

---

## SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 18 SEPTEMBER 2013

---

#### Present:

The Mayor, Councillor White  
The Sheriff, Councillor Mrs Blatchford  
Councillors Baillie, Barnes-Andrews, Bogle, Chaloner, Claisse, Cunio, Daunt, Fitzhenry, Furnell, Hammond, Hannides, B Harris, L Harris, Kaur, Inglis, Jeffery, Keogh, Kolker, Laming, Letts, Lewzey, Lloyd, Mead, Mintoff, Moulton, Noon, Norris, Dr Paffey, Parnell, Payne, Pope, Rayment, Shields, Smith, Spicer, Stevens (items 51-56(a) and 56(c) onwards), Thomas (Items 51-55 only), Thorpe, Tucker, Turner, Vassiliou, Vinson and Whitbread (items 51-56(b) and 56(d) onwards)

#### 51. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Burke, McEwing and Morrell.

#### 52. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> July, 2013 be approved and signed as a correct record.

#### 53. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR AND LEADER

##### (i) Cancellation of Extraordinary Council and Special Cabinet Meetings (16<sup>th</sup> October)

Members were reminded that there was no longer a need to hold an Extraordinary Council Meeting or Special Cabinet Meeting on Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> October.

##### (ii) European and City Council Elections 2014

It was noted that the Council of Europe had now determined that the European Elections would be held on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2014; and the Government had approved the required regulations to confirm that the local elections in 2014 would be deferred so they were combined with the European elections. Accordingly, the Annual Council Meeting would be held on the 4<sup>th</sup> June as provisionally published.

#### 54. DEPUTATIONS, PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- (i) The Council noted that the deputation from Mr Westcott concerning Group Leaders' Allowances had been withdrawn.
- (ii) The Council received and noted a deputation from Mr Fitzpatrick and Mr Simms concerning Dale Valley Residents' Association – New Charges to Residents' Parking Schemes.

- (iii) The Council received and noted a deputation from Issa Farrah concerning Cuts to Youth Services.

## 55. EXECUTIVE BUSINESS

The report of the Leader of the Council was submitted setting out the details of the business undertaken by the Executive (copy of report circulated with agenda and appended to signed minutes).

The Leader and the Cabinet made statements and responded to Questions.

The following questions were then submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.1:

### **1. Permit Charges**

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Rayment

What is the Executive's rationale for the introduction of 1st permit charges in residents' parking areas?

#### Answer

The justification was stated in the Cabinet report earlier this year.

This stated that we accept the need to have residents parking priority where there are pressures from parking caused by commuters, visitors or shoppers. The Council is seeking to cover some of its costs in issuing residents parking permits.

Background:

- Current income from second permits and visitors' permits brings in around £50k per year.
- The cost of administering all types of permits in these areas is £260k every year.
- The proposal to charge £30 for first residents permits are expected to bring in £130k per year. This would still leave an annual cost to all the residents of the City of £80k.
- There have been policies for charging for different types of permits since 1973. The proposed charge is designed to ensure that the schemes become more self funding by those that benefit from the scheme.

We will be further consulting with the residents in all the zones to ensure that parking restrictions that best meet their current needs.

## **2. City Centre Parking charges**

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Rayment

In light of potential night time commuter parking on the outskirts of the City Centre, as a result of the new night time City Centre parking charges, will the Executive consult with other residents' parking areas close to the City Centre in Freemantle Ward, and not just the Polygon area, about the possible extension of enforcement times to 8pm?

### Answer

The current First permit proposals were advertised with Polygon Area Controlled Parking Zone hours extended until 8pm so that this would limit displacement from the City centre evening charges proposals if approved.

We are consulting with all 13,000 residential properties within all the Controlled Parking Zones to understand how well their parking restrictions are working and whether any changes are necessary. Any changes will be dependent upon the level of response that we receive.

If the evening charges are approved and there are any displacement effects on other resident parking areas close to the city centre adjustments to permit times will be considered as necessary.

## **3. Athelstan Road highways issue**

Question from Councillor Lewzey to Councillor Rayment

Could the Cabinet Member please confirm that she has been looking at the Athelstan Road highways issue.

### Answer

I can confirm that I have visited Athelstan Road to see for myself the problems caused by large lorries using this north – south highway route.

I have asked officers to develop a revised proposal that builds upon previous ideas and I will bring this forward for consideration when it has been designed and costed.

## **4. Fraudulent Claims**

Question from Councillor Vinson to Councillor Barnes-Andrews

What use has the Council made of its powers under the 2002 Proceeds of Crime Act to recoup fraudulent claims?

### Answer

Regulatory Services have arrangements in place to carry out financial investigations to pursue Proceeds of Crime Act action in relevant cases. There are currently two cases under financial investigation. Further details cannot be provided at this stage due to legal reasons

## 5. Potholes and Uneven Pavements

Question from Councillor Vinson to Councillor Rayment

How many complaints has the Council received during each of the last three years concerning damage and injuries to (a) motorists (b) cyclists and (c) pedestrians as a result of potholes and uneven pavements? How many litigations have there been as a result of deficient road and pavement surfaces ? What has been the cost to the Council of such complaints and/or litigation and how does this compare as a proportion of the Council's spend on highway maintenance?

### Answer

Highways claims received by Southampton City Council are categorised as 'carriageway' or 'footway'

### **Southampton City Council**

#### **Claims received by SCC:**

Year	No. of 'Carriageway' Claims Received	No. of 'Footway' Claims Received
2010-11	62	64
2011-12	6	7
2012-13	3	1

#### **Payments by SCC during year on Highways claims:**

Year	Total Payments During Year
2010-11	£604,755
2011-12	£478,751
2012-13	£604,957

The 'Total Payments During Year' figure relates to all 'highways' claim settlements or part payments made in the period irrespective of when the claim was received, noting that complex and high value claims can take a significant period to reach conclusion, and that a claimant has up to three years from the date of an incident in which to submit a claim.

The Council entered into a Highways Service Partnership with Balfour Beatty in October 2010 and they assumed responsibility for dealing with all new claims in respect of loss, damage or injury occurring after this date, from potholes or uneven pavements.

In terms of 'highway claims', the Council is therefore dealing with a decreasing number of claims from before this date.

## **Balfour Beatty**

### **Complaints received by BBLP**

Year	Motorists	Cyclists	Pedestrians
2010-11*	132	5	95
2011-12	98	7	187
2012-13	183	8	163

### **Claims Received by BBLP**

The figures below represent all claims received since 4<sup>th</sup> October 2010 including those that have proceeded to the litigation stage.

Year	Claims From Motorists	Claims From Cyclists	Claims From Pedestrians
2010-11 *	89	3	28
2011-12	41	6	80
2012-13	59	10	95

\*The highways partnership commenced on the 4<sup>th</sup> October 2010 hence these figures represent a partial year from 4<sup>th</sup> October 2010 – 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011.

### **Cost to the Council of such complaints and/or litigation and how does this compare as a proportion of the Council's spend on highway maintenance?**

Under the terms of the highways contract, a lump sum of approximately £2.7m is paid annually for revenue activities including reactive maintenance. It is the responsibility of Balfour Beatty to allocate this budget. Balfour Beatty take the risk regarding insurance claims, so repudiation and settlement of all claims is their responsibility. Hence there is no additional cost to the council for claims on events that have taken place since 4<sup>th</sup> October 2010.

The Council is currently investing £4.2m Capital into roads maintenance in 2013/14.

## **6. Equal Pay**

Question from Councillor Smith to Councillor Barnes-Andrews

Would the Cabinet Member please update Council on the progress to deal with the outstanding issue of equal pay?

### **Answer**

We have held discussions with Trade Unions about ways we can future proof the Council against any risk of equal pay claims. Informed by those discussions we will be formally consulting on a set of concrete proposals with the aim of reaching an agreement.

## 7. Off Street Parking Charges

Question from Councillor Smith to Councillor Rayment

What surpluses are generated from on street and off street parking charges?

Answer

The surpluses that were generated from on street and off street parking charges in 2012/13 were as follows:-

<b>Net Operating Income (Surplus)</b>	
	<u>2012/13</u> <u>Actual</u> <u>£</u>
On Street	1,077,000
Off Street	2,542,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,619,000</b>

The on street surplus is ring fenced for transport related initiatives (including financing of Multi Storey Car Parks and highways capital works) and may be carried forward between financial years.

## 8. Limited Waiting Restrictions

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Rayment

What Council budget changes have been made since May 2012 relating to introducing new parking schemes such as introducing limited waiting restrictions?

Answer

If the Member is asking if we have removed a budget for minor traffic management schemes the answer is that no changes have been made.

## 9. Off Licences

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Kaur

At the last council meeting I asked to be sent the legal advice that the Cabinet Member received regarding the use of Cumulative Impact Licensing policies with respect to off licences. Please can I have this as promised as it has not been sent to me (preferably printed in the written response to this question)?

Answer

The matter is in hand. However it would be inappropriate to include the Council's legal advice in any public response.

The legal position when the matter was first raised in relation to off licences has changed, not least due to revised Home Office guidance which would appear to support the proposition that the Licensing Cumulative Impact Policy may now be applicable to off licences. This requires some site specific analysis as nationally this has not been tested by many authorities. Richard Ivory will ensure that Councillor Moulton is provided with the information and, if required, a briefing as soon as possible.

## **10. Fountains Cafe and Bargate**

Question from Councillor Hannides to Councillor Tucker

What are the Executive's future plans for Fountains Cafe and the Bargate?

### Answer

Following an assessment of the options available to us, we intend to offer the opportunity to operate Fountains cafe to the open market.

Some prolonged negotiations with a prospective tenant for the Bargate have recently come to an unsuccessful conclusion. We intend to liaise with local community and cultural groups to assess the level of interest from them to become occupiers of the Bargate. Securing a use, which would deliver public access is our preference, alongside reducing costs / attracting income for the Council.

## **11. SeaCity Museum**

Question from Councillor Hannides to Councillor Tucker

Following a successful first year for SeaCity Museum, what are the Executive's plans for exploring alternative management arrangements for the museum?

### Answer

There are no current plans for alternative management for SeaCity museum.

## **12. Outsourcing**

Question from Councillor Hannides to Councillor Barnes-Andrews

Are there any Council Services that are being considered for outsourcing?

### Answer

As part of the challenging Budget Process all options to produce a balanced Budget will be considered by the Labour Group.

### **13. Highways Work**

Question from Councillor Vinson to Councillor Rayment

Is the Cabinet Member aware of the power granted by the Transport Secretary to Surrey and East Sussex County Councils to require commencing work on the highways and to decide when companies can dig up the roads?

### Answer

Yes I am aware of the Traffic Management Common Permit Scheme being implemented by these authorities.

Southampton has reserved its position to become a member of this scheme at a later date, depending upon the results of the business case currently being worked on by our officers.

### **14. Personal Information**

Question from Councillor Vinson to Councillor Barnes-Andrews

To whom has the Council sold the personal information of individuals, e.g. from the electoral register?

### Answer

The only instance relates to the sale of the edited electoral register. The law requires the sale of the full register of electors to specified organisations for specified uses, the charges for which are also laid down in the regulations. In addition, the law also lays out the rules for the sale of the edited electoral register.

Since publication of the last register in December 2012 the following companies have requested and been supplied with copies of the full electoral register:

- Equifax PLC
- Callcredit PLC
- Experian Ltd
- Aristotle International Europe
- Crediva Ltd

The edited register has been requested and supplied to University of Southampton.

The prescribed forms of registration advise potential electors of the requirements for the full and edited registers. The Electoral Registration Officer makes and keeps two versions of the electoral register - the full register and the edited register. The full register lists everyone who is entitled to vote. It can be checked by calling at the council offices or at some local libraries. Only certain people and organisations can have copies of the full register, and they can only use it for specified purposes. These include electoral purposes, the prevention and detection of crime and checking identity on applications for credit. The law says who can have a copy of the full register and what



they can use it for. The full list of such persons and purposes is given in the Representation of the People (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2002. It is a criminal offence for them to pass it on to anyone else or to use it for any other purpose.

The edited register leaves out the names and addresses of people who have asked for their names to be excluded from that version of the register. The edited register can be bought by anyone who asks for a copy and they may use it for any purpose.

It is this that has raised issues recently, given that on payment of a fee, the law requires that it must be supplied to anyone who pays for it, and the use is unlimited.

## **15. Drop Kerb Costs**

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Rayment

What increases have there been in the cost of drop kerb installations over the past couple of years?

### Answer

Prior to the commencement of the Highways Services Partnership with Balfour Beatty in October 2010, the average council charge for providing a vehicular dropped crossing into a residential property was approximately £1,300.

The current charge is approximately £1,700.

The reason for this difference is that Balfour Beatty includes the full cost of providing the service including New Roads and Street works Act compliance, multiple inspections.

One of the benefits of the Balfour Beatty contract is that it has revealed the full cost of the services I provided. Previously not all costs would have been allocated to individual priced works.

Officers are aware of the impact of this real cost increase, and are exploring ways to make it easier for smaller contractors to carry out the works direct for residents.

## **16. CCTV**

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Kaur

What plans does the Administration have for expanding CCTV coverage in the city, in particular in crime hot spots in residential areas?

### Answer

Southampton has an extensive network of CCTV cameras available to the Council and the police for the detection of crime and keeping local residents and businesses safe. The majority of these cameras are in fixed locations. In addition to these the Council maintains three mobile CCTV cameras that can be deployed in a range of locations to

address the needs and concerns of residents and businesses across the City about crime and anti-social behaviour.

CCTV cameras in Southampton are managed by Balfour Beatty. The Council works closely with its partners to review how best to respond to crime hot spots through a range of interventions and strategies, including the targeted use of CCTV.

We will continue to work together to maximise the impact through partnership of our own council resources, new resources such as Section 106 funding arising from City development as well as through joint working with our partners in Hampshire Police and Balfour Beatty as part of a wider approach to cutting crime and keeping our residents safe.

## **17. The Former Boating Lake**

Question from Councillor Parnell to Councillor Tucker

What is the Administration's present position and policy for the future of the former boating lake on the Sports Centre?

### Answer

Following the Planning and Rights of Way Panel hearing in June and the consultation on the former boating lake, Active Nation had been engaged and were developing plans for the Sports Centre. A timetable had been prepared and funding was being identified. All the information was presently being collated and once assimilated would be circulated to all Members.

## **18. HMOs**

Question from Councillor Turner to Councillor Payne

Will the Cabinet Member for Housing tell us if he has plans for HMOs to be licensed in accordance with the Additional licensing measures?

### Answer

The licensing of all houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) in the Bargate, Bevois, Portswood and Swaythling wards commenced on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2013. A team is now in place to process applications and inspect licensable properties. Over 200 applications have been received to date.

The Council's new additional licensing scheme means that properties within these wards such as shared houses, bedsits, and some flats where facilities are shared, will be checked to ensure that they are safe and well-managed. Landlords must also have suitable arrangements in place to deal with anti-social behaviour and the disposal of waste.

The success of the scheme will be reviewed in 2016 to determine whether other wards within the City would benefit from the licensing of all HMOs.

## **19. Primary School Places**

Question from Councillor Turner to Councillor Bogle

Could the Cabinet Member for Children's Services tell us if enough has been done to provide places in primary schools for this year and the following year?

### Answer

The City remains committed to working with Primary schools to explore ways of meeting current and future demands for places and I feel we are doing well to meet a significant rise in demand.

For the 2012/13 academic year there were a total of 3,060 places available in Year R (the first year of primary school). This number of places will be replicated in each primary age year group so children can stay in the same school throughout their Primary education.

In May 2013 there were 2,964 Year R children attending schools in the city, leaving a surplus of just under 100. In 2013/14, we anticipate a Year R cohort of just under 2,900, leaving an anticipated surplus of 160.

In 2014/15 several additional school expansions will provide the city with 3,135 Year R places compared to a predicted Year R cohort of 3,058 for that year.

For the academic year that has just started, more parents got their first preference school at both Reception (86.2% compared to 82.1%) and Infant to Junior Transfer (97.6% compared to 97.2%) than in 2012. Similarly, fewer parents could not be offered any of their preferences than last year in both Transfers (3.6% compared to 4.9% Year R, and 0.9% compared to 1.1% in the Infant to Junior transfer).

By way of comparison in the 2006/2007 academic year the Year R cohort was just over 2,100.

## **20. Traffic Safety Outside of Schools**

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Rayment

With numerous primary schools expanding and in some cases tripling in size, what plans does the Administration have to improve road and traffic safety outside of schools?

### Answer

The Council actively works with schools through their School Travel Plans in order to reduce the amount of cars associated with the school journey. There is generally no safety issue associated with children in the vicinity of schools, although where the need for improvements are identified, we work closely with colleagues in Children's Services to find an appropriate solution.

We maintain close links with Children's Services colleagues throughout the entire Primary School Expansion Programme.

## 21. Community Payback

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Kaur

What Council budget changes have been made relating to supporting Community Payback work since May 2012?

### Answer

The Council budgets and resources deployed in supporting Community Payback work have remained constant since May 2012 and consistent with levels of support before that time. The outcomes targeted and delivered have also remained unchanged, i.e. at least 10,000 hours of Community Payback work each year delivering environmental improvement projects to directly benefit Southampton's neighbourhoods and communities.

## 56. MOTIONS

### **(a) Royal Mail**

Councillor Pope moved and Councillor Jeffery seconded:-

"Given the two delivery offices in Southampton, the Southampton Mail Centre and delivery offices just outside the City, this Council recognises that the Royal Mail is part of the fabric of our nation and believes that plans for its privatisation will lead to high prices, a loss of jobs that will impact on our citizens and a reduction in services for the people in our City who need those services the most. Therefore we resolve that Southampton City Council should formally sign the "Save our Royal Mail" petition to put pressure on the Government to reverse its decision and protect the country's postal services; and that the Leader of the Council should write to the Secretary of State for Business and Enterprise conveying the terms of this Resolution."

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE MOTION WAS DECLARED CARRIED

RESOLVED that the motion be approved.

### **(b) Community Pubs**

Councillor Letts moved and Councillor Lloyd seconded:-

"Given the recent changes of use of pubs in Southampton, for example the Castle at Midanbury to a Tesco store and the Hope and Anchor at Freemantle to a Co-op store, and the prospect of other pubs being similarly affected, Council notes the possibility of submitting the following proposal to the government under the Sustainable Communities Act:

'That the Secretary of State help protect community pubs in England by ensuring that planning permission and community consultation are required before

community pubs are allowed to be converted to betting shops, supermarkets and pay-day loan stores or other uses, or are allowed to be demolished.’

The Council notes that if this power was acquired it would allow the Council to determine if pubs should be demolished or converted into other uses and could save many valued community pubs.

The Council resolves to submit the proposal to the government under the Sustainable Communities Act and to work together with Local Works and the Campaign for Real Ale to gain support for the proposal from other councils in the region and across the country.”

Amendment moved by Councillor Fitzhenry and seconded by Councillor Moulton:-

Second paragraph, third line, delete “to betting shops, supermarkets and pay day loan stores or other users, or are allowed to be” and replace with “or”

Third paragraph, second line, delete “could save many valued community pubs” and replace with “determine the impact of such changes.”

AMENDED MOTION TO READ:

Given the recent changes of use of pubs in Southampton, for example the Castle at Midanbury to a Tesco store and the Hope and Anchor at Freemantle to a Co-op store, and the prospect of other pubs being similarly affected, Council notes the possibility of submitting the following proposal to the government under the Sustainable Communities Act:

‘That the Secretary of State help protect community pubs in England by ensuring that planning permission and community consultation are required before community pubs are allowed to be converted or demolished.’

The Council notes that if this power was acquired it would allow the Council to determine if pubs should be demolished or converted into other uses and determine the impact of such changes.

The Council resolves to submit the proposal to the government under the Sustainable Communities Act and to work together with Local Works and the Campaign for Real Ale to gain support for the proposal from other councils in the region and across the country.”

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE AMENDMENT WAS DECLARED CARRIED

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE MOTION AS AMENDED WAS DECLARED CARRIED

RESOLVED that the motion as amended be approved.

NOTE: Councillor Letts declared a personal interest in the above matter, as a Member of CAMRA, and remained in the meeting during the consideration of the matter.

Councillor Stevens declared a pecuniary interest in the above matter, as a former owner/consultant within the pub trade, and left the meeting during the consideration of the matter.

### **(c) Bus provision**

Councillor Fitzhenry moved and Councillor Daunt seconded:-

“Council notes that as part of this year’s budget the Council withdrew c£500,000 of bus subsidies from bus operators in the City. Council recognises that the changes in routes that took place in June of this year following these cuts has led to real problems for many residents in the City. Council recognises that many residents no longer have a local bus and that other residents now are faced with significantly reduced services. Council believes that the current situation is not acceptable.

Council urges the Executive to urgently look at the situation and seek to improve matters with partners and that in doing so, they ensure they maximise the use of government grants and capital monies awarded to ensure bus provision is useable by all members of the community. Council also urges the Executive to reinstate the bus users’ forum and seek to hold an urgent meeting to discuss possible solutions.”

Amendment moved by Councillor Thorpe and seconded by Councillor Jeffery:-

First line, first paragraph delete “c£500,000” and replace with “c£392,000”

At the end of second line in the first paragraph insert “bus companies”

Third line, first paragraph delete “that took place” and “following these cuts”

Fourth line, first paragraph delete “real” and “many residents” and after “problems for” insert “some bus users”

Fourth line, first paragraph delete the sentence “Council recognises that many residents no longer have a local bus and that other residents now are faced with significantly reduced services.”

Seventh line, first paragraph delete “acceptable” and replace with “ideal.”

First line, second paragraph delete “urgently look at the situation and seek to improve matters with partners and that in doing so, they ensure they maximise the use of government grants and capital monies awarded to ensure bus provision is useable by all members of the community” and replace with “build on existing relationships with these private companies and to continue to effectively encourage the use of all forms of sustainable transport.”

Fifth line, second paragraph delete “reinstate the bus users forum and seek to hold an urgent meeting to discuss possible solutions” and replace with “lobby local bus companies on more rigorous public consultation.”

## AMENDED MOTION TO READ

Council notes that as part of this year's budget the Council withdrew c£392,000 of bus subsidies from bus operators in the City. Council recognises that the bus companies' changes in routes, in June of this year, has led to problems for some bus users in the City. Council believes that the current situation is not ideal.

Council urges the Executive to build on existing relationships with these private companies and to continue to effectively encourage the use of all forms of sustainable transport. Council also urges the Executive to lobby local bus companies on more rigorous public consultation."

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE AMENDMENT WAS DECLARED  
CARRIED

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE MOTION AS AMENDED WAS DECLARED  
CARRIED

RESOLVED that the motion as amended be approved.

NOTE Councillor Whitbread declared a pecuniary interest in the above matter, as a shareholder, and left the meeting during the consideration of the matter.

### **(d) Litter and fly tipping**

With the consent of the meeting, Councillor Vinson altered and moved and Councillor Turner seconded:-

"This Council is concerned at the rising tide of litter and fly tipping across our City, and calls on the Administration to bring forward a strategy as soon as possible, drawing on the full range of available powers and best practice elsewhere, including consideration of education, waste reduction measures, waste collection facilities, levies, penalties and rewards, to combat this more effectively."

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE ALTERED MOTION WAS DECLARED  
CARRIED

RESOLVED that the altered motion be approved.

