

**CABINET****19 October 2016****Attendance:**

Councillor Godfrey -	<i>Leader (Chairman) (P)</i>
Councillor Weston -	<i>Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Built Environment (P)</i>
Councillor Byrnes -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Transport &amp; Professional Services (P)</i>
Councillor Horrill -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Housing Services (P)</i>
Councillor Humby -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Business Partnership (P)</i>
Councillor Miller -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Economy &amp; Estates (P)</i>
Councillor Pearson -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Environment, Health &amp; Wellbeing (P)</i>

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

Councillors Evans, Prince, Tait, Thompson and Weir

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

Councillors Bell, Clear and Scott  
Monica Gill and David Light (TACT)

---

**1. MEMBERSHIP OF CABINET COMMITTEES ETC**

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson clarified that the Liberal Democrat Group had requested that they be entitled to a second standing invitee to the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee (the existing invitee being Councillor Evans).

Cabinet also noted that, as Chairman of the Bar End Forum, Councillor Ashton had requested that its membership be extended to include a representative from the residents of Chilcomb Lane.

**RESOLVED:**

1. That Councillor Bell be added to the list of standing invitees of the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee.
2. That Councillor Evans replace Councillor Bentote as a deputy on the West of Waterlooville Forum.
3. That the Bar End Forum be extended to include a representative from residents of Chilcomb Lane.

## 2. **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Councillors Godfrey and Humby declared disclosable pecuniary interests in respect of agenda items due to his role as a County Council employee and County Council respectively. 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.

Councillor Miller declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a Bishops Waltham Parish Councillor in respect of Report CAB2856 and left the room during discussion on that item and did not speak or vote thereon.

Councillor Horrill declared a personal and prejudicial interest as a trustee of Youth Options in respect of Report CAB2839 and left the room during discussion on that item and did not speak or vote thereon.

## 3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meetings held on 7 September 2016 be approved and adopted.

## 4. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Three members of the public and/or representatives from local organisations spoke regarding CAB2852 and CAB2838(LP) and their comments are summarised under the relevant minutes below.

Jon Walker and Councillor Tait also addressed Cabinet on a general matter as summarised below.

As the owner of a business in Stonemasons Court (Parchment Street, Winchester), Jon Walker expressed concern about a recent letter received by various Parchment Street businesses requiring them to remove their A-Boards currently situated outside WH Smiths. He emphasised that his business had increased 100% since putting up an A-Board in that area and conversely, another trader had seen their business substantially reduced since removing their Board. He had particular concern about the timing of the removal request, so close to the vitally important Christmas trading period. In addition, the option of licensing A-Boards had not been offered. Mr Walker noted the ongoing involvement of Winchester BID in seeking a solution but did not consider the suggestion of one large A-Board was appropriate.

The Chairman emphasised that the letter referred to by Mr Walker had been issued by the County Council as it had responsibilities for highways matters. However, he would discuss further the possible ways forward with Officers.

In response to questions, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services confirmed that the City Council's Licensing Team were responsible for the licensing of tables and chairs on the highways. However, the County Council had general responsibility for highways matters.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Catherine Turness (Winchester BID) confirmed that this was an ongoing issue which the BID had been involved with for a number of years. Improvements to signage across the town centre were being considered, including installing wall mounted signs; however, she acknowledged this took time. She believed that the County Council had issued the letter to traders following complaints received about the proliferation of A-Boards in the area in question. Following discussions with the City and County Councils, a temporary solution of one large A-Board, to include details of all the businesses trading along Parchment Street, was proposed and would shortly be installed. She suggested it was preferable to assess the impact of this before examining further options.

As County Councillor with responsibility for this matter, Councillor Humby stated it was a County-wide issue and he was aiming to negotiate solutions at a local level. He emphasised the duty of care to protect partially sighted highway users but also appreciated the impact on businesses. He stated he would discuss the matter further with City and County Officers, together with the BID.

Councillor Tait supported the comments made by Mr Walker. He emphasised that various traders in the town centre, including WH Smiths, continued to leave trade waste bins on the highway which also caused an obstruction, but were not being targeted by the County Council. He suggested that complaints be made to the County Council regarding these bins in order that they could be removed. In addition, A-Boards were being used at other places around the centre, including outside the Guildhall and for the High Street Market, which were not being required to be removed. Councillor Tait highlighted the importance of A-Boards towards the success of local businesses.

