

**CABINET****16 September 2009****Attendance:**

Councillor Beckett -	<i>Leader and Portfolio Holder for Economy and Tourism (Chairman) (P)</i>
Councillor Allgood –	<i>Portfolio Holder for Finance and Efficiency (P)</i>
Councillor Coates –	<i>Portfolio Holder for Housing (P)</i>
Councillor Cooper –	<i>Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Communities and Safety (P)</i>
Councillor Godfrey –	<i>Portfolio Holder for Performance and Organisational Development (P)</i>
Councillor Pearson –	<i>Portfolio Holder for Environment (P)</i>
Councillor Stallard -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Heritage, Culture and Sport (P)</i>
Councillor Wood –	<i>Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access (P)</i>

**Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:**

Councillors Evans, Learney and Thompson

Mrs B White (TACT)

**Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:**

Councillor Busher

1. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 8 July 2009, less exempt items, be approved and adopted.

2. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mrs Matthews (a resident of Wickham) spoke in opposition to the proposed improvements to the High Street, Winchester and her comments are summarised under the relevant agenda item below (Report CAB1887 refers).

3. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Beckett advised that advice had recently been received from the Planning Inspector on the Council's draft Core Strategy for the Local Development Framework (LDF). This was a normal part of the process and as the Government's requirements have changed over time, experience in

assessing those LDF's already submitted has meant the Inspector could clarify the level of detail now required. Further work was necessary in some areas and a revised timetable would be considered and agreed by the next meeting of the Cabinet (LDF) Committee on 20 October 2009.

Councillor Allgood reported that the Treasury Management Informal Member/Officer Group had recently met and was reviewing the performance of the Council's investments. In addition, the external auditor's draft Annual Management Report had been received which confirmed that the Council was making proper arrangements for its use of resources.

Councillor Coates advised that a Care Commission report had awarded a good rating to the Council's sheltered housing service, with no recommendations for further improvements. Cabinet thanked the Council staff involved with sheltered housing for their work in providing this service.

4. **DISPOSAL OF VACANT COUNCIL DWELLINGS (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**

(Report [CAB1892](#) refers)

Mrs B White reiterated TACT's opposition to the Council's asset sales policy in the long term. She highlighted that the results of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) review would be published soon and the Government appeared to be moving towards both encouraging councils to build new housing and to avoid the need for void properties being sold.

The Chairman thanked Mrs White for her comments and emphasised that the Council were also awaiting the results of the HRA review with much interest.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson addressed Cabinet on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group. She stated that the Group opposed the principle of selling Council properties, especially if situated on an estate as two of these properties were (namely 122 Alresford Road, Winchester and 22 Jesty Road, New Alresford). In addition, these two properties both had three bedrooms and were consequently much in demand and it was not appropriate for them to be sold in the current economic climate, when the Council could not expect to realise the maximum capital. She highlighted that 122 Alresford Road was only twenty years old and queried how the poor state of disrepair had occurred in such a short space of time? Councillor Thompson suggested that both these properties could be advertised through the Choice Based Lettings scheme as in need of repairs and available at a lower rent. In conclusion, the Group requested that Cabinet reconsider the proposed sale of these two properties, but considered the sale of 101 Colebrook Street, Winchester was an acceptable exception.

In clarification, the Head of Landlord Services advised that 122 Alresford Road was adjacent to the Winnall estate, but not formally part of it. He confirmed that it was possible for the Council to offer properties to tenants as in need of repair. However, it was considered that this would only make the property available to applicants with sufficient funds and/or capabilities to carry out the

repairs and consequently not fairly address the housing needs of all applicants.

With regard to the queries raised about tenants failing to properly maintain properties, the Head of Landlord Services confirmed that the Council would take appropriate action when it became aware of such situations. However, there were not resources available to carry out annual inspections of all properties.

In response to questions, the Head of Landlord Services confirmed that he considered that the proposed sale of all three properties fell within the Council's agreed policy with regard to such disposals.

Councillor Coates also highlighted that the funds from such sales were urgently required to meet the shortfall in the Council's maintenance programme.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the sale of 122 Alresford Road, Winchester, 101 Colebrook Street, Winchester and 22 Jesty Road, New Alresford be approved, based on the current valuations detailed in the exempt appendix to the Report.
2. That details of the consideration obtained on sales be included in the monitoring reports submitted to Cabinet when the capital programme is reviewed.

