
SOUTHAMPTON CITY COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
14 NOVEMBER 2012

Present:

The Mayor, Councillor Burke
The Sheriff, Councillor White
Councillors Baillie, Barnes-Andrews, Mrs Blatchford, Bogle, Chaloner, Claisse, Cunio, Daunt, Fitzhenry, Furnell, Hannides, B Harris, L Harris, Kaur, Inglis, Jeffery, Keogh, Kolker, Laming, Letts, Lewzey, Lloyd, Mead, McEwing, Mintoff, Morrell, Moulton, Noon, Norris, Dr Paffey, Parnell, Payne, Pope, Rayment, Smith, Spicer, Stevens (Minute 73(b) onwards), Thomas, Thorpe, Tucker, Turner, Vassiliou, Vinson, Whitbread and Dr R Williams

68. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor Shields.

69. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Special Council Meeting and the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 12th September 2012 be approved and signed as correct records.

70. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE MAYOR AND LEADER

(i) Southampton Cenotaph Families and Friends Group

The Mayor informed Members he had accepted an invitation for the Mayor to become the Patron of the Southampton Cenotaph Friends and Families Group. This was a charity group formed to contribute to the advancement of education, the advancement of arts, culture and heritage, and the promotion of remembrance and Southampton's war memorials.

(ii) Visiting Students

The Mayor welcomed students from the University of Hof, Bavaria, Germany to the meeting.

(iii) Protocol for Executive Questions

The Mayor confirmed the adoption of an informal protocol for the next meeting or two in relation to questions to the Executive. The protocol that would be adopted would mean the following:

- a. if there was an endless string of supplementary questions of a very technical nature, it is suggested that that is an indication that the questioner could, and indeed should, have asked the question elsewhere and the Mayor would end that question and move on to the next question.

- b. generally, supplementary questions would be limited to the questioner rather than taken from any member (although this is not an absolute prohibition and the Mayor would exercise discretion);
- c. normally, there would be no more than three supplementary questions (again, not an absolute prohibition, but an overall approach, and the Mayor would exercise discretion).

(iv) Officers attending at Full Council meetings

The Mayor confirmed that the process for officers attending Full Council meetings and questions to officers on reports remained unchanged:

- a. if the matter was very complicated, members were expected to ask such questions in advance.
- b. if members did not do this, and in the Mayor's view they should have asked the matter in advance, then they go without the answer, unless the question is so significant that either the Chief Executive, Chief Financial Officer or Monitoring Officer feel that the Council can no longer proceed to make a decision without knowing the information.
- c. the report template is being revised in order to highlight who is to be contacted in advance,
- d. officers would continue to be contacted in advance to advise on who is intending to come. Arrangements can be made with officers waiting for their item to find them somewhere quiet to work and get them just prior to the item. The only people who can release them from attending the meeting are the Solicitor to the Council and the Democratic Services Manager in agreement with the Mayor. If there is a specific issue or problem, then there are things that can be done but this needs to be arranged in advance of the meeting.

71. DEPUTATIONS, PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- (i) The Council received and noted a deputation from Mr. N. Chaffey, calling on Council to reject the proposed cuts to jobs and council services and speaking in support of those councillors who are willing to fight the government austerity agenda.
- (ii) The Council noted that Mr. A .Berry who had requested to make a deputation to the Council meeting was not in attendance.

72. 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. Promoting Fan and Community Ownership

Question from Councillor Parnell to Councillor Payne

Following the motion concerning Promoting Fan and Community ownership, how many letters or E mails were sent and what has been the response?

Answer

The aim of Cllr Pope's motion in September was to call for action and encourage community organising, not burden the Council with additional commitments. Following the motion, Cllr Pope has worked on the issue in addition to his Council duties, resulting in virtually no burden on the authority. His work has included encouraging other councils to adopt a similar motion and he has recently been approached by the Daily Mail newspaper, which is interested in the campaign. Cllr Pope also met several MPs and officials in London this month (November) to discuss the content of his motion and encourage further action.

2. Family Matters Grant

Question from Councillor Parnell to Councillor Rayment

Family matters grant. How much of the £765,600 (2012/13) has been spent? Are we on target to receive the further £166,400 if we meet the agreed targets? Is the grant ring fenced?

Answer

40% of resource has been spent and by the end of the financial year this will have increased to 86%. The resource is ring-fenced, so can be used with families as the programme develops.
We are on track to draw down the £166,400 as we successfully move families forward.

3. Scheduled Meetings

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Dr. Williams

Please will the Leader say how many meetings he has had with Helius since he became Leader and give the dates and attendees?

Answer

The Leader has met with senior representatives of Helius on two occasions since he became Leader, as detailed below:

25 June 2012 – met with Adrian Bowles, Chief Executive; Rozie Haines, Environmental Planner and Paul Brighton, Planning Director of Helius, plus Cllr Asa Thorpe, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport

17 October 2012 – met with Adrian Bowles, Chief Executive; Rozie Haines, Environmental Planner and Paul Brighton, Planning Director of Helius, plus Paul Nichols, Senior Manager and Steve Harrison, Planning Officer/Team Leader SCC.

4. Resident and Community Groups

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Rayment

What is the Cabinet Member doing to ensure that resident and community groups are properly insured and what is she doing to support them in achieving this?

Answer

The Communities Team offers advice and information to community organisations on appropriate insurance cover, both face-to-face and through its online guide on insurance, available from

<http://www.southampton.gov.uk/living/comliving/Resources/howtoguides.aspx> and in hard copy on request.

Groups can apply to Community Chest for contributions towards insurance cover. The next round closes on 15th November.

As well as this support, up to now the council, via the Communities Team, has offered an umbrella insurance scheme for small groups. This has recently been reviewed and the cover provided has found to be more expensive than individual insurance plus it does not offer the cover that all groups require, particularly around events. The Communities Team has therefore recently concluded a 12 week consultation exercise on the proposal to cease offering this insurance cover. The results have been collated but no final decision has been reached.

However, what has been agreed is that cover will continue for another year. This could be via the existing provider or another insurance company. Options are currently being explored about what would provide the best value and most appropriate cover. In addition, the Communities Team will continue to work with groups to ensure that they have adequate cover.

5. Capital Projects

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Letts

Please would the Cabinet Member list all capital projects that have stopped under the new Administration?

Answer

No schemes have been stopped although within schemes, projects may be reprioritised (with any changes approved in line with the Financial Procedure Rules).

The Capital Programme is regularly reviewed and this will continue.

6. Speed Limits

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Thorpe

Would the Cabinet Member please update Council on any plans he has to introduce 20mph limits in residential city streets and, given the interest of many residents in Freemantle ward in reducing traffic speeds, will he please work with me to look at either

piloting a scheme here or prioritising the area for the early introduction of such a scheme?

Answer

In accordance with our stated Local Transport Plan policies we are examining the practicality of introducing targeted area speed reduction measures with appropriate calming measures in residential estates and district centres. With limited resources to undertake this work we are currently developing a list of locations where there is evidence of a need for speed reduction as evidenced by casualty statistics. In addition, we will be considering where we can gain added value by implementing them in association with other Council investments such as the estates regeneration or neighbourhood improvement schemes.

