

**CABINET****4 December 2013****Attendance:**

Councillor Wood -	<i>Leader (Chairman) (P)</i>
Councillor Humby -	<i>Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Economic Development (P)</i>
Councillor Coates -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Housing (P)</i>
Councillor Godfrey -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Finance &amp; Organisational Development (P)</i>
Councillor Miller -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Business Services (P)</i>
Councillor Warwick -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods &amp; Environment (P)</i>
Councillor Weston -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Built Environment (P)</i>

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

Councillors Evans, Hutchison, Learney, Pines, Tait and Weir

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

Councillors Clear, Hiscock, Izard and Scott

---

**1. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

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

The Chief Executive declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of CAB2522 as he was a personal friend of the Chief Executive of Winchester Area Community Action (WACA). He left the room during consideration of this item.

**2. MINUTES****RESOLVED:**

That the minute of the previous meeting held on 23 October and 4 November 2013 (less exempt items), be approved and adopted.

### 3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Contributions were received on various agenda items, as detailed under the relevant Minutes below.

In addition, Mrs D Andrewes spoke during general public participation on behalf of the Hamble River Valley Forum. She gave a brief summary of the composition of the Forum and raised a number of concerns which in general related to the view that the use of the River Hamble was being swayed too far in favour of commercial interests. More should be done to ensure equal access to all, including those with smaller boats, kayaks etc. In addition, more consideration should be given to protecting and conserving the beauty and biodiversity of the river valley, particularly in Upper Hamble.

Cabinet thanked Mrs Andrewes for her comments and were broadly in support of the aims of the Forum, especially in terms of ensuring equal access. It was noted that both Councillor Weston and Councillor Humby (in his County Council role) were also representatives on the River Hamble Management Committee.

### 4. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Wood reported that the consultation on the proposals for River Park Leisure Centre had now closed with a large number of comments being received. These would be examined in detail with the aim of a further Report being submitted, hopefully to Cabinet in January 2014.

Councillor Humby welcomed the news that Winchester had received the Purple Flag award in recognition of its evening economy, for the fourth year running. He thanked the Economic Development Team and Winchester BID for their work in achieving this award.

Councillor Humby also announced that a number of businesses within the District had won "Beautiful South" awards, namely: Marwell Zoo; Marwell Hotel; Hampshire Food Festival; Lainston House; and South Winchester Lodges.

### 5. **ADOPTION OF REVISED WINCHESTER DISTRICT COMMUNITY STRATEGY 2010-2020**

(Report CAB2533 refers)

Councillor Wood introduced the Report and thanked those who had responded to the consultation on the Strategy. As a result of comments received, a number of changes were proposed, primarily in relation to the priority on Climate Change and references to areas such as Stanmore and Winnall. The proposed changes were outlined in the Report and more detail would be included within the Portfolio Plans, which would be reported directly to Council on 8 January 2014.

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

Councillor Pines expressed concern that the lack of specific reference to the priority areas of Stanmore and Winnall would make it much more difficult for community organisations to apply for grants and other assistance from various bodies. He highlighted that there were also other areas within the District that required special attention, for example to address mental health issues or rural isolation. He requested that further discussions be held to amend the Strategy wording to address these concerns prior to its approval at Council. He also queried whether it would be possible for updates on progress against the Strategy to be provided on an ongoing basis, for example via the Council's webpages, to better facilitate performance monitoring.

Councillor Learney expressed concern that the Strategy did not set out clear priorities for the Council, which was particularly essential at times of significant pressure on resources. She also believed that there should be specific mention of priority areas within the District and did not agree with the removal of references to older people. In general, she believed that the stated policies were too broad and did not set out a clear message regarding the Council's priorities.

During public participation, comments were received from Mrs A Sealey (WinACC), Mrs R Aron (Stanmore Community Association and Carroll Centre) and Mrs K Barratt.

Mrs Sealey welcomed the re-inclusion of a specific priority to tackle climate change, which had been requested by more than 75% of those that had responded to the consultation. She also congratulated the Council on developing a number of specific plans to tackle carbon emissions, such as the Cycling Strategy and the Low Carbon Route Map.

Mrs Barratt endorsed the comments made above and emphasised that tackling climate change was such an important issue, it should underlie all the Council's actions and the aim be reiterated as many times as possible in all the Council's published materials.

