

# Cabinet

**Monday, 26<sup>th</sup> September 2011  
at 5.00 pm**

## **Council Chamber**

This meeting is open to the public

### **Members**

Councillor Smith, Leader of the Council  
Councillor Moulton, Cabinet Member for Children's  
Services and Learning  
Councillor Baillie, Cabinet Member for Housing  
Councillor Fitzhenry, Cabinet Member for  
Environment and Transport  
Councillor Hannides, Cabinet Member for  
Resources, Leisure and Culture  
Councillor White, Cabinet Member for Adult Social  
Care and Health

(QUORUM – 2)

### **Contacts**

Cabinet Administrator  
Judy Cordell  
Tel: 023 8083 2766  
Email: [judy.cordell@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:judy.cordell@southampton.gov.uk)

Director of Economic Development  
Dawn Baxendale  
Tel: 023 8091 7713  
Email: [dawn.baxendale@southampton.gov.uk](mailto:dawn.baxendale@southampton.gov.uk)

## **BACKGROUND AND RELEVANT INFORMATION**

### **The Role of the Executive**

The Cabinet and individual Cabinet Members make executive decisions relating to services provided by the Council, except for those matters which are reserved for decision by the full Council and planning and licensing matters which are dealt with by specialist regulatory panels.

### **Executive Functions**

The specific functions for which the Cabinet and individual Cabinet Members are responsible are contained in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution. Copies of the Constitution are available on request or from the City Council website, [www.southampton.gov.uk](http://www.southampton.gov.uk)

### **The Forward Plan**

The Forward Plan is published on a monthly basis and provides details of all the key executive decisions to be made in the four month period following its publication. The Forward Plan is available on request or on the Southampton City Council website, [www.southampton.gov.uk](http://www.southampton.gov.uk)

### **Key Decisions**

A Key Decision is an Executive Decision that is likely to have a significant

- financial impact (£500,000 or more)
- impact on two or more wards
- impact on an identifiable community

Decisions to be discussed or taken that are key

### **Implementation of Decisions**

Any Executive Decision may be "called-in" as part of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny function for review and scrutiny. The relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel may ask the Executive to reconsider a decision, but does not have the power to change the decision themselves.

### **Southampton City Council's Seven Priorities**

- More jobs for local people
- More local people who are well educated and skilled
- A better and safer place in which to live and invest
- Better protection for children and young people
- Support for the most vulnerable people and families
- Reducing health inequalities
- Reshaping the Council for the future

### **Procedure / Public Representations**

Reports for decision by the Cabinet (Part A of the agenda) or by individual Cabinet Members (Part B of the agenda). Interested members of the public may, with the consent of the Cabinet Chair or the individual Cabinet Member as appropriate, make representations thereon.

**Smoking policy** – The Council operates a no-smoking policy in all civic buildings.

**Mobile Telephones** – Please turn off your mobile telephone whilst in the meeting.

**Fire Procedure** – In the event of a fire or other emergency, a continuous alarm will sound and you will be advised, by officers of the Council, of what action to take.

**Access** – Access is available for disabled people. Please contact the Cabinet Administrator who will help to make any necessary arrangements.

### **Municipal Year Dates (Mondays)**

2011	2012
6 June	16 January
4 July	6 February
1 August	13 February
5 September	12 March
26 September	16 April
24 October	
21 November	
19 December	

## CONDUCT OF MEETING

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

The terms of reference of the Cabinet, and its Executive Members, are set out in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution.

### BUSINESS TO BE DISCUSSED

Only those items listed on the attached agenda may be considered at this meeting.

### RULES OF PROCEDURE

The meeting is governed by the Executive Procedure Rules as set out in Part 4 of the Council's Constitution.

### QUORUM

The minimum number of appointed Members required to be in attendance to hold the meeting is 2.

### DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Members are required to disclose, in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct, **both** the existence **and** nature of any "personal" or "prejudicial" interests they may have in relation to matters for consideration on this Agenda.

### PERSONAL INTERESTS

A Member must regard himself or herself as having a personal interest in any matter:

- (i) if the matter relates to an interest in the Member's register of interests; or
- (ii) if a decision upon a matter might reasonably be regarded as affecting to a greater extent than other Council Tax payers, ratepayers and inhabitants of the District, the wellbeing or financial position of himself or herself, a relative or a friend or:-
  - (a) any employment or business carried on by such person;
  - (b) any person who employs or has appointed such a person, any firm in which such a person is a partner, or any company of which such a person is a director;
  - (c) any corporate body in which such a person has a beneficial interest in a class of securities exceeding the nominal value of £5,000; or
  - (d) any body listed in Article 14(a) to (e) in which such a person holds a position of general control or management.

A Member must disclose a personal interest.

Cont/...

## **Prejudicial Interests**

Having identified a personal interest, a Member must consider whether a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably think that the interest was so significant and particular that it could prejudice that Member's judgement of the public interest. If that is the case, the interest must be regarded as "prejudicial" and the Member must disclose the interest and withdraw from the meeting room during discussion on the item.

It should be noted that a prejudicial interest may apply to part or the whole of an item.

Where there are a series of inter-related financial or resource matters, with a limited resource available, under consideration a prejudicial interest in one matter relating to that resource may lead to a member being excluded from considering the other matters relating to that same limited resource.

There are some limited exceptions.

Note: Members are encouraged to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer or his staff in Democratic Services if they have any problems or concerns in relation to the above.

## **Principles of Decision Making**

All decisions of the Council will be made in accordance with the following principles:-

- proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
- due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
- respect for human rights;
- a presumption in favour of openness, accountability and transparency;
- setting out what options have been considered;
- setting out reasons for the decision; and
- clarity of aims and desired outcomes.

In exercising discretion, the decision maker must:

- understand the law that regulates the decision making power and gives effect to it. The decision-maker must direct itself properly in law;
- take into account all relevant matters (those matters which the law requires the authority as a matter of legal obligation to take into account);
- leave out of account irrelevant considerations;
- act for a proper purpose, exercising its powers for the public good;
- not reach a decision which no authority acting reasonably could reach, (also known as the "rationality" or "taking leave of your senses" principle);
- comply with the rule that local government finance is to be conducted on an annual basis. Save to the extent authorised by Parliament, 'live now, pay later' and forward funding are unlawful; and
- act with procedural propriety in accordance with the rules of fairness.

