

**CABINET****9 November 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</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 Evans, Hiscock, Hutchison, Learney and Thompson  
Mr A Rickman (TACT)

**Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:**

Councillors Banister, Mitchell and Tait

---

**1. MEMBERSHIP OF CABINET COMMITTEES ETC**

Cabinet agreed to replace Councillor Cooper as deputy in place of Councillor Coates on the Project Integra Management Board.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans requested that the Liberal Democrat Group should be able to appoint a deputy standing invitee on the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee, should one of their nominated representatives be unable to attend.

The Chairman agreed that this was acceptable in principle and that the name of the Member appointed be reported to the Corporate Director (Governance) in due course.

**RESOLVED:**

That the following changes to Cabinet Committees be agreed:

- (i) That Councillor Cooper replace Councillor Coates as deputy on the Project Integra Management Board.
- (ii) That the Liberal Democrat Group appoint a deputy member standing invitee for the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee, should one of their nominated representatives be unable to attend (name to be advised).

## 2. **MINUTES**

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans referred to representation from Frau A Reinewald (Chairman of the German Giessen/Winchester twinning society). Councillor Evans emphasised the significance of the forthcoming fiftieth anniversary of the twinning society in 2012, and that should Mayor of Giessen wish to attend celebrations in Winchester, the City should return the same hospitality that Giessen had previously shown to Winchester's mayors.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Evans for her comments and advised that he would discuss arrangements for appropriate celebrations with Councillor Johnston.

### RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 October 2011 less exempt items, be approved and adopted.

## 3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Chairman noted that Mr M Slinn had registered to speak under Report CAB2240 and his comments are summarised under the relevant agenda item below.

## 4. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Stallard referred to the announcement on 7 November 2011 that the 2012 Olympic Torch relay would be passing through Winchester on 11 July 2012. The Mayor had also recently met with the nominated torch bearers and Councillor Stallard emphasised the honour for Winchester and its residents from this occasion.

Councillor Cooper reported that details were soon to be published of a Christmas initiative arranged by the Winchester Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership.

5. **CHANGE PLANS 2012/13: CONSULTATION DRAFT**  
(Report [CAB2249](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report would also be considered by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 14 November 2011.

The Chairman highlighted that the draft Change Plans, as set out at in the appendices to the Report, were intended for consultation with members of The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and also with key stakeholders. The content of the draft Plans acknowledged the Council's challenging position with regard to its budget.

Councillor Wood emphasised that Cabinet would not be in a position to make budget commitments arising from actions proposed within the Plans until such time that the Council's overall budget position was clearer. It was therefore agreed that the Council's eventual adoption of the Plans in January 2012 be subject to a rider to this effect.

With regard to representation from other Councillors on the draft Change Plans, the Chairman advised that such contributions would be addressed as part of the overall evaluation of responses at the conclusion of the consultation exercise.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson referred to the draft Active Communities Change Plan and drew several matters to the attention of Cabinet.

- In addition to the Council's priority areas of Stanmore, Highcliffe and Winnall there should be more general regard to pockets of deprivation within the rural areas, including at Wickham.
- The Theme 2 Outcome should include a challenging target for the number of new affordable dwellings to be built. She was pleased that there was recognition that it would be possible to build Council Houses in the future. The use of General Fund land for their construction (as well as Housing Revenue Account sites) should also specifically be considered.
- Theme 2 also referred to the development of a shared service approach with other Local Authorities. What additional shared services were proposed at this time?
- With regard to the Theme 3 expected Outcome, what arrangements were in place to notify residents and to involve local Councillors of the mapping exercise referred to?

The Chairman noted Councillor Thompson's comments and advised that the Council continued to deliver initiatives to improve the lives of residents throughout the District, and especially within its priority areas. He also confirmed that changes to the funding of the Housing Revenue Account were

likely to eventually bring forward increased opportunities for the Council to build new affordable homes, including Council Houses. The Chairman also reported that he continued to work closely with the Leaders of neighbouring Councils to explore potential new shared services, especially where these afforded greater efficiencies and savings and were likely to ensure the maintenance of services to residents in light of budget constraints.

