

CABINET

22 March 2006

Attendance:

Councillor Campbell - *Portfolio Holder for Community Strategy* (Chairman) (P)

Councillor Beveridge – *Portfolio Holder for Planning* (P)

Councillor Collin – *Portfolio Holder for Healthy and Inclusive Communities* (P)

Councillor Evans – *Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport* (P)

Councillor Hiscock – *Portfolio Holder for Housing* (P)

Councillor Knasel - *Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport*

Councillor Learney – *Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources* (P)

Councillor Wagner – *Portfolio Holder for Environmental Health* (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Allgood, Busher, Coates, Mitchell and Sutton

Mr A Rickman (TACT)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Davies

Mrs H Dewdney (TACT)

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Knasel.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 1 March 2006, less exempt items, be approved and adopted.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Statements relating to the Land at Meadowside (CAB1244) and Winchester Cathedral Close Plan (CAB1218) are set out under the appropriate Report below.

Councillor Mitchell requested that Cabinet reconsider the decision not to award the full amount of grant requested by the Weeke Community Centre. He emphasised the important role undertaken by the Centre, including offering facilities for people outside the Weeke area and its intention to accommodate a disabled group in the near future. Consequently, the grant was required as soon as possible to enable installation of a disabled access toilet.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Mitchell for his comments and agreed that the matter would be reconsidered. Councillor Learney advised that the Winchester Town Forum budget would be examined again in the light of any underspends in 2005/06 to ascertain whether there was scope for the full level of grant to be awarded.

As Chairman of Planning Development Control Committee, Councillor Busher queried whether the split between her role and that of the Portfolio Holder for Planning should be better advertised, particularly to relevant outside organisations. This suggestion was noted.

4. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Campbell reported that she had spoken at a recent, well-attended, Climate Change Conference held in Winchester, at which a number of young people had requested that more be done to involve their age group with this issue. As a consequence, a youth conference would be arranged for later in 2006.

On behalf of Councillor Knasel, Councillor Campbell advised that an update report on the latest situation regarding concessionary travel, in particular grants for community transport, would be submitted to the next Cabinet on 13 April 2006.

Councillor Collin stated that he had attended a successful Community Safety Partnership conference entitled "Alcohol: The Good, The Bad and The Ugly" - the slides from which would shortly be available on the Council's Website via the following link: <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/General.asp?id= SX8CAF-A78189F8>

Councillor Beveridge reported that he had attended a South East Design Champions event which aimed to promote good design across the region.

Councillor Evans stated that she had attended the Hyde Abbey Gardens AGM and the gardens were now nearing completion. She thanked the Chairman of the Group, Mrs Barbara Hall, who stood down at the meeting, for all her hard work and inspiration on the project. She suggested that the Leader write to Mrs Hall on behalf of the Council to express its thanks and Councillor Campbell agreed to undertake this.

5. **ADDITIONAL CABINET MEETING**

Cabinet noted that an additional meeting would take place on Thursday 13 April 2006 at 9.00am.

6. **DISPOSAL OF RECREATIONAL LAND AT MEADOWSIDE, WHITELEY** (Report CAB1244 refers)

Councillor Collin declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of this item as an employee of the County Council. He left the room during its consideration.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Allgood, as the County Councillor for the Southern Parishes Electoral Division, spoke in support of the County Council's proposals to locate a new school on land at Meadowside, as he considered it was in the best interests of the Whiteley community. In summary, his reasons were the opportunity it afforded to provide a new school, church, community facilities, an all-weather pitch and improved football pitches. He did not consider that the alternative suggestions for locating the school were viable or acceptable to residents. The company owning the land adjacent to the recreation ground had indicated they did not wish to sell. In addition, the option of locating a school in North Whiteley was inappropriate, as it was outside the development area and had access problems. In conclusion, he believed it was the Council's duty to co-operate with the County Council and put the requirements of children first.

In response to questions, Councillor Allgood confirmed that the petition received at the public meeting on 9 February 2006 had been passed to County Councillor Kirk (Executive Member for Education) and discussed with the education officers. However, it was not specifically referred to at the recent County Council Cabinet meeting to discuss the issue of Whiteley School.

Councillor Campbell reported that a copy of this petition, which contained 70 signatures against the County Council's proposals, had also been presented to her for City Council consideration.

Five members of the public, parish council and other interested parties spoke regarding this item and their comments are summarised below.

Mr J Sandfield (Whiteley resident) spoke in support of the County Council's proposals and emphasised the requirement for a new Whiteley school to be provided as soon as possible, to prevent parents having to drive their children to alternative schools outside of the settlement. He also welcomed the proposals to improve the football pitches at Meadowside as these currently suffered from poor drainage. He had contacted Sports England and been advised that a new pitch took about five months to bed in.

Reverend B Dugmore supported the points raised by Mr Sandfield. He mentioned the sometimes difficult history of the Whiteley development and considered this had resulted in a divided community. He emphasised that only about five per cent of the residents had responded to the County Council consultation.

Mr M Miles (Hampshire Playing Fields Association) spoke in opposition to the County Council's proposals because of the detrimental effect on the Meadowside facility. He emphasised the effort involved in establishing the Whiteley Junior Football Club and feared that the current levels of enthusiasm and commitment might be lost if the development was to proceed.

Mr P Wright (Whiteley Parish Council) spoke in opposition to the County Council's proposals and considered that it would result in the loss of more than the five per cent of land at Meadowside. He also outlined concerns regarding the County Council's consultation process.

Mr M Evans (Whiteley Parish Council) confirmed that the Parish Council supported the requirement for a school but were opposed to it being located on land at Meadowside and consequently supported the recommendations in Report CAB1244. He handed two petitions to the Chairman against the County Council's proposals, one containing 220 signatures from members and parents of the Football and Cricket Clubs, and the second containing 70 signatures from the parents of children at the existing Whiteley Primary School. He believed there was a significant risk any planning application would be "called in" as it was contrary to national planning policy. The Parish Council considered that a better location for a new school was currently available in North Whiteley. With regard to the alternative suggestion to relocate pitches in Leafy Lane, he believed that this could result in potential access difficulties. In conclusion, Mr Evans stated that locating a school at Meadowside would urbanise an area created for recreational use and would cause considerable disruption for a number of years to sporting activities.

Mr A Smith (County Council Director of Property, Business and Regulatory Services) outlined the County Council's plans in more detail and responded to questions from Members.

In summary, he made the following points regarding the proposed development:

- The County Council had allocated £6 million for the provision of a school in Whiteley and had requested that the design be progressed in order that the project could be completed by September 2007;
- The school could be designed so as not to compromise the existing facilities at Meadowside Leisure Centre;
- The net gain of the proposals would be a junior football pitch and multi-purpose hall;
- The likelihood of the requirement to extend the school further was remote, but if necessary it could be achieved without losing any more recreational space at Meadowside;
- The development would inevitably result in disruption, but this could be minimised by the keeping the cricket pitch open until the end of the 2007 season and one football pitch remaining open throughout;
- It would still be possible to extend the existing Meadowside Centre;
- The existing pitches would be moved a maximum of 40 metres to the west and the work would require cutting and filling of land to be carried out;
- There was no requirement for additional sewerage provision for drainage;
- Discussions with a landowner adjacent to the Meadowside Centre had confirmed that they were not willing to dispose of their land;
- The suggestion to locate a school in North Whiteley, outside of the settlement boundary would be a high risk planning strategy.

Mr Smith stated that the proposed school footprint would result in a loss of about five per cent of the total City Council land at Meadowside. However, he acknowledged that the junior all-weather pitch would result in a loss of another six to seven per cent of land. The County Council would encourage the school to allow joint recreational management of this pitch with the Meadowside Centre. Mr Smith advised that there was no current proposal to fence off the all-weather pitch, but acknowledged that any school were likely to require this because of issues of security of pupils.

In response to questions regarding ultimate responsibility for a new school, Mr B May (Portsmouth Diocese) confirmed that the proposal was for a school to be promoted by the Diocese, but the maintenance of the building and responsibility for the playing fields would remain with the County Council.

A number of Members expressed concern that the proposal was for a one-form entry school only, as it was considered there was already a requirement for two-form entry (for example, a few years ago 34 children were refused entry into the current primary school and since then more houses had been built). In response, Mr Smith reported that the County Council's Education Officers had advised that a new school would not be at capacity for two or three years.

With regard to the timetable for the project, Mr Smith confirmed that the DFES deadline was 31 May 2006. The County Council considered the DFES might agree to an extension to this date to enable practical difficulties to be dealt with, but only if a site had been identified.

With regard to the alternative proposal put forward by the City Council that playing fields be relocated to County Council owned land at Leafy Lane (paragraph 1.23 of the report refers), Mr Smith indicated that the site was not ideal for playing fields as it was situated on the edge of the built up area. Mr Smith also advised this would result in an opportunity cost to the County Council of approximately £4 million and the

overall cost of the school would rise to an unacceptably high figure of £11 million. This was because the County Council wished to retain land at Leafy Lane for possible housing development, which would also contribute to open space provision.

The Chairman thanked Mr Smith for attending and answering Members' questions.

The Director of Development outlined the history to the proposals as outlined in the Report. He advised that the County Council's proposals would result in a loss of significantly more land at Meadowside than the five per cent stated. He also confirmed there was a significant risk any planning application would be 'called in' as contrary to national policy resulting in potentially considerable delays.

With regard to the alternative suggestion to consider locating a school in North Whiteley, the Director confirmed that Policy C5 did permit essential infrastructure, such as a school, to be built outside a settlement boundary. A land owner in this area had offered land for sale to the County Council at a reasonable price. A planning application would be needed to test whether a school could be satisfactorily developed on this site.

The City Secretary and Solicitor advised that various issues regarding open space covenants and access to the site would need to be resolved at the County Council's expense. If the City Council were to dispose of the land, a statutory consultation process would have to be undertaken by placing adverts in the local press. The results of that consultation would have to be considered before a final decision was made.

During debate, Cabinet agreed that they needed to balance the requirement for a new school in Whiteley against the effects of disposal of land at Meadowside. As the proposals would limit the boundaries of the current centre on two sides, the ability to expand would be severely restricted. Cabinet also emphasised that the results of the recent consultation had been evenly split between those in favour of the County Council's proposals and those against. Members considered that the County Council should have regard to the longer-term, for example additional development in North Whiteley, and consider in more detail the alternative proposals set out in the Report. There was a requirement for additional discussions to take place between members of the County and the City Councils, along with Whiteley Parish Council, the Hampshire Playing Fields Association and representatives of sports interests in Whiteley.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet confirms its support for the principal of providing additional primary school capacity in Whiteley;
2. That Hampshire County Council be informed that the City Council considers that their proposals will do significant harm to community recreation facilities, and therefore cannot at this stage agree to the disposal of land at Meadowside Recreation Ground on the basis suggested by the County Council;

3. That the County Council explore alternative options by consulting with relative stakeholders for provision of a new school and enhanced recreational facilities for the people of Whiteley.

4. That Cabinet agree to reconsider the disposal of land at Meadowside Recreation Ground if the County Council brings forward an acceptable alternative proposal;

5. That the Director of Development be given authority to enter into detailed discussions regarding alternatives outlined in this paper, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources and Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport. Such discussions should take account of consultations with all the relevant stakeholders.

7. **WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL CLOSE PLAN**
(Report CAB1218 refers)

During the public participation period, Mr A Weeks (Chairman of Winchester City Residents Association), Mr A Munns (Cathedral Receiver General) Mr P Wilson (Adams Hendry – Planning Consultant for the Cathedral) spoke regarding this item.

Mr Weeks spoke in opposition to the report's recommendations and advised that the Residents' Association had established a committee to consider this matter in detail which had produced its own findings. He emphasised the unique character of the Cathedral Close which required protection and it was considered that development should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. Examples of acceptable development included enabling accommodation for key workers and the welfare of visitors.

Mr Munns confirmed that the Cathedral had received a copy of the Resident Associations' report. He thanked the Council officers involved in the development of the proposals for their assistance and also welcomed the advice received from English Nature. He supported the recommendations set out in Report CAB1218 and agreed that the issue of affordable housing provision could only be resolved at the planning application stage. In response to questions, Mr Wilson explained that the term "key worker" did not conform to the definition set down by Government, but did adhere to the Council's own Strategy Document's second category of designated employees of non-profit making organisations. He advised that the intention was to provide accommodation for a number of cathedral workers, such as vergers and specialist stonemasons.

Cabinet supported the Report's recommendations and some Members commented that the Cathedral Close should be allowed to evolve and highlighted the Visitor's Centre as a relatively recent example of successful new development.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the opportunity to be involved in the production of the Cathedral Close Plan and the public consultation that was carried out on it be welcomed, and it be broadly agreed that it represents an appropriate, coherent and sensitive Plan for the future of the Close.

2. That the detailed proposals in the Plan, including its provisions regarding affordable housing, can only properly be considered when planning and listed building application(s) are submitted, taking account of the prevailing planning policies and other considerations at that time.

8. **CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN 2006/07**

(Report CAB1220 refers)

Councillor Beveridge requested that work relating to adoption of the Winchester District Local Plan be included as an additional corporate objective for his Portfolio under the "Homes and Jobs" Corporate Priority. This was agreed. The City Secretary and Solicitor advised that a Report containing the exact wording of this amendment should be submitted to Council on 19 April 2006 for its approval.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN (PERFORMANCE PLAN PART 1) 2006/07 BE APPROVED AS SET OUT IN REPORT CAB1220, SUBJECT TO THE AMENDMENT TO THE PLANNING PORTFOLIO TO BE OUTLINED IN REPORT CL36.

RESOLVED:

That the approach to producing the Performance Plan for 2006/07 be approved.

9. **BUSINESS PLANS 2006/07**

(Report CAB1237 refers)

Cabinet noted that the Business Plans had been considered by the various Scrutiny Panels and copies of the draft minutes of the Social Issues, Environment and Local Economy Scrutiny Panels held in March 2006 were reported for the information of Members. In addition, the Chief Executive, the City Secretary and Solicitor and the Directors of Finance and of Human Resources reported on discussions held at the Resources Scrutiny Panel meeting the previous evening. In general, Panels had asked detailed questions regarding the content of the Plans but had not raised any significant issues requiring amendment.

The City Secretary and Solicitor reported that the Resources Scrutiny Panel had asked the Principal Scrutiny Committee to undertake a post-implementation review of the Business Plans' development in comparison with its initial recommendations.

The Chairman noted that the Environment Scrutiny Panel had expressed concern about the withdrawal of funding for historic buildings grants and suggested that part of the Local Authority Business Growth Incentive (LABGI) be allocated to this area (Report CAB1243 below also refers).

In discussion of the suggestions for future work proposed by the Local Economy Scrutiny Panel, the City Secretary and Solicitor confirmed that these should be noted at this stage and they would be subject to future approval as part of the Scrutiny Work Programme process.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Business Plans for 2006/07 be approved.
2. That delegated authority be given to the appropriate Directors to undertake minor editing to finalise Business Plans, considering the points made by the Scrutiny Panels, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holders.
3. That Cabinet notes that progress against these programmes of work will be reviewed by Portfolio Holders at least quarterly and updated as required to reflect opportunities and pressures arising during the year, with reference to Cabinet if required.

10. **DELIVERING DECENT HOMES – THE HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE 2006/07 TACT COMMENTS ON REPORT CAB1231 AND CAB1226**
(Reports CAB1231 and CAB1239 refer)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr A Rickman outlined TACT's comments regarding Report CAB1231. Cabinet noted that these comments were contained in full in Report CAB1239 which had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept this item onto the agenda in order that TACT's comments could be considered alongside consideration of Report CAB1231.

Cabinet were advised that the Social Issues Scrutiny Panel had considered the HRA Business Plan at its meeting on 16 March 2006.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Coates emphasised the demand for disabled adaptations within the Council's housing stock and suggested that £100,000 of the LABGI funding could be allocated in order to progress faster with improvements (Report CAB1243 below also refers).

During discussion of this request, Members noted the impacts of wider issues such as Social Services being encouraged to allow elderly people to remain at home as long as possible. In addition, Councillor Hiscock explained that this policy would impact on the take-up of the Council's sheltered housing stock. There was also the potential that disabled adaptations would be required to be removed before a new tenant moved in or alternatively the property would have to be ring-fenced for a limited selection of people with the consequential effect on the waiting lists.

The Director of Communities reported that he was meeting with representatives from the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) later that day in order to discuss the possibility of Council tenants being able to apply to the Council for Disabled Facilities Grants which are currently limited to private householders. He undertook to report back on the outcome of discussions. He confirmed that it was possible for the Council to provide capital funding if it wished.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan update for 2006/07, including the proposed Major Repairs, Renewals and Maintenance Programme, be approved.
2. That the Director of Communities be given authority to make minor editing amendments in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing prior to final publication of the Plan.
3. That TACT's comments on the HRA Business Plan Update be welcomed.
4. That the Director of Communities report to a future Cabinet on the outcome of discussions with GOSE regarding funding for disabled adaptations.

11. **HOUSING SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS IMPROVEMENTS**
TACT COMMENTS ON REPORT CAB1231 AND CAB1226
 (Reports CAB1226 and CAB1239 refer)

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 noted that TACT comments were contained in Report CAB1239 which had not been notified for inclusion on the agenda within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept this item onto the agenda in order that TACT's comments could be considered alongside consideration of Report CAB1226.

The Director of Development reported that Southern Water had indicated a willingness to adopt one of the works in the next year with a further two or three works to be adopted in the next few years. Cabinet welcomed Southern Water's increased cooperation.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Director of Development, in consultation with the Director of Communities, be authorised to progress the works outlined in the Report.
2. That the proposals to carry over the under spend of £84,700 from 2005/06 in to 2006/07 to allow works to be carried out on those sites where delays have been caused by land purchase issues be approved, subject to the final capital commitments at the end of March 2006.

12. **REVIEW OF DISTRICT WIDE PARTNERSHIPS**
 (Report CAB1242 refers)

One Portfolio Holder stated that they would welcome further advice on their roles within the district partnerships. The Chief Executive noted this request.

The Chief Executive reported that the actions relating to individual partnerships would be taken around the relevant partnership meetings in the near future to ensure that all organisations were aware of their role.

The Chief Executive confirmed that Cabinet were responsible for the role and monitoring of the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP), in particular through the work of the Leader. One Member suggested that Cabinet should be responsible for scrutinising the LSP and this idea was noted.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Review of District Wide Partnerships Action Plan detailed at Appendix 2 of the Report be approved.

13. **ECONOMIC ACTION PLAN**
(Report CAB1241 refers)

The Director of Development reported that the Local Economy Scrutiny Panel had made a number of detailed comments on the Plan at its meeting on 15 March 2006. In summary, he advised that these comments included:

- With regard to economic prosperity, a requirement for a clear link with the Social Inclusion Strategy and vice versa;
- Clearer delineation of target groups for action;
- Emphasis of the significant role of the Local Strategy Partnership and the need for it to set clear targets;
- Requirement to take account of the possible impact of large scale new development on the economy and infrastructure of the District.

The Chairman suggested that Hampshire Broadband Forum should be included within the list of key stakeholders. The Chief Executive noted this point but commented that it was considered access to the various broadband activities could be achieved through the County Council.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Economic Action Plan Final Draft be approved subject to the Chief Executive being granted delegated authority to agree minor editing changes, following consultation with the Leader and the Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport.

2. That, if following consideration of the points raised by the Local Economy Scrutiny Panel and further discussions with the Leader and Portfolio Holder outlined in Recommendation 1 above, any significant changes are considered necessary, a further report be submitted to Cabinet for approval.

14. **ALLOCATION OF LOCAL AUTHORITY BUSINESS GROWTH INCENTIVE SCHEME (LABGI) FUNDING**
(Report CAB1243 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.

Members noted that this Report would also be considered by Principal Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 27 March 2006 and if that Committee or Cabinet raised any objections to the proposed funding, the decision would be referred back to full Council on 19 April 2006 for approval.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Busher and Sutton spoke regarding this item.

Councillor Busher expressed concern that the proposed funding appeared to concentrate on the City Centre area rather than being equally distributed across the District. In particular, with regard to the "Winchester in Bloom" funding, she emphasised that other towns in the District did not receive similar levels of funding. She considered the funding could be better utilised, for example to contribute towards the concessionary travel scheme.

In response, the Chairman reminded Members that an update report on concessionary travel arrangements would be submitted to the next Cabinet on 13 April 2006 and that £10,000 had already been set aside to assist community transport schemes to take account of the withdrawal of tokens.

Councillor Sutton declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as a member of the Hampshire Buildings Preservation Trust and the owner of a historic building. She requested that some of the funding be used for the restoration of the historic buildings grant. She emphasised the role played by historic buildings in attracting visitors to the District and therefore contributing to its economic prosperity.

Cabinet also noted Councillor Coates request regarding funding for disabled adaptations outlined under Report CAB1231 above.

Councillor Learney outlined the principle agreed at Council that the LABGI funding be used for business improvement projects across the whole District, and for one-off items where there was a long-term benefit. She did not consider a one-off funding amount would be particularly appropriate for historic buildings grants and therefore suggested that a growth proposal be considered within the budget for 2007/08 for this item. This was agreed.

For similar reasons, Cabinet did not consider the funding should be used for disabled adaptations, as it would provide a limited benefit for one year only.

In response to questions, the City Secretary and Solicitor confirmed that Council on 23 February 2006 had agreed to the immediate allocation of £35,000 towards "Winchester in Bloom". However, this funding would be subject to an agreed service level agreement (SLA) and discussions with the organisation to require a sustainable planting scheme having regard to the likely water shortages this year. Cabinet discussed whether a proportion of this amount could be allocated to other "In Bloom"

projects within the District. However, it was noted that this funding had already been agreed by Council and could not be significantly altered without reference back to Council on 19 April 2006. In addition, other organisations had received support in the form of officer advice in the past.

Members emphasised that a number of the proposals for funding would benefit the wider District, for example Planning Service Improvements and the signage decluttering project.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That subject to the agreement of Principal Scrutiny Committee, the funding of £408,000 received from the Local Authority Business Growth Incentive scheme be allocated as follows:

- 'Winchester in Bloom' - £35,000, subject to agreement of a SLA and a sustainable planting scheme by the Director of Communities in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport
- Planning Service improvements - £120,000
- Economic Development Strategy and Action Plan - £150,000
- Cultural Services relocations - £60,000
- Signage decluttering project - £30,000
- Year of Sculpture - £13,000

2. That the funding be allocated to the budget of the relevant Directorate and that detailed spending proposals (where not defined in Recommendation 1) be agreed by the Director in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder.

3. That a growth proposal be considered within the Development Directorate's budget for 2007/08 for the restoration of historic buildings grants.

15. **WINCHESTER BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID)**
(Report CAB1240 refers)

The Chief Executive reported that larger businesses tended to be supportive of BIDs because if agreed, all businesses within the area, regardless of size, were required to contribute.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That Cabinet support the principle of a BID and funding of certain start-up costs to take us towards a referendum of businesses within

the proposed BID area, including ongoing support to the City Centre Partnership for staff time, the costs of preparing for and running a referendum of local businesses affected, and preparing for the collection of BID contributions.

2. That authority be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Director of Finance, the Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport and the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources, to agree the final amount committed to developing a BID.

3. That authority be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the City Secretary and Solicitor and the Portfolio Holder for Economy and Transport, to agree and sign the Memorandum of Understanding being developed to commit the Council to developing a BID to referendum.

16. **PLANNING GRANTS 2006/07**
(Report CAB1232 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the following planning grants be made in 2006/07:

- a) £7,500 Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre
- b) £10,500 South Downs Joint Committee (formerly East Hampshire AONB)
- c) £7,000 Hampshire Wildlife Trust (restoration of St. Faiths Meadow)
- d) £10,500 to Hampshire Wildlife Trust (wardening of Winnall Moors and St. Faith's)
- e) £5,500 British Trust for Conservation Volunteers (for local environment projects)
- f) £10,000 Itchen Navigation Project (£10,000 in each of the next five years, total contribution £50,000)

17. **CARBON MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME: STRATEGY AND DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**
(Report CAB1227 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the Carbon Management Strategy be approved.
- 2. That a target of a 50% reduction on the baseline CO₂ emissions level by 2012 be set, which will frame the development of the implementation plan.

18. **RENOVATION AND PROTECTION WORKS TO ABBEY HOUSE, THE BROADWAY, WINCHESTER**
(Report CAB1224 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Sutton welcomed the proposals for the restoration of Abbey House, but queried whether further investigation should be undertaken into the introduction of a sprinkler system.

The Director of Communities confirmed that this matter had been fully investigated and English Heritage did not recommend the use of a sprinkler system in this type of listed building. The proposal was to install a wireless fire system which would be linked to a 24 hour control centre. The City Secretary and Solicitor mentioned that sprinklers could damage the house contents and also there was no provision in the budget to install a more expensive sprinkler system. However, Cabinet requested that further investigation be undertaken into this suggestion and, in particular, the inclusion of a sprinkler system in areas more at risk of fire, such as the kitchen.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the works to Abbey House as set out in paragraph 1.3 of the Report be undertaken as soon as possible, subject to further investigation regarding the introduction of a sprinkler system, with delegated authority given to the City Secretary and Solicitor in consultation with the Director of Finance and the Portfolio Holder for Finance to make the final decision.

2. That the Capital Programme for works to Abbey House (£50,000 in 2005/06, £50,000 in 2006/07 and £50,000 in 2007/08) be revised to £150,000 in 2006/07, to enable the works to be undertaken at the same time.

19. **ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE CONSTITUTION**
(Report CAB1228 refers)

Members noted that this Report would also be considered by Principal Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 27 March 2006.

Cabinet considered that they could not support the proposals contained within the Report at the current time. In particular, Members considered that the suggestions would result in too many restrictions being placed on the roles of individual members.

It was therefore agreed that a further meeting take place between Councillors Campbell, Evans, Allgood and the Group Leaders to discuss the matters raised in the Report further.

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

RESOLVED:

That a meeting be arranged between Councillors Campbell, Evans, Allgood and Group Leaders to discuss the matters raised in the Report further and a report be brought back to a future Cabinet and Principal Scrutiny Committee as appropriate.

20. **WINCHESTER EXCAVATIONS COMMITTEE - FUNDING**
(Report CAB1223 refers)

One Member queried whether any of the work could be viewed on the Internet. The Director of Development advised that this possibility was under consideration. Cabinet also requested that a public display and formal presentation of the "Winchester Studies" be organised.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the conversion of the loan of £10,000 previously given to Winchester Excavations Committee to a grant to cover the costs of accommodation for the current financial year be approved.

2. That the Winchester Excavations Committee be requested to consider ways to increase accessibility of the "Winchester Studies" through use of the Internet, a public display and formal presentation of the work to the public.

21. **REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES**
(Report CAB1234 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the following appointments be made from the nominations received (term of office in brackets):

- a) Southampton Post Office and Telecom Committee
Councillor Pearson (31 March 2010)
- b) Knowle Community Buildings Association
Councillor Clohosey (Representative) and Councillor Evans (Observer)

22. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Forward Plan for April 2006, be noted.

23. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

1. That in all the circumstances, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

2. That the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items of business because it is likely that, if members of the public were present, there would be disclosure to them of 'exempt information' as defined by Section 100I and Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972.

| <u>Minute Number</u> | <u>Item</u> | <u>Description of Exempt Information</u> |
|----------------------|---|---|
| 24 | Exempt Minutes of the Previous meeting |) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). (Para 3 Schedule 12A refers) |
| 25 & 26 | 152 High Street Winchester and Land to the rear of 114 Lovedon Lane, Kings Worthy |) |

24. **EXEMPT MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minutes of the previous meeting held 1 March 2006 be approved and adopted.

25. **152 HIGH STREET WINCHESTER AND LAND REAR OF 114 LOVEDON LANE, KINGS WORTHY**

(Report CAB1235 refers)

Cabinet considered the above report which set out proposals regarding the above property and land (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 9.00am and concluded at 2.30pm

EXEMPT MINUTE – NOT FOR PUBLICATION

CABINET

22 March 2006

26. **152 HIGH STREET WINCHESTER AND LAND REAR OF 114 LOVEDON LANE, KINGS WORTHY**
(Report CAB1235 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the new letting of 152 High Street be agreed at £47,000 per annum for a ten year lease with a review at the fifth year, with the remaining terms to be agreed by the Chief Estates Officer.
2. That a permanent easement for a vehicular access be granted over the car park land in Ramsey Road, Kings Worthy for the benefit of the land to the rear of 114 Lovedon Lane subject to the consideration of £45,000 being paid by the grantee together with an undertaking to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs.

Chairman