

Minutes

Meeting of : The Council
Meeting held in : The Auditorium, City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury
Date : Monday 20 February 2006

Present

Councillor E R Draper - **Chairman**
Councillor Mrs C A Spencer - **Vice-Chairman**

Councillors G A N Anderson, M Baker, F D Bissington, Mrs P J Bissington, J A Brady, R Britton, D W Brown, A J A Brown-Hovelt, K A Cardy, Mrs E A Chettleburgh, P M Clegg, J A Cole-Morgan, J M Collier, T F Couper, D A Culver, B E Dalton, C Devine, P D Edge, Mrs M I Evans, S R Fear, Mrs J A Green, Mrs J M Greville, M A Hewitt, J B Hooper, S J Howarth, G E Jeans, P J Leo, I D McLennan, Ms S C Mallory, C G Mills, W R Moss, J R L Nettle, J C Noeken, M J Osment, P V H Paisey A G Peach, Mrs M M A Peach, L Randall, B M Rycroft, P W L Sample, I R Tomes, Miss M A Tomlinson, J M Walsh, Mrs S A Warrander, I C West, F Westmoreland, Mrs S A Willan, T Woodbridge and K C Wren

Apologies were received from Councillors Mrs P Brown, J Rodell, J R G Spencer and C R Vincent

255 Declarations of Interest:

Councillor B E Dalton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in rental garages (Agenda Item 7 (e) (3) minute 260(e)) and withdrew from the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillor J R L Nettle declared a personal and prejudicial interest in rental garages (Agenda Item 7 (e) (3) minute 260(e)) and withdrew from the meeting during consideration thereof

Councillor P W L Sample declared a personal and prejudicial interest in any matters relating to the Court Service or Salisbury Magistrates Court but since no matters in connection with these were discussed, was not required to leave the meeting.

256 Appointment of the Acting Chief Executive:

The Council considered the recommendation (minute 8) of the Appointments Sub-Committee meeting on 16 January 2006. The Leader advised that he had no objections to the recommended appointment.

Resolved – that Mr David Crook be appointed as the Acting Chief Executive pending the longer term recruitment process for the Head of Paid Service/Chief Executive expected in the latter part of 2006.



Awarded in:
Housing Services
Waste and Recycling Services



257 Public Questions/Statement Time:

(a) Sunday Parking Charges

Mr David Ensor of Churches Together Salisbury made the following statement:

Over 1000 citizens come to the centre of Salisbury on Sunday mornings for church services. Many use the car parks between 1000 and 1300 hrs; a reasonable estimate would be 200 cars. The Cathedral relies on Crane Street and New Street, the Baptist Church on Brown Street, the Methodist Church and the Salvation Army on Salt Lane, St. Thomas' and the United Reform Church on the Central car park.

On this estimate the Council will cream off over £10,000 in the first year from church worshippers, money which would otherwise be donated to the respective churches. It can be reasonably assumed that, as it will cost £1 each week to park a car to go to church, the offering will receive £1 less, particularly among pensioners. Shoppers park to spend; worshippers park to give.

The churches in Salisbury supply a valuable contribution to the city by the provision of a variety of community social activities. Most uniformed youth work is based on the churches. Social care volunteers for many of the charities in Salisbury come from the churches. Yet the churches are discriminated against when applying for grants to support these social welfare activities. The Council's policy is that no church should receive grants for these purposes from Council funds.

There must be a means of mitigating this new impost upon people who park in order to attend their churches on a Sunday. In some areas of the country a form of concession has been arranged for worshippers, similar to the disabled disc or by an annual season ticket at very low cost. We urge the Council to consider ways in which this could be achieved.

A simpler solution, which would support the contribution being made by the churches to Salisbury, would be to make the operating hours for Sunday parking from 1300-1600 hrs (or 1700hrs).

We urge the Council to consider these options.

On behalf of the Chairman, the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport replied that a written response would be sent to Mr Ensor within ten working days.

(b) Brunel Link and By-Pass

Mr Colin Duller of Harnham made the following statement:

The need for a by-pass and bridge I feel is a pressing issue which the council ignores at its peril.

Harnham needs a relief road, the industrial estate needs another access for the people who use or live in the area.

Red herrings thrown up by outside groups such as ACT and the Green issue groups such as Agenda 21 are just obscuring our very real problems now and in the future.

This is an engineering problem not a social one.

The Chairman thanked Mr Duller for his statement.

