

CABINET

19 May 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Campbell (Chairman) (P)

Beveridge (P)
Collin
Evans (P)
Hiscock (P)

Knasel (P)
Learney (P)
Wagner (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Beckett, Bennetts, Davies, de Peyer and Mather

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Busher, Higgins, Mitchell and Pearson.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Collin.

2. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman advised that Fareham Borough Council had initially indicated that they did not wish to be part of the newly reformed Whiteley Forum. It was hoped the Forum would include the County Council, Parish Council representatives and business leaders.

The Chairman also mentioned that an Audit Commission report which focussed on partnership working in the Health for All Partnership would soon be available.

3. **FUTURE MEETING DATES AND TIMES**

RESOLVED:

That meetings of Cabinet continue to commence at 9.00am and that the timetable of meetings for 2005/06 be agreed as set out on the agenda front sheet (and as contained in Report CAB945, Cabinet 13 October 2004).

4.

APPOINTMENT OF PORTFOLIOS FOR THE 2005-06 MUNICIPAL YEAR
(Oral Report)

Cabinet agreed to make the portfolio appointments set out below.

RESOLVED:

1. That the following arrangements for the allocation of Portfolios be agreed for 2005/06:

Culture, Heritage and Sport – Councillor Evans
Finance and Resources – Councillor Learney
Housing – Councillor Hiscock
Environmental Health – Councillor Wagner
Economy and Transport – Councillor Knasel
Healthy and Inclusive Communities – Councillor Collin
Planning – Councillor Beveridge

5. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20 April 2005 be approved and adopted (less exempt items).

6. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Six Winchester residents spoke in opposition to the proposal to increase fees for on-street parking permits (as set out in Report CAB1044) and their comments are summarised under the Report heading below.

7. **PROPOSED VARIATION OF FEES FOR ON-STREET PARKING PERMITS IN WINCHESTER**

(Report CAB1044 refers)

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

Councillor Beveridge declared a personal, but not prejudicial, interest in respect of this item as a resident permit holder of a Ward affected by the proposed fee increase. He remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

Six Winchester residents spoke in opposition to the proposal to increase fees for on-street parking permits and some requested that the decision be deferred. Their comments are summarised below:

Mr M Gibbons (Clausenteum Road, St Cross resident):

- increase was excessive and discriminated against residents who had no choice but to park on the road;
- there had been insufficient scrutiny of the need for the increases, the costings were not transparent and Cabinet should not make a decision without further investigation and referral to full Council;
- the objections received had not been adequately summarised in the report;

- if the increase was agreed, then individual roads should be allowed to “opt-out” of the residents’ parking scheme.

Mrs Dixon (Hyde resident) stated that she supported the principle that costs of operating the residents’ parking scheme should not be subsidised from Council Tax income. However, she raised a number of detailed queries about the financial information provided in support of the increase, including the following points:

- how had the figure of £310,000 (as an estimate of the total permit scheme costs) been calculated;
- she queried the level of management overheads stated as she believed, at approximately 24%, it was much too high;
- the income from parking penalty charge notices issued for other parking contraventions whilst wardens were patrolling residents’ parking schemes should be off-set against the cost of the scheme.

Dr Pickering (St Faiths Road, St Cross):

- the objections received had been misrepresented in the summary included in the report and the letter sent to all residents advising of the increase did not include the most common objections;
- the reasoning for the proposed increase was based on inaccurate costings. In addition, residents were advised that more detailed financial information would be available at the Cabinet meeting;
- there had been inadequate consultation and Cabinet appeared just to be “rubber stamping” the decision without adequate scrutiny. He stated that at a public meeting organised by the residents, a Ward Councillor had stated that the charges would have to rise.

Mr J Bone (St Faiths Road, St Cross):

- residents are being unfairly targeted as a source of additional income;
- consideration of the residents’ parking scheme should include consideration of car parks (because if all car parking was free, there would be no need for a residents’ scheme);
- more information required about the parking budget;
- the fees should be increased gradually to minimise impact.

Mr S Morea (St Faiths Road, St Cross):

- the residents parking scheme was only introduced in some areas in 1996 so the increase was above inflation levels from that time;
- the comparison with other local authorities did not include consideration that the more expensive authorities offered concessions for elderly residents, visitors etc;
- costings not been properly scrutinised and should include consideration of possible savings, such the efficiency of the parking office and reducing the frequency of parking attendants visits to certain roads.

Mrs S Pickering (St Faiths Road, St Cross):

- the scheme should be subsidised by the Council Tax;
- the Council should seek to make savings by improving the efficiency of the parking service;
- the Council should give assurances that the money raised by the increase would not be used to offset losses in other areas, such as Park and Ride;
- The local Ward Councillor should have been willing to represent the views of local residents at the meeting.

The Chairman thanked the six members of the public for their comments.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors de Peyer, Davies and Mather also spoke on this item.

Councillor de Peyer thanked the officers for their work in preparing the report. However, he agreed with many of the comments made by the members of the public and consequentially requested that a decision on any increase be deferred to allow further investigation, particularly into the possibility of reducing costs. In addition, he believed that the consultation carried out with affected residents had not been adequate.

Councillor Davies endorsed the comments made by Councillor de Peyer and agreed that the decision should be deferred. He emphasised that the fundamental purpose of the residents' parking scheme should be to prevent commuter parking to the benefit of residents and not to raise revenue for the Council. He stated that a review of the whole area of the scheme was required in addition to consideration of possible savings (for example, whether permits had to be issued annually).

Councillor Mather also agreed with the comments made by the public and other Councillors. She emphasised the large number of people that had objected to the proposed increase and believed that their comments were not adequately summarised in the report. She raised concerns about the calculation of the costs involved and the effect of the size of the increase on residents on a low income, such as pensioners. In summary, she believed more investigation was required and requested that the decision be deferred.

The Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport highlighted the background to the proposed increase, emphasising that the proposals had been debated by cross party meetings of the Parking Review Informal Scrutiny Group and the Environment and Access Performance Improvement Committee where it was proposed that the fee increase for the first permit be reduced from £25 to £20. In addition, these recommendations had been considered by Cabinet on 15 December 2004 and 19 January 2005 where it was agreed that a scratch card system be introduced for occasional visitors (Report CAB998 refers). The Portfolio Holder explained that the residents' parking scheme operated as a privilege for residents who lived in the town centre area and excluded residents from elsewhere in the District from parking in these areas. Therefore, it was reasonable to expect residents benefiting from the scheme to meet the costs.

The Director of Development stated that eight further letters of objection and one letter of support had been received since the preparation of the report to Cabinet.

In response to questions regarding possible savings in the administration and enforcement of the scheme, the Director of Development explained that it was necessary to maintain certain levels in order to combat misuse and fraud.

Following debate, Cabinet agreed that the proposed fee increase should be agreed as set out in the report. However, further investigation was required on a number of the issues raised.

Members agreed that there should be a further review undertaken into the operation of the residents' parking scheme. This review should consider the costs involved in administering and enforcing the scheme, including a more detailed analysis of the level of management overheads. It should also investigate whether any adjustment was required to the areas included within the scheme or whether different zones with differential charging should be introduced within the scheme itself to reflect the different levels of parking pressures on different areas of the town.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the proposed revision to the fees for parking permits be implemented as advertised and the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to make the Order.
2. That a letter be sent to all permit holders advising of the fee increase and including a full explanation of the reason behind the decision.
3. That the Parking Review Informal Scrutiny Group be requested to review the costing and scope of the residents' parking scheme as outlined above and a report be made to a future Cabinet meeting.

8. **ANNUAL APPOINTMENTS TO CABINET COMMITTEES AND INFORMAL MEMBER/OFFICER WORKING GROUPS ETC 2005/06**
(Report CAB1076 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

1. That a Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee be established with the following terms of reference:

“(i) to exercise the functions contained in any agency agreement with the County Council with regard to traffic management, park and ride or on-street parking;

(ii) to exercise any District Council functions with regard to temporary road closures, park and ride or off-street parking.”

