

CABINET**15 June 2011****Attendance:**

Councillor Beckett -	<i>Leader and Portfolio Holder for Local Economy and Tourism (Chairman) (P)</i>
Councillor Cooper -	<i>Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Communities, Safety and Public Health (P)</i>
Councillor Coates -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Strategic Housing and Landlord Services (P)</i>
Councillor Godfrey -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Administration, Innovation and Improvement (P)</i>
Councillor Humby -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement (P)</i>
Councillor Stallard -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport (P)</i>
Councillor Weston -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport (P)</i>
Councillor Wood -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Finance and Estates (P)</i>

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Collin, Jackson, Learney and Tait

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Hutchison, Mitchell, Scott, Ruffell and Thompson
Mr A Rickman (TACT)

1. MINUTES

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney spoke on behalf of Councillor Evans regarding the previous meeting's appointment of Councillor Cooper as the Council's representative on the North of Fareham Strategic Development Area (SDA) Community Liaison Group. She requested that as the Ward Members for Whiteley, Councillors Evans and Clear be briefed after Liaison Group meetings. Councillor Cooper agreed to undertake this.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19 May 2011, be approved and adopted.

2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There were no questions asked or statements made.

3. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Weston announced that both the City and County Councils had received an award from the Institute of Civil Engineers for the High Street refurbishment and the South Winchester Park and Ride scheme.

Councillor Godfrey welcomed the recent decision of Personnel Committee to approve a scheme for the Council to employ two apprentices to work towards a qualification in Customer Services (Report PER195 refers).

Councillor Beckett reported that he had signed a Portfolio Holder Decision Notice approving the Portfolio Holder Delegations for 2011/12 (PHD348 refers).

4. **SILVER HILL, WINCHESTER – COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER** (Report [CAB2183](#) refers)

Cabinet noted a correction to the Report as there was not an Exempt Appendix C, as stated in the executive summary.

The Chairman stated that confirming the use of Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) gave a clear indication to both affected properties and Henderson Global Investors UK Property Fund (Henderson) of the Council's intention to proceed with the Silver Hill redevelopment scheme.

The Corporate Director (Operations) advised that the Council had the previous day received an appraisal of the scheme undertaken by Henderson which appeared to demonstrate its viability. However, the Council would carry out its own analysis of the appraisal and report back to Cabinet at a future date.

In response to questions, the Corporate Director (Governance) advised that external legal advice indicated that the Full Indemnity Agreement offered broadly the same level of protection to the Council.

One Member requested that a further report be prepared outlining the scheme's milestones and also clarifying the situation regarding CCTV. The Chief Executive advised that the milestones were previously outlined in Report CAB2085, but a further update could be provided. A separate briefing could be provided to Members regarding CCTV.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Tait, Jackson and Learney addressed Cabinet and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Tait raised a number of concerns regarding the intentions and management of Henderson and the ability of the Council to manage the project in-house. He also believed that the current planning permission was not workable and disputed statements in the Report regarding support for the scheme.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Tait for his comments but emphasised that the Report was only concerned with matters relating to the CPO and did not consider wider issues relating to the development agreement.

The Chief Executive advised that the project management of the scheme would not be undertaken by the Council, but by Henderson and, in due course, their development partner. It was not appropriate for the Council to comment on the chosen management of the company. The Corporate Director (Operations) advised that the Council and Henderson were currently nearing the end of an agreed "standstill" period following the acquisition by Henderson. During this period, it was agreed that there would not be high levels of expenditure on publicity and public consultation.

Councillor Jackson requested that the proposed closure of Silver Hill to through traffic should include an exception for cyclists.

The Corporate Director (Operations) responded that this level of detail had not yet been determined. Cabinet agreed that the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport take this request forward for consideration.

Councillor Learney welcomed the proposals as a step forward in the progression of the scheme. However, she expressed concern about the number of details which had yet to be finalised within a relatively short timescale. She also requested that the Council work with Henderson to maximise the sustainability of the scheme, including the provision of a Combined Heat and Power Scheme.

