

**CABINET**

**12 October 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 Beckett, Busher, Davies and Higgins

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Mitchell and Jackson

---

384. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held 14 September 2005, less exempt items, be approved and adopted.

385. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mrs J Berry addressed the meeting regarding Report CAB1112 – River Park Leisure Centre – refurbishment. Mrs Berry stated that she was speaking on behalf of her daughter (aged 12) and others. She presented a petition to the City Council against the proposal to remove the flume from the River Park Leisure Centre as part of the refurbishment. The flume was an item of fun and as a leisure centre the River Park should not just concentrate on fitness and training. A decrease in its usage could be explained due to its restricted opening hours and the requirement for staff to be both at the top and bottom of the flume to ensure its safe operation. The use of a flume encouraged children to be independent and go to the Leisure Centre without their parents. She asked that the flume remain as part of the refurbished Leisure Centre.

Mrs C Slattery spoke in respect of Report CAB1135 – South East Plan “Where Shall We Live” consultation. Mrs Slattery stated that she encouraged the protection of the rural character of central Hampshire. With development impacting on the north and south of the County, central Hampshire should be protected as a buffer zone and an area where residents could find an area of landscape in which to exercise and enjoy recreational pursuits. She did not support any increase in new builds from 800 dwellings per annum to 1000 dwellings per annum. She also spoke of the work she had carried out for the Council for the Protection of Rural England in identifying windfall development sites which could offset the need for the Winchester City North

MDA. She additionally expressed concern at the size of the Strategic Development Areas as discussed for Fareham Borough north of the M27 and for Eastleigh Borough north of Hedge End and the implications for Winchester if such large scale development was ever proposed for Barton Farm.

In conclusion, she supported the recommendations put forward to Cabinet, particularly recognising the need to protect Barton Farm to avoid an increase in traffic congestion and to retain a landscaped entrance from the A34 into Winchester.

386. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Health reported that the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) Inspection Team had visited the City Council regarding sustainability issues. The cross cutting work of the City Council and the work of the Environmental Health teams had been studied and the Inspector's draft report of was now awaited.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning welcomed to the meeting the new Head of Planning Control (Fiona Tebbutt) who had commenced work with the City Council on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> October 2005.

The Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport stated that she would be attending the South East Tourism ExSEllence Awards in which a number of individuals and organisations from the District would be presented with awards. These included Winchester's Tourist Information Centre named the best in the south east by the judges, Marwell Zoological Park runner up in the Tourism Website of the Year category; Signe Higgins, Visitor Assistant at the Westgate Museum was highly commended for Outstanding Customer Service and Milnthorpe holiday apartment was highly commended in the Self Catering Holiday of the Year section.

387. **ROLL FORWARD OF CORPORATE STRATEGY AND REVENUE BUDGET 2006/09**

(Report CAB1126 refers)

The Leader stated that the report represented further ongoing work to align the budget to the Council's Corporate Strategy. Further work would be undertaken so that an updated version of the Report's contents would be form the background to decision making in next year's budget making process. Consultation would take place to assist in updating the proposals.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Davies addressed the meeting. He enquired as to whether the statement in paragraph 2.4 of the report that: "no significant changes to the Council's policy direction are being recommended" was sufficient and whether a mechanism should be included that the Council would be able to respond and act upon changes in direction - perhaps brought about through external factors, for example the outcome of the CPA inspection into sustainability or the implications of the Children's Act.

In reply, the Chief Executive clarified that the examples raised above by Councillor Davies would influence the provision of services as they cut across areas of Council service provision for example housing and community safety. Therefore the method of delivery may change as a response to new external factors but the overall direction of the Council to improve the quality of life for its residents would still underpin the Council's objectives for the next three years.

The Chief Executive added that Appendices 1 and 2 to the report were not quite aligned in terms of their subject matter and that Appendix 2 was the more up to date version.

The Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport explained that on page 14 of the above Report reference to savings relating to the Cultural Centre were in fact a redirection of funds to economic development to provide improved support for one of the Council's Corporate Priorities and that the report should be amended to reflect this.

Following debate, Cabinet also supported a proposal by the Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport that Appendix 2 item 3 – High Quality Environment should also recognise the Council's commitment to providing Park and Ride facilities in Winchester, together with the importance of reducing traffic congestion as these issues were separate and distinctive to the work being carried out in the Air Quality Action Plan.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That subject to the amendments as highlighted above, the draft Corporate Strategy and Revenue Budget be agreed as a basis for consultation with staff, Members and partner organisations during Autumn 2005, on the understanding the documentation will continue to be refined to give a stronger outcome focus as part of this process and that the budget continues to be developed.

