

CABINET**18 March 2015****Attendance:**

Councillor Pearson -	<i>Leader (Chairman) (P)</i>
Councillor Godfrey -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Finance & Organisational Development (P)</i>
Councillor Read -	<i>Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Built Environment (P)</i>
Councillor Byrnes -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Business Services (P)</i>
Councillor Jeffs -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Communities & Transport (P)</i>
Councillor Miller -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Housing (P)</i>
Councillor Stallard -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Environment, Health & Wellbeing (P)</i>

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Gottlieb, Henry, Laming, Learney, Tait, Weston and Wright

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors J Berry, Cook, Green, Hiscock, Humby, Lipscomb, Scott, Thompson, Warwick and Weir
Mr D Chafe (TACT)

1. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Councillor Stallard declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of agenda items due to her role as a County Councillor. Councillor Godfrey declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of agenda items due to his role as a County Council employee. However, with the exception of the item on Athelstan House (Report CAB2663 and minute below refers), as there was no material conflict of interest, they remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Standards Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council involvement.

Councillor Gottlieb declared a personal, but not prejudicial, interest in respect of Report CAB2675 as a member of the Winchester Deserves Better campaign group. He remained in the room and addressed Cabinet regarding this item.

2. **MEMBERSHIP OF CABINET COMMITTEES**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Stallard replace Councillor Southgate as the Chair of the Fairness and Equality Informal Policy Group (full membership: Councillors Stallard, J Berry, Clear, Weir, Warwick and Dibden).

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 February 2015 be approved and adopted.

4. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Harvey Cole, Karen Barratt, Rose Burns and Patrick Davies addressed Cabinet regarding Report CAB2675 and their comments are summarised under the relevant minute below.

5. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Pearson welcomed Claer Lloyd-Jones to the meeting who had recently been appointed to undertake the independent review of the Council's Silver Hill decisions.

Councillor Pearson announced that £1.6 million of Fieldfare funding had recently been announced and congratulated all those involved, including Councillor Humby as previous Leader, for this achievement.

Councillor Jeffs reported on the closure of Friarsgate Multi Storey Car Park with effect from 30 March 2015 as it was deemed to no longer be safe for use.

6. **SILVER HILL – REVIEW OF PROJECT POSITION**

(Report CAB2675 refers)

Prior to consideration of the Report, Councillor Pearson gave a statement which in summary provided an update on two commitments he had made when he became Leader, about four weeks previously. The first was to establish an Independent Review of how the Council had come to make certain decisions which were quashed by the Judicial Review and this Independent Review was now underway. The second commitment was to listen to Winchester residents' regarding moving the much needed regeneration of the Silver Hill area forward. Report CAB2675 gave an overview of the options available and he emphasised that he wanted other Councillors and the public to have the opportunity to better understand the options in order to make informed contributions on the way forward.

Therefore, Henderson had been requested to arrange a public exhibition of the Silver Hill scheme that was approved in 2009 which following the High Court case, remained the subject of the Development Agreement, and he welcomed views on this and other options contained in the Report.

The Chief Executive emphasised that the Report provided an update on the current situation and did not contain recommendations as to the way forward. At this stage, the key date to note was 1 June 2015 which was the date on which the existing 'long stop' agreement with Henderson expired.

Cabinet welcomed to the meeting Tim Hellier, representative from Berwin Leighton Paisner Solicitors.

In response to queries, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services explained that the 2009 scheme was still the subject of the Development Agreement (DA) and could be progressed by Henderson provided certain conditions were met before 1 June 2015 (whereby the scheme would become "unconditional"). After this date, either the Council or Henderson could decide to terminate the DA if the DA had not gone unconditional prior to 1 June. There were dispute resolution provisions within the Development Agreement should there be any dispute as to whether the necessary conditions have been met. Both parties had a duty to act in good faith and the dispute resolution process could not be used to delay the process past the 1 June date in order to prevent the DA otherwise going unconditional.

Mr Hellier emphasised the obligation on the Council (and Henderson) to act in the utmost good faith to the agreed common purpose whilst the DA was in place. He referred to a court case involving Chelsea Barracks for further definition on what was meant by acting in good faith. This case decided that parties acting under a good faith clause should adhere to the spirit of the contract, observe reasonable commercial standards of fair dealing, and be faithful to the common purpose and justified expectations of the parties to the contract.

