

CABINET**7 December 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 Evans, Jeffs, Hutchison, Learney, Tait and Thompson
Mr A Rickman (TACT)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Gottlieb, Hiscock, Mitchell and Scott

1. MEMBERSHIP OF CABINET COMMITTEES ETC**RESOLVED:**

That the following changes to Cabinet Committees etc be agreed:

- (i) That Councillor Coates replace Councillor Cooper as deputy on the Project Integra Management Board.
- (ii) That Councillor Mrs C Fraser be appointed as the representative from the Eastleigh Borough Council Hedge End, West End and Botley Local Area Committee to the North Whiteley Development Forum.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 9 November 2011 less exempt items, be approved and adopted.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Chairman noted that Mr E Shelton, Mrs E Bell, Mrs C Slattery, Mr I White and Mr Bruty had registered to speak under Report CAB2273 and their comments were summarised under the relevant agenda item below.

In addition, Councillor Hutchison spoke regarding Report CAB2269 as Chairman of the Informal Scrutiny Group (ISG), as he was unable to stay until that point of the meeting.

In summary, Councillor Hutchison emphasised that the recommendations of the ISG had been unanimously supported by both the ISG and The Overview and Scrutiny Committee. In addition, he highlighted the particular importance of the recommendation that the Council adopted a leadership role in carbon reduction measures and the potential savings to the Council that could result.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Hutchison for this work as Chairman of the ISG and for his comments, which would be taken into account under Report CAB2269 below.

4. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Stallard reported on the successful annual Sports Award ceremony which had taken place at the Winchester Guildhall on 1 December 2011.

Councillor Humby congratulated relevant officers on the Council winning a national award for its Blueprint consultation exercise.

Councillor Cooper reported that he had recently approved the second round of community chest grants, resulting in a total of £10,000 being awarded in grants amongst about 30 local organisations.

Councillor Godfrey announced that as the Estates Team had now achieved the Customer Service Excellence accreditation, the entire Council was now accredited, the first Council to achieve this in the country. The Council would soon be applying for corporate accreditation. The Chairman and Members congratulated staff on this achievement.

Councillor Weston highlighted the Council's introduction of a new way of displaying the hygiene standards of food businesses, adopting a national scheme which had been developed by the Food Standard Agency. All the information was available via the Council's Website.

The Chairman reported that a budget consultation with local business leaders had taken place on the previous day. The comments made were generally positive and would be taken into account in setting the Council's budget in February 2012.

5. **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT REFORM AND BUSINESS PLANNING FOR 2012/13**

(Report [CAB2260\(HSG\)](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report had been considered by the Cabinet (Housing) Committee at its meeting on 6 December 2011 which had supported the recommendations.

Members welcomed the opportunities for the Council to build new homes and emphasised that these must be matched to particular demands for types of housing.

In response to questions, the Head of Landlord Services confirmed that the Government had announced proposed changes to the 'right to buy' process and use of receipts. A further report on this would be brought back to Members. He confirmed that at the current time, only a very small number of council homes in the District were purchased under 'right to buy' each year.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson welcomed Recommendation 2 of the Report and urged the Council to allocate as much finance as possible towards building new homes. She requested that flexibility as to exact budgets be retained as there was some uncertainty regarding the exact figures.

The Head of Landlord Services highlighted that Paragraph 3.2 stated that the figures quoted were only indicative at this stage. Cabinet also noted that revised Business Plans would be submitted on an annual basis and could be adjusted in the light of changing circumstances.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the key priorities to be considered both in the development of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan and HRA budget for 2012/13 be agreed as set out in 8.2 of this report.
2. That the proposals for the establishment of a programme of Council new build housing be supported.
3. That the Head of Finance and Head of Landlord Services be authorised to prepare any technical response to the HRA Self Financing Determinations consultation that they consider to be necessary.

4. That, in view of the proposed significant changes of approach following the introduction of Self Financing, The Overview and Scrutiny Committee be asked for its views on the development of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan and HRA budget for 2012/13.

