

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

Wednesday, 10th August, 2011

The decisions contained within these minutes may not be implemented until the expiry of the 5 working day call-in period which will run from 12th to 18th August. These minutes are draft until confirmed as a correct record at the next meeting.

Present:

Councillor Paul Crossley
Councillor Nathan Hartley

Councillor David Bellotti
Councillor Simon Allen
Councillor Tim Ball
Councillor Cherry Beath
Councillor David Dixon
Councillor Roger Symonds

Leader of the Council
Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Youth
Cabinet Member for Community Resources
Cabinet Member for Wellbeing
Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning
Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development
Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods
Cabinet Member for Transport

34 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair was taken by Councillor Paul Crossley, Leader of the Council.
The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

35 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the evacuation procedure as set out in the Agenda.

36 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

37 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

There were none.

38 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

39 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 23 questions from the following Councillors: Nigel Roberts, Eleanor Jackson, Bryan Chalker, Patrick Anketell-Jones, Tim Warren, Charles Gerrish, Anthony Clarke, Malcolm Hanney (15); and from the following members of the public: Rae Harris.

[Copies of the questions and response, including supplementary questions and responses if any, have been placed on the Minute book as Appendix 1 and are available on the Council's website.]

40 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

The Chair announced that although David Redgewell had been registered to speak, he had been too unwell to attend the meeting. He asked for the warm regards of the Cabinet to be recorded, and said that he would send a get well note to David on behalf of the Council.

David Dunlop (The Bath Society) made a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website]* relating to the flood risk at Bathampton meadows.

Councillor Tim Ball asked David Dunlop for the source of the estimates of a half-hour flood rate on the meadows. David replied that the worst case scenario was in fact that if the river were blocked by debris, the flooding would take only 6 minutes.

The Chair referred the statement to Councillor Roger Symonds for his response.

George Bailey made a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 6 and is available on the Council's website]* relating to the proposals to change the road system around Radstock.

The Chair referred the statement to Councillor Roger Symonds for his response.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson made a statement which is recorded at item 14 of the agenda.

41 MINUTES OF TWO PREVIOUS CABINET MEETINGS

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor Roger Symonds, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 13th July 2011 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

And

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 14th July 2011 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

42 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

43 CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

The Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel had referred a matter to Cabinet relating to the Bath Transport Package. The Notes from the Panel's meeting had been circulated in the public gallery before the Cabinet meeting *[a copy is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 2 and can be seen on the Council's website]*. The Chair referred the submission to Councillor Roger Symonds for a response.

Councillor Symonds gave a written response [*copies of which were put into the public domain as he spoke and a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendices 3 and 4 and can be seen on the Council's website*]. He added that the Bath Transport Package was still a work-in-progress and would not be finalised until 9th September, when the bid would be delivered to government. He hoped that all councillors would support the bid. He thanked officers for the extremely hard work they were doing to prepare the bid in time.

The Chair asked the Cabinet to note the Panel's submission and Councillor Symonds' response.

44 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

There were none.

45 COMMUNICATION AND MEDIA PROTOCOL (SAFEGUARDING)

Councillor Simon Allen, in proposing the item, explained that the partnership between the Council, Police and PCT was increasingly aware of the importance of good media protocols, not least to protect innocent families in the event of tragic events. It was essential that communications issued by the partnership should do no harm to those involved. The protocol had already been approved by the PCT and by the Police, so it only remained for Cabinet to agree it on behalf of the Council.

Councillor Cherry Beath seconded the proposal and felt that the protocol was very sensible. She strongly felt that the importance of the multi-agency approach and the need to protect vulnerable adults. She welcomed the emphasis on training in the proposals.

Rationale

The multi-agency protocol sets out clear arrangements, practice guidance and training needed for LSAB member agencies regarding managing safeguarding cases which might attract media attention. The implementation of the protocol will ensure that media presentations are coordinated appropriately.

Other Options Considered

None.

On a motion from Councillor Simon Allen, seconded by Councillor Cherry Beath, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that the Local Safeguarding Adults Board should adopt the proposed Communications and Media Protocol.

46 QUALITY PARTNERSHIP SCHEME FOR CORRIDOR 3 OF THE GREATER BRISTOL BUS NETWORK

Councillor Tim Warren made an *ad hoc* statement welcoming the West of England transport scheme which was almost at fruition. He asked Cabinet to work hard to achieve a maximum fares ceiling. He urged Cabinet to secure more frequent services on the A37 between Bristol and the Norton Radstock area.

Councillor Roger Symonds, in proposing the item, said that the first Quality Partnership Scheme (between Midsomer Norton and Bath) was almost complete. This second scheme would be due for completion in 2012. He agreed that the 4 authorities had worked well together and commended the hard work already done by Councillor Charles Gerrish. He thanked officers for their work too and warned that the second scheme would be more difficult to achieve. He would be meeting soon with First Bus and would argue strongly for equitable fares but reminded Councillor Tim Warren that he had no powers to enforce fare rates.

Councillor Nathan Hartley seconded the proposal and said that attention should be given to the relationship between the Council and First Bus.

Councillor Paul Crossley said that the scheme being proposed was a continuation of ongoing work. He felt that attention must be paid to family friendly pricing, especially at off-peak times.

Rationale

The recommended actions are a key part of the delivery of the GBBN major scheme.

Other Options Considered

Consideration has been given to removing some of the standards of services from the quality partnership scheme and negotiating them for inclusion in the voluntary partnership agreement that will support it. The fundamental principle is that the substantial investment by the public sector in infrastructure should be matched by a requirement on bus operators to provide a high-quality bus service on a commercial basis with a reasonable rate of return.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor Nathan Hartley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that a Quality Partnership Scheme be made covering the bus route corridor between Bath and Bristol via Keynsham;

(2) To DELEGATE to the Divisional Director for Planning & Transport Development the power to determine the appropriate standard of services in the Quality Partnership Scheme; and

(3) To DELEGATE to the Divisional Director for Planning & Transport Development the power to decide in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport on any revisions to the standard of services in the Quality Partnership Scheme arising from the formal review process.

47 DETERMINATION OF THE STATUTORY NOTICE TO ALTER THE LOWER AGE LIMIT AT ST. MARY'S CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL (WRITHLINGTON)

Councillor Eleanor Jackson made a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 7 and is available on the Council's website]* in which she wholeheartedly supported the school's application.

Councillor Nathan Hartley, in proposing the item, paid tribute to the commitment and devotion of the group of parents who had run the existing Early Years group so successfully on a voluntary basis and who were now stepping down. He thanked the Governors of the school for their eagerness to maintain the provision and to spend school funds on refurbishment of the premises.

Councillor Simon Allen seconded the proposal and said how pleased he had been to see that there was widespread support for the proposals. He felt that removing a transition stage for children was always a good thing, and that maintaining the provision within school was therefore very welcome.

Councillor Cherry Beath endorsed the earlier comments.

Rationale

Capacity and sustainability in the local area should not be an issue because the proposal is for the school to take over running an existing pre-school provision currently run on a voluntary basis by a management committee, so no new places are being created that might have a negative effect on the viability of other provision locally. The proposal will ensure that this age group of children have access to high quality education, and a seamless transition into school. St. Mary's C of E Primary school benefits from excellent liaison and links with the Local Authority, a host of outside agencies and support, as well as strong links with a wide range of educational networks

Other than a response from the NUT who had no objections to the proposal, no responses were received during the six week representation period following publication of the statutory notice. No objections to the proposal were raised during the consultation period and there was one response from the local MP offering his assistance if required.

