

COUNCIL

19 July 2006

EXTRACTS FROM MINUTES OF CABINET AND PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

REPORT OF CITY SECRETARY AND SOLICITOR

Contact Officer: Chris Ashcroft Tel No: 01962 848284 cashcroft@winchester.gov.uk

RECENT REFERENCES:

None

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Appendix A to this report sets out minute extracts relating to issues for the consideration of Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council determines the matters set out in the minute extracts.

MINUTE EXTRACTS FROM CABINET, 10 JULY 2006

1. **PROPOSED SCHOOL AT MEADOWSIDE, WHITELEY**
(Report CAB1298 refers)

Councillor Allgood declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item through his role as the County Division Member for Whiteley following advice from the City Secretary and Solicitor. Councillor Allgood left the room during the consideration of this item and did not speak or vote thereon.

Councillor Hollingbery declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in this item as he had commented on the proposed school on a website. Councillor Hollingbery spoke and voted thereon.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Parish Councillor M Evans (as Chairman of Whiteley Parish Council) spoke against the proposal. Local residents wanted a new school but the majority responding to the consultation were against the Meadowside site. In summary he stated that the County Council should investigate alternative sites for the school and that one such site (North Whiteley) was more acceptable to the local community as it represented a better long term solution. He also requested that the City Council undertake an independent Environmental Impact Assessment.

The Parish Council had asked the National Playing Fields Association to prepare a report on the suitability of the relocated pitches at Meadowside and there was concern about proximity to adjacent houses.

Parish Councillor M Evans indicated that more than 350 residents had submitted a petition to the Parish Council against the use of the Meadowside site for a school and he proposed to present this to the next City Council meeting.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr M Miles (Hampshire Playing Fields Association) spoke against the proposal. The existing facility was an extremely attractive recreational space and there was already a shortfall of 16 acres for recreational use at Whiteley. Mr Miles distributed to Members a map which set out the likely effect that the completed school would have on the Meadowside Leisure Centre's playing fields. From this he highlighted that the pitches, which were already well used, would be moved to an area of wetland and would be too close to neighbouring residential properties. He concluded that if the school was approved in the location set out in the Report, it was likely to have a severe effect on the sports clubs that used these leisure facilities, in particular its younger members and volunteer coaches. Temporary loss of the facilities during the relocation period could affect Club membership.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans spoke regarding this item. Whilst she was supportive of the case for the new school, she was against its proposed location for a number of reasons which included the possibility that the proposal could constrain the Meadowside Leisure Centre's options for expansion. She added that the proposed location of the school had provoked considerable opposition from the local community and that the petitions received earlier in the year, as well as representations received in the current consultation process, should be taken into account. However, if Cabinet were minded to recommend the release of the site, she advised that the area of

mitigation land from the County Council would need careful consideration. Councillor Evans also stated that her views would not prejudice her participation to determine any planning application should it come to a future meeting of Planning Development Control Committee on which she served as a member.

The Chairman noted the comments made and whilst sympathising with the request to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment, he explained that this was not possible in advance of a planning application because of a September funding deadline which affected the County.

Cabinet noted the minutes of its previous discussion on this issue from 31 May 2006 and following debate, agreed that the requirements of recommendation 3 (which referred to land offered by the County in mitigation) had not been met.

In response to questions, the Director of Development confirmed that the County Council had offered mitigation land in the form of additional open space at Leafy Lane Whiteley totalling 0.85 hectares. In addition it had offered to transfer at no cost the land which formed the proposed neighbourhood green allocated in the Whiteley Local Plan which had an area of approximately 1 hectare. The Director of Development explained that he believed that this was the best offer that the County Council would be able to make whilst also retaining a developable site at Leafy Lane. The weakness of the proposal was that Leafy Lane was on the periphery of the Whiteley development and was less accessible than the Meadowside recreation ground which had been designed as a focal point. It was therefore unlikely to serve the community as well as the area of open space at Meadowside. In answer to a question he explained that the Leafy Lane site was allocated for residential development and that some part of the neighbourhood green would, in any case, be required to be transferred as open space.

