

Minutes

Alamein Suite
City Hall, Salisbury
4.00 pm: 2 February 2005

Part I: Procedural Matters

ACTIONED BY
Cabinet Member
(Contact Officer)

468. Present:

Councillors K C Wren (Leader), J M Collier (Deputy Leader), J C Noeken & Mrs M M A Peach (Planning and Economic Development), D W Brown & Mrs S A Willan, (Environment and Transport), J A Cole-Morgan & R Britton (Community and Housing) and Mrs S A Warrander & D A Culver (Resources).

The Chairman of the Council, Councillor P V H Paisey (minutes 474,479,484) Councillor Mrs Chettleburgh (minute 484) were also in attendance and with the Chairman's permission spoke on the matters set out under the minutes as indicated.

469. Code of Conduct - Members & Officers' Interests:

Cllr Wren
(S Agland)

470. Minutes:

The [minutes](#) of the last meeting were approved and signed by the Chairman.

Cllr Wren
(S Agland)

471. Public Questions and Statements:

The following question was submitted by Mr Anthony Makepeace-Warne of Victoria Road Salisbury

Are Councillors content that the Residents' Parking Scheme consultative process undertaken by the Salisbury Joint Transportation Team (JTT), during the Spring of 2004, was fair, and that the recommendations arising from that report are therefore a true reflection of the wishes of residents, in that:

The Questionnaire The questionnaire sent to every household within all Salisbury residential parking zones offered three 'Options for Change' but did not offer an option for 'No Change'. Residents were therefore made to believe, quite incorrectly that, even if they were content with the scheme as currently operated, they were obliged to select a 'change' option.

The Workshops That the number of workshops and selection to attend them was unfair. According to JTT figures 156 residents offered to make themselves available for the workshops but only two workshops, each of 30 residents were conducted, names being selected at random. In the case of Zone H this random selection meant that of the 4 residents selected 2 came from Hulse Road although none were selected from Victoria Road notwithstanding 7 residents offering to make themselves available.

It is submitted that the consultative process was unfair and that the conclusions and recommendations drawn from that process, and subsequently agreed by Council, are therefore flawed

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport replied

Thank you for asking a question at this meeting of the Cabinet. I note that you also intend to raise the matter at the full Council meeting on 21st February 2005.

You ask whether I believe the consultative process carried out by the Salisbury Joint Transportation Team in early 2004 was fair and whether the changes subsequently agreed by the Council were flawed. The answers are that, yes, I do believe the consultation was fair and well carried out and, no, I do not think the changes to the residents' parking scheme are flawed.

With regard to the questionnaire, you are correct in stating that the option of 'no change' was not given. However, the information sheet that accompanied the questionnaire outlined the problems besetting the residents' parking scheme very clearly and it was reasonable for the District and County Councils to expect respondents to understand that leaving the scheme unaltered was not a realistic proposition. In fact seven alternative ways forward were listed in the information sheet, from which respondents were asked to select three in order of preference. Ample space was also given on the questionnaire form for any other comments that respondents wished to make.

I note your criticisms relating to the workshops. During the consultation, a total of 156 responses were received from residents living in limited waiting zones who indicated that they would be prepared to attend a workshop session. There were 13 responses received from residents of Victoria Road, of which 7 indicated they would be prepared to attend a workshop session. To keep the numbers attending the workshops manageable, 30 responses were drawn at random from the 156. Of these, none were from Victoria Road, reflecting the 1 in 22 chance of being selected. However, 4 residents from elsewhere in Zone H were invited to the workshop session, two from Hulse Road, one from Donaldson Road and one from Ridgeway Road. Only the residents from Hulse Road and Donaldson Road actually attended.

We are currently carrying out a further consultation to see if residents living in limited waiting zones wish to convert to residents-only zones. This exercise has yet to be concluded, so I am unable to comment on the outcome. What I can say is that the two Councils are always receptive to comments from users of their services and if you wish any other matters, relevant to the residents' parking scheme, to be considered, you should write to the Salisbury Joint Transportation Team, who will then investigate whether any further changes need to be made.

Councillor Brady made the following statement

I have been leading the scrutiny review looking at the costs of the office centralisation project and it is not an easy task. We have not had the opportunity to look at the figures being presented today, and therefore we are not able to make any recommendation to Cabinet. However we should be in a position to complete our work before the next Full Council meeting.

From a personal point of view, I believe that the figures for the Bourne Hill project being presented to Cabinet today are much more realistic - £11.75 million. My experience with cost overruns is that they are usually down to the client making changes to the contract rather than problems in the actual construction work. Thus the problem of cost overruns is one that should be controllable.

I am pleased to see that Cabinet are instructing Officers to commission an independent value for money report on the preferred option of Bourne Hill. We are all aware of the risks associated with the site, and I would hope that the figures

presented today, which include allowances for inflation will be the final figures presented to Council for approval before building contracts are signed.

Looking back to when the decision was made to go with Bourne Hill, the so called sequential test clearly indicated Bourne Hill as the better option, with Bourne Hill scoring 50 points against Old Sarum 37. I know that this is now history, but I would draw the Cabinet's attention to this as the scores have been made on a subjective basis and could be open to question. For instance, on the financial side, Bourne Hill was shown as the cheaper option by £1,000,000. I do hope that the independent value for money report will update these comparisons to ensure that the decision to continue with the Bourne Hill project remains the best for the Council Tax payer, who I am sure will take a great interest in the project once they become aware that we are embarking on a project which is going to cost just under £12 million based on today's report.

The Leader advised that the Cabinet would ensure that the Resources Scrutiny Panel was fully involved in the process and that its views would be taken into account.

472. Call-in:

No decisions from the last meeting had been called-in.

473. Forward Plan:

The Leader presented his [Forward Plan](#) for the period 1 March 2005 – 30 June 2005 (previously circulated) that would be published on 14 February 2005 to become operational from 1 March 2005.

Agreed: that the Leader's previously circulated Forward Plan be adopted for publication on 14 February 2005, subject to the following items being moved from March to April –

- a. Options and Proposals for IT disaster recovery and
- b. Internal Audit Strategic Plan 2005/6 -2008/9.

**Cllr Wren
(S Agland)**

Minutes

Part 2: Recommendation to the Council

(The recommendations set out below will be considered by the Council on 21 February 2005)

ACTIONED BY
Cabinet Member
(Contact Officer)

Cllr D Brown
(E Teagle)

474. Proposed Car Parking Charge Adjustments 2005/06:

The Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport introduced the previously circulated [report of the Head of Forward Planning & Transport](#). The views of the Environment & Transport Overview & Scrutiny Panel from its meeting on 10 January were also considered. The views of the Salisbury Joint Transportation Committee to be held on 14 February will be reported to Full Council. Councillor Brown recommended one change to that shown at schedule 1 to the report namely that that proposed 12 month season ticket price be reduced to £950, but that the price for 6 and 3 months remain as indicated in the report. As regards the Market Square, he recommended no change to the current charging regime for this Car Park, and similarly that no changes should be made to the disabled provision at this location - in presenting these proposals Councillor Brown was acting upon the recommendations of the Environment and Transport Scrutiny Panel.

As regards On Street Bay Suspension charges, he proposed that as an incentive to ensure bay suspensions are kept to the minimum time necessary, that a charge of £30- for a week or part thereof be made and that any part of a subsequent week also be charged at £30.

Councillor Brown referred to the heading on page 7 of the report concerning Sunday and Evening charges and made it clear that as far as car park charges for 2005/6 are concerned the Cabinet had no intention to introduce charges for these periods. A report on this subject will be coming to Cabinet as part of the 2006/7 corporate planning process.

Councillor Mrs Peach explained that the City Centre Management was concerned at the potential impact that an increase in short stay charges may have on shoppers and Councillor Mrs Warrander referred to the need to be mindful of the potential effect increased charges may have in residential parking zone areas with drivers entering the City looking to use such areas to avoid parking costs - both these observations were noted by the Cabinet for future reference. Councillor Brown advised that when considering Car Park charges regard was always had to the effect on the local economy.

Recommended to Full Council on 21 February 2005: that:

- (1) The car parking charge adjustments described in Schedules 1 and 3 in the report, incorporating the necessary amendments to reflect the price change to £950 for a 12 month season ticket, "no change" to current tariffs in the Market square or any changes to the disabled provision in this location and the On-Street Bay Suspensions charge of £30 a week or part thereof , with

- no reduction in charge for subsequent weeks, be approved for introduction in May 2005.
- (2) The on-street surplus for 2004/2005 be spent on meeting the costs of ITS and park and ride before any off-street surpluses are used;
- (3) The Salisbury Joint Transportation Committee be requested to endorse these recommendations at its meeting of 14th February 2005.

475. Portfolio Holder Plans:

The Cabinet considered the Portfolio Plans as amended at its December meeting, having regard to the views (where given) of the various Overview and Scrutiny Panels (all previously circulated). A schedule of amendments to the Plans was circulated at the meeting.

As regards [Resources](#), Councillor Mrs Warrander advised that the Scrutiny Panel's concerns regarding the adequacy of funds available to pay for the Centralised Office project had largely been addressed in the report presented to Members at the information evening on 18 January.

As regards [Environment and Transport](#), Councillor Brown addressed the Scrutiny Panel's resolutions in turn -

1. agreed - any report on roundabout advertising should in the first instance be considered by the Panel
2. the review to be undertaken into whether to move certain services from the General Fund to the City/Parish precepts will not be considered for implementation until 2006/7 and thus the Scrutiny Panel has the opportunity to include this issue within its coming work programme should it wish and forward its views to Cabinet in good time before any decisions are taken
3. public conveniences - there is no statutory obligation to provide such facilities, but clearly the Authority would wish to do so. Also there is provision within the medium term financial strategy to make proposals to absorb the accumulated impact of the freeze on this service - consequently there is no case for re-categorising this function.
4. the report on Climate change is awaited by Cabinet
5. the redrafting of paragraph 6.11 has been done and is reflected in the schedule of revisions circulated at the meeting.

As regards [Community and Housing](#), Councillor Cole-Morgan advised that the comments were dealt with at the Scrutiny Panel meeting.

As regard [Planning and Economic Development](#), Councillor Noeken advised that that the Panel was still concerned about the changes to the level of parish council involvement in the determination of planning applications and that subsequent to the Panel meeting, a meeting with Parishes took place last week and this matter would be further considered by the Planning and Economic Development Scrutiny Panel on 14 February - both he and his deputy, Councillor Mrs Peach were planning to attend the Panel meeting.

The Chief Executive advised that further to last December's Cabinet meeting, the issue of internal capacity had been carefully considered at a meeting of the extended management team last Monday. This exercise had established that overall there appeared to be the capacity to deliver on the actions within the portfolio plans, although there were slight concerns around Customer Services and IT services and discussions would be held with the respective service heads to determine ways of overcoming potential pinchpoints.

Respective Portfolio Holders

Recommended to Full Council on 21 February 2005: that the previously circulated Portfolio Plans (as amended by the above schedule of revisions) together with the recommendations therein be adopted.

*Cllr Wren/Mrs
Warrander
(A Osborne)
(M Tiller)*

476. Revenue Budget 2005/06 (including Fees and Charges Strategy) and Council Tax 2005/06:

The Cabinet Member for Resources introduced the previously circulated report of the Head of Financial Services and the Chief Accountant. A revised appendix A was circulated at the meeting which reflected the Government's final Local Government Finance Settlement for 2005/6, which gives this Council £6.651 million, a decrease of £11,511 from the provisional settlement figure.

Recommended to Full Council on 21 February 2005

- (1) the draft Revenue Estimates for 2004/05 (revised) and 2005/06 (original) be approved as previously circulated, but taking account of the final Government Settlement (2005/6)
- (2) For the year 2005/06 the sum of £527,752, giving a Council Tax of £35.24 (at Band D) (thereby contributing £77,192 to reserves) be determined as the amount of the special expenses incurred in the City of Salisbury in accordance with Section 35 (2) d of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
- (3) Taking into account the following:
the surplus on the Council Tax collection fund estimated at £220,945, of which £25,662 falls on the District Council Tax providing an adjustment of 57p surplus for a Band D property.

The basic amount of Council Tax at Band D for District Council purposes in 2005/06 be £111.39 (an increase of 4.8 %) based on a net District budget requirement of £11,902,100 excluding City Area Committee. This will therefore require £216,852 to be drawn from the Council's reserves resulting in a projected General Fund reserves balance of £1,273,000 at 31.3.06.

Further to 3 above the District Tax sum together with the information from Wiltshire County council, Wiltshire Police Authority, Wiltshire and Swindon Fire Authority and the relevant Town and Parish Councils be incorporated in the formal Tax Resolution (to be circulated prior to the Council Tax meeting) for adoption by Full Council showing the Tax Rates for Bands A-H for each part of the District Council's Areas.

477. Housing Revenue Account Budget & Rent Setting 2005/06:

The Cabinet Member for Community & Housing introduced the previously circulated report of the Head of Financial Services and Head of Housing Management. It was noted that in paragraph 4.6 of the report the year referred to should read 2006.

*Cllr Cole-Morgan
(A Osborne)
(D Streek)*

Recommended to Full Council on 21 February 2005: that

- (1) the HRA Budget for 2004/2005 (revised) and 2005/06 (original) be approved.
- (2) the increase for dwelling rents in accordance with rent restructuring be approved.
- (3) the level of increase for service charges at 2.5% and garage rents at 3.5%, be approved.

478. Capital Programme (Including Housing and the Office Project) 2004/05 – 2009/10:

The Cabinet Member for Resources introduced the previously circulated report of the [Head of Financial Services and Management Team](#).

**Cllr Mrs Warrander
(A Osborne)**

Recommended to Full Council on 21 February 2005: that

- (1) the current financing of the Capital Programme be noted;
- (2) the Revised Capital Programme 2004/2005-2009/2010 as set out in the previously circulated report, be approved;
- (3) in principle a financing strategy using the prudential system for the construction of Centralised Offices that has no impact (or a saving) on the Council's revenue budget be approved (appendix 3 refers)
- (4) the Officers be instructed to commission an independent value for money assessment of the preferred option for centralised offices between gateways 'C' and 'D' of the project.

479. Temporary Stop Notice Provisions – Town & Country Planning Act 1990:

The Cabinet Member for Planning & Economic Development introduced the previously circulated [report of the Head of Development Services](#).

**Cllr Noeken
(S Thorne)**

Recommended to Full Council on 21 February 2005: that

- (1) the Council generally welcomes the proposed introduction of Temporary Stop Notices;
- (2) the above, together with the comments detailed at 1- 5 of the report's recommendations, be communicated to the ODPM as this Council's response to the Consultation Paper;
- (3) with effect from the date that the power to issue a Temporary Stop Notice comes into force, Part 6, paragraph 14.23(b) of the Constitution is amended to read:

“That the Head of Development Services be authorised to initiate enforcement action (including Enforcement Notices and Temporary Stop Notices) and subsequent prosecutions, on behalf of the District Council subject to the Ward Member calling it in on behalf of the public or Parish Council, the HDS considering it expedient to exercise such powers and subject to the Head of Legal and Property Services being satisfied as to the evidence.”

- (4) Paragraph 14.29 (a) should be amended to allow the HDS to approve planning applications provided that:

“In the opinion of the HDS the proposal is in general conformity with the Local Development Plan, other adopted policy guidance or development brief.”

Minutes

Alamein Suite
City Hall, Salisbury
4.00 pm: 2 February 2005

Part 3: Cabinet Decisions

All decisions set out in this section of the minutes will be implemented on or after 15th February 2005 (unless called in for consideration by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel)

ACTIONED BY
Cabinet Member
(Contact Officer)

480. Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy 2005/6:

Agreed: that consideration of the [Private Sector Housing Renewal Strategy for 2005-2006](#) be deferred to a future meeting.

Cllr Cole-Morgan
(J Hudson)

481. Audit Commission Consultation – Comprehensive Performance Assessment:

The Leader introduced the [report of the Policy Director, Debbie Dixon](#) (previously circulated).

Cllr Wren
(D Dixon)

Agreed: that the proposed response set out at paragraphs 4.1-4.5 in the report be submitted to the Audit Commission by 15th February 2005.

482. Joint Consultative Forum:

The Cabinet Member for Resources introduced the previously circulated policies and recommendations of the Forum arising at its meeting on 24 January 2005.

Cllr Mrs Warrander
(A McConkey)

Agreed: that the recommendations from the Joint Consultative Forum meeting held on 24 January 2005 relating to (a) [Smoking Policy](#) and (b) [Draft Discretionary Additional Payment Policy](#), be adopted, subject in respect of the latter, to the word "exceptional" replacing the word "significant" in the first paragraph of section 2.3.

Note - in respect of the smoking policy, the Officers will revise the policy to reflect the decision.

483. The Civil Contingencies Act 2004:

The Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Development introduced the [report of the Head of Development Services and Emergency Planning Coordinator](#) (previously circulated).

Cllr Noeken
(S Thorne)

Agreed: that

- (1) Option B be adopted as the position of Salisbury District Council and delegated authority be given to the Head of Development Services, in his role as Emergency Planning Coordinator to enter into detailed negotiations with the County Council regarding the drafting of a Service Level Agreement;

- (2) the existing arrangement of Voluntary call-out for LAIO's (with callout fee) be continued; and
- (3) the cabinet member for Planning and Economic Development undertake the portfolio for Emergency Planning at Salisbury District Council.

484. Guide to Shopfronts & Advertisement Design:

The Cabinet Member for Planning & Economic Development introduced the previously circulated [report of the Conservation Officer](#).

Agreed: that the leaflet be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

**Cllr Noeken
(J Sage)**

The meeting finished at 5.30pm
There were two members of the public present