6. **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT – 2012/13 RENT SETTING AND BUDGET PRINCIPLES**

(Report [CAB2262\(HSG\)](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report had been considered by the Cabinet (Housing) Committee at its meeting on 6 December 2011 which had supported its recommendations.

In response to questions, the Head of Landlord Services confirmed that the Localism Act gave local authorities the power to set rents at a level they chose. However, the Government assumed that its Guideline Rent increases would be followed in calculating the level of debt allocated to the Council.

During the public participation period, Mr A Rickman (TACT) addressed Cabinet and, in summary, expressed concerns about the yearly increase in rents and the potential effects of this resulting in increasing debt and repossessions.

The Chairman thanked Mr Rickman for his comments. Councillor Coates stated that the Council took various measures at an early stage to assist tenants facing rent arrears.

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

Councillor Thompson shared TACT's concern about the high level of the rent increases for both council dwellings and garages. She requested an assurance that funds raised from the increase in garage rents be spent on essential garage repairs.

Councillor Evans also highlighted the poor condition of some garage blocks and requested that additional funds from the increase in garage rents be spent on garage repairs.

The Head of Landlord Services advised that a survey of garage conditions had been undertaken and the results could be included within the forthcoming budget report in order that Cabinet could make a decision as to spending priorities. This was agreed.

In response to questions, the Head of Landlord Services confirmed that the Government could revisit the level of the Housing Revenue Account reform self financing settlement at any stage in the future.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE HEAD OF LANDLORD SERVICES BE AUTHORISED TO IMPLEMENT THE HOUSING RENTS INCREASE FOR 2012/13 IN LINE WITH THE GOVERNMENT GUIDELINE, AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 2 OF CAB2262(HSG), RESULTING IN AN OVERALL AVERAGE INCREASE OF 7.34%.

2. THAT GARAGE RENTS BE INCREASED BY 5.6% IN LINE WITH THE INFLATION PROVISION INCLUDED IN THE INCREASE FOR DWELLING RENTS.

3. THAT ALL SERVICE CHARGES CONTINUE TO BE BASED ON ACTUAL COSTS INCURRED, BUT THAT COMBINED INCREASES FOR RENT AND SERVICE CHARGES FOR EXISTING TENANTS BE SUBJECT TO A MAXIMUM INCREASE OF 6.1% + £2.17 AND THE HEAD OF LANDLORD SERVICES BE AUTHORISED TO IMPLEMENT THE CHANGES.

7. CURRENT HOMELESSNESS ISSUES

(Report [CAB2259\(HSG\)](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report had been considered by the Cabinet (Housing) Committee at its meeting on 6 December 2011 which had approved the recommendations.

The Head of Strategic Housing clarified that in respect of the possible “wet shelter”, the Council was proposing it might contribute towards the capital costs of a building, but would be seeking support from other organisations towards the ongoing revenue costs.

The Head of Strategic Housing provided an update to the information set out in Paragraph 4.3 of the Report as the County Council had now indicated it was proposing a 10% cut in expenditure on the Excluded Persons Cluster (reduced from 16% stated in the Report).

The Chief Executive emphasised the differences between people who were designated as homeless and those that were rough sleepers. He highlighted that it was important not to make direct correlations between increasing pressures that were causing a rise in homelessness and the numbers of rough sleepers.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson expressed concerns about the increase in homelessness and believed that bed and breakfast accommodation should be used only as a very last resort. She supported the temporary use of Barnes House, although highlighted that it was not

sustainable as a long term option. She also supported proposals for a “wet shelter”. Finally, she believed that the numbers of rough sleepers counted might have been reduced because St Catherine’s Hill had not been included in the count area.

The Head of Strategic Housing emphasised that the Rough Sleeper count could, by its nature, only offer a snapshot of numbers on that particular night and the safety of staff carrying out the count had to be taken into account in deciding what areas to cover.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That Barnes House and 27 Eastgate Street are used as temporary accommodation for homeless households and that the decision be reviewed in 12 months.
2. That a 12 month fixed term post be created to assist in the management of the extra temporary accommodation and helping residents move on to permanent accommodation using Homelessness Prevention Funding.
3. That the Head of Strategic Housing, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Housing and Landlord Services, commission the Rough Sleepers Pilot with the Trinity Centre using the funding of up to £120,000 provided by the Communities and Local Government Department.
4. That the Council undertake a feasibility study of the provision of a “wet shelter”.
5. That representations be made to the County Council about the scale of cuts proposed to the Excluded Persons supporting people funding.

