

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT (2)

Meeting: Cabinet

Place: The Kennet Room, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14
8JN

Date: Tuesday 30 April 2019

Time: 9.30 am

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on 18 April 2019. Additional documents are now available and are attached to this Agenda Supplement.

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Stuart Figini, of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line 01225 718221 or email stuart.figini@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225)713114/713115.

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk

5 **Public participation and Questions from Councillors** *(Pages 3 - 20)*

Questions and responses are attached.

7 **Wiltshire Local Plan Review Update - Strategy Development** *(Pages 21 - 26)*

An update to the main report is attached.

8 **ICT and Digital Strategy** *(Pages 27 - 30)*

An update to the main report is attached.

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 26 April 2019

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Cabinet

30 April 2019

**Adrian Brabazon – statement and question regarding agenda item 7 - Wiltshire
Local Plan Review Update Strategy Development**

**To Councillor Toby Sturgis - Cabinet Member for Spatial Planning,
Development Management and Property**

Statement and Question

The strategy development report, paragraphs 21-25, relating to Chippenham HMA and the numbers referenced in Appendix 4 - Alternative Development Strategies 6.1 for the same HMA, appear to conflict in messaging.

Within the strategy report, the text related to Chippenham C (CH-C) – Melksham Focus states *'Housing requirements based on economic forecast for Melksham and follow a recent track record of sustained economic growth (for housing this means from about 3,000 homes in CH-A to about 4,000 homes). The strategy diverts the scale of new housing away from settlements that are more environmentally constrained or sensitive.'*

My interpretation of this statement is that the housing requirement numbers for constrained settlements such as Calne and Devizes should have a lower allocation in Option CH-C when compared to allocations in Option CH-A – rolling forward the Wiltshire Core Strategy. Within this Melksham should have a higher allocation to the 4,000 homes referenced above.

However, this is not reflected in the Housing allocations for Option CH-A and CH-C in Appendix 4 (see below), where there is in fact negligible difference in the settlement allocations, notwithstanding the difference in employment allocations.

Can this be clarified, as this potentially compromises any strategic choices related to the Chippenham HMA, which is clearly critical given the growth expectation in this HMA.

OPTION CH-A Housing and employment land requirements are distributed pro-rata rolling forward the current strategy. Housing requirements are increased pro-rata to match a higher assessment of housing needs.

Roll forward the Wiltshire Core Strategy Distribution of homes and jobs

2016-2036				
	Housing		Employment	
Settlement Area	Requirement	Residual	Requirement	Residual
	<i>Dwellings</i>		<i>Hectares</i>	
Calne	2050	859	5.5	5
Chippenham	6441	1830	25.7	-
Corsham	1740	1266	5.5	2
Devizes	2870	2023	9.1	-
Malmesbury	1260	714	7.2	-
Melksham	3199	1849	5.5	2
Rest of HMA	2840	1471	2.9	-
Total	20400	10012	61.4	9

OPTION CH-C Rather than WCS scales of growth, rates of development at Calne, Corsham, Devizes and Malmesbury are 'capped' to a 40% increase on the WCS as a deliverable response to the much higher assessment of local housing need.

Melksham Focus

The rate of development at Chippenham rolls forward the current strategy uncapped, reflecting its prospects for future growth and as a response to past suppressed demand.

Melksham has a focus for growth, continuing its recent track record. One option would be to see new homes supported by the provision of new road infrastructure.

For employment, the strategy responds to the conclusions of the Employment Land Review that there is a case for new allocations in Melksham and Corsham.

2016-2036				
	Housing		Employment	
Settlement Area	Requirement	Residual	Requirement	Residual
	<i>Dwellings</i>		<i>Hectares</i>	
Calne	2015	825	-	
Chippenham	6440	1829	-	
Corsham	1710	1234	4	
Devizes	2815	1967	-	
Malmesbury	1240	693	-	
Melksham	3390	2044	5	
Rest of HMA	2790	1420	-	
Total	20400	10012	9	

Response

Thank you for your statement and question. The intention of the Melksham Focus Option is to allow for the testing of a genuine alternative strategy for Melksham, at a level of around 4,000 homes as set out in paragraph 23 of the main report (quoted above). The figures and description as set out in the table containing 'Option CH-C: Melksham Focus' at Appendix 4 of the report have now been corrected through an Addendum. The revised table is as follows:

