

CABINET

3 February 2010

Attendance:

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

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Busher, Collin, Thompson and Learney
Mr A Rickman (TACT)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Barratt, Bell, Higgins, Humby and Tait
Mrs B Cole (TACT)

1. MEMBERSHIP OF CABINET COMMITTEES

At Cabinet on 9 December 2009, it was agreed that the Council's membership on the North Whiteley Development Forum be as follows: Councillors Anthony (Chairman), Achwal, Allgood, Busher and Ruffell (deputy Councillor Cooper). Subsequently, Councillor Allgood was appointed as one of the two County Councillor representatives on the Forum. Cabinet was therefore requested to agree the appointment of a replacement for Councillor Allgood as a City Council representative.

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Cooper be appointed as a member of the North Whiteley Development Forum, with Councillor Humby as the deputy - full City Council membership: Councillors Anthony (Chairman), Achwal, Busher, Cooper and Ruffell (deputy Councillor Humby)

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 13 January 2010, less exempt items, be approved and adopted.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr A Rickman (TACT) spoke regarding Report CAB1958 and his comments are summarised under the relevant agenda item below.

4. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Beckett updated Members on the current position regarding the proposed re-letting of Avalon House to the Hampshire Primary Care Trust (PCT). A priority for Hampshire PCT had been to determine whether it should pursue the option of putting forward Hampshire Community Health Care as a Community Foundation Trust (CFT). However, recent guidance from the Department of Health had resulted in the decision that it should not be considered as a CFT. Consequently, Avalon House was no longer required by the Hampshire PCT as a headquarters building, as had previously been intended.

Councillor Beckett advised that there remained considerable NHS requirements for office and consulting space within Winchester for which Avalon House was actively being considered, but the NHS would not be able to consider what other potential users could be located there until the end of March 2010. Other parties were continuing to express an interest in Avalon House and their requirements were also being considered by the Council.

Councillor Beckett also explained the reasons why a number of the reports to be considered by Cabinet at this meeting had not been made available within the statutory deadline. Four reports related directly to the Budget and the fifth related to the opportunity to dispose of land to assist the Council in funding its capital programme. The current economic circumstances, and particularly the announcement that administrators had been appointed for Thornfield Ventures (the developers of Silver Hill) had implications for the capital programme in 2010/11 and beyond. Work on the revision of the programme at short notice had resulted in the late availability of the Reports.

Councillor Beckett thanked the Head of Finance and her team for the work in producing these Reports. He emphasised that the three main budget reports would also be considered by Principal Scrutiny Committee and Council, which would enable non-Cabinet Members to scrutinise them more fully.

Councillor Beckett also reported on the PUSH response the previous week which raised objections to the Government's housing requirement continuing in the present economic circumstances.

5. **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUDGET AND RENT SETTING – 2010/11**

(Report [CAB1958](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report had been considered by the Social Issues Scrutiny Panel on 1 February 2010 which had made a number of comments, but had not made any recommendations to Cabinet.

Councillor Coates stated that an average rent increase of 1.09% was proposed and he emphasised the Council would be required to pay the same amount of negative subsidy to the Government whether or not any increase was imposed. The Government's HRA reform proposals had not yet been announced, but were expected later in February 2010.

Mr Rickman (TACT) raised a number of concerns regarding the Report, as summarised below. With regard to Paragraph 9.1 which stated that monies from asset sales had been reinvested in housing stock, he requested that 100% of the proceeds of such sales be used for the modification and/or refurbishment of the Council's own existing void properties in order that revenue from rent could be increased. This was in preference to financing housing association schemes. He mentioned the specific example of void accommodation at White Wings, Denmead. Mr Rickman also queried why it was proposed in Paragraph 6.2 that a one-off contribution from the HRA 2010/11 budget should be included in the Capital Programme to part-fund renewal of the IT database.

In response, the Chairman emphasised that the agreed Council policy on use of receipts from asset sales was to utilise 50% towards housing enablement and 50% to be allocated to the HRA budget. The Head of Landlord Services confirmed that this money was used to renovate existing properties, but emphasised that the primary aim of the Council was to address housing need, whether through its own properties or use of housing associations. He confirmed that discussions were ongoing regarding the best future use of White Wings.

The Head of Landlord Services clarified that the contribution referred to in Paragraph 6.2 of the Report was towards the capital programme for housing.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson congratulated officers on producing a budget that generated savings, but made a number of comments on the Report, as summarised below:

- Concern that the proposed budget did not address the fundamental issues regarding negative subsidy payments;
- Disagreement with the policy of selling standard stock council houses and the consequential loss of rental income;
- Concern about the impact of raising sheltered housing charges, particularly on tenants on low incomes;
- Suggestion that the proposed level of reserves be reduced by £50,000 and this sum be transferred to fund increased housing maintenance;

- Concern about the amounts required for funding of a new IT database.

