

**WINCHESTER CITY COUNCIL**

At an Ordinary Meeting of the Council held in the Guildhall, Winchester on 22 April 2009.

Attendance:

Councillor Read (The Mayor in the Chair) (P)

Councillors:

Achwal (P)	Huxstep (P)
Allgood (P)	Izard (P)
Anthony (P)	Jackson (P)
Barratt (P)	Jefferies (P)
Baxter (P)	Johnston (P)
Beckett (P)	Learney (P)
Bell (P)	Lipscomb (P)
Berry (P)	Love (P)
Biggs (P)	Mason (P)
Busher (P)	Mather (P)
Chamberlain (P)	Maynard (P)
Clear (P)	Mitchell (P)
Coates (P)	Nelmes (P)
Collin (P)	Pearce (P)
Cook (P)	Pearson (P)
Cooper (P)	Pines (P)
Evans (P)	Ruffell (P)
Fall (P)	Sanders (P)
Gemmell (P)	Spender (P)
Godfrey (P)	Stallard (P)
Hammerton (P)	Stephens (P)
Henry (P)	Tait (P)
Hicks (P)	Thompson (P)
Higgins (P)	Verney (P)
Hiscock (P)	Weston (P)
Hollingbery (P)	Wood (P)
Howell (P)	Worrall (P)
Humby (P)	Wright (P)

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Council held on 19 February 2009 be approved and adopted.

2. **COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR**

The Mayor reported with regret the recent death of Mr (Dixon) Jeffrey Smith, who was elected to represent St Michael Ward in 1953 and was Mayor in 1967/68. He served on the Council until 1974 and continued to be active in the community for many years thereafter. The Council stood for a few moments in silent tribute to his memory.

The Mayor then reminded the meeting about the St George's Ball to be held on Friday 24 April 2009.

3. **COMMUNICATION FROM THE LEADER**

The Leader announced that, following a notification last Friday from the Administrators dealing with the collapse of the Heritable Bank, it was likely that the City Council would recover 70 - 80% of its £1 million investment.

4. **QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14**

1. Current Levels of Recycling

The Portfolio Holder for Environment, Councillor Pearson, answered a question from Councillor Johnston.

2. Progress with Affordable Housing Projects

The Portfolio Holder for Housing, Councillor Coates, answered a question from Councillor Evans.

3. Travellers Site, Appledown Lane, nr New Alresford

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access, Councillor Wood, answered a question from Councillor Cook.

4. Size of the Council's Housing Waiting List

The Portfolio Holder for Housing, Councillor Coates, answered a question from Councillor Tait.

5. 20mph Speed Limits

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access, Councillor Wood, answered a question from Councillor Pines.

6. Traffic Arrangements in Parchment Street, Winchester – Provision for Cyclists

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access, Councillor Wood, answered a question from Councillor Jackson.

## 7. Funding of Public Conveniences in New Alresford

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Beckett, answered a question from Councillor Cook.

Councillors Evans and Clear both declared personal (but not prejudicial) interests as members of Wickham Parish Council, in relation to a supplementary question regarding public conveniences at Wickham.

## 8. Unsold Council Houses

The Portfolio Holder for Housing, Councillor Coates, answered a question from Councillor Cook.

## 5. **PETITIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 15**

The Mayor informed the Council that there were two new petitions to be presented, plus one presented to the last meeting where the petitioner was exercising the right to address the Council again.

### (1) StreetReach

The first petition was presented by Ms Malyha Ahmed and Mr Calum Joyce representing StreetReach. The prayer of the petition was as follows:-

‘Young people of Winchester want to work with Winchester City Council to provide land in central Winchester for a building which is open to all young people and inclusive. We have already undertaken extensive research with young people, architects and youth workers and have identified an ideal site owned by Winchester City Council adjacent to the leisure centre in Winchester. We seek Winchester City Council’s commitment for this land to be made available for this purpose.’

In support of the petition the following points were made:-

- StreetReach represented a large and diverse group of young people and over 200 signatures had been gained for the petition.
- the suggested location related well to existing leisure facilities and was central, which had the advantage of it not being seen as ‘belonging’ to one particular locality/group of young people.
- whilst the availability of KAYAC and St John’s House (YMCA) was noted, the proposed multi-storey youth community hall would offer a different and much needed facility.
- external pursuits were also planned as part of the new centre.

