



Winchester
City Council

COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 1

From: Councillor Clear

To: The Portfolio Holder for Environment

“After some considerable time a Traffic Regulation Order was finally signed some weeks ago for the long awaited yellow lines in Wickham. May I ask when or if this work will eventually commence?”

Reply

“The Traffic Regulation Order to which Cllr Clear comes into effect on the 1st August. The Council’s contractor has not yet been able to undertake the lining of the road because of utility works but these are expected to be complete towards the end of July. An order for the lining has been placed and will take place as soon as possible after the roadworks are finished.”



Winchester
City Council

COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 2

From: Councillor Green

To: The Leader with Portfolio for Housing Services

“In light of the Grenfell fire tragedy could the Portfolio Holder explain to me what justification there is for removing fire extinguishers from flats owned by this council?”

Reply

“The City Council reviewed its Fire Safety Policy in November 2015 and determined at that time to only provide fire extinguishers at locations where staff are on site and trained in their use. Extinguishers were then removed from all other locations. This follows the most up to date national advice on fire safety in communal housing.

Depending on the specific schemes, residents are advised either to “stay put” in their homes or to “get out and stay out”. Site specific safety advice has been issued to all residents and has been resent in recent weeks as an additional reminder. In no cases would the City Council encourage any residents to actively fight a fire in a communal area.

We will of course remain open to any revised or new advice that may come forward from the Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service or from Government and national bodies and will amend our procedures accordingly.”



Winchester
City Council

COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 3

From: Councillor Weston

To: The Leader

“Can the Leader confirm that the Council is not going down the Compulsory Purchase Order route with regards to the Central Winchester Regeneration Project but allowing the site to be developed organically and ensuring that the Council’s finances will not be stretched?”

Reply

“As Members are aware, following the purchase of the bus station, the Council now owns the majority of the land in the Central Winchester area. We have also heard from JTP in the warmly welcomed presentation at the IPG that the council could develop the Central Winchester area ‘bit by bit’.

Our focus is on the development of the Supplementary Planning Guidance to ensure we create a vibrant new quarter for our city. But we will soon turn our attention to how this new quarter can be delivered. There are many options to consider and our officer team will bring them forward for consideration in due course.

Compulsory Purchase was a main theme of the old scheme – but not this one. We have drawn a line, moved on and are pleased that the people of Winchester town are inspired by what we are creating for our city.

If an owner of a property in the Central Winchester area wished to sell their interest, the Council may consider purchasing this by agreement at Market Value. Alternatively, we welcome approaches from individuals who want to invest in their property in accordance with the emerging SPD.

There may be some instances where in order to achieve the wider community development objectives of the area, that a compulsory purchase order may be necessary. However compulsory purchase would only be used as a last resort.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 4

From: Councillor Izard

To: The Portfolio Holder for Built Environment

“On the 20th July Eastleigh Borough Council are seeking Councillors approval to the emerging strategic approach in respect of their draft Local Plan. Several Parishes within the Winchester District, particularly Colden Common, will be affected by the vast development and major road still proposed on their doorstep.

It is understood that recent proposed meetings with Winchester officers have been cancelled. Can the Leader please confirm what is the current position of the consultation process with Eastleigh Borough Council including any other Authorities and what measures are in hand to protect the interests of the many Winchester District residents who will suffer the consequences of such proposals.”

QUESTION 5

From: Councillor Cook

To: The Portfolio Holder for Built Environment

“Eastleigh Borough Local Plan as I’m sure you are aware still do not have a rubber stamped Local Plan to this date. I should like to ask the Portfolio Holder what exactly is the latest state of play when it involves the proposed Plan of now 5200 Homes which is known as the Option B and C which impacts on land that is located in the WCC domain and forthwith truly understanding their obligation as a Council and Neighbour to their Duty to Cooperate with our Officers and have we already made written notification of the meetings that should then didn’t take place?”

Reply

“As most Councillors know I am sure, Eastleigh Borough Council is considering a report at its Cabinet meeting tomorrow which identifies the area north of Bishopstoke as its preferred option for a major new development area within its emerging Local Plan.

Cllr Horrill has written to the Leader of Eastleigh Borough Council to express this Council's concern about the way that Eastleigh is approaching its Local Plan preparation and the lack of meaningful consultation or engagement which has taken place with us and with local communities. Officers have been expressing our concerns to their Eastleigh colleagues on this vital issue for some months, but despite repeated assurances there has been no satisfactory dialogue with Parish Councils or local Members. Some technical meetings have taken place but others have been cancelled recently apparently due to staff availability at Eastleigh which is also a cause for concern.