One Member queried what would be the situation should Henderson seek to progress the 2009 scheme as being viable, when in its 2014 application for variations to the DA Henderson had argued that the 2009 scheme was not viable? The Chief Executive stated that should this situation arise, a decision would need to be made depending on the actual facts of the application.

Members queried whether minor modifications could be made to the 2009 scheme? The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that the JR decision decided that the 2014 amendments would have to be regarded as material, and these could not therefore be accepted. However, "non-material" amendments could be made, where the changes proposed were of such a trivial nature that they would not be regarded as material. If such a situation arose, the Council would take external legal advice to assist Members in deciding how to proceed. He cautioned that it would be open for a third party to challenge through the JR process if they disagreed with the Council's decision.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services confirmed that the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) had to be exercised by March 2016. If the Council decided to start the development process again, it would most likely have to also start a new CPO process. The possible timescale for this was set out in Appendix 2 to the Report (a new CPO was expected to take two years, in addition to time spent before that by the Council in determining its strategy and undertaking a procurement process).

In response to questions, the Chief Executive confirmed that it was possible for a new building for St Clements Surgery to be provided separately to any Silver Hill regeneration scheme. However, if the Council was to have a role in this, there would be significant financial implications. Officers were meeting with the Surgery and a further Report would be submitted to Cabinet in due course.

Cabinet noted that the condition of Friarsgate MSCP would continue to be monitored with no immediate decisions as to, for example, whether it should be demolished. There were currently 131 parking spaces available in the car park and Officers had advised there should be sufficient capacity for this to be displaced to other car parks in the city following closure at the end of the month. However, the situation around the Christmas period would have to be monitored. The four disabled parking bays would be moved to the Middle Brook Street car park (and this move advertised to users).

In response to questions, the Head of Estates advised that the MSCP was inspected on a weekly basis. When closed, the car park would be secured to prevent pedestrian or vehicular access.

The Head of Estates also pointed out the deteriorating poor condition of other properties in the proposed re-development area.

The Chief Executive reported that the Managing Director of Stagecoach UK had written to Henderson regarding the bus station and requested that this letter be shared with the Council. The letter expressed Stagecoach's concern regarding the impact of delays in the development of the Silver Hill area and highlighted that unless the scheme was to proceed, it would have to consider closing the bus station and seek to develop the site separately. Whilst Stagecoach remained strong supporters of the scheme, the company's main focus must be to provide a service to its customers.

In response to questions, Mr Hellier stated that he believed the timeframe outlined in Appendix 2 of the Report of starting a new development process of 7 to 9 years was realistic, although it might be possible to reduce it slightly.

The Chief Finance Officer responded to Members' questions regarding the financial implications to the Council of the various options outlined in the Report. She advised that if the 2009 scheme under the Development Agreement was to proceed, this would have a beneficial impact on the Council's budget, due to for example the impact on the Council's own landholdings in Kings Walk and Section 106 receipts.

If the Development Agreement did not proceed, there was a significant risk if the Council failed to meet its obligations under the contract and Henderson sought damages. If both parties complied with their contractual obligations and one party decided to terminate the Agreement after 1 June, the Chief Finance Officer advised there would still be significant implications to the Council regarding decisions as to its existing properties owned in the area. There would also be significant costs to the Council if the decision was made to start again with a new scheme.

The Chief Executive highlighted Paragraph 10.2 b) which emphasised that external advice received from Deloitte was that in the current economic climate, developers were less willing to take on financial risks of such a development and the costs of promoting an alternative development might fall on the Council.

A Member asked whether it was possible to guarantee that any legal advice on possible options would not be subject to successful challenge by judicial review. The Chief Operating Officer, said that specialist external advice would be obtained to assist the Council in its decisions, but in complex areas which may be open to different interpretations, it was not always possible to eliminate all risk, especially in a situation where a third party challenge might be made. The Council would need to consider any advice before making decisions.

In response to questions, the Corporate Director confirmed that the planning permission granted in 2014 for Silver Hill was subject to a routine referral to the Secretary of State for him to consider whether to call it in. If the Secretary of State did decide to call in the application, there would be an Inquiry and there was no set timescale for this process. In addition, the Henderson appeal against the JR decision was also ongoing with an uncertain timetable. Consequently, it was considered that the outcome of the 2014 Planning Committee resolution to grant permission was too uncertain for the Council to make any assumptions that the 2014 scheme could be implemented. The Corporate Director also confirmed that the Council had sought to obtain comprehensive re-development of the site.

Public Participation

Four members of the public addressed Cabinet during the public participation session and their comments are summarised below.

Harvey Cole raised concerns about the amount of retail floorspace proposed under the Silver Hill scheme and suggested that the relevant Local Plan policies also required review. He believed that the amount and timetabling of retail floorspace in the Plan was not in accordance with the latest identified requirements.

The Corporate Director confirmed that the retail floorspace requirements would be kept under review and specifically, if the decision was taken to start

again with a new development for Silver Hill, the retail provision would also be reviewed.

Karen Barratt believed that there were a significant number of Winchester residents opposed to the current Silver Hill development proposals and that the Report set out an overly negative assessment of alternative options. She considered that the Council should terminate the Development Agreement with Henderson as soon as it was able to and emphasised that Henderson had previously argued that the 2009 scheme was not viable. Public perception of the Council's relationship with Henderson had been severely damaged by recent events. She also believed that in seeking to appeal the JR decision, Henderson were not acting in the best interests of Winchester.

Rose Burns argued that the law relating to procurement was not complex but was based on common sense to require public competition for large contracts, secure best value and prevent corruption. The Silver Hill Development Agreement had never been put out to public competition because the previous developers, Thornfield had signed a lock-out agreement with the Council. Mrs Burns believed that the 2009 scheme which was subject of the Development Agreement could not be relied upon because evidence had been given to the recent JR process that the scheme was not viable.

Patrick Davies expressed concern about the letter from Stagecoach and the possibility of the company deciding to close the bus station. He considered proper provision for public transport to be a vital element of any scheme and reiterated concerns expressed by Mr Cole above regarding the 2014 planning permission containing too much retail provision.

In response to questions, the Chief Executive confirmed that after 1 June, if the decision was taken to end the DA, one of the alternative options would be to undertake piecemeal development of the area. However, Cabinet noted that the Council had previously decided that a comprehensive development of the area was the preferred approach and piecemeal development risked further delays and more disruption.

Representations from non-Cabinet Members

At the invitation of the Chairman, five Councillors addressed Cabinet and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Laming stated that answers were required to a number of questions before any decision as to how to proceed could be taken:

- How could Henderson regard the 2009 scheme as viable when it had argued against this when making the 2014 amendments?
- Would it be possible for Henderson to fulfil the necessary conditions for the Development Agreement to become unconditional before 1 June 2015?
- The legal opinion regarding the chances of a successful appeal against the JR decision should have been shared with all Councillors;

- The possible timescale for “starting again” should have been prepared by a project engineer.

The Chairman noted that most of these points were already under consideration. The Chief Executive emphasised that the projected timetable prepared by BLP (Appendix 2 of the Report) was only indicative at this stage. Should a decision be taken to start again, a comprehensive timetable would be prepared.

Councillor Gottlieb believed that the Council should not take any further decisions until after the May Council elections and the results of the JR appeal and possible Secretary of State call-in were known. He emphasised that if the 2009 scheme under the Development Agreement became unconditional, the Council would lose the opportunity to look again at proposals for the area. He highlighted that Henderson had argued in 2014 that the 2009 scheme was not viable and believed that the level of changes necessary to make the 2009 scheme viable would be so significant as to be subject to successful challenge and not raise issues of the Council acting in bad faith. He considered that the Council should terminate its agreement with Henderson which he believed was a reasonable approach and the Council was legally entitled to do. Councillor Gottlieb stated that the advice received by the Council was misleading and would result in the Council heading in the wrong direction. Instead, the Council must ensure a new redevelopment contract should be offered to the open market. He disputed the length of time it would take to achieve this and believed this could be achieved within one year.