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

Councillor Byrnes reported on the proposed arrangements to increase car parking capacity within Winchester in the run-up to Christmas. These included making the lower floor of Tower Street Multi Storey Car Park (MSCP) available at weekends for staff members of BID businesses to park (making approximately 150 car parking spaces available in the centre car parks), extending the Park and Ride operating hours until 20:30 hours, and the Chesil Street MSCP lift operating at weekends. In addition, a new Car Park Counter System would be in operation which would enable visitors to check a webpage giving real time car parking capacity information.

Councillor Miller welcomed the extension of the Employment Mentoring Programme until December 2017 and highlighted the various successes under the scheme to date.

Councillor Weston reported that Professor Martin Biddle had attended a meeting of the Central Winchester Regeneration Informal Policy Group (IPG) the previous evening to provide advice on the archaeology of the area and the development process. In summary, he believed that there will be archaeology of considerable importance to understanding the history of Winchester in the area but that there was no requirement to excavate this before development and that provided that best practice was followed it could remain preserved in situ. His presentation to the IPG would be made available on the Council's website. In addition, the IPG had heard praise for the Council's own Historic Environment Team.

Councillor Horrill provided an update on the work of the New Homes Delivery Team. In 2012, the Council had set a target of providing 300 new homes and to date, 250 homes had either been completed or were various stages of planning. She congratulated the Team for this achievement.

Councillor Miller thanked those involved for the recent restoration works at Bishops Waltham Pond.

6. **MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL POSITION**  
(Report CAB2844 refers)

In introducing the Report, the Chairman emphasised the reduction in Government grants, the uncertainty regarding the New Homes Bonus and the requirement for the Council to seek methods of increasing income generation locally. The Head of Finance highlighted the proposed move to Outcome Based Budgeting.

In response to questions, the Corporate Director (Professional Services) confirmed that the Council would be examining alternative sources of income, such as Strategic Asset Purchase Schemes.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Prince raised four queries, as summarised below:

- Would a project be put in place and appropriate resources made available to enable the successful implementation of Outcome Based Budgeting?
- Had adequate regard been had to the impact of a rise in inflation on contracts and/or staffing costs?
- Had adequate regard been had to the impact of increased expenditure on new and emerging Council projects?
- Did the Strategy assume that Council Tax levels would remain static and have regard to the impact of an increased number of residences?

With regard to the last point, the Chairman stated that the Report assumed that Council Tax would not rise, but no decision would be made on this until Council in February 2017. As Council Tax rates were relatively low, increases in residences would not have a significant effect on the overall amount collected.

The Head of Finance confirmed that the Report had regard to a range of scenarios, including changes in inflation rates and new projects coming on stream. He was currently examining whether additional resources would be required to implement Outcome Based Budgeting or whether this could be achieved by adjusting existing resource priorities.

The Chairman requested that other Councillors bring forward any suggestions as to how future budget challenges could be met prior to the consideration of the full budget at Council in February 2017.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Capital Strategy and Programme be approved in January 2017.
2. That all of the main Financial Strategies, other than in Recommendation 1 above, be agreed at the February 2017 Council in conjunction with Council Tax setting.
3. That the Council's continuing need to promote change in how it does things and drive to replace lost central Government grant with new funding streams be recognised and supported.

7. **STATION APPROACH – PROCUREMENT PROCESS UPDATE (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**  
(Report CAB2852 refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report had been considered at The Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 17 October 2016 where Members had generally supported the proposed way forward. The Committee had requested that the membership of the Evaluation Panel be extended to include at least one local Councillor.

During public participation, Kate Macintosh and Michael Carden addressed the meeting and their comments are summarised below. The Chairman also noted a request from Chris Higgins to speak regarding this Report but, as participation was at the Chairman's discretion, declined to permit him to speak on this occasion.

Kate Macintosh expressed concern about the retention of the original Design Brief as she considered the Brief had been identified by all stakeholders, including the previous Design Jury and Architects as one of the reasons why the project had failed previously. A new Brief should take account on the currently ongoing Transport Assessment Study and not require as many car parking spaces previously put forward. The Council should undertake a public realm study as a starting point and extend the areas under

consideration in the study to make it more meaningful. She welcomed the proposal to seek RIBA advice and highlighted this should include appointment of a Design Champion for the scheme and enable the Panel to have the final decision on the scheme.

In response to questions from the Chairman as to what should be changed in the Brief, Ms Macintosh stated it was not rational to concentrate so much parking on a site so close to a train station. However, the Chairman highlighted that the Brief stated that approximately the same level of parking as currently offered across the Carfax and Cattle Market sites should be retained and had the necessary flexibility to allow this number to be adjusted if required (including between the two sites).

Michael Carden (City of Winchester Trust) welcomed the Council's discussion proposals with RIBA and requested that the Trust be advised of the details of this. He had requested a meeting with the Council to seek reassurance on a number of points, including the following (other points had been made directly to the Chairman outside of the meeting):

- The Design Brief had been ignored in previous outcomes and in future proposals, the urban design requirements should be emphasised and observed;
- The capacity requirements were too prescriptive and could negatively impact on height and design;
- The Traffic Assessment Study should be completed before the design is developed. He asked that a revised version of the Design Brief be vetted by RIBA and issued for comment.

The Chairman confirmed that he would meet with Mr Carden to discuss further the Trust's points. However, he queried why the Trust now considered the Design Brief should be fundamentally changed? In response, Mr Carden acknowledged that the Brief did appear to enable flexibility and it might have been the previous process that had resulted in designs that were not considered to be suitable for Winchester. The Trust remained concerned that the restrictive capacity requirements and focus on economic viability could have a negative impact on design.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson disputed that The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had generally supported the proposals and had continued to have a number of concerns regarding the way forward. She believed the Brief was confused as to whether it was a Development or a Design Brief. She acknowledged statements that the Brief was sufficiently flexible to take account of the Traffic Movement Study but this was based around the proposals from Bidder B in the previous process. She queried when it was proposed that the Cattle Market site be developed and whether parking spaces would be counted across both sites. She believed the model was high risk in the current economic climate and that the Report did not mention public engagement or consultation (which she believed had not been effective under the earlier process). Finally, she asked Cabinet to approve the inclusion of a local ward councillor in the Evaluation Panel.

The Chairman clarified that although the Traffic Assessment Study included reference to the increased parking spaces within the previous proposals, it also stated it would examine alternative parking arrangements. He emphasised that the new approach would allow complete flexibility to amend the Design Brief and the design which emerged, and this would involve consultation and engagement with all stakeholders. If any Councillors or stakeholders had any specific changes they wished to see to the Brief they should advise him accordingly.

The Chairman stated that it was not intended to develop both the Carfax and Cattle Market sites at the same time, in order to minimise disruption. It was proposed that the Carfax site be developed first. However, before development began it would be necessary to have a view as to how different elements of a scheme, including parking, could be allocated between the two sites.

During debate, a number of Cabinet Members spoke in support of the Design Brief (including the flexibility it allowed) and emphasised the considerable consultation that had taken place prior to its introduction. Members also highlighted the requirement for high class office development in Winchester and for development to proceed to assist with the Council's own financial plans. The requested improvements to the public realm around the Station area could also be achieved if the Council could access the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) grant.

With regard to The Overview and Scrutiny Committee request regarding the composition of the evaluation panel (Paragraph 8.9 of the Report refers), Cabinet agreed that this include one City Centre Ward Councillor. Cabinet also agreed that there was no requirement to include a senior Council officer on the panel.

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

**RECOMMENDED:**

**THAT BUDGET PROVISION OF £1.5 MILLION BE MADE FOR THE COMMISSIONING OF THE NECESSARY DESIGN WORK AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICES TO PROGRESS WORK ON STATION APPROACH, INCORPORATING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CARFAX SITE AND THE PREPARATION OF A PUBLIC REALM STRATEGY.**

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the details of the proposed procurement process outlined in the Report be noted.

2. That that a direction under Contract Procedure Rule 2.4a be made and the Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration) be authorised to negotiate a contract with the RIBA Competitions Office (to assist in the procurement of a design team for the Station Approach redevelopment using the restricted procedure under the Public Contracts Regulations 2015), at a cost as set out in Exempt Appendix 4 of the Report, to be funded from the Major Projects Station Approach Budget for 2016/17.

3. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration), in consultation with Leader, to agree the procurement process (with the assistance of the RIBA Competitions Office) for a design team to carry out architectural and design services as set out at paragraph 8.2 of the Report, including the options as detailed in paragraph 2.5, based on the restricted procedure under the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

4. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration) in consultation with Leader and with the agreement of the RIBA Competitions Office in accordance with the terms of their appointment to a) agree the criteria and method of assessment of the standard selection questionnaires, b) agree the criteria and methods of assessment of proposals, c) agree the composition of the selection panel, d) to draw up a shortlist of suitable firms to be invited to submit proposals and e) to recommend a design team for appointment.

5. That a payment of £3,000 each be agreed to all tenderers who complete an interview as per the recommendation of RIBA.

6. That the outcome of the procurement process be reported to a future meeting of Cabinet to authorise the appointment of a design team and the necessary fees.

8. **PROPOSED PURCHASE OF KING ALFRED YOUTH ACTIVITY CENTRE (KAYAC) PREMISES, WINNALL VALLEY ROAD, WINCHESTER (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**

(Report CAB2839 refers)

Cabinet noted that under the Council Constitution Access to Information Procedure Rules (Rule 15 General Exception), this was a key decision which was not included in the Forward Plan for October 2016. It was necessary to take it as an urgent item and under this procedure the Chairman of The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had agreed to the matter being considered at this meeting.

The Chairman thanked Youth Options for their work over previous years. At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Tait highlighted that the existing premises were used by a number of organisations for a variety of community activities, such as Winnall Rock School. He acknowledged that the current



location was not ideal but expressed concern that facilities should be retained within Winchester.

The Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration) advised that he was not able to give full details at the current time, but that a potential tenant had come forward who was interested in the retention of some of the services as part of their a business model.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the purchase of the freehold of the KAYAC building in Winnall Valley Road, Winchester be approved on the terms set out in the Report and in Exempt Appendix B to the Report.

2. That approval be given under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4 to the capital expenditure for the project as set out in Exempt Appendix B.

3. That the Assistant Director (Estates & Regeneration) be authorised to accept tenders for the works identified in the report in accordance with Contract Procedure Rule 9.2 (obtaining quotations/tenders).

4. That the Assistant Director (Estates & Regeneration) be given delegated authority to agree terms and let the premises for commercial purposes.

5. That the Assistant Director (Estates & Regeneration) be authorised to submit planning and other applications for works requiring statutory consent if these prove to be necessary.

9. **CHANGE OF USE OF OFFICES TO DWELLING HOUSE – ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION TO REMOVE PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS**  
(Report CAB2838(LP) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report had been considered at Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee on 5 October 2016 where its recommendations had been supported (the minutes were contained within Report CAB2858 below).

The Assistant Director (Environment) introduced the item and set out the problems associated with the conversion of office premises to housing using permitted development rights in Winchester where supply of appropriate office accommodation was already limited. Intervention by means of an Article 4 Direction was justified on the basis of evidence provided by the County Council, and on behalf of the Enterprise M3 LEP (Regeneris market report), and the action was supported by the Winchester BID and Chamber of Commerce. He provided an update to the figures from the County Council

which showed that since the introduction of Permitted Development Rights (PDRs) in 2013 it was estimated that approximately 6.8% of Winchester's office space had been converted to housing (c2807 sq.m) or had approval to be converted (c4493 sq.m).

During public participation, Catherine Turness (BID) spoke in support of the proposed introduction of an Article 4 Direction and highlighted the increasing difficulties for businesses in finding new office premises, as had been demonstrated by the experience of Nick Joynes who had spoken at both a previous Cabinet and Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee meetings. She referred to a Report for the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) which stated that between May 2013 and October 2015 there were 34 prior notifications of office to residential, 20 in the town centre potentially effecting 8,000 sq.m of B1(a) space. However, BID understood the reasons for the Council proposing to wait for 12 months before the Article 4 Direction came into force.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans also supported the proposals, and having attended the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee as an invited member, sympathised with Mr Joynes's situation. She queried how quickly the Council could start the process of implementing an Article 4 Direction as she considered it was an urgent matter.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services confirmed that the making of the Direction would be treated as a priority and that any objections received could be dealt with within the 12 month period prior to the Direction coming into effect.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to make an Article 4 Direction under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 to remove permitted development rights under Class O of Schedule 2, Part 3 (Development consisting of a change of use of a building and any land within its curtilage from a use falling within Class B1(a) (offices) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order, to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of that Schedule). The Direction will apply to Winchester Town as set out in the emerging Winchester District Local Plan Part 2 and will come into effect 12 months after the Article 4 is made ; and

