



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 1

From: Councillor Therese Evans

To: Portfolio Holder for Environment, Health and Wellbeing

“Could the Portfolio holder for Environment, Health and Wellbeing please inform me of the local consultation process undertaken by the Council when new place/road names are suggested to the Council by developers? “

Reply

“The Council has a procedure for dealing with the naming of new developments.

Developers should always apply directly to the Council at the earliest opportunity for new postal addresses, i.e. as soon as development starts.

The applicant or developer may suggest a possible name or names for any new street(s). Several suggestions for names can be put forward which provides options should officers or the Parish Council/Ward Councillors have concerns about the developer’s proposals.

The proposed street names are then passed to the relevant Ward Councillors and Parish Council for approval. They are given 5 weeks to approve the suggested names and can at this stage, if they do not agree with the developer’s proposal, suggest their own names that conform to our policy.

If they do not agree with the developer’s proposal officers will seek acceptance from the developer of the newly suggested names from Ward/Parish. Where there is a disagreement which cannot be resolved the Portfolio Holder will give final approval of street names. In practice they will usually follow the recommendation of the Ward Councillors or Parish Council.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 2

From: Councillor Margot Power

To: The Portfolio Holder for Local Economy

“What proportion of the funding available from the respective LEPs has been allocated to schemes in the Winchester District, and how much has been in the form of grants, and how much on the revolving loan basis?”

Reply

“The Winchester District straddles the borders of both the Solent Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to the south and the Enterprise M3 (EM3) LEP to the north. Over the last year, both LEPs have started to become major distributors of Government and European funds totaling many millions of pounds.

These funds are not allocated on a geographic basis by the LEPs, but are increasingly awarded through a series of grants programmes designed to support delivery of the objectives in their respective Strategies for Growth.

Members will know that the Council secured a £14 million grant from the Solent LEP for transport improvements to help bring about the North Whiteley extension project. EM3 LEP is currently considering a bid to support public realm developments as part of the Station Approach project. The Council has also supported third party bids for funding, such as Marwell Zoo’s bid for an anaerobic digester.

It is true that there are many more opportunities for the Council and other local organisations to apply for these funds. Officers are currently in discussion with Members about creating capacity within the Council to do this effectively.

In the meantime, I have instigated a programme of regular meetings with the newly appointed geographic lead for Winchester at EM3 LEP to help identify further opportunities for collaboration and funding for the Winchester District.”



SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 3

From: Councillor Jan Warwick

To: The Portfolio Holder for Housing Services

“Can the Portfolio Holder outline the measures being undertaken by her department to cope with the recent increase in homelessness numbers in Winchester?”

Reply

“The Council’s Housing Options team deals with all initial approaches concerning housing advice and homelessness through its early intervention daily triage service. Looking at the statistical information collated and available for formal homeless applications and housing options cases, I am pleased to advise that, in general, homelessness in Winchester is not increasing. We are, however, experiencing an increase in the amount of rough sleeping and street activity in Winchester; I have detailed below the approach the team and our wider support agencies are taking to address both rough sleeping and street activity.”

Rough Sleeping: “The City Council has introduced a pathway model for rough sleepers that clearly outlines the district wide approach including how each rough sleeper is assessed, including written advice and assistance, accommodation options and whether the City Council has an ongoing responsibility to support them. If a rough sleeper does not have a local connection to Winchester, part of the ‘pathway’ approach is to re-connect them to an area where a connection can be established. This reconnection is undertaken in a supported and planned way and is undertaken in conjunction with the retraction of alternative service offers, including voluntary sector support.”

The ‘pathway’ starts with an outreach session to identify rough sleepers and rough sleeping hotspots and this takes place in the early morning on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday in partnership with our voluntary sector agencies and the Councils Community Safety team. The outreach sessions allow the authority to monitor and record the amount of rough sleepers in the

City and to ensure they are signposted to the front line housing options services for advice and the voluntary sector partners for support. A fortnightly task and targeting meeting lead by the Council in conjunction with our partner agencies is held to ensure positive plans are in place to support individuals with a route out of rough sleeping.