OPTION CH-C Melksham Focus	Melksham has a focus for growth, continuing its recent track record. One option would be to see new homes supported by the provision of new road infrastructure. Higher rates of growth in the rest of the HMA respond to past trends and housing needs.			
	The rate of development at Chippenham represents a mid-point between rolling forward the current strategy uncapped, and a higher growth option (CH-B) reflecting its prospects for future growth and as a response to past suppressed demand.			
	As a consequence, rates of development at Calne, Corsham, Devizes and Malmesbury are reduced.			
	For employment, the strategy responds to the conclusions of the Employment Land Review that there is a case for new allocations in Melksham and Corsham.			
	2016-2036			
	Housing		Employment	
Settlement Area	Requirement	Residual	Requirement	Residual
	<i>Dwellings</i>		<i>Hectares</i>	
Calne	1610	420	-	
Chippenham	6930	2320	-	
Corsham	1370	890	4	
Devizes	2250	1405	-	
Malmesbury	990	445	-	
Melksham	3950	2600	5	
Rest of HMA	3300	1930	-	
Total	20400	10010	9	

This page is intentionally left blank

Nadine Crook – statement and question regarding agenda item 11 - Children's Centre Buildings Consultation

To Councillor Laura Mayes – Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Skills

Statement

I'm Nadine Crook, a mum of 2. I live in Warminster.

I started the campaign to save Westbury's Children centre because of my experience in Warminster when our children's centre was closed in 2016. When the centre closed we were promised that groups and services would continue to be run in alternative community buildings. I have set out in my report to scrutiny, which is in the cabinet report appendix, that the promises were hollow. After the centre closed the universal provision disappeared. I now use Westbury's children's centre. The Council referred to its "successful use of wider community venues" in the Children's Select Committee Report on 5th March. This couldn't be further from the truth in Warminster.

When I queried the abandonment of virtually all support in Warminster, I was told that there were plenty of good toddler groups in the town. Unlike children's centre groups, they are mainly run by volunteers not trained staff. They focus on social support rather than early education, have no early intervention remit, cannot signpost those in need and are run in church halls or a private school – not neutral locations.

A good level of open access support, not just 1 ½ hours per week on the same day each week at a breast feeding group, which is the case in Warminster now, is essential to identify people needing further help.

You cannot rely on, for example, health visitors to pick up on people needing help as visits are so infrequent now. Only groups and a base where people know where to go to get advice, support and if needed referral on to other services can pick this up.

The Council states that the White Horse Children's centre is being closed because it is underused. This is not because of lack of need. It is because the council chose several years ago to stop some groups and push most groups out of the centres. Advertising of what is available has been poor too. This situation could easily be reversed and the centre could be used far more effectively to reach out to the local community. Running groups at the centre would also encourage people to drop-in for

advice more often. This is a model that has successfully been used by other authorities.

The council has already closed nearly half the children's centres and drastically reduced the number of open access groups. The key reason given is to focus staff resources on "outreach support to the families most in need". Appendix 18 of the cabinet report says that only 4 families are receiving outreach support by the children's centre service in Westbury at the moment. This is a staggeringly low number in one of Wiltshire's most deprived areas. There must be more families than this who could benefit from support by children's centre staff who simply have not been picked up.

I understand that times are very tough for the council and why it would often seek to focus limited resources on those most in need. However, if it focuses so strongly on those who are already "in the system" and virtually abandons any open access groups run by children's centre staff, it is inevitable that people needing help will not be picked up right at the start.

To conclude:

- the area immediately around the White Horse Children's Centre is one of the most deprived in Wiltshire
- the centre is in a town, there is a high concentration of people needing help from the children's centre staff. This is in line with offering services "in places that are accessible to families", as the Executive Summary in the cabinet report says
- the community venues model is failing parents in Warminster, it will fail Westbury too
- the level of outreach service in Westbury, with nearly half of the centres already closed is minimal. This is despite staff, in theory, being "freed up" to do this work
- the closure would be contrary to several of the council's Business Plan objectives and statutory requirements
- the Sutton Trust's 'Stop Start' report found that the most disadvantaged will be the worst affected by the closure of the children's centre

Unfortunately it can only be concluded that the starting point for the closure proposal is "we will show savings of £22,000".

No consideration appears to have been given to:

- research into the effectiveness of children's centres particularly in deprived areas,
- the effectiveness of the Council's proposed model in reaching those in need,
- the council's statement that it will spend a little now to save a lot in the future

A well run, active children's centre gives a tremendous opportunity to improve the life chances for those most in need. The proposed alternative model has been shown to

be flawed and it will miss people in need. They will only reappear later at far greater cost to the state.

Please could Wiltshire Council see the wider picture and not plough on regardless. The local community would be very happy to work with the council to promote and maximise the opportunities of our children's centre.

Question

Prior to the Cabinet meeting, can the council please provide detailed evidence to show how, through the proposals put forward in Westbury, it will be meeting its statutory duties under the Childcare Act 2006

NB: I have also provided some comments relating to policies, research and legislation, please see the Appendix below.