Councillors Fall, Love and Tait each declared personal (but not prejudicial) interests in this matter because of their respective roles with the StreetReach group. They all remained in the meeting.

During discussion, Members praised the actions of all the young people involved in preparing and submitting the petition. The meeting recognised that there was a need to improve youth facilities, although alternatives to the proposed site adjoining the leisure centre would need to be investigated, if a scheme was progressed. The point about a central location avoiding any 'tribalism' was particularly noted, together with making sure that young people were asked what they wanted, rather than assumptions being made by older generations.

In conclusion, the Portfolio Holder for Communities and Safety (Councillor Cooper) explained that there was a District-wide need to improve youth facilities. Groups such as the Winchester & District Children & Young Peoples Partnership and Hampshire Youth Options could provide useful advice and support. A City Council grant application to MyPlace for youth facilities had recently failed and officers were now examining what could be done to ensure a successful bid next time. A report on the issues raised in the petition would be submitted to a future meeting of Cabinet and the Winchester Town Forum. Consideration would also be given to inviting a group of young people to address the Social Issues Scrutiny Panel.

## (2) City of Winchester Trust

The second petition was presented by Mr Michael Carden of the City of Winchester Trust relating to the possible provision of a Knowledge Park at Bushfield Camp. The prayer of the petition was as follows:-

'We the undersigned on behalf of the City of Winchester Trust ask the City Council to delete from the Core Strategy Preferred Option document of its District Development Framework, prior to publication for public consultation, any reference to a "knowledge park of about 20 hectares" or any other development at Bushfield Camp for the following reasons:-

- (a) the whole of the Bushfield Camp area is within a 'Site of Importance for Nature Conservation' (SINC).
- (b) the site can be seen from much of the downland to the east of Winchester, in particular from the popular viewpoint of St Catherine's Hill. "This rolling open downland of Bushfield is key to the character of Winchester and its setting" (Kim Wilkie).

The Trust urges members to make no provision in the LDF for development at Bushfield Camp on grounds of its national landscape importance, and because the need for a knowledge park is not proven. Should it become so, we urge that a different and less sensitive site be found'

Mr Carden added that Bushfield was not a brownfield site and the SINC designation covered the whole area. It helped to provide a unique setting for Winchester and development of any part of the valley would seriously damage that aspect.

Councillor Beckett declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as a member of Compton & Shawford Parish Council, because Bushfield Camp came within that Parish. Councillors Berry, Jackson and Lipscomb declared personal (but not prejudicial) interests as members of the City of Winchester Trust. They all remained in the meeting.

The Mayor explained that, as there would be an opportunity to discuss Bushfield Camp during the next main item, he did not propose to take comments at this stage, but would ask the Leader and relevant Portfolio Holders to refer to Mr Carden's points as part of the debate.

### (3) Save Barton Farm Group

Mr Gavin Blackman referred to the petition submitted by the Save Barton Farm Group to the Council meeting held on 7 January 2009 (Minute 579 refers), which requested that the Council protect Barton Farm from significant development, by omitting the site from the 2009 Preferred Options proposals for housing .

Mr Blackman explained that he did not propose to reiterate all the strong arguments previously made against development of this site, but would focus on the following key housing points:-

- pro-development arguments had been linked to what had taken place at Badger Farm, but Barton Farm would be twice the size and present significantly different problems, so the comparison was irrelevant.
- the development would irreparably damage the north of Winchester and it was certainly not the 'least worst' option as it had been termed.
- there were other ways to satisfy the housing numbers e.g. by meeting the need for more affordable housing in the rural areas, as indicated by the HCC Rural Strategy.
- there was updated evidence to show that sufficient brownfield sites existed to prevent any greenfield sites being triggered until 2014, so there was no immediate need to designate Barton Farm for development.
- the LDF strategy was flawed and no responsible Council would endorse its policies. Instead, the Council should take control and challenge the South East Plan and the housing numbers within it.

The Mayor explained that, as there would be an opportunity to discuss Barton Farm during the next main item, he did not propose to take comments at this stage, but would ask the Leader and relevant Portfolio Holders to refer to Mr Blackman's points as part of the debate.

## 6. CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDED MINUTES

It was noted that Report CL55 had been circulated after the statutory deadline. The Mayor agreed to accept the report onto the agenda, because of the urgent need for Council to determine all the matters set out therein.

