

CABINET

9 September 2015

Attendance:

Councillor Godfrey -	<i>Leader (Chairman) (P)</i>
Councillor Weston -	<i>Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Service Delivery (P)</i>
Councillor Read -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Built Environment (P)</i>
Councillor Byrnes -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Local Economy (P)</i>
Councillor Horrill -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Housing Services (P)</i>
Councillor Miller -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Estates (P)</i>
Councillor Pearson -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Environment, Health & Wellbeing</i>

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors J Berry, Burns, Simon Cook, Gottlieb, Laming, Power, Tait, Thompson and Warwick

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Mr D Chafe (TACT)

1. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Councillor Godfrey declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of agenda items due to his role as a County Council employee. However, as there was no material conflict of interest, he remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Standards Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council involvement.

2. MEMBERSHIP OF CABINET COMMITTEES ETC

Cabinet noted that one nomination had been received from the existing representative, Councillor Mather, to be re-appointed to the Winchester Charity School Education Foundation.

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Mather be re-appointed as the Council's representative on Winchester Charity School Education Foundation until May 2018.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 6 July 2015, in addition to the special meetings held on 13 July and 16 July 2015 less exempt minutes, be approved and adopted.

4. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Contributions from the public were taken at the time of the relevant item and minuted accordingly.

5. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

On behalf of Cabinet, the Leader expressed best wishes to the Queen on becoming the country's longest serving monarch on this day.

Councillor Horrill congratulated the Housing Options Team on receiving "silver status" as part of the national programme on homelessness prevention.

Councillor Horrill also outlined the Council's proposed response to the ongoing refugee crisis in Syria. The Council were taking initial steps by, for example, holding discussions with other local authorities and were awaiting Government advice on the detail of what was required. She emphasised that any assistance would not impact upon those already on the Council's housing waiting list. The Chairman added that the Council had also agreed to provide a storage point for a local community group for collecting items to be passed onto refugees.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson addressed Cabinet and welcomed the support to be offered by the Council for refugees. She requested that the Council designate an officer to work with organisations and other local authorities in coordinating a response. She was aware of local people who would be willing to offer spare rooms to refugees but did not know who to contact to facilitate this.

The Chairman welcomed the support and acknowledged that local groups and people wanted to assist, but emphasised that at the current time, the level of help required was not known.

Councillor Byrnes announced the opening of the extension to Wickham car park which would offer an additional 38 spaces. He thanked the Head of Parking Services and team for their work in achieving this.

Councillor Miller reported that the lighting at Chesil multi story car park was currently being replaced which would result in a reduction in carbon emissions, in addition to cost savings.

6. **CAPITAL STRATEGY 2015**
(Report CAB2710 refers)

The Chairman thanked Officers for their work towards delivering an extensive programme of projects as set out within the Strategy. He also emphasised the importance of maintaining the Council's existing assets. He highlighted that the first meeting of the Cabinet (Major Projects) Committee would take place on 6 October 2015 which would allow greater discussion and transparency about the Council's major project proposals. In addition, he emphasised the importance of the ongoing consultation regarding proposals for Station Approach.

The Chairman requested a change to the Strategy to require that post implementation reviews for all major projects be reported to The Overview and Scrutiny Committee (and not just those where cost over runs were more than 10% for schemes over £1m).

The Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) emphasised the ambitious nature of the programme. He agreed that all post implementation reviews could be referred to The Overview and Scrutiny Committee and suggested that they could also be considered by the Cabinet (Major Projects) Committee.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Simon Cook (Chairman of The Overview and Scrutiny Committee) welcomed this proposed change. He stated that approaches to scrutiny generally varied widely across other local authorities and he would be asking the Committee to examine this further as part of a review of how scrutiny is undertaken.

Cabinet agreed to this amendment, as detailed in the recommendation below.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Power addressed Cabinet and in summary raised the following points:

- The Strategy should include reference to projects' contributions to the public realm;
- It should emphasise the importance of the Council creating an income stream from its assets;
- The Finance Team should have adequate resources to enable it to be a 'critical friend';
- The Council should build on Officers' experience in managing Major Projects, possibly through external recruitment;
- The Strategy should include tangible milestones on projects.