Para 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that: *'Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide selection of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area, including those contained in any neighbourhood plans that have been made'*. Para 157, goes on to state, *'Crucially local plans shouldbe based on co-operation with neighbouring authorities, public, voluntary and private sector organisations'*.

All Local Plans are examined by an independent inspector to ensure that they comply with all the necessary legal and procedural requirements, together with the tests of 'soundness' and the Duty to Cooperate. In this respect the para 181 of the NPPF states that: *'Local Planning Authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when their local plan is submitted for examination'*.

The NPPF is clear in that cooperation should be seen as a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking through to implementation. It is not unreasonable to question whether Eastleigh has satisfied the NPPF tests in what they have done to date.

In producing our own Local Plan we have always sought to consult and engage our communities even when the issues have been difficult for us discuss. I do not think it is too much to ask for Eastleigh to follow the same approach where development could have a significant effect on our residents. That is not being uncooperative, it is setting high standards.

I therefore agree with both Cllr Cook and Cllr Izard that this Council and our communities should be given the opportunity for meaningful dialogue with Eastleigh. Any proposed development should only be contained in its draft Local Plan if it has been the subject of proper assessment of all the relevant constraints and proposes convincing and effective mitigation for any negative impacts. The Leader has made these points in her letter to Cllr House and we will continue to engage positively with Eastleigh with our communities' concerns in mind."



Winchester
City Council

COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 6

From: Councillor Weir

To: The Portfolio Holder for Built Environment

“How does the amount of money Winchester City Council collects from new housing developments for highways improvements and road safety measures compare with other districts in Hampshire?”

Reply

“The City Council collects contributions under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations from each qualifying development. The principle of CIL is that it is a ‘single pot’ levy covering all development impacts so it is not possible to say how much has been collected for highways improvements or road safety measures or to compare this figure with others. From the total amount collected each local authority will take its own decision about how CIL is used based on local priorities. The City Council will make a decision about how to use CIL funds not already allocated later in the year as part of the budget setting process so that projects can be included in the Council’s capital expenditure programme.

The City Council gives 25% of CIL receipts (after accounting for the share for parish councils) to Hampshire County Council (which is the Highway Authority) but it does not determine how this are used. The amount collected so far which has or will be paid to the County Council is £572,000.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 7

From: Councillor Gemmell

To: The Leader

“May we have an update on Station Approach?”

Reply

“The procurement process being run with the RIBA Competitions Office to appoint a design team for the project is nearing its conclusion.

The evaluation process of shortlisted tenders is being completed and a paper will be brought to 14th August Cabinet (Station Approach) Committee meeting asking for approval to appoint the winning bidder, as agreed at 20th March Cabinet meeting CAB2864.

Once appointed the design team will prepare a full programme to work towards the agreed milestones as listed below, this will include a full engagement process at each key stage:

- Phase 1 - Disposition of uses for both Carfax and Cattlemarket sites, public realm strategy for the whole area and Concept Designs for Carfax - by February 2018
- Phase 2 - Development of Design to planning application – by November 2018
- Phase 3 - Technical Design – by February 2019”



COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 8

From: Councillor Thompson

To: The Leader with Portfolio for Housing Services

"With uncertainties in the housing market and the apparent stalling of house building in large sites in and around the City, what are the implications for the delivery of affordable homes on these sites and what does the Council intend to do to ensure that the provision of much needed affordable housing in the City does take place sooner rather than later?"

Reply

"The Council is not aware that any particular site in the District has stalled. Our major development areas at Kings Barton and West of Waterlooville are building out steadily and of the sites allocated in Local Plan Part 2 adopted in April, a significant number of these now have planning permission or are actively being pursued. Taking the development at Kings Barton as an example, as of the first week of July 26 private houses were occupied; the first 8 shared equity homes will be handed over in August with a further 4 by the end of August. During November 2017 the first tranche of rented affordable will be available. In terms of Phase 1B currently under construction, there will be 60 rental units and 29 intermediate units. There have been delays in completing the S106 agreement and getting a start on site at North Whiteley but these have related to the timing of infrastructure funding decisions and school place analysis not affordable housing.

However, it may be correct to say that the outlook for large scale market housing delivery generally is less certain at the moment than it has been for several years, with the effect of Brexit on demand and supply one of the contributing factors. This could lead to a slowing of construction in areas where the market is less vibrant. It is therefore important that the Council makes its direct contribution to affordable housing delivery.

The Council adopted its new Housing Strategy earlier this month. Amongst its priorities is the delivery of new affordable homes. The Strategy recognises that the market will not deliver all the affordable homes the area needs without

intervention from the Council. The Council will do this through a combination of direct action and working with partners.

The Strategy undertakes to double the supply of new Council homes to 300 in the period 2017-2020. Approximately 100 Council homes are on site at present and will provide homes for rent as well as our first homes for shared ownership.

In partnership with HARAH the Council is supporting the development of affordable homes on rural exception sites and it is soon to launch a rural housing campaign to promote the development of more affordable homes to meet rural communities' needs.

The Strategy commits to establishing a local housing company or other specialist vehicle to support new development. It also is looking at innovative models of delivery, including community led housing initiatives (such as community land trusts), modular construction, co-living models and homes aimed at those impacted by the single room benefit allowance.

The HRA debt cap is a barrier to development. Next month we will be meeting with Government to discuss how to overcome this barrier and repeat the success of the three Council housing schemes delivered when debt cap was temporarily lifted a small number of years ago. We are already in discussions with the Homes and Communities Agency in order to secure grant funding to support new development.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 9

From: Councillor Ruffell

To: The Portfolio Holder for Business Partnerships

"Could the Portfolio Holder update us on how we are supporting Businesses right across the district"?

Reply

"Winchester City Council has a variety of activities that support businesses across the whole District.

- Business support commissioned from Enterprise First – this includes a new package of networking events, training and one-to-one advice sessions which will be available in locations across the District, for example Holiday Inn and The Wickham Centre amongst others. The first networking session takes place on Thursday 20 July then on the third Thursday of the month. The first training session takes place on Friday 28 July. For more information, go to <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/business/business-support-advice/business-advice/>
- Business grants – providing a one-off grant designed to help with the start-up or development of small businesses across the Winchester District. Grants are typically a maximum of £1,500. Recipients in the last year have been based in Droxford, Knowle and Curdrige as well as many other locations around the District. More information is available at www.winchester.gov.uk/business/business-grants/business-grant/
- Tourism marketing – attractions and accommodation providers across the District are able to take advantage of the benefits of the Destination Management Partnership that markets the District to tourists far and wide. More information is available at <http://www.visitwinchester.co.uk/>

In addition, there are a number of activities targeted at rural areas of the District:

- LEADER – the Fieldfare Local Action Group distributes funding and support to rural businesses and communities across the Winchester

City, East Hampshire District and Eastleigh Borough Council areas. Winchester City Council is the accountable body for this funding, and manages the team who deliver the programme. £1.6 million has been allocated to the area in the current round to 2021. More information is available at <http://www.fieldfareleader.org.uk/>

- Market towns development – work in the four market towns across the District (Alresford, Bishops Waltham, Denmead and Wickham) has been very successful in bringing new audiences to the town centres. Large scale events including the annual Taste of Wickham and Bishops Waltham’s Road to Agincourt are complemented by smaller scale school-holiday trails and projects to reintroduce the town centres to local families.
- Rural planning guidance note – a document looking specifically at the planning issues faced in rural areas is available for free at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning/planning-applications/> This enables applicants to be directed to the policies that are most likely to affect their development, and guide them through the process of applying for planning permission.

Officers are now building on the recent work undertaken under the banner of ‘Better Business for All’, and establish a whole Council approach to economic development. There are a number of teams across the Council which interact with business customers, and officers are finding new ways of joining up these services to offer a more streamlined approach to the business community. Whether it is environmental health, planning, revenues, tourism, estates or any number of other teams, the aim is to make best use of the advice we have available to help businesses to achieve their potential. Officers from across these teams have undertaken Business Insights training to improve their interaction with and understanding of businesses.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 10

From: Councillor Hutchison

To: The Leader

“The structure outlined for major projects includes Advisory Groups and mini Cabinets; can the Leader please inform us how these two Groups will work, and work together, what the remit of the Advisory Groups will be and how they will contribute to the development of projects?”

Reply

“We have worked hard over the past six months to create a governance process for our major projects that is inclusive but gets the business done.

Therefore our Cabinet set out a new approach to managing the projects in March this year:

- The establishment of a Station Approach Cabinet Committee
- An Advisory Panel comprising of representatives of certain organisations be appointed to provide advice to the Evaluation Board and that recommendations be sought from those organisations as to the representative they wish to appoint to the Panel.

The Cabinet Committee will oversee the project and have the responsibility for making the required formal decisions e.g. whether to move through the agreed gateways and to consider and approve the associated engagement strategy.

A Station Approach Advisory Panel has now also been established as agreed to provide ongoing input into both the procurement of the architect and the development of the design leading up to the submission of a planning application. The Advisory Panel includes a ward councillor, a further councillor nominated by Cabinet, a representative of the City of Winchester Trust and a representative of the Business Improvement District. In addition to the comprehensive

engagement with all residents and stakeholders, led by the appointed architect, the Advisory Panel will provide a sounding board and critical friend for the design team.

