

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT (1)

Meeting: Council

Place: Lansdowne Hall, Civic Centre, Trowbridge, St Stephen's Pl,
Trowbridge BA14 8AH

Date: Tuesday 19 October 2021

Time: 10.30 am

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on 11 October 2021. Additional documents are now available and are attached to this Agenda Supplement.

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Kieran Elliott, of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line 01225 718504 or email kieran.elliott@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

6 **Public Participation** (Pages 3 - 8)

Questions from members of the public are attached.

13 **Members' Questions** (Pages 9 - 14)

Questions from Members are attached together with responses.

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 15 October 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Full Council

19 October 2021

Item 6 – Public Participation

From Peter Curtis

**To Councillor Nick Botterill, Cabinet Member for Development Management,
Strategic Planning and Climate Change**

I am a resident of Great Durnford and a Parish Councillor. I am deeply concerned by the huge number of houses proposed for the area south of Amesbury, the disregard for the status of our landscapes and, in my opinion, the wanton greed of developers.

Question (P21-19)

Does the cabinet stand by the principles set out in the Local Plan draft spatial strategy that allocated 350 homes to Amesbury, rather than the increase to 1,500+ homes for the town proposed by property developers in response to the council's Regulation 18 consultation?

Response

A verbal response will be provided at the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Full Council

19 October 2021

Item 6 – Public Participation

From Nick Beard

**To Councillor Nick Botterill, Cabinet Member for Development Management,
Strategic Planning and Climate Change**

Question (P21-20)

Can the cabinet member for strategic planning confirm that any of the sites that came forward for development – such as that for 1,200 houses in south west Amesbury or employment land at High Post near Salisbury – will go through a thorough process of analysis and assessment before they are considered for inclusion in the Local Plan?

Response

A verbal response will be provided at the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Full Council

19 October 2021

Item 6 – Public Participation

From Bill Jarvis

To Councillor Dr Mark McClelland, Cabinet Member for Transport, Waste, Street Scene and Flooding

Last week the so called EV charging strategy was presented to Cabinet, item 6 on the agenda. Put up as a major milestone by the Cabinet member for Climate, I was looking forward to some innovative and imaginative solutions.

Having reviewed it, my heart sank.

You intend to invest £70,000 in the next 3 years on refurbishing existing facilities. This at a time of huge growth in EV sales. You plan to use an agile approach.

You use Government figures to make the case that only 30% of cars will be electric by 2030. 58,000 in Wiltshire. While this is a ludicrously low number, how are you going to address all the visitors transiting?

How does that fit with an ambition to get to net zero by 2030 in Wiltshire? How does that fit with getting a 68% reduction in carbon emissions by 2030 (Central Govt)

How does that give anyone an incentive to buy an EV or even visit Wiltshire in their EV, as there will be nowhere to recharge.

You then propose that the price for using the refurbished chargers will be £0.35 per kwh. Which magazine recently calculated that once the rate went above £0.33 it was cheaper, fuel wise, to drive a petrol or diesel car. Big incentive to change there then. At present you spend £25k per year on electricity.

You also plan to provide charging points in public car parks, for those who cannot install a charger at their home. Most people who live in such accommodation were probably looking to save money with their EV. You have now disabused them of that dream. So, it's all ok if you can charge at home and pay a domestic rate of £0.20, really good saving for those that have a drive. But a huge penalty for visitor to our county and for those who aren't able to park their car off road. Big incentive there then.

No real consideration has gone into this proposal and, as you admit, it is a sticking plaster to enable a proper strategy to be put in place... in 3 years time.

Question (P21-21)

How are you going to make a proper EV support strategy, which we have been waiting for ever since you issued the EV survey, so long ago I've even lost the date?

Response

A verbal response will be provided at the meeting.

Question (P21-22)

- a) How are you going to give proper support to those who can't put a charger at home, on street charging. Charging bays, charger time share?
- b) ... and, when are you going to do a proper job of calculating what is a fair and reasonable realistic rate per kw?

Response

A verbal response will be provided at the meeting.

Wiltshire Council

Council

19 October 2021

Councillor Questions Update

Summary

1. A total of 3 questions from Councillors have been received since the last meeting of Full Council on 20 July 2021.
2. Details of questions submitted and the order they will be received at the meeting are shown at Appendix 1. Responses are included at Appendix 2.
3. One question was deemed by the Chairman to be operational in nature and in accordance with the constitution a response to the question was sent by officers.
4. All questions were received before the first deadline of 5 October 2021. The two non-operational questions were therefore guaranteed written responses as attached to this report.
5. The Chairman will go through the questions and responses, as is customary, take them as read and giving the questioner an opportunity to ask one relevant supplementary question for each question submitted.

