

# UPDATED AGENDA SUPPLEMENT (1)

---

**Meeting:** Council  
**Place:** Corn Exchange - Devizes  
**Date:** Tuesday 12 July 2011  
**Time:** 10.30 am

---

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on 30.06.2011. The reports detailed below are now available and are attached to this Agenda Supplement. Please bring this supplement with you to the meeting.

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Yamina Rhouati, of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line 01225 718024 or email [yamina.rhouati@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:yamina.rhouati@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](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk)

---

5. **Petitions Update** (Pages 1 - 4)

The Chairman will report receipt of the following petitions received after publication of the summons:

A. Petition – Car Parking Charges in Borough Parade and Emery Gate Car Park, Chippenham

A petition with 3,007 signatories will be presented by Cllr Desna Allen on behalf of concerned customers.

The Petition states that:

‘The Parking Charges increased by 110% in May 2011’

‘We, the undersigned, are concerned customers who urge the Council to act now to reduce the parking charges’

B. Denominational Home to School Transport

Details of a petition and supporting statement which will be presented by Mr Michael Stevenson MBE, Chair of Governors, St Augustine's Catholic College, Trowbridge, are attached.

8. **Councillors' Questions** *(Pages 5 - 24)*

Details of question from the under-mentioned Councillors and responses are attached:

Councillors Jeff Osborn, John Knight, Helen Osborn, Ricky Rogers, Jon Hubbard, Chris Caswill, and Brian Dalton.

9. **Minutes of Cabinet and Committees** *(Pages 25 - 40)*

Minutes of the following Committees attached:

Audit Committee – 13 May 2011  
Audit Committee – 29 June 2011

10. **Wiltshire Council Constitution** *(Pages 41 - 44)*

Please see attached revised Scheme of Delegation on Development Control to replace Appendix 1 – pages 89-92 of the Summons.

The revised Scheme includes amendments which will be proposed at the meeting and are shown in bold text for ease of reference.

---

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 11 July 2011
-----------------------------------

## Wiltshire Council

### Council

12 July 2011

---

### Item No. 5 – Petitions Denominational Home to School Transport

Council is asked to consider the following petition which will be presented by Mr Michael Stevenson MBE, Chair of Governors, St Augustine's Catholic College, Trowbridge:

#### **Petition to Wiltshire Council**

In September 2007 Wiltshire Council changed the home to school transport from a free scheme to one where parents currently already make a substantial contribution of up to £418 per year per child. Our Catholic Secondary School St Augustine's Catholic College received a letter on the 5 May 2011 from Wiltshire Council informing them of their intention to cease discretionary home to school transport for students in Years 7-11 attending this college from September 2012. The Council wish to make savings of around £170,000. It states that Wiltshire Council will notify parents directly affected by this decision, in writing, in the next few days; their decision to do this will be taken at the Cabinet meeting in July 2011.

We are asking that Catholic communities across Wiltshire should have an open and fair consultation on this important matter; it is unacceptable to simply inform those affected when changing a key policy. The consultation should be thorough, it should set out to contact all interested parties including the families of current and prospective students, Catholic Parishes in Wiltshire, the Diocese of Clifton, our Catholic Schools and other faith schools and their respective organisations. The findings and the full implications should be published and any options fully discussed with our communities before a decision is taken.

**Please sign below if you agree to a full consultation being conducted before any decision is made:**

The petition has approximately 450 signatories, an updated figure will be provided at the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Item No. 5 – Petitions**

**Denominational Home to School Transport**

**Supporting Statement by Mr Michael Stevenson MBE, Chair of Governors,  
St Augustine's Catholic College, Trowbridge**

As Chair of Governors at St. Augustine's Catholic College, I would like to voice my concern at Wiltshire Council's proposal to cancel the subsidy for denominational transport for Faith schools with effect from September 2012. A proposal which appears to have been made without consultation of the parties involved, including your own councillors – thus silencing the voice of our elected representative which cannot be right under any circumstance. To compound the error your decision to place the matter before Cabinet during the school's summer recess smacks of a Council afraid to face up to its responsibilities.

I will take a moment to refer you to the events in 2007 when the Council previously wanted to reduce the subsidy to Faith schools. There was a full consultation process, well led by the Education Department of the Council, where everyone was given the opportunity to voice their concern. An evening meeting was arranged which allowed parents and other concerned parties to meet the Council. As a result a compromise was reached which satisfied all parties and everyone felt that justice had been done. I fail to see why this procedure cannot be adopted now and would like you to explain the Council's reasoning.

You will be aware there are currently a lot of parents with pupils attending Faith schools that rely on the subsidy and have factored it in to their budget – often a very tight budget in these troubled times. Yet your decision to remove the subsidy for all from 2012 has given no consideration to these families. A decision which I would challenge on both moral and financial grounds particularly as part of the headline on the Wiltshire Council web page states '*Where everybody matters*' - I fail to see how this can be true when this proposal affects so many people, including those of religious minorities.

If Central Government insists on giving parents the right to choose the school their children attend; if parents have the right to send their children to a school which upholds the ethics and teaching of their faith; if West Wiltshire Council has always in the past given its constituents a full opportunity to voice their concerns, why has the

new unitary Council – which is supposed to be more efficient - suddenly ignored all these factors.

In summary I am very concerned at the way the Council has handled the matter of Denominational transport for Faith schools. I am very concerned at the loss of the subsidy and the effect it will have on families who want to send their children to a school which upholds and teaches their Faith. I am very concerned at the loss of income to families with children already attending Faith schools particularly in these troubled financial times.

Finally I would at this stage point out on current Council spending the minimal amount of money you would have to find to keep the Denominational Transport subsidy intact and how much benefit it would give to so many families.

I would like you to reconsider your proposal and consequent decisions and ask you:

- a. To allow a full debate on the matter for all parties involved.
- b. To change the date of the Cabinet meeting to within school term time to allow all those who wish to attend to do so, and/or to schedule an evening meeting to allow parents to meet with the Council.
- c. To keep the present subsidy for Denominational Transport for the foreseeable future.

I would also like to present to the Council this petition showing the concern parents have regarding your proposal.

Wiltshire Council

Council

12 July 2011

---

## COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS

### QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLOR JEFF OSBORN TROWBRIDGE GROVE DIVISION

#### TO COUNCILLOR DICK TONGE CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

#### Question 1

Please can I be informed as to the revenue obtained from the Bradford Road, Trowbridge and the Church Street, Trowbridge car parks since the new charging regime was introduced?

For the sake of comparison can the revenue for the same period last year please be indicated?

I appreciate that previously there was no charge for the Bradford Road car park.

Also can I please be told the total cost of installing from scratch the electric ticket machine?

#### Response

<u>2010/2011</u>	<u>Apr – June</u>
Bradford Rd	£1099.00
Church St	£6189.00

<u>2009/2010</u>	<u>Apr - June</u>
Bradford Rd	£Nil
Church St	£7520.00

#### Machine Installation Costs

##### Ticket machines,

£2950.00 Metric

£401.08 SSE Connection

##### Signage,

£50 Groundworks for Signage Poles

£82.50 Signage Poles

£6926.00 Global total (West) Signage Trowbridge not specifically identified separately.

**Notices in the press, etc,**

£2649.98 Global total for press notices, Trowbridge not specifically identified separately.

**TO COUNCILLOR TOBY STURGIS**  
**CABINET MEMBER FOR WASTE, PROPERTY, ENVIRONMENT AND**  
**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SERVICES**

**Question 2**

A number of my constituents have contacted me regarding the new procedure for disposing of "medical sharps" such as diabetic needles.

Previously you had a yellow plastic container issued by the GP surgery. Once this was full of sharps, you returned it to the surgery for disposal.

Now, you still are issued with the yellow container but once it is full you are given a Wiltshire Councillor telephone number to ring and arrangements are then made to collect the container.

Apparently a person is employed by the Council to drive all over the county collecting these containers. Then they are all taken to Cornwall for disposal.

Please confirm that the above is the current procedure.

When and why did this change?

What are the respective costs involved between the two procedures.

Is there not a security/safety issue in asking people to leave a container of sharps on their doorstep waiting for collection?

Should not a communication exercise be implemented to fully explain to those members of the public precisely what is involved?

Finally, can the personnel at the other end of the said telephone number be made fully aware of the procedure? Some of my constituents reported that they found the said personnel extremely unhelpful and unable to answer pertinent questions.

**Response**

The procedure described by Cllr Jeff Osborn is correct, except that the waste is currently taken to Hestridge in Somerset for waste transfer/disposal.

The council was advised in 2007/08 by local GP surgeries and pharmacies that they had negotiated new General Practitioner contracts and previous well-established system whereby patients took their used "sharps" back to their local pharmacy or GP



would cease with immediate effect, as they had concluded (with no prior consultation with the local authority) that this was a service that we should provide as Clinical waste falls under Schedule 2 of the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992 (clinical waste from households is defined as "a household waste for which a charge for collection may be made". At very short notice the then Wiltshire District Councils worked to extend the small number of other household clinical waste collections it undertook in order to accommodate this new service need. At no point have charges been directed to the user, although the authority has the opportunity to do so. It was felt that, as Kennet District Council had adequately trained members of staff and vehicles already used for this purpose, they provided this service on behalf of the other Wiltshire districts prior to the creation of Wiltshire Council.

The previous arrangements, where diabetic patients returned their used sharps to their local GP or Pharmacy incurred zero cost to the local authority, as we had no involvement in the storage, collection or disposal of the waste. In terms of costs to the Council, we have seen increases in both collection and disposal costs. In respect of collection there is only a marginal difference, as the council's already provided clinical waste collections from some households in Wiltshire. The Council currently employ one driver, a vehicle and a part time officer and these resources remain unchanged from the old procedure to the new. The collection vehicle operates on a scheduled route around the County; the only change is that he makes more calls than was the case before the GP Practices changed their policy. This does incur an extra cost but this is a relatively minor increase because the majority of the mileage is to travel around his countywide route and the resources deployed remain the same. However, disposal costs will have increased as disposal is required to be either via Autoclave or incineration which typically costs in the region of £650 per tonne. It is also the case that the extra administration of this service also incurs additional cost to the authority. The service will shortly be reviewing this service in terms of a "lean systems" review, to see if this can be provided in a more efficient, and customer-focused manner.

We do not instruct customers where to leave the waste. We would prefer customers not to leave them on the doorstep as we recognise that this would not be the safest practice. Wherever possible we try to arrange collection by receiving the waste by hand from the resident or, if they are not at home, we might agree to collect from inside their front porch. If they are not at home on the scheduled collection day then we ask the customer where they intend to leave it for collection. However, the "sharps boxes" themselves are designed to rigorous EU-approved standards to ensure that the contents cannot be tampered with, once placed in the box, so actual risks of "needle-stick" injuries are minimal to anyone coming into contact with the box.

We are always interested to know how we can improve our communications. We are aware that customers receive information from their local chemist and GP Practice, we publish information on the Council's website and if customers phone Customer Services they will try to provide information. If Cllr Osborn has some ideas or suggestions on how we can improve our communications we would be pleased to receive them.

We are concerned by your advice that some of your constituents experienced some difficulty in receiving advice from our staff when they telephoned in to the Council. We will review the information provided to the relevant staff and identify any training needs. It is always our intention to be as helpful as possible and we try to continuously improve the service that we provide. We are very grateful therefore that these matters have been brought to our attention. To assist us in this it would be helpful if Cllr Osborn could contact his constituents to obtain more specific details of the occasions when they contacted the Council and experienced these difficulties.

**QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR JOHN KNIGHT**  
**TROWBRIDGE CENTRAL DIVISION**

**TO COUNCILLOR DICK TONGE**  
**CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT**

**Question 3**

- a. Can the Cabinet member please advise me as to the revenue and number of users achieved by the Council since the implementation of the new off street parking order on 18th April 2012 up until week ending 25th June 2011?
- b. Can the Cabinet member also advise me as to the revenue and number of users achieved by the Council for the corresponding period during 2010?

**Response**

The occupancy figures are shown in **Appendix 1**, attached. Revenue figures will be provided to the end of June as soon as they are consolidated together with the corresponding figures for 2010. It is difficult to supply figures for part months.

**QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR HELEN OSBORN**  
**TROWBRIDGE LAMBROKE DIVISION**

**TO COUNCILLOR LIONEL GRUNDY OBE**  
**CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

**Question 4**

- a. Can it please be explained to councillors why the Wiltshire schools who opted to become academies remain members of Wiltshire Council's School Forum?
- b. As more Wiltshire Council schools become Academies will the governing bodies of these schools be fully responsible for providing cover for teachers that are on 'long term' sick?

## **Response**

- a. The Wiltshire Schools Forum is currently constituted with the following 'Schools' members:

<b>Schools (13 representatives)</b>	<b>Nominated by:</b>
4 x primary headteachers	PHF
3 x secondary headteachers	WASSH
1 x Special school headteacher	WASSH
1 x Academies Rep.	Academy Schools in Wiltshire
2 x primary governors	(see below)
1 x secondary governor	(see below)
1 x governor for special needs	(see below)

In accordance with good practice guidance, for each category of Schools Forum member there is where possible a nominating body, usually the relevant federation or association of teachers / governors. This arrangement is both fair and has proved durable over its years of operation. Of the head teachers above 2 are from schools which are or propose to become academies. Wiltshire wide it is expected that there may be 13 secondary schools, 1 special school and up to 5 primary schools who may have converted to academy status by the end of this academic year.

The December 2010 DfE guidance document "Schools Forums: Operational and Good Practice Guidance" states the following: "Whatever the membership structure of schools members on a forum, the important issue is that it should reflect most effectively the profile of schools across the authority to ensure that there is not an in-built bias towards any one phase or group"

Within Wiltshire we wish to work with the whole community of Wiltshire schools and continue to do this through Schools Forum and throughout the work of the Department.

As of July 2011 no concerns have been raised at meetings regarding Academy representation on the boards, but a report reviewing the Schools Forum membership and its constitution is already being prepared to be considered at the next meeting in October, in part to address the changing composition and status of many of Wiltshire Schools. This will clarify arrangements in a number of areas and ensure that the Forum complies with best practice. Any changes to the membership of the Schools Forum, its constitution and role, and its sub-groups will be considered at the October meeting.

Currently funding for academies is based on the local authority funding formula, albeit on a lagged basis, and therefore decisions made at Schools Forum do impact on both academies and mainstream schools. Any changes in the funding regime for academies or mainstream schools may lead to a change in the role of the Schools Forum and we would expect that this will be addressed by the DfE in the future consultation on schools funding.

N.B. There are also 4 positions for voting governor representatives on the forum, two for primary school governors, one for a secondary school governor and one for a governor from a special school. There are currently vacancies for the last two positions. The governor representation have previously been filled on the basis of historic arrangements and expressions of interest received, but with the development of the nascent Wiltshire Governor's Association and Wiltshire Special Schools governors Group, it is suggested that these groups become the nominating groups for the four positions in future.

- b. All schools, whether maintained or academy, are responsible for meeting the costs of cover for staff who are absent due to sickness. Schools are able to pay in to an insurance scheme managed by the Council to assist them in meeting these costs. This scheme is being offered to academies as well as maintained schools.

**QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR RICKY ROGERS**  
**SALISBURY BEMERTON DIVISION**

**TO COUNCILLOR DICK TONGE**  
**CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT**

**Question 5**

Re-Design Works Junction of Roman Road/Pembroke Road Adjoining Wilton Road A36 Salisbury

- a. What is the total cost of the scheme to date?
- b. What is the estimated cost of the further proposed road markings?
- c. What criteria was applied for this scheme to become a priority when other local roads are in a disgraceful state?
- d. Why were four out of the five local schools excluded from any consultation on this scheme?
- e. How will the public concerns about this scheme be dealt with?

## **Response**

- a. The construction cost of the scheme was £36,866. The design and supervision fee came to £24,260 although this did include some preliminary design work on another proposed cycle scheme in Salisbury (Around £5,000 of work). Therefore total cost was £61,126 minus the approx. £5k. The proposed waiting restrictions require a Traffic Regulation Order which will cost around £4,500.
- b. The cost of the road markings are included in (a) above.
- c. This scheme was prioritized because it formed part of the wider 'Connect 2' project aimed at providing a continuous cycle route through Salisbury (as part of National Cycle route 24). Pedestrian and cycling links between Bemerton Heath, the City Centre, and the Connect 2 route were felt to be particularly inadequate at this location. As part of the 'Safe Routes to School' initiative, the scheme also addressed pedestrian safety concerns as outlined by the parents and children of Lower Bemerton Primary School in their school travel plan. £150,000 was originally set-aside for cycling improvements on Churchfields Road. However, due to engineering complexity this project was postponed and the funding diverted to other cycling and walking projects around Salisbury (of which this was one).
- d. This location was highlighted by Lower Bemerton Primary School as a key pedestrian severance point on their journey to and from the school. We always try and involve all schools in consultations.
- e. To date the Council has received two complaints that centre on the availability of parking adjacent to the Best One Store and the impact on traffic flow around the pedestrian refuge. In response to this a waiting restrictions proposal has been formulated as mentioned in a. above. It is proposed to advertise the restrictions in October this year.

**QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLOR JON HUBBARD**  
**MELKSHAM SOUTH DIVISION**

**TO COUNCILLOR JANE SCOTT OBE**  
**LEADER OF THE COUNCIL**

**Question 6**

- a. Does the Leader now recognise that the three core concerns raised in the NHS motion (*fragmentation of service, priority for private sector bidders and local governance*) which I proposed on 17 May have become central issues for the Government's response to the 'pause' in the NHS bill?
- b. Would the Leader not agree, in hindsight, that the Council would have better discharged its responsibilities to Wiltshire residents by conveying concerns on these key issues, rather than remaining silent?
- c. In the circumstances, and considering that the council had several more weeks in which to lodge any comments, was it not an error to say that the timing of the motion was wrong?

**Response**

Given the submission of previous motion on this matter, and the response given at Council on 17 May 2011 (page 21 of the main agenda pack refers), the previous response is reiterated.

Since the initial response on 17 May 2011, it has been agreed that the first Health and Wellbeing Board meeting will be held in September 2011. In addition the staff consultation process has started as part of the Section 75 transfer of the Public Health team from the PCT to Wiltshire Council.

Wiltshire is considered to be a leading authority both within the South West and nationally and remains committed to fulfilling our responsibilities as an early implementer.

**Question 7**

- a. What was the cost in each of the years 2009-10 and 2010-11 of additional work, taken on by the Council's external auditors, KPMG, beyond their originally agreed remit?
- b. What were the reasons for the additional work being contracted to KPMG?
- c. What are the expectations for 2011-12 for additional work to be undertaken by the council's external auditor, in terms of additional costs, and reasons?

## **Response**

- a. For 2009/2010 KPMG charged the Council £27,950 additional fee due to carrying out additional work on the Council's financial statements) to obtain assurance that data was accurately and completely migrated from the previous Wiltshire County Council and District Council's financial systems into SAP. The audit fee for this year though was less overall than the previous Council's collective fees. There was also an additional fee of £3,619 to respond to questions and objections from local electors

The 2010/11 audit is currently in progress so the Council is yet to receive a final invoice for the year. KPMG have communicated that an additional fee is possible due to work to be carried out in respect of following up on Internal Audit but we and they are hopeful this can be managed within the overall fee as other controls have been actioned since 2009/10 thus incurring no additional charge for 2010/11.

- b. KPMG are appointed as the Council's external auditors by the Audit Commission. The Council does not have the authority to appoint it's own external auditors.
- c. At this stage it is not expected that there will be any additional audit work required for 2011/12. However this audit will not be finalised until September 2012.

## **TO COUNCILLOR LIONEL GRUNDY OBE** **CABINET MEMBER FOR CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

### **Question 8**

- a. At what stage did you become aware of the shortcomings in Criminal Records Bureau checks in Wiltshire schools and Surestart Children's Centres, as identified by Internal Audit?
- b. What steps are you, and Council officers, taking to resolve the potentially disastrous confusion about responsibilities and requirements for CRB checks?
- c. What assurance can you give the public that these shortcomings are going to be quickly resolved?

## **Response**

- a. National Guidance around CRB checks has changed frequently over the last few years however the DCSF publication 'Safeguarding Children and Safer Recruitment in Education 2007' remains the key guidance for schools to follow. HR guidance to schools on CRB and safer recruitment topics has been issued on a regular basis since 2006. The Schools HR Online website holds the current guidance and information. HR has also issued regular ISA/CRB Newsletters to inform schools of the changing requirements

The internal audit in 2010 identified the need to improve the requirements of service providers of children's centre services. CRB clearances are obtained for people working with children and vulnerable people every three years. Centres keep a Single Central Record (SCR) to identify who needs to be CRB checked and when. Staff have undertaken safer recruitment training. Robust monitoring of the contract on a quarterly basis ensures contract holders are upholding the highest standards of safeguarding for children and young people. The only published Ofsted inspection of a children's centre completed so far, commended the children's centre on its safeguarding practice. In the update to the action plan in October 2010 no further concerns were raised.

- b. The Protection of Freedoms Bill 2010-11 is currently passing through its reporting stages towards an autumn 2011 Bill. This will make changes to the CRB checks and restrict the scope of the current Vetting and Barring Scheme. This will resolve the changing information on the Independent Safeguarding Act/CRB checks. It is expected that the CRB and ISA will be combined and replaced by a new body called the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS). Current 'transitional' CRB arrangements will apply until the new Bill goes into law and Schools and Children's Centres are aware of this. Since April 2011 Children's Centres have been commissioned and provided by four independent providers: 4Children, Spurgeons, Barnardo's and The Rise Trust and through the regular monitoring meetings we are assured that safeguarding children is compliancy tested through their contract requirements. As soon as the Protection of Freedoms Bill 2010-11 is law, new guidance will be issued by HR to schools and we will ensure that the independent providers also issue guidance to their Children's Centres.
- c. We have ensured that a Single Central Record (detailing all staff CRB and pre-employment checking information) is in place for each School and Children's Centre. Ofsted, when inspecting, reviews this SCR and safeguarding procedures. For Children's Centres, CRB and safeguarding is integral to their contracts and they conduct audits of safeguarding to show their child protection training is up-to-date and they have protocols in place for sharing information. The Head of Early Years and Childcare is also a member of the Local Safeguarding Children's Board (LSCB).

**TO COUNCILLOR TOBY STURGIS/DICK TONGE**

**CABINET MEMBERS FOR WASTE, PROPERTY, ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SERVICES / HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT**

**Question 9**

When Melksham's new Asda store was going through the planning process much was made of the free shuttle bus that would be provided as part of the Section 106 agreement that accompanied the development. I understand that Asda have fulfilled their part of the agreement on this, but Wiltshire Council have chosen to use the money provided to subsidise their own paid for services, rather than provide the free



shuttle bus promised to the people of the town. Could you please clarify why the council changed the use of the funding from that which was originally promised to the people, and give some indication of how removing services such as this contribute to the council's alleged commitment to the viability of our market towns?

### **Response**

The Planning Committee resolved that permission should be granted subject to conditions and a legal agreement to secure, amongst other things:

- (i) Sustainable transport measures which will include a £500k contribution based on £100k per annum towards bus transport to Melksham Town Centre from the application site

The s106 agreement does not specify a free bus, and officers in Passenger Transport Unit (PTU) have never been in discussions about a free service being provided. Officers have been negotiating an expansion of the town bus service that links Asda to a wider area of the town, and which also improves the town service for other users. This is a better option than a free bus on grounds of benefit to the wider public and the long term sustainability of the service. Indeed, PTU officers would have argued against a free bus for these reasons if this had been proposed at the time that the agreement was being negotiated.

The improvements that are being made to the town bus will be introduced in full on 1st August, and include;

- a half hourly bus service to Asda from the Market Place and the Forest area (this is already in operation thanks to the agreement of the current bus operator until the full new services are in place)
- an improved hourly service from Dunch Lane, Granville / Portman Rd, Roundponds / Shurnhold and the Rail Station to Asda and the town centre, including cross town journeys giving improved access to the Hospital / Doctors Surgery and other areas of the town without changing buses in the Market Place
- the service to be run by two low floor easy access buses in dedicated Melksham Town Bus livery

**QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR CHRIS CASWILL**  
**CHIPPENHAM MONKTON DIVISION**

**TO COUNCILLOR JOHN THOMSON**  
**CABINET MEMBER FOR ADULT CARE, COMMUNITIES AND HOUSING**

**Question 10**

The Council's Internal Audit team have recently reported weaknesses in the administration of residents' cash and care records in four visited care homes. What steps are being taken to remedy this situation? And what can be done to ensure that the problem is not more widespread in Wiltshire?

**Response**

This was a medium risk raised by the Audit report. Since then this matter has been discussed with the Order of St John - they have undertaken an internal review. This review has involved the restructuring of their internal finance team, who will undertake unannounced visits to care homes that will include addressing the key areas raised by the Audit report. The Department of Community Services are undertaking a follow-up review of the issues raised within the Audit report and analysing the internal review undertaken by the Order of St John. We will then follow this up with examination of practice in other Care homes across the Council – this will be a standard process as part of our contract management arrangements for Care homes.

**Question 11**

- a. How many, if any, of the patients being treated at Winterbourne View were Wiltshire residents? Have satisfactory alternative arrangements now been made for their ongoing care?
- b. Are any Wiltshire residents being treated at Castlebeck's Rose Villa rehabilitation centre in Bristol, and if so, have any arrangements been made to review that facility?

**Response**

- a. Three of the residents at Winterbourne View are Wiltshire residents. The hospital is now closed and all residents have alternative placements. NHS Wiltshire is the commissioner and they have arranged alternative placements for the 3 Wiltshire residents.
- b. Four Wiltshire residents did reside at Rose Villa at the point the safeguarding alert was raised. A Safeguarding investigation was carried out and NHS Wiltshire are satisfied that measures were put in place that ensured the safety of the residents.

**QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR BRIAN DALTON**  
**SALISBURY HARNHAM DIVISION**

**TO COUNCILLOR DICK TONGE**  
**CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT**

**Question 12**

- a. How much income was taken in Wiltshire council owned car parks in the City of Salisbury for the months of April, May & June for the years 2009, 2010 & 2011? Each car park separately for each of the three yearly-quarters.
- b. The same question for off street; but a total for each quarter will do, but if this can be broken down to each street that would be good.

**Response**

Figures for the months of April, May and June 2011, together with details of the corresponding figures for the previous years mentioned, are attached at **Appendix 2**

This page is intentionally left blank

# Occupancy Report

# APPENDIX 1

		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11													
Region	District	Operator	Category	Description	Apr-08	May-08	Jun-08	Jul-08	Aug-08	Sep-08	Oct-08	Nov-08	Dec-08	Jan-09	Feb-09
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Market Square	57.07%	62.18%	61.00%	66.93%	67.16%	61.64%	49.73%	53.41%	53.27%	50.48%	51.00%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Sainsburys (LS) incl Millstream	38.37%	40.54%	40.67%	41.16%	40.95%	41.59%	43.80%	46.31%	49.54%	38.48%	38.22%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Central (SS)	50.08%	49.01%	46.41%	45.56%	49.65%	46.05%	49.58%	52.17%	59.34%	42.84%	42.28%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Maltings	47.75%	49.48%	46.81%	48.07%	51.16%	47.52%	47.84%	53.94%	63.29%	46.52%	44.72%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Salt Lane	61.83%	60.88%	59.95%	61.04%	61.68%	64.55%	47.26%	65.54%	71.47%	59.66%	55.12%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Brown Street (West & East)	67.62%	71.14%	70.54%	73.46%	71.81%	70.81%	70.25%	69.47%	70.91%	61.81%	60.50%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	College Street	16.36%	14.20%	14.98%	14.51%	11.63%	12.28%	11.53%	13.52%	13.65%	11.66%	12.43%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Culver Street	18.39%	27.03%	27.61%	29.33%	27.11%	28.09%	29.44%	34.75%	35.01%	28.25%	28.90%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Coach Park	73.17%	85.93%	123.70%	127.31%	95.19%	57.31%	59.54%	61.00%	40.56%	34.81%	42.40%
SA	Salisbury	STC	Off-Street	Lush House	77.44%	79.93%	80.88%	82.04%	84.01%	77.31%	76.19%	67.91%	80.80%	64.91%	65.52%
SA	Salisbury	STC	Off-Street	Southampton Road	33.07%	41.74%	40.52%	34.50%	35.22%	46.90%	39.69%	38.17%	31.33%	34.36%	32.94%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Bath Road								51.04%	53.97%	45.66%	42.81%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Borough Parade								77.82%	76.76%	70.30%	65.07%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Brake Mead								3.75%	3.31%	2.06%	3.45%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Emery Gate								38.57%	46.47%	43.28%	43.85%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Gladstone Road								36.61%	44.40%	22.06%	19.28%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Monkton Park Peak	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Monkton Park Off Peak	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Sadlers Mead								28.55%	21.36%	26.52%	28.43%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Spanbourne Avenuu								13.65%	10.20%	10.29%	13.73%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Wood Lane								34.08%	31.86%	29.55%	29.65%
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Bradford Rd											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Broad St											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Church St											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Court St											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Lovestead											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Southwick Country Park											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	St Stephens Place											
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Central	67.34%	69.82%	69.41%	70.58%	72.42%	70.57%	72.97%	71.42%	81.25%	69.42%	63.30%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Couch Lane	4.17%	6.95%	7.08%	8.23%	9.69%	14.76%	21.05%	12.18%	11.14%	11.39%	12.34%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Northgate										1.64%	9.56%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Sainsbury	55.99%	63.54%	62.47%	58.26%	65.32%	60.02%	62.11%	61.20%	66.93%	58.13%	55.37%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Sheep Street	46.53%	46.49%	43.91%	45.88%	23.97%	48.22%	53.72%	48.84%	46.25%	44.18%	37.45%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Station Road	43.00%	40.20%	45.04%	40.97%	32.13%	39.10%	40.51%	45.65%	38.76%	37.43%	33.00%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Vales Lane	37.88%	40.95%	38.36%	42.09%	41.57%	40.26%	44.36%	45.64%	56.73%	42.76%	39.09%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	West Central	71.62%	77.59%	69.17%	70.13%	77.26%	67.14%	66.52%	69.79%	76.13%	62.61%	58.83%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Wharf	22.96%	27.45%	28.11%	29.70%	30.40%	23.15%	19.77%	24.12%	26.69%	19.58%	18.82%
NW	WB and Cricklade	WCC	Off-Street	Boroughs Field								53.71%	56.07%	54.75%	51.73%
NW	WB and Cricklade	WCC	Off-Street	Wood Street									9.33%	13.97%	9.96%
SA	Amesbury	WCC	Off-Street	Central											
SA	Amesbury	WCC	Off-Street	Church Street											
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Bath Road											
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Church Street											
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	King Street											
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Lowbourne											
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Union Street											
NW	Calne	WCC	Off-Street	Church Street								53.79%	45.11%	47.07%	44.74%
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Central Zone A											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Central Zone B											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Chinns											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Emwell											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Furlong											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Smallbrook Lane											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Western Zone A											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Western Zone B											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Weymouth Street											
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Georges Lane (Cars)	45.31%	45.92%	42.90%	48.47%	49.97%	44.44%	50.12%	37.98%	55.17%	40.58%	38.51%
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Hilliers Yard	61.62%	61.32%	59.93%	63.76%	64.73%	57.62%	61.36%	60.88%	76.53%	56.07%	50.06%
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Hyde Lane	55.04%	56.09%	54.99%	57.94%	60.44%	57.31%	54.72%	57.45%	64.26%	54.04%	49.17%
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Kenet Place	55.04%	56.09%	54.99%	57.94%	60.44%	57.31%	54.72%	57.45%	64.26%	54.04%	49.17%
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Polly Gardens	32.14%	32.91%	27.91%	34.68%	34.64%	29.28%	34.78%	36.28%	50.99%	32.26%	25.07%
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Savenake Hospital	31.99%	30.78%	33.16%	34.44%	31.04%	38.27%	42.07%	43.55%	36.51%	38.95%	28.51%
NW	Malmesbury	WCC	Off-Street	Station Road								67.36%	58.76%	68.85%	57.94%
NW	Corsham	WCC	Off-Street	High Street								50.03%	36.61%	57.23%	56.73%
NW	Corsham	WCC	Off-Street	Newlands Road								84.97%	79.94%	82.49%	76.67%
NW	Corsham	WCC	Off-Street	Post Office Lane								25.97%	26.68%	24.59%	20.43%
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Avoncliff											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Barton Farm											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Bridge Street											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Budbury Place											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Newton											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	St Margrets											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	St Margret's Hill											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Station Zone A											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Station Zone B											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	High Street Zone A											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	High Street Zone B											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Warminster Road Zone A											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Warminster Road Zone B											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Westbury Leigh											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Westfield House											
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Brown Street	30.72%	36.56%	29.42%	30.64%	29.75%	34.89%	22.08%	20.83%	19.56%	23.86%	18.76%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Castle Street	33.38%	32.92%	33.60%	35.13%	32.03%	34.75%	35.88%	36.63%	36.97%	34.27%	32.82%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Catherine Street	52.58%	48.36%	52.44%	51.37%	49.93%	52.32%	51.50%	46.76%	51.86%	49.18%	50.18%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Chipper Lane	43.67%	42.69%	41.73%	45.61%	43.13%	44.92%	45.38%	43.57%	43.66%	38.62%	40.47%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Endless Street	20.19%	19.36%	18.69%	19.40%	18.79%	19.30%	19.82%	19.07%	20.46%	18.93%	18.29%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Milford Street	34.94%	34.01%	34.12%	33.93%	32.95%	20.36%	29.04%	34.68%	37.57%	31.05%	27.36%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Cranebridge Road	25.97%	26.95%	28.63%	27.95%	30.02%	28.08%	27.10%	23.62%	32.45%	22.56%	25.80%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Ivy Street	26.90%	28.25%	27.11%	35.22%	32.08%	34.76%	35.95%	37.38%	34.33%	31.24%	27.83%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Salt Lane	23.06%	28.25%	23.89%	27.97%	26.48%	29.38%	30.75%	29.49%	32.00%	25.34%	23.02%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Scots Lane	59.27%	55.31%	54.77%	60.13%	51.53%	58.00%	58.34%	55.82%	60.92%	51.21%	48.13%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Blue Boar Road	47.49%	47.33%	49.54%	49.61%	45.77%	50.22%	43.09%	46.49%	36.94%	48.20%	50.24%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Fisherston Street	56.63%	56.51%	53.74%	55.94%	53.57%	57.82%	52.85%	54.49%	54.67%	51.91%	51.24%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Winchester Street	33.57%	30.56%	31.43%	33.23%	31.16%	30.77%	31.85%	34.53%	34.40%	34.19%	34.07%
KE	Marlborough	WCC	On-Street	High Street	77.06%	76.13%	78.22%	78.02%	80.90%	76.79%	64.31%	70.65%	76.80%	65.86%	62.01%
NW	Malmesbury	WCC	On-Street	Cross Hayes								73.69%	76.10%	68.21%	64.08%
Total Occupancy Off Street					46.87%	49.53%	50.02%	51.48%	49.98%	48.06%	48.14%	47.40%	48.04%	41.36%	39.19%
Total Occupancy On Street					57.31%	56.80%	57.54%	58.48%	58.80%	57.46%	50.76%	60.51%	63.68%	56.50%	53.52%
Total Occupancy					52.09%	53.16%	53.78%	54.98%	54.39%	52.76%	49.45%	53.95%	55.86%	48.93%	46.36%

# Occupancy Report

# APPENDIX 1

		12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22													
Region	District	Operator	Category	Description	Mar-09	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	Jul-09	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	Nov-09	Dec-09	Jan-10
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Market Square	53.35%	57.94%	58.17%	61.87%	64.98%	66.80%	70.45%	64.12%	53.93%	49.41%	45.97%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Sainsburys (LS) incl Millstream	47.91%	44.07%	45.80%	45.51%	45.37%	42.17%	45.78%	54.21%	48.54%	51.75%	42.13%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Central (SS)	47.76%	48.60%	49.17%	46.22%	50.27%	50.15%	53.19%	57.45%	54.96%	61.32%	43.58%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Maltings	46.42%	47.99%	49.46%	47.81%	50.02%	50.20%	50.02%	56.65%	55.74%	63.10%	44.84%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Salt Lane	62.89%	61.93%	62.99%	63.39%	71.60%	59.99%	61.67%	73.35%	74.88%	68.75%	56.40%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Brown Street (West & East)	68.76%	70.16%	70.89%	69.37%	82.82%	75.33%	74.55%	81.96%	80.89%	79.55%	61.10%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	College Street	17.03%	15.92%	16.83%	16.75%	18.41%	13.86%	22.66%	26.15%	25.64%	22.09%	21.29%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Culver Street	33.13%	29.65%	31.37%	32.57%	35.10%	32.04%	32.41%	36.34%	35.29%	36.73%	33.29%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Coach Park	65.96%	68.65%	101.83%	100.67%	138.24%	112.50%	96.35%	83.80%	52.20%	45.56%	31.73%
SA	Salisbury	STC	Off-Street	Lush House	76.24%	80.76%	80.09%	76.73%	86.68%	86.79%	79.20%	77.63%	70.75%	81.40%	58.60%
SA	Salisbury	STC	Off-Street	Southampton Road	47.95%	38.94%	44.35%	51.41%	37.13%	33.83%	51.73%	48.81%	49.87%	33.93%	38.52%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Bath Road	48.17%	47.20%	48.48%	45.85%	46.80%	43.98%	46.77%	48.22%	49.83%	56.40%	43.13%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Borough Parade	73.50%	78.65%	76.73%	76.53%	77.42%	74.43%	76.07%	76.74%	78.55%	82.75%	65.01%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Brake Mead	4.30%	7.84%	7.73%	6.33%	8.35%	12.15%	8.08%	6.36%	2.07%	2.00%	3.05%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Emery Gate	47.20%	49.52%	50.82%	48.85%	51.84%	52.35%	48.75%	52.25%	53.61%	65.38%	47.05%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Gladstone Road	20.63%	21.84%	25.18%	21.15%	21.03%	21.77%	20.20%	25.44%	26.74%	40.91%	19.98%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Monkton Park Peak	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.91%	1.86%	1.01%	1.74%	1.24%	1.32%	1.28%	1.48%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Monkton Park Off Peak	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	2.12%	2.01%	1.83%	2.06%	2.98%	2.38%	2.93%	1.76%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Sadlers Mead	31.50%	28.99%	30.33%	29.53%	28.88%	25.75%	30.02%	29.67%	32.21%	24.65%	28.40%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Spanbourne Avenue	12.34%	14.57%	13.43%	11.32%	13.15%	11.29%	4.98%	8.18%	9.58%	11.42%	7.23%
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Wood Lane	35.10%	32.40%	36.31%	32.15%	30.49%	26.50%	27.74%	28.97%	31.58%	39.70%	29.18%
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Bradford Rd											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Broad St											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Church St											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Court St											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Lovesmead											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Southwick Country Park											
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	St Stephens Place											
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Central	67.66%	70.47%	35.93%	65.63%	68.90%	66.79%	58.08%	69.06%	69.00%	77.41%	59.31%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Couch Lane	20.86%	21.67%	8.17%	16.57%	18.15%	18.22%	15.92%	13.08%	7.57%	7.82%	5.97%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Northgate	7.88%	13.24%	6.50%	11.82%	12.52%	10.52%	10.72%	19.00%	21.95%	24.58%	21.91%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Sainsbury	58.96%	64.07%	32.05%	58.40%	61.34%	57.43%	33.51%	50.05%	57.05%	62.07%	50.74%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Sheep Street	40.16%	42.81%	21.41%	39.66%	41.55%	38.52%	38.54%	42.10%	44.07%	48.79%	38.96%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Station Road	39.03%	35.00%	18.99%	35.30%	36.14%	29.62%	36.02%	34.04%	39.82%	33.25%	22.50%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Vales Lane	39.54%	44.88%	21.39%	39.53%	44.28%	39.73%	40.51%	45.78%	45.02%	59.02%	34.15%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	West Central	65.84%	70.33%	35.25%	66.68%	74.96%	71.68%	57.02%	73.19%	70.57%	74.86%	59.74%
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Wharf	23.64%	28.66%	13.32%	25.59%	29.27%	31.64%	26.78%	24.13%	21.88%	24.17%	16.86%
NW	WB and Cricklade	WCC	Off-Street	Boroughs Field	56.93%	59.26%	61.22%	57.38%	58.49%	54.20%	48.87%	51.62%	55.07%	58.31%	46.39%
NW	WB and Cricklade	WCC	Off-Street	Wood Street	11.26%	14.60%	11.83%	10.69%	13.19%	10.91%	10.90%	9.80%	11.92%	12.71%	8.71%
SA	Amesbury	WCC	Off-Street	Central											
SA	Amesbury	WCC	Off-Street	Church Street											
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Bath Road											
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Church Street											
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	King Street											
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Lowbourne											
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Union Street											
NW	Calne	WCC	Off-Street	Church Street	49.10%	52.51%	52.45%	51.53%	51.73%	51.61%	52.60%	53.68%	56.75%	53.45%	42.75%
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Central Zone A											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Central Zone B											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Chinns											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Emwell											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Furlong											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Smallbrook Lane											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Western Zone A											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Western Zone B											
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Weymouth Street											
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Georges Lane (Cars)	45.26%	46.97%	25.88%	43.67%	47.99%	47.14%	45.66%	50.92%	46.20%	49.72%	35.06%
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Hilliers Yard	56.84%	63.12%	37.08%	58.02%	63.75%	61.41%	57.37%	61.72%	59.83%	71.27%	48.91%
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Hyde Lane	56.12%	58.96%	36.22%	57.90%	61.14%	58.78%	54.79%	57.69%	56.16%	61.14%	43.26%
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Kennet Place	56.12%	58.96%	36.22%	57.90%	61.14%	58.78%	54.79%	57.69%	56.16%	61.14%	43.26%
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Polly Gardens	29.19%	30.68%	14.55%	21.94%	30.76%	28.12%	28.34%	34.00%	29.46%	43.40%	24.49%
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Savenake Hospital	48.59%	48.18%	43.10%	38.50%	37.27%	31.47%	51.49%	47.97%	53.14%	49.37%	34.78%
NW	Malmesbury	WCC	Off-Street	Station Road	70.61%	88.01%	85.86%	93.29%	87.39%	84.60%	63.55%	70.90%	63.40%	60.20%	53.66%
NW	Corsham	WCC	Off-Street	High Street	62.80%	62.76%	61.56%	74.78%	79.82%	66.21%	80.49%	82.10%	83.33%	83.29%	57.18%
NW	Corsham	WCC	Off-Street	Newlands Road	85.20%	89.01%	86.81%	86.07%	85.27%	83.19%	85.27%	84.70%	82.16%	84.49%	71.14%
NW	Corsham	WCC	Off-Street	Post Office Lane	24.56%	24.67%	23.70%	24.97%	25.01%	23.16%	25.97%	27.02%	21.26%	30.61%	21.29%
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Avoncliff											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Barton Farm											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Bridge Street											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Budbury Place											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Newton											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	St Margrets											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	St Margaret's Hill											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Station Zone A											
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Station Zone B											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	High Street Zone A											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	High Street Zone B											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Warminster Road Zone A											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Warminster Road Zone B											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Westbury Leigh											
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Westfield House											
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Brown Street	20.61%	26.85%	28.52%	32.02%	33.22%	30.79%	32.53%	36.23%	31.99%	34.99%	21.40%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Castle Street	36.30%	32.54%	31.39%	32.78%	37.03%	30.84%	37.87%	40.98%	31.05%	33.11%	29.19%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Catherine Street	51.09%	48.45%	46.49%	53.28%	54.51%	60.60%	58.36%	61.93%	52.72%	56.14%	49.83%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Chipper Lane	38.56%	37.44%	36.60%	42.24%	41.99%	37.62%	40.70%	37.92%	31.21%	26.93%	26.07%
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Endless Street	15.69%	18.05%	19.00%	20.15%	20.49%	18.70%	23.62%	24.81%	20.76%	21.16%	18.07%

Occupancy Report

APPENDIX 1

Table with columns: Region, District, Operator, Category, Description, Feb-10, Mar-10, Apr-10, May-10, Jun-10, Jul-10, Aug-10, Sep-10, Oct-10, Nov-10, Dec-10. Includes rows for various districts like Salisbury, Chippenham, Trowbridge, etc.

# Occupancy Report

# APPENDIX 1

Region	District	Operator	Category	Description	Jan-11	Feb-11	Mar-11	Apr-11	Apr-11	May-11	Jun-11	Jul-11	Aug-11	Sep-11	Oct-11	Nov-11	
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Market Square	47.95%	47.46%	27.76%	63.26%	49.11%	46.07%	55.11%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Sainsburys (LS) incl Millstream	32.36%	35.68%	37.61%	44.13%	29.30%	42.77%	37.29%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Central (SS)	40.71%	43.73%	44.09%	56.05%	22.08%	22.86%	22.22%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Maltings	42.16%	42.33%	38.63%	50.87%	38.29%	32.34%	33.18%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Salt Lane	46.50%	48.43%	41.53%	55.48%	41.45%	58.86%	53.88%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Brown Street (West & East)	63.09%	64.76%	62.62%	77.60%	67.19%	82.11%	80.63%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	College Street	19.72%	18.39%	16.31%	15.48%	10.75%	14.81%	14.95%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Culver Street	30.49%	31.80%	26.92%	35.07%	13.21%	13.67%	13.99%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	Off-Street	Coach Park	29.52%	39.17%	57.87%	0.63%	62.92%	97.12%	112.79%						
SA	Salisbury	STC	Off-Street	Lush House	61.28%	65.04%	66.03%	84.35%	73.29%	67.17%	72.33%						
SA	Salisbury	STC	Off-Street	Southampton Road	34.65%	34.57%	35.77%	42.97%	6.22%	0.25%	2.93%						
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Bath Road	40.22%	40.65%	43.16%	68.82%	38.97%	39.99%	38.25%						
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Borough Parade	68.70%	73.28%	72.21%	121.83%	77.39%	68.93%	67.09%						
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Brake Mead	1.93%	2.99%	3.64%	8.79%	14.34%	5.15%	7.31%						
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Emery Gate	48.65%	50.80%	48.33%	81.88%	49.84%	41.44%	40.33%						
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Gladstone Road	17.68%	18.14%	19.22%	42.57%	22.69%	15.49%	4.45%						
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Monkton Park Peak	1.24%	1.42%	1.84%	2.53%	0.86%	1.31%	1.62%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Monkton Park Off Peak	2.14%	2.67%	3.08%	3.76%	4.74%	15.46%	16.38%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Sadlers Mead	28.08%	29.53%	29.47%	44.27%	23.53%	28.61%	24.46%						
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Spanbourne Avenun	4.97%	13.08%	5.46%	11.41%	5.86%	5.53%	5.28%						
NW	Chippenham	WCC	Off-Street	Wood Lane	29.49%	31.13%	29.41%	55.22%	27.33%	29.27%	25.86%						
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Bradford Rd													
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Broad St													
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Church St													
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Court St													
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Lovestead													
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	Southwick Country Park													
WW	Trowbridge	WCC	Off-Street	St Stephens Place													
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Central	57.93%	60.92%	54.43%	85.75%	37.23%	61.91%	60.78%						
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Couch Lane	6.18%	9.01%	9.03%	1.28%	2.39%	9.97%	10.15%						
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Northgate	27.32%	32.06%	28.03%	45.56%	25.29%	36.85%	34.15%						
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Sainsbury	46.55%	53.13%	45.53%	25.79%	11.30%	55.53%	41.23%						
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Sheep Street	16.15%	40.94%	37.50%	55.84%	23.76%	40.36%	34.01%						
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Station Road	24.78%	26.45%	29.81%	35.22%	10.23%	16.13%	11.01%						
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Vales Lane	39.04%	40.76%	34.40%	56.30%	26.63%	41.50%	38.92%						
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	West Central	63.18%	69.53%	64.11%	100.15%	44.12%	67.41%	61.11%						
KE	Devises	WCC	Off-Street	Wharf	14.74%	18.95%	18.95%	34.36%	18.20%	21.15%	20.58%						
NW	WB and Cricklade	WCC	Off-Street	Boroughs Field	49.50%	51.65%	50.81%	82.43%	54.56%	48.97%	48.86%						
NW	WB and Cricklade	WCC	Off-Street	Wood Street	8.73%	10.42%	10.40%	14.85%	7.19%	10.04%	10.06%						
SA	Amesbury	WCC	Off-Street	Central					15.88%	13.24%	14.53%						
SA	Amesbury	WCC	Off-Street	Church Street					25.00%	29.68%	28.44%						
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Bath Road							0.43%						
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Church Street							0.13%						
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	King Street							0.61%						
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Lowbourne							0.29%						
WW	Melksham	WCC	Off-Street	Union Street							0.58%						
NW	Calne	WCC	Off-Street	Church Street	40.55%	41.05%	41.90%	62.97%	11.93%	13.37%	2.71%						
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Central Zone A								0.00%					
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Central Zone B													
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Chinns													
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Emwell													
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Furlong													
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Smallbrook Lane													
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Western Zone A													
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Western Zone B													
WW	Warminster	WCC	Off-Street	Weymouth Street													
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Georges Lane (Cars)	36.89%	40.98%	42.16%	70.56%	41.85%	40.16%	37.96%						
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Hilliers Yard	31.10%	48.05%	47.22%	79.04%	66.91%	51.66%	50.37%						
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Hyde Lane	54.79%	58.77%	56.57%	88.66%	59.25%	58.27%	57.41%						
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Kennet Place	54.79%	58.77%	56.57%	88.66%	59.25%	58.27%	57.41%						
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Polly Gardens	23.81%	26.80%	26.65%	45.08%	32.90%	24.81%	24.83%						
KE	Marlborough	WCC	Off-Street	Savenake Hospital	48.10%	50.10%	49.36%	67.54%	43.30%	34.89%	45.98%						
NW	Malmesbury	WCC	Off-Street	Station Road	57.97%	54.37%	54.71%	95.75%	29.49%	20.45%	18.07%						
NW	Corsham	WCC	Off-Street	High Street	77.61%	81.70%	85.06%	131.84%	78.35%	79.60%	73.76%						
NW	Corsham	WCC	Off-Street	Newlands Road	72.34%	74.91%	75.80%	119.32%	63.98%	41.83%	43.72%						
NW	Corsham	WCC	Off-Street	Post Office Lane	21.51%	22.82%	23.40%	39.44%	24.70%	23.33%							
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Avoncliff													
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Barton Farm							1.07%						
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Bridge Street							0.24%						
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Budbury Place													
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Newton													
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	St Margrets							0.06%						
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	St Margaret's Hill													
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Station Zone A							0.49%						
WW	Bradford on Avon	WCC	Off-Street	Station Zone B							2.17%						
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	High Street Zone A													
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	High Street Zone B													
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Warminster Road Zone A													
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Warminster Road Zone B													
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Westbury Leigh													
WW	Westbury	WCC	Off-Street	Westfield House						0.26%	0.06%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Brown Street	31.96%	39.39%	33.45%	45.52%	34.00%	27.46%	38.55%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Castle Street	27.05%	34.51%	34.26%	45.51%	29.26%	26.46%	32.81%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Catherine Street	52.38%	52.80%	50.71%	63.29%	43.29%	49.54%	51.69%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Chipper Lane	17.04%	7.67%	8.45%	18.18%	26.86%	22.23%	38.29%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Endless Street	18.74%	21.74%	20.90%	23.84%	15.83%	14.35%	20.90%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Milford Street	34.17%	34.49%	35.57%	45.40%	27.29%	32.78%	36.56%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Cranebridge Road	21.45%	23.05%	28.02%	41.12%	37.08%	21.84%	17.62%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Ivy Street	28.04%	26.85%	57.34%	39.81%	23.24%	17.03%	32.18%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Salt Lane	20.09%	25.91%	34.76%	34.97%	26.19%	29.53%	14.28%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Scots Lane	53.26%	64.02%	64.05%	83.77%	50.85%	36.58%	64.70%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Blue Boar Road	51.45%	56.86%	55.13%	57.18%	36.19%	33.51%	47.36%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Fisherton Street	45.74%	52.93%	52.38%	65.96%	32.53%	48.69%	57.92%						
SA	Salisbury	WCC	On-Street	Winchester Street	34.27%	37.46%	37.31%	51.46%	10.23%	7.79%	41.93%						
KE	Marlborough	WCC	On-Street	High Street	61.98%	66.56%	66.55%	106.08%	77.64%	66.54%	65.83%						
NW	Malmesbury	WCC	On-Street	Cross Hayes	70.43%	75.75%	95.52%	124.26%	82.95%	80.57%	78.08%						
				Total Occupancy Off Street	36.40%	39.70%	38.45%	55.66%	33.18%	35.41%	28.41%						
				Total Occupancy On Street	55.31%	59.68%	67.16%	92.58%	63.60%	58.47%	60.66%						
				Total Occupancy	45.85%	49.69%	52.80%	74.12%	48.39%	46.94%	44.53%						



## APPENDIX 2

### Salisbury Parking Figures (April, May, Jun) Qrt 1 - LAST 3 Years Comparison

#### Off Street Car Parks

Off Street	Car Parks	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
ORD C178	Brown Street (East)	4,873	7368	7,939
ORD C179	Brown Street (West)	42,277	60592	72,255
ORD C180	Central Salisbury	275,627	247334	222,286
ORD C181	College Street Salis	11,822	8773	12,995
ORD C182	Culver Street Salisb	55,172	40058	44,451
ORD C186	Maltings Salisbury	234,927	169663	168,868
ORD C187	Market Square Salisb	21,665	42475	43,506
ORD C188	Millstream Salisbury	7,579	10590	15,811
ORD C189	New Canal Salisbury	1,042	838	1,003
ORD C190	Salt Lane Salisbury	79,601	58530	52,900
	<b>Total</b>	<b>£734,585</b>	<b>£646,221</b>	<b>£642,014</b>

#### On Street Parking

On Street	Locations	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
ORD C192	Blue Boar Row Salisb	3,537	3,202	3,870
ORD C193	Brown Street Salisbu	5,894	5,474	7,830
ORD C194	Castle Street Salisb	5,865	3,363	6,670
ORD C195	Catherine Street Sal	5,170	4,795	5,216
ORD C196	Chipper Lane Salisbu	5,550	4,733	4,993
ORD C197	Crane Street Salisbu	1,556	1,348	1,554
ORD C198	Endless Street Salis	5,313	4,571	5,882
ORD C199	Fisherton Street Sal	4,224	3,768	4,204
ORD C200	Ivy Street Salisbury	2,083	2,131	2,794
ORD C201	Milford Street Salis	8,576	9,559	12,815
ORD C202	Salt Lane Salisbury	85	920	2,180
ORD C203	Scotts Lane Salisbur	3,161	2,604	4,099
ORD C204	Winchester Street Sa	1,954	2,038	1,995
	<b>Total</b>	<b>£52,968</b>	<b>£48,506</b>	<b>£64,101</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

## AUDIT

---

### **DRAFT MINUTES OF THE AUDIT MEETING HELD ON 13 MAY 2011 AT COUNCIL CHAMBER - BROWFORT, DEVIZES.**

#### **Present:**

Cllr Richard Britton, Cllr Nigel Carter, Cllr Chris Caswill, Cllr Peter Doyle, Cllr George Jeans, Cllr David Jenkins, Cllr Julian Johnson, Cllr Alan Macrae, Cllr Helen Osborn, Cllr Sheila Parker (Vice Chairman), Cllr Bridget Wayman and Cllr Roy While (Chairman)

#### **Also Present:**

Cllr Fleur de Rhe-Philipe, Cllr Jane Scott OBE

---

#### 16. **Apologies**

There were none.

#### 17. **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman informed the Committee of two points to note;

- There would be a presentation from Gerry Cox, Head of Internal Audit Partnership, South West Audit Partnership (SWAP).
- The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) has issued a consultation document on the Future of Local Public Audit. The document will be circulated out of Committee and members comments will noted.

#### 18. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes were approved subject to;

- Cllr Doyle being listed within apologies
- A minute on Benefits realisation.

## **Resolved**

**To approve as a correct record and sign the minutes of the meeting held 23 March 2011.**

19. **Members' Interests**

There were none.

20. **Public Participation and Committee Members' Questions**

There was no public participation.

21. **SAP Development PID**

Mark Stone, Interim Programme Director – ICT, IM and The Campus and Operational Delivery Programme updated the Committee on the SAP Project Initiation Document.

He thanked KPMG for their comprehensive SAP Post Implementation Report from November 2010. SAP is now a subset of the ICT project.

Outstanding actions that remain unresolved are detailed within Appendix A included in the agenda at pages 27 – 32. This is aligned to phase one of the Information Services Technology Plan.

Short to mid – term business development requirements were identified in Appendix B included in the agenda at pages 33 – 38. These are aligned to phase 2 of the Information Services Technology Plan.

The Committee acknowledged that this was a useful document and recognised the difficulties of merging 5 Authorities into 1 Unitary Council. It was agreed that this report detailed a way forward, but it was felt that the document did not resemble a plan as there were no start or finish dates and therefore monitoring progress would be difficult.

This point was noted, start dates and risk assessments would be added, in addition the Information Services Technology Plan would be made available to Members via SharePoint.

Concern was raised over the number of outstanding projects and work to be done. In particular the number of workarounds that were in place.

The Interim Project Director explained that the number of projects was not considered to be large in terms of a £1Bn organisation. Workarounds were being systematically removed when issues had been resolved. Issues were

being addressed holistically rather than using a 'sticking plaster' approach, ensuring that the 'end to end' process was right.

Confirmation was requested that all members of staff had been trained in SAP.

In response to this it was confirmed that all members of staff were trained prior to SAP 'going live', however training will be an ongoing, due to staff movement and development.

A number of the Committee raised concern over the bullet points, within the conclusion of the report in particular:

- Business processes are not well aligned with SAP leading to duplication of effort.

Corporate Director, Resources, Dr Carlton Brand, explained that the business of Wiltshire Council is continually changing, and currently is going through major restructuring. Business processes would constantly be reviewed and developed.

Members of the Committee queried the future SAP developments road map (Appendix C) expressing concern that there was no allocated budget for these projects.

The Interim Project Director explained that the future road map for SAP contained 25 projects some of which have been investigated and costed, and that business cases were in development for financial approval. He went on to explain that as a department resources were finite and budgets were managed to deliver the best options. However with more resource the projects could be delivered more quickly.

The Committee acknowledged that as a Council there was a 4 year Business Plan and that the main priority was to deliver the objectives within this plan.

## **Resolved**

### **To note the report and the work that is taking place.**

#### **22. Audit Plan 2011/12**

Steve Memmott, Head of Internal Audit presented the Internal Audit Plan 2011-12 and sought the Committees views.

Wiltshire Councils Business Plan recognised the need for cost reductions and for service delivery changes to meet the corporate goals with reduced resources. Specific areas for review within the audit plan include those that are featured within the Business Plan:

- Cost Reduction Areas

- Benefits and Outcomes
- Raising Income

Appendix 1 sets out the detailed audit plan of productive work for 2011-12 included in the agenda at pages 63-68.

The Committee thanked the Head of Internal Audit for the Plan and welcomed a number of the audits specified within the plan.

Members of the Committee asked whether it would be possible to see a longer term plan to fit in with the cycle of the Business Plan. The Head of Internal Audit explained that risk changes continually and the plan addressed those risks and the controls that mitigate them. There has been a dedicated move away from cyclical audit planning.

Another issue where Committee members expressed concern was the area of seeking efficiencies. It was felt that undoubtedly contractors would try and protect themselves and that savings made in one area would manifest themselves elsewhere. The risk of cost efficiencies should be realised. The Corporate Director, Resources, Dr Carlton Brand acknowledged that cost shunting was an issue and we should be mindful of this. The Head of Internal Audit, Steve Memmot, explained that capacity is built into the plan to take on audits when necessary and that audit days stated within the report are provisional.

Committee members asked whether Internal Audit would investigate Section 106 monies. The Head of Internal Audit noted this request. Corporate Director, Resources, emphasised that rumours currently circulating around Section 106 monies were 99% untrue. The new system was in place and currently data was being loaded onto the database. The system would be operational in 4 – 6 weeks. He explained that the database would be searchable by Area Board and by Ward.

The Leader asked why there was an Internal Governance Audit in each department except for the Department of Neighbourhood and Planning. The Head of Internal Audit explained that the Internal Governance Audit had already taken place. He went on to explain that Internal Audit were specifically looking at how each department were rolling out and administering corporate policies in accordance with the Corporate Plan.

The Leader extended her personal thanks and thanks on behalf of the Committee for being the leader of such an excellent department for so long. All members of the Committee agreed.

23. **Forward Work Programme**

**Resolved**

**The Plan was noted.**

24. **Date of next meeting**

The next Audit Committee meeting will take place on 29 June 2011, in the Council Chamber, Monkton Park.

25. **Urgent Items**

There were none.

26. **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

Following a lengthy discussion, where the Solicitor to the Council Ian Gibbons explained the rationale behind the recommendation, he reminded the Committee of the fine balancing act between withholding and disclosing information and whether the public interest is outweighed.

Paragraph 2 - Information likely to reveal the identity of an individual. It protects an individual's privacy. It allows use of data about them without revealing publicly who they are.

Paragraph 3 - Information about financial or business affairs. This could be information about individuals, companies or the Authority itself. The exemption is there to help the Authority carry on business relationships effectively. The rule may cover such issues as procurement or tenders.

Paragraph 4 - Information relating to any consultations or negotiations within the Authority. i.e. whenever there are, or plan to be, negotiations or discussions with employers over terms of employment. This exemption allows the Authority to carry on negotiations without their position being prejudiced.

Following a recommendation to accept the resolution it was put to the vote and won. Councillors Caswill, Osborn and Jenkins asked for their votes against to be recorded.

**Resolved**

**To agree that in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 to exclude the public from the meeting for the business specified in Item Number 12 because it is likely that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 2, 3 and 4 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information to the public.**

## 27. **Future Provision of Internal Audit Services**

Michael Hudson, Interim Chief Financial Officer, explained to the Committee the options available for the delivery of the Council's Internal Audit service and the internal and external drivers that have led to this review.

In summary these options were;

1. Retain in – house and restructure.
2. Enter into a partnership model of delivery with another local authority.
3. Outsource the service to an external private provider.

The Interim Chief Finance Officer went on to explain that against the assessment criteria and weightings the Internal Audit service had been assessed as being a good service. He stated that they were an excellent team.

After consideration of the detailed assessments, Option 2 (SWAP Partnership) was the recommended option.

Members of the Committee welcomed the recommended option noting the potential for economies of scale, further career prospects for staff and the sharing of specialist knowledge and best practice. However some of the Committee urged caution, stressing the need for stability within Internal Audit during this period of significant change that Wiltshire Council was currently experiencing. The team had an excellent working relationship with the areas they were auditing and that a change would be unhelpful at this stage. The Interim Chief Finance Officer reaffirmed the continuity of staff, and the need to invest through opportunities. The team needed to be flexible and have sufficient skills and capacity to ensure it can respond to the changing needs of its client. The Service needed to plan for the continual investment in the staff to ensure the high levels of skills are retained, coupled with the growing focus on joint local authority working, standardisation of processes that is driving the sharing of best practice. SWAP have the specific resource and technological systems.

The Leader re-iterated that the management restructure and the future provision of internal audit were two separate issues.

The Interim Chief Financial Officer explained that should the Committee recommend the proposal to Cabinet a paper would be brought back to this Committee detailing the negotiations that had taken place.

### **Resolved**

- i) **Approve Officers to enter into formal negotiations with the South West Audit Partnership (SWAP) under a section 101 of the Local**



**Government Act 1972 as amended by the 2000 Act, agreement, to assess further the feasibility of Wiltshire Council entering into a joint local authority Internal Audit partnership.**

- ii) Bring back to Audit Committee any formal proposal to enter a TUPE transfer arising from these negotiations, for consideration.**
- iii) Agree that in case negotiations with SWAP result in this option being withdrawn, in parallel with SWAP negotiations the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Finance, and the Chairs of Audit Committee and Resources Overview & Scrutiny Commission, should pursue alternative arrangements to ensure the Internal Audit Service has effective leadership following option IA as proposed in this report as set out at paragraph 21.**

(Duration of meeting: 10.30 am - 1.25 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Anna Thurman, of Democratic Services, direct line (01225) 718379, e-mail [anna.thurman@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:anna.thurman@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

This page is intentionally left blank

## AUDIT

---

### **DRAFT MINUTES OF THE AUDIT MEETING HELD ON 29 JUNE 2011 AT COUNCIL CHAMBER - MONKTON PARK OFFICES, CHIPPENHAM.**

#### **Present:**

Cllr Chris Caswill, Cllr George Jeans, Cllr David Jenkins, Cllr Julian Johnson, Cllr Jacqui Lay, Cllr Alan Macrae, Cllr Sheila Parker (Vice Chairman), Cllr Bridget Wayman and Cllr Roy While (Chairman), Cllr Jeff Osborn

#### **Also Present:**

Cllr John Brady, Cllr Fleur de Rhe-Philippe

---

#### 28. **Apologies**

Apologies were received from Cllrs Jane Scott OBE, Peter Doyle, Richard Britton and Nigel Carter.

#### 29. **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman had two announcements.

- He welcomed Cllr Jacqui Lay as a new member of the Committee and Cllr John Brady as a non-voting committee member.
- The Chairman informed the Committee that the next meeting would start earlier, due to the nature of business on the agenda.

#### 30. **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The Chairman of the Audit Committee welcomed Cllr Jeff Osborn, Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee to update members on a meeting between Scrutiny and Audit representatives, where the roles and responsibilities regarding SAP were discussed.

The outcome of this meeting was that Scrutiny, through the ICT Task Group would assume the lead role in reviewing the development of SAP as part of its responsibility for monitoring the implementation of the ICT plan. It was recognised that SAP was not simply an ICT application and therefore other

Business Plan priorities about transformation and shaping the future were interlinked. It was also noted that there was common membership across Audit and Scrutiny function which would help facilitate wider discussions.

The Chairman of the Audit Committee explained that financial implications related to SAP would be brought to the Audit Committee.

In response (para 27, page 6 of the agenda refers) Michael Hudson, Interim Chief Finance Officer explained that Option 2 was now in formal process, he was able to add that there was a timetable and that targets were being made.

The minutes of the previous minutes were deferred for signing until the next meeting.

31. **Members' Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

32. **Public Participation and Committee Members' Questions**

There was no public participation.

33. **Interim Audit Report 2010-11**

The Interim Chief Finance Officer, Michael Hudson gave an overview of the interim audit findings, he explained that KPMG have carried out interim audit testing of processes and controls to inform the 2010/11 audit opinions in relation to the Council's statement of accounts and value for money conclusions. As part of that audit KPMG have sought to place reliance on internal audit's findings.

Rachael Tonkin, Manager, KPMG updated the Committee on the key findings of the report. The review of the Council's general control environment was completed in March 2011. The review of IT control environment is on-going and due to finish shortly.

- **Organisation Control Environment** – effective overall, no specific areas for further improvement.
- **IT Control Environment** – review is still on-going, work suggests that KPMG will be unable to rely fully on the Council's IT controls. Issues identified in last years report have been addressed and this has been noted but these improvements have not yet fully addressed all underlying issues. Detailed feedback will be given through *the Report to those charged with governance 2010/11* in September.
- **Controls over Key Financial Systems** – overall the majority of key financial systems are sound, some weaknesses were noted and recommendations provided. Some additional substantive work will occur at year end in some areas.

- **Review of Internal Audit** – Full reliance was given on internal audit's work on key financial systems, however this was not the case for internal audit's IT work where additional significant testing is taking place.
- **Accounts Production Process** – The Council's overall process for the preparation of the financial statements is sound. The Council has implemented all of the recommendations in ISA 260 Report 2009/10 relating to the financial statements.
- **IFRS Re-statement** – the transition to IFRS accounts has generally gone well.

Members of the Committee sought clarification on a number of points including;

Accounts production '**significant challenges**' - Rachael Tonkin explained that there was a lot more work to be undertaken when producing IFRS accounts. Michael Hudson made clear that this was the first time that the accounts had been produced in this way. The interpretation of CIPFA guidance would perhaps not be the same as that of KPMG and clarification would be sought.

'**Alter our audit strategy**' - Rachael Tonkin explained that significant additional testing would take place during the audit of the financial accounts. This would have implications on the amount of work KPMG would need to undertake and have an effect on the fee. Options have been discussed with Finance staff and KPMG would work closely with them to minimise costs.

**User Access, SAP** - Members questioned whether there were still issues. It was reported that the number of access users had significantly reduced but not enough for KPMG to issue a full assurance. Michael Hudson accepted that there was need for improvement. The advice given will be taken and the recommendations made will be a top priority for the finance team.

Assurance was sought that 'bolt ons' and 'add ons' to SAP would not be used. It was explained that the ERP system could integrate with a number of systems and that many systems had been inherited. Michael Hudson would seek confirmation and report back to the Committee.

Members sought reassurance from KPMG that the audit work was on schedule to inform the final report. Rachael Tonkin reported to the Committee that the audit work was broadly on track, being only slightly behind on the IT audit work but this should be back on track within the week. Planning discussions for 2011/12 were already taking place.

Michael Hudson re-iterated again that changes within the internal audit team had no reflection on the IT audit, the internal audit report had been written prior to the Head of Internal Audit leaving.

Cllr John Brady, Cabinet Member for Finance, Performance and Risk, stated that there were a number of very positive points and that this was an interim report. Darren Gilbert, Senior Manager, KPMG described that in the 2009/10

report there were 18 high risks, the interim report details a very different picture. The Chairman concluded that whilst there were still issues a considerable amount of progress had been made, he re-iterated that the interim report is work in progress. He thanked Rachael Tonkin and Darren Gilbert from KPMG for their report and input.

**Resolved:**

**That the report containing the interim audit findings was noted.**

34. **Annual Audit Fee 2011/12**

The proposed indicative external audit fee for 2011/12 is £370,260 excluding external grant audit fees that are proposed at £80,000. This represents a 15% or £65,340 reduction from the 2010/11 audit fees of £435,600.

**Resolved:**

**That the proposed fee is noted.**

35. **Internal Audit Report 2010/11**

Estelle Sherry, one of the three Principal Auditors presented the Internal Audit Annual Report 2010/11. She explained that the report had been drawn up differently than in previous years drawing attention in the report onto internal audit work and its outcomes. Internal audit opinion, work completed and key risks arising have been brought to the front of the report.

Key areas of note were;

- **The IA Opinion**

The Council has improved its overall control environment, the opinion given is substantial assurance in spite of;

- Realignment of services within directorates
- Budget cuts
- Management redundancies affecting service areas
- Implementation of new systems across many services

- **IA Work 2010/11 and Direction of Travel**

Internal audit finalised reports on a total of 44 planned audits and completed 30 follow up reviews. None of the planned audits received a no assurance statement.

- **Summary of Audits Completed** – key issues and high risks included

- Housing Rents – failure to conduct effective verification checks on standing data changes to rent liabilities prior to adjustment and implementation.

- Bridge Management – failure by the Bridge Team to undertake inspections of bridges formerly the responsibility of District Councils.
  - Passenger Transport Procurement – limited scope for further procurement savings due to pressures being experienced by suppliers.
  - 5 Rivers Leisure Centre – breach of CRB requirements through failure to hold evidence that staff are CRB checked.
- **Summary of Follow ups** – follow ups have found that management have taken effective action in response to reported risks in the vast majority of cases.
  - **Management Engagement with Internal Audit Process** – Internal audit has the responsibility to report on results of work and on management responses to risk reported. Effective and timely implementation of actions to mitigate or eliminate risks is management responsibility. Included within the internal audit report is a section (para 14, page 55 of the agenda refers) highlighting where management have not been acceptably responsive and have sought to avoid engagement.
  - **Key Risks Arising** – In year 48 high risks were reported in 23 of 44 audits completed. Examples where there were multiple high risks were:
    - The provision of care homes – inadequate legal involvement with OSJ contracts, methods for assessing usage was found to be confusing and variable, poor control over the control of the resident’s cash and records.
    - CRB records for schools and children’s centres – CRB check evidential failures, poor control over personnel records, inconsistent communications with schools and children’s centres.