**388. SOUTH EAST PLAN "WHERE SHALL WE LIVE" CONSULTATION  
(Report CAB1135 refers)**

In considering this item Cabinet took into account the comments made by Mrs Slattery during the public participation period.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Busher addressed the meeting. She stated that she agreed with the conclusions of the report particularly highlighting the dangers of significant development at Hedge End and North of Fareham and the impact these proposals would have on the rural character of the area. She also raised concerns at the implications for infrastructure and that the south of the district could become an interchange of major traffic routes, which would put development pressure on the boundary of the new South Downs National Park. In conclusion she requested that on page 12 of the Report paragraph 5.3 the deletion of the wording "maybe questionable" to be replaced by "are questionable".

Following debate, Cabinet agreed to Councillor Busher's amended wording for paragraph 5.3.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Beckett addressed the meeting. In summary Councillor Beckett stated that he supported the Report's conclusions. Option 1 was the most viable course of action as the developments north of Whiteley and West of Waterlooville were sustainable and the support of other local authorities in the south east to the City Council's approach should be encouraged. He continued that there should also be some protection by means of a local gap for the Knowle Village development, as was the case for Wickham. Whiteley Way should

also be completed before a single home was occupied north of Whiteley, and Yew Tree drive and Rookery Avenue at Whiteley should also be opened. He also stated that a detailed strategy for water was required.

Cabinet noted that the City Council's response as set out in the report, including the reference to protecting the separate identity of Knowle.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins addressed the meeting. He stated that he was concerned that there might be a possible extra extension to the Winchester (Barton Farm) development. Windfall sites such as those at the Police Headquarter site in Winchester had recently become available, allowing the District to meet its housing needs without triggering the Barton Farm development.

The Chief Executive explained that the Options in paragraph 4.3 of the report might give a false impression that some of the new greenfield site provision might include Barton Farm. This was not necessarily the case and should be clarified. Barton Farm was currently only planned to take place as a complete development of a Major Development Area rather than piecemeal development. He added that the number of dwellings required in this Option related to sites across the District rather than being site specific.

In the last sentence of paragraph 5.3 bullet point 1 of the Report, Cabinet agreed that emphasis should also be placed on the need for an overall delivery agency to manage the economic prosperity of the area and not just economic growth, as there was a need for higher quality employment positions with high remuneration to build a better quality of life for the residents of the area. It was also agreed on page 14 that Whiteley Way and the Botley by pass should be completed in conjunction before development at the scales indicated in Option 1 should take place and that the City Council should press for Rookery Avenue and Yew Tree Drive to be opened.

Cabinet also agreed that the Strategic Development Area in Fareham Borough north of the M27 should be much smaller to be situated in the Fareham Borough area only.

The Leader stated that the report and recommendations would be submitted to Council on 2 November 2005 which would be after the date of response to the consultation document issued by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH).

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

**RECOMMENDED:**

**THAT THE COMMENTS SET OUT IN BULLET POINTS AT PARAGRAPHS 5.3 AND 5.4 OF REPORT CAB 1135, AS AMENDED ABOVE, BE ENDORSED AS REPRESENTING THE CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE "WHERE SHALL WE LIVE" CONSULTATION.**

RESOLVED:

That, in view of the response deadline and pending endorsement or otherwise from Council, the comments set out in the bullet points at paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4 of Report CAB 1135, as amended above, be submitted to the strategic planning authorities as the City Council's holding comments on the "Where Shall We Live" consultation.

389. **SOUTHAMPTON AIRPORT MASTER PLAN CONSULTATION**  
(Report CAB1131 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins spoke on this item. He spoke of aircraft flying over St Giles Hill in Winchester at an altitude the equivalent of 2500 feet, which was too low. The profile of the hill and the noise wave generated were not acceptable. It was unnecessary for aircraft to fly low over St Giles Hill as a straight approach to Southampton Airport was only required from Twyford and therefore the aircraft would be able to approach by open countryside rather than over the built up area of Winchester. He also suggested that aircraft might be able to approach at a steeper incline (3.5 degrees or 4 degrees, rather than at a 3 degree approach as at present) and that quieter aircraft be used.

