

WINCHESTER TOWN FORUM

12 March 2014

Attendance:

Councillors:

Hutchison (Chairman) (P)

E Berry

J Berry (P)

Collin (P)

Green (P)

Hiscock (P)

Mather (P)

Maynard (P)

Nelmes

Pearce

Pines (P)

Prowse (P)

Sanders (P)

Scott (P)

Tait (P)

Tod (P)

Weir (P)

Witt (P)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillor Gottlieb

1. **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE MEETING**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Prowse be appointed Vice-Chairman for the meeting.

2. **DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS**

Councillors Mather and Tod declared disclosable pecuniary interests due to their roles as Hampshire County Councillors. However, 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.

3. **MINUTES**

One Member stated that he had sought assurances regarding Winchester centre's preparedness for the risk of flooding at the last meeting and had received a response from the Corporate Director. However, this was not included in the minute. Although this discussion had taken place at the end of the meeting and was not on the agenda. However, the Chairman agreed to note the exchange.

In response to a query from a Member, it was agreed that the minute regarding the King George V Pavilion (Report WTF198 refers) be amended to clarify the intention as follows (additional wording in italics):

“One Member suggested that when the King George V Pavilion was replaced, the possibility of including a plaque *naming the pavilion* in honour of Terry Paine be investigated ...”

A Member expressed concern about the number of oral reports on the agenda for Town Forum meetings. The Chairman highlighted that Officers had been busy dealing with the recent flooding issues, however he would aim to ensure written reports were provided as far as possible in the future.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the above amendments, the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 22 January 2014, be approved and adopted.

4. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr M Carden (2020 Group), Mrs J Martin (City of Winchester Trust), Mr D Jones (Winchester Litter Pickers Group) and Mrs K Barratt spoke during public participation and their comments are summarised below.

Mr Carden spoke on behalf of the 2020 Group (City of Winchester Trust and WinACC). In summary, the 2020 Group believed that there was a need for a more joined up approach to be taken as to how Winchester Town should be developed, rather than what he considered to be the current piecemeal approach. The Vision for Winchester document should be used as the basis for the development of a practical document to guide the process of change. This should become an element of the Local Plan to answer questions such as what type of development should be situated in which areas. The document should include a clear “check list” of criteria developed from the Vision’s ten principles. Mr Carden stated that if the Forum wished, the 2020 Group could provide a possible framework for such a document to the next Forum meeting, or informally prior to this.

A number of Members supported this approach and requested that if possible, this be fed into Local Plan Part 2. However, the Assistant Director (Built Environment) explained that the time constraints involved in developing Local Plan Part 2, and the requirement that anything in Local Plan Part 2 must comply with Local Plan Part 1, might make this practically difficult or not possible to achieve. The Chairman agreed to investigate the possibility further outside of the meeting. He suggested an early meeting between members of the Vision for Winchester Group and representatives of the 2020 Group.

Mrs J Martin (City of Winchester Trust) spoke regarding the Trust’s proposals to seek the introduction of “Local Listing” for buildings of significance within

the Town area (which were not otherwise listed). She explained that the Trust were asking the public to put forward suggestions for inclusion which, if considered appropriate by the Trust, would be passed onto the Council.

In response to questions, the Assistant Director (Built Environment) explained that as part of Local Plan Part 2 the Council were intending to develop a Local List for the whole District and were already working with the Trust. Inclusion on such a list did not add statutory protection to individual properties, but could be regarded as a material consideration when determining planning applications for example. Officers are intending to begin the List in Winchester and then roll it out across the District which will take time to do.

Members requested that a report be submitted to a future meeting on the subject of Local Listing, with particular reference to support for the City of Winchester Trust.

Mr Jones (Winchester Litter Pickers Group) thanked the Forum for its support at the previous meeting to providing new bins in 12 locations recommended by the Group. Mr Jones stated that due to a donation from a member of the Group, the Group were offering to sponsor six of the black and gold style bins at six specific sites (of the 12 locations requested). The Group were offering funding of up to £2,000 to enable this and requested that the relevant bins include a plaque acknowledging this.

The Chairman welcomed this suggestion and thanked the Litter Pickers Group for their donation and their ongoing work in clearing litter.

Mrs Barratt expressed concern regarding recent press reports that the revised Silver Hill development would no longer include a bus station. She believed such a facility was vital for bus users, particularly the elderly or those with young children and those connecting ongoing buses out of Winchester. This was because it provided a central point for information (as well as offering facilities such as public toilets and shelter from bad weather). She requested that proper consultation be undertaken with bus users before such a change was agreed.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Barratt for her comments which would be addressed in the agenda item regarding Silver Hill below.

5. **SILVER HILL UPDATE**
(Oral Report)

The Corporate Director advised that Hendersons were in the process of putting together an update on the Silver Hill scheme. It was intended there would be a public exhibition of the updated scheme on 27 and 28 March 2014, with an all Member briefing arranged for 26 March 2014. Following this, a Cabinet meeting in June/July 2014 would consider the requirement for the Council's consent as landowner. A revised planning application was therefore likely in September/October 2014 and if permitted Henderson would be looking to start work as soon as possible thereafter.

The Corporate Director advised that Stagecoach owned the current bus station, not the Council. The original planning application for Silver Hill included a bus station, but Stagecoach had since indicated that it did not require one. He emphasised that it would not be in the Council's interest to insist on provision of a bus station if the bus company would not make use of it. However, the revised proposals would include facilities for bus users, such as co-location of bus stops.

In response to questions, the Corporate Director confirmed that there would be opportunity for Member and public comments on the revised proposals under the usual procedures.

RESOLVED:

That the update be noted.

6. **WINCHESTER TOWN EVENING BUS SERVICE**
(Report WTF201 refers)

During discussion of the Report and the passenger numbers contained in Appendix B, a number of Members commented that there had been a lack of advertisement of the service. The Chairman stated that he had contacted relevant parish councils, the University and the Street Pastors who had said that they would advertise the availability of the buses. He acknowledged a possible issue that the timing of the buses could be better tied in with train times.

The Assistant Director (Built Environment) suggested that the Forum award delegated authority to him, in consultation with the Chairman, to make any minor adjustments to the timetable, in order that these could be taken into account by the County Council before the service went out to tender. Given the time constraints and need (if proceeded with) to provide continuity of service it would not be feasible to undertake a complete review of the service.

Some Members commented that subsidising bus services was a County Council responsibility, not a City Council one. In addition, it was noted that the service only operated in a limited area of the town and referred to passenger feedback about the service and its route. However, other Members believed that further consideration should be given to continuing the service, depending on the results of the tender process. It was agreed that the County Council be authorised to tender the service for a period of two, rather than three years and for the matter to be given further consideration at the next meeting in June when a decision would be made.

RESOLVED:

1. That having regard to the operation of the service to date in terms of the number of passengers using the Winchester Night Bus,

in principle support be given to the continuation of the service after September 2014 when the current contract expires.

2. That Hampshire County Council be authorised to tender the service for a period of 2 years based upon the service provided for by the current contract, subject to any minor adjustments to the timetable to be agreed by the Assistant Director (Built Environment), in consultation with the Chairman.

7. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) – DEVELOPMENT OF REGULATION 123 LIST**
(Oral Report)

The Head of Strategic Planning drew Members' attention to CAB2569, which would be considered by Cabinet on 19 March 2014. The Report was seeking approval for the Council's Regulation 123 list which described the range of infrastructure projects which the Council intended would or might be funded from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It also recommended an instalments policy for CIL payments and suggested a mechanism for the distribution of funds collected from CIL and sought Cabinet approval for this. As part of the process of collecting CIL funds, it is also proposed that the Council seek surcharges where appropriate, in line with the CIL regulations.

In Recommendation 5 (iii), the Report proposed the following:

“That income received from CIL be appropriated as follows: 15% of CIL from qualifying development to the Winchester Town Account for expenditure on infrastructure projects in the Winchester Town area which are consistent with the Council's Regulation 123 list.”

Some Members noted that it was proposed that parish councils be entitled to 25% of CIL where a neighbourhood plan was approved. The Corporate Director clarified that the Town area did not have any neighbourhood plans currently and it was not anticipated there would be any in the future. A number of Members commented that although it did not have a neighbourhood plan, there were other equivalent documents in place, such as the Vision for Winchester. In addition, the Town area had a special status as it provided a number of facilities which were used by the wider District. Consequentially, Members believed that Cabinet be requested to award the Town Account 25% of CIL, rather than the 15% proposed.

Other Members considered that, as the Forum did not have the same powers to spend such monies as Parish Councils did, it was not appropriate to increase the percentage awarded as suggested. The Corporate Director confirmed that the annual budget and capital programme would require Cabinet approval. However, following debate the majority of Members present agreed that Cabinet be requested to increase the percentage of CIL awarded to the Town Account from 15% to 25%. The Chairman agreed to pass on the Forum's comments to Cabinet.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet be requested to agree that 25% of CIL from qualifying development be appropriated to the Winchester Town Account for expenditure on infrastructure projects in the Winchester Town area which are consistent with the Council's Regulation 123 list.

8. **LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - UPDATE ON WINCHESTER CONSULTATION MEETINGS**
(Oral Report)

The Chairman requested that Members provide a brief update on the consultation meetings held within their Ward.

In summary, Members reported mixed levels of attendance and response to the meetings held. Some meetings had been well attended and Members believed that they were a useful exercise in generating debate on Local Plan Part 2. A number of concerns had been raised by attendees about the requirement for improvements to the infrastructure to address the increased demands caused by new housing developments. However, some Members believed that the meetings had not raised any new issues or engaged with different groups of people.

The Corporate Director advised that officers had welcomed the consultation process as a worthwhile exercise. The consultation process would run until the beginning of April and an information report summarising responses would be brought to the meeting of the Town Forum in June 2014.

One Member commented that in the future, different ways of consulting should be considered in order to include the wider community, including young people. The Chairman agreed that this suggestion could be considered further at the June meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the update be noted.

9. **UPDATE ON WINCHESTER TOWN ACCESS PLAN, 20MPH SPEED LIMITS AND WALKING STRATEGY**
(Oral Report)

The Chairman stated that he and four other Town Forum Members were on the Walking Strategy Group and good progress had been made on the Draft Strategy. A report would be submitted to a future Town Forum.

With regard to 20mph speed limits, the Corporate Director advised that the closing date for comments was 19 February 2014. There had been 37 representations: 14 objections; 22 support and one neutral. A report would be

submitted to Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee on 29 April 2014 and, if agreed, the order would be in place in August 2014.

Members generally supported the proposals for introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Winchester, although some Members commented that the speed limit should be introduced across all Town Wards, as currently there were some gaps. In addition, the possibility of introducing shared use areas and gateways into the town should be examined further.

RESOLVED:

That the update be noted.

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm and concluded at 9.00pm.

Chairman