Over the past few weeks outreach sessions have identified 13 rough sleepers who do not have a local connection to the Winchester District (2 of whom hold social tenancies in other districts) and following advice interviews, each individual has been offered a reconnection to their local area where they are able to access housing advice and assistance to support them out of rough sleeping by our neighbouring councils. At the end of last week the out of area figure for rough sleeping had reduced to 7.”

Street Activity: “It is fair to say that members of the public often believe the City Centre has a rough sleeping issue but often perceived homeless is actually connected to street activity such as begging.

To address this issue the Winchester Bid operate a ‘Spare Change for Real Change’ initiative to reduce street activity by encouraging members of the public to give to this scheme rather than to individuals and collection boxes can be found in many local shops. Officers are currently working with the Winchester Bid to relaunch and highlight the alternative giving scheme.

Council officers called an emergency strategic Task & Targeting meeting last Thursday to discuss the increase in rough sleeping imported from other areas and the increase in street activity. Those agencies involved included the Police, Probation, Nightshelter outreach officer, Winchester Bid, Council’s Community Safety team and Parking team. The meeting highlighted positive ways in which we could work together to share information and local intelligence for example considering the use of enforcement powers where appropriate to move on street activity (begging) and to work with local shops and parking staff to ensure they are deterring street activity on their premises including shop doorways. An example of street activity includes a housed tenant bringing a sleeping bag into the town centre and begging whilst claiming to be homeless, this individual has been known to collect in excess of £100 pounds in a day.

Homelessness cannot be solved in isolation or by the Council alone and the Preventing Homelessness Strategy identifies the measures needed to ensure the Council continues to focus on prevention measures to reduce homelessness in partnership with the wider community and our partner agencies.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 4

From: Councillor Dominic Hiscock

To: The Portfolio Holder for Built Environment

“How does LPP 1 and LPP 2 protect us from land currently used for employment purposes being lost when landowners want to develop housing?”

Reply

“Local Plan Part 1 includes policy CP8 which promotes economic development, and CP9 which resists the loss of existing or allocated employment land and premises, unless certain factors apply. Similarly, the Local Plan Part 2 (as recommended for publication) includes policies that promote economic development in various locations e.g. Station Approach, Winchester (WIN5 – WIN7); Tollgate Sawmill, Bishops Waltham (BW5); Sun Lane, Alresford (NA3); Little Park Farm, Whiteley (SHUA4). It also seeks to retain employment allocations or provision on specific sites e.g. Winnall, Winchester (WIN11 and also to be reinforced by the emerging Winnall Planning Framework); Morgan’s Yard, Waltham Chase (WC1); and Solent Business Parks (SHUA2 , SHUA3).

There are, therefore, planning policies in place or proposed through the Local Plan to prevent the loss of employment sites.

However, the Government introduced permitted development rights with a ‘prior notification’ process whereby local authorities have to approve proposals to convert certain types of employment premises (Use Classes B1 - offices and B8 - Storage & Distribution) to residential unless there are specific objections in terms of flood risk, transport or contamination. Planning authorities are not able to resist therefore such proposals where they meet the relevant permitted development criteria, notwithstanding their local policies on employment land and uses.

The City Council applied to have several areas exempted from the permitted development provisions before they were introduced, but this was not agreed by the Government. Originally these changes of use from employment to

residential were temporary but the Government has indicated recently that they will be made permanent. The Council could also look at making Article 4 Directions to restrict permitted development rights in certain areas where evidence shows that the loss of employment premises is a real problem.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 5

From: Councillor Rose Burns

To: The Leader

“At the Personnel Committee on 29th September 2015 an exempt paper about structural reorganisation was discussed and it seems a key decision is tabled for the Cabinet meeting on 21st October, without disclosure of the paper to councillors. In view of the following:

- a) the independent reviewer examining the background to the adverse Judicial Review decision, and Silver Hill scheme generally, has not yet reported,
- b) next year we face the Boundary Commission changes with a full election of councillors in reorganised constituencies, and
- c) the Council currently has an unprecedented number of major projects being undertaken, can the Leader confirm that there will be no key decision taken by Cabinet about the proposed structural reorganisation within the Council certainly in advance of the publishing of the independent review, probably not before the election in May, and in any event not without a comprehensive look at the Council’s structure with consequent debate by full Council.”