The Corporate Director (Operations) agreed to investigate the current situation regarding the Combined Heat and Power scheme and report back to Members. The planning permission required a Sustainability Strategy to be prepared. He acknowledged that the timescale was tight, but that was due to the desire of Henderson to progress the scheme as soon as possible.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That compulsory purchase powers be used to facilitate the comprehensive redevelopment of the Silver Hill area of central Winchester and the Corporate Director (Governance) be authorised:

(i) To make a Compulsory Purchase Order (the Order) for the Silver Hill development area pursuant to Sections 226(1)(a) and 226(3)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 and Section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (as necessary) for the purpose of acquiring the Order Lands which are shown on the plan attached as Appendix A to the Report;

(ii) To make all amendments or additions to the Order Lands plan to encompass all additional lands or rights which may be required for the scheme including but not limited to any interests which have the benefit of restrictive covenants or easements and rights over the development site, subject to prior consultation with the Leader;

(iii) To advertise the making of the Order and to take all relevant action to facilitate the promotion and confirmation of the Order by the Secretary of State including publication of the Statement of Reasons, the Statement of Case and all necessary evidence in support of the Council's case at any resulting public inquiry. Additionally to appoint any necessary consultants to assist in facilitating the promotion and confirmation of the Order;

(iv) Upon the Order having been confirmed and becoming operative to execute General Vesting Declarations or, at his discretion, to serve Notices to Treat and where necessary Notices of Entry under Sections 5 and 11 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 in respect of land included in the Orders;

(v) To negotiate and agree terms with interested parties for the purchase by agreement or payment of compensation for any of the interests or rights included in the Order and where appropriate to agree relocations;

(vi) To take all necessary steps in relation to compensation issues which are referred to the Tribunals Service, including advising on the appropriate uses and compensation payable and in issuing any appropriate certificate and be further authorised to appoint chartered surveyors jointly with Henderson to assist and advise in this regard.

5. **BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS (BIDS): SECOND BID BALLOT AND RENEWAL ARRANGEMENTS**

(Report [CAB2181](#) refers)

Councillor Beckett declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item as he was the Council's representative on the BID Board. He remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

The Chairman acknowledged the success of both the Segensworth and the Winchester BIDs and emphasised a key principle that the BID levy should not be used to undertake any work that was already covered through pre-existing Council services committed in baseline statements.

The Assistant Director (Economic Prosperity) advised that it was intended to bring a further report on the draft business plans and exact areas for each BID to Cabinet in November 2011.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Learney, Tait and Collin addressed Cabinet and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Learney spoke in support of the Winchester BID, but believed it was too focussed on the requirements of the retail sector and should broaden its approach to a wider variety of businesses and to offer benefits for the public generally. She requested that businesses be advised of the likely areas impacted by the proposed 25% reduction in Council grant to the City Centre Partnership (which hosts the BID company) and also drew attention to the possible effect of the Government's proposals regarding local redistribution of business rates. Finally, she queried whether the BID approach could be adopted by other market towns in the District.

The Chairman stated that the 25% reduction had already been proposed to the BID Board. He believed that the Winchester BID had offered improvements for Winchester in general, and not just the retail sector. Councillor Cooper highlighted the liaison between the BID and the Local Community Safety Partnership. The possibility of the Council encouraging other market towns to adopt the BID process was noted, in addition to the as yet unclear impact of the Localism Bill on business rates.

As Chairman of the Winchester Town Forum, Councillor Collin reiterated the requirement to ensure the Winchester BID also focussed on the non-retail sector. He emphasised the dual role of the Council as both member of the BID and, as local authority, facilitator of the BID process. He queried how the boundaries of the BID area were determined.

The Corporate Director (Governance) advised that the BID itself determined its area boundaries, but the Report to Cabinet in November would give Members the opportunity to comment. The Assistant Director (Economic Prosperity) emphasised that the Winchester BID Director was carrying out one-to-one discussions with businesses in order to ascertain the requirements of different sectors.

Councillor Tait also acknowledged the success of the Winchester BID, but questioned its priorities regarding areas and levels of spending.

The Chairman stated that the BID itself decided on its priorities with its Members through both its Board and a Committee.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the principle of a BID Ballot in 2012 to determine whether there will be a second Segensworth BID be supported.
2. That the Head of Revenues be authorised to make arrangements for Fareham Borough Council to continue to collect the Segensworth BID levy, should the Ballot be successful.
3. That the principle of a BID Ballot in 2012 to determine whether there will be a second Winchester BID be supported.