**5. HOUSING TERM MAINTENANCE CONTRACTS**  
(Report [CAB1888](#) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney (on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group), requested that backbench Members from all parties be involved at an early stage in the tendering process. She also expressed concern that the Report made reference to standards approved by the Housing Best Value Review in 2003, which she considered to be out of date. She supported TACT's comments as set out in paragraph 3 of the Report regarding the importance of establishing clear failure criteria within the contracts. Finally, she emphasised the importance of any agreements not restricting the possible future sale of the Bar End depot.

The Chairman thanked Councillor Learney for her comments and agreed that Members could be involved through the Social Issues Scrutiny Panel reviewing the proposed heads of terms of the specification, before it was finalised. Councillor Coates pointed out that it had been possible under the current contract to remove work from a contractor and the Council had also reviewed its own internal procedures to assist in improving turnaround times.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the basis for the letting of the contracts as outlined in Appendix A of the Report and the “key dates” in the tender process shown in Appendix B of the Report be approved.

2. That a Direction be made under Contracts Procedure Rule 2.1 to approve the evaluation of tenders on the basis of 40% price: 60% quality and that the contract should be for a five year term.

3. That the Head of Landlord Services (in consultation with the Head of Legal Services and the Head of Finance) be authorised to compile a shortlist of tenderers (based on responses to the PQQ) for the two term maintenance contracts, issue invitations to tender to those companies selected, and prepare an evaluation matrix to be used to assess the two tenders.

4. That the proposed heads of terms for the contract specification be referred to the Social Issues Scrutiny Panel for comment, before it was finalised and any material changes be considered by Cabinet.

5. That a further report on the evaluation of both tenders received be submitted to Cabinet in due course and at the latest by December 2010.

6. **PRIVATE SECTOR HOUSING STRATEGY**  
(Report [CAB1883](#) refers)

Councillor Godfrey declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item due to his role as a County Council employee. He remained in the room and spoke and voted thereon.

In response to questions, the Head of Strategic Housing advised that the provision of sites for gypsies and travellers would be addressed primarily through the Local Development Framework process and targets set by the South East England Regional Assembly. He agreed this point could be clarified in the Strategy.

One Member raised a number of detailed concerns and queries regarding the Strategy, as summarised below:

- concern why risk management issues were considered to be none?
- the list of parishes on page 11 of the Strategy was incomplete.

- concern over the significant difference in the number of empty properties quoted in the Strategy and those listed as vacant under Council Tax.
- the Strategy was too lengthy and the Action Plan did not appear to be adequately linked.

The Head of Strategic Housing responded to comments made above and agreed to make such amendments to the Strategy as were considered necessary, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Private Sector Housing Strategy be adopted, subject to any revisions that may need to be agreed by the Portfolio Holder for Housing, under the Portfolio Holder Decision Making Scheme, to take account of the points made above and following any recommendations flowing from the validation of Equality Impact Assessment, the rural proofing and the sustainability assessment.

7. **CAPITAL PROGRAMME – WINCHESTER HIGH STREET IMPROVEMENTS**  
(Report [CAB1887](#) refers)

Councillors Allgood and Godfrey both declared personal (but not prejudicial) interests in this item due to their roles as a County Councillor and a County Council employee respectively. They remained in the room and spoke and voted thereon.

Mrs Matthews spoke in opposition to the proposed improvements to the High Street, Winchester and her comments are summarised below. In particular, she considered that the proposal to use high quality and high cost materials, such as York stone, was an unnecessary expense in the current economic climate. She also highlighted the poor condition of roads and pavements in rural areas which she considered should be given priority in terms of expenditure.

Mrs Matthews queried the proportion of Council expenditure within Winchester as opposed to the rural areas and suggested that Winchester town residents be required to contribute more towards such works of direct benefit to the town. She also asked what proportion of the works was being financed by the County Council.

The Chairman thanked Mrs Matthews for her comments and agreed to respond in writing to the detailed points made. On a general point, he emphasised that highway maintenance was a County Council responsibility. The City Council was making a contribution towards this particular scheme to reflect its own responsibilities for securing enhancements to take account of the historic environment.

The Chairman also emphasised the importance of Winchester as a historic city and that its relationship to tourism within the District should be recognised. In addition, a significant proportion of the funding from NNDR and taxpayers was collected from within the town itself. The Chairman also highlighted that the County Council was funding the majority of the improvement works, with the City Council contributing additional monies to ensure the works was carried out to a standard considered appropriate in such an historic city.