Other Options Considered

The school and the Early Years team did consider whether a replacement voluntary management committee could be identified to continue to run the provision but there has been no interest from the local community. Also the inclusion of the pre-school as part of the school is expected to improve educational outcomes for children and allow one whole phase of transition – from pre-school into school - to be eliminated.

On a motion from Councillor Nathan Hartley, seconded by Councillor Simon Allen, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that the lower age limit of St. Mary's C of E Primary school be altered from age 4 to age 3 by the addition of Early Years provision to commence on 1 September 2011.

48 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT TO 30TH JUNE 2011

Councillor Charles Gerrish made an *ad hoc* statement in which he referred to paragraph 5.9 of the report and asked whether the Council was investing any funds in the parent company of the Ulster Bank (the Royal Bank of Scotland). He welcomed investment in other local authorities but asked whether any funds were invested in authorities which were considered to be at risk themselves.

Councillor David Bellotti, in proposing the item, referred to paragraph 5.5 of the report which identified that the Council's projected total borrowing at March 2012, based on the capital programme approved in the February 2011 budget, would be £151M. The current level of borrowing was at £90M. He also referred to paragraph 5.6 which related to the Council's share of the old Avon debt, because he had felt that it was important to spell out this debt in the report even though it was a deferred liability.

In reply to the comments made by Councillor Gerrish, and after taking advice from officers, he stated that the Council had no investments held in the parent company of the Ulster Bank (the Royal Bank of Scotland). Nor did the Council have any investments in local authorities which might be considered at risk; however, he himself held the view that all local authorities were in any case underwritten by government, so those investments were not at risk.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal.

Rationale

The Prudential Code and CIPFA's Code of Practice on Treasury Management requires regular monitoring and reporting of Treasury Management activities.

Other Options Considered

None.

On a motion from Councillor David Bellotti, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To NOTE the Treasury Management Report to 30th June 2011, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice; and

(2) To NOTE the Treasury Management Indicators to 30th June 2011.

[Subsequent to the meeting the Council's 151 officer gave the following clarification: Whilst the Council currently has no direct investment with the Royal Bank of Scotland plc, the Council does hold investments with National Westminster Bank plc which is a 100% owned subsidiary of the Royal Bank of Scotland plc. The Royal Bank of Scotland plc forms part of the Royal Bank of Scotland Group plc which is 81% owned and supported by the UK Government. National Westminster Bank are also the Council's appointed bankers.]

The meeting ended at 7.15 pm

Chair _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

CABINET MEETING 10th August 2011

The following Statements and Questions had been registered by the time of publication.

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

There were 5 notices of intention to make a statement at the meeting. Where the intention is to speak about an item on the Agenda, the speaker will be offered the option to speak near the beginning of the meeting or just before the Agenda item.

- David Dunlop, The Bath Society
Re: Bath Transportation Package
- Vito Pecchia
(Sent apologies – unable to attend)
- David Redgewell (South West Transport Network)
(Sent apologies – unable to attend)
- George Bailey
Re: Roads in Radstock
- Cllr Eleanor Jackson
Re: St Mary's Primary School Age Limit (Agenda Item 14)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Nigel Roberts
What is the footfall in Bath now and what was it 10 years ago? Do we keep the return rate for tourists and if so what is the rate of return?		
	Answer from:	Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>We have footfall data from 2004 to 2011. Footfall counts were undertaken on a quarterly basis in Feb / May / Aug / Dec each year. Average footfall varies depending on the time of the year. The headline trends are as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Average weekly footfall in December has risen from 56,000 in 2004 to 60,000 in 2010, although this is down on the peak of 70,000 in December 2009</i> • <i>Average weekly footfall in February is down from 50,000 to approximately 43-44,000</i> • <i>Average weekly footfall in the summer months (May / Aug) is down from 49-50,000 to 35 – 37,000</i> <p><i>To set against this, from 2004 to 2011 it is estimated that annual expenditure per head</i></p>		

on convenience and comparison goods has increased by 19% to an average of £5,791. Bath attracts 4.7 million day and staying visitors per year - we believe there are an additional 1 million registered as London visitors (and thus do not appear in Bath's numbers).

Last three visitor surveys - one due this year.

	Recommend to friends	Return Visits
2001	78%	53%
2004	74%	56%
2006	79%	65%

Number of visitors have been recovering from the high point in 2001 however the impact of the SouthGate Development hasn't yet been subject to a visitor survey.

M 02	Question from:	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
<p>1) What possible justification is there for raiding the Social Housing Capital Budget for £400,000 for an unwanted road in Radstock when there are rough sleepers in Radstock as well as in Bath in desperate need of proper accommodation?</p> <p>2) Why is the A362 being diverted through the main shopping street in Radstock, when Peasedown St John has a bypass for the A367 and no-one would dare send the A362 from Stones Cross, Midsomer Norton down the High Street, Midsomer Norton, or make that road two way?</p> <p>3) When is B&NES going to start the public consultation on the future of the Victoria Hall which was promised us by the previous administration?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p>1. When considering the original planning consent for the former railway land, the Council identified £520,000 (see Development Control Committee Report to planning application 06/02880/EOUT) to support the delivery of the affordable housing element of the proposals. Some of the funds have been allocated to support the delivery of the infrastructure which has in turn secured £800,000 from the Homes and Communities Agency. This is essential to facilitate the delivery of 57 affordable housing units on the former railway land.</p> <p>2. The design principles behind the road layout are that they provide regeneration opportunities for both the former railway land site and the centre of Radstock by providing more logical movement for vehicles and pedestrians that make the town centre a more legible place. The development of the Former Railway land was subject to a full traffic assessment as part of the planning application.</p> <p>3. Officers have begun discussions with the Radstock Town Council as the current leaseholder to clarify their requirements and aspirations for Victoria Hall. When B&NES and Radstock Town Council have worked up a series of options for the future of Victoria Hall, there will be an opportunity for the public to be consulted.</p>		
Supplementary Question:		
<p>1) Is it not the case that 57 affordable homes is only 27% of the entire build, not 35% which is council policy?</p> <p>2) Why was data used from the 2006 survey (which was inadequate and incomplete)</p>		

when data from the 2009 survey was available which might have led to different conclusions?

Answer from: Councillor Cherry Beath

I would like to thank Councillor Jackson for her invitation to visit Radstock recently, which I enjoyed and found enlightening. We have noted the points she raised with us on that visit and will bring them to officers to see if aspects of the plans can be amended in a sustainable way. I will give a full response to her questions within 7 days.

(Response later provided):

1) At the time of the granting planning consent, the viability model concluded that 27% of the overall residential provision was affordable with a 51%/49% split between social rent and intermediate affordable housing. Further explanation can be found in the Committee Report for Planning Application no. 06/02880/EOUT available on the Council's website.

2) The planning application, including the Transport Assessment took place when the application was submitted in 2006. The 2009 survey was therefore not available.

M 03 Question from: Councillor Bryan Chalker

Noting the welcome commitment agreed at the last Cabinet Meeting of £85,000 to implement a 30 minute frequency bus service on the 6/7 route in Bath, could the Cabinet Member please provide an update on the progress of negotiations with First to implement this service, when we can expect this more frequent service to materialise and that funding will be in place to maintain this service in future years?

