

MINUTES

Meeting: SALISBURY AREA BOARD
Place: Salisbury Methodist Church, St Edmund Church Street, Salisbury
Date: 30 November 2010
Start Time: 7.00 pm
Finish Time: 9.10 pm

Please direct any enquiries on these minutes to:

James Hazlewood (Senior Democratic Services Officer), Tel: 01722 434250 or (e-mail) james.hazlewood@wiltshire.gov.uk

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

In Attendance:

Wiltshire Councillors

Cllr Mary Douglas (Chairman), Cllr Christopher Cochrane (Vice Chairman),
Cllr John Brady, Cllr Richard Clewer, Cllr Bill Moss, Cllr Ricky Rogers and
Cllr Paul Sample

Wiltshire Council Officers

Marianna Dodd, Salisbury Community Area Manager
James Hazlewood, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Carolyn Johannesen, Communications Account Manager
Graeme Hay, Head of Service - Local Highways and Streetscene (South)

City and Parish Councils

Salisbury City Council – Su Thorpe, Cheryl Hill, John English, Ann Chalke, Annie Child
Laverstock and Ford Parish Council – Liz Dore

Partners

Wiltshire Police – Inspector David McMullin
Wiltshire Fire and Rescue – Mike Franklin
“Our Salisbury” - Salisbury Community Area Partnership (SCCAP) – Debrah Biggs
St Edmunds Community Association – David Humphrys, Mary Stephens, Tony West
Age UK Salisbury District – David Kane

Salisbury Festival – Maria Bota
Salisbury Tenants Panel – Colin Duller
Milford Preservation Group – Alan Hotchkiss
Salisbury Journal – Annie Riddle

Members of Public in Attendance: 17
Total in attendance: 45

<u>Agenda Item No.</u>	<u>Summary of Issues Discussed and Decision</u>	<u>Action By</u>
1.	<p><u>Welcome and Introductions</u></p> <p>The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting of the Salisbury Area Board.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Apologies for Absence</u></p> <p>Apologies for absence had been received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Brian Dalton • Councillor Keith Humphries, who had been due to attend as the visiting Cabinet Representative • Stephanie Denovan – Wiltshire Council’s Service Director for Schools and Learning • David Law, of Laverstock and Ford Parish Council. 	
3.	<p><u>Minutes</u></p> <p><u>Decision</u> The minutes of the meeting held on 30 September 2010 were agreed a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p> <p>The Chairman also referred to the issue of whether the Community Payback scheme could be used to remove graffiti from privately-owned buildings. This was still being clarified and would be reported to the next Area Board meeting.</p> <p>In relation to minute 11 (Parking Strategy – Results of Consultation) it was reported that the faded lines in Resident Parking Zone A had been repainted during August and September. The signage would also be clarified, and residents would be consulted on whether the scheme should be left as per the current operation or whether the existing Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) should be brought into effect.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>Councillor Ricky Rogers declared a prejudicial interest in agenda item 15c (Community Area Grants) specifically in relation to the application from Life Education Centres (LEC). Councillor Rogers explained that he was the Chairman of the LEC, and as such would leave the room for consideration of the item.</p>	

5.	<p><u>Chairman's Announcements</u></p> <p>The Chairman referred to the following announcements, details of which were set out in the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse Winter Weather – page 19 • Census 2011 – pages 21-24 • Results of Waste Consultation – page 25, plus additional detailed information available at the back of the meeting. • Local Flood protection – page 27-28 • Face-to-face Customer Services – page 29. 	
6.	<p><u>Update from Representatives</u></p> <p>Su Thorpe, Leader of Salisbury City Council, gave an update on behalf of the City Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fair at the end of October had gone extremely well, with good turnouts to all events. In particular, the carnival at the end of week was the first carnival in the city for many years, and had been well received and would be repeated. In future years, other organisations would be encouraged to take part, particularly smaller groups. • The events to mark Remembrance Sunday had also been very well attended, as had the Freedom of the Rifles parade, which had been attended by HRH the Duchess of Cornwall. • On 25 November the city's Christmas lights had been switched on by Sally Taylor of BBC South Today. • Ideas for further events were welcomed. • The City Council was approaching its budget-setting period. • Opening hours for the City Council over the Christmas period were available on the website – www.salisburycitycouncil.gov.uk. • The guildhall project was still on time and on budget. City Councillors would be shown the progress on 15 December, with many of the major improvements already completed. <p>Liz Dore of Laverstock and Ford Parish Council confirmed that she had nothing to report to the meeting.</p>	
7.	<p><u>Wiltshire Good Neighbours</u></p> <p>At the Chairman's invitation, Jasper Dorgan Programme Manager for Community First introduced this item and handed over to Helen Lines to explain the Wiltshire Good Neighbours Scheme.</p>	

Helen explained that Wiltshire Good Neighbours was primarily a signposting and information service, designed to help vulnerable people to live independently for longer. Wiltshire was lucky to have a strong voluntary sector in place, however the challenge was to link those in need with the services on offer.

It was hoped that this would empower clients to take control of the choices and decisions about the services they used. This in turn would forge social bonds between the clients and the service providers, preventing social exclusion and improving the quality of life for the older residents of Wiltshire.

The Scheme would be based around Good Neighbour Co-ordinators, who would be paid employees of Community First. These would be local people with an in-depth knowledge of the local community and the services which were on offer locally. They would be contracted to work 10 hours a week and would be the public-facing side of the scheme, by working to become known and trusted in their communities.

The Coordinators would work to identify those in need, by visiting local clubs and by developing awareness of the scheme. They could also offer a service whereby they could visit clients in their own homes to complete a written assessment of their needs and use this to advise on which services may be required.

It was proposed to have 25 Good Neighbour Co-ordinators in place by September 2011, each covering a small cluster of parishes, with the project being rolled out in 3 phases. A project covering Winterbourne, Idmiston, Porton, Gomeldon and East Gomeldon would be included in the first phase. It was not proposed to introduce the scheme in Salisbury, as the scheme had been designed on a rural model. It was considered that the need was much greater in rural areas, although it was hoped that the scheme could be delivered in semi-rural areas (e.g. Wilton).

The Chairman thanked Jasper and Helen for the presentation and expressed disappointment that the scheme would not be coming to Salisbury. On that basis the Chairman proposed a roundtable discussion on identifying the needs of the Salisbury in terms of a similar service. Prior to this, questions and comments were invited from the floor:

- Reference was made to the positive effects of pet ownership in terms of longevity and quality of life. Helen acknowledged this and commented that the scheme could help link older pet owners with support groups such as dog

	<p>walking groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In response to a question regarding the costs of the scheme, Helen explained that it would cost £80,000 in the first year, rising to £120,000 a year thereafter. Community First was a charity, formerly known as Wiltshire Rural Community Council, employing around 40 people. Around 18% of the charity's income came from Wiltshire Council, with the remainder from trust funds, corporate funds and other funding streams including the lottery. • It was acknowledged that the scheme would inevitably overlap with some existing services, such as Neighbourhood Watch, but it was considered that the network of Good Neighbour Coordinators and the shared information would help compliment and maximise the benefits from existing services. • The view was expressed that rural areas often had better support networks for older and vulnerable residents, but that urban areas often had more isolation in terms of older residents. Helen commented that the scheme had been designed for rural areas, but that an urban version could be designed and implemented in the future, although there were currently no plans to do so. <p>The meeting was invited to break into small groups and discuss the following questions:</p> <p><i>Question 1 - Is there a need for a similar service in Salisbury?</i></p> <p><i>Question 2 - If so, how could we meet this need?</i></p> <p><i>Question 3 - Should we ask for a Good Neighbour Co-ordinator for Salisbury?</i></p> <p>Each group was then invited to feedback ideas and comments on the issues. A full summary of the points made, including those submitted in writing after the meeting, is attached as Appendix A to these minutes. Any resulting actions would be reported to the next meeting of the Area Board.</p>	
8.	<p><u>Update from Police</u></p> <p>At the Chairman's invitation, Inspector David McMullin gave a brief overview of the Neighbourhood Policing Teams (NPTs) operating within the city. There were currently six teams, two of which covered the city centre, and the remaining four of which covered</p>	