Tara Shannon, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Appendix 1 - Councillor Questions Summary

Appendix 2 - Questions received

Appendix 1 - Councillor Submitted Questions Summary

Questions will be received in the order listed below as specified in the Constitution

Questions for Council (attached at Appendix 2)

Ref	Questioner	Date Received	Written or Verbal	Subject	Cabinet Member
21-03	Cllr Brian Dalton	12/7/21	Written	Salisbury Air Ambulance	Cllr Richard Clewer
21-05	Cllr Bridget Wayman	04/10/21	Written	Buildings at Risk	Cllr Richard Clewer

Operational Questions – Officer response

21-04	Cllr Ian Thorn	09/09/21	Operational	CATG grants awarded	Cllr Dr Mark McClelland
-------	----------------	----------	-------------	---------------------	-------------------------

Item 17 – Members’ Questions

From Cllr Brian Dalton, Salisbury Harnham West Division

To Councillor Richard Clewer, Leader of the Council

Question (21-03)

Wiltshire Air Ambulance

On 21 July 2020, I tabled a motion to council (Motion 22) about Wiltshire Air Ambulance, which if memory serves me well, as it’s not attached to those minutes, it was unanimously approved by full council and resolved:

To support the amended motion as set out below. This Council acknowledges the outstanding work of all those emergency, armed forces and other services, including our own staff, who responded to the Novichok attack in Salisbury and Amesbury. Among those who put themselves at risk were the Wiltshire Air Ambulance team. This Council notes the commitment made by Government to meet the costs incurred and the losses made by this Council and the other services involved including the Wiltshire Air Ambulance.

This Council calls on Government to honour that commitment This Council calls on its leadership to:

- 1. meet with the leadership of Wiltshire Air Ambulance to formulate and execute a campaign to recover the costs*
- 2. make further representations directly to Government to meet the costs incurred by Wiltshire Air Ambulance in the Novichok attack*
- 3. work with our Wiltshire MPs to continue to support this campaign for the fair treatment of the Wiltshire Air Ambulance*

One year on:

- Can I ask if the council has met these three requirements (as at 13/07/21)?
- And if so, what has been the outcome of those three requirements?

Response

Wiltshire Council has met with the Air Ambulance to discuss these outstanding costs. It was understood at that meeting that the direct costs from that incident – medical equipment and PPE – had already been covered through South Western Ambulance Service.

The charity has identified some indirect costs as follows from the period of closure (1 August – 14 August 2018):

- Charity team relocated to alternative offices in Trowbridge
- Volunteers unable to return equipment, cash tins or buckets
- Cash counting to be done manually and no cash counting facility
- Cancellation of Events as did not have access to fundraising equipment, marquees etc
- Paramedics relocated to Chippenham Ambulance Station
- Helicopter grounded

It was noted that Wiltshire Council had supported the Air Ambulance through this period by providing alternative office accommodation.

In addition, the charity discussed some sunk costs that might be considered, such as

- Pilots unable to fly
- Employed staff who were specific to the closed building – receptionist and facilities staff
- Depreciation cost on all assets – buildings, aircraft, medical equipment and aviation equipment
- HP interest on aircraft
- Associated costs of flying – CAA fees and the Chief Pilot Services
- Light, heat and water

These costs sit outside the commitment given by Government. The Government's position is that any business interruption impact should be covered by insurance. The charity did have business interruption insurance in place, however they note that this only covered the increased costs of working and not any potential loss in income.

Nonetheless, the query regarding the indirect costs was raised again with the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy on 26 February 2021 and followed up on 2 September 2021. While a response has been delayed due to re-deployment in the Department, they will consider whether further support is appropriate and respond in due course.

Item 13 – Members’ Questions

From Cllr Bridget Wayman, Nadder Valley

To Councillor Richard Clewer, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for MCI, Economic Development, Heritage, Arts, Tourism and Health & Wellbeing

Question (21-05)

Buildings at Risk

I have previously asked the question of the Leader that support and resources are allocated to ensure that officers have the appropriate ability to go to Court to gain access to a property that is designated as a Building at Risk, in this case, Zeals House, the home of the Chafyn Grove family who have made significant philanthropic gifts in the past to Mere, the City of Salisbury and Salisbury Cathedral). Zeals House is in a very poor condition and is a Grade 1 listed building owned by an offshore company with absentee owners. I am also aware of another important Building At Risk (BAR) at Roche Court in Winterslow, in desperate need of repair although the ownership problems are somewhat different.

I have not received any response from the Leader to my request that officers are allocated the resources to pursue these type of cases and I am sure there are other examples across the county. It would appear that we have no strategy for Buildings at Risk which may explain why there is such an ad hoc approach to these matters. It is vitally important that we have a strategy in place in order for the Council to protect our important heritage. It may not be a statutory responsibility for the Council to tackle Buildings At Risk, but we should not be ignoring them when they are an important part of our heritage.

Would the Leader commit to preparing a strategy and ensuring resources are available for officers to protect our heritage?

Would the Leader also call English Heritage (champions of our heritage and developers of the Buildings at Risk approach) to account for their lack of action?

Response

The Council does seek to assist in securing a positive outcome for Buildings at Risk. However, each building has unique problems that may require bespoke solutions and a co-ordinated approach between the Council, Historic England and the landowner. Where landowners are less co-operative, the difficulties and costs increase, and the Council’s Planning Enforcement and Legal Teams may have to be involved, adding to their already busy workload. The impact of covid, which has

restricted out of office travel by Historic England Officers has created additional difficulties in progressing matters. There have been a number of cases where we are awaiting confirmation from Historic England on their position, and in the absence of this it is proving difficult to progress these complex cases using a multi-agency approach in a timely manner. Like the Council, Historic England has its own budgetary constraints and priorities and is involved with many other buildings at risk outside of Wiltshire and may not be able to respond as quickly as local authorities would like.

The Council will continue to do its best to help find a way forward for such buildings, but where landowner co-operation is not forthcoming, experience indicates that solutions are not straightforward and can often only be achieved after prolonged engagement. Officers will continue to engage with Historic England to highlight the importance of reducing delays to achieve timely solutions.