Reply

“Changes to the organisation’s staffing structure are a matter for the Chief Executive, as Head of Paid Service. The proposals set out in PER275 are part of an ongoing programme of organisational development, which has been the subject of a series of changes over a number of years.

This programme, which has consistently had the full support of Cabinet, is designed to prepare the Council for the challenges we face in the future, making us more flexible and responsive, better able to plan strategically for new challenges and better equipped to manage the programme of major projects we are driving forward.

I know the Chief Executive considers that the recommendations from the independent review of Silver Hill are likely to affect how the Council works, our

policy making procedures and our governance practices, but that staffing structures to implement those recommendations are a separate matter. I agree with that view.

Far from delaying decisions, I believe that we should be moving ahead precisely because of the new challenges the Council will face, whether from the matters listed in the question or others as diverse as devolution and financial austerity.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 6

From: Councillor Martin Tod

To: The Portfolio Holder for Local Economy

“Is it the Conservative Cabinet as a whole or the Conservative Portfolio Holder at the time that should be held accountable for the abject failure of the portable event space?”

Reply

“Members will have read a full Report on the portable event space, presented to Cabinet at this morning’s meeting ([CAB2727](#) - Disposal of the Portable Event Space refers).

It was very unfortunate that the staging company selected for the project went into administration before the structure was complete. They are not the first supplier to have gone into administration, and are unlikely to be the last.

Attributing blame for this disappointing outcome is, I would suggest, less constructive than learning the lessons from this experience which are included within the Report.”



SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 7

From: Councillor Kim Gottlieb

To: The Leader

“The Leader may recall that back in November 2008 the Council agreed to a scheme in order to enable the developer to save SDLT (stamp duty), payable on the head lease that has yet to be granted in respect of the Silver Hill proposal. The tax rules were changed in 2013 and, apparently, the tax scheme agreed to in 2008 would likely now be regarded by HMRC as ‘aggressive avoidance’. Can the Leader please confirm that experts, fully independent of those giving the Council advice in 2008, will be asked to investigate the whole matter and to check with HMRC that the Council is following acceptable practice?”

Reply

“The original advice was given by the Council’s retained solicitors, BLP. Further advice has been taken from them which confirms that the Council’s approach is entirely lawful and appropriate.

One of BLP’s partners was a member of HMRC’s Interim GAAR Advisory Panel, which was appointed to approve the guidance published to accompany the General Anti-Abuse Rules introduced in Finance Act 2013. The advice received indicates that the “scheme” put forward and approved in 2008 is not of the type that is within the purview of this legislation.

Further, the advice received does not share the views that this would be regarded as “aggressive avoidance”: rather, an exercise of the choice available to taxpayers as to how to structure their arrangements under the UK tax legislation.

On that basis, there would be no need to check with HMRC in relation to acceptable practice, not least because stamp duty land tax, like most other taxes, is required to be self-assessed and HMRC will review the returns and payments made in due course.

Given BLP's expertise, I do not consider that there is any need to seek a second opinion on this matter. BLP are suitably qualified to give the necessary advice."



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 8

From: Councillor Jamie Scott

To: The Portfolio Holder for Housing Services

“Can the Portfolio Holder explain the impact of a 1 % rent reduction over four years on the HRA ?”

Reply

“CAB2723(HSG) dated 30 September 2015 set out what could be the potential impacts of the rent reduction proposals.

It is estimated that the measure will result in assumed reduction in income (as forecast in the current Housing Revenue Account Business Plan) of £1m per annum, increasing to £5m per annum by 2019.

It is proposed that a report reviewing options for rebalancing Housing programmes to ensure the Business Plan is deliverable will be considered at the November meeting of the Cabinet (Housing) Committee.

Officers are reviewing what scope is available for making use of the limited borrowing “headroom” available and other changes to mitigate the impact of the reductions. It will also be necessary to review future plans for all discretionary programmes as well as options for reducing costs and generating additional income.