In addition, there are other existing tools which all elected representatives may choose to utilise, such as Speedwatch or targeted enforcement activity. In these initiatives we work closely with our partners in the Police to address speed issues. This involves a range of interventions from providing local residents with resources to undertake speed surveys and issuing warning notices, to requesting mobile speed enforcement by the Police. Any Councillor or local community concerned about the speed of traffic in their streets should in the first instance raise this with the council's road safety officer.

7. Lordshill District Centre

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Dr. Williams

What timescales does the Leader have in mind for the development of new housing in and around Lordshill District Centre now that Sainsbury's have indicated that they will not be building a new store there?

Answer

The proposal for new housing at Lordshill combines the use of the Oaklands school site (excluding the Pool) for housing with an evaluation of the potential for new housing along Lordshill Way, where verges are of sufficient width to create additional housing sites. These new proposals are not dependent on a redevelopment of the Sainsbury's store. The work is at an initial stage and conceptual proposals are being evaluated in advance of the preparation of a development brief for the most promising sites. When this work is complete (early in 2013), it will be possible to publish an outline procurement and development timetable.

8. Member and Officer Street Champions

Question from Councillor Vinson to Councillor Thorpe

Will the Cabinet Member appoint an elected member and a senior officer to champion street issues as recommended in the recent report, 'The State of our Streets'?

Answer

The new City Services Division brings together into one integrated unit three of the principal front-line services charged with delivering responsive and value for money streetscene services; waste and recycling, street cleaning, and grounds maintenance.

These arrangements will continue to successfully discharge this responsibility into the future, both through direct management of the services within this division plus effective liaison with the Highways Service Partnership.

9. Neighbourhood Street Champions

Question from Councillor Vinson to Councillor Thorpe

Has the Cabinet Member considered involving residents in the upkeep of their local environment as volunteer street champions, as practiced in the London Borough of Hillingdon?

Answer

The administration and officers within the new City Services Division recognise the vital contribution that can be made by residents who volunteer to actively engage in the care of their local environment. The aspiration is to continuously simplify and speed up the streetscene reporting and rectification process to encourage all residents to become 'street champions' and quickly and easily report any problems.

In addition to the City Council's long-standing Customer Gateway service which aims to provide an on-site response within one working day of report, the City Council has also recently integrated the national 'Fix my Street' web application into its own website, to facilitate simpler and faster online reporting of local streetscene problems. The City Services Team is also currently deploying mobile technology to close the time gap between a customer reporting a streetscene defect and the problem being resolved on site.

Further, the 'Do you want to help' section of Southampton Online's street cleansing web-page that states the *'team are always delighted to support individuals or groups who would like to help and improve the local environment, by organising their own "clean up". The team can offer advice, loan equipment and remove the rubbish once collected; ensuring the event is a success.'*

Many individuals and groups have been supported by the City Council in helping keep their neighbourhood clean and supporting this form of community engagement and activity in the future will continue.

10. Street Works by Utilities

Question from Councillor Vinson to Councillor Thorpe

What use is made by the Council of powers to require permits or introduce 'lane rental' schemes for street works, as recommended in the recent report 'The State of our Streets'?

Answer

Officers are investigating the options of moving to a permit scheme for the management of road openings in the city which is carried out by Balfour Beatty as part of the Highways Service Partnership. The introduction of a permit scheme would be a major change to the current method of management.

East Sussex and Surrey are also currently developing a scheme which would enable Southampton to join at a later date and an assessment will be undertaken to check if this approach is more cost effective than developing our own local scheme.

Recommendations on the preferred approach will be brought forward in due course.

11. Child Protection

Question from Councillor Turner to Councillor Bogle

In view of the fact that a committee of MPs has concluded that some children are being left too long in neglectful and possibly violent homes, are we acting soon enough to protect vulnerable children in Southampton?

Answer

I believe we are; though it is important to state there are no hard and fast rules for acting 'soon enough'. Careful individual judgements must be made and complex cases each judged on their merits, based on statutory guidance and professional expertise. We recognise children do better if they can remain with their families. Those families must be safe, secure and supportive. We are committed to working with families to support them for as long as is reasonable so that they can look after their own children as long as the children are judged to be safe. We assess all children to identify those at risk. Where significant risk of harm exists we act to remove as quickly as possible, working with our partners, police and health.

12. Academy School

Question from Councillor Turner to Councillor Bogle

Can the Cabinet Member for Children's Services inform Council why it is taking so long for a secondary school in Southampton to become an Academy, and what action is the executive taking to rectify this?

Answer

A total of four secondary schools are currently in the process of converting to Academy status. These are the three schools which are part of the Grouped Schools PFI contract (Cantell, Redbridge and Woodlands); and Bitterne Park School.

The conversion of the PFI schools to Academy status is complicated by a number of commercial issues that flow from the existing PFI contract. The Council has taken independent, specialist legal advice which demonstrates that the transfer arrangements as proposed by the DFE would leave the Council with significant, uncontrollable commercial risks. The Council raised this issue with the DFE as early as May 2012 and has suggested a number of ways in which it might be resolved. We have not had a satisfactory response to date from either the DFE or their specialist lawyers.

The conversion of Bitterne Park secondary school to Academy status was stopped by the DFE in June 2012 because of an outstanding financial issue. We are working closely with the school and DFE to resolve this.

The Council remains committed to effecting the conversion of all four schools to Academy status as soon as is practically and reasonably possible.

13. Personal Budgets

Question from Councillor Turner to Councillor Stevens (answered on behalf of Councillor Stevens by Councillor Rayment)

Is Southampton on target to achieve the Government's objective of 100% of eligible people having personal budgets by April 2013?

Answer

82.31% of eligible individuals using social care services were in receipt of an Individual Budget on 1st November 2012 and the service has an action plan to ensure 100% target is reached by 31st March 2013. All service users are offered Individual Budgets at their first assessment for services and a programme of reviews is underway to ensure those currently in receipt of services are offered an Individual Budget. The national performance indicator has been changed.

14. Unadopted Roads

Question from Councillor Turner to Councillor Thorpe

Will the Cabinet Member consider how residents in unadopted roads can be protected against excessive parking?

Answer

Unadopted streets are not maintained by the Council and have their own local management arrangements.

To address excessive parking there are two principal options

Option 1. Residents can apply to have the streets adopted provided that the land owner brings the road(s) up to adoptable standards. This may require considerable financial investment and requires unanimous consent from all property owners whose frontages border the unadopted street. In addition there would be a financial liability to the Council for ongoing maintenance as a consequence of the adoption.

Option 2. Landowners of private/unadopted streets can employ a private management company to manage the streets for them and there are a great many of these companies in existence. Wheel clamping is no longer an option as it is now illegal however a permit system operated by a management company can be introduced with a ticketing arrangement for non permit holders who park in these streets.

15. Complaints

Question from Councillor Vinson to Councillor Noon

Will the Cabinet Member for Efficiency and Improvement detail the number of complaints made to the Local Government Ombudsman against SCC for each of the last three years by subject, together with the outcomes?

