

CABINET

29 June 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Campbell (Chairman) (P)

Beveridge (P)

Collin(P)

Evans (P)

Hiscock (P)

Knasel (P)

Learney (P)

Wagner (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Bennetts, Higgins and Verney

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Bidgood, Davies and Mitchell

122. **LEADER AND PORTFORLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Leader reported that the proposals for the Silver Hill, Winchester redevelopment were now on public display.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning reported that an offer had been made to an applicant for the post of Head of Planning Control and a response was awaited.

The Portfolio holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport reported that the Hat Fair would be held on the forthcoming weekend and commented upon the local residents' proposals to commemorate the 900th anniversary of Hyde Abbey.

123. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meetings held on 19 May and 1 June 2005 be approved and adopted (less exempt items).

124. **PUBLIC PARTICIPTATION**

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting approximately 40 members of the public in attendance for the item relating to report CAB1056 – Traffic Management, Parchment Street, Winchester and surrounding roads. Thirteen people spoke on this item and their comments are summarised below.

Mr Eads-Forth, a resident of North Walls commented on the added noise pollution and time taken to travel that had resulted from the Experimental Traffic Order. The scheme had benefited the residents of Parchment Street to the detriment of those living in North Walls, Union Street and Friarsgate. Only 28% of respondents to the questionnaire had commented that the scheme had been an improvement and this did not include the views of residents in North Walls.

Mr Pitkin stated that although he was a resident of St Cross he used a parking space at Northgate Chambers in St Peter Street. He proposed that a more suitable solution was for St Peter Street to be one way from North Walls as it was wider than Parchment Street and had less parked cars. This proposal would have the advantage of an easier entry from North Walls as opposed to reversing traffic in St Peter Street where the poor sight lines resulted in limited visibility. The proposals could be further enhanced by the provision of traffic lights at the junction of St Peter Street, which could be phased with those at the junction of Parchment Street. He concluded that the present arrangements were to the benefit of residents of Parchment Street and to the detriment of others including residents of North Walls.

Mrs Griffiths, a resident of Parchment Street, spoke of the large increase in traffic volumes in the town over the last 15 years and the benefits to Parchment Street that had been gained by the Experimental Traffic Order in terms of safety for children and improvements to air quality. She was sorry that the traders were losing trade but this might be due to national trends. There was inconvenience due to the added time for travel but this had to be put in the context of the 3,000 traffic movements per day in Parchment Street, which had not been designed to take that volume of traffic.

Mr R Backhouse stated that as a resident of Parchment Street he also was in support of the recommendation of the extension of the Experimental Traffic Order in order that more data could be obtained. There had been benefits to Parchment Street in improvements to quality of life through a reduction of traffic volumes and pollution. The character of the street had changed and was now more residential. He was disappointed at the traders' attitude and suggested that additional evidence was required to substantiate the claimed decrease in trading position. Improvements to the Casson Block also would improve the area. He asked Cabinet to take into consideration the requirements of PPG13 relating to transport. The objections from those living in villages north of Winchester could be addressed by parking their cars in Tower Street car park. Although there had been an increase in traffic in North Walls, the relative impact in that street was less than the benefit gained by an 83% traffic reduction in Parchment Street.

Mr Bevan stated that as a delivery driver the Experimental Traffic Order had made delivering in Winchester very difficult. The old system was much better. When a delivery had now been made to St Peter Street, delivery vehicles had to negotiate North Walls, Union Street and Friarsgate before they could make a second drop in Parchment Street. In all a delivery vehicle might have to negotiate the one way system three times and he questioned why Parchment Street should be treated different from any other street.

Mrs Gunn, a resident of Parchment Street, stated that the Experimental Traffic Order had resulted in a reduction in noise on Parchment Street and that longer driving times for vehicles were dependent upon where the journey had commenced from, as vehicles travelling from the south had a shorter journey. She supported the extension of the experimental period for a further six months.

Mrs Frankum representing the Salvation Army in Parchment Street commented on the added times taken for delivery vehicles to visit the Salvation Army premises with the additional cost in petrol and added pollution. It took an extra 20 minutes for their delivery vehicles to have to negotiate North Walls and St Georges Street. She added that the additional journey time would also make it more expensive to use taxis. She recognised the environmental benefits to the residents of Parchment Street and asked that the Council consider making the part of Parchment Street from North Walls to the Salvation Army premises two way to allow their premises to be accessed more easily.

