

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

Wednesday, 9th May, 2012

These minutes are draft until confirmed as a correct record at the next meeting.
--

Present:

Councillor Paul Crossley	Leader of the Council
Councillor Nathan Hartley	Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Youth
Councillor David Bellotti	Cabinet Member for Community Resources
Councillor Simon Allen	Cabinet Member for Wellbeing
Councillor Tim Ball	Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning
Councillor Cherry Beath	Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development
Councillor David Dixon	Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods
Councillor Roger Symonds	Cabinet Member for Transport

207 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

208 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

209 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

210 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

There were none.

211 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

212 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 18 questions from the following people: Councillors Nigel Roberts, Eleanor Jackson (2), John Bull, Tim Warren (2), Patrick Anketell-Jones (2), Vic Pritchard, Mathew Blankley, Anthony Clarke, Colin Barrett (2), Kate Simmons; and members of the public Sarah Moore, Katrina Davies, Mrs S Osborne, Liz Richardson.

[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.]

213 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones, in a statement about Urban Broadband [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website*], noted the award by government of £100M to cities (including Bristol) and the additional £15M for smaller cities. He felt that the council must not be left behind in this race and called on the Cabinet to do the work necessary to submit an application to DCMS.

The Chair referred the statement to Councillor Cherry Beath for her consideration. There were a number of other speakers, all of whom made their statements at the relevant agenda item.

214 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

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

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 11th April 2012 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

215 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

216 CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

The Chair announced that recommendations from the Resource PDS Panel would be considered at item 18 on the Agenda.

217 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

218 WORLD HERITAGE SITE SETTING SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Councillor Tim Ball said that the proposals spoke for themselves and he moved the recommendations.

Councillor Cherry Beath seconded the proposal and gave her full support. She said the document was an important step in protecting the world heritage status of Bath.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor Cherry Beath, it was **RESOLVED** (unanimously)

- (1) To APPROVE the Draft City of Bath World Heritage Site Setting Supplementary Planning Document for public consultation as part of the process leading to adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document to policies BH.1 in the Bath and North East Somerset Council Local Plan and B4 in the Core Strategy once it is adopted; and
- (2) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director for Planning and Transport Development, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning, to make minor text changes and minor design changes to the layout, if required, and for the inclusion of the rest of the appendices and changes to the selection of photos to the Draft Supplementary Planning Document.

219 GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Councillor Judith Chubb-Whittle (Chair, Stanton Drew Parish Council) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website*] expressed the view of the Parish Council that the site at Stanton Wick should be removed from the consultation list.

Councillor Ashton Broad (Whitchurch Parish Council) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 21 and on the Council's website*] asking for the Woollard Lane site to be removed from the consultation list.

Cllr Maggie Hutton (Vice-Chair, Camerton Parish Council) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website*] explaining why the Parish Council felt so strongly that the open site at Daglands in Camerton should be removed from the consultation list. She presented two petitions, one of 370 signatures from residents of Camerton, and one of 75 signatures from Camerton children together with their art, letters and poems asking for the site to be saved.

The Chair referred the petitions to Councillor Tim Ball for his consideration.

Philip Townshend (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Clark Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Dr Christopher Ree (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Karen Abolkheir (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 8 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Liz Richardson (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 9 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Sue Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 10 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Jennie Jones (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 11 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list. She presented a petition to Cabinet of 1161 signatures objecting to the inclusion of the site in the consultation.

The Chair referred the petition to Councillor Tim Ball for his consideration.

Paul Baxter (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 12 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Cllr David Veale in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 22 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Camerton play area from the consultation list. He felt that access onto the highway made the site unviable and the loss of the play area to the community would be too great.

Mary Walsh (Joint Chair, Whitchurch Action Group) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 13 and on the Council's website*] asking the Cabinet to remove the Woollard Lane site from the consultation list. She disputed the contention that the site was brown-field, and explained that it had historically been acknowledged as green belt.

Peter Duppa-Miller (Secretary, B&NES Local Councils Association) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 14 and on the Council's website*] said that the West of England Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment 2007 was out of date and should be reviewed. He felt that further suitable non green-belt land should be identified to the far south of the area.

Cllr John Kelly (Publow with Pensford Parish Council) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 23 and on the Council's website*] said he was horrified and angered by the inclusion of the Stanton Wick site which he felt was totally unsuitable.

Cllr Tony Marwood (Chair, Clutton Parish Council) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 15 and on the Council's website*] asking Cabinet to remove the Clutton open space from the consultation list.

Christine Saunders (a resident of Whitchurch) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 16 and on the Council's website*] asked Cabinet to remove the Woollard Lane site from the consultation list.

Alison Ginty (a resident of Camerton) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 17 and on the Council's website*] appealed to Cabinet to remove the Camerton play park from the consultation list. She reminded Cabinet that the play park had been developed by local people and that it was the only safe play area in the village.

Suzanne Arnold in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 18 and on the Council's website*] appealed to Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Debbie Saunders (a resident of Stanton Wick) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 19 and on the Council's website*] referred to the extremely low matrix score achieved by the Stanton Wick site and asked Cabinet to remove it from the consultation list.

Jacqui Darbyshire (a past resident of Stanton Wick) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 20 and on the Council's website*] appealing to Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Tracey Cuthbert (a resident of Twerton Travellers Site) in an *ad hoc* statement explained that she felt part of the community and had no problems with the local community. Her daughter was at the local school and they had found the Head, staff and other children very helpful and friendly. She felt that gypsies and travellers can be valued members of a local community.

Councillor Jeremy Sparks in an *ad hoc* statement supported the concept of suitably managed sites. He felt however that Stanton Wick would not be a suitable site because there were highway concerns and no local shops or facilities. He felt the site had only been shortlisted because of its size.

Councillor Tim Warren in an *ad hoc* statement expressed grave concerns that the list was unbalanced and that some of the sites did not meet government guidelines. He asked Cabinet to reconsider the list.

Councillor Vic Pritchard in an *ad hoc* statement said he was against the Stanton Wick site. The Cabinet proposals were based on an out-of-date government directive and a Regional Spatial Strategy which was now defunct. He felt that Cabinet should review the requirements now it had more freedom.

Councillor Tim Ball introduced the item by reminding Cabinet that the Council had been guilty of failing in its duty for not identifying sites after so many years. He emphasised that the proposals would be the beginning of at least 8 weeks of consultation. The Cabinet was determined to consult as widely as possible on the proposals. He emphasised that if a site were shown not to be suitable, he would not allow it to stay on the list at the end of the consultation. He explained that there would be another Cabinet report in September, then a government inspector would make comments, then a final decision would be made by Cabinet in December. He made brief mention of the key points about each site. Finally, he said that after visiting all the sites he had been struck that the Camerton play park space was totally inappropriate, so that site would be removed from the list before consultation. He explained therefore that the proposal he was moving was different from the one published in the report.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal and emphasised that what was being proposed was that the Council would start the statutory consultation process.

Councillor David Dixon said he understood why residents were turning out in large numbers about the proposals. He felt it was because in the past the Council had not appeared to be listening to residents – but he assured those present that the Cabinet was determined to listen to what the community was saying during the consultation process.

Councillor Nathan Hartley thanked all those who had spoken. He reminded the Cabinet of the obligation to identify gypsy sites in the area. He thanked Tracey Cuthbert for her statement and for making him welcome when he visited the Lower Bristol Road site. He knew that many people had a particular interest in home to school transport issues, and confirmed that gypsy children had exactly the same rights as other children. He responded to one comment that secondary schools had been excluded from the matrix by saying that many gypsy children's attendance past the age of about 12 is sporadic; the law specifically protects gypsy parents from prosecution because it is recognised that many gypsy children start training in the family business at that age. He referred to a chart, which had been put into the

public galley before the meeting [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 24 and on the Council's website*] which he had asked to be prepared and which showed the places available and the walking distances from each proposed site to each of the nearest primary and secondary schools. He expressed support for the recommendations.

Councillor Simon Allen thanked all the speakers. He acknowledged that there was a lot of detail to take in, and that there would be more to come. He promised an open and honest consultation. He had attended a meeting in his ward at which about 150 people had expressed their opposition, and he asked everyone to take part in the consultation. He himself was supportive of the proposals.

Councillor Cherry Beath said that the debate proved that people felt passionate about their communities. It was precisely this kind of debate which would ensure that the right sites would be eventually chosen. Her main concern was to get assurances about the wellbeing of local communities and about the suggestions of contamination on some of the sites.

Councillor David Bellotti thanked Councillor Ball for making it clear that this would be only the beginning of the consultation period and that sites could and would be withdrawn if they were shown to be unviable; other sites would be added as they were suggested. He emphasised the huge risk of taking no action – which might end in a costly legal battle as had been seen in the news. He explained that if the Council had no identified sites, it would not be possible to clear an illegal encampment. But if the Council had designated sites, then it was possible to clear an illegal encampment. He observed that travellers were real people, with real needs which the Council had a duty to support.

Councillor Roger Symonds responded to some of the comments about the pressure on the local transport infrastructure at some of the proposed sites. He guaranteed that transportation officers would properly appraise the viability of each site to make sure that local road systems could support any proposed sites.

Councillor Tim Ball summed up by thanking all the speakers. He confirmed that at the end of the process he did not expect all the sites to go forward because the Cabinet would listen to all the comments made during the consultation.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was **RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To NOTE that an Issues and Options consultation was carried out between 21 November 2011 and 16 January 2012 during which the broad site assessment criteria were consulted on and a Call for Sites conducted. The response to that consultation is set out in the Consultation Statement (Appendix 3) and formed the basis for the technical site assessment (Appendix 2);

(2) To NOTE that the list of preferred sites in the report was derived from the longer list of sites considered in the technical assessment (Appendix 2);

(3) To AGREE that the Preferred Options document (Appendix 1), which includes the list of preferred sites in para. 5.8, is taken forward for public consultation;

(4) To AGREE that the public consultation on the preferred sites is undertaken over an extended period of 8 weeks to run from mid-May 2012 to maximise the period over which comments can be submitted;

- (5) To NOTE that an initial report on the Preferred Options public consultation will be made to Cabinet in September 2012, which may include an assessment of additional sites coming forward;
- (6) To NOTE that the list of preferred sites will be reviewed in light of the public consultation and as part of the preparation of the draft Plan which is due to be considered by Cabinet in December 2012 for formal public consultation;
- (7) To AGREE that only new sites will be considered for inclusion and not those already rejected through the initial site assessment;
- (8) To NOTE that the Council will seek to review and update the 2007 needs assessment in liaison with the West of England partner authorities;
- (9) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director of Planning & Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning, to make minor textual amendments prior to publication of the Preferred Options document; and
- (10) To NOTE as an erratum to paragraph 5.8 of the report that the site at Camerton is deleted from the list and that it could accommodate only 8 not 9 pitches.

220 COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT FUND

Councillor Paul Crossley in proposing the item thanked the officers of Policy and Partnerships for their hard work in preparing the arrangements for the fund. He was delighted that the main recommendations for use of the fund had come from the community.

Councillor Nathan Hartley seconded the proposal. He also was delighted with the proposals. He announced the launch of a brand new fund of £100K, to be used to ensure that the young people we work with have a better chance of fulfilling their goals and aspirations. £60K of the fund was earmarked to fund groups and initiatives that support young people to get involved with positive activities and £40,000 was for young people who were struggling to find training or employment. He was confident that the fund would make a huge difference in a number of young lives.

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor Nathan Hartley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To AGREE the provisional funding allocations in relation to the Performance Reward Programme Main Grant Fund and that conditional offers be made with regard to the projects identified, subject to successful negotiations on grant agreements as set out in the report;
- (2) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director, Policy and Partnerships, in consultation with the Council Leader and Section 151 Officer, to sign funding agreements that have been finalised according to this process, put in place performance management arrangements and reallocate any sums returned to the fund in accordance with the prioritisation assessment agreed by the LSP Board;
- (3) To AGREE the proposed funding allocations in relation to the Fund for disadvantaged communities, regeneration and localism projects, including the £60,000 allocation for equalities projects recommended by the LSP Board following its deliberations on the Main Grant Fund;

(4) To DELEGATE authority to the identified Divisional Directors, in consultation with relevant Cabinet members and the Section 151 Officer, to manage the budgets allocated under the Fund for disadvantaged communities, regeneration and localism projects;

(5) To AGREE the funding profile for the Ward Councillors Initiative as follows:

2012-13: £3000 for each member

2013-14: £3000 for each member

2014-15: No allocation

(6) To AGREE the allocation of £100,000 from the Fund for disadvantaged communities, regeneration and localism projects for a new Future Fund.

221 THE GUILD CO-WORKING HUB

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones in an *ad hoc* statement welcomed the initiative. He noted that the area was in competition with a number of larger cities such as Bristol. He felt that the proposed hub would be an excellent start – but that it would only be a test-bed which would inform other developments such as Bath Quays and Bath Western Riverside.

Councillor Cherry Beath in proposing the item said that there was clear evidence of demand for the provision. The area had high levels of self-employment, with many looking for work space, but that cost was a major factor. She referred to a letter of support which she had received, signed by the Chair of Creative Bath and the two Universities. She strongly supported the development, and congratulated John Wilkinson (Economic Enterprise & Business Development Manager) for the work he had done in getting third parties involved.

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal.

Councillor Paul Crossley said that he was excited that the Council was working with a range of businesses and manufacturers to set up the hub.

Councillor Cherry Beath summed up by observing that the proposed arrangements would be for a community interest company.

On a motion from Councillor Cherry Beath, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE that up to £500,000 capital provisionally allocated in the 2012/13 budget be used to redevelop an area in the Guildhall to become a Co-Working Hub;

(2) To AGREE that the final layout of the Co-Working Hub will be agreed by Council officers in conjunction with the Cabinet members for Sustainable Development and Community Resources;

To AGREE that a lease be granted by the council to a Community Interest Company to deliver the Co-Working Hub. The specific details of the governance arrangements will need to be agreed by the Council's Section 151 officer in consultation with the Cabinet member for Sustainable Development and Community Resources.

222 KEYNSHAM TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION AND WORKPLACES PROGRAMME – RIVERSIDE SITE ASSEMBLY AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER

Councillor David Bellotti in proposing the item said that the issues were straightforward. He referred to paragraph (2) of the proposals and explained that the Council needed the powers because it could not in all conscience leave the secondary site to degenerate next to the site which was being renewed. The Cabinet intended to bring forward plans for the secondary site in due course.

Councillor Cherry Beath seconded the proposal and gave her full support to the plans and the need to use the CPO powers if necessary.

On a motion from Councillor David Bellotti, seconded by Councillor Cherry Beath, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AUTHORISE the Chief Property Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources to take all necessary steps to make, as necessary, a CPO or CPOs under Section 226(1) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 for the acquisition of land and/or the creation of new rights pursuant to Section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (or any such other legislation may be appropriate for the delivery of the scheme) in respect of acquisition of land and/or rights within the indicative area shown on the attached site plan for the Riverside office block and its environs, Temple Street, Keynsham to bring forward the area for redevelopment following the Council's vacation in 2014.

The Chief Property Officer is authorised, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources, to take all necessary steps in the process of making, confirmation and implementation of any CPO, including the publication and service of all notices, and the presentation of the Council's case at Public Inquiry.

(2) To AUTHORISE the Chief Property Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources, to acquire interests in land and new rights within any CPO either by agreement(s) or compulsorily and approve agreement(s) with land owners setting out the terms of the withdrawal of objections to the Order, including where appropriate seeking exclusion of land or new rights from the Order and or making arrangements for re-housing or relocation of occupiers;

(3) To AGREE that any use of the CPO powers is subject to authorisation from the S151 Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources in respect of the anticipated financial implications of the authorisation.

223 NEWBRIDGE AND WESTON - PARKING RESTRICTIONS TRO

Councillor Roger Symonds in proposing the item explained that there had been a backlog of yellow line proposals, and that officers from the Transportation Division had worked hard to bring them to this point. He observed that his recommendation was to implement some of the proposals as advertised, but in some cases to overturn or to amend the proposals.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the motion.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

To AGREE that in regard to the advertised proposals below that the proposals are implemented, modified or withdrawn as below:

(1) proposal to prohibit parking in lengths of Apsley Road, Burleigh Gardens, Cedric Road, Chelsea Road, East Lea Road, Manor Road, Meadow Gardens, Newbridge Gardens, Newbridge Hill, Newbridge Road, Partis Way, Penn Gardens, Penn Hill Road, Penn Lea Road, South Lea Road, Westfield Park, West Lea Road and Weston Park;

Apsley Road: That the Double Yellow Line (DYL) junction protection in Apsley Road from Newbridge Road is implemented as advertised. That the proposal for DYL on the west side of Apsley Road from Newbridge Hill is modified to reduce the length of DYL to commence at a point 94 metres south of the junction of Newbridge Hill, extending for a distance of 20 metres in a south westerly direction into the western cul-de-sac, in response to public feedback.

Burleigh Gardens: That the proposal to implement DYL on the east side from its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 190 metres in a southerly then westerly direction encompassing the turning head in the western spur of Burleigh Gardens is modified to implement DYL on the east side from its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 11 metres in a southerly direction. Then DYL on the south side of Burleigh Gardens from a point 150 metres south westerly from the eastern kerbline of its junction with South Lea Road in a westerly direction for a distance of 44 metres, encompassing the turning head in the western spur of Burleigh Gardens to allow traffic movement.

That the DYL on the west side of the road from the junction from its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 11 metres in a southerly direction is implemented as advertised for junction protection purposes.

Cedric Road: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

Chelsea Road: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

East Lea Road: To implement DYL on the junction on the east side from its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 19 meters as advertised to ensure traffic flow and road safety issues are resolved. To modify the proposal on the western side of East Lea Road to DYL from the junction of South Lea Road for a distance of 19 meters then reduce restriction to Single Yellow Lines in operation 10am till 4pm Monday to Friday only for a distance of 155 meters in response to public feedback on the issues faced in the location.

Manor Road: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

Meadow Gardens: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

Newbridge Gardens: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

Newbridge Hill: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

Newbridge Road: That the proposals for DYL at the junction with Apsley Road are implemented as advertised to protect the junction. That the proposals for DYL at the junction of Westfield Park are modified and reduced from a point 8 meters west of its junction with Westfield Park for a distance of 28 metres in an easterly direction.

Partis Way: That the proposal to implement DYL on the west side of Partis Way from its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 20 metres in a southerly direction is implemented as advertised.

That the proposal to implement DYL on the east side of Partis Way from a point 5 metres south of its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 182 metres in a southerly direction is modified to DYL from a point 5 metres south of its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 15 meters in a southerly direction then Single Yellow Lines from a point 20 metres south of its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 167 metres in southerly direction in operation 10am till 4pm Monday to Friday only.

That the proposal to implement DYL on the west side of Partis Way from its junction with Newbridge Hill for a distance of 43 metres in a northerly direction is modified and reduced to 20 metres in length.

That the proposal to implement DYL on the east side of Partis Way from its junction with Newbridge Hill for a distance of 209 metres in a northerly direction then easterly direction encompassing the turning head in the eastern spur of Partis Way is modified to DYL on the east side of Partis Way from its junction with Newbridge Hill for a distance of 20 metres in a northerly direction for junction protection purposes, then Single Yellow Lines in operation 10am till 4pm Monday to Friday only on the east and south side of Partis Way, in response to public feedback on the issues faced in this location, from a point 20 metres north of its junction with Newbridge Hill for a distance of 132 metres in a northerly then easterly direction and DYL in the turning head in the eastern spur of Partis Way on the south side from a point 152 metres north easterly of its junction with Newbridge Hill for a distance of 55 metres encompassing the turning head for traffic flow purposes.

Penn Gardens: That the proposal is modified and the DYL are reduced in length on the north side to extend a distance of 15 metres in an easterly direction from its junction with Penn Hill Road to increase residential parking availability whilst protecting the junction for safety reasons.

Penn Hill Road: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

Penn Lea Road: That the proposals are withdrawn and not implemented at this time due to public objections to the proposals.

South Lea Road: To implement DYL on north side junctions with West Lea, East Lea and Penn Lea Roads as advertised to ensure traffic flow and road safety issues are resolved. To modify the proposal on the south side of South Lea Road from DYL to Single Yellow Lines in operation 10am till 4pm Monday to Friday only in response to public feedback on the issues faced in the location apart from the following junctions; with West Lea Road where DYL will be implemented from its junction with West Lea Road for a distance of 23 metres in an easterly direction, from its junction with Burleigh Gardens where DYL will be implemented from a point 8 metres west of its junction with Burleigh Gardens for a distance of 29 metres in an easterly direction and Partis Way where DYL will be implemented from a point 8 metres west of its junction with Partis Way for a distance of 8 metres in an easterly direction for junction protection purposes.

Westfield Park: To modify the advertised restrictions of DYL on both sides of Westfield Park from its junction with Newbridge Road for a distance of 18

metres in a southerly direction to a reduced length of 10 metres extending from its junction with Newbridge Road in a southerly direction in response to public feedback. This will strike the best possible balance between junction protection and availability of parking.

West Lea Road: To implement DYL on East side for a distance of 9 meters as advertised to ensure traffic flow and road safety issues are resolved. To modify the proposal on the western side of West Lea Road to DYL from the junction of South Lea Road for a distance of 9 meters then reduce restriction to Single Yellow Lines in operation 10am till 4pm Monday to Friday only for a distance of 211 meters in response to public feedback on the issues faced in the location.

Weston Park: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as the changes will increase road safety at the junction.

(2) proposal to restrict parking in lengths of Lucklands Road, Purlewent Drive and Chelsea Road:

Lucklands Road: That the proposals are withdrawn and not implemented at this time.