Cabinet – 20 April 2009

Minutes of Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee (25/3/09)

Councillors Allgood and Godfrey declared personal (but not prejudicial) interests in matters contained within the LDF which related to Hampshire County Council, as they were a County Councillor and County Council employee respectively.

Councillor Achwal declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in those matters in the LDF which related to North Whiteley, as she was a member of Whiteley Parish Council. Councillor Cooper declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in those matters in the LDF which related to West of Waterlooville, as he was Chairman of Southwick and Widley Parish Council.

Councillor Beckett declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as a member of Compton & Shawford Parish Council, because certain policies within the LDF related to that Parish. Councillors Berry, Jackson and Lipscomb declared personal (but not prejudicial) interests as members of the City of Winchester Trust, which had commented on various aspects of the LDF.

All the above Members remained in the meeting.

Councillor Beckett declared a personal and prejudicial interest related to Policy CP10 (Otterbourne-Southdown Settlement Gap) as he owned land affected by the proposals. He left the meeting during consideration of that part of the LDF.

Councillor Berry indicated that under the pre-determination provisions in the Planning Protocol, she would abstain and asked that her abstention be recorded in the minutes. She exercised her rights to address the Council.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access, Councillor Wood, moved that the recommendations in Recommended Minute 2 attached to Report CL55 be approved and adopted. On behalf of the Council, he congratulated the Head of Strategic Planning and the team of officers involved, for all their hard work and thoroughness in producing the LDF document.

The Council noted that the last three words had been omitted from Policy MRTA 2 (Level 4) where 'demonstrate local needs' should be added to the end of the sentence. This was agreed.

Amendment (1) Councillor Learney (2) Councillor Mitchell

That the text of Policies WT1 and WT2 be amended by the words struck out and the new insertions in italics, as set out below:-

'Policy WT1 - Strategy for Winchester Town

The vision for Winchester Town is to focus on providing a range of accommodation to meet the needs of the whole community and to ensure that the local economy builds on its existing and growing strengths in higher education, creative and media industries, and other knowledge-based activities, whilst respecting the Town's special heritage and setting.

This vision will be achieved through the provision of:-

- Development and redevelopment of existing premises, sites with planning permission and other opportunities within the defined built-up area of Winchester, ~~which are expected to contribute approximately 2000 homes.~~
  - Plus development *if required* of a new neighbourhood to the north of Winchester at Barton Farm for 2,000 homes, of which 40% will be affordable, and associated support facilities and services in accordance with the requirements of Policy WT2.

'Policy WT2 - Strategic Housing Allocation – Barton Farm

'Land at Barton Farm, Winchester (to the east of Andover Road and south of Well House Lane as shown on the attached plan) is allocated for the development of 2,000 dwellings together with supporting uses. *This allocation will only be released when monitoring shows it is needed to meet the requirements of the South East Plan.*

~~The~~*Any* development must accord with Policy SS2 in addition to the following site-specific requirements:

- The creation of a distinctive, well integrated neighbourhood of Winchester Town which meets the needs of all sectors of the community, including families, the young and older people to ensure equality and social cohesion;  
Etc...

Delegated authority to be given to the Head of Strategic Planning in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access to make associated amendments to the supporting text with specific reference to the Annual Monitoring Report and the 5 year supply of housing land.'

Amendment carried.

Amendment (1) Councillor Collin (2) Councillor Higgins

That the text of Policies WT1 and WT3 be amended by the words struck out, as set out below:-

'Bushfield Camp – amendment to WT1

'Policy WT1 Strategy for Winchester Town

The vision for Winchester Town is to focus on providing a range of accommodation to meet the needs of the whole community and to ensure that the local economy builds on its existing and growing strengths in higher education, creative and media industries, and other knowledge-based activities, whilst respecting the Town's special heritage and setting.

This vision will be achieved through the provision of :-

.....

- Creation of additional employment space to support the expansion of the knowledge and creative industries ~~through the specific provision of a 'knowledge park' (at Bushfield Camp), to the south west of the Town, in accordance with the requirements of Policy WT3.~~

etc...

Policy WT3 – *deleted entire*

Delegated authority to be given to the Head of Strategic Planning and the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access to make associated amendments to the supporting text.'

Amendment lost.

Amendment (1) Councillor Ruffell (2) Councillor Humby

'Policy SH4

That all text from paragraph 6.25 and the proposed Policy SH4 (including the map on page 60) be deleted and the following words inserted:-

The City Council notes it is required by the South East Plan to co-operate with Eastleigh Borough Council in undertaking studies into the feasibility of a Strategic Development Area of up to 6,000 dwellings to the north/north-east of Hedge End.

The City Council will require that those feasibility studies take full account of the significant constraints on any development in that part of the Winchester District adjacent to the proposed SDA due to the sensitivity of the natural landscape and environment, and the



importance of a long term open gap to protect the separate identity of the existing settlements of Durley and Curdridge.'

Following discussion, the proposer and seconder agreed to alter the above amendment to incorporate a further amendment proposed by (1) Councillor Learney and (2) Councillor Mason as follows:-

New para. 6.25

Land within Winchester District is sensitive in terms of landscape and biodiversity, while land within Eastleigh Borough appears more suitable for development and less sensitive. Therefore, at this stage, this suggests that any land in Winchester should be used for green infrastructure and gaps. This may include recreational space and land to mitigate environmental impact.'

Both Amendments carried.

Amendment (1) Councillor Evans (2) Councillor Clear

That the text of Policy SH5 be amended by the words struck out and the new insertion in italics, as set out below:-

'Policy SH5

'The City Council will work with Fareham Borough Council to help develop a Strategic Development Area of up to 10,000 dwellings together with supporting uses, centred immediately to the north of Fareham. Land within Winchester District (*as shown in the Plan below*) will form part of the open areas required by the South East Plan to ensure separation between the SDA and the existing settlements of Knowle and Wickham by defining the long-term open gaps. ~~This land (shown on the plan below) may be suitable for some open rural uses associated with the SDA, provided these retain its open nature and secure its effective use and management as a long-term open gap between the settlements.'~~

Amendment carried.

Amendment (1) Councillor Busher (2) Councillor Chamberlain

'That in Policy CP10 the words 'seek to' be deleted from line 1'.

Amendment carried.

Substantive Motion carried

RESOLVED:

That Recommended Minute 2 attached to Report CL55, as amended, be approved and adopted.

Cabinet – 18 March 2009

Principal Scrutiny Committee – 23 March 2009

Use of LABGI Receipts for Recession Support for Local Businesses and Transfer to Property Fund

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Beckett, moved that Cabinet Recommended Minute 780 be approved and adopted.

RESOLVED:

1. That Recommended Minute 780 be approved and adopted.
2. That Recommended Minute 839 of Principal Scrutiny Committee be noted.

Cabinet – 20 April 2009

Housing Rents – Latest Government Proposals

The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities, Councillor Coates, moved that Cabinet Recommended Minute 1 attached to Report CL55 be approved and adopted.

RESOLVED:

That Recommended Minute 1 attached to Report CL55 be approved and adopted.

Cabinet – 20 April 2009

Principal Scrutiny Committee – 21 April 2009

Review of Electoral Arrangements

Councillor Cooper declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as Chairman of Southwick and Widley Parish Council, as part of the report related to the concern of the Boundary Committee for England about electorate figures in that area.

The Chairman of Principal Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Chamberlain, moved that Principal Scrutiny Recommended Minute 1 as attached to Report CL55 be approved and adopted.

RESOLVED:

1. That Recommended Minute 1 as attached to Report CL55 be approved and adopted.

2. That Recommended Minute 4 of Cabinet as attached to Report CL55 be noted.

Cabinet – 20 April 2009

Principal Scrutiny Committee – 21 April 2009

Insurance Reserve Review

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources, Councillor Allgood, moved that Cabinet Recommended Minute 3 as attached to Report CL55 be approved and adopted.

RESOLVED:

1. That Recommended Minute 3 as attached to Report CL55 be approved and adopted.

2. That Recommended Minute 2 of Principal Scrutiny Committee as attached to Report CL55 be noted.

7. **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 item 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>
###	Appointment of Independent Members and Parish Representatives to the Standards Committee	Information relating to any individual (Para 1 to Schedule 12A refers).

Special Committee (Appointment of Independent Members and Parish Representatives to the Standards Committee) – 1 April 2009

The Chairman of the Committee, Councillor Hiscock, moved that Recommended Minute 860 be approved and adopted.

RESOLVED

That Recommended Minute 860 be approved and adopted.

The meeting commenced at 7pm and concluded at 1am.

The Mayor