In response to additional questions, the City Secretary and Solicitor explained that the amount of public consultation undertaken by the Council had exceeded that which was required by law. The results of this consultation were noted by Cabinet and the Chairman updated the Report in that, subsequent to its publication, a total of 36 representations (31 households) had registered their support to the proposals and 119 representations (104 households) had objected.

Having regard to all the responses received, Cabinet agreed that whilst there was a clear need for a school in Whiteley, the local community would be best served by delaying its implementation so as to consider alternative sites and to retain the existing and well-used leisure facilities.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT, HAVING GIVEN CAREFUL CONSIDERATION TO:

- A) THE REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED DURING THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS AND**

B) CONCERNS ABOUT THE SUITABILITY OF THE OPEN SPACE MITIGATION LAND OFFERED AT LEAFY LANE, WHITELEY,

THE PROPOSED APPROPRIATION AND SUBSEQUENT DISPOSAL OF THE LAND AT MEADOWSIDE BE NOT PROCEEDED WITH.

2. **OUTDOOR SPORTS CENTRE – BAR END (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**
(Report CAB1247 refers)

Councillor Allgood declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in this item as a County Councillor and he spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Hollingbery declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in this item as his daughters were members of a local athletics club. He spoke and voted thereon.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr T Geddes (Pro Vice Chancellor, Winchester University) spoke in support of the running track and all weather pitch set out in the Report. In summary, he suggested that the joint project between the University, the County Council and the City Council would enhance the University's role in the local community and would help attract a better calibre of future students to the University. He added that local people's use of the proposed facilities would be encouraged.

Student use occurred mainly on Wednesday and Sunday afternoons for 30 weeks of the year. On this basis the facility would be available for public use at other times. The University would be responsible for the revenue expenditure on the facility. The University had also recently invested in improvements to the changing facilities.

Ms McCallum (Winchester and District Athletics Club) explained that there was an existing and increasing demand from the community for the proposed facilities. She added that the track would be of great benefit to the area's talented young athletes and that, in addition to hosting inter-school competitions, an 8 lane track could make Winchester eligible as a holding camp for one of the national teams at the 2012 London Olympics.

Councillor Wagner spoke in support of the all-weather, 8 lane track.

Councillor Rees also spoke in support of the proposal in principle, but raised concerns regarding the allocation of the whole of the Winchester Town sports element of the Open Space Fund to the project and that this might affect other future bids on the Fund and the maintenance of other Open Spaces. As Chairman, he requested that the issue be considered by the Town Forum.

Councillor Pines echoed the comments raised by Councillor Rees and suggested, as a District wide facility, that the project should also be partially funded by Parish Councils' Open Space Funds. As a Ward Member, he added that the traffic implications of the project should be carefully considered.

Councillor Higgins, as a Ward Member, also welcomed the proposal and suggested that as a planning gain, the surrounding area be considered as a Home Zone scheme with a 20mph speed limit.

In welcoming the proposal in principle, Councillor Hiscock also suggested that District wide funding be sought and that a broader public consultation exercise was needed to determine the need for the track. Additionally, he raised concerns about the future maintenance costs of the facilities.

Councillor Sutton spoke on behalf of Councillor Evans, who was unable to attend this part of the meeting. Councillor Evans supported the scheme as it benefited sport, the local economy and tourism but raised concerns regarding the depletion of the Town's Open Space Fund.

In response to the comments made, the Chairman explained that an agreed five-year programme of playground refurbishments in the town would be unaffected by the proposal. He also agreed to investigate the possibility of attracting Open Space Funds from Parish Councils, although this was likely to be limited because the money had to be mainly spent locally.