The Chairman agreed with the concerns about the impact of negative subsidy and emphasised that the current system meant that the Council would not receive all the rent from any additional houses let.

The Head of Landlord Services explained that the service for all sheltered tenants had been regularised, with the charge being based on actual costs and the support charge element decreasing. However, about 40% tenants in sheltered housing would receive an increase in charges, although this would be capped. In addition, approximately 60% of sheltered housing tenants were in receipt of housing benefits.

The Head of Landlord Services advised that it was essential that the IT system was upgraded as the providers would not be able to support the current system beyond 2011. The costs included in the Report were estimated and would be subject to a full business case analysis and tendering process before award of contract.

Councillor Coates stated that he considered the proposed level of reserves to be appropriate and should not be reduced, particularly as historically the level of reserves had been maintained at a higher level.

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

RECOMMENDED:

- 1. THAT THE HEAD OF LANDLORD SERVICES BE AUTHORISED TO IMPLEMENT THE HOUSING RENTS FOR 2010/11 INCREASE IN LINE WITH THE GOVERNMENT GUIDELINE, AS SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 5 OF THE REPORT CAB1958, RESULTING IN AN OVERALL AVERAGE INCREASE OF 1.09%.**
- 2. THAT THE HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT REVISED BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR 2009/10 AND BUDGET FOR 2010/11 AS DETAILED IN APPENDIX 1 BE APPROVED.**
- 3. THAT NO INFLATIONARY INCREASE BE APPLIED TO GARAGE RENTS.**
- 4. THAT ALL SERVICE CHARGES CONTINUE TO BE BASED ON ACTUAL COSTS INCURRED, BUT THAT ANY INDIVIDUAL INCREASES BE SUBJECT TO THE SAME CAPPING RULES AS FOR DWELLING RENTS (-0.9% + £2.17), AND THE HEAD OF LANDLORD SERVICES BE AUTHORISED TO IMPLEMENT THE CHANGES.**

**5. THAT THE CURRENT POLICY TO SELL UP TO 10
VACANT DWELLINGS PER ANNUM BE CONTINUED UNTIL
MARCH 2011.**

6. **HOUSING SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS IMPROVEMENTS**
(Report [CAB1967](#) refers)

The Head of Access and Infrastructure outlined the difficulties experienced in seeking the agreement of Southern Water to adopt works. He confirmed that talks were also still ongoing with Albion Water.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Head of Access and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Head of Landlord Services, be authorised to progress the programme for 2010/11 as outlined in the Report, subject to funding being included in the Capital Programme.

2. That, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rule 6.4, authority be given to incur capital expenditure for the Schemes set out in paragraph 4.1 of the Report.

3. That the Head of Access and Infrastructure be given delegated authority to make minor adjustments to the programme (including the bringing forward of identified reserve schemes) to meet the maintenance and operational needs of the City Council Sewage Treatment Works as required in consultation with the Head of Finance and Head of Landlord Services.

7. **TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY**
(Report [CAB1960](#) refers)

This Report had not been 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 Principal Scrutiny Committee on 8 February 2010 and Council on 18 February 2010.

Councillor Allgood emphasised that the Strategy assumed that borrowing would only be authorised if it enabled the Council to achieve its policy objectives and the financial appraisal for the projects also demonstrated a significant level of return on the capital employed. It was anticipated that there would be a level of borrowing requirement during 2011/12.

The Head of Finance confirmed that the maximum levels of financing and borrowing permitted, as specified in the Strategy, were to enable the Council sufficient flexibility in its workings. However, there were no current proposals to borrow the levels of sums outlined in the Report.

The Head of Finance stated that she had yet to analyse the impact of the latest position with regards Avalon House on the Council (as announced by the Leader above).

The Chairman thanked the Head of Finance and her team for her work in producing the Report.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2010/11 AS SET OUT IN REPORT CAB1960 BE APPROVED, INCLUDING:

(A) THE ADOPTION OF THE PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS 2010/11-2012/13 SETTING OUT THE EXPECTED CAPITAL ACTIVITIES (AS REQUIRED BY THE CIPFA PRUDENTIAL CODE FOR CAPITAL FINANCE IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT) AND THE TREASURY MANAGEMENT PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS THAT ARE NOW IN CIPFA TREASURY MANAGEMENT CODE OF PRACTICE.

(B) A REVISION OF THE CAPITAL FINANCING REQUIREMENT FOR 2009-10 CURRENT YEAR.

(C) THE MINIMUM REVENUE PROVISION (MRP) STATEMENT WHICH SETS OUT THE COUNCIL'S POLICY ON MRP WHICH SETS OUT HOW THE COUNCIL WILL PAY FOR CAPITAL ASSETS THROUGH REVENUE EACH YEAR.

(D) THE INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2010/11 CONTAINED IN THE TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, AND THE DETAILED CRITERIA INCLUDED IN APPENDIX B.

(E) THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME HAS CREATED A BORROWING REQUIREMENT. THE BORROWING LIMITS ON ARE SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 4.2.12 OF THE REPORT.

2. THAT THE REVISION TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION, FINANCIAL PROCEDURE RULES AT APPENDIX

A, AS LAID DOWN BY THE REVISED CIPFA TREASURY MANAGEMENT CODE OF PRACTICE, BE APPROVED.

NB UNDER THE CODE, PRINCIPAL SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ARE TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR EFFECTIVE SCRUTINY OF THE TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AND POLICIES.

3(A). THAT THE STRATEGY BE KEPT UNDER REGULAR REVIEW TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF ANY CHANGES IN THE CURRENT GLOBAL ECONOMIC SITUATION AND PENDING DCLG INVESTMENT GUIDANCE; AND

3(B). THAT THE UPDATED TREASURY MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS SET OUT IN APPENDIX B OF THE REPORT BE NOTED.

8. **CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2009/10 TO 2013/14**
(Report [CAB1963](#) refers)

This Report had not been 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 Principal Scrutiny Committee on 8 February 2010 and Council on 18 February 2010.

As the programme included some joint working proposals with the County Council, Councillor Allgood declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest in respect of this item due to his role as a County Councillor. Councillor Godfrey declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as a County Council employee. Both Councillors remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Beckett emphasised that each individual project listed in the programme would require further approval before any funds were committed.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney supported the principle of borrowing to finance the Council's priorities where the scheme would also generate a return. However, she expressed disappointment that the Council had moved from a debt-free position to one where it was necessary to consider borrowing. In addition, she was concerned regarding the £5 million of deferred capital projects listed in Appendix C of the Report, as she believed it was likely that at least some of those would come forward and suggested that they be listed in order of priority. In particular, she queried the inclusion of The Square, Winchester in the deferred list, as previous reports had indicated that this was an urgent priority.

In response, Councillor Beckett advised that the Council had faced expenditure on maintenance of its properties which had accumulated over previous years. Significant acquisitions, such as the West Wing for the

Council's office use, had also offered savings. He advised that work on The Square was dependant on progress by the County Council.

Councillor Beckett agreed to ask officers to consider placing the list of deferred capital projects in priority order. However, he emphasised that the programme was affected by uncertainty regarding the Silver Hill development, which meant that it was not possible to take account of any possible related capital receipts. However, he was hopeful that the scheme would go ahead and this would then improve the position regarding potential capital receipts.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE PROPOSED CAPITAL PROGRAMME FOR 2009/10 TO 2013/14 BE APPROVED AS SET OUT IN APPENDIX A OF THE REPORT CAB1963 (AS ALSO INCLUDED IN THE BUDGET FOR CONSIDERATION BY COUNCIL, CAB1964 REFERS), AND THE PROPOSED FINANCING OF THE PROGRAMME BE NOTED, (ALSO NOTING THAT INDIVIDUAL SCHEMES WITHIN THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME EACH REQUIRED APPROPRIATE APPROVAL BY CABINET OR UNDER THE SCHEME OF DELEGATION INVOLVING PORTFOLIO HOLDERS IN ACCORDANCE WITH FINANCIAL PROCEDURE RULES BEFORE ANY FUNDS WERE COMMITTED).

2. THAT THE CAPITAL PROJECTS LISTED AT APPENDIX C BE DEFERRED AND CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO LISTING THE DEFERRED PROJECTS IN ORDER OF PRIORITY IN THE NEXT REPORT ON THE REVIEW OF THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME.

9. **BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2010/11**

(Report [CAB1964](#) refers)

This Report had not been 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 Principal Scrutiny Committee on 8 February 2010 and Council on 18 February 2010.