Response

The Childcare Act 2006 states that a Local Authority must –

a. improve the well-being of young children in their area, and

b. reduce inequalities between young children in their area in relation to the matters mentioned in subsection

a service is made available—

(a) by providing the service, or

(b) by providing advice and assistance to parents and prospective parents on gaining access to the service.

Wiltshire Council will continue to provide a service which meets these requirements through the delivery of appropriate services which parents will have advice and assistance on how to access.

Appendix

Wiltshire Council's Business Plan states that:

"At times, we all need support. We will protect the vulnerable by intervening early, where possible, and working with partners and local communities to ensure everyone gets the support they need as soon as possible. For children, this will mean a clear focus on work in the early years." i

One of Wiltshire Council's 4 key priorities is "Protecting those who are most vulnerable... We want to build communities that enable all residents to have a good start in life... investing in early intervention, prevention and promoting community inclusivity." ii

I believe the council's proposals for the White Horse Children's Centre are contrary to its Business Plan:

- it will not protect the most vulnerable
- the current targeted system is reaching a minimal number of families in need in Westbury – one of the most deprived areas in Wiltshire
- removing virtually all open access opportunities will close a key opportunity to pick up on those in need
- it is not investing in early intervention and prevention, the only focus has been to save the £22,000 per year it costs to run the centre. There has been no consideration of the savings to social services and other public services a well run centre can bring further down the line for this very small initial investment. Research has demonstrated these benefits

A recent report by the Sutton Trust said:

"The major national evaluation of children's centres and their impact (2009-14) found positive effects, especially improvement in family outcomes; these were linked to family engagement with children's centres and service use. Families registered to centres that had experienced reductions in resources (cuts to staff and/or services) were associated with poorer effects on family outcomes, whereas effects were positive for families registered with centres that had increased resources (expanding services and/or staff) between 2011 and 2013. Positive effects were also associated

with greater service use by families. The most disadvantaged groups showed stronger positive effects, and were more likely to use services at their registered local children's centre rather than services at other centres or institutions. They might thus be more affected by cuts to provision at their local centre." [emphasis added] iii

It went on to recommend that:

“Children’s centres should reconnect with their original purpose. Shifting the balance too far towards referred children and families, away from open access, and merging children’s centres into preventative teams working with a very much wider age group, serves a very different function and requires very different skills. It does not seem to fit well under the label of a local ‘children’s centre’. A good mix of children is important for social mobility and children’s social development.”

Again, the proposals for the White Horse Children’s Centre act against these recommendations as they:

- almost wholly focus on referred children and families
- remove any open access to the facilities and staff at the centre
- will only allow open access to staff for a specific session a week (e.g. Little Learners - assuming this group continues). Many people will not be able to attend at that specific time so will therefore have no access to the staff

The 2013 Children’s centres statutory guidance for local authorities states:

“Local authorities should not close an existing children’s centre site in any reorganisation of provision unless they can demonstrate that, where they decide to close a children’s centre site, the outcomes for children, particularly the most disadvantaged, would not be adversely affected and will not compromise the duty to have sufficient children’s centres to meet local need. The starting point should therefore be a presumption against the closure of children’s centres.” iv

The proposed closure is against this statutory guidance because:

- the starting point of the proposals has been to save £22,000 in the case of Westbury
- there has been no presumption against closing the children’s centre
- the council’s rudimentary impact assessment in Appendix 1 is based on no statistics. Either they have not been considered or the council just does not know the reality of the impact. They are unable to demonstrate that outcomes for the residents in this deprived area will not be adversely affected. Under the Mitigating Action Plan it says “Outline activities you plan to undertake to mitigate impact on particular groups” there is no mention of deprivation. This is possibly because the assessment is to cover all proposed closures, half of which are not in areas of deprivation
- it will therefore fail its duty to meet local need

i P18. Business Plan 2017 – 2027. Wiltshire Council

ii P2. Ibid

iii P8. Stop Start. George Smith, Kathy Sylva, Teresa Smith, Pam Sammons and Aghogho Omonigho.
April 2018

<https://www.suttontrust.com/research-paper/sure-start-childrens-centres-england/>

iv P9. Sure Start children’s centres statutory guidance. For local authorities, commissioners of local health services and Jobcentre Plus. DfE. April 2013

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/678913/childrens_centre_stat_guidance_april-2013.pdf

Hebe Mitchell – statement and question regarding agenda item 11 - Children's Centre Buildings Consultation

To Councillor Laura Mayes – Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Skills

Statement

If you're a parent with a worry or if you have a newborn baby it is essential that when you feel you need help or advice you can access it immediately. The only service which offers a drop in service on most days, for any subject or question is our children's centre.

During my first pregnancy my midwife signed me up for the baby steps group due to anxiety. The most helpful thing about being a part of this group was the support I felt, I knew they were there when I needed them and they made me feel safe.