With regard to the affect on the Winchester Town element of the Open Space Fund, the Chairman proposed that should there be a shortfall in the fund in the monies required then the balance should be loaned from the General Fund and repaid as new Open Space Funding became available. He noted that the on-going revenue costs of the facility would be met by the University. In agreeing this proposal, Cabinet noted that large developments such as the possible redevelopment of the Police Headquarters site and Silverhill were likely to speed these repayments. However, it was agreed that the Director of Finance investigate recharging the lost interest from the General Fund to the Open Space Fund. A member suggested that an alternative approach could be to consider that the interest element could be a District cost and a contribution towards the Scheme by the General Fund.

In response to questions, the Director of Development confirmed that there were currently no other applications pending for funding from the sport element of the Town's Open Space Fund.

The Chairman indicated that if other small scale sports schemes emerged during the repayment period, then it might be possible to adjust the repayment period to allow such schemes to proceed if appropriate.

In supporting the scheme, the Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport explained that the details of the scheme had yet to be agreed, but it was likely that parking could be provided at the nearby Park and Ride sites (with a safe route provided across Bar End Road to the track) and the possibility of parking at the Garrisons' Ground would be investigated. A Traffic Impact Assessment would be submitted with the planning application.

At the conclusion of debate, Cabinet agreed with the recommendations in the Report and requested that the Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport report to a future meeting, having first sought the views of the Winchester Town Forum on detailed proposals for the progression of the project.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT, SUBJECT TO THE SUPPLEMENTARY CAPITAL ESTIMATE NOT BEING CALLED IN BY PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:-

A) THE PRINCIPLE OF PROVIDING A NEW MULTI-SPORTS FACILITY INCLUDING AN ATHLETICS TRACK, AN ARTIFICIAL TURF PITCH AND OTHER FACILITIES AT BAR END, WINCHESTER BE APPROVED, AND THAT OPTION B BE CONFIRMED AS THE PREFERRED OPTION;

B) SUBJECT TO SPORT ENGLAND COMMUNITY INVESTMENT FUND AND SITA TRUST (LANDFILL TAX CREDIT SCHEME) ENHANCING COMMUNITIES PROGRAMME PROVIDING GRANT AID TOWARDS THE PROJECT, A SUPPLEMENTARY CAPITAL ESTIMATE OF £1,000,000 IN 2007/08 BE APPROVED;

C) THE TOTAL UNCOMMITTED SPORT ELEMENT OF THE OPEN SPACE FUND FOR WINCHESTER TOWN BE USED TO FUND PART OF THE £1M CONTRIBUTION AND THAT AS OTHER SUCH FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE THEY BE USED TO REPAY THE AMOUNT FUNDED DIRECTLY BY THE GENERAL FUND WITHOUT BEING COMMITTED ELSEWHERE.

RESOLVED:

That subject to Council approval of 1 above:

2. That the Director of Communities be authorised to advise the University of Winchester to proceed with the detailed design and implementation of the project subject to the necessary permissions.

3. That the expenditure of £10,000 from the Open Space Fund in 2006/07 be approved as a contribution towards the fees necessary to develop funding bids.

4. That, subject to the carrying out of the statutory advertisement procedure under Section 123(2a) of the Local Government Act 1972 for the proposed disposal of open space land, compliance with the Local Government Act 1972 General Disposal (England) Consent 2003 and any necessary consents of the National Playing Fields Association and the Charity Commission, the Director of Communities, City Secretary and Solicitor, Director of Finance and Chief Estates Officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport and the Leader of the Council, be authorised to enter into appropriate arrangements for the funding, construction, management of the project, the leasing of the land owned by the City Council which is required for the project, and public access arrangements to the facilities.

5. That the Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport report to a future meeting of Cabinet on the detailed proposals for progression of the project, having worked with Winchester Town Forum.

6. That the Director of Finance be asked to report upon whether it is appropriate to consider the options for recharging any lost interest from the General Fund to the Open Space Fund.

3. **ALIGNMENT BETWEEN PORTFOLIO HOLDERS AND SCRUTINY PANELS**

(Report CAB1299 refers)

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT ALIGNMENTS BETWEEN PORTFOLIO HOLDERS AND SCRUTINY PANELS BE ON THE BASIS OF APPENDIX 1 TO THE REPORT.

2. THAT THE CITY SECRETARY AND SOLICITOR BRING FORWARD A REPORT TO A FUTURE MEETING TO MAKE THE NECESSARY CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION.

MINUTE EXTRACTS FROM PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, 10 JULY 2006**1. PROPOSED SCHOOL AT MEADOWSIDE, WHITELEY**

(Report CAB1298 refers)

In respect of this item, Councillors Anthony declared a personal and prejudicial interest due to the proximity of his home to the site. He left the room during consideration of the item.

Councillor Collin asked that it be recorded in the minutes that he had not attended the meeting for this item because he had a personal and prejudicial interest in the matter, as an employee of the County Council.

The Chairman advised that the Report was being considered by the Committee following her request under Council Procedure Rule 36 that it be included on the agenda.

The Committee noted that the Report had also been considered by Cabinet at its meeting held earlier in the day. Cabinet had resolved to recommend to Council on 19 July 2006 that the appropriation and subsequent disposal of recreation land at Meadowside for the construction of a new Primary School be not supported. Cabinet had concerns about the suitability of the mitigation land proposed by the County Council at Leafy Lane. Furthermore, it was reported that Cabinet had taken into account the results of the consultation exercise following the advertisement of the proposals. The Chief Executive advised that, subsequent to publication of the Report, a total of 36 representations (31 households) had registered their support to the proposals and 119 representations (104 households) had objected. This was in addition to the continued opposition from Whiteley Parish Council and the Hampshire Playing Fields Association.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillor Stallard, Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport.

Members asked a number of questions regarding the mitigation land and the impact on the Meadowside playing fields should the school be built. Councillor Stallard responded as follows:

There was concern that mitigation land at Leafy Lane to compensate for the loss of informal recreational land at Meadowside would, as a result of its peripheral location, would be underused by residents. It would not be as accessible as the Meadowside site. It was noted that part of the land had been designated in the 1987 Whiteley Local Plan to serve the local community as a 'neighbourhood green'.

The consultation exercise showed that the concerns of local residents regarding the land disposal indicated that this issue outweighed the acknowledged need for a new school at Whiteley.

It was considered that the immediate pressure to provide a new school at Whiteley would be relieved once school provision was made in the development at North Whiteley, although it was appreciated that this was at least 5 years away.

An interim report by the National Playing Fields Association highlighted concern about the proximity of playing fields to houses due to nuisance to residents. It also raised concerns of safety regarding the location of cricket fields less than 40 metres away from children's playgrounds.

The existing car park at Meadowside was already at capacity at peak times from users of the leisure facilities and would be under additional significant pressure if the school was built.

The number of users of the Meadowside Centre was increasing. However, the erection of the school would inhibit future expansion of the Meadowside Centre.

Members asked a number of questions regarding planning issues related to the proposals. The Director of Development responded as follows:

It was confirmed that development of recreation land at Meadowside for the construction of a new Primary School would be contrary to Policies RT1 and RT2 of the recently adopted Winchester District Local Plan. These policies were based upon national guidance regarding the protection of recreational land. Any decision to support the proposals would have had to set out justification for a departure from policy, having regard to the suitability of the mitigation land and the proposed community use of the school facilities.

It was explained that the flexibility of policies within the Local Plan allowed for the development of the alternative site suggested for the school at land north of the existing Whiteley development. Policy C5 could allow essential community facilities, such as a school, to be provided outside the existing development boundary.

It was clarified that development of a school at Meadowside would be Hampshire County Council's planning application and would be determined by it as a County matter. However, the Local Plan policies were relevant considerations.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Canon David Issacs representing the Diocese of Portsmouth.

Members asked a number of questions and Canon Issacs responded as follows:

It was explained that the location of a new school should take account of existing links with the community, including homes, leisure facilities, and commerce. Therefore, the Meadowside site was considered by the Diocese as 'fit for purpose'. This was in comparison to alternative siting on the land North of Whiteley due to its relative isolation from existing community. He accepted that other people might have different views.

Although appreciative of the work carried out on the project to date, the decision made by Cabinet not to support the appropriation and disposal of the land at Meadowside would mean continued pressures

on both the County and City Council to provide a new school. Furthermore, it was unlikely that the £4 million government funding could be easily renegotiated as this had been secured until September 2006. This funding stream had been available because of the involvement of the Church in a voluntary School Project. If the project was delayed a new application for funding would have to be made.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Bennett (Assistant Head of Estates, Hampshire County Council), Mr Eardley (Strategic Planning Manager for Children's Services, Hampshire County Council) and Mr Coughlan (Director of Children's Services, Hampshire County Council).

Members asked a number of questions regarding the proposed siting of the school at Meadowside and Mr Eardley, Mr Coughlan and Mr Bennett responded as follows:

The decision of Cabinet was disappointing as the County considered that the site at Meadowside was the best suited for the proposals (due to existing infrastructure) and that the need for a new school had been unanimously acknowledged by local residents.

Members were reminded by Mr Coughlan of the City Council's obligations under the Children Act 2004 to work in partnership to achieve benefits for children and young people.

The £4 million government funding for the proposal was a one-off and alternatives could not be secured easily. The County Council had to provide £1.5 million match funding. The prospect for a new school was now unlikely until development at North Whiteley commenced. As a consequence, primary school aged children (4 – 11) would be required to travel to schools outside Whiteley.

It was explained that the admissions policy of a new school would not be controlled by the County Council and was regulated by statute. Admission would be open to all denominations.

It was confirmed that the County Council would continue to look to the removal of the surplus capacity within schools in the Western Wards, in the context of those pupils who would continue to be displaced from the Whiteley area. There were 325 surplus places in the Fareham Western Wards in January 2006. It was likely 150 of those places would be needed for Whiteley pupils.

It was confirmed that the County Council was in support of the Diocese in their rejection of the land North of Whiteley as an alternative site. A feasibility study had demonstrated significant additional cost implications from remedial works to the sloping and water logged site as well as construction of a necessary access road. The road itself would cost between £1 million and £1.5 million. There was also concern of the unknown relationship of the alternative site to the future development at North Whiteley, in addition to the likely prospect of the school eventually being surrounded by disruptive construction sites. The development of a school at North Whiteley should be part of a planned approach and sited accordingly.

It was explained that the need for a further school for the existing development had been first identified in 1998. However a lack of funding and suitable site had meant this was not forthcoming, requiring the current fall back position of transporting pupils to schools outside Whiteley.

It was acknowledged that the new school would have been a one form entry and thus smaller than those usually constructed. However, it had been gauged as sufficient for the probable pupil numbers at this stage. Church schools were often this size. It would have also eventually been complemented by school provision built as part of the North Whiteley development, which would require 1 or 2 additional schools.

The view that the land North of Whiteley was not best suited for a new school had been supported via professional advice and it had been considered that the opportunity for significant Government funding was worth making the necessary compromises regarding the loss of recreational land at Meadowside.

Any decision to extend costs (such as for the necessary access and remedial works to the land North of Whiteley) would not be supported by the County Council as they were obliged to offer value for money to Council Tax payers.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Parish Councillor Evans, (Chairman of Whiteley Parish Council).

Members asked a number of questions regarding the proposals and Councillor Evans responded as follows:

Whiteley Parish Council supported the need for a new school but not at the proposed location at Meadowside. It was suggested that an insufficient feasibility study had been undertaken regarding the alternative site, and inadequate consultation with the Parish Council by the County Council. Current new development at Dickens Drive was already taking place adjacent to the land North of Whiteley.