The Chief Executive advised that the Change Plans were 'forward looking' documents and he gave assurances that officers would engage with Ward Councillors with regard to initiatives referred to wherever appropriate.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans also referred to the draft Active Communities Change Plan and drew several matters to the attention of Cabinet.

- Councillor Evans supported Councillor Thompson's reference to Wickham requiring the Council's special focus due to indications of pockets of deprivation in that area.
- The development of Neighbourhood Plans was important and the Council should encourage as many parish councils as possible to undertake this work, including providing them with the necessary support.

In response, Councillor Evans was advised that Denmead Parish Council was being provided support from the Council (utilising CLG funding) to develop its Neighbourhood Plan and that other parish councils would eventually be encouraged to learn from the experience of this pilot project to compile their own plans.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney raised some general points with regard to the draft Change Plans and drew several matters to the attention of Cabinet.

- Were the draft Change Plans as set out the preliminary view of the Administration?
- For the key priorities within the Plans to be subject to proper scrutiny, they should ideally be supported by specific budget allocations.
- With the addition of the Portfolio Plans referred to within the Report, Councillor Learney was concerned about a proliferation of Plans. She also referred to the potential for confusion as to which portfolio holder was accountable for each of the outcomes and programmes of work.

In response, the Chief Executive explained that the Change Plans would remain as 'high level' documents for approval by full Council as the framework for Cabinet to deliver. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee would scrutinise the progress to deliver each of these outcomes. The specific programmes of

work to achieve these outcomes would be monitored by portfolio holders, who would utilise the Council's performance management system, Covalent.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hiscock referred to the Economic Prosperity draft Change Plan and drew several matters to the attention of Cabinet.

- A business park at Bushfield Camp would be likely to detract from the business area already in existence in the central town area.
- Ward Councillors and residents should be engaged with any economic planning process for the Town area that might be proposed.
- With regard to the roll out of High Speed Broadband across Hampshire, the Council should ensure cooperation with all relevant Councils.
- The encouragement of improved public transport in rural areas was central to the development of a thriving rural economy.
- There should be more 'hard targets' within the Plan as opposed to the more general programmes of work as set out.

Responding, the Chairman advised that it was intended that consultation on draft Change Plans would assist with delivering hard targets within the documents. These finalised documents would then be recommended to Council for adoption.

The Corporate Director (Operations) referred to the work still to be done with regard to the emerging Core Strategy and that this was likely to inform any Area Action Plans for the town area.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hutchison referred to the High Quality Environment Change Plan and drew several matters to the attention of Cabinet.

- The Waste Minimisation Plan (Theme 6) should be within the top three priorities within the overall Plan.
- The District's reduction of carbon emissions should be presented in terms of wider benefits within communities, i.e. healthy lifestyles, warmer homes and saving money.
- There should be an overall strategy with regard to reducing the District's carbon emissions, which would be inclusive of initiatives to harness future Government funding streams.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Hutchison for his comments and advised that they would be considered with all the responses to the consultation on the draft Plan.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Draft Change Plans for 2012/13 attached as the four Appendices to the report be approved as a basis for consultation with key stakeholder groups.
2. That the proposal to produce more detailed Portfolio Plans for approval through the Portfolio Holder Decision Notice procedure by the end of March 2012 be approved.
3. That Council be asked to adopt the Change Plans, and a further report be made direct to Council taking account of comments made during consultation, in January 2012.
4. That it be noted that approval of Change Plans by Council on 5 January 2012 would be subject to any changes arising from the consideration of the Council's budget for 2012/13 at its meeting on 23 February 2012.

6. **CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2012/13 TO 2014/15 – GENERAL FUND BUDGET REQUIREMENTS**

(Report [CAB2251](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report would also be considered by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 14 November 2011.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney highlighted that without additional information, it was unclear how some items were intended to be financed, which were of greater priority and also what revenue impact there might be from the proposed capital expenditure. Without this information, it was difficult to make informed comments on the initial proposals. Councillor Learney also drew attention to apparent commitment within the programme with regard to kerbside glass recycling, an initiative originally proposed by the previous Liberal Democrat Administration.