2. That the following appointments be made for the 2005/06 Municipal Year (with terms of reference be agreed as set out above and in the report):

- (i) Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee – Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport plus any two other Cabinet Members to be selected by the City Secretary and Solicitor in alphabetical rotation.
- (ii) Housing Options Appraisal Steering Group:
Councillors: Coates, Davies, Hiscock, Steel and Tait
TACT Representatives: Mr Bungey, Mr Gore, Mr Hayes, Mr Rickman and Mr Whitfield (deputy: Mr Gilbert-Wood) and representative from TPAS
Officers: B Merrett, F Lyon, H Bone, R Botham and L MacLachlan
- (iii) Air Quality Informal Member/Officer Working Group:
Councillors: de Peyer, Hammerton, Knasel, Learney, Mitchell, Pearson, Saunders, Wagner and Wright.
Officers: (City Council) R Heathcock, A Jowsey, S Blazdell, P Tidridge, D Massey (County Council) A Wren, P Fydall, K Travers and P Syddall

- (iv) Service Charges Informal Member/Officer Working Group:
Councillors: Coates, Hiscock, Hoare, Pines and Steel
TACT Representatives: Ms Greaves, Mr Rickman, Ms Stevenson-Baker
Officers: L Bingham, R Boardman, R Botham, A Crosskey, L Curtis, S Tong, B Merrett, F Sutherland
- (v) West of Waterlooville Forum:
Councillors: Chamberlain, Collin (Chairman), Cooper, Hiscock, Rees and Stallard
Deputies: Allgood, Clohosey, Goodall and Pines

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE MINOR CHANGES TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION, PART 3, SECTION 3, PORTFOLIO HOLDER SCHEME OF DELEGATION BE APPROVED AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 2.1 OF THE REPORT AND OUTLINED BELOW:

TRANSFER OF THE FOLLOWING DELEGATION TO THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING (FROM THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR CULTURE, HERITAGE AND SPORT):

"TO AGREE THE RELEASE OF MONEY FROM THE OPEN SPACE FUND FOR INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS, UP TO A LIMIT OF £50,000 PER PROJECT."

9. **LGA ANNUAL CONFERENCE AND EXHIBITION – APPOINTMENT OF DELEGATES**
(Oral Report)

RESOLVED:

That the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council (Councillors Campbell and Evans respectively) and Councillors Beckett, Davies and Hoare be appointed as the Council's representatives to the 2005 LGA Conference and Exhibition (to be held 5 to 8 July 2005).

10. **MINOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION – SCHEME OF DELEGATION TO OFFICERS**
(Report CAB1074 refers)

In response to questions, the Chief Executive stated that although the proposed amendment regarding Open Space funding specified consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, in practice it was expected that the Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport would also be informally consulted by the Portfolio Holder for Planning.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the changes to the Part 3 of the Constitution, Section 6, be approved as outlined in Appendix A of the report.

2. That the Scheme of Delegation to Portfolio Holders be amended as outlined in paragraph 2.6 (Part 3 of the Constitution, Section 3).

11. **COMMUNITY GRANTS – EMERGENCY CAPITAL AWARD 2005/06**

(Report CAB1077 refers)

As a local Ward Member, Councillor Wagner highlighted the requirement for improved CCTV at the Colden Common Community Association.

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

RESOLVED:

That a grant award of £5,000 to Colden Common Community Association be approved from the grant budget for 2005/06, subject to a minimum contribution of £2,500 from the Parish Council and the organisation entering into a funding agreement with the City Council.

12. **ANNUAL APPOINTMENTS TO EXTERNAL BODIES**

(Report CAB1078 refers)

It was reported at the meeting that Councillor Tait should be included in the list of nominations for both Winchester Inclusive Housing Forum and Winchester Housing Trust. In addition, Winchester Housing Group (WHG) had indicated that it only required one representative for the new year and consequentially, Councillor Maynard had withdrawn his nomination. WHG had also expressed a preference for Councillor Rees to continue as their representative.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the following appointments to external bodies be made for the 2005/06 Municipal Year (deputies in brackets):

- (i) Bishops Waltham Sports Committee – Councillor Chamberlain (Goodall)
- (ii) Carroll Youth Centre – Councillors Darbyshire and Tait (Rees)
- (iii) Central Hampshire Transport Strategy Panel (formerly CHARTS) – Councillors Busher, Davies, Knasel and Lipscomb (Bennetts and Jeffs)
- (iv) South Downs Joint Committee – Councillors Beveridge and Sutton (Busher)
- (v) Forest of Bere and Eversley Joint Members Working Group – Councillors Beveridge and Pearson
- (vi) Hampshire & Isle of Wight Association of Local Authorities (HIOWA) – Councillors Campbell and Evans
- (vii) Hampshire County Council Annual Meeting with Parish & District Councils regarding public transport issues – Councillor Knasel
- (viii) Health for All Committee – Councillors Collin, Hammerton, Rees and Chairman of relevant Scrutiny Body.
- (ix) Local Government Association – Councillor Campbell (Evans)
- (x) Local Government Association Rural Commission – Councillor Beveridge (Campbell)