Mr Mariner representing the City Centre Partnership stated that an improved traffic flow in the town could stimulate the business economy but a number of businesses in Parchment Street had been affected by the Experimental Traffic Order. There were approximately 70 residential units in Parchment Street and 24 traders, mostly operating businesses that were privately owned. Mr Mariner had been asked to represent the traders because their businesses had been adversely affected by the temporary order. Takings had been reduced by between 10% and 35% which was well above the national trend in the down turn in retail takings as reported in the press. If the Council wished to inspect audited figures then he would consult with the traders to see these could be released. The report provided statistics on air quality, but there was no measurable benefits stated for improvements to air quality or the quality of traffic flow. He was also concerned at the wider trading impact on the town if the Experimental Traffic Order had reduced the number of vehicles by 1,000 as stated in the report. The attitude of the residents in Parchment Street was understandable, but this had been at a significant cost to traders and delivery drivers.

Ms Sirl, a resident of Parchment Street, stated that there was overwhelming support for the Experimental Order reversing the one way traffic flow in Parchment Street and such a proposal was supported by PPG13. There was an unsupported claim made by the traders suggesting a down turn in trade since the experiment, but all retail traders were suffering and the trades involved were focusing on the wrong issues. 10 retail stores could not hold the whole scheme to ransom. 3,000 traffic movements per day on a narrow street were unacceptable and the needs of pedestrians should also be taken into account as well as traffic.

Mrs Lawson, representing the Oxfam shop in Parchment Street, stated that the issues were a question of balance between small businesses and residents within the area. The quiet enjoyment of the residential properties was appreciated but other premises needed to trade. Half of the businesses on the street stated that they had suffered a decrease in trade. However, an increase in pedestrian shoppers generated by the reduction in vehicles would be advantageous. New signage was needed to attract pedestrian customers from the centre of the town to its side streets to support independent traders and also the successful promotion of special events such as the Hat Fair to attract people into the town. The Council needed to encourage such approaches otherwise it would be necessary to reconsider the Experimental Scheme for Parchment Street.

Mrs Couper-Johnston, a resident of Parchment Street, stated that the Council needed to take into consideration PPG13 which placed pedestrian welfare before cars. The traders would need to demonstrate why their businesses had suffered as the result of the Experimental Traffic Order over other traders in the town. The Experimental Traffic Order had reduced pollution for asthma sufferers, reduced noise, improved safety for pedestrians and generally had led to an improved life for those living in Parchment Street. The evidence available pointed to the retention of the scheme.

Ms S Walker, a resident of Parchment Street, stated that the extra time taken for deliveries, estimated as an extra five minutes, was not a large amount of time for the change in the quality of life for the residents of Parchment Street and Middle Brook Street. The benefits included the decrease in noise, increases in pedestrian safety and a reduction in pollution. She also questioned the relationship between the decrease in passing car traffic and the claimed decrease in trade at the shops in Parchment Street. The traffic changes had not affected North Walls to a greater extent than was the case under the previous traffic flow and the scheme was a success and should be made permanent.

Mr Mirchandani, a resident of Parchment Street, stated that the street was very narrow and was a principal pedestrian route through to Hyde, North Walls Car Parks, the River Park Leisure Centre and St Bede's Primary School from the town centre. Traffic movements in Parchment Street had far exceeded those of comparable roads, which conflicted with the residential pedestrian movements. The objectors had highlighted the extra time of travel and the added mileage, but the inconvenience of motorists needed to be balanced against the needs of pedestrians and residents.

The Chairman thanked the public speakers for their comments and stated that these points would be addressed under consideration of report CAB1045 below.

125. **TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT – PARCHMENT STREET, WINCHESTER AND SURROUNDING ROADS**

(Report CAB1056 refers)

Public Representations.

Cabinet noted the comments made by the public speakers in the public participation period outlined above.

Councillor Representations

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Bennetts, Higgins and Verney addressed the meeting.