Answer

The Local Government Ombudsman reports publically on the outcomes for all Local Authority by annual letter received in June of each year. The annual letter is presented to Governance Committee annually in either July or September (depending on the timing of it's receipt) together with a covering report setting out key findings and outcomes / case summaries of any matter of note and performance against our Local Authority comparator group. Please see the attached Spreadsheets for number of complaints by subject area and finding for:

- a) Period ending 31/03/2010
- b) Period ending 31/03/2011
- c) Period ending 31/03/2012, and
- d) Period 01/04/2012 – 08/11/2012 (SCC figures only)

Appendix 2: Local Authority Report – Southampton City Council	For the Period Ending – 31/03/2010
LGO Advice Team	

Enquiries and complaints received	Adult Care Services	Children and Family Services	Education	Housing	Benefits	Public Finance inc. Local Taxation	Planning and building control	Transport and highways	Other	Total
Formal/informal premature complaints	0	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	1	8
Advice given	0	1	1	3	0	0	1	1	0	7
Forwarded to investigative team (resubmitted prematures)	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	1	5
Forwarded to investigative team(new)	2	0	6	7	0	6	4	2	6	33
Total	2	2	7	15	1	8	6	4	8	53

Investigative Team									
Decisions	MI reps	LS	M reps	NM reps	No mal	Omb disc	Outside jurisdiction	Total	
2009/2010	0	7	0	0	8	7	6	28	

Copies of the last 3 annual reports to Governance Committee (which contain more general detail on the nature of the complaints the Council agreed to resolve locally (settle) through the Ombudsman process, total cost to the Council of such settlements and other areas of concern) may be obtained at:

2010:

<http://www.southampton.gov.uk/modernGov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=153&MId=1516&Ver=4>

2011:

<http://www.southampton.gov.uk/modernGov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=153&MId=2014&Ver=4>

2012:

Since 2003 only one matter has resulted in a formal finding of maladministration against the Council resulting in a statutory report. That matter was determined in October 2012 and is the subject of a separate detailed report on today's Council agenda in accordance with the Ombudsman's required procedures.

16. Fairness Commission

Question from Councillor Vinson to Councillor Dr. Williams

What has the Fairness Commission achieved to date?

Answer

Work to date on the Fairness Commission has involved:

- research into other councils who have established Fairness Commissions to identify costs, approach, membership etc
- consideration of existing work streams that could inform the work of such a Commission e.g. Welfare Reforms Review
- decision to map existing work streams, previous, current and proposed consultation that could inform the work of the Commission to ensure no duplication e.g. consultation on Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- discussion about potential themes for the Commission to focus on including work and income, family, communities and housing, access to advice and information, local democracy
- with a view to having the first meeting in the New Year.

17. Public Funds

Question from Councillor Smith to Councillor Dr. Williams

If a councillor was discovered to have misused public funds what in your opinion would be the honourable thing for that councillor to do?

Answer

Any such instance would be referred to Standards and Governance, the Monitoring Officer and Full Council. I would expect each instance to be treated on its merits and the advice and recommendations provided from the three bodies referenced above.

18. Woolston Bus Service

Question from Councillor Smith to Councillor Thorpe

Can the Cabinet Member update me on progress to reinstate the 1A bus service as promised to residents living around Jurds Lake Way in the Woolston Ward by Councillor Dr. Williams?

Answer

An hourly bus service will commence operation on the 3 December 2012.

19. New Children's Hospital

Question from Councillor Parnell to Councillor Bogle

Who represented Southampton at the launch of the £70 million plan for a new Children's hospital at the General Hospital?

Answer

A senior manager was scheduled to attend this event. However, on the day last minute family commitments meant that this was not possible.

The NHS University Hospital Trust is represented on the Children and Young People's Trust Board and partners, including the Council, have been engaged and will continue to be, in the development of the Children's Hospital.

20. Oaklands Pool

Question from Councillor Hannides to Councillor Payne

Do you expect the Pool to reopen this year?

Answer

Given the substantial repair work required before the building could be handed over to a community group, the pool will not be reopening this year. Discussions with Community Groups are continuing to see if such an agreement can be secured.

21. Interest Equalisation Account

Question from Councillor Hannides to Councillor Letts

Interest rates are expected to remain unchanged for the medium term, do you believe it is sensible to keep adding millions of pounds of revenue funds to the Interest Equalisation Account?

Answer

In 2009 a major debt restructuring exercise was undertaken in order to take advantage of market conditions and produce net revenue savings but in achieving interest rate savings, the Council exposed itself to variable interest rate risk. Whilst in a climate of low interest rates this was and remains an obviously a sound strategy, at some point when the market starts to move the Council will need to act quickly to lock into fixed long term rates.

In order to mitigate these risks, it was recommended in the February 2009 Treasury Management Strategy report to Council that an Interest Equalisation Reserve be created from the savings arising from the switch to lower rate variable interest rate debt,

and maintained at a prudent level to help to manage volatility in the future and ensure that there is minimal impact on annual budget decisions.

Council approved the addition of £1.0M to the Reserve in July 2012 which increased the total sum set aside in the Interest Equalisation Reserve to almost £3.1M.

Based on our current TM assumptions this would allow us a period of approximately 2 years in which to manage the impact on the revenue budget of switching from lower rate variable interest rate to fixed long term rates.

These assumptions are regularly reviewed and any resulting impact on the amount it is considered prudent to maintain in the Interest Equalisation Reserve is also reassessed.

22. Treasury Management

Question from Councillor Hannides to Councillor Letts

What are the key priorities driving the Council's Treasury Management strategy and are you relying on generating surpluses to support your budget plans?

Answer

The core elements of the TM Strategy as approved by Council on 15 February are:

- To continue to make use of short term variable rate debt to take advantage of the current market conditions of low interest rates.
- To constantly review longer term forecasts and to lock in to longer term rates through a variety of instruments, as appropriate during the year, in order to provide a balanced portfolio against interest rate risk.
- To secure the best short term rates for borrowing and investments consistent with maintaining flexibility and liquidity within the portfolio.
- To invest surplus funds prudently, the Council's priorities being:
 - Security of invested capital
 - Liquidity of invested capital
 - An optimum yield which is commensurate with security and liquidity.
- To approve borrowing limits that provide for debt restructuring opportunities and to pursue debt restructuring where appropriate and within the Council's risk boundaries

For borrowing, we review the interest rate position and forecasts and the relative costs of variable v fixed rates on an ongoing basis to ensure that we can respond to any changes in a timely manner. Supported by our advisors Arlingclose we also review the instruments available to us to balance the portfolio against interest rate risk.

For investments the fundamental considerations remain security, liquidity and risk in that order of priority and going forward there is no increased reliance on investment income as a result of changing these priorities.

23. Townhill Park

Question from Councillor Baillie to Councillor Payne

Why did you state (at least twice in public - Cabinet and Full Council) that there was no cost to the proposed acquisition of 450 new homes in Townhill Park?

Answer

The question is not accurate. I said there would be no extra cost to the 30-year HRA business plan compared to the original proposals.

The Townhill Park estate regeneration proposals presented to Cabinet in April 2012 and Full Council in May 2012 were at a total cost to the HRA of £33M.

The cost of the current proposals, including the acquisition of 450 new homes in Townhill Park, remains within the April 2012 total cost envelope for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) of circa £33M. That is, there is no additional net cost to the HRA from acquiring the new homes.