4. That the principle of reclaiming in full the cost of the Winchester BID levy collection from the Winchester BID company be approved.

5. That the Winchester BID company be informed that, in drawing up the baseline statement for 2012/13, it is recommended that the Winchester City Council grant to the Winchester City Centre Partnership be reduced by 25%.

6. That both BID companies be informed that in the current economic situation it cannot commit to the continuation of the baseline services throughout the life of the BID.

7. That a further report on the draft business plans and exact areas for each BID be brought to Cabinet so it can consider whether to confirm its continued support prior to any BID Ballot.

6. **EQUALITY ACT 2010 UPDATE**
(Report [CAB2186](#) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the overall approach to equality be approved, in addition to the:

- (a) Equality Policy and Action Plan (Appendix 2 of the Report);
- (b) IIA screening process and criteria for use (Appendix 3 of the Report);
- (c) Equality Assessment process (Appendix 4 of the Report);
- (d) Equality Monitoring Policy and Guidance (Appendix 5 of the Report).

2. That all contracts in excess of a *de minimus* level of £100,000 should be automatically subject to a mandatory IIA.

7. **PARTNERSHIP FOR URBAN SOUTH HAMPSHIRE (PUSH): REVISION TO THE PUSH PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT**
(Report [CAB2184](#) refers)

Councillor Godfrey declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item as a County Council employee. He remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

The Chairman stated that PUSH remained an important organisation for the Council to be involved in, in particular as a possible means of attracting Government funds into the area.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney addressed Cabinet and in summary stated that the Liberal Democrat Group supported the aims of PUSH

regarding regenerating economically deprived areas. She emphasised that the organisation should continue to campaign for necessary infrastructure improvements.

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

RESOLVED:

That the revised Partnership Agreement relating to PUSH be approved, as set out in Appendix 1 of the Report.

8. PUBLICATION OF PLANS FOR PLACES AFTER BLUEPRINT
(Report [CAB2177\(LDF\)](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee held 6 June 2011 had been circulated with a supplementary agenda, as detailed below (Report CAB2190 refers). The Committee had recommended a number of changes to the “Plans for Places” document, the details of which were to be agreed by the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) had endorsed the publication of “Plans for Places” at its Planning Committee that week and their final decision would be made at the full Authority meeting the following week.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the results of the economic update, and in particular its potential impact on required housing numbers, would be reported back to the Cabinet (LDF) Committee for decision, along with the consultation results.

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

Councillor Learney emphasised the controversy surrounding decisions on future housing requirements in Winchester Town. In particular, she highlighted comments made by the Chairman at the Committee meeting that the Barton Farm site was likely to be considered, even if the current Cala Homes appeal was dismissed. She agreed with the requirement to carry out further analysis of the housing requirements as soon as possible.

Councillor Collin stated that the Winchester Town Forum had established an informal group to examine the Vision for Winchester with the intention of feeding its findings into the current consultation. He emphasised the aim of encouraging more people to live and work in Winchester.

During discussion, Cabinet noted that the Blueprint process had not resulted in a consensus regarding the future development requirements of Winchester Town and it was hoped that the next stage of consultation could clarify views.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That "Plans for Places, *after Blueprint*", be agreed for publication and a period of public consultation for 6 weeks.
2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement, to make any minor amendments and corrections as necessary, prior to publication, including the minor amendments set out above and the addition of consultation questions.
3. That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Leader, the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement, and the Head of Legal Services to determine any changes necessary to the consultation document, process, or timetable, in light of any comments received from South Downs National Park Authority.

9. **REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2011**

(Report [CAB2178\(LDF\)](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee held 6 June 2011 had been circulated with a supplementary agenda, as detailed below (Report CAB2190 refers).

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Winchester District Local Development Scheme (LDS) 2011 be agreed and submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.
2. That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement, to make any minor amendments and corrections as necessary to the LDS prior to submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.
3. That, subject to no direction to the contrary being received from the Secretary of State, a further report be brought back to Cabinet for a resolution that the Scheme be brought into effect on a date to be specified in the resolution.