Councillor Allgood thanked the Head of Finance and her team for her work in producing the Report, in co-operation with Cabinet Members. He emphasised that consultation had been undertaken on the budget proposals with the groups as set out in Paragraph 1.5 of the Report. The Local Strategic Partnership had requested that the Council place more emphasis on climate

change issues, particularly to meet the carbon challenge target. Councillor Allgood highlighted that the budget already included approximately £1.2 million spending on projects that contributed towards carbon reduction, for example, the South of Winchester Park and Ride the proposed refurbishments of the Guildhall, Avalon House and River Park Leisure Centre (Report CAB1965 below refers). The Revenue Budget growth proposals also included provision for a post of Building Surveyor which would spend 50% of its time on energy related issues.

Councillor Allgood advised Cabinet that a key element of setting the budget was to keep any increase in the recommended level of Council Tax to a minimum and this aim had been achieved. He also congratulated officers on making significant savings, at the same time as improving service levels (as recognised by the recent Audit Commission inspection).

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Busher commented that the late availability of the Report had hampered her ability to give it proper consideration prior to the meeting, although she accepted the reasons for its lateness as outlined by the Chairman. She requested further clarification of the statement at Paragraph 3.2(g) that there might be some top slicing at County level of Local Public Service Agreements (LPSA) performance reward grants. She also queried the Council's proposed expenditure on consultancy.

The Head of Finance emphasised that she could provide further information for Members on any queries raised following consideration of the Report, prior to the Council meeting.

The Corporate Director (Policy) reported that there were discussions ongoing regarding the treatment of LPSA grants and possible top slicing by the County Council. Councillor Beckett advised that he would raise concerns about this at a meeting of the Hampshire Senate.

With regard to expenditure of consultancy, the Head of Finance advised that this detail was not included in the standard level of presentation of the budget paper, but was available and could be made available to Members if required.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS:	
1. THAT THE FOLLOWING LEVEL OF GENERAL FUND BUDGET AND SERVICE BUDGETS FOR 2010/11 BE APPROVED:	
	<u>2010/11</u>
	<u>£</u>
GROSS BUDGET FOR GENERAL FUND SERVICES	18,652,738
<u>LESS</u>	
CAPITAL FINANCING	(4,117,000)

TRANSFERS TO/(FROM) RESERVES	(515,703)
CONTRIBUTIONS TO/(FROM) WINCHESTER TOWN ACCOUNT	35,661

<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>14,055,697</u>
<u>LESS CHARGES ON WINCHESTER TOWN ACCOUNT</u>	
	(863,506)

<u>TOTAL CITY NET EXPENDITURE</u>	<u>13,192,191</u>

2. THAT THE GROWTH, SAVINGS AND INCREASED INCOME, AS SET OUT IN APPENDICES D, E1 & E2 OF THE REPORT BE APPROVED.

3. THAT THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME SET OUT IN APPENDICES G1 AND G2 BE CONFIRMED.

4. THAT THE POLICY AS PREVIOUSLY AGREED BY THE COUNCIL ON 14 JULY 1999 (MIN 186 REFERS) BE CONFIRMED TO TREAT ALL EXPENSES OF THE COUNCIL AS GENERAL EXPENSES OTHER THAN THOSE SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFIED AND ITEMISED IN THE WINCHESTER TOWN ACCOUNT. IN CONSEQUENCE OF WHICH THE SUM OF £827,845 BE TREATED AS SPECIAL EXPENSES UNDER SECTION 35 OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE ACT 1992 IN RESPECT OF THE WINCHESTER TOWN AREA (APPENDIX K OF THE REPORT).

5. THAT THE COUNCIL TAX FOR THE SPECIAL EXPENSES IN THE WINCHESTER TOWN AREA AT BAND D BE SET AT £61.32 FOR 2010/11.

6. THAT THE BALANCE ON THE COLLECTION FUND CALCULATED AT 7 JANUARY 2010 OF £293,000 SURPLUS FOR COUNCIL TAX, BE APPROVED.

7. THAT THE LEVEL OF COUNCIL TAX AT BAND D FOR CITY COUNCIL SERVICES BE SET AT £126.27 FOR 2010/11.

8. THAT PARISH COUNCIL TAXES BE NOTED AS IN APPENDIX L.

9. THAT FOR THE MEMBERS ALLOWANCES SCHEME, IN VIEW OF THE CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION:

(A) A REDUCTION OF 5% BE APPLIED FROM 1 APRIL 2010 TO THE BASIC, SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY, CO-OPTees' AND

DEPENDENT CARERS ALLOWANCES; AND TO THE SUBSISTENCE RATES, AND THAT

(B) THE INFLATION INDEX IN THE MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME BE ONLY APPLIED FOR 2010/11 SHOULD IT RESULT IN A GREATER PERCENTAGE REDUCTION THAN THE 5% REFERRED TO IN (A) ABOVE.

10. THAT, FOLLOWING THE CONSULTATION PROCESS, IT BE NOTED THAT NO CHANGES WERE REQUIRED TO THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN APPROVED AT COUNCIL ON 6 JANUARY 2010 (REPORTS CAB1935 AND CL62 REFER).

10. **CAR PARKS MAJOR WORKS PROGRAMME**
(Report C[AB1968](#) refers)

Councillor Wood explained that the layout and design of Chesil Street Multi-Storey car park (MSCP) with only one possible entrance and exit, resulted in practical difficulties with the operation of a “pay on exit” system. For example, if the machines did not work for any reason, the Council had no alternative but to open the barriers, resulting in loss of parking income. It was, therefore, proposed that a “pay and display” system be reintroduced in Chesil Street MSCP to reflect the practical difficulties, together with on going maintenance issues and the need to upgrade the pay on foot equipment throughout the Town. Opportunities to enhance choice in terms of payment methods in Chesil MSCP, including pay by credit card or by mobile phone, would be explored.

Councillor Wood advised that an assessment of the condition of Friarsgate multi-storey car park would be undertaken and a further report submitted, having regard to the current situation regarding the Silver Hill proposals.

One Member queried how much the Council was charged in service charges on credit card payments and the potential impact on income. The Head of Access and Infrastructure agreed to ascertain the exact level of charge, believed to be about 4%.

In response to queries about reducing the level of lighting in car parks during daylight hours and reducing energy consumption, the Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that some car park lighting would be upgraded as part of the County Council's Private Finance Initiative Scheme for Street lighting. In addition, the City Council would consider upgrading lighting in car parks on an annual basis in order to improve efficiency and reduce energy usage.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney welcomed proposals to retain “pay-on-foot” systems at The Brooks MSCP and Middle Brook Street car parks and stated that she would have preferred for Chesil Street MSCP to

remain as “pay-on-foot”. She asked that when the “pay-on-foot” IT system was replaced a bar-code system be used on tickets rather than the current metallic strip – as this system was in use in other authorities and was more robust. She added that she had received some complaints from users of the “pay-by-phone” payment system. Finally, she queried whether town centre businesses had been consulted on the proposals?

Councillor Beckett confirmed that businesses had been consulted as part of the general consultation on the Council’s budget proposals.

The Head of Access and Infrastructure advised that “pay-by-phone” systems were nationally regarded as the way forward and experience indicated that their increased use resulted in fewer customer difficulties. There were now approximately 4,500 users per month at Winchester. He confirmed that the work to re-introduce “pay-on-foot” systems would be subject to a tendering process and the comments regarding use of bar codes would be noted.

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

RESOLVED:

That, subject to Council approval of the overall Budget:

1. the Car Parks Major Works Programme for 2010/11, as outlined in Appendix 1 be approved, including the authority to incur the capital expenditure in accordance with Financial Procedure Rule 6.4;
2. the indicative programme for 2011/12 be noted as a basis for planning and preparing future works;
3. the release of £180,000 from the Car Park Property earmarked reserve, be approved, to fund the planned expenditure (capital and revenue);
4. the Head of Access and Infrastructure be given delegated authority to make minor adjustments to the programme, in order to meet maintenance and operational needs of the District’s car parks throughout the year as required, in consultation with the Head of Finance and the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access;
5. a report on the programme be submitted on an annual basis setting out progress and recommending future priorities;
6. the Pay on Foot payment system be removed from Chesil Street Multi-storey Car park (MSCP) and replaced with a pay and display payment system and that the Pay on Foot payment system for The Brooks and Middlebrook Street car parks be retained and upgraded;

7. a capital growth bid of £160,000 to convert Chesil Street MSCP to Pay and Display and to upgrade the Pay on Foot payment systems in The Brooks and Middlebrook Street car parks, be included in the Council's capital programme (being considered elsewhere on this agenda).

11. **RIVER PARK LEISURE CENTRE – REFURBISHMENT PROPOSALS**
(LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)
(Report [CAB1965](#) refers)

The Head of Property Services clarified that the reference to 12 years in the Report, related to the proposed length of the contract for operation of the Centre, as opposed to the specific longevity of the defined plant and equipment. Individual life cycles could be determined by the Centre's Asset Register. He explained that the costs outlined in Appendix A were estimates resulting from the Feasibility Study and that more detailed costings were included in the exempt appendix.

The Head of Property Services advised that the Centre had an Energy Performance Operational Rating of C, compared typically with similar buildings having a rating of between D and E. It was confirmed that the main heating boilers that were replaced in 2006 would not be part of the refurbishment proposals. However, the existing combined heat and power unit (CHP) was currently being considered for either major overhaul or replacement as part of the refurbishment proposals.

The Head of Economy, Culture and Tourism explained that the Council was liable to pay the contractor for loss of income during the period of closure and the Report included a maximum estimate of this cost. However, the contractor had offered to operate an "open book" system whereby the Council would only be liable for actual costs incurred. The loss of income was included in the Council's revenue budget projection.

Cabinet supported the Report's proposals and emphasised the importance of continuing to provide a leisure centre to the District.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the estimated capital cost of all proposed works and fees totalling £3.736m be noted.
2. That the likely period of closure of the Centre be proposed to commence in April 2011, with a full re-opening in October 2011 and that the upper level of additional revenue cost for the closure period itself is approximately £780,000 in 2011/12.

3. That all works classified as “Essential”, “Desirable” and “Optional Environmental Improvements” should be included in the project.

4. That the financial appraisal supporting the Property Report be noted, as set out in Appendix D.

5. That subject to the inclusion of this project and related financing in the Capital Programme, that a Capital Sum of £300,000 be approved in accordance with Financial Procedure Rule 6.4 for design specification and contract procurement works, in order to progress the project and enable a provisional start on site in April 2011.

6. That a further report be made to Cabinet to include: a definitive schedule of works including those proposed by DC Leisure, a procurement plan that considers both Council and DC Leisure sponsored works and proposals for the appointment of a Project Team to design, specify, procure and manage the project to successful conclusion.

12. **COMMUNITY GRANTS – REVENUE AWARDS 2010-2011**
(Report [CAB1962](#) refers)

Councillor Pearson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of this item as the Chairman of Bishops Waltham Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB). Councillor Busher also declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a member of the Bishops Waltham CAB Committee. Both Councillors left the room and took no part in the debate or decisions on this Report.

Councillor Stallard declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest as the City Council’s representative on the Havant and Waterlooville CAB (in an observer capacity only). She remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Cooper updated Cabinet on the outcome of the Winchester Town Forum meeting on 20 January 2010 (Minutes contained as CAB1973 below), and again expressed disappointment that the Forum had not supported all 24 of the grant applications considered for Town Forum Grant.

Cabinet thanked Councillor Cooper for his work in ensuring that all applicants for revenue awards had received a grant.

One Member raised concern that the balance in favour of key clients might need to be reconsidered for the future to avoid a risk of smaller organisations being disproportionately affected in reducing levels of grants. Councillor Cooper noted these comments and agreed that this would be examined further.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Collin queried whether the proposed grant to Hampshire and IOW Youth Options had taken into account

the impact of Hampshire Families no longer being a tenant at King Alfred's Youth Centre (KAYAC). Councillor Cooper confirmed that regular discussions were held with KAYAC and at the time of the grant, the relocation of Winnall Rock School had not been determined. KAYAC were hopeful that they could find a new tenant to occupy the space left by Hampshire Families.

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

RESOLVED:

Subject to Council approval of the 2010/11 budget:

1. That the recommendations for the 2010/11 Community Grant awards from the Town Account of £41,813 (which includes Community Grant Capital awards of £12,000) approved by Winchester Town Forum at their meeting on 20 January 2009 (WTF141 and WTF 142) be endorsed.

2. That the following grant awards for 2010/11 from the General Fund Revenue Grants Budget be approved. It should be noted that it is a condition for payment of these awards that each recipient accepts a clearly defined Service Level Agreement with appropriate performance targets:

(i)	Age Concern Winchester	£1,295
(ii)	Bishops Waltham & Meon Valley CAB	£41,190
(iii)	Bumps2 Bundles	£1,300
(iv)	Carroll Centre (The)	£5,320
(v)	Deaf Plus	£1,000
(vi)	Eating Disorders Family and Friends Support Group	£500
(vii)	Hampshire & IOW Youth Options	£11,500
(viii)	Hampshire Deaf Association	£1,300
(ix)	Hat Fair	£29,407
(x)	Havant & District CAB	£600
(xi)	Homestart Meon Valley	£11,155
(xii)	Homestart Winchester and Districts	£4,350
(xiii)	KIDS	£1,455
(xiv)	Olive Branch (The)	£1,000
(xv)	Relate Winchester	£3,460
(xvi)	Signature Care and Support	£4,010

(xvii)	Stanmore Combined	£420
(xviii)	Trinity Centre, Winchester	£87,350
(xix)	United Savings and Loans (Winchester Savers)	£6,915
(xx)	Vitalise	£500
(xxi)	Winchester & District Mencap	£455
(xxii)	Winchester & District Young Carers Project	£1,835
(xxiii)	Winchester Area Community Action (WACA)	£101,800
(xxiv)	Winchester CAB	£118,975
(xxv)	Winchester Churches – Nightshelter	£3,480
(xxvi)	Winchester Churches Housing Group - Keystone	£4,980
(xxvii)	Winchester Detached Youth Work Project	£6,875
(xxviii)	Winchester Festival	£2,910
(xxix)	Winchester Folk Festival (Mayfest)	£870
(xxx)	Winchester Live at Home Scheme	£5,345
(xxxii)	Winchester Rent Deposit Scheme	£2,000
(xxxiii)	Winchester Rural Youth Theatre	£6,500
(xxxiv)	Winchester Youth Counselling	£2,245
(xxxv)	Winnall Community Association	£3,535
(xxxvi)	Winnall Junior Youth Club	£1,200
(xxxvii)	Winnall Rock School	£4,475

3. That a sum of £21,000 be set aside from the revenue grants budget to support the arts programme at the Tower Arts Centre (CAB1685 -July 2008 refers). This award together with an allocation of a further £4,000 set aside in the Winchester Town Account will match fund a Hampshire County Council award of £25,000. This initial three year agreement remains in place until 2010-2011 after which it will be reviewed.

4. That the transfer of £607 from the grants reserve to supplement the Community Revenue Grants Budget for 2010/11 be approved, in order that all applications for revenue support can be met at an appropriate level.

13. **COMMUNITY CAPITAL GRANTS – CAPITAL AWARDS 2010-2011**
(Report [CAB1961](#) refers)

Councillor Allgood declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of this item as vice-president of Hambledon Cricket Club. Councillor Busher also declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a member of the St Peter's Church Committee. Both Councillors left the room and took no part in debate or decision on this Report.

Councillor Coates declared a personal (but not prejudicial) interest due to his involvement with Hambledon Cricket Club, although he was not a member. He remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

Councillor Cooper expressed disappointment that the Winchester Town Forum at its meeting on 20 January 2010, had not agreed to contribute £5,000 from the Town Account towards the proposal from the YMCA to redevelop St John's House. He was therefore recommending that Cabinet fund this additional £5,000 from reserves, in order that the full £20,000 grant could be awarded.

In response to questions, the Head of Partnerships, Communications and Improvement outlined the reasons why the grant application from Weeke Community Association was not supported at this time. However, the application would be reconsidered in future years if the Association could demonstrate that it was working with the wider community.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Collin advised that he had attended the meeting of the Winchester Town Forum on 20 January 2010 and believed that the majority of Forum Members had chosen not to support the request for £5,000 for YMCA due to lack of notice to consider the request in a proper manner. In addition, there were concerns expressed regarding the inclusivity of membership of the proposed facilities.

Councillor Beckett advised that he and Councillor Cooper had met the Chief Executive of the YMCA and received verbal assurances regarding the availability of the proposed facilities to all young people, regardless of their sexual orientation or religion. It was proposed that the Service Level Agreement with the YMCA would include such assurances. With regard to the lack of notice to the Forum, he advised that this had been recognised and the Forum had therefore only been asked to make budget provision for £5,000 to enable it to consider the detail at a later stage. However, the Forum had decided not to make this provision.

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

RESOLVED:

Subject to Council approval of the 2010/11 budget, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rule 6.4:

1. That a budget of £9,000 from the 2010/11 Capital Grants Budget be approved to support the Council's Community Chest Small Grants Scheme.

2. That the following Community Capital Grants for 2010/11 be approved, subject to compliance with any conditions specified in Appendix 1 of the Report:

(i)	Alresford & District Community Association	£5,000
(ii)	Hambledon Cricket Club	£6,000
(iii)	St. Faith's Parish Hall Committee	£4,000
(iv)	St. Peter's Church Hall, Bishops Waltham	£1,000
(v)	Waltham Chase Village Hall Committee	£6,000
(vi)	Wickham Community Association	£4,000
(vii)	Winchester Dramatic Society	£20,000

3. That an additional capital grant award for 2010/11 of £20,000 to Winchester YMCA be approved to support the delivery of a dedicated Young Peoples Recreational Venue and Youth Cafe at St Johns House, Winchester. This award would be subject to compliance with the conditions detailed at Paragraphs 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4 of the Report.

4. That the release of £65,000 from the Major Investment Reserve and the release of £10,000 from the earmarked Leisure, Arts and Cultural Grants Reserve be approved, in order that all the awards in Resolutions 1, 2, & 3 above can be met.