In response, the Chairman advised that kerbside glass recycling was previously postponed, and so a provision remained within the Programme. Whether a commitment to this could be afforded would depend on its prioritisation amongst other items within the Programme.

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

RESOLVED:

That the initial Capital Budget requirements be confirmed, in the context of the Winchester District Sustainable Community Strategy and

the emerging Change Plans, as the basis for consultation as part of the Budget deliberations.

7. **POOLING OF HOUSING CAPITAL RECEIPTS**

(Report [CAB2246](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report would also be considered by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 14 November 2011.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Rickman (TACT) made reference to the current budget pressures on the Housing Revenue Account and that he hoped that the reform of Housing Finance would help improve this situation. Mr Rickman emphasised that TACT believed that 100% of the capital receipt from previous asset sales should be retained by the Council and be utilised to benefit tenants. The recent clarification of the rules by DCLG was disappointing and its impact would be felt by tenants for some time. Finally, Mr Rickman advised that he would be retiring after the next TACT AGM.

The Chairman thanked Mr Rickman for his comments and on behalf of the Cabinet, also thanked him for his considerable contribution with regard to council housing matters over the years.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson expressed disappointment at the requirement to make the payment to the DCLG, because of the adverse impact upon the Council's ability to make further investment in affordable housing. Councillor Thompson reminded Members that the Liberal Democrat group had not supported the policy to sell standard Council family homes in estate areas. Councillor Thompson also advised that she supported the retention of the Council owned hostel accommodation at Sussex Street and Barnes House due to an increase in homeless clients at this time.

In response, the Chairman advised that he shared Councillor Thompson's disappointment at the outcome of the DCLG's decision, and confirmed that Cabinet would only support future disposals that would allow 100% retention of the capital receipt.

The Head of Landlord Services confirmed that all the eight properties sold that were subject to the pooling requirement were either non standard estate homes, or were houses where the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) was unable to sustain the necessary repairs required to bring them to the required standard. In addition, 43 new affordable homes had been constructed that could be directly attributed to the funds generated by sales policy.

Responding to a question from a Member, the Corporate Director (Governance) clarified that informal discussions had previously taken place in 2006 with the DCLG and with the auditor with regard to the proposed use of the capital receipts from the sales policy. However, discussions at that time had focused on the permissible use of such receipts and not the issue which had now arisen.

The Head of Landlord Services confirmed that a number of houses that required repairs costing in excess of the policy threshold had been retained rather than being sold each year – as each case was considered on its individual merits.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That it be noted that the Head of Finance is now required to make payment to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) of £1,635,280, plus interest in accordance with the revised pooling returns which have been submitted to the external auditor and as reflected in the approved Statement of Accounts.

2. That the reduced availability of capital receipts be taken into account in the revised Capital Programme 2011/12 to 2014/15 as follows:

- (a) £817,640 - 50% General Fund – Affordable housing/regeneration
- (b) £817,640 - 50% Housing Revenue Account (HRA) – Re-investment in stock condition.

3. That should any further sales be progressed under the vacant HRA sales policy, to ensure that the Council can retain 100% of the capital receipt:

- (a) such sales should be made only to builders/developers who covenant to carry out substantial works of repair, improvement or conversion required prior to onward sale into owner/occupation by an individual who intends to use it as their only or principal home.
- (b) additional categories of purchasers be also considered if the Government's proposals to add additional categories where 100% of the receipt can be retained, as referred to in Report CAB2247, are implemented.

4. That the advice of Leading Counsel that Barnes House and 84-88 Sussex Street could be sold under the existing Regulations, subject to the condition outlined in Recommendation 3(a) above, be noted.

5. That in view of the current increase in need for additional homelessness accommodation, the Head of Landlord Services be authorised to delay the disposal of Barnes House and 84-88 Sussex Street until 2012/13.



6. That a report on the increasing pressures on the Homelessness service be brought to Cabinet in December, including an options appraisal of utilising the above properties as temporary homeless accommodation at least for the next twelve months.