8. **FUTURE OF BLANCHARD ROAD PLAY AREA, BISHOPS WALTHAM**
(Report [CAB2271](#) refers)

The Chairman reported that he had received representations from Bishops Waltham Parish Council requesting that the Council reconsider the transfer of the freehold of the land in question. However, after taking advice from officers, he considered that the transfer should remain on a leasehold basis as outlined in the Report.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the proposal to grant a lease of the play area at Blanchard Road, Bishops Waltham to Bishops Waltham Parish Council for a term of 25 years for a nominal rent as set out in the report be approved.
2. That the proposal be advertised as set out in paragraph 4.3 of the report and if any representations are received, a further report on these be brought back to Cabinet.
3. That delegated authority be given to the Head of Estates to agree detailed terms with the Parish Council for the grant of the lease.

9. **HARRIS BEQUEST – SENIOR CITIZEN’S HOUSING**

(Report [CAB2270](#) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

1. That HSBC Trustee (Hong Kong) Limited be informed that:
 - a) Winchester City Council confirms that it will comply with the terms of the Bequest and
 - b) Stephen Whetnall, Corporate Director (Governance), is hereby authorised to accept the receipts from the estate and to give discharge to the executors for such receipts.
2. That when the Bequest is received by the Council a further report be made to Cabinet upon proposals for its use.

10. **PUBLICATION OF WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 1 – JOINT CORE STRATEGY**

(Report [CAB2258\(LDF\)](#) refers)

MINUTES OF CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE HELD 28 NOVEMBER 2011 AND UPDATE REPORT (TAKING ACCOUNT OF DECISIONS MADE AT THAT MEETING)

(Report [CAB2273](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that Report CAB2258(LDF) had been discussed in detail at the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee meeting held 28 November 2011. The minutes of that Committee meeting, together with a copy of the Joint Core Strategy with tracked changes resulting from the Committee meeting, was set out in Report CAB2273. All references to page numbers below related to the amended Core Strategy as set out in Report CAB2273 Appendix 2.

Members also noted that the recommendations from Cabinet would be submitted to a Special Council, to be held the following day on 8 December 2011. The Chairman requested that debate at Cabinet be restricted to the changes made to the Core Strategy and any further amendments requested at the meeting. He highlighted that if any member of the public wished to make a point at the Special Council meeting, they could ask their Ward Councillor to raise it on their behalf.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that further corrections to Policy MTRA3 and CP3 of the Joint Core Strategy as amended, had been circulated to all Members via email prior to the meeting (as attached as an Appendix to the minutes).

The proposed changes to Policy MTRA3 were to include Meonstoke within the second rather than the first list of villages, as set out. In addition, to correct the accidental omission of Bramdean, Northbrook and Itchen Abbas (part) from the second list.

The proposed changes to Policy CP3 related to the affordable housing provision and had arisen from discussion of a draft of a consultant's study which had indicated that in some parts of the District, the specified amount of affordable homes could make a proposal unviable.

The Head of Strategic Planning also reported on a recommended change to Policy DS1 to include an addition to the bullet point on Page 23 to relate to air quality. This was requested to provide a means by which further assessments in relation to air quality could be referenced.

During discussion by Cabinet, the following points were raised for clarification and/or further amendment:

- Policy MTRA3, Page 58 – Paragraph beginning “Other development proposals may be supported ...” One Member queried the significance of local communities views in support of development. The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the intention of this paragraph was to clarify that local communities did not necessarily have to produce a Neighbourhood Plan to support their development proposals as other means of indicating clear community support could be acceptable.
- Policy WT2, Page 33, second bullet point. One Member spoke against the proposed amended wording as he believed it did not provide adequate protection against any development at Barton Farm not taking place strategically. He stressed that any development should spread from the present limits of Winchester on a gradual basis from the southern urban edge of the site. Members also suggested that the proposed phasing plan be approved by Cabinet.