- (xi) Local Government Association Urban Commission – Councillor Knasel (Hiscock)
- (xii) National Parking Adjudication Joint Committee – Councillor Knasel
- (xiii) Project Integra Management Board – Councillor Wagner (Evans)
- (xiv) Project Integra Policy Review and Scrutiny Committee – Councillor Pearson (Hutton)
- (xv) Solent Transport Strategy Panel – Councillor Clohosey (Allgood)
- (xvi) South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) – Councillor Campbell (Evans)
- (xvii) Southampton, Hampshire, Isle of Wight and Portsmouth Arts Forum – Councillor Evans (Chairman of relevant Scrutiny body)
- (xviii) Tourism South East – Councillor Evans (Knasel)
- (xix) Tower Arts Management Committee – Councillor Tait (Love)
- (xx) Twyford Waterworks – Councillor Sutton (Wagner)
- (xxi) WCC/Serco Member Liaison Meeting – Councillors Campbell, Busher, Davies, Hiscock, Learney, Lipscomb and Wagner
- (xxii) WCC/Steria UK Member Liaison Meeting – Councillors Chamberlain, Davies, Learney and Lipscomb.
- (xxiii) Winchester Allotment Holders Society – Councillor Nunn
- (xxiv) Winchester District Joint Consultative Committee – Councillors Campbell, Davies and Lipscomb plus Portfolio Holders relevant to the business on the agenda.
- (xxv) Winchester Highway & Transport Advisory Panel - Councillors Busher, Clohosey, Davies, Knasel, Jeffs and Lipscomb (de Peyer, Hammerton and Wagner)
- (xxvi) Winchester Housing Group – Councillor Rees
- (xxvii) Winchester Inclusive Housing Forum (formerly Winchester Housing Needs Group) – Councillors Love and Tait
- (xxviii) Winchester Housing Trust – Councillor Bennetts (Tait – Observer)
- (xxix) Winchester Indoor Sports Association (Lido Sports Club) – Councillor Sutton
- (xxx) Winchester Road Safety Council Committee – Councillor Knasel (Pearson)

2. That the following appointments to external bodies be made for period stated:

- (i) Age Concern (until 31 May 2006) – Councillor Collin (Cooper)
- (ii) Bishops Waltham Citizens Advice Bureau (until 15 May 2006) – Councillor Busher
- (iii) Havant Citizens Advice Bureau (until 30 May 2006) – Councillor Allgood
- (iv) Henry Smith Charity (St John) (until 30 April 2008) – Councillor Pines
- (v) Relate (until 30 June 2006) – Councillor Love
- (vi) St John's Winchester Charity (until 6 June 2009) – Councillors Davies and Higgins (*nb Councillor Verney to continue as a representative until September 2008*)
- (vii) Trinity Centre Management Committee (until 30 June 2006) – Councillor Hiscock and Love
- (viii) Whiteley Community Association (until 30 May 2006) – Councillor Anthony
- (ix) Winchester City Centre Management Limited (until 30 June 2006) – Councillor Knasel

13. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Council's Forward Plan for May 2005, be noted.

14. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

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 a particular employee, former employee or applicant to become an employee of, or a particular office-holder, former office-holder or applicant to become an office-holder under the authority. (Para 1 to Schedule 12A refers).
##	Exempt minutes of the Previous meeting) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (other than the authority). (Para 7 Schedule 12A refers).
##	101 High Street, Winchester) Any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services. (Para 9 to Schedule 12A refers).

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

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minutes of the previous meeting held 20 April 2005 be approved and adopted.

16. **101 HIGH STREET, WINCHESTER**
(Report CAB1082 refers)

Cabinet considered the above report which set out proposals regarding 101 High Street, Winchester (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 9.00am and concluded at 11.50am