

COUNCIL

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 22 FEBRUARY 2011 IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNTY HALL, TROWBRIDGE

Present:

Cllr Desna Allen, Cllr Richard Beattie, Cllr Chuck Berry, Cllr John Brady, Cllr Richard Britton, Cllr Rosemary Brown, Cllr Liz Bryant, Cllr Allison Bucknell, Cllr Jane Burton, Cllr Trevor Carbin, Cllr Nigel Carter, Cllr Chris Caswill, Cllr Ernie Clark, Cllr Richard Clewer, Cllr Christopher Cochrane, Cllr Peter Colmer, Cllr Linda Conley, Cllr Mark Connolly, Cllr Christine Crisp (Vice-Chair), Cllr Michael Cuthbert-Murray, Cllr Brian Dalton, Cllr Paul Darby, Cllr Andrew Davis, Cllr Peter Davis, Cllr Tony Deane, Cllr Bill Douglas, Cllr Peggy Dow, Cllr Peter Doyle, Cllr Rod Eaton, Cllr Nick Fogg, Cllr Peter Fuller, Cllr Richard Gamble, Cllr Jose Green, Cllr Mark Griffiths, Cllr Mollie Groom, Cllr Lionel Grundy OBE, Cllr Brigadier Robert Hall (Chairman), Cllr Mike Hewitt, Cllr Malcolm Hewson, Cllr Alan Hill, Cllr Charles Howard, Cllr Jon Hubbard, Cllr Chris Humphries, Cllr George Jeans, Cllr David Jenkins, Cllr Julian Johnson, Cllr Simon Killane, Cllr John Knight, Cllr Jerry Kunkler, Cllr Jacqui Lay, Cllr Alan Macrae, Cllr Howard Marshall, Cllr Laura Mayes, Cllr Ian McLennan, Cllr Jemima Milton, Cllr Francis Morland, Cllr Bill Moss, Cllr Christopher Newbury, Cllr John Noeken, Cllr Stephen Oldrieve, Cllr Helen Osborn, Cllr Jeff Osborn, Cllr Mark Packard, Cllr Sheila Parker, Cllr Graham Payne, Cllr Stephen Petty, Cllr Leo Randall, Cllr Fleur de Rhe-Philipe, Cllr Pip Ridout, Cllr Bill Roberts, Cllr Ricky Rogers, Cllr Judy Rooke, Cllr Paul Sample, Cllr Jane Scott OBE, Cllr Jonathon Seed, Cllr John Smale, Cllr Carole Soden, Cllr Toby Sturgis, Cllr Julie Swabey, Cllr John Thomson, Cllr Dick Tonge, Cllr Anthony Trotman, Cllr Bridget Wayman, Cllr Ian West, Cllr Fred Westmoreland, Cllr Stuart Wheeler, Cllr Roy While, Cllr Christopher Williams and Cllr Graham Wright

78. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Jeff Ody, Cllr Russell Hawker, Cllr Howard Greenman, Cllr Mary Douglas, Cllr Tom James, Cllr Peter Hutton, Cllr Keith Humphries and Cllr Nina Phillips.

79. Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the Meeting held on 9 November 2010 were presented.

Resolved:

That the minutes of the last Council meeting held on 9 November 2010 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

80. **Declarations of Interest**

The Chairman reminded Councillors of the Monitoring Officer's advice previously circulated to them on declaring interests as necessary in respect of:

- proposals to set the budget and Council tax levels and agreeing garage rents as part of the item on the Wiltshire Council's Business Plan and 2011/12 Budget (minute no. 85 refers) and
- any landholdings affected by proposals contained in the item on the South Wiltshire Core Strategy – Review of Housing and Employment Requirements (minute no. 86 refers).

Declarations of interests made during the meeting are referred to at minute nos. 85, 87 and 89)

81. **Announcements by the Chairman**

a) Meeting Information

Particularly for the benefit of the members of the public present, the Chairman confirmed advice previously circulated to Councillors over arrangements for this meeting. Given that the item on the Budget (minute no.85 refers) was likely to take a long time, Council would not commence with its consideration of the item on the South Wiltshire Core Strategy (minute no.86 refers) until approximately 4pm. This would then be followed by the item on the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan (minute no. 87 refers). He invited the members of the public present for these items to stay to hear the Budget debate or alternatively to return at 4pm. It was noted that those who had previously contacted the Council on these two items had been advised of this arrangement.

b) New Year's honours

On behalf of Council, the Chairman congratulated the Wiltshire residents who received national recognition in the New Year's Honours list details of which he read out.

Of particular note, it was reported that the High Sheriff for Wiltshire for the period 2003-04 David Newbigging from Fyfield had received a Knighthood for services to cancer research.

c) Total Respect Training

The Chairman reminded Councillors of their role as "corporate parents" of Wiltshire's Looked After Children and young people. He explained that the total respect training programme would be held on Wednesday 16 March at County Hall. The programme sought to develop knowledge and understanding of young people's views, rights and issues, and was aimed at improving individual practice and producing strategic recommendations to improve the quality of care for looked after children and young people. All Councillors were urged to attend.

82. Petitions

a) Petitions Received

The Chairman reported receipt of three petitions for presentation to this meeting on parking charges in respect of Devizes, Marlborough and Bradford on Avon. Given their relevance to the item on the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan to be considered later in the meeting, which incorporated the Car Parking Strategy, the Chairman advised that the petitions would be considered at that item (please refer to minute no. 87 for details of the petitions received.)

b) Petitions Update

A report by the Head of Democratic Services was presented which gave details of 11 petitions received for the period since the last Council meeting.

In response to a query, the Chairman reassured Council that as well as the statutory petition scheme, the Council also continued to operate a more accommodating discretionary petition scheme as evidenced by the petitions presented at this meeting as referred to in (a) above.

Resolved:

That Council note the report, the petitions received and the actions being taken, as set out in the Appendix to the report presented.

83. Public Participation

Question

The Chairman reported receipt of two questions from Mr Phil Matthews of the Wiltshire Involvement Network which questioned the decision to suspend the Network and its funding. He also sought an assurance that funding would be available to continue its work up until Healthwatch was set up. Details of the questions and responses from the Leader were presented and are reproduced at Appendix A to these minutes.

Statements

The Chairman reported receipt of written statements on the following areas as circulated:

- From Godshill Parish Council in respect of the item on the South Wiltshire Core Strategy (minute no.86 refers)
- From Mrs Margaret Taylor on behalf of Devizes Town Council in respect of car parking in Devizes as referred to in the Car Parking Strategy of the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan (minute no. 87 refers).

Please refer to individual minutes for details of verbal representations made at this meeting (minute nos. 85, 86 and 87 refer).

84. **By Election - Bromham, Rowde and Potterne**

Council noted the report of the Deputy Returning Officer on the results of the Bromham, Rowde and Potterne By-election held on 21 December 2010. The Chairman congratulated the successful candidate Cllr Liz Bryant and on behalf of all Councillors, welcomed her to this her first meeting of Council.

85. **Wiltshire Council's Business Plan and 2011/12 Budget**

Declarations of interest

Cllr Dalton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item in so far as it related to the setting of garage rents as referred to in the proposals concerning the Housing Revenue Account by virtue of the fact that he held a garage tenancy. Cllr Dalton left the meeting during consideration of that element of the budget.

The following Councillors declared personal interests by virtue of their membership of the undermentioned Housing Associations:

- Selwood Housing Association - Cllrs Rod Eaton, Graham Payne, Jon Hubbard and Ernie Clark.
- Sarsen Housing Association - Cllr Nigel Carter
- Westleigh Housing Association - Cllr Allison Bucknell
- Jephson Housing Association – Cllr Peter Fuller

Cllr Tony Trotman declared a personal interest in the leisure review proposals by virtue of his professional capacity.

Cllr Richard Beattie declared a personal interest by virtue of his membership of the Visit Wiltshire Partnership.

Cllrs Steve Oldrieve and Howard Marshall declared an interest by virtue of their respective wives being employed by the Council.

Cllr Julie Swabey, declared a personal interest by virtue of being related to an officer of the Council.

Public Participation

Mr Kevin Wells on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Calne Leisure Centre sought reassurance over continued funding of the Leisure Centre by the Council to ensure its continued success. Cllr Stuart Wheeler, Cabinet member for Leisure, Sport and Culture confirmed that subject to the budget being approved at this meeting as presented, funding for Calne Leisure Centre would be continued.

The Chairman invited Council to consider the Business Plan and Financial Plan for 2011-15 and to agree the Council's Budget and the Council Tax levels for 2011-12. He reminded Council that it had a legal obligation to set a budget.

The Chairman explained how he intended to manage the debate on the budget item as summarised by the previously circulated paper on the Budget Process.

The Chairman drew Councillors' attention to the various budget papers which had been previously circulated, including the Council's Business Plan and Financial Plan as revised. He also referred to the following budget reports as previously considered and recommended by Cabinet as circulated on the:

- Capital programme 2011-12 to 2014-2015
- Housing Revenue Account Budget and Rent Setting 2011-12
- Schools Budget Proposals 2011-12
- Fees and Charges 2011-2012
- Council Tax Resolution 2011-2012

All as recommended by Cabinet at its meeting on 15 February 2011.

- Treasury Management Strategy 2011-12

As recommended by Cabinet at its meeting on 25 January 2011.

The Chairman also drew attention to the report of the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee held on 10 February 2011.

The Chairman explained the order in which he would invite Councillors to speak on the budget and the time allowed for group leaders and other members of the Council.

The Chairman invited Cllr Scott, Leader of the Council to present her budget speech which was circulated at the meeting and attached as Appendix B to these minutes.

The Leader explained that in her opinion, the proposed budget for the year ahead was sound, and one which would maintain front line services in better shape than other similar sized councils as well as provide significant investment in the future of Wiltshire.

The Leader further emphasised that far reaching changes to the concept of Local Government and its responsibilities were underway, at a time when unprecedented savings were required by the Government's 4 year plan for Local Government.

The intentions of the Council were to continue:

- to provide high quality, low cost, customer focused services
- to ensure local, open and honest decision-making and
- to work with our partners to support Wiltshire's communities.

The Leader moved the recommendations of Cabinet on adoption of the Business Plan, Financial Plan and budget proposals and this was duly seconded by Cllr Thomson, the Deputy Leader.

At the Chairman's invitation, Cllr Jeff Osborn presented the report of the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee held on 10 February 2011. He considered this was a unique budget and noted there was no proposal to increase Council tax due to Government funding to ensure zero tax increases. He welcomed the proposed capital investments in leisure and the campus projects.

Group leaders were then invited to respond to the Leader's motion or move an amendment to the Leader's motion.

Cllr Jon Hubbard, leader of the Liberal Democrat Group responded to the Leader's motion and questioned the merit of having a Business Plan and Financial Plan which covered a 4 year period set against a budget for one year. He considered there were so many legislative and other changes affecting Local Government not least of all, the Localism Bill that would need to be addressed which would make it difficult to predict how the Authority would work for the majority of the 4 year period.

Cllr Hubbard gave notice that he intended to propose a series of 9 amendments to the budget, details of which were circulated together with the comments of the Interim Chief Finance Officer in his capacity as the S.151 Officer. The Chief Finance Officer stated that the amendments had been reviewed by him in consultation with other statutory officers. His comments included the risk element of the proposed amendments but also pointed out that overall the proposed amendments when taken together as one amendment, still maintained the robustness of the budget.

The Leader acknowledged the right of a political group to propose amendments to the budget. However, she considered that in the interests of transparency, details of proposed amendments should have been made available earlier for consultation and open to scrutiny as had the Cabinet's proposals. In the circumstances, she moved that the meeting be adjourned to allow each political group time to consider and form a view on the proposed amendments. On being seconded and put to the vote, it was

Resolved:

That the meeting be adjourned for a period of at least two hours after which a view to be taken by the Chairman, following consultation with a representative of each political group on whether a further period of adjournment was required.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Note: The meeting adjourned at 11.50am.

MEETING RECONVENED

Note: The meeting reconvened at 2.00pm.

AMENDMENTS

Cllr Jon Hubbard proposed 9 amendments which were taken individually as detailed below and seconded by Cllr Peter Colmer:

Amendment 1

The introduction of a charging scheme for car parking permits for council premises.

£0.175m to be raised annually through the introduction of a progressive charging scheme for council employees to park at council premises. This scheme, similar to the one successfully introduced at the RUH in Bath, would see employees paying a small charge, the amount of which is directly linked to their salary, for the privilege of parking their cars at council premises.

Many people see it as hypocritical of this council to be providing over 1400 free parking spaces to staff, highly paid senior officers and councillors whilst at the same time massively increasing the cost to the residents of Wiltshire to park in their towns and villages.

In year one of this scheme £0.100m of the revenue gained would be invested in promoting and providing alternative staff transport schemes, such as encouraging car sharing, investment in providing adequate

facilities for cycle storage and the availability of subsidised cycle safety equipment.

This amendment would provide a net increase in revenue to the council of £0.075m'.

Cllr John Noeken as Cabinet member for Resources responded to the amendment and in so doing referred to proposals for an alternative staff transport scheme and that all of the four hubs provided facilities to encourage cycling. He also explained that the amendment proposed would require a change to the contracts of employment for staff and that priority was being given to dealing with pay harmonisation. Cllr Noeken added that whilst the amendment was a commendable thought, it was not possible to take it forward at this point in time.

The Chairman gave other Group Leaders the opportunity of responding to amendment No. 1 before opening the debate to other members of the Council.

On being put to the vote, Amendment No. 1 was LOST and a recorded vote having been requested by the requisite number of Councillors, the voting was recorded as follows:

For Amendment No. 1 (22)

Cllrs Desna Allen, Rosemary Brown, Trevor Carbin, Chris Caswill, Peter Colmer, Paul Darby, Bill Douglas, Peggy Dow, Malcolm Hewson, Jon Hubbard, David Jenkins, Simon Killane, John Knight, Howard Marshall, Steve Oldrieve, Helen Osborn, Jeff Osborn, Mark Packard, Stephen Petty, Judy Rooke, Ian West and Graham Wright.

Against Amendment No. 1 (58)

Cllrs Richard Beattie, Chuck Berry, John Brady, Richard Britton, Liz Bryant, Allison Bucknell, Richard Clewer, Chris Cochrane, Linda Conley, Mark Connolly, Christine Crisp, Andrew Davis, Peter Davis, Fleur de Rhe Philipe, Tony Deane, Peter Doyle, Rod Eaton, Nick Fogg, Peter Fuller, Richard Gamble, Jose Green, Mark Griffiths, Mollie Groom, Lionel Grundy, Robert Hall, Mike Hewitt, Alan Hill, Charles Howard, Chris Humphries, Julian Johnson, Jerry Kunkler, Jacqui Lay, Alan Macrae, Laura Mayes, Ian McLennan, Jemima Milton, Bill Moss, John Noeken, Sheila Parker, Graham Payne, Leo Randall, Pip Ridout, Bill Roberts, Ricky Rogers, Jane Scott, Jonathon Seed, John Smale, Carole Soden, Toby Sturgis, Julie Swabey, John Thomson, Dick Tonge, Tony Trotman, Bridget Wayman, Fred Westmoreland, Stuart Wheeler, Roy While and Chris Williams.

Abstentions Amendment No. 1 (5)

Cllrs Jane Burton, Nigel Carter, Ernie Clark, Michael Cuthbert-Murray and Francis Morland.

Cllr Jon Hubbard proposed the following amendment No. 2 which was seconded by Cllr Peter Colmer:

Amendment 2
Fixing Wiltshire's Broken Road Network

'An additional £0.500m investment in Highways revenue for 2011/12 allowing for vital County-wide repairs to road infrastructure. Pothole, kerb and pavement repair removes potential deterrents to walking and cycling, and improves motor vehicle efficiency.

To be funded through drawing on the list of savings identified at the head of (the report presented by the Liberal Democrat group).

Cllr Dick Tonge, Cabinet member for Highways and Transport responded to the amendment and on seeking clarification on exactly where this would be funded from was advised it was proposed to fund this from savings from the Policy and Communications budget.

The Chairman gave other Group Leaders the opportunity of responding to the amendment before opening the debate to other members of the Council.

On being put to the vote, Amendment No. 2 was LOST and a recorded vote having been requested by the requisite number of Councillors, the voting was recorded as follows:

For Amendment No. 2 (28)

Cllrs Desna Allen, Rosemary Brown, Trevor Carbin, Chris Caswill, Ernie Clark, Peter Colmer, Michael Cuthbert-Murray, Paul Darby, Bill Douglas, Peggy Dow, Nick Fogg, Malcolm Hewson, Jon Hubbard, David Jenkins, Simon Killane, John Knight, Howard Marshall, Ian McLennan, Francis Morland, Steve Oldrieve, Helen Osborn, Jeff Osborn, Mark Packard, Stephen Petty, Ricky Rogers, Judy Rooke, Ian West and Graham Wright.

Against Amendment No. 2 (57)

Cllrs Richard Beattie, Chuck Berry, John Brady, Richard Britton, Liz Bryant, Allison Bucknell, Jane Burton, Nigel Carter, Richard Clewer, Chris Cochrane, Linda Conley, Mark Connolly, Christine Crisp, Andrew Davis, Peter Davis, Fleur de Rhe Philipe, Tony Deane, Peter Doyle, Rod Eaton, Peter Fuller, Richard Gamble, Jose Green, Mark Griffiths, Mollie Groom, Lionel Grundy, Robert Hall, Mike Hewitt, Alan Hill, Charles Howard, Chris Humphries, Julian Johnson, Jerry Kunkler, Jacqui Lay, Alan Macrae, Laura Mayes, Jemima Milton, Bill Moss, John Noeken, Sheila Parker, Graham Payne, Leo Randall, Pip Ridout, Bill

Roberts, Jane Scott, Jonathon Seed, John Smale, Carole Soden, Toby Sturgis, Julie Swabey, John Thomson, Dick Tonge, Tony Trotman, Bridget Wayman, Fred Westmoreland, Stuart Wheeler, Roy While and Chris Williams.

Cllr Jon Hubbard proposed the following amendment No. 3 which was seconded by Cllr Peter Colmer.

Amendment 3

Investing in Wiltshire Road Network Infrastructure

‘£0.500m investment in Highways capital; allowing £5.00m for major resurfacing and improvement works. Prevents vehicle damage and improves efficiency, reducing vehicular carbon emissions

To be funded through drawing on the list of savings identified at the head of’ (the report presented by the Liberal Democrat group identified at the meeting as being funded from the Policy and Communications budget).

The Leader of the Council questioned the targeting of the Policy and Communications budget as a means of funding the proposed amendments. She explained that the Policy and Communications budget was to provide for internal and external communications with its primary role to communicate with the public and allow for public engagement. She emphasised that it was not therefore a designated resource for the administration.

The Chairman gave other Group Leaders the opportunity of responding to the amendment before opening the debate to other members of the Council.

On being put to the vote, Amendment No. 3 was LOST and a recorded vote having been requested by the requisite number of Councillors, the voting was recorded as follows:

For Amendment No. 3 (25)

Cllrs Desna Allen, Rosemary Brown, Trevor Carbin, Chris Caswill, Ernie Clark, Peter Colmer, Paul Darby, Bill Douglas, Peggy Dow, Nick Fogg, Malcolm Hewson, Jon Hubbard, David Jenkins, Simon Killane, John Knight, Howard Marshall, Francis Morland, Steve Oldrieve, Helen Osborn, Jeff Osborn, Mark Packard, Stephen Petty, Judy Rooke, Ian West and Graham Wright.

Against Amendment No. 3 (60)

Cllrs Richard Beattie, Chuck Berry, John Brady, Richard Britton, Liz Bryant, Allison Bucknell, Jane Burton, Nigel Carter, Richard Clewer, Chris Cochrane, Linda Conley, Mark Connolly, Christine Crisp, Michael Cuthbert-Murray, Andrew Davis, Peter Davis, Fleur de Rhe Philipe, Tony Deane, Peter Doyle, Rod Eaton, Peter Fuller, Richard Gamble, Jose Green, Mark Griffiths, Mollie Groom, Lionel Grundy, Robert Hall, Mike Hewitt, Alan Hill, Charles Howard, Chris Humphries,

Julian Johnson, Jerry Kunkler, Jacqui Lay, Alan Macrae, Laura Mayes, Ian McLennan, Jemima Milton, Bill Moss, John Noeken, Sheila Parker, Graham Payne, Leo Randall, Pip Ridout, Bill Roberts, Ricky Rogers, Jane Scott, Jonathon Seed, John Smale, Carole Soden, Toby Sturgis, Julie Swabey, John Thomson, Dick Tonge, Tony Trotman, Bridget Wayman, Fred Westmoreland, Stuart Wheeler, Roy While and Chris Williams.

Cllr Jon Hubbard proposed the following amendment No. 4 which was seconded by Cllr Peter Colmer:

Amendment 4

Working towards a Healthier Wiltshire for All

'£0.561m annually to re-introduce Free Swimming for under-16s and over-65s; As part of the Olympic preparations, and to meet Wiltshire Area Board commitments in the 2014 Leading by Example initiative. This investment emphasises the importance of health in a good quality of life in Wiltshire.

To be funded through drawing on the list of savings identified at the head of' (the report presented by the Liberal Democrat group).

This was identified at the meeting as being funded from the ICT budget by withdrawing the use of smart phones across the Council with an exception for staff who were required to work late or mainly worked off site.

Cllr Stuart Wheeler, Cabinet member for Leisure, Sport and Culture explained that free swimming had been a Government funded scheme. Unfortunately, when considered against other Council priorities and the financial pressures on the Council, continuation of the scheme could not be funded by the Council following withdrawal of Government funding. Officers were however looking to develop healthier for all proposals which would include provision for access to leisure centres and swimming pools for the most vulnerable.

The Chairman gave other Group Leaders the opportunity of responding to the amendment before opening the debate to other members of the Council.

On being put to the vote, amendment No. 4 was LOST and a recorded vote having been requested by the requisite number of Councillors, the voting was recorded as follows:

For Amendment No. 4 (27)

Cllrs Desna Allen, Rosemary Brown, Trevor Carbin, Chris Caswill, Ernie Clark, Peter Colmer, Paul Darby, Bill Douglas, Peggy Dow, Malcolm Hewson, Jon Hubbard, David Jenkins, Simon Killane, John Knight, Howard Marshall, Ian McLennan, Francis Morland, Steve Oldrieve, Helen Osborn, Jeff Osborn, Mark

Packard, Stephen Petty, Ricky Rogers, Judy Rooke, Paul Sample, Ian West and Graham Wright.

Against Amendment No. 4 (59)

Cllrs Richard Beattie, Chuck Berry, John Brady, Richard Britton, Liz Bryant, Allison Bucknell, Jane Burton, Nigel Carter, Richard Clewer, Chris Cochrane, Linda Conley, Mark Connolly, Christine Crisp, Michael Cuthbert-Murray, Andrew Davis, Peter Davis, Fleur de Rhe Philipe, Tony Deane, Peter Doyle, Rod Eaton, Nick Fogg, Peter Fuller, Richard Gamble, Jose Green, Mark Griffiths, Mollie Groom, Lionel Grundy, Robert Hall, Mike Hewitt, Alan Hill, Charles Howard, Chris Humphries, Julian Johnson, Jerry Kunkler, Jacqui Lay, Alan Macrae, Laura Mayes, Jemima Milton, Bill Moss, John Noeken, Sheila Parker, Graham Payne, Leo Randall, Pip Ridout, Bill Roberts, Jane Scott, Jonathon Seed, John Smale, Carole Soden, Toby Sturgis, Julie Swabey, John Thomson, Dick Tonge, Tony Trotman, Bridget Wayman, Fred Westmoreland, Stuart Wheeler, Roy While and Chris Williams.

Abstention Amendment No. 4 (1)

Cllr George Jeans

Cllr Jon Hubbard proposed the following amendment No. 5 which was seconded by Cllr Peter Colmer.

Amendment 5
Supporting Economic Growth and Helping Prevent Youth
Unemployment in Wiltshire

'£0.250m investment in 2011/12 to support employers to increase the number of Apprentices in Wiltshire. This is an investment in future growth and young people in Wiltshire. Enabling small and medium business to train apprentices without taking on the burden of additional training fees.

To be funded through drawing on the list of savings identified at the head of' (the report presented by the Liberal Democrat group).

This was identified at the meeting as being funded from the Policy and Communications budget.

Cllr John Brady as Cabinet member for Economic Development, Planning and Housing commented that he had explained this at the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Select Committee. The intention was to use the proposed budget to fund various skills programmes with partner agencies. Funding would be made available by the Government for apprenticeships.

The Chairman gave other Group Leaders the opportunity of responding to the amendment before opening the debate to other members of the Council. Cllr

Jeff Osborn commented that 1 in 5 16-24 year olds were now out of work and should the amendment be lost, he hoped that work could be undertaken with Cllr Brady to provide assistance to this particular category.

On being put to the vote, amendment No. 5 was LOST and a recorded vote having been requested by the requisite number of Councillors, the voting was recorded as follows:

For Amendment No. 5 (26)

Cllrs Desna Allen, Rosemary Brown, Trevor Carbin, Chris Caswill, Ernie Clark, Peter Colmer, Paul Darby, Bill Douglas, Peggy Dow, Malcolm Hewson, Jon Hubbard, George Jeans, David Jenkins, Simon Killane, John Knight, Howard Marshall, Francis Morland, Steve Oldrieve, Helen Osborn, Jeff Osborn, Mark Packard, Stephen Petty, Judy Rooke, Paul Sample, Ian West and Graham Wright.

Against Amendment No. 5 (58)

Cllrs Richard Beattie, Chuck Berry, John Brady, Richard Britton, Liz Bryant, Allison Bucknell, Richard Clewer, Chris Cochrane, Linda Conley, Mark Connolly, Christine Crisp, Andrew Davis, Peter Davis, Fleur de Rhe Philipe, Tony Deane, Peter Doyle, Rod Eaton, Nick Fogg, Peter Fuller, Richard Gamble, Jose Green, Mark Griffiths, Mollie Groom, Lionel Grundy, Robert Hall, Mike Hewitt, Alan Hill, Charles Howard, Chris Humphries, Julian Johnson, Jerry Kunkler, Jacqui Lay, Alan Macrae, Laura Mayes, Ian McLennan, Jemima Milton, Bill Moss, John Noeken, Sheila Parker, Graham Payne, Leo Randall, Pip Ridout, Bill Roberts, Ricky Rogers, Jane Scott, Jonathon Seed, John Smale, Carole Soden, Toby Sturgis, Julie Swabey, John Thomson, Dick Tonge, Tony Trotman, Bridget Wayman, Fred Westmoreland, Stuart Wheeler, Roy While and Chris Williams.

Abstentions Amendment No. 5 (2)

Cllrs Jane Burton and Nigel Carter.

Cllr Jon Hubbard proposed the following amendment No. 6 which was seconded by Cllr Peter Colmer.

Amendment 6
Keeping Wiltshire Safe

‘£0.125 million investment in Special Constables for 2011/12; providing the investment necessary to support 100 new Special Constables, a value-for-money method of maintaining strong police presence in Wiltshire through offering 100% Council-tax relief inducement for Specials for one year.

To be funded through drawing on the list of savings identified at the head of' (the report presented by the Liberal Democrat group).

The Leader reported that adoption of this amendment would result in financial implications for the Police in funding the cost of additional uniforms and other incidental costs. She would not be supporting the amendment given that there had been no prior consultation with the Police on such a proposal. Cllr Carole Soden, Vice-Chairman of the Police Authority agreed that this was not something the Council should impose on the Police.

The Chairman gave other Group Leaders the opportunity of responding to the amendment before opening the debate to other members of the Council.

On being put to the vote, amendment No. 6 was LOST and a recorded vote having been requested by the requisite number of Councillors, the voting was recorded as follows:

For Amendment No. 6 (22)

Cllrs Desna Allen, Rosemary Brown, Trevor Carbin, Chris Caswill, Peter Colmer, Peggy Dow, Malcolm Hewson, Jon Hubbard, George Jeans, David Jenkins, Simon Killane, John Knight, Howard Marshall, Steve Oldrieve, Helen Osborn, Jeff Osborn, Mark Packard, Stephen Petty, Judy Rooke, Paul Sample, Ian West and Graham Wright.

Against Amendment No. 6 (62)

Cllrs Richard Beattie, Chuck Berry, John Brady, Richard Britton, Liz Bryant, Allison Bucknell, Jane Burton, Nigel Carter, Ernie Clark, Richard Clewer, Chris Cochrane, Linda Conley, Mark Connolly, Christine Crisp, Michael Cuthbert-Murray, Andrew Davis, Peter Davis, Fleur de Rhe Philipe, Tony Deane, Peter Doyle, Nick Fogg, Peter Fuller, Richard Gamble, Jose Green, Mark Griffiths, Mollie Groom, Lionel Grundy, Robert Hall, Mike Hewitt, Alan Hill, Charles Howard, Chris Humphries, Geoge Jeans, Julian Johnson, Jerry Kunkler, Jacqui Lay, Alan Macrae, Laura Mayes, Ian McLennan, Jemima Milton, Bill Moss, John Noeken, Sheila Parker, Graham Payne, Leo Randall, Pip Ridout, Bill Roberts, Ricky Rogers, Jane Scott, Jonathon Seed, John Smale, Carole Soden, Toby Sturgis, Julie Swabey, John Thomson, Dick Tonge, Tony Trotman, Bridget Wayman, Fred Westmorland, Stuart Wheeler, Roy While and Chris Williams.

Abstention Amendment No. 6 (1)

Cllr Francis Morland

Cllr Jon Hubbard proposed the following amendment No. 7 which was seconded by Cllr Peter Colmer.

Amendment 7 Protecting our Youth Service

'Reverse the proposed new cuts of £0.225m across the Youth Service. The work undertaken by our Youth Service helps reduce the levels of perceived and actual anti-social behaviour by young people in our communities. The cost benefits of this are obvious and this improves the opportunities for our young people in these difficult times. This will particularly benefit vulnerable and disadvantaged young people across the county.

To be funded through drawing on the list of savings identified at the head of' (the report presented by the Liberal Democrat group)

Cllr Grundy, Cabinet member for Children's Services confirmed there were no proposals to cut frontline services in this area. At his request, Cllr Clewer, Portfolio Holder for Youth and Skills updated Council on initiatives concerning youth service provision.

The Chairman gave other Group Leaders the opportunity of responding to the amendment before opening the debate to other members of the Council.

On being put to the vote, amendment No. 7 was LOST and a recorded vote having been requested by the requisite number of Councillors, the voting was recorded as follows:

For Amendment No. 7 (23)

Cllrs Desna Allen, Rosemary Brown, Trevor Carbin, Chris Caswill, Peter Colmer, Peggy Dow, Malcolm Hewson, Jon Hubbard, David Jenkins, Simon Killane, John Knight, Howard Marshall, Ian McLennan, Francis Morland, Steve Oldrieve, Helen Osborn, Jeff Osborn, Mark Packard, Stephen Petty, Ricky Rogers, Judy Rooke, Paul Sample, and Ian West.

Against Amendment No. 7 (56)

Cllrs Richard Beattie, Chuck Berry, John Brady, Richard Britton, Liz Bryant, Allison Bucknell, Jane Burton, Nigel Carter, Richard Clewer, Chris Cochrane, Linda Conley, Mark Connolly, Christine Crisp, Michael Cuthbert-Murray, Andrew Davis, Peter Davis, Fleur de Rhe Philipe, Tony Deane, Peter Doyle, Peter Fuller, Richard Gamble, Jose Green, Mark Griffiths, Mollie Groom, Lionel Grundy, Robert Hall, Mike Hewitt, Alan Hill, Charles Howard, Chris Humphries, Julian Johnson, Jerry Kunkler, Jacqui Lay, Alan Macrae, Laura Mayes, Jemima Milton, Bill Moss, John Noeken, Sheila Parker, Leo Randall, Pip Ridout, Bill Roberts, Jane Scott, Jonathon Seed, John Smale, Carole Soden, Toby Sturgis,

Julie Swabey, John Thomson, Dick Tonge, Tony Trotman, Bridget Wayman, Fred Westmoreland, Stuart Wheeler, Roy While and Chris Williams.

Abstentions Amendment No. 7 (3)

Cllrs Ernie Clark, Nick Fogg and George Jeans.

Cllr Jon Hubbard proposed the following amendment No. 8 which was seconded by Cllr Peter Colmer.

Amendment 8
Improving Learning and Teaching in our Schools

‘Reduce the savage proposed cuts in spending on School Improvement through a reduction in the proposed spending on £0.191m. In line with national policy, including the Pupil premium, evidence shows focusing investment on the early years creates savings in the future. This funding allows for extra school advisers, further teacher training, facilitating enhanced learning experiences for young people in the context of total budget reductions.

To be funded through drawing on the list of savings identified at the head of’ (the report presented by the Liberal Democrat group).

Cllr Grundy, Cabinet member for Children’s Services confirmed that the proposed budget included provision for investing £4.3 million in 2011-12. Some of this money would be used to provide a core team of officers to support schools as necessary linking into children’s attainment and early intervention programmes. At his request, Cllr Alan Macrae, Portfolio Holder for Schools explained these initiatives in more detail.

The Chairman gave other Group Leaders the opportunity of responding to the amendment before opening the debate to other members of the Council.

On being put to the vote, amendment No. 8 was LOST and a recorded vote having been requested by the requisite number of Councillors, the voting was recorded as follows:

For Amendment No. 8 (21)

Cllrs Desna Allen, Rosemary Brown, Trevor Carbin, Chris Caswill, Peter Colmer, Jon Hubbard, David Jenkins, Simon Killane, John Knight, Howard Marshall, Ian McLennan, Francis Morland, Steve Oldrieve, Helen Osborn, Jeff Osborn, Mark Packard, Stephen Petty, Ricky Rogers, Judy Rooke, Paul Sample, and Ian West.

Against Amendment No. 8 (57)

Cllrs Richard Beattie, Chuck Berry, John Brady, Richard Britton, Liz Bryant, Allison Bucknell, Jane Burton, Nigel Carter, Richard Clewer, Chris Cochrane, Linda Conley, Mark Connolly, Christine Crisp, Michael Cuthbert-Murray, Andrew Davis, Peter Davis, Fleur de Rhe Philipe, Tony Deane, Peter Doyle, Peter Fuller, Richard Gamble, Jose Green, Mark Griffiths, Mollie Groom, Lionel Grundy, Robert Hall, Mike Hewitt, Alan Hill, Charles Howard, Chris Humphries, George Jeans, Julian Johnson, Jerry Kunkler, Jacqui Lay, Alan Macrae, Laura Mayes, Jemima Milton, Bill Moss, John Noeken, Sheila Parker, Leo Randall, Pip Ridout, Bill Roberts, Jane Scott, Jonathon Seed, John Smale, Carole Soden, Toby Sturgis, Julie Swabey, John Thomson, Dick Tonge, Tony Trotman, Bridget Wayman, Fred Westmoreland, Stuart Wheeler, Roy While and Chris Williams.

Cllr Jon Hubbard proposed the following amendment No. 9 and in so doing, paid tribute to the hard work and dedication of officers who worked in this particular area. The amendment was seconded by Cllr Peter Colmer.

Amendment 9 Protecting our most Vulnerable Children

'Whilst there are opportunities for considerable savings on previous expenditure on Children's Social Care, we feel that the level of cuts proposed will result in a reduced service for the most vulnerable of our young people in care and therefore would reduce these cuts by £0.254m. Investing properly in their futures at an early stage can save considerable amounts in the future.

To be funded through drawing on the list of savings identified at the head of' (the report presented by the Liberal Democrat group).

Cllr Lionel Grundy, Cabinet member for Children's Services reported that social services provision was adequately funded and that the service had recently undergone transformation. The last Ofsted inspection had classified the service as 'good' although pointed out that the service required increased administrative support which was provided immediately. Cllr Grundy commented that he would not be supporting the amendment as the service was already operating well.

Cllr Sheila Parker, Portfolio Holder for Vulnerable children explained that the service was already making savings whilst supporting vulnerable families.

The Chairman gave other Group Leaders the opportunity of responding to the amendment before opening the debate to other members of the Council.

On being put to the vote, amendment No. 9 was LOST and a recorded vote having been requested by the requisite number of Councillors, the voting was recorded as follows:

For Amendment No. 9 (23)

Cllrs Desna Allen, Rosemary Brown, Trevor Carbin, Chris Caswill, Peter Colmer, Malcolm Hewson, Jon Hubbard, George Jeans, David Jenkins, Simon Killane, John Knight, Howard Marshall, Ian McLennan, Francis Morland, Steve Oldrieve, Helen Osborn, Jeff Osborn, Mark Packard, Stephen Petty, Ricky Rogers, Judy Rooke, Paul Sample, and Ian West.

Against Amendment No. 9 (56)

Cllrs Richard Beattie, Chuck Berry, John Brady, Richard Britton, Liz Bryant, Allison Bucknell, Jane Burton, Nigel Carter, Richard Clewer, Chris Cochrane, Linda Conley, Mark Connolly, Christine Crisp, Michael Cuthbert-Murray, Andrew Davis, Peter Davis, Fleur de Rhe Philipe, Tony Deane, Peter Doyle, Peter Fuller, Richard Gamble, Jose Green, Mark Griffiths, Mollie Groom, Lionel Grundy, Robert Hall, Mike Hewitt, Alan Hill, Charles Howard, Chris Humphries, Julian Johnson, Jerry Kunkler, Jacqui Lay, Alan Macrae, Laura Mayes, Jemima Milton, Bill Moss, John Noeken, Sheila Parker, Leo Randall, Pip Ridout, Bill Roberts, Jane Scott, Jonathon Seed, John Smale, Carole Soden, Toby Sturgis, Julie Swabey, John Thomson, Dick Tonge, Tony Trotman, Bridget Wayman, Fred Westmoreland, Stuart Wheeler, Roy While and Chris Williams.

The amendments by the Liberal Democrat group having been LOST, the Chairman invited other Group Leaders to comment on the Leader's motion or to propose amendments to it.

Cllr Nigel Carter commented on the budget proposals referring to the positive and constructive scrutiny of the budget led by Cllr Jeff Osborn. He added a note of caution that the Council should be as proactive as it could in the area of enterprise and economy to ensure the economic viability of the County. He was delighted with efforts being made in energy management but added this area needed sustained investment to ensure the right culture prevailed to maximise impact. He also referred to the self insurance fund in the context of the scale of programme for the hubs.

Cllr Ricky Rogers acknowledged it was a difficult year to set the budget. He was opposed to the proposal to join the Local Government Association preferring the £88k membership fee was used towards the reinstatement of free swimming.

With no further amendments proposed by the other Group Leaders, other members of the Council were given the opportunity to debate the Leader's motion and or propose any further amendments.

Following a lengthy debate, the Leader of the Council responded to the points raised during debate.

Following clarification by the Chairman on what was being proposed, the Leader's motion was put to the vote and CARRIED by a show of hands. It was therefore

Resolved:

Business Plan and Financial Plan

- (a) That the Business Plan and linked Financial Plan 2011-15 as presented be adopted and that the Chief Executive be given delegated authority to make any amendments of a minor nature to ensure the Plans are accurate and clearly presented following consultation with the Leader of the Council, the S.151 Officer and the Monitoring Officer.
- (b) To approve the investments and savings as set out in sections 5 and 6 respectively of the Financial Plan that provides for a net revenue budget in 2011/12 of £329.847 million.
- (c) To set a Wiltshire Council Band D council tax for 2011/12 of £1,222.43 as per section 9 of the Financial Plan which represents a zero percentage increase.
- (d) To agree to membership of the Local Government Association for the 2011/12 financial year and pay the fee of £87,982 to the Association from reserves set out in the Financial Plan for this period.

Capital Programme

To approve the Wiltshire Council Capital Programme for 2011/12 to 2014/15 as shown in Appendix A of the report presented.

Housing Revenue Account Budget

- (a) To approve the Housing Revenue Account Budget for 2010/11 (revised) and 2011/12 (original) as presented.
- (b) To approve the increase for dwelling rents in accordance with the rent restructuring.
- (c) To approve an increase of 4.6% for service charges.
- (d) To approve that there be no increase to garage rents to avoid an adverse effect on void rates.

Schools Budget

To approve the overall Schools Budget of £274.653 million.

Fees and Charges

To approve the fees and charges as included in the revenue budget proposals for 2011/12.

Treasury Management Strategy

- (a) To adopt the Prudential and Treasury Indicators (Appendix A of the report presented).
- (b) To adopt the Annual Investment Strategy (Appendix B of the report presented).
- (c) To delegate to the Chief Finance Officer the authority to vary the amount of borrowing and other long term liabilities within both the Treasury Indicators for the Authorised Limit and the Operational Boundary.
- (d) To Authorise the Chief Finance Officer to agree the restructuring of existing long term loans where savings are achievable or to enhance the long term portfolio.
- (e) To agree that short term cash surpluses and deficits continue to be managed through temporary loans and deposits.
- (f) To agree that any long term surplus cash balances not required to cover borrowing are placed in authorised money-market funds, particularly where this is more cost effective than short term deposits and delegate to the Chief Finance Officer the authority to select such funds.

Council Tax Resolution

- a) That it be noted that at its meeting on 14th December 2010 Cabinet calculated the following amounts for the year 2011-12 in accordance with The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (Amendment) Regulations 2003 made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 ("the Act"):
 - i) £179,297.66 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (Amendment) Regulations 2003, as its council tax base for the year;
 - ii) Part of the Council's Area (Council Tax Base for each parish)
- b) That it be noted the revenue and capital budget proposals for 2011-12 are as approved within these minutes.

- c) That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2011-12 in accordance with sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992:
- i) £880,892,037 (Gross Revenue Expenditure including parish precepts) being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2) (a) to (e) of the Act;
 - ii) £543,788,000 (Revenue Income) being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3) (a) to (c) of the Act;
 - iii) £337,104,037 (Net Revenue Expenditure including parish precepts) being the amount by which the aggregate at ci) above exceeds the aggregate at cii) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year;
 - iv) £105,191,569 (Total of Revenue Support Grant, share of National Non Domestic Rating Pool and Estimated Balance on the Collection Fund to be refunded to council tax payers) being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of redistributed non-domestic rates and revenue support grant and increased by the amount of any sum which the Council estimates will be transferred from its collection fund to its general fund pursuant to the Collection Fund (Community Charges) (England) Directions 1994 under section 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988;
 - v) £1,293.45 (Wiltshire Council Band D tax plus average parish councils Band D Tax) being the amount at ciii) above less the amount at civ) above, all divided by the amount at ai) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year as shown below:

Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
862.30	1006.02	1149.73	1293.45	1580.88	1868.31	2155.75	2586.90

- vi) £12,733,037 (Aggregate of parish and town council precepts) being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in section 34(1) of the Act;
- vii) £1,222.43 (Band D tax for Wiltshire Council purposes only)

being the amount at cv) above less the result given by dividing the amount at cvi) above by the amount at ai) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates as shown below:

Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
814.95	950.78	1086.60	1222.43	1494.08	1765.73	2037.38	2444.86

viii) Part of the Council's Area (List of each Parish's Council Band D tax)

That the table at Appendix C shows the amounts relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at aii) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate;

- d) That it be noted that for the year 2011-12 the **Wiltshire Police Authority** has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Authority, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
105.18	122.71	140.24	157.77	192.83	227.89	262.95	315.54

- e) That it be noted that for the year 2011-12 the **Wiltshire & Swindon Fire Authority** has stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Authority, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and Section 83 of the Local Government Act 2003, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Band A £	Band B £	Band C £	Band D £	Band E £	Band F £	Band G £	Band H £
41.59	48.52	55.45	62.38	76.24	90.10	103.97	124.76

- f) That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at cviii), d) and e) above, the Council, in accordance with section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the amounts shown in the table at Appendix C as the amounts of council tax for the year 2011-12 for each of the categories of dwellings shown in the table:-

Part of the Council's Area (List of total tax figures for all bands of property

for all parishes within Wiltshire – including Parish, Wiltshire Council, Wiltshire Police Authority and Wiltshire and Swindon Fire Authority elements).

86. **South Wiltshire Core Strategy - Review of Housing and Employment Requirements**

Public Participation:

The following members of the public addressed Council on this item:

Mr Roger Yeates	– Downton Parish Council
Mr Phillip Coward	– Hillbrush Ltd
Mr Ron Champion	– Laverstock and Ford Parish Council
Ms Sarah Champion	– Bishop Down Farm Residents' Association
Mr Steve Hannath	– Resident of Laverstock and Ford Parish

A written statement was circulated from Godshill Parish Council

Cllr John Brady, Cabinet member for Economic Development, Planning and Housing responded to the points made during public participation.

Cllr Brady presented a report which drew Council's attention to the findings of a review of the housing and employment requirements included within the draft South Wiltshire Core Strategy (SWCS) as submitted to the Secretary of State. The report sought approval of a number of amendments to the draft SWCS arising from the review. Cllr Brady drew Council's attention to changes to the recommendations relating to the distribution of housing as circulated in a revisions paper.

Cllr Brady explained the background to the need to review the housing and employment requirements within the SWCS.

Following approval of the draft South Wiltshire Core Strategy (SWCS) by Council in November 2009, the SWCS proceeded straight to the Examination in Public (EIP) stage. In July 2010, around the time the Inspector was due to publish his report, he suspended the EIP to allow the Council to undertake a review of the housing and employment figures in light of the Government's stated intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS). This review has now been completed, in the context of the Wiltshire-wide review of housing requirements and as a result, 'focused changes' to the SWCS should be put forward to the Inspector for his consideration. As a consequence of the 'focused changes' other changes would need to be made elsewhere in the document. These 'consequential' changes would also be submitted to the Inspector.

Cllr Brady moved the proposals contained in the report presented which included the proposed changes to the draft SWCS and the further revisions as circulated and this was duly seconded.

The revised housing figures considered by Council are set out in the following table:

Settlement/Area	No. of Dwellings 2006 - 2026
Salisbury & Wilton (including allocations for Salisbury in Laverstock Parish, which is part of Southern Community Area)	6,060
Rest of Wilton Community Area	220
Salisbury/Wilton Community Area Sub-total	6,280
Amesbury	2,100
Rest of Amesbury Community Area	295
Amesbury Community Area Sub-total	2,395
Downton	190
Rest of Southern Community Area	365
Southern Community Area Sub-total	555
Mere	200
Rest of Mere Community Area	50
Mere Community Area Sub-total	250
Tisbury	200
Rest of Tisbury Community Area	220
Tisbury Community Area Sub-total	420
South Wiltshire Total	9,900

Cllr Brady explained the proposals made were to ensure that a sound planning framework was put in place as soon as possible for South Wiltshire to allow the authority to manage necessary growth. This was to ensure homes and jobs were provided in the most sustainable way that best conserved the natural environment and maximised benefits for local communities. The proposals would also ensure that progress continued to be made on preparing an up to date planning policy framework for Wiltshire.

The Chairman then opened the debate allowing Group Leaders to speak first, followed by Councillors representing the South Wiltshire area of the County before opening the debate to other Councillors. The Chairman referred Council to questions from Cllr Ian McLennan as circulated.

Cllr McLennan referred to his questions addressed to Cllr Brady who responded to the questions with details of the responses circulated at the meeting. A copy of the questions and responses are attached as Appendix D to these minutes.

During debate, Cllr McLennan proposed the following amendment which was duly seconded:

‘That given all of the information so far, that the 500 housing allocation for Hampton Park be removed from the draft SWCS and to retain the housing allocation for Long Hedge in Laverstock and Ford’.

Cllr Brady explained that he was unable to support the amendment and whilst he had sympathy with such a view, making such a change at this stage in the process had the potential to render the Strategy unsound.

Following further debate, the amendment was put to the vote and LOST.

Cllr McLennan proposed a further amendment as follows which was duly seconded.

'To reduce the housing provision by removing any development east of Green Lane that also protects Green Lane itself and that the strategic gap should be set at two thirds of the distance from Long Hedge in Laverstock and Ford'.

However, following further debate, Cllr McLennan replaced the above amendment with the following, in part based on comments made earlier in the debate by Cllr Sample and this was duly seconded:

'To incorporate the decision of the Strategic Planning Committee dated 16 February 2011 as part of the submission to the Inspector on the draft SWCS and that the Community Forum referred to in the Revisions paper to include local parish councillors from Laverstock and Ford Parish Council and the local Division members'.

Cllr Brady commented that he was happy to take on board these amendments within his proposition with the proviso that details of the Strategic Planning Committee's decision be included as an informative only and this was agreed by Cllr McLennan.

A lengthy debate ensued with Cllr Brady responding to the points made.

For the avoidance of doubt, Cllr Brady clarified the proposals before Council and on being put to the vote, it was

Resolved:

That Council:

(i) approves the proposed changes to the draft South Wiltshire Core Strategy, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report presented (both focused and consequential), arising from the review of housing and employment requirements set out in the draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy; and further

(ii) approves the additional amendments to the draft South Wiltshire Core Strategy as follows:

- i. Those amendments summarised in the revisions paper as circulated in Agenda supplement 2.**

Mrs Margaret Willmot

COGS (Cycling Opportunities Group, Salisbury)
Written statement presented by Cllr Chris Cochrane

As referred to earlier in the meeting (minute No. 82 refers), the Chairman reported receipt of the following petitions received for presentation to this meeting:

Petition – Car Parking – Devizes

The Chairman reported receipt of a petition organised by the Devizes Guardians and the Devizes Chambers of Commerce. The petition presented by Cllr Nigel Carter with 4657 signatures called on the Council to retain the one hour limit for free parking in Devizes Market Place

Petition – Car Parking – Marlborough

The Chairman reported receipt of a petition submitted by Cllr Peggy Dow on behalf of the Marlborough Chamber of Commerce. The petition with 71 signatures called on the Council to lower the parking charges for Marlborough to the level defined in the New Strategy and for Hillier's Yard and Polly Garden car parks to be redesignated as short stay car parks with a maximum stay of three hours.

Petition – Car Parking - Bradford on Avon

The Chairman reported receipt of a petition organised by the Bradford-on-Avon Chambers of Commerce. The petition with approximately 1600 signatures objected to the removal of free car parking in St Margaret's car park and to levy only reasonable charges on other town parking.

The Chairman drew Council's attention to the following previously circulated documents:

- report of the Rapid Scrutiny Exercise meeting held on 25 January 2011 together with a schedule of recommendations. Cllr Peter Doyle, lead member on the Rapid Scrutiny Exercise confirmed that all of the recommendations had been accepted by Cllr Tonge.
- Question from Cllr Peggy Dow in respect of parking charges in Marlborough together with the response from Cllr Dick Tonge, Cabinet member for Highways and Transport.

At the start of this item, Councillor Dick Tonge drew Council's attention to the related Traffic Regulations Orders, the consultation on which had expired on 21 February 2011. Cllr Tonge referred to the consultation feedback and responded to the main comments and objections received.

Cllr Tonge presented the proposed Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2026 (LTP) for adoption by Council. The document was previously considered by Cabinet at its meeting on 15 February 2011 when it resolved to recommend adoption of the LTP by Council.

Cllr Tonge explained that the Local Transport Plan (LTP) was a statutory document, of which an updated version (LTP3) had to be published by 31 March 2011. The scale and scope of the LTP3 was reduced in light of ongoing planning and funding uncertainties. Once clarity was restored, the remaining elements of the LTP3 were planned to be developed during 2011/12.

The LTP3 was currently made up of the following elements:

- Strategy
- Implementation Plan
- Freight Strategy
- Public Transport Strategy
- Road Safety Strategy
- Car Parking Strategy (as approved by Cabinet at its meeting on 14 December 2010).

Cllr Tonge gave a brief synopsis of each of the above strategies and Cllr Richard Gamble provided further detail in respect of the Public Transport Strategy including the proposed transrail link.

The Chairman opened the debate starting with Group Leaders before opening the debate to other members.

Cllr Nigel Carter proposed the following amendment seconded by Cllr Jane Burton:

‘To maintain the one hour limit for free parking in Devizes Market Place and to delete reference to ticket machines and for there to be no street furniture in Market Square.’

On being put to the vote, the amendment was LOST.

Cllr Tonge responded to the points raised during debate.

Resolved:

That Council:

- (i) **adopts the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan (LTP3) 2011 – 2026 as presented;**
- (ii) **notes that further LTP3 theme strategies and area strategies, and an implementation plan for 2012/13 – 2014/15 are planned to be developed in 2011/12 and**

- (iii) **delegates authority to the Corporate Director for Neighbourhood and Planning in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport to finalise the document for publication by 31 March 2011.**

88. **Councillors' Questions**

The Chairman reported receipt of questions from Cllrs Ernie Clark, Howard Marshall, Jon Hubbard, Jeff Osborn, Chris Caswill and Russell Hawker. Details of the questions and responses given were previously circulated and are attached as Appendix E to these minutes.

Supplementary questions were made in some cases summarised as follows:

Cllr John Hubbard – consideration of community campus proposals at Melksham Area Board – was it appropriate to debate an issue at the Area Board after the decision had been made rather than consult on the proposals?

Cllr Stuart Wheeler explained that he had consulted the Chairman of Melksham Area Board who confirmed that a special meeting of the Area Board would be convened to discuss the proposals followed by consultation. The Leader of the Council also clarified that this process had been agreed unanimously by Melksham Area Board.

Cllr Jon Hubbard – Melksham community campus proposals and siting of library – questioned whether the resiting of Melksham library following refurbishment of the Town centre library represented best value.

Cllr John Noeken explained that the Council needed to take a longterm view and consider future cost as part of the Workplace Transformation Programme.

Cllr Chris Caswill – effect of frontloading reductions in Government grant – sought clarification of the effect of frontloading rather than spreading the cuts evenly. Cllr Caswill asked if the reduction by £11.477 m was as a result of front loading? Cllr Fleur de Rhe Philipe undertook to provide a written answer.

Cllr Jeff Osborn – Future Jobs Fund Scheme – asked whether the Council had lobbied the Government over retaining the Scheme.

The Leader of the Council confirmed that she had personally lobbied the Government on this issue.

89. **Notice of Motion 15 - Government Funding of the EU - from Councillors Mike Cuthbert-Murray and Russell Hawker**

The Chairman referred to the notice of motion presented by Cllr Trevor Carbin at the last meeting on 9 November 2010 on the Daylight Saving Bill which was

deferred to this meeting. The Chairman explained that Cllr Carbin had since withdrawn his motion.

Declaration of Interest

Cllrs Toby Sturgis, Chris Humphries and Jane Scott declared a personal interest in this item as their respective businesses were in receipt of EU funding.

The Chairman reported receipt of the following motion from Cllrs Mike Cuthbert-Murray and Russell Hawker:

“In the light of the current and ongoing deep Government funding cuts to this council and the significant adverse effects this is causing via reduced staffing and services, we believe that the Government should ensure that its funding to the EU does not increase - or better still, is cut - so that funding to this and other principal authorities can be restored to levels where we can provide a satisfactory level of service and support to Wiltshire people. We will inform our local MPs and ask them to act accordingly in Parliament and to explain their actions in this respect to us.”

Once moved by Cllr Mike Cuthbert-Murray and seconded by Cllr Nigel Carter, Cllr Cuthbert-Murray was invited to speak to the motion.

The Chairman moved that the motion be debated and this was duly seconded by the Vice-Chairman and on being put to the vote, it was

Resolved:

That notice of motion no.15 be debated

The Chairman invited Group Leaders to speak on the motion before opening the debate to other Councillors. The Leader of the Council commented that this was a matter which if supported, should be taken up by Councillors through their MPs and not as a Council matter.

Resolved:

That the motion be NOT adopted.

90. **Minutes of Cabinet and Committees**

The Chairman moved that Council receive and note the under mentioned minutes as listed in the separate Minutes Book and this was duly seconded by the Vice-Chairman.

Meeting

Date

Cabinet 2010	16 November & 14 December 25 January & 15 February 2011
Cabinet Capital Assets Committee	10 January & 7 February 2011
Children's Services Select Committee 2011	25 November 2010, 27 January
Environment Select Committee 2010,	2 November & 21 December 11 January 2011
Health and Adult Social Care Select 2011 Committee	11 November 2010, 13 January
Organisation and Resources Select 2011 Committee	18 November 2010, 20 January
Licensing Committee 2011	30 November 2010, 17 January
Northern Area Planning Committee	3 November, 24 November & 15 December 2010, 26 January 2011
Western Area Planning Committee	8 December 2010, 12 January & 9 February 2011
Southern Area Planning Committee	18 November & 9 December 2010, 13 January 2011
Eastern Area Planning Committee	16 December 2010, 6 January 2011
Standards Committee	24 November 2010, 12 January 2011
Officer Appointments Committee	14 December 2010
Staffing Policy Committee	24 November & 16 December 2010, 9 February 2011
Audit Committee	15 December 2010
Wiltshire Pension Fund Committee	2 December 2010

The Chairman then invited questions from Councillors on points of information or clarification on the above mentioned minutes and gave the Chairmen of those meetings the opportunity to make any important announcements on the work of their respective Committees. No questions were asked.

Resolved:

That the above mentioned minutes be received and noted.

91. **Review of Allocation of Seats on Committees to Political Groups**

The Chairman presented the report of the Service Director, Legal and Democratic Services. As referred to earlier in the meeting (minute no. 84 refers), Cllr Liz Bryant was elected to the Council following the by-election held on 21 December 2010. A review of the allocation of seats on committee to political groups was not required as the political balance on the Council remained unchanged.

Council was asked to confirm Cllr Bryant's appointment to Devizes Area board and to approve any requests from Group Leaders for changes to committee membership in accordance with their previously approved allocation of seats. No changes were requested.

Resolved:

- a) **To note the report presented.**
- b) **To confirm the appointment of Cllr Liz Bryant who was elected to the Bromham, Rowde and Potterne Electoral Division, to the Devizes Area Board.**

92. **Dates of next meetings**

Resolved:

To approve the dates of Council meetings for 2011/12 as follows:

17th May	2011 (Annual)
12th July	2011
8th November	2011
21st February	2012 (Council Tax setting).

93. **Wiltshire Police Authority**

The minutes of the Wiltshire Police Authority meeting held on 2 December 2010 and the report of the Police Authority were received and noted. No questions on these documents had been received from Councillors.

94. **Minutes of the Wiltshire and Swindon Fire Authority**

The minutes of the Wiltshire and Swindon Fire Authority meeting held on 16 December 2010 were received and noted. No questions had been raised by Councillors.

Duration of meeting 10.30am – 11.00pm
(including an adjournment from 11.50am – 2.00pm)

Appendices

- Appendix A - Questions from Mr Phil Matthews and response
- Appendix B - Budget speech by Leader of the Council
- Appendix C - Wiltshire Council Tax Levy 2011-12 by Parish
- Appendix D - Questions from Cllr Ian McLennan (South Wiltshire Core Strategy and responses
- Appendix E - Councillors' Questions and responses

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Yamina Rhouati, of Democratic & Members' Services, direct line 01225 718024, e-mail yaminarhouati@wiltshire.gov.uk

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

(Duration of meeting: 10.30 am - 11.00 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Council

22 February 2011

Public Participation

**Question from Mr Phil Matthews, Wiltshire Involvement Network
To Councillor Jane Scott, Leader of the Council**

Question 1

The Wiltshire Involvement Networks(LINKS) is a Statutory Government organisation set up by Act of Parliament to represent patients and public in Wiltshire.

Why was the decision to recently suspend this organisation and its funding taken by Council Officers instead of the democratically elected Members of the Council?

Response

The Chief Executive has instigated a review of the process followed in connection with the investigation of a complaint arising from a meeting of Wiltshire Involvement Network (WIN) on 10 August 2010. This issue will be covered in that review. The outcome of the review will be reported to Cabinet at the earliest opportunity.

Question 2

At a Healthwatch Stakeholders meeting held on Feb 8th 2011 , Earl Howe made it clear that good relationships were needed with Local Authorities and that conversations were needed with them with regards to the money that they have been provided with for LINKS. Therefore can I have an assurance that funding will be available to continue the work of the Wiltshire Involvement Network up an until Healthwatch is set up?

Response

The Director of Community Services has requested a meeting with the WIN to discuss various issues including the funding arrangements for next year. The Council is committed to funding the WIN through a Host organisation for 11/12 as there is progression to the establishment of Health Watch.

This page is intentionally left blank

Mr Chairman

When we met at this time last year we knew that difficult times lay ahead. We knew that our government grant would be cut and that we were in for a period of enforced financial saving and we have been planning for this. However, we did not know, nor foresee, the extent of savings that the new coalition government would require us to make in the first year of their 4 year plans; and nor did we envisage that we would be affected by over 300 new pieces of legislation changing the whole concept of local government and its responsibilities.

The changes in legislation and regulation that are being proposed will alter the relationship between the public sector and our citizens and service users. We will need to change radically in how we will be organised and how we deliver services in the future.

Our resources over the next 4 years will be reduced – we will have to absorb a cut of over 28% in grant funding from the government – and manage the new pieces of legislation. This will not be easy but it would be considerably more difficult had we not combined our 5 councils into one with the appreciable financial savings that brought and continues to bring during this transformation stage.

We will have a completely new partnership landscape to deal with and will need to take account of the expected growth in the number of older people living in our county in the next few years and the increasing number of young children needing our care.

We have looked to the future and produced a business plan that sets out how we intend to meet these challenges over the next 4 years. Whilst today's meeting will consider the budget for next year – our proposals will be in the context of the changing picture for the next few years and beyond.

There are no short-term solutions but our proposals are robust with a planned approach to managing our resources well for the future.

We have openly shared and discussed our proposals with our local communities and stakeholders and we have taken their views into account in our budget planning.

Our vision is to create stronger, more resilient communities. This vision is all about people and places, fostering a sense of community belonging and self-sufficiency where communities can solve problems locally with our support.

Our communities are already becoming more self-reliant, reducing the dependency on public services.

We recognise that a new and different way of working is going to be critical for the future and with significantly diminished resources we have to empower and enable local communities to take a greater control over their futures.

Our business plan sets out what we aim to achieve between now and 2015. It highlights our business model for the next 5 to 10 years. The changes will be phased so that the first 4 years will set the foundations to make the Council as efficient as possible and well equipped for the future.

We believe we can do this because we are taking a long term, pragmatic view and we can take advantage of being a new unitary authority. Unlike many other councils across the country and our neighbouring authorities we are not stopping services or closing facilities and we are not making thousands of staff redundant.

We are different - we are ambitious – we are visionary – but we are also realistic.

We plan to use our resources to:

- √ protect the most vulnerable in our communities
- √ invest in the future of Wiltshire by enhancing some principal service areas, and;
- √ keep the council tax low

We will do this not only by making savings that will cover the cut in government funding but also fund the investments we wish to make.

We propose to invest an additional £34 million over the next 4 years into protecting and safeguarding vulnerable adults and this reflects the expected growth in the number of ageing adults that will need our services. We anticipate that 14% more older people will receive our services in the next few years.

We will also invest £4.7 million into protecting and safeguarding vulnerable children as we know that there is a 5% increase in the number of looked-after children that will need to receive high quality local placements either in foster care or residential placements close to family, friends and their local community.

We know that around 11% of children and young people in Wiltshire are considered to be living in poverty. We want Wiltshire schools to be outstanding whether they are academies or maintained schools, and enable pupils to fulfil their potential. We are proposing an investment of £3.2 million into improving the attainment and progress of pupils' learning.

We will also provide support for young people to move into employment and training. Working closely with our partners we have a range of strategies in place to support young people secure employment. Whilst NEET levels in Wiltshire remain below the national level, this remains an important priority for us.

The Wiltshire Potential Future Job Fund created 495 sustainable new jobs for 18–24 year olds, and the new 100 Apprentice Campaign aims to have 100 new Wiltshire apprentices enrolled within the 100 day period. Working with Job Centre Plus – we have secured work experience placements for 300 unemployed 18–24 year olds and as part of the Action for Wiltshire initiative, the 'Get Prepared Programme' for 16-18 year olds supports young people moving into employment, training or further education.

We are in no doubt that the economic recession has hit Wiltshire – the claimant unemployment in the county has risen during the recession by 4,500 and the growth

in unemployment has been higher than the national average. Whilst the dependency on public sector employment of 22.3% is broadly in line with national levels of 21.8% - we expect the impact on public sector cuts to result in an additional 3,000 job losses across Wiltshire over the next 4 years. Parts of the county are more vulnerable, especially those areas that are dependent on military activity. The closure of RAF Lyneham by the end of 2012 will result in a reduction in the local economy of around £90 million by 2015 and the loss of around 3,400 jobs. There is also a threat to employment at the Health Protection Agency at Porton Down, owing to proposals to relocate up to 600 staff to Essex.

We will need to build economic resilience through developing a broader sector mix and employment base. We are therefore proposing to invest £4 million into supporting the local economy helping the private sector to create 6,000 new jobs as well as safeguarding existing jobs.

We will invest a further £15 million of capital and revenue into broadband so that 85% of Wiltshire will be covered by superfast broadband in the next 4 years. This is in response in part to the business community and their requirements to compete in the market and therefore remain in the county. It is also a requirement if we are to attract new businesses to the county

The maintenance of our highways is really important to local people and businesses and was a top priority when we consulted with our communities. We have made improvements already. Our response time for repairs to non-urgent highways defects has been reduced by 95% and for urgent defects to less than one day. The condition of our roads has been improved by reducing the maintenance backlog by 16% over the last 5 years.

We have also delegated budgets to community area transport groups to prioritise road improvements locally and parish councils have been offered extra salt bags to assist communities during freezing weather and our area boards have been allocated extra grit bins at locations of their choice.

In 2011-12 funding for highways maintenance will increase over and above 2010/11. In addition, it is expected that a number of invest-to-save schemes will be brought forward in our capital programme. Spend on minor repairs and highways maintenance will be looked at as part of our commercial procurement review to achieve savings so that we will be able to do more with the same budget.

The overall increased spend on highways will be £417,000 and we will achieve a further 10% reduction in the roads maintenance backlog.

One of our key priorities and proposed areas of investment is our waste collection service. We need to divert waste from landfill in the medium to long term to secure significant cost savings for residents through reductions in Landfill Tax charges. Our target is to reduce land filled waste to less than 25% of the total collected by 2014.

In addition, we need to harmonise waste collection and recycling arrangements to provide a consistent service across Wiltshire.

The average recycling rate in Wiltshire is already ahead of target - in excess of 40%. However, major investment, encouragement and education will be needed to meet an increased target of 50%.

We have a contract for the delivery of 50,000 tonnes per year of waste to the Lakeside energy waste incinerator near Slough. A second contract for the construction in Westbury of a mechanical and biological treatment (MBT) plant is being finalised. This will provide further capacity to divert waste from landfill. While we continue to put waste into landfill we are required to pay Landfill Tax at a rate of £56 per tonne in 2011/12, rising by £8 per tonne per year until reaching £80 per tonne in 2014.

We propose to invest £23 million into waste and recycling. Wiltshire residents will receive kerbside collections every week on an alternate weekly basis collecting; plastic bottles and cardboard; glass, papers, cans, foil and textiles (the existing black box service); non-chargeable optional garden waste; and remaining waste.

You will be aware that the coalition government has recognised the importance of energy efficiency and introduced an Energy Bill last December. The Bill makes provision for a new 'Green Deal' to improve the energy efficiency of homes and businesses from autumn 2012. The details of how this will work are emerging and during 2011 we will look at how we can best take advantage of this for Wiltshire.

We spent £14 million on energy and transport in 2009/10, with an associated carbon footprint of 66,000 tonnes of CO₂. We have set a target to reduce our carbon footprint by 20% by 2013/14.

The Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) means that for every tonne of carbon emitted from our buildings and streetlights we will have to pay £12 in 2011/12 and 2012/13; £16 in 2013/14 and increasing amounts thereafter. If we do not invest in energy efficiency projects our tax burden will be higher.

We are proposing a further investment of £2 million to help to reduce our carbon emissions, which will reduce the cost of our energy bills.

During 2010/11, £0.5 million was allocated in our capital programme and £0.7 million was secured as a zero per cent government loan. This funding is being invested in a range of energy efficiency projects such as LED bollards, an air source heat pump at the Shurnhold office, and building management systems at leisure centres.

In total the £1.2 million invested in 2010/11 will save £275,000 per year on energy bills, or a total of £1.37 million over 5 years.

We have a good track record of investing in our communities through grants, new ways of doing things with our area boards and in supporting community area partnerships. We propose a further investment of £3.2 million to strengthen area boards and increase the capacity for local people to influence decisions, which affect their local community and continue to involve local people in tackling projects and resolving problems to improve the quality of life in their area. We want to encourage and recognise the contribution and value of volunteering in Wiltshire as this will be vital for sustaining delivery of some services locally.

We already have over 100 volunteers to help in our libraries.

We have been a leader on localism for some time and have strong foundations and relationships, which will help us to shift our role and the role of communities in the future. Our area boards have been pivotal in bringing about new ways of working and we see their role in the future as vital to building resilience in our communities.

Affordable Housing remains a top Wiltshire priority. The average Wiltshire house price is £234,000 but the average salary of £26,000 is well under the £45,000 needed to buy a 2-bedroom terraced house. We have a housing waiting list of 12,000+ of which over a quarter are in the highest need category.

Unfortunately, there are only around 45 housing association and council homes allocated each week. Whilst Wiltshire has an impressive record of creatively delivering new affordable homes, the numbers always fall short of the massive need. So at a time when it is increasingly difficult to deliver affordable homes through conventional routes, there is the reassurance that Wiltshire is on the threshold of delivering the only affordable Housing PFI scheme in the South West.

The project will see delivery of in excess of 250 new affordable homes to rent across the west of Wiltshire and we will build further new council homes in 2011. Our ambition is to enable the development of 450 affordable homes each year. Our PFI investment is primarily the provision of council land, enabling between 250 and 350 new affordable homes to rent.

Failure to deliver affordable housing puts big pressure on other services, such as homelessness, care service and health. A sharp increase in homelessness can result in increased use of bed and breakfast (B&B) with a cost running into millions.

And finally on our programme of investment, we intend to put £3.5 million into leisure. The indoor leisure facilities that we inherited as a result of the new unitary council are broadly outdated, inefficient and unsustainable.

Our proposals enable us to deliver sustainable, cost effective, high quality, indoor leisure facilities that will be part of a wider service delivery project.

The local campus project will be responsible for the delivery of fewer, more efficient and better placed facilities - which as well as providing a location for a range of services will ensure the provision of high quality multi-functional indoor leisure services to all sectors of the community.

We will develop service campus in 5 pilot areas – Corsham, Melksham, Pewsey, Tisbury and Wootton Bassett and we will explore new ways to deliver services in these campus by involving local communities and giving them influence in the development and running of the community services in their area.

Successful delivery of this ambitious business plan will be based on good management and by ensuring that our business and organisational structure is fit for purpose.

We will deliver our programme of investment by reducing our management costs by £8 million – this has already been achieved with 220 managers taking voluntary redundancy.

We will make £36 million by reducing the costs of purchasing our goods and services and a further £6.7 million net through our workplace transformation programme.

By transforming our services and reviewing how we do things we will save £47 million. We will look at each service from a customer point of view, determine exactly what they need rather what we think they need and eliminate any current waste and beaurocracy

I am not aware of any other council making this level of investment and transforming how they work to improve their local communities.

Wiltshire is in a unique place and our plan is ambitious, but realistic. We are confident that we are well placed to deliver a new and exciting local government that

will shift the roles between public sector and community – we want to support our communities to be able to help themselves and improve the quality of life and economy of Wiltshire in these difficult times and beyond.

We know we can make Wiltshire a better place by building on the strong foundations that we have in place. We see the next few years as a real opportunity to deliver improvements and the biggest cultural change ever seen in local government.

Next year's budget is the most difficult of the 4 years as we have to make changes quickly and, having focused on the next four years, I will now focus on the proposals for 2011/12.

Our intentions are to continue;

To provide high quality, low cost, customer focused services

We must provide the services Wiltshire needs, to the standard that residents want, and give value for money. Our customers must be the starting point for our services so that we know that what we are providing is what they want and need.

To ensure local, open and honest decision-making

We want people to have a real say on decisions that affect them and their communities. They must be able to influence those decisions and be part of the decision making process. Our 18 community areas have been a success and we will build on that success.

To work with our partners to support Wiltshire's communities

We will work closely with our customers and communities to resolve issues and challenges. We will also work with the voluntary sector, businesses and other public organisations such as the NHS, the homes' and communities' agency, emergency services and the justice system. By doing so, we can be more effective and achieve so much more.

And so what do we have in the budget we are considering today to meet these intentions.

We start from knowing that the funding settlement means that we will receive a net £16.4 million less than last year. And yet with the savings we will make, we will, unlike most other authorities, make considerable investments in Wiltshire's future. We will invest over £8 million in the protection of vulnerable adults and children. We will put £1 million into the economy.

We will invest £2.5 million into our policy for waste management and recycling, over £1 million into energy efficiency, over £300 thousand into leisure facilities and over £300 thousand into providing high speed broadband to assist the business community.

In providing a net £3 million for inflation redundancies and reserves, we will be making a total investment in Wiltshire of some £18.8 million. So we have needed to find an additional £33.1 million to fund our ambitious and bold plans for investing in Wiltshire's future.

We are grateful to central government for recognising the difficulties all councils faced in such hard times to keep council tax low. We believe this is vital to the sustainability of our communities and intend to freeze council tax in 2011/12 and welcome the government's funding for this

But in order to protect those services, which our residents have told us, are the most important to them and to keep council tax rises to a minimum in the future, we have had to take a number of difficult decisions. I did not enter politics to make cuts and I am proud our proposals are not as drastic as you will have seen across other parts of the country. Nevertheless, to deliver a robust and sound budget we have had to put forward £33.1 million pounds of saving proposals. These include increasing a number of charges to the less vital of the services we provide. We will reduce the opening hours of our libraries but, unlike other councils, we will not close any. We will reduce the hours our leisure centres are open but have taken notice of the hours in which they are most used; and we will only close those that are little used.

Of course some charges are being raised above the current inflation rate but I believe they are not unduly burdensome. I know that residents will understand that in the present economic climate some discretionary services will have to cost more. This is the price we have to pay for 12 years of a labour government.

You will all have had the opportunity to study the administration's budget proposals in detail and I will not waste time in going over that detail. Unlike whatever proposals the opposition have in mind, we have made ours public for all to see, and comment upon, in line with our commitment to transparency.

It has not been an easy or comfortable year. The necessary reduction in the number of posts has meant losing so many staff that have given loyal and valuable service to the council and I have personally regretted having to say goodbye to many officers that I, and my Cabinet, have worked closely with and valued their expertise and commitment.

In many cases these redundancies have placed an additional burden on the remaining staff and they are due our most grateful thanks for the manner in which they have responded in the recent difficult months.

The Corporate Management Team have been magnificent in their commitment to see Wiltshire through these difficult years ahead and my grateful thanks are due to them all. I wish to add my particular thanks to Michael Hudson and his team for unravelling the complex messages and detail that have been received from government affecting our financial position and ability to fix a sound budget. It is to his, and his team's, credit that I can propose such a sound budget for the year ahead and one which I believe will maintain our front line services in better shape than other councils as well as provide significant investment in the future of our county and I commend it to the Council.

Jane Scott
Leader, Wiltshire Council
22 February 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council Tax Levy 2011-12 By Parish

Appendix B

Parish / Town	Band D £			
	Wiltshire Council	Police	Fire & Rescue	Town / Parish
Aldbourne	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.63
Alderbury	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	34.08
All Cannings	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	34.68
Allington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	41.73
Alton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	19.36
Alvediston	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Amesbury	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	47.14
Ansty	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	17.49
Ashton Keynes	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	48.27
Atworth	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	28.27
Avebury	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	47.98
Barford St Martin	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	33.65
Baydon	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	34.73
Beechingstoke	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Berwick Bassett & W/Bourne Monkton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	6.17
Berwick St James	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	9.66
Berwick St John	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	23.40
Berwick St Leonard	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Biddestone	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	28.51
Bishops Cannings	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	19.71
Bishopstone	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	17.97
Bishopstrow	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	14.65
Bowerchalke	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	25.30
Box	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	76.16
Boyton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	7.01
Bradford On Avon	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	89.02
Bratton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	47.60
Braydon	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Bremhill	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	10.76
Brinkworth	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	27.23

Council Tax Bandings £							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
978.14	1,141.17	1,304.18	1,467.21	1,793.25	2,119.30	2,445.35	2,934.42
984.44	1,148.52	1,312.58	1,476.66	1,804.80	2,132.95	2,461.10	2,953.32
984.84	1,148.98	1,313.12	1,477.26	1,805.54	2,133.81	2,462.10	2,954.52
989.54	1,154.47	1,319.38	1,484.31	1,814.15	2,144.00	2,473.85	2,968.62
974.63	1,137.07	1,299.50	1,461.94	1,786.81	2,111.68	2,436.57	2,923.88
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
993.15	1,158.67	1,324.19	1,489.72	1,820.77	2,151.81	2,482.87	2,979.44
973.38	1,135.61	1,297.84	1,460.07	1,784.53	2,108.98	2,433.45	2,920.14
993.90	1,159.55	1,325.20	1,490.85	1,822.15	2,153.44	2,484.75	2,981.70
980.57	1,144.00	1,307.42	1,470.85	1,797.70	2,124.55	2,451.42	2,941.70
993.71	1,159.33	1,324.94	1,490.56	1,821.79	2,153.02	2,484.27	2,981.12
984.15	1,148.18	1,312.20	1,476.23	1,804.28	2,132.33	2,460.38	2,952.46
984.87	1,149.02	1,313.16	1,477.31	1,805.60	2,133.89	2,462.18	2,954.62
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
965.83	1,126.81	1,287.77	1,448.75	1,770.69	2,092.63	2,414.58	2,897.50
968.16	1,129.52	1,290.88	1,452.24	1,774.96	2,097.67	2,420.40	2,904.48
977.32	1,140.21	1,303.09	1,465.98	1,791.75	2,117.52	2,443.30	2,931.96
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
980.73	1,144.18	1,307.63	1,471.09	1,798.00	2,124.90	2,451.82	2,942.18
974.86	1,137.34	1,299.81	1,462.29	1,787.24	2,112.19	2,437.15	2,924.58
973.70	1,135.99	1,298.26	1,460.55	1,785.11	2,109.68	2,434.25	2,921.10
971.49	1,133.40	1,295.31	1,457.23	1,781.06	2,104.88	2,428.72	2,914.46
978.59	1,141.69	1,304.78	1,467.88	1,794.07	2,120.26	2,446.47	2,935.76
1,012.49	1,181.25	1,349.99	1,518.74	1,856.23	2,193.73	2,531.23	3,037.48
966.39	1,127.46	1,288.52	1,449.59	1,771.72	2,093.85	2,415.98	2,899.18
1,021.07	1,191.25	1,361.42	1,531.60	1,871.95	2,212.30	2,552.67	3,063.20
993.45	1,159.03	1,324.60	1,490.18	1,821.33	2,152.48	2,483.63	2,980.36
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
968.89	1,130.38	1,291.85	1,453.34	1,776.30	2,099.26	2,422.23	2,906.68
979.87	1,143.19	1,306.49	1,469.81	1,796.43	2,123.05	2,449.68	2,939.62

Wiltshire Council Tax Levy 2011-12 By Parish

Appendix B

Parish / Town	Band D £			
	Wiltshire Council	Police	Fire & Rescue	Town / Parish
Britford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	2.90
Broad Hinton & W/Bourne Bassett	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	13.95
Broad Town	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	12.38
Broadchalke	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	18.59
Brokenborough	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	13.14
Bromham	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	43.50
Broughton Gifford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	18.46
Bulford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	36.94
Bulkington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	36.24
Burbage	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	42.01
Burcombe	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	20.50
Buttermere	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Calne	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	201.94
Calne Without	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	5.31
Castle Combe	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.93
Chapmanslade	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	16.00
Charlton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	20.13
Charlton St Peter & Wilsford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	9.19
Cherhill	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	15.56
Cheverell Magna (Great Cheverell)	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	31.63
Chicklade	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Chilmark	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	26.90
Chilton Foliat	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	29.68
Chippenham	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	131.56
Chippenham Without	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	37.72
Chirton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	11.36
Chitterne	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	41.70
Cholderton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	39.43
Christian Malford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.49
Chute	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	34.90

Council Tax Bandings £							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
963.65	1,124.27	1,284.87	1,445.48	1,766.69	2,087.91	2,409.13	2,890.96
971.02	1,132.86	1,294.69	1,456.53	1,780.20	2,103.87	2,427.55	2,913.06
969.97	1,131.64	1,293.29	1,454.96	1,778.28	2,101.60	2,424.93	2,909.92
974.11	1,136.47	1,298.81	1,461.17	1,785.87	2,110.57	2,435.28	2,922.34
970.48	1,132.23	1,293.97	1,455.72	1,779.21	2,102.70	2,426.20	2,911.44
990.72	1,155.84	1,320.96	1,486.08	1,816.32	2,146.55	2,476.80	2,972.16
974.03	1,136.37	1,298.70	1,461.04	1,785.71	2,110.38	2,435.07	2,922.08
986.35	1,150.74	1,315.13	1,479.52	1,808.30	2,137.08	2,465.87	2,959.04
985.88	1,150.20	1,314.50	1,478.82	1,807.44	2,136.07	2,464.70	2,957.64
989.73	1,154.68	1,319.63	1,484.59	1,814.50	2,144.40	2,474.32	2,969.18
975.39	1,137.95	1,300.51	1,463.08	1,788.21	2,113.33	2,438.47	2,926.16
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
1,096.35	1,279.07	1,461.79	1,644.52	2,009.97	2,375.41	2,740.87	3,289.04
965.26	1,126.14	1,287.01	1,447.89	1,769.64	2,091.39	2,413.15	2,895.78
978.34	1,141.40	1,304.45	1,467.51	1,793.62	2,119.73	2,445.85	2,935.02
972.39	1,134.45	1,296.51	1,458.58	1,782.71	2,106.83	2,430.97	2,917.16
975.14	1,137.67	1,300.18	1,462.71	1,787.75	2,112.80	2,437.85	2,925.42
967.85	1,129.16	1,290.46	1,451.77	1,774.38	2,096.99	2,419.62	2,903.54
972.09	1,134.11	1,296.12	1,458.14	1,782.17	2,106.20	2,430.23	2,916.28
982.81	1,146.61	1,310.41	1,474.21	1,801.81	2,129.41	2,457.02	2,948.42
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
979.65	1,142.93	1,306.20	1,469.48	1,796.03	2,122.58	2,449.13	2,938.96
981.51	1,145.09	1,308.67	1,472.26	1,799.43	2,126.59	2,453.77	2,944.52
1,049.43	1,224.33	1,399.23	1,574.14	1,923.95	2,273.75	2,623.57	3,148.28
986.87	1,151.35	1,315.82	1,480.30	1,809.25	2,138.20	2,467.17	2,960.60
969.29	1,130.85	1,292.39	1,453.94	1,777.03	2,100.13	2,423.23	2,907.88
989.52	1,154.44	1,319.36	1,484.28	1,814.12	2,143.95	2,473.80	2,968.56
988.01	1,152.68	1,317.34	1,482.01	1,811.34	2,140.67	2,470.02	2,964.02
978.05	1,141.06	1,304.06	1,467.07	1,793.08	2,119.09	2,445.12	2,934.14
984.99	1,149.15	1,313.31	1,477.48	1,805.81	2,134.13	2,462.47	2,954.96

Wiltshire Council Tax Levy 2011-12 By Parish

Appendix B

Parish / Town	Band D £			
	Wiltshire Council	Police	Fire & Rescue	Town / Parish
Chute Forest	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	30.29
Clarendon Park	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	5.36
Clyffe Pypard	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	8.50
Codford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	15.70
Colerne	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	48.44
Collingbourne Ducis	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	44.52
Collingbourne Kingston	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	42.26
Compton Bassett	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	16.58
Compton Chamberlayne	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	40.78
Coombe Bissett	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	34.87
Corsham	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	116.68
Corsley	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	12.96
Coulston	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.69
Cricklade	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	146.48
Crudwell	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	28.32
Dauntsey	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	27.26
Devizes	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	104.80
Dilton Marsh	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	26.59
Dinton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	33.32
Donhead St Andrew	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	15.12
Donhead St Mary	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	25.13
Downton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	30.67
Durnford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	11.11
Durrington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	47.86
East Kennett	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
East Knoyle	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	20.72
Easterton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	52.49
Easton Grey	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Easton Royal	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	35.84
Ebbsbourne Wake	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	16.23

Council Tax Bandings £							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
981.91	1,145.57	1,309.21	1,472.87	1,800.17	2,127.47	2,454.78	2,945.74
965.29	1,126.18	1,287.05	1,447.94	1,769.70	2,091.46	2,413.23	2,895.88
967.39	1,128.62	1,289.85	1,451.08	1,773.54	2,096.00	2,418.47	2,902.16
972.19	1,134.22	1,296.25	1,458.28	1,782.34	2,106.40	2,430.47	2,916.56
994.01	1,159.69	1,325.35	1,491.02	1,822.35	2,153.69	2,485.03	2,982.04
991.40	1,156.64	1,321.86	1,487.10	1,817.56	2,148.03	2,478.50	2,974.20
989.89	1,154.88	1,319.85	1,484.84	1,814.80	2,144.76	2,474.73	2,969.68
972.77	1,134.91	1,297.03	1,459.16	1,783.41	2,107.67	2,431.93	2,918.32
988.91	1,153.73	1,318.54	1,483.36	1,812.99	2,142.62	2,472.27	2,966.72
984.97	1,149.13	1,313.29	1,477.45	1,805.77	2,134.09	2,462.42	2,954.90
1,039.51	1,212.76	1,386.01	1,559.26	1,905.76	2,252.26	2,598.77	3,118.52
970.36	1,132.09	1,293.81	1,455.54	1,778.99	2,102.44	2,425.90	2,911.08
978.18	1,141.21	1,304.24	1,467.27	1,793.33	2,119.38	2,445.45	2,934.54
1,059.37	1,235.94	1,412.49	1,589.06	1,942.18	2,295.30	2,648.43	3,178.12
980.60	1,144.04	1,307.46	1,470.90	1,797.76	2,124.63	2,451.50	2,941.80
979.89	1,143.21	1,306.52	1,469.84	1,796.47	2,123.10	2,449.73	2,939.68
1,031.59	1,203.52	1,375.45	1,547.38	1,891.24	2,235.10	2,578.97	3,094.76
979.45	1,142.69	1,305.93	1,469.17	1,795.65	2,122.13	2,448.62	2,938.34
983.93	1,147.93	1,311.91	1,475.90	1,803.87	2,131.85	2,459.83	2,951.80
971.80	1,133.77	1,295.73	1,457.70	1,781.63	2,105.56	2,429.50	2,915.40
978.47	1,141.56	1,304.63	1,467.71	1,793.86	2,120.02	2,446.18	2,935.42
982.17	1,145.86	1,309.55	1,473.25	1,800.64	2,128.02	2,455.42	2,946.50
969.13	1,130.65	1,292.17	1,453.69	1,776.73	2,099.77	2,422.82	2,907.38
993.63	1,159.23	1,324.83	1,490.44	1,821.65	2,152.85	2,484.07	2,980.88
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
975.53	1,138.13	1,300.71	1,463.30	1,788.47	2,113.65	2,438.83	2,926.60
996.71	1,162.84	1,328.95	1,495.07	1,827.30	2,159.54	2,491.78	2,990.14
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
985.61	1,149.89	1,314.15	1,478.42	1,806.95	2,135.49	2,464.03	2,956.84
972.54	1,134.63	1,296.72	1,458.81	1,782.99	2,107.16	2,431.35	2,917.62

Wiltshire Council Tax Levy 2011-12 By Parish

Appendix B

Parish / Town	Band D £			
	Wiltshire Council	Police	Fire & Rescue	Town / Parish
Edington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	17.42
Enford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	29.70
Erlestoke	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	57.05
Etchilhampston	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	19.60
Everleigh	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	34.70
Figheldean	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	63.00
Firsdawn	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	21.44
Fittleton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	37.63
Fonthill Bishop	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Fonthill Gifford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	23.87
Fovant	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	19.79
Froxfield	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	29.80
Fyfield & West Overton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	22.77
Grafton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	16.64
Great Bedwyn	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	25.27
Great Hinton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	18.10
Great Somerford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	18.28
Great Wishford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	17.36
Grimstead	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	12.95
Grittleton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	14.75
Ham	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	15.64
Hankerton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	23.37
Heddington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	13.92
Heytesbury & Knook	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	26.08
Heywood	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	12.25
Hilmarton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.69
Hilperton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	11.99
Hindon	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	32.18
Holt	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.43
Horningsham	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	53.19

Council Tax Bandings £							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
973.33	1,135.56	1,297.77	1,460.00	1,784.44	2,108.88	2,433.33	2,920.00
981.52	1,145.11	1,308.69	1,472.28	1,799.45	2,126.62	2,453.80	2,944.56
999.75	1,166.38	1,333.00	1,499.63	1,832.88	2,166.13	2,499.38	2,999.26
974.79	1,137.25	1,299.71	1,462.18	1,787.11	2,112.03	2,436.97	2,924.36
984.85	1,149.00	1,313.13	1,477.28	1,805.56	2,133.84	2,462.13	2,954.56
1,003.72	1,171.01	1,338.29	1,505.58	1,840.15	2,174.72	2,509.30	3,011.16
976.01	1,138.69	1,301.35	1,464.02	1,789.35	2,114.69	2,440.03	2,928.04
986.81	1,151.28	1,315.74	1,480.21	1,809.14	2,138.07	2,467.02	2,960.42
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
977.63	1,140.58	1,303.51	1,466.45	1,792.32	2,118.20	2,444.08	2,932.90
974.91	1,137.40	1,299.88	1,462.37	1,787.34	2,112.31	2,437.28	2,924.74
981.59	1,145.19	1,308.78	1,472.38	1,799.57	2,126.76	2,453.97	2,944.76
976.90	1,139.72	1,302.53	1,465.35	1,790.98	2,116.61	2,442.25	2,930.70
972.81	1,134.95	1,297.08	1,459.22	1,783.49	2,107.76	2,432.03	2,918.44
978.57	1,141.66	1,304.75	1,467.85	1,794.04	2,120.22	2,446.42	2,935.70
973.79	1,136.09	1,298.38	1,460.68	1,785.27	2,109.86	2,434.47	2,921.36
973.91	1,136.23	1,298.54	1,460.86	1,785.49	2,110.12	2,434.77	2,921.72
973.29	1,135.51	1,297.72	1,459.94	1,784.37	2,108.80	2,433.23	2,919.88
970.35	1,132.08	1,293.80	1,455.53	1,778.98	2,102.43	2,425.88	2,911.06
971.55	1,133.48	1,295.40	1,457.33	1,781.18	2,105.03	2,428.88	2,914.66
972.15	1,134.17	1,296.19	1,458.22	1,782.27	2,106.31	2,430.37	2,916.44
977.30	1,140.19	1,303.06	1,465.95	1,791.71	2,117.48	2,443.25	2,931.90
971.00	1,132.84	1,294.66	1,456.50	1,780.16	2,103.83	2,427.50	2,913.00
979.11	1,142.29	1,305.47	1,468.66	1,795.03	2,121.39	2,447.77	2,937.32
969.89	1,131.54	1,293.18	1,454.83	1,778.12	2,101.41	2,424.72	2,909.66
978.18	1,141.21	1,304.24	1,467.27	1,793.33	2,119.38	2,445.45	2,934.54
969.71	1,131.34	1,292.95	1,454.57	1,777.80	2,101.04	2,424.28	2,909.14
983.17	1,147.04	1,310.89	1,474.76	1,802.48	2,130.20	2,457.93	2,949.52
978.01	1,141.01	1,304.01	1,467.01	1,793.01	2,119.01	2,445.02	2,934.02
997.18	1,163.38	1,329.57	1,495.77	1,828.16	2,160.55	2,492.95	2,991.54

Wiltshire Council Tax Levy 2011-12 By Parish

Appendix B

Parish / Town	Band D £			
	Wiltshire Council	Police	Fire & Rescue	Town / Parish
Hullavington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	34.46
Idmiston	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.28
Keevil	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	25.23
Kilmington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	25.88
Kington Langley	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	52.31
Kington St Michael	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	37.98
Lacock	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	22.27
Landford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	31.19
Langley Burrell	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	30.13
Latton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	23.40
Laverstock & Ford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	10.78
Lea & Cleverton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	21.78
Leigh	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.32
Limpley Stoke	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	37.29
Little Bedwyn	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	15.89
Little Cheverell	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	27.53
Little Somerford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.27
Longbridge Deverill	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	10.04
Luckington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	16.36
Ludgershall	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	66.49
Lydiard Millicent	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	18.74
Lydiard Tregoze	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	32.12
Lyneham	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	19.79
Maiden Bradley	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	72.90
Malmesbury	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	169.11
Manningford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	34.09
Marden	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	6.12
Market Lavington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	53.97
Marlborough	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	119.41
Marston	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.34

Council Tax Bandings £							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
984.69	1,148.81	1,312.92	1,477.04	1,805.27	2,133.50	2,461.73	2,954.08
977.91	1,140.89	1,303.87	1,466.86	1,792.83	2,118.79	2,444.77	2,933.72
978.54	1,141.63	1,304.72	1,467.81	1,793.99	2,120.16	2,446.35	2,935.62
978.97	1,142.14	1,305.29	1,468.46	1,794.78	2,121.10	2,447.43	2,936.92
996.59	1,162.70	1,328.79	1,494.89	1,827.08	2,159.28	2,491.48	2,989.78
987.04	1,151.55	1,316.05	1,480.56	1,809.57	2,138.58	2,467.60	2,961.12
976.57	1,139.33	1,302.09	1,464.85	1,790.37	2,115.89	2,441.42	2,929.70
982.51	1,146.27	1,310.01	1,473.77	1,801.27	2,128.77	2,456.28	2,947.54
981.81	1,145.44	1,309.07	1,472.71	1,799.98	2,127.24	2,454.52	2,945.42
977.32	1,140.21	1,303.09	1,465.98	1,791.75	2,117.52	2,443.30	2,931.96
968.91	1,130.39	1,291.87	1,453.36	1,776.33	2,099.29	2,422.27	2,906.72
976.24	1,138.95	1,301.65	1,464.36	1,789.77	2,115.18	2,440.60	2,928.72
977.93	1,140.93	1,303.91	1,466.90	1,792.87	2,118.85	2,444.83	2,933.80
986.58	1,151.01	1,315.44	1,479.87	1,808.73	2,137.58	2,466.45	2,959.74
972.31	1,134.37	1,296.41	1,458.47	1,782.57	2,106.67	2,430.78	2,916.94
980.07	1,143.42	1,306.76	1,470.11	1,796.80	2,123.49	2,450.18	2,940.22
977.90	1,140.89	1,303.86	1,466.85	1,792.81	2,118.78	2,444.75	2,933.70
968.41	1,129.82	1,291.21	1,452.62	1,775.42	2,098.22	2,421.03	2,905.24
972.63	1,134.73	1,296.83	1,458.94	1,783.15	2,107.35	2,431.57	2,917.88
1,006.05	1,173.72	1,341.39	1,509.07	1,844.42	2,179.76	2,515.12	3,018.14
974.21	1,136.59	1,298.95	1,461.32	1,786.05	2,110.79	2,435.53	2,922.64
983.13	1,146.99	1,310.84	1,474.70	1,802.41	2,130.12	2,457.83	2,949.40
974.91	1,137.40	1,299.88	1,462.37	1,787.34	2,112.31	2,437.28	2,924.74
1,010.32	1,178.71	1,347.09	1,515.48	1,852.25	2,189.02	2,525.80	3,030.96
1,074.46	1,253.54	1,432.61	1,611.69	1,969.84	2,327.99	2,686.15	3,223.38
984.45	1,148.52	1,312.59	1,476.67	1,804.82	2,132.96	2,461.12	2,953.34
965.80	1,126.77	1,287.73	1,448.70	1,770.63	2,092.56	2,414.50	2,897.40
997.70	1,163.99	1,330.26	1,496.55	1,829.11	2,161.68	2,494.25	2,993.10
1,041.33	1,214.88	1,388.43	1,561.99	1,909.10	2,256.20	2,603.32	3,123.98
977.95	1,140.94	1,303.93	1,466.92	1,792.90	2,118.88	2,444.87	2,933.84

Wiltshire Council Tax Levy 2011-12 By Parish

Appendix B

Parish / Town	Band D £			
	Wiltshire Council	Police	Fire & Rescue	Town / Parish
Marston Meysey	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	20.08
Melksham	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	68.42
Melksham Without	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	37.51
Mere	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	72.32
Mildenhall	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	29.41
Milston	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	14.37
Milton Lilbourne	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	26.94
Minety	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	17.89
Monkton Farleigh	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	22.23
Netheravon	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	47.67
Netherhampton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	9.06
Nettleton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	10.55
Newton Toney	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	39.06
North Bradley	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	11.82
North Newnton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	15.23
North Wraxall	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	9.92
Norton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Norton Bavant	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Oaksey	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	53.26
Odstock	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	34.69
Ogbourne St Andrew	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	15.18
Ogbourne St George	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	22.35
Orcheston	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	16.86
Patney	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	7.38
Pewsey	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	57.19
Pitton & Farley	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	18.56
Potterne	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.66
Poulshot	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	32.75
Preshute	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	25.01
Purton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	97.71

Council Tax Bandings £							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
975.11	1,137.63	1,300.14	1,462.66	1,787.69	2,112.72	2,437.77	2,925.32
1,007.33	1,175.23	1,343.11	1,511.00	1,846.77	2,182.55	2,518.33	3,022.00
986.73	1,151.18	1,315.63	1,480.09	1,809.00	2,137.90	2,466.82	2,960.18
1,009.93	1,178.26	1,346.57	1,514.90	1,851.54	2,188.18	2,524.83	3,029.80
981.33	1,144.88	1,308.43	1,471.99	1,799.10	2,126.20	2,453.32	2,943.98
971.30	1,133.19	1,295.06	1,456.95	1,780.71	2,104.48	2,428.25	2,913.90
979.68	1,142.96	1,306.24	1,469.52	1,796.08	2,122.63	2,449.20	2,939.04
973.65	1,135.92	1,298.19	1,460.47	1,785.02	2,109.56	2,434.12	2,920.94
976.54	1,139.30	1,302.05	1,464.81	1,790.32	2,115.83	2,441.35	2,929.62
993.50	1,159.09	1,324.66	1,490.25	1,821.41	2,152.58	2,483.75	2,980.50
967.76	1,129.06	1,290.34	1,451.64	1,774.22	2,096.81	2,419.40	2,903.28
968.75	1,130.22	1,291.67	1,453.13	1,776.04	2,098.96	2,421.88	2,906.26
987.76	1,152.39	1,317.01	1,481.64	1,810.89	2,140.14	2,469.40	2,963.28
969.60	1,131.20	1,292.80	1,454.40	1,777.60	2,100.79	2,424.00	2,908.80
971.87	1,133.86	1,295.83	1,457.81	1,781.76	2,105.72	2,429.68	2,915.62
968.33	1,129.73	1,291.11	1,452.50	1,775.27	2,098.05	2,420.83	2,905.00
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
997.23	1,163.43	1,329.63	1,495.84	1,828.25	2,160.65	2,493.07	2,991.68
984.85	1,148.99	1,313.13	1,477.27	1,805.55	2,133.83	2,462.12	2,954.54
971.84	1,133.82	1,295.78	1,457.76	1,781.70	2,105.65	2,429.60	2,915.52
976.62	1,139.39	1,302.16	1,464.93	1,790.47	2,116.00	2,441.55	2,929.86
972.96	1,135.12	1,297.28	1,459.44	1,783.76	2,108.07	2,432.40	2,918.88
966.64	1,127.75	1,288.85	1,449.96	1,772.17	2,094.38	2,416.60	2,899.92
999.85	1,166.49	1,333.13	1,499.77	1,833.05	2,166.33	2,499.62	2,999.54
974.09	1,136.45	1,298.79	1,461.14	1,785.83	2,110.53	2,435.23	2,922.28
978.16	1,141.19	1,304.21	1,467.24	1,793.29	2,119.34	2,445.40	2,934.48
983.55	1,147.48	1,311.40	1,475.33	1,803.18	2,131.03	2,458.88	2,950.66
978.39	1,141.46	1,304.52	1,467.59	1,793.72	2,119.85	2,445.98	2,935.18
1,026.86	1,198.01	1,369.14	1,540.29	1,882.57	2,224.86	2,567.15	3,080.58

Wiltshire Council Tax Levy 2011-12 By Parish

Appendix B

Parish / Town	Band D £			
	Wiltshire Council	Police	Fire & Rescue	Town / Parish
Quidhampton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	27.13
Ramsbury	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	38.04
Redlynch	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	19.24
Roundway	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	30.22
Rowde	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	57.96
Rushall	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	27.52
Salisbury	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	85.00
Savernake	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	7.35
Seagry	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	52.96
Sedgehill & Semley	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	18.19
Seend	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	18.30
Semington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	19.78
Shalbourne	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Sherrington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Sherston	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	31.53
Shrewton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	23.45
Sopworth	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	8.33
South Newton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	18.88
South Wraxall	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	14.34
Southwick	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	19.83
St Paul Without	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	11.57
Stanton St Bernard	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	17.70
Stanton St Quintin	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	16.88
Stapleford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	27.28
Staverton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	29.72
Steeple Ashton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	44.86
Steeple Langford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	20.06
Stert	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	10.00
Stockton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	5.04
Stourton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	13.74

Council Tax Bandings £							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
979.81	1,143.11	1,306.41	1,469.71	1,796.31	2,122.91	2,449.52	2,939.42
987.08	1,151.60	1,316.10	1,480.62	1,809.64	2,138.67	2,467.70	2,961.24
974.55	1,136.97	1,299.39	1,461.82	1,786.67	2,111.51	2,436.37	2,923.64
981.87	1,145.51	1,309.15	1,472.80	1,800.09	2,127.37	2,454.67	2,945.60
1,000.36	1,167.09	1,333.81	1,500.54	1,833.99	2,167.44	2,500.90	3,001.08
980.07	1,143.41	1,306.75	1,470.10	1,796.79	2,123.47	2,450.17	2,940.20
1,018.39	1,188.12	1,357.85	1,527.58	1,867.04	2,206.50	2,545.97	3,055.16
966.62	1,127.73	1,288.82	1,449.93	1,772.13	2,094.34	2,416.55	2,899.86
997.03	1,163.20	1,329.37	1,495.54	1,827.88	2,160.22	2,492.57	2,991.08
973.85	1,136.16	1,298.46	1,460.77	1,785.38	2,109.99	2,434.62	2,921.54
973.92	1,136.24	1,298.56	1,460.88	1,785.52	2,110.15	2,434.80	2,921.76
974.91	1,137.39	1,299.87	1,462.36	1,787.33	2,112.29	2,437.27	2,924.72
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
982.74	1,146.53	1,310.32	1,474.11	1,801.69	2,129.26	2,456.85	2,948.22
977.35	1,140.25	1,303.13	1,466.03	1,791.81	2,117.59	2,443.38	2,932.06
967.27	1,128.49	1,289.69	1,450.91	1,773.33	2,095.75	2,418.18	2,901.82
974.31	1,136.69	1,299.07	1,461.46	1,786.23	2,110.99	2,435.77	2,922.92
971.28	1,133.16	1,295.04	1,456.92	1,780.68	2,104.43	2,428.20	2,913.84
974.94	1,137.43	1,299.92	1,462.41	1,787.39	2,112.36	2,437.35	2,924.82
969.43	1,131.01	1,292.57	1,454.15	1,777.29	2,100.43	2,423.58	2,908.30
973.52	1,135.78	1,298.02	1,460.28	1,784.78	2,109.29	2,433.80	2,920.56
972.97	1,135.14	1,297.29	1,459.46	1,783.78	2,108.10	2,432.43	2,918.92
979.91	1,143.23	1,306.54	1,469.86	1,796.49	2,123.12	2,449.77	2,939.72
981.53	1,145.13	1,308.71	1,472.30	1,799.47	2,126.65	2,453.83	2,944.60
991.63	1,156.90	1,322.17	1,487.44	1,817.98	2,148.52	2,479.07	2,974.88
975.09	1,137.61	1,300.12	1,462.64	1,787.67	2,112.70	2,437.73	2,925.28
968.39	1,129.79	1,291.18	1,452.58	1,775.37	2,098.16	2,420.97	2,905.16
965.08	1,125.93	1,286.77	1,447.62	1,769.31	2,091.00	2,412.70	2,895.24
970.88	1,132.70	1,294.50	1,456.32	1,779.94	2,103.57	2,427.20	2,912.64

Wiltshire Council Tax Levy 2011-12 By Parish

Appendix B

Parish / Town	Band D £			
	Wiltshire Council	Police	Fire & Rescue	Town / Parish
Stratford Toney	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Sutton Benger	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	15.95
Sutton Mandeville	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	6.54
Sutton Veny	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	31.30
Swallowcliffe	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	14.49
Teffont	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	48.62
Tidcombe & Fosbury	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	0.00
Tidworth	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	66.89
Tilshead	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	45.93
Tisbury	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	42.39
Tockenham	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.98
Tollard Royal	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	46.94
Trowbridge	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	114.71
Upavon	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	29.54
Upper Deverills	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	34.94
Upton Lovell	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	28.61
Upton Scudamore	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	19.42
Urchfont	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	53.58
Warminster	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	72.06
West Ashton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	13.22
West Dean	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	38.83
West Knoyle	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	32.49
West Lavington	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	41.02
West Tisbury	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	15.52
Westbury	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	67.07
Westwood	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	21.02
Whiteparish	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	39.15
Wilcot & Huish	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	14.92
Wilsford-cum-Lake	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	6.80
Wilton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	76.62

Council Tax Bandings £							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
972.35	1,134.42	1,296.47	1,458.53	1,782.64	2,106.76	2,430.88	2,917.06
966.08	1,127.10	1,288.10	1,449.12	1,771.14	2,093.17	2,415.20	2,898.24
982.59	1,146.35	1,310.11	1,473.88	1,801.41	2,128.93	2,456.47	2,947.76
971.38	1,133.28	1,295.17	1,457.07	1,780.86	2,104.65	2,428.45	2,914.14
994.13	1,159.83	1,325.51	1,491.20	1,822.57	2,153.95	2,485.33	2,982.40
961.72	1,122.01	1,282.29	1,442.58	1,763.15	2,083.72	2,404.30	2,885.16
1,006.31	1,174.04	1,341.75	1,509.47	1,844.90	2,180.34	2,515.78	3,018.94
992.34	1,157.73	1,323.12	1,488.51	1,819.29	2,150.06	2,480.85	2,977.02
989.98	1,154.98	1,319.97	1,484.97	1,814.96	2,144.95	2,474.95	2,969.94
978.37	1,141.44	1,304.49	1,467.56	1,793.68	2,119.80	2,445.93	2,935.12
993.01	1,158.52	1,324.01	1,489.52	1,820.52	2,151.52	2,482.53	2,979.04
1,038.19	1,211.23	1,384.25	1,557.29	1,903.35	2,249.41	2,595.48	3,114.58
981.41	1,144.99	1,308.55	1,472.12	1,799.25	2,126.39	2,453.53	2,944.24
985.01	1,149.19	1,313.35	1,477.52	1,805.85	2,134.19	2,462.53	2,955.04
980.79	1,144.26	1,307.72	1,471.19	1,798.12	2,125.05	2,451.98	2,942.38
974.67	1,137.11	1,299.55	1,462.00	1,786.89	2,111.77	2,436.67	2,924.00
997.44	1,163.68	1,329.92	1,496.16	1,828.64	2,161.11	2,493.60	2,992.32
1,009.76	1,178.06	1,346.34	1,514.64	1,851.22	2,187.81	2,524.40	3,029.28
970.53	1,132.29	1,294.04	1,455.80	1,779.31	2,102.82	2,426.33	2,911.60
987.61	1,152.21	1,316.81	1,481.41	1,810.61	2,139.81	2,469.02	2,962.82
983.38	1,147.28	1,311.17	1,475.07	1,802.86	2,130.65	2,458.45	2,950.14
989.07	1,153.91	1,318.75	1,483.60	1,813.29	2,142.97	2,472.67	2,967.20
972.07	1,134.08	1,296.09	1,458.10	1,782.12	2,106.14	2,430.17	2,916.20
1,006.43	1,174.18	1,341.91	1,509.65	1,845.12	2,180.60	2,516.08	3,019.30
975.73	1,138.36	1,300.97	1,463.60	1,788.84	2,114.08	2,439.33	2,927.20
987.82	1,152.46	1,317.09	1,481.73	1,811.00	2,140.27	2,469.55	2,963.46
971.67	1,133.61	1,295.55	1,457.50	1,781.39	2,105.27	2,429.17	2,915.00
966.25	1,127.30	1,288.33	1,449.38	1,771.46	2,093.54	2,415.63	2,898.76
1,012.80	1,181.60	1,350.40	1,519.20	1,856.80	2,194.39	2,532.00	3,038.40

Wiltshire Council Tax Levy 2011-12 By Parish

Appendix B

Parish / Town	Band D £			
	Wiltshire Council	Police	Fire & Rescue	Town / Parish
Wingfield	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	29.71
Winsley	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	15.34
Winterbourne	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	28.65
Winterbourne Stoke	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.99
Winterslow	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	25.19
Woodborough	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	8.48
Woodford	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	17.56
Wootton Bassett	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	186.78
Wootton Rivers	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	19.69
Worton	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	25.10
Wylve	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	24.30
Yatton Keynell	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	23.62
Zeals	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	18.18
Averages / Totals	1,222.43	157.77	62.38	71.02

Council Tax Bandings £							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
981.53	1,145.12	1,308.70	1,472.29	1,799.46	2,126.63	2,453.82	2,944.58
971.95	1,133.94	1,295.93	1,457.92	1,781.90	2,105.88	2,429.87	2,915.84
980.82	1,144.29	1,307.76	1,471.23	1,798.17	2,125.10	2,452.05	2,942.46
978.38	1,141.45	1,304.50	1,467.57	1,793.69	2,119.82	2,445.95	2,935.14
978.51	1,141.60	1,304.68	1,467.77	1,793.94	2,120.11	2,446.28	2,935.54
967.37	1,128.61	1,289.83	1,451.06	1,773.51	2,095.97	2,418.43	2,902.12
973.43	1,135.67	1,297.90	1,460.14	1,784.61	2,109.08	2,433.57	2,920.28
1,086.24	1,267.28	1,448.32	1,629.36	1,991.44	2,353.51	2,715.60	3,258.72
974.85	1,137.32	1,299.79	1,462.27	1,787.22	2,112.16	2,437.12	2,924.54
978.45	1,141.53	1,304.60	1,467.68	1,793.83	2,119.98	2,446.13	2,935.36
977.92	1,140.91	1,303.89	1,466.88	1,792.85	2,118.82	2,444.80	2,933.76
977.47	1,140.38	1,303.29	1,466.20	1,792.02	2,117.84	2,443.67	2,932.40
973.84	1,136.15	1,298.45	1,460.76	1,785.37	2,109.98	2,434.60	2,921.52
248,497.98	289,915.11	331,329.75	372,746.96	455,578.81	538,410.58	621,244.94	745,493.92

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Council

22 February 2011

South Wiltshire Core Strategy – Review Of Housing And Employment Requirements

**Questions From Councillor Ian McLennan
Laverstock, Ford & Old Sarum Division**

**To Councillor John Brady, Cabinet Member For Economic
Development, Planning And Housing**

Question 1

Page 129 of Council papers

Page 30 Strategic Objective 2

The requirements for South Wiltshire have dropped by 20%. There is a will in Government and amongst rural councillors, to permit some local building to house the young of their community.

Why does the document still insist that “Well over half the number will have been built in or around Salisbury”?

Answer

The role and function of Salisbury in terms of its level of services, employment and cultural facilities clearly indicates that it is the most sustainable location for growth within South Wiltshire, particularly when considered against the more rural nature of the other settlements within South Wiltshire.

A considerable level of growth is focused to the area outside of Salisbury (3,900 dwellings), which will enable housing development to take place in the more rural parts of the area.

Question 2

The first desired outcome states that the local character will be respected.

Why is the Parish of Laverstock & Ford not included in this desired outcome and why is a previously essential strategic gap separating two communities within the parish and part of a Conservation zone, now not worthy of retention at all?

Answer

The recommended changes within the document to the Development Template for Hampton Part (SWCS, Appendix A, Page 143) place greater emphasis on the need to ensure an appropriate strategic gap between Ford and Salisbury, in order to respect the local character of Ford.

Salisbury City is a constrained environment with its administrative boundaries not covering the full extent of its urban area. Some of the future housing will need to be provided on the edge adjacent to its urban area. This means that development may need to take place in the neighbouring parish of Laverstock. The sites selected for growth have been subject to a rigorous appraisal process and are based on clear and credible evidence. These reasons must be based on sound planning reasons rather than the administrative boundary of the parish where they are located.

It is appreciated that any development could have an impact on local character but it is important that through sensitive design and landscaping local character is respected as much as possible.

Question 3

Page 130 of Council Papers

Desired outcomes – Relocation of businesses from Churchfields Estate to more unconstrained locations.

Why has the ideal relocation site for Churchfields – namely Netherhampton Road, been deleted entirely and the remote site of Longhedge – in the rural parish of Laverstock & Ford – been allocated 8 hectares of additional land, when none of the employment land allocated to Old Sarum (Next door), in the current Local Plan, has been used?

Answer

The review does not propose to change the employment land allocation of 8 hectares at Longhedge. In addition, available employment land currently exists in the Netherhampton area as well as at Old Sarum. The business community has clearly stated that a range of choice of decant sites is required, including land to the north of the City.

The 'review' clearly sets out the reappraisal of the sites and the rationale why the Netherhampton Road site is not the best option (see section 11 of the Topic Paper 20 review on site comparison). This process looks at a number of criteria cumulatively and there is no single reason which would explain why a site is ranked in the order it is.

Question 4

Why has the 'TOWN/ancient Capital' Wilton been drastically cut from an allocation of 950 to 220, when representatives were calling out for development to save the town?

Answer

The review concludes that because of the strategic growth to the west of Salisbury (Fugglestone Red – 1250 dwellings, 8 hectares employment), together with the UKLF site at Wilton (450 dwellings, 3 hectares employment), Salisbury and Wilton are best considered together (see paragraphs 9.8 to 9.14, Topic Paper 20). Simply put, Wilton and Salisbury have a special functional relationship and while it is important to recognise their individual characteristics, the relationship should be acknowledged.

There was local concern that the proposed housing numbers suggested for the Wilton CA Core Strategy and the reduction also recognises that outside of Wilton the Community Area is extremely rural in nature and with few larger villages has limited scope to accommodate modest new development.

Question 5

Why are Alderbury, Coombe Bissett, Pitton, Whiteparish and the Winterslows depicted as having Downton as a service centre, when there is no natural relationship at all? Why is Laverstock & Ford Parish not mentioned in its own right and described only as "Settlements located in the northern part of the community area"?

Answer

This is based on the established Community Areas. The functional relationship of settlements is mentioned in paragraph 9.2 of the draft Core Strategy (submission draft) which mentions the strong functional influence of Salisbury on this Community Area. It should be borne in mind that the review has a narrow focus based on assessing implications of locally derived growth figures, a remit agreed with the Inspector. The role of Downton, as a Local Service Centre, has not therefore been reconsidered through the review. However, the settlement hierarchy was discussed at EIP and the Inspector will draw his own conclusions on this matter.

Question 6

Page 132 council papers

Page 49 Core Policy 2 Strategic Allocations

There are only four major greenfield sites allocated in the whole of South Wiltshire. How can having two allocated in one rural parish (Laverstock & Ford) be either fair or justifiable?

Answer

This has been justified through the objective scrutiny of the alternative options available to identify the best (least worst options) for development. Salisbury is a highly constrained environment and sound planning reasons, based on evidence, have been used to determine, which sites should come forward during this plan period (see response to question 2 above). The location of two sites in one parish is not in itself a reason that can be used to justify the reduction in the level of growth in an area.

The sites identified in Laverstock and Ford Parish will serve Salisbury. While this is unfortunate it is a consequence of the relationship between the Parish and the City. Furthermore, this strategic growth will not impact on Laverstock village itself.

Question 7

As a result of the proposed allocations Laverstock & Ford Parish – largely rural until the last Local Plan – is targeted for 950 dwellings + 8 hectares of additional Employment land and the removal of most of its green space. This is in addition to the 850 dwellings and several hectares of Employment land, absorbed in the current Local plan. Given that 474 of the dwellings are yet to be built and none of the Employment land has been used, this burden is far too great for a single parish to be allocated. Given the complete unfairness and blatant disregard for local representation, will the cabinet member explain how he is able to support this undoubted rape of a single parish and loss of its entire character?

Answer

The dwellings are planned as urban extensions to Salisbury, which has insufficient land within its restricted boundary. The site identification process has been based on an objective assessment of the landscape and constraints around Salisbury. Although two of the new sites fall within the Parish, the evidence is clear that they represent two of the best of the few options open to us. Careful design of the proposed developments and securing the planning gain (such as the large area of open space to be gifted to the community at Hampton Park), will be important to ensure that high quality outcomes can be delivered, including much needed affordable housing.

Question 8

Apart from an orchestrated petitioning by people living, in many cases, miles from the site, what are the reasons that the ideal expansion of Netherhampton Road to accommodate dwellings and Churchfields relocation has been removed from the Core Strategy?

Answer

As mentioned (see response to question 3) the sites were selected using an evidence based approach and have been reviewed and ranked using objective criteria, as set out in the review document. That document sets out the reasons why Netherhampton Road was in environmental terms the least best of the sites. As the revised housing figures suggest that we do not need all of the strategic allocations at this time, it was logical to remove this one and identify it as a reserve site to come forward in the longer term if required. The evidence did not correlate with your view that the site represents an 'ideal expansion'.

Question 9

Page 133 Council Papers

Page 145-7 Core Strategy Hampton Park Development

Place Shaping Requirements:

"Defining the Strategic Gap between the development and the settlement of Ford"

How can that statement be meaningful, whilst the numbers remain at 500 and used virtually all the existing Strategic Gap?

Answer

The review and proposed changes have reinforced the need to plan appropriately for a strategic gap. There may be some misunderstanding about this gap with the map within the draft Core Strategy making the gap look narrower than it is. By its nature a strategic gap is an area of undeveloped land between built up areas. For this purpose, the total open area that would be maintained between Ford and the built edge of the new development including the existing fields outside of the strategic allocation site would represent the strategic gap. At its narrowest this gap would provide a buffer of some 172 metres and at its maximum 208 meters. The design of the site will need to be subject to appropriate structural landscaping which will help soften

the impact on views from Ford. I recognise that the gap, albeit a reduced one, must be maintained into the future.

Question 10

“A community forum be established to help steer the development for the site and ensure that outcomes meet local needs”

How can the virtual elimination of the existing narrow strip of land separating Ford & Hampton Park (both in the Parish of Laverstock & Ford) permit any local needs? Surely, these needs should have been met by deleting the allocation, as local need and fair play dictate?

Answer

In addition to the answer to Question 9, I would point out that there has been a constructive dialogue with community representatives over this site. I recognise that some of the community were reluctant to accept the principle, but they also took the view that if it did happen then they would enter into engagement and seek the best outcomes for the community. This has revolved around such things as the future use of the large area of land to be given to the community as part of this application (known as the ‘country park’), and an appraisal of existing and complimentary community facilities in relation to the existing development.

We must be mindful that if we did delete a site without sound evidence on which to base that judgement, that the Inspector would not be likely to accept it.

Question 11

Given the rejection of 500 additional dwellings at Hampton Park, at the Strategic Planning meeting of 16th February and the comments by councillors from the rest of Wiltshire, that the site was unsuitable for development, owing to the impact on Ford (due to the loss of the strategic gap) and Old Sarum Ancient Monument (development could be seen), can the will of the local people and the unanimous verdict of the councillors be upheld and the whole of the strategic gap be retained as an essential ingredient to the setting of Salisbury and the Parish of Laverstock & Ford?

Answer

The reasons for refusal by the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) generally related to the need for further information before the authority could determine the application. It is recognised that an additional reason was added, which considered the application to be contrary to the existing development plan (saved policies C7, H23 and G1 - Salisbury Local Plan). In considering this particular application, the SPC gave little weight to the emerging policies within the draft South Wiltshire Core Strategy.

When making new planning policy, we must ensure that it is based on robust and credible evidence. Officers cannot find robust evidence on which to conclude that the site is unsuitable. Indeed we must bear in mind that the SWCS was originally submitted by a unanimous vote of Full Council. The Core Strategy does not seek to remove the gap and indeed the review reaffirms the importance of retaining a gap, which we will retain in the long term.

There is no wish to compromise the setting of Old Sarum. Work has been undertaken with English Heritage and their consultants on a Landscape Heritage Appraisal, to try and mitigate impacts wherever possible. The confinement of the Hampton Park development to the south east of the wider development site and the retention of the green space ('country park'), would help mitigate any potential impacts and help ensure that future development does not encroach into the setting of Old Sarum.

Salisbury itself is visible from the ramparts of Old Sarum and to embargo new growth from its view, would prevent any growth future development taking place in this side of the City.

This page is intentionally left blank

Wiltshire Council

Council

22 February 2011

Councillors' Questions

**Questions From Councillor Ernie Clark
Hilperton Division**

To Councillor Jane Scott OBE, Leader Of The Council

Question 1

Wiltshire Council is due to relocate to the old George Ward school site soon. However, during November 2010, I noticed a number of Haven Fire vans outside the old school site including evenings and weekends.

The school had pupils in it until July and presumably had a fire alarm system that safeguarded the pupils and staff. Why, four months later, did it seem that the whole of the premises needed a new system? What work was required, why the apparent urgency and what was the cost?

Response

The school's occupation was under a fire risk assessment and management protocol in line with the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005, which would have acknowledged the presence of a functional fire alarm system. This system was not a full fire detection system, and relied on manual call points. This system, coupled with a robust fire risk assessment, based on the school's hours of use, evacuation procedures and the like, provided adequate protection for the pupils and staff at the school up to July, and was the responsibility of the school to manage.

The nature of the works carried out at the school to change its use from a school to an office, albeit for temporary use, required a full Building Regulations application to be made. This brings with it a requirement to comply with the current building regulations. The building regulations are not required to have been retrospectively applied to existing occupied school buildings. The former school is to be used on a temporary basis and so only absolutely necessary works have been specified. In order to ascertain what the legal minimum installation would be, a Pre-occupation Fire Risk Assessment (in accordance with the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005) was undertaken early on and a fire strategy developed in support of the Building Regulation application.

The system installed provides for smoke detection to corridors and escape routes only, with heat detection to tea-points, communications rooms, boiler room and the canteen/kitchen. We have not installed a full detection system to all areas. The developed fire strategy makes allowance for the fact that the occupied areas of the building are on the ground floor and escape doors are numerous. In conjunction with active management by the Council over the next two years, this has avoided the

need to install a full detection system. In addition, some works have been necessary to improve the sound level of the existing fire alarm sounders to meet current building regulations requirements for office buildings.

The cost of works to the fire alarm system is in the order of £48,000.

In summary, the works to the fire alarm system at the former George Ward School have been specified to match the requirements of the Building Regulations, and to fit with a robust fire risk assessment in line with fire safety regulations. These works have been wholly necessary in order for the use of the buildings to be changed from a school to an office.

Question 2

What progress is being made to recover the 'non-pensionable honoraria' awarded either for doing additional work or 'acting up' at Kennet District Council? Has any money actually been recovered yet?

Response

The Council is pursuing two claims amounting to a total sum of approximately £ 20,000. Both cases are being contested and one of the individuals has instructed a solicitor. The Council is considering its position in the light of the points raised in defence.

**To Councillor John Brady, Cabinet Member For Economic Development,
Planning And Housing**

Question 3

What is the likely cost to Wiltshire Council for a) the tenure reforms required by the government and b) the cost to close the housing waiting list to accept only people that WC define to be in housing need?

Response

The costs associated with the tenure reform and the potential changes to the housing waiting list are not yet known because Wiltshire has not yet decided how it would like to take advantage of these new flexibilities. Our current position is that any cost associated with this reform will be absorbed within existing budgets as we have no provision within existing budgets to incur extra expenditure for this work.

Wiltshire Council

Council

22 February 2011

Councillors' Questions

Question From Councillor Howard Marshall, Calne Central Division

**To Councillor John Brady, Cabinet Member For Economic Development,
Planning And Housing**

Question 1

Following the restructuring and downsizing of the Planning Enforcement team, can the Cabinet Member assure me that we will have the capability to enforce the ever increasing digressions of the developers? Particularly in the North where we are left with one full time officer and one part time officer to do the work formerly done by a team of four plus one part time officer. Also can the cabinet member tell me the extent of the backlog of work currently not completed.

Response

Following the Management Review, the service is undergoing a number of changes as it moves from four independently managed teams, one in each each hub, to a single county wide team with one manager who took up post on the 14th Feb. The Enforcement Team is currently reviewing the way it operates, its structure, the job descriptions of officers and how it applies staff to ensure effectiveness is improved and the allocation of resources reflects demand.

The number of open enforcement cases varies across the county and is as follows: -

North Hub (Monkton Park)	280
Central Hub(The former Devizes and Bradley Rd hubs)	167
South Hub (Bourne Hill)	152

The number of open cases does not mean there is a 'backlog', all cases are being investigated but enforcement is often a slow process. Having said this, capacity to deal with cases in the north has been affected because of the absence of the former manager due to illness, but this is now in the process of being addressed as part of the service review process and a vacant post in the north hub is currently being advertised.

Wiltshire Council

Council

22 February 2011

Councillors' Questions

Question From Councillor Jon Hubbard Melksham South Division

**To Councillor John Thomson, Cabinet Member For Adult Care, Communities
And Libraries**

Question 1

At the recent Area Board meeting in Melksham, attended by the Cabinet Member, the proposed new Community Campus was on the agenda. A presentation of the council's single proposed site was given but there was no opportunity for questions or discussion. Instead a very limited number of points of clarification were permitted. From these it became clear that no economic impact assessments, transport studies or feasibility studies have taken place, and they will not take place until after the final consultation for the public has completed.

In addition, the public are being invited to participate in a consultation on the issue before the issue is debated and before councillors (and the public) have the opportunity to ask questions of officers in a public forum such as the Area Board (the consultation is due to close on the 15th March and the Area Board scheduled for the issue to be discussed is on the 29th March).

Could the cabinet member please tell me:

- 1) In his opinion does this "putting the cart before the horse" demonstrate best practice or will he confirm that, in this instance, the council have got it wrong?
- 2) If he does believe that the practice that has been followed is acceptable could he please explain how this demonstrates how the Council's by-line "where everybody matters" can be justifiably used?
- 3) Does he intend to make it standard practice for the facts about proposals only to be disclosed only once any consultations have been completed?

Response

- 1) The Council has undertaken an assessment of the options for developing a community campus to serve the Melksham Community Area and following an appraisal of the audit and research work done to date a preferred option has been put forward for public consultation. The audit and research work has not included an economic impact assessment or a transport plan as this would form part of a potential future planning application. This was made very clear at the Area Board on the Wednesday 2 February 2011. An initial baseline feasibility study on the preferred site has been undertaken to determine broad deliverability

and initial cost estimates. This information was made available at the Area Board and on the Council's website.

The proposed preferred option has been presented to the community and the Council is asking that local people make their views known at a specially convened Area Board on the 29 March 2011. Detailed questions were not recommended for the Area Board on the 2 February as the intention was to give a detailed presentation and supporting information that would most likely give local people the answers to the majority of questions. Local people have been asked to consider the proposal and are invited to participate in a detailed debate, held in a public forum, on the 29 March.

In the interim period local people have an opportunity to participate in the consultation by direct contact up to the 29th March with the Council through either a dedicated email address or by writing into the Council. In addition the Melksham Community Area Partnership are holding a series of consultation events and will be collating information to present to the specially convened Area Board on the 29th March. The consultation is being led by the Area Board, rightly in my view.

The concept of a community campus is essentially tailoring service provision to the local community to ensure local needs are met. An extensive consultation exercise is taking place, led by the Area Board, this I understand will include opportunities for open debate, but as the only locally elected body representing the entire community area, it is only right that the elected members of Area Board shape the consultation process as I believe they have in this case.

The Council has been open and transparent about the process to date through a detailed presentation at the Area Board on the 2 February 2011. This included the rationale behind the preferred option and it is intended that any questions local people have about both the proposed option and the rationale behind it can be openly discussed at the specially convened Area Board on the 29 March 2011, I understand that is the specific purpose of the special area board meeting. Once these discussions have taken place locally elected Members will be asked to come to a view on whether they wish to support the current proposal. This ensures locally elected Members will have an opportunity to take part in, and observe the detailed debate before making a decision on how they would wish to project to proceed.

To Councillor John Noeken, Cabinet Member For Resources

Question 2

At the recent Area Board meeting in Melksham the proposed new Community Campus was on the agenda. A presentation of the council's single proposed site was given but there was no opportunity for questions or discussion. Instead a very limited number of points of clarification were permitted. From these it became clear that no economic impact assessments, transport studies or feasibility studies have taken place, and they will not take place until after the final consultation for the public has completed.

In addition, the public are being invited to participate in a consultation on the issue before the issue is debated and before councillors (and the public) have the opportunity to ask questions of officers at the Area Board (the consultation is due to close on the 15th March and the Area Board scheduled for the issue to be discussed is on the 29th March).

It has therefore not been possible for members or the public to ask questions in a public forum on this issue. Therefore I am asking today, and in order that they are a matter of public record, the questions that I believe I, and others, should have been permitted to ask at the meeting where the proposal was presented.

1. The library is currently used by a number of organisations that are based, or meet, in the Town Centre (such as the majority of the Town's primary schools and voluntary groups such as the Cubs). Can the cabinet member tell me what impact assessment has been made on how these groups will be affected by the closure of the town centre library?
2. Wiltshire recently spent £288,727 refurbishing Melksham's Town Centre Library. How does it represent best value for money to spend it and then scrap it?
3. Wiltshire Council, and its predecessor West Wiltshire District Council, fought the new Asda Development in Melksham on the basis that it was an 'out-of-town' development and this was against their policy. Could the Cabinet Member please inform me when they performed a about turn on this?
4. I, along with many others, have been asking for a copy of the proposals for the Campus for several months. Indeed in November when I presented to this council a petition signed by 2,184 local residents objecting to the proposed closure of the Town Centre Library and its relocation to the Melksham Oak site I was informed that there were, as yet, no such plans and that such documents were not yet produced. Yet now that we finally have the council's proposals I see that the Sustainability Appraisal Report, the main document released to the public, is dated October 2010. Can the Cabinet Member please explain why this document was withheld from members, despite their requesting it, and could he say, categorically for the record, what other reports are being, will be or have been produced in relation to the Melksham Campus and provide a timeline for when they will be available to the public.
5. In the council's own sustainability report when looking at the preferred option the report itself identifies the potential impact on the Town Centre of removing the library and says (Page 54, item 13 Community Facilities) "If a campus were built in this location, retention of some services in the town centre eg the library,

should be considered” and then (Page 55, item 14 Education and Skills)
 “Provision of a new library may be better located within the town centre where there would be greater accessibility to a wider number of people.”

Most damaging however is the statement (Page 55, Item 16 Economy) “Directing services and facilities to town centre locations would draw people into the centre, helping to improve vitality and viability of retail and other businesses. Development of an edge-of-town campus would have the opposite effect and would be unlikely to aid regeneration – a priority for the town and stated in the Wiltshire LDF.”

Why is the council not following its own advice and policy?

6. Why has the council dismissed the option of a split site campus, with the Library and Youth Centre being retained at their current locations and the new development at Melksham Oak housing the remaining facilities as being hypothetical and therefore impossible to cost? These facilities are in place at their current locations and surely the cost of these buildings is known to the council?

Response

1. The current proposal for a community campus in Melksham looks at the re-provision of attractive, up to date, accessible and improved library facilities within a campus facility on the Woolmore Farm site. This facility would be designed to cater for the needs of the Melksham community area and as such a potential planning process would include the production of a sustainable transport assessment and a plan to encourage continued use of library facilities for existing users.
2. The potential savings of delivering a community campus far outweigh the historical investment made into the existing library facility, details of which were presented at the Melksham Area Board on 2 March 2011. From a value for money perspective, it is important that future costs are analysed rather than historic ones.
3. In spatial planning terms there are a variety of policies that could be seen to either support central development or edge of town development, this would be dependent on the application concerned. An example of such a policy would be the adopted Leisure & Recreation Development Plan Document that advises the replacement of indoor leisure facilities in Melksham be firstly considered on the Woolmore Farm site.
4. The proposal for the Melksham Community Campus was presented to the area board in February 2011. As the question indicates, you have been asking for a copy of the Campus proposal, which was not available until the Sustainability Assessment was completed. It must be understood the Sustainability Appraisal is not the campus proposal but part of the process of developing one. All background information and audit and research work is available. The Sustainability Appraisal, a non-statutory spatial planning tool that is one part of the background audit work, was completed firstly in October 2010. However as a first draft it needed to be reviewed before being made available. Even now for

example, the Sustainability Appraisal does not include any weighting for the travel plan which will need to accommodate any planning application. Any planning application will include consideration of the development of sustainable transport arrangements that will be to the benefit of the wider Melksham Community Area. The final draft of the sustainability appraisal was made available in early 2011 and the Council has made it clear that it is a public document and available to all. Additional work that will need to be completed assuming the current proposal proceeds include an economic impact assessment and the transport plan forming part of a planning process. The timeline for this is clear within appendix b of the campus development and management proposal Cabinet paper considered on 15 February 2011 and was specifically covered in the presentation at the area board.

5. The Sustainability Appraisal is not Council policy; it is a spatial planning tool which is considered one part of the audit and research work associated with the community campus proposal. The findings of the appraisal have been assessed against the remainder of the audit work and the current proposal best meets the wider objectives of what the Council is looking to achieve from the co-location of services and consideration of the report will both shape the nature of items such as transport arrangements to any Campus.
6. The proposed option for community campus delivery in Melksham is a single site option. The benefits to the library and youth services if they remain in their present position are likely to be outweighed by the wider benefits co-location presents. This includes the potential for better quality modern services, extended opening hours, cross-service use, vastly improved fit for purpose and efficient buildings that reduce running costs, significant ongoing financial and environmental savings and the reduction of risk to the Council. It is important to emphasise that the final recommendation to Cabinet on the Melksham Campus will be made by the Area Board, which is leading the consultation process.

Wiltshire Council

Council

22 February 2011

Councillors' Questions

**Question From Councillor Jeff Osborn
Trowbridge Grove Division**

**To Councillor Lionel Grundy OBE, Cabinet Member For Children's Services
And Councillor John Brady, Cabinet Member For Economic Development,
Planning And Housing**

Question 1

Given that the Conservative led Government has terminated the Future Jobs Fund Scheme, what is this Council doing to tackle the scandal of rising youth unemployment in Wiltshire?

Response

The Wiltshire Potential Future Jobs Fund (FJF) contract with Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) is to create 495 new/additional jobs for unemployed young people aged 18-24 between October 2009 and March 2011. The contract runs until September 2011.

By 15 February 2011, all 495 jobs had been advertised with Job Centre Plus. 416 of these have been filled; another 15 are waiting on start dates. Thanks to our 21 employer partners we are confident we will fill all the vacancies giving 495 unemployed young people the chance of real work in a real job.

Our Jobcentre Plus (JCP) colleagues have indicated that as at 25 January the destinations for 209 Wiltshire Potential FJF leavers were:

- 46% found work,
- 1% University
- 1% travelling
- 2% maternity leave
- 12% unknown
- 38% went back on benefit,

Given the opportunity Wiltshire Council would certainly have sought to expand its FJF programme beyond September 2011.

The FJF experience in Wiltshire has been an unqualified success for both its employees and its employers. It has also been a very positive and far reaching example of successful partnership working which has helped the development of

even stronger working relationships to tackle worklessness in Wiltshire especially with Jobcentre Plus and with Wiltshire College.

The issue of young people's lack of preparedness for the world of work is of key importance for Wiltshire Works - the Worklessness sub-group of the Employment & Skills Board (ESB). At its meeting on 11th February the Action for Wiltshire Board agreed to convene a special meeting of Wiltshire Works to look at support for 16-24 year olds.

Young People are amongst the people priorities in the Wiltshire Work & Skills Plan which outlines relevant activity aimed at increasing opportunities to help young people achieve their potential such as:

- Wiltshire Works Grant

We are working with JCP locally on a national pilot to provide 40 jobs for existing long term unemployed (2 year+). The jobs will be for at least 30 hours a week and last for 13 weeks. We are recruiting local employers as part of the Action for Wiltshire programme with 20 vacancies at the start of February 2011 and another 20 vacancies at the start of March 2011.

- Work Experience for unemployed young people

We are working with JCP on a work experience initiative for up to 300 unemployed 18-24 year olds who have been claiming JSA for 13 weeks or more to offer them work experience placements of up to 8 weeks and pay their travel costs if they live independently of family or with family in receipt of income based benefits.

The aims of the initiative are to:

- Maximise the number of young people moving into employment or training through providing young unemployed people with quality work experience. If successful this will minimise the number of young people flowing onto the DWP Work Programme.
- Working with Wiltshire College, neighbouring universities, employers and sector skills councils to develop the Higher Education offer and increase access to Higher Education
- Addressing attitude/cultural barriers of employers regarding their perception of young people
- A Basic Skills project to assist those who left compulsory education without the minimum skills level required for employability
- The WSEP Basic Skills Performance Reward Grant project being delivered by Wiltshire College commenced in August 2010. The project seeks to assist those who left compulsory education without the minimum skills level required for employability. Specifically it aims to:

- Increase the number of adults obtaining a Skills for Life qualification at Entry Level 3
 - Increase the number of adults passing a Level 1 National Test in Adult Literacy (and/or Numeracy) from any of the accredited examining bodies
 - Increase number of adults who gain a Level 2 qualification in Adult Literacy (and/or Numeracy) from any of the accredited examining bodies or any other Level 2 Qualification
- Through its own Skills for Life contract with the Skills Funding Agency, Wiltshire Council has been actively raising the Basic Skills levels of its workforce to increase employability. In 2008/09 139 staff were enrolled on programme with an achievement rate of 94.2%. In 2009/10 74 staff were enrolled on programme with an achievement rate of 97.3%. The lower number of learners is due to funding changes which excluded stand alone Skills for Life provision in 2009/10 so that the numbers are only for those enrolled on NVQ courses. Through the Family Learning Skills for Life contract with the Skills Funding Agency, the Council has been actively raising the Basic Skills levels of its communities. In 2008/09 there were 138 on programme with an achievement rate of 93.5%. In 2009/10 there were 64 on programme with an achievement rate of 94%. Enrolment numbers were fewer in 2009/10 as a result of national policy changes which now embed Family Learning Skills for Life courses within longer Family Learning courses rather than deliver as additional 'bolt-on' courses. In the past learners on very short Family Learning programmes were able to join 6 hour 'move on' courses but the short delivery times only suited higher level learners who needed to brush up on their existing skills. This new, longer, integrated approach has worked well as learners working at lower levels have more time to prepare and feel less anxious about taking the test.
 - Wiltshire 100 in 100 Apprentices Campaign
We are working with Wiltshire College to achieve 100 new apprentices starting an apprenticeship in 100 days. This was launched on 10th January and an event is being held on 1st March to get as many employers as possible to pledge to take on an apprentice.
 - Economy & Enterprise service is also working with HR & Organisational Development on a developing an Apprenticeship Action Plan in regard to Wiltshire Council employing apprentices and maximising the opportunities arising from apprenticeships to up skill its existing workforce.
 - A recent decision has been taken by the Wiltshire Strategic Economic Partnership (WSEP) Employment & Skills Board for the Apprenticeships MoU Group between relevant Wiltshire Council services and National Apprenticeship Service (NAS) to formally become a sub-group of the ESB.

Assisting young people with the transition from education to employment is featuring as a priority in the emerging Employment & Skills Strategy for Wiltshire as well as the Wiltshire Assembly's Action for Wiltshire Programme – Support for Recovery (phase 2) , which has areas of focus on:

- A programme of employability and informal skills development for young people and new labour market entrants
- Establishing a network of local entrepreneurs/business owners to be engaged as role models and provide placements or projects for young people to gain a practical context for skills application and practice
- Young Entrepreneur Society pilot to provide the right environment that will help prepare young people to start their own businesses. We ran this course for FJF employees in during the autumn and it was very well received.
- ESF Response to Redundancy

This is a programme of training and skills development for those at risk of redundancy or recently made redundant across Wiltshire & Swindon which only has until March 2011 to run. The Accountable Body is New College Swindon but both Wiltshire Council and Wiltshire College are partners. Overall the project is doing really well and the partnership is on target. So much so that we were asked by the SFA if we wanted to increase our allocation and extend the project to end March 2011 (otherwise would have ended in December 2010). We secured a further £100K approximately. With the project ending at the end of March we are focusing our efforts on building further links with employers.

Keeping NEET levels below the national average is another important priority and is being achieved by:

- The 'Get Prepared Programme' an Action for Wiltshire Initiative to support 16 to 18 year old young people move into employment, training or further education.
- Ensuring that vulnerable groups have access to additional support and guidance, for example an intensive personal adviser is co-located with the Looked After Children team.

**Wiltshire Council
Council**

22 February 2011

Councillors' Questions

**Question From Councillor Chris Caswill
Chippenham Monkton Division**

**To Councillor John Thomson, Cabinet Member For Adult Care, Communities
And Libraries**

Question 1

- a. Have any representations being made to the government on the Council's behalf in respect of the deeply regrettable proposals to cut the mobility component of the Disability Living Allowance?
- b. Will he take this opportunity to make clear this Council's concern about the effects of this proposed reduction of the living standards and working opportunities of Wiltshire citizens?
- c. What would be the cost to this Council of restoring this cut for the citizens of Wiltshire were going to be otherwise affected?
- d. If this policy is implemented, would he consider proposing to the Cabinet that the restoration of this allowance be included in the 2012 – 2013 budget?

Response

- a. The council has written to our local MPs.
- b. We have written to MPs. We have also suggested that if this were to be implemented then a ringfenced grant could be made available to Local councils to help provide some alternative support.
- c. we estimate that there are approx 400 people in residential homes in Wiltshire who we fund that may claim DLA, and the total loss to them would be estimated at approx £1m.a year. In addition there will be some people under 65 in residential care who fund themselves, whom we are unaware of.
- d. As part of our regular reviews of people's services in our care we would always discuss all their care and support needs and together with them, their families and the providers try to find ways of helping their needs be met. This will continue.

Question 2

Will he take this opportunity to give a public assurance that it is the intention to reverse the cuts in public library opening hours and the services which have been removed from other libraries as soon as the Council's financial circumstances permit?

Response

There is no provision in the 4 year plan to reverse the cuts in public library opening hours. Wiltshire Council is facing a budget reduction of 28.4% over the coming years. To help the council meet this target, the library service will need to reduce its budget.

Following comprehensive consultation, including with area boards and customer focus groups, proposals for how the library service will be managed were approved by Wiltshire Council's Cabinet on 25 January 2011. This will be made in part by introducing rationalised core library opening hours and by working with volunteers to operate our smallest libraries and to extend opening hours at other locations. We are pleased that the proposals for the library service in Wiltshire unlike those of neighbouring authorities will avoid the need for any library to close.

- All 31 of Wiltshire's libraries will be retained
- All five of Wiltshire's mobile libraries will be retained
- All libraries will still receive funding from Wiltshire council for premises costs, power, cleaning and computer systems
- Library stock would continue to be provided to all library branches
- Self service technology will be introduced to all libraries to improve efficiency and help communities extend library opening hours through support from volunteers who will be trained and supported by Wiltshire library staff

The proposals come into effect September 2011 allowing time for volunteers to be recruited and trained. Officers are currently attending Area Boards and Parish Councils to outline the proposals and discuss ways of working with communities to extend the library opening beyond the new core opening hours and how communities can make better use of their library buildings.

The response from communities has so far been positive. To date 156 volunteers have come forward, before we have started a recruitment campaign. We are optimistic that ultimately that the new ways of working with communities and volunteers could result in longer opening times for smaller rural libraries.

To Councillor Dick Tonge, Cabinet Member For Highways And Transport**Question 3**

- a. What is the full cost of installing pedestrian refuges on the A 4 on either side of the Beckhampton roundabout?
- b. How many accidents involving death or serious injury have occurred within the close vicinity of this roundabout in the last five years?

Response

- a. £21,541.41
- b. Fatal Accidents 0
Serious Injury 0
Slight Collisions 9

Works have been undertaken following a meeting between George Batten and the then MP Mr Michael Ancram in 2009 after concerns had been raised by local residents about speed of vehicles, difficulty of crossing the road, difficulty of access from side roads, and the dangers caused by motorcyclists using the area as a drag strip.

To Councillor Jane Scott OBE, Leader Of The Council**Question 4**

How many charitable, voluntary and arts organisations have already had their grants from Wiltshire Council reduced in the financial year 2010 – 2011?

How many more of these organisations will have their grants reduced in FY 2011 – 2012 and FY 2012 – 2013?

Will she arrange for a list of the affected organisations, and the size of the reductions, to be sent round to all members?

Response**In the financial year 2010/11**

The total grants allocation to the Voluntary sector from the VCS Unit is £2.4m. In this year 12 organisations have had their grants reduced although the overall spend in the voluntary sector did not reduce. The total amount of this movement was £470,000. Some of this reduction came from projects ending, some from merging 4 ex-district funded VCS support services into one countywide service, some from moving services to another provider, or from bringing projects in house . The savings have provided new services, including a volunteering data base which matches potential volunteers with current volunteering opportunities - which has helped over 1,000 volunteers this year, and the Wiltshire Good Neighbours .

In the financial year 2011/12

8 organisations will have their funding reduced (2 of these are also counted in 2010/11 above). Four of them are merging into one organisation (for carers) making efficiency savings to cover the reduced funding.

A further 5 organisations who provide support services to the VCS will have reduced funding. This is a very slight reduction since savings have been identified elsewhere, including grant aid from external funders. Efficiency savings here are expected to come from groups collaborating and sharing back office functions to reduce core costs.

In the financial year 2012/13

The total is unknown since discussions on this will take place in 2011. However we have negotiated other support and funding for 17 lunch clubs to continue the services they provide .

A report detailing all the organisations affected, with details of the financial reductions, will be circulated to Members .

**To Councillor Fleur De Rhe-Philipe, Cabinet Member For Finance, Performance
And Risk**

Question 5

- a. In cash terms, what is the effect on this Council's 2012 – 13 budget of the decision by the Government to frontload reductions in the local authority grant for the coming year?
- b. What representations did this Authority make to the government in respect of the scheduling of the budget reductions?

Response

- a. In cash terms formula grant will reduce by £11.477 million.
- b. None, as we did not feel it would be of any added benefit.

Question 6

With respect to the Government funding allocations to Wiltshire Council for FY 2011-12, how much was attributable to additional money Intended (but not ring fenced) for adult social care from the Department of Health?

Response

At this time we are finalising negotiations with the PCT around this money and how it will be used. To that end we have assumed 88% of the monies within our base budget.

Wiltshire Council

Council

22 February 2011

Councillors' Questions

**Question From Councillor Russell Hawker
Westbury West Division**

To Councillor Jane Scott OBE, Leader Of The Council And Councillor John Thomson, Cabinet Member For Adult Care, Communities And Libraries

Question 1

I refer to the Confidential "Complaint Investigation Report" dated 31st August 2010 which was circulated to members by email on 11 February this year and which purports to exercise power to judge whether an alleged racist comment is actually racist.

Exactly what Law (specifying, please, the precise legislation and/or regulations and/or statutory guidance, including clause numbers and quoting the parts that apply in this matter, or common law, including citation and basic decision summaries and principles that apply) applied or applies to the council in relation to racial equality in public meetings of the council and / or partners?

Where exactly in any of the Law does it say that a comment is racist just because someone asserts that it is - or any basis looking anything like this? What does it say?

Where exactly in any of the Law does it say that the usual common law test of "reasonableness" cannot be used at the discretion of any tribunal or judge in assessing the meaning of words in Law and whether a comment reasonably means what the complainant thinks and alleges?

What powers and authority did the "Investigator" have to carry out an investigation and also judge what is relevant and choose what is fact or not and then also decide and state a determination of the allegations in the report (ie. one person acting as in-house investigator, jury and judge), stating exactly who gave the investigator these powers and why?

What tribunal or judicial decisions exist that show that the phrase "jungle drums" is racist?

Why does the Investigation report not bother to explain any relevant law (ie. no reference to legislation or caselaw)?

Why does the report not bother to explain how the comment is believed to breach the law.

Why does the report not bother to explain the powers of the investigator or where any powers come from.

Why would anyone receiving such a report be expected to think it actually has any status in law or be legitimate or be part of any competent activity of the council or deserves to be treated with anything but concern for its obvious and astonishing shortcomings?

Which members of the cabinet were involved in this matter? At what stage did they know the contents of the report and were they required by the constitution of the council or Law to decide on how to proceed with the matter (please specify who, dates and what was decided)? Did any cabinet member approve the report (who and when)? Which staff were involved in approving the report and actions that followed?

What legal advice was given by any properly qualified legal staff in this matter at any stage (why and to who and when, by whom, stating the qualifications of the staff)?

Do you accept that there should be a better way of handling trivial complaints and have you identified what legal possibilities exist? When will a lawful but common sense approach to trivial complaints be implemented, and how?

Response

The Chief Executive has instigated a review of the process followed in connection with the investigation of the complaint to which you refer. The outcome of the review will be reported to Cabinet at the earliest opportunity.