

# Questions by Councillors under Council Procedure Rule 19.1

- Each questioner will have 2 minutes in which to ask their question.
- If a questioner who has submitted a question is unable to be present, the Mayor may ask the question on their behalf, or invite another Councillor to do so, or indicate that a written reply will be given and published on the website following the meeting. or decide, in the absence of the questioner, that the question will not be dealt with.
- Please note that following the response given by the Leader, a Cabinet Member or Committee Chair, the questioner may also ask a supplementary question which must arise directly out of the original reply.
- The **total** time allocated for Councillor questions will normally be limited to 40 minutes.
- Written answers will be published to questions submitted (but not supplementary questions) following the meeting.

|    | From Cllr:     |
|----|----------------|
| 1  | Bolton         |
| 2  | Prest          |
| 3  | Godfrey        |
| 3a | Warwick        |
| 4  | Williams       |
| 5  | Wallace        |
| 6  | Cramoysan      |
| 7  | Lee 1          |
| 8  | Horrill        |
| 9  | Brook          |
| 10 | Langford-Smith |
| 11 | Pearson        |
| 12 | Lee 2          |



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

## **QUESTION 1**

From: Councillor Bolton

To: The Cabinet Member for Community and Engagement (Cllr Becker)

"Do the administration agree that the consultation proposal, Hampshire Together - modernising our hospitals and health services, conducted by the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Integrated Care Board and Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust is NOT a political issue and do the administration agree that this council's objective should be to encourage ALL residents to engage with the NHS to understand the true facts and make their views known to the NHS in this process?"

#### Reply

The subject of the consultation – the future and location of the NHS hospital services for our residents is without question a political issue. Hampshire Together is, as stated in the first line on its own website, part of the government's New Hospital Programme – its inclusion in that programme is a political decision.

The decisions about the timing and funding availability for any potential new hospitals is also a decision for the government – and therefore is also a political decision.

However, the political nature of the decision goes beyond that. And perhaps this is where you and I disagree on what counts as political. Politics isn't a dirty word. Politics is representation.

It's therefore absolutely right for the council – and for local politicians – to raise the concerns that residents bring them. And to raise questions that they have for themselves.

Like many people I speak to, I still want to know more about what exactly is meant by the Urgent Care and maternity proposals in Winchester and what that means for us. I want to understand how people who rely on public transport are expected to access the new hospital and what the Trust is doing to ensure that public transport is available and affordable - I represent people living in one of the most deprived parts

of the District and some of those most unlikely to have private transport – so of course I will ask questions about what the proposals are likely to mean for them.

I know you think that asking those questions is political, as if that's a bad thing. Call me naïve, but I've got another way of describing it: It's doing our job.

As for the second part of your question: It's absolutely right to ask residents to respond on their own account. Which is why we've been doing our part to make sure that the public is engaged in the decision making process.

That is why this Council held a meeting in public to hear about the proposals, where the Trust was also present. It is why members of the public, as well as councillors were able to ask questions. It is why at that meeting I specifically asked questions about the consultation and how Hampshire Together were seeking to make sure that the views of people from across Hampshire, from all walks of life were able to be heard and represented before any further decisions were made. It is why I asked questions about whether the timings for events had taken into account the needs of working people. It is why I have publicised the Hampshire Together consultation and listening events at multiple meetings at Cabinet. It is why we keep publicising the events on our social media. Because the public's views as well as questions about the proposals, matter.



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

#### **QUESTION 2**

From: Councillor Prest

To: The Cabinet Member for Business and Culture (Cllr Thompson)

"Walking through the city centre in the run up to Christmas it was easy to come to a series of conclusions: that the city was thriving; that the Christmas market stall holders and shopkeepers were doing brisk business; and finally, that whilst occasionally stretched to its limits, Winchester's infrastructure, transport and parking absorbed the influx admirably. Indeed, a casual glance at last week's Hampshire Chronicle reveals the High Street vacancy rate is at its lowest since 2019 and Winchester Cathedral experienced a 20% rise in attendance at its Christmas services. Can the Cabinet member for Business and Culture confirm for the Council this anecdotal evidence of a bumper Winchester Christmas with any hard data around footfall and visitor numbers in the festive period?"

## Reply

Thank you for your question.

I am delighted to confirm that the data suggests that we did indeed have a bumper Christmas in Winchester this year. In evidence gathered by the BID, footfall in our High Street in December was up by 3.5% compared with December 2022 with an average footfall per day of just under 30,000. This is better than the national picture where footfall levels remain unchanged during 2023 and 2022.

Our vacancy rate in the High Street remains at 5% which is much lower than the national average – less than half - and business confidence across all sectors for independents and nationals is 7 on a scale of 1 - 10.

Our partners also had a good Christmas with the Winchester Science Centre's Cosmic Christmas sold out for the first year. Glow Marvell 2023 saw their number of visitors doubled compared with 2022 and the Cathedral had a 20% uplift in attendance at Christmas services.

We have also spoken to a number of street market traders who confirmed that Christmas 2023 was very good for them. And local pubs have reported record breaking trade during the Christmas period.

Our own social media also worked well with visits to the Visit Winchester website up by a whopping 77% compared with 2022 and entries to our '12 Days of Christmas Competition' were up by 50%.

Of course all of this couldn't happen without strong partnership working between the Council, Winchester BID and the Cathedral. Each organisation played their part in making sure that residents and visitors alike could really enjoy all that our beautiful City has to offer over the festive season in a safe and welcoming environment.



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

#### **QUESTION 3**

From: Councillor Godfrey

To: The Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan (Cllr Porter)

"The Cabinet Member is aware of the inclusion of a residential housing allocation of 3,000 homes at Popham Airfield in the Reg 18 Local Plan Update by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. This new town proposal has caused great consternation among residents of my ward, particularly those in Micheldever Station, which adjoins the Popham Airfield site. Apart from the imposition of a large new settlement in the countryside on our boundary, the proposal includes several significant infrastructure requirements within Winchester District. What dialogue has taken place between Winchester City Council and Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council over the inclusion of Popham Airfield in their Local Plan Update?"

## Reply

Thank you for your question Cllr Godfrey.

WCC does not agree that a new development in the countryside, such as is proposed for Popham, is the most carbon or socially efficient way to build a community – and we have serious questions about whether this particular proposal is even deliverable.

District Councils have a duty to co-operate both before and after the publication of the plan, so we were surprised to see the proposal for Popham come up in their Reg 18 plan, without any consultation from BDDC to WCC – even though the proposal comes right to the Winchester District border.

The challenge here is the fact that a key transport linkage falls so clearly to the Overton Road which as you and I know, is not the best road for a mass transit of traffic, including foot and cycle ways etc. alongside it: it cannot be done without land take within Winchester district.

The proposal also includes the use of local facilities at Micheldever Station, including the station itself, rather than providing their own or linking to their own communities which was completely unexpected and again, not something we were consulted on.

To connect to facilities in the Winchester district as the proposal, Winchester would have to agree to make allocations in that area in our own plan – which we have not done and have no plan to do.

It is a risk that a proportion of the site is considered previously developed land and so if the Government force a simplistic 'brownfield first' policy onto planning authorities – without considering other factors such as connectivity, infrastructure and local facilities – we could end up with an unwanted and unsustainable speculative development with major negative impacts on our area.

The Dever society and many residents have written to me expressing their fears for their community if Popham goes ahead.

I am urging local residents to express their opinions to the BDDC consultation. Their opinions will provide useful context for our neighbouring district. Meanwhile, WCC's obvious need is to protect the landscape around the hamlet of Micheldever Station too.



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

# **QUESTION 3a**

From: Councillor Warwick

To: The Cabinet Member for Community and Engagement (Cllr Becker)

"Last September I asked the City Council's leadership if the new Pavilion at the King George V playing grounds could be named after former England footballer, Terry Paine MBE. Terry's name had been suggested some years ago when the pavilion was expected to be replaced. Terry was born in Winchester in 1939, grew up and played football in the Highcliffe area before representing Winchester City and Southampton FC. Terry was a member of the 1966 world cup winning squad and is not just a football legend, arguably the most famous footballer to come from Winchester and is also a truly respected member of the local community. I wondered if any progress has been made on a decision?"

#### Reply

I visited the new pavilion at KGV again on Monday – it is a beautiful building that sits seamlessly in its environment and will offer the community an amazing new facility and home for women's and girls' football and for cricket. It is on track for completion soon.