10. **MINUTES OF CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE HELD 6 JUNE 2011**
(Report [CAB2190](#) refers)

The above Report 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, due to the need to consider the minutes alongside the two LDF-related Reports outlined above.

Cabinet received the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee held 6 June 2011 (attached as Appendix A to these minutes). It was noted that the recommended minutes had been dealt with under the two items above.

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee held 6 June 2011 be received.

11. **COUNCILLOR AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT CABINET MEETINGS**
(Report [CAB2185](#) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the changes to the Public Participation procedure for Cabinet be agreed, as set out in Paragraph 2 of the Report.

12. **ANNUAL APPOINTMENTS 2011/12 - UPDATE**
(Report [CAB2182](#) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney stated that the Liberal Democrat Group wished to nominate the following Councillors for appointments outlined in the Report:

- West of Waterlooville Forum – Councillor Collin;
- Cycling Champion – Councillor Jackson;
- Winchester District Board of the CPRE – Councillor Clear.

In addition, Councillor Learney emphasised the importance of establishing a group to examine the significance of the treasury management implications of the re-financing of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), either by Cabinet or The Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

In addition to the appointments outlined in the Report, Members noted that Cabinet was requested to appoint a deputy Member to the Joint Environmental

Services Committee with East Hants District Council (Councillors Beckett and Weston appointed as the two representatives at Cabinet on 19 May 2011).

With regard to the possible establishment of Informal Policy Group (Paragraph 2.3 of the Report refers), Councillor Coates proposed that a Housing Strategy Informal Policy Group (IPG) be established to meet on four or five occasions and report back to Cabinet in 12 to 18 months time. Cabinet agreed that, as Portfolio Holder for Strategic Housing and Landlord Services, Councillor Coates be appointed Chairman of this IPG and requested nominations from a further four Councillors (two Liberal Democrat and two Conservative).

Cabinet agreed that issues regarding public health generally were still waiting for further Government clarification of its intentions and therefore agreed that this IPG be deferred.

With regard to the suggestion of establishing a Group to examine HRA issues, Cabinet highlighted that the Cabinet (Housing) Committee would deal with executive matters in this area, and suggested that The Overview and Scrutiny Committee establish an Informal Scrutiny Group.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the following appointments to Cabinet Committees etc be made for the 2011/12 Municipal Year:
 - a) West of Waterlooville Forum – Councillor Coates to replace Councillor Chamberlain (full Membership would be: Councillors Cooper (Chairman), Coates, Clear, Evans, Pearson and Stallard (with deputy to be appointed).
 - b) Cycling Champion – Councillor Jackson (to liaise with the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport);
 - c) Housing Strategy Informal Policy Group: Councillor Coates (Chairman) plus two Liberal Democrat Members and two Conservative Members and appropriate officers (names to be advised).
 - d) That the appointment of a Public Health Informal Policy Group be deferred for reasons outlined above.
 - e) That it be suggested to The Overview and Scrutiny Committee that it establish an Informal Scrutiny Group to undertake a review of the treasury management implications of the re-financing of the HRA.

f) That Councillor Coates be appointed as the deputy representation on the Joint Environment Services Committee with East Hants District Council.

2. That the following appointments to external bodies be made for the 2011/12 Municipal Year (deputies in brackets):

- a) Bishops Waltham Sports Committee – Councillor McLean (Councillor Chamberlain);
- b) South East Employers – Councillors Local Democracy Network – Councillors Gemmell and Huxstep
- c) Winchester District Board of the Campaign to Protect Rural England – Councillor Pearson;
- d) River Harbour Management Committee – (Councillor Cooper - deputy)

13. **NON-DOMESTIC RATES – WRITE OFF OF IRRECOVERABLE DEBTS**
(Report [CAB2180](#) refers)

Cabinet requested that any future write offs be submitted for approval on a more regular basis.

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

RESOLVED:

That approval be given to write off debts as detailed in the Report, amounting to £121,597.42.

14. **ST CLEMENTS SURGERY, WINCHESTER (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**
(Report [CAB2189](#) refers)

The Corporate Director (Operations) expanded on the detail contained in the Report and in particular emphasised that Henderson had no obligation to acquire the option agreement which had previously been agreed by the Council with Thornfield to dispose of Upper Brook Street car park for the purposes of a new surgery. Henderson did not wish to acquire the option agreement and the Report therefore suggested that in the interests of timeliness, the Council appoint architects to undertake the design process and submit a planning application for a new surgery.

