

MINUTES

Meeting: AMESBURY AREA BOARD
Place: Antrobus House, 39 Salisbury Road, Amesbury, SP4 7HH
Date: 27 January 2011
Start Time: 6.00 pm
Finish Time: 8.26 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 John Smale (Chairman), Cllr Mike Hewitt (Vice Chairman), Cllr Ian West, Cllr Fred Westmoreland and Cllr Graham Wright

Cllr Christopher Cochrane (Portfolio Holder for ICT, Information Management and Business Transformation)

Wiltshire Council Officers

Mark Smith, Service Director
Karen Linaker, Amesbury Community Area Manager
Nicholas Bate, Emergency Planning Officer
Matthew Woolford, Media Relations Manager
James Hazlewood, Senior Democratic Services Officer

Town and Parish Councils

Amesbury Town Council – Andrew Duncan
Durrington Town Council – M Wardell, David Healing, Mary Towle
Allington Parish Council – Mike Brunton
Bulford Parish Council – Gordon Burt
Idmiston Parish Council – Chris Hammer
Newton Toney Parish Council – Stan Stubbs, Tim Miles
Shrewton Parish Council – Carole Slater

Tilshead Parish Council – George Murray
Winterbourne Stoke Parish Council – Pete Stoner, Peter Smith
Wylde Parish Council – Tom Cox

Partners

Police – Inspector Martyn Sweett, PC Smith
Stonehenge School – Phil Monk
14 Regiment, RA – Lt Col Matt Allott
UK Youth Parliament – Jamie Capp

Members of Public in Attendance: 18

Total in attendance: 48

<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 Amesbury Area Board and thanked Antrobus House for hosting the meeting. It was noted that Michael Light, the caretaker, had recently been in hospital. On behalf of the Area Board, the Chairman wished him a speedy recovery.</p> <p>At the Chairman's invitation, the Councillors and officers sitting at the front of the meeting introduced themselves.</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 John Noeken • Paul Fisher – Idmiston Parish Council • Jo Howes – NHS Wiltshire • Mike Franklin – Fire and Rescue Service 	
3.	<p><u>Minutes</u></p> <p><u>Decision</u> The minutes of the meeting held on 2 December were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p>	
4.	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>Councillor Graham Wright declared a prejudicial interest in item 11 (Performance Reward Grant) in relation to the application from Larkhill Community Partnership, as he was the Chairman of the Partnership. Councillor Wright confirmed that he would leave the room for the duration of the debate and vote, having exercised his right to speak.</p> <p>There were no other declarations of interest.</p>	
5.	<p><u>A303 Countess Roundabout Combined Scheme</u></p> <p>Dave Sledge (Highways Agency Area Manager) introduced the item, reiterating that the current works related to a safety project</p>	

rather than a traffic reduction programme, although it was hoped that the works may also reduce traffic congestion. Dave introduced Mark Arberry, also from the Highways Agency, to give an overview of the project.

Mark explained that the project consisted of two parts:

- **Safety improvements**, including the widening of the access to the roundabout from the East and West, introduction of traffic signals, and a new 40 mph speed limit. This element would cost £1.59 million.
- **Planned maintenance**, including carriageway resurfacing, replacement of drainage, and upgrading of lighting. This element would cost £3 million.

The total cost of the works was therefore £4.59 million, which took account of the economies of scale in terms of both elements being undertaken at the same time. This was in addition to the reduced disruption to the local road network (and community) of combining the schemes. The safety element of the scheme would produce a first year rate of return of 26.4% by reducing accidents at the site, and so the capital investment in the safety element of the works would be paid back in around four years.

The works would take place over a 17-week programme, incorporating site establishment, 12 weeks of works, and an allowance for the Easter holiday traffic management embargo.

It was regrettable that the community could not have been given more notice of the proposed plans. However, the 2010 general election and subsequent spending review had meant that the project had not been confirmed until shortly before the start date. In terms of on-going consultation and engagement with the local community, a representative of Balfour Beatty Mott Macdonald (BBMM) – the contractors for the works – would be in the Amesbury Community Shop every Tuesday from 10am to 4pm to help with queries from local residents.

The Chairman thanked Mark for the overview and invited questions and comments from the floor:

- Concern was raised that there may be other sites on the A303 with higher accident rates. Mark confirmed that a review had been undertaken of all roundabouts along the A303 corridor. Countess roundabout had the second highest rate (after the Cartgate roundabout near Yeovil), with around 60 accidents over the period 2002-2010. A similar safety scheme had already been implemented at the Podimore roundabout, which had significantly reduced

accidents at the site.

- At the request of the meeting, Jeff Colenzo (BBMM) explained the phases of the works. In relation to the contraflow arrangements, it was noted that there would be no access onto the roundabout from the A345, although traffic would be able to exit the A303 to the South, during phase 3 (when the contraflow would be on the westbound carriageway), and to the North during phase 6 (contraflow on the eastbound carriageway). Traffic could not be allowed to join the contraflow at the roundabout for safety reasons, and to maintain the flow of traffic. During these phases (1-7 March, and 11-18 April), traffic on the A345 would be diverted to join the A303 at the Solstice park junction. It was noted that the Countess Services would remain open throughout the period of the works.
- Responding to concerns that the proposed traffic signals would exacerbate the existing traffic queues, Mark commented that a detailed analysis of the traffic flow had been undertaken. It was anticipated that there would be no negative impact on the A303 traffic, and there would be a small benefit to the A345 traffic. This was corroborated by evidence from the similar scheme at the Podimore roundabout.
- Concern was raised that the traffic signals may increase “rat running” on Stonehenge road, as people joining the A303 Westbound from Amesbury tried to avoid the junction. The Chairman commented that this option was available at the moment, and would continue to be a problem, until a long-term solution for the A303 was implemented.
- With reference to the overrunning of the recent roadworks at the A345/London Road/High Street junction, concern was raised that this project could also overrun, causing more disruption to local residents. Dave explained that there would be financial penalties for BBMM (as a private contractor) if the work was not completed on time and budget.
- Councillor Graham Wright expressed thanks to Wiltshire Council highways for encouraging the contraflow arrangements as an alternative to closing the roundabout entirely. However, he hoped that the closures to the A345 could be kept to the two short proposed periods, to minimise the impact on Durrington and Larkhill.

6.	<p><u>Chairman's Announcements</u></p> <p>The Chairman referred to the written announcements set out at pages 17 – 44 of the agenda.</p> <p>In addition, Wilts and Dorset Buses had announced a change to bus routes affecting the 5, 6, 16, 95, and 96 services. More information was available at the back of the room. The Chairman commented that Wilts and Dorset was a private company and so Wiltshire Council would only have limited influence in this issue.</p>	
<p>Note – <i>The Chairman commented that he would make a small change to the order of the agenda, and take item 8 (Stonehenge Broadband Group) as the next item.</i></p>		
7.	<p><u>Stonehenge Broadband Group</u></p> <p>Andy Shuttleworth, of the Stonehenge Broadband Group, gave an overview of the group's activities since the previous update to the Area Board at the meeting on 21 October 2010.</p> <p>The bids under BT's Race to Infinity project had been unsuccessful, although Shrewton had come 46th out of 5000 participating exchanges (with 256 votes from 1182 connections – 21.66%). It was considered that these results demonstrated the level of local interest and would suggest Shrewton as an ideal launch-point for broadband solutions in the Amesbury Community Area and potentially Wiltshire in general, with Winterbourne Stoke as the logical point of access to high speed fibre trunks under the A303.</p> <p>The Government had agreed a new minimum Universal Service Commitment (USC) of 2 Mbps by 2012, and also to support the concept of 'digital hubs' in every community by 2015, to boost economic growth.</p> <p>The Group was arranging talks with BT, Virgin, and NextGenUs to discuss options for a private-public partnership to deliver a local high-speed internet access solution. It was proposed that the Stonehenge Broadband Group would form its own Community Interest Company (CIC) to work with whichever service provider offered the most effective solution.</p> <p>Support from the Area Board was sought in a number of areas, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Championing villages within the Shrewton exchange area as possible locations for any pilot schemes. • Lobbying Wiltshire Council to permitting microtrenching in Wiltshire, waive wayleave fees across council-owned land for broadband purposes, and to encourage pole-sharing by utilities and telephone companies across Wiltshire • Support from Wiltshire Council in lobbying for reduction in the business rate for broadband companies prepared to extend networks into rural areas • Support for lobbying the MoD to allow, where security permits, access to dark fibre in Wiltshire. <p>The Chairman thanked Andy for the presentation and invited questions and comments from the floor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Chris Cochrane (Portfolio Holder for ICT, Information Management and Business Transformation) commented that the Council was aware of the opportunities that new technology could provide in terms of high speed internet access. The Council was also committed to supporting Broadband access in rural communities. Around £6.3 million would be available over the next four years for this type of project, although the funds would need to be invested in the most effective locations. • It was noted that a similar scheme could be required to the south of the A303. • Concern was expressed regarding the use of microtrenching, as this could result in a long-term reduction in the quality of road-surfacing. <p>The Chairman concluded by saying that Cllr Noeken, as Cabinet Member leading on the council's broadband strategy, would provide a full response on behalf of the Area Board and Council to the Stonehenge Broadband Groups recommendations.</p>	Cllr Noeken
8.	<p><u>Updates from Partners and Town/Parish Councils</u></p> <p>The Chairman referred to the updates set out in the agenda and invited further updates from Town/Parish Councils and other Partners, including outside bodies. It was noted that the preferred option was for written updates, to minimise time spent during the meeting.</p> <p>Written updates from Police, Fire and Rescue, and NHS Wiltshire,</p>	

	<p>were set out at pages 45 – 54 of the agenda.</p> <p>Several comments and concerns were raised by representatives of Amesbury and Durrington Town Councils, in relation to the proposed new Wilts and Dorset bus routes, particularly the lack of advance consultation with Town and Parish Councils. The Chairman asked for comments to be emailed to him, and copied to Karen Linaker.</p> <p>Jamie Capp of the UK Youth Parliament, asked the meeting to note that the UK Youth Parliament and Wiltshire Assembly of Youth elections would be taking place on the second week of February – details of candidates were available on www.sparksite.co.uk. Those present were requested to encourage participation by young people.</p>	
9.	<p><u>Community Resilience - Town and Parish Councils' Emergency Plans</u></p> <p>Nick Bate, Emergency Planning Officer, gave a presentation on town and parish emergency plans. Local Communities were being encouraged to prepare themselves for emergency scenarios in a way which would complement the emergency services. This was particularly relevant given the recent bad weather, with some communities becoming hard to access due to snow and ice.</p> <p>The plans were compiled using national 'at risk' data, as well as local risk information from the individual parishes, and local knowledge of assets such as village halls, equipment, and food/fuel supplies. A nominated person would take responsibility for holding a full version of the plan and ensuring that it was kept up to date. Consideration was required in terms of data security, as names, addresses and telephone numbers would be included in the plan.</p> <p>The government had produced a template to assist with the production of Emergency Plans, which would be circulated amongst Town and Parish Councils via their clerks.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Nick for the presentation, and invited questions and comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was suggested that some parishes might include reference to major emergency plans for any nearby military facilities such as Boscombe Down. • It was also suggested that some smaller parishes may wish 	

	<p>to work with adjacent parishes on a combined plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, the idea of parishes having their own plans was welcomed, particularly as this would help identify vulnerable people in the community. • Thanks were expressed to Nick and the Emergency Planning Team for the successful exercises they had organised over the past years. • Responding to a question regarding insurance, Nick confirmed that parishes should always contact the on-duty Emergency Planning Officer. If authority was given for action to be taken in place of Wiltshire Council, then those acting would automatically be covered by the Council's liability insurance. 	
10.	<p><u>Community Area Grants</u></p> <p>In the absence of Councillor John Noeken (Lead Member for Grants), the Chairman introduced this item, thanking the other members of the grants panel who had assisted in reviewing the bids: Roger Fisher (Amesbury Town Council), and Trevor Woodbridge (independent representative).</p> <p><u>Decision</u> Wiltshire Heritage Museum was awarded £2,040 towards the cost of piloting a new Henge Hopper Bus Service linking Stonehenge and Amesbury in the spring of 2011. <i>Reason The application met the Community Area Grants criteria for 2010/11 and would support the provision of sustainable transport to local facilities and attractions, benefiting tourism, trade, and local communities.</i></p> <p><u>Decision</u> The Stonehenge School was awarded £990 towards two Solomon Theatre Company evening performances to the community, to highlight the issues of domestic abuse and alcohol misuse. <i>Reason The application met the Community Area Grants criteria for 2010/11 and would help address identified issues of concern in the Amesbury Community Area (i.e. domestic abuse and alcohol misuse) in an innovative and accessible way.</i></p> <p>It was noted that the application from Amesbury Community Carnival Committee had been withdrawn.</p> <p>It was noted that the application from Life Education Centre was</p>	<p>Karen Linaker</p> <p>Karen Linaker</p>

	<p>recommended for refusal, on the basis that the application was for a contribution to running costs, and as such did not meet the Community Area Grant Criteria. However, Councillors were invited to consider whether the application demonstrated wider community benefit and so justified an exception to the criteria.</p> <p>During discussion, Councillor Mike Hewitt, speaking as Chairman of the Health and Adult Social Care Select Committee, expressed the hope that long-term funding could be secured for the project. Karen Linaker commented that the applicants were currently looking at long-term funding opportunities, in consultation with the Charities Information Bureau.</p> <p><u>Decision</u> Life Education Centre was awarded £2,100 towards the cost of delivering an education programme to primary school children in the Amesbury Area on forming healthy living lifestyle choices.</p> <p><i>Reason – 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><u>Decision</u> Idmiston, Porton and Gomeldon Village Design Statement Team was awarded £997 towards funding the generation of a Village Design Statement.</p> <p><i>Reason The application met the Community Area Grants criteria for 2010/11 and would help the community ensure that new development fitted the local surroundings and complemented local character.</i></p> <p><u>Decision</u> Newton Toney Memorial Hall Committee was awarded £3,400 towards providing an all-weather (synthetic) cricket pitch on the village recreational field.</p> <p><i>Reason The application met the Community Area Grants criteria for 2010/11 and would help provide a local sports facility for this and nearby communities.</i></p>	<p>Karen Linaker</p> <p>Karen Linaker</p> <p>Karen Linaker</p>
11.	<p><u>Performance Reward Grants</u></p> <p>The Chairman invited Liz Murray to introduce the application,</p>	

which sought £65,000 towards the costs of the Larkhill Play Parks project.