Purlewent Drive: That the proposals are withdrawn and not implemented at this time.

Chelsea Road: That the restrictions are implemented as proposed as no objections were received.

(3) proposal to introduce prohibition of loading /unloading in lengths of Cedric Road:

That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objection have been received.

(4) proposal to vary the residents' parking places in Cedric Road:

That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objection have been received.

(5) proposal to remove 2 disabled parking bays in Chandler Close:

That the proposal is implemented as advertised. Chandler Close will still retain 3 disabled bays for use by residents whilst increasing the availability of parking of all.

224 CABINET RESPONSE TO RESOURCES PDS WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

The Chair welcomed Councillor John Bull (Chair of the Resources PDS Panel), and invited him to introduce the Panel's recommendations.

Councillor John Bull explained that a cross-party group of four members of the Panel had worked on the report. They had interviewed a number of officers. The broad conclusions had been that there was not great abuse of the system. They had identified clear criteria for the use of consultants in the Council although it was not always evident whether they had been applied.

He referred to the advice of the National Audit Office that agency accounts could be an efficient way of engaging consultants where necessary, because this would enable the Council to dip in and out of the agency provision as required.

He made two particular recommendations:

- (i) Council expenditure on consultants is of such public interest that it should be identified in Service Action Plans;
- (ii) The Resources PDS Panel should be given an analysis from the Staff Satisfaction Survey relating to working with consultants.

Councillor David Bellotti thanked Councillor Bull and his Panel for their work in bringing this to Cabinet's attention, and agreed that this was a very timely debate. He had arranged to attend the forthcoming Panel meeting, at which he would give a response to the Panel. He assured the Panel that he would listen to their views and would report back to Cabinet.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chair _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEETING 9th May 2012

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

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

There were 23 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.

Statements about issues NOT on the Agenda

- Cllr Patrick Anketell-Jones

Re: Urban Broadband

Re: Agenda Item 12 (World Heritage Site SPD)

- ~~Alan Langton (Trustee, Bath Preservation Trust)~~ (Not present at meeting)

Re: Agenda Item 13 (Travellers Sites)

- Cllr Judith Chubb-Whittle (Chair, Stanton Drew Parish Council)
- Cllr Ashton Broad (Whitchurch Parish Council)
- Cllr Maggie Hutton (Vice-Chair, Camerton Parish Council)
- Philip Townshend (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Clark Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Dr Christopher Ree (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Karen Abolkheir (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Liz Richardson (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Sue Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Jennie Jones (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Paul Baxter (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Cllr David Veale
- Mary Walsh (Joint Chair, Whitchurch Action Group)
- Peter Duppa-Miller (Secretary, B&NES Local Councils Association)
- Cllr John Kelly (Publow with Pensford Parish Council)
- Cllr Tony Marwood (Chair, Clutton Parish Council)
- Christine Saunders
- Alison Ginty
- Suzanne Arnold
- Debbie Saunders
- Jacqui Darbyshire

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Nigel Roberts
<p>The works in James Street West, finally had a sign saying that the cycle lane was closed. However, this was right at the end of the path with no indication, as for car drivers, of a diversion. This will cause cyclists to have to turn round with an unnecessary lengthening of their journey. With the importance of encouraging cycling as environmentally sustainable transport, please could the executive councillor review how this situation could have been improved</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>The gas main replacement on James St West took up half the carriageway, meaning that westbound vehicles had to drive over the contra flow cycle lane. As a consequence it was necessary to close the cycle lane to ensure cyclists did not collide head-on with oncoming traffic. A sign was erected telling cyclists that the cycle lane was closed, and suggesting they dismount and follow the route on foot, on the footway, for approximately 100m, before remounting. This was considered the best option, as to divert cyclists via Charles Street and Monmouth Place would have caused them an unnecessary detour, as well as forcing them to use heavily trafficked roads.</i></p>		

M 02	Question from:	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
<p>When is the cabinet going to make up its mind about how it is going to administer that half million for 'economic development' in Radstock?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>The exact details of the proposals are still to be discussed. This provisional allocation is broadly intended to support the development of the 'street scene', encouraging property regeneration and attracting private investment.</i></p>		

M 03	Question from:	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
<p>Given that one of the two remaining NRR directors resident in Radstock is telling people that the NRR Company is hibernating as it has nothing to do, That the NRR has no staff, no address, no nothing as well as nothing to do as Linden Homes is managing the site, And that were it to make a success of the GWR railway lands development profits would be applied in Midsomer Norton according to its constitution Why doesn't B&NES together with the Homes and Communities Agency which has a financial claim on the site, apply a merciful euthanasia?</p>		

Answer from:	Councillor Cherry Beath
<i>I am not in a position to comment on the future of Norton Radstock Regeneration Company - it is a private limited company. However, I fully support the redevelopment of the former railway land.</i>	

M 04	Question from:	Councillor John Bull
-------------	-----------------------	----------------------

What are BANES doing to assist the Friends of Long Acre Hall in their aspiration to take over the building for use as a community centre?

Answer from:	Councillor David Bellotti
---------------------	---------------------------

The property at 3 and 4 Longacre has been empty and unused for a long time and is owned by the Council. The property at 2 Longacre (Caroline House) is owned by the Council but subject to a lease granted by the Council with over 30 years to run. 2 Longacre has also been empty and unused for a long time. All those properties are in very poor condition and contribute to a depressing street scene in the London Road.

Separate to consideration of those properties the Council decided that London Road generally was in desperate need of regeneration and £750K was allocated in this year's capital programme budget for that purpose. This regeneration scheme is being managed in the Council by Major Projects and they are working very closely with local residents and local councillors. Many of the residents who are Friends of Longacre Hall are engaged with the Council on this regeneration scheme.

The Council put 3 and 4 Longacre on the open market last summer and received a number of bids. One bid was from RE: Generate which referred to Community Groups they had consulted. Their proposal included a community facility in the properties mentioned. In considering this bid very carefully the Council noted that there were already at least four other community facilities, with capacity available and a local track record of good governance, very close to this property. These include the Somer Community Housing Trust, the Riverside Centre and two Churches.

It was decided to accept another bid, which was from the private sector, and sell 3 and 4 Longacre because this will guarantee regeneration of those properties and will also provide much needed housing. The Council is currently in negotiation with the leaseholders of 2 Longacre regarding the future of that property. We expect to see some progress regarding 2 Longacre very soon.

This way forward clearly provides the best opportunity to regenerate the London Road area and also provides the best value for money for the Council and residents.

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

Is there any prospect of some community use at No 2, Longacre?

Answer from:	Councillor David Bellotti
---------------------	---------------------------

We will first need to resolve the issue of the 30-year lease before that can be considered.

M 05	Question from:	Councillor Tim Warren
<p>At the Full Council meeting of July 2011, it was agreed that Council: 'instruct officers to work on alternatives to Bathampton Meadows P&R, possibly involving rail, as part of our future Transport Strategy'.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide an update on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • progress with finding alternatives to the Bathampton Park & Ride site; • progress with developing a new Transport Strategy; • when a report is likely to be presented to Full Council for consideration of both of the above? 		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p>Bathampton P&R: <i>A high level consultant brief has been prepared for issue to a multi-disciplined independent team of experts to consider alternative sites for an eastern park and ride.</i></p> <p>Transport Strategy: <i>The 18th September has now been set aside for a Transport Conference with the purpose of creating a forum to hear from local people, businesses, employers, transport stakeholders & interest groups. This important step will create the platform for the views expressed to shape the developing Transport Strategy.</i></p> <p>Reports to Council: <i>Eastern Park and Ride: A report will be provided after the consultants have produced their independent report on the siting of an eastern park and ride. The process is likely to take between 3 and 4 months and once options have been presented these will be considered by Cabinet in the first instance.</i> <i>Transport Strategy: The views expressed at the Transport Conference will need to be captured according to topic; these will then be collated into a report outlining what people told us. This exercise will need to be completed first before we look to the next steps of formulating this into policy</i></p>		

M 06	Question from:	Councillor Tim Warren
<p>During the construction of the new Keynsham town centre it will be even more important for the Council to do whatever it can to support Keynsham High Street and make life easier for local traders through this inevitably difficult period.</p> <p>Many local businesses have called a period of free short-stay parking to be introduced in the town to support this aim.</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member therefore look into the possibility of introducing two hours of free parking part of in Ashton Way car park, whilst introducing chargeable longer-stay parking in part of Ashton Way to help fund the free short-stay parking?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>The implementation of free parking in Keynsham is not currently being considered during the redevelopment of the town centre. Short term chargeable parking allows for a</i></p>		

high turnover of spaces which is essential to support the businesses and the economic vitality and viability of the town. Consideration, however, is being given to the duration of stay within each car park as part of the regeneration project to ensure that there is a balance of short and long stay parking available to all visitors in both the short and long term.

M 07	Question from:	Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones
<p>Noting the CPO report on the Cabinet Agenda, can the Cabinet Member please provide an update on discussions held with Topland over the future of the Keynsham Riverside site, the council's current thoughts on the future use of the site and any preferences it has, and when Keynsham residents will next be given the chance to give their views on the what they would like to see at the site?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor David Bellotti
<p><i>Discussions are proceeding between the Council and Topland, but the content of those discussions cannot be disclosed due to commercial confidentiality. The Council has considered several options with regard to the future use of the current Riverside building, but all are dependent upon the outcome of the current negotiations with Topland. There will be full consultation with all Keynsham residents and stakeholders at the appropriate time.</i></p>		

M 08	Question from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p>The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment determines that 11% of the population of B&NES have caring responsibilities. Do you believe this to be a true and accurate figure?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Simon Allen
<p>The 11% figure is derived from a local public perception survey of the resident adult population conducted in April 2009. These are people who self-define as a carer, by answering the following question:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p><i>A carer is a person who looks after someone, relative, friend or neighbour, who through illness or impairment is unable to look after him / herself. That person may be an adult or a child or young person. Do you consider yourself to be a carer?</i></p> </div> <p>The question was, at the time, considered best practice for deriving a crude figure for the overall population. In responding specifically to Cllr Pritchard's question; I would certainly not say that this is a definitive number but is, however, the best figure available to us at the time and helps to provide context as to the role carers are currently playing in the area. Whilst we believe that survey-based research is probably the best method we have of</p>		

understanding the position of the entire population, I would note, though, that this figure was identified in the recent Health and Wellbeing Board workshop as being an area for further development as we take the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) forward. As a result we have started examining other mechanisms (such as examining contextual data from GPs or revising the wording in surveys) to improve the accuracy of that number.

Further Information on Carers is provided by way of further context as follows:

B&NES JSNA

The (draft) JSNA includes the following statements on carers:

- There are 1462 carers known to the Council (adult social care data)
- There are currently 155 young carers registered with the Young Carers Service in this area. This is 0.52% of the 0-15 year population compared with 2.1% estimate nationally
- 23% of secondary school survey respondents and 12% of primary school respondents said they cared for family members after school on the day before the survey (SHEU survey of school pupils)

Demographic Trends

It is estimated that unpaid Carers provide up to 70% of care in the community and save the national economy an estimated £87 billion a year.

