

Minutes

Meeting of : The Council
Meeting held in : The Auditorium, City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury
Date : Monday 25 June 2007

Present

Councillor Mrs E A Chettleburgh - **Chairman**

Councillors:

R A Beattie, R Britton, Ms J V Broom, D W Brown, K A Cardy, P M Clegg, R J Clewer, J A Cole-Morgan, I C Curr, B E Dalton, Mrs S L Dennis, C Devine, E R Draper, P D Edge, J M English, Mrs M I Evans, S R Fear, M G Fowler, Mrs J A Green, M A Hewitt, Mrs C R Hill, J Holt, S J Howarth, G E Jeans, J P King, Ms J F Launchbury, M D Lee, D J Luther, Mrs H McKeown, C G Mills, I M Mitchell, Ms C J M Morrison, W R Moss, J C Noeken, D O Parker, L Randall, A C Roberts, J C Robertson, B M Rycroft, P W L Sample, J F Smale, Mrs C A Spencer, J R G Spencer, A A P Thorpe, Miss M A Tomlinson, C R Vincent, J M Walsh, I C West, F Westmoreland, K C Wren and G Wright

Apologies were received from Councillors I D McLennan (Vice-Chairman), M J Osment and I R Tomes

Officers:

David Crook (Acting Chief Executive), Steve Milton (Principal Democratic Services Manager), Tom Bray and Paul Trenell (Democratic Services), Alan Osborne (Head of Financial Services), John Crawford (Head of Legal and Property Services)

The Chairman presented a Certificate of Best Practice Approval on sheltered housing schemes, from the National Centre for Sheltered Housing, to members of the Housing Department to highlight the quality of officers and their determination and professionalism.

26. Declarations of Interest:

There were none



Awarded in:
Housing Services
Waste and Recycling Services



27. Public Questions/Statement Time:

Mr Frank Dobson made a statement regarding the 30 MPH limit on the Coombe Road. This is attached at Annex A to the minutes together with a reply from the Chairman.

Mrs Mary Stephens made a statement regarding the Bourne Hill Offices. This is attached at Annex B to the minutes.

28. Minutes:

Resolved - that the minutes of the annual meeting held on Monday 21 May 2007 (previously circulated) be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

29. Chairman's Announcements:

The Chairman announced her theme for the year and highlighted the very important work that our different faiths achieve in their communities. She has been aware for some time that it is not only the spiritual needs that some of our faiths fulfil. Our government is letting go of some community services which our city churches are trying to address. An example of this that one of our churches is working with the NCH running an after school club and supervised play in one of our parks, but it is with all the faiths that she would like to share ideas for the whole District

The Chairman informed Members that there was a successful visit to Parliament on Tuesday 19 June 2007 to lobby the Government on the unitary process for Wiltshire. Three of the Wiltshire Districts were there, Kennett spoke well in opposition to Unitary for Wiltshire and other counties attending were Cornwall, Somerset, Co Durham, Yorkshire and Shropshire. It was good to have the news from North Wilts and Swindon to strengthen the districts' argument before our evening meeting with the minister Phil Woolas, this was our opportunity to put forward the case for Salisbury District Council. The leader and deputy answered all the minister's questions with confidence, ably supported by Councillor Clegg and Mark Wareham, representative of UNISON.

Finally, Councillors were asked to make a note of two forthcoming meetings – special Cabinet on Monday 23 July and special Council on Wednesday 25 July 2007 both relating to the Bourne Hill project.

30. Cabinet Recommendation:

a. Review of Cabinet Portfolio Responsibilities: Councillor Sample

The Council considered the Cabinet's recommendation from its meeting on 13 June 2007 (Minute 011) together with the previously circulated report of the Head of Democratic Services).

Resolved – that the recommendations from Cabinet be adopted.

b. Corporate Plan and Best Value Performance Plan: Councillor Sample

The Council considered the Cabinet's recommendation from its meeting on 13 June 2007 (Minute 012) together with the previously circulated report of the Acting Chief Executive).

Resolved – that the Corporate and Best Value Performance Plan be adopted and a new forward looking corporate plan be produced following agreement of a new set of political priorities:

c. Annual Statement of Accounts 2006/07: Councillor Roberts

The Council considered the Cabinet's recommendation from its meeting on 13 June 2007 (Minute 013) together with the previously circulated report of the Head of Financial Services).

Resolved – that the Statement of Accounts for the financial year ended 31 March 2007 be approved.

31. Audit Committee Recommendation: Statement on Internal Control 2006/07: Councillor Roberts

The Council considered the previously circulated recommendation of the Audit Committee from its meeting held on 13 June 2007 (minute 013) and the previously circulated report of the Acting Chief Executive.

Resolved – that the Statement on Internal Control 2006/07 be adopted.

- 32. Standards Committee Recommendation Model Code of Conduct: Councillor Mills**
The Council considered the previously circulated recommendation of the Standards Committee from its meeting held on 18 June 2007

Resolved – that the Revised Code of Conduct be adopted

- 33. Questions on Cabinet Decisions taken since the last Council Meeting:**
A number of questions were raised by Members in connection with those matters that had been considered by the Cabinet on 13 June 2007. Those requiring further action were as follows:-

Councillor Brown asked (Cabinet Minute 014 refers).

The minutes quote the Leader as saying the former administration “failed to consult adequately” with local residents on the scheme, adding that a “wider community debate and fully consultation” are needed.

The agreement reached at Cabinet (paragraph 14 (1) to (7)) poses several questions and I would ask the Portfolio Holder if he will answer the following:

Have the bin contractors agreed to a two month hold being placed on the existing order for wheelie bins and what is the projected cost of compensation likely to be paid by the Council for this delay and/or eventual cancellation of the contract?

Councillor Brown asked (Cabinet Minute 017 refers).

Reference is made to the Salisbury District Council Risk Register at Appendix 2 to the Report on Performance Monitoring (Review of the Fourth Quarter and the Annual Review). Item 5 on this Risk Register concerns “failure to meet targets for diverting household waste from landfill” and it shows the Impact as being “Major” and the Probability of it occurring “Almost Certain”.

However, the Residual Status ratings (up-dated as at 4th June 2007) indicate the Impact as now being “Moderate” and the Probability of it occurring “Possible”.

Would the Portfolio Holder not agree with me that, until the decision on how to proceed with Alternate Week Collections of refuse is determined, the Risk Register should continue to reflect the previous ratings of “Major” and “Almost Certain”, and will he undertake to see that this is changed back without delay?

- 34. Project and Policy Progress Reports:**
There were no project or policy progress reports to consider.
- 35. Reports of other Committees/Panels on which questions were asked:**
There were none.
- 36. Call In Matters:**
There were none.
- 37. Questions to the Council Chairman, Cabinet Member, Chairman of any Committee - on any matters not on the agenda in relation to which the Council has powers or duties or which affects the District:**
Councillor Cole-Morgan put his question to the Cabinet Member for Community and Housing as set out at agenda item 13 (previously circulated).

The Cabinet Member replied as follows:-

Councillor Cole-Morgan then asked a supplementary question as follows:

“Given the recognition of quality implicit in the Code of Practice approval, which, incidentally, belies the claim in this Lib/Dem manifesto that “Salisbury’s once proud Sheltered Housing Scheme has been destroyed by the Conservatives in the last four years”.

Given the fact that Sheltered Housing support services can realistically only be financed from either the HRA or Supporting People,

Given that any significant increase in Supporting People funding would seem highly unlikely due to the intense pressure on SP budgets,

Given that every ordinary SDC council house tenant is already currently contributing about £5 a month, i.e. £60 a year, out of their own rent, to subsidise services for those in our sheltered housing through the Housing Revenue Account, (a state of affairs which cannot be right but which has gone on since before 2001),

And, now, having had time to look at least at the headline financial figures for his portfolio,

Does the Portfolio Holder still believe that the aspiration in the Lib Dem manifesto to “review the decision” on Sheltered Housing wardens i.e. presumably to reintroduce them, is still realistic,

And, if so, where is the additional money going to come from for either in-house or community provision?

In framing his reply I would ask him to bear in mind

That we have 22 sheltered housing schemes,

That we currently employ 12 housing support officers and

That to meet our Supporting People commitments we are obliged to provide weekday cover to our 500 plus residents every week of the year.

