

Planning & Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Committee

MINUTES

Commencing: 6.00pm
11 November 2003
Bourne Hill
Salisbury

Present

Councillor P D Edge (Chairman)
Councillor Mrs E Chettleburgh (Vice Chairman)
Councillor R Britton
Councillor A J A Brown Hovelt
Councillor M A Hewitt
Councillor Mrs C A Spencer
Councillor I R Tomes
Councillor S A Willan

In Attendance

H Collar (SDC)
J Meeker (SDC)
N Styles (SDC)

Apologies

Councillor Ms S C Mallory
Councillor T Woodbridge
D Crook (SDC)

Public/Observers

0

3. Public Questions/Statements

There were no public questions or statements.

4. Councillor Questions/Statements

Councillor Britton asked the following questions :-

Q1. Is the Chairman of the Panel content with the progress of the Panel in adhering to its work programme timetable, especially when considering the number of Panel meetings cancelled during the past few months ?

A1. The Chairman responded that he was satisfied with the progress of Panel.

Q2. With reference to the decision of the Cabinet (at its meeting of 29 October 2003) to recommend to Wiltshire County Council that the Salisbury District housing allocation in the Wiltshire Structure Plan be raised from 1,000 to 1,500 (and preferably to 2,000) houses, would the Panel agree that the reason given for this recommended increase in the housing allocation (ostensibly to ensure the adequate provision of affordable housing in the District) is not entirely valid and that factors other than increasing the number of new homes built were more relevant to ensuring the adequate provision of affordable housing in an area ? Would the Panel also agree that the large scale development that the 2,000 or 1,500 extra houses would represent, would be inappropriate for a District such as Salisbury and that consideration should be given as to what 'kind of place' Salisbury should be in the (near and longer-term) future ? Should the Panel concur with these points, would the Panel agree that the Cabinet's decision on this matter should be called in and the Cabinet (or a representative from the Cabinet) be requested to attend the next meeting of the Panel to fully explain their decision ?

A2. The Chairman asked the Panel Members for their comments on the matter.

Following discussion and the receipt of advice that the deadline date for calling in a Cabinet decision made on 29 October had passed, the Panel **agreed** that the request detailed at Annex A (attached) be forwarded to the Cabinet for consideration at its meeting of 26 November 2003.

5. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings of 19 August 2003 were **agreed** as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

6. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations.

7. Scrutiny Review of the efficacy (in meeting the Scheme objectives) of the Council's 'R2' Policy

Members received a presentation (see Annex B, attached) from the Forward Planning Officer outlining how the Council's 'R2' Policy currently operates, its background and its perceived limitations.

During the discussion that followed Members made the following points :-

1. The need to extend the period within which 'R2' funds must be used, from 5 years (the current 'use within' period) to 10 years.
2. The need for the scheme to allow for 'R2' funds to be spent within a progressively widening geographical area (up to a point) from the designated village should that village not be able to utilise the funds allocated.
3. The need for the new Local Development Framework to widen the scope of R2 enabling the collection of contributions for the funding of *internal* recreational facilities (and not just external recreational facilities, as at present).
4. The current practice of determining the funding split (for child, youth and/or adult facilities) of any funds according to the number of bedrooms existing within a new dwelling (or dwellings), should be discontinued. Instead, the recipient parish/ward should be able to determine the use (including target age group) of any funds allocated.
5. The need to reconsider (according to prevailing housing market conditions) the sums requested from developers as a result of the granting of a permission.
- ~~6.~~ The need to allow for the Scheme to provide for the ongoing maintenance (and, possibly, upgrading) of facilities installed using 'R2' funding.
7. The need to reduce the current administrative burden of the Scheme on the Council. For example, by reducing the number of Officers/Council Service Units involved in the Scheme and/or levying an administration charge on developers involved in the Scheme.
8. In addition to point 8, above; the need to allocate a 'Lead Officer' with the responsibility of overseeing the operation and ongoing updating of the Scheme.

9. Support for the need to upgrade the current ICT system used for tracking the payment, take-up and spend of funds. Such an upgrade should allow for Parishes to be updated, at least twice a year, of the status of their existing/remaining 'R2' funds.
10. With reference to any amendments made to the existing Scheme, the need to consider the legal implications of this amendments on any funds collected but not yet utilised.

The Panel **requested** that Officers report back to the Panel on :-

1. any proposed amendments to the Scheme that it would be possible to effect (perhaps as Supplementary Planning Guidance) in advance of the next round of Local Development Framework determination (due to commence two years hence);
2. any proposed amendments required to be implemented as part of the next Local Development Framework process.

11. **Dates of Next Meetings**

The forward meeting dates of the Panel were (subject to ratification by new Panel Members, following the 1 May District Council election) **agreed** as follows :-

- Tuesday 9 December 2003, commencing 1800hrs (provisional)
- Tuesday 13 January 2004, commencing 1800hrs (provisional)
- Tuesday 10 February 2004, commencing 1800hrs (provisional)

The meeting closed at 1940hrs.