As people live longer and the prevalence of physical disability, illness, dementia, and so on, increases, the number of people in the community needing care is inevitably going to increase. The Government is estimating that there will be a 30% increase in the number of people with a caring role by 2026, rising to 50% by 2041.

Research suggests that Carers are more likely than the general population to suffer from health problems, and it is estimated that nearly one in four Carers themselves have health problems or disabilities.

The 2001 Census of Population reported that of the 6 million people in the UK who were providing unpaid care two-thirds of these Carers were of working age, combining paid work and care. 58% of Carers are women and the over 65s account for around a third of all Carers providing more than 50 hours of care a week.

Carers in the South West region

In 2001 there were 492,451 carers in the South West region of England (10% of the region's population compared with 10% across England as a whole).

16% of men and 24% of women aged 50-64 were carers

Two fifths of carers aged 75 or over provided 50 or more hours care per week

Carers who provided 20 or more hours of care per week (30% of all carers in the region) were reported to be more likely to:

- Live in social housing
- Live in a household with no working adult
- Live in a household with a person with a limiting long-term illness

Demand for care in the South West Region is growing

Between 2008 and 2030 it is expected that in the region:

- The number of people aged 85+ will more than double to 308,100, increasing from 2.8% of the population to 4.9% (compared with an increase from 2.2% to 3.9% in England as a whole)
- The number of people with a limiting long-term illness (LLTI) will increase by two fifths, from almost 946,000 to over 1.3 million.
- More than twice as many people aged 65 or over will have dementia: over 118,000 people

- The number of carers will increase by over 114,000 or 22%, compared with 15% in England as a whole.

Carers' health and wellbeing

The 2001 Census showed that in the South West region :

- 53,399 carers were themselves in poor health (11% of all carers, compared with 13% of carers in England)
- 18,653 carers in poor health provided 50 hours or more of care per week (35%)
- Up to 50 years of age, people in poor health were more likely to be carers than people whose health is good or fairly good
- Carers in poor health were more likely to provide 50 or more hours of care per week than other carers.

M 09	Question from:	Councillor Mathew Blankley
<p>In your answer to the question I tabled at the last Cabinet meeting, you stated that in order for plans to reopen Salford Station to progress '<i>a feasibility study will first be needed to assess the impact of a new station on the rail network, amongst other factors.</i>'</p> <p>Will the Cabinet therefore commit to undertaking the necessary feasibility study, noting that the Council has agreed to fund such a study on the proposed Frome to Radstock rail link?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>I am happy to confirm that we have already commissioned Halcrow to review the feasibility of re-opening Salford Station. I have asked officers to prepare a report to the next Cabinet setting out a programme for taking this work forward</i></p>		

M 10	Question from:	Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones
<p>Has the Council, or will it soon, undertake an audit of the fibre-optic broadband network already laid within Bath (or due to be installed imminently)?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>We haven't undertaken an audit of the fibre-optic broadband network already laid within Bath (or due to be installed imminently). However, we are aware that a company called City Fibre own a fibre-optic network in the city.</i></p>		

M 11	Question from:	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p>I am very disappointed to see that the Lansdown residents parking proposals have still not been published. It has been promised on numerous occasions in the past year that these proposals would be published for agreement by the Cabinet Member, most</p>		

notably an undertaking given to Cllr Lees that proposals for residents parking zones in Bath would be published by the 18th November last year.

Given the abysmal level of consultation, transparency and information provided to local residents over the status of these plans, can the Cabinet Member please provide a firm date on which the Lansdown proposals are finally to be published and considered by Cabinet?

Answer from:

Councillor Roger Symonds

The Traffic Regulation Order Forward Plan has now been supplied to all Councillors. The forward plan sets out the schedule for each stage of the Traffic Regulation Order process in all areas currently on the waiting list. It is also recognised that some areas and schemes that are currently included on the forward plan may not be deemed appropriate and could be replaced by bringing forward more suitable schemes.

Supplementary Question:

Thank you for your reply. Can you explain why the Cabinet is going to the expense of re-examining the Sion Road scheme, when it was only resolved 18 months ago and there has since been agreement with Bath Spa to reinstate the yellow lines?

Answer from:

Councillor Roger Symonds

All schemes on the forward plan are being reassessed before they are progressed to ensure they are still relevant due to the length of time since the initial assessment was undertaken. This ensures that if the traffic or road conditions have changed so any alterations to the needs of the scheme can be considered before advertising

M 12

Question from:

Councillor Colin Barrett

Verge Maintenance and Bedding

Please can you inform me when the cutting of grass verges was last carried out in Weston Village and what are the frequencies? When are the flower tubs outside Brookside House and the roundabout at the bottom of Lansdown Lane going to be planted, and will they also be planted in the future with both Spring and Summer plants?

Answer from:

Councillor David Dixon

Highway verges within Weston are normally cut with a motorised triple mower at the Council's standard cutting frequency for urban areas of between 2 to 3 weeks. However, due to the recent wet weather and heavy ground conditions the mowing team is currently behind schedule. This position will be caught up as soon as ground conditions improve.

The flower tubs will be planted with summer bedding at the normal time of June/July. Regular winter planting of containers was stopped at least 5 years ago during a savings

round.

The Council was intending to plant the roundabout with a permanent planting of ground cover roses. However Councillor Malcolm Lees has come forward with a group of local volunteers, to plant and maintain the roundabout with annuals. This is a welcome offer and is much appreciated. On-going planting and maintenance of this roundabout will not be provided by the Council in future, unless additional resources are found.

M 13	Question from:	Councillor Colin Barrett
<u>Parking Weston Village</u> Can the Cabinet Member inform me when the proposed Parking Zones will be implemented in Weston Village; i.e. Manor Road, Lucklands Road and Weston Park? Residents have been waiting for these requests to be implemented since June 2011 and have raised this matter with me on numerous occasions.		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<i>The Traffic Regulation Order Forward Plan has now been supplied to all Councillors. The forward plan sets out the schedule for each stage of the Traffic Regulation Order process in all areas currently on the waiting list. It is also recognised that some areas and schemes that are currently included on the forward plan may not be deemed appropriate and could be replaced by bringing forward more suitable schemes. Consideration of the schemes for Weston Village are scheduled for the first quarter of 2013.</i>		

M 14	Question from:	Councillor Kate Simmons
Can the Cabinet Member please provide reassurance that the Council continues to believe that any new leisure centre in Keynsham built as a result of the redevelopment of the Riverside site should remain within the town centre, and that residents will be fully consulted on options for a new location if one is required?		
Answer from:		Councillor David Dixon
<i>As part of the workplaces project the Council has undertaken to look at the potential redevelopment options for the Riverside site. All options will include the requirement to retain a leisure centre for Keynsham. Prior to any detailed proposals being developed the project will undertake a consultation exercise on all emerging options.</i>		

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P 01	Question from:	Sarah Moore
<p>I was pleased to see the Liberal Democrat cabinet allocated money to provide a playing field for Oldfield Park Junior School. I would like to ask the cabinet member responsible for Early Years, Children and Youth the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the purchase of the various land now gone through? 2. When will the field be made available for use by the children? <p>I feel it is vital for young people's health and wellbeing to have access to a safe local outside area on which they can carry out various sports and other activities on a regular basis and would therefore ask if this can be provided as quickly as possible.</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Nathan Hartley
<p><i>1. The purchase has now been completed and the land is in Council ownership.</i></p> <p><i>2. A works programme is being developed which will need to take into account several issues e.g. removal of unsuitable materials from site, necessary ecology restrictions, seeding and planting seasons. This may mean the school may not access to the actual team games area until 2013 but we will be working closely with the school to bring into use as much of the field as possible as early as possible which will include habitat and grassed play areas.</i></p>		

P 02	Questions from:	Katrina Davies
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please confirm the accepted level of traveller % to local resident % that has been agreed / approved in previous suggested sites. My understanding is that 25 people live in Stanton Wick against some proposed 200 travellers. Is there no % that is considered an unacceptable level of dwarfing on a local community? 2. Please confirm how many children are expected within the travellers that are intended to use the site and what schooling they are being offered? My understanding is that Pensford School had 14 places this year, all of which have been taken. I am unsure how many places would / could be available in Stanton Wick / Drew but cannot imagine there are many. How will the travelling children have the amenities they require if local schools do not have places available? 3. Please confirm what steps have been taken and how additional teaching resources have been funded and made available for any additional children that will be attending local schools? It is possible that children of a travelling community who have gaps in their education and / or move schools will need additional assistance in order to maintain acceptable / expected levels of attainment, what are the calculated projections of the learning needs of the traveller children and how have these needs been considered and addressed? If this is the case how many additional teachers will be available to them and how are the costs of this being met? Are there any plans to expand the local schools to accommodate? And if not why not, if this is 		

necessary? If you are unaware of how many children will need placement - how can you consider it to be a suitable site without this information?

4. Please confirm which GP surgeries will be expected to deal with the registration of an additional circa 200 people and how this will impact on abilities of the surgeries to deal with timely local appointments. Are additional GPs being brought into the area and if so how many and how will this be funded?
5. Please confirm the Highways responses to date regarding significant traffic on these currently infrequently used roads, if the highways are yet to comment please confirm when they will do so and where the responses can be accessed . Please confirm how the additional strain on these roads will be monitored and how the roads will be maintained and funded for this maintenance? Please confirm what the thought process has been regarding access issues on these narrow roads and what systems are being put into place to deal with the same and how this is being funded?
6. Please confirm the levels of ecology awareness that have been undertaken to date. Has the site being inspected for endangered species / flora / fauna etc How has the wildlife and countryside act been adhered to? Are there any veteran trees on the site? Has a bat survey been undertaken? Please provide a copy of the ecological reports to date or advise where these may be viewed?
7. Please confirm the statistics available in relation to levels of crime (pre and post) in previous localities where travellers sites have been set up and whether or not the same has increased post traveller site set up? If these statistics suggest that crime in local areas has increased please confirm - what level of funding will be put in place to deal with the extra policing and safety and how this will translate on a day to day basis? If these statistics are not available please confirm why not as surely this needs to be considered in order to know whether (if any) additional policing is necessary?
8. Please confirm what refuse will be available to the travellers and how this will be funded?
9. Please confirm what level of council tax banding the travellers will be expected to pay and what proof of payment will be available. Please also confirm what the penalty for non payment will be and how this will be enforced?
10. Please confirm how you will deal with unauthorised expansion should this situation occur and how this will be monitored in order to stop such a situation from occurring?
11. I have been advised that the site is a brown site in a green belt but that it has been previously rejected planning permission. Please confirm if this is accurate - why the previous planning was rejected and why this new planning / development differs and is being considered?