I felt inspired by the women who had helped me and once I had settled into motherhood I contacted them to enquire about what training I could do. As a breastfeeding mother who is very passionate on the subject I completed the training to become a breastfeeding peer supporter. Since then I have run the Mum2Mum group every week.

I can guarantee that if a breastfeeding mother who needs help doesn't get the support she needs within 24 hours there is a high chance of that mother giving up. Which is utterly heartbreaking.

50% of what we gain from the children's centre is social. Drop in services scattered around the town will not offer this same benefit. Therefore if a mother wanted to access a still running children's centre she would have to travel to Trowbridge.

The cost of a return bus ticket is now £7! The buses are becoming more infrequent and this would require a 1.2 mile walk!

The cost of a return train ticket is £4 and would require a 2.1 mile walk!

I suffer with a pregnancy related disability which means that after a point in my pregnancy I can't walk for longer than 5 minutes. I was very lucky to have found a house so close to the children's centre which I can access since I don't drive.

I'm now expecting my second baby and if I were in need of accessing a proper children's centre I would need to spend money we may not have and walk further than my disability allows with a toddler and a newborn. And this is all after overcoming my anxiety of public transport which is enhanced dramatically by travelling with small children

If the centre closes the Council will be failing in its statutory duty. The guidance which underpins the Childcare Act 2006 (section 5a) states that local authorities should: ensure that children's centres and their services are within reasonable reach of all families with young children in urban or rural areas, taking into account distance and availability of transport.

Question

The council has already closed nearly half the children's centres and drastically reduced the number of open access groups. The key reason given is that it wants to focus staff resources on "outreach support to the families most in need". Appendix 18 of the cabinet report says that only 4 families are receiving this outreach in Westbury at the moment.

Does this indicate that there are only 4 such families who meet the intervention level? Or are the targeting methods not finding them?

Response

At the time that the report was prepared there were only four families receiving outreach support. Referrals for services come from a variety of sources, including self-referral and do not include the work carried out by other children's centre supported services which focus on disadvantaged groups that are attended by families. The future plan is to dovetail services with Health Visitors more effectively so that all targeted families are aware of the children's centre services offer.

**Lydia Wiltshire – statement and question regarding agenda item 11 -
Children’s Centre Buildings Consultation**

**To Councillor Laura Mayes – Cabinet Member for Children, Education and
Skills**

Statement

Since the birth of my second child I have been using the White Horse Children’s Centre for its drop in clinic but mainly for the mum to mum breastfeeding peer support group.

I was recommended the mum to mum group by my health visitor as I was having some difficulties with breastfeeding. The locality of the group meant that it was easy for me to access with a new born baby as I was also recovering from a traumatic birth. I was made to feel extremely welcomed by the volunteers and also the staff within the children’s centre and I’ve continued to visit the group on a weekly basis. It was later discovered that my son had a tongue tie and whilst we were waiting for an appointment to get it cut the children’s centre were able to loan me an electric breast pump so that I could continue to feed him. This was a massive help to me as purchasing one myself would have been a massive cost.

I feel that the children’s centre is a safe place for new mums, it has a lovely room with comfy chairs and toys. Also having the staff there to talk to on a drop in basis is extremely helpful. If the groups were located in more public venues I wouldn’t have felt as comfortable as they aren’t necessarily aimed at young families and don’t have the added privacy of the rooms at the children’s centre.

I appreciate that the Council wants to provide services in venues that people access anyway. Very few new Mums go out to the sports centre or library as they don’t have facilities for babies or the privacy for breastfeeding mums. But new Mums like me do go to the Children’s centre. Westbury library is really small and doesn’t have changing facilities and the sports centre feels very big and too daunting.

The Children’s centre is the venue that people would prefer to go to get help and support. It’s the best place for a breast feeding group to be held. We need both the groups and to be able to drop in or ring up, because sometimes you need to see someone – social media or even a phone call won’t tell you if your baby is latched on and feeding properly.

Question

The Council states that one reason it is closing the Westbury children's centre is because it is underused. Advertising appears to be very poor, with many people not knowing what is available to them. What methods have been used to advertise the services the centre provides and what can be done to improve advertising in the future?

Response

All children's centre services are advertised on social media and through e-mail to parents. They are also promoted to maternity services, Health Visitors, nurseries and preschools who are then able to make referrals as necessary. We will work with the children's centre services providers to ensure that the services are visible to parents with children under the age of five.

**Lydia Wiltshire – statement and question regarding agenda item 11 -
Children’s Centre Buildings Consultation**

**To Councillor Laura Mayes – Cabinet Member for Children, Education and
Skills**

Statement

Hello my name is Delcey Orchard-Smith, I'm Mum to a one year old - Richard, and currently pregnant with my second.

I'm a frequent user of The White Horse Children's Centre in Westbury. I've used the centre since I was 26 weeks pregnant with Richard, initially it was for the Baby Steps Programme but from attending that one course I found many other programmes and groups of use to Richard and myself. These include Breastfeeding Group - which subsequent to attending, I myself am now training to be a Breastfeeding Peer Support Volunteer, The Sensory Room in the centre for Richard's gross motor skills development, Little Learners, New Mum and Baby Group, The Health Visitor Clinic and my husband used the National Careers Service. All of these were and still are accessed through the children's centre.

Whilst I appreciate the council are stating that the majority of these services will still be available albeit from other local buildings (such as libraries or public council buildings) I don't think the personal and private nature of some of these groups or programmes are being taken into account. Personally I wouldn't have felt comfortable going to a public, non secure building to attend a breastfeeding group as a new first time Mum, the fact the group was held in a safe and private space made all the difference to me. The same things goes for things like The Freedom Programme which supports mother's who have or are suffering domestic abuse. The National Careers Service, my husband suffers depression and anxiety and would never have used this service if he didn't know it was in a safe and private environment.

I think taking away the building would potentially leave parents who suffer from mental health issues or who are simply in the throws of new parenthood to fend for themselves and isolate many families resulting in further avoidable issues down the line. I really hope for the sake of saving money the council do not put the needs of families and our future generations in jeopardy.

Question

Many of the groups and services run at the children's centre require privacy and a neutral location which helps put people at ease. I understand that social services appreciate this and have used the building for visits between parents and children. The only other venues suggested have been the sports centre, library and Westbury Leigh Community Centre. Does the cabinet acknowledge that these venues cannot offer an appropriate alternative for these specific requirements?

Response

The venues that will be used will be appropriate for the specific requirements of families. There is no intention to make any family feel uncomfortable. There are other venues that are currently being considered and the plan is to make the service as friendly and accessible as possible.

Ian Cunningham – Mayor of Westbury statement and question regarding agenda item 11 - Children’s Centre Buildings Consultation

To Councillor Laura Mayes – Cabinet Member for Children, Education and Skills

Statement

The decision to close the White Horse Community Centre is not a good one. The centre is in an area of high deprivation particularly from the point of view of education and skills. The Ham area rates in the bottom 10% in the educational domain of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation. One of the key aims of a children centre was to ensure that children arrive at school with a good level of development (GLD).

The area of Westbury the children’s centre sits in was mistakenly described as an area of low deprivation in the original plans and justifications for closure. The rapid scrutiny committee have recently corrected this but all previous work was done with this misunderstanding of the true nature of the centre’s immediate locality in place.

We are told that the cost of running the centre is about £22,000 per year. This seems to be a very small amount of money saved for a significant loss for Westbury. Social aspects are important for new Mothers. A place that is well-recognised, conveniently located, “always there” and non-judgemental, where you can arrive for one reason and then discuss other issues is important. Relying on targeting can miss people.

We are concerned that social media is proposed as the main method of “advertising”. In an area of low educational achievement, it is likely that there are many with no or low reading skills. How likely are they to find services advertised on the web or through social media? Services that move or have to be asked for are not as easy to find as a building that everyone knows about.

The centre is ideally located next to an infant & junior school, both of which have high levels pupil premium and are a natural gathering place for parents with children. This makes access to the children centre’s services for those who also have pre-school children particularly easy.

The Town Council was concerned to hear of the experience of Warminster, where very quickly, support groups disappeared and we would like to see some guarantees around services and funding. We also note that after the closure of Westbury’s youth centre, with the promise of targeted services, the staff resources were gradually chipped away until there are now none. This is a problem in an area where there are few people with the resources or abilities to offer services even when some funding

may be available. Youth services were “cast adrift” by the loss of their building. We would like to see some guarantees that the same will not happen to the services that are in the children’s centre.

Given the small cost involved and the earlier mis-representation of Westbury as a low deprivation area (this has been corrected since the scrutiny committee) perhaps Westbury could continue as is as useful comparison between the current and proposed new way of working?

We have already reported our concerns about the consultation in that so few people knew it was happening – even volunteers at the centre were unaware. With a question like the first one, which forced people to state a preference between buildings and staff (as though they were mutually exclusive) it is hardly surprising that in the small number of responses given (relatively speaking) staff “won”; there was no option to say that both were important, as the town council said.

Question

The report says that under the new provision, only deprived families will be specifically targeted. The current system gives more opportunities for people to self-present for help, regardless of status. A key aim of the children’s centres was that they were there for everyone. Wiltshire Council’s Business plan also acknowledges that “At times, we all need support.”

Does the cabinet then agree that deprivation, rather than specific need for services, should be the main factor for receipt of support?

Response

Specific need for services is the main factor considered but there will always be a need to focus on those who are more deprived as they do not always have access to support that other members of society do.

Wiltshire Council

Cabinet

Date of meeting: 30 April 2019

AGENDA ITEM 7

Subject: Wiltshire Local Plan Review Update: Strategy Development ADDENDUM

Cabinet member: Councillor Toby Sturgis - Spatial Planning Development, Management and Property

Key Decision: Yes

Addendum

To ensure consistency between the Alternative Developments Strategies in Appendices 4 to 7 and the summaries provided in the Committee Report and to correct drafting errors some amendments have been made to the tables in the report, Appendix 4 and Appendix 8. A further minor amendment is also made to correct a drafting error in the main report. These are detailed below.

In addition, for clarity, the start of Proposal (ii) is also amended as follows: “Agree that the alternative development strategies, as set out in Appendices 4 to 7, identified for the Chippenham Housing Market Area...” (amendment is shown in underlined text).

Amendments to main report

Amendments are made to the summaries of the proposed Alternative Development Strategies included in the main report at **Paragraphs 23, 29, 35 and 39**, as set out below. In addition, the figure in **paragraph 21** is amended to a proposed 43% increase (instead of 45% increase).

Note: The figures presented in the tables are rounded to the nearest 100 homes. For finer grain information refer to Appendices 4-7.

For ease of reference to the amendments, deleted text is shown as ~~strikethrough~~ and new text underlined.

Table at Paragraph 23: Page 59 of the agenda pack

Chippenham Housing Market Area - Alternative Strategies
<p><i>Chippenham A (CH-A) - Roll forward the core strategy</i></p> <p>Housing and employment land requirements are increased by <u>43%</u> 45% and distributed pro-rata to roll forward the current strategy.</p> <p>New employment allocations proposed only at Calne, Corsham and Melksham.</p>
<p><i>Chippenham B (CH-B) - Chippenham Expanded Community</i></p> <p>More constrained settlements (Corsham, Calne, Devizes and Malmesbury) <u>and Melksham</u> continue at Core Strategy rates of <u>housing growth. Rest of the HMA at a scale equivalent to rolling forward the strategy.</u> Chippenham receives the balance (from about <u>6,400</u> 6,500 homes in CH-A to about <u>9,800</u> 10,000 homes).</p> <p>New employment allocations proposed only at Chippenham and Calne.</p>
<p><i>Chippenham C (CH-C) - Melksham Focus</i></p> <p>Housing requirements based on economic forecast for Melksham and follow a recent track record of sustained economic growth (for housing this means from about <u>3,200</u> 3,000 homes in CH-A to about 4,000 homes). <u>Higher rates are also proposed in the rest of the HMA.</u> The strategy diverts the scale of new housing away from settlements that are more environmentally constrained or sensitive (<u>Calne, Corsham, Devizes and Malmesbury</u>).</p> <p>New employment land proposed only at Melksham and Corsham.</p>

Table at Paragraph 29: Page 61 of the agenda pack

Salisbury Housing Market Area - Alternative Strategies
<p><i>Salisbury A (SA-A) - Roll forward the core strategy</i></p> <p>Housing and employment land requirements are reduced by 11% and distributed pro-rata rolling forward the current strategy.</p> <p>New employment land proposed only at Salisbury/Wilton and Tidworth/Ludgershall.</p>
<p><i>Salisbury B (SA-B) - Focus on Salisbury</i></p> <p>Scales of housing development at Amesbury, Tidworth and Ludgershall are constrained to around current levels of commitments, <u>while rest of HMA reflects assessed need (-11%).</u> The residual need is met at Salisbury (from about <u>5,400</u> 5,000 homes in SA-A to about <u>6,700</u> 6,000 homes).</p> <p>New employment land proposed only at Salisbury.</p>

<p><i>Salisbury C (SA-C) - Focus on the rest of the HMA</i></p> <p><u>Housing</u> growth at Salisbury, Amesbury and Tidworth and Ludgershall constrained to around current levels of commitments, <u>while Salisbury reflects assessed need (-11%)</u>. Remaining balance of housing needs focussed on the rural area.</p> <p>For employment, the rest of the HMA accommodates growth which follows development trends for small scale employment growth in the rural parts of the HMA.</p>
<p><i>Salisbury D (SA-D) - Boscombe/Porton New Community</i></p> <p>Housing at Salisbury, Amesbury and Tidworth/Ludgershall is constrained to current levels of commitments. Recognises that employment growth has taken place in the Boscombe and Porton area and directs housing growth to a new community related to this economic potential.</p> <p>New employment land proposed only at Boscombe and/or Porton.</p>

Table at Paragraph 35: Page 63 of the agenda pack

<p>Swindon Housing Market Area (Wiltshire part) - Alternative Strategies</p>
<p><i>Swindon A (SW-A) - Roll forward the core strategy</i></p> <p>Housing and employment land requirements are reduced by 16% and distributed pro-rata rolling forward the current strategy.</p>
<p><i>Swindon B (SW-B) - Focus on Royal Wootton Bassett</i></p> <p><u>Housing</u> development is constrained at Marlborough to current commitments <u>plus windfall allowance and growth in rest of HMA reflects assessed need (-16%)</u>. No further development beyond existing commitments west of Swindon. The balance is focussed on Royal Wootton Bassett (from about 900 homes in SW-A to about 1,300 homes).</p> <p>New employment land proposed only at Royal Wootton Bassett.</p>
<p><i>Swindon C (SW-C) - Focus on the rest of the HMA</i></p> <p>Growth in <u>Marlborough and the rest of the HMA rural area continue Core Strategy rates of housing growth. is set to levels achieved 2006-2016</u>. Development is constrained at Marlborough to current commitments and reduced at Royal Wootton Bassett. No further development beyond existing commitments west of Swindon.</p> <p>New employment land only proposed at Marlborough and rest of the HMA.</p>

Table at Paragraph 39: Page 64 of the agenda pack

Trowbridge Housing Market Area - Alternative Strategies
<p><i>Trowbridge A (TR-A) - Roll forward the core strategy</i></p> <p>Housing and employment land requirements are decreased by 4% and distributed pro-rata rolling forward the current strategy.</p>
<p><i>Trowbridge B (TR-B) - Westbury Growth Point</i></p> <p>Housing requirements for Westbury are led by employment forecasts (from about 1,400 1230 to about 2,100 homes). <u>Growth continues at Core Strategy rates at Warminster and reflects assessed needs at Bradford on Avon (-4%)</u>. Consequential reductions to reflect existing commitments are focussed on Bradford on Avon and Trowbridge.</p> <p>New employment land proposed only at Westbury.</p>
<p><i>Trowbridge C (TR-C) - Focus on the rest of the HMA</i></p> <p>Housing requirements for the rest of the HMA are aligned to actual rates of past house building (from about 640 600 to about 1200 homes). <u>Warminster reflects assessed need (-4%) and Westbury continues at Core Strategy Rates.</u> Housing requirements are lower than TR-A at Trowbridge and Bradford on Avon as a result.</p> <p>New employment land proposed only in the rest of the HMA.</p>

Amendments to Appendix 4 - Page 113 and 121 of the agenda pack

- (i) Replace Table 1 in Appendix 4 with the following table to correct error, listing the settlements alphabetically with their corresponding numbers consistent with other Tables in Appendix 4:

Principal Settlement/Market Town	Wiltshire Core Strategy 2006-2026		Rolling Forward for 2016 – 2036	
	Housing	Employment	Housing	Employment
	<i>Dwellings</i>	<i>Hectares</i>	<i>Dwellings</i>	<i>Hectares</i>
Calne	1440	6	2050	5.5
Chippenham	4510	28	6440	25.7
Corsham	1220	6	1740	5.5
Devizes	2010	9.9	2870	5.5
Malmesbury	885	5	1260	7.2
Melksham	2240	6	3200	7.2
Rest of HMA	1992	1.6	2840	2.9
Total	14365	62.5	20400	61.4

Table 1 Housing and Employment Requirements - Rolling forward the current strategy for 2016 – 2036

- (ii) Replace ‘Option CH-C: Melksham Focus’ in the Table on the final page of Appendix 4 with the following. This has been corrected to present a genuine alternative strategy for Melksham, consistent with paragraph 23 of the main report, which clarifies that the objective of this option was to provide an option allowing a higher rate of growth at Melksham (circa 4,000 homes) to be tested.

OPTION CH-C Melksham Focus Melksham has a focus for growth, continuing its recent track record. One option would be to see new homes supported by the provision of new road infrastructure. Higher rates of growth in the rest of the HMA respond to past trends and housing needs.

The rate of development at Chippenham represents a mid-point between rolling forward the current strategy uncapped, and a higher growth option (CH-B) reflecting its prospects for future growth and as a response to past suppressed demand.

As a consequence, rates of development at Calne, Corsham, Devizes and Malmesbury are reduced.

For employment, the strategy responds to the conclusions of the Employment Land Review that there is a case for new allocations in Melksham and Corsham.