## AGENDA

**Agendas and papers are now available via the Council's Website**

### **1 APOLOGIES**

To receive any apologies.

### **2 DISCLOSURE OF PERSONAL AND PREJUDICIAL INTERESTS**

In accordance with the Local Government Act, 2000, and the Council's Code of Conduct adopted on 16th May, 2007, Members to disclose any personal or prejudicial interests in any matter included on the agenda for this meeting.

NOTE: Members are reminded that, where applicable, they must complete the appropriate form recording details of any such interests and hand it to the Democratic Support Officer

### **3 STATEMENT FROM THE LEADER**

### **4 RECORD OF THE PREVIOUS DECISION MAKING**

Record of the decision making held on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2011, attached.

### **5 MATTERS REFERRED BY THE COUNCIL OR BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR RECONSIDERATION (IF ANY)**

There are no matters referred for reconsideration.

### **6 REPORTS FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES (IF ANY)**

There are no items for consideration

### **7 EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS**

To deal with any executive appointments, as required.

## **ITEMS FOR DECISION BY CABINET**

### **8 SECONDARY SCHOOL ESTATE PROGRAMME 2011/12**

Report of the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Learning seeking approval to spend on the investment approvals for the Secondary Estate, attached.

**9 PARKING STANDARDS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

Report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport seeking approval for the adoption of a document setting out new parking standards for the City, attached.

**10 TOWN DEPOT - CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FOR DEMOLITION**

Report of the Cabinet Member for Resources, Leisure and Culture seeking approval to spend on the demolition of Town Depot, attached.

**11 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC - CONFIDENTIAL PAPERS INCLUDED IN THE FOLLOWING ITEM**

To move that in accordance with the Council's Constitution, specifically the Access to Information procedure Rules contained within the Constitution, the press and public be excluded from the meeting in respect of any consideration of the confidential appendix 1 to item 12.

Confidential appendix 1 contains information deemed to be exempt from general publication based on Category 3 of paragraph 10.4 of the Council's Access to Information Procedure Rules. It is not considered to be in the public interest to disclose this information because this appendix contains confidential and commercially sensitive information relating to the property interests potentially involved in this matter.

**12 DISPOSAL OF THE FORMER EASTPOINT CENTRE FOR TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT USES**

Report of the Leader of the Council seeking approval for the Council to enter into an option for the sale of the Eastpoint Centre for the purpose of providing Education and Training facilities, attached.

NOTE: This report is presented as a general exception item in accordance with paragraph 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules of Part 4 of the Council's Constitution, as it has not been included in the Council's Forward Plan.

# Agenda Item 4

## EXECUTIVE DECISION MAKING

### RECORD OF THE DECISION MAKING HELD ON 5 SEPTEMBER 2011

#### Present:

Councillor Smith	-	Leader of the Council
Councillor Moulton	-	Cabinet Member for Children's Services and Learning
Councillor Baillie	-	Cabinet Member for Housing
Councillor Hannides	-	Cabinet Member for Resources, Leisure and Culture
Councillor White	-	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health

Apologies: Councillor Fitzhenry

#### 27. FIRST QUARTER PERFORMANCE MONITORING FOR 2011/12

On consideration of the report of the Cabinet Member for Leader of the Council, Cabinet noted that 77% of Council's Key Killer Performance Indicators and 89% of the Service Improvement Actions and Projects set out in the 2011/12 Council Plan are reported to be on target.

#### 28. FINANCIAL MONITORING FOR THE PERIOD TO THE END OF JUNE 2011

On consideration of the report of the Cabinet Member for Resources, Leisure and Culture, Cabinet noted the following:

- (i) the current General Fund revenue budget monitoring position for the General Fund 2011/12 as at Month 3 (June), which is a forecast over spend at year end of £0.4M against the budget approved by Council on 16 February 2011, as outlined in paragraph 4.
- (ii) that the baseline forecast over spend for portfolios is £2.0M.
- (iii) that portfolios plan to take remedial action to manage a number of the corporate and key issues highlighted in this report and that the financial impact is reflected in the forecast position.
- (iv) that the Risk Fund includes £2.4M to cover service related risks, and that the estimated draw at Month 3 is £0.5M to cover expenditure which is included within the baseline forecast portfolio over spend of £2.0M.
- (v) that the Revenue Development Fund totals £1.4M. At this stage of the year it has been prudently assumed that the remainder of the Fund will be fully utilised.
- (vi) that £104,300 has been allocated from the contingency to fund the recommendations contained in the 2010/11 Grants to Voluntary Organisations report as approved by Cabinet on 21 June 2010.
- (vii) that £45,000 has been allocated from the contingency to reflect the fact that the savings proposal to increase the cost of Meals on Wheels has been reviewed and amended such that the planned increase in income will not be delivered in 2011/12

- (viii) that it has been assumed that the remaining contingency of £100,700 will be fully utilised by the end of 2011/12 with this sum being allocated to fund the majority of the cost of introducing a market supplement of £1,400 per annum for a range of social workers within Children's Services and Learning on a temporary six month basis
- (ix) the forecast level of balances which will fall below the minimum level of £4.5M in the medium term if further remedial action is not taken in year to reduce the forecast over spend from the current level of £0.4M to at least a break even position.
- (x) the performance to date with regard to the delivery of the agreed savings proposals approved for 2011/12 as detailed in Appendix 9.
- (xi) the performance against the financial health indicators detailed in Appendix 10.
- (xii) the performance outlined in the Quarterly Treasury Management Report attached as Appendix 11.
- (xiii) the current HRA budget monitoring position for 2011/12 as at Month 3 (June), which is a forecast over spend at year end of £34,800 against the budget approved by Council on 16 February 2011, as outlined in paragraph 19.

29. MEETING THE CARE QUALITY COMMISSIONS STANDARDS IN COUNCIL CARE HOMES

DECISION MADE: (Ref: CAB 11/12 6529)

On consideration of the report of the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health Cabinet agreed the following:

- (i) That subject to the addition by Council of the sum detailed in Appendix 1 for improvements to the fabric and furnishings of the Council owned residential homes, to approve capital expenditure, in accordance with the Financial Procedure Rules as described in this report.

30. DISPOSAL OF LAND AT 512 PORTSMOUTH ROAD SHOLING, SOUTHAMPTON

DECISION MADE (Ref: CAB 11/12 6697)

On consideration of the report of the Cabinet Member Resources, Leisure and Culture, Cabinet agreed the following decision:

- (i) To approve the principle of the sale of the Council's freehold interest; and
- (ii) To delegate authority to Head of Property and Procurement following consultation with the Executive Director for Corporate Services and the Cabinet Member for Resources, Leisure and Culture to approve the preferred bidder, agree terms of the sale and carry out all ancillary matters to enable disposal of the site.



31. CITY PLAN

DECISION MADE: (Ref CAB 11/12 7042)

On consideration of the report of the Leader of the Council, Cabinet made the following decision:

To endorse the draft City Plan 2011 – 2014 prepared by Southampton Connect and to recommend its approval to Council on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

32. TO ADOPT THE SOUTHAMPTON JOINT STRATEGIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT 2011 - 14

DECISION MADE (Ref: CAB 11/12 6870)

On consideration of the report of the Executive Director of Health and Adult Social Care and the Director of Public Health the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health made the following decision:

- (i) To agree the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) 2011-14;
- (ii) That authority be delegated to the Executive Director of Health and Adult Social Care and the Director of Public Health to update the JSNA as new data and information becomes available.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 8

<b>DECISION-MAKER:</b>	CABINET
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	SECONDARY SCHOOL ESTATE PROGRAMME 2011/12
<b>DATE OF DECISION:</b>	26 SEPTEMBER 2011
<b>REPORT OF:</b>	CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES AND LEARNING
<b>STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	
None	

## **BRIEF SUMMARY**

At the Cabinet Meeting of 06/06/11, it was agreed to add £4,500,000 to the Children's Services and Learning (CSL) Capital Programme for the purpose of addressing key maintenance and suitability issues across the City's secondary school estate. The associated report stated that proposals for the investment profile at individual schools were being developed, with a view to bringing these back to Cabinet to request approval to spend on each of these items.

The purpose of the current report is to set out the final investment proposals for each of the schools in question and to seek approval to spend against these.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

In accordance with the Education Acts and having had regard to s2 Local Government Act 2000 and the provisions of the Community Strategy:

- (i) To vire, in accordance with the Financial Procedure Rules, a sum of £4,500,000 from the Secondary School Estate Capital budget to the following schemes:
  - £650,000 Bitterne Park Capital Investment
  - £670,000 Chamberlayne College Capital Investment
  - £650,000 Regents Park Capital Investment
  - £575,000 Sholing Tech. Capital Investment
  - £600,000 St. Anne's Capital Investment
  - £520,000 St. George Capital Investment
  - £485,000 Upper Shirley High Capital Investment
  - £350,000 Secondary Investment Programme Contingency
- (ii) To approve, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, capital expenditure of £4,500,000 from the Children's Services & Learning Capital Programme, for investment in the secondary school estate.

## **REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The secondary school estate has a significant profile of backlog maintenance issues. This is due, in part, to the fact that investment in ongoing maintenance had been reduced when it had been thought that the secondary estate would be largely rebuilt under Building Schools for the Future. In the absence of this investment, it is now critical that a programme be formulated to address key maintenance and suitability issues across the estate.

2. The proposals contained within this report were developed by CSL's Strategy and Capital Programme Team, on the basis of a reasoned assessment of schools' condition surveys and discussions with Heads regarding suitability items. The proposals have been agreed by all of the secondary schools concerned as comprising a solution that addresses the most pressing issues, whilst ensuring an equitable distribution of resources across the estate. As these proposals provide a platform for commonly agreeable solution, it is proposed that they be approved and actioned.

### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

3. In addition to the proposals that form the subject of this report, two other options for the allocation of the secondary investment pot were put to schools for their consideration. The first was a condition-driven set of proposals, meaning that the capital pot was allocated to schools solely on the basis of the items identified within their condition surveys. As condition items are given a priority score, the secondary estate was taken as a whole and the "top" £4.5m worth of issues identified to be addressed. This option had the advantage of being entirely transparent and objectively-determined. However, the option also had a number of key drawbacks, which the schools felt outweighed the advantages:
  - An inequitable distribution of investment, with, at the extremes, some schools receiving up to a 390% greater investment profile than others; and
  - An inability for schools to have input into the issues that they would like to see addressed, owing to the fact that the identification of priority items was based solely on the content of the condition surveys. This meant that "suitability" items (such as the need for additional toilets) could not be factored-in and, since a number of schools deemed these latter items to be more pressing than the condition issues, they found this option to be unpalatable.
4. The second discarded option was a mix of the other two (i.e. the judgement-based and the condition driven options). Again, this was rejected, due to the perceived lack of flexibility that this provided schools with in determining the focus of the investment.

### **DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)**

5. As alluded to above, the proposals contained within this report were the subject of extensive consultation. The process of developing the preferred solution was broken-down as follows:
  - Initial Meetings with Schools – these were held with individual schools in April 2011, to go through their priorities for investment, together with consideration of the key issues identified within the condition surveys pertaining to their buildings.

- Presentation to Secondary Heads Forum – after all schools had been met individually, two options for investment were worked up by the Strategy & Capital Programme Team and brought to the Secondary Heads Forum. The options presented were the one that forms the basis of the proposals in this paper and the condition-driven option. Heads were divided on which of the two options was preferable and the Forum asked the Strategy & Capital Programme Team to develop a third option (a mix of the other two options) for consideration.
  - Meeting with Building Surveyors – after having developed all three options, the Strategy & Capital Programme Team met with Capita’s Building Surveying Department to discuss the proposals in detail. This led to a few amendments to the proposals, which ensured that all of the urgent condition issues were picked up.
  - Decision on Preferred Option – on 23 June 2011, the three developed options were presented to the Secondary Heads Forum, with a view to establishing agreement on the preferred way forward. After debating the issues, it was collectively agreed that the judgement-based option was the fairest and most flexible basis upon which to proceed. The agreed option forms the basis of this paper.
  - Follow-up Meetings with Schools – having agreed the proposals for spend at each school, a final set of meetings with individual schools was undertaken to brief them on the process going forward.
6. The proposed capital investment profile at each of SCC’s (non-PFI) secondary schools is detailed below. A summary of all of the proposals contained in this report is provided in *Appendix 1*.
7. Bitterne Park Capital Investment
- The school has a significant backlog maintenance schedule. However, the buildings in greatest need of repair (and also which have significant suitability issues associated with them) are those which comprise the school’s Maths Block. As such, it is proposed that a project is formulated to reconfigure and refurbish this area of the school. As the buildings in question are modular classrooms, it is proposed that they be remodelled, in order to deliver a more “permanent” structure. A high-level feasibility study on the works required to deliver this has been undertaken and has estimated a project cost of between £1.0m and £1.3m. As such, it is proposed to phase the project in order that contract formation is scheduled for the 2012/13 financial year (to allow two year’s worth of capital funding for the school to be rolled into one project). The project will not be approved to proceed to implementation until such time as the 2012/13 capital allocation is determined to be sufficient to finance this. If insufficient funding were to be forthcoming to the authority (e.g. as a consequence of the school transferring to Academy status prior to this point), then the investment would be sought from the school and/or the DfE to meet the funding deficit. Should such additional funding be unavailable, the project would be reconfigured and/or descoped accordingly. The funding allocated to the project from the 2011/12 capital allocation is £650,000.

8. Chamberlayne College Capital Investment

Chamberlayne also has a significant amount of backlog maintenance required. As such, investment at this school is being directed to items identified on its condition survey. Specifically, it is proposed that resources are allocated to the following items:

- £255,000 for the replacement of windows and window frames;
- £145,000 for the reinstatement of roof coverings;
- £200,000 for the replacement of pipework; and
- £70,000 for the installation of improved lighting.

The above items represent all of the condition issues that were highlighted in the school's condition survey as being of highest priority.

9. Regents Park Capital Investment

Regents Park is in a similar position to the two preceding schools. Again, it is proposed that investment in condition issues is a key priority, with the identified items in this respect being as follows:

- £180,000 for the replacement of windows and window frames;
- £160,000 for the reconfiguration of the fire alarm system and
- £100,000 for the encasing of external staircases, which presently pose a significant Health & safety risk.

In addition, there are a number of suitability items that the school requires in order to support its curriculum delivery and bring the buildings in line with national guidance, as detailed below:

- £160,000 for an additional toilet block, which is required to provide for the fact that the school was redesignated as coeducational under *Learning Futures*; and
- £50,000 for drainage to the schools only grass pitch, which is prone to water-logging, making it unusable for a large portion of the year.

10. Sholing Tech. Capital Investment

Sholing Tech. has a moderate backlog maintenance schedule, compared to its Southampton peers. It is proposed that investment at this school is directed towards the following condition items:

- £245,000 for the replacement of windows and window frames; and
- £170,000 for the reinstatement of roof coverings.

Furthermore, as with Regents Park, there is also a need for an additional toilet block at this school, in order to take account of its recently becoming coeducational. Again, it is proposed that a sum of £160,000 be allocated for this purpose.

11. St. Anne's Capital Investment

There is a significant backlog maintenance schedule at St. Anne's. However, the major priority item is the replacement of the heating pipework throughout the school. It is estimated that £300,000 would be sufficient to remedy this issue in its entirety.

Further to the above, the school has identified the fact that they would like to initiate a project to refurbish the disused onsite chapel, with a view to its being used as a performing arts space in the future. It is proposed that £300,000 be allocated to this project from the 2011/12 capital allocation. Although this amount will not meet the anticipated cost of delivering the full vision for this space, it should be sufficient to bring the area into a useable state of repair, with the option being retained to deliver further progress towards the vision from future capital allocations.

12. St. George Capital Investment

St. George is in a comparatively good state of repair. Discussion with building surveyors has identified that there is only one critical condition related issue requiring attention at the school; this being the roof of the Science Block. It is estimated that the reinstatement of this item will cost £120,000.

As there is significantly less need for condition works at St. George, the school have asked for a capital investment in delivering an all weather sports pitch. It is proposed that £400,000 be allocated for this purpose, which may be supplemented by investment by the school and/or funding from external bodies, depending on the specification of pitch required.

13. Upper Shirley High Capital Investment

Upper Shirley High has a moderate level of condition-related buildings issues. In this respect, it is proposed that investment be directed to the following:

- £150,000 for the reinstatement of roof coverings;
- £150,000 for the replacement of pipework; and
- £25,000 for the replacement of windows and window frames.

As with the other two schools that became coeducational under Learning Futures (see above), there is a need for an additional toilet block at Upper Shirley High. Again, £160,000 has been allocated to this within these proposals.

Although the school has recently become an Academy, SCC's Capital Maintenance allocation for 2011/12 was calculated on the basis of the authority having responsibility to maintain these buildings. Furthermore, the 14-19 Diplomas, SEN and Disabilities grant had been earmarked for BSF schools (of which Upper Shirley High was one). As such, there is no conflict in allocating a programme of works to this school within the current financial year. This position has been confirmed within the school's Transfer Agreement of 29 July 2011 and agreed contractually prior to the Local Authority ceasing to maintain the school.

14. Secondary Investment Programme Contingency

As the above amounts do not allow for contingency items, it is proposed that the remaining £350,000 be placed in a programme-level contingency fund. Managing the budget in this fashion (as opposed to at the level of individual projects) will allow greater flexibility in how it is employed.

## RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

### Capital/Revenue

15. £4.5 million was added to the Children's Services & Learning capital programme by Cabinet in June 2011, funded from Department for Education 14-19 Diplomas, SEN & Disabilities Grant.
16. The budgets for each project are detailed in Appendix 1 and summarised in the table below:

	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Bitterne Park Capital Investment	£50,000	£600,000	£650,000
Chamberlayne College Capital Investment	£670,000	£0	£670,000
Regents Park Capital Investment	£500,000	£150,000	£650,000
Sholing Tech. Capital Investment	£425,000	£150,000	£575,000
St. Anne's Capital Investment	£50,000	£550,000	£600,000
St. George Capital Investment	£170,000	£350,000	£520,000
Upper Shirley High Capital Investment	£335,000	£150,000	£485,000
Secondary Investment Contingency	£175,000	£175,000	£350,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£2,375,000</b>	<b>£2,125,000</b>	<b>£4,500,000</b>

17. The ongoing revenue costs of schools are met from the Individual Schools Budget funded from Dedicated Schools Grant.

### Property/Other

18. The additional resources being made available to address building condition issues and therefore reduce the maintenance backlog are welcomed.

## LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

### Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:

19. The Council has a variety of powers and duties in relation to the provision of appropriate secondary education (and facilities for the provision of such education) in relation to maintained schools under The Education Act 1996 and regulations made there under. In addition, the responsibilities in relation to the funding of capital matters in maintained schools is set out in the School Finance Regulations and the Scheme for Financing Schools approved under s.48 of the School standards & Frameworks Act 1998.
20. Upper Shirley high School is an Academy, not a maintained school. As such the Education Act provisions set out above do not apply. The Council has a power to assist Academy schools, including providing financial assistance, under s.2 Local Government Act 2000 if it is considered likely to improve the social, economic, or environmental well-being of its area or inhabitants of its area. The proposals for Upper Shirley high School have been assessed in line with the Council's approved Community Strategy and it is considered that the proposals set out in this report will improve the environmental and social well being of students at that school and is therefore within the Council's discretionary powers under the Act (see further Policy Framework Implications below).



### **Other Legal Implications:**

21. In preparing, considering and implementing the proposals in this report the Council is required to have regard to the provisions of the Equalities Act 2010.

### **POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS**

22. The capital investment proposed for SCC's secondary schools will contribute to the outcomes of both the 14-19 Strategy and the Children & Young People's Plan by improving the condition, suitability and efficiency of the estate in question.
23. In addition, capital investment in the City's secondary estate will contribute to Objective 2.3 of the council's *Community Strategy*. Specifically, improving secondary-age learning environments directly supports the Council's aim of "developing and sustaining successful... secondary schools that local people choose to send their children to."

<b>AUTHOR:</b>	Name:	Karl Limbert	Tel:	023 8091 7596
	E-mail:	<a href="mailto:karl.limbert@southampton.gov.uk">karl.limbert@southampton.gov.uk</a>		

**KEY DECISION?** Yes

**WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:**

All

### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line**

#### **Appendices**

1.	Summary of Secondary Estate Investment Proposals
----	--

#### **Documents In Members' Rooms**

1.	None
----	------

#### **Integrated Impact Assessment**

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out.	No
--	----

#### **Other Background Documents**

**Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:**

Title of Background Paper(s)

Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)

1.	None	
----	------	--

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>DECISION-MAKER:</b>	CABINET
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	PARKING STANDARDS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)
<b>DATE OF DECISION:</b>	26 SEPTEMBER 2011
<b>REPORT OF:</b>	CABINET MEMBER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT
<b>STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	
Not applicable.	

## **BRIEF SUMMARY**

This report seeks the approval of Cabinet to adopt new Parking Standards for Southampton.

This is a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which will set out new requirements and recommendations regarding the amount and design of vehicle and cycle parking outside the defined City Centre area. This SPD will, in many cases, increase the maximum parking that developers may provide compared to the existing parking standards in force. It also includes more detailed requirements and guidance regarding parking design than the existing standards and sets out new requirements and recommendations for travel plans.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- (i) To approve and adopt the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document

## **REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. These Parking Standards provide the City and developers with updated and more flexible/ appropriate parking standards.
2. These parking standards will help SCC to ensure that new developments do not create unsustainable demand for on-street parking and the attendant problems this brings.
3. We have stated in our LDF Core Strategy that we will develop updated parking standards as part of that policy framework.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

### **Continue to use existing parking standards**

4. This option has been rejected as it would:
  - (i) mean SCC would persist with Parking Standards that do not reflect recent changes to national policy which afford more flexibility to Local Authorities to set their own maximum parking standards. The Local Plan (Review) Parking Standards date back to 2006;
  - (ii) mean SCC would persist with Parking Standards that may not allow developers to provide an adequate amount of parking for some developments, meaning that future development could place an unacceptable strain on parking supply in some areas, with the attendant issues this would bring; and

- (iii) mean SCC would persist with Parking Standards that do not incorporate recommendations on many basic items (eg minimum garage and bay sizes) as well as not featuring guidance on more recent developments such as permeable surfacing, Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), electric vehicle charging provision, and accessible design (e.g. home zones and shared surfaces).

#### **DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)**

5. The SPD sets out new maximum parking standards for the area outside of the City centre zone. The separate City Centre Action Plan (CCAP) will set out new parking standards for the area within the City centre zone.
6. This SPD aims to ensure that developers can provide a suitable level of vehicle and cycle parking at new developments, to avoid various problems that inadequate parking can cause for new and existing residents and for network management.
7. It also supports various aims of local and national policies. At a national level, this includes working to achieve the requirements of PPG13 and PPS3/4, which advocate taking account of expected car ownership levels, the importance of good design, and the need to use land efficiently. At a local level, it supports the aims of Southampton City Council's LDF and Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP3).
8. Finally, in the longer term, this document will help work toward better use and management of the highway network – a statutory duty under the Traffic Management Act (2004) which SCC must undertake.
9. This SPD improves upon the existing parking standards in the following key areas:
  - Completely new residential parking standards have been set out. These are still maximum standards, but maximum values have been considerably increased (typically around 50 to 100%) compared to the previous standards. This gives developers the ability to provide more parking at their developments if it is needed, although developers are not expected to provide more parking than is necessary.
  - The structure of the standards has also been simplified compared to the previous standards and should be more easily explained and acceptable to the public and to developers alike.
  - New accessibility area definitions are set out. The criteria used to describe an area as “high” accessibility are now stricter than before and the “medium” accessibility zone has been removed, meaning there are only two accessibility level areas defined. The high accessibility zone is defined as areas close to bus corridors with 20+ buses per hour. This is a level of bus frequency which it is felt would enable genuinely car free living (and thus reduced requirements for parking) for typical residents and their travel patterns. This is a simplification compared to the previous standards and is intended to better reflect the reality of non-car accessibility than in the previous Parking Standards.

- Inclusion of design guidance. Unlike before, this document sets out minimum dimensions for bay sizes, garages, cycle parking design etc to ensure that parking provided at sites is usable for typical vehicles. It also sets out expectations regarding placement of parking bays (for vehicles and cycles) in relation to developments, and provides “good practice” examples from existing sites in Southampton setting out the parking design features we wish to see provided in new developments.

### **Consultation**

10. Consultation has been undertaken in line with the statement of community involvement. An initial stakeholder consultation occurred over 2 weeks in June 2011, contacting key stakeholders (developers and their consultants, and some key businesses and community representatives) to seek their review of an initial draft.
11. This was followed by a 6 week formal stakeholder consultation period between 11 July and 22 August 2011, where draft versions of the document were sent to residents and community groups listed on the Planning Policy contacts list, in addition to a wide range of other stakeholders. Some 187 organisations have been contacted as part of this consultation; 15 responses were received.
12. The document has also been discussed at Planning and Rights of Way Panel and will be on the agenda of the OSMC committee on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2011.
13. Feedback from consultation has been fairly minimal, with a good level of support. Whilst a consultation summary is provided at appendix 4 for Members full consideration, key consultation comments were as follows:
  - There were some questions over whether the high accessibility zone criteria were too strict, but it is felt these are justified and have not been relaxed.
  - There was some concern that HMO parking is not addressed in this SPD- HMO parking will be addressed separately in the forthcoming HMOs SPD.
  - There were some comments that the maximum allowed parking for some developments is still too low- despite these standards allowing at least one parking space, even for a single bed unit- a significant increase on the previous standards.
  - There was some debate about more significant requirements for electric vehicle charge points at Planning and Rights of Way panel but it is felt it would be best to review this element of the SPD over time as the electric vehicle market develops.

### **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

#### **Capital/Revenue**

14. No financial implications for SCC. This policy does not require additional financial resource as enforcement of parking policies is part of the existing development control process.

**Property/Other**

15. No foreseeable property implications for Southampton City Council.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:**

- 16. Local Authorities are required to set out maximum parking standards for new developments in the Government’s Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13). Whilst PPG13 allows local setting of parking provision maxima for many development types, PPG13 does specify national maxima for parking provision for some classes of development.
- 17. The contents of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 and PPS4 also set out the Government’s expectation that Local Authorities set out parking standards. Of note is the following statement in PPS3:  
[Local Authorities must, in consultation with stakeholders and communities]  
*“develop residential parking policies for their areas, taking account of expected levels of car ownership, the importance of promoting good design and the need to use land efficiently”.*

**Other Legal Implications:**

- 18. Developers must comply with these parking standards. Developers submitting planning applications which are not compliant with the contents of this guidance may have their applications refused.
- 19. The content and correctness of this SPD may be affected by future changes to PPG13, PPS3 or 4, and potentially by any new planning legislation and/or guidance introduced by the government.

**POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS**

- 20. This SPD is a supporting document to the LDF Core Strategy. In the LDF Core Strategy we have stated that we will develop these new Parking Standards. It supports the LDF Core Strategy and other associated policies and guidance forming this framework.
- 21. This SPD is in line with national policies and guidance set out in PPG13 and PPS3/4.

<b>AUTHOR:</b>	Name:	Richard Pemberton	Tel:	023 8083 4912
	E-mail:	Richard.pemberton@southampton.gov.uk		

**KEY DECISION?** No

<b>WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:</b>	With the exception of the City Centre Action Plan area, these parking standards will apply to all wards and all communities where new developments are proposed.
------------------------------------	--

## SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

**Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line**

### **Appendices**

1.	Final Parking Standards SPD for adoption
2.	Summary of Formal Public Consult
3.	Consultation Statement
4.	SEA Screening Statement
5.	Integrated Impact Assessment- Stage 1 & 2 forms
	Additional copies of all documents available upon request from Richard Pemberton (contact for this SPD)

### **Documents In Members' Rooms**

	None.
--	-------

### **Integrated Impact Assessment**

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out.	Yes
--	-----

**Other Background Documents** Transport Policy, 4th Floor, One Guildhall Square, Southampton SO14 7FP

**Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:** Transport Policy, 4th Floor, One Guildhall Square, Southampton SO14 7FP

Title of Background Paper(s)      Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)

This page is intentionally left blank



<b>DECISION-MAKER:</b>	CABINET
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	TOWN DEPOT - CAPITAL EXPENDITURE FOR DEMOLITION
<b>DATE OF DECISION:</b>	26 SEPTEMBER 2011
<b>REPORT OF:</b>	CABINET MEMBER FOR RESOURCES LEISURE & CULTURE
<b>STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	
Not applicable.	

## **BRIEF SUMMARY**

The Capital Update report presented to Council on 14 September 2011 includes an addition to the Resources Portfolio Capital Programme for the demolition of surplus redundant buildings at the old Town Depot. Subject to approval of the Capital Programme 2010/11 to 2013/14 by Council this report seeks approval for expenditure of £550,000 phased approx. £250,000 in 2011/12 and approx. £300,000 in 2012/13.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- (i) To approve in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules capital expenditure of £550,000 phased approx. £250,000 in 2011/12 and approx. £300,000 in 2012/13.
- (ii) That the Head of Property and Procurement is granted Delegated Powers to vary the scope and programme of the work following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources, Leisure and Culture within the overall budget parameters of the scheme.
- (iii) To delegate authority to the Chief Financial Officer, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources, Leisure and Culture to approve additional expenditure of £100,000 for the demolition and associated costs, bringing the total scheme up to a maximum of £650,000.

## **REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The Council's approved Capital Programme for 2010/11 to 2013/14 includes a scheme for the demolition of surplus redundant buildings at the old Town Depot. Cabinet authority is required for the approval to spend. This report is the vehicle for obtaining the necessary approval. Demolition of all redundant buildings at the Town Depot plus enhanced perimeter site security is a significantly more cost effective alternative to retention of the buildings over an assumed five year void period.

## **DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)**

2. In November 2009 Cabinet authorised the construction of the new City Depot at Dock Gate 20 Millbrook, and approved the capital costs of the new facility. The moving out of services from Town Depot has already commenced and is scheduled to be complete by 31 December 2011.

3. On 29 September 2009 cabinet took the decision to market the Town Depot site and to secure a development partner for the redevelopment of the Town Depot site and adjacent land for a major leisure led mixed use development.
4. **Consultation with the Head of City Development** - During 2009 the council commenced a two stage competitive tendering exercise through OJEU for the selection of a development partner. The intention is to work with a developer to enter into an exclusivity agreement which will enable them to conduct site investigations and to test development viability. If the developer can demonstrate viable development (which is not guaranteed) that meets the council's aspirations, it will then enter into negotiations to sign a Development Agreement which could take up to 9 months or so to complete. Thereafter the programme could include an 18 month period for the submission and determination of a planning application including the judicial review period prior to any development commencing on site but excludes any time provision for Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO's). If development proposals are not viable then a further marketing exercise may be required in better market conditions. The best case scenario is a disposal of the site in a minimum of 3.5 years but more realistically this will take 5 years or more.
5. A feasibility study has estimated that the costs of demolition down to slab level including removal of fuel tanks plus associated site security is within the range of £550,000 to £650,000 including asbestos removal.
6. The risk of asbestos costs escalating can be mitigated if phased intrusive asbestos surveys are undertaken as and when buildings become vacant so that the extent of asbestos is known in time for the tendering for the main demolition contract.
7. An Options Appraisal has demonstrated that the cost of demolition and management of a vacant site is the more cost effective option than retention of the buildings for which there is a significant, empty rates liability, insurance, repairs and maintenance and boarding up costs and additional security costs. The buildings are of poor quality and would be highly unlikely to attract temporary uses.
8. **Temporary open site users:** a demolished site will allow potential revenue earning uses such as a lorry park, car park including stadium match-day parking, boat show park and ride, coach depot, container storage, car boot sale venue. No consultations have yet been carried out with potential parties. Whilst there would be likely to be planning objections to a car park, this may not be the case for a lorry park. It may take a while to establish such a facility which may include additional washing and catering facilities but this option could be explored after demolition. Potential use as a lorry park strengthens the case for demolition. If this is feasible the Head of Parking Services advises that the Council should be seeking a minimum target revenue income of £30,000 p.a. after costs. However use as a lorry park would only be an interim use so the Council would need to consider the implications for future service provision when the site is eventually sold for redevelopment.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

9. The Options Appraisal considered retention of all buildings, and retention of permanent building structures whilst removing temporary structures. The clear business case favoured demolition of all buildings which are poor quality, with the sole exception of the former window factory which has potential to be let out and generate rental income. Retention of all buildings would not be cost effective over the assumed 5 year void period as the cost of boarding up, enhanced security costs and empty rates liability would exceed the initial outlay on demolition by approx £65,000 over an assumed 5 year void period. Demolition will have the added benefit of enhancing the capital receipt on eventual disposal and provides more opportunities for storage or lorry parking income to off-set costs.

## **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

### **Capital/Revenue**

10. Subject to approval of the Capital Programme 2010/11 to 2013/14 by Council on 14 September the scheme was added to the Resources Capital Programme, phased £250,000 in 2011/12 and £300,000 in 2012/13. The scheme will be funded by Direct Revenue Financing from General Fund Balances. Any addition and subsequent approval to spend, up to a scheme value of £650,000, will need to be approved by the Chief Financial Officer following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources, Leisure and Culture and will also be funded by Direct Revenue Financing from General Fund Balances.

### **Property/Other**

11. A largely cleared site will also enhance the appeal and value of the site when marketed for disposal.
12. The former window factory plus the former recycling bin storage space on Endle Street have letting potential to bring in a total of approx £40,000 pa.

## **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

### **Statutory Power to undertake the proposals in the report:**

13. Section 2 Local Government Act 2000 provides broad powers for the Council to do anything which it considers is likely to achieve the promotion or improvement of the economic social or environmental well being of its area.

### **Other Legal Implications:**

14. It is necessary to apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for the method of demolition. The planning authority will also consider whether the demolition project is likely to have significant environmental effects, possibly requiring from the applicant an Environmental Impact Assessment and for a screening opinion to be issued.

## **POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS**

15. The proposals are not contrary to the Policy Framework.

<b>AUTHOR:</b>	Name:	David Reece	Tel:	023 80832796
	E-mail:	david.reece@southampton.gov.uk		

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line**

**Appendices**

1.	None
----	------

**Documents In Members' Rooms**

1.	None
----	------

**Integrated Impact Assessment**

Do the implications/subject/recommendations in the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment to be carried out.	Yes/No
--	--------

**Other Background Documents**

Title of Background Paper(s)	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
------------------------------	--

1.	None	
----	------	--

**Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:**

<b>WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:</b>	
------------------------------------	--

<b>DECISION-MAKER:</b>	CABINET
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	DISPOSAL OF THE FORMER EASTPOINT CENTRE FOR TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT USES.
<b>DATE OF DECISION:</b>	26 SEPTEMBER 2011
<b>REPORT OF:</b>	LEADER OF THE COUNCIL
<b>STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY</b>	
Appendix 1 of this report is not for publication by virtue of Category 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person including the Council) of paragraph 10.4 of the Council's Access to Information Procedure Rules as contained in the Council's Constitution. It is not considered to be in the public interest to disclose this information because this Appendix contains confidential and commercially sensitive information relating to the property interests potentially involved in this matter.	

## **BRIEF SUMMARY**

The Eastpoint Centre, currently leased to Eastpoint Centre Ltd, is due to be passed back to the Council, following Eastpoint's relocation to its new Conference facility once completed, currently estimated mid – late October.

Apprenticeships Training Limited (ATL) is the largest training provider in the building services engineering sector and see the former Eastpoint site as an ideal opportunity to provide training based in Southampton for the wider region. This report sets out the proposed terms for the sale of the site to ATL.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Having complied with paragraph 15 of the Council's Access to Information Procedure Rules:

- (i) To approve the terms of disposal as set out of this report.
- (ii) To delegate the detailed terms of disposal to the Director of Economic Development after consultation with the Head of Property and Procurement and the Head of Legal Democratic Services.

## **REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. To bring new training and employment facilities to Southampton.
2. To provide a solution regarding the former Eastpoint Centre and site that has the potential to add to the training provision in the City and may reduce costs to the Council.
3. To further regenerate the Thornhill neighbourhood through external investment.
4. This report is submitted for consideration as a General Exception under paragraph 15 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules in Part 4 of the City Council's Constitution, notice having been given to the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and the Public. In order to secure the completion of the lease and option agreement at the earliest possible date thereby mitigating any void period and potential security and running costs a decision is required as soon as possible and before the publication of the next

forward plan.

## **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

- The site has been considered as a residential development site, which remains a viable option, subject to planning permission. Historically, the site has been a centre for education and training and such continued use will provide benefits to the local and wider community and business (including the new Eastpoint Conference facility), which the alternative option would not. Whilst there is an operator willing to run a facility it is the preferred option.
- As the property was to remain vacant pending sale, the Council had agreed the option of demolition and retention of the site until the land value increases. This would keep the site safe and to reduce holding costs. Provision for demolition has been made within the Leaders Capital programme. However, these options have a longer implementation period than the preferred option detailed in this report and will not delivery any immediate training benefits.
- A lack of training and employment sites in Southampton means that the proposed disposal would be the preferred option to demolition of the building and its continued use will be advantageous to the local community and local business (including the new Eastpoint Conference facility).

## **DETAIL (Including consultation carried out)**

1. At its meeting of 21 December 2009 Cabinet approved revised terms for the disposal of the Eastpoint Centre. That decision was taken to facilitate the development of part of the site to provide a new Eastpoint Facility. Itchen College was granted an option to purchase the remainder of the site. Lack of funding resulted in that option not being taken up by Itchen College. In the intervening time consideration has been given to a range of options relating to the use of the building and site once it is vacated by the Eastpoint Centre Ltd in Autumn 2011.
2. ATL is a training company for people who already work, or want to work, in the Building Services Engineering sector. ATL is part of the MIS Group with an annual turnover in excess of £67m and is the largest training provider in this sector. It is also one of the longest standing training providers in the sector having been established 1992. The company provides a comprehensive range of training and assessment through four company-owned centres including one outside the City's boundary at Hedge End.
3. ATL now wish to relocate from their Hedge End premises to larger and more appropriate facilities. They are seeking an alternative site, and the former Eastpoint site at Bursledon Road is most appropriate. They propose to provide new training opportunities on this site. Such training facilities will complement the new Eastpoint Conference Centre which is due to open shortly.
4. The proposal is for ATL to initially occupy and run its business from the existing (old) Eastpoint building which will enable it to establish a presence on this site and with the local community. At the same time, it enables the

preparation and submission of a planning application for the development of the site into a new purpose built adult training facility and confirmation of funding to purchase the site and undertake the redevelopment. In addition the Council would no longer need to demolish and incur these costs. The new facility could be constructed along the Bursledon Road frontage, and / or include a partially refurbished existing building, whilst training continues to be provided.

5. The structure of the transaction will therefore be on the basis of a short term lease until September 2013 on a peppercorn rent allowing occupation of the existing building together with an option to purchase the site. If ATL exercise the option, they will pay the purchase price to the Council and ownership of the site will transfer from the Council to them. The completion of the lease and option agreement will be sought at the earliest possible date in order to mitigate any void period and potential security and running costs.
6. If ATL were not to exercise the option then at the end of the lease the Eastpoint Centre would revert back to the Council and could be sold in the open market. While officers will be working closely with ATL during the option period, there could be a “void period” between the property reverting back to the Council and the completion of a sale, in which case the Council would have to consider the options available to maintain site security and to minimise holding costs. It is important for the Council to explore the current opportunities whilst still planning to minimise costs through a potential demolition if a sale was not achieved by ATL by Sept 2013. Hence it is proposed to retain the option of demolition and the associated budgets that have been agreed by full Council on 14<sup>th</sup> Sep 2011.
7. Further work will be necessary for the City Council to be satisfied about the viability of ATL, assessment of risks, particularly about ATL securing funding to achieve a purchase.

## **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

### **Capital/Revenue**

8. The Leaders Portfolio capital programme originally included provision of £130,000 to cover demolition costs. This was recently increased by Council on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2011 as part of the General Fund Capital Programme update. The revised budget is now £380,000 with delegated powers to increase this by a further £100,000 if necessary. This budget exists as a necessary contingency in the event that the transaction does not proceed and will remain in the capital programme until 2013/14 when the future of the site is determined. Use of this budget will be subject to separate approval to spend at that time in accordance with financial procedure rules.
9. There will be a capital receipt from the sale of the property and this is set out in Confidential Appendix 1. The existing level of capital receipt built into the Council’s capital programme funding position is also set out in Confidential. 1
10. There are no revenue costs currently incurred by the Council as these are the responsibility of the existing occupier. Under the proposed lease this will continue to be the case as ATL will be responsible for all costs and outgoings under the lease to be granted to them.

11. The Council will be liable for revenue costs of site security and other holding costs in the event of a void period between the property reverting back to the Council and the completion of a sale. This will also be the case if ATL does not exercise the option to purchase the site, resulting in a void period between the end of the ATL lease and the completion of a sale.

**Property/Other**

12. The site is approximately 5.9 acres and the building about 75,000 ft<sup>2</sup>. If the site were to be sold on the open market it would probably be for residential development purposes. The property is due to be passed back to the Council following the relocation to new Eastpoint Conference facility, once completed, currently estimated to be mid – late October.

**LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Statutory power to undertake proposals in the report:**

13. The property is to be sold under section 123 Local Government Act 1972 and the offer meets the “best consideration” criteria..

**Other Legal Implications:**

14. None.

**POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS**

15. None.



<b>AUTHOR:</b>	Name:	Paul Mansbridge	Tel:	023 80832635
	E-mail:	Paul.mansbridge@southampton.gov.uk		

**KEY DECISION?** Yes

<b>WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED:</b>	Bitterne
------------------------------------	----------

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

**Non-confidential appendices are in the Members' Rooms and can be accessed on-line**

**Appendices**

1.	Confidential Appendix
2.	Site Plan

**Documents In Members' Rooms**

1.	None.
----	-------

**Integrated Impact Assessment**

Do the implications/subject of the report require an Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) to be carried out.	No
--	----

**Other Background Documents**

**Integrated Impact Assessment and Other Background documents available for inspection at:**

Title of Background Paper(s)	Relevant Paragraph of the Access to Information Procedure Rules / Schedule 12A allowing document to be Exempt/Confidential (if applicable)
------------------------------	--

1.		
2.		

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 12

by virtue of paragraph number 3 of the Council's Access to information Procedure Rules

Appendix 1

Document is Confidential

This page is intentionally left blank