The Corporate Director (Operations) advised that approval of the phasing plan was not an executive function and would instead be undertaken by the Planning Development Control Committee. That Committee could consider

such matters as timing and start points of development in considering whether or not to approve such a Plan.

Following debate, Cabinet agreed to a further amendment to the second bullet point as set out below with additional words shown underlined (and reproduced as a schedule of all amendments, attached to these minutes):

“The proposal should follow an organic sequence of development, radiating from the southern urban edges of the site, in accordance with a phasing plan to be produced and approved.’

- Policy DS1, Page 22, Paragraph following bullet points. In response to a Member’s query, the Head of Strategic Planning explained that the reference to a “sequential approach” had been removed to remove any potential confusion, as this phrase was more normally used in relation to retail developments. He confirmed that “previously developed land” would be prioritised, but that this definition no longer included back gardens.
- Policy MTRA3, Page 57. One Member queried why this had been amended to include the phrase ‘may be supported’ rather than ‘will be supported’. It was explained that this was to recognise that ‘will’ implied that any application would be acceptable which was not necessarily the case.
- Policy CP21, Pages 102-103. In response to a query, the Head of Strategic Planning confirmed that the proposed wording did allow for any changes in the Community Infrastructure Levy requirements.
- Policy SH2, Page 44. One Member requested that an additional bullet point be included which stated that the MDA must be bounded by the local gap. The Head of Strategic Planning explained that this was not necessary as the Denmead gap was already retained and Policy CP18 referred.
- Policy SH3, Page 49, Paragraph 3.59. One Member requested that the sentence “The uses and management of the area should, so far as possible ...” be amended by the substitution of the word “must” for “should, so far as possible”. This was agreed.
- Paragraph 3.60, Page 49. One Member queried whether the phrase “cooperate with” (as used in Policy SH4) should be used throughout when dealing with the relationship between Winchester City and Fareham Borough Councils (rather than “work closely with” which was used in 3.60). The Corporate Director (Governance) explained that the Council had a duty in the Localism Act to cooperate with other local planning authorities. It was agreed that no change was required.
- Policy CP11, Page 83. In response to a query, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Government had not yet stipulated a future programme for the level of the Code for Sustainable Homes new residential developments were expected to achieve.

During the public participation period, Mr E Shelton (WinACC), Mrs E Bell, Mrs C Slattery, Mr I White (Save Barton Farm Group) and Mr Bruty addressed the meeting and their comments are summarised below.

On behalf of WinACC, Mr Shelton welcomed the inclusion of Policies CP11 and 12 and requested that Cabinet ensure that these proposals were not weakened in any way as a consequence of any proposed changes at Special Council. He also highlighted that Report CAB2268 below stressed the requirement for the Council to achieve its own carbon reduction targets. He drew attention to one specific correction to Paragraph 7.8 of the Strategy (Page 83) to make reference to *low-carbon* (as opposed to low-energy) generation measures. This was agreed and the Chairman thanked WinACC for their input.

Mrs E Bell expressed concern that small settlements on the edge of urban boundaries (for example, Pitt) were not offered adequate protection from development and should be included either within Policy MTRA4 or within MTRA3. However, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that such smaller settlements already had adequate protection through existing countryside policies, but was asked to consider whether the wording of Policy MTRA4 could be clarified.

Mrs Bell also requested that Policy CP18 either be cross-referenced in MTRA 3 or 4, or brought forward to sit within that section of the Core Strategy. The Corporate Director (Operations) advised that Inspector's did not favour such cross-referencing. In addition, the Head of Strategic Planning stated that the possibility of moving Policy CP18 had been considered, but not pursued as it would lead to unnecessary duplication.

Mrs Bell also raised other more detailed points in relation to building and parking standards, but was advised that these were not relevant to the strategic nature of the Core Strategy.

Mrs Slattery spoke on behalf of Mr Gareth Rees who had submitted his concerns to Cabinet regarding the potential negative impact of the Silverhill and Barton Farm developments on traffic levels and consequentially businesses in Winchester.