2. That delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director (Environment) and Head of Legal and Democratic Services to consider any objections received after the Direction is publicised and, either to confirm the Direction or return the matter to Cabinet for further consideration.

10. **MINUTES OF CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE HELD 5 OCTOBER 2016**

(Report CAB2858 refers)

Cabinet noted that the recommended minute from the Committee had been dealt with under the item above (Report CAB2838(LP) refers).

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee held 5 October 2016 be received (as attached as Appendix A to the minutes) and the recommendations contained therein be approved.

11. **UPDATE OF PLAY AREA REFURBISHMENT PLAN 2015-2020**

(Report WTF237refers)

12. **EXTRACT FROM MINUTE OF THE WINCHESTER TOWN FORUM HELD 21 SEPTEMBER 2016**

(Report CAB2857 refers)

The Interim Managing Director advised that as Winchester Town Forum at its meeting on 21 September 2016 had not recommended any schemes to be approved for funding from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds, there was no requirement for Cabinet approval at the current time.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Weir spoke as Chair of Winchester Town Forum and thanked Officers for their support in preparation of the Refurbishment Plan. She stated that a Forum Informal Working Group had been established to review the Council's approach to play area management. Following the decision at the last Forum, a further Report would be submitted to the next meeting of the Town Forum on 16 November 2016.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the approved four year refurbishment programme and the delay incurred due to insufficient funding within the Winchester Town Account be noted.

2. That it be noted that some schemes in the programme may be suitable for the District wide CIL funding and these can be assessed in accordance with the protocol agreed as part of Report CAB2807.

13. **USE OF COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY FUNDS FOR THE PROPOSED JUBILEE HALL CAR PARK EXTENSION AT BISHOPS WALTHAM**  
(Report CAB2856 refers)

The Assistant Director (Environment) stated that in addition to benefiting business and residents of Bishops Waltham, the proposed extension would also offer wider benefits due to its status as a Market Town. He advised that the scheme was coming forward now (ahead of annual budget considerations) because tenders received were due to expire shortly and there was a risk that having to retender could significantly increase the cost which could prejudice the delivery of the scheme.

In response to questions, the Assistant Director confirmed that if for any reason, the Bishops Waltham Parish Council contribution to the overall cost of the project was not forthcoming and this meant it could not proceed, the agreed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds would be allocated to a different project.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That a supplementary capital estimate of £50,000 in 2016/17 towards the cost of implementing the extension to the car park at Jubilee Hall in Bishop's Waltham be approved, to be funded by the City Council's General Fund share of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

2. That under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4, authority be given to incur capital expenditure of up to £50,000 for the Project, by means of a payment to Bishop's Waltham Parish Council.

14. **REQUEST FOR THE CREATION OF A PROCUREMENT OFFICER POST**  
(Report PER293(REV) refers)

In response to questions, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services stated that the Legal Services Team would work closely with the new Procurement Officer who would assist in examining detailed procurement requirements, subject to final checking by Legal Services to ensure lawfulness.

The Corporate Director (Professional Services) confirmed that the aspiration was that the post would be self-funding, depending on the scale of the Council's projects. There would be two elements to the post: strategic procurement and spend analysis. It was intended that the new post would be advertised early in 2017.

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

RESOLVED:

That the establishment of a procurement specialist post be approved.

15. **SECTION 15A COMMONS ACT 2006 TOWN OR VILLAGE GREENS DEPOSIT STATEMENT BY OWNER**  
(Report CAB2840(HSG) refers)

Cabinet noted that the Report had been considered at Cabinet (Housing) Committee on 11 October 2016 where the Recommendations had been supported, including by representatives of TACT.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration), in consultation with the Assistant Director (Chief Housing Officer), Head of Landscape and Open Space, Members for the ward where the land is located, the Portfolio Holder for Housing and the Portfolio Holder for Economy and Estates, be authorised to complete and deposit statements under section 15A Commons Act 2006 with the Commons Registration Authority in respect of land within Winchester City Council's ownership.

2. That the delegated authority approved following consideration of Report CAB2816(HSG) be rescinded accordingly.

16. **MINUTES OF CENTRAL WINCHESTER REGENERATION INFORMAL POLICY GROUP (IPG) HELD 13 SEPTEMBER 2016**  
(Report CAB2854 refers)

In response to questions, the Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that consideration was ongoing on determining whether the works carried out on site were sufficient to constitute formal implementation of the 2009 Silver Hill planning permission and he would report back to the IPG as soon as possible.

Whilst noting the involvement of the Winchester Town Forum in the consultation process, one Member emphasised the importance of extending consultation wider. As Chair of the IPG, Councillor Weston confirmed that consultation would be District-wide.

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Central Winchester Regeneration Informal Policy Group held 13 September 2016 (as attached as Appendix B to the minutes) be noted.

17. **MINUTES OF CENTRAL WINCHESTER REGENERATION INFORMAL POLICY GROUP (IPG) HELD 3 OCTOBER 2016**  
(Report CAB2855 refers)

As Chair of the IPG, Councillor Weston confirmed that the Assistant Director (Chief Housing Officer) and his Team, as well as TACT Members, would be included in those consulted.

The Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration) advised that the demolition of the Friarsgate Multi Story car park had begun. In addition, work was under way to improve the appearance of buildings within the area which were in Council ownership. A number of new tenants had also been found for empty premises within the area.

Councillor Weston stated that the IPG wished to make progress without delay as they were working to a tight deadline for the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document. As the IPG did not have delegated authority to approve expenditure, it was suggested that delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director (Policy and Planning), in consultation with the Leader, to approve procurement of a consultant to prepare the draft Document (under the guidance of the Group) and carry out the consultation processes that would be required. Cabinet noted that there was an agreed budget for production of the SPD.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the minutes of the Central Winchester Regeneration Informal Policy Group held 3 October 2016 (as attached as Appendix C to the minutes) be noted.

2. That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director (Policy and Planning), in consultation with the Leader, to approve procurement of a consultant to assist in the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document.

18. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

Cabinet noted that an item on Devolution and Reorganisation of Local Government should be included on the Forward Plan for December 2016 Cabinet.

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Forward Plan for November 2016, be noted.

19. **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>
##	Station Approach – Procurement Process Update (Exempt appendix)	) Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). (Para 3 Schedule 12A refers)
##	Proposed Purchase of KAYAC Premises, Winnall Valley Road (exempt appendix)	)
##	Confidential Item – Report by Assistant Director (Estates & Regeneration)	)

20. **STATION APPROACH – PROCUREMENT PROCESS UPDATE (EXEMPT APPENDIX)**  
(Report CAB2852 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Exempt Appendix be noted.

21. **PROPOSED PURCHASE OF KAYAC PREMISES, WINNALL VALLEY ROAD, WINCHESTER (EXEMPT APPENDIX)**  
(Report CAB2839 refers)

Cabinet noted that under the Council Constitution Access to Information Procedure Rules (Rule 15 General Exception), this was a key decision which was not included in the Forward Plan for October 2016. It was necessary to take it as an urgent item and under this procedure the Chairman of The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had agreed to the matter being considered at this meeting.

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

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Exempt Appendix be noted.

22. **CONFIDENTIAL ITEM – REPORT BY ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (ESTATES & REGENERATION)**  
(Report CAB2853 refers)

Cabinet noted that under the Council Constitution Access to Information Procedure Rules (Rule 15 General Exception), this was a key decision which was not included in the Forward Plan for October 2016. It was necessary to take it as an urgent item and under this procedure the Chairman of The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had agreed to the matter being considered at this meeting. In addition, the Report had been considered at The Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 17 October 2016 where Members had supported the recommendations contained therein.

Cabinet considered the contents of the above Report and recommended a way forward (detail in exempt minute).

The meeting commenced at 10.00am and concluded at 1.00pm