Councillor Higgins (a Ward Member for St John and All Saints) stated that he had originally objected to the Experimental Traffic Order in view of the anticipated knock on effects in St George's Street. However, having seen the results, on the whole his concerns had not been justified and also the flow of traffic in North Walls had not been affected. There was concern from traders in Parchment Street but these needed to be compared with another street in the town to see if the same drop in sales had been incurred elsewhere. Improved signage and publicity was required in order that the interest of the traders in Parchment Street were supported as well as those of the residents.

Councillor Bennetts (a Ward Member for St Paul) stated that there was a question of natural justice between the traders and residents affected by the Experimental Traffic Order. Heavy commercial vehicles using the routes could be controlled but Mr Bevan's statement in the public participation period on the longer time taken for delivery vehicles and taxi drivers to complete their work needed to be taken into consideration. He would also be interested on the views of the ambulance service and other emergency services to the Experimental Order. Air quality issues also needed to be assessed. The needs of the objectors should be taken into consideration as well as those supporting the Experimental Order and he also supported its extension for a further six months in order that a comprehensive traffic survey as proposed in part 9 of the report, could be undertaken.

Councillor Verney (a Ward Member for Cheriton and Bishops Sutton) stated that he was concerned at the large number of objections including those from the traders and that the extension of the Experimental Traffic Order should be for a period less than six months.

Response to points raised above

The following item had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item onto the agenda as a matter requiring urgent consideration in order that the information submitted by the Director of Development could be taken into consideration by Cabinet. The Director of Development circulated at the meeting additional information containing the names of 22 additional representations wishing the experimental changes to be permanent; 3 additional representations wanting the experimental changes to be removed and also a summary of additional responses to the questionnaire received since the report was compiled. In summary the representations for the Parchment Street reversal to be made permanent were 105 (19%) in favour 413 (76%) against and 24 (5%) unsure. For Middle Brook Street for the alterations to be made permanent 98 (19%) were in favour, 298 (58%) were against and 118 (23%) were unsure. A rebuttal statement regarding the traders' report set out within report CAB1045 had also been circulated directly to all Cabinet members by the residents of Parchment Street.

The Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport stated his personal view was with some regret that he was not recommending that the Experimental Traffic Order be made permanent at this time. However gathering further data, particularly on air quality, was important and a final decision should only be taken after extending the experiment for a further six months. The revised arrangements had been of benefit to the streets affected but had resulted in problems for traders, drivers and delivery persons. A meeting had been held with affected traders but the impact could be further analysed by seeking their consent for the Council to examine their trading accounts (cash books) for the last six months. The trading accounts could be compared with any impact reported in similar streets in Winchester to ascertain whether there was a consistency of approach. There was also support for additional signage in the town centre to direct shoppers to the secondary retail areas and he added that a new landscaping design for the Casson Block would shortly be considered by the Council. The Council's decision in six months time would need to take into consideration the needs of all parties.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Health stated that although there was no demonstratable improvement in air quality as yet, the perceived quality of the air had improved for residents. The Council was required to develop an action plan for the air quality management area as required by DEFRA and this would be completed for submission in July. Hampshire County Council would take the lead on this and significant action points would be looking at the options for reducing traffic movements and increasing air quality. Two principal pollutants, particulates and nitrogen oxide would be measured to establish factual records upon which decisions could be based.

The Leader stated that the uniqueness of Winchester was the quality and depth of its secondary shopping streets and improvements in signage would add to these streets integration within the shopping facilities of the town. The extension of the experimental order would allow the data from traders to be examined and compared with streets not subject to the Experimental Traffic Order and the results of the wider traffic survey could also be taken into account. The approval of an Experimental Traffic Order for an extended period would also allow the Director of Development to consider the points made by the public speakers and the public representation as contained in the report.

In response to a Member's question the City Secretary and Solicitor clarified that the next review could be considered by the Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee and that this body had the authority to determine the matter or refer it to Cabinet if it so wished.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Experimental Traffic Order be continued until November 2005, the order having commenced in November 2004, so that further data can be collected.

2. That a report be taken to the Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee before the end of December 2005 for decision.

3. That the Director of Development work with the City Centre Partnership to undertake further consultation with the traders to ask that the trading accounts (cash books) of traders affected in Parchment Street can be compared with those of similar streets in Winchester not subject to the Experimental Traffic Order and that the Council investigate the introduction of pedestrian signage to highlight the shopping opportunities in the secondary streets adjacent to the town centre.

126. **CAPITAL OUTTURN 2004/2005**
(Report CAB1083 refers)

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources outlined the reasons for the principal items of underspend as set out in the report.

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

RESOLVED:

That subject to the matter not being called-in by the Principal Scrutiny Committee, approval be given to the carry forward of capital funds totalling £1.338 million from 2004/2005 to 2005/2006, in accordance with financial procedure rules 7.7 and 7.8.

127. **OVERVIEW OF FINAL ACCOUNTS 2004/2005**
(Report CAB1088 refers)

The Portfolio Holder for Planning explained the variance of £202,359 within the Development Control Budget. This was due to an error in the calculation of performance which had affected planning delivery grant, the extra cost associated with major planning applications (which were not met by incoming fees) and the extra recruitment of staff during the year to improve service provision, for example in the field of enforcement.

The Chief Executive sought Cabinet's approval for an extra £20,000 to be carried forward to be allocated as £10,000 for use in supporting the Joint Procurement Officer with Eastleigh Borough Council and towards performance management work in response to the IDEA report and an additional £10,000 for other performance management work. The reasons for this additional carry forward had been discussed with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources and the Director of Finance.

Cabinet supported the additional carry forward of £20,000 resulting in a revised total amount of £189,520.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That subject to the matter not being called-in by the Principal Scrutiny Committee, in accordance with financial procedure rule 7.7 the amount of £189,520 on general fund be approved to be carried forward to 2005/2006 as a one off contribution from the 2004/2005 budget for the purposes specified in Appendix 6 of the report and as explained by the Chief Executive above.

2. That the capital financing details as set out in Appendix 7 of the report be noted.

128. **SOUTH EAST PLAN UPDATE**
(Report CAB1104 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be noted and a further report be brought to the next meeting of Cabinet regarding the consultation on District - level housing provision.

129. **PLANNING POLICY STATEMENT 6 (PPS6): “PLANNING FOR TOWN CENTRES” AND IMPLICATIONS FOR WICKHAM PRIMARY SHOPPING FRONTAGE**
(Report CAB1101 refers)

The Leader referred to correspondence she had received from Councillor Clohosey, a Ward Member for Wickham, who supported plans set out in the report to consider the enhancement of the scope of the primary shopping area in Wickham Square.

The Director of Development confirmed that he had contacted Denmead Parish Council to explore whether similar issues as raised at Wickham Square were applicable to Denmead and the Parish Council had confirmed that it was not seeking to have its primary shopping designation changed.

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

RESOLVED:

That the extent of the Wickham Primary Shopping Area, as defined in the Winchester District Local Plan Review, be re-examined and any proposals for changes be put forward to Cabinet alongside future Proposed Modifications in response to the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector’s Report.

130. **DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT BRIEF FOR THE FORMER TAYLORS COACHES AND THE OLD STATION YARD, SUTTON SCOTNEY**
(Report CAB1102 refers)

The Director of Development reported that Councillor Godfrey (a Ward Member for Wonston and Micheldever) had submitted proposed amendments to paragraphs 5.8, 6.1 and 6.22 of the report as set out below:

Paragraph 5.8 – the site is currently served by two accesses from Oxford Road (a primary access to the site and a minor access to the north of the former Taylors Coaches’ office building) and one access from Wonston Road. All these existing accesses are in the form of simple priority junctions. Existing access on Wonston Road serves both the Old Station Yard and the former Taylors Coaches’ site while the main access on Oxford Road serves only the former Taylors Coaches’ site. All the site’s existing vehicle accesses provide pedestrian access, although no specific pedestrian facilities are provided.

Paragraph 6.1 – Scottish and Southern advises that new high voltage cables will be required from Carthage Close to a new sub-station on the site in order to serve the sites redevelopment.

Paragraph 6.2 – ~~If required,~~ Any street lighting ~~will be~~ if provided ~~to~~ will meet the requirements of the County Council. A high standard of design will be expected for street lighting and any other street furniture provided as part of the site’s development, given its rural location and its position with the adjoining village’s Conservation Area.

Cabinet agreed that these amendments should be incorporated into the design and development brief.

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

RESOLVED:

That subject to the incorporation of the amendment set out above, the Design and Development Brief for land at the Old Station Yard and the former Taylors Coaches Site, Oxford/Wonston Road, Sutton Scotney, be endorsed as providing more detailed guidance to the provisions of proposal S.16 of the Local Plan Review.

131. **BAA SOUTHAMPTON NOISE REROUTEING TRIALS**
(Report CAB1075 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the latest information of the noise routeing trial at Southampton Airport be noted and that the proposed way forward set out in section 7 of the report be endorsed.

132. **EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 6 JUNE 2005**
(Report CAB1092 refers)

Scrutiny Review – Affordable Housing
(Report PS185)

Cabinet agreed that a Members' Seminar on affordable housing issues should be held prior to a detailed report addressing the issues raised by the Principal Scrutiny Committee being submitted back to that Committee and to Cabinet at a future date.

The Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport suggested that the reference to partnership with parishes should also include other stakeholders.

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

RESOLVED:

That the recommendations contained within the extract from the minutes of the Principal Scrutiny Committee held on 6 June 2005 be deferred for consideration at a future meeting of Cabinet following the holding of a Members' Seminar on affordable housing issues.

133. **DEVELOPMENT AT THEATRE ROYAL, WINCHESTER**
(Report CAB1072 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman Councillor Bennetts (a Ward Member for St Paul) addressed the meeting. Councillor Bennetts referred to the aims and strategies of the Theatre Royal for social inclusion and involvement of young people in the local area. He referred to the recent success of the Winnall Rock School concert at the Theatre Royal which was attended by 300 persons.

The Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport stated that it was not only the work of the Theatre Royal in social inclusion that should be appreciated but also its added value to the District in terms of economic value and visitor numbers.

The Director of Finance drew the attention of Members to the information contained in the exempt appendix and the potential risks that the Theatre, and in consequence the Council, might be exposed in the future. Cabinet also debated the nature of the additional £5,000 revenue funding, which would be matched on a 1:2 ratio by the County Council giving a total grant of £7,500. The Director of Finance suggested that this additional £5,000 should be met from virement from an existing budget and should not be a commitment in the base budget. However, after debate, Cabinet agreed that due to long term matching funding as provided by the County Council, the funding should be made permanent subject to the annual review of all budgets.

Cabinet also supported the transfer of legal liabilities from the Winchester Theatre Fund to the Winchester Arts Trust limited.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the new arrangements for the management of both Winchester Rural Youth Theatres and the Youth Dance Scheme by the Theatre Royal Winchester be confirmed.

2. That the Director of Development in consultation with the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to finalise the legal arrangements relating to the transfer of legal liabilities from Winchester Theatre Fund to Winchester Arts Trust Limited as outlined in paragraph 4.

3. That the Director of Development in consultation with the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to finalise the arrangements for transfer to Hampshire County Council for the freehold of land under the Jewry Street electricity sub station as outlined in paragraph 4.

4. That subject to the annual review of all budgets, the additional funding to the Theatre Royal, Winchester be approved in the terms outlined in paragraph 5 of the report and that the base budget be increased to £205,000 from the 2006/2007 municipal year.

134. **REVIEW OF DECISION MAKING STRUCTURES, COUNCIL MEETINGS AND MEMBER SERVICES**

(Report CAB1091 refers)

Cabinet agreed that the continuation of buffets before meetings should be discontinued with beverages only to be served for the meeting in order to achieve budget savings.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES, AS SHOWN IN TRACK CHANGES ON APPENDIX B, BE APPROVED AND ADOPTED.

2. THAT THE PROPOSAL TO REQUEST ALL MEMBERS AT THE BEGINNING OF EACH MUNICIPAL YEAR, TO EITHER OPT IN OR OUT OF RECEIVING FULL PAPER COPIES OF THE PLANNING DEVELOPEMT CONTROL AND THE LICENSING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE AGENDAS BE AGREED.

3. THAT BUFFETS BE NOT SERVED BEFORE MEETINGS BUT BEVERAGES CONTINUE TO BE PROVIDED.

RESOLVED:

That the remaining points made by the Group Leaders at their meeting held on 23 May 2005, as set out in Appendix A, be agreed and the general progress on other matters be noted.

135. **MINUTES OF THE WINCHESTER TOWN FORUM HELD 9 JUNE 2005**
(Report CAB1093 refers)

Cabinet noted that Minute 7 – Minor Amendments to Constitution – Winchester Town Forum would be referred to Council for determination.

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE WINCHESTER TOWN FORUM BE AGREED AS FOLLOWS:

1. TO ACT AS A CONSULTATIVE AND ADVISORY BODY REGARDING ISSUES AFFECTING THE SIX WINCHESTER TOWN DISTRICT WARDS WHICH, ON OCCASIONS, MAY ALSO INCLUDE “CROSS BOUNDARY” MATTERS INVOLVING ADJOINING AREAS (EG BADGER FARM, OLIVERS BATTERY AND HARESTOCK).

2. TO FORWARD ANY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION PRINCIPALLY TO CABINET, BUT ALSO TO ONE OF THE REGULATORY COMMITTEES AND/OR COUNCIL WHEN APPROPRIATE.

3. TO HAVE DELIGATED POWERS TO INCUR THE FOLLOWING EXPENDITURE:

(A) ~~THAT THE INCURRING OF EXPENDITURE BE LIMITED TO THE COST OF MEETING FACILITIES, OFFICER TIME, ARRANGING AND ATTENDING MEETINGS, PLUS OCCASIONAL RESEARCH WORK.~~

(B) *TO AUTHORISE GRANTS FROM THE TOWN ACCOUNT WITHIN THE BUDGET APPROVED BY COUNCIL IN FEBRUARY EACH YEAR.*

4. THAT NO DISCUSSIONS TAKE PLACE ABOUT SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS WHICH FALL WITHIN THE REMIT OF ANY OTHER OF THE COUNCIL'S REGULATORY COMMITTEES.

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Winchester Town Forum held on 9 June 2005 be received and the recommendation relating to the minor amendments to constitution – Winchester Town Forum be approved subject to Council's endorsement.

136. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES

Cabinet agreed to the following.

RESOLVED:

That the following appointments be made.

(a) Knowle Communities Building Association – Councillor Clohosey as a representative and Councillor Evans as an observer.

(b) Solent Transport Strategy Panel – Councillor Allgood as the additional representative (to join Councillor Clohosey) and Councillor Busher as a deputy.

137. FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

RESOLVED:

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

138. PARK AND RIDE BUS CONTRACT

(Report CAB1100 refers)

Cabinet agreed that the exempt embargo on the above report be removed, subject to the information contained in paragraph 4.1 of the report, which related to the costs of the contract with the bus operator, remaining exempt.

The following item had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item onto the agenda as a matter requiring urgent consideration in order that information submitted by the Director of Development relating to the Hospital Park and Ride bus survey taken between 20th and 24th June 2005 could be taken into consideration by Cabinet.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins (a Ward Member for St John and All Saints) stated that he would welcome a delay for further consultation. He enquired whether a through ticket from the Park and Ride to the Hospital in Romsey Road would be possible and the impact of such proposals on bus flows. He asked for major discussion on the proposals and that ample information on the provision of transport availability to the hospital be made available.

The Director of Development stated in reply to a Member's question that higher capacity vehicles carrying 75 passengers would be too large to turn around in the hospital forecourt but that the hospital authority had indicated that they would be willing to fund alterations to facilitate the turning of higher capacity vehicles. With respect to through ticketing the Director of Development explained that the situation was complicated due to both commercial and contract bus services being involved. The cost implications to the City Council would be significant as the City would be charged by the bus operators even if the usage was low.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Health enquired whether the City Council should ask companies wishing to tender for the main Park and Ride bus service (which was to be renewed from 31 October 2005) to also tender for a three year period as well as a five year period. This would allow for technological advancements in bus technology, for example, engines that could run on dual fuel or cleaner diesel, to be used at the earliest opportunity. Following debate it was acknowledged that a five year contract would cost less than a three year contract and should therefore be pursued. However, an option should be included within the contract that the City Council could take a view on advancements in technology and whether it wished to adopt this technology balanced against the cost implication at the appropriate time.