Answer from:

Councillor Tim Ball

Thank you very much for this question which raises a number of important matters. The Cabinet will be deciding at this meeting whether to take forward a Preferred Options paper for public consultation in May.

These questions will be taken forward and considered as part of the formal consultation process. A formal decision will be needed to be taken by Cabinet after the Consultation process has been completed.

P 03	Questions from:	Mrs S Osborne
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Cabinet Minutes dated 10 November 2010 (presumably 2011) Agenda Item 8 specified consultation with local residents. Please explain why this did not occur. 2. Please justify why this greenbelt development is proposed contrary to Planning policy for traveller sites Policy E, and when all other planning applications in Stanton Wick have had to adhere to greenbelt/brownfield regulations and process, including reinforcement by Judicial Review. 3. Explain how 'very special circumstances' could be applied when the site fails on nearly all criteria test. Policy B11. 4. Please quantify the budget available and from what source, to achieve deliverability (I understand the £1.8m is in respect of the transit site): - <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Servicing site with adequate water supply and electricity (it doesn't have these), and full sewerage b. remediation of contaminated land. c. investigating and making safe all mineshafts and working (collapsed shaft has been infilled this week) d. provision of a safe walking route (there is none, only a muddy ramble) e. highways making adequate and safe. f. building education block and other on site work. g. investigating the bats and their habitat and making suitable provision to safeguard. h. investigating the extent of the adder population and suitable provision to safeguard. 5. Explain how safeguarding requirements will be met on an ongoing basis above these redundant mine workings. 6. Explain specifically how 'undue pressure' on local infrastructure and services will be avoided, particularly highways and schools. Policy B 11f. 7. Explain how this large and overwhelming site will promote peaceful and integrated co-existence given your own site assessment notes that 'the site would not directly assist the aim of social integration' Policy B 11a C and H 23. 8. Explain what constitutes a 'hazardous' site such that a matrix assessment mark of '0' would apply. 9. Explain how this site satisfies gypsy criteria on size, location to services and road network and land quality. 10. Where has the predominance of unauthorised gypsy sites been in the last 5 years? 		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball
<p><i>Thank you very much for this question which raises a number of important matters. The Cabinet will be deciding at this meeting whether to take forward a Preferred Options paper for public consultation in May.</i></p> <p><i>These questions will be taken forward and considered as part of the formal consultation process. A formal decision will be needed to be taken by Cabinet after the Consultation process has been completed.</i></p>		

P 04	Questions from:	Liz Richardson
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the detailed site assessment report - undated - unreferenced - I note that section 6.2, f: states "use of the site MUST have NO harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers". Please can you provide a definition of the word "amenities" in this context. 2. In the detailed site assessment report - undated - unreferenced - Appendix 3 I note the reason for rejection of GT3 - can you justify why GT2 should not also have the same reasoning applied. 3. In the site statement for GT2 - it says "land to the immediate north of Wick Lane is not particularly sensitive" - I'm sure you do not intend this to mean Pensford. Please can you highlight the land area you mean, since Wick Lane runs predominantly North South. 		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball
<p><i>Thank you very much for this question which raises a number of important matters. The Cabinet will be deciding at this meeting whether to take forward a Preferred Options paper for public consultation in May.</i></p> <p><i>These questions will be taken forward and considered as part of the formal consultation process. A formal decision will be needed to be taken by Cabinet after the Consultation process has been completed.</i></p>		

This page is intentionally left blank

The Guild Co-Working Hub

We welcome the Council's initiative in creating the Guild Co-working Hub. It is an idea whose time has come.

However, no one can be in any doubt there is a race on to attract and establish creative, technical and green businesses.

City centres like Bristol are being developed as the new engines of economic growth; the Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone will draw in much large scale investment. It too will be looking for creative, digital media companies to establish themselves there and if we are not careful Bath will be left trailing.

Despite this, Bath is well positioned to make a valuable contribution to the West of England economy by creating the right environment for small, sole proprietor and start up businesses. The city is fortunate in having a compact, walkable city centre ideally suited to ideas based businesses that work so well through informal social contact.

The Guildhall hub is an excellent start but will be no more than a testbed for this kind of commerce; the Council must not lose sight of future development. Once established the hub can inform the shape of sites like Bath Quays and Western Riverside which will be vital in retaining those businesses needing room for expansion.

At the moment I fear that the Council's development plans for these areas are beginning to lag behind those of our neighbours and competitors. When will we see definitive proposals brought forward for these sites?

We have two options before us:-

1. In five years time Bristol will be rapidly moving forwards with its Enterprise Zone, capturing the very types of business we would seek to nurture whilst our plans are still on the drawing board.
2. Or, we too, can have a thriving creative sector, making the West of England and A4 corridor the Country's number one destination for new media and creative businesses.

The development of these creative quarters is being pursued in cities right across the country and the Council needs to make a special effort to ensure it gets its share of this fast growing economic sector.

This page is intentionally left blank

Submission to Cabinet meeting 9 May 2012

Opposition to BaNES proposal to develop the Old Colliery Site, Stanton Wick as a Gypsy, Traveller site.

Speaker Judith Chubb-Whittle, Chair of Stanton Drew Parish Council.

In support of the overwhelming opposition voiced by the residents of Stanton Wick hamlet and Stanton Drew village, at our Parish Public meeting on 2nd May 2012, the parish council vehemently opposes the proposal on the following grounds;

1. The scoring matrix defies logic.
How can a site that was scored 17th out of 23 sites becomes one of the preferred top 7 sites, when alternative sites demonstrated superior access to amenities against the scoring matrix?
2. The proposed 15 permanent pitches & 5 transient pitches will totally dominate the hamlet of 26 dwellings i.e. approx. 60 people, contravening *Planning Policy For Traveller Site* document, March 2012.

Based on *Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites document*, a pitch comprises of an average 1.7 caravans but the DPD recommends using an average of 3 caravans. This could mean an influx of 50 to 100 people into the hamlet putting significant pressure on the local community utilities and services, especially the already faltering mains water supply, with existing properties forced to have independent means of pressure boosting.

3. The DPD states that amenities should be accessible by foot, cycle & public transport within 1500m. The local shop in Pensford is due to close in 5 months' time, financial, retirement reasons. The shop has been on the market for over 2 years. The next shop is over 3 miles away, as is the dentist. The doctors' surgery is 5 miles away. No public transport runs to this site.
4. The scoring matrix does not take into account secondary schools, 4.5 miles away. In consultation with secondary school age travellers, walking to schools & urban areas is important for social integration. So say same age local children in recent Parish plan surveys.
5. Road accessibility – accessing public transport & shop is not ideal to either walk or drive. The lane is narrow, it floods at the bridge, and there are few passing places, no street lighting or pavement.

6. 2011 Filers Coaches[next door to the proposed site] applied for retrospective parking for **8** coaches, which was refused on the grounds of

- ***' inappropriate use of Green Belt'***

It is a Site of Nature Conservation.

- *'vehicle parked...would detract from the openness & rural character of this area'*
- *'local road system, is unsuitable in width, & alignment at junctions.*
- *'location is remote from services & public transport...*
- *Benefits ...clearly do not outweigh the harm by reason of appropriateness.*

Have Highways been consulted?

- 2005 BaNES Economic Development Dept turned down an application on the Old Colliery buildings site as
- *'...not in a sustainable location for a significant employment use...particularly unsuitable for HGV traffic.'*
- Contamination report during winter 2009/10 for the landowner, reported **arsenic concentrations exceeding MRLs**, stating that;
'certain areas are unsuitable for use in garden & landscape areas...600mm of Made ground would need to be removed & replaced'

Thus creating many HGV movements during remediation works.

Asbestos roofs were also noted as a **significant hazard**.

Is this a healthy place to live in? What about long term health issues?

The mine workings are known to be unstable, remediation works are taking place now on one of the shafts.

Has a mine survey been done?

Is this a safe place for people to live?

We fully understand that BaNES needs to provide authorised sites but location of unauthorised sites over the past 10 yrs in BaNES indicates that travelling communities prefer to be near urban areas.

Is it fair on the travellers to PUT them in an unhealthy, unsafe remote ghetto, that will put significant pressure on them and existing inhabitants?

Camerton Parish Council puts forward the following reasons why our Park (Daglands Open Space), is an unsuitable location for development as a Travellers' Site.

The primary reason is the loss of Amenity for young people - the Park is a multi-purpose play, sports and recreational area which meets the objectives of Local Plan Policy (SR1A). This policy has been used as a justification for rejecting other play areas, but not Camerton's.

In the Parish Plan, the children scored the Park as the most valuable asset in Camerton. Under the Pathfinder Scheme the Park was upgraded. The children designed an activity boat which was built & paid for under the scheme. Over £40,000 was spent on the project and significant other monies have also been spent by various organisations. The investment, by young people, in the Park has contributed to a fall in youth anti-social behaviour.

- The Park was provided by a 106 Agreement when Cam Brook Close was built (23.03.92).
- It is located within 50 meters of a major high voltage power line and within 200m of a minor one. Correction of this reduces Camerton's score by 5 and its ranking to 10th.
- A recent traffic survey recorded in excess of 5,000 movements a day on Camerton Hill - many of which were speeding. There is also a permanent width restriction which should further reduce the score by 1.
- The hazards of large vehicles towing caravans, using restrictive roads within a housing estate, are worrying to say the least.
- The Park is adjacent to an estate of 70 houses and is outside the building line. It is situated in a very prominent and high position which dominates the Cam Valley and is overlooked by the Limestone Link (national footpath). Site G3 was rejected because it would have "a significant visual impact and

a substantially adverse impact on the character of the area”, this could equally be applied to Camerton.

But most of all it's our Park – vital to our children's health and well being, vital to our teenagers as a safe space to gather; a place we want to keep, a place we are still improving and developing.

Over 75 children, under the leadership of one young person, have become Active Citizens; they have signed a petition, drawn pictures and written letters of protest which I proudly present to you on their behalf; together with, a Residents Petition signed by over 320 people.

No alternative, suitable land is available for a replacement Park (as required by the National Planning Policy Framework); therefore, Cabinet Members **please** remove Camerton Play Park from the list of proposed Travellers' Sites.

I leave you with the words of 9 year old Aron.

Please do not take our park away,
Or where else will we play?
On the streets with the cars and lorries,
If one of us is injured, you'll be sorry.

We are told to get fit, and go out to play,
How are we going to do that if you take our park away?
This is a plea from the bottom of my heart,
Please do not take away our park.

MY NAME IS PHIL TOWNSHEND, I AM A RESIDENT OF STANTON WICK AND I'M A MEMBER OF THE STANTON WICK ACTION GROUP.

8 OF THE GROUP WILL BE SPEAKING THIS EVENING

AND IN THE 24 MINUTES THAT WE HAVE AVAILABLE TO US WE INTEND TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE PROPOSAL TO LOCATE A TRAVELLERS SITE AT THE OLD COLLIERY BUILDINGS IN STANTON WICK IS FLAWED,

UNSUSTAINABLE

AND NEITHER REPRESENTS THE INTERESTS OF THE TRAVELLERS NOR THE LOCAL COMMUNITY.

MY PARTNER AND I PURCHASED OUR HOUSE IN STANTON WICK IN SEPTEMBER 2011. DURING THE LEGAL PROCESS WE IDENTIFIED VARIOUS PLANNING APPLICATIONS, ONE OF WHICH IN PARTICULAR RELATED TO AN INCREASE OF VEHICLES OPERATING OUT OF A LOCAL COACHYARD.

THERE WERE SEVERAL APPLICATIONS AND REJECTIONS OF WHICH THE MOST RECENT IN NOVEMBER 2011 WAS REJECTED AGAIN ON APPEAL.

IT IS WORTH NOTING THAT ALL THESE APPLICATIONS TO EXTEND A COACHYARD USE BY ONLY 8 VEHICLES WAS BASED ON ;

"INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GREENBELT THAT WOULD DETRACT FROM THE OPENESS AND RURAL CHARACTOR OF THE AREA. IN ADDITION INCREASED TRAFFIC FLOW WOULD RESULT IN CONJESTION AND INCONVENIENCE TO OTHER ROAD USERS AND MENTION WAS ALSO MADE AS TO THE UNSUSTAINABILITY OF THE LOCATION.

REMEMBER THE COACH YARD APPLICATION WAS FOR THE USE OF AN ADDITIONAL 8 VEHICLES !!!

AFTER LENGTHY CONSULTATION WITH OUR LAWYER, WE DECIDED TO PROCEED WITH OUR PURCHASE ON THE BASIS OF STANTON WICK BEING SITUATED WITHIN GREENBELT AND WHERE THE LOCAL AUTHORITY HAD SHOWN ITSELF TO RESPECT THE GREENBELT BY CONTINUALLY REJECTING THESE PLANNING APPLICATIONS.

I AM THEREFORE FINDING IT INCREASINGLY DIFFICULT TO RECONCILE THAT AN ADDITIONAL 8 VEHICLES ARE DEEMED TO BE INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT AND THE INCREASED TRAFFIC WOULD CAUSE CONJESTION AND INCONVENIENCE TO OTHER

ROAD USERS, YET A 15 PERMANENT PITCH TRAVELLER SITE WITH AN ADDITIONAL 5 TRANSIT PITCHES IS DEEMED

APPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT....

AND THE INCREASED TRAFFIC THIS WOULD BRING TO STANTON WICK WOULD NOT CAUSE CONGESTION AND INCONVENIENCE.

FOR THOSE OF YOU WHO DON'T KNOW THE GEOGRAPHY, THE 2 LOCATIONS ARE NEXT DOOR TO EACH OTHER, EVEN SHARING THE SAME POSTCODE !

HOW CAN ONE BE APPROPRIATE YET THE OTHER INAPPROPRIATE ? HOW CAN IT BE THAT ONE WILL PUT A STRAIN ON TRAFFIC IN WICK LANE, YET THE OTHER WILL NOT ?

RECENTLY ISSUED NATIONAL GUIDELINES RELATING TO TRAVELLERS IN THE GREENBELT CLEARLY STATE, AND I QUOTE ;

"INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT IS HARMFUL TO THE GREENBELT AND SHOULD NOT BE APPROVED EXCEPT IN VERY EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES"

"TRAVELLER SITES (TEMPORARY OR PERMANENT) IN THE GREEN BELT ARE INAPPROPRIATE"

BANES, YOUR PROPOSAL IS FLAWED,

YOUR INTERPRETATION IS INCONSISTENT

AND IT WOULD APPEAR THAT YOU ARE PREPARED TO FLY IN THE FACE OF NATIONAL GUIDELINES TO FORCE THIS PROPOSAL ONTO STANTON WICK RESIDENTS. WHATEVER HAPPENED TO LOCALISM ?

THERE ARE NO "VERY EXCEPTION CIRCUMSTANCES".

Statement of Clarke Osborne – on behalf of Stanton Wick Action Group

My Name is Clarke Osborne; I am a resident of Stanton Wick and a member of the Group

I want to briefly examine the scoring matrix that has been applied to this most important and significant process, and has resulted in what we consider to be an unsupportable outcome.

A number of members of our group are well versed and experienced in the use of scoring matrices and have examined the BaNES published information available on the setup and implementation of this process.

In our opinion the scoring matrices as set out are flawed as they do not correctly identify the scoring criteria and allocate inappropriate scoring rates to a number of them.

Examples are;

- Green Belt and Contaminated land are not given a yes/no question (the yes answer would exclude them), yet, outside of the scoring matrix World Heritage was.
- Availability of drainage and proximity to secondary schools was not scored,

Notwithstanding, we consider that the scoring applied in respect of the Stanton Wick site is wrong. The application of what we consider to be appropriate scoring brings the total to minus 8 (your score was 10)

The principle areas of error scoring are;

- Proximity to food shop – no sustainable food shop and no safe walking route
- Proximity to primary school – no safe walking route
- Proximity to public transport – no safe walking route
- Near to hazardous place – it is a hazardous place
- Brownfield land – it is in the Green Belt. There is no definition of Brownfield Land only Prior Developed Land which is strictly controlled within the Green Belt
- Noise – there are 2 properties directly adjacent

Proper account has not been taken of the revised and adopted Government directive in respect of locating Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Green Belt. This explicitly removed the word “normally” and therefore repositioned the directive as being “inappropriate” in the Green Belt.

We also submit that your Maxtrix scoring self assess “no special circumstances” in respect of potential Green Belt location.

120509-CAOSubmission9MayBaNES

Statement of Clarke Osborne – on behalf of Stanton Wick Action Group

Lastly and notwithstanding both of the forgoing we are somewhat bemused and concerned that this site which was placed 17th in the 23 sites assessed suddenly was elevated to the top 7 and your short list, thus completely dismissing the outcome of your scoring matrix.

We question how this has happened, how the scoring and evaluation process has been designed and conducted and if any external influences of politics, discussions with landowners and or Gypsies has influenced this site selection?

We submit that, the assessment process is flawed, the assessment of the Stanton Wick site is flawed and the selection of Stanton Wick to your short list is outside of the criteria set out by yourselves and required by Government.

We urge you to withdrawal this site from your list.

Speaking on behalf of Stanton Wick Action Group. Statement by Chris Ree

Re Staton Wick Colliery Proposed Site: Implications for Local Amenities and Infrastructure

I wish to consider the implications the Stanton Wick proposal on local amenities and infrastructure.

We have consulted the document ‘Govt Planning Policy for Travellers March 2012’ and note that it states that local planning authorities should:

- ❖ **enable access to health, education and welfare and employment infrastructure and to have due regard to protection of local amenity.**
- ❖ **ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest community**
- ❖ **ensure that policies promote integrated coexistence between site and community, and importantly avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services**

It is plain that the Stanton Wick Colliery proposal satisfies none of these criteria:

- Access to Schools
The matrix used in assessment scores the Colliery site as 1. i.e 1.5km to local school via a safe walking route. This is incorrect. There is no safe walking route as described. Access to Pensford requires the use of a minor lane which has a gradient of 1:5, has no lights, no pavement, is mostly single track, has 2 blind 90 degree bends and floods frequently. When icy you take your chances.
- Access to shops
With regard to proximity to a food shop similar considerations apply as the shop and school are very close and for the same reasoning above access via safe walking route is nonexistent and should score 0 and not 1 on the matrix. Furthermore, the above food shop is not capable of providing for a weekly shop. All supermarkets are more than 2.4 miles away and none are on a direct bus route.
- Access to Health : In the matter of access to health facilities the situation is even worse. All surgeries are at least 5 miles away.
- Domination of nearest community: The nearest settled community is Stanton Wick, a hamlet of 26 dwellings and 60 people and so the proposal clearly contravenes this instruction. The proposal for 20 pitches exceeds guidance (Circular JAN 2006), restated in local DPD, which recommends a maximum of 15 pitches and the DPD stated preference for sites of no more than 5 pitches.
- Infrastructure: The sheer size of this proposal will place huge strain on local infrastructure.
 - For schools, it is obvious that a large influx of students would cause disruption to the functioning and character of any local small school.
 - Stanton Wick has a marginal water supply. Doubling the population would take it beyond breaking point.
 - The site may well accommodate individuals of high health need and sited as it is on the periphery of all local practices areas would constitute a major challenge for the provision Primary Health Care.

- The site has no mains sewage. Septic tanks for a site of this size may cause significant contamination of Salters Brook and footpath to the north east. It may be necessary to use tankers with consequences for traffic.
- It is inconceivable that the net effect of all this on local infrastructure will assist 'achieve sustainable development'.

BANES Site Allocation and Development Plan Document states that is essential that sites provide a healthy and safe environment. Sites should therefore not be located on contaminated land.

- The site is contaminated with arsenic. A survey in 2010 revealed levels 'indicating a potentially significant risk to health'. The stated remediation strategy involved removal 60cm of surface soil to be replaced by 15cm of 'clean' topsoil with a geomembrane underneath. It is likely that much of the removed soil will require offsite disposal. It is important to note that the survey was limited to those areas previously built upon and contamination could exist in a wider area.
- In addition above normal levels of Carbon Dioxide in ground gas assessments require protective measures applied to some aspects of residential development. I acknowledge that all of these issues are solvable but the cost of doing so is bound to be very large and some of the recommendations extremely problematic.
- The site is possibly hazardous with respect to soil instability and subsidence.

In summary for this site, walking access to shops and schools is extremely poor, access to drs is worse, there no employment, the site is contaminated and potentially hazardous, the site will dominate and overwhelm the local community and swamp its infrastructure. It is not sustainable, it is extremely poor choice of site and should be removed from consideration.

Chris Ree 8 5 12

My name is Karen Abolkheir I live in Stanton Wick and I'm a member of the Group.

The proposed site is on Wick Lane, a C classified substantially single track road running from the A368 through Stanton Wick straight into Pensford's Conservation Area.

We object to the proposed development of this site as the location and access cannot support any increase in traffic movement for the following reasons:

- The Lane is rural, narrow with few passing places; has no footpath; is unlit, is steep and in wet periods - muddy.
- There are three 90 degree bends with extremely limited visibility causing numerous car accidents.
- The T-junction onto the A368 has very limited visibility and is very dangerous. It has been the subject of many near misses and accidents.
- Access to the A37 at Pensford is difficult at peak times and visibility to the left limited.
- There are 2 old and narrow Bridges on route. A medieval listed bridge in Pensford, and the old Railway Bridge which is cracking and has a propensity to flood. A lorry became stuck on this Bridge & blocked the road for 10 hours.
- Congestion in the Conservation area of Pensford is already high at peak periods.
- The road is not salted and becomes particularly hazardous in winter.
- A Coach depot adjacent to the site already places a heavy traffic burden through to the A368. This has been previously recognised by your Planning Department.
- The Coach depot has had 2 planning applications turned down in the last 2 years and one is still pending.

One of the reasons for refusal was given as "due to an increase in vehicle movements on the road system which is unsuitable to accept additional traffic by reason of its inadequate width, alignment & junction.

In January the owner of the proposed site formally objected to the recent application to extend this Depot quoting increased traffic movements as one of his reasons.

- The lane is regularly used for horse riding, cycling and ramblers and any addition to the traffic must be considered to increase the likelihood of serious accident.

Your own documentation states that the site is heavily constrained by its access and that 'reducing reliance on car travel is an important objective of local and national planning'.

This site is not in a sustainable area for development as all residents in Stanton Wick rely on their cars to access shops and healthcare. Any significant increase in the existing traffic on Wick Lane cannot be accommodated.

In summary our concerns are:

1. The inadequate local road networks and lack of any capacity for safe access onto the A368 & A37
2. The safety of all road users especially vulnerable ones
3. Inconvenience for all road users
4. Noise and pollution increase for residents of Stanton Wick and parts of historic Pensford

And we urge the Cabinet to withdraw this site from the short list immediately.

Thank you

I particularly wish to draw your attention to a point of Procedure and Ethics.

First let me familiarise you with the scale of the proposed site. The area in question is some 10 Hectares - or 25 Acres. It is hard to visualise an area that is so big - let me help - that is approximately 15 football pitches - or for non sporty locals - just under HALF the entire area of Bath's Royal Victoria Park.

A site size that I'm sure you would agree would be daunting in many urban settings and a size that is completely overwhelming in a Hamlet of just 26 houses and 60 people.

Let me also familiarise you with land value. Generally in the green belt area within BaNES good agricultural land could fetch £10,000 per acre if you are lucky enough to find a buyer! The 10 Hectare site in question consists of 2 adjoining titles - the smaller of these only covers the old colliery buildings and has planning consent to restore these for 1 residential dwelling - the significantly larger title covering the bulk of the 10 Hectares is without any planning consent it is a mining spoil heap and will therefore have a significantly lower land value than good agricultural land.

Anyone living within our Green Belt know it is nearly impossible to get planning consent for even a modest 'In Keeping' extension - and thus most landowners accept that land will not have any planning potential.

The PROCESS that BaNES will take any remaining sites into after this 8 week consultation provides a means for PRIVATE landowners to get planning permission on land that previously would have been deemed unsuitable for development and thus gives them the potential to vastly increase the land value. All at the cost of BaNES taxpayers.

Cabinet

Can you assure BaNES taxpayers that we will not be exploited by landowners who may be using your planning process to inflate the value of their land and who at a 'convenient' moment could withdraw from the the process with planning consent - leaving you with 'political egg on your faces' and themselves with a hugely inflated land value.

What process do you have in place to lock in landowners to ensure that this CAN NOT HAPPEN?

This page is intentionally left blank

My name is Sue Osborne; I am a resident of Stanton Wick and a member of the Group

I want to briefly consider the aspects of social cohesion and matters of heritage

In considering this site as a serious option there is an obligation on BANES to consider the risks and threats to the social cohesion and peaceful and integrated co-existence between the travelling community and the local settled communities. (Policy B 11a refers).

If this site were to proceed, planning permission will not have been applied equally, the travellers benefitting from permissions never available to local landowners for residential development beyond the existing building footprint, or even a few extra coaches for Filers. It would be quite natural for any settled community to feel this is unjust and discriminatory.

The village C road cannot safely sustain any traffic increases. The consequence of burdening the road further will be heightened, when increases in traffic cause additional stress to road users and pedestrians. This will naturally result in angst, frustration and tension as cars, other vehicles and sundry paraphernalia emerge from this segregated development.

Social cohesion cannot be fostered when any new community overwhelms the existing community, imposing an alternate culture and ethos, placing pressure on the amenities of the community; be it driving or walking safely around these tiny villages.

In addition there is concern about the natural consequences to the character and ethos of the small village schools endeavoring to cater for cultural shifts. Stanton Drew is particularly tiny.

These communities identify strongly with their mining heritage and agree with BANES own Pensford Conservation Area Appraisal which acknowledges 'the council has a duty to pay special attention to preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in exercising planning powers'. The Appraisal recognises the special character of the area in which the local people live.

There was wholehearted support for the restoration of both substantial properties, The Winding House and The Bath House, part of Broadoak Colliery (Old Colliery as you refer to it).

This site is symbolic of our local history and heritage - it played a significant part in the North Somerset Coalfield operations.

How can social cohesion be encouraged and fostered if this site is handed over for the proposed development with complete disregard to BANES own assessment of its historical importance and their acknowledged responsibilities as an Authority.

Your report says 'the site would not directly assist the aim of social integration' We fully agree, and go further, in that we can see a high risk of tension emanating from the areas that I have briefly addressed .

Very special circumstances indeed.

On behalf of the settled communities who have voiced their objection through the petitions, we strongly urge you to remove this site from your short list.

Thank you

Statement of Jennie Jones – on behalf of Stanton Wick Action Group

My name is Jennie Jones, I am a resident of Pensford and a member of the Stanton Wick Action Group.

Only two weeks ago Banes published a shortlist of seven proposed gypsy/traveller sites, one of these sites being the Old Colliery, Stanton Wick.

We are very concerned and are seeking legal advice on the issues that no prior consultation on the site finding process has been undertaken and that the publication of the short list was only circulated to Parish Councils 12 working days before this evenings meeting.

Stanton Wick Action Group was quickly formed to ensure that the communities of Stanton Wick, Pensford and Stanton Drew were fully informed, had access to all available information and knew how to make their opinions and concerns known to this meeting.

We wrote to all residents providing background information and set up a website which we have populated with all of the information that we have been able to collect in the time available. We also provided residents with information how they can effectively communicate their opinions.

Two open meetings were called, one in Pensford on 28th April and the other in Stanton Drew on 2nd May. Both village halls were completely full. Over 500 residents attended the two meetings.

Both meetings discussed and debated the information announced by BaNES together with background information on both the consultation process to date and the site selection process and results.

Both meetings were unanimous in the view that the selection of this site is both misguided and is not sustainable – it is simply bad planning and should be withdrawn from the list at this meeting.

Cllr Jeremy Sparks attended and spoke in full support at both meetings.

We have undertaken a house by house personal contact petition collection and on behalf of those signing I present to you this evening, three petitions, which have been taken in the communities of Pensford/Publow, Stanton Wick and Stanton Drew.

All three petitions call on you the Cabinet Committee of BaNES to remove Stanton Wick from the shortlist of 7 proposed sites and avoid further time, expense and delay whilst this

Statement of Jennie Jones – on behalf of Stanton Wick Action Group

site, which comprises the largest number of pitches in the proposals, fails on further consultation and planning.

The result of the personal contact and petition which has by necessity been undertaken in less than a week;

In Stanton Wick – 100% of households signed

In Stanton Drew – ~~xx~~% of households visited signed *over 95%*

In Pensford/Publou – well over 90% of households signed

We have come across only two households who are actively in favour of the site.

Each of the signatures to these petitions has been provided with information (not rumour or speculation). These are not signatures which have been coerced or trivialised and I trust this Committee will recognise them as such.

They represent the overwhelming voice and wishes of the residents of these settled communities and we hope and trust that they will be heard and the Committee will act.

You say you listen to the public – we sincerely hope this is the case.

Thank you

The site at Pensford Colliery is unsuitable under both the national guidelines and the matrix. A generous score of 10 out of 47, equivalent to 2 out of 10, suggests that there is little to be gained from referring this site to consultation but there is another more subtle reason for turning it down.

National guidelines describe permanent traveller sites as harmful and inappropriate development in the green belt. They are only to be allowed under "very special circumstances." The use of the word very and the removal of the word normally from the latest issue of this guidance tells us that it is to be interpreted narrowly and will only be found to apply in extremely restricted circumstances.

The council asserts that the lack of traveller sites in BANES, the need for them to be provided and the relative scarcity of non green belt land (the council area is roughly 2/3rds green belt) constitutes very special circumstances. But think for a moment what that position if upheld would mean for the area. Firstly we need to realise that there is very little development that is forbidden in the green belt. Wind farms, waste incinerators, large scale housing development are all theoretically possible but only in very special circumstances or words to that effect. If the council are found to have very special circumstances purely as a result of the makeup of the council area, which will not change, and subjective assessment that a project is required the effect would be extraordinary. It will be the end of effective green belt protection from council initiatives in Bath and North East Somerset. If you think I am exaggerating consider this. Who cannot conceive of social housing, wind farms or sewage treatment plants being put forward as meeting a pressing need? Indeed all forms of development serve a purpose and address a need. The council are not even legally obliged to provide traveller pitches and yet you still perceive there to be a need that qualifies as very special circumstances.

This exemption won't exist for us. It will take two years for them to pass the extension in rubble stone to mirror the local vernacular but for the council the door will be open on all green belt land throughout the county.

Nor could it be claimed that the site is so good that it contributes to very special circumstances. We have just heard how it contravenes practically every guideline on the provision of traveller sites. It is too large, too remote, the infrastructure could not cope and it is probably contaminated.

It is hard to imagine a judge accepting an interpretation that lifted the effects of national legislation from the council based on nothing more than the arbitrary location of its boundary. That such an exemption could even be sought would I suspect leave many voters angry and annoyed.

The open countryside of BANES is as much a part of the beauty and character of this area as the city it protects. We look to our representatives in council to respect this when making their choices, to take their time and only fill your quota for traveller sites as and when sites that are actually suitable become available.

Statement – Mary Walsh Joint Chair, Whitchurch Village Action Group

Whitchurch Village Action Group Parcel 7100 Woollard Lane Whitchurch

The Green Belt at Whitchurch Village has been under pressure from governments and developers for many years now Locals have told us they wish the green belt to be maintained and protected.

We have taken our awareness stands to many venues – Bristol Balloon Fiesta Bath & West show, WI meetings, Parish Councils, car boot sales, village fêtes. We sent information to the residents of Whitchurch Village. The response has been overwhelmingly in support of maintaining the green belt – over 6000 people have responded to our stands. 69% of Whitchurch village residents replied and told us they wanted to protect the green belt from development.

The Prime Minister, David Cameron has publicly reassured the nation that the green belt will be protected. The national planning policy framework states at Policy E Travellers Sites in green belt Point 14. Inappropriate development is harmful to the green belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Travellers Sites (temporary or permanent) in the green belt are inappropriate development. Local government minister, Bob Neil, has hardened the planning policy to safeguard the green belt by further saying Travellers Sites are inappropriate in the green belt and local opinion must be taken into account.

In your own local authority core strategy spatial options 4 point 3 states – retain the green belt.

Since 1978 this Local Authority has refused planning permission for this site three times deeming it unsuitable therefore why the council would now decide to double the number of pitches on this unsuitable site. The location has not changed although trees have been removed and hedges cut back to give the appearance of a well maintained site it doesn't take away from the fact that this is in the green belt. The Site has never had a permanent building as stated by the Inspector In 1982 upon the expiry of a temporary licence it was still referred to as a green belt land The inspector in 2009 referred to the site as Green Belt We ask when did this become brownfield and who was responsible for change. We therefore dispute that this is Brownfield land and would ask you to amend the scoring accordingly.

My colleague will talk to you about the highways and core strategy observations and in the meantime I would respectfully ask you to remove this site from your options list.

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Peter Duppa-Miller

To: Cabinet

Reference: G3200.

Date: 9 May 2012.

GYSIES, TRAVELLERS and TRAVELLING SHOW PEOPLE.

- 1. I am Peter Duppa-Miller, the Secretary of the B&NES Local Councils Association and also the Clerk to Combe Hay Parish Council.**
- 2. Taking into account the detailed caravan counts in B&NES between July 2009 and January 2012, it is recommended that the West of England Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment 2007 be reviewed forthwith, in order to establish a more reliable basis for the current process of preparing the B&NES Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People Site Allocations Development Plan Document.**
- 3. It is also recommended that further suitable land (particularly land to the far south of the District and thus not in the Bristol/Bath Green Belt) should be identified and assessed.**
- 4. These two actions, taken together, might very well do away with the need to put forward sites in the Green Belt, which not only contravenes paragraph 14 of DCLG's "Planning Policy for Traveller Sites" dated March 2012 but also for which the "very special circumstances" argument is, inevitably, weak - if not specious.**
- 5. Turning to site GT.7 (the land between the Former Fullers Earth Works and the (soon to be expanded) Park and Ride site - which is in Combe Hay Parish, not in Bath) – please amend both the assessment and the reason for rejection to include "because it is heavily undermined and hence unstable and also because it was used for landfill for many years and hence is very severely contaminated, this land is NOT SUITABLE for development as a Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Show People site".**

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement to Cabinet by Tony Marwood, Clutton PC

Councillors, although we are not one of the 7 sites shortlisted, I wish to comment on behalf of Clutton PC on our inclusion as a potential site.

GTTSP people suffer with bad health, low life expectancy, get few services and facilities, so following last year's call for sites, it was clear that Clutton did not have any sites that fulfilled the need from within the Parish. Similarly, their plight cannot be improved or even stabilised by living in a rural community which has little or no local facilities whatsoever, and that's not just in Clutton, but most Villages across B&NES.

From the 'Site Scoring Matrix' :-

- The nearest full sized shop is Tesco's at Midsomer Norton, and that is in miles away, not metres.
- A safe route to the School rates 3, this is completely wrong as there is no safe route to the school. The road has no pavements.
- The Doctors Surgery is 1.4 miles away, this again is only reached by roads with no pavements.
- Transport Node value of 3 relates to a bus from outside the Post Office which only runs once a day with a 30 minute stay in Bath. This is not a meaningful service. In any event the Bus Stop can only be reached by a road with no pavements.
- Site Screening is 1, but the matrix has completely omitted the Public Right of Way CL6/7 which runs diagonally across the site, and negates any screening or privacy.
- Classing the Flood Risk as 0 is untrue, the site regularly swamps, and is very difficult to negotiate without wellingtons as is well known by those who use the footpath. It is bordered by two streams, and often resembles the Glastonbury Festival on a bad year. It is damp, and there is no evacuation of the surface water.
- Contaminated Land rates 0, but this site was the run-off from the Clutton Sewage Works which existed up until the 1970's when a pumping station was installed. There will be resultant containments, and any new foul water, sewage, or oil from servicing vehicles has to be pumped back to the pumping station, or discharged straight into the streams bordering the site.
- 5 for Hazardous Place ignores the immediate proximity to the sewage pumping station.

- If safe access to Highways scores 5, why then did the owner of the land, which is the only access to this site, and which needs his permission to cross, have a planning application turned down because of the dangerous access onto the highway.
- Adequate Turning scores 1, but is compromised by the proximity of the Public Footpath.
- Contrary to scoring 1, the existing road network cannot cope with additional vehicles especially Vans and Caravans, there are very narrow country lanes throughout the village where two cars have difficulty passing.

I am unsure how wide B&NES has cast its net in its Site search, but other than the site is B&NES free land, we can see no merit whatsoever in considering it. May we suggest that there are many potential sites along the old Bath Bristol Midland Railway route, and along the Avon River corridor, which can deliver the opportunities needed, and which would provide ready accessibility to all the essential facilities and services that are so important to the welfare of these members of our society.

Thank you for listening, and hopefully you now recognise just how totally unsuitable Clutton is. Lastly, I ask that our rejection which says "The site should not be allocated due to the impact on the wider landscape" is replaced with the words "This land is NOT SUITABLE for use as a GTTSP site".

FOR CHRISTINE SAUNDERS Re Parcel Land 7100 Woollard Lane Whitchurch

I WOULD ASK THAT THIS SITE BE TAKEN OFF YOUR OPTIONS LIST. IT IS FELT THAT THIS OPTION FOR A TRAVELLERS SITE AT WHITCHURCH VILLAGE IS OBVIOUSLY INAPPROPRIATE BECAUSE IT IS WITHIN THE GREEN BELT BUT THE FOLLOWING OBSERVATIONS ALSO DEMONSTRATE ITS UNSUITABILITY.

FIRSTLY THIS SITE WAS REFUSED BY BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL THREE TIMES, WHO OBVIOUSLY DEEMED THIS SITE UNSUITABLE BUT UNDER APPEAL WAS GIVEN A **TEMPORARY** ONLY LICENCE UP TO 2015 TO ALLOW OTHER SITES TO BE ESTABLISHED.

IN YOUR CORE STRATEGY, IN YOUR ISSUES AND OPTIONS EVALUATION THIS SITE SCORES 19 and not 30 AND INDEED THE LOCAL PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT 2.7 DEEMS THIS SITE UNSUITABLE FOR 5 REASONS

1 IT DOES NOT HAVE GOOD ACCESS TO LOCAL SERVICES, FACILITIES ETC OTHER THAN BY CAR.

2 THE ACCESS IS ONTO AN EXTREMELY BUSY ROAD WITH NO FOOTPATH

3 IT WILL IMPACT ON A MAIN A37 ARTERIAL ROUTE INTO BRISTOL

4 ESSENTIAL SERVICES LACKING

5 THIS SITE IS WITHIN 1000 METRES OF A HIGH PRESSURE GAS MAINPIPE WHICH SURELY CONSTITUTES A HAZARD.

AGAIN CORE STRATEGY POLICY CP11

- A. ALL SERVICES, SHOPS, SURGERIES, EMPLOYMENT, NEED A CAR
- D. IMPACT ON THE MAIN A37 ARTERIAL ROUTE INTO BRISTOL
- E. SEWAGE, ESSENTIAL SERVICES ARE LACKING

FINALLY, THIS DEVELOPMENT IS OUTSIDE THE HOUSING BOUNDARY FOR WHITCHURCH VILLAGE AND AS THIS COUNCIL HAS ALREADY THREE TIMES REFUSED PERMISSION FOR THIS SITE CAREFUL CONSIDERATION MUST BE GIVEN BEFORE ANY INTENTION TO DOUBLE THE SIZE OF THIS TEMPORARY SITE. MOST IMPORTANTLY IT IS WITHIN THE GREEN BELT.

I WOULD ASK THAT THIS SITE IS TAKEN OUT OF YOUR OPTIONS SHORT LIST.

This page is intentionally left blank

I am very concerned about the Banes proposal to create 9 permanent traveller's pitches on Camerton Play Park.

As a primary school teacher in a local school, in fact having taught many children that live in Camerton at present I find it extremely surprising that Banes would even consider removing such a facility, in reality disadvantaging our local children. I have recently attended the launch of the Director of Public Health Award, an award developed locally to encourage local children and young people to adopt healthy lifestyles- of which a key element is raising their activity level. At the launch of this award one of your cabinet ministers, Nathan Hartley, spoke very eloquently about his own experiences as an overweight young adult. This valued award replaces a national scheme 'Healthy Schools', which was a victim of central government cutbacks. However, Banes decided to champion this cause by prioritizing the health of our young people. The latest health profile for Banes shows that 17% of our 10 and 11 year olds are obese? So I ask you councillors, how can our one and only safe and well used play park possibly be considered for redevelopment into a traveller's site. Local people have worked together to develop, use and to secure its future. I ask you to reconsider and to put the health and well being of our children first. As the famous children's author AA Milne says, "A bear however hard he tries grows tubby without exercise".

Thank you for your consideration.

Alison Ginty

This page is intentionally left blank

Re: Stanton Wick site proposals

I WOULD LIKE TO TALK ABOUT HOW THIS PROPOSED TRAVELLER SITE WILL AFFECT MY CHILDREN, AS WE ACTUALLY LIVE ACROSS THE VERY NARROW LANE TO THIS SITE.

WE MADE A LIFESTYLE CHOICE 9 YRS AGO TO LIVE WITHIN COUNTRY SIDE TO PROVIDE OUR CHILDREN WITH A QUIET, HAPPY AND SAFE LIFE WHICH UP TILL NOW WE HAVE ACHEIVED(MY DAUGHTERS ARE 9 & 7).

BY ALLOWING A POSSIBLE 240+ PEOPLE (20 PITCHES, 60 CARAVANS, 4 PER VAN) TO MOVE INTO OUR 60 PEOPLE HAMLET WOULD I FEEL CAUSE EXTREME UPSET TO MY CHILDRENS LIVES.

THEIR EDUCATION WILL SUFFER AS THEY ARE CURRENTLY IN A SMALL SCHOOL WITH ONLY 69 PUPILS AND 12 STAFF IN A VERY OLD AND SMALL BUILDING SO THE EXTRA CHILDREN THIS SITE WILL INCURR WILL PUT THE SCHOOL UNDER IMMENSE STRAIN . THE ADDITION OF ONLY 14 RECEPTION PUPILS THIS SEPTEMBER WILL FORCE YEARS 2,3&4 INTO ONE CLASS AS IT IS

THEY ARE PART OF A SMALL TIGHTKNIT COMMUNITY AND ARE KNOWN AS INDIVIDUALS, NOT JUST ANOTHER ANNONYMUS KID PROVIDING A SAFE ENVIROMENT

FINALLY THE EXTRA TRAFFIC THIS AMOUNT OF PEOPLE WOULD CREATE IS BOTH UNSAFE AND UNHEALTHY AS OUR HOUSE IS CLOSE TO THE ROAD WHICH RAISES CONCERN OF CARS ACTUALLY COLLIDING WITH OUR HOUSE AND FUMES COMMING THROUGH OPEN WINDOWS, NOT TO MENTION WALKING ALONG THE LANE WILL BE IMPOSSIBLE WITH ALL THE EXTRA TRAFFