

CABINET

Tuesday, 18 July 2023

Attendance:

Councillors
Tod (Chairperson)

Becker
Learney
Porter

Thompson
Westwood

Apologies for Absence:

Councillors Cutler

Members in attendance who spoke at the meeting

Councillors Brook, Godfrey, Horrill, Laming and Wallace

[Video recording of this meeting](#)

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received as noted above.

2. **MEMBERSHIP OF CABINET BODIES ETC.**

There were no changes to be made.

3. **DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Councillors Porter and Tod declared personal (but not prejudicial) interests in respect of various agenda items due to their role as County Councillors.

4. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Four members of the public/representatives from parish councils spoke regarding reports CAB3412 and CAB3413 and their comments are summarised under the relevant minutes below.

5. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Councillor Tod advised that a member of the public, Paul Cooper, had contacted him regarding his deputations regarding item 8 - Bushfield Camp Concept Masterplan (report CAB3378 refers) and that particular points had been omitted from the summary in the draft minutes. Councillor Tod explained that the minutes were not intended to be a verbatim account and referred to the video

recording of the meeting. However, Councillor Tod proposed that the minute referring to Mr Cooper's deputations be amended to read as follows (additions in bold):

'He considered that the proposed development would lead to significantly worse traffic congestion in an already busy area. He also expressed concern about the possible impact of employees choosing to park on-street in neighbouring areas **and the risk that this would require the introduction of parking permits**. He requested that the proposals be rejected.'

Councillor Tod then noted that a further correction was required to be made to the minutes to note that Councillor Warwick had been in attendance.

RESOLVED:

That subject to the amendments outlined above, the minutes of the previous meeting held 21 June 2023 be agreed as a correct record.

6. **LEADER AND CABINET MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Councillor Learney referred to the Renewables drop-in event held the previous week had been valuable and this had explored the potential for renewable energy from a variety of renewable sources from across the district.

Councillor Becker reported that the newly refurbished and upgraded playground at River Park was now open and was proving popular and demonstrated the council's continued commitment to make improvements to the area.

Councillor Becker then referred to the Para Olympic Personal Best event that was to take place on Thursday 14 September at the Winchester Sports & Leisure Park and the sports stadium.

Councillor Thompson reported that the Gurkha Museum in Winchester had been awarded development funding from the National Lottery Heritage Fund. This would assist with a programme of refurbishment the museum's collections and improvements to accessibility (both physically and virtually) and outreach work and education.

Councillor Tod announced that archaeological investigations were now underway in trial trenches at the Coitbury House car park within the Central Winchester Regeneration site.

Councillor Tod also announced that he had been informed by the Leader of Hampshire County Council that the 'County Deal' process would not proceed as local agreement between the Unitary Authorities and the County Council could not be found on the geography of a county deal that met agreement with the Minister. However, the county council remained open to collaborate with other districts and unitaries to try and achieve more support and powers from central government.

7. **STRATEGIC OUTLINE CASE FOR STATION APPROACH (LESS EXEMPT APPENDICES)**
(CAB3413)

Councillor Tod introduced the report and explained the council's careful and considered approach to understand whether a viable scheme was able to be progressed. He referred to the detailed stages of the work and information gained, and the conclusions now reached as set out in the report.

Dr Nicholas Dennis spoke during public participation as summarised briefly below.

He highlighted potential loss of revenue due to delays in the project, highlighting that some areas were currently fenced off and the old registry office building and office buildings in Andover Road remained empty. He also pointed out that both the North Walls Police Station site and the former recreation centre at River Park were yet to be developed. He believed that if there were net costs required to proceed with the Station Approach proposals, residents would not be happy for this to be achieved from making savings elsewhere. In summary, he considered that the council should focus on smaller scale, achievable projects and postpone this scheme.

At the invitation of the Leader, Councillors Wallace and Godfrey addressed Cabinet as summarised briefly below.

Councillor Wallace

He highlighted that Station Approach was a great opportunity to accelerate the transition of Winchester into a more environmentally friendly and sustainable city. The area was an important local transport system hub and as transport was the largest contributor of Green House Gases emissions in the district, transport improvements should be at the centre of the project. Regarding buildings, the council must be ambitious in aspiring to achieve the best possible development for the city that achieved the council's environmental, social and governance objectives. This should include adaptable/flexible modularised buildings to meet changing demand and technologies.

Councillor Godfrey

He noted that budget for consultants to complete the concept masterplan has been increased but he queried its adequacy, especially as it was 18 months until the next decision milestone. He also asked whether underlying studies work that had been previously undertaken could be re used. He was also unclear of the involvement of the rail companies in the master planning phase and subsequent development. Finally, he referred to the critical success factors required to be achieved for the project to continue. He queried if there had been any indication of the shortlisted options in the scope of the masterplan being capable of providing such an affordable scheme or providing the land value equivalent to its current land value?

Councillor Tod, together with the Interim Strategic Director, Director of Regeneration and the Project Lead responded to the points raised by members of the public and councillors. In particular, the following points were clarified:

- The council did not wish for there to be decommissioned and unproductive sites in its ownership – the empty office buildings (not in the council's ownership) were reflective of the lack of modern, flexible spaces that were required by businesses.
- A priority of the project was for there to be a connected, sustainable low carbon development with transport at its centre and the project was also key to the overall vision regarding repurposing city centre parking.
- The council had set very ambitious green ambitions as part of the Regulation 18 Local Plan and this would also apply to any development put forward by the council.
- There was a desire to ensure that the project's consultancy budget remained sufficient to take forward to master planning. Some of the previous work undertaken (such as that for the Carfax site) would be utilised as was still valid.
- There was flexibility between specific budget headings, so funds could be moved around cost estimates matured.
- Decisions regarding affordability and viability would be taken at further steps throughout the life of the project, having regard to the market situation at these times.
- Liaison with Network Rail would be necessary throughout the life of the project (notably at the next stage regarding the area as a transport interchange) and would be achieved without formal partnership arrangements.

Cabinet received the questions and comments raised by [the Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 3 July 2023](#) and Councillor Tod invited the chairperson (Councillor Brook) to address the meeting. He thanked the committee for its valuable input, and he responded to each of the points made. The Strategic Director confirmed that student accommodation was a specific policy consulted upon as part of the Regulation 18 Local Plan and that it would not fall under the council's category of affordable housing.

Officers present responded to questions from Cabinet Members, including confirming that a detailed risk register was to be brought to the Cabinet Committee: Regeneration Committee in October 2023 for review.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That feedback provided by the Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 3 July 2023 be noted.
2. That the Strategic Outline Case for Station Approach be considered and the recommended approach to progress the project as

outlined in Option 3 of section 13.3 in report CAB3413 be agreed.

3. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Director with responsibility for the Station Approach project, in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Asset Management to finalise the brief to procure the concept masterplan as outlined in points 4 and 5 below.

4. That the procurement and subsequent award and entering into a contract of a multi-disciplinary team to produce a concept masterplan for Station Approach be agreed as outlined in sections 3.2 and 14 of the report.

5. That an evaluation model of 70% Quality / 30% Cost for the procurement of a multi-disciplinary team to produce a concept masterplan for Station Approach be agreed as stated in section 3.2 of the report.

6. That the release of £295,000 from the Regeneration Reserve to fund stage 2 of this project be approved, as set out in section 12.5.3 of the report.

8. **FUTURE OF WASTE AND RECYCLING**
(CAB3409)

Councillor Learney introduced the report and reminded that some of the detail of final proposals from government regarding managing recycling and funding available had yet to be determined. The council was to also explore reducing carbon emissions from the waste fleet, recognising that this would be achieved at an additional cost.

At the invitation of the Leader, Councillors Wallace and Horrill addressed Cabinet as summarised briefly below.

Councillor Wallace

He highlighted that the limited capabilities of existing recycling centres were hindering Hampshire's recycling performance and so was pleased at the opportunities now presented. He suggested that as part of the consultation, it be considered that a panel of residents be established who would have the opportunity to input the proposals as they progressed. He also highlighted risks identified of significant increases in costs and therefore managing these risks was very important, so costs weren't passed onto the districts. Finally, the proposal to move the waste collection fleet over to Hydrotreated Vegetable Oil (HVO) must only be seen as a short-term measure.

Councillor Horrill

She requested clarity of the mechanisms to be used to consult with residents, and when this was likely to take place. Regarding modelling of the figures related to a new collection service, she queried why consultants were necessary for this work. She also queried what the funds brought forward from last year's budget would be used for? Finally, she requested clarification of the likely cost to the council should the government determine that garden waste collection should be free of charge to residents.

Councillor Learney, together with the Strategic Director and Service Lead – Environmental Services responded to the points raised by councillors including setting out initial consultation proposals and likely budget implications.

The Service Lead – Environmental Services responded to questions from Cabinet Members, including confirming the government's current intentions regarding consistency of recycling services and a system that would work for all partners. Councillor Tod advised that Hampshire leaders had written to government requesting further multi-lateral negotiation regarding a financial model that achieved a system wide approach for recycling. The Chief Executive emphasised that the County Council and district councils would work closely together to deliver a high quality and critical service for residents.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Council's recycling performance and its ambition to increase recycling rates, help households reduce waste they generate, reduce the waste service carbon footprint within the context of the most cost effective and sustainable service be noted.

2. That it be noted that there will be a need to alter the current recycling collections to reflect national and regional requirements.

3. That undertaking a consultation to help inform a new waste strategy for household properties be approved.

4. That it be agreed to proceed to draft a contract variation, and a mobilisation plan with the Council's waste collection contractor to operate the existing waste and recycling collection fleet on Hydrotreated Vegetable Oil (HVO) as an initial solution to reduce the carbon emissions, to be considered as part of the 2024/25 budget setting process.

5. That the current offer from Hampshire County Council of an Inter-Authority Agreement and the intention to work with Hampshire County Council to achieve a mutually affordable and sustainable solution be noted, so that the Council can respond to the offer by October 2023.

9. **PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AT KINGS BARTON**
(CAB3418)

Councillor Becker introduced the report which set out details for the future management and maintenance of open spaces at Kings Barton and the associated commuted sums of money.

Councillor Iredale (Headbourne Worthy Parish Council) spoke during public participation as summarised briefly below.

The parish council was disappointed to learn that £75,000 had been deducted from CALA's commuted sum and had not had the opportunity to

take part in this negotiation. There would be a net effect of an increase in the parish council's precept. She also referred to two pieces of land at the southern entrance to Kings Barton that were likely to be more expensive to maintain.

The Service Lead – Community responded to the points raised by Councillor Iredale and advised that it had been recognised that although the actual sum achieved had not been the preferred outcome of the parish council, it had been accepted by them so to ensure that the open space was transferred to the most appropriate body. The land that did require more intensive maintenance was balanced by most of the open space that required less work and so the total sum was appropriate for the open space across the whole development.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That all areas of public open space within the Kings Barton development that fall within the boundary of Headbourne Worthy parish (the area marked A in appendix 1 of report CAB3418) are transferred directly from Cala Homes to HWPC, or its successor together with the appropriate proportion of the commuted sum to meet the costs of future management and maintenance of the areas of open space. This includes land ready now and which will become available in later phases.
2. That all areas of public open space within the Kings Barton development that fall within the boundary of St Barnabas ward (the area marked B in appendix 1 of the report) are transferred from Cala Homes to Winchester City Council, together with the appropriate proportion of the commuted sum to meet the costs of future management and maintenance of the areas of open space, and allocated to the Town Account. This includes land ready now and which will become available in later phases.
3. That £75k costs incurred by Cala Homes in establishing the Barton Meadows nature reserve are met by reducing the overall commuted sum payable for management of public open space at Kings Barton.
4. That the commuted sums for the future maintenance of all public open space within the Kings Barton development will be calculated as follows:
 - a. Phase 1a = $43,233\text{m}^2 @ £11.79/\text{m}^2 = £509,717.07$, less £25k = £484,717.07
 - b. Phase 1b = $26,279\text{m}^2 @ £11.79/\text{m}^2 = £309,829.41$, less £25k = £284,829.41
 - c. Phase 2a = $12,652\text{m}^2 @ £11.79/\text{m}^2 = £149,167.08$, less £25k = £124,167.08
 - d. For all subsequent phases, using the council's standard rate for public open space maintenance at the date of transfer (which currently stands at £13.77/m²)

5. That, all of the rates above apply as at the date of this approval and will be subject to inflation at the point of transfer from the developer.

6. That, the Service Leads Legal and Built Environment be authorised to enter into all necessary legal agreements in order to formalise the commuted maintenance payments, the future management of the open space within St Barnabas ward on behalf of the city council by HWPC and any other consequential amendments arising from the approved recommendations.

10. **STRATEGIC HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (SHELAA) REPORT**
(CAB3412)

Councillor Porter introduced the report, emphasising that the SHELAA was a document that set out a strategic land availability assessment and was not setting out site allocations. Many of the additional sites added were for employment use.

Ian Tait and Councillor Godbold (Badger Farm Parish Council) spoke during public participation as summarised briefly below.

Ian Tait

He referred to the sites in Pitt Vale which had been removed from the SHELAA although he explained the original two sites were now one site which was now being promoted by a single developer. He advocated that the council should be purchasing land to build a new council housing estate and the Pitt Vale site could fulfil that need. He also asked where the five sites owned by the council within the SHELAA were located and whether these could deliver meaningful numbers of new affordable housing.

Councillor Godbold

He highlighted that the Bushfield Camp area was stated as being in the Winchester town area in the SHELAA, when it was in Compton and Shawford Parish. The area of Bushfield previously known as area WIN32 had now been renumbered and site CS15 close to Sainsburys had also been added. The parish council was concerned at the collective impact of the potential development at these locations.

At the invitation of the Leader, Councillors Laming and Horrill addressed Cabinet as summarised briefly below.

Councillor Laming

He requested that development at Bushfield Camp be sympathetic, having regard to the landscape and areas of SINC and protective species here. He was concerned that the site had moved away from employment to a mixed development, and he questioned whether inclusion of homes may negatively impact on overall viability. He also referred to other sites adjacent to

Bushfield and so he suggested a need for an overall masterplan for the area and for the whole town area.

Councillor Horrill

She considered that the council should reiterate that the SHELAA was not specifying site allocations with a presumption for planning permission. She also asked when the council would receive the Regulation 18 consultation responses. There had also been some redefinition of boundaries in the latest SHELLA and whether this was reflective of any change in strategy. She also requested that there be conversations with ward councillors of those wards particularly impacted with sites coming forward.

Councillors Porter and Tod and the Strategic Planning Manager responded to the points raised by members of the public and councillors. It was confirmed that officers would check that specific sites such as Bushfield were referred to as being in their correct parish boundary. It was also confirmed that Pitt Vale was not an allocated site within the Regulation 18 document. Furthermore, sites listed in the SHEELA were those put forward by owners that could be developed, and they could suggest what was envisaged the site would be eventually used for, however this was not what necessarily would come to fruition. Ownership of sites were not in the public domain.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the 2023 Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) which is attached at Appendix 1 of report CAB3412 be approved and published as part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan; and
2. That authority be delegated to the Strategic Planning Manager, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan, to make any necessary edits and minor alterations prior to the publication of the SHELAA.
3. That it be ensured that Site Ref CS15 (Bushfield Camp) is correctly identified as being located within the Compton and Shawford Parish Council area before the SHELAA is published on the website.

11. **REVISED COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY STRATEGY**
(CAB3385)

Councillor Porter introduced the report, emphasising that the review of CIL especially reflected the need to ensure that the priorities for CIL funding reflected the priorities in the Council Plan and supporting strategies.

At the invitation of the Leader, Councillors Wallace and Brook addressed Cabinet as summarised briefly below.

Councillor Wallace

He requested confirmation that the council was allowed to use CIL funds for health and education facilities. The CIL scoring criteria aligned with Council Plan priorities, but was there opportunity to update or refresh the criteria as real-world issues arose? He believed some parts of the district had benefitted disproportionately from the CIL scheme and only one out of the 12 proposed scoring criteria took account of where development had occurred and queried whether the revised criteria were sufficient to re-balance the CIL distribution?

Councillor Brook

The changes to the CIL application criteria was welcomed as provided greater clarity to the process and she also welcomed cross party discussions that had taken place as part of the review. It was useful to see the detail of expenditure across the district to date on CIL projects. However, she was disappointed at the continuation of ring-fencing of 90% of funds for specific projects. There may be local projects that could be completed before a project utilising the ring-fenced sums was even started. She questioned whether should any large cross parish projects coming forward may require a review of the 90% ringfencing?

Councillors Porter, together with the CIL Implementation Officer responded to the points raised by members of the public and councillors. It was reiterated that CIL was spent in communities where these had been impacted by new development and so could be used to support health and education facilities if this was required. Ring-fencing would be reviewed if large cross parish projects were to come forward and there would be regular review of the infrastructure list which would include consultation with ward and parish councillors.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That the Strategic Procedural Overview for CIL allocation and spending which apportions percentages of the CIL retained by the city council be split into specific themes as detailed in Appendix A of the report be agreed.
2. That the reviewed and refreshed Infrastructure List be agreed (Appendix B).
3. That the refreshed criteria for considering all CIL bids and the scoring matrix found in Appendix C be agreed.
4. That the CIL bid timetable is changed from the beginning of the year (1January to 31March) to 1 September to 30 November.

12. **THE DEAN CAR PARK, NEW ALRESFORD**
(CAB3398)

Councillor Learney introduced the report.

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

RESOLVED:

1. That a contract be entered into to purchase a completed car park and freehold ownership of the associated land rather than the original decision to acquire the land and procure a contractor to construct the car park. (As per CAB3005).
2. That an additional budget of up to £60,000, for stamp duty and the provision of payment machines and signage be agreed, bringing the total revised budget to £1,065,000 and approve expenditure of the budget under Financial Procedure Rule 7.4.
3. That authority be delegated to the Corporate Head of Asset Management to finalise and enter into the contract with the developer/landowner for the purchase of the land and the new car park.

13. **Q4 PERFORMANCE MONITORING**
(CAB3403)

Councillor Tod introduced the report and drew attention to the action notes of the Performance Panel that had convened on 22 May 2023 to consider the report in detail (as set out at Appendix 4) which had then been taken to the Scrutiny Committee. The output of this process was then brought to Cabinet.

At the invitation of the Leader, Councillors Horrill and Wallace addressed Cabinet as summarised briefly below.

Councillor Horrill

She expressed concern that the usual process of responses to the Panel's questions being provided in good time for the following Scrutiny Committee had not taken place on this occasion.

Councillor Wallace

Regarding a utility scale renewable energy generation scheme that was being undertaken by the Council and referred to the report, he requested further information to understand the project further. He reiterated that all Members be kept informed and consulted upon on future projects and decisions.

Councillors Tod and Councillor Learney, together with the Strategic Director & Monitoring Officer responded to the points raised by councillors including confirming that the role of the Performance Panel would be reconsidered by the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Leader, the Chairperson of Scrutiny

Committee and the leader of the principal opposition group. Councillor Learney referred to the Carbon Neutrality Action Plan and projects to help deliver renewable energy outcomes.

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

RESOLVED:

That the progress achieved during Q4 of 2022/23 be noted and the contents of the report be endorsed.

14. **FUTURE ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION BY CABINET**

Councillor Tod referred to the legal requirements of the Forward Plan to give notice of forthcoming decisions for the subsequent month and he would consider how to give greater visibility of what decisions were coming up over a longer period.

At the invitation of the Leader, Councillors Wallace addressed Cabinet as summarised briefly below.

Councillor Wallace

He queried the land transaction item scheduled for August 2023, however there was no cabinet meeting scheduled for August and therefore how would this take place without Member review? He also asked when a constitutional review was scheduled to happen.

Councillors Tod and the Chief Executive responded to the points raised by Councillor Wallace.

RESOLVED:

That the list of future items as set out in the Forward Plan for August 2023 be noted.

15. **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> |
|----------------------|---|--|
| 16 | Strategic Outline case for Station Approach (exempt appendices) |) Information relating to the) financial or business affairs of) any particular person (including) the authority holding that) information). (Para 3 Schedule) 12A refers) |

16. **STRATEGIC OUTLINE CASE FOR STATION APPROACH (EXEMPT APPENDICES)**

Cabinet agreed that it did not require to ask questions or debate the content of the exempt appendices.

RESOLVED:

That the exempt appendices to the report be noted.

The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and concluded at 1.00 pm

Chairperson