In respect of the Leisure Centre project it was agreed by Cabinet that a Cabinet Committee would be established (this has now met on two occasions) and that Bar End Forum members and Sports Groups would continue to be involved in the project on an informal basis along with other interested parties. The thorough and ongoing programme of engagement lead by the Council's architects has provided very valuable information in terms of input, foresight and local knowledge.

This is considered to be a better mechanism for this project as it provides an opportunity for very wide input from a wide range of stakeholders. But engagement is important to me and I will keep this under review as we move through the project.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 11

From: Councillor Tait

To: The Leader

“Does the Leader share my concern that when considering rural exception sites, offering the landowner around £10,000 a plot is grossly inadequate if we really want to see an increase in the number of homes built and the willingness of landowners to come forward with sites. If the Leader does share my view does she have an idea of what is an appropriate amount?”

Also could the Leader explain what advantage our CP4 policy offers affordable housing developers and how many times have we seen developments which have seen a proportion of open market housing thus creating a higher land value (the policy allows up to 30% open market housing if that facilitates land coming forward subject to viability).

Reply

“Benchmark land values on rural exception sites are actually a little above £10,000 per plot. In order to ensure that affordable housing schemes are economically viable it is important that land values offered do not exceed the minimum acceptable level. WCC is part of the HARA partnership that has delivered over 400 new rural affordable homes on land secured at benchmark land values. The partnership regularly reviews the benchmark land values so it understands whether these are supporting or hindering development. The last review concluded that benchmark land values were not a barrier to development. Enough landowners were prepared to offer land at benchmark value rates, with sometimes more than one site in a particular parish being available.

Last year a landowners’ event hosted by the South Downs National Park Authority (a HARA partner) concluded that sometimes owners were more interested in benefits other than a capital receipt, such as securing a long term income stream from housing.

HARAH has, in its Business Plan, a target of reviewing benchmark land values this year, an exercise that will include further discussions with land owners. It is important that this review is carried out taking account of all the evidence and not led by individual landowner aspirations. Doing so would be likely to set an undesirable precedent, create inflationary pressures and undermine overall affordable housing delivery.

To date it has always been possible to deliver homes on rural exception sites with 100% affordable housing. All schemes that have delivered housing, or are on-site, have been able to do so by varying affordable tenure mixes rather than introducing market homes, thus maximising affordable housing delivery. Mixed tenure schemes recently completed, or due to complete in 2018, include Soberton (4 rented and 4 shared ownership), Waltham Chase (10 rented and 2 shared ownership) and Shedfield (9 rented and 4 shared ownership).”



Winchester
City Council

COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 12

From: Councillor Porter

To: The Portfolio Holder for Business Partnerships

“How will the Council be supporting the Post Offices in our district as the Post Office Counters Ltd places new conditions on all post offices?”

Reply

“I am proud of this Council’s track record of supporting micro- and small businesses. As you will see in my response to Cllr Ruffell’s question on our support for businesses across the District elsewhere in these papers, we provide a broad menu of opportunities and services and not a ‘one size fits all’ package.

Knowing the important role that the post office – like the village pub and shop – has played in the community for many decades, I am naturally keen to explore the local impact of any national changes. My officers will do this on a case by case basis, when we know more about the implications for post offices in our District.

Among other factors, it is important to consider location, opportunities for colocation and collaboration, levels of current and projected usage and local demographics when determining appropriate measures of support. Our ongoing support for West Meon Village Shop since it was established as a community enterprise in 2006 – working with Hampshire County Council and other funding bodies - is an example of what can be done to protect services of this kind.”



COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 13

From: Councillor Mather

To: The Portfolio Holder for Health and Wellbeing

“Please could you update us on progress with the Bar End Leisure Centre project, especially as regards details of public engagement?”

Reply

“A full update on the project was presented to the Cabinet (Leisure Centre) Committee on 17th July.

A full design team has now been appointed to progress the design work informed by engagement at all key stages. The next major milestone will be consideration of the Outline Business Case in the autumn which will set out the financial aspects of the project and the implications of this for the Council.

Stride Treglown architects (in conjunction with LA architects) on behalf of Winchester City Council and The University of Winchester hosted five engagement sessions between 21–29 June.

During these sessions the architects focused on potential opportunities, aspirations and constraints for the Bar End site as a whole.

The drop in sessions took place at the following venues:

Venue: Winchester Sport Stadium (SO23 0QA)

- Friday 23rd June between 4pm - 6pm
- Saturday 24th June 10am-12pm and 2pm-4pm
- Thursday 29th June 3pm-5pm

Venue: Winchester Guildhall (SO23 9GH)

- Friday 23rd June 11am-2pm

The event was promoted as follows:

- 1500 letters door dropped to local residents and businesses
- Emails
- WCC website
- Flyers at Winchester Sport Stadium
- Social media including Facebook and twitter
- Press release

The display boards from phase one are available on the council website and an online feedback questionnaire was available for comments until Friday 7th July.

The second phase of engagement will focus on the emerging Design Framework and early concept ideas for the Sport and Leisure Centre, these will take place on:

Venue: Winchester Guildhall (SO23 9GH)

- Friday 21st July between 3.00pm and 7.30pm
- Tuesday 25th July between 3.00pm and 8.00pm at Guildhall Winchester

Venue: Winchester Sport Stadium (SO23 0QA)

- Saturday 22nd July between 10.00am and 4.00pm

The events have been promoted as follows:

- 1450 flyers door dropped to local residents and businesses
- Over 1200 email invitations
- 4,000 current River Park Leisure Centre members invited by email
- WCC website
- Flyers distributed to:
 - Winchester Sport Stadium (+posters)
 - St Clement doctors surgery
 - St Paul's doctors surgery
 - Bishop on the Bridge Pub
 - Black Boy Pub
 - King Alfred Pub
 - Discovery Centre (+ posters)
 - Guildhall tourism centre (+ posters)
 - Winchester City Council reception (+ posters)

Copies of the exhibition boards and a feedback questionnaire will be available on the Council's website from Friday 21st July until Friday 18th August.

Anyone wishing register their interest about the project can email: consultation@stridetreglown.com



COUNCIL MEETING – 19 July 2017

Question under Council Procedure Rule 14

QUESTION 14

From: Councillor Tait

To: The Portfolio Holder for Built Environment

“Could the Portfolio Holder explain why it was considered appropriate to treat the 3 double sided A board planning applications promoting businesses in Parchment Street, St Thomas Street and Little Minster Street as Advert Consent (AVC) applications rather than full applications in view of the fact that all three boards are affixed to the pavement and should surely be considered as "permanent" fixtures on the Highway thus requiring full consent. Should our Highways Officer have been consulted over the proposals?

Could she also advise me as to whether it is necessary for the 3 A boards to be licensed as they are on the highway and if the answer is yes then have they?

Does she also share my concern that whilst the County Council are presently pursuing prosecution of business owners who place their own A boards on the Highway apparently no action is being taken against the 3 boards covered by the following planning applications:
17/00739/AVC, 17/00738/AVC and 17/00741/AVC. Why is this?

Reply

“There have been concerns for some time about ‘clutter’ in our High Streets. In Winchester, this has included the visual and physical impact associated with the proliferation of A boards promoting individual businesses in the secondary shopping streets.

My officers have worked with the Winchester Business Improvement District (BID) and Hampshire County Council Highways Department to develop a pragmatic and sympathetic response to these concerns. This has consisted of introducing single, composite A-boards at the High Street end of three of the secondary shopping streets on the understanding – secured from retailers in advance – that they would then remove their individual boards.

To answer Cllr Tait's questions more specifically:

- a) The display of advertisements is subject to separate consent process within the planning system. This is set out in the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements)(England) Regulations 2007. If advertisement consent is given, a separate planning permission is not required. Therefore the applications by the BID for the three A boards followed the correct legislative procedure. The case officer considered the appropriateness of the scale, the context and the fact that the proposal was part of a strategy to support multiple businesses. There is no requirement to consult the highways engineer, but the case officer did consider highway safety and liaised with the applicant to ensure that appropriate advice had been taken from County Highways. Conditions of the consent advise that the advertisement should not be displayed without the permission of the owner, or to hinder the ready interpretation of any road traffic sign etc.
- b) At the present time, Hampshire County Council does not issue licences for A boards as they do not generally support the presence of A boards on the highways. However, the relevant County officer has been involved in developing the proposals to create the three composite boards, and has approved them as a pragmatic alternative to a far higher number of individual boards which can be problematic for those with visual and mobility impairments, as well as restricting access for emergency vehicles.
- c) No action is being taken to remove the three A boards granted advertising consent because, as I have indicated above, these are part of a strategy developed with the BID and County Council Highways to reduce the overall level of street clutter. The proposals were explained to businesses well in advance, and they were given the opportunity to influence the design and content.

I hope this allays Cllr Tait's anxieties about the rationale for the boards and the process followed. I am sure he will agree that the new boards are smart and well positioned, and provide a business-friendly solution to what has been a growing issue for our High Street."