The Chairman advised that he had previously read the correspondence from Mr Rees. The Corporate Director (Operation) highlighted that the concerns did not relate to the strategic matters being addressed by the Core Strategy.

On behalf of the 'Save Barton Farm Group', Mr White queried whether the proposed changes to Paragraph 3.2, Page 22 would have any impact on the allocation of Barton Farm for development? The Corporate Director (Operations) advised that the changes had resulted from Members wishing to emphasise that greenfield sites would not be allocated before previously developed land. However, it did not effect the proposals regarding Barton Farm.

Mr Bruty queried the size of the area of land referred to as Bushfield Camp (page 36) as he believed it had altered since previous documents. In addition, he emphasised the importance of protecting Barton Farm from development in order to preserve it for future generations. In particular, he drew attention to the Secretary of State's use of the phrase "irreversible loss" in relation to Barton Farm and believed that this decision was now being ignored by the Council.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the area of land at Bushfield Camp totalled 63 hectares, which included Whiteshute Ridge. The area of the land shown on the map accompanying Policy WT3 had been checked and was 43 hectares.

The Corporate Director (Operations) emphasised that it was a matter of common ground that Barton Farm was designated as countryside and is an important area. This is why there must be "compelling justification" for it to be allocated for development. The Planning Inspector considering CALA's most recent application had said that this compelling justification existed but the Secretary of State disagreed. However, his decision notice made clear that that he expected the Council to make a decision on whether to allocate the site or not at the conclusion of the Blueprint process, which had now been reached.

The Chairman also acknowledged the importance of Barton Farm to Winchester residents, but emphasised that the Council had to plan for the Government objectives and local needs in terms of housing numbers.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Jeffs and Evans spoke under this item and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Jeffs spoke regarding Policy MTRA2 (Page 55) and requested that the stated provision of new homes in New Alresford and Bishops Waltham be reduced by about 100 dwellings in each settlement. He believed that this was possible as there appeared to be a discrepancy in the overall allocations with overprovision of 200 homes.

The Head of Strategic Planning explained that the figures for each settlement were quoted as an approximate guide and stated as a range of provision (i.e. for New Alresford, the range was between 400 and 500 new homes). At the Development Allocation document stage, allocations would be considered within this range, but also having regard to the capacity within existing settlement boundaries.

In response to a further query from Councillor Jeffs, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that there had not previously been a designated gap between New Alresford and any other settlement within planning policy (as it was not considered necessary due to the existing protection of countryside policies).

Councillor Evans spoke regarding Policy SH4 (Page 49 onwards), and referring to discussions outlined above, she believed “working with” was a preferable phrase than “cooperate”.

Councillor Evans requested the addition of wording to emphasise that the City Council would work with Fareham Borough Council to encourage it to locate some of the green infrastructure associated with the North Fareham Strategic Development Area (SDA) alongside the existing countryside to reinforce the gap. The Head of Strategic Planning advised that this issue was already included in the Core Strategy. However, Cabinet agreed that the exact wording be re-examined to ascertain whether it could be strengthened to address Councillor Evans’s point. (additional wording is outlined in the Appendix to these minutes).

Councillor Evans also requested an amendment to Policy MTRA1 (page 54) to specifically acknowledge the effect the proposed Fareham SDA would have on Wickham. Cabinet acknowledged that the size of the Fareham SDA and any other similar large developments could have an impact on nearby smaller settlements. It was agreed that additional wording be drafted to acknowledge this point and submitted to Special Council for approval (additional wording is outlined in the Appendix to these minutes).

Finally, on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group, Councillor Evans raised concerns regarding the proposed changes to Policy CP3 which would be stated in more detail for debate at the Special Council meeting.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 1 – JOINT CORE STRATEGY AS SET OUT IN CAB2273, APPENDIX 2 AND AMENDED AS OUTLINED IN THE APPENDIX TO THESE MINUTES, BE APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION (PRE-SUBMISSION) AND SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RELEVANT STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

2. THAT THE SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY BE REQUESTED TO APPROVE THE PLAN FOR PUBLICATION (PRE-SUBMISSION) AND SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, IN SO FAR AS RELEVANT TO THE AUTHORITY AS LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY FOR THAT PART OF WINCHESTER DISTRICT LYING WITHIN THE NATIONAL PARK.

