



# Minutes

Name of meeting	<b>CABINET</b>
Date and Time	<b>THURSDAY 13 JANUARY 2022 COMMENCING AT 5.00 PM</b>
Venue	<b>COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNTY HALL, NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT</b>
Present	Cllrs D Andre, J Bacon, P Fuller, C Jarman, J Jones-Evans, P Jordan, K Love and I Stephens
Also Present (Non voting)	Cllrs G Brodie, C Critchison, R Downer, S Ellis, S Hastings, K Lucioni, C Quirk and P Spink
Officers Present	J Metcalfe, C Ashman, J Brenchley, S Crocker, N Dix, A Minns, W Perera, C Potter, C Rowland and C Shand
Apologies	Cllr L Peacey-Wilcox

---

81. **Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2022 be approved.

82. **Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Jones-Evans declared an Interest in the item relating to Newport Harbour as she was the local member for the western side of the Harbour.

83. **Public Question Time - Maximum 15 Minutes for Written Questions and 15 Minutes for Oral Questions**

There were no Public Questions received.

84. **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman announced that he had been busy with his portfolio and deputising for the Leader at various meetings. He reported that it had just been announced by the office of the Police and Crime Commissioner that the name of the Hampshire Constabulary was to be changed to "Hampshire and Isle of Wight Constabulary".

**85. Report of the Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Business Development and Tourism**

**85a Name Change - Fairway Athletics Track**

The proposed name change was in honour of the work done by Ray Scovell to develop sport of the island, and was well-deserved. Following the Corporate Scrutiny meeting on 11 January, the comments of Lake Parish Council had also been sought and they had been happy to support the recommendation.

**85b Newport Harbour – Supplementary Planning Document**

The document was an important step in moving to the next stage of the regeneration of Newport Harbour. It would give confidence to potential investors over several years that the council was in full support of the plan. Since the Cabinet meeting in 2020 a few changes had been made to take into account the current housing crisis. Following Cllr Price's petition, housing at Seaclose gate had previously been removed from the plan, however it was believed that the council needed to focus on its own assets to help address the housing crisis, therefore views would again be sought on housing in Fairlee Road. The community would be involved in meaningful consultation. It was recognised that Seaclose park was important for recreation, and another Newport councillor believed that most people would be opposed to housing at Seaclose as there were other brownfield sites which could be used. Consultation would take place on the document as a whole rather than piecemeal to avoid further work at a later date.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had made no comment due to the upcoming consultation.

**86. Report of the Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education and Lifelong Skills**

**86a School Funding Formula and Budget Setting 2022/23**

There had been some minor amendments to the national funding formula used to allocate funding to the council. The proposed local formula had been agreed by the Schools' Forum and the DfE needed to be notified of it by 21 January 2022, and allocations confirmed to schools by 28 February 2022.

The high needs block showed a significant budget shortfall of approximately £1.33 million as the formula did not fully account for the high number of SEN children on the island. The position was similar in a number of other authorities. There was to be a government SEND review in Spring 2022 and the results would be awaited with interest.

**87. Report of the Cabinet Member for Environment, Heritage and Waste Management**

**87a Supporting the UNESCO Biosphere**

The framework was intended to assist in taking forward and developing the UNESCO biosphere status of the island. There were 17 goals set out in the document which were intended to create a sustainable future for the island and its residents and visitors. Since the status had been awarded progress had so far been slowed due to the pandemic, however it was hoped to move forward with integrating the goals into planning and policy, which would cut across all portfolios. A steering group was to be set up to promote the aims of the biosphere, which would be independently chaired. Many people had contributed to the framework and the Cabinet Member asked for his thanks to be recorded to Richard Grove and Joel Bateman of the AONB.

Member training sessions on the biosphere would be announced soon.

A suggestion was made that the document should be rewritten in Plain English, to make it easier for the ordinary person to understand.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had supported the recommendations and would be monitoring the delivery of actions.

**88. Report of the Cabinet Member for Highways PFI, Transport and Infrastructure**

**88a Deployment of Electric Vehicle Charge Points in council car parks.**

A lease arrangement was the preferred option as it would be the least costly to the council. A tendering process had been carried out in Hampshire, and the council would be able to take advantage of that arrangement. Machines would be installed in the car parks identified in addition to the on-street ones which were already funded. It was hoped that as demand grows, the number of machines could be increased into more car parks. It was important to catch up with the mainland, as visitors to the island would expect machines to be available. Town and Parish Councils would be consulted prior to any further installation.

It was noted that the Corporate Scrutiny Committee had been in support of the recommendation.

**88b Floating Bridge 6 - outcomes from Gateway 5 Review**

This independent report which had been requested by the SLEP 15 months ago was welcomed by the Cabinet. Mediation had been agreed to take place on 2 March 2022. A further report would come back to Cabinet following the mediation process and would make recommendations as to the future viability of FB6, along with any further actions. It was hoped for an agreeable settlement.

The had been no comment from the Corporate Scrutiny Committee.

89. **Report of the Cabinet Member for Community Protection, Digital Transformation, Housing Provision and Housing Needs**

89a **Hackney and Private Hire Licensing Policy including the relevance of convictions policy**

The policy was to set out the standards for licensed vehicles and drivers and had been updated to include safeguarding training for drivers. Consultation had been carried out between November and December 2021. Some comments had been received and considered when finalising the policy. There would not be an upper age limit on vehicles provided they were kept in good order. It was agreed that it was important to ensure that taxis, particularly those used for school transport were safe. The taxi trade were encouraged to use or replace vehicles with electric ones.

There had been no comment made by the Corporate Scrutiny Committee.

89b **Street Trading Policy**

The policy had been updated to meet current and future requirements. Consultation, including with existing street trading consent-holders, had taken place between November and December 2021. All comments received had been considered. The Licensing Committee had been briefed on the policy. This would tie in with the council's pop-ups initiative and would help to get businesses going for small traders, especially following the COVID pandemic. Town and Parish Councils would be consulted to identify some appropriate sites.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had made no comment.

89c **Development of Relocatable Homes**

Members were looking forward to making a positive impact on islanders suffering homelessness. There would be 20 x 2-bedroom homes with affordable rents and running costs. They were of a high standard with around 60 years longevity, and could be moved to other areas. This would be a temporary arrangement and a stepping-stone to finding longer term accommodation. It was important to get families out of B&B accommodation, particularly those with children. The necessary authorisations would be agreed in February before moving the project forward.

It was hoped that more homes could be provided in the future if resources could be found.

The Corporate Scrutiny Committee had recommended that the Policy and Scrutiny Committee for Neighbourhoods and Regeneration should monitor the delivery of the actions set out and should consider establishing a task and finish group to look at other innovative ways of providing social housing.

## 89d **Amendments to the Covert Surveillance Policy**

The council was required to have a up to date policy, and this had been reviewed and updated in 2020. It was noted that the powers available had only been used once in the previous three years in relation to a benefit fraud case.

### 90. **Cabinet Member Announcements**

The Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Business Development and Tourism reported that the council would be distributing a grant for the hospitality and leisure sector to business which had been affected by COVID. The businesses would have to apply for the grant by 20 February, to be allocated by 28 February.

There would also be an Additional Restrictions grant for people affected outside the hospitality and leisure sector. All applications would be considered en masse and then allocated.

The Cabinet Member had attended a levelling up event in DecemberThe first networking event for culture and the arts would be held on 9 February.

The Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education and Lifelong Skills reported that there had been a positive return to school after Christmas, with a 90 per cent attendance rate, the national rate being 86 per cent. There had been low staff absence.

The deadline for primary school admissions for September 2022 would be on 15 January.

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Heritage and Waste Management reported that three of the aims within his portfolio had been progressed, these being climate change, dark skies and the biosphere, with policies having recently been adopted. The fly tipping task and finish group had met earlier in the week and a report would come forward soon. Procedures were to be simplified and there would be more education around dog waste.

The Cabinet member for Planning and Community Engagement reported that at the Conservative Party Conference the Prime Minister had said that councils should oppose greenfield developments. It was hoped that this would be contained in the Planning white paper but it was still not known. It was a big issue for island residents.

There had been an update to Councillors and Town and Parish Councils the previous month on the Island Plan. This was also available online.

There was a need to update neighbourhood plans to influence planning decisions.

A review was to be carried out of Air B&B properties, with people using private rented accommodation for Air B&B. There was also a plan to bring empty properties back into use.

Work was ongoing to resolve the issues with the Planning Portal.

The Cabinet Member for Strategic Finance, Transformational Change and Corporate Resources said that he was pleased that the Cabinet Member for Planning and Community Engagement was to visit Freshwater Parish Council. The budget consultation was underway and as many people as possible were encouraged to take part. The document had been simplified and this had brought benefits as over 700 responses had already been received.

The Cabinet Member for Highways PFI, Transport and Infrastructure reported that he had been trying to resolve residents' ongoing concerns regarding the ferry companies and had been working with a transport expert to have questions asked directly. Lord Barclay had also been assisting and had written to the ferry companies, enquiring as to whether they had complied with commitments they had given to the OFT.

91. **Consideration of the Forward Plan**

The item relating to the disposal of land at Nettlestone was to be put back to March Cabinet to allow time for discussion with the local councillor.

The next meeting of Cabinet would consider the outcome of the consultation on the future of Chillerton and Rookley Primary School. There had been 212 responses to the survey and a report was currently being prepared.

92. **Members' Question Time**

Written questions were received from Cllr Oliver (MQ 02-22) and Cllr Price (MQ 03-22) both concerning the Newport Harbour Supplementary Planning Document. Written responses had been prepared and would be sent to the Councillors concerned.

CHAIRMAN

## Member Question time of the Leader

To view any Member questions that were put to the Leader, they will be listed as an additional PDF document below the Member question time of the Leader section within the online minutes, an example is displayed below:

### **29. Member Question Time of the Leader**

- [View the background to item 29.](#)

A question must be submitted in writing on 17 November 2020.

#### **Additional documents:**

- [MQ - 15/20](#)  PDF 96 KB

This page is intentionally left blank

## Cabinet – Thursday 13 January 2022

### Written question from Cllr Martin Oliver to the Leader

I see from the Cabinet report on the Newport Harbour Masterplan, that it is proposed to build new homes on the site of the Fairlee Service Station.

Can the Cabinet Member confirm whether the Council has?

- (a) secured a formal option for the development of this site before promoting it for residential use and
- (b) identified and agreed a site for the relocation of this business, and if not, why not?

## ***Response***

- a) The site has yet to be promoted for residential use so a formal option is not in place – it is worth noting the only part of the site area referenced in the masterplan is in private ownership
- b) At this stage ie. Site masterplan consulted for adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document, only the principle of development and some potential options are set out. Detailed development proposals and therefore necessary land take are still to emerge. As a result further discussions have yet to take place with the neighbouring landowner regarding their position regarding potential sale of the site to deliver housing, the council would provide assistance in finding an alternative site should that be required.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Cabinet – Thursday 13 January 2022**

**Written question from Cllr Matthew Price to the Leader**

In regards to what appears to be an unexpected and complete reversal of the previous decision to remove the option of housing at the entrance to Seaclose Park and re-introduce the option to now include this part of Seaclose Park within the Newport harbour Master plan, can I ask why the cabinet are willing to ignore the huge public opposition to this as highlighted by my recent campaign? Will the cabinet reconsider this tonight and remove the option entirely from the Newport harbour Master plan consultation and confirm that the wishes of the community that I represent (and the many people who across the Island opposed it) will be respected?

## ***Response***

The extensive consultation in developing the original masterplan for the harbour in 2019 resulted in significant changes to proposed housing allocations in and around Seaclose park . The further feedback the member refers to has also been reflected in the proposed masterplan put forward for potential adoption as an SPD, ie a need to carefully consider the design and scale of any specific proposals for development in this part of the harbour area, with a range of options set out for further consideration.

Since the original decision by the previous administration, the significant impact of the pandemic on the island housing market and the desperate need for affordable housing requires us to carefully reconsider all our land assets and ruling out any development in this location at this point would not support our affordable housing objectives.

The range of site allocations set out in the document seek to achieve an appropriate mix of market, affordable and social housing to meet local needs and the area at Seaclose represents an opportunity to provide affordable family housing with much needed access to greenspace, which will attract Homes England funding, compared to the primarily flatted development the proposed harbourside sites in the masterplan will provide.

Further consultation on the SPD and following that any specific proposals that might come forward will ,of course, be subject to full planning applications with their own consultation requirements. I understand the local member has also received assurance of being involved along with the local community from the outset in the development of any design, scale and mix of units should proposals come forward.

This page is intentionally left blank