### **(e) Biomass power station**

Councillor Moulton moved and Councillor Fitzhenry seconded:-

"This Council notes that Helius Energy may need to find significant local demand for the heat energy produced by its proposed biomass power station, if it is to take advantage of potential government funding or subsidies. In light of the Council's previously stated opposition to the proposed power station, this Council agrees that in so far as is legal it will never become a customer of Helius Energy's heat output or of any companies that might in the future build or operate its scheme or one like it on a similar scale, on the same site or elsewhere in the Western Docks. On the same basis, Council makes it clear that

should a large wood burning biomass power station be approved and eventually built in the Western Docks the City Council will at no stage ever directly or indirectly purchase any heat power generated by it.

Council resolves that it will write to Helius Energy to advise them accordingly, with the letter preferably signed by all 4 Group Leaders”

With the consent of the meeting, Councillor Shields altered and moved an amendment and Councillor Furnell seconded:-

Add two new paragraphs at the beginning of the Motion:

“Council reaffirms its commitment to the Low Carbon Strategy adopted in 2011, and in particular priority number two which commits the Council and its partners to generate and use energy in a sustainable way so that Southampton will be a city where carbon-intensive living will be ‘powered down’ by reducing energy demand and diverse low-carbon energy supply will be ‘powered up’ by new technologies through efficient design and a diverse low-carbon energy supply mix.

Council maintains its opposition to a large wood burning biomass power station in the Western docks and – should a planning application be submitted by Helius Energy along the lines that have been proposed – urges the Government of the day to respect local concerns and use its authority to block the plan.”

Add after “heat” in the first paragraph, sixth line “or electricity”

Add after “heat power” in the first paragraph, last line “or electricity”

Add at the end of the last paragraph:

“A copy of this letter should also be sent to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change to help inform any decisions taken on the plant’s future.”

AMENDED MOTION TO READ:

Council reaffirms its commitment to the Low Carbon Strategy adopted in 2011, and in particular priority number two which commits the Council and its partners to generate and use energy in a sustainable way so that Southampton will be a city where carbon-intensive living will be ‘powered down’ by reducing energy demand and diverse low-carbon energy supply will be ‘powered up’ by new technologies through efficient design and a diverse low-carbon energy supply mix.

Council maintains its opposition to a large wood burning biomass power station in the Western docks and – should a planning application be submitted by Helius Energy along the lines that have been proposed – urges the Government of the day to respect local concerns and use its authority to block the plan.

This Council notes that Helius Energy may need to find significant local demand for the heat energy produced by its proposed biomass power station, if it is to take advantage of potential government funding or subsidies. In light of the Council’s previously stated opposition to the proposed power station, this Council agrees that in so far as is legal it will never become a customer of Helius Energy’s heat or electricity output or of any



companies that might in the future build or operate its scheme or one like it on a similar scale, on the same site or elsewhere in the Western Docks. On the same basis, Council makes it clear that should a large wood burning biomass power station be approved and eventually built in the Western Docks the City Council will at no stage ever directly or indirectly purchase any heat power or electricity generated by it.

Council resolves that it will write to Helius Energy to advise them accordingly, with the letter preferably signed by all 4 Group Leaders. A copy of this letter should also be sent to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change to help inform any decisions taken on the plant's future.

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE AMENDMENT WAS DECLARED  
CARRIED

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE MOTION AS AMENDED WAS DECLARED  
CARRIED

RESOLVED that the motion as amended be approved.

57. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS TO THE CHAIRS OF COMMITTEES OR THE  
MAYOR

It was noted that no questions to the Chairs of Committees or the Mayor had been received.

58. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES, SUB-COMMITTEES AND OTHER BODIES

It was noted that the appointment of Councillor Jeffery and Councillor Pope on South East Employers had been swapped. Councillor Pope would now have the role as representative, and Councillor Jeffery the role of substitute.

59. HAMPSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN: ADOPTION

The report of the Leader of the Council was submitted recommending to Council the adoption of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (copy of report circulated with agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED

- (i) That the Inspector's report be noted;
- (ii) That it be noted that the Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) would supersede the saved policies of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (1998) and the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2007);
- (iii) That the Minerals and Waste Plan (2013) which incorporates the Inspector's Main Modifications and Additional Modifications be approved and adopted;  
and

- (iv) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning, Transport and Sustainability, following consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make minor changes to the Plan prior to adoption.

60. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2013/14 - 2017/18

The report of the Cabinet Member for Housing and Sustainability was submitted seeking approval for the revised Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Programme (copy of report circulated with the agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED

- (i) That the revised Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Programme set out in Appendix 1 to the report be approved; and
- (ii) That the use of resources to fund the HRA Capital Programme as shown in Appendix 3 to the report be approved.

61. THE GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2012/13 - 2015/16

The report of the Cabinet Member for Resources was submitted seeking approval for changes to the Capital Programme (copy of report circulated with the agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED

- (i) That the revised General Fund Capital Programme, which totals £167.0M (as detailed in paragraph 4 of the report) and the associated use of resources be approved;
- (ii) That the changes to the programme as summarised in Appendix 2 and described in detail in Appendix 3 to the report be noted;
- (iii) That the portfolio programme and structures changes, slippage and re-phasing and financial and project issues as described in detail in Appendix 3 to the report be noted;
- (iv) That £2,820,000 be added to the Environment and Transport Capital Programme funded by Local Transport Plan (LTP) government grant in 2014/15 for Integrated Transport Schemes (£1,351,000) and Highways Maintenance Schemes (£1,469,000);
- (v) That a sum of £508,000 be added to the Children's Services Capital Programme for Bitterne Park 6<sup>th</sup> Form in 2013/14 funded by government grant;
- (vi) That it be noted that the revised General Fund Capital Programme is based on prudent assumptions of future Government Grants to be received, due to the uncertainty surrounding the Comprehensive Spending Review for 2015/16 and future years;

- (vii) that it be noted that the additional temporary borrowing taken out in 2010/11 and 2011/12 due to cash flow issues, now totalling £9.4M, is expected to be repaid by the end of 2014/15 when anticipated capital receipts are finally forecast to be received;
- (viii) That in addition to the forecast capital receipts that are assumed as a key element of funding the capital programme presented for approval, it be noted that there may be additional receipts that flow from the sale of assets programme and that towards the end of 2013/14, it should be possible to better estimate the amount and timing of any forecast additional receipts;
- (ix) That the financial and project issues for each portfolio which are set out in paragraphs 29 to 33 of the report and detailed in Appendix 3 to the report be noted.

## 62. SAFER CITY AND YOUTH JUSTICE STRATEGY

The report of the Cabinet Member for Communities was submitted, detailing the Safer City and Youth Justice Strategy for Southampton (copy of report circulated with agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED that the Safe City Plan 2013/14 (Appendix 2 to the report) and the Youth Justice Strategic Plan 2013/14 (Appendix 3 and 4 to the report) be approved.

## 63. PEOPLE DIRECTORATE TRANSFORMATION

The report of the Cabinet Member for Change was submitted detailing the project plan for the People Directorate Transformation Programme and seeking the delegation of authority to the Director of People to act in strategic and operational matters relating to this transformation (copy of report circulated with agenda and appended to signed minutes).

### RESOLVED

- (i) That the progress from April 2013 to implement the transformation of the People Directorate, including the specific savings proposals which will impact on the 2014/15 budget and staffing levels detailed in appendices 1 & 2 to the report be noted;
- (ii) That the Executive's proposals for staffing reductions in Adult Social Care and Children's Services within the People Directorate which are brought forward for consultation as part of the Transformation work and are set out in appendices 1 & 2 to the report be noted;
- (iii) That the proposed establishment of an Integrated Commissioning Unit, which will lead to budget pressure of up to £125k per annum from 2014/15, and a part year pressure in the current year be noted;

- (iv) That delegated authority be granted to the Director of People, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Change (lead member for the decision), and the Cabinet Member for Resources, the Cabinet Member for Health & Adult Social Care, the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and the Chief Financial Officer, to enter into formal consultation with staff, recognised trade unions, partners, customers, parents, carers and stakeholders on the wider transformation work and the savings proposals set out in the appendices to the report with a view to being able to implement the structural changes necessary to implement the transformation by April 2014; and
- (v) That the Director of People be authorised to undertake any ancillary actions necessary to deliver the Transformation Programme as agreed by Cabinet.