5. That Cabinet expresses regret that it is unable to support the grant application submitted by the Weeke Community Association and All Saints Church Hall, Denmead.

14. **PLAYGROUND FIVE YEAR REFURBISHMENT PLAN**
(Report [WTF143](#) refers)

Councillor Beckett advised that the Report had been referred to Cabinet for it to agree expenditure of any approved funds. The refurbishment plan had

been considered and agreed by the Winchester Town Forum at its meeting on 20 January 2010 (minutes contained as Report CAB1973 below).

Cabinet commented that the capital budget had been reduced because of current financial constraints and some Members expressed concern that the Winchester Town Forum did not allocate funds from the Town Account. However, it was agreed that the 5 year plan provided a suitable programme of schemes that could be considered against the available financial resources. Wherever possible, open space funding should be used to enable schemes to proceed.

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

RESOLVED:

That the priorities and the programme of schemes listed in the report be agreed and that, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rule 6.4, authority be given to incur capital expenditure in 2010/11 wholly funded from the Open Space Fund, subject to the approval of the Proposed Capital Programme and Budget, by Council in February 2010.

15. **MINUTES OF THE WINCHESTER TOWN FORUM HELD 20 JANUARY 2010**
(Report [CAB1973](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that most of the recommendations contained in the Minutes had been dealt with under consideration of other Reports above.

However, Cabinet were asked to agree that no amendments be made to the Open Space Strategy 2009-2010 in relation to the Winchester Town area. This was agreed.

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Winchester Town Forum held 20 January 2010 be received and the recommendations contained therein be agreed.

16. **REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2009**

(Report [CAB1969](#) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the Revised Winchester District Local Development Scheme, as attached as Appendix A to Report CAB1905(LDF), shall have effect from 3 February 2010.

17. **CITIZENS' PANEL AUGUST 2009 (CP14)**

(Report [PS394](#) refers)

The Chief Executive advised that the Report had been considered by Principal Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 18 January 2010, where it was noted that the Mosaics Project might replace the requirement for a Citizen's Panel.

The Head of Partnerships, Communication and Improvement advised that the Council was required by statute to involve residents, but this did not have to be through the method of a Citizen's Panel, although it was the preferred means of consultation of most other councils in Hampshire. The Place Survey was held every two years, but it was not possible for the Council to ask its own questions within this Survey.

During discussion, a number of Members expressed the view that the Citizens' Panel was no longer of great use to the Council and requested proposals for how it could be replaced.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Report be noted.

18. **RESPONSE TO POSTAL SERVICES INFORMAL SCRUTINY GROUP (ISG)**

(Report [CAB1957](#) refers)

A number of Members considered that further investigations were required before a decision could be made about whether to encourage Council payments through post offices.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Learney agreed with comments made by Members above. She suggested that the Council should include examination of the appropriateness of retaining its cash office in this work.

Cabinet requested further investigation of the possibility of utilising rural post offices as local offices, perhaps through the introduction of a pilot scheme. In addition, it requested further information regarding the cost per transaction of payments made at post offices, as opposed to those made by other means.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the approach set out to the Postal Services ISG be endorsed, as set out in the Report.
2. That further investigations be undertaken into the possibility of Council payments via post offices being more widely advertised and encouraged.
3. That further investigations be undertaken in the possible extension of the Local Offices scheme to rural sub-post offices, as set out in Paragraph 4.8 of the Report.

19. **RESPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES**

(Report [CAB1970](#) refers)

Cabinet noted that in addition to the nomination included in the Report, a nomination had been received for Councillor Hiscock to be appointed as a representative.

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

RESOLVED:

That the following appointments be made to the Community Outdoor Sports Centre Management Committee:

Councillors Hiscock and Stallard (both for the period until 28 February 2012).

20. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Forward Plan for February 2010, be noted.

21. **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.

22. **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)
##	River Park Leisure Centre – Refurbishment Proposals (exempt appendix)	
##	Property Transactions – Faberlux Yard	
##	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)

23. **EXEMPT MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minutes of the previous meeting, held on 13 January 2010 be approved and adopted.

24. **RIVER PARK LEISURE CENTRE – REFURBISHMENT PROPOSALS – EXEMPT APPENDIX**

(Report CAB1965 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the information contained within the exempt appendix be noted.

25. **PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS – FABERLUX YARD**

(Report CAB1974 refers)

This Report had not been 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 in relation to discussions on the capital programme, prior to Council on 18 February 2010.

Cabinet considered the above report which set out proposals regarding Faberlux Yard, Winchester (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 9.00am and concluded at 12.40pm

Chairman