7. That the previous decision to dispose of 41a St Catherines Road (CAB2095 refers) be rescinded and that this property continue to be used as temporary homeless accommodation until further notice.

8. That it be agreed that the vacant HRA sales policy be reviewed in due course following the implementation of the Government's Housing Refinancing proposals – as the policy had been adopted as an interim measure pending implementation of the refinancing measures for the HRA.

9. That all Members of Council be advised of Cabinet's response to this report, as set out above.

8. **STREAMLINING COUNCIL HOUSING ASSET MANAGEMENT:  
DISPOSALS AND RECEIPTS – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION PAPER**  
(Report [CAB2247](#) refers)

The Head of Landlord Services apologised that the Council's responses to the consultation questions 9 and 10 were omitted from the Report. However, it was explained that these questions related to the consultation paper proposing no change to the existing Leasehold legislation, which was acceptable to the Council. It was also confirmed that the proposed changes to the regulations would be over the longer term and would therefore influence the new financing regime of the HRA.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson advised that the Liberal Democrat Group supported the Council's proposed responses to the consultation paper as set out and requested that the Council do all that it could to ensure that it was able to retain 100% of the receipt from non right-to-buy sales.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the Head of Landlord Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Housing and Landlord Services, be authorised to respond directly to the consultation paper in accordance with the draft responses as set out above and in the Report.

9. **GENERAL FUND BUDGET CONSULTATION 2012/13**  
(Report [CAB2250](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report would also be considered by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 14 November 2011.

Councillor Wood introduced the Report and confirmed that there remained uncertainty with regard to the Council's allocation of formula grant from the Government.

In response to questions, the Corporate Director (Governance) clarified that any forthcoming changes to the Member's Allowances scheme as a result of the Independent Remuneration Panel's current review were a matter for the whole Council, and were not likely to be significant. The changes were likely to be related to the Council's changes to the scrutiny arrangements and adoption of the strong Leader model which had taken place since the Independent Remuneration Panel's comprehensive review of Member's allowances in 2010. He reminded Members that the Council had previously agreed to a general 5% reduction to the Panel's recommended allowances. If Council was minded to make any budget reductions due to the current economic situation, then it should have regard to the relativities between allowance rates previously recommended by the Independent Remuneration Panel.

The Head of Finance also explained that since the abolition of the Government's LABGI payment, there was not likely to be any replacement of a direct business growth incentive payable to the Council until possibly the 2013/14 financial year.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney suggested that the Report should have included options as to how to address the likely budget deficit which consultees could then question. Also, some potential measures might take time to implement, such as changes to staffing.

In response, the Chairman and Councillor Wood advised that the Administration would welcome ideas as to how to address the deficit, but that it was considered that it could not commit to proposals at this stage of the process that it might not eventually be able to deliver upon over the longer term.

The Chief Executive also responded to questions and clarified that the Council had previously undertaken to reduce its salary bill by 15% (70 posts) over a three year period. This reduction remained a necessity and since September 2010, 42 posts had been removed from the establishment. Further proposals with regard to some specific posts were currently being consulted upon.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Report be approved, in the context of the Winchester District Sustainable Community Strategy and the Change Plans, as the basis for budget consultation.

10. **CAR PARKING CHARGES AND OPERATION REVIEW**  
(Report [CAB2240](#) refers)

The Head of Access and Infrastructure drew attention to an error in the Report. Appendix 1 should indicate that the current and proposed charge for up to one hour parking for Basingwell Street, Bishops Waltham was free.

Mr M Slinn (WinACC) spoke during public participation and his comments are summarised below.

Mr Slinn advised that he supported the broad charging strategy in the Report with regard to having differential tariffs in the inner and outer areas of the town. This was likely to positively impact on air quality and congestion in the town centre. Mr Slinn supported the proposed tariffs at Chesil Street multi storey which served many drivers entering Winchester from the south and discouraged them from driving into the town centre. The Council should also consider implementing a similar tariff at Gladstone Street car park and at Tower Street multi storey to serve drivers entering Winchester from the north.

The Chairman thanked Mr Slinn for his comments which would be referred to officers to be considered in the next review.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney raised a number of points related to the content of the Report.

- The introduction of discounted residents' permits was welcomed, however it was requested that, so to ensure consultation with Members, the delegated authority to the Head of Access and Infrastructure proposed at Recommendation 5 (to introduce and set charges etc for monthly and part time permits) be instead amended to the portfolio holder decision making process.
- Although the broad charging strategy with regard to having differential tariffs in the inner and outer areas of the town was supported, had the Winchester BID been consulted on the proposals in the town area?
- Any free parking period at Bishops Waltham should be matched with that eventually offered by the new Sainsburys, so to encourage people to park and shop in the town. Other towns and villages in the rural areas, notably at Wickham, should continue to have flexible schemes that allowed for a quick turnaround for visitors.

- Had car parking charges in neighbouring towns and cities been compared with that proposed in Winchester so to ensure that the Council's charges were not out of kilter?

The Chairman responded to the comments raised by Councillor Learney. He advised that the Council would work closely with both Bishops Waltham and Wickham Parish Councils to ensure appropriate parking schemes continued to be applied in those areas. The Head of Access and Infrastructure confirmed that the Council did make comparison with parking schemes at similar places to Winchester, such as Salisbury and Chichester, and advised the Councils' tariffs were broadly similar.

Finally, Cabinet agreed to revise recommendation 5 with regard to delegated authority being granted instead under the portfolio holder decision making process, so to ensure consultation with all Members.

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

#### RESOLVED:

1. That changes to the cost of parking in Winchester Town be advertised and implemented as set out in Appendix 1 of the Report.
2. That discussions be undertaken with Stagecoach regarding potential cost savings from amendments and improvements to the park and ride service as described in Paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13 of the Report and that a further report be made to Cabinet in January 2012.
3. That there be no increases in parking charges in the rural areas of the District.
4. That a new discounted residents only 'season ticket' be introduced for a limited number of car parks at a cost of £240 per permit, as set out in Paragraph 2.18 of the Report, on a trial basis for a period of 1 year to evaluate the impact in both financial and operational terms.
5. That delegated authority be given to the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport through the portfolio holder decision making process, to develop and set charges and dates for introduction for other season tickets, for both 'monthly' and 'part-time' use, to maximise effective use of existing car parking capacity.
6. That the Head of Legal Services be authorised to give public notice under Section 35C of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended) required to give effect to a) the changes set out in 1 and 4 above for implementation from 1 January 2012 and b) the

changes referred to in 5 above, for implementation from a date to be determined.

7. That the budgets for 2011/12 and 2012/13 be adjusted to reflect the additional expenditure and changes to income as detailed in Paragraph 5.2 of the Report.

11. **HOCKLEY VIADUCT AND NATIONAL CYCLE NETWORK ROUTE 23: PROGRESS REPORT**

(Report [CAB2241](#) refers)

The Chairman, Councillor Beckett, declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as a current member and former Chairman of Compton and Shawford Parish Council, which supported the cycle route. Councillor Beckett remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Godfrey declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as an employee of Hampshire County Council, which was referred to within the report. Councillor Godfrey remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

The item had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. However the Chairman agreed to accept the item onto the agenda as a matter requiring urgent consideration in order to allow the project to commence without further delay.

During discussion, it was clarified that Sustrans would project manage the process, under the supervision of the Council. Whilst Sustrans remained expert in the delivery of such engineering projects, tendering for various aspects of the project would be brought to Cabinet for consideration as part of full project update in early 2012. Any use of Section 106 developer open space contributions as part of the project could only be considered over the longer term, when the Open Space Strategy was reviewed.

The Corporate Director (Operations) drew attention to the detailed Resource Implications section of the Report (page 8), in particular paragraph 8.5, which referred to on-going work to explore other options for the joint funding of the project.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the appointment of Sustrans to project manage and procure the repair works to the Viaduct in section 2.2 (ii to vi) of this report be approved.
2. That the Head of Access and Infrastructure be authorised to progress the appointment and direction of Sustrans, in consultation

with the Head of Legal Services, and that a direction be made under Contract Procedure Rule 3.3(a) accordingly.

3. That £48,630 be added to the project budget to be funded by grant from the LEADER programme to the original capital allocation for the project, taking the total project budget to a total of £548,630.

4. That the Head of Access and Infrastructure be authorised, under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4, to incur expenditure of up to £110,000, as set out in the table at Paragraph 8.11 of the Report, from the above total sum.

5. That officers report back to Cabinet early in 2012 on the results of the tendering exercise managed by Sustrans on the Council's behalf, with a view to seeking agreement to the next stages of the project.

12. **WINCHESTER MUSEUMS: IMPROVING THE LONG TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF THE SERVICE**

(Report [CAB2248](#) refers)

Councillor Godfrey declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as an employee of Hampshire County Council, which was referred to within the report. Councillor Godfrey remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

Cabinet noted that the Report would also be considered by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 14 November 2011.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the revised Collecting and Collections Management Policy for Winchester Museums, attached at Appendix 1 of the Report, be adopted.

2. That the Head of Museums be authorised, subject to consultation with the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA), to arrange the de-accessioning and sale of item A.1506 from the art collection, with proceeds to be ring fenced for urgent conservation work on other items in the art collection.

3. That the Head of Museums be authorised, subject to consultation with the MLA, to arrange the de-accessioning and sale of item WINCM:ETHNO 181 from the ethnography collection, with proceeds to be ringfenced for expert analysis of archaeological specimens held at Bar End.

4. That the Head of Museums be authorised to agree, from time to time, the giving or long term loan (at no cost) to other Accredited

museums of any other part of the ethnography collection which can better be displayed or interpreted by those museums, to the greater public benefit: any such disposal would be in accordance with the revised Collecting and Collections Management Policy for Winchester Museums, and subject to consultation with the Portfolio Holder, Arts Council England, South East and the Head of Finance.

5. That the appreciation of Hampshire County Council's Museums Service be recorded for the exceptional work of key staff in co-ordinating the Major Grant bid to Arts Council England, South East, on behalf of the partners of the Hampshire and Solent Alliance.

6. That the Assistant Director (Economic Prosperity) be authorised, working with the Council's Heads of Finance, Organisational Development and Legal Services, to continue investigations with Hampshire County Council and Southampton City Council into the viability and desirability of fully integrated merger, with conclusions and recommendations to be returned to Cabinet early in 2012.

13. **SECOND WINCHESTER BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT:  
BUSINESS PLAN, MAP AND BASELINE STATEMENT**

(Report [CAB2239](#) refers)

Councillor Godfrey declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as an employee of Hampshire County Council, which was referred to within the report. Councillor Godfrey remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Cooper reminded the meeting of the valuable input of the Business Improvement District (BID) with regard to crime and reduction initiatives in the town centre.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hiscock commented on the Report.

Councillor Hiscock queried whether the revised BID boundary should include the Winchester School of Art as there was a discrepancy between the Plan and the text of the report. Councillor Hiscock also referred to the details within Appendix 2 to the Report, in particular he questioned whether the BID were able to substantiate the consequences of a 'no' vote as set out on page four?

In response, the Chief Executive reminded Members that the Draft Business Plan and comments therein were those of the BID. The Chairman advised that he would raise this point direct with the BID as it was possible that alternative funding streams may be available to potentially fund the services listed that may be threatened by a 'no' vote.

The Assistant Director (Economic Prosperity) advised that it was understood that the revised boundary did not include the Winchester School of Art but would check this outside of the meeting and confirm to Members.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the draft Business Plan, Map and Baseline Statement for the Winchester BID be noted, and the City Council's continued support for the next BID Ballot be confirmed.

2. That the BID Board be advised of the comments as set out above and the Assistant Director (Economic Prosperity) be authorised, in consultation with the Leader, to return any additional comments to the BID Board for consideration in preparing the final version of the Plan.

14. **PROJECT INTEGRA 2011 – 2016 REVIEW**  
(Report [CAB2253](#) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the responses to the Project Integra Review implementation report be endorsed, as set out in paragraphs 2.5 of the Report.

2. That the comments made in 2.6 of the report be agreed. .

3. That these responses are sent by the City Council to the Review Board.

15. **FINAL REPORT OF THE ALLOCATION OF GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES INFORMAL SCRUTINY GROUP – RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CABINET**  
(Report [CAB2242](#) refers)

Councillor Godfrey declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as an employee of Hampshire County Council, which was referred to within the report. Councillor Godfrey remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

The Head of Strategic Planning clarified that the recommendations of the Informal Scrutiny Group could satisfactorily inform the Council's ongoing work to develop the Core Strategy.

On behalf of Cabinet, the Chairman thanked the Members of the Informal Scrutiny Group for their work and the officers for their support.

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



## RESOLVED:

That the following recommendations of The Overview and Scrutiny Committee be approved.

1. That a commitment to undertake a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) and a Travelling Showmen Accommodation Assessment (TSAA) be set out in a Core Strategy policy. The policy should include criteria for allocating sites and assessing planning applications.

2. That the above GTAA and TSAA should be carried out, working with neighbouring authorities.

3. That the principle of making suitable provision for gypsies and travellers (including permanent and transit sites) and travelling showmen, based on the assessed need, be supported, including:

- a) Sites should be spread around the District with no over-concentration in any one location and be of a scale commensurate with the size of the settlement to avoid dominating the settled community or overloading services.
- b) Sites should be located at an appropriate distance from the settled community which still allows access to services.
- c) Sites should be suitably screened.
- d) Sites must provide appropriate site facilities such as sanitation, services and waste management and room for storing equipment for Travelling Showmen.

4. That temporary planning permissions should be reviewed against the policy criteria: if sites meet the criteria, permissions may be extended or made permanent but if they are found not suitable, enforcement action should be prioritised (which should also help prevent new unauthorised sites becoming established).

5. That the enforcement process at Carousel Park, Micheldever be continued to make this site available for travelling showmen again.

6. That the Council should proactively work with travelling showmen to identify suitable sites for allocation where needed.

7. That further investigations and negotiations be undertaken with a view to possibly taking over Tynefield from Hampshire County Council and managing this site to improve its occupancy/capacity.

8. That Members of the ISG be invited to attend and make

representations to the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee when it considers the allocation of site(s) in detail, to share expertise acquired throughout the Review.

9. That the funding available for both revenue and capital costs of providing sites be investigated to establish the likely ongoing cost of site provision.

10. That Parish Councils be given the opportunity to be involved in identifying potential sites.

11. That Guidance be sought from the Council's equalities consultant/group on ways to increase cultural awareness of gypsies and travellers with Members, Parish Councils and the wider community.

16. **MINUTES OF THE CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE HELD 28 SEPTEMBER 2011**  
(Report [CAB2252](#) refers)

Cabinet received the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee held 28 September 2011 (attached as Appendix A to these minutes).

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee held 28 September 2011, less exempt minute, be received.

17. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

The Head of Finance drew attention that the December Forward Plan would include a revised Treasury Management Strategy.

RESOLVED:

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

18. **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
##	75 Hyde Street, Winchester – Update	) (including the authority holding that information). (Para 3 Schedule 12A refers)
##	Phase 4 Organisational Development	) 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)

#### 19. **EXEMPT MINUTE OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minute of the previous meeting held on 12 October 2011 be approved and adopted.

20. **WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT – PHASE 4**

(Report PER198 refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report had been considered by Personnel Committee at its meeting on 7 November 2011 and the Chief Executive reported that Personnel Committee had supported its recommendations.

Cabinet referred to the above Report, which set out proposals for changes to the organisation's staffing structure (detail in exempt minute).

21. **75 HYDE STREET, WINCHESTER UPDATE**

Cabinet noted the action taken by the Chief Executive under his emergency powers following the oral report to the previous Cabinet meeting regarding 75 Hyde Street (and the subsequent report to The Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 17 October 2011, Report OS22 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the action outlined above be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 12.50pm