In addition to the audit work undertaken internal audit staff have provided help and advice across the directorates. National Fraud Initiative (NFI) work has also been ongoing as has Financial Management Standard in Schools (FMSiS). The requirement to undertake FMSiS ceased in December 2010; final assessments were still completed as a service to schools. From Sept 2011 it is likely that Schools Financial Value Standard (SFVS) will start. Guidance from the Department of Education is awaited.

Despite a challenging year for the internal audit team, where there has been reduced capacity, and the proposal of an alternative vehicle for the delivery of the internal audit function, internal audit has delivered 91% planned audits with 96% of staff time being spent productively.

Members of the Committee congratulated the team for a good report under challenging circumstances.

Concern was raised regarding the high risk areas of CRB checks and care homes. Members agreed that 33 weeks was too long a timeframe for management response. The Chairman suggested that a letter be written to all managers stipulating their responsibilities in light of internal audit highlighting risk areas. A report would be brought to the next meeting to give the Committee guidance that these issues were resolved. It was noted that in respect of the CRB issue both OFSTED and CRB were issuing conflicting guidance to schools and youth centres.

Members of the Committee expressed concern over the issue of VAT receipts and allowances. Ian Gibbons, Monitoring Officer explained that this had been referred to Group Leaders and a further note had been issued to members confirming the position. He agreed to look into any particular concerns about VAT receipts.

Issues were raised over Land Charges and that discretion should be given. It was noted that there had been impact due to staff turnover. Should members know of delays then members of the public should be directed to Cllr Sturgis.

**Resolved:**

**That the internal audit report is noted and that internal audit reports should be sent to relevant Cabinet members where areas of concern have been highlighted.**

36. **Consultation on the Future of Local Public Audit (DCLG)**

Michael Hudson, Interim Chief Finance Officer, introduced a report which set out Wiltshire Council's proposed response to the consultation document issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), entitled the Future of Local Public Audit.

Committee members thanked him for the report. They agreed that a commissioning process was a healthy way forward. He explained that the appointment of auditors must come from the register of local public statutory auditors which would possibly consist of 4 – 5 external auditors. To ensure that the relationship between the Council and the auditor does not become too close a system of rotation is proposed. Members concurred that a system of rotation was appropriate and that it was in the public interest to see the process of rotation.

There was strong support for the inclusion of independent members, including that of the Chair and Vice Chair which would create more transparency.

On balance members felt that Option One of the consultation paper (para 23, page 97 of the agenda refers) was the appropriate way forward, with accounts produced resembling those in the private sector with increasing transparency and improving reporting to the Public .

The Interim Chief Finance Office thanked the Audit Committee for their comments and that these would be used to shape the final response to the proposals out for consultation.



**Resolved:**

**That the report be noted and a response is sent to the DCLG based on the draft responses and taking account of the comments from members.**

37. **Annual Governance Statement 2010-11 Draft**

The Monitoring Officer, Ian Gibbons, presented the Draft Annual Governance Statement (AGS) for 2010-11 for the Committee's preliminary comments.

It was noted that the Council was required to prepare and publish an AGS as part of its annual review of the effectiveness of its governance arrangements (para 4, page 115 of the agenda refers), meeting the six principles of good governance adopted in its Code of Corporate Governance.

The draft AGS would be revised in the light of any comments this Committee, or any other body consulted, wished to make and the ongoing review work by the Assurance Group.

The draft AGS would be presented to Cabinet, the Standards Committee and KPMG, External Auditors, with any comments being presented to this Committee at its meeting on 28 September 2011 when the AGS would be presented for final approval.

Members noted that significant progress had been in the Housing Landlord Service Improvement Plan and questioned whether this needed to remain a significant governance issue. The Committee asked the Assurance Group to keep this under review and to: refer in the AGS to the new requirement to send internal audit reports to Cabinet Members; review the governance arrangements for section 106 agreements; include outstanding harmonisation issues arising from LGR as part of the significance governance issue relating to the Transformation Programme.

**Resolved:**

**To ask the Assurance Group to review and amend the AGS in light of the above comments.**

**To note that the draft AGS will be revised further in the light of ongoing work by the Assurance Group and any comments of the Standards Committee and Cabinet, before being brought back to the Committee for final approval on 28 September 2011.**

38. **Forward Work Programme**

**Resolved:**

**The plan was noted.**

39. **Date of next meeting**

The next meeting will take place on the 28 September 2011, in the Council Chamber, Monkton Park starting at 10.30am with a working lunch. Members should note that this is likely to be a lengthy meeting continuing into the afternoon.

(Duration of meeting: 10.40 am – 1.05pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Anna Thurman, of Democratic Services, direct line (01225) 718379, e-mail [anna.thurman@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:anna.thurman@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

**Appendix 1 - Revised**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SCHEME OF DELEGATION**

The Director of Development (and any officers designated by that officer) is authorized to: -

- determine any planning application and discharge conditions under delegated powers (including tree/hedgerow work applications);
- deal with all enforcement matters (including deciding on the expediency of taking/not taking action and issuing enforcement notices, including listed building enforcement and urgent works notices and taking any further action, including prosecution and direct action in respect of any breach of control);
- deal with all types of appeal and their format;
- where an appeal has been lodged against a planning decision and Counsel advises that specific refusal reasons are unreasonable and/or likely to undermine or weaken the council's case and time constraints prevent the matter being brought back to committee, officers, in consultation with the committee Chairman and local Division Member are authorised to inform the appellant and the Planning Inspectorate that the council will not seek to defend such reason(s) at appeal;
- make and confirm Tree Preservation Orders; Tree Replacement Notices and serve notices requiring action in relation to dangerous trees, and to initiate any associated direct action required to deal with dangerous trees; deciding whether to prosecute for breaches of the Planning Acts in relation to tree and hedgerow matters;
- determining any applications made under the High Hedges provisions of the anti-social behaviour legislation; including any necessary enforcement action;
- deal with decisions, correspondence and consultations under relevant local government, social, planning, listed building, conservation, building and environmental and other legislation. This includes proposals to change legislation or national guidance and consultation by other planning authorities;
- determine the requirements for, and amend when necessary the local validation list for planning applications;
- make and confirm Article 4 directions restricting or removing permitted development rights;

- nominate officers to represent the council on forums and working parties;
- authorise officers to enter land and buildings in the course of their duties;
- enter into, modify or discharge planning or legal agreements securing controls over development (e.g. Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act);
- make changes to conditions approved at committee (in the light of changing circumstances between the meeting and the issue of the decision) provided this is in line with the principles of the committee's decision. Any such changes will be reported back to a subsequent committee for member's information;
- set fees for planning advice and applications where legislation allows such fees to be set 'locally';
- set charges for copying, planning history searches, high hedge applications and discretionary fees for Local Land Charges;
- refuse applications following a resolution to grant permission or consent if the required legal agreements are not completed by the applicant within the timeframe set out in the officer's report;
- institute and defend judicial reviews and statutory challenges in consultation with the head of legal services.
- Make and serve Building Preservation Notices.

This is provided that none of the following conditions apply: -

**Additional amendment in bold (July 2011)**

***Applications submitted by Wiltshire Council will not be dealt with under delegated powers where an objection has been received raising material planning considerations.***

Reference to Committee by Wiltshire Council Division Member

Division Members can requests in writing/email that a planning application within **their** Division proceed to determination by way of an area committee. (Any request must be received within 21 days of the circulation of the weekly list of 'applications received' in which it appears, and set out the material planning consideration(s) which warrant the application going before committee). Officers will confirm what action is being taken following receipt of the request.

Where it has not been possible or appropriate to call an application in within this time, officers will accept call in requests in the following circumstances: -

1. An application has not been determined and it can still go to committee and be determined within the target date.

2. The application is already going to go out of time (because of negotiations/amended plans etc.) and taking it to committee will make no difference to performance.

Where neither of the above apply, and the Division Member thinks there is a strong case to delay the determination of the application and take it to committee, they can discuss the case with the relevant Area Development Manager who will then make an informed decision whether or not to exercise delegated powers.

- a. It is perfectly acceptable for councillors to nominate a substitute(s) to undertake their planning responsibilities, including application 'call in', if they have a conflict of interest or during periods of absence such as holidays or illness.
- b. Applications for tree work, prior approvals, Certificates of Lawfulness; notifications and variations/discharge of legal agreements - where the latter would bring them in line with a planning decision already made by the council, will not be eligible for call-in and will be dealt with under delegated powers.

**Additional amendment in bold (July 2011)**

- c. If private applications are made by an elected member or a senior officer of the council or their close relations, ***or by a planning officer and objections are received raising material planning considerations the application will be determined by committee.***

The following applications shall be dealt with by the Strategic Planning Committee:

- Large-scale major developments which, by their nature (e.g. scale, location etc.) have wider strategic implications and raise issues of more than local importance. This will include applications of a similar nature by Wiltshire Council to develop any land of Wiltshire Council, or for development of any land by Wiltshire Council or by Wiltshire Council jointly with any other person which have similar implications or raise similar issues.
- Planning applications for mineral extraction or waste disposal, other than small scale works which are ancillary to an existing mineral working or waste disposal facility;
- Applications, which if approved, would represent a significant departure from the policies of the statutory development plan, where they are recommended for approval;
- Applications called in by a Division Member that cross the boundary of two area committees;

- Any application that the Director of Development deems raises issues that should be considered by the Strategic Planning Committee.

There will be occasions where it would be possible to deal with certain applications under delegated powers but where the Director of Development considers it inappropriate to do so, having considered any public representation and consultee responses. In these cases the applications will be determined by an appropriate planning committee.

## **Definitions**

Planning application means any application submitted to the council for determination and included within the Governments' PS1 and PS2 returns. (This is a statistical questionnaire dealing with performance which local authorities have to submit regularly to the government and which divides planning application into distinct categories; householder, minor, major etc.)

'Large scale major development' means any application for 200 or more houses; residential development of 4ha or more or other development of more than 10,000 square metres or more than 2 ha, as defined by the Government in the PS1/2 return.

Householder development and the other descriptions of development referred to above shall have the meaning ascribed to them in the Government's PS1/2 return.

Enforcement notices includes all other formal notices under the Planning Acts used to investigate and remedy alleged breaches of planning control or improve the appearance of an area, including Breach of condition notices and Section 215 notices.

A private application is one which has no connection with a member or officer's council duties. For example, if an officer submitted a Regulation 3 application on behalf of Wiltshire Council it would not be a private application.

### **Additional amendment in bold (July 2011)**

~~A 'senior officer' within the Development Service will mean a Team Leader, Area Development Manager or the Service Director. In respect of other council services,~~ A 'senior officer' will mean any Service Director, Corporate Director or the Chief Executive.

A close relation is defined as spouse, partner, sibling, parent or offspring.