

**Contact Name:** *Melanie Stephens*  
**Tel No:** *(023) 8028 5588*  
**E-mail:** *melanie.stephens@nfdc.gov.uk*  
**Date:** *10 September 2013*

## **NOTIFICATION OF COUNCIL DECISIONS**

### **COUNCIL – 9 SEPTEMBER 2013**

The following decision was taken at the above meeting: -

#### **Agenda Item 5 – Report of Cabinet**

The recommendations were agreed.

#### **Agenda Item 7 – Questions to Portfolio Holders**

##### **(1) Cranleigh Paddock Specialist Dementia Unit**

Cllr Lagdon asked the Portfolio Holder for Housing & Communities how the possible closure of the Cranleigh Paddock Specialist Dementia unit at Lyndhurst by Hampshire County Council (HCC) would affect the sheltered housing unit on that site, should the closure go ahead. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that HCC were currently consulting on a proposal to close the dementia unit which was run on a site part owned by HCC and New Forest District Council. The impact of a future closure of the unit would be considered seriously by this Council to ensure that the building could operate independently. If HCC did decide to close the unit, the building, after having minor repairs, would be able to continue to operate. The Portfolio Holder said that it was premature to discuss this matter in detail until discussions took place with HCC. However the Portfolio Holder assured members that the interests of tenants and the wider older population of the District remained paramount. Any decision by the District Council on the future of the building would be subject to consideration by the Cabinet and consultation with the existing residents.

##### **(2) Car Parking Charges**

Cllr C Harrison asked the Portfolio Holder for Planning & Transportation whether he was aware of the recent high court ruling on the subject of the income from car park charges, which stated that local authorities must set parking charges to cover costs and not to raise funds for other purposes, and if he intended to challenge this ruling. The Portfolio Holder answered that the high court ruling specifically related to residential on street permit systems and as such it was not yet known how this impacted on income from other parking schemes. The Council could not challenge the high court judgement only the authority against which the judgement was made could. The Council's car park charges were reasonable and it could, if required, be demonstrated that the surplus was applied to related items such as machine replacement, non-domestic rates, resurfacing, and public transport schemes such as Wheels to Work. In some years, income was higher than in others often dictated by the weather.

THIS DECISION LIST HAS BEEN PREPARED BY THE COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR AND IS CIRCULATED TO INFORM COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS IMMEDIATELY OF DECISIONS REACHED AT COUNCIL MEETINGS. THE WORDING OF RESOLUTIONS IN THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING MIGHT DIFFER FROM THE ABOVE.