

MINUTES

Meeting: WESTBURY AREA BOARD
Place: Heywood and Hawkeridge Village Hall, Heywood, BA13 4LP
Date: 19 August 2010
Start Time: 7.00 pm
Finish Time: 8.55 pm

Please direct any enquiries on these minutes to:

Penny Bell (Democratic Services Officer), Tel: 01722 434353 or (e-mail) penny.bell@wiltshire.gov.uk

Papers available on the Council's website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk

In Attendance:

Wiltshire Councillors

Cllr David Jenkins (Chairman), Cllr Julie Swabey (Vice Chairman), Cllr Russell Hawker and Cllr Michael Cuthbert-Murray

Cllr Stuart Wheeler (Cabinet Member for Leisure, Sport and Culture)

Wiltshire Council Officers

Sally Hendry, Westbury Community Area Manager

Penny Bell, Democratic Services Officer

Julia Cramp, Service Director for Commissioning and Performance, Department of Education

Tom Ward, Community Safety Manager

Mark Smith, Service Director for Amenities and Leisure

Lucy Murray-Brown, Leisure Partnership Manager

Town and Parish Councillors

Westbury Town Council – F Morland, D Tout, C Mitchell, S Ezra

Bratton Parish Council – K Davis

Heywood Parish Council – P Sexstone

Partners

Wiltshire Police – Inspector Dave Minty

BA13+ Community Area Partnership – Reverend Jonathan Burke, Carole King, Kerry Eatwell

Members of Public in Attendance: 36**Total in attendance: 54**

<u>Agenda Item No.</u>	<u>Summary of Issues Discussed and Decision</u>	<u>Action By</u>
1.	<p><u>Chairman's Welcome, Introductions and Announcements</u></p> <p>The Chairman, Councillor David Jenkins, welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Westbury Area Board and announced that it was good to be holding the meeting in Heywood Village Hall again. The venues for the Area Board meetings were alternated between town and village venues to increase accessibility for all residents within the Community Area.</p> <p>The Chairman introduced the councillors and officers present, including Councillor Stuart Wheeler, Cabinet member for Leisure, Sport and Culture, and Inspector Dave Minty, Wiltshire Police Divisional Commander.</p> <p>The Chairman made the following announcements:</p> <p>a) Review of Local Transport Plan – Car Parking Strategy Consultation Details of the Car Parking Strategy consultation were in the agenda at page 3 and people were encouraged to submit a response. The results of the consultation would be reported back to the Area Board at its meeting on 7 October 2010.</p> <p>b) Community Payback – Call for ‘Grot Spots’ The Community Payback Scheme had recently been launched as a result of a successful bid to provide funding for the scheme to be expanded and improved. Details of the Scheme were in the agenda at page 5. A map of the Westbury Community Area was available at the back of the hall for people to make a note of any ‘grot spots’ that they felt could benefit from the Scheme.</p> <p>c) Reducing Unnecessary Street Lighting People were reminded that an initiative was underway that sought to reduce unnecessary street lighting, in order to reduce light pollution in the night sky and save on energy costs. Ideas for areas that may benefit should be reported to Sally Hendry, Community Area Manager.</p> <p>d) Primary Care Centre Update A press release had been issued by NHS Wiltshire regarding the planning application for the Westbury Primary Care Centre development and details were in the agenda at page 9. The planning reference was W/10/02170/FUL and people were encouraged to submit their views.</p>	

	<p>e) Local Transport Plan Scheme – Funding Allocation Further to the announcement made at the last meeting, people were reminded that a Community Area Transport Group (CATG) was being set up to consider small scale transport improvement schemes and make recommendations to the Area Board. Nominations were being sought for members of the CATG and anybody interested should contact Sally Hendry for further information.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Apologies for Absence</u></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Sally Willox (Youth Development Coordinator), Sabina Edwards (Westbury Librarian), Clive Michael and Dr Peter Biggs.</p>	
3.	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>Councillors David Jenkins, Russell Hawker and Michael Cuthbert-Murray all declared prejudicial interests in Item 9 (Community Area Grant application from Westbury Town Council) as they were all dual-hatted members of Westbury Town Council and Wiltshire Council. However, they had all been granted dispensations by the Standards Committee which enabled them to speak and vote on the matter.</p> <p>Councillor Hawker declared a prejudicial interest in Item 9 (Community Area Grant application from Leigh Park Community Association, Westbury) as he was a member of the Association. Councillor Hawker would leave the room for consideration of this item.</p> <p>Councillor Cuthbert-Murray declared a personal interest in Item 7 (The Future of Westbury Pool and Leighton Sports Centre) as he was a member of the Save Westbury Pool campaign group.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Minutes</u></p> <p>Councillor Hawker highlighted a spelling mistake in the name of Francis Morland on page 1 of the minutes. It was agreed that this would be amended.</p> <p><u>Decision</u> The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p>	Penny Bell