Every effort will be made to ensure that the changes do not adversely impact the priority areas of Housing Repairs and New Build.”



SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 9

From: Councillor Janet Berry

To: The Portfolio Holder for Service Delivery

“Given that the Government plans to bring forward by twelve months the full implementation of Individual Electoral Registration to 1st December 2015, what measures are the Council taking to ensure that as many local residents as possible are registered to vote?”

Reply

“The legislation has always allowed for the end of transition to IER to be brought forward to December 2015. Therefore, in our approach to registration and particularly the 2015 canvas, we have considered how the Council could endeavour to verify all electors who wished to be registered before 30 November 2015. The legislation requires the Council to carry out a full canvas this year and to this end we have sent every property in the District an initial Household Enquiry Form (HEF), followed by a reminder where no form has been returned. Any remaining households who fail to return the reminder are then being visited by a canvasser with a third form.

Any new electors added to the Household Enquiry Form are being sent an Invitation to Register and these are being followed up in a similar way, with a reminder and then properties with any outstanding forms will have a personal visit.

With regard to electors who were on the register prior to 10 June 2014, there was a transitional protection which is now coming to an end. Electors who are as yet unconfirmed will have received on average 9 items of correspondence since June 2014 advising them of the changes to legislation and explaining what actions they must take to register.

We are working with such electors, who have failed to respond to previous correspondence, to contact them via telephone, email or letter to advise them that they must make a new application to register or they will be removed on 30 November 2015. Through our work to date we have discovered, through

data that the Council is permitted to use, that a number of these individuals are no longer resident and, therefore, should be removed from the register.

All of our correspondence contains details of the online registration service via www.gov.uk/register-to-vote, the direct line telephone number for the Electoral Services Team and an email address to ensure a variety of channels are open to the recipients.

Student response has been good as the Council is working closely with the accommodation managers at the University of Winchester and College of Art.

Care Home returns are being coordinated by staff and the care home managers (who are updating the Council on a monthly basis regarding arrivals and departures).

Military establishments are providing details of unit movements to ensure the Council can capture service registrations where appropriate.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 10

From: Councillor Derek Green

To: The Portfolio Holder for Housing Services

“Can the Portfolio Holder explain how the loss of parking spaces in Minden Way as a result of Estate improvements will now be rectified ?”

Reply

“The Estate Improvement at Minden Way involved installing a number of laybys on the odd numbered side of the carriage way. The aim was to widen the carriageway so that traffic, including buses could travel along the road more safely and easily. This improvement was put forward following an estate walkabout in 2012 and was supported by officers and local members.

Since the bays have been installed residents are continuing to only park on the odd side of the road which has caused problems with double parking and inappropriate use of the road/laybys. Officers have reviewed the improvement and will be writing to residents shortly, requesting vehicles are parked on the even side of the road and only in the laybys on the odd side of Minden Way. Officers in Highways are also looking into measures to help assist with encouraging people to park sensibly on the odd side of the road.

If this is established, the laybys will achieve what they set out to, and there will be increased car parking on this road.”



SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 11

From: Councillor Anne Weir

To: The Leader

“Would the Leader explain why the Council has chosen competitive dialogue as the procurement process for the Station Approach area design? What other procurement options were considered and ruled out, and why?”

Reply

“Officers obtained independent legal advice on procurement options at the outset of the process and this has been openly discussed at the Cabinet meetings and at Station Approach Panel meetings.

There were a number of procedure options available including the usual procedures of "Open", "Restricted" and "Competitive Dialogue", as well as an "Open Design Contest" (which means that all interested tenderers can submit a final design) or a "Restricted Design Contest" (which, like the Restricted Procedure, allows the Client to short-list interested tenderers, and only send out tender documents to those short-listed tenderers).

An Open Procedure was discounted, as the Council would not want to receive a potentially unlimited number of designs to evaluate - an element of short-listing/initial sifting is seen as essential. This also resulted in the Open Design Contest being discounted.

The Restricted Procedure was also discounted as it does not allow for any sort of engagement and anticipates a "paper-only" tender process. The Council specifically wants to engage with architects during the procurement process in order to confirm its requirements and provide feedback on the developing designs in a timely manner.

The Restricted Design Contest should also be run in accordance with the principles of the Restricted Procedure. This means that the Restricted Design Contest is unlikely to provide the flexibility required in terms of engaging with

bidders as part of the design development process during the procurement procedure. This is because guidance anticipates that the Restricted Design Contest will, like the Restricted Procedure, be a paper-based two-stage procedure, with little or no dialogue between the client and its participants.

As such, the competitive dialogue procedure is the best route which allows for both short listing and engagement with bidders during the process.

This route will enable dialogue on all aspects of the proposed designs and solutions with each architectural team, as long as it treats all bidders equally and does not disclose confidential or copyright information from one bidder to another without the former's consent. This will enable the Council and its advisers to provide clear input and feedback on any initial designs provided by each bidder and, through the dialogue, to ensure that all of the designs submitted are acceptable and are commercially viable.

The dialogue process is particularly important to ensure that the designs for both the buildings and the public realm of are a high quality and in accordance with the principles which the Council is seeking to achieve. It is also important due to the complexity of the project particularly the public realm and transport aspects which will need to meet the aspirations and objectives of multiple stakeholders, in particular the County Council, who will be able to set those out through the dialogue process.”



SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 12

From: Councillor Rose Prowse

To: The Portfolio Holder for Local Economy

“Following the further implementation of parking restrictions in Mid to Lower Stanmore Lane, Other roads in Stanmore without restrictions are now under even more pressure. They find themselves in a unique category compared to other town residential areas due to parking pressures from student resident parking, hospital workers, prison workers and University of Winchester/commuter parking.

With this in mind, what assurance, procedure and timescale can the residents of Upper Stanmore Lane, Wavell Way, Mildmay Street, Lower The Valley and associated roads expect in order that existing parking pressures and expected displacement will be monitored and consultation occur?”

Reply

“The implementation date for the Traffic Regulation Order referred to has not been agreed yet, so it is not possible to give specific timescales, however the impact of all new TROs are always monitored upon their completion.

If Members wish for a new review of the roads in the Upper Stanmore area to be instigated this would need to be included in the list of TRO requests taken forward for possible inclusion in the 2016/17 TRO Programme, which will be taken to Committee early next year.

Timescales for any future TRO investigations and subsequent consultations, etc would be dependent on other priorities on the agreed programme.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 13

From: Councillor Lucille Thompson

To: The Portfolio Holder for Housing Services

“What was the outcome of the meeting, referred to in the Minutes of Cabinet Housing on 30/9/15, between DCLG officials and Hampshire authorities, regarding the Government’s right to buy of Housing Association stock?”

Reply

“The meeting referred to above was arranged to discuss the proposals for councils to dispose of “High Value” council homes to assist with funding the latest Right to Buy proposals.

Officers learnt very little from the meeting, other than it being clear that no details have yet been determined. It was suggested that annual payments back to Government will be based on assumptions rather than actual sales. However, no information was available on issues such as thresholds, what proportion of receipts could be retained, how they will be redistributed etc.

The Housing and Planning Bill which has been published in recent weeks reaffirms the commitment to the proposal but again contains very little detail.

Subject to the final detail of the scheme, it is intended to bring forward proposals for a proactive approach to asset sales which makes best use of assets rather than a reactive approach of selling any property above a certain value when they become vacant, irrespective of other issues such as local supply and demand, property condition, etc. Further information on options will be reported to Cabinet (Housing) Committee and officers will also prepare briefings for members as soon as more information is available.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 14

From: Councillor Neil Cutler

To: The Portfolio Holder for Environment, Health and Wellbeing

“Many roads in the district have not been regularly swept this year and with the autumn leaf fall there is severe risk of flooding due to blocked drains. Could the Portfolio Holder furnish members with a detailed schedule for road sweeping and drain cleaning planned throughout the district this autumn?”

Reply

“The annual leaf clearance programme which will ensure that the list of priority roads are swept on a 3 weekly cycle will commence on 26 October and continue until Christmas. The programme will be published on the City Council’s website and also circulated to members for information.

This year an additional ‘Hit Squad’ will be provided as a rapid response to any problems that may occur such as blocked gullies in between the sweeping visits or for any roads not on the priority list. This service has already commenced and is being tasked with problem areas for attention.

Whilst the City Council is responsible for leaf removal any gullies blocked by silt still remain the responsibility of Hampshire County Council and should be reported to them for attention.”



SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 15

From: Councillor Vivian Achwal

To: The Portfolio Holder for Built Environment

“Does the Portfolio Holder believe that the policy we have on 40% affordable housing is being achieved?”

Reply

“Information has been provided in response to previous Council questions on this issue on several occasions (6 November 2013, 8 January 2014, 2 April 2014, 6 November 2014, 7 January 2015). The Council’s policy on affordable housing provision (CP3) includes the following requirement:

“In order to help meet affordable housing needs, all development which increases the supply of housing will be expected to provide 40% of the gross number of dwellings as affordable housing, unless this would render the proposal economically unviable...”

The policy includes a viability proviso because all local planning authorities are required by the Government to operate such a test. It is not a matter of local discretion.

In addition, in November 2014 the Government introduced a policy preventing authorities seeking affordable housing provision on sites of 10 units or less and which have a combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sq m. In July 2015 the Government’s actions were found to be unlawful by the High Court and the exemption struck down, but this is subject to appeal

The Council's policy has achieved the objective of ensuring that all qualifying new development must provide 40% affordable housing if it can afford to do so. It would be wrong to suggest that the policy has failed if a particular development cannot provide the 40% figure because the fact that we have such a policy does not change development economics.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 16

From: Councillor Kim Gottlieb

To: The Leader

“On 21st May 2015, Cabinet voted to not extend the long stop date in the Development Agreement with Henderson/THRE from 1st June 2015 to 31st October 2015. It has however allowed this to happen by default. Can the Leader please explain why the Council is allowing its own decision making process to be subverted in order to accommodate a third party developer?”

Reply

“Under the terms of the Development Agreement, either the Council or Henderson/THRE have the right to terminate the Agreement if it had not gone unconditional by a date specified in the agreement. Although this date passed several years ago, the Council and Henderson/THRE had previously mutually agreed that neither would exercise this termination right before a certain date (1 June 2015).

At its meeting of 21 May, Cabinet decided not to formally extend the Long Stop date provisions, and took other decisions with a view to the Silver Hill development being progressed further. Submissions were subsequently made by Silverhill Winchester No. 1 Limited, which were considered by the Council and approved (with some modifications) in July 2015. As set out in report CAB2736, work is continuing towards the Agreement going unconditional, in line with the decisions of Cabinet and Council in July. I do not agree therefore that the Council’s decision-making process is being subverted – rather, the decisions taken are being implemented.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 17

From: Councillor Jamie Scott

To: The Portfolio Holder for Housing Services

“Can the Portfolio Holder explain the practical difficulties of implementing the "Pay to Stay" proposal ?”

Reply

“Government proposals to charge a market rent for households earning above £30,000 were confirmed in the Housing and Planning Bill published last week.

Little detail on the proposals has been confirmed, although it has been indicated that HMRC data will be made available to local councils. The expected implementation date for this scheme is April 2017.

In the absence of any detail, it is not possible to state what the practical implications of such a scheme will be. Further briefings for members will be prepared as soon as more information is known.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 18

From: Councillor Martin Tod

To: The Portfolio Holder for Built Environment

“Since 2006, have the Council's actions been compliant with saved Planning Policy W6?”

Reply

“Policy W6 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review (2006) resists the development of additional public car parks in Winchester, stating:

“In order to assist in reducing traffic flows in the town centre and to encourage the use of Park and Ride, particularly for long stay parking, the development of additional public car parks in Winchester will not be permitted, other than in accordance with Policy W.4.”

Policy W.4 provides for the development of Park and Ride car parks.

Therefore, the terms of the policy have been met in that no additional public car parks have been permitted in Winchester, other than Park and Ride as allowed for by policy W4. While policy W.6 does not relate specifically to increasing or decreasing parking spaces, the explanatory text accompanying it states that some existing long stay parking will be withdrawn or converted to short stay and that Park and Ride is not intended to increase the stock of parking in Winchester.

Since the adoption of the Local Plan Review in 2006 the following changes have been made to public car parking provision in Winchester, although many of these have arisen as a result of managing the parking stock of the town, rather than as a result of planning applications:

The Council's approach during the period of the 2006 Local Plan has been to take appropriate opportunities to help facilitate development which it supports on car park sites. This has resulted in car park spaces being re-utilised for the St Bedes School Extension on the St Peters Car Park, for the Discovery Centre at Jewry Street car park and as planned for the Chesil Extra Care

Scheme on Chesil surface car park and the St Clements Doctors' surgery on Upper Brook Street Car Park. Other similar opportunities may arise in the future which the Council will consider. The Council has also actively sought to control on street parking and extensive new parking schemes have been implemented in areas such as Stanmore, Winnall and Abbots Barton. In addition as part of the introduction of the South Winchester Park and Ride scheme negotiations were held with the County Council and the Hospital to remove long term parking in the centre of Winchester and to relocate staff to the Park and Ride sites. A pricing strategy has also been introduced to encourage long term parking at the Park and Ride sites.

There have also been substantial changes in the Government's planning advice on parking. At the time that policy W.6 was developed and adopted, Government advice sought to reduce the amount of car parking provided as a means of reducing traffic generation (Planning Policy Guidance Note 13). It was subsequently found that this approach simply caused problems elsewhere and the National Planning Policy Framework now expects authorities to improve the quality of public parking and to set local parking standards based on local need. As a result, the emerging Local Plan Part 2 does not propose to carry forward policy W.6"



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 19

From: Councillor Lucille Thompson

To: The Portfolio Holder for Housing Services

“What impact will the 1% rent reduction have on the Council's new build programme?”

Reply

“CAB2723(HSG) dated 30 September 2015 set out what could be the potential impacts of the rent reduction proposals.

It is estimated that the measure will result in assumed reduction in income (as forecast in the current Housing Revenue Account Business Plan) of £1m per annum, increasing to £5m per annum by 2019.

It is proposed that a report reviewing options for rebalancing Housing programmes to ensure the Business Plan is deliverable will be considered at the November meeting of the Cabinet (Housing) Committee.

Officers are reviewing what scope is available for making use of the limited borrowing “headroom” available and other changes to mitigate the impact of the reductions. It will also be necessary to review future plans for all discretionary programmes as well as options for reducing costs and generating additional income.

Every effort will be made to ensure that the changes do not adversely impact the priority areas of Housing Repairs and New Build.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 20

From: Councillor Kim Gottlieb

To: The Leader

“Can the Leader please provide a timetable that makes clear the intended timings for when, 1) Henderson intends to start works on site, 2) Henderson requires the existing St Clements surgery to be vacated, and 3) when the Council expects the new surgery to be completed, including its being fully fitted out and ready to serve its patients?”

Reply

“As set out in the letter from the developer attached as Appendix 1 to CAB2736, it intends to start work on site by the end of this year. The construction of the new surgery is planned to take 13 months. The developer’s construction programme for the Silver Hill scheme takes account of this and would not require vacant possession of the St. Clements Surgery site until after completion of the new surgery. If the Silver Hill scheme is allowed to move forward on the planned programme, a new surgery with better facilities can therefore be provided by August 2017, with no interruption to medical provision for patients.”



Winchester
City Council

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING – 21 October 2015

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 21

From: Councillor Kim Gottlieb

To: The Leader

“Could the Leader please advise of what steps have been taken to comply with the instructions of the Information Commissioner as per his Decision issued on 17th September 2015, and when will the Council make available all the viability information on Silver Hill the Commissioner said it should?”

Reply

“The information has now been disclosed to the complainant.”