

CABINET**31 May 2006****Attendance:**

Councillor Beckett - *Leader* (Chairman) (P)

Councillor Allgood – *Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources* (P)

Councillor Coates – *Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities* (P)

Councillor Hollingbery – *Portfolio Holder for Performance and Communications* (P)

Councillor Lipscomb – *Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport* (P)

Councillor Pearson – *Portfolio Holder for Environment, Health and Safety* (P)

Councillor Stallard - *Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and Sport* (P)

Others in attendance who addressed the meeting:

Councillors Beveridge, Evans and Sutton

Mr A Rickman (TACT)

Others in attendance who did not address the meeting:

Councillors de Peyer, Higgins, Hiscock, Jackson, Johnston and Learney

Mrs H Dewdney (TACT)

1. MINUTES

The City Secretary and Solicitor reported that the appointments to the South Downs Joint Committee had been inadvertently omitted from the previous minutes (Councillors Lipscomb and Huxstep were appointed with Councillor Busher as deputy).

In addition, it had since been ascertained that due to an informal arrangement with East Hants District Council, the City Council should only appoint one representative for 2006/07, not two. There was no provision for deputies to be appointed, although a Member could attend in an observer status.

Cabinet noted that the appointment to the Project Integra Management Board made at the last meeting should be amended as Board Members must be Members of Cabinet. It was therefore agreed that Councillor Coates replace Councillor Saunders as the deputy Member on this Board.

The City Secretary and Solicitor advised that Councillor Higgins should be included in the list of “others in attendance who did not address the meeting.” This correction was agreed.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor Evans queried whether a Service Level Agreement (SLA) had been obtained from the providers of the floral displays for Winchester (in relation to the Leader’s announcement at the last Cabinet meeting). She also asked whether the appointments to the Solent Transport Strategy Panel, the Central Hampshire Transport Strategy Panel and the Health for All Committee could be reconsidered to allow representation from the Liberal Democrat Group.

In response, the Chief Executive advised that the Director of Communities was in discussions with Winchester in Bloom regarding agreeing a SLA.

With regard to the appointments to the two County Council traffic Panels, Councillor Beckett stated that he was awaiting further advice from the County Council about the Panels continuing role before considering the request further. He had noted the comments regarding the Health for All Committee.

RESOLVED:

1. That the minutes of the previous meeting held 18 May 2006 be approved and adopted, subject to noting the omission of Councillor Higgins as being in attendance and the appointments to the South Downs Joint Committee and change to Project Integra Management Board (NB Resolution 2 and 3 below).

2. That the following Members be appointed to the South Downs Joint Committee for the 2006/07 Municipal Year:

Councillor Lipscomb (Councillor Huxstep - Observer)

3. That Councillor Coates replace Councillor Saunders as the Deputy Member on the Project Integra Management Board (other Member is Councillor Pearson).

2. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr A Rickman (TACT) and three members of the public spoke at the meeting and their comments are noted under the relevant items below.

3. **LEADER AND PORTFOLIO HOLDER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Allgood reported that Alexis Garlick had been appointed to the post of Assistant Director of Finance. He also updated Members on the recent telephone problems experienced by the Council which had now been solved and thanked the relevant staff for their work over the past weekend dealing with the problem.

4. **DISPOSAL OF RECREATIONAL LAND AT MEADOWSIDE, WHITELEY**

(Report CAB1275 refers)

Councillor Allgood declared a personal and prejudicial interest as he was the County Councillor for the area covering Whiteley and he had been advised by the City Secretary and Solicitor that this raised a potential conflict of interest under Standards Board Guidance because the terms of a land transaction with the County were under consideration by Cabinet. He left the room during consideration of this item.

Councillor Hollingbery declared a personal but not prejudicial interest as he had previously published comments in respect of this proposal. He remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

Cabinet also noted that the Ward Councillors for Whiteley, Councillors Anthony and Chapman, had asked that it be recorded that they had not attended this meeting because of their personal and prejudicial interest in respect of this item due to the proximity of properties in which they had interests.

Under the Council's Constitution Access to Information Procedure Rules (Rule 15.1 General Exception), this was a Key Decision, which had not been included in the Forward Plan. Under this procedure, the Chairman of Principal Scrutiny Committee had been informed.

Mr M Evans (Chairman of Whiteley Parish Council) spoke in opposition to the proposal to dispose of the recreational land at Meadowside. He thanked the Leader and some Cabinet Members for visiting Whiteley on 30 May 2006. In summary, the Parish Council objected to the proposal for the reasons outlined at the previous Cabinet meeting on 22 March 2006. He stated that Meadowside was the only open space in Whiteley and its usefulness had developed over the previous ten years. He emphasised the large number of local residents also opposed to the disposal and disputed the claims made by the Diocese of Portsmouth that the land at North Whiteley was unsuitable. Mr Evans requested that an independent study be undertaken on all the issues involved, including an Environmental Impact Assessment, and consulting all the relevant stakeholders. The study should include consideration of land at Leafy Lane and North Whiteley. He concluded by emphasising that the Parish Council would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the City Council in this respect.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillors Beveridge, Sutton and Evans spoke regarding this item and their comments are summarised below.

Councillor Beveridge emphasised that disposal of the land was contrary to planning policies and that if the land was disposed of alternative amenity land would be required to meet the strict criteria listed in the policies. These included issues such as location, general suitability and availability. He also stated that it was now clear that the figure of a five per cent net reduction originally provided by the County Council was misleading as it related only to the reduction in recreational land due to the building of the school itself and not the consequential impact upon the informal open space. In summary, he believed Cabinet should consider very carefully the effect on the local community of the loss of recreation and amenity land as a result of the proposal.

Councillor Sutton emphasised the detrimental effects on the Whiteley community, and in particular sports clubs, if the open space land was disposed of. In addition, the disposal would prevent further expansion of the Meadowside Centre. She believed that the alternative site of Leafy Lane was too remote and also suffered from pollution as it was located adjacent to the M27 Motorway.

Councillor Evans queried what new information was available since the last time the proposal was discussed at Cabinet on 22 March 2006. She stated that many of the new facilities proposed in relation to the school would have to be fenced off for security reasons which would increase the reduction in the amount of land open to the community. She queried whether the County Council would be required to purchase the land at "best consideration". She also questioned why the land North of Whiteley was considered to be too isolated as this was not the view taken by the Local Plan Inspector and Council planning officers. In summary, Councillor Evans agreed that a school was required for Whiteley but disputed that the one-form entry sized school would be sufficient and emphasised the large number of local residents opposed to the proposal.

The Chief Executive stated that the most significant new information received since the Cabinet meeting on 22 March 2006 was a letter from the Diocese of Portsmouth which confirmed that they did not consider the land suggested at North Whiteley to be

appropriate because it was “detached from the community and the difficulties of transport issues for young children” (letter attached as Appendix 1 to the Report). Discussions had also taken place with the County Council about a number of technical issues raised, although further discussions were required, including clarification of the total amount of land that would be lost to the community.

Councillor Beckett stated that if a decision was taken to support the principle of disposal of land, this would enable further consultation to be undertaken as part of the Open Space statutory consultation process and the planning application process. He also emphasised that Recommendation 3 of the Report set out a number of detailed conditions that the County Council. The City Council would have to be satisfied about the answers to these points before any disposal could take place and consider any public objections arising from the open space consultation. However, if the decision to dispose of the land in principle was not taken, this consultation process could not commence. The City Secretary and Solicitor confirmed that the Report to the 10 July 2006 Cabinet meeting would provide up-to-date information regarding discussions with the County Council.

The City Secretary and Solicitor confirmed that any planning application would not be considered before the 19 July 2006 Council deadline for the consultation on appropriation/disposal of open space land. He advised that the statutory requirements for the open space consultation involved publication of advertisements in the local newspapers. A number of Members commented that it was important that the consultation should be as wide and thorough as possible in the time available. The Chief Executive confirmed that the Council would undertake some informal consultation, including liaising with Whiteley Parish Council about the possibility of utilising their publications for this purpose.

During debate, some Members expressed concern that answers to the issues raised in the Report were required before an in principle decision could be taken to dispose of the land. They also queried whether the Diocese should be requested to provide further explanation of their stance regarding the possible alternative site of a school at North Whiteley. However, the majority of Members agreed to support the principle of disposal of land at Meadowside Recreation Ground as it would enable further consultation to take place. A final decision would be taken as to whether to proceed after considering any public comments received and the response of the County Council.

One Member requested that the County Council be requested to supply more information on possible pupil numbers for the school, although it was acknowledged that decisions on school provision was a matter for the County Council as Education Authority.

Cabinet agreed that further clarification was required regarding the amount of informal open space land that would be lost. In particular it should be confirmed that the Council should seek mitigation for all the informal open space land which would be converted to formal use and therefore lost to the community.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the principle of disposing of land at Meadowside Recreation Ground for the provision of a new school by Hampshire County Council be supported, subject to the consideration of any objections received following the statutory advertisements referred to in recommendation 2 below and the County Council's response to the proposed conditions set out in recommendation 3 below.

2. That the City Secretary and Solicitor be authorised to advertise the proposed appropriation of the open space land shown on the plan in Appendix 2 from S 19 Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (recreational land) to planning purposes (Part IX) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and its proposed subsequent disposal to enable the provision of the new school on the site.

3. That the County Council be asked to confirm that the following conditions can be met before any transfer of land takes place:

- (i) that the County Council obtains planning consent for the school and its ancillary facilities;
- (ii) that the County Council obtains planning consent for the replacement of all the recreational facilities which are affected by the proposal;
- (iii) that mitigation land be provided at the County Council's Leafy Lane site over and above the open space standard required for any residential development subsequently approved for that site, as set out in more detail in paragraph 2.2 of the Report;
- (iv) that the County Council agrees to purchase the land at best consideration (taking into account the reprovision and improvement of the open space and other facilities) as determined by the Chief Estates Officer;
- (v) that the County Council provides a full indemnity against all costs and compensation arising from the breach of covenants on the recreational land and all of the City Council's costs arising from the project including all legal work, temporary relocation of team sports, and any loss of income at the Meadowside Centre caused by the construction process;
- (vi) that the County Council obtains all other necessary consents and agreements and confirms that these are in place;
- (vii) that funding for the provision and operation of the new school is confirmed as being available immediately prior to transfer and the transfer contains suitable provisions to be determined by the Chief Estates Officer to protect its position if the school is not built by a certain date;
- (viii) that the County Council enters into a legal agreement with the City Council which guarantees the provision of replacement facilities to the appropriate standard and on a schedule to be settled by the Director of Communities having regard to the needs of facility users;

(ix) that the Diocese of Portsmouth/County Council be required to bring forward their proposals to secure effective arrangements for community use of the school premises.

4. That the County Council be invited to commence work to demonstrate the conditions set out above can be met.

5. That it be noted that the development of recreational land at Meadowside would represent a departure from the Council's approved Local Plan policies;

6. That a report be made to a special meeting of Cabinet on 10 July 2006 to consider the outcome of the statutory public consultation process and any response from the County Council/Diocese to the proposed conditions outlined above, with the decision on whether to dispose of the land to be taken at the meeting of the Council on 19 July 2006.

5. **WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: ANALYSIS OF REPRESENTATIONS ON PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS AND PROPOSED ADOPTION OF LOCAL PLAN**

(Report CAB1272 refers)

Councillor Lipscomb declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in respect of this item as a member of the Dever Society. Councillor Hollingbery declared a personal but not prejudicial interest as a member of the Dever Society, Bishops Waltham Society and The Alresford Society. Councillor Beckett declared a personal but not prejudicial interest as a member of the Compton and Shawford Parish Council. Councillor Pearson declared a personal but not prejudicial interest as a member of Swanmore Parish Council and Swanmore Society. All four Councillors remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

Two members of the public spoke regarding this item and their comments are summarised below.

Mr J Hayter raised issues regarding the Sustainability Appraisal and Policy H3. Mr Hayter suggested that the new H.3 policy would score poorly on some aspects of the Sustainability Appraisal, in a similar way to the Major Development Area policies and the housing exception sites policy. He suggested that if policy H.3 were amended in accordance with his suggestions its Sustainability Appraisal score could be improved. Mr Hayter also suggested that failure to do this would lead to a high risk of the Local Plan being called-in by the Secretary of State and that the work on policy H.3 by the consultants appointed by the Council was inadequate.

In response, Mr Opacic (Head of Strategic Planning) explained that he did not consider the new H.3 policy to be comparable with the MDA or housing exceptions sites policies. Those policies would lead to purely greenfield development, whereas the majority of development under the new policy H.3 would be brownfield, as under the old policy H.3. Given this, it was more appropriate to look at the Sustainability Appraisal score for the old policy H.3 and how this would change as a result of the new policy. Mr Opacic concluded that, as the Inspector had proposed the new H.3 because he felt the old H.3 was not sufficiently sustainable, the new policy must score better than the old one, which itself did not score poorly on those aspects highlighted by Mr Hayter.

Mr Opacic said that the Secretary of State would only be likely to call-in the Plan if she felt that central Government intervention was necessary. He considered this to be most unlikely in relation to policy H.3, especially as the Council was proposing to adopt the Inspector's recommendation, and in the light of Government statements about progressing old-style plans to adoption and the importance of housing delivery

In summary, Mr Opacic advised that to modify policy H.3 and its explanatory text as suggested by Mr Hayter's comments could not be achieved without undertaking a further Proposed Modifications process and this would prevent the Plan from being adopted by the deadline of 21 July 2006.

Mrs P Edwards (City of Winchester Trust) acknowledged that the Council was in a difficult situation regarding the adoption of the Plan because of the timescales involved. However, she expressed concern that the allocation of reserve sites would be carried forward into the Local Development Scheme without further public consultation. She emphasised that the public would lose confidence in the process if they did not believe that their objections were given due weight.

In response, Mr Opacic confirmed that it had always been the Council's intention that the Local Plan Review would be adopted and carried forward into the Local Development Scheme. Once the Local Plan was adopted, the Council would proceed with the Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework as soon as possible having regard to the requirements of the South East Plan. One element to be considered in the development of the Core Strategy would include the strategy for housing provision, and the suitability of the proposed local reserve sites would be reconsidered either as part of the Core Strategy itself or in the subsequent Development Provision and Allocations development plan document.

Mr Opacic explained that if the Council does not adopt the Local Plan by 21 July 2006 it might be subject to challenge because it had not undertaken a "Strategic Environmental Assessment" of the Plan. Consequently, only minor changes could be made at this stage as to make more major changes would require consultation to be carried out on further Proposed Modifications and therefore the deadline would not be met. Mr Opacic explained that if Council decided to adopt the Plan, there would follow a four week period in which the Secretary of State could consider whether to call it in. However, he did not consider that this was likely to occur and the previous advice of the Government Office for the South East had also indicated the Secretary of State would only use her powers in limited circumstances.

Mr Opacic advised that minor amendments to Appendix 2 of the Report were proposed to take account of comments made by English Nature in relation to the Appropriate Assessment for the Francis Gardens site. Copies of the revised Appendix were circulated at the meeting and are appended to these minutes. One Member raised a detailed query regarding terminology in relation to aquifers and it was agreed that this be checked prior to final publication.

As a Ward Councillor for the area, Councillor Allgood highlighted the significant number of objections received in relation to the proposal to include Little Frenchies Field as a reserve site. In addition, Denmead Parish Council had made a comment to the Inspector that this site would be ideally suited for recreational use because of its location near to King George V playing fields, but this point had not been included in the Inspector's Report. In conclusion, he proposed that an additional recommendation be agreed proposing that the Council re-examine opportunities for amending or deleting any or all of the reserve sites at the earliest opportunity as part of the work upon the Local Development Framework.

In response to Members' queries about the implications of removing one or more of the reserve sites stipulated in the Plan, the City Secretary and Solicitor confirmed that this would require further modifications and consequently prevent the Council from meeting the deadline of 21 July 2006.

With regard to the Analysis of Representations on the Proposed Modifications relating to Chapter 6: Housing (Appendix 1 of the Report refers), Mr Opacic emphasised the proposed minor change which required that developers take account of other relevant policies in the Plan that might apply to Local Reserve Sites, for example regarding nature conservation and flood risk. This would enable the situation regarding these factors, which may change over time, to be taken into account if and when any Local Reserve Sites were released.

As a member of the former Winchester District Local Plan Committee, Councillor Pearson queried whether it had been agreed that an open watercourse at Abbey Mill, Bishops Waltham should be provided (Chapter 13: Settlements refer). However, Mr Opacic confirmed that the wording outlined in the Report reflected what was agreed at the Committee and this required that an open watercourse only be provided "if possible", as it was considered too onerous to require otherwise.

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

RECOMMENDED:

1. THAT HAVING REGARD TO THE REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED, THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW BE ADOPTED, AS PROPOSED TO BE AMENDED BY THE PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS PUBLISHED IN JANUARY 2006, AS THE STATUTORY LOCAL PLAN FOR THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT.

2. THAT THE NECESSARY STATUTORY NOTICES AND PROCEDURES TO BE UNDERTAKEN TO ENABLE ADOPTION OF THE LOCAL PLAN REVIEW AS SOON AS POSSIBLE FOLLOWING COUNCIL'S RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE PLAN.

3. THAT THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING AND TRANSPORT BE GIVEN DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO APPROVE MINOR EDITORIAL AND UPDATING CHANGES TO THE LOCAL PLAN REVIEW TEXT AS NECESSARY, PRIOR TO PUBLICATION, INCLUDING THE ADDITIONAL MINOR CHANGES REFERRED TO IN REPORT CAB1272.

4. THAT THE MINOR CHANGES TO THE APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT FOR THE FRANCIS GARDENS LOCAL RESERVE SITE, TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE COMMENTS OF ENGLISH NATURE (AS APPENDED TO MINUTES), BE APPROVED AND THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING AND TRANSPORT, BE AUTHORISED TO MAKE ANY CONSEQUENTIAL MINOR EDITORIAL ADJUSTMENTS.

5. (A) THAT IT BE NOTED THAT THERE IS STRONG LOCAL OPPOSITION TO THE PRINCIPLE AND LOCATION OF LOCAL RESERVE SITES IN THE DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW AND THAT,

THEREFORE, THE CASE EXISTS FOR REMOVING OR AMENDING THEM WHEN THE CORE STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT PROVISIONS DOCUMENTS ARE PREPARED AS PART OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK;

(B) THAT THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE REPORT TO A FUTURE CABINET MEETING ON THE PROCEDURE AND TIMESCALE FOR REVIEWING HOUSING PROVISION, INCLUDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMENDING OR DELETING ANY OR ALL OF THE LOCAL RESERVE SITES, AT AN EARLY STAGE IN THE PRODUCTION OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK.

6. **DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS ON LOCAL RESERVE SITES AND INFILLING POLICY: ANALYSIS OF REPRESENTATIONS AND PROPOSED ADOPTION**
(Report CAB1273 refers)

Cabinet agreed an amendment to the proposed recommendation as set out in the above Report (as detailed below). The contents of the Report were for background information at this stage as the Council considered Report CAB1272 above.

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

RECOMMENDED:

THAT COUNCIL BE ADVISED:

- A) OF THE OUTCOME OF THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS AND THE OFFICERS' RECOMMENDED RESPONSE, AS BACKGROUND INFORMATION IN CONSIDERING THE ADOPTION OF THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW; AND**
- B) THAT CABINET WILL CONSIDER ITS RESPONSE TO THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND TAKE A DECISION UPON THE ADOPTION OF THE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS AT ITS MEETING ON 26 JULY 2006, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DATE GIVEN IN THE FORWARD PLAN.**

7. **AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES**
(Report CAB1264 refers)

Under the Council's Constitution Access to Information Procedure Rules (Rule 15.1 General Exception), this was a Key Decision, which had been included in the Forward Plan for an earlier date (18 May 2006). Under this procedure, the Chairman of Principal Scrutiny Committee had been informed.

Mr Rickman (TACT) queried whether developers were adhering to the requirements of the Local Plan regarding provision of affordable housing.

The Director of Communities advised that in general developers were meeting these requirements, although he acknowledged that there was still an overall shortage of affordable housing.

The Director advised that if adopted, the status of the Guidelines would initially be Council policy and as such, informal planning guidance. However, it was intended that the document would be developed into a Supplementary Planning Document.

Some Members expressed concern that the Guidelines would prevent employers (such as the hospital) building affordable housing and stipulating that they should be occupied by their employees only (page 7, Section 7 of Appendix 1 of the Report refers). The Director of Communities emphasised that it was important for the Council to retain some control over occupation as there was a wide range of people requiring such homes. However, the Guidelines did allow employers to approach the Council to request that an exception be made. Cabinet agreed that the Director of Communities, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities and the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport, be requested to agree amended wording to emphasise that there was some flexibility available.

Cabinet discussed the proposal in the Guidelines that "...there should normally be no groups of more than five affordable dwellings" (Page 3, Section 3 of Appendix 1 of the Report refers). The Director of Communities confirmed that this matter had been discussed with housing associations and that the guidelines already contained some flexibility about maximum numbers and recognised that issues such as overall design of development were also important. Members agreed that although large groupings of affordable housing should be avoided to ensure better integration throughout a development, more flexibility should be retained over the exact limit stipulated. It was therefore agreed that delegated authority be granted to the Director of Communities, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities and Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport, to agree the exact wording of this section.

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

RESOLVED:

That the Affordable Housing Guidelines set out in Appendix 1 to the Report be adopted, subject to changes to reflect the discussions outlined above and any minor editing changes to be agreed by the Director of Communities in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Communities, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transport, and the Director of Development.

8. FINAL REPORT ON MAKINS COURT REDEVELOPMENT AND ASSOCIATED ISSUES

(Report CAB1230 refers)

Councillor Allgood declared a personal, but not prejudicial interest, as a family member used to work for one of the contractors involved in the redevelopment at an early stage in the project. He remained in the room, spoke and voted thereon.

The Director of Communities advised that the Constitution required a final report to be submitted to Cabinet on a project of this size. However, the report could not be prepared until all the relevant information about the redevelopment, such as financial

liabilities, had been concluded. In addition, more regular updates had been reported as part of the quarterly Capital Programme monitoring report and the Portfolio Holder was also regularly updated on progress.

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

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Report be noted.

9. **MINUTES OF THE WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE FORUM**
(Report CAB1263 refers)

In response to a question, the City Secretary and Solicitor advised that the planning application had not yet been received.

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

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the West of Waterlooville Forum be received.

10. **APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTIES TO WEST OF WATERLOOVILLE FORUM**
(Oral Report)

At the previous Cabinet meeting on 18 May 2006, it was agreed that the following Members be appointed to the West of Waterlooville Forum for 2006/07: Councillors Hollingbery (Chairman), Chamberlain, Collin, Cooper, Hiscock and Stallard. The appointment of deputies was deferred.

However, since the appointments were made, Councillor Hiscock had agreed to stand down as Member to enable a representative from the Labour Group to be appointed. Cabinet therefore agreed that Councillor Hiscock be replaced by Councillor Rees.

The City Secretary and Solicitor confirmed that as the Forum was an informal body, Members appointed as deputies could deputise for other political groups.

RESOLVED:

That the following appointments be made to the West of Waterlooville Forum for 2006/07:

- (i) That Councillor Hiscock be replaced by Councillor Rees.
 - (ii) That Councillors Clohosey and Hiscock be appointed as deputies.
- (Revised Membership: Councillors Hollingbery (Chairman), Chamberlain, Collin, Cooper, Rees and Stallard. Deputies: Clohosey and Hiscock)

11. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION**

The Director of Communities advised that the estimated costs for the University Outdoor Sports Centre at Bar End were £1.8 million with funding being sought from a variety of sources.

The Chief Executive confirmed that Cabinet Members would be consulted on the proposed Community Strategy report which was due to be submitted to Cabinet on 13 September.

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items, as set out in the Forward Plan for June 2006, be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.00am and concluded at 12.30pm

Chairman