Mrs R Aron believed that the proposed change in relation to Stanmore and Winnall did not go far enough to meet the concerns expressed in the consultation, and outlined by Councillor Pines above. Without the specific inclusion of these priority areas, community organisations, such as the Carroll Centre and the Community Association, would find it much more difficult to apply for funding and therefore continue with their work. She referred to proposals for an improved community building which would require such funding support.

In response to the comments made, Councillor Wood agreed to give further consideration to amending the wording of the Strategy to address concerns

raised in connection with priority areas. It was agreed that this be reported to Council on 8 January 2014.

In response to comments made by Councillor Learney, Councillor Wood emphasised that the detailed actions would be included within the Portfolio Plans. The Chief Executive advised that these Plans could be used for performance monitoring purposes and he would give further consideration to the request from Councillor Pines that “live” performance monitoring information be provided.

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

**RECOMMENDED:**

**1. THAT THE RESPONSES RECEIVED DURING THE CONSULTATION PERIOD BE NOTED.**

**2. THAT THE COMMUNITY STRATEGY 2010 -2020 BE ADOPTED, AS ATTACHED AT APPENDIX 1 AND UPDATED BY REPORT CL90,, SUBJECT TO ANY FINAL MINOR AMENDMENTS TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY THE HEAD OF POLICY IN CONSULTATION WITH THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL.**

**3. THAT THE CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER BE GIVEN DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO MAKE THE APPROPRIATE CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE REPLACEMENT OF CHANGE PLANS WITH PORTFOLIO PLANS, AS OUTLINED IN SECTION 5 OF THE REPORT.**

**RESOLVED:**

That the following be reported for approval direct to Council on 8 January 2014:

(a) proposed changes to Appendix 1 to take account of concerns raised above; and

(b) Portfolio Plans for the period 2014/15, currently under preparation.

6. **CAPITAL PROGRAMME BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS**

(Report CAB2541 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the forecast General Fund Revenue implications of the Capital Programme be noted.

7. **CAR PARKING STRATEGY**

(Report CAB2539 refers)

Councillor Warwick introduced the Report and thanked all those that had contributed to the consultation on the draft Strategy. She stated that following approval of the Strategy, car parking charges would be reviewed early in 2014. In addition, the Strategy should be considered in conjunction with a number of other documents, such as the Cycling Strategy and the emerging Walking Strategy.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Weir addressed Cabinet as Chairman of the Winchester Town Forum Informal Group which had met to discuss the draft Strategy. She welcomed the inclusion of the reference to the Winchester Town Access Plan and residents' parking schemes. The importance of encouraging use of Park and Ride should be recognised further by the use of an effective car parking pricing differential. She emphasised that it was important to see the Strategy as a transitional plan and use the next five years to gather data to move forwards.

Mr J Beveridge (WinACC) spoke during public participation and welcomed many of the general principles of the Strategy. However, WinACC had four concerns:

- The Strategy ignored evidence that Winchester had more central car parking spaces than required and earlier policies to reduce the number of spaces provided in this area;
- It should not be assumed that removing central car parking had a negative effect on the economy as studies had found it could improve the pedestrian experience and shared space schemes could also prove beneficial eg in St Georges Street;
- The intention to enhance 'gateway' car parks was supported, but the Cattle Market car park should be used in preference to Gladstone Street, and Durngate car park should be promoted above Middle Brook Street car park;
- A stakeholder discussion should be held before the Strategy was finally approved.

Councillor Warwick noted comments made and emphasised that the Strategy had a difficult balancing act to achieve to try to meet the various competing demands. The Head of Major Projects advised that work with

large employers was ongoing to move staff parking out of the city centre, in addition to removing on-street parking areas which were previously being used by commuters. He stated that Durngate car park was already considered as an important gateway car park.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the responses to the consultation on the Council's document 'Towards a Winchester District Parking Strategy' be noted.
2. That the Winchester Parking Strategy be approved and that authority to make any minor textual amendments and to publish the final Strategy be delegated to the Head of Major Projects in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods and Environment.

8. **WINCHESTER EXTRA CARE SCHEME**  
(Report CAB2538 refers)

The Head of New Homes Delivery confirmed that the Council had examined a number of different possible sites and Chesil Street surface car park was considered to be the best option, following advice from the County Council. The Chief Executive confirmed that the proposals fell within the City Council's responsibility as housing authority, but the County Council had been closely involved due to the nature of the accommodation proposed.