One Member queried whether Winchester Town Forum could be required to contribute towards the works. However, the Chairman advised that the Forum did not have capital funds available to enable this.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans spoke as a Ward Councillor for Wickham and expressed some sympathy with the views of Mrs Matthews and other residents of the rural parishes, regarding the poor condition of roads and pavements. However, she recognised that responsibility for maintaining highways rested with the County Council. Councillor Wood explained the improvements that the County Council had made to its procedures for responding to complaints about highway defects.

The Chairman emphasised that the City Council did also contribute capital funding to District wide projects.

In response to questions, the Head of Access and Infrastructure confirmed that improvements were planned for the whole of The Square, Winchester but the exact brief had not yet been completed.

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

**RECOMMENDED:**

**THAT, SUBJECT TO THE VIEWS OF PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, PROVISION BE MADE IN THE REVISED CAPITAL PROGRAMME FOR:**

**A) A CAPITAL SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE OF £100,000 FUNDED BY LABGI RESERVES, FOR THE PROVISION OF REPLACEMENT DIRECTIONAL SIGNAGE AND STREET FURNITURE AS AN ELEMENT OF THE HIGH STREET IMPROVEMENT WORKS; AND**

**B) A SUPPLEMENTARY CAPITAL SUM NOT TO EXCEED £150,000 FUNDED BY LABGI RESERVES, FOR IMPROVEMENT WORKS TO THE SQUARE, WINCHESTER AS A CONTINUATION OF THE HIGH STREET IMPROVEMENTS.**

## RESOLVED:

1. That authority be given to incur capital expenditure under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4 of £500,000 towards the total £2.2m cost of the High Street improvement works agreed with the County Council (to be released in staged payments to be determined by the Corporate Director (Operations));

2. That subject to the views of Principal Scrutiny Committee, and the matter being considered under its rights of call-in, a capital supplementary estimate of £100,000 be approved, funded by LABGI reserves, for the provision of replacement directional signage and street furniture as an element of the High Street improvement works and, subject to the approval of Council, to its inclusion in the revised capital programme, and authority be given to incur this expenditure under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4 as and when required, as part of the County Council's contract for the High Street improvements or by way of direct payments (which will be in accordance with the Council's relevant Financial Regulations).

3. That, subject to the approval of Council to its inclusion in the capital programme, a supplementary capital sum not to exceed £150,000, based on a contribution of no more than 20% of the total cost of improvement works to The Square in Winchester as a continuation of the High Street improvements be approved, subject to detailed design work, financial appraisal and the commitment of funds by the County Council, funded by LABGI reserves.

8. **GUILDHALL BAPSY BEQUEST ESSENTIAL REPAIRS AND REFURBISHMENT (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**

(Report [CAB1871](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that this Report was not notified for inclusion within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept this item onto the agenda, as an item requiring urgent consideration, in order that the matter could be discussed prior to its consideration by both Principal Scrutiny Committee on 21 September 2009 and Special Council on 1 October 2009.

In introducing the Report, Councillor Allgood advised that the consultant's report had found works required with a cost totalling approximately £5 million. However, it was considered that to carry out only the essential elements of the work would cost £3.198 million.

The Head of Estates responded to questions regarding the proposed improvements to the energy efficiency of the building. He also confirmed that the proposed improvement works were required in order to maintain the competitiveness of the Guildhall as a desirable conference venue.

In response to questions, the Chairman stated that he considered the proposed expenditure to be an investment for the future viability of the

Guildhall and, as such, it was not reasonable to expect future increased revenue from improved bookings to fully recompense the capital funding allocated.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans advised that the Liberal Democrat Group did support the principle of the refurbishment proposals. However, she expressed some concerns that the proposals did not fully recognise the importance of the Bapsy Bequest and requested that measures be taken to ensure that its significance was acknowledged.

The Corporate Director (Governance) advised that Paragraph 10.4 of the Report, together with additional details set out in previous Cabinet reports, gave details of the terms of the Bapsy Bequest. In addition, the figure contained within the Exempt Appendix C to the Report gave an additional breakdown of expected costs and indicated those elements that were being funded from the Bequest. He did not consider it appropriate to give a further breakdown of likely costs in open session in advance of the tendering process. However, the total costs shown for the Bapsy elements in the Exempt Appendix C totalled £1.505m – compared to £1.422m available from the Bequest. The Bapsy elements related to the improvement of the King Alfred Hall and its access arrangements. The Corporate Director confirmed that the Hall would be renamed in memory of the Bapsy Marchioness of Winchester and an exhibition case would be provided to recognise her generosity.

