

CABINET

14 December 2005

Attendance:

Councillors:

Campbell (Chairman) (P)

Beveridge (P)

Collin (P)

Evans (P)

Hiscock (P)

Knasel (P)

Learney (P)

Wagner

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Beckett, Busher, Davies, Higgins and Sutton

Mr A Rickman (TACT)

583. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Wagner and Mrs H Dewdney (TACT).

584. **MINUTES**

Councillor Evans (Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport) noted the concerns expressed by Principal Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 5 December 2005 regarding the proposal for a new display area in the Market Lane Toilets (Report CAB1073 refers). However, she emphasised the advantages of both providing a new display and generally improving the appearance of the area. Cabinet agreed that the scheme would proceed.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 November 2005 be approved and adopted.

585. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

585.1. **General**

Mr Atkins raised a number of comments, in various capacities, as summarised below:

- i) In his capacity as a New Alresford Town Councillor, Town Trustee and Member of the Committee of the Arlebury Park Social Club, Mr Atkins expressed concern about the proposed withdrawal of travel tokens (Report CAB1170 below refers). In particular, he queried whether Alresford Town Trustees would be reimbursed for tokens already purchased.

- ii) In his capacity as a Town Councillor, Mr Atkins stated that the Town Council supported the proposal to designate a Local Reserve Site in New Alresford (Report WDLP54 below refers).
- iii) As a Town Councillor, Mr Atkins expressed concern about matters relating to the Swan Appeal and in particular his view that Councillor Beveridge should have declared an interest.
- iv) As a Town Councillor, Mr Atkins stated he would contact Councillor Collin regarding the pilot scheme for City Council information to be available at the Town Council Office.
- v) As a Town Councillor, Mr Atkins expressed concern about the closure of the shop in Mitford Road, particularly as this would result in the loss of a facility close to Makins Court Residential Home.
- vi) In a personal capacity, Mr Atkins thanked officers for documents he had received under Freedom of Information requests. However, in relation to this information, he believed that Cabinet should be more open about Group discussions held outside the formal meetings.

In response, Councillor Beveridge (Portfolio Holder for Planning) stated that he was prepared to seek further advice about whether there were any areas in which he should declare an interest, but was unaware of any at the current time. The Chairman clarified that the role of Portfolio Holder for Planning was separate to the role as a Member of Planning Development Control Committee. The Chairman also advised that matters relating to the shop in Mitford Road had been fully debated at a previous meeting and a decision already taken.

585.2. **Matters relating to Winchester District Local Plan Review**

Four people spoke regarding various aspects of the Local Plan Review and their comments are summarised below:

(i) Mr A Weeks (Chairman of Winchester City Residents' Association) spoke in opposition to the principle of designating local reserve sites because of the lack of public consultation, shortcomings in the method of selection and the choice of the four specific sites. With regard to the proposed site at Pitt Manor, he emphasised that a clear definition should be retained between urban development and countryside and the boundary should be fixed along Kilham Lane.

(ii) Mr J Hayter (Bishops Waltham Society) raised a number of detailed comments and suggested amendments regarding the proposed modifications to the Local Plan Review (Report CAB1162 below refers). These amendments had been notified to the Director of Development, other relevant officers and Cabinet Members in writing prior to the meeting.

(iii) Mr J Gardner (White, Young and Green Planning) advised that he represented Taylor Woodrow which had an interest in the proposed local reserve site in Denmead. He spoke in support of both the principle of local reserve sites and the designation of the four sites proposed. In summary, he emphasised that the Inspector the had decided that the local reserve sites were required and circumstances had not changed since the Inquiry. He believed that the Local Plan must provide certainty for developers and landowners as well as local residents.

(iv) Mr D Bond advised that he worked for a Planning Consultancy which represented developers with an interest in the proposed local reserve site at Francis Gardens, Winchester. He spoke in support of the principle of local reserve sites and the four specific sites proposed. He reported that he had attended the Inquiry on a

number of occasions and had suggested the option of identifying reserve sites. Also, the local community had been aware of the proposals and had made representations to the Inspector. He had also attended the meeting of the Winchester District Local Plan Committee on 9 December 2005 and did not believe Members had demonstrated clear reasons for rejecting the proposal for local reserve sites. He submitted that the Council would have greater control by designating the Local Reserve Sites. Otherwise, if the housing land supply failed the Council would be risking 'planning by appeal'.

586. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman advised that the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) had made their submission to the County Council on the proposals for housing distribution in the South East Plan. In turn, the County Council had made their submission to the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA).

The Chairman also reported that in relation to the South East Plan, an organisation had recently been established comprising of District Council Leaders across the whole South East region (one from each County selected in turn to attend each meeting).

Councillor Learney (Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources) reported on the success of the recent "It's Ok to Ask" campaign to increase benefit take-up.

Councillor Evans stated that the Museums Service had been awarded National Accreditation Status.

Councillor Beveridge advised that the provisional allocation for the development control aspect of the Planning Delivery Grant was £181,394, which was about £44,000 more than had been allocated for the same aspect in 2005/06.

Councillor Knasel (Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport) stated that he and officers from the Parking Section had recently attended a House of Commons Transport Committee on the subject of penalty charges. The Council had been regarded as an example of good practice relating to its use and management of penalty charge notices.

587. **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUDGET 2006/07**
(Reports CAB1178 and CAB1180 refer)

Cabinet noted that TACT comments on the HRA Budget Report were contained in Report CAB1180 which had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item, as a matter requiring urgent consideration, in order that TACT comments could be taken account during consideration of the HRA Budget.

The Chairman expressed her thanks to TACT for its work in consideration of the Budget paper.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT HOUSING RENTS FOR 2006/07 INCREASE IN LINE WITH THE GOVERNMENT GUIDELINE, WHICH ASSUMES A BASIC INCREASE IN CURRENT ACTUAL RENTS OF 3.2% PLUS ONE SIXTH OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CURRENT AND FORMULA RENTS UNDER RENT RESTRUCTURING.

2. THAT FOR PROPERTIES WHERE TARGET RENTS ARE BELOW CURRENT RENTS, ONE HALF OF THE REDUCTION BE APPLIED IN 2006/07 AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 6, RATHER THAN THE ONE SIXTH LOWER LIMIT ALLOWED UNDER RENT RESTRUCTURING RULES (TO ENSURE THE AVERAGE RENT INCREASE REMAINS WITHIN 5% OVERALL).

3. THAT THE HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET FOR 2006/07 AS DETAILED IN APPENDIX 1, BE AGREED, SUBJECT TO ANY FINAL MINOR AMENDMENTS REQUIRED FOLLOWING ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE ACTUAL ODPM SUBSIDY DETERMINATIONS IN LATE DECEMBER AND SUBJECT TO THE FINAL RENT AS DETAILED ABOVE (ANY MATERIAL CHANGE WILL BE REPORTED TO CABINET IN JAN 2006).

4. THAT EXISTING CHARGES IN RELATION TO GARAGE RENTS BE INCREASED BY 3.2%.

5. THAT NEW SERVICE CHARGES BE INTRODUCED FOR GENERAL NEEDS PREMISES WHERE COMMUNAL FACILITIES ARE SHARED BY RESIDENTS, AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 4.1.a) OF THE ABOVE REPORT, SUBJECT TO THE GOVERNMENT RENT CAPPING LIMIT OF THE TOTAL INCREASE IN RENT AND ANY NEW SERVICE CHARGES OF INFLATION PLUS 0.5% PLUS £2 AND THAT THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITIES BE GIVEN DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO IMPLEMENT THE CHANGES, PROVIDED NO MATERIAL COMMENTS ARE RAISED BY TENANTS THROUGH FORMAL CONSULTATIONS.

6. THAT SERVICE CHARGES AT SHELTERED SCHEMES BE AMENDED TO REFLECT ACTUAL COSTS AT EACH SCHEME AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 9, WITH ANY INCREASES BEING LIMITED TO GOVERNMENT CAPPING LIMITS.

7. THAT THE CURRENT POLICY OF SUBSIDISING SUPPORT COSTS AT CATEGORY 2.5 SHELTERED SCHEMES BE CHANGED TO A POLICY OF CHARGING FOR THE FULL COST, BUT WITH THE INCREASE BEING PHASED IN OVER A FIVE YEAR PERIOD AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 8 OF THE REPORT.

8. THAT THE CONTINUED FUNDING PROVIDED TO THE CENTRAL CONTROL SERVICE AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 4.2 BE NOTED AND CABINET CONSIDER STEPS TO ENSURE THAT THIS IS ADDRESSED WITHIN 2006/07.

588. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN INSPECTORS' REPORT – 'LOCAL RESERVE' SITES**
(Report WDLP54 refers)

Cabinet noted the comments made on this Report in the public participation period at the start of the meeting.

Cabinet were advised that the Report had been considered at the Winchester District Local Plan Committee on 9 December 2005 and copies of the minutes of that meeting had been circulated to all Members prior to Cabinet. In summary, the Committee had recommended that the principle of Local Reserve Sites and the four sites recommended by the Local Plan Inspector be not accepted. In summary, the reasons for their decision were:

- insufficient public consultation on the principle and the specific sites;
- latest housing completion figures made identification of sites unnecessary;
- the identification of sites would build up unrealistic expectations of developers and unnecessary worry for local residents.

Councillor Beveridge disputed that there had not been public consultation and stressed that the proposals had been discussed in great detail at the Public Inquiry, which included the opportunity for members of the public to address the Inspector. In addition, once the proposed modifications to the Local Plan were published, then there would be a further period of six weeks for the public to comment. With regard to the latest housing figures (as set out in Report CAB1163 below), he stated that there remained a number of uncertainties, such as when the development at West of Waterlooville would commence. The Inspector had concluded that, because of these uncertainties, there was a requirement for modest reserve housing provision. With regard to the final point made by the Committee, he emphasised that formal identification of the four specific sites would give more control to the Council over their potential development.

In conclusion, Councillor Beveridge did not support the recommendations of the Winchester District Local Plan Committee and proposed an alternative recommendation as set out below:

“That without “clear and cogent” reasons to the contrary, Council agrees:

- (i) to the principle of identifying local reserve sites in the Local Plan Review; and
- (ii) to allocate local reserve sites, as recommended by the Local Plan Inspector, at:
 - Pitt Manor, Winchester;
 - Francis Gardens/Worthy Road Winchester;
 - Spring Gardens, Alresford;
 - Little Frenchies Field, Denmead.”

At the invitation of the Chairman, four Councillors spoke regarding this item and their comments are summarised below.

As a member of the majority of the Winchester District Local Plan Committee that had rejected the Report's proposals, Councillor Davies spoke in support of the Committee's decision. With regard to the proposition that the Committee had not formed clear reasons to reject the proposal, he considered that it was not appropriate for Councillors to form detailed reasons at the meeting itself, but instead should take

officer advice before final decisions were made at Council. He emphasised that the concept of local reserve sites was a new one and the affected residents had not been notified of the specific proposals. In comparison, interest groups and developers had been invited to the Stakeholder meetings on this subject. In summary, he believed that consultation had been biased towards developers, with insufficient account taken of notifying local residents individually.

Councillor Beckett also stated that there should have been additional consultation with residents living near the proposed four local reserve sites. He also queried whether the recommendations of Cabinet would go directly to Council or be referred back to the Winchester District Local Plan Committee for further consideration. In response, the City Secretary and Solicitor advised that Cabinet should now recommend directly to Council on 11 January 2006.

Councillor Busher (Chairman of Planning Development Control Committee) spoke in support of the identification of the four proposed local reserve sites. She emphasised the severe financial implications to the Council of any further delay, as outlined in Report WDLP54. She also agreed that the Inspector had considered in detail the various options and members of the public were present at the Inquiry. Councillor Busher stated that the identification of the sites put the Council in a much stronger position to resist pressure from developers than if no sites were formally identified. Not to agree the local reserve sites could risk "planning by appeal."

Councillor Sutton (Vice-Chairman of Winchester District Local Plan Committee) supported the comments made by Councillor Busher and, in particular, emphasised that she did not believe clear reasons had been given by the Committee to reject the Report's proposals. She also stated that if a decision was delayed, resulting in a need for a separate Inquiry, there was no guarantee that another Inspector would reach a different conclusion.

The Chief Executive responded to a number of detailed questions on the Report and the comments made in discussions above. He emphasised that the Council must demonstrate clear reasons to reject the Inspector's recommendations on local reserve sites and he did not believe that such reasons were apparent. Further work could be undertaken in order to attempt to find such reasons. However, such work might raise new issues which would risk the requirement for a second Public Inquiry, at considerable expense and delay to the Council.

One Member queried what controls were present, if the need for one of the four reserve sites was triggered, to ensure the necessary infrastructure was in place before development commenced. The Chief Executive advised that the Inquiry had considered in great detail issues such as infrastructure and transport in relation to each site. If the requirement for a site was triggered, the Local Plan contained policies that required adequate infrastructure was provided. The use of the reserve sites would also give the Council flexibility in managing land supply, if sufficient sites did not come forward; it could avoid triggering the need to complement the larger, Winchester City North MDA, for example.

Following further consideration, Cabinet rejected the recommendation of the Winchester District Local Plan Committee and agreed with the proposals as set out in the Report and amended above.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT WITHOUT "CLEAR AND COGENT" REASONS TO THE CONTRARY, COUNCIL AGREES:

- (I) TO THE PRINCIPLE OF IDENTIFYING LOCAL RESERVE SITES IN THE LOCAL PLAN REVIEW; AND**
- (II) TO ALLOCATE LOCAL RESERVE SITES, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE LOCAL PLAN INSPECTOR, AT:**
 - **PITT MANOR, WINCHESTER;**
 - **FRANCIS GARDENS/WORTHY ROAD WINCHESTER;**
 - **SPRING GARDENS, ALRESFORD;**
 - **LITTLE FRENCHIES FIELD, DENMEAD.**

589. DRAFT POLICIES ON REPLACEMENT POLICY H.3 AND LOCAL RESERVE HOUSING SITES

(Report WDLP55 refers)

Cabinet noted that this Report had been considered at the Winchester District Local Plan Committee on 9 December 2005. The Committee had recommended that the proposals set out in the Report regarding replacement Local Plan Policy H.3 be agreed and that Cabinet be asked to note the draft policy on Local Reserve Sites. The Chief Executive had also been requested to formulate revised wording of the explanatory text with reference to housing shortfall and public consultation. Cabinet agreed that the Chief Executive agree the wording with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and report to Council on 11 January 2006 for formal agreement.

The Chief Executive responded to a number of comments made by Mr Hayter in the public participation period outlined above. He explained that the Local Plan should not go into too much detail, but should instead provide key points to which more detailed guidance could refer, by using Supplementary Planning Documents. In response to Mr Hayter's specific concern that Replacement Policy H.3 would allow ribbon development along bus routes, the Chief Executive confirmed that he believed the revised wording was robust enough to prevent this and the detail that would be included within the draft Supplementary Planning Document would also set criteria to prevent this form of development.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE DRAFT POLICIES AND EXPLANATORY TEXT RELATING TO THE INSPECTORS' RECOMMENDED REPLACEMENT POLICY H.3 AND LOCAL RESERVE SITES, AS SET OUT IN APPENDICES 1 AND 2 OF WDLP55 AND AMENDED AS SET OUT ABOVE (WITH REVISED WORDING REPORTED DIRECTLY TO COUNCIL), BE ENDORSED AND INCORPORATED INTO THE COUNCIL'S PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS IN RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTORS' REPORT.

RESOLVED:

That the Chief Executive be given delegated authority, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, to formulate revised wording of the explanatory text with reference to housing shortfall and public consultation for recommendation to Council on 11 January 2006.

590. **POLICY H.5 AND 'IN PERPETUITY'**
(Report WDLP56 refers)

Cabinet noted that this Report had been considered at the Winchester District Local Plan Committee on 9 December 2005. The Committee had agreed with the recommendations as set out in the Report.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE PROPOSED WORDING CHANGE IN MOD 6.39, AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 3.1 OF REPORT WDLP56, BE APPROVED AND INCORPORATED IN THE SCHEDULE FOR CHAPTER 6: HOUSING (ATTACHED AS APPENDIX 1 TO REPORT WDLP52).

591. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS**
(Report CAB1162 refers)

The Chief Executive confirmed that the modifications proposed following the meetings of the Winchester District Local Plan Committee held 17 October, 27 October and 15 November 2005 had been incorporated in the above Report.

Councillor Beveridge advised that one correction was required to the Housing Chapter, Paragraph 6.74, as follows:

Add the following sentence before the last sentence beginning 'Applicants should ...':

"In some locations the space about buildings in an area, often combined with the type and extent of tree cover, is such an intrinsic part of its character that even the lower end of the density threshold cannot be successfully achieved without harm being caused."

Councillor Beveridge also drew attention to an error in relation to an objection regarding the former railway line at New Alresford and recommended that the proposed 'RT.1' policy be deleted from all of the former railway line for consistency. Cabinet agreed to these amendments. Members also agreed that delegated authority be granted to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, to make any further minor corrections required.

On behalf of Cabinet, the Chairman expressed her thanks to the Head of Strategic Planning and the other Strategic Planning Officers involved in the Local Plan Review for all their work.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE "PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO THE LOCAL PLAN REVIEW", AS SET OUT IN APPENDIX 1 TO REPORT CAB1162, AND AS AMENDED IN THE PREAMBLE ABOVE AND IN THE MINUTES RELATING TO REPORTS WDLP54, 55 AND 56 ALSO SET OUT ABOVE, BE APPROVED FOR PUBLICATION AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, FOLLOWED BY A SIX WEEK PERIOD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

2. THAT DELEGATED AUTHORITY BE GIVEN TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING, TO MAKE MINOR EDITORIAL CHANGES TO FINALISE THE REVIEW PRIOR TO ITS PUBLICATION FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.

592. **THE SOUTH DOWNS MANAGEMENT PLAN – DELEGATION OF RESPONSIBILITY**

(Report CAB1177 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 Principal Scrutiny Committee had been informed.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR PRODUCING A MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THAT PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA WITHIN THE EAST HAMPSHIRE AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (AONB), AND THE SUBSEQUENT PUBLICATION OF A DRAFT PLAN, BE DELEGATED TO THE SOUTH DOWNS JOINT COMMITTEE.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet reaffirms the Council's support for the key ambitions and principal policy issues which are being further developed for inclusion in a South Downs Management Plan.

593. **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK MONITORING: ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2005**

(Report CAB1163 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Davies and Busher addressed Cabinet regarding this item. Councillor Davies believed that it was unfortunate the Report had not been ready in time to be considered by the Winchester District Local Plan Committee, as it contained relevant updated information. He queried how the findings in the Report would now be taken forward and requested that the necessary steps be taken to ensure all Members were aware of its contents. With reference to

paragraph 7.5 of the Report, Councillor Busher requested clarification about the status of the various types of Design Statements.

In response to Councillor Busher, the Chief Executive confirmed that Policy H.3 would strengthen the status of some Village Design Statements in rural areas. He advised that, at the request of the Environment Scrutiny Panel, he would shortly be contacting all the authors of the various Design Statements advising that their Statements may require some updating to bring them in line with the new policies.

The Chief Executive confirmed that the Report would be referred to the Local Strategic Partnership and could also be referred to the relevant Scrutiny Panels if Members thought it appropriate. However, responsibility for monitoring the information contained in the Report remained with Cabinet.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the content of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) be endorsed and submitted to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister as the 2005 Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report of the Council.

2. That delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, to make minor editorial changes to finalise the AMR prior to submission and to add the schedules/maps of housing commitments and completions, referred to at paragraph 3.5 of the Report.

594. **REVIEW OF CAR PARKING CHARGES**
(Report CAB1169 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the schedule of proposed parking charges attached to Appendix 1 of the Report be approved, that the increases be implemented from 1 April 2006, and that the Off Street Parking Places Order be amended accordingly by giving public notice of the variation of charges.

595. **CONCESSIONARY TRAVEL SCHEME**
(Report CAB1170 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Higgins and Busher addressed Cabinet regarding this item. Councillor Higgins welcomed the introduction of free bus passes for every person aged over 60 years, but also requested that free Senior Citizen Railcards should be offered as an alternative. Councillor Busher agreed that free Railcards should be offered and also expressed concern about the impact on Dial-a-Ride users of the withdrawal of the travel token system. She emphasised that elderly people, particularly in rural areas, might not be able to walk the distance to and from a bus stop. In addition, provision of a rural bus service was being depleted and was not available in some rural areas.

Cabinet also noted the comments made by Mr Atkins in the public participation period at the start of the meeting.

A number of Members also expressed concern that a free or discounted Senior Citizen Railcard was not being offered. They believed that offering this alternative could be cost beneficial to the Council and not require an additional budget provision as set out in the Report.

The Director of Development explained that if people opted to have a free Railcard, this would cost the Council £20 per card, however many times the person then decided to travel by train. In comparison, the Council would not have to pay for each free bus pass issued. He advised that the calculations for the cost of the new bus pass scheme would be based on independent survey work and not on actual usage as recorded by bus drivers. The Director acknowledged that it was not possible to completely predict the cost of the new scheme as it was impossible to know exactly how people would behave. For example, more people over 60 years old might chose to take the option of a completely free bus pass than previously opted to use the discounted scheme.

One Member queried whether a survey could be undertaken of potential users in order ascertain a better estimate of the costs and, particularly, whether a free Senior Railcard could be offered as an alternative. The Director of Development emphasised the tight timetable involved as the Council was required to have issued all free bus passes ready for their use on 1 April 2006. This required letters to be sent to all holders of existing passes and travel tokens advising them of the changes.

The Director of Finance confirmed that the Council had recently been notified of the provisional Government settlement, which was approximately £400,000 more than expected. Although no detail was available yet, it was assumed that this additional revenue was due in part to the additional cost of the free bus pass scheme.

Following further debate, Cabinet agreed to the recommendations as set out in the Report, subject to a requirement that the situation be monitored in the light of experience in 2006/07. A further report would be made to Cabinet on the possibility of offering a free Senior Citizens Railcard for the 2007/08 financial year.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That progress with the free fare bus pass scheme be welcomed and free fare bus passes be offered to people aged 60 years or more from 1 April 2006.
2. That free or discounted Senior Citizen Railcards should not be offered as an alternative to the free fare bus pass scheme at this time, but that the situation be monitored and a further report be submitted to Cabinet in due course, to enable a decision to be made in relation to the scheme for 2007/08
3. That the Council's contribution to the core cost of Winchester Dial-a-Ride be increased by £22,000 from existing resources within the proposed 2006/07 base budget, to replace the current fare related payment, grant for the scheduler and including a small allowance for inflation.

596. **IEG5 – SUBMISSION OF STATEMENT**

(Report CAB1160 refers)

The Chairman thanked all the officers involved for their work which was reflected in the good progress outlined in the statement.

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

RESOLVED:

That the IEG5 Statement be approved for submission, subject to minor amendments being made by the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources.

597. **COUNCIL TAX BASE 2006/07**

(Report CAB1151 refers)

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE CALCULATIONS CONTAINED IN REPORT CAB1151 FOR THE COUNCIL TAX BASE FOR 2006/2007 BE APPROVED.

2. THAT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (CALCULATION OF TAX BASE) REGULATIONS 1992, THE AMOUNT CALCULATED BY WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 2006/2007 IS 46,207.85 PROPERTIES AT BAND D EQUIVALENT.

3. THAT THE AMOUNT CALCULATED AS THE COUNCIL TAX BASE FOR EACH PARISH WITHIN THE AREA OF WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL AND FOR WINCHESTER TOWN SHALL BE AS STATED IN APPENDIX C TO CAB1151.

598. **NON-DOMESTIC RATES – RURAL SETTLEMENT LIST 2006/07**

(Report CAB1142 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the list of Rural Settlements shown in Appendix A of the Report be approved for the year 2006/07.

599. **DISPOSAL OF HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) LAND TO THE REAR OF 4-10 GREAT FIELD ROAD, WEEKE (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**
(Report CAB1158 refers)

Cabinet noted that this report would also be considered by Principal Scrutiny Committee on 16 January 2006 for it to decide whether it wished to exercise its powers of "call-in".

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 Principal Scrutiny Committee, the disposal of the freehold interest in the area of the land to the rear of 4-10 Great Field Road, Weeke to Atlantic Housing Limited at a nominal consideration be approved, subject to terms and conditions to be agreed by the Chief Estates Officer, taking account of the requirements of General Consent A (Disposal of Land to Registered Social Landlords) 2005 under Section 25 of the Local Government Act 1988.

600. **CUSTOMER SERVICE CENTRE - POST IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW**
(Report PS205 refers)

Cabinet noted that this Report had been considered by Principal Scrutiny Committee on 5 December 2005, which had suggested that Cabinet should ensure that solutions for the outstanding issues as detailed in the Report, were not prejudiced by any decision on the next phase of the Customer Service Centre (CSC) above. Councillor Learney agreed that this would be included in the Report on the next phase of the CSC, which was due to be submitted to Cabinet in January 2006.

The Chief Executive congratulated the Director of Finance and the Customer Service Centre Manager on their work to date and also all Council staff who had generally responded positively to the implementation of the CSC.

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

RESOLVED:

That the issues raised in the post implementation review of the Customer Service Centre be taken into account in decisions on the next phase of the Centre.

601. **COMMUNITY GRANTS – EMERGENCY CAPITAL AWARD 2005/06**
(Report CAB1152 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That a grant award of £2,000 to Waltham Chase Village Hall from the grant budget for 2005/06 be approved, subject to a minimum contribution of £1,000 from the Parish Council and the organisation entering into a funding agreement with the City Council.

602. **“SAFER FOOD BETTER BUSINESS” PROJECT**
(Report CAB1154 refers)

The Director of Communities confirmed that a press release would be issued on the project as outlined in the Report.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the work on the Safer Food Better Business project as outlined in the above report be endorsed.

2. That the City Council act as Lead Project Contractor and funding co-ordinator for the project and that the Director of Communities be authorised to enter into the necessary agreements.

603. **GOOD SCRUTINY GUIDE**
(Report PS206 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the Good Scrutiny Guide be endorsed as framework and Guidance for the work of Principal Scrutiny Committee and the Scrutiny Panels.

604. **BUDGET MONITORING OVERVIEW TO OCTOBER 2005**
(Report CAB1164 refers)

Cabinet noted that this Report had been considered by Principal Scrutiny Committee on 5 December 2005, which had requested further information on the reasons for the budget variance for the Community Services Directorate.

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

RESOLVED:

That the content of the Report and the comments of Principal Scrutiny Committee as outlined above be noted.

605. **APPROVAL OF BUSINESS RATE DEBT WRITE-OFF**
(Report RE10 refers)

The Director of Finance requested that Cabinet approve a business rate debt write-off of £33,369.34 as set out in Report RE10 which was considered by the Resources Scrutiny Panel on 19 October 2005.

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

RESOLVED:

That the business rate debt of £33,369.34 be approved as set out in Report RE10.

606. **MINUTES OF THE CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE**
(Report CAB1153 refers)

Cabinet received the minutes of the Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee held 3 November 2005 (attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee held 3 November 2005 be noted.

607. **MINUTES OF THE WINCHESTER TOWN FORUM**
(Report CAB1168 refers)

Cabinet received the minutes of the Winchester Town Forum held 23 November 2005.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Winchester Town Forum held 23 November 2005 be noted.

608. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

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

609. **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>
610	Disposal of HRA Land to Rear of 410 Great Field Road, Weeke – Exempt Appendix) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (other than the authority). (Para 7 Schedule 12A refers).
611 and 614	HR and Payroll Integrated System) 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).
612 and 615	80-82 Sussex Street, Winchester)
613 and 616	River Park Leisure Centre Refurbishment – Award of Contract) 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).

610. **DISPOSAL OF HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) LAND TO THE REAR OF 4-10 GREAT FIELD ROAD, WEEKE - EXEMPT APPENDIX**
(Report CAB1158 refers)

Cabinet noted the information contained within the Exempt Appendix which set out the financial details of the proposed disposal of land.

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

RESOLVED:

That the information contained within the Exempt Appendix to the Report be noted.

611. **HUMAN RESOURCES (HR) AND PAYROLL INTEGRATED SYSTEM**
(Report CAB1155 refers)

Cabinet considered the above Report which recommended the procurement of a new HR and Payroll integrated system (detail in exempt minute).

612. **80-82 SUSSEX STREET, WINCHESTER**
(Reports CAB1175 and CAB1180 refers)

Cabinet considered the above Report which recommended a course of action regarding the future use of 80-82 Sussex Street (detail in exempt minute).

Cabinet noted that TACT comments on the HRA Budget Report were contained in Report CAB1180 which had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item as a matter requiring urgent consideration in order that TACT comments could be taken account of during consideration of the Report.

613. **RIVER PARK LEISURE CENTRE REFURBISHMENT – AWARD OF CONTRACT**
(Report CAB1176 refers)

Cabinet considered the above Report which recommended a course of action regarding the award of the contract for the refurbishment of River Park Leisure Centre (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 9.00am and concluded at 12.20pm

CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE**3 November 2005**Attendance:

Councillors:

Knasel (Chairman) (P)

Learney (P)

Wagner (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillor Hiscock

617. PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS, OLD GARDENS, WINCHESTER
(Report CAB1127(TP) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, three members of the public spoke regarding the proposed waiting restrictions. Mr Fowler spoke on behalf of his elderly aunt, Mrs Newman who lives at 13 Park Road but whose property had sole vehicular access via Old Gardens. The relevant letter of objection was contained within Appendix F to the above Report. Mr Fowler explained that Mrs Newman objected to the restrictions as currently outlined as it was believed it would make the situation worse for his aunt as it would concentrate more parking opposite her garage. No objection had been raised to the proposal when it was originally advertised as there had been some confusion about the exact section of road to be covered. In addition to concerns about access to property, Mr Fowler also stressed the difficulties caused for any emergency vehicles wishing to access the area.

Mr Morgan also spoke in support of Mrs Newman's objections to the proposals, emphasising the difficulty experienced reversing out her garage because of the cars parked opposite.

Mrs Gardner advised that she was a resident of Old Gardens and wished to speak in support of the proposed restrictions as set out in the Report. She emphasised the long standing nature of the problems experienced by parking in this cul-de-sac and mentioned that the residents had policed the area themselves by asking drivers not to park there. She expressed sympathy for the difficulties experienced by Mrs Newman, but suggested the Committee should approve the proposals as outlined and then consider extending the double yellow lines at a future date.

Councillor Hiscock spoke as a Ward Councillor for the area and emphasised that the difficulties caused by vehicles parking in Old Gardens had been ongoing for a number of years. He expressed sympathy with the points raised on behalf of Mrs Newman, but considered that the proposals should be agreed as outlined in the Report. The Committee should then undertake to consider extending the double yellow lines as soon as possible.

The Director of Development confirmed that it was not legally possible for the proposed restrictions to be extended beyond that which was advertised. Therefore the options available to the Committee were either to agree the proposal as advertised, to reduce it, or to reject it and start the process of advertising the extended proposed restrictions again.

In response to questions, the Director of Development advised that there was a waiting list of Traffic Regulation Orders outstanding and the budget for 2005/06 had already been fully allocated. However, he suggested that consideration of extending the double yellow lines in Old Nursery Gardens could be included within the general Parking Review that was currently being undertaken. Any Order that was required could then be advertised at the same time as other changes to reduce costs.

Following discussion, the Committee agreed with the recommendations as set out in the above Report. However, an additional recommendation should be agreed that the possibility of extending the double yellow lines further round Old Nursery Gardens, to address the concerns expressed on behalf of Mrs Newman, be considered as part of the Parking Review. The Director of Development advised that it was expected that the Review would be completed by April and the Order could be advertised after this time. If there were no objections, it could be implemented by May 2006.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the proposed revision to the Traffic Regulation Order in Old Gardens, Winchester be approved such that the existing 'No waiting 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturday' waiting restrictions be amended and 'No waiting at any time' waiting restrictions be introduced as advertised and the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to make the necessary order.

2. That the concerns raised by the residents of Old Gardens and nearby properties be noted and that a review of parking problems in Old Gardens be included within the Parking Review to take place in Spring 2006.

618. **PAYMENT OF PARKING CHARGES BY MOBILE PHONE (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**

(Report CAB1120(TP) refers)

The Director of Development advised that since the Report was prepared, the companies outlined in the Exempt Appendix were offering different terms than those included within the Report, in order to try and attract more customers to this new technology. He explained that the first three companies (outlined in paragraphs 1.2 to 1.4 of the Report Appendix) all relied on using an RFID reader. However, the fourth company (outlined in paragraph 1.5) did not require an in-car system and consequently cost less. The cost to the Council involved rental of a BlackBerry Unit to allow internet access and the costs involved in processing credit/debit card payments. Therefore he estimated the cost to the Council would be between £500 and £1,200 per annum, dependant on customer take-up.

During discussion, Members commented on the potential risk to the Council's reputation if the system failed and for example, a driver was issued with a parking

ticket in error. In addition, Members expressed concern that the system was new and untested and consequently one suggested that the companies involved should offer payment to the Council to trial the system for them. Overall, Members concluded that the benefits to the Council and the potential risks did not warrant a trial at this stage. However, the Committee requested that Officers monitor the development of such systems and report back if appropriate at a future date.

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

RESOLVED:

That the proposed trial of accepting payment of parking charges by mobile phone, as set out in the above Report, be not agreed at this stage.

619. **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>
620	Payment of Parking Charges by Mobile Phone – Exempt Appendix) 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).

620. **PAYMENT OF PARKING CHARGES BY MOBILE PHONE - EXEMPT APPENDIX**
(Report CAB1120(TP) refers)

The Committee noted the exempt information contained in the Appendix to the Report.

The meeting commenced at 2.30pm and concluded at 3.20pm

Chairman