Cabinet agreed that due to the high cost of the service the Romsey Road Park and Ride bus service should be terminated at the end of the six month experimental period but that the reference to no further action be taken to provide a Park and Ride service for the Romsey Road area until it is considered as part of the proposals for the new park and ride site to the south of Winchester should be deleted from recommendation 1. The Director of Development was requested to continue dialogue with Romsey Road employers to find out whether the service could be improved in the future in order that a higher take up of bus passengers could be achieved and suitable funding might be provided by employers in the area.

Cabinet also agreed that the Director of Finance be added to those authorised to accept the lowest tender in Recommendation 5.

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

RESOLVED:

1. (a) That the Romsey Road Park and Ride bus service be terminated at the end of the six month experimental period subject to discussions taking place with employers in the affected area to see whether they are willing to provide funding to address the financial shortfall.

(b) That subject to the outcome of the discussions referred to above, the Chief Executive in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Economy and Transport and Finance and Resources be given delegated authority to confirm the arrangements for the closure of the Romsey Road service.

2. That for the main Park and Ride bus service on Mondays to Fridays, the two evening journeys departing from the rail station at 19.00 and 19.15 be retained in the time table, the 18.37 departure from the rail station be deleted and a new 09.23 departure from St Catherine's car park be added.

3. That for the main Park and Ride bus service, after 17.00 buses should no longer stop at Barfield car park when travelling towards the town centre and between 09.30 and 16.00 the off peak 15 minutes frequency should be retained.

4. That Officers be instructed to prepare and seek tenders for the main park and ride bus contract for a five year period from 01 November 2005, and that new vehicles should be specified with diesel engines to Euro 4 standard (to be introduced within six months of the start of the contract), and the capacity of 75 passengers subject to the successful trials of such higher capacity vehicles.

5. That the Director of Development and the Director of Finance (in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Economy and Transport and Finance and Resources) be authorised to accept the lowest tender.

139. **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.

Minute Number	Item	Description of Exempt Information
140	Minutes – 19 May 2005 – 101 High Street	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (other than the authority). (Para 7 Schedule 12A refers). 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).

- 140 Minutes – 1 June 2005 – Silver Hill Consultants and minute extract from Principal Scrutiny Committee 11 May 2005
- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (other than the authority). (Para 7 Schedule 12A refers).
- 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).
- 140 Minutes 1 June 2005 – E Procurement System
- 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).
- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (other than the authority). (Para 7 Schedule 12A refers).
- The amount of any expenditure proposed to be incurred by the authority under any particular contract for the acquisition of property or the supply of goods or services. (Para 8 to Schedule 12A refers).
- 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).

		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 11 to Schedule 12A refers).
141	Depot Services Contract – six monthly monitoring and performance	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (other than the authority). (Para 7 Schedule 12A refers). 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).
143	Park and Ride bus contract (paragraph 4.1 of the report)	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (other than the authority). (Para 7 Schedule 12A refers).
142	Funding arrangements for Theatre Royal, Winchester	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (other than the authority). (Para 7 Schedule 12A refers).
140.	<u>EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD 19 MAY 2005 AND 1 JUNE 2005</u>	

Cabinet considered the exempt minutes from the meetings held on the 19 May 2005 (101 High Street, Winchester) and 1 June 2005 (Silver Hill Consultants, E Procurement System and minute extract from Principal Scrutiny Committee - 11 May 2005)

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minutes of the previous meetings held on 19 May 2005 and 1 June 2005 be approved and adopted.

141. **EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 6 JUNE 2005**

(Report CAB1092 and PS184 refers)

Depot Services Contract – Six Monthly Monitoring and Performance

The Director of Communities reported that since meeting with the contractor there had now been an improvement in service delivery and targets had been met. However this was only over a short term period and a sustainable improvement over the longer term was required.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Principal Scrutiny Committee held on 6 June 2005 relating to the Depot Services Contract – Six Monthly Monitoring and Performance, be noted.

142. **FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THEATRE ROYAL, WINCHESTER**

(Report CAB1072 refers)

RESOLVED:

That the contents of Exempt Appendix 3 to the report be noted.

143. **PARK AND RIDE BUS CONTRACT**

(Report CAB1099 refers)

Cabinet noted that this report excluding paragraph 4.1 had been made available for public inspection and had been considered in the open part of the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of exempt paragraph 4.1 to the report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.00 am and concluded at 1.30 pm

Chairman