We are aware of the suggestion that Terry be represented in the pavilion, and his name is certainly in the mix, but there are other partners in the KGV project, representatives from whom will also sit on a Community Steering Group (which we are required to have as a condition of Football Federation funding), and who will also have an interest in the naming of the pavilion (and the function room). Those partners include:

- Winchester City Flyers FC
- Compton and Chandlers Ford CC
- Hampshire Girls Youth Football League
- Hampshire FA
- Hampshire Cricket Board
- Highcliffe Community Forum
- Football Foundation (major funding partner)

The first meeting will take place in early March, and one of the first matters to be discussed will be the name of the pavilion as it's only right that we take the views of the community groups into account when taking the decision.



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

## **QUESTION 4**

From: Councillor Williams

To: The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance and Performance (Cllr

Cutler)

"Hampshire County Council are consulting on closing the Bishop's Waltham and Alresford Tips/HWRCs, how is this likely to affect fly-tipping and what action is planned to address potential increases that blight our rural communities?"

## Reply

Fly tipping incidents across Hampshire increased when HCC introduced charging for DIY materials, and further increased massively across the whole country with the closure of HWRCs during lockdown.

It seems highly likely that further closures and reduced opening hours of HWRCs would add to the likelihood of increased fly tipping across Hampshire.

We, in the Winchester district, suffered from an increase in fly tip incidence at a similar rate to our neighbouring authorities between 2020 and 2022, which is why we put in place a change to our strategy, employing a dedicated fly tipping officer with experience of evidence gathering and prosecution. This, along with the use of cameras and improved signage in hotspots, has resulted in a 40% reduction in the number of incidences in 2022/23.

This reduction was the 5<sup>th</sup> highest across the country and by far the largest reduction in Hampshire.

Our comparable neighbouring authorities, Test Valley and East Hants showed an increase of 38% and 41% respectively.

This vindicates our approach of evidence gathering, interviews under caution and prosecution. Unfortunately, it takes up to two years to reach the courts, but in recent months we have had three successful prosecutions resulting in substantial fines and possibly more importantly criminal records for the perpetrators. These were all for offences committed in 2022.

We believe that this approach is more effective than the use of Fixed Penalties. Unfortunately DEFRA is using the number of FPNs as the main KPI for measuring success and this has resulted in some opportunistic and misleading attacks on our highly effective approach.



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

#### **QUESTION 5**

From: Councillor Wallace

To: The Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan (Cllr Porter)

"As a result of Climate Change, extreme weather events are becoming more frequent. In fact, the latest data shows that since 1980 the number of extreme weather events around the world have increased more than three-fold. In the UK this is reflected in hotter summers and more intense rainfall, especially in winters, such as we experienced in Winchester last month.

Climate change is already being considered in planning for national infrastructure projects. For example, the new M3 Junction 9 project is considering average temperature changes of up to 5°C by the end of century, plus modelling on the effects of more extreme rainfall. In contrast, consideration of the impact of climate change to Local Authority planning approvals appears to have been limited to date, and when the Winchester district was hit by flooding last month, it was reported that some of the flooding occurred in newly built homes.

In order to mitigate the risks of problems now and in the future, please can you confirm what authority we have as the Local Plan Authority to seek higher standards of climate resilience in planning applications?"

#### Reply

Thank you for your question Cllr Wallace.

Thank you for joining our recent Member briefing on this subject. It is useful for members to understand the complexity of the domestic water cycle and our reliance on private water companies who provide water, and manage waste water and Hampshire County Council as the flood authority. And many of us have been doing our best to stand up for residents on this problem.

Winchester City Council routinely seeks consultation responses for planning applications from the Flood Authority, Hampshire County Council, and the feasibility of connections to Southern Water sewers, and drainage systems, as well as ecology, highways, heritage etc.

The new Local Plan includes a specific chapter on managing the impacts of climate change. The material significance of the plan's new policies grows in current applications as the Local Plan timetable progresses.

Policy CN1 sets standards for mitigating and adapting to climate change, including water management.

CN2 the energy hierarchy

CN3 energy efficiency to reduce our carbon emissions.

CN4 water efficiency standards in new developments

and

D9 tackles overheating of homes

You will know that CN3 includes the LETI energy standards. These are the most demanding possible standards for energy efficiency and vital for achieving carbon neutrality. The Government has confused matters recently with an announcement about using Target Emissions Rates instead. We are one of the leading authorities working with the TCPA to challenge the announcement and ensure we can have the strongest possible environmental standards in our local plan.



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

## **QUESTION 6**

From: Councillor Cramoysan

To: The Leader (Cllr Tod)

"When is the new GP surgery in Upper Brooke St, Winchester, going to open?"

## Reply

Thank you for your question.

As you know, construction started in March last year – and the latest news is that it's proceeding on schedule. If you look at the hoarding, it says August 2024. And we've checked today – and the hoarding is right.

It will take a few weeks after that to furnish the building and relocate the surgery – but our full expectation is that it will be open in the fourth quarter of this calendar year.



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

## **QUESTION 7**

From: Councillor Lee (1)

To: The Leader (Cllr Tod)

"The challenges to 'Go Green Faster,' 'Scale up actions and increase pace of delivery' and 'consider the impact on nature's recovery in all strategic plans, policy areas and decision-making processes' have been recognised in our:

- Council Plan 2020- 2025
- CNAP report in Dec 2022
- Sep 2023 Nature Emergency declaration
- Emerging new Local Plan.

The Council Plan says we will continue to listen and adjust our Plans over the lifetime of the plans.

New critical changes have emerged in the last 5 months that point to an urgent need to adjust our Plans as soon as possible, especially as:

- Our Nature Emergency declaration in Sep 23 is already out of date following the new State of Nature report
- Revelation the planet's <a href="https://hottest.year">hottest year</a> has just been recorded. For the first time new records show global warming has exceeded 1.5°C across an entire year.

#### Why is 1.5°C significant?

This temperature target is crucial to mitigate the most damaging impacts of climate change- more severe heatwaves, flooding (far too evident locally), and droughts, affecting ecosystems and agriculture and our way of life.

The temperature change raises the challenge to start the adaptation process to the rapid changing climate conditions with higher threats to our infrastructure and our nature. The prolonged breach of the 1.5°C limit directly threatens biodiversity. Many species will now struggle to thrive.

We need to move away from self-congratulatory back slapping celebrations based on the Climate Emergency UK assessment<sup>1</sup> that Winchester is fourth in a lacklustre league table on climate action progress. We need to commit to faster action by starting a review and updating of our strategic plans, policy areas and especially our decision-making processes. Not tomorrow, not next month or next year but now! Our reference points for decision making in Cabinet and Committees are now critically out of date.

Question. Can I ask for a commitment to consider a full review of all our strategic plans, policy areas and decision-making processes as soon as possible and not as previously suggested in due course?"

## Reply

Thank you very much indeed for this question – which I much appreciated – and for highlighting the need for urgency of action to tackle the Climate Emergency.

Indeed, as the County Councillors present will know I tried and failed earlier today in this very room to try and get acceleration of the programme that Hampshire is currently working on.

I would say however that you're a year too late with this question. It's a very good question. The reason I say that is because it's the one I asked as soon as I became leader in May 2022. That's what led to 'Greener Faster' being adopted as an area of focus by Full Council in January 2023.

All parts of the council were asked to review their plans to deliver this – and are now working to deliver the plans that resulted. While I recognise that the international situation has changed as you highlight, our urgency and commitment to cut carbon has not.

The priority now is to execute those plans – ahead of the Council Plan refresh scheduled to come into force for 2025. Adding in another review before the next council plan will just slow us down.

That doesn't mean we're complacent. If we come 4<sup>th</sup> in a national league table – our immediate response is to see what we can learn from those who came 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup>. We are already talking with officers about how we can even better embed carbon reduction in the way the council works – and thinking about how our next council plan will measure up to the carbon challenge we face.

 $<sup>^{1}\,\</sup>underline{\text{https://councilclimatescorecards.uk/methodology/\#section-developing-the-scoring-system}}$ 



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

#### **QUESTION 8**

From: Councillor Horrill

To: The Cabinet Member for Place and Local Plan (Cllr Porter)

"Would the Cabinet Member agree that building the right homes in the right places – protecting our precious countryside and building more in urban areas where demand is highest is a key strategic aim for this Council? Would she agree taking a brownfield first approach to deliver new homes where people want to live and work, without concreting over the countryside is a key strategic aim for this Council? If so, how does she intend to ensure these two strategic aims are built into our Reg 19 local plan?"

#### Reply

Cllr Horrill,

Thank you for your question.

As I'm sure Cllr Horrill recalls, we already have a 'brownfield first' policy baked into our Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan.

The foreword – on the third page of the document - states:

This local plan takes the approach of 'brownfield first' – both in prioritising the use of previously developed land over green fields, but also in the phasing of development.

The second objective of the plan – on page 22 of the Local Plan is:

Maximise the use of land as a resource which is needed to accommodate growth through the promotion and prioritisation of brownfield land, making best and efficient use of available land which is suitable for development, and achieve high quality design which makes a positive contribution to the public realm.

and then the details of our approach to brownfield land are set out in more detail in policy D6 'Brownfield Development and Making Best Use of Land' on page 99, strategic policy H2 'Housing Phasing and Supply' on page 232.

And on page 142, Strategic Policy NE1 "Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and the natural environment in the district" makes clear that:

Development will only be permitted where it demonstrates that it will protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity, including the natural beauty of the landscape, all natural resources, habitats and species.

I believe the combination of these policies absolutely addresses the priorities you highlight in your question.

And it is absolutely our intention to carry the principles that we outlined in the policies we proposed forward into the regulation 19 plan.



## **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

#### **QUESTION 9**

From: Councillor Brook

To: The Leader (Cllr Tod)

"In July 2023, this Council unanimously supported the Debate Not Hate campaign and the leader released a statement that said, "We will continue to encourage healthy debate and discussion and we will challenge intimidation and abuse." In light of this, why did the administration at the previous council meeting feel it was ok to speak to opposition Cllrs with sarcasm and contempt, and belittling them whilst responding to their fellow Lib Dem's praising how wonderful they are, just because there is an election in May. Should the administration have put through an amendment back in July that said treating fellow Cllrs with respect and professionalism in the spirit of healthy debate only counts when not electioneering?"

## Reply

I don't recognize what you say as a characterization of what happened at the last meeting.

The 'Debate, not Hate' motion that we passed in January 2023 is one I take very seriously.

The term used in the motion is quite specific – abuse and intimidation – it talks of personal and hurtful attacks – and is framed in terms of councillors feeling unsafe and unable to represent their residents. It talks about threats to safety of councillors – and many of us present remember the very serious examples quoted in the debate that we held.

No-one I have spoken to has any recollection of this type of abuse and intimidation happening at the last Full Council. You make no such reference in your question or in your the response to the follow up email that I sent you after I received your question and asked for specific examples.

The press were also present – who would I would trust to have reported any such activity – and the Mayor also has powers to intervene if this kind of behaviour takes place – and neither of these happened.

That said, avoiding the intimidation and abuse covered by the Debate Not Hate campaign is not enough on its own and I do believe that we should always be trying to do better in our council meetings – particularly to ensure that we have an environment where all councillors feel confident to participate.

The concept of 'Debate, not Hate' is in two parts. Avoiding hate. And encouraging healthy debate. The latter is as important as the former. And part of that is having an environment where everyone feels able to take part.

That doesn't mean it will be a wholly painless experience. It never feels great to lose a debate or a vote – or to have a request rejected – and that inevitably happens to most of us over the years.

I think back to my own time as a new opposition councillor asking questions of the then Conservative cabinet – and it was not always a pleasant experience. The Council has improved since then and I would not want to go back to how things were a decade ago.

So while I don't believe we currently have a problem with hate, intimidation or abuse, I also believe we should never be complacent and should always strive to improve further. All parties have a role in that. And I'm happy to work with fellow councillors of all parties and none to make it happen.



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

## **QUESTION 10**

From: Councillor Langford-Smith

To: The Cabinet Member for Community and Engagement (Cllr Becker)

"Could I ask the Cabinet Member what measures are in place to ensure that there is the correct medical cover with regards to the Major Development Areas within our district to ensure that Winchester District residents receive the medical cover they deserve?"

## Reply

At the last Full Council, my colleague, Cllr Porter, outlined our approach to ensuring adequate provision – not just for our own Major Development Areas – but also for neighbouring areas that affect us – namely that:

"Winchester City Council is determined that our residents will have access to the best primary healthcare possible – and is willing to work with whoever we need to in order to make that happen. We have provided land for a GP surgery being built in Winchester and funding for two more consulting rooms at Bishops Waltham. WCC has a strong working relationship with the NHS's Integrated Care Board for Hampshire".

Master planning of major development areas always includes the need for investment in new or improved health facilities. We are led by our health partners in identifying the best and most appropriate way for that to be delivered. However, compared to other services, the funding mechanism for health facilities and services is extremely complicated. The council continues to work with the NHS's Integrated Care Board for Hampshire to strive for health facilities that are adequate to meet the needs of our growing population and to ensure that all residents can get access to the GP services they need.



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

## **QUESTION 11**

From: Councillor Pearson

To: The Cabinet Member for Climate Emergency (Cllr Learney)

"I note with interest the emerging changes in collection of Waste, and for Recycling. However the presentation by the 'Lead - Environmental Services' while detailing information in the recent Environment Act fails to say where, once divided into one of the several bins, the 'food waste is destined to be sent, and the means of transport: Do we have an 'anaerobic digester/s' as possible destination/s? If not, does Project Integra plan on building any - or do we (I note that the Government has announced capital grants)? What are the possible locations of these 'anaerobic digesters'?"

# Reply

We will be collecting food waste using specialised food waste collection trucks. Households will be provided with a kitchen caddy for internal use to be emptied into either a larger container which will be used at the kerbside for collection or a communal bin.

It is currently planned that the food waste will be taken to existing transfer stations, then taken onwards to an anaerobic digestion facility by the waste disposal authority.

The view of our waste disposal authority, Hampshire County Council is that there is enough current capacity from commercial anaerobic digestion facilities locally to manage Hampshire's food waste. In addition, Veolia have planning permission to convert the Alton materials recycling facility into an anaerobic digestion facility with the capability to accept waste from across the County.



# **Question under Council Procedure Rule 15(3)**

## **QUESTION 12**

From: Councillor Lee (2)

To: The Cabinet Member for Housing (Cllr Westwood)

"My questions relate to the unanswered question I raised at the recent Housing Committee, namely:

- <u>Carbon/energy build and retrofit standards</u>. We seem to have a myriad of standards - AECB CarbonLite Building Standard, Passivhaus Plus and Passivhaus/AECB etc. (AECB = Association for Environment Conscious Building).
  - Can we clarify what standards our housing is actually built/retrofitted to, and the level of accreditation achieved. These are quite different standards for cost savings and climate impacts!
- <u>Register of total Carbon/energy savings</u>. Where do we record the total Carbon/energy savings for all our new homes and those retrofitted to a higher carbon/energy efficiency standard? If done, how, and where are these recorded and published?
- Online database of case studies and successes. Can our housing upgrades be added to the 'Low Energy Buildings Database' – an excellent education and dissemination tool to celebrate and share our achievements and best practise.

As Full Council only allows me one question, I have highlighted the questions of concern above for fellow Councillors information which I request are answered separately to us all.

My single Full Council question is based on the low housing score we achieved in the UK Climate Emergency Action Scorecard - question 1.9 under 'Buildings and Heat.'

Can the Council provide a service to showcase our recently retrofitted and/or Passivhaus homes to the public, with a show home programme including case study achievements in an online portal, such as, for example in the 'Low Energy Buildings Database' – an excellent education and dissemination tool.

If it helps in answering my question. I believe there may be external organisations such as WinACC or similar who could support WCC with volunteers to show/explain said properties to members of the public."

## Reply

- We already publish information of our retrofit program on our own website at <a href="https://www.winchester.gov.uk/climate-change-and-energy/climate-emergency-what-we-are-doing-now/energy-saving-homes">https://www.winchester.gov.uk/climate-change-and-energy/climate-emergency-what-we-are-doing-now/energy-saving-homes</a>. But we need to be aware the retrofit program is upgrading people's homes, and as such the opportunity for show homes not available. However, one element of our retrofit communication program is to provide testimonials via video that are available on our website. These videos can be accessed by anyone with web access and can provide a 'virtual' show home experience of the retrofit benefits.
- In addition the Council already publishes information on its new homes build program on our own website at <a href="https://www.winchester.gov.uk/housing/new-affordable-housing">https://www.winchester.gov.uk/housing/new-affordable-housing</a> and provides information on schemes in early stages, currently being built, and completed schemes. Where possible we do have show homes in new developments, but these close as the development is fully occupied.
- However, using the council retrofit program to encourage private home owners to improve their own properties in a simar way is important, and sharing the achievements of this program can be included in the Housing Strategy 2023-2028 action plan. I will ask the officers to do this.