Liz explained that the project sought to refurbish the existing play park in Larkhill to provide a safe and freely accessible play area for local children. The proposals were based on wide-ranging evidence of need which had been drawn from all parts of the community. The benefits included:

- aesthetic and structural improvements to the existing equipment
- a high quality play facility for local families, in particular isolated young mothers
- providing significant investment in a community where there is a perception of under-investment
- support for the aims of the Military and Civilian Integration (MCI) project.

Liz also commented that a huge level of support had been generated for the project, including from Claire Perry MP, and the Brigadier of 43 Wessex Brigade.

It was also noted that the application omitted to list the £10,000 received towards the project from the Army Central fund.

The Chairman invited questions and comments from the floor:

- Councillor Graham Wright, as Chairman of the Larkhill Community Partnership, spoke in support of the application, commenting that all 22 stakeholders in the partnership were fully in support of the project.

(Note: Having declared a prejudicial interest in the application, Councillor Graham Wright left the room for the remainder of this item)

- A number of those present spoke in support of the project, referring to the need to demonstrate investment in this part of the community, and also the huge level of local interest which the scheme had generated.
- Responding to a question from a Councillor, Karen Linaker (Amesbury Community Area Manager) confirmed that if the Performance Reward Grant application was successful, the money would only be released on confirmation that the project was going ahead.

	<p><u>Decision</u> The Amesbury Area Board supported the bid from Larkhill Community Partnership (for the Larkhill Play Parks Project) to go forward for determination by the Performance Reward Grant Panel.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked and congratulated Liz on her hard work on the project so far.</p>	<p>Karen Linaker</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p><u>Name of Area Board</u></p> <p>The Chairman introduced the report, which set out the results of a consultation with Town/Parish Councils, following a request to review the name of the Area Board. A summary of the responses was set out in the report at page 95-97 of the agenda, and the report noted that 14 out of 22 councils (64%) did not wish to see an alternative name applied. However, following concerns that this was misleading, as a number of Parish Councils had not responded to the consultation, the Chairman asked that this comment be disregarded. Nevertheless, the report concluded that the Area Board's name should remain that of the "Amesbury Area Board" on the basis that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. there was no conclusive, or majority view, as to an alternative name; and 2. the overriding principle by which Area Boards were named was based on their identification with the main market town or larger settlements that they covered. <p>During discussion, the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern was reiterated that Town and Parish Councils who had not responded should not be counted as supporting the existing name. The view was raised that a number of Parishes did not attend meetings of the Area Board, and had not produced parish plans; this may indicate that they did not wish to engage with the Area Board process. One parish representative commented that he was "disgusted" at the process of the consultation taken so far. • Representatives of some Parishes who had not suggested an alternative name, commented that this had been following discussion and careful consideration, and did not indicate that the name of the board was immaterial to the Parish. • The view was expressed that the name of the Area Board was of little consequence in the context of other issues 	

	<p>facing the community and the Council. There was concern that time and resources may be better directed towards other matters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that the size of parishes had not been taken into consideration in terms of weighting the votes, and that this may have affected the result of the consultation. <p>In bringing the discussion to a conclusion, it was suggested that Town and Parish Councils be consulted again, and be given the choice of the options raised so far, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amesbury Area Board • Five Valleys Area Board • South East Wiltshire Area Board • Stonehenge Area Board <p>It was also proposed that all Town and Parish Councils be required to respond to this survey and that officers contact the clerks to ensure that a complete response was available on which Area Board could base its decision. It was also noted that any recommendation from the Area Board to change its name would need to be referred to the Council for a final decision.</p> <p><u>Decision</u> It was agreed that a further consultation with Town and Parish Councils be undertaken as outlined above.</p>	<p>Karen Linaker</p>
<p>13.</p>	<p><u>Future Meeting Dates, Evaluation and Close</u></p> <p>It was noted that there would be an informal (i.e. non-decision-making) meeting of the Area Board on Thursday 24 February 2011, 6pm at the Bowman Centre, Shears Drive, Archers Gate, Amesbury, SP4 7XT. This meeting was primarily to receive an update on community planning in the Area, and to discuss and agree a way forward.</p> <p>The next ordinary meeting of the Area Board would be held on Thursday 31 March 2011, 6pm at Winterbourne Glebe Hall, Winterbourne Earls, SP4 6HA.</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank