

CABINET**20 March 2017****Attendance:**

Councillor Horrill -	<i>Leader and Portfolio Holder for Housing Services (Chairman) (P)</i>
Councillor Weston -	<i>Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Built Environment (P)</i>
Councillor Ashton -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Professional Services</i>
Councillor Godfrey -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Finance (P)</i>
Councillor Griffiths -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Health & Wellbeing (P)</i>
Councillor Humby -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Business Partnerships (P)</i>
Councillor Miller -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Economy & Estates (P)</i>
Councillor Warwick -	<i>Portfolio Holder for Environment (P)</i>

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Burns, Elks, Evans, Porter and Thompson

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors Clear and Scott

1. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Councillors Godfrey and Humby declared disclosable pecuniary interests in respect of agenda items due to their roles as a County Council employee and County Council member 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.

2. MEMBERSHIP OF CABINET COMMITTEES ETC

Cabinet noted a requested change to the invited representatives on the Cabinet (Housing) Committee to replace Councillor Izard with Councillor Elks.

Cabinet agreed to the following for the reasons set out above.

RESOLVED:

That the change to the membership of Cabinet (Housing) Committee be agreed as set out above.

3. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the previous meetings held on 8 February 2017 be approved and adopted.

4. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Eleven members of the public and/or representatives spoke regarding Report CAB2864 and two spoke regarding Report CAB2910. Their comments are summarised under the relevant minutes below.

5. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Godfrey welcomed the recent Government announcement to offer more than £9,000 over the next four years to assist businesses facing a rise in their business rates following the revaluation exercise. A new discretionary rate relief scheme would be proposed to assist local businesses.

Councillor Weston announced that the Council had been successful in two appeals against decisions not to approve planning permission for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) in Stanmore following the introduction of the Article 4 Direction restricting permitted development rights in the area.

Councillor Griffiths gave details of a recent successful prosecution of a fly tipper in the District.

6. **STATION APPROACH RIBA PLANS OF WORKS STAGES DOCUMENTATION (LESS EXEMPT APPENDIX)**

(Report CAB2864 refers)

The Chairman emphasised the importance of the Station Approach scheme to the Council and recognised that a number of different stakeholders wished to be involved in the decision-making process. Consequently, a new governance approach was being recommended, as set out in the Report. She also highlighted that the Report set out to fulfil the requirements of the Full Council resolution on 2 November 2016. In particular, the Council had considered the Regeneris report which showed the lack of Grade A office space in Winchester.

Councillor Horrill acknowledged concerns expressed about the impact of Brexit on national economic performance, but emphasised that the project approach had a number of steps which would allow the Council to consider its position at each point. The Project Brief had been adapted since the previous version, in particular by the inclusion of a paragraph stipulating the flexibility of requirements (as had been recommended by the City of Winchester Trust).

- Concerns regarding transport issues were also acknowledged and discussions had taken place with the County Council and a Transport

Board would be established with the City Council which would consider wider transport matters. In addition, a separate transport study specifically for Station Approach had also been commissioned. With regard to the selection of the design team, it was recognised that it was important for any firm to have a breadth of knowledge of individuals within (for example, expertise on public realm in addition to office development).

The Chairman noted that some detailed comments on the proposals had been submitted by various people and gave assurance that these be dealt with outside of the meeting as appropriate.

Eleven members of the public and/or representatives from local organisations addressed Cabinet as summarised below.

Catherine Turness (Winchester BID) supported the scheme moving forward in order to provide high quality office space to prevent existing businesses from relocating and to encourage new businesses to Winchester. She gave two specific examples of local businesses that were unable to find suitable premises to illustrate her points. She welcomed the inclusion of the BID on the Advisory Panel.

Joe Harvey (Winchester BID and Charters) provided information on the first quarter of 2017 from the CoStar Commercial Property Database demonstrating the lack of any Grade A office space in Winchester. In addition, he emphasised that there was demand for such office space and highlighted six major office requirements totalling 125,000 square feet of demand for Grade A office space.

Kevin Travers (Enterprise M3 LEP) stated that with regard to availability of office accommodation, Winchester and Guildford had been identified as the two most constrained markets in the area. The requirement for town centre locations with good transport links was highlighted and a 2013 study had indicated that 37 of the 52 businesses who responded had difficulty obtaining commercial property in Winchester. He highlighted the significant pressure on LEP funding and emphasised that a firm commitment to the project would be welcomed to ensure the release of funds.

Stewart Dunn (Hampshire Chamber of Commerce) also emphasised the difficulties for local businesses due to the lack of suitable office space as demonstrated in the recent LEP study and Lambert Smith Hampton 2016 report. Prime rents in Winchester were averaging at approximately £25 per sq.ft compared to £18 per sq.ft. elsewhere therefore demand was strong in the City

Chris Holloway (WinACC) thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to be involved in detailed discussions on proposals. She noted that the Council had to balance a wide range of matters in progressing development and sought assurance that tackling climate change and reducing carbon emissions would remain an important consideration. She suggested more guidance should be offered on completing the environmental considerations section of Committee

Reports and the Advisory Panel should include a representative with expertise on climate change issues.

Kate Macintosh welcomed the changes to the governance process proposed but expressed concern that the Design Brief had not changed greatly. She also believed that the development should not progress until after the transport study and preferably also the Central Winchester regeneration project had been completed. She also highlighted concerns about the levels of car parking proposed in the previous scheme and believed that the Report contained misleading information regarding the requirement for Grade A office space.

Phil Gagg also disputed the information provided in the Report regarding the requirement for Grade A office accommodation. He emphasised that Station Approach was a sensitive strategic site which offered an ideal place to develop public transport facilities and it was premature to concentrate on office accommodation and additional car parking.

Michael Carden (City of Winchester Trust) welcomed the Report but expressed some concern about the tendency for Grade A office accommodation to consist of very large offices which might be contrary to the design requirements of the Station Approach area. He considered the original Railway Inn building should be retained in a new scheme. He welcomed the County Council transport studies but was concerned information would not be available prior to the design stage.

John Hearn (urban designer and local resident) welcomed the inclusion of RIBA and the inclusion of flexibility in the Design Brief. He considered that the design should not be finalised until the results of the transport study were available. He believed that the Brief should emphasise the importance of ensuring a successful high quality townscape and define good sustainable development. In addition, an analysis of what went wrong with the previous process should be included.

Judith Martin agreed that the reasons for the previous failure of the project should be analysed in order to regain public confidence and did not welcome continuing reference to the previous work of Tibbalds. She queried whether the businesses seeking new office accommodation would be prepared to pay the relatively high level of Winchester rents and did not believe Winchester could compete with larger cities in the region, such as Oxford.

Patrick Davies queried the lack of definition of the aim to secure high quality public realm within the Station Approach area. He expressed concern that if the office space and car parking requirements remained the same as under the previous proposals, the resulting scheme would ultimately be unacceptable in terms of design and public realm.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Thompson, Hutchison and Burns addressed Cabinet as summarised below.

Councillor Thompson generally welcomed the changes to the process outlined in the Report but expressed concern that the Brief remained largely unchanged with the consequential impact on final design. She believed there should be a masterplan for the whole area, including the Cattlemarket site. She also queried how proposals for high quality Grade A office space would be balanced with the Council's stated aims to provide high quality housing in the area. She suggested that the business case lacked detailed figures and the LSH report appeared to suggest there was available office space in Winchester.

Councillor Hutchison welcomed the development of the Station Approach area in a sensitive and high quality manner. She believed the Report was a good step in the right direction but had concerns that the required outcome might not be achievable. She highlighted the importance of movement, place and retail in addition to office and housing requirements. She had submitted detailed notes on the Report and would welcome the opportunity to discuss these further before the Brief was issued.

Councillor Burns expressed concern that the business case did not include sufficient evidence and highlighted that the LSH report preceded the Brexit Referendum and that the Council should seek to realise the best return on the Station Approach area, possibly by the development of more housing. The transport studies should be available before the scheme was progressed. She noted that the development area included two separate Council Wards and queried the representation of ward members on the Advisory Panel.

The Chairman noted the comments made and confirmed that tackling climate change would remain a key consideration. She acknowledged concerns about waiting for transport and other studies to be available but emphasised that the Council was not able to wait several years for this and consequentially the processes would have to happen in parallel. She also noted comments regarding retaining the Station Inn together with the importance of townscape and public realm and would ask that these points were reviewed. However, she emphasised that any scheme would have to achieve a balance between various different requirements.

During discussion, Cabinet noted that the County Council had given an undertaking to focus on the transport study around the Station Approach area as an initial requirement. As the Council's champion for engagement on this project, Councillor Humby welcomed differing views which would be given full consideration, but it was essential that the final scheme was viable. There had been a number of studies outlining the requirement for Grade A office space in Winchester and consideration could be given as to whether this could be more clearly presented.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the content of the Report be noted and be satisfied that the requirements of RIBA Plan of Work Stages 0 and 1 have been met.
2. That the Station Approach Business Justification Case and supporting Evidence of Need be approved and the project to develop an outline business case be authorised and proceed to the next RIBA stage (RIBA Stage 2).
3. That the establishment of a Station Approach Cabinet Committee as set out in a separate report elsewhere on the agenda be noted.
4. That the revised Station Approach Brief be approved for use in the new procurement process subject to any changes agreed at Cabinet and the Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration) be authorised to finalise the brief in liaison with the Portfolio Holder for Estates.
5. That the principles of the procurement and the associated evaluation criteria be approved and the start of the new procurement process be authorised.
6. That the evaluation weighting of a 70% overall score for quality aspects and 30% for price to reflect the importance of quality in the evaluation of the tenders be approved.
7. That an Advisory Panel of comprising representatives of certain organisations be appointed to provide advice to the Evaluation Board and that recommendations be sought from those organisations as to the representative they wish to appoint to the Panel.
8. That the Evaluation Board be authorised, with advice from the Advisory Panel, to undertake the selection process and gives delegated authority to the Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration), as the lead officer of the Evaluation Board, to recommend a design team to the newly appointed Cabinet Committee in accordance with the procurement process and associated evaluation criteria.
9. That the Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration) be authorised to retain the services of i-Transport, Mace and Vail Williams throughout the design stages of the project to provide professional advice on the emerging design in relation to transport assessment, cost consultancy and commercial and valuation advice under Contract Procedure Rule 2.4(a).
10. That the Assistant Director (Estates and Regeneration) be authorised to procure other technical and professional services

required to support the project within the existing budget for Station Approach as part of the procurement of the architectural services.

7. **BAR END SPORT AND LEISURE PARK PROJECT UPDATE**
(Report CAB2910 refers)

Councillor Griffiths announced that so far the Council had received over 50 expressions of interest in relation to the appointment of a design team and it was important that the architect selected had previous experience of building leisure centres. The aim was for the new centre to be carbon neutral. The Report set out the proposals for new governance arrangements as the scheme was progressed and Councillor Ashton would be the Member Champion for engagement.

Two representatives of local groups spoke during public participation and their comments are summarised below.

Chris Holloway (WinACC) highlighted the Council's previously stated commitment to cutting carbon emissions and to reduce the carbon footprint of a new centre to as close to zero as possible. She emphasised the requirement to also consider the environmental impact of users of a new leisure centre in terms of travel to and from the centre.

Sue Falconer (SALT) welcomed the purchase of the Garrison Ground and the commitment to regularise the King George V (KGV) playing field. She noted the commitment to public engagement and emphasised the importance of ensuring local community sports groups were involved in consultation as their commitment to a new facility was crucial to its success.

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

Councillor Porter welcomed proposals for a Cabinet Committee and part of the Garrison Group being the preferred location but requested more flexibility for this to be changed if the Urban Design Framework indicated this. She also queried whether it was an appropriate time to regularise the Fields in Trust designation across the KGV playing field and highlighted that they flooded. She suggested Hampshire Parent Carers Network should be included in the consultation, together with the Ministry of Defence (as Sir John Moore Barracks currently offered alternative facilities which could be used when the current leisure centre was closed). The requirements of a hydrotherapy pool were a completely separate and specialised area. Finally, she suggested the new facilities could include additional areas such as an outdoor paddling pool.

Councillor Thompson expressed disappointment that the tender documents had been issued without the opportunity for wider input. She recognised the necessity to keep the existing leisure centre open whilst the new centre was built. She expressed concern that the Brief appeared to be stipulating an unimaginative box design, together with the proposed 60/40 quality/cost split and that the Masterplan for the area should be completed first. Public

engagement should include the whole of Winchester town and the wider District.

Councillor Griffiths noted and responded to a number of the comments raised. She confirmed the wider environmental impact of users of the new centre would be considered and that the possibility of mitigating flooding was being investigated. The Council were in contact with the Army in addition to the Pinder Trust and she welcomed any additional contact information for interested groups. She confirmed the wish to achieve an exciting design for new facilities.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the establishment of a Cabinet (Bar End Leisure Centre) Committee as set out in a Report CAB2913 elsewhere on this agenda be noted.
2. That, subject to successful technical evaluations, a part of the Garrison Ground area at Bar End be recognised as the preferred location for the new sport and leisure centre for the purposes of the Urban Design Framework, such Urban Design Framework to be developed in tandem with the scheme for the Leisure Centre.
3. That subject to 2) above, delegated authority be given to the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to regularise the Fields in Trust designation across KGV Playing Field.
4. That the entire Garrison Ground be designated for sport and leisure use (including the siting of a sport and leisure centre and its related infrastructure, such as parking and access).
5. That results of the heat mapping and energy masterplanning study be used to inform the scheme.

8. **RIVER PARK LEISURE CENTRE – ESSENTIAL REPAIRS (LESS EXEMPT APPENDICES)**
(Report CAB2914 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Burns and Porter addressed Cabinet as summarised below.

Councillor Burns expressed concerns that the contractor was not covering more of the costs of repairs and believed that they should pay up to the financial limit stipulated in the contract (and at least half of the total cost). She believed a number of the repairs now required were as a result of the contractor's actions.

Councillor Porter agreed with some concerns raised but believed the current situation meant it was important to move forward and take necessary action to ensure the facility remained open to the public.

Councillor Miller and the Corporate Director (Service Delivery) advised that Section 3 of the Report provided further details about the different obligations of the Council and the contractor which had been examined in depth by Officers. Cabinet noted that the concerns raised by Councillor Burns had been examined in detail on a number of previous occasions. The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that the contract specified that should the cost of a repair exceed the financial limit specified, the Council was liable to pay all the costs (including the amount below the financial limit).

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

RESOLVED:

1. That essential repairs which are necessary to maintain the safe function and operation of River Park Leisure Centre be carried out, including:

- a) Work to the electrical system;
- b) Cleaning and repairs to the main pool structural frame;
- c) The installation of a UV system and control panel to manage pool water quality;
- d) The replacement of the Building Management System (BMS),
- e) The replacement of the voice system (clarity voice system);
- f) Replacement of the pool pumps.

2. That specialist consultants be appointed to assist in the design and procurement of these works in accordance with Contract Procedure Rule 9.2 (Obtaining quotations/Tenders).

3. That the Assistant Director (Estates & Regeneration) be authorised to submit any applications for works requiring statutory consent.

4, That the works described in the Report be agreed and that the budget including contingency and professional fees set out in Exempt Appendix A be approved, funded from reserves set aside for this purpose.

5. That authority be given under Financial Procedure Rule 6.4 to incur the capital expenditure referred to in the report.

9. **POTENTIAL ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION(S) TO REMOVE PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS FOR CHANGE OF USE OF SINGLE DWELLING HOUSE TO HOUSE IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION – WINNALL AND OTHER AREAS OF WINCHESTER**

(Report CAB2917 refers)

Councillor Weston highlighted that the Council had successfully defended two appeals against refusal of planning permission for conversion to HMO in Stanmore, which demonstrated the effectiveness of an Article 4 Direction. There was evidence of an upward trend in the number of HMOs in Winnall so it was considered it was an appropriate time to consider the introduction of a non-immediate Article 4 in the area. However, she emphasised that the Council recognised the importance of HMOs generally in providing a mix of housing tenures.

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

Councillor Elks spoke as a Ward Councillor and stated that she and Councillor Hiscock had sought the views of Winnall residents, including consulting the Winnall Forum, community centre, social club and school. Residents recognised that HMOs offered a vital form of housing. However, they did have concerns regarding the potential impact on parking in the area, together with the impact on the general environment and community of Winnall.

Councillor Burns spoke on behalf of the petition signed by residents of Fiona Close, Winnall and highlighted their concerns that a further four houses in Fiona Close would be converted to HMOs before the end of 2017. Therefore, the proposal to implement a non-immediate Article 4 Direction would not address their particular situation. However, she acknowledged that the Council were unable to take action at the moment as only 10% of the houses in Fiona Close had been converted to an HMO.

Councillor Evans also acknowledged the importance of HMOs in providing a housing mix but highlighted that they could change the balance in an area and expressed concern about the potential knock-on impact of the Report's proposals on other areas of Winchester. She added that there were a number of unlicensed HMOs around Winchester and suggested that the Portfolio Holder note specific examples for enforcement action.

Councillor Weston confirmed that other areas of Winchester were being monitored and welcomed specific information from local Councillors.

In response to questions regarding possible action to address the wider parking difficulties experienced by Winnall residents, the Corporate Director (Service Delivery) advised that residents had been consulted recently regarding the possibility of introducing a residents' parking scheme but it had not been supported. However, the matter could be re-examined at an appropriate point in the future.

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 a non-immediate Direction under the provisions of Article 4(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 to remove permitted development rights under Class L of Schedule 2, Part 3 (development consisting of a change of use of a building from a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order, to a use falling within Class C4 (houses in multiple occupation) of that Schedule. The Direction will apply to the Winnall neighbourhood of Winchester as shown on the plan attached at Appendix A and will come into effect 12 months after the A4 is made ; and

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

3. That having considered the petition from the residents of Fiona Close, Winnall, Winchester, an immediate Article 4 Direction is not made for this road but that Fiona Close be included in the non-immediate Article 4 Direction covering the Winnall neighbourhood (recommendation 1 above)..

10. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2 (LPP2): DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT & SITE ALLOCATIONS – PROPOSED ADOPTION**
(Report CAB2903(LP) refers)

In response to questions regarding Recommendation 2 of the Report, the Head of Strategic Planning advised that the Core Strategy (Local Plan Part 1) had been prepared jointly with the South Downs National Park (SDNP). However, LPP2 would replace the 2006 Local Plan outside the National Park, but the SDNP was not likely to have their new Plan in place prior to Autumn 2018. Therefore the Recommendation was proposed in order to ensure some policies were “saved” in the SDNP area of the District in the meantime.

The Head of Strategic Planning advised that a complete copy of the proposed revised Plan was now available for all Members.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN PART 2 – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT AND SITE ALLOCATIONS, AS SUBMITTED TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN MARCH 2016 AND MODIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE INSPECTOR’S RECOMMENDED MAIN MODIFICATIONS (SEE APPENDIX 1 OF THE REPORT AND THE PROPOSED ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS (AS PROPOSED TO BE AMENDED, SEE APPENDIX 2 OF REPORT), BE ADOPTED AND THAT FORMAL NOTICES BE PUBLISHED TO COMPLETE THE PROCESS OF STATUTORY ADOPTION.

2. THAT ALL REMAINING ‘SAVED’ POLICIES OF THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW 2006, AS LISTED IN THE NEW APPENDIX E OF THE LOCAL PLAN (SEE MM1 PART 2 AT APPENDIX 1 OF THE REPORT), BE NO LONGER ‘SAVED’ WITHIN THAT PART OF THE DISTRICT OUTSIDE THE SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK.

3. THAT AUTHORITY BE DELEGATED TO THE HEAD OF STRATEGIC PLANNING, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR BUILT ENVIRONMENT, TO UNDERTAKE MINOR UPDATING AND AMENDMENTS IN ORDER TO INCORPORATE THE VARIOUS MODIFICATIONS AND CONSEQUENTIAL CHANGES TO THE PLAN, INCLUDING TO CORRECT ERRORS AND FORMAT TEXT, WITHOUT ALTERING THE POLICY INTENTIONS OF THE PLAN.

11. **MINUTES OF THE CABINET (LOCAL PLAN) COMMITTEE HELD 27 FEBRUARY 2017**

(Report CAB2918 refers)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson highlighted a correction to the minute to include Councillor Bell as being present as an invited Councillor rather than Councillor Clear.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services noted this correction.

Cabinet noted that the recommended minute relating to the proposed adoption of Local Plan Part 2 had been considered under discussion of Report CAB2903(LP) above.

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

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the above correction, the minutes of the Cabinet (Local Plan) Committee held 27 February 2017 be received (as attached as Appendix A to the minutes).

12. **NON-DOMESTIC RATES – WRITE-OFF OF IRRECOVERABLE DEBTS**
(Report CAB2905 refers)

Councillor Godfrey stated that the debts primarily related back to 2013/14 and involved various businesses. Writing off NNDR bad debts resulted in a reduction to the NNDR collection fund, as explained in Paragraph 2.1 of the Report. He emphasised that overall the Council achieved a 98.7% collection rate.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson expressed concern about the level of the debts recommended for write off and in particular, the length of time over which they had accrued. She queried whether the Council should be taking more action to collect debts and whether the Report recommendations should be referred to Council because of the amounts involved.

Councillor Godfrey provided further details about the actions taken to recover debts but unfortunately, there still remained a small proportion uncollected (approximately 1.5% annually). He highlighted that the Council had low levels of bad debts. Council approval was required for any individual debt over £250,000 and all those listed in the Report were below this level.

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

RESOLVED:

That the debts listed in Appendix A of the Report amounting to £496,532 be approved for write off as no further action if available to the Council.

13. **AMENDMENTS TO THE CABINET STRUCTURES**
(Report CAB2913 refers)

The Chairman noted that the proposals for new Cabinet Committees had been broadly welcomed by other Members during relevant discussions above.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Thompson welcomed the proposals and focussing specific Cabinet Committees on specific projects. She queried whether the practice of including standing invitations for named non-Cabinet Members would be extended to the new Committees? She also requested clarification of the status of the Bar End Forum under the proposals.

The Chairman welcomed the suggestion of continuing to invite named Councillors to the new Committees. The Bar End Forum consisted of a number of stakeholders who would be able to input into the Engagement Strategy directly but it was not proposed it should continue in its current form.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the amended structure of the Cabinet Committees be approved.
2. That the terms of reference for the Cabinet Committees be approved.
3. That it be noted that the meetings will occur as and when decisions are required from the respective Cabinet Committees.

14. **MINUTES OF THE CABINET (HOUSING) COMMITTEE HELD 1 FEBRUARY 2017**
(Report CAB2919 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Housing) Committee held 1 February 2017 be received (as attached as Appendix B to the minutes).

15. **MINUTES OF THE CABINET (TRAFFIC AND PARKING) COMMITTEE HELD 2 FEBRUARY 2017**
(Report CAB2918 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Cabinet (Traffic and Parking) Committee held 2 February 2017 be received (as attached as Appendix C to the minutes).

16. **MINUTES OF THE CENTRAL WINCHESTER REGENERATION INFORMAL POLICY GROUP (IPG) HELD 7 FEBRUARY 2017**
(Report CAB2915 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Central Winchester Regeneration Informal Policy Group held 7 February 2017 be received (as attached as Appendix D to the minutes).

17. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Forward Plan for April 2017, be noted.

18. **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 RIBA Plans of Works Stages Documentation (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)
##	River Park Leisure Centre Essential Repairs (exempt appendices))

19. **STATION APPROACH RIBA PLANS OF WORKS STAGES DOCUMENTATION (EXEMPT APPENDIX)**

(Report CAB2864 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Exempt Appendix be noted.

20. **RIVER PARK LEISURE CENTRE – ESSENTIAL REPAIRS (EXEMPT APPENDICES)**
(Report CAB2914 refers)

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

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Exempt Appendices be noted.

The meeting commenced at 2.00pm and concluded at 4.55pm

Chairman