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

**RECOMMENDED:**

**THAT SUBJECT TO THE VIEWS OF PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE:**

**1. THE PROPOSALS FOR THE REFURBISHMENT AND ALTERATION OF THE GUILDHALL DESCRIBED IN THE REPORT BE AGREED AND THE INDICATIVE BUDGET COST OF £3.198 MILLION BE APPROVED.**

**2. A SUPPLEMENTARY CAPITAL ESTIMATE OF £1.884 MILLION BE APPROVED IN ADDITION TO £64,000 OF GUILDHALL WORKS ALREADY IN THE PROGRAMME IN 2009/10, TO ENABLE THE ADDITIONAL MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT WORKS TO BE UNDERTAKEN TO THE GUILDHALL AT THE SAME TIME AS THE BAPSY SCHEME IS IMPLEMENTED UTILISING THE BAPSY BEQUEST IN FULL, TOGETHER WITH ACCUMULATED INTEREST, ASSUMED AT £1.422 MILLION OF WHICH £1.250 MILLION IS CURRENTLY INCLUDED IN THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME.**



**3. THAT THE ASSOCIATED REVENUE CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSALS (OF UP TO £300,000 RELATING TO LOST INCOME DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PERIOD IN 2010/11) BE APPROVED AS A SUPPLEMENTARY REVENUE ESTIMATE IN ACCORDANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7.10 OF THE FINANCIAL REGULATIONS, TO BE FUNDED FROM THE MAJOR INVESTMENT RESERVE.**

RESOLVED:

1. That a programme be agreed with the project managers for keeping the Guildhall open as far as is practical during the construction works so as to minimise disruption to users.

2. That the Head of Estates be authorised to submit planning and other applications for works to be undertaken to the Guildhall requiring statutory consent.

3. That a direction be made under Contract Procedure Rule 3.3(a) to authorise the Head of Estates to appoint the Project Managers, Architects, Structural and Mechanical & Electrical Engineers outlined in paragraph 1.3 of the report to develop the project to enable Planning and Listed Building applications to be submitted to enable a project commencement date of January 2010 to be achieved, if the Council approves the project at its meeting on 1 October 2009.

4. That a budget of £75,000 be approved under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4 (release of capital expenditure) to enable the statutory applications to be developed and submitted following the meeting of Cabinet on 16 September and in advance of the Council meeting on 1 October 2009.

5. That subject to the Council approving the project at its meeting on 1 October 2009:

- a) a direction be made under Contract procedure rule 3.3(a) to authorise the Head of Estates to appoint the Project Managers, Architects Structural Engineers and Mechanical & Electrical Engineers outlined in paragraph 1.3 of the Report to undertake the main construction project
- b) authority be given under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4 to incur the capital expenditure for the scheme up to the amount included in the Capital Programme approved by the Council
- c) the Head of Estates be authorised to accept the tenders received for the works in accordance with the Contract Procedure Rules, following their assessment by the Quantity Surveyors and subject to their ability to undertake the works within the required timescale.

9. **CAPITAL STRATEGY AND PROGRAMME 2009/10 – 2012/13**  
(Report [CAB1886](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that this Report was not notified for inclusion within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept this item onto the agenda, as an item requiring urgent consideration, in order that the matter could be discussed prior to its consideration by both Principal Scrutiny Committee on 21 September 2009 and Special Council on 1 October 2009.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney expressed concern (on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group) about the late availability of the Report, which made it difficult for both other Councillors and members of the public to consider it prior to the meeting. She also expressed concern about the high levels of capital expenditure proposed and its significant effect on the Council's reserves. She considered there was an additional risk that the anticipated receipts from capital sales would not be received prior to the funding being committed. Councillor Learney advised that she supported invest to save initiatives and did not fundamentally object to the principle of prudential borrowing. In addition, she was satisfied regarding the plans for the proposed expenditure on the Guildhall. However, whilst welcoming the overall intention behind the High Street improvements, she queried whether it was appropriate timing to seek a further supplementary estimate for the proposals in The Square in the current financial climate. In conclusion, she requested that Cabinet seriously reconsider its existing plans and their viability.

In response, the Chairman referred Councillor Learney to the points made in debate about the High Street improvements outlined above. He also highlighted that Cabinet had previously been criticised for not seeking to fully utilise its capital reserves. Councillor Beckett emphasised that in addition to proposed sales, there may be other alternative means of achieving future capital receipts. He did not consider it an appropriate time for the Council to seek to realise some of its previously agreed disposals of commercial properties in the current economic climate. He noted comments made about borrowing and advised that this matter would be considered at a future Cabinet and referred to Council for decision.

Cabinet thanked the Head of Finance for her work in preparation of the Report.