In response to questions, the Head of New Homes Delivery advised that the County Council used a range of scoring factors to assess the suitability of a site, such as the proximity to a range of facilities. One Councillor queried why the alternative of the Cattle Market car park site was not being pursued as this appeared to be in an equally good, if not better, location. Following further discussions, it was agreed that further information on the evaluation background to the decision as to choice of site be provided and the Head of New Homes Delivery undertook to supply this information.

Other Members raised some concern about the need to improve pedestrian safety along walking routes into town, should the Chesil Street site be selected.

The Chief Operating Officer drew Members' attention to an email from Councillor Byrnes (who was unable to attend), which had been circulated prior to the meeting. In summary, Councillor Byrnes supported the intention to increase extra care housing provision, but objected to the proposed location on Chesil Street surface car park as he believed it was

important for the local economy that central car parking spaces were retained.

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

Councillor Hutchison welcomed the proposal and considered Chesil Street was the preferred location, but agreed with concerns raised about the safety of the pedestrian route into the town centre. He requested that an area based approach be adopted to improve the traffic flows, streetscape and pedestrian safety. He also emphasised the importance of the design of the frontage of the scheme.

Councillor Pines agreed with comments raised about the assessment of the suitability of the site and believed other locations, such as St Peters Street car park should be considered. He also suggested the Council should consider the wider area, including possible re-development of the Multi Storey car park, Avalon House and the Conservatory. If the decision was taken to proceed, it should not be one-bedroom flats and traffic should be directed along the Barfield Close rather than along Chesil Street.

Mr D Nicholson spoke during public participation as proprietor of a number of local businesses in the area, including the Black Boy public house and the Black Rat restaurant. He opposed the proposals as he considered parking being available at the Chesil Street surface car park was essential for his businesses continuing success. He believed the Council should instead redevelop the multi-storey car park or Avalon House for use for housing.

In response, the Corporate Director stated that the Chesil Street MSCP was currently underused and improvements could be made to the building and signage to make it more attractive and encourage use. The Head of New Homes Delivery advised that Avalon House was not suitable as it was not large enough to accommodate the housing need. In response to a comment from Councillor Pines, he advised that the Conservatory was in the ownership of A2 Housing and not within the Council's control.

The Head of New Homes Delivery advised that consultation would be undertaken with local residents and businesses and full consideration would be given as to how the loss of car parking spaces could be mitigated. The Chief Executive also emphasised this point and that wider consideration would be given to general improvements to the area, including the possibility of a local shop.

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

## RESOLVED:

1. That support be confirmed for the principle of an Extra Care scheme as part of the Council's new homes Approved Development Programme with an initial budget of £10.883 million.

2. That officers commission the technical studies and local consultation to determine whether the land currently occupied by the Chesil Street surface car park can accommodate the scheme.

3. That in providing further advice, Officers provide more details of the factors which rendered alternative sites less acceptable.

4. That expenditure on professional fees and associated costs necessary to develop this scheme to the next stage, estimated at £39,000 in 2013/14 and £230,000 in 2014/15, be approved in accordance with Finance Procedure Rule 6.4.

5. That a further report is brought back to Cabinet, in accordance with the Council's Financial Procedure Rule 6.4, prior to the submission of a planning application detailing the outcome of the consultation with local residents, studies, the estimated final scheme cost and the overall viability.

6. That the Chief Finance Officer, in conjunction with the Head of Legal Services and Assistant Director (Chief Housing Officer), be authorised to finalise the Grant funding arrangements with the Homes and Communities Agency, Hampshire County Council and Sentinal Housing Association.

9. **STATION APPROACH DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT – CONSULTATION'S REPORT**  
(Report CAB2540 refers)

The Head of Strategic Planning emphasised that the Development Assessment would be the basis for detailed discussion and fed into work on Local Plan Part 2. It had been produced in response to requests from various sources from both within and outside the Council.

Winchester Town Forum had considered the proposals at its meeting on 27 November 2013 and had discussed the preferred form of future consultation. The Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Officers advised that consultation would take place as part of the Local Plan Part 2 process and full scale consultation before then would be of limited use.

Mr M Carden (2020 Group) and Mr P Gagg (WinACC) spoke during public participation and their comments are summarised below.