The Corporate Director (Operations) advised that Report CAB2183 considered above set out the current situation with regard to the Silver Hill compulsory purchase order (CPO). The current location of St Clements surgery on Tanner Street would be on land subject to CPO and it was therefore necessary that an alternative location was found.

One Member queried whether the Primary Care Trust (PCT) had given a written commitment of its intention to relocate the surgery to the proposed site on Upper Brook Street. Or if this was not possible, a written guarantee that

the PCT would reimburse the Council for monies spent should it then decide to locate the surgery elsewhere. The Corporate Director (Operations) advised that no such written guarantees had been received, although extensive discussions had been held with the PCT, which indicated their support of the proposed approach. He advised that the PCT would not be prepared to give such a formal written undertaking prior to further design work being produced.

The Chief Executive acknowledged the risk highlighted by the Member, but emphasised the risks to the Silver Hill development if an alternative surgery location could not be found and the CPO was consequentially not confirmed. He also added that the relocation of the surgery offered benefits to its patients in terms of an improved building.

In response to questions, the Corporate Director (Operations) confirmed that it was reasonable to expect a displacement of car parking revenue from Upper Brook Street car park to other nearby car parks.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Collin spoke in support of proposals to ensure St Clements Surgery remained in the town centre. He requested that all the car parking for the surgery be situated on site.

The Corporate Director (Operations) advised that achieving maximum reasonable on site car parking provision would form part of the brief to the architects.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That agreement in principle to the use of the Upper Brook Street site as a location for a new surgery building for the St Clements practice be confirmed.
2. That a direction be made under Contract Procedure Rule 2.4 (a) to authorise the Corporate Director (Operations) to appoint Architecture PLB, on the terms set out in the exempt Appendix, to design and submit a planning application for a new surgery building in consultation with the St Clements practice and NHS Hampshire.
3. That a further report be made to Cabinet in due course on the development options for the proposed development of the new surgery.

15. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

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

16. **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>
##	St Clements Surgery, Winchester – exempt appendix) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). (Para 3 Schedule 12A refers)
##	Proposed New Depot, Barfield Close, Winchester)
##	Continued Provision of Microsoft Office)
##	Environment Services Contract – Pest Control & Street Care Teams) 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)

##	Continued Provision of Microsoft Office) Information in respect of) which a claim to legal) professional privilege could) be maintained in legal) proceedings. (Para 5) Schedule 12A refers)
----	--	---

17. **ST CLEMENTS SURGERY, WINCHESTER (EXEMPT APPENDIX)**
(Report CAB2189 refers)

Cabinet considered the content of the exempt appendix which set out the fee proposal for the appointment of Architecture PLB, as set out above.

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

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the exempt appendix be noted.

18. **PROPOSED NEW DEPOT, BARFIELD CLOSE, WINCHESTER**
(Report CAB2172 refers)

The Chairman reported that he would chair a public meeting on 16 June 2011 to address local residents concerns regarding the proposals. However, he emphasised that the above Report sought decisions on the financial aspects of the proposal and a planning application would be considered by the Planning Development Control Committee in due course.

Cabinet considered the above Report which identified progress made with the proposed development of a new Depot on land at Barfield Close, Winchester (detail in exempt minute).

19. **ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CONTRACT – PEST CONTROL AND STREET CARE TEAMS**
(Report PER191 refers)
EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF PERSONNEL COMMITTEE HELD 6 JUNE 2011
(Report CAB2191 refers)

Report CAB2191 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, due to the need to consider the minutes alongside Report PER191.

Cabinet considered Report PER191 in connection with the budget implications of proposed staffing changes (detail in exempt minute).

20. **CONTINUED PROVISION OF MICROSOFT SOFTWARE**
(Report CAB2188 refers)

Under the Council's Constitution Access to Information Procedure Rules (Rule 15.1 – General Exception), this was a key decision which was not included in the Forward Plan. Under this procedure, the Chairman of The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been informed.

Cabinet noted that the Report would be considered by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 20 June 2011.

Cabinet considered the above Report which set out proposals regarding the continued provision of Microsoft software (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 1.50pm

Chairman