It was acknowledged that the number of responses to the City Council's public advertisement regarding the proposed appropriation and disposal of recreation land was relatively low in comparison to the total population of Whiteley of between 4500 and 5000 people. There may have been public confusion between the required responses to the County and City Council consultation exercises.

Although the Parish Council was opposed to the Meadowside site appropriation and disposal, it had not undertaken a negative campaign in the area. It was stated that opposition had arisen during the County Council's earlier consultation exercise.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Councillor Beckett, Leader of the Council.

Members requested that Councillor Beckett explain to the Committee the decision of Cabinet held earlier that day. In summary, Councillor Beckett responded as follows:

The previous recommendation of the meeting of Cabinet held 31 May 2006 to dispose of the land at Meadowside had been subject to conditions and these had not been met regarding mitigation recreational land. The proposal had also generated significant public opposition. Cabinet had considered that in the longer term, the provision of a new school would eventually be met on another site as North Whiteley developed. The shorter term benefits of providing a school at Meadowside would be outweighed by the longer term disadvantages of permanently losing recreational land in this central location.

At the conclusion of debate, the Committee resolved to support Cabinet's decision to not appropriate and dispose of land at Meadowside for the purposes of the construction of a new school. In recognising the public's opposition to the proposals, it was considered that the Meadowside site was not ideal, nor was the mitigation land proposed by the County Council. It was suggested that alternative sites be sought (including as part of the Master Planning for proposals for the North Whiteley development).

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE RECOMMENDATION OF CABINET TO NOT AGREE TO THE APPROPRIATION AND SUBSEQUENT DISPOSAL OF LAND AT MEADOWSIDE, WHITELEY FOR THE PURPOSES OF CONSTRUCTION OF A SCHOOL, BE SUPPORTED.

2. **CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS UNDER THE COMMITTEE'S POWERS OF CALL-IN**

- (i) **OUTDOOR SPORTS CENTRE – BAR END (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX 7)**
(Report CAB1190 refers)

The Committee noted that Cabinet had recommended approval of the proposals at its meeting held earlier in the day.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr Geddes, Pro Vice Chancellor of the University of Winchester.

Mr Geddes explained that part of the University's Strategic Plan was to raise its profile in the City by endeavouring to make its facilities available for community use. Currently, students only utilised facilities for a few days per week (totalling approximately 11 hours) for 30 weeks of the year and it had been noted that there were community sporting groups who were currently poorly served by existing facilities. Mr Geddes also explained that now was an appropriate time to advance the proposals, as it had been proven that after 2007 the

necessary contractor expertise would be in short supply, and costs at a premium, due to the preparations for the 2012 Olympics. Furthermore, Sport England Community Investment funding and the University's own capital funding could be at risk if the proposal was significantly delayed.

Mr Geddes also clarified that the University would be responsible overall for the facility although a Management Board would be established. This would include representation from the University and City Council together with community sporting groups. A covenant on the land would secure it as a sporting facility in perpetuity.

The Director of Communities clarified that following the securing of funding, drawings of the development would be prepared and utilised as part of a major public consultation exercise (to include those of the non sporting community). The facility was to be fully integrated with all sectors of the community.

Responding to discussion, the Director of Communities and the Chief Executive reported that Cabinet recognised that the utilisation of the Town Area Open Space Fund may offer difficulty to those sporting community groups seeking support to their initiatives and could possibly hinder the development of an even spread of facilities over the Town Area until the Fund was replenished by developer contributions. It was thought that this could take a minimum of at least 2 years although future significant Town Area developments (such as Silverhill and redevelopment of the Police Head Quarters site) would offer significant open space contributions to the fund. In the meantime, after considering each proposal on its own merits, if other schemes were permitted this might require the repayment period to the General Fund to be varied.

During discussion, it was noted that the proposals would provide excellent facilities for Town residents as well as those from the rest of the District and some Members questioned whether it was appropriate to use Town Area Open Space Funds to fund the project in total. Responding to questions, the Director of Development explained that it was possible to ask parishes to consider a proportion of open space funds from elsewhere in the district being allocated for the project. However, it was not appropriate to seek significant amounts as guidance required the open space provision to be reasonably located in relation to the original development providing the funding.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Beckett explained Cabinet's decision to support the proposal. He stated that Cabinet recognised that the decision to utilise the total uncommitted Sport element of the Open Space Fund for Winchester Town may be a burden on other prospective Town sporting projects. Therefore, alternative funding may be sought from the open space fund by way of rescheduling the repayment period to the General Fund. The Leader also acknowledged that although changes to the Open Space Funding system were likely, this was not likely to be before the completion of this project. The Leader also reminded the Committee that the Council was only part funding the facility and also that it would provide

additional significant social, sporting and economic benefits to the Town Area.

The City Secretary and Solicitor advised that in addition to Cabinet's support of the proposals, it had additionally requested that the Director of Finance report back on suggestions that interest could be charged on funds moved from the General Fund to the Open Space Fund. Cabinet had also asked that consideration be given to waiving interest, as a District wide contribution to the scheme. Furthermore, the details of the proposals for progression of the development would be eventually reported to Cabinet and the Winchester Town Forum.

At the conclusion of debate, it was agreed that the matter should not be called-in for review. The majority of Members did not support further investigation of alternative funding of the scheme, notably from sources other than the uncommitted Sport element of Town Area Open Space Fund.

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE DECISION OF THE MEETING OF CABINET HELD ON 10 JULY 2006 TO RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF A SUPPLEMENTARY CAPITAL ESTIMATE OF £1,000,000 FOR THE PURPOSES OF A NEW MULTI-SPORTS FACILITY AT BAR END, WINCHESTER, BE NOT CALLED-IN FOR REVIEW.

3. **ALIGNMENT BETWEEN PORTFOLIO HOLDERS AND SCRUTINY PANELS**

(Report CAB1299 refers)

Members noted that this Report had also been considered by Cabinet at its meeting held earlier that day where its recommendations were supported.

The Chief Executive responded to questions regarding the scrutiny by the Local Economy Scrutiny Panel of the work of the Conservation section of the Cultural Services Division. It was clarified that questions relating to the performance of the Conservation Team (in relation to development control matters) could be raised at the Local Economy Scrutiny Panel.

The Director of Finance confirmed that the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources had responsibility for the embedding of the Council's Risk Management programme within the culture of the Council.

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE PROPOSED ALIGNMENTS BETWEEN PORTFOLIO HOLDERS AND SCRUTINY PANELS BE AGREED AS SET OUT IN APPENDIX 1 TO THE REPORT.

4. **CAPITAL OUTTURN**

(Report CAB1268 and Report PS237, Extract of Minutes refers)

The City Secretary and Solicitor advised that Cabinet, at its meeting held on 21 June 2006, had approved the proposals as set out.

RECOMMENDED:

THAT THE DECISION OF CABINET TO APPROVE THE CARRY FORWARD OF CAPITAL FUNDS TOTALLING £1.755 FROM 2005/06 TO 2006/07, IN ACCORDANCE WITH FINANCIAL PROCEDURE RULE 7.8, BE SUPPORTED

5. **CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS UNDER THE COMMITTEE'S POWERS OF CALL-IN**

(i) **OUTDOOR SPORTS CENTRE – BAR END (EXEMPT APPENDIX 7)**
(Report CAB1190 refers)

Members referred to Exempt Appendix 7 that set out details of estimated costs and funding.

RESOLVED:

That the information contained in Exempt Appendix 7 to the Report be noted.

6. **NEW OFFICES – FEASIBILITY REPORT UPDATE**

(Report CAB1192 and Report PS237, Extract of Minutes refers)

The City Secretary and Solicitor advised that Cabinet, at its meeting held on 21 June 2006, had approved the proposals as set out.

The Committee considered a Report which provided an update on the feasibility report on new offices (detail in exempt minute).