The Chief Finance Officer advised that a further report on the financial implications of the Strategy would be submitted to the next Cabinet on 21 October 2015.

The Chairman noted comments and agreed it was essential the Council had the necessary skills. He emphasised the establishment of the Major Projects Team and the levels of skills and knowledge which were being developed within it.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT, SUBJECT TO THE AMENDMENT DETAILED BELOW, THE DRAFT CAPITAL STRATEGY 2015 BE APPROVED (AS ATTACHED AS APPENDIX A TO THE REPORT):

SECTION 10 - PERFORMANCE MONITORING, PAGE 16 –

“POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEWS ARE CARRIED OUT SIX MONTHS AFTER IMPLEMENTATION FOR EACH MAJOR SCHEME APPROVED WITH FINDINGS REPORTED TO THE PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT GROUP AND TO THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE IF REQUIRED DUE TO COST OVER RUNS OF MORE THAN 10% FOR SCHEMES OVER £1M.”

7. OPTIONS FOR RIVER PARK LEISURE CENTRE

(Report CAB2708 refers)

The Chairman stated that the financial evaluation recently undertaken by RPT Consulting had examined five options (as set out in Paragraph 1.7 of the Report) and recommended that Option 2 and Option 5 be examined further. The other options were not considered to be viable. It was not possible to publish the evaluation at the current time as it contained information regarding the expected contributions of external partners and discussions with them were on-going. However, the evaluation would be made public as soon as possible.

Option 2 involved an upgrade of existing facilities and would cost approximately £6m – £9m. Option 5 involved a new building at the eastern side of Bar End and was estimated to cost £25 - £28m. The Chairman stated that it was proposed to give further consideration to the design and business case for Option 5 (including confirming external contributions) with a final decision to be taken at Council in January 2016. Option 2 was being retained in case Option 5 proved to be unviable on further investigations.

The Chairman requested that Recommendation 2 of the Report be amended to allow approval of the £25,000 to fund additional design and planning work as a virement from the Asset Management Plan (rather than a supplementary estimate). This was agreed.

Three members of local interest/sports groups spoke during public participation and their comments are summarised below.

Emma Back (Chief Executive of Winchester Sport Art and Leisure Trust) welcomed the proposals for the Council to work in partnership with other organisations and the opportunity to contribute to the RTP report. The Trust were committed to raising funds (£1m) for a Sports and Recreation Hub at Bar End and urged the Council to retain Option 4 and work to bring the Garrison Ground into the Hub as this offered important recreational spaces and was also vital for access. She stated that Winchester Fit for Future group had undertaken work with a local architect regarding access to Bar End which could be shared with the Council. She requested that the Council focus on community orientated operating models for a new centre.

Ms Back also spoke on behalf of Ruth Ashton (Chair of Winchester Netball Club) who wished to highlight the current difficulties caused by the shortage of suitable indoor facilities to hire in Winchester.

The Chairman welcomed Ms Back's support and noted comments regarding increasing demand within Winchester for sports and leisure facilities and the need to increase provision rather than to simply maintain existing. He stated that Option 5 would allow the Garrison Ground to be safeguarded for the foreseeable future as it was not required for the leisure building and the Council was investigating whether it could purchase it.

Sam Fulling (Chief Executive of Winchester City Penguins Club) welcomed the proposals for a new facility and believed that this should include a multi-functional 50 metre pool, which would then have the ability to be split into different uses. He highlighted his experience in a previous role with Saracens Rugby of provision of a new centre in London. He also emphasised that the Penguins Club currently spent approximately £150,000 per annum on pool hire across 5 different pools and would welcome being involved as a partner.

Ashley Blakeley (District Sports Winchester) highlighted the current shortage of sports facilities in Winchester compare to other cities, such as Southampton. He mentioned that Romsey Mountbatten School had recently installed a 3G pitch which had increased revenue throughout the year.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Laming, Warwick, Burns, Thompson and J Berry addressed Cabinet and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Laming emphasised that the Council should make a decision on the future of the Leisure Centre without further delay, otherwise he believed there was a risk that possible contributors to funding, such as the University, could set up their own facility. The Council should appoint a project manager reporting directly to the Leader and set up a joint working party to include external partners. A design competition should be held. He believed there were other potential funders who had not yet been approached by the Council. A new facility should include a 50 metre pool and a 12 court hall to offer increased availability and flexibility of use. The possibility of linking with Park and Ride services to improve accessibility to a Bar End site should be investigated.

In response to questions from the Chairman, Councillor Laming suggested other potential funders could include the Ministry of Defence and other large employers in the area, such as IBM.

Councillor Warwick welcomed the Report and the proposal to make the RPT appraisal public as soon as possible. However, she believed that the appointment of an architect to undertake further design work should be through a procurement process and a public design competition. She also emphasised the importance of involving future partners on a decision on facility mix. Any future centre could be operated by a Leisure Trust.

In response, the Chairman highlighted that any decision to involve different architects for the further study would cause further delays to the process. The Corporate Director advised that Roberts Limbrick were one of the most well-resourced and respected firms of leisure architects in the country. He confirmed that there would be a further procurement process for any major contract for the final design. He also emphasised that the Council were seeking to progress proposals as quickly as possible, but highlighted that the University were not yet able to fully commit to funding.

Councillor Burns referred to historic details of the contract with Places for People and believed that the company should have been required to undertake additional repairs to the Centre to date, as well as being required to undertake a full interim refurbishment of the Centre to enable its continued use until any new facility was built. If the Council decided on Option 5 it should not enter into a design, build and operate contract and should not tie itself to a single contractor.

In response, the Chief Executive advised that the Head of Estates had provided a detailed report on the maintenance of the existing Leisure Centre which did not indicate that Places for People had neglected their responsibilities under the contract. He emphasised that the Council was responsible for major maintenance. However, he could examine further any specific examples of alleged shortfalls, if provided by Councillor Burns.

The Chief Executive advised that a design, build and operate contract might be an option but emphasised that there was no prior commitment with any operator, including Places for People. The Council would go out to tender for any new contract. He also refuted any implications that the University were stipulating the use of a particular operator.

Councillor Thompson welcomed the report and highlighted proposals were likely to result in strong views from both Hyde residents (in relation to potentially losing a local facility) and Highcliffe residents if Option 5 was pursued. She requested further information be made available regarding possible transport links to Bar End, including consideration under the re-letting of the Park and Ride bus contract. She highlighted the current energy inefficiency of the existing centre and the opportunity to address this in a new facility.

The Chairman highlighted the planned consultation and agreed that the possibility of altering the Park and Ride contract be examined further. He confirmed improving the energy efficiency of the centre would be an element of the design expectations.

As a Ward Councillor for St John & All Saints, Councillor J Berry requested that the proposed consultation be as wide-reaching and inclusive as possible, including local meetings in the Highcliffe area and the involvement of young people. Consultation should also include future options for the use of the Bar End depot. She believed that any decision on the depot should be delayed until the consultation exercise had been completed. There should be the opportunity for the public to comment and influence the design of any new centre.

The Chairman emphasised that as the Bar End depot site was not considered to be viable for a new centre he believed delaying consideration of alternative uses could not be justified. He confirmed that proposed future consultations would include the opportunity to input into the final design.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That a period of public consultation be undertaken to determine the public response to the options of either a replacement for River Park Leisure Centre at Bar End (Option 5) or the refurbishment of the existing facility to extend its lifespan.
2. That a virement from the Asset Management Plan of £25,000 be approved for additional design and planning work in support of the consultation process.
3. That a direction under Contracts procedure Rule 2.4 (b) be made and delegated authority given to the Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) to authorise the entering into of a further contract with Roberts Limbrick Architects for the production of a more detailed study of the Option 5 layout and design.
4. That a further report be made to Cabinet by January 2016 so it can make recommendations to Council to seek approval for a final choice of option.
5. That the Head of Estates be authorised to prepare proposals for the redevelopment of the former Bar End Depot site which retain the possibility of providing vehicular and pedestrian access to the land at the rear.

8. **SILVER HILL – NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING ARCHAEOLOGY AND OTHER IMPLEMENTATION STAFFING ISSUES**
(Report CAB2707 refers)

The Chairman stated that because of the complexity of the Silver Hill site and other sites in the town, such as Station Approach, he considered the proposal to allocate additional resources to the Historic Environment team should be supported. In addition, he supported the proposal for an Implementation Officer, as set out in Paragraph 3.5 of the Report.

The Corporate Director emphasised that the Council had its own in-house expert archaeological advice and would also liaise with Historic England (formerly English Heritage). He advised that at the time of consultation on the 2014 scheme, English Heritage had indicated that they were satisfied with the proposed approach.

Cabinet welcomed to the meeting Tracy Matthews, Historic Environment Officer (Archaeology) who responded to a number of detailed questions from Members. She confirmed the Winchester Excavations Committee would also be kept informed.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Warwick, Laming, Gottlieb, Burns and Thompson addressed Cabinet and their comments are summarised below.

As proposer for the Notice of Motion, Councillor Warwick stated that she wished to avoid a repeat of the Brooks development where much of the site was not investigated for archaeology. She welcomed the proposed enhancements to the Historic Environment Team. However, she queried whether the agreed archaeological costs to be met by the developer in 2005 would be sufficient at the current time. She also believed that there was a potential conflict of interest in the Council's involvement in development of the site and providing independent archaeological advice. She sought assurance of the following points: that the schedule would allow adequate time for investigations; there would be good public access to the site; a proper and full assessment would be carried out into any major finds; and Members and the public would be kept fully informed.

The Chairman stated that the costs had been fully investigated by the Council.

Ms Matthews confirmed that some level of public viewing opportunities was envisaged, but for health and safety reasons, there would not be access to the site itself.

Councillor Laming emphasised the importance of the site both locally and nationally in terms of potential archaeological finds and expressed concern about possible damage due to the deep foundations required because of the geology of the area.

Councillor Gottlieb believed that archaeological investigations should have begun already, as anticipated under the 2003 brief. He considered that the scale of the buildings proposed would require extensive foundations and because the layout and position of new buildings was fixed, this risked significant damage to any archaeological remains within the site. He did not believe it was appropriate for the developer to have the responsibility for archaeological investigations and the Council should not just rely on Historic England.

Ms Matthews outlined the archaeological investigations that had been undertaken on the site over the last few years, which included geotechnical investigations and drilling bore holes. The resulting report had given a more detailed picture of the situation beneath ground level and further detail would be available following evaluation trenching and ongoing monitoring of water levels. The developer was also undertaking further work to better understand the hydrology of the area.

Councillor Burns welcomed the update from Ms Matthews. However, she also expressed concern that the site should have adequate protection to ensure any archaeological remains were not destroyed. She considered that an independent archaeologist was necessary to achieve this and that Professor Martin Biddle had indicated his willingness to take on this role on a pro bono basis, with suitable contribution to the Winchester Excavation Committee. She was concerned that the foundations required would result in destruction of archaeology in excess of the 2% permitted.

The Chairman reiterated that Historic England would be involved and the Winchester Excavations Committee kept informed.

Councillor Thompson shared concerns about the lack of capacity in the Historic Environment Team, particularly with the amount of development proposed, and supported the proposal for additional resources.

With regard to the third Report Recommendation, Cabinet agreed that the detail could be agreed by the Leader through the Portfolio Holder Decision Making procedure, rather than a further report to Cabinet.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE NOTICE OF MOTION NOT BE SUPPORTED BECAUSE IT IS BASED UPON AN INCORRECT PRESUMPTION THAT THE ARRANGEMENTS FOR MANAGING ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS THROUGH THE PLANNING PROCESS FOR SILVER HILL ARE IN SOME WAY DEFICIENT WHEN THIS IS NOT THE CASE.