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

**RECOMMENDED:**

**THAT, SUBJECT TO THE VIEWS OF PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE,**

- 1. THE CAPITAL STRATEGY FOR 2009 BE APPROVED.**

**2. THE REVISED CAPITAL PROGRAMME FOR 2009/10 TO 2012/13 BE APPROVED (NB. INDIVIDUAL SCHEMES WITHIN THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME EACH REQUIRE APPROPRIATE APPROVAL BY CABINET OR PORTFOLIO HOLDERS, IN ACCORDANCE WITH FINANCIAL PROCEDURE RULES BEFORE ANY FUNDS ARE COMMITTED).**

10. **MEMBERSHIP OF THE FUTURE SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY: A CONSULTATION BY THE DEPARTMENT FOR ENVIRONMENT, FOOD AND RURAL AFFAIRS (DEFRA)**  
(Report [CAB1874](#) refers)

Councillor Godfrey declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item due to his role as a County Council employee. He remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

The Corporate Director (Policy) advised that informal discussions were continuing between the relevant local authorities and it was anticipated a further update would be available following the meeting of Portfolio Holders to be held the following week.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the comments a-d below be endorsed as the Council's response to the consultation on membership of the future South Downs National Park Authority:
  - a) Given the extensive size, diversity and complexity of the South Downs National Park area, combined with the representational needs of the Park's communities, parishes, local authorities and national stakeholders, the City Council expresses a clear preference for the establishment of a Park Authority of the maximum, 37-member size.
  - b) As from the 'Maximum' Option, Table 2, paragraph 5.3 of this report
  - c) As from the 'Maximum' Option, Table 2, paragraph 5.3 of this report.
  - d) The City Council does not wish to be excluded from the list of Councils appointing to the National Park Authority.
2. That the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access be given delegated authority to negotiate on the Council's behalf, to promote the above views and to modify them if necessary to achieve a collective view with other authorities.

11. **TREASURY MANAGEMENT STEWARDSHIP REPORT FOR 2008/09**  
(Report [CAB1890](#) refers)

Councillor Beckett confirmed that the Treasury Management Informal Member/Officer Group would be giving consideration to the potential to invest in UK building societies, as was being promoted in recent press reports.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That the Treasury Management Stewardship Report for 2008/09 and the Actual 2008/09 Prudential Indicators be approved, as outlined at Appendix A to the Report.

12. **PERFORMANCE REPORT 2008/09**  
(Report [CAB1860](#) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney welcomed that the 'Place Survey' had indicated that the majority of residents considered the Winchester District to be a good place to live. However, she queried what actions Cabinet would take to address the areas where the survey found a lower satisfaction with performance, for example with refuse collection and recycling. In addition, she believed that information contained within the majority of the Report was of little significance to the Council.

Councillor Pearson responded that that the reasons for the lower level of satisfaction with the Council's refuse/recycling collection arrangements and performance would be investigated further, but was probably due in part to residents' initial reactions to the fortnightly collection routine. He confirmed that the possibility of kerbside glass collection and collection of organic kitchen waste would be considered at an appropriate future date.

Cabinet also noted that in 18 out of the 32 questions asked as part of the Place Survey, the Council had been rated as being in the best 25% of all local authorities.

Councillor Godfrey advised that relevant sections of the Report would be reported to Scrutiny Panels for their consideration.

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

**RECOMMENDED:**

**THAT, SUBJECT TO THE VIEWS OF PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE, THE PERFORMANCE REPORT 2008/09 BE APPROVED.**

RESOLVED:

That the Chief Executive be authorised to complete and refine the text of the document, in consultation with the Leader, for recommendation to Council.

13. **SUPPORT FOR WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL CHRISTMAS EVENTS**  
(Report [CAB1885](#) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the views of Principal Scrutiny Committee, Cabinet approves a grant of £7,500 to be funded from Local Authority Business Growth Incentive (LABGI) reserves already identified in support of recession measures, to assist the development of Winchester Cathedral's Christmas events in 2009.

14. **TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP OF THE MODEL OF HMS CONSTANTINE**  
(Report [CAB1882](#) refers)

Councillor Stallard advised that, if sold, the model would have to be offered to a public body to comply with the Council's collections policy. At the time of writing, Southampton Museums Service had been approached, but had not shown any interest in buying the model. She confirmed that the display of the model at the National Maritime Museum would include a plaque stating it had been donated by the Council.

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

RESOLVED:

That the transfer of ownership of the model of the HMS Constantine as a gift to the National Maritime Museum be approved, with immediate effect.