(c) Brunel Link/Harnham Relief Road Scrutiny Review

The Chairman read out the following statement on behalf of Mr Neil Philpott, SWEP Board Member:

"As I am unable to attend and speak personally at the Full Council meeting I am writing on behalf of the South Wiltshire Economic Partnership to re-confirm our aims and objectives regarding the Churchfields Industrial Estate. We felt it was necessary to do this in the light of the above review and the principal recommendation, which asks Salisbury District Council to review its policy of support.

SWEP have long recognised the importance of the site to the local economy, at 33 hectares the Churchfields Industrial Estate is the largest employment site in South Wiltshire. It is home to approximately 165 companies, employing around 4,500 people, together these businesses have a combined annual turnover of around £600 million.

SWEP have strategically supported the development of the site by developing, as part of its 20 year vision, an aspiration for a landmark, high quality, large scale purpose built business park at Churchfields. SWEP has also developed many actual initiatives on the ground over the years through the Churchfields Business Action Group in an attempt to alleviate some of the problems and sustain and protect the employment use.

A key issue for businesses and users on Churchfields is access and parking. The site has developed on a somewhat ad hoc basis over the last 30 years and it is clear that to maintain and protect the use of the site action needs to be taken. SWEP therefore support the removal of the existing barriers to access, not necessarily agreeing that the Brunel Link and Harnham Relief Road is the correct option. However, there is a more fundamental strategic issue that needs to be resolved and that is the development of a long term plan for the most appropriate use of the site, i.e. a high class business park.

SWEP's progress with this action have been delayed by the SDC vision and we look forward to feeding into this work in the near future.

(d) Proposed Cuts to Arts Grants

Fiona Curtis of Windlesham Road made the following statement:

"I am a young member of the Salisbury Community and a voter who has benefited from the outreach and youth programmes that are run by the Playhouse and also the Arts Centre and the Salisbury International Arts Festival. I am a member of Stage 65 Youth Theatre and I've also been on an incredibly valuable work placement scheme with the Playhouse and Festival during my gap year before university.

"I know that all three organisations are completely committed to people like me in the city. The Arts Centre has just undergone a major refurbishment and the Playhouse has nearly raised the necessary funds for a new community and education space. These will make both places even more useful resources for the whole community.

"I am very worried and concerned that the members of the Council do not fully understand the risks they are taking in proposing to cut the grants to Salisbury's arts organisations. It might just be a small amount out of the overall savings, but the impact could be devastating.

"Some amazing projects have been able to flourish with the support you had been giving to the arts, which may be damaged or disappear unless you change your minds and vote against these cuts. All of these are so important to people like me for developing our life skills, confidence and self esteem. I'd like to mention just a few....

"Activities like Stage 65 Youth Theatre which was invited to perform at the National Theatre's youth theatre festival in London last year, or the Arts Centre's rock concerts for under 18's give opportunities almost every week for the young people of Salisbury to enjoy and express ourselves in a safe environment away from dangers of alcohol or drugs.

"Then there are arts projects for users of mental health services or with special needs, such as the Arts Centre's Kingfisher Project or the Playhouse's children's theatre programme which schools such as Exeter House regularly visit or long term projects with the Sarum Centre and Greencroft Centre. The Playhouse's education department runs over a thousand workshops every year in schools with youths at risk in Amesbury and the Friary Estate. The Playhouse worked closely with Trafalgar School in Downton and Alderbury and West Grimstead Primary to help them achieve beacon and Artsmark status.

"The arts scene in Salisbury sets it apart from other cities. I understand that the Council is having to make difficult decisions this year, but at a time like this when they are under pressure it is all the more important to consider the long term implications of any decision they make. As someone who has grown up in Salisbury I urge the Council to invest in the future of our arts so that future generations can have the same advantages that I have had".

The Chairman thanked Miss Curtis for her statement.

Mr Olu Taiwo of Methuen Drive Salisbury made the following statement:

"I am a relative new comer to Salisbury, and one of the things that most attracted me about settling here was the vibrancy of its cultural life. Not only have I been able to experience extraordinary events year-round, but I am also able to participate in and lead them. Salisbury International Arts Festival has been instrumental to the development of this vibrancy, and there is much that happens now in Salisbury that would not have happened without the Festival's mantle to encourage and develop it. The Festival has enabled groups such as the Community Choir to start, grow and flourish it provides a platform and the confidence for local community-based groups to show themselves off; it works towards large-scale community projects from which other work then develops, the Festival was instrumental in enabling the appointment of the Arts Development Officer, whose post has done so much to further enrich the cultural lives of those in this District. During the Festival things happen that do not, cannot happen at other times of the year.