Mr Carden reiterated comments made at Winchester Town Forum and generally welcomed the Tibbald's report. However, he expressed some concern that it did not appear that Supplementary Planning documents would result from the Assessment. He believed full public engagement and consultation on the proposals was essential, together with a flexibly programmed Action Plan, a flexible overall Masterplan Framework, including Building Design Guidance and a Strategy for the Public Realm (largely composed of streets around the area).

Mr Gagg welcomed the recognition of cycling/walking in the Assessment but believed important aspects were missing, such as cycle routes within the site itself and consideration of improvements for pedestrian/cyclist access into the town centre. He also expressed concern about proposals for including a car park in the centre of the site and lack of consideration of a public transport hub at the Station.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Hutchison stated that Town Forum Members wanted wider public engagement, but this required careful consideration as to the appropriate timing and form. He considered that the next consultation meeting, intended for January, should be with the stakeholders listed in the Tibbald report only. He also emphasised the experience and knowledge Mr Carden could offer in further discussions.

In response to comments made, the Head of Strategic Planning welcomed the agreement that the initial meeting should be with stakeholders and the detailed points raised by Mr Carden could be discussed further there. He believed that some of the criticisms raised were incorrect as Tibbalds had engaged with stakeholders at an event arranged by them before the Assessment was prepared. In addition, the consultants had considered routes into the town centre, including cycle paths, but until actual development took place on site it was not possible to set out exact routes.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the concept masterplan and development principles set out in the report from Tibbalds be noted and that these be used to inform the development of planning policies and proposals for the area.
2. That officers arrange to discuss with key stakeholders the conclusions of Tibbald's report, to inform how matters are taken forward.

10. **SOLENT DISTURBANCE AND MITIGATION PROJECT INTERIM PLANNING FRAMEWORK**  
(Report CAB2537 refers)

During discussions, some Members expressed concern about the proposals and in particular the fact that monies raised would be spent outside the District and contributions could impact on the viability of developments within the Winchester District.

The Assistant Director (Built Environment) acknowledged these concerns, which had also been shared by Officers and other affected local authorities. He explained that Officers already had to assess the viability of proposals in the light of the Council's existing policies and the level of contribution proposed was unlikely to have a significant effect. The contributions needed to be spent on the area which was being affected which was outside the District. However, Natural England had reminded local authorities of their obligations to provide suitable mitigation for development, and it was believed the proposals offered a pragmatic solution. The Assistant Director (Built Environment) advised that failure to agree to the policy would be likely to lead to Natural England objecting to residential development in the south of the District, which would create problems for developers and could detrimentally affect the delivery of housing.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans did not object to the principle of the proposals, but had concerns regarding its operation in practice, including regarding the viability statement. In addition, she queried what would be the situation if other local authorities chose not to participate?

The Assistant Director advised that all local authorities in PUSH and adjoining areas had provided an estimate of the likely housing numbers involved across the whole of the affected area. The Council would need to keep the situation under review and re-evaluate its stance, should other local authorities decide not to be involved.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Winchester City Council agrees to seek financial contributions in line with the Interim Planning Framework (commencement date to be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning) for all new residential development proposals within the 5.6km zone to be used for the mitigation of increased recreational activity along the Solent coastline (initially £172 per dwelling) in order to enable the Council to meet its obligations under the Habitat Regulations unless it can be demonstrated that a development can provide mitigation by other means.

2. That the City Council continues to work with other PUSH authorities and Natural England to agree and implement formal arrangements to collect and spend contributions received from residential developments in the 5.6km zone in order to implement the Interim Planning Framework.

3. That the City Council should work with other local authorities and Natural England to develop a long-term joint strategic avoidance and mitigation strategy as appropriate. Details of this, which may involve the use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds, will be reported to Cabinet once developed. If other local authorities decide not to support the Interim Planning Framework Winchester will need to review its position.

11. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY CHARGING SCHEDULE:  
ADOPTION OF DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE AND INTRODUCTION  
OF CIL CHARGE**

(Report CAB2529(LDF) refers)

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

Councillor Learney emphasised that it was very important that the Council was clear about how the CIL monies would be allocated, as there would be more demands on the funds than monies available. In addition, it was essential that parish councils, in addition to the Winchester Town Forum, understood the proposals and she requested more clarity on consultation on the Regulation 123 list. She reiterated that the Liberal Democrat Group considered that all parishes and the Town area should receive 25% of funding collected.