2016-2036				
Settlement Area	Housing		Employment	
	Requirement	Residual	Requirement	Residual
	<i>Dwellings</i>		<i>Hectares</i>	
Calne	1610	420	-	
Chippenham	6930	2320	-	
Corsham	1370	890	4	
Devizes	2250	1405	-	
Malmesbury	990	445	-	
Melksham	3950	2600	5	
Rest of HMA	3300	1930	-	
Total	20400	10010	9	

Amendment to Appendix 8 - Page 149 of the agenda pack

Because of the correction to the ‘Option CH-C: Melksham Focus’, the maximum number of additional dwellings proposed to be tested at Melksham would increase to 2,600 from 2,045 in Appendix 8, as follows:

Dwellings		
	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>
Chippenham HMA		
Melksham	890	2600

Wiltshire Council

Cabinet

30 April 2019

Subject: ICT & Digital Strategy – ADDENDUM SHEET

**Cabinet member: Cllr Philip Whitehead - Cabinet Member for
Finance, Procurement, ICT and Operational Assets**

Key Decision: Key

Addendum

The costs associated with the ICT & Digital Strategy have been refined since the publication of the report, and are detailed below. Those budget elements already approved, and those seeking approval, are identified.

30 April 2019

Subject: ICT & Digital Strategy - ADDENDUM

Cabinet member: Councillor Philip Whitehead – Cabinet Member for Finance, Procurement, ICT and Operational Assets

Key Decision: Key

Introduction

The costs associated with the ICT & Digital Strategy have been further refined since the preparation of the report, based on information gathered in the interim. In addition, the extent to which the proposed costs are covered by the existing approved capital budget, and the extent to which further funds would be required, have been explored and are described below. There is no proposed change to the revenue costs.

Updated Capital Costs

The ICT & Digital Strategy will require primarily capital investment, and this is broken down in the strategy document into several areas. (A detailed spreadsheet of all costs referred to below is attached as an Appendix).

The 'Get-Well' programme has an approved capital budget running over 3 years (see Appendix G in the strategy document):

2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022
£8.953m	£1.433m	£1.333m

The ICT 'business as usual' has an approved capital budget (routine replacement of laptops, routine network upgrades etc.) of:

2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022
£2.518m	£0.866m	£0.866m

The ICT & Digital Strategy also captures the costs of the replacement of Line of Business applications, which have historically been the subject of individual capital bids from within the business. To date SAP, OLM Adult Care, Children's Services Case management and Northgate M3 have approval and allocated capital budget for replacement as follows:

2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022
£4.453m	£0.028m	£0.329m

The total approved capital budget for 2019/2020 to 2021/2022 is £20.777 million. Capital budget is also approved for 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 for a total of £11.086 million, to create an overall approved ICT capital programme budget of £31.863 million over five years.

Request for New Capital Budget:

It is recommended that Full Council approve additional capital budget of £11.100 million to create a capital budget for the replacement of line of business applications and various technological equipment not normally covered by ICT budgets (including such things a library self-service kiosks, the audio-visual equipment that allows council meetings to be broadcast, etc – see Appendix E of the strategy for a full list), as contracts come up for renewal, and as applications and equipment reaches the end of its useful life. This budget will be managed by the Digital Board and will be allocated upon completion of a full business case. Note that wherever possible applications will be replaced with “Software as a Service”, which will incur lower capital costs, hence these figures should represent a worst-case position, although full discovery of all applications is continuing.

The capital financing costs for this budget based on a 5-year annuity at 2.53% would be £2.391 million per annum. This would need to be built into 2020/2021 budget setting and corresponding savings identified.

New Capital Budget Request:

2019/2020	2020/2021	2021/2022	2022/2023	2023/2024
£4.559m	£2.013m	£1.056m	£3.471	£0.000

If this budget is not approved, then replacement of IT applications and key IT-related systems will need to come forward to Full Council for approval on a case by case basis as they arise. They are however integral to the ICT and Digital strategy and the successful technological functioning of the council, and replacements will be required to continue to support service delivery.

The Digital Programme – Microsoft Cloud Navigator is not included above or in the IT Strategy as it is being managed as a standalone programme.

Adopt a strategic approach: recommended

ICT exists only to support the needs and successful operation of the organisation, and an ICT & Digital Strategy must operate top-down if it is to achieve this. The approach recommended provides a logical flow from corporate to operational needs, examines relevant technology trends and best practice, examines where the organisation’s current provision is and where it falls short, paints a vision of a desirable and achievable future state, and proposes how to get there, in the context of improved organisational governance. It is recommended that this approach is adopted.

To adopt this strategy, it is recommended Full Council approve an additional capital budget for Applications and Key IT of £11.100 million for the period 2019/2020 to 2023/2024. Full Council should acknowledge that by increasing

the capital budget the capital financing revenue budget will need to be increased in future years by circa £2.391 million per annum. This will need to be addressed as part of 2020/2021 budget setting as part of the capital programme and revenue budget setting.

This would increase the overall ICT capital budget for the period 2019/2020 to 2023/2024 from £31.863 million to £42.963 million.

Paul Day – Interim Director, Digital Transformation & IT