"But its remit is also to be an international forum, to present work to this community that can usually only be seen in London or even abroad, to put Salisbury on the map culturally. Through the Festival, Salisbury has

been regularly brought into focus in the national press for positive reasons, with fascinating pictures, interesting stories, reinforcing the city's position as a place that people want to come to visit, to move to, a place in which we as residents are proud to live.

"Yet, in common with the Arts Centre and the Playhouse, the Festival's economy remains fragile. A cut in the grant to these arts bodies would not only result in at least one of them closing, but the domino effect would mean that the whole community was poorer economically as well as culturally; over £280,000 of the 2005 Festival budget was spent with local suppliers and businesses, future community projects through to 2009 which involve partner organisations including English Nature, English Heritage, The Conservation Foundation would just not happen. For the well-being of the people in this District, the arts are an amenity and a resource that cannot be thrown away or dismissed as a disposable luxury".

The Chairman thanked Mr Taiwo for his statement.

(f) **Tisbury and District Sports Centre**

Mr Coutman of Tisbury made the following statement:

"I am a member of a group that has been set up locally to consider ways of supporting and improving the Tisbury and District Sports Centre.

The Centre is highly popular with all ages and much of the time it is oversubscribed. However, despite its popularity and being oversubscribed, the Centre is run at a deficit.

Councillors will be aware of the strong local opposition to an earlier proposal to save money by closing the Centre. They will also be aware of the relief when the Cabinet decided not to adopt it.

We as a group have been considering whether there is any way in which the unmet demand could be met and the deficit reduced. We have already undertaken some research and we have a proposal in mind.

In essence, the proposal is to raise funds to add a fitness studio to the existing building. We envisage the facility generating extra income that would substantially exceed the additional running costs.

The group would like to work with the council to achieve its objectives. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with Cllr Cole-Morgan and senior managers to discuss the proposal in more detail.

We would be happy to circulate our thoughts to any councillor that was interested after the meeting".

The Chairman invited the Community and Housing Portfolio Holder to reply to this statement. Councillor Cole-Morgan replied that he was aware of the work undertaken by this group and would be very pleased to meet with them to discuss this matter further.

(g) **Budget and Proposed Cuts**

Mr John English of the Greencroft Salisbury made a statement along the following lines:

"Eight years ago the Head of Finance at the District Council advised us that we would be in financial trouble in a few years if we did not increase the Council Tax by a small amount each year. Now the Administration seems to be surprised at the financial difficulties the Council finds itself in.

"However, the Council needs to preserve the quality of life and the service it provides for its citizens.

"Salisbury heavily relies on its tourist trade and consequently its need to maintain a beautiful city. The arts represent an economic benefit and do much for our youth. To cut them would be a very short-sighted thing to do. This Administration is presiding over a gradual decline into mediocrity with its constant cuts. I understand that alternative budget proposals will be placed before Councillors tonight and I hope you will adopt them.

Local Businesses are also under a duty to support this city. There is a saying that you should not just milk the cow, you must also feed it".

The Chairman thanked Mr English for his statement.

258 Minutes:

Resolved - that the minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 12 December 2005 (previously circulated) be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

259 **Chairman's Announcements:**

The Chairman had no announcements.

260 **Cabinet Recommendations:**

a. **Harnham Relief Road/Brunel Link – Final Scrutiny Report: Councillor D Brown**

Before moving the recommendation, the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport informed Council members of the following matters:

Since Cabinet met on 18th January, the South West Regional Assembly has come into the frame. In July last year, Government provided them with indicative funding figures for their Regional Transport Allocation streams up to 2015/16. Although not yet confirmed, indications are that the South West Regional Assembly will receive £90 million for transport schemes for 2006/2007.

The Regional Assembly considered its regional priorities on 27th January and categorised various road/transport schemes into three main listings:

List One: Schemes in Principal Urban Areas, such as Bristol – which are recommended to be funded first.

List Two: Inter-Regional Schemes such as the Weymouth Bypass and the Westbury Bypass, and even a scheme down in Cornwall – schemes that have completed and passed, or in the final stages of completing, all of the statutory processes already. These have been recommended for funding second.

List Three: According to the guidance issued by the Department for Transport, this listing should include “schemes where a degree of work done at present does not allow a confident judgement on the value of the schemes or whether they could be delivered within the Regional Funding Allocation period, but which the region would want to include in the later part of the Regional Funding Allocation programme in the light of further work.” The Harnham Relief Road and Brunel Link scheme has been placed on List Three which is generally regarded as a home for the “difficult ones” that have some way to go before they can graduate to List Two.

Whereas previously, major transport schemes (those over £5 million) such as the Harnham Relief Road/Brunel Link were funded direct from the Department for Transport, they are now being prioritised and funded at Regional Level out of the Regional Funding Allocation. The decision to transfer these schemes to Region was a Government one, notified via DfT.

The Regional Assembly was told to aim at submitting its “advice” on scheme listings to the Department for Transport by the end of January. Bearing in mind that the Harnham Relief Road/Brunel Link is currently forecast to cost in the region of £20 million, I asked WCC if the £90 million for Region included the funding initially approved for the Harnham Relief Road/Brunel Link under the Government’s own Salisbury Transport Plan. The answer was no.

The County Council, as promoter of the scheme, intends that process on their Planning Application should continue for the time being; and that over the next few weeks they will seek clarification from the Department for Transport about the status of the Brunel Link/Harnham Relief Road scheme and realistic prospects for funding. This in turn will inform consideration of future progress of this scheme.

The reason for seeking clarification is simple: (a) the Brunel Link/Harnham Relief Road scheme had already been “provisionally accepted” by DfT for funding as part of the Salisbury Transport Plan. However (b) Region’s recent advice appears to be capable of a different interpretation; it is vague and equivocal.

It is not at all clear how DfT will react to this conundrum, but in view of the change in funding stream arrangements and the fact that DfT have now apparently decided that Region will henceforth be responsible for advising priorities on road schemes that they (Region) wish to pursue within their Regional Transport Allocation, the situation is confused to say the very least.

Councillor Clegg, Chairman of the Planning and Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Panel presented his Panel’s findings.

Following these statements, the Council considered the Cabinet’s recommendation from its meeting on 18 January 2006 (Minute 703) concerning the final Scrutiny report from the Environment and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Panel’s meeting held on 6 December 2005 (appendix 1). Wiltshire

County Council's initial response to the Scrutiny Panel's recommendations (appendix 2). The Cabinet's response (in addition to its recommendation set out below, as amended at the Council meeting) (appendix 3).

Resolved – that

1. the response (referred to in appendix 3), be forwarded to Wiltshire County Council, together with a formal request that they (as proposer of the new road scheme) complete the work on the planning application and provide the additional data and supporting documentation (as listed in their initial response paper) as a matter of priority;
2. no further action be taken in respect of the Scrutiny Panel's recommendations (set out in paragraphs 15.0.1 - 15.0.4 of the Panel's report) until such time as Wiltshire County Council receives clarification from the Department of Transport about the status of the scheme and realistic prospects for funding;
3. the excellent quality of work produced by the Environment and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Panel be acknowledged.

b. Proposed Car Parking Charge Adjustments 2006/07: Councillor D Brown

The Council considered the Cabinet's recommendation from its meeting on 1 February 2006 (Minute 727) together with the report of the Head of Forward Planning & Transportation, which included the views of the Environment & Transport Overview & Scrutiny Panel.

Councillor Brown moved the resolution as set out below *.

Councillor Sample then moved and Councillor Mrs Chettleburgh seconded the following amendment:-

1. That the Park and Ride charges be reduced to £1.50 per day to stimulate up-take of the scheme;
2. Raise City Centre parking charges to £6.00 per day to encourage more long term parkers and commuters to use the Park and Ride Scheme; and
3. Scrap proposals to introduce Sunday city centre parking charges .

A recorded vote was requisitioned in respect of whether to adopt the amendment and the voting was as follows:-

FOR

Councillors Mrs E A Chettleburgh, B E Dalton, P D Edge, Mrs J M Greville, C G Mills, P W L Sample, Miss M A Tomlinson and I C West (8)

AGAINST

Councillors G A N Anderson, M Baker, F D Bissington, Mrs P J Bissington, J A Brady, R Britton, D W Brown, A J A Brown-Hovelt, K A Cardy, P M Clegg, J A Cole-Morgan, J M Collier, T F Couper, D A Culver, C Devine, E R Draper, Mrs M I Evans, S R Fear, Mrs J A Green, M A Hewitt, J B Hooper, S J Howarth, G E Jeans, P J Leo, I D McLennan, Ms S C Mallory, W R Moss, J R L Nettle, J C Noeken, M J Osment, P V H Paisey, A G Peach, Mrs M M A Peach, L Randall, B M Rycroft, Mrs C A Spencer, I R Tomes, J M Walsh, Mrs S A Warrander, F Westmoreland, Mrs S A Willan, T Woodbridge and K C Wren (43)

The amendment was lost.

***Resolved – that**

- (1) the car parking charge adjustments as set out in Appendix 2 of the report be approved for introduction on 3rd April 2006; (the Sunday On Street charging proposals will need to be recommended to Wiltshire County Council as Highway Authority);
- (2) the on-street surplus for 2005/2006 be spent on meeting the costs of park and ride and ITS before any off-street surpluses are used; and
- (3) once the car parking charge adjustments have been implemented, the impact of these shall be monitored regularly with a view to extending, if necessary, the residents' parking scheme in order to mitigate any negative effects.

c. Portfolio Plans: (Respective Cabinet Members)

The Cabinet considered the four Portfolio Plans (previously circulated) as recommended by the Cabinet at its meeting on 1 February 2006 (minute 728).

During the consideration of the Community and Housing Portfolio Plan, the Portfolio Holder, Councillor Cole-Morgan made the following statement:

“In view of the difficulty the major arts organisations in Salisbury will face in adjusting to reduced levels of local authority support, especially after the recently announced and unpreluded cut by the County Council, the Cabinet has been scouring the council’s finances for ways in which the blow can be softened.

“As a result we are undertaking a year’s deferral of the imposition of the £50k reduction in the major arts budget, so that it will not now come into effect until the financial year 2008/09, thus giving the three major arts organisations two full years in which to take ameliorating action.

“It is proposed to do this by reducing the amount of money earmarked for reserves in 2007/08, which is in effect the contingency for that year. Clearly, such a measure must be a one off. It cannot be repeated without endangering the council’s good financial standing and the arts organisations must understand that these savings will have to be imposed and that they need to use the extra time provided to work together and prepare for them.

“The Cabinet is conscious of how fortunate Salisbury is to have such a rich arts scene and, from the voluminous correspondence we have been receiving recently, can be in no doubt of how much it is valued by many people; though it has to be said that in our public consultations funding the arts usually comes low down the priority list.

“The Cabinet also recognises that, apart from enhancing the lives of many people, the major arts organisations have a significant economic effect, providing employment and encouraging both tourism and inward investment.

“But the arts like sport are not a statutory element of council expenditure and, when every other avenue of saving has been explored, as government grants fail to keep pace with national inflation in the council’s employment costs for the third year in succession, the arts must along with sports provision and other non-statutory elements take some of the strain.

“In the medium-term financial strategy, the Cabinet looked at a reduction of £95,000 in the major arts budget but, having listened to the arts organisations on the problems this would create, reduced it to just over half that amount. And the Council is already working in partnership with the arts organisations putting our own art capacity and facilities into the pot to help them find ways in which the savings can be made that will have least impact on their service to the public.

“This co-operative approach has been welcomed by the chairs of the three major arts organisations who recognise that this council has a long and very creditable history of supporting the arts regardless of which administration is in power.

“They realise that the arts budget reductions have not been proposed out of any lack of appreciation of the importance of the arts organisations to our community or criticism of their work. To emphasise this point letters will be sent to the Arts Council and other funders pointing out that the proposed reduction in funding is being forced on us by the shortfall in central government support and is not the consequence of any lowering of our appreciation of the beneficial role of the arts in our community.”

NOTE: This matter is outside the 2006/07 Budget Setting process.

During the consideration of the Environment and Transport Portfolio Plan, Councillor Mrs Evans raised concerns on behalf of the residents of Bemerton Heath in respect of the new Wilts and Dorset Bus route around the estate.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport asked Councillor Mrs Evans to put her concerns in writing to him so that he could pursue this matter via the Quality Bus Partnership.

Resolved - that the previously circulated Portfolio Plans which incorporated the Cabinet’s amendments be approved.

d. Revenue Budgets 2006/07 and Council Tax 2006/2007: (Councillors Wren & Culver)

The Council considered the Cabinet's recommendation from its meeting on 1 February 2006 (minute 729) together with a report from the Head of Financial Services and Chief Accountant containing the revised estimates. The Council Tax resolution, including the County Council, Police Authority, Fire Authority and Parish precepts were all previously circulated under separate cover letter dated 13th February 2006.

The Leader moved the resolution set out below*.

Councillor Sample then moved and Councillor Mrs Chettleburgh seconded the following amendment:-

1. Scrap the Council's £100,000 to the "Salisbury Vision" project.
2. Cut the number of Council Press and PR officers to one officer.
3. Reduce the budget for the Salisbury Citizen – or increase advertising revenue for the publication.
4. Reduce the allowances for the Leader of the Council and the Members of the Cabinet by 25%
5. Reduce the number of senior officers by one Policy Director and cut the associated PA post
6. Reduce Park and Ride charges to £1.50 per day to stimulate up-take of the scheme
7. Raise City Centre parking charges to £6.00 per day to encourage more long term parkers and commuters to use the Park and Ride Scheme
8. Cancel Conservative proposals to close SDC Leisure Centres on Bank Holidays
9. Revoke the cuts planned by the Conservatives for the Arts Budget
10. Scrap proposals to introduce parking in the City Centre on Sundays

Note: that the proposals 1 to 10 above are estimated to be broadly council tax neutral across the years 2006/07 and 2007/08.

A recorded vote was requisitioned in respect of whether to adopt the amendment and the voting was as follows:-

FOR

Councillors Mrs E A Chettleburgh, B E Dalton, P D Edge, Mrs J M Greville, C G Mills, P W L Sample, Miss M A Tomlinson and I C West (8)

AGAINST

Councillors G A N Anderson, F D Bissington, Mrs P J Bissington, J A Brady, R Britton, D W Brown, A J A Brown-Hovelt, K A Cardy, P M Clegg, J A Cole-Morgan, J M Collier, T F Couper, D A Culver, E R Draper, Mrs M I Evans, S R Fear, Mrs J A Green, M A Hewitt, S J Howarth, G E Jeans, P J Leo, I D McLennan, Ms S C Mallory, W R Moss, J R L Nettle, J C Noeken, M J Osment, P V H Paisey, A G Peach, Mrs M M A Peach, L Randall, B M Rycroft, Mrs C A Spencer, I R Tomes, J M Walsh, Mrs S A Warrander, F Westmoreland, Mrs S A Willan, T Woodbridge and K C Wren (40)

The amendment was lost.

***Resolved -**

- (1) that the draft Revenue Estimates for 2005/06 (revised) and 2006/07 (original) be approved as previously circulated, taking account of the final Government Settlement (2006/07); and
- (2) that for the year 2006/05 the sum of £552,901, giving a Council Tax of £37 (at Band D) (thereby contributing £12,851 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; and
- (3) that taking into account the following:
the deficit on the Council Tax collection fund estimated at £383,610, of which £44,810 falls on the District Council Tax providing an adjustment of £1.00 deficit for a Band D property.

The basic amount of Council Tax at Band D for District Council purposes in 2006/07 be £116.96 (an increase of 5 %) based on a net District budget requirement of £12,494,100 excluding City Area

Committee. This will therefore add £126,685 to the Council's reserves resulting in a projected General Fund reserves balance of £1,647,000 as at 31.3.07.

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 (previously circulated under cover letter dated 13th February 2006) be incorporated in the formal Tax Resolution and adopted by Full Council showing the Tax Rates for Bands A-H for each part of the District Council's Areas.

NOTE - the Cabinet expressed thanks to the Head of Financial Services, the Chief Accountant and all other finance staff involved in the budget preparation, for their excellent work.

NOTE: In moving the budget, the Leader gave an undertaking on behalf of the Administration that it was planned to defer the imposition of the £50,000 reduction in the arts budget so that it will not now come into effect until the financial year 2008/9, and that appendix D of the budget report attached to the agenda at item 7d, would need to be revised to reflect the reduction in projected general fund reserves in 2007/8 from £1,914,000- to £1,864,000 at the relevant time.

NOTE: Councillor Mrs Chettleburgh requested that her dissent to the resolution above be recorded

e. Housing Revenue Account Budget & Rent Setting 2006/07: Councillor Cole-Morgan

The Council considered the Cabinet's recommendation from its meeting on 1 February 2006 (minute 730) together with the report of the Head of Financial Services and Head of Housing Management.

Resolved – that

- (1) the HRA Budget for 2005/2006 (revised) and 2006/2007 (original) be approved;
- (2) the increase for dwelling rents in accordance rent restructuring be approved; and
- (3) the level of increase for service charges and garage rents at 3.5% be approved.

f. Capital Programme 2005/06 - 2010/11: Councillor Culver

The Council considered the Cabinet's recommendation from its meeting on 1 February 2006 (Minute 731) together with the report of the Head of Financial Services incorporating the below amendments.

Resolved – that

- (1) the current financing of the Capital Programme set out at Appendix 1 of the previously circulated report be approved;
- (2) the Revised Capital Programme 2005/2006-2010/2011 set out at Appendix 2 of the report be approved, subject in respect of the Community and Housing Portfolio the line "affordable housing (Housing Corporation) £661,000 2006/07" being replaced by "Renovation Grants (Regional Housing Board Grant) £661,000 2006/07"

g. Housing Act 2004 – Housing Health and Safety Rating System (HHSRS), Licensing of Houses In Occupation, Management Orders: Councillor Cole-Morgan

The Council considered the Cabinet's recommendation from its meeting on 1 February 2006 (minute 732) together with the report of the Senior Environmental Health Officer and the Private Sector Housing Policy Officer.

Resolved - that

- (1) delegated powers be given to the Head of Environmental Services to determine the level of HMO Licensing fees, the terms of the licence and the information required from landlords and to approve, refuse or revoke licences. That this will be undertaken with reference to good practice outlined in the 'HMO Licensing Project Plan' published by the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health, the HMO Network and other guidance published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and in consultation with other local authorities.
- (2) delegated powers are given to the Head of Environmental Services to issue HHSRS notices and determine enforcement charges and that the principles of the national enforcement concordat are implemented.
- (3) the Officer Scheme of Delegation be revised to incorporate the above proposals.

261 Questions on Cabinet Decisions taken since the last Council Meeting:

This matter was adjourned deferred for consideration at the next Council Meeting.

262 Project and Policy Progress Reports:

This matter was adjourned for consideration at the next Council Meeting.

263 Reports of other Committees/Panels on which questions were asked:

This matter was adjourned for consideration at the next Council Meeting.

264 Notice of Motion:

Notice of Motion 139 proposed by Councillor P W L Sample and seconded by Councillor P D Edge (as set out at Agenda Item 11).

Resolved – that this matter be adjourned for consideration at the next Council meeting.

265 Call in Matters:

There were none.

266 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:

This matter was adjourned for consideration at the next Council meeting.

267 Election of Leader of the Cabinet:

Resolved - that Councillor Richard Britton be elected Leader of the Cabinet for the remainder of the 2005/06 Municipal Year.

Tributes were paid to Councillor Wren by the various Members of the Council, including the Leaders of Labour, Liberal Democrat and Independent Groups.

268 Election of Deputy Leader of the Cabinet:

Resolved - that Councillor Fred Westmoreland be elected Deputy Leader of the Cabinet for the remainder of the 2005/06 Municipal Year.

269 Election of Cabinet Members:

Resolved - that as result of the matters set out under minutes 267 and 268 above, Councillors Brady and Nettle replace Councillors Wren and Collier on the Cabinet.

NOTE: Following the election, the Leader announced changes to Cabinet Portfolio arrangements as follows:-

- (1) Councillor Mrs Willan to become Deputy Portfolio Holder for Resources.
- (2) Councillor Brady to become Deputy Portfolio Holder for Community and Housing.
- (3) Councillor Nettle to become Deputy Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport.

270 Election to the Overview and Scrutiny Panels:

Resolved - that

- (1) Councillor Collier be elected to the OSP for Environment and Transport in place of Councillor Nettle for the remainder of the 2005/06 Municipal Year
- (2) Councillor Wren be elected to the OSP for Resources in place of Councillor Brady for the remainder of the 2005/06 Municipal Year

271 Election to the Salisbury Transportation Plan Joint Committee:

Resolved - that Councillor Brady be elected to the STPJC for the remainder of the 2005/06 Municipal Year, with Councillor Mrs Willan as his named Deputy.

NOTE: Consequently Councillor Noeken is no longer a named deputy.

272 Extension of Meeting:

In compliance with Council Policy, as the Council could not conclude its business within 3 hours, it resolved to extend the meeting by one and a half hours (during which time the matters recorded under minutes 260 (c) – 273 were considered).

The meeting closed at 22:30

Members of the Public: 77