In response to questions, Councillor Gottlieb stated his opinions were based on him being a developer with over 30 years experience in this particular area. He confirmed he could provide his alternative timeframe in writing for Cabinet Members.

Councillor Tait expressed his concern about the current situation and the actions of Councillor Gottlieb and the Winchester Deserves Better campaign. He emphasised the deteriorating state of the Silver Hill area and the need for urgent action and urged Cabinet Members to be brave in taking future decisions.

Councillor Gottlieb requested that it be recorded in the minutes his disagreement with the views expressed by Councillor Tait regarding his actions.

Councillor Wright queried whether he was still a member of The Overview and Scrutiny Committee since his resignation from the Conservative Group and his position as an Independent Councillor. The Chief Operating Officer confirmed that he remained on this Committee until any decision was made to change committee membership at the next Council on 1 April 2015. Councillor Wright highlighted that Henderson had previously stated that the 2009 scheme was not viable and so it was wrong for it to be considered as viable now. He suggested that The Overview and Scrutiny Committee

exercise its powers to investigate the situation regarding decisions taken in relation to Silver Hill.

The Chief Executive responded that Paragraph 3.2 of the Report stated that, in principle it may be possible that the 2009 scheme could proceed, though this was not a proposal of the Council or its officers. Although it had been raised as a possibility by Henderson no decisions regarding this had yet been taken by either the Council or Henderson.

Councillor Learney noted the controversy surrounding Silver Hill but highlighted that in addition to objections, she had also received correspondence in support. She emphasised that in the interests of transparency the public must receive adequate information on the way forward and noted Cabinet's intention to enable this. A key concern was the viability of the 2009 scheme given Henderson's previous statements on this matter. She recognised that the Council had to act in accordance with the Development Agreement until the "long stop" date of 1 June 2015. Councillor Learney requested that a debate be held at Council as soon as possible on the option of withdrawing from the Development Agreement, including full information on the consequent risks and costs of starting again, with all information to be made available in the public domain.

Cabinet noted that the Report would also be considered by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 23 March 2015.

Cabinet agreed that there were no matters that required consideration in exempt session.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Report be noted.

7. **ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN REVIEW**
(Report CAB2655 refers)

Cabinet noted that the Appendices to the Report had not been made available for publication with the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the Appendices onto the agenda as a matter requiring urgent consideration to enable their contents to be considered alongside the Report.

In discussing the Report, Cabinet congratulated the Head of Estates and Team for the number of successful projects undertaken since he had started in post. These included Abbey Mill and Avalon House which had both been successfully re-let to the benefit of the Council and Winchester in general.

With regard to Paragraph 1.41 of the Report, the Chairman emphasised that a site fronting Bar End Road was only one of a number of options under consideration for the development of a new Leisure Centre.

With regard to the Energy Managers Report (contained as Appendix A to CAB2655), the Head of Estates confirmed that the Council always sought to use the latest energy efficiency technology available. Cabinet congratulated the Energy Manager for his report.

The Head of Estates advised that the Council had recently completed a series of public consultation events regarding options for the future of the Station Approach area. Differing views had been expressed at these events and a further report would be brought to Cabinet later in the year.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Tait addressed Cabinet and in summary thanked the Head of Estates and Team for their work in successfully managing the Council's assets. He highlighted the requirements for more affordable housing within the District. However, he questioned the usefulness of Abbey House to the Council.

In response, Councillor Read commented that the proposals for expenditure on Abbey House would enable increased use of the building.

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

RESOLVED:

That the progress in the delivery of the Asset Management Plan be noted.

8. **LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND –
DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WINCHESTER**
(Report CAB2668 refers)

Councillor Godfrey highlighted that of the 16 points made in the Council's submission on the suggested approach for devising new Ward boundaries (Appendix 1 of CL101 refers), 12 had been taken on board but 4 had not been. Cabinet might wish to consider recommending to Council that the Commission review these 4 points.

Cabinet noted that the deadline for comments to the Commission was 6 April 2015 and the Report would be considered at The Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 23 March prior to Council on 1 April 2015.

The Corporate Director advised that the Barton Farm Forum had expressed some concern about the proposal for Barton Farm to be parished and not included within the Town Wards.

One Member queried whether it was possible to suggest changes to proposed Ward names as he considered the proposed Wickham Ward did not reflect the historic importance of Southwick so should be renamed "Southwick and Wickham". The Chief Operating Officer confirmed it would be possible to suggest such name changes, although for consistency with other Ward names, "Wickham and Southwick" might be regarded as preferable.

In response to questions, the Chief Operating Officer confirmed that the proposals did not affect the current status of parish councils or parish precept charges. For example, although a separate parish ward had been created for Harestock, it remained within Littleton and Harestock Parish and would be subject to the Parish precept. It would not become part of the Town area, and therefore subject to the Town precept, unless further changes were made as a result of a future Community Governance Review by the City Council, which would involve community consultation.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Henry, Laming and Learney addressed Cabinet and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Henry spoke as a Ward Member for Colden Common and Twyford in opposition to the Commission proposals to divide the existing Ward. She emphasised the shared nature of the two communities, including doctors' surgery, churches, local charities and youth and community groups. The current Police Team structure aligned with the existing Ward. The communities faced shared challenges in terms of lack of public transport, concern regarding traffic along the B335 and issues with airplane noise. In addition, she did not believe that Twyford shared anything currently with the parishes it was suggested it be joined with and the proposed new Ward was too large, both in terms of geographical area and number of electors. Councillor Henry confirmed she would be making a submission directly to the Commission.

Councillor Laming stated that Badger Farm had grown out of Oliver's Battery and had a number of community links and the two parish councils wished to remain in the same City Council Ward. He did not consider there were any links between Badger Farm and Stanmore. If any change was required, it would be better to join with Hursley and Compton.

Councillor Learney expressed disappointment that the Commission had not adopted all 16 of the Council's stated preferences. She believed that the Council should reaffirm these principles and also address any other anomalies contained within the Commission's proposals. Councillor Learney highlighted that the Council had wanted Barton Farm to be within a Town Ward. She suggested that Barton Farm be warded within the current Headbourne Worthy Parish to ensure that in any future governance review it was easier to define boundaries and include it within the Town area. She also queried whether the Commission's proposed changed boundary in this area covered all of the proposed Barton Farm development.

Following discussion, Cabinet agreed to recommend to Council that the Commission reconsider the remaining four points not included within the current draft proposals (as set out in the recommendation below).

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE COUNCIL WELCOMES THE FACT THAT THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION TOOK ACCOUNT OF 12 OF THE POINTS MADE IN THE COUNCIL'S SUBMISSION ON THE SUGGESTED APPROACH FOR DEVISING NEW WARD BOUNDARIES (APPENDIX 1 OF CL101 REFERS).

2. THAT THE COMMISSION BE ASKED TO RECONSIDER THE REMAINING POINTS THAT HAD BEEN MADE BY THE COUNCIL AND WHICH ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE CURRENT DRAFT PROPOSALS:

- A) THE BARTON FARM DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE PART OF THE "TOWN WARDS";**
- B) EITHER DURLEY OR UPHAM PARISHES (NOT BOTH) SHOULD BE JOINED WITH BISHOPS WALTHAM TO MAKE A NEW SINGLE WARD;**
- C) THE PARISHES OF BISHOPS SUTTON, TICHBORNE, OLD ALRESFORD, BIGHTON AND ITCHEN STOKE ALL LOOK TOWARDS NEW ALRESFORD AS THEIR LOCAL COMMUNITY HUB, SO SHOULD ALL BE PLACED IN THE SAME WARD, IF AT ALL POSSIBLE (THE CURRENT DRAFT PROPOSALS EXCLUDE TICHBORNE FROM THE PROPOSED ALRESFORD & ITCHEN VALLEY WARD).**
- D) COLDEN COMMON AND TWYFORD PARISHES SHARE MANY COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS, SO SHOULD REMAIN IN THE SAME WARD.**

9. PLAY AREA REFURBISHMENT PLAN 2015-2020

(Report CAB2666(REVISED) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report had been considered at the Winchester Town Forum meeting of 11 March 2015.

In response to questions, the Corporate Director advised that, unlike parish councils, the Town Forum could not increase its precept independently of the City Council overall. It was not possible to vire Section 106 monies within the Sports fund over to be used for the purpose of play areas, unless permitted within the terms of the specific Section 106.

Members expressed concern about the potential impact of the funding shortfall on play areas within Winchester Town. It was suggested that a Report be brought back to Cabinet in six months time to enable measures to address this shortfall to be considered. This was agreed.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Capital Expenditure budget growth proposals totalling £120,000 in 2015/16 (Year 1 of the plan) be approved.
2. That authority to incur Capital Expenditure under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4 be granted.
3. That a further Report be submitted to Cabinet in six months time to enable consideration of available options to address the funding shortfall for play areas in the Winchester Town area.

10. HIGH QUALITY PLACES SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT - ADOPTION

(Report CAB2669 refers)

In response to questions, the Head of Development Management confirmed that the Council had consulted widely on the contents of the High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document. Although there was no specific section on Conservation Areas, the importance of the historic environment was emphasised at various sections of the document.

The Head of Development Management explained that the document did not refer specifically to current carbon reduction/energy efficient technology as this was constantly evolving.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Weston addressed Cabinet and in summary, thanked the Head of Development Management and Team for their work in producing the document. She also welcomed the recent Members' training event on place shaping. She emphasised that the consultation had been undertaken as part of that on Local Plan Part 2. The contents of the SPD would provide useful guidance to both City and Parish Councillors, together with planning officers, developers and the public.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the High Quality Places Supplementary Planning Document, amended as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 to the report, be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.

2. That the Head of Development Management be given delegated authority to make minor factual changes and corrections, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, prior to the publication of the document.

11. **RETAIL AND TRANSITIONAL RATE RELIEF**

(Report CAB2664 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Council awards rate relief of up to £1,500 to occupied retail properties with a rateable value of £50,000 or less in accordance with guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government from 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016.

2. That the Council awards rate relief to properties with a rateable value of £50,000 or less which are in receipt of transitional relief at 31 March 2015 and which would experience such increases in accordance with guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government in rates in 2015/16 and 2016/17 if it were not for this relief.

3. That the Scheme of Delegation to Officers (as set out in Part 3, Section 6 of the Council's Constitution) be amended to enable the award of rate relief in respect of retail and transitional properties under Section 47 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988, to be delegated to the Local Taxes Manager.

12. **WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE FORUM – REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE**

(Report CAB2667 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the revised Terms of Reference for the West of Waterlooville Forum be agreed, as attached as Appendix 1 to the Report.

13. **MINUTES OF THE CABINET (HOUSING) COMMITTEE HELD 4 FEBRUARY 2015**

(Report CAB2674 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Housing) Committee held 4 February 2015 be received (as attached as Appendix A).

14. **MINUTES OF THE CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE HELD 9 FEBRUARY 2015**
(Report CAB2671 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee held 9 February 2015 be received (as attached as Appendix B).

15. **MINUTES OF THE CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE HELD 10 FEBRUARY 2015**
(Report CAB2672 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee held 10 February 2015 be received (as attached as Appendix C).

16. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Forward Plan for April 2015, be noted.

17. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

RESOLVED:

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

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

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
##	Athelstan House) Information relating to the) financial or business affairs of) any particular person (including) the authority holding that) information). (Para 3 Schedule) 12A refers)

18. **ATHELSTAN HOUSE, WINCHESTER**
(Report CAB2663 refers)

Councillor Stallard declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of this item due to her role as a County Councillor. She considered that there might be the potential for a material conflict of interest in respect of this item and therefore left the room and took no part in the debate or decision.

Councillor Godfrey declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of this item due to his role as a County Council employee. However, as there was no material conflict of interest with his role at the County Council, he remained in the room, spoke and voted under the dispensation granted on behalf of the Standards Committee to participate and vote in all matters which might have a County Council involvement.

Councillor Humby declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in respect of this item due to his role as a County Councillor. He remained in the room, but did not speak and as he was not a Cabinet Member, took no part in the decision.

Cabinet considered the above Report which set out proposals regarding the future of Athelstan House (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 2.05pm