3. THAT THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT, BE GIVEN DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO APPROVE ANY MINOR CHANGES REQUESTED BY THE NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY PRIOR TO PUBLICATION OF THE PLAN.

RESOLVED:

4. That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement, to add the appendices to the Local Plan and make minor amendments to the Plan and accompanying documents prior to publication, in order to correct errors and format text without altering the meaning of the Plan;

5. That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement, be authorised to submit the Plan and accompanying documents to the Secretary of State following the publication period, in accordance with the relevant statutory and regulatory requirements;

6. That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement, be authorised to make editorial amendments to the Local Plan and accompanying documents prior to submission to the Secretary of State, to correct errors and format text without altering the meaning of the Plan;

7. That the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement/Leader, be authorised to make suggested changes to the Plan before and during the public examination process.

8. That approval be given to appoint a Programme Officer and undertake other work as necessary to prepare for and undertake the public examination (including meeting the Planning Inspectorate's fees), provided this is within the allocated LDF budget/Reserve.

11. **MINUTES OF CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE HELD 10 NOVEMBER 2011**
(Report [CAB2275](#) refers)

Cabinet received the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee held 10 November 2011 (attached as Appendix A to these minutes).

Cabinet noted that it had been agreed at the Council meeting, on 20 July 2011, that the Notice of Motion referred to in the above minutes would be recommended directly back to Council (scheduled for 11 January 2012).

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) held 10 November 2011 be received.

12. **SILVER HILL UPDATE**
(Report [CAB2272](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report would also be considered by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting to be held on 23 January 2012.

During discussion, the Corporate Director (Operations) explained that a payment of £300,000 was due by the end of 2011 from the developer as part of the Section 106 Legal Agreement regarding CCTV, with a further payment of £700,000 due when the Development Agreement became unconditional which was expected to be in the first quarter of 2013 (in lieu of the CCTV centre being located off-site).

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

RESOLVED:

That the update report be noted.

13. **WINCHESTER MARKET UPDATE**
(Report [CAB2274](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report would also be considered by Winchester Town Forum at its meeting to be held on 23 January 2012.

In summary, the Head of Estates explained that the Report set out proposals which sought to ameliorate the concerns which had been raised by some members of the public and High Street retailers. Principally, these changes proposed to reduce the number of market stalls between Marks & Spencer and Laura Ashley to reduce congestion, introduce market stalls to the upper end of the High Street on a trial basis and improve the quality of goods.

During debate, it was noted that the increased footfall in the town centre had not, according to the Community Safety Partnership Team, been reflected by an increase in street crime. Members also noted that, from November 2011, the Winchester Business Improvement District (BID) had collected footfall data and that this would be made available to the Council to extrapolate trend information.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Tait spoke as a Ward Member and commended the Head of Estates and the Market Manager for the success of market and, in summary, supported the proposals in the Report.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney also welcomed the success of the market; in particular the arts, food and antiques markets and the opportunities these provided local traders. However, she underlined the importance of retaining Winchester's reputation as a quality shopping centre in comparison with other local centres. She also raised concerns regarding how some traders had encroached out of their designated stall areas and concerns about the visual impact of introducing market stalls to the Buttercross area. Furthermore, she explained that the dismantling of stalls at the end of the trading day could be to the detriment of the town centre's evening economy.

In response, the Chairman welcomed the comments received and explained that these would be taken into account as part of the on-going review of the market.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Market Manager be thanked for achieving a rapid improvement in the numbers of traders attending the Winchester Markets.
2. That the BID be thanked for their feedback on the Market.
3. That the number of stalls on the section of High Street between Marks & Spencer and Laura Ashley be reduced from a maximum of 20 to 14 with immediate effect, to improve the visibility of the adjoining shops and to facilitate the pedestrian flow during busy periods.
4. That the trial siting of up to six stalls above the Buttercross during the Christmas period be reviewed early in the New Year before deciding whether to make this a permanent feature.
5. That further consultations be held with the BID, retailers, market traders and the Market Manager over the potential to develop a themed approach to the range of stalls in the High Street on certain days. (Saturday would remain a general market, albeit the Market Manager would, as now, continue to locate individual retailers where he thinks most appropriate.)
6. That the above consultation include consideration of reducing the number of days the market is held in the pedestrianised section of the High Street, for example by, ending the Thursday Market, subject to consideration of any impact on the overall success of the Market.

7. That only traders offering high quality products and standards of service be licensed to trade on the pedestrianised section of the High Street, and that issues of what constitutes high quality products and service be determined by the Head of Estates.

8. That a professional survey of residents and market users be commissioned into perceptions of the Market, to be used in connection with a further review of the Market to be presented to Cabinet in March.

9. That standards for the dress of stall holders trading on the weekday and Saturday markets on the High Street be agreed by the Head of Estates with the Market Manager and implemented from March 2012 to allow time for discussion with traders.

10. That if (as expected) the Awards System introduced by the Food Standards Agency for the management of food hygiene is extended to markets and street vendors, the implications of its implementation be considered with the Environmental Health Team and traders and that it be adopted as soon as practicable.

11. That monthly meetings take place between officers of the Council and the BID to ensure regular and clear communications as these recommendations are implemented.

12. That a further report on the Markets be brought to Cabinet in March 2012.

13. That the report be referred to the Winchester Town Forum for their consideration as to whether they wish to raise any issues with the Leader or Cabinet.

14. **COUNCIL TAX BASE 2012/2013**
(Report [CAB2254](#) refers)

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE CALCULATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT FOR THE COUNCIL TAX BASE FOR 2012/2013 BE APPROVED.

2. THAT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (CALCULATION OF TAX BASE) REGULATIONS 1992 (AS AMENDED), THE AMOUNT CALCULATED BY WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 2012/2013 IS 48,323.83 PROPERTIES AT BAND D EQUIVALENT.

3. THAT THE AMOUNT CALCULATED AS THE COUNCIL TAX BASE FOR EACH PARISH WITHIN THE AREA OF WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL AND FOR WINCHESTER TOWN SHALL BE AS STATED IN APPENDIX C TO THIS REPORT.

15. **NON-DOMESTIC RATES – RURAL SETTLEMENT LIST 2012/13**

(Report [CAB2255](#) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the list of Rural Settlement shown in Appendix A of the Report be approved for the year 2012/13.

16. **NON-DOMESTIC RATES – WRITE OFF OF IRRECOVERABLE DEBTS**

(Report [CAB2257](#) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That approval be given to write-off debts as detailed in the Report amounting to £51,444.03.

17. **ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN 2011-2016 (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**

(Report [OS24](#) refers)

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD 14 NOVEMBER 2011

(Report [CAB2269](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that Report OS24 had been considered by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 14 November 2011 and the relevant minute extract from the Committee was contained within Report CAB2269.

During debate, Members discussed the Report's Recommendation 2 from The Overview and Scrutiny Committee, which suggested that a wider group of Members oversee the Plan's implementation. However, Cabinet noted the possibility that some of the decisions arising from the Plan may require a prompter response than could be provided by committee and considered that it was not appropriate to establish a standing Scrutiny body for this issue. Therefore, at the conclusion of debate, Cabinet agreed that wider member involvement in the implementation of the Asset Management Plan should be facilitated through an annual report to The Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and that it may wish to use an Informal Scrutiny Group` as a part of this process to facilitate wider member involvement.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the updated Asset Management Plan be adopted (as contained in Appendix 1 of Report OS24) and the Cabinet decisions in recommendations 4-13 on the AMP in CAB 2209 (Appendix 2) be confirmed, subject to:

(a) The work programme identified in updated Appendix C to the Plan being reviewed in the light of available financial and staffing resources and subject to a further report to Cabinet.