Councillor Evans highlighted the potential difficulties because of the delay in the South Downs National Park adopting CIL in their area. She also queried whether funding for infrastructure for large developments within the District would come from Section 106 contributions, rather than CIL?

The Head of Strategic Planning clarified that the Council would continue to require Section 106 contributions for items not covered by CIL, such as infrastructure requirements for a large development. The purpose of the Regulation 123 list was to set out when Section 106 contributions could not be required in order to prevent any double-charging.

With regard to the request for further consultation, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that consultation had already been carried out.

Cabinet noted that at the Cabinet (Local Development) Committee on 27 November 2013, it had been recommended that the Regulation 123 List be referred to the Winchester Town Forum for consideration at its meeting on 12 March 2014.

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

**RECOMMENDED:**

**1. THAT THE CITY COUNCIL'S COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) CHARGING SCHEDULE BE ADOPTED, INCORPORATING THE COUNCIL'S MODIFICATIONS PUBLISHED IN JULY 2013 AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE EXAMINER'S REPORT OF OCTOBER 2013.**

**2. THAT THE CIL CHARGING SCHEDULE BE BROUGHT INTO EFFECT IN RELATION TO DEVELOPMENT WHICH IS 'FIRST PERMITTED' ON OR AFTER 7 APRIL 2014.**

**RESOLVED:**

1. That authority be delegated to the Head of Strategic Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment, to prepare and publish the adopted Charging Schedule, as modified, and associated guidance notes and publicity material in advance of the Levy being brought into effect.

2. That the 'Regulation 123 List' be developed, taking account of current and expected Government advice, and submitted for consideration by Winchester Town Forum at its meeting of 12 March 2014, and approval by Cabinet no later than its meeting of 19 March 2014.

3. That officers develop a mechanism for prioritising projects for CIL funding based upon the development of a programme of infrastructure projects, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment and taking account of the content of Section 4 of the Report, with the final programme to be presented for agreement by Cabinet. Thereafter this programme shall be reviewed and up-dated annually by Cabinet.

4. That the development and implementation of a phased payments policy and mechanism for the collection of CIL payments relating to larger scale developments be delegated to the Assistant Director (Built Environment), in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Built Environment.

12. **REVISED LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 2014**  
(Report CAB2528(LDF) refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the revised Winchester District Local Development Scheme 2014, as set out in Appendix 1 to the Report, be approved and brought into effect from 1 January 2014.

13. **MINUTES OF THE CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE HELD 27 NOVEMBER 2013**  
(Report CAB2543 refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report had not been made available for publication within the statutory deadline. The Chairman agreed to accept the item onto the agenda as a matter requiring urgent consideration, to inform the discussion of Reports CAB2529(LDF) and CAB2528(LDF) above.

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee held 27 November 2013 be received (as attached as Appendix A) and the recommendations contained therein be agreed.

14. **FUTURE FUNDING FOR VOLUNTARY SECTOR SUPPORT**  
(Report CAB2522 refers)

Councillor Humby emphasised that the proposals were necessary in order to make the best use of diminishing resources, whilst acknowledging that Winchester Area Community Action (WACA) had provided a good service over the years. The County Council supported the City Council's move to a commissioning approach.

Mr T Lewis (Chairman of WACA) and County Councillor J Porter spoke during public participation and their comments are summarised below.

Mr Lewis referred to the comments from WACA which had been circulated to all Cabinet Members prior to the meeting. WACA did not agree with the Report's recommendations and believed that WACA, through a grant-based SLA, would offer the best support for the voluntary sector, at the lowest risk for the funding available. He emphasised that the Consultants' Report (listed as a Background Documents of CAB2522) recognised the value provided by WACA and the risk to both the voluntary sector and direct service users if the Council switched to a new partner. In addition, WACA considered that there would be no cost disadvantage in continuing with a SLA-based grant as opposed to a commission.

County Councillor Porter spoke in opposition to the proposals as the Chairman of various charities which currently used the facilities of WACA.

She emphasised the value of the organisation. This included offering a payroll service and providing training for volunteers. As a County Council observer on WACA, she believed that the County Council was also supporting a 3 year grant based SLA approach in some Districts. The County was supporting the lead given by each District on how to take the service forward.

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

Councillor Learney generally supported the commissioning approach, but believed that there was a risk in this instance that the Council would pay more for services and the Council would lose the benefits of the very flexible service currently offered by WACA. She expressed concern that the Report was unclear about the financial risks to the Council, including potential loss of income from office rentals and pensions liabilities.

Councillor Tait spoke as the Council's nominated representative on WACA and endorsed the comments made by Mr Lewis. He had concerns that moving to a commissioning approach would negatively impact upon what the Council was seeking to achieve. He emphasised the positive contributions of WACA over the previous 25 years.

Councillor Humby acknowledged the points made and the excellent work undertaken by WACA. However, the City Council needed to consider how to best take the service forward, including how it could develop in the rural areas. He considered that a commissioning approach would best achieve these aims.

One Member did not support a commissioning approach because of the risk that it could destabilise WACA and threaten some of its other activities. He thought that the potential costs to the Council were understated and that the service could end up being undertaken by a provider from outside the local area. WACA already undertook support in the rural areas.

Other Members supported the commissioning approach.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the move away from annual core funding for WACA to the advertising of a contract for a new, pilot commissioned service for the two financial years starting from Spring 2014 be approved.
2. That the Assistant Director (Economy & Communities) draft the specification for this service, in consultation with the

Portfolio Holder for Economic Development, based on the findings of the recent consultation programme.

3. That the Assistant Director (Economy & Communities) be authorised to finalise discussions with the County Council to determine potential for co-commissioning the support service.

4. That the Assistant Director (Economy & Communities) seek final approval for the specification, the evaluation process for the procurement and the recommended budget allocation for 2014/15 through the Portfolio Holder Decision Notice process before advertising the opportunity on the South East Business Portal in January 2014.

5. That the allocation of three months of core funding for WACA in 2014/15 based on the current year's grant (equating to £21,125) be authorised to enable the organisation to manage the transition, should it not be successful in securing the commission.

6. That officers be requested to provide practical support for WACA during any transition period to ensure that the contracts and projects for which it is responsible (outside the scope of the Council's core grant) are appropriately accommodated.

15. **GOVERNANCE REVIEW – IMPACT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION ELECTORAL REVIEW – OPTIONS FOR THE COUNCIL'S ELECTORAL CYCLE**  
(Report CAB2542 refers)

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

**RECOMMENDED:**

**1. THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN AS TO WHETHER THE COUNCIL SHOULD COMMENCE STATUTORY CONSULTATION ON A PROPOSED CHANGE TO WHOLE COUNCIL ELECTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION IN 2016.**

**2. THAT REPORTS BE BROUGHT TO FULL COUNCIL TO ENABLE IT TO DETERMINE SUBMISSIONS TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION ON:**

**(A) STAGE 1 - COUNCIL SIZE**

**(B) STAGE 2 - WARDING ARRANGEMENTS**

**BEFORE THE COMMISSION UNDERTAKES THE FORMAL PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESSES FOR THOSE STAGES OF THE ELECTORAL REVIEW.**

## RESOLVED:

That an Informal Policy Group be established, with membership as follows, to act as a sounding board in taking forward the Council's response to the Commission's Electoral Review and the Council's own Governance Review:

Councillors: Godfrey, McLean, Wright, J Berry together with up to three Liberal Democrat Members (names confirmed subsequent to the meeting as Councillors Clear, Learney and Weir)

16. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

## RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Forward Plan for December 2013, be noted.

17. **EXEMPT BUSINESS**

## RESOLVED:

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

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

<u>Minute Number</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Description of Exempt Information</u>
##	Exempt minutes of the previous meeting	) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person
##	Estates Restructure	) (including the authority holding that information).
##	Bringing together the Council's Legal and Democratic Services Teams	) (Para 3 Schedule 12A refers)



18. **EXEMPT MINUTE OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD 4 NOVEMBER 2013**

RESOLVED:

That the exempt minutes of the previous meeting held 4 November 2013 be approved and adopted.

19. **ESTATES RESTRUCTURE**  
(Report PER241 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That a supplementary revenue estimate of £21,000 in 2013/14, £66,000 in 2014/15 and thereafter as identified in Appendix 3, and subject to it not being called in by The Overview and Scrutiny Committee

20. **BRINGING TOGETHER THE COUNCIL'S LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES TEAMS**  
(Report PER242 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That £16,000 be allocated from vacancy management savings in 2013/14 and a one-off growth item of £19,000 be included in the 2014/15 Budget to support the Council's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission.

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 1.45pm

Chairman