15. **GRANT FOR WINCHESTER EXCAVATIONS COMMITTEE**  
(Report [CAB1895](#) refers)

Whilst expressing support for work of such an historic nature, one Member expressed concern about the length of time before "The Winchester Studies" were completed. He also believed that the grant could be funded from within the Economic and Cultural Services budget.

In response, the Chairman advised that he considered it appropriate for the funding to be met from Local Authority Business Growth (LABGI) reserves.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans advised that she had been a member of the Excavations Committee for the previous eight years and supported the proposed grant. She confirmed that the requirement to work towards completion of the Studies within a short timescale was understood by the Committee and it was anticipated that this grant would enable this.

In response to questions about work to increase accessibility to information from the finished detailed academic publications, the Head of Economic and Cultural Services confirmed that it was still intended to produce concise guides for the public as resources permitted in the future.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That in accordance with Financial Procedure Rule 7.3, a supplementary revenue estimate be approved, for the provision of a grant funded from unallocated Local Authority Business Growth Incentive (LABGI) reserves of £15,000, spread over the two financial years (2009/10 and 2010/11), to support the continued progress of the Winchester Excavations Committee, subject to match funding being secured by the Committee from other sources.

16. **CCTV CONTROL ROOM RELOCATION AND SYSTEM UPGRADE TENDERS (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**  
(Report [CAB1893](#) refers)

Councillor Cooper advised that the tendering process had indicated potential savings of approximately £68,000. Delaying the relocation to 2010 would require a repeat of the tendering process which would incur more costs. He was therefore recommending that the relocation of the CCTV control room proceed without delay.

In response to questions, the Corporate Director (Operations) and Chief Executive clarified that Paragraph 2.4 of the Report confirmed that Thornfield had agreed within the Section 106 agreement for Silver Hill to reimburse the Council expenditure up to a maximum of £300,000 on the preparatory works at Basepoint. However, the works which were already underway were only expected to cost around £10,000.

The Corporate Director (Operations) explained that the new system would, in principle, enable connection with the CCTV in Bishops Waltham or other similar locations although this was not part of the project proposal.

One Member expressed some concern about the impact of the new IT system and the calculated levels of savings outlined in the exempt Appendix to the Report. He also queried the impact of the recent award of the HPSN2 contract by the County Council and whether this would enable further savings to be made, for example through broadband connections rather than by dedicated

cable links. The Corporate Director (Operations) confirmed that further investigations into the figures quoted would be undertaken and that as it was proposed to use an internet protocol based software system it was intended to make use of HPSN2 when this became available. Following further discussion on this matter, Cabinet agreed to the recommendations as set out, subject to consideration of the information contained within the exempt appendix.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney raised a number of concerns on behalf of Councillor Collin who was unable to attend the meeting. He had reiterated his request that the Council reconsider the possibility of relocating the CCTV control room with the new Fire Service premises in Winnall. He had outlined the advantages of this approach and believed that the delays in the Silver Hill development removed the timing difficulties.

The Head of Access and Infrastructure confirmed that Councillor Collin's suggestion had been considered when originally raised, about a year ago. It had been decided that it was not feasible considering the different timescales being worked to by the Council and the Fire Service. In addition, he confirmed that preliminary works on the relocation of the CCTV control room to Basepoint had already commenced.

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

**RESOLVED:**

That subject to further consideration of the information contained within the exempt appendix to the Report:

1. the relocation of the CCTV control room proceed in 2009/10.
2. expenditure of up to £550,000 from the existing provision in the capital programme be authorised under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4 (authority to release capital expenditure) for the CCTV control room relocation and system upgrade.
3. the Corporate Director (Operations) in consultation with the Head of Legal Services and the Portfolio Holder for Communities and Safety be given delegated authority to appoint a contractor to undertake the relocation and upgrade works subject to the resolution to his satisfaction of issues as set out in Appendix 2 to this report.
4. that the revised timetable for the relocation and upgrade of the CCTV control room and system be noted.

17. **PARKING OFFICE SATURDAY OPENING**  
(Report [CAB1884](#) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney expressed disappointment that rather than reducing the Parking Office opening hours, the

opportunity should have been taken to consider opening the Council's main reception on Saturday mornings. She emphasised that the new Choice Based Lettings procedures required applicants to regularly access the internet and this was a service they could reach at the Council. She also highlighted that more people visited the Parking Office on Saturday mornings than visited the Council's Area Offices (Local Access Points).

In response, the Chief Executive confirmed that further consideration would be given to the possibility of extending the Council's opening hours to include Saturday mornings. He would submit a Report outlining more detailed costings to a future Cabinet meeting. However, this would not affect the timescale of the current proposal.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Parking Office does not open on Saturday morning following the move to the City Offices planned for completion on 5 October 2009.

18. **HAMPSHIRE HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

(Report [CAB1891](#) refers)

Councillor Godfrey declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item due to his role as a County Council employee. He remained in the room and voted thereon.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Head of Partnerships, Communications and Improvement be authorised to respond to the consultation along the lines set out in Section 4 of the Report.

19. **PROPOSED TIMETABLE OF MEETINGS 2010/11**

(Report [CAB1878](#) refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans questioned why meetings had to be held on the same day of the week, as this caused problems for Members who might also have to attend a Parish Council meeting on the same day. In particular, she mentioned her own difficulties attending Principal Scrutiny Committee which normally met on a Monday, as Wickham Parish Council always met on the third Monday of each month.

In response, the Chairman highlighted that there were 43 parishes within the District, so it was impossible to avoid potential clashes with all of their



meetings. In addition, the Corporate Director (Governance) advised that Council meetings were timetabled to fit in with the Council cycle. Cabinet also commented that many Councillors preferred to have meetings on the same day of the week, in order that they could make plans appropriately.

Cabinet welcomed the reinstatement of the September Council date as a provisional date to be used if required.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Timetable of Meetings for the 2010/11 Municipal Year be agreed, as set out in the Appendix to the Report.

20. **REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES**

(Report [CAB1877](#) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the following appointment be made (term of office in brackets):

Streetreach (formerly Winchester Detached Youth Work Project) –  
Councillor Love (until 30 September 2010)

21. **MINUTES OF THE SOCIAL ISSUES SCRUTINY PANEL HELD 16 JULY 2009**

(Report [CAB1876](#) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the recommendations of the Panel regarding the establishment of an Informal Scrutiny Group to consider Elderly People's Issues be endorsed.

2. That the recommendations of the Panel regarding the Final Report of the Youth Facilities Informal Scrutiny Group (Report SO92 refers) be supported.

3. That the remaining minutes of the Social Scrutiny Panel held 6 July 2009 be received.

22. **MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY PANEL HELD 20 JULY 2009**

(Report [CAB1875](#) refers)

With regard to the recommendations of the Public Convenience Provision Informal Scrutiny Group, Councillor Pearson advised that numbers 7 and 13 were not possible in the current financial climate. Recommendation 1 had already been implemented as Tower Street Public Conveniences had been closed. It was agreed that he would give further consideration and respond as appropriate under the Portfolio Holder decision making process to the remaining recommendations outlined in Report EN87.

With regard to the Panel's proposals to establish Informal Scrutiny Groups, the Corporate Director (Governance) clarified that the approval of either Cabinet or Principal Scrutiny Committee was required. In addition, it was open to Cabinet to make comments to the Panel regarding the timing of such groups and other such matters.

Councillor Pearson highlighted that a large number of scrutiny groups had already been held to consider matters within the Environment Division and emphasised the significant amount of officer time required to resource these.

Following discussion, Cabinet endorsed the proposal for a Tree Strategy Informal Scrutiny Group, subject to concerns being raised about adequate officer time being available.

With regard to the proposed establishment of a CCTV Informal Scrutiny Group after the Tree Strategy work had concluded, Cabinet requested that the Panel be reminded of potential timing difficulties, with regard to the proposed relocation of the CCTV control room (CAB1893 refers).

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the recommendations of the Panel regarding the Final Report of the Public Conveniences Informal Scrutiny Group (Report EN87 refers) be referred to the Portfolio Holder for Environment for further consideration under the Portfolio Holder decision making process, subject to comments outlined above.
2. That the recommendations of the Panel regarding the establishment of an Informal Scrutiny Group to consider the Council's Tree Strategy be endorsed, subject to comments outlined above regarding officer time.
3. That the Panel be requested to have regard to potential timing issues regarding its proposal to establish of Informal Scrutiny Group to consider CCTV issues, having regard to issues outlined in Report CAB1893.

4. That the remaining minutes of the Environment Scrutiny Panel held 20 July 2009 be received.

23. **MINUTES OF THE LOCAL ECONOMY SCRUTINY PANEL HELD 21 JULY 2009**

(Report [CAB1880](#) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Local Economy Scrutiny Panel held 21 July 2009 be received.

24. **MINUTES OF THE RESOURCES SCRUTINY PANEL HELD 22 JULY 2009**

(Report [CAB1879](#) refers)

Cabinet expressed concern about the Panel's proposal to establish an Informal Scrutiny Group to consider the Guildhall at the current time, having regard to the proposals outlined in Report CAB1871 above.

Councillor Allgood proposed that, instead, an Informal Member/Officer Group comprising representatives from each political group, meet with him to consider current issues arising following approval of the proposed refurbishment of the Guildhall and review of the Guildhall Catering contract. This approach was agreed.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the recommendations of the Panel regarding the establishment of an Informal Scrutiny Group to consider the Guildhall not be endorsed and, alternatively, an informal Member Officer Group led by the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Efficiency be established, as suggested above.

2. That the remaining minutes of the Resources Scrutiny Panel held 22 July 2009 be received.

25. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Forward Plan for September 2009, be noted.

26. **DECISIONS TAKEN BY PORTFOLIO HOLDERS UNDER THEIR DELEGATED POWERS**

RESOLVED:

That the decisions taken by Portfolio Holders under their delegated powers since the last Cabinet meeting, as set out on the agenda sheet, be noted.

27. **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>	
##	Exempt minutes of the previous meeting	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). (Para 3 Schedule 12A refers)	
##	Guildhall Bapsy Bequest		
	Essential Repairs & Maintenance – Appendix C		
##	Sale of Vacant HRA Dwellings – Appendix		
##	Tender Report –		
##	Contracts for Heating Systems Upgrade & Associated Works		
##	Grant for Theatre Royal, Winchester		
##	Decision under Section A.2 of the Scheme of Delegation to Officers		
##	Exempt minutes of the previous meeting		Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings. (Para 5 Schedule 12A refers)
##	Guildhall Bapsy Bequest		
	Essential Repairs & Maintenance - Appendix C		

28. **EXEMPT MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minutes of the previous meeting, held on 8 July 2009 be approved and adopted.

29. **GUILDHALL – BAPSY BEQUEST ESSENTIAL REPAIRS AND REFURBISHMENT – EXEMPT APPENDIX C**

(Report CAB1871 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the information contained within the exempt Appendix of the Report outlined estimated project costs and Bapsy costs assessment, be noted.

30. **SALE OF VACANT HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT DWELLINGS – EXEMPT APPENDIX**

(Report CAB1892 refers)

Cabinet considered the property valuations contained in the exempt appendix (detail in exempt minute).

31. **TENDER REPORT – CONTRACTS FOR HEATING SYSTEMS UPGRADE AND ASSOCIATED WORKS**

(Report CAB1889 refers)

Cabinet considered the above Report which set out proposals regarding the contracts for heating systems upgrade and associated work in the Council's Housing stock.

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

RESOLVED:

That Framework Contracts for the provision of heating systems upgrade works for the period 1 October 2009 to 30 September 2010 be awarded to the three contractors specified in Paragraph 3.1 of the Report, on terms as set out in Paragraph 3.4.

32. **GRANT FOR THEATRE ROYAL, WINCHESTER**

(Report CAB1872 refers)

Councillor Godfrey declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item due to his role as a County Council employee. Councillor Allgood declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item as he

was an Observer on the board of the Theatre Royal through his role as a County Councillor. Councillor Stallard declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item as she was an Observer on the Theatre Board and also a member of the Arts Council England, South East. All three Councillors remained in the room, spoke and voted.

Cabinet considered the above Report which set out proposals regarding a grant for the Theatre Royal, Winchester (detail in exempt minute).

33. **CCTV CONTROL ROOM RELOCATION AND SYSTEM UPGRADE TENDERS – EXEMPT APPENDIX**

(Report CAB1893 refers)

Cabinet considered the tender details and financial appraisals as contained in the exempt Appendix to the Report.

The Head of Access and Infrastructure gave further clarification of the information contained within the Appendix, in response to queries raised by Members.

RESOLVED:

1. That the recommendations outlined in the minute above be agreed.
2. That the information contained within exempt Appendix 2 of the Report be noted.

34. **GUILDHALL CATERING CONTRACT UPDATE**

(Report CAB1894 refers)

Cabinet noted that this Report was not available for this meeting and would now be considered at its next meeting on 14 October 2009.

35. **DECISION UNDER SECTION A.2 OF THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION TO OFFICERS – DISPOSAL OF HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) LAND AT WILLIS WAYE, KINGS WORTHY, WINCHESTER**

(Report CAB1881 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the decision made under Section A.2 of the Scheme of Delegation to Officers, as detailed in the Appendix to the Report, be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.00am and concluded at 2.00pm.

Chairman