(b) The inclusion of updated Appendix D2 and updated exempt Appendix D1.

(c) That the review of the long term future property requirements of the City Museums and Abbey House be added to the work plan.

2. That an annual report be submitted to The Overview and Scrutiny Committee detailing progress toward the delivery of the objectives set out in the Asset Management Plan and the Committee be asked to consider whether it wishes to establish an Informal Scrutiny Group to assist with that process.

18. **FINAL REPORT OF THE CITY COUNCIL'S EFFORTS TO REDUCE ITS CARBON FOOTPRINT INFORMAL SCRUTINY GROUP – RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CABINET**
(Report [CAB2268](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that recommendations 9 to 14 below would also be considered by the Personnel Committee.

Following debate, Cabinet agreed that the recommendations in the above Report required a further report setting out the probable costs and effects of the proposals, together with information on which proposals the Council had already implemented and which proposals could be practicably implemented.

The Chairman agreed that, following consultation with officers, Councillor Hutchison (Chairman of the Informal Scrutiny Group) be informed when the additional report would be considered together with a response to his comments regarding leadership raised earlier in the meeting.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Hutchison and the Informal Scrutiny Group for the work that they had undertaken.

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

RESOLVED:

That a further Report be prepared by officers setting out the probable costs and effects of the proposals, together with which

proposals the Council had already implemented and which proposals could be practicably implemented.

19. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

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

20. **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 any individual. (Para 1 Schedule 12A refers)
##	Care & Support Arrangements in Extra Care Housing) 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)

##	Asset Management Plan – 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)
----	--	--

21. **EXEMPT MINUTE OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minute of the previous meeting held on 9 November 2011 be approved and adopted.

22. **CARE AND SUPPORT ARRANGEMENTS IN EXTRA CARE HOUSING**
(Report CAB2266(HSG) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report had been considered by the Cabinet (Housing) Committee at its meeting on 6 December 2011. It would also be considered by Personnel Committee on 24 January 2011.

Cabinet referred to the above Report, which set out proposals regarding care and support arrangements at Extra Care housing schemes (detail in exempt minute).

23. **ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN 2011-2016 (EXEMPT APPENDIX)**
(Report OS24 refers)

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons as set out in the Report.

RESOLVED:

That information contained within the exempt appendix be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30am and concluded at 1.30pm.

Appendix to Minutes of Cabinet 7 December 2011

Further amendments to Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy

Page	Para/Policy No.	Detail of Amendment
23	Policy DS1	Add 'air quality' to final bullet
33	Policy WT2	2nd bullet add 'southern' after 'radiating from the ...' and 'and approved' after 'phasing plan to be produced'.
49	Para 3.59	3 rd sentence after 'Fareham Borough, add "and the City Council would encourage the co-location of green infrastructure so as to reinforce the buffer between the SDA and Knowle and Wickham. It is also..." Last sentence replace 'should, so far as possible,' with 'must'
54	Para 3.76	Additional sentence to be added to end of para to read "In addition, some settlements are concerned about the impact of adjacent major development, for example the Fareham SDA to the south of Wickham".
57	Policy MTRA3	Amend list of settlements which have a defined settlement boundary to delete Meonstoke. Amend list of settlements which have no defined settlement boundary to also include:- Bramdean, Meonstoke, Northbrook and Itchen Abbas (part).
59	Policy MTRA4	Amend first para of policy to read "In the countryside, defined as land outside the built-up areas of Winchester, Whiteley and Waterlooville and the settlements covered by MTRA 2 and 3 above, the Local Planning Authority will only permit the following types of development :"
66	Para 5.23	After first sentence add ". For instance, at low points in the market cycle the target may be challenging in parts of the District with lower property prices, such as smaller sites in the South Hampshire Urban Areas (outside of the strategic allocation sites), and on sites with particularly high existing use values. Such areas are not expected to contribute significant amounts of the housing needed in the District, but where specific viability"
66	Policy CP3	First para of policy, after affordable housing add "unless this would render the proposal economically unviable".
83	Para 7.8	2 nd sentence replace 'low-energy' with 'low-carbon energy'