Answer from: Councillor Roger Symonds

We are continuing to have discussions with First over the detailed proposals and I will let Councillors know when the improved service will be delivered. We will have to review our funding of this improvement when we consider our budget for next year.

M 04 Question from: Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones

A commitment was made by the previous Cabinet that work would be undertaken to fully restore Victoria Bridge to its former glory as a suspension bridge, with the possibility of erecting a relief 'Bailey Bridge' alongside during the closure period.

Could the Cabinet Member please provide an update as to what progress has been made on plans to restore Victoria Bridge and reaffirm the Council's commitment to a total restoration and reopening of the bridge whilst providing an interim crossing as stated above?

Answer from: Councillor Roger Symonds

The Council has investigated a number of options. These included the provision of a

temporary bailey bridge whilst the necessary negotiations progress with English Heritage over a permanent solution. As a result of works to south river bank and the lack of suitable land on the north river bank there is no landing point for a temporary structure. Consequently, officers have advised a temporary alternative bridge is not feasible and are now progressing with a more permanent solution.

The Council remains committed to a permanent restoration of the structure. Independent structural experts and a specialist in bridge restoration have been engaged to work up options. Given the historic significance of the structure it should be expected that negotiating a suitable solution with English Heritage will take some time. The Consultant's report should be available in September and officers will report back to Members once it has been reviewed.

A site meeting will take place within the next couple of weeks between the Cabinet Member for Transport, Cycling Champion, Cycle Bath representative and officers from the Highways/Major Projects Team to consider what works are required to provide a temporary diversion route for cyclists using the alternative Midland Road Destructor Bridge.

Supplementary Question:	
--------------------------------	--

May I ask the Cabinet member whether Council's river champion and I may be invited to attend the site meeting?

Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds
---------------------	--------------------------

I will take steps to arrange this. I also overlooked in my response to say that I would be inviting the local councillors to attend.

M 05	Question from:	Councillor Tim Warren
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Can the Cabinet Member please confirm when the details of the final bid to DfT for the Bath Transport Package will be made available to all Councillors?

Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds
---------------------	--------------------------

The details of the Council's bid were agreed at full Council on 14th July 2011

Supplementary Question:	
--------------------------------	--

Can the Cabinet Member please confirm when the details of the final bid to DfT for the Bath Transport Package will be made available to all Councillors?

Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds
---------------------	--------------------------

The date for submission to government is 9th September.

M 06	Question from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p>Many residents in Keynsham have expressed their disappointment with the decision by the Planning Inspector to give permission for the K2 development to proceed in its current form and the impact this could have on local residents and traffic throughout the town. Could the Cabinet Member provide information on what discussions will now be taking place with the developer to seek agreement on the construction of an alternative access road (other than Park Road) to this development, and that the Council remains committed to securing a new access road having regard to the Council's own land also earmarked for development.</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball
<p><i>Following receipt of the Inspector's decision letter, Officers are seeking to establish preliminary discussions with developers Taylor Wimpey, in order to explore the extent to which the company might be prepared to incorporate an alternative access arrangement for the site, although Members will understand that there is now no undetermined planning application that can be used as a foundation for these discussions. Establishing the extent of any future Council commitments in this respect will in all probability fall within the responsibilities of other Cabinet Members, but the details of this cannot be established until we fully understand the position to be taken by Taylor Wimpey. Officers will ensure that in due course Members are advised of the outcome of the initial discussions.</i></p>		

M 07	Question from:	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide details of the expected timeline for Culverhay School to be converted into a co-educational Academy or Free School, whether the Cabinet Member has a view on which option would be preferable to the Council, and when the full business plan is to be published for all Councillors and members of the public to view?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Nathan Hartley
<p><i>Every effort is being made to ensure that Culverhay School can become co-educational at the earliest possible opportunity. This will be difficult to achieve for September 2012, but is not impossible. It should be achieved, however, ready for the new pupils to attend Culverhay in September 2013 at the latest.</i></p> <p><i>The Governing Body of Culverhay School have made it clear that they wish to convert to Academy status at the earliest opportunity and have requested that the Secretary of State approves this. The Council support the school in this as it would deliver the Council's stated aim of keeping Culverhay school open and achieving co-educational status for the school on this site at the earliest opportunity.</i></p> <p><i>At present, the Department for Education have two applications to review, the Academy application, and the Sirius Wood Free School application. I am happy to wait on the Minister to decide which application should be successful.</i></p> <p><i>The Secretary of state has yet to decide if Culverhay will be able to convert to an</i></p>		

Academy.

A school that is applying to be a sponsored academy does not make public / publish a business plan. The financial information is only shared between the Sponsorship Division at the DfES and the Sponsor.

A Free School does have to make available its business and finance plan and that would be published on the Free School section of the DfES website if a Free School were to be established.

M 08	Question from:	Councillor Malcolm Hanney
<p>1. Newbridge Park & Ride Extension Although Cllr. Crossley (Leader of Council) gave a pledge in May 2011 that there would be no extension of the Park and Ride at Newbridge, the proposals to Cabinet and Council contain provision for such an extension. It would appear, however, that the financial totals (without appropriate detail) provided for decision by Cabinet and Council include provision for an extension of Newbridge by 500 spaces.</p> <p>a) Please confirm that the capital financing requirements in respect of Newbridge have been overstated and by how much and that any bid to DfT will be reduced to reflect only an additional 250 spaces.</p> <p>b) What are the revenue implications for the Council given there will now be substantially less income as a result of fewer spaces?</p> <p>2. The amount of £1.89m referenced as 'BWR Transport Scheme' is contained within the revised package. I understand that this amount is payable by Crest under the BWR S106 Agreement but only towards the BRT. Why would Crest still want to pay this amount, which is now entirely at their discretion, when you have eliminated the BRT which is likely to affect the viability of BWR? Without and until Crest's agreement to an alternative, which isn't evident, shouldn't this element be deleted from any bid to DfT or it be made clearer that the Council will step in to fund this amount if Crest choose not to?</p> <p>3. Isn't the amount of £1,616,500 for City Centre Works double-counting? Isn't this already being funded under the Council's Public Realm budget?</p> <p>4. I note that Bus Stops and Real Time Information are still £4,587,292 when there is no BRT and no Eastern Park & Ride? Similarly, the amounts for Ticket Machines (£175,000) and Variable Messaging Signs (£803,250) are unchanged. Given the elimination of the BRT, the elimination of an Eastern Park Ride, and a halving of the expansion at Newbridge, isn't this stretching credibility with the DfT in terms of value for money?</p> <p>5. The revised Property Costs of £909,000 are expressed as 'net'. a) Please confirm that it is the Administration's intention not to renew the planning consents for the BRT route and the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride, to dispose of any properties acquired in relation to those elements of the Bath Transport Package, and not to protect the BRT route in any way for the future. b) Please advise whether the previous granting of planning consents in respect of the BRT Route and / or the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride affect the consideration of alternatives as may be contemplated by the Administration and for what timescale?</p> <p>6. The amounts included for Risk (£2,685,144) and Inflation (£1,094,509) look very high given the elimination of the BRT, the Eastern Park and Ride and the halving of the</p>		

Newbridge Park and Ride extension and the fact that inflation and risk cannot apply to costs already expended. Please confirm that the amounts included for inflation and risk can be fully justified and please let me have detailed computations for review.

7. The amount for vehicles is unchanged at £2,950,000. Why would a Park & Ride operator consider anywhere near this level of investment when there is no BRT, no Eastern Park and Ride (1400 spaces) and a halved Newbridge Park and Ride extension (250 spaces less)?

8. There is an amount of £7,952,000 set down as 'BID' which includes expenditure in respect of elements of the scheme that will not now be progressed. Please confirm the amount of such expenditure on elements of the scheme not being progressed and confirm they will not be included in the bid to DfT or in the Council's contribution to the revised Bath Transport Package.

9. It would appear that the Council's financial commitment as per the Council resolution is:-

£21.6m (being Council contribution to revised package of £17.8m plus at least £3.8m revenue reversion risk related to the deletion of the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride and the BRT) plus:-

a) Any additional costs relating to 'alternatives to Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride possibly including rail as part of our future Transport Strategy' (Resolution 1.9)

b) Any additional costs relating to other unfunded aspirations (Resolutions 1.10-1.15)

In both the Council's letter of 18 July 2011 to Mr. Emerson (the Inspector appointed in connection with the Draft Core Strategy) and in the Council Agenda Paper, great stress is placed on the initiatives set out in Resolutions 1.9-1.15. However none of these have any funding for implementation i.e. of relevant measures that Officers may suggest in response or that Cabinet would like to do irrespective of Officer advice? So how realistic is it (in the absence of any specific or detailed funding proposals) that the DfT and the Inspector for the Core Strategy will take the Council seriously in terms of a bid to Government for funding and as evidence of a credible Transport Strategy / Core Strategy?

10. Resolution 1.10 suggests additional signage on the A46 to direct more traffic to an extended Lansdown P&R. However, Lansdown is only being extended by 390 spaces while the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride would have accommodated 1,400 spaces. Is there any concern the additional signs may direct traffic to a full Lansdown P&R with possibly even more signs needed to send on somewhere else?

11. In considering alternatives to the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride which has now been ruled out, please confirm for the record that Lambridge is not an option given the proposals regarding the Recreation Ground with Bath Rugby?

12. Given the deletion of key elements of the Bath Transport Package which were integral to the Draft Core Strategy, will the Council not be subject to increased challenge as to the deliverability of the Core Strategy with consequential risk of planning applications (that would otherwise have been contrary to the Core Strategy) being approved at Appeal, urban extensions, and serious difficulties in terms of credibility for the Examination by the Inspector including at the public hearings?

13. The aforesaid letter of 18 July 2011 to the Inspector (paras 8.19-8.22) indicates that 'The draft Bath Parking Strategy has not yet been approved by Members and is, therefore not yet publicly available. A programme for approval by Members and public release of the Parking Strategy is still being assessed in light of the need to amend it as a result of changes to the BTP.'

Why was there no mention of the potential impact on the Council's Parking Strategy in the Council Agenda Paper?

14. What are the prospects for the development of Avon Street Car Park and Coach Park and other key sites in the absence of a viable Transport Strategy, a viable Parking Strategy and a viable Core Strategy?
15. When will the views of the Urban Regeneration Panel (URP) and the Transport Commission be sought on the revised 'Package'?

Answer from:

Councillor Roger Symonds

1. a) *The interim analysis provided to Cllr Gerrish for the Council meeting did indeed include the costs of 500 spaces because the impact of the reduction is still subject to the outcome of the TVG application. The best and final bid to DfT will include the estimated cost of providing 250 spaces. We estimate that this amendment will reduce the cost of this element of the scheme by £265,000 and this new figure is included in the attached breakdown of scheme costs.*
- b) *The revenue implications of changing individual elements of the bid are still being worked on. The Council's Transport Strategy assumes that as P&R spaces increase, city centre car parking spaces are released for economic development. It follows that development of fewer P&R spaces will retain more city centre spaces. As these spaces generate more income than P&R spaces (because of the higher tariff) there is a compensating revenue effect.*
2. *I do not accept that this will affect the viability of the BWR. The development of BWR will continue to need improved public transport to reduce its impact on the surrounding road network. The payment is not 'entirely at their discretion' but are covered by the terms of the signed 106 agreement which provide for Crest's funding of an alternative to the BRT to serve the BWR site.*
3. *Yes the City Centre works are funded by the PR&MS budget and are included as part of our Local Contribution as originally envisaged in our Expression of Interest submitted in December last year.*
4. *The Bus Stops and Real Time Information will be spent on the show case bus routes throughout the City and they provide significant benefits supporting the scheme. The costs of these elements have been reviewed and are now set out in the attached table. In the light of the Smartcard project separately funded by DfT through the WoE, the £175,000 for Ticket Machines is no longer needed and these costs will not be included in the Best and Final Bid.*
5. a) *This Administration will not renew the planning permission for a Park and Ride on Bathampton meadows and we are discussing with officers the best way to protect the former BRT route from future development.*
- b) *The consideration of alternatives to the BRT & Bathampton Meadows P&R will be judged in the light of the National & Council planning policy in force at the time. We do not have a timescale for these proposals at the moment.*
6. *The attached table shows the revised risk and inflation element of the project. They are robust and provide confidence that the project can be delivered at these costs.*
7. *This element of the project is currently being reviewed and we currently estimate that the reduced P&R expansion will result a requirement of £400,000 for new vehicles and this is now included in the scheme costs in the attached table. This will not impact the funding requirement of the Council.*
8. *A detailed breakdown of this amount has been provided to Cllr Hanney and includes costs of developing elements of the project that have now been deleted. As indicated in the Council paper the amount of expenditure on elements of the scheme not being progressed is £3.8m.*

9. The Council's commitment is not £21.6m. The full amount of the bid costs of circa £8.0m is included within the Council's commitment of £17.8m. The revenue reversion risk simply means that bid costs relating to deleted elements that would otherwise be capitalised will fall to revenue. The costs have already been incurred, there is no additional expenditure.

Proposals in paragraphs 1.9 – 1.15 of the Council resolution will not form part of the bid for funding to DfT. Cabinet have asked that the proposals are evaluated as part of the Council's future Transport strategy. The revised Bath Transport Package will not represent the totality of the Council's Transport Strategy just as the original package did not. The Council will have the opportunity to explain to the Inspector at the inquiry into the Core Strategy how our emerging transport strategy will support the objectives of our plan.

10. The Variable Message signs referred to in question 4) above will indicate if spaces are available at Lansdown P&R sites. When this is full drivers will be directed to available spaces within the city.

11. Yes Lambridge has been ruled out as an alternative the Bathampton Meadows P&R.

12. As set out in my answer to question 9 above the Council will have the opportunity to explain its emerging transport strategy at the examination in public for the Core Strategy.

13. The Council paper was dealing very specifically with amendments to the BTP and a wider discussion of the potential changes to an emerging Parking Strategy was not considered possible at that stage. In any event officers have been directed to identify and evaluate an alternative Park and Ride site to the East as part of the emerging Transport Strategy. Other measures to encourage modal shift and reduce the demand for city centre parking spaces are also being considered. The removal of the A4 P&R from the bid will impact the timing of the redevelopment of city centre car parks but not necessarily the quantum.

14. Revision of the BTP does not automatically invalidate any of these strategies. The BTP was only part of the wider Transport Strategy has been de-scoped as requested by DfT.

The revised package still has elements that increase P&R capacity and allow for phased development of city centre car parks. It was highly unlikely all of the car parks would have been developed simultaneously any way. Removing unpopular elements from the bid has improved the cost benefit ratio of the scheme, reduced the cost to DfT and improving the scheme deliverability by removing the need for CPO's. All these things will be attractive to DfT.

There is time to develop a more sustainable Transport Strategy and seek alternative sources of funds for other capital schemes over the period of the Core Strategy.

15. The Transport Commission will not be meeting prior to the submission of the revised Package so they will not be able to comment. The Urban Regeneration Panel will have the opportunity to discuss the Package at their meeting on 1st September 2011. The Chair of the Transport Commission has indicated that it might be more productive to support development of the emerging Transport Strategy rather than review revisions to the scheme bid. There is insufficient time for the Commission to complete a detailed evaluation of the scheme before the submission deadline in September.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P 01	Question from:	Rae Harris
<p>How is the Council proposing to deal with the Community Development implications - and opportunities - in the Government's imminent piece of major legislation, the Localism Bill (I am deliberately using the same wording as the title of one of the new Policy Development & Scrutiny Panels)?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Paul Crossley
<p><i>The Localism Bill contains significant implications for the way that Councils work with local communities. These arise particularly from the proposals for the new Community Rights to Buy and to Challenge, for Neighbourhood Planning, for referenda and more widely. The Council has been carefully monitoring the Bill's progress through Parliament. Officers are currently considering what the Council will need to put in place to meet the opportunities and the challenges of the new legislation. Some of the exact implications of the Bill will depend on the final provisions agreed:</i></p> <p><i>The Council is well-placed to deliver the community empowerment aspects of the Bill. In helping communities find local solutions to local issues, the Council will build on the wide range of work it has already undertaken. This ranges from the "Listening Matters" projects in Bath and Keynsham to, extensive work with parishes on Parish Planning, as well as many other projects. The Council will listen to communities, support active citizens and promote the community leadership roles of local elected members as "champions" of their localities.</i></p> <p><i>The Council is investing in local communities to help them help themselves. The Council has extended the Ward Councillors' Initiative to all Councillors to help elected members make a real difference in their communities. The LSP has also recently launched new funds designed specifically to help boost community capacity. The Council will continue to build our relationship with Parishes and the July Cabinet meeting agreed to develop further the Bath City Liaison Forum to strengthen collaboration between public services and local residents. Also in July, Cabinet received a report on the Local Development Scheme which highlighted the potential impact of the neighbourhood planning arrangements contained in the Localism Bill. Further reports will of course be presented to Cabinet on aspects of the Localism Bill as appropriate.</i></p>		

Bath and North East Somerset Council
Cabinet meeting Wednesday 10th August 2011

David Dunlop The Bath Society

The Society respectfully reminds you of two new paragraphs in the Core Strategy submitted to the Inspector earlier this year.

1 Proposed change ref 12 (page 29) (Bath Strategic Issues):-

New 11 :*“In order TO ENABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE CENTRAL AREA AND WESTERN CORRIDOR SIGNIFICANT WORKS WILL BE NEEDED TO MITIGATE FLOOD RISK together with essential land remediation ”*

2 Proposed change ref 83 (page 112) (paragraph 6.28 and new paragraphs 6.28a &b) :-

New 6.28a*“The Flood Risk Management Strategy (June 2010) has identified and assessed a range of flood risk management options to enable development in vulnerable areas without increasing the flood risk elsewhere. THE STRATEGY HAS CONCLUDED THAT THERE IS NO STRATEGIC SOLUTION TO REDUCING PEAK FLOW THROUGH BATH WHICH IS EITHER TECHNICALLY OR ECONOMICALLY VIABLE. As such THE STRATEGY PROPOSES THE PROVISION OF COMPENSATORY STORAGE UPSTREAM COMBINED WITH ONSITE FLOOD DEFENCES. NEW DEVELOPMENT MUST PROVIDE STORAGE TO OFFSET THE VOLUME OF WATER THAT WOULD BE DISPLACED IN A FLOOD EVENT BY THE DEFENCES ON SITE”.*

These compensatory upstream holes would total about 350,000 cubic metres in size, located mostly at Bathampton Water Meadows, much of which already floods. Also suggested are Claverton and Kensington Meadows – already in the flood plain (as are many of the properties along the south side of London Road).

The Atkins report (June 2010) advocates that Flood Mitigation works at Bathampton Meadows should involve lowering the height of the area proposed as a car park in the BTP, by 8.8 metres, to allow it to flood which would put 1400 cars and passengers at risk. We cannot see how such a combination squares with PPS25 Practice Guidelines. Comments in the appendices confirm our suspicions. Depending on water volume and flow rates the area could fill in less than half an hour.

GIVEN PPS25 CONSTRAINTS, B&NES MUST DECIDE WHETHER BATHAMPTON WATER MEADOWS SHOULD CONTRIBUTE TO BATH’S ECONOMY BY ENABLING DEVELOPMENT DOWNSTREAM IN THE CENTRAL AREA AND WESTERN CORRIDOR (AND ALSO PROTECT THE WORLD HERITAGE SITE) OR JUST BECOME A CAR PARK FOR FOLK WHO COULD TRAVEL MORE ENVIRONMENTALLY BY BUS, TRAIN OR BIKE. THE SITE CANNOT BE BOTH.

Lastly, was the Transport Commission made aware of this muddled thinking ?

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT TO CABINET 10th August 2011

Within the Bath Transport Package there are the talked-about provisions, such as real-time displays. I hope it has not been forgotten that cuts were proposed to be effective from April 2012 and still appear to be in place. It seems ironic that expansion is proposed simultaneously with reduction.

- The brave decision was taken to allocate funds to the Business Case for the Frome – Radstock branch, but a study in this year in itself is insufficient. The appropriate provisions for signalling etc. on the main line must also be included in the next tranche of redevelopment by Network Rail: without this, we may have to wait 20 years for another attempt, if then. Therefore, considerable lobbying will be needed to include this with the major upgrades of routes in the West.
- Another primary concern now is that the so-called ‘showcase’ routes emanating from Bath down the A367 to Radstock and Wells or Midsomer Norton will suffer the inevitable delays at Radstock: then the real-time displays will be really useful! It is still totally unclear why there would be improved traffic flow around Radstock. I am sure that if the analysis of the survey of 2009 had been positive, we would have heard.
- Another worrying factor is that The Street will be carrying all the traffic it does now, plus the heavy traffic from the Frome Road. Currently, bus stops are in The Street, ensuring they travel slowly: in future they will be moving much faster while travelling away from the A367 to stop in the new link road. .
- This is a Conservation Area, but with all that vibration buildings will not last long. It has been said “when its gone, its gone”: that applies equally well to buildings as to green space.

One last thought: when there are claims on buildings insurance in perhaps 18 months after completion, who will those insurers sue, B&NES perhaps?

Thank you,

George Bailey

This page is intentionally left blank

BATH TRANSPORT PACKAGE

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport introduced the item to the Panel. He explained that a number of elements had now been removed from the original BTP proposal and that the Bid as it currently stands is deliverable without the need to go through any further statutory processes.

He added that a segregated bus route was still planned to support Bath Western Riverside (BWR) and would likely run from the Windsor Bridge through to Green Park.

Councillor Neil Butters asked if the 9 showcase bus routes could be revealed.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that a map of the routes was available and that he would send one to all Panel members.

Councillor Neil Butters asked what type of buses would be used on the bus route through BWR.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that he felt it would be unlikely to use the 'bendy bus' model and that he expected the vehicles to be based on the existing pattern.

Councillor David Martin asked for the Cost Benefit ratio for the revised package as opposed to the previous one.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that the ratio for the revised package was well above two and had been improved by the revisions. He added that the package was very deliverable and affordable.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney commented that he was disappointed in the lack of financial figures available within the report. He then asked the officers present a series of questions.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked them to confirm that the capital financing requirements in respect of Newbridge Park & Ride have been overstated and that any bid to DfT will be reduced to reflect only an additional 250 spaces.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport confirmed that the revised bid included costs for 500 additional spaces at the Newbridge Park & Ride but the final bid will be revised to 250 additional spaces.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked for an assurance relating to the viability of the £1.89m referenced as 'BWR Transport Scheme' contained within the revised package. His understanding was that this amount was payable by Crest under the BWR S106 Agreement but only towards the BRT.

He added that without and until Crest's agreement to an alternative, which

wasn't evident, shouldn't this element have been deleted from any bid to DfT or be made clearer that the Council would step in to fund this amount if Crest chose not to?

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that he believed that there was enough flexibility within the agreement to enable Crest to honour their commitment.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked if the amount of £1,616,500 for City Centre Works had been double-counted. Was it not already being funded under the Council's Public Realm budget?

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport confirmed that this figure was already within the budget for the Public Realm and was part of the Council's local contribution.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked if it was the Administration's intention not to renew the planning consents for the BRT route and the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride, to dispose of any properties acquired in relation to those elements of the Bath Transport Package, and not to protect the BRT route in any way for the future.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that any decisions on those matters would be a matter for the Council in the future, not at this moment in time.

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery added that such decisions may be worked through as part of the overall Transportation Policy.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked for confirmation that the amounts included for Risk (£2,685,144) and Inflation (£1,094,509) will be fully justified as part of the final bid as he felt they currently look very high given the elimination of the BRT, the Eastern Park and Ride and the halving of the Newbridge Park and Ride extension.

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery replied that these figures may of course reduce as they are still being worked on and that he would be happy to make them available once the package has been finalised.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney commented that the amount for vehicles in the report was unchanged at £2,950,000. He asked why a Park & Ride operator would consider anywhere near this level of investment when there was no BRT, no Eastern Park and Ride (1400 spaces) and a halved Newbridge Park and Ride extension?

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that that was a valid point and would review that element of the bid.

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery added that the £2,950,000 appears as both a cost and a source of third party funding in the revised bid and so will not affect the Council's net contribution.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked how realistic it was (in the absence of any specific or detailed funding proposals) that the DfT and the Inspector for the

Core Strategy will take the Council seriously in terms of a bid to Government for funding and as evidence of a credible Transport Strategy / Core Strategy?

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery replied that section 3.3 of the current report highlighted the revenue reversion risk. He added that officers were evaluating sections 2.15 – 2.21 of the report which includes working on alternatives to Bathampton Meadows P&R, possibly involving rail, as part of our future Transport Strategy.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport added that he expected the Core Strategy Inspector to ask similar questions and during that inquiry we will show that the final bid is highly deliverable and that we will need to develop our transport strategy to show how it can support the Core Strategy over the next 20 years.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked if, in considering alternatives to the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride which had now been ruled out, it could be confirmed for the record that Lambridge was not an option given the proposals regarding the Recreation Ground with Bath Rugby?

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery confirmed that Lambridge was not an option as an alternative site to the proposed Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked that given the deletion of key elements of the Bath Transport Package which were integral to the Draft Core Strategy, will the Council not be subject to increased challenge as to the deliverability of the Core Strategy with consequential risk of planning applications (that would otherwise have been contrary to the Core Strategy) being approved at Appeal, urban extensions, and serious difficulties in terms of credibility for the Examination by the Inspector including at the public hearings.

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery replied that it will be our job as officers to convince the Inspector that our Transport Strategy can support our Core Strategy. The bid for DfT funding for a revised Bath Transport Package is only part of that Transport Strategy.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked why was there no mention of the potential impact on the Council's Parking Strategy in the Council Agenda Paper.

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery replied that the Parking Strategy was being amended in light of the revised bid for the Bath Transport Package and that the Cabinet had asked officers to look at alternative Park & Ride sites as part of the Transport Strategy.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked what the prospects for the development of Avon Street Car Park and Coach Park and other key sites were in the absence of a viable Transport Strategy, a viable Parking Strategy and a viable Core Strategy.

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery replied that the Transport Strategy will need to be viable before work on any of these sites takes place. The additional Park & Rides are key to this.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked when will the views of the Urban Regeneration Panel (URP) and the Transport Commission be sought on the revised 'Package'.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that they would both be contacted before the bid was submitted and that he was aware that the Transport Commission was due to meet next month.

Councillor Geoff Ward asked how the revised bid can be seen as value for money when despite the reduction of the overall cost the Council contribution remains the same.

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery replied that the improved cost benefit ratio indicated that the revised scheme was better value for money.

There is no reduction in the Council contribution because the Department for Transport (DfT) have advised that the local contribution is expected to be maintained.

Councillor Geoff Ward asked what the difference in projected traffic reductions between the two bids was.

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery replied that the bid should not simply be seen as a scheme to reduce traffic flow. He added that it should also be noted for the contribution it will make to Economic Growth and Development. He said he would be happy to send to the Panel the corresponding figures in relation to CO2 and noxious emissions.

Councillor Caroline Roberts asked for clarification on which bus companies will be used for the service to BWR and the new Park & Ride service.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that the Park & Ride contract will be re-tendered and that we might want to serve BWR using one of the existing bus routes from the west not necessarily the P&R buses.

The Chairman asked if a timeline had been set for sections 2.15 – 2.21 of the report.

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery replied that there was not as these are intended to form part of the development of the Transport Strategy.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney commented that he found it odd that the DfT would approve a bid without an approved Transport Strategy.

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery replied that elements of the revised bid are still within the current strategy.

Councillor David Martin expressed his view that the Council should use Low Carbon Emission buses where possible within the new package.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy & Transport replied that the Council can express exactly what form the vehicles should take for the P&R service.

The Chairman commented that she also felt a lack of confidence relating to the financial figures within the report.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney asked that the revised financial figures of the bid be referred back to an open session of the Cabinet prior to the bid being submitted.

Councillor Caroline Roberts disagreed with this proposal and felt the views of the Panel could be passed to the Cabinet Member.

The Strategic Director for Service Delivery commented that the final bid itself will be open to the public.

The Chairman asked the Panel to vote on the proposal from Councillor Hanney to refer the revised financial figures of the bid back to an open session of the Cabinet prior to the bid being submitted.

3 members of the Panel voted in favour of the proposal, 3 voted against and there were no abstentions. The Chairman of the Panel has the discretion to use a second vote in this situation which resulted in the proposal being carried.

The Panel **RESOLVED** to ask that the revised financial figures of the bid be referred back to an open session of the Cabinet prior to the bid being submitted.

This page is intentionally left blank

Concern was expressed at the Panel hearing that the financial information available to the Council at its meeting on 14th July was incomplete, in particular that the scheme costs broken down to individual scheme elements was not available within the papers.

The purpose of the report to Council was to seek approval to revise the best and final bid to DfT by removing elements identified in the Joint Local Transport Plan i.e. the BRT and the A4 Park and Ride. Approval from Council was sought because these proposals could be seen as contrary to existing transport policy.

The report identified a maximum contribution from the Council of £17.8m and delegated to relevant officers, in consultation with Cabinet authority, authority for finalising amendments to the scope of the bid and financial arrangements. Revenue reversion risks of £3.8m were also identified in the report.

It is clear that Council were aware that the figures were subject to further refinement and indeed they still are. The interim breakdown of figures provided to Cllr Hanney does not affect the limits set by Council for best and final bid. As long as the final bid complies with those limits the interim analysis of individual elements is not material to the decision. Attached to this paper is the latest estimate of the cost of the BTP broken down to individual elements with a reconciliation to the table provided to Cllr Gerrish at the Council meeting.

The following specific questions were recorded in the minutes:

1. Newbridge Park & Ride Extension

Although Cllr. Crossley (Leader of Council) gave a pledge in May 2011 that there would be no extension of the Park and Ride at Newbridge, the proposals to Cabinet and Council contain provision for such an extension.

It would appear, however, that the financial totals (without appropriate detail) provided for decision by Cabinet and Council and advised to this Committee include provision for an extension of Newbridge by 500 spaces.

a) Please confirm that the capital financing requirements in respect of Newbridge have been overstated and by how much and that any bid to DfT will be reduced to reflect only an additional 250 spaces.

The interim analysis provided to Cllr Gerrish for the Council meeting did indeed include the costs of 500 spaces because the impact of the reduction is still subject to the outcome of the TVG application. The best and final bid to DfT will include the estimated cost of providing 250 spaces. We estimate that this amendment will reduce the cost of this element of the scheme by £265,000 and this new figure is included in the attached breakdown of scheme costs.

b) What are the revenue implications for the Council given there will now be substantially less income as a result of fewer spaces?

The revenue implications of changing individual elements of the bid are still being worked on. The Council's Transport Strategy assumes that as P&R spaces increase, city centre car parking spaces are released for economic development. It follows that development of fewer P&R spaces will retain more

city centre spaces. As these spaces generate more income than P&R spaces (because of the higher tariff) there is a compensating revenue effect.

2. The amount of £1.89m referenced as 'BWR Transport Scheme' is contained within the revised package. I understand that this amount is payable by Crest under the BWR S106 Agreement but only towards the BRT.

Why would Crest still want to pay this amount, which is now entirely at their discretion, when you have eliminated the BRT which is likely to affect the viability of BWR?

Without and until Crest's agreement to an alternative, which isn't evident, shouldn't this element be deleted from any bid to DfT or it be made clearer that the Council will step in to fund this amount if Crest choose not to?

This will not affect the viability of the BWR. The development of BWR will continue to need improved public transport to reduce its impact on the surrounding road network. The payment is not 'entirely at their discretion' but are covered by the terms of the signed 106 agreement which provide for Crest's funding of an alternative to the BRT to serve the BWR site.

3. Isn't the amount of £1,616,500 for City Centre Works double-counting? Isn't this already being funded under the Council's Public Realm budget?

Yes the City Centre works are funded by the PR&MS budget and are included as part of our Local Contribution as originally envisaged in our Expression of Interest submitted in December last year.

4. I note that Bus Stops and Real Time Information are still £4,587,292 when there is no BRT and no Eastern Park & Ride? Similarly, the amounts for Ticket Machines (£175,000) and Variable Messaging Signs (£803,250) are unchanged. Given the elimination of the BRT, the elimination of an Eastern Park Ride, and a halving of the expansion at Newbridge, isn't this stretching credibility with the DfT in terms of value for money?

The Bus Stops and Real Time Information will be spent on the show case bus routes throughout the City and they provide significant benefits supporting the scheme. The costs of these elements have been reviewed and are now set out in the attached table. In the light of the Smartcard project separately funded by DfT through the WoE, the £175,000 for Ticket Machines is no longer needed and these costs will not be included in the Best and Final Bid.

5. The revised Property Costs of £909,000 are expressed as 'net'.

Please confirm that it is the Administration's intention not to renew the planning consents for the BRT route and the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride, to dispose of any properties acquired in relation to those elements of the Bath Transport Package, and not to protect the BRT route in any way for the future.

This Administration will not renew the planning permission for a Park and Ride on Bathampton meadows and we are discussing with officers the best way to protect the former BRT route from future development.

6. The amounts included for Risk (£2,685,144) and Inflation (£1,094,509) look very high given the elimination of the BRT, the Eastern Park and Ride and the halving of the Newbridge Park and Ride extension and the fact that inflation and risk cannot apply to costs already expended. Please confirm that the amounts included for inflation and risk can be fully justified and please let me have detailed computations for review.

The attached table shows the revised risk and inflation element of the project. They are robust and provide confidence that the project can be delivered at these costs.

7. The amount for vehicles is unchanged at £2,950,000. Why would a Park & Ride operator consider anywhere near this level of investment when there is no BRT, no Eastern Park and Ride (1400 spaces) and a halved Newbridge Park and Ride extension (250 spaces less)?

This element of the project is currently being reviewed and we currently estimate that the reduced P&R expansion will result a requirement of £400,000 for new vehicles and this is now included in the scheme costs in the attached table. This will not impact the funding requirement of the Council.

8. There is an amount of £7,952,000 set down as 'BID'. What is this comprised of? Does it include any costs relating to elements of the Bath Transport Package that are not now included?

A detailed breakdown of this amount has been provided to Cllr Hanney and includes costs of developing elements of the project that have now been deleted.

9. It would appear that the Council's financial commitment as per the Council resolution is:-

£21.6m (being Council contribution to revised package of £17.8m plus at least £3.8m revenue reversion risk related to the deletion of the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride and the BRT) plus:-

- a) Any additional costs relating to 'alternatives to Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride possibly including rail as part of our future Transport Strategy' (Resolution 1.9)
- b) Any additional costs relating to other unfunded aspirations (Resolutions 1.10-1.15)

In both the Council's letter of 18 July 2011 to Mr. Emerson (the Inspector appointed in connection with the Draft Core Strategy) and in the Council Agenda Paper, great stress is placed on the initiatives set out in Resolutions 1.9-1.15. However none of these have any funding for implementation i.e. of relevant measures that Officers

may suggest in response or that Cabinet would like to do irrespective of Officer advice? So how realistic is it (in the absence of any specific or detailed funding proposals) that the DfT and the Inspector for the Core Strategy will take the Council seriously in terms of a bid to Government for funding and as evidence of a credible Transport Strategy / Core Strategy?

The Councils commitment is not £21.6m. The full amount of the bid costs of circa £8.0m is included within the Council's commitment of £17.8m. The revenue reversion risk simply means that bid costs relating to deleted elements that would otherwise be capitalised will fall to revenue. The costs have already been incurred, there is no additional expenditure

Proposals in paragraphs 1.9 – 1.15 of the Council resolution will not form part of the bid for funding to DfT. Cabinet have asked that the proposals are evaluated as part of the Council's future Transport strategy. The revised Bath Transport Package will not represent the totality of the Council's Transport Strategy just as the original package did not. The Council will have the opportunity to explain to the Inspector at the inquiry into the Core Strategy how our emerging transport strategy will support the objectives of our plan.

10. Resolution 1.10 suggests additional signage on the A46 to direct more traffic to an extended Lansdown P&R. However, Lansdown is only being extended by 390 spaces while the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride would have accommodated 1,400 spaces. Is there any concern the additional signs may direct traffic to a full Lansdown P&R with possibly even more signs needed to send on somewhere else?

The Variable Message signs referred to in question 4) above will indicate if spaces are available at Lansdown P&R sites. When this is full drivers will be directed to available spaces within the city.

11. In considering alternatives to the Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride which has now been ruled out, please confirm for the record that Lambridge is not an option given the proposals regarding the Recreation Ground with Bath Rugby?

Yes Lambridge has been ruled out as an alternative the Bathampton Meadows P&R.

12. Given the deletion of key elements of the Bath Transport Package which were integral to the Draft Core Strategy, will the Council not be subject to increased challenge as to the deliverability of the Core Strategy with consequential risk of planning applications (that would otherwise have been contrary to the Core Strategy) being approved at Appeal, urban extensions, and serious difficulties in terms of credibility for the Examination by the Inspector including at the public hearings?

See answer to question 9) above.

13. The aforesaid letter of 18 July 2011 to the Inspector (paras 8.19-8.22) indicates that 'The draft Bath Parking Strategy has not yet been approved by Members and is,

therefore not yet publicly available. A programme for approval by Members and public release of the Parking Strategy is still being assessed in light of the need to amend it as a result of changes to the BTP.'

Why was there no mention of the potential impact on the Council's Parking Strategy in the Council Agenda Paper?

The Council paper was dealing very specifically with amendments to the BTP and a wider discussion of the potential changes to an emerging Parking Strategy was not considered possible at that stage. In any event officers have been directed to identify and evaluate an alternative Park and Ride site to the East as part of the emerging Transport Strategy. Other measures to encourage modal shift and reduce the demand for city centre parking spaces are also being considered. The removal of the A4 P&R from the bid will impact the timing of the redevelopment of city centre car parks but not necessarily the quantum.

14. What are the prospects for the development of Avon Street Car Park and Coach Park and other key sites in the absence of a viable Transport Strategy, a viable Parking Strategy and a viable Core Strategy?

Revision of the BTP does not automatically invalidate any of these strategies. The BTP was only part of the wider Transport Strategy has been de-scoped as requested by DfT.

The revised package still has elements that increase P&R capacity and allow for phased development of city centre car parks. It was highly unlikely all of the car parks would have been developed simultaneously any way. Removing unpopular elements from the bid has improved the cost benefit ratio of the scheme, reduced the cost to DfT and improving the scheme deliverability by removing the need for CPO's. All these things will be attractive to DfT. There is time to develop a more sustainable Transport Strategy and seek alternative sources of funds for other capital schemes over the period of the Core Strategy.

15. When will the views of the Urban Regeneration Panel (URP) and the Transport Commission be sought on the revised 'Package'?

The Transport Commission will not be meeting prior to the submission of the revised Package so they will not be able to comment. The Urban Regeneration Panel will have the opportunity to discuss the Package at their meeting on 1st September 2011. The Chair of the Transport Commission has indicated that it might be more productive to support development of the emerging Transport Strategy rather than review revisions to the scheme bid. There is insufficient time for the Commission to complete a detailed evaluation of the scheme before the submission deadline in September.

Bath Transportation Package	Original Expression of interest	Council 14th July	Current Cabinet 9th August
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Preparation Costs	7,952	7,952	7,952
Property costs (net)	10,997	990	990
Main scheme	22,553	18,852	18,905
A4 P&R	5,039	0	0
City Centre works (Public Realm)	1,514	1,616	1,616
Other work (BWR)	0	1,890	1,989
	48,055	31,300	31,452
Vehicles	2,950	2,950	400
Total	51,005	34,250	31,852
Funded by			
Dft Grant	25,600	11,300	11,664
Borrowing (Service supported)	6,500	1,000	1,000
Borrowing (Corporate)	12,400	12,000	11,786
Revenue reversion		3,500	3,500
S 106 BWR	2,000	1,989	1,989
Capital receipts	1,514	1,514	1,514
	48,055	31,300	31,452
Vehicles	2,950	2,950	400
TOTAL	51,005	34,250	31,852

**Bath Transportation Package
July 2011 Scheme Estimate**

		June Update	Sunk costs	Stats fees	Stats costs	Landscape upkeep	Less 250 spaces	Stand alone contract	Economy of scale for stand alone contract	Correction to Lot 1 tender split	Spec to sports pitch	Off site disposal of spoil	Lansdown Road George Street junction	Inflation uplift on term contracts above 2.7%	Revised scope and programme	Design price development	July 2011 Scheme Estimate
		7,952,000															7,952,000
	Bid																772,987
	Sunk Land Costs		772,987														772,987
	Property net		990,487														217,500
	Main scheme	18,851,777															
	Enabling Works & Stat Fees			- 48,751													
	Newbridge	265,201			346,060	12,869	- 265,145	26,730	113,471	- 72,518							216,450
	Odd Down	832,227			6,655	12,869		8,668	45,396	- 173,533		115,479					2,265,149
	Upgrade to existing P&R route	637,000											198,000			- 133,000	702,000
	Lansdown	831,025			6,655	105,570				275,015							1,218,265
	On Street	641,524												247,417		327,576	969,100
	Bus stops & RTI	4,587,292													- 175,000	1,070	4,835,779
	Ticket Machines	175,000															
	VMS	803,250			279,223							15,753					1,098,226
	Preparation Costs	1,610,432													241,469		1,851,901
	Land assembly fees	44,200													- 44,200		
	Site Supervision Costs	857,872													143,185		1,001,057
	Statutory Utility/Service	1,254,295															
	CC&P Installation	429,125			- 638,593										- 615,702		
	CC&P	15,072,124													- 115,282		313,843
	Risk	2,685,144															
	Inflation	1,094,509														- 1,105,144	1,580,000
		18,851,777														911,450	2,005,959
	A4 P&R																
	City Centre	1,616,500														- 488	1,616,012
	R Transport Scheme	1,890,000													99,000		1,989,000
		31,300,765															
	Vehicles	2,950,000															400,000
		34,250,765													- 2,550,000		31,852,989

This page is intentionally left blank

St Mary's CE Primary School Request to extend the lower age limit by addition of the Early Years Provision.

I am speaking this evening in support of this application. I have visited the school a number of times recently and seen the enormous improvements which have been made since 2008 when rolls were falling, and I was afraid the school would close. Instead it has been transformed, both as an educational facility and as a centre for community activity, with grounds so varied, well cultivated and imaginative that we entered them in the South West in Bloom competition. This is due to the hard work of staff, parents and pupils, and it makes a lot of sense now to extend the process by this measure.

There is much research to show that access to high quality Early Years provision helps children do better throughout their school careers. The years 3-5 are absolutely vital, but the more so in Writhlington where there is a lack of resources and modern play facilities and an inadequate bus service to Radstock. Children need a safe and happy environment in which to socialise and make friends. The school is the hub of the community, and children will benefit from being in one integrated system. I am informed that the current Writhlington Pre-School committee has agreed to the dissolution of their group from the end of term in July and St Mary's governors are proposing to incorporate the provision in the school to meet the needs of all the pre school children in Writhlington. Parents have been told that the school will continue to ensure that there is a comprehensive and well balanced curriculum and it is evident that children will still be safe and secure –and encouraged to eat their vegetables!, They run a 'Stay and Play' scheme for the Writhlington community and I know myself from talking to people how good their community links are. I also know for how many troubled families this will be a lifeline. I see children running to school in their enthusiasm –something which never happened at the grim 1950s primary school I attended.

So I request you to support the proposal

Cllr Eleanor Jackson (Lab. Radstock)

This page is intentionally left blank