The Officers clarified that the length of the runway at Southampton Airport presently dictated that a 3 degree angle of descent was required.

Following debate, Cabinet agreed that resolution 2 (ii) should also state that a steeper angle of descent to the airport should be introduced as soon as was technically possible. It also considered that BAA should be encouraged to seek reductions in future noise levels.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the content and purpose of the Southampton Airport Master Plan consultation, insofar as it affects Winchester District, be noted.

2. That written representations be made to BAA Southampton by October 31 2005, to the effect that:

(i) the Council is generally supportive of the economic benefits of growth at the airport, but is concerned at the resulting noise impacts on the residents of the district;

(ii) the Council therefore actively encourages BAA and operators from Southampton Airport to continually seek measures to improve current noise performance; welcomes the recent decision of the operator FlyBE to replace its fleet of BAe146 aircraft with more modern EMBRAER195s;

(iii) noise monitoring should be implemented in the vicinity of the airport with immediate effect, and the results published as soon as possible, and;

(iv) BAA Southampton compile and implement a noise quota system for operations at Southampton, which should aim to limit disturbance

to be no greater than current levels and to actually seek reductions from those levels in the future.

(v) the Council presses the airport and operators to adopt a steeper angle of descent to the airport as soon as technical advances allow.

390. **PLANNING IMPROVEMENT PLAN AND PLANNING DELIVERY GRANT**  
(Report CAB1110 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Beckett spoke on this item. He stated that he welcomed the plan and suggested a number of amendments. On page 9 of the plan ID 1.7 – the increase in the threshold for contrary representations triggering a committee report should be amended from 4 to 6 different households. In addition there should be early contact with Parish Councils to explain the changes in the process that would take place. He also requested that the Portfolio Holder for Planning report to the Environment Scrutiny Panel on the progress of the improvement plan.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Stallard spoke on this item. She spoke of a number of inadequacies in the consultation process with Parish Councils over the proposals, including those with Denmead Parish Council. The proposals placed the Parish Councils in a difficult position. The Parish Council's representations could be vetoed by an officer taking away the opportunity for a Parish Council to refer an item to Planning Development Control Committee. The changes that were to take place would need to be well explained to Parish Councils, including further technical training. She also raised concerns at proposals to have electronic only copies of planning applications with access online. If a parish did not have online access where could they find out information about an application? She also supported the reduction in the proposed threshold for contrary representations to be reduced from 10 to 6 as suggested by Councillor Beckett. She concluded by asking where Village Design Statements rested in the new proposals.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Davies spoke on this item. He stated that Planning Development Control Committee should deal with major and significant applications only and that the report's proposals were a step in the right direction. He questioned why Parish Councils and objectors thought that there might be a different decision by taking an application to Planning Development Control Committee rather than at officer level, as there should be consistency of decision making between officers and Members.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Busher spoke on this item. She appreciated the work that had been carried out to put forward the Planning Improvement Plan. There was considerable officer time in preparing reports for Committee and if the number of less significant applications that were brought to Committee could be reduced, then this could be a benefit. She supported the Portfolio Holder for Planning being responsible to the Environment Scrutiny Panel and commented that the holding of Planning Development Control Committee meetings on a single day every three weeks should be kept under review, to assess the workload for the Committee. It was also important for Ward Members to be trained fully in planning matters to give informal advice to local residents and the Parish Council.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning stated that he would support ID 1.7 to be amended to read: "Increase the threshold for contrary representations triggering a committee report from 4 to 6 representations containing material planning considerations", and

for ID 1.8 to be amended to read: "Parish Councils to make representations using improved comment form. Any requests for applications to be referred to Committee for decision to be justified with appropriate reasons, which shall be assessed by the Head of Planning Control. A written explanation shall be sent to the Parish Council if decision is not to refer application to Committee."

The Portfolio Holder for Planning added that Village Design Statements were referred to in committee reports and issues relating to them were raised at Committee and therefore they would remain effective. With regard to online applications this was particularly aimed at Parish Councils and was an important factor in promoting e-governance. In respect of the Parish Council referral not being accepted by the Head of Planning Control, the Parish Council would be able to consult with the Ward Member(s) who would be able to exercise their right to refer the matter to Committee if it contained material considerations.

