATED POWERS**

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken by Portfolio Holders under their delegated powers since the last Cabinet meeting, as set out on the agenda sheet, be noted.

14. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

1. That in all the circumstances, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

2. 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>
##	Exempt minutes of the previous meeting) Information relating to the) financial or business affairs) of any particular person) (including the authority) holding that information).) (Para 3 Schedule 12A refers))) Information in respect of) which a claim to legal) professional privilege could) be maintained in legal) proceedings. (Para 5) Schedule 12A refers)
##	Tourism Service: Collaborative Working with Hampshire County Council) Information relating to any) individual. (Para 1 Schedule) 12A refers))) Information which is likely to) reveal the identity of an) individual. (Para 2 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 4 Schedule 12A refers)

15. **EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minutes of the previous meetings held on 24 November 2010 and 8 December 2010 be approved and adopted.

16. **TOURISM SERVICE: COLLABORATIVE WORKING WITH HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**
(Report CAB2113 refers)

Councillor Evans declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item as she was the Council's elected representative on the Management Board of Tourism South East. Councillor Collin also declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as he was also a County Councillor. Both Councillors remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

Cabinet considered the above Report which set out proposals for collaborative working between the City Council and County Council on the Tourism Service (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 11.50am

Chairman