There are additional costs to acquire the 450 new homes, but these costs are offset over the 30 year business plan by the additional affordable rent income generated to the HRA.

The affordability assessment for the current proposals show that there is a net capital cost to the HRA of £9.2M (after capital receipts) and that the 30 year HRA revenue surplus will be reduced by approximately £23.9M, a total cost of £33.1M.

The model makes provision for the total borrowing associated with the acquisition of the 450 new homes (which is £37.7M) to be repaid over the life of the current 30 year HRA business plan. At the end of the 30 years, there will be additional net income from the 450 units estimated at £3.5M per annum, which will make an ongoing positive contribution to the HRA.

24. Townhill Park Rents

Question from Councillor Baillie to Councillor Payne

What effect do you envisage will occur to an average family presently in a Council home in Townhill Park from a potential doubling of their rent?

Answer

An increase in rent will depend on the individual circumstances of the household.

Currently Households already on housing benefit will have the rent increase met providing it is within local Housing Benefit caps;

1 bed £64.62

2bed £115.38

3bed £178.85

4bed £242.31.

Households not already on benefit may be entitled to assistance.

Following the introduction of universal credit in October 2013 its affordability is only threatened if rent payments plus other benefits exceed the Benefits Cap. People in work are not affected by the Universal benefit cap. Income remains the same regardless of rent level because HB increases to cover additional rent – up to the Housing Benefit Cap.

25. Townhill Park Consultation

Question from Councillor Baillie to Councillor Payne

Exactly what consultation has taken place since the last Full Council Meeting regarding the potential doubling of rents in Townhill Park?

Answer

Recent consultation in Townhill Park has taken the following forms:

4 consultation meetings:

11th and 15th September for Phase 1 residents (part of the statutory consultations)
18th and 22nd September all residents of the study area and the Southampton residents of the adjacent local area.

At these consultations Board 2 of the display 'What this could mean for you?' contained specific information on Affordable Rents. (see table below) It explained that the Council has chosen to charge up to 80% of market rents on the new Council homes and gave examples of Target and Affordable Rent as contained in the November Cabinet/Council report.

	Target Rent	Affordable Rent
One bed flat	£73.11	£101.54
Two bed flat	£84.25	£120
Two bed house	£89.69	£144

Information explained that by 2015 (the earliest time new housing would be available) Council homes will be charging target rents to achieve the required parity with housing associations. Therefore comparisons of increased rates were shown target and affordable as the average actual rents for 2011/12 shown in the Cabinet report will not exist.

Although the increases are still significant against the situation that will exist in 2015 (target rent) they represent an increase of 38%, 42.4% and 60.6% respectively not 100%.

Phase 1 Statutory Consultations (s105 Housing Act 1985)

In addition to the consultation meetings all residents, leaseholders and tenants of leaseholders in Phase 1 received a letter setting explaining the proposed redevelopment and seeking their views. In addition a visit from the Tenant Liaison Officers (TLO) was offered to SCC tenants.

As reported in the Cabinet report no written representations in response to the statutory consultations have been received from SCC tenants, leaseholders or leaseholder tenants.

As reported in the consultation analysis (Appendix 2 of the November Cabinet/Council report) 74% of SCC tenants in Phase 1 received a face to face visit. The TLO's had been briefed to include the discussion of Affordable Rent and what it would mean with

tenants. The TLO's discussed what Affordable Rent meant and that rents would be considerably higher with all tenants who thought they might like to move back to Townhill Park and made them aware that they would have to allow for this in their decision to move back.

As reported in the analysis of the consultations the TLO's did not receive adverse comment regarding this as people seemed to have accepted that Council rents would be increasing. Subsequent to this question the TLO's have been asked whether they had any indication of a difference in reaction to the increased rents between tenants in work compared to those on benefit. They were not aware of any difference.

The consultation information also explained how new homes will be much more energy efficient. This should reduce considerably the running costs for tenants which will help to mitigate the rent increases.

26. Jobs In Schools

Question from Councillor Baillie to Councillor Bogle

Why do you believe that jobs in schools are less important than jobs at SCC?

Answer

I don't

27. STEP Programme

Question from Councillor Smith to Councillor Letts

In view of your constant adjustments to the STEP programme, what are the differences between what existed previously and what you are proposing now?

Answer

The additions to the existing redeployment programme in the form of STEP are:

- Additional one month's redeployment period in order to enhance the likelihood of redeployment. (from 3 months to 4 months).
- Additional support and priority training
 - Priority training being made available from the Capita Learning and Development Team
 - Enhanced support via Skills Training UK, this is a Central Government Funded 2 day course to prepare staff for possible redundancy and to assist in accessing the job market and options
 - Further work being undertaken to secure additional European funded external training and alternative employment taster courses for staff
- Intranet site– covering internal and external training options, explaining the redeployment process and signposting the internal and external support available.
- Enhanced redeployment opportunities:
 - Extended redeployment period

- Staff matched to vacant jobs and given priority to apply for other vacancies
- Staff at risk matched to other potential vacancies, where staff not at risk can leave the Authority under a voluntary arrangement if agreed with their manager.
- Improved processes for matching staff.

28. Sale of artwork

Question from Councillor Daunt to Councillor Payne

Given your proposed job cuts and likely service cuts, will you reconsider your position on the sale of artwork to help plug the financial gap?

Answer

The Museums Association only allows deaccessioning of items to support the collections they come from. There are no plans to deviate from that professional advice. It should also be noted that one-off capital windfalls aren't suitable for meeting revenue pressures where funding is needed each year.

29. Future Adult Services Provision

Question from Councillor Claisse to Councillor Stevens (answered on behalf of Councillor Stevens by Councillor Rayment)

Bearing in mind the findings of the recent management consultant's report and the rejection of the use of a LATCO by SCC, how does the Cabinet Member see the shape of future Adult Services provision?

Answer

Adult social care direct care provision will continue to be provided from within the Council but will be modernised in response to the greater clarity that will be achieved by the review of capacity and needs assessment identified in the commissioning strategy of which the initial draft is expected early in the new calendar year. The Administration wishes to retain a provider of last resort whilst the market for care provision remains fragile but internal care provision will be proactively supported to change as necessary to respond to the changing social care agenda.

73. MOTIONS

(a) Council Funding

With the consent of the meeting, Councillor Letts altered and moved his motion and Councillor Dr Williams seconded:-

“Council notes the impact that the Government's austerity programme has had on the City of Southampton.

This Council notes the potential for further cuts in funding for the budget round in 2013-14.

Council believes it is the duty of all Councillors elected by the citizens of Southampton to do the best they can to secure a fair funding deal from any government for our City.

Council calls on all Group leaders to jointly lobby Government ministers on behalf of the City to secure the best funding deal available.

Council calls on all elected representatives both parliamentary and local government to 'Stand up for Southampton'."

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

Additional text to be added at the end of the Motion:

'Council also calls on the Government to recognise the adverse impact on Southampton of the closure of the Ford plant and to take this into account in determining future grant allocations to the City'.

Amended Motion to read:

Council notes the impact that the Government's austerity programme has had on the City of Southampton.

This Council notes the potential for further cuts in funding for the budget round in 2013-14.

Council believes it is the duty of all Councillors elected by the citizens of Southampton to do the best they can to secure a fair funding deal from any government for our City.

Council calls on all Group leaders to jointly lobby Government ministers on behalf of the City to secure the best funding deal available.

Council calls on all elected representatives both parliamentary and local government to 'Stand up for Southampton'.

Council also calls on the Government to recognise the adverse impact on Southampton of the closure of the Ford plant and to take this into account in determining future grant allocations to the City.

The Council agreed to suspend Council Procedure Rules 14.2, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, 14.9 and 16.2:-

- (i) to enable the above items to be considered together;
- (ii) to enable any amendments to be proposed, seconded and considered at the same time;
- (iii) to enable any amendment to be re-introduced later into the meeting.

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE AMENDMENT IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR VINSON WAS DECLARED CARRIED

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

RESOLVED that the motion as amended be approved.

(b) Planning and Housing

Councillor Vinson moved and Councillor Turner seconded:-

This Council believes that local people, through their democratically elected local authorities, are the most suitable judges of what development is acceptable in an area and the suitable level of contributions that developers should make.

This Council opposes:

- The Secretary of State's proposals for the Planning Inspectorate to have powers to override agreements between Councils and developers over the number of affordable housing units allocated to planning applications.
- The Secretary of State's proposals for planning permission – currently required for extensions of more than three or four metres from the rear wall of any home – to only be needed for those reaching beyond 8m for detached homes and 6m for others.
- The Secretary of State's proposals for the Planning Inspectorate to take planning powers away from local authorities deemed to be slow or of making poor quality planning decisions in determining applications.

This Council urges the Government to listen to the concerns being expressed by the cross-party LGA.

This Council resolves to formally write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, outlining this Council's opposition to the plans."

With the consent of the meeting, Councillor Mrs Blatchford altered and moved an amendment and Councillor Jeffery seconded:

In first paragraph:-

In the first line, after "This Council believes that", delete "local people, through their democratically elected local authorities,"

and insert "all development should contribute to improving the quality of life for the citizens of Southampton. Democratically elected local authorities,"

In the third line after "...suitable judges of what development" add "and standards" and after "are acceptable" add "together with".

Insert fourth bullet point:

- The Secretary of State's proposals for the review of Building Regulations that will harm standards on energy efficiency, accessible access, noise, vibration, fire safety, security, ventilation, drainage and waste.

Add at end of motion:

That Officers respond to the consultation on extending permitted development rights for Homeowners and Businesses in consultation with the Cabinet Member and Chair of the Planning and Rights of Way Panel.

Amended Motion to read:-

This Council believes that all development should contribute to improving the quality of life for the citizens of Southampton. Democratically elected local authorities are the most suitable judges of what development and standards are acceptable together with the suitable level of contribution that developers should make. This Council opposes:

- The Secretary of State's proposals for the Planning Inspectorate to have powers to override agreements between Councils and developers over the number of affordable housing units allocated to planning applications.
- The Secretary of State's proposals for planning permission – currently required for extensions of more than three or four metres from the rear wall of any home – to only be needed for those reaching beyond 8m for detached homes and 6m for others.
- The Secretary of State's proposals for the Planning Inspectorate to take planning powers away from local authorities deemed to be slow or of making poor quality planning decisions in determining applications.
- The Secretary of State's proposals for the review of Building Regulations that will harm standards on energy efficiency, accessible access, noise, vibration, fire safety, security, ventilation, drainage and waste.

This Council urges the Government to listen to the concerns being expressed by the cross-party Local Government Association.

This Council resolves to formally write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, outlining this Council's opposition to the plans.

That Officers respond to the consultation on extending permitted development rights for Homeowners and Businesses in consultation with the Cabinet Member and Chair of the Planning and Rights of Way Panel.

Further amendment moved by Councillor Fitzhenry and seconded by Councillor Smith:

Delete first and last bullet points:-

- The Secretary of State's proposals for the Planning Inspectorate to have powers to override agreements between Councils and developers over the number of affordable housing units allocated to planning applications.
- The Secretary of State's proposals for the Planning Inspectorate to take planning powers away from local authorities deemed to be slow or of making poor quality planning decisions in determining applications.

Amended Motion to read:

This Council believes that local people, through their democratically elected local authorities, are the most suitable judges of what development is acceptable in an area and the suitable level of contributions that developers should make. This Council opposes:

- The Secretary of State's proposals for planning permission – currently required for extensions of more than three or four metres from the rear wall of any home – to only be needed for those reaching beyond 8m for detached homes and 6m for others

This Council urges the Government to listen to the concerns being expressed by the cross-party Local Government Association.

This Council resolves to formally write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, outlining this Council's opposition to the plans."

The Council agreed to suspend Council Procedure Rules 14.2, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, 14.9 and 16.2:-

- (i) to enable the above items to be considered together;
- (ii) to enable any amendments to be proposed, seconded and considered at the same time;
- (iii) to enable any amendment to be re-introduced later into the meeting.

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE AMENDMENT IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR FITZHENRY WAS DECLARED LOST

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE AMENDMENT IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR MRS BLATCHFORD WAS DECLARED CARRIED

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE MOTION AS AMENDED BY COUNCILLOR MRS BLATCHFORD WAS DECLARED CARRIED

RESOLVED that the motion as amended be approved.

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

1. Licensing Rules

Question from Councillor Moulton to Councillor Cunio

Following my request that the Council and police work together to look at introducing tougher licensing rules in and around Shirley Road and High Street, what progress has been made?

Answer

The Licensing team and the police along with other agencies already work effectively to ensure that the licensing laws are effectively enforced. Individual complaints are investigated as appropriate. There has been no evidence to date submitted by the police to start considering any revision to the current Cumulative Impact Policy areas.

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

RESOLVED that subject to certain decisions that may, from time to time be made by the Council, the following Committees, Sub-Committees and other bodies be appointed

with the allocation of seats to political groups shown therein and they be delegated authority to act within their Terms of Reference.

Political Group	Seats on Council	%
Labour	28	58.33
Conservative	16	33.33
Liberal Democrats	2	4.16
Labour Councillors Against The Cuts	2	4.16

Committees	Labour	Con	Lib Dem	Labour Councillors Against The Cuts	Number of Seats to Groups
Overview and Scrutiny Management(10)	5 (5.88) Minus 1 seat	3 (3.33)	1 (0.14)	1	10
Planning and Rights of Way (7)	4 (4.08)	3 (2.33)	0	0	7
Employment and Appeals Panel (7)	4 (4.08) Minus 1 seat	2 (2.33)	0	1 (0.29)	7
Chief Officer Employment Panel (6)	4 (3.49) Minus 1 seat	2 (1.99)	0	0	6
Licensing Committee (13)	7 (7.58) Minus 1 seat	5 (4.33)	0	1	13
Governance Committee - Combined Standards and Governance and Audit Committees (9) includes 2 Independent Members	4 (4.08)	3 (2.33)	0	0	7
Sub-Committees	Labour	Con	Lib Dem	Labour Councillors Against The Cuts	
Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel (7)	5 (4.08)	2 (2.33)	0	0	7

Scrutiny Panel A (7)	4 (4.08)	2 (2.33)	1 (0.29)	0	7
Scrutiny Panel B (7)	4 (4.08)	2 (2.33)	1 (0.29)	0	7
Licensing General Sub-Committee (5) (Membership must come from membership of Licensing Committee)	3 (3.12)	2 (1.66)	0	0	5
Standards Sub-Committee (4) Including 1 Independent Member (Membership from Governance Committee)	2 (1.74)	1 (0.99)	0	0	3
Standards Appeal Sub-Committee (4) Including 1 Independent Member (Membership from Governance Committee)	2 (1.74)	1 (0.99)	0	0	3
TOTAL	48	28	3	3	82

Appointment to Committees / Sub-Committees and other Bodies NOT subject to political proportionality and therefore not included in the above calculations

Committee/Sub-Committee	Labour	Cons	Lib Dem	Labour Councillors Against The Cuts	
Standards and Governance ((10) including the Mayor and 3 independent members) N.B. Appointment to S&G until end of June only	Cllr Laming Cllr Keogh	Cllr Hannides Cllr Inglis	2		6

Licensing and Gambling Sub-Committee (3) (Any 3 Members drawn from the Licensing Committee membership on rotation basis)	2	1			3
Other bodies	Labour	Cons	Lib Dem	Labour Councillors Against The Cuts	
Hampshire Fire and Rescue Authority (3)	Cllr Barnes-Andrews Cllr McEwing	Cllr Smith			3
South East Employers (3 + 3)	Cllr Letts Cllr Tucker (Deputy)	1 (+1) (Deputy)	Cllr Vinson Cllr Turner (Deputy)		6
Local Democracy Network for Councillors (2)		1	Cllr Vinson		2
Partnership for Urban South Hampshire – Overview and Scrutiny Committee (1)			Cllr Vinson		1
Police Joint Committee (Police Authority) (1) <i>(Overall proportionality is calculated across the County. This may require a change in appointment)</i>	Cllr Rayment Cllr Mrs Blatchford (Deputy)				2

Until November Shadow Police and Crime Panel (1) plus 1 deputy <i>(Overall proportionality is calculated across the County.)</i>	Cllr Rayment Cllr Mrs Blatchford (Deputy)				2
Nomination of additional co- optees for consideration by Police and Crime Panel					
New Shadow Health and Well-being Board (5) – Cabinet Members for Adults, and Children’s Services and Communities plus one each from opposition Groups	Cllr Stevens Cllr Bogle Cllr Rayment	Cllr Baillie	Cllr Turner		5

OTHER APPOINTMENTS

It was noted that the following changes had been made:

- (i) Councillor Lewzey would fill the Labour vacancy on the Licensing General Sub-Committee;
- (ii) Councillor Keogh would fill the Labour vacancy on the Heath Overview and Scrutiny Panel;
- (iii) Councillor Tucker would stand down from the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee;
- (iv) Councillor Thorpe would stand down from the Chief Officer Employment Panel;
- (v) Councillor Laming would stand down from the Employment and Appeals Panel:
and
- (vi) Councillor Kaur would fill the Labour vacancy on Scrutiny Panel A.

76. LOCAL GOVERNMENT OMBUDSMAN REPORT

The report of the Head of Legal, HR and Democratic Services was submitted regarding the findings of the Local Government Ombudsman in relation to an adult social services matter (copy of report circulated with agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED

- (i) that the report of the Local Government Ombudsman attached at Appendix 1 to the report be received;
- (ii) That the Ombudsman's settlement proposals that have been agreed by the Proper Officer under powers delegated to him to settle Local Government Ombudsman complaints in accordance with the Council's Constitution be noted: The settlement that has been agreed is to:
 - a) Meet the full cost of Mrs Elliot's care in Care Home B from 31st July 2011 (less the assessed contribution Mrs Elliot needed to pay.)
 - b) Refund the top up fees Mrs Elliot's family had paid from 31st July 2011 and pay them interest on those payments at the Council's standard interest rate.
 - c) Pay Mrs Elliot's family £500 to recognise the time, trouble and distress caused to them.
 - d) Review the Council's guidance for staff regarding the availability of services at the Council's 'usual rate'.
 - e) In the short term, to negotiate access to placements at the Council's 'usual rate' with key care home providers. In the medium term, to hold discussions with care home providers to develop an agreement on fee levels.

77. TRIENNIAL REVIEW OF GAMBLING ACT 2005 POLICY

The report of the Head of Legal, HR and Democratic Services was submitted seeking the adoption of a revised Gambling Act Policy (copy of the report circulated with the agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED that the draft revised Gambling Act policy be adopted.

78. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC - CONFIDENTIAL PAPERS INCLUDED IN THE FOLLOWING ITEM

RESOLVED: 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 following confidential report .

The report is considered to be confidential, the confidentiality of which is based on category 4 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 Report contains confidential and commercially sensitive information relating to the personal interests of employees involved in this matter.

The information contained therein is potentially exempt as it relates to individual personal details and information held under the Data Protection Act 1998. Having applied the public interest test it is not appropriate to disclose this information as the individuals' legal expectation of privacy outweighs the public interest in the exempt information.

79. EMPLOYEES' TERMS AND CONDITIONS LITIGATION - SETTLEMENT TERMS

The confidential report of the Head of Legal, HR and Democratic Services was submitted regarding employees' terms and conditions litigation and the proposals for settlement (copy of report circulated with the agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED:

- (i) That the Council resolves to settle the legal proceedings under Multiple Reference No. 3462 (Case No. 3101094/2011) brought by Unison, Unite and UCATT against the Council in the terms as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report; and
- (ii) That the Head of Legal, HR and Democratic Services be authorised to undertake all such action to give effect to this decision.

80. REVISION OF THE COUNCIL'S EQUALITY POLICY AND OBJECTIVES

The report of the Cabinet Member for Communities was submitted seeking approval to a revised Equality Policy and Equality Action Plan (January 2013 to March 2016) (copy of report circulated with agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED:

- (i) That the revised Equality Policy be approved;
- (ii) That the new Equality objectives, to be monitored through an Equality Action Plan, be approved.

81. TOWNHILL PARK REGENERATION FRAMEWORK: SCHEME APPROVAL FOR PHASE 1

The report of the Cabinet Member for Housing and Leisure was submitted regarding further consideration of the financial model and approval of the capital expenditure for the implementation of Phase 1 (copy of report circulated with agenda and appended to signed minutes).

The Council agreed to suspend Council Procedure Rules 14.2, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, 14.9 and 16.2:-

- (i) to enable the above items to be considered together;
- (ii) to enable any amendments to be proposed, seconded and considered at the same time;
- (iii) to enable any amendment to be re-introduced later into the meeting.

Amendment moved by Councillor Baillie and seconded by Councillor Hannides:

Add additional recommendations (iv) and (v) as follows:

- (iv) that Council notes that the rationale behind estate regeneration is the poor quality of many of Southampton's estates, together with significant social, economic, education and health deprivation found on those estates. Council further notes that all the available evidence tells us that only with wholesale estate regeneration will the social, economic, education and health deprivation of those residents be improved on those estates.
- (v) that Council asks Cabinet to note that significant economic and social damage may occur through only offering homes at affordable rent and Cabinet will therefore endeavour to offer a significant number of homes at social rent.

Amended recommendations to read:

- (i) To agree that the HRA capital programme will fund the site preparation costs set out in this report, currently estimated at £11.8M, and:
 - (a) To approve a virement of £10.5M from the uncommitted provision for Estate Regeneration, which exists in the HRA capital programme and business plan, and £1.3M from the uncommitted funding for affordable housing in the Housing GF capital programme to establish a specific budget of £11.8M for the regeneration of Townhill Park, the phasing for which is set out in Appendix 1.
 - (b) To approve, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, capital spending of £3.9M on site preparation costs, including the purchase of leasehold interests, for Phase 1 of the Townhill Park regeneration project phased, £0.5M in 2012/13, £2.0M in 2013/14 and £1.4M in 2014/15.
 - (c) To approve, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, capital spending of up to a further £3.9M on the purchase of leasehold interests for properties in phases 2 and 3 of the Townhill Park regeneration project phased, £0.5M in 2013/14, £0.8M in 2014/15, £1.4M in 2015/16 and £1.2M in 2016/17.
- (ii) To approve the use of £23.9M of the 30 year HRA revenue surplus to meet the long term revenue costs of the regeneration of Townhill Park, which includes the requirement to repay the debt on the dwellings that have been disposed of from the general HRA revenue balance as there is no net capital receipt to fund this repayment.
- (iii) To agree that the General Fund capital programme will fund the highways infrastructure and open space improvements at an estimated cost of £2.6M with the method of funding this being agreed once the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy and the value of the GF capital receipts become known.
- (iv) That Council notes that the rationale behind estate regeneration is the poor quality of many of Southampton's estates, together with significant social, economic, education and health deprivation found on those estates. Council further notes that all the available evidence tells us that only with wholesale estate regeneration will the social, economic, education and health deprivation of those residents be improved on those estates.

- (v) That Council asks Cabinet to note that significant economic and social damage may occur through only offering homes at affordable rent and Cabinet will therefore endeavour to offer a significant number of homes at social rent.

Further amendment moved by Councillor Vinson and seconded by Councillor Turner:

Add additional recommendation (iv):

- (vi) That the difference between Target and Affordable Rent be phased in over three years.

Amended recommendations to read:

- (i) To agree that the HRA capital programme will fund the site preparation costs set out in this report, currently estimated at £11.8M, and:
 - (a) To approve a virement of £10.5M from the uncommitted provision for Estate Regeneration, which exists in the HRA capital programme and business plan, and £1.3M from the uncommitted funding for affordable housing in the Housing GF capital programme to establish a specific budget of £11.8M for the regeneration of Townhill Park, the phasing for which is set out in Appendix 1.
 - (b) To approve, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, capital spending of £3.9M on site preparation costs, including the purchase of leasehold interests, for Phase 1 of the Townhill Park regeneration project phased, £0.5M in 2012/13, £2.0M in 2013/14 and £1.4M in 2014/15.
 - (c) To approve, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, capital spending of up to a further £3.9M on the purchase of leasehold interests for properties in phases 2 and 3 of the Townhill Park regeneration project phased, £0.5M in 2013/14, £0.8M in 2014/15, £1.4M in 2015/16 and £1.2M in 2016/17.
- (ii) To approve the use of £23.9M of the 30 year HRA revenue surplus to meet the long term revenue costs of the regeneration of Townhill Park, which includes the requirement to repay the debt on the dwellings that have been disposed of from the general HRA revenue balance as there is no net capital receipt to fund this repayment.
- (iii) To agree that the General Fund capital programme will fund the highways infrastructure and open space improvements at an estimated cost of £2.6M with the method of funding this being agreed once the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy and the value of the GF capital receipts become known.
- (iv) That the difference between Target and Affordable Rent be phased in over three years.

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE AMENDMENT IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR VINSON WAS DECLARED LOST

UPON BEING PUT TO THE VOTE THE AMENDMENT IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR BAILLIE WAS DECLARED LOST

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

RESOLVED:

- (i) That the HRA capital programme will fund the site preparation costs set out in the report, currently estimated at £11.8M be agreed and:
 - (a) That a virement of £10.5M from the uncommitted provision for Estate Regeneration, which exists in the HRA capital programme and business plan, and £1.3M from the uncommitted funding for affordable housing in the Housing GF capital programme to establish a specific budget of £11.8M for the regeneration of Townhill Park, the phasing for which is set out in Appendix 1 to the report be approved.
 - (b) That, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, capital spending of £3.9M on site preparation costs, including the purchase of leasehold interests, for Phase 1 of the Townhill Park regeneration project phased, £0.5M in 2012/13, £2.0M in 2013/14 and £1.4M in 2014/15 be approved.
 - (c) That, in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, capital spending of up to a further £3.9M on the purchase of leasehold interests for properties in phases 2 and 3 of the Townhill Park regeneration project phased, £0.5M in 2013/14, £0.8M in 2014/15, £1.4M in 2015/16 and £1.2M in 2016/17 be approved.
- (ii) That the use of £23.9M of the 30 year HRA revenue surplus to meet the long term revenue costs of the regeneration of Townhill Park, which includes the requirement to repay the debt on the dwellings that have been disposed of from the general HRA revenue balance as there is no net capital receipt to fund this repayment be approved.
- (iii) That the General Fund capital programme will fund the highways infrastructure and open space improvements at an estimated cost of £2.6M with the method of funding being agreed once the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy and the value of the GF capital receipts become known be agreed.

NOTE:

FOR: AMENDMENT IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR BAILLIE: Councillors Smith, Baillie, Claisse, Daunt, Fitzhenry, Hannides, B.Harris, L.Harris, Ingis, Kolker, Mead, Moulton, Norris, Parnell, Turner, Vassilliou Vinson and White

AGAINST: Councillors Dr. R. Williams, Barnes-Andrews, Mrs Blatchford, Bogle, Chaloner, Cunio, Furnell, Jeffery, Kaur, Keogh, Laming, Letts, Lewzey, Lloyd, McEwing, Mintoff, Morrell, Noon, Dr Paffey, Payne, Pope, Rayment, Spicer, Stevens, Thomas, Thorpe, Tucker, and Whitbread

ABSTAINED: Councillor Burke

FOR: AMENDMENT IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR VINSON: Councillors Turner and Vinson

AGAINST Councillors Dr. R. Williams, Barnes-Andrews, Mrs Blatchford, Bogle, Chaloner, Cunio, Furnell, Jeffery, Kaur, Keogh, Laming, Letts, Lewzey, Lloyd, McEwing, Mintoff, Morrell, Noon, Dr Paffey, Payne, Pope, Rayment, Spicer, Stevens, Thomas, Thorpe, Tucker, and Whitbread

ABSTAINED: Councillors Burke, Smith, Baillie, Claisse, Daunt, Fitzhenry, Hannides, B.Harris, L.Harris, Ingis, Kolker, Mead, Moulton, Norris, Parnell, Vassiliou, and White

FOR: SUBSTANTIVE MOTION: Councillors Dr. R. Williams, Barnes-Andrews, Mrs Blatchford, Bogle, Chaloner, Cunio, Furnell, Jeffery, Kaur, Keogh, Laming, Letts, Lewzey, Lloyd, McEwing, Mintoff, Morrell, Noon, Dr Paffey, Payne, Pope, Rayment, Spicer, Stevens, Thomas, Thorpe, Tucker, and Whitbread

AGAINST: Councillors Smith, Baillie, Claisse, Daunt, Fitzhenry, Hannides, B.Harris, L.Harris, Ingis, Kolker, Mead, Moulton, Norris, Parnell, Vassiliou and White

ABSTAINED: Councillors Burke, Turner and Vinson

82. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC - CONFIDENTIAL PAPERS INCLUDED IN THE FOLLOWING ITEM

RESOLVED 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 appendices to the following Item.

Confidential appendices 1 and 2 contain 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 in the public interest to disclose this because doing so would prejudice the Authority's ability to achieve best consideration for the disposal of land and the awarding of a contract to carry out building works.

83. LIBRARY PROVISION IN WOOLSTON

The report of the Cabinet Member for Housing and Leisure was submitted regarding library facilities in the Woolston area (copy of report circulated with agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED:

- (i) That in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, a sum of £957,000 be added to the Housing and Leisure Capital Programme for the fitting out of the community facilities including the replacement library in Centenary Quay funded from Council resources;
- (ii) That it be noted that the proposal is to fund the fit out from capital receipts as set out in appendix 2 of the report;
- (iii) That a significant element of the capital receipts funding is from the potential sale of site 1 as identified in confidential appendix 2 of the report, and that no decision has yet been made to sell site 1 be noted;
- (iv) That it be agreed that the shortfall in capital funding required for the fit out be funded from general Council resources should the sale of site 1 not proceed.

84. SOUTHAMPTON YOUTH OFFENDING SERVICE (YOS) ANNUAL YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN 2012/13

The report of the Cabinet Member for Communities was submitted seeking approval of the Southampton Youth Offending Service (YOS) Annual Youth Justice Plan 2012/13 (copy of report circulated with agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED that the Southampton Youth Offending Service Annual Youth Justice Plan 2012/13, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be approved.

85. INCREASING SOUTHAMPTON'S RECYCLING RATE AND ENHANCING COLLECTIONS

The report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport was submitted regarding the bid submitted to the Government's Weekly Collection Support Scheme (copy of report circulated with the agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED: that subject to notification of the bid being successful in the sum of £8.28m:

- (i) That government grant funding of £8.28m be accepted;
- (ii) That the addition of the capital scheme "Weekly Collection Support Scheme" to the Environment & Transport Capital Programme in order to deliver the outcomes of the bid, a total of £2,165,000 to be funded by government grants be approved;
- (iii) That the capital expenditure on the capital scheme "Weekly Collection Support Scheme" of £2,165,000 phased £876,000 in 2012/13, £979,000 in 2013/14 and £310,000 in 2014/15, be approved;
- (iv) That the addition of £1,097,000 to the 2012/13 revenue estimates of the Environment and Transport Portfolio funded by government grant be approved and that it be noted that further additions of £2,373,000 to the 2013/14 and £2,645,000 to the 2014/15 revenue estimates would be formally made as part of the preparation of those financial years' budget;
- (v) That it be noted that if, as part of the announcement, Southampton has been awarded an amount less than the total bid but the partial award still enables the key elements of the bid to be delivered, that delegated authority is given to the Director of Environment & Economy following consultation with the portfolio holder for Environment & Transport, portfolio holder for Resources, Head of Legal, HR & Democratic Services and Head of Finance & IT to proceed with accepting a reduced allocation of up to £1.28m.

86. ADDITION OF TRANSPORT FUNDING TO THE CAPITAL AND REVENUE PROGRAMMES

The report of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport in association with the Cabinet Member for Resources was submitted seeking to accept new funding and add to the capital and revenue programmes for transport (copy of report circulated with agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED:

- (i) that grant funding from the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) of £9.013M split between Capital £7.193M and Revenue £1.819M over the following three years 2012/13 to 2014/15. Total awarded to Transport for South Hampshire, £17.839M be accepted;
- (ii) that a further LSTF allocation of £330K to deliver Real Time Information (RTI) Phase 4 capital works in 2012/13 be accepted;
- (iii) that grant funding of £50K from Better Bus Area Fund (BBAF) to fund Capital expenditure of £40K in 2012/13 and Revenue expenditure of £10K in 2012/13 be accepted;
- (iv) That £7.193M, phased £0.610M in 2012/13, £4.584M in 2013/14 and £1.999M in 2014/15 be added to the Environment and Transport Capital Programme, Integrated Transport, in order to deliver transport measures across the City funded by LSTF grant;
- (v) That a further £330K of LSTF allocation be added to the Environment and Transport Capital Programme, Integrated Transport, to deliver Real Time Information Phase 4 capital works in 2012/13;
- (vi) That £40K of Better Bus Area Fund (BBAF) be added to the Environment and Transport Capital Programme, Integrated Transport towards transport measures across the City in 2012/13;
- (vii) That £1.392M of Public Realm Section 106 contributions phased £142K in 2012/13, £302K in 2013/14 and £948K in 2014/15 be added to the Environment and Transport Capital Programme, Public Realm, in order to deliver the Centenary Quay public realm;
- (viii) That £910K of Strategic Transport Section 106 contributions phased £80K in 2012/13, £410K in 2013/14 and £420K in 2014/15 be added to the Environment and Transport Capital Programme for Integrated Transport, towards developing transport measures across the City;
- (ix) That expenditure in accordance with Financial Procedure Rules, be approved on schemes and projects totalling £9.865M to the Environment and Transport Capital Programme for Integrated Transport, phased £1.202M in 2012/13, £5.296M in 2013/14 and £3.367M in 2014/15 funded as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report on schemes as detailed in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 of the report;
- (x) That the addition of £428,000 to the 2012/13 revenue estimates of the Environment and Transport Portfolio funded by government grant (LSTF and BBAF) be approved and it be noted that further additions of £894,000 to the 2013/14 and £507,000 to the 2014/15 revenue estimates would be formally made as part of the preparation of those financial years' budget; and
- (xi) That it be noted that Southampton would play a lead authority role for the delivery of a South Hampshire Smartcard for Public Transport, Legible Cities projects procured by SCC as lead authority for TfSH from LSTF Funding including developing a joint back office as agreed at TfSH Joint Council committee 25/09/2012, for which a scheme of £5M is included in the proposed capital programme, contained within the total addition to the capital programme of £9.865M.

87. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AND PRUDENTIAL LIMITS MID YEAR REVIEW

The report of the Head of Finance and IT (Chief Financial Officer) was submitted regarding the Treasury Management Strategy and Prudential Limits Mid Year Review (copy of report circulated with agenda and appended to signed minutes).

RESOLVED:

- (i) That any changes to the Council's Prudential Indicators as detailed within the report be approved;
- (ii) That delegated authority continue to be granted to the Chief Financial Officer, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Resources to approve any changes to the Prudential Indicators or borrowing limits that will aid good treasury management.
- (iii) That it be noted that the continued proactive approach to TM has led to reductions in borrowing costs and safeguarded investment income; and
- (iv) That changes to the 2011/12 Capital Financing Requirement to that reported in the Outturn report due to an amendment to the funding of the programme with a reduction in capital contributions and a corresponding increase in borrowing be noted.