This means having sufficient additional officers to cover both leave and sickness.

Please could the reply be made available to every member of Council?”

The Portfolio Holder thanked Councillor Cole-Morgan for his question and agreed to circulate a written response to all members. Attached as Annex C to the minutes

38. Exempt Business:

Since there were no questions arising it was not necessary to move into exempt business.

*The meeting finished at:7.25 pm
Members of the public: 17*

Mr Frank Dobson
142 Coombe Road
Salisbury
Wilts SP2 8BL

01722 416414

25/06/07

Statement Full Council - Monday 25 June 2007

Chairman and Members of the Council

Coombe Road – 30 MPH Speed Limit

Has Coombe Road really got a 30 mph speed limit? Because as far as I am aware there are no signs to indicate this as you go out of the city. There is one as you come into the city at the top by Harvard heights, but this is obviously not enough as many drivers are coming down that road with speeds in excess of 50 mph and anything up to 70 mph!

Why are there not any of the following:

1. 30 mph signs
2. electric markers boxes indicating your speed with smile/sad faces
3. speed cameras
4. slow down roundabout ahead
5. or any other traffic calming methods

Are we waiting for a fatality to happen before we do anything?

Why no pedestrian crossing?

The most vulnerable people in our society trying to cross the road the elderly, infirmed and children are in great danger. Since there is to be a community centre over on Rowbarrow even more important that there should be a crossing.

Noise is a recognised pollution, therefore noise pollution from excess speeds should also be taken into consideration as well. The higher the speeds the louder the noise will be, especially with the very large vehicles that use this road.

This is another problem, although you cannot stop large vehicles using the road, you can make them more aware of the speed limits, otherwise they will continue to ruin the roads and any money saved in not putting up signs etc will be outweighed by road repairs and damage to house foundations. The very least that should happen is a speed camera – we know they are the most effective form of speed control. It is very difficult for me to see why anyone would object to this proposal as all that is being asked for is the law of the land to be applied for the safety and well being of the people that live in and around Coombe Road

Frank Dobson

The Chairman thanked Mr Dobson for his question and advised that we will seek information from the Wiltshire County Council and give a reply within 10 working days

Annex B

Mrs Mary Stephens
34 Wyndham Road
Salisbury
Wilts SP1 3AB

Thank you Madam Chair

I was pleased to hear that Cabinet will recommend to this Council a full examination and consultation of all the options for the way forward with the Bourne Hill project.

I am concerned, as a council taxpayer, that if the costs cannot be capitalised it will have a profound effect on our council tax.

It was evident before the election that there was strong public opinion against the Project and that there was a possibility that this could result in a change of administration.

We hear at the Constructors Forum that the contract with the construction company was signed as late as 26th April. Surely those responsible should have foreseen the financial implications and hesitated for just seven days.

I believe that there should be a legal process that will ensure that they are held to account for this appalling lack of caution. We, the taxpayers, should not have to carry the cost of this error of judgment.

Thank you

Mary Stephens

Annex C

Strategic Housing
Salisbury District Council, 26 Endless Street
Salisbury, Wiltshire SP1 1DR

direct line: 01722 434357

fax: 01722 434530

email: areynolds@salisbury.gov.uk

web: www.salisbury.gov.uk

DATE: 11 July 2007

OUR REF: AR/YS

YOUR REF:

Dear Councillor Cole-Morgan

Thank you for the supplementary question at Council on 25th June 2007 concerning our review of sheltered housing.

I am in the process of familiarising myself with the financial and policy issues currently affecting the service.

A detailed review of service charges is underway which should provide a much clearer picture as to how we can levy appropriate charges and reflect the true cost utility supplies. Wiltshire County Council's Supporting People Team has also recently completed a review of older people's accommodation and has now convened a countywide working group to examine the findings and to set out the future role of sheltered housing.

The outcome of these two issues will have a direct impact on any review and therefore it is only prudent that our review will be considered once we have understood the outcomes from this work.

At this time there is no decision to reinstate Housing Support Officers back on-site, however, if after a review or as a result of Supporting People outcomes, then it may be that a dedicated team is established that would deliver an enhanced service, ie extra care.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Ian Tomes
Portfolio Holder - Housing