5.	<p><u>Updates from Partners</u></p> <p>NHS Wiltshire Updates from NHS Wiltshire for July and August were included in the agenda at pages 25 to 29.</p> <p>BA13+ Community Area Partnership Jonathan Burke of the BA13+ Community Area Partnership reported that a meeting of the Partnership had taken place on 2 June and the major topics of discussion had been community transport and restorative justice. The Partnership had also awarded two grants; one relating to summer youth activities and one relating to a photographic competition. The next meeting of the Partnership would be on 1 September and people were very welcome to attend.</p> <p>Westbury Town Council The recent Summer Street Fair held in Westbury had been very successful and was well attended and enjoyable. An Italian Food Market would be taking place in Westbury Market Place on Saturday 4 September.</p> <p>Chamber of Commerce The Chairman reported, on behalf of the Westbury Chamber of Commerce, that an objection was currently being devised to the Car Parking Strategy proposals.</p>	
6.	<p><u>Anti-Social Behaviour in our Community Area</u></p> <p>Tom Ward, Community Safety Manager for the West and South of the county, provided an overview of anti-social behaviour in Wiltshire and what was being done to respond to the issues.</p> <p>Anti-social behaviour included things such as noise, neighbour nuisance, vagrancy/begging, drugs, prostitution, street drinking and rowdy behaviour amongst other things.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council had recently devised an Anti-Social Behaviour Reduction Strategy which sought to prevent, intervene, enforce and reassure, and it was reported that, since April 2010, rowdy/nuisance behaviour had decreased by 12% (249 incidents).</p> <p>Any complaints regarding anti-social behaviour should be sent to Rowena Green at rowena.green@wiltshire.gov.uk or by telephone on 0300 456 0100. Rowena was responsible for distributing log sheets, liaising with appropriate agencies and agreeing/delivering responses.</p> <p>Inspector Dave Minty, Area Commander, Wiltshire Police, provided</p>	

	<p>reassurance that anti-social behaviour was not considered to be a big problem in Westbury Community Area, however it was a very big problem for people that suffered from it. Wiltshire Police recognised this and was committed to working in partnership with the appropriate agencies to resolve the problems.</p> <p>Inspector Minty drew attention to the report at page 31 of the agenda and highlighted that the most persistent form of anti-social behaviour was rowdy/inconsiderate behaviour with an average of 62.3 calls per month to the police. Westbury Community Area suffered from an average of 2.2 incidents per 1000 population which was considered good; however there was room for improvement.</p> <p>Councillor Swabey announced that she was often approached by people who had suffered due to anti-social behaviour but were reluctant to report it due to fear of reprisal. In response to this, Inspector Minty stated that he understood people's fear, but that it was important that they reported it so that the issues could be dealt with. He suggested that local councillors could work closely with the victim and the Police to provide support and reassurance. Tom Ward also added that Wiltshire Council has produced leaflets regarding the Victims and Witness Charter which may be of help.</p> <p>In response to a question regarding the responsibility and timescales of dealing with abandoned vehicles, Tom commented that Wiltshire Council was responsible; however it was not part of the remit of the anti-social behaviour team. Tom agreed to find out more details and report back to the Area Board at the next meeting.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Inspector Minty and Tom Ward for their contributions to the meeting.</p>	Tom Ward
7.	<p><u>The Future of Westbury Pool and Leighton Sports Centre</u></p> <p>Councillor Stuart Wheeler, Cabinet Member for Leisure, Sport and Culture, gave a presentation on the Council's proposals for leisure provision in the county over the next 25 years.</p> <p>Cabinet had considered a paper in November setting out the context of the review, with a vision to getting more people more active, more often, in order to support Wiltshire's aim to be healthiest county by 2014.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council had inherited some form of financial responsibility for 23 leisure facilities on 1 April 2009 and it was considered that the present indoor leisure facility stock was broadly outdated,</p>	

inefficient and unsustainable. £93 million would be required over the next 25 years to sustain the existing buildings, and this did not include any service or building enhancements, which were much required in some of the centres.

For Westbury Community Area, the following was proposed:

- Westbury Swimming Pool – refurbishments to be undertaken leading to the devolvement of the facility to the Community to run.
- Leighton Recreation Centre – Refurbishment and improvements leading to the devolvement of the facility to the community to run. Improvements to include:
 - 6 rink indoor bowls facility
 - Café and catering facilities.

Devolvement of services could be to a community group or the Town Council. Wiltshire Council had commissioned a report on the community trust options to help assist with the proposals and community groups would be given support and advice to set up the organisation. Community groups in Calne and Cricklade were already successfully running leisure provision and had volunteered to give advice and support where requested.

The Chairman invited comments and questions on the proposals, and the following concerns were expressed by members of the public:

- It appeared that Wiltshire Council was retaining profitable leisure facilities and disposing the unprofitable ones to community groups.
- Full surveys needed to be carried out so that the Council was not passing over inadequate facilities to the community.
- The Council should not dismiss the possibility of Leighton Sports centre being combined with Westbury Pool, with one management body running both. All voices needed to be heard.
- It appeared that Wiltshire Council was abandoning Westbury facilities, but residents would still paying their council tax which would instead be supporting new facilities in other towns.
- The proposal for an indoor bowls facility had not come about from community consultation and it would have been better to ask local people what type of facility they would like to see.
- The footprint of Leighton Sports Centre was limited which could hinder development proposals there.
- It was not known how a community trust would work and it

	<p>would be important that some sort of ‘safety net’ should be put in place to safeguard any facilities devolved to communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figures in Appendix C of the recent paper to Cabinet needed explaining as they were unclear; specifically the published ongoing expenditure to 2035 being £2,086,100. Councillor Wheeler stated that officers would check on this and report back. • Councillor Hawker enquired as to the level of income the bowls facility was likely to generate and Councillor Wheeler said that these figures could be provided. • There was interest in how the decision process would happen and specifically who would make the final decision. Councillor Wheeler responded that Cabinet would be making the decision, which would be a public meeting where representations could be made. • There was some concern in relation to local sports clubs being approached in the consultation, to which Councillor Wheeler confirmed that they were. • An enquiry was made as to how “managed by the local community” actually worked and Councillor Wheeler gave examples of community-run facilities in Calne and Cricklade; both were willing to offer support and mentoring where required. • A question arose regarding what would happen if the community was not willing to take on the running of the pool; to this Councillor Wheeler responded that, at this stage, the consultation was based on a set of proposals. Those proposals would need to be reconsidered following the consultation should there be the need. <p>Councillor Wheeler stated that all comments and concerns would be noted and that this was a genuine consultation to inform future plans. The views of the community would be taken on board and the final proposals may look different.</p> <p>Councillor Wheeler asked people to take part in a ‘live’ voting exercise using the handheld voting devices. The questions were intended to provide an initial indicative snapshot of the community’s views and would not make up part of the formal consultation.</p> <p>Upon being asked to participate in the voting exercise, many members of the public expressed concern that the questions were slanted and had been devised to achieve specific answers. There was also concern with the leisure consultation questionnaire, with members of the public feeling the same about the questions contained within that. The Chairman asked for a show of hands</p>	<p>Cllr Wheeler</p> <p>Cllr Wheeler</p>
--	---	---

	<p>from those members of the public that objected to the survey and the questionnaire, and the majority of people present raised their hand.</p> <p>Councillor Wheeler provided assurance that this was a snapshot only and was not intended to be a formal consultation. The voting exercise proceeded with an average of 17 people taking part; the results are attached at Appendix A.</p>	
8.	<p><u>Issues Update</u></p> <p>Sally Hendry, Community Area Manager, provided an update of community issues that had been received, a summary of which was included in the agenda at pages 33 to 38.</p> <p>Sally announced that, in response to an issue that had been raised, a new pedestrian crossing had been installed on the A350 near the Cedar Hotel to improve pedestrian safety. There had also been a number of dog fouling warning stickers placed around the Community Area to discourage illegal dog fouling. Sally also had some dog fouling stickers that could be handed out for people to use if they had particular problems in their areas.</p> <p>Another issue that had recently been resolved was rubbish dumping at Bitham Brook which had become very unsightly. Sally announced that, after some investigation, Wiltshire Council was found to be the owner of the land and Street Scene officers had arranged for the site to be cleaned up next week.</p> <p>Anybody with a local issue that required attention could submit a form either by post, online, or by contacting Sally for further details.</p>	
9.	<p><u>Community Area Grants</u></p> <p>Councillors considered two applications for Community Area Grants, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Leigh Park Community Association (Westbury)</u> <p>Councillor Hawker left the room for consideration of this item.</p> <p>An application had been received from Leigh Park Community Association (Westbury) for £885 to help to pay for publicity to raise the profile of the organisation.</p> <p><u>Decision</u> Westbury Area Board awarded the sum of £885 to Leigh Park Community Association (Westbury).</p>	<p>Sally Hendry</p>

	<p><u>Reason:</u> The application met the Community Area Grants Criteria 2010/11 and linked to Wiltshire Council's priority of engaging with local people.</p> <p>Councillor Hawker returned to the room.</p> <p>2. <u>Westbury Town Council</u></p> <p>An application had been received from Westbury Town Council for £229 to help with the purchase of a mobile PA system that could be used by the community for events.</p> <p><u>Decision</u> Westbury Area Board awarded the sum of £229 to Westbury Town Council on the condition that the Royal British Legion should have use of the equipment for its Remembrance Parade.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The application met the Community Area Grants Criteria 2010/11 and would encourage tourism in the local area.</p>	Sally Hendry
10.	<p><u>Performance Reward Grants</u></p> <p>Councillors considered an application for funding from the Performance Reward Grant Scheme of £12,566 to fund the purchase of energy monitors for all Wiltshire libraries.</p> <p>The Area Board was not making a decision to award the funding, but was deciding whether to lend its support to the application. The final decision would be made by the Performance Reward Grant Panel.</p> <p><u>Decision</u> Westbury Area Board supported the application for energy monitors in all Wiltshire Libraries.</p>	Sally Hendry
11.	<p><u>Future Meeting Dates and Forward Plan</u></p> <p>The next meeting of the Westbury Area Board would be held on Thursday 7 October 2010, 7.00 pm at Matravers School in Westbury.</p> <p>A Forward Plan indicating future agenda items was included in the agenda at pages 49 to 50.</p>	
12.	<p><u>Evaluation and Close</u></p> <p>An evaluation of the evening's meeting was conducted using the handheld voting system. The results are attached at Appendix A.</p>	

	The Chairman thanked everyone for coming and contributing to the meeting and stated that he hoped to see everyone at the next Area Board meeting in October.	
--	--	--

Appendix A

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

Please note: This survey was conducted to provide an indicative 'snap-shot' and the results do not form part of the formal consultation.

Results by Question

Session Name: Area Board voting 19-08-2010 20-57

Created: 20/08/2010 06:37

1.) Q1. Your age?

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Under 18	0%	0
18 - 24	0%	0
25 - 34	15.79%	3
35 - 44	5.26%	1
45 - 54	36.84%	7
55 - 64	21.05%	4
65 - 74	15.79%	3
75+	5.26%	1
Totals	100%	19

2.) Q2. Your gender?

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Female	31.58%	6
Male	68.42%	13
Totals	100%	19

3.) Q3. Where do you live?

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Bratton	0%	0
Coulston	0%	0
Dilton Marsh	5%	1
Edington	10%	2
Heywood	10%	2
Westbury	45%	9
Other	30%	6
Totals	100%	20

4.) Q4. Have you paid to use one of the Council's leisure centres in the last 12 months?

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Yes	42.11%	8
No	57.89%	11
Totals	100%	19

5.) Q5. High quality modern facilities with a variety of activities will encourage more people to become active?

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Strongly Agree	28.57%	6
Agree	47.62%	10
Neutral	14.29%	3

Appendix A

Please note: This survey was conducted to provide an indicative 'snap-shot' and the results do not form part of the formal consultation.

Disagree
Strongly Disagree

	0%	0
	9.52%	2
Totals	100%	21

6.) Q6. Local communities should be able to directly influence and/or manage their local services

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Strongly Agree	38.46%	5
Agree	30.77%	4
Neutral	23.08%	3
Disagree	7.69%	1
Strongly Disagree	0%	0
Totals	100%	13

7.) Q7. The price of using leisure facilities can be a barrier to stop people taking part

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Strongly Agree	50%	9
Agree	38.89%	7
Neutral	11.11%	2
Disagree	0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0%	0
Totals	100%	18

8.) Q8. Admission prices should be reflective of the size and quality of the facility

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Strongly Agree	12.50%	2
Agree	62.50%	10
Neutral	6.25%	1
Disagree	6.25%	1
Strongly Disagree	12.50%	2
Totals	100%	16

9.) Q9. There should be a standard pricing policy across all facilities, irrespective of the size and quality

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Strongly Agree	0%	0
Agree	13.33%	2
Neutral	13.33%	2
Disagree	40%	6
Strongly Disagree	33.33%	5
Totals	100%	15

10.) Q10 The council should try to provide multi-purpose indoor leisure facilities within 20 minutes travel time from home

Responses (percent) (count)	
--	--

Appendix A

Please note: This survey was conducted to provide an indicative 'snap-shot' and the results do not form part of the formal consultation.

Strongly Agree	28.57%	4
Agree	28.57%	4
Neutral	21.43%	3
Disagree	14.29%	2
Strongly Disagree	7.14%	1
Totals	100%	14

11.) Q11. Introducing car parking charges at leisure facilities could be a barrier to stop people taking part

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Strongly Agree	58.82%	10
Agree	29.41%	5
Neutral	5.88%	1
Disagree	5.88%	1
Strongly Disagree	0%	0
Totals	100%	17

12.) Venue

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Excellent	33.33%	6
Good	44.44%	8
OK	22.22%	4
Poor	0%	0
Very poor	0%	0
Totals	100%	18

13.) Room layout

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Excellent	5.26%	1
Good	52.63%	10
OK	42.11%	8
Poor	0%	0
Very poor	0%	0
Totals	100%	19

14.) Welcome

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Excellent	30%	6
Good	45%	9
OK	20%	4
Poor	0%	0
Very poor	5%	1
Totals	100%	20

15.) Public involvement

Responses

Appendix A

Please note: This survey was conducted to provide an indicative 'snap-shot' and the results do not form part of the formal consultation.

	(percent)	(count)
Excellent	23.81%	5
Good	52.38%	11
OK	14.29%	3
Poor	9.52%	2
Very poor	0%	0
Totals	100%	21

16.) Opportunity to speak

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Excellent	21.05%	4
Good	57.89%	11
OK	21.05%	4
Poor	0%	0
Very poor	0%	0
Totals	100%	19

17.) Agenda

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Excellent	0%	0
Good	63.16%	12
OK	31.58%	6
Poor	0%	0
Very poor	5.26%	1
Totals	100%	19

18.) Presentations

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Excellent	5.26%	1
Good	63.16%	12
OK	15.79%	3
Poor	10.53%	2
Very poor	5.26%	1
Totals	100%	19

19.) Chairman

	Responses (percent) (count)	
Excellent	20%	4
Good	50%	10
OK	5%	1
Poor	15%	3
Very poor	10%	2
Totals	100%	20

20.) Electronic voting system

Responses

Appendix A

Please note: This survey was conducted to provide an indicative 'snap-shot' and the results do not form part of the formal consultation.

	(percent)	(count)
Excellent	11.76%	2
Good	41.18%	7
OK	29.41%	5
Poor	0%	0
Very poor	17.65%	3
Totals	100%	17

21.) Meeting overall

	Responses	
	(percent)	(count)
Excellent	5%	1
Good	60%	12
OK	20%	4
Poor	0%	0
Very poor	15%	3
Totals	100%	20

This page is intentionally left blank