	<p>the surrounding residential areas.</p> <p>One on-going project for the NPTs was working with retail units to share data on offenders, in a system similar to the pub watch scheme. The NPTs would also continue to work with Neighbourhood Watch.</p> <p>Inspector McMullin referred to the crime statistics which had been tabled, commenting that overall crime was down and that Salisbury compared favourably with other sectors, with Wiltshire paced at number one out of 15 similar constabulary areas.</p> <p>The city police had also been working closely with Salisbury City Council (SCC) on the events mentioned under item 6 by Su Thorpe. Inspector McMullin commented on the particular success of the Freedom of the Rifles parade, and thanked Annie Child for her hard work on this, to a round of applause.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Inspector McMullin for the update and for the on-going hard work of the police.</p>	
9.	<p><u>Grit Bins</u></p> <p>The Chairman introduced the report set out at page 37 of the agenda, commenting that, following the severe weather last winter, a large number of requests for additional grit bins had been received. It was not feasible for the Council to meet the cost of providing and filling all 422 additional bins requested across Wiltshire, but 100 new bins would be provided, equating to an additional 10% for each Area Board. For the Salisbury Area Board this equated to six, although it was believed that the city actually had 91 bins in total.</p> <p>The meeting was referred to appendix 1 to the report (pages 39 – 41 of the agenda, revised version tabled at the meeting) which set out the current locations by electoral division, and the requests which had been received, following announcements at previous meetings of the Area Board. It was proposed that the additional six bins be allocated to the six divisions for which requests had been received. The relevant Councillors would be asked to nominate the priority locations.</p> <p>Referring to a tabled document listing the locations of all 91 grit bins in the city, Councillors queried whether it was necessary to have 13 bins on Lime Kiln Way. It was proposed that officers be requested to visit the site and to determine whether five bins could be reallocated from this location to the five electoral divisions for</p>	

	<p>which multiple requests had been received.</p> <p>Concern was raised that there was a lack of clarity over how many grit bins there were in the city. It was considered that there should be a holistic approach to this service and that a fuller review should be undertaken.</p> <p><u>Decision</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The additional six bins be allocated to the divisions for which requests had been received, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Martins and Cathedral • St Edmund and Milford • St Marks and Bishopdown • St Francis and Stratford • Fisherton and Bemerton Village • Harnham 2. Highways officers be requested to visit Lime Kiln Way to identify whether the street requires 13 grit bins. If considered appropriate, five of these bins to be reallocated to the following electoral divisions, for which multiple requests had been received <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Martins and Cathedral • St Edmund and Milford • St Marks and Bishopdown • St Francis and Stratford • Harnham 3. The relevant Councillors be asked to nominate the precise locations for any additional bins in their divisions, based on the requests received. 4. The Salisbury Area Board requests a comprehensive review of grit bins within the city, looking at how bins are installed, used, and maintained, and identifying the criteria used to install bins. 	<p>Marianna Dodd</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p><u>Local Transport Plan (LTP) funding - Prioritisation of Schemes</u></p> <p>The Chairman introduced the item, explaining that the Board had a budget of £14,758 to allocate towards locally-identified, small-scale transport schemes. To help prioritise the schemes, a Community Area Transport Group (CATG) had been established, and the group's recommendations were set out in the report at pages 44-45, with the full list of schemes and the minutes of the CATG meeting set out as appendices to the report.</p> <p><u>Decision</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Salisbury Area Board approves the Salisbury Community Area Transport Group's (CATG) 	<p>Marianna Dodd</p>

	<p>recommendations for the prioritisation of schemes for funding as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A3094 Harnham Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traffic calming / control measures ○ Moving a pedestrian refuge nearer the roundabout • Coombe Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pedestrian crossing near Pulseline bus stops ○ Flashing speed signs ○ Moving a pedestrian refuge to the town side of St Andrews Way • Laverstock Road/Manor Farm Junction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A Mini-roundabout at the T-junction of Laverstock Road and Manor Farm Road ○ Zebra / Pedestrian crossing / pedestrian refuge <p>2. The Salisbury Area Board requests Highways Officers to design and implement a scheme for Harnham Road (as the highest scoring scheme), ensuring that the money allocated to the Area Board results in the implementation of a scheme rather than being spent on surveys or further assessment.</p>	
11.	<p><u>Reducing Street Lighting</u></p> <p>At the Chairman’s invitation, Councillor Richard Clewer update the meeting on this project, which sought to upgrade around 100 street lights to energy saving units, which could automatically switch off between midnight and 5am, reducing costs, carbon emissions and light pollution.</p> <p>Although the Council’s Climate Change officers continued to liaise with residents’ groups, no firm proposal for a street had been indentified for this project to go ahead.</p> <p>The view was expressed that the project should not be enforced on communities who did not want it, as streetlighting could help increase the perception of safety which was often a bigger issue than the reality of safety. Although the project could work well in rural areas, there was concern that the city, with its late night economy, may not be suitable for reduced street lighting.</p> <p>It was suggested that motion activated technology could be explored.</p> <p>Cheryl Hill, Deputy Leader of Salisbury City Council, commented</p>	

	<p>that she had submitted a proposal for alternate lights on Bishops Drive to be upgraded.</p> <p>It was also suggested that Wilton Road might be a suitable location for the project.</p>	
12.	<p><u>Your Local Issues</u></p> <p>Marianna Dodd (Salisbury Community Area Manager) referred to the issues update which had been tabled. A total of 67 issues had been received to date, 36 of these had been resolved or passed onto the relevant department for further action. There were 31 issues currently in progress.</p>	
13.	<p><u>Grants Evaluation</u></p> <p>The Chairman referred to the report at page 53 of the agenda, which set out responses from various bodies who had received grants from the Area Board during 2009/10. This was to allow the Board to ensure the grant funding was resulting in benefit to the community and to help inform future grant decisions.</p> <p>There were no questions and the Area Board agreed to note the report. For those projects for which information had not yet been provided, it was requested that a further report be brought to the next Board</p>	Marianna Dodd
14.	<p><u>Update from Salisbury City Community Area Partnership (SCCAP)</u></p> <p>Debrah Biggs, (Chairman of “Our Salisbury”, the Salisbury Community Area Partnership (SCCAP)) outlined the State of the Area Debate event which had been run on Thursday 18 November. A drop-in event had been held during the day in the library, and the day had culminated in a Question Time style debate in the evening.</p> <p>The SCCAP Steering group had met recently and had asked Debrah to feedback that they were disappointed with the lack of support from the Area Board at the State of the Area event. It was considered that there was scope to further develop the partnership working arrangements and that hopefully this could be achieved sooner rather than later.</p> <p>In relation to the questionnaire which SCCAP had sent out to inform the development of the Community Plan, around 1400 responses had been received so far. The data from these was</p>	

	currently being input by volunteers, and any other volunteers would be welcomed.	
15.	<p><u>Community Area Grants</u></p> <p>a. <u>Salisbury City Community Area Partnership (SCCAP) Core Funding 2010/11</u></p> <p><u>Decision</u> The Salisbury Area Board awarded the second tranche of core funding to Salisbury Community Area Partnership (SCCAP); the sum of £7,825.</p> <p><u>Reason</u> – To support the Partnership and to allow its work to continue.</p> <p>b. <u>Motion received from Councillor Paul Sample</u></p> <p>The Chairman introduced the item, commenting that concerns had been expressed regarding the extensive questioning of grant applicants at previous meetings of the Area Board. Although the Board was required to be thorough when determining the spend of public money, there was concern that the nature of the public questioning could be off-putting to some applicants.</p> <p>In order to address this, the Chairman had visited other Area Boards and had identified the method used at the Amesbury Area Board, where a small informal panel reviewed the applications in advance of the meeting and sought clarification, allowing the Area Board to make the final decision based on all the required information and avoiding the public questioning of applicants. The Chairman had proposed a similar process for the Salisbury Area Board.</p> <p>Councillor Paul Sample moved the motion as set out in the agenda papers adding that the transparency of decision-making was important if the Area Board was to maintain the trust of the public. Councillor Sample considered that the move to take decisions on grants in public was a significant improvement on the former Salisbury District Council arrangements, whereby grants were determined by a panel meeting in private. It was important that the public decision-making should continue, although the process required some form of review to mitigate the cross-examination of some applicants in public meetings.</p> <p>Debrah Biggs reported that the SCCAP Steering Group had considered and supported the motion, having agreed that the Area</p>	Marianna Dodd

Board should remain transparent. Debrah added that SCCAP would welcome the opportunity to become more involved in terms of decision making at the Area Board, for example commenting on how well grant applications met the criteria of the community plan, once this was in place.

It was noted that only the elected Councillors on the Area Board could vote on decisions, although it would be appropriate for partner organisations to be consulted on grant applications in advance, as they were currently able to express support for or opposition to a grant application at the meeting if they so wished.

The Chairman invited the Area Board Councillors to give their views. The Board supported the motion, with Councillors emphasising the importance of robust evaluation of application and the need to maintain an open and honest decision-making procedure. It was also noted that the Salisbury Area Board sought the view of the public at its meetings; not all Area Boards did this.

Decision

In order to be transparent and command public confidence, this Area Board believes that applications for grants made by local organisations to Salisbury Area Board should be discussed in public at meetings of the Salisbury Area Board. For these reasons it does not believe the establishment of a Grants Panel, which meets in private between Boards to look at the grant applications and make recommendations to the Board, should be pursued.

Following the above decision, the Chairman proposed that the process for evaluating grant application prior to Area Board meetings be revised to encourage earlier involvement of Councillors. This could be achieved by application forms being sent directly to Councillors when they were received, allowing questions and points of clarification to be resolved in advance, while the debate and determination of the application could still take place in public.

It was suggested that the grant applications could also be sent in advance to SCCAP and to Salisbury City Council for their comments, which could then be reported to the board through the officer's report.

Some concern was raised that involving third parties in the grant evaluation process may contravene the policy agreed by Cabinet, although this could be checked outside of the meeting.

	<p><u>Decision</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Salisbury Area Board agreed that grant applications should be sent to all Area Board Councillors as soon as the deadline for submission of grants has passed, to allow Councillors to raise comments, concerns and queries well in advance of the decision-making meeting. 2. The Board further agreed that Salisbury City Council and Salisbury City Community Area Partnership be consulted on all grant applications, by means of the application being sent to them in advance of the meeting, and any comments being included within the officer's report. 3. That point 2 above be subject to officers confirming that this process complies with the legal and procedural framework for determining grant applications. <p>c. <u>Community Area Grants</u></p> <p>(Note – Having declared a prejudicial interest in the following application, Councillor Ricky Rogers left the room for consideration of the application)</p> <p><u>Decision</u></p> <p>Life Education Centres Ltd was awarded £2,500 to help support the delivery of an education programme to primary school children on forming healthy lifestyle choices from January to July 2011</p> <p><i>Reason</i> – <i>The application did not meet the Community Area Grants Criteria 2010/11 in that the funding would be used for on-going costs, and the project had already started. However, the Area Board considered that the exception to the criteria was justified in this case due to the wider community benefit which would be realised by the project working directly with primary school children to encourage healthy lifestyle choices.</i></p>	<p>Marianna Dodd</p> <p>Marianna Dodd/ James Hazlewood</p> <p>Marianna Dodd</p>
16.	<p><u>Future Meeting Dates, Evaluation and Close</u></p> <p>The next meeting of the Salisbury Area Board will be held on 20 January 2011 at St Francis Church Hall, Beatrice Road, Salisbury, SP1 3PN.</p>	
<p><u>Appendix A - Feedback from Roundtable discussion at item 7</u></p>		

This page is intentionally left blank

**Salisbury Area Board
30 November 2010**

Feedback on Round Table discussion regarding Good Neighbour Scheme

1. Is there a need in Salisbury?

- Yes, not necessarily funded by Council
- Yes
- Yes, in Salisbury and its peripheral villages

2. If so, how could we meet this need?

- Possible link in with CAB or Age UK etc who have lots of knowledge already

- SCC could do this in partnership with Community First
- Enlist help from existing networks, such as doctors, churches, luncheon clubs, community centres, schools, milkmen and postmen. Not just for elderly, but also people such as disabled and young carers

- Bring back post offices and milkmen
- Be aware that strangers can be worrying to older people

- Strongly recommend to learn from past experience
- Eg, CAB project engaging over 1 ½ year period realised £1.5m in unclaimed benefits. Much learning re type of person needed – v. special with sensitivity, life experience and the modis operandi for identifying those in need

- Use existing resources where feasible eg. Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinators know the people in their areas and usually would know their circumstances and issues. CAB itself? Historically, they used travelling vans to engage in rural communities

3. Should we ask for a Good Neighbour Co-ordinator for Salisbury?

- Yes, several please
- Yes, need at least 8
- 10 hours work per week is tokenism
- Use existing resources where feasible

This page is intentionally left blank