The Director of Development commented that the initiative with Parish Councils should not be seen as a veto, but as a method to establish whether there were material planning considerations to assist the Council in assessing a planning application. He made reference to a letter from Denmead Parish Council dated 11 October 2005 and the points raised therein had been covered by the Committee report and during debate. With regard to point 6 of the letter, which referred to the procedures of other local authorities, he commented that in many cases they were more restrictive than Winchester in the number of items that were referred to Committee.

Cabinet debated whether it was sufficient for the Head of Planning Control to have sole discretion on whether an item referred from a Parish Council should be referred to Planning Development Control Committee. Discussion took place on whether the Chairman of Planning Development Control Committee should be contacted by the Head of Planning Control, where she was minded to decline referring an item to Committee. It was agreed that this could place the Chairman in an onerous position and might be perceived as compromising the Chairman's impartiality. Therefore, at this stage, it was agreed not to include the Chairman within the referral process, but that this situation could be monitored and reviewed in the light of working practice.

It was also noted that where objectors were unable to secure 6 separate letters with material considerations that were contrary to an officer's recommendations, they were at liberty to approach the Ward Member to have an item referred to Committee at a Ward Member's discretion.

Following debate, Cabinet agreed the amendments to ID 1.7 and ID 1.8. It was also agreed that progress on the implementation of the Improvement Plan be monitored by the Environmental Scrutiny Panel in due course.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That subject to the above amendments, the Planning Improvement Plan be approved for implementation, subject to Recommendation 2.

2. That the consequential amendments to the Constitution, as set out in Appendix 2 of the Report be approved subject to paragraph 1 (iv) being

amended to read as follows: "6 or more representations, which the Head of Planning Control considers relate to material planning considerations, are received from separate individual addresses which are contrary to the officer's recommendations."

3. That those items requiring additional resources be put forward as growth items for consideration as part of the 2006/07 budget making process.

4. That the amount of Planning Delivery Grant received in 2005/06 be noted.

391. **COMMUNITY REVENUE GRANTS – REVIEW OF PRIORITIES FOR 2006/07**  
(Report CAB1125 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the amended application criteria, as outlined in Appendix 1 of the Report for the community revenue grants in 2006/07 be approved.

2. That the amended grant priorities, as outlined in Appendix 2 of the Report, for the community revenue grants in 2006/07 be approved.

3. That the amended application form, as outlined in Appendix 3 of the Report, for the community revenue grants in 2006/07 be noted.

392. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN - INSPECTORS' FEES**  
(Report CAB1128 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

1. That up to £100,000 of the agreed growth for the District Plan Reserve of £130,000 for 2006/07 be brought forward to cover the shortfall in funding for 2005/06, subject to the matter not being called in by Principal Scrutiny Committee.

2. That officers submit a report to a future meeting of Cabinet regarding the expected costs associated with the production of the Council's Local Development Framework and the implications for future budgeting.

393. **CARROLL YOUTH CENTRE – EMERGENCY GRANT REQUEST**  
(Report CAB1133 refers)

Councillor Learney declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and left the meeting during its consideration.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins spoke on this item. He stated that he was concerned at the payment of an emergency grant of £19,000 as the



financial position at the youth centre may decline leading to further requests and also similar requests from other youth centre groups.

The Chief Executive replied that the City Council was not in a position to run the youth centre itself and this was a one off grant to reflect special circumstances and to secure the future of an important centre in Winchester.

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

RESOLVED:

That the decision made under Section A.2 of the Scheme of Delegation to Officers, as detailed in the Report, be noted.

394. **DECISION UNDER SECTION A.2 OF THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION TO OFFICERS – APPOINTMENT OF CONSULTANTS**  
(Report CAB1137 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the decision made under Section A.2 of the Scheme of Delegation to Officers, as detailed in the Report, be noted.

395. **MUSEUMS COLLECTING AND COLLECTIONS MANAGEMENT POLICY**  
(Report CAB1130 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the revised Collecting and Collections Management Policy as attached as Appendix 1 of the Report be approved for immediate adoption.

396. **PERIODIC ELECTORAL REVIEWS – CONSULTATION BY THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION**  
(Report CAB1124 refers)

At invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Higgins spoke on this item. He stated that in the absence of proportional representation he would prefer to see smaller Wards with single Member representation. This would give better value to voters than the present arrangements where three Members represented some Wards.

The Leader commented that the consultation focused on numbers within Wards rather than establishing community identities.

Following debate, Cabinet agreed that the responses contained within the report should be considered further by the Leader and the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources and that a further report be submitted directly to Council on 2 November 2005.

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

**RECOMMENDED:**

**THAT COUNCIL DETERMINE THE FINAL RESPONSE TO THE ELECTORAL COMMISSION, FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT TO BE SUBMITTED BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR FINANCE AND RESOURCES, AS A RESULT OF THE RESOLUTION SET OUT BELOW.**

RESOLVED:

That the responses contained within the report be considered further by the Leader and the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources and that the subsequent report be submitted directly to Council on 2 November 2005.

397. **PROPOSED TIMETABLE OF MEETINGS 2006/07 AND CHANGES TO TIMETABLE FOR 2005/06**

(Report CAB1134 refers)

The Portfolio Holder for Planning stated that he would consult further with the Chairman of Planning Development Control Committee and the officers on the dates for meetings of the Planning Development Control Committee, to see if any adjustments were required to achieve an effective three weekly committee cycle on a single day.

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

RESOLVED:

That subject to any adjustments being required to achieve an effective three weekly committee cycle for Planning Development Control Committee:-

- (a) the Timetable of Meetings for the 2006/07 Municipal Year be approved.
- (b) the amended Timetable of Meetings for the remainder of the 2005/06 Municipal Year be approved and
- (c) the City Secretary and Solicitor, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, be authorised to settle any revisions necessary to accommodate the revised meeting schedule for the Planning Development Control Committee.

398. **MINUTES OF THE CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE HELD ON 8 SEPTEMBER 2005**

(Report CAB1129 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee held on 8 September 2005 be received.

399. **RIVER PARK LEISURE CENTRE – REFURBISHMENT (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**

(Report CAB1112 refers)

In considering this item, Cabinet took into consideration comments made in the public participation part of the meeting by Mrs Berry.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Davies spoke on this item. He stated that there should be more accurate facts and figures on the opening times of the flume before a decision was taken for its removal. Due to staff shortages the flume had not been readily available for users and he did not consider that the removal of the flume could be classified as an improvement work.

The Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport responded that the decision to close the flume had been taken by Cabinet in 2004 as a result in decline in usage and the contract for refurbishment was now out to tender.

The Director of Development (formerly the Director of Community Services) stated that sessions for children using inflatables had increased in popularity and that there had been a shift in customer experiences, with the River Park Leisure Centre being unable to compete with new attractions such as Basingstoke Aqua-dome, in terms of the provisions of water rides. The refurbishment of the existing flume would also be expensive. The flume's replacement by a slide for smaller children could be considered as long as the cost was reasonable.

Cabinet considered that the decline in usage justified the removal of the flume and that the amount of provision of inflatables for the sessions was a more suitable provision for younger people, given the nature of the venue etc.

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

Cabinet agreed that the approach to be taken to negotiations with DC Leisure over the loss of income in the closure period, as set out in exempt Appendix 3, should be considered under Exempt Business.

RESOLVED:

1. That it be noted that the estimated cost of the essential works required at the River Park Leisure Centre is contained within the budget provision of £1.4m already made.

2. That it be noted that the programme of work at the centre will be from April to June 2006.

400. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

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

401. **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>
402	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).
402	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).
404 and 407	CCTV Monitoring Contract	)
403 and 406	River Park Leisure Centre – Exempt Appendix	) 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).
405 and 408	Park and Ride Bus Contract	)
402	Exempt Minutes of the Previous meeting	) 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).
404 and 407	River Park Leisure Centre – Exempt Appendix	)

402. **EXEMPT MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD 14 SEPTEMBER 2005**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minutes of the previous meeting held on 14 September 2005 be approved and adopted.

403. **RIVER PARK LEISURE CENTRE – REFURBISHMENT (EXEMPT APPENDIX)**  
(Report CAB1112 refers)

Cabinet considered the above report that considered the approach to be taken to negotiations with DC Leisure over the loss of income in the closure period, as set out in exempt Appendix 3 (detail in exempt minute).

404. **CCTV MONITORING CONTRACT - EXTENSION**  
(Report CAB1132 refers)

Cabinet considered the above report that considered an extension to the current contract to provide CCTV monitoring (detail in exempt minute).

405. **PARK AND RIDE BUS CONTRACT**  
(Report CAB1138 refers)

Cabinet considered the above report that considered the Park and Ride bus contract (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 9.00 am and concluded at 1.10 pm