RESOLVED:

1. That recognising the significant and unusual volume of development activity that may be taking place in Winchester over the next three years -:

- (a) additional resources be allocated to the Historic Environment team to provide additional capacity for the supervision and management of archaeological investigations and public engagement, initially by the creation of a temporary fixed term post for two years (estimated grade of Scale 5), and the situation thereafter be subject to further review.
- (b) the cost of approximately £82,000, over two years, be funded by way of a revenue budget virement from the Flexible Resource Management savings in the year to date.

2. That the additional resources required for the implementation of the Silver Hill project be supported in principle, and the decision on how this is taken forward be taken by the Leader, via the Portfolio Holder decision making process.

9. **MAGDALEN HILL CEMETERY EXTENSION**

(Report CAB2698 refers)

The Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) advised that since the Report was produced, further archaeology had been discovered on the site which required an additional £20,000 of expenditure (increasing the total of the supplementary estimate required to £105,000). The Chief Operating Officer advised that as the amount of the supplementary estimate was above £100,000, it was subject to consideration of call-in by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

One Member queried whether access to the site of the extension being gained from Alresford Road rather than through the existing cemetery, possibly might reduce costs involved? The Assistant Director explained that there were practical difficulties in achieving this but agreed it could be examined further. The Chairman requested that this be reported to the Winchester Town Forum at its meeting on 23 September 2015.

Cabinet also debated the merits of using iron railings for the eastern boundary of the extension, as opposed to less costly post and rail fencing, with differing views being expressed. It was noted that iron railings would last longer and, on balance, were favoured by the majority of Cabinet.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Power addressed Cabinet and in summary emphasised the shortage of burial spaces in Market Towns and suggested a District-wide report should be prepared.

The Chief Operating Officer clarified that it was the responsibility of individual parish councils to provide burial sites in their parish.

The Chief Finance Officer explained that the full cost and benefits of an extension would be met by the Winchester Town Account and consequentially, Cabinet should take account of the Winchester Town Forum's views on the proposals.

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

RESOLVED:

That subject to any comments from the Town Forum and the decision not being call-in by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

1. That the preference be for iron railings to be used for the scheme along its east boundary (as set out in Section 3 of the report) which will in turn help to define the overall character of the cemetery extension.

2. That approval be given under Financial Procedure Rule 7.2 for a capital budget supplementary estimate of £105,000 in 2015/16 in addition to the current Capital Budget of £135,000 to enable the Extension to be constructed.

3. That approval under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4 be given to release the total scheme funding (£240,000) to enable the scheme as shown in Appendix 1 to the report to be constructed during the autumn.

4. That the Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) be authorised to let a contract for the project in accordance with the Council's Contracts Procedure Rules, and in consultation with the Leader, to take into account any points raised by the Town Forum within the budget made available in 2 and 3 above.

10. **CASSON BLOCK, ST GEORGE'S STREET, FORECOURT/FRONTAGE ENHANCEMENT SCHEME**

(Report CAB2712 refers)

The Head of Economy and Arts confirmed that the proposals had resulted from consultation with business representatives from the Casson Block. Further work would be undertaken to assess the effect of any improvements on footfall to the area. In addition, further consultation was proposed with the wider business community and local residents.

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

Councillor Tait welcomed the Report as a real opportunity to improve the area and increase footfall. However, he believed progress should be alongside measures to encourage businesses to maintain good discipline in maintaining the appearance of their stores and areas outside, particularly regarding refuse bins. In addition, signage to other shopping areas, such as Parchment Street should be improved.

The Head of Economy and Arts advised that the Public Realm Working Group, together with Winchester BID, were examining the issues of refuse bins and signage with the aim of finding solutions.

Councillor Thompson also welcomed the proposals but believed that they should not be funded by the Winchester Town Access Plan (WTAP) as this had been established to improve accessibility to the Town, not for cosmetic improvements.

The Assistant Director (Policy and Planning) advised that £150,000 had been allocated within WTAP to support general improvements in St Georges Street. The monies were allocated a number of years ago, but proposals had stalled pending the redevelopment of the Silver Hill area. It was therefore proposed the money be used at this stage and alternative funding be reconsidered as and when further proposals under WTAP come forward from the County Council.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rule 7.2, approval is given to vire £150,000 of capital budget in 2016/17 from the Winchester Town Access Plan to the Casson Block project, subject to the matter not being called in by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and
2. That, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rule 7.4, approval is given for the revenue budget virement of £5,000 of existing Local Economy budget and £5,000 of existing Estates budget in 2015/16, for the design phase of the works.

11. **SUPPORTING EMPLOYMENT THROUGH PLANNING AND PROCUREMENT PROCESSES**

(Report CAB2717 refers)

The Assistant Director (Economy and Communities) advised that although it was not possible to require future planning applicants to introduce an employment and skills plan, recent approaches to the North Whiteley consortium had indicated they supported the general principle. She requested that Recommendation 2 of the Report be amended to emphasise that it could not be a mandatory requirement. This was agreed.

The Chief Executive highlighted the national shortage of skills in the construction market which could potentially impact upon the Council's own new build housing programme. The measures proposed in the Report should go some way to addressing this.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Construction Industry Training Board's Client Based Approach be formally recognised as the Council's preferred approach to securing employment and training opportunities through planning and procurement processes.

2. That the promotion of the Client Based Approach be applied with immediate effect to all large scale planning applications (10 or more houses/1000sq.m plus floor space).

3. That the Client Based Approach be applied with immediate effect to the Council's procurement for all construction and building projects of a size or value equivalent to a large scale planning application (10 or more houses/1000sq.m plus floor space).

4. That the Head of Democratic and Legal Services be delegated to make appropriate amendments to the Contracts Procedures rules in the Constitution to reflect the Council's aspiration to apply this approach wherever practicable, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, Head of Estates and Assistant Director (Economy and Communities).

12. **DEVOLUTION: UPDATE ON THE HAMPSHIRE & ISLE OF WIGHT SUBMISSION**

(Report CAB2715 refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report would also be considered by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 14 September 2015.

The Chairman stated that the formal prospectus from all Hampshire and Isle of Wight authorities had been submitted to the Secretary of State on 4

September 2015. It was available on the Council's website and a briefing had been arranged for all Councillors on 21 September 2015. The Council would have to consider whether it wished to accept the Government's proposal at meetings of Cabinet and Council in October/November 2015.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Power sought reassurances regarding the safeguarding of rural services and also transparency as to how funding under any devolution would be divided. She also believed that, if further devolution to parish councils was proposed, not all currently had the necessary skills and resources so further support would be required.

The Chief Executive noted these comments and confirmed discussions to date had focussed on rural matters and the partners would undertake work on governance arrangements for the appropriate division of funding. He advised that there would be a further briefing session arranged for a date in October.

Cabinet expressed their thanks to the Leader and Chief Executive for their work in developing the proposals to date.

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

RESOLVED:

That progress made be noted.

13. **MINUTES OF THE CABINET (HOUSING) COMMITTEE HELD 30 JUNE 2015**
(Report CAB2713 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Housing) Committee held 30 June 2015 be received (as attached as Appendix A).

14. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

The Chairman reported that a Special meeting of Cabinet had been arranged for 17 September 2015 to consider reports on proposals for the Station Approach and St Clement's surgery.

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Forward Plan for October 2015, be noted.

15. **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 minute of the previous meeting: Silver Hill – Submissions by Silverhill Winchester No.1 Ltd & Council's response (exempt appendices)) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). (Para 3 Schedule 12A refers)) Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings. (Para 5 Schedule 12A refers)

16. **EXEMPT MINUTE**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minute of the previous special meetings held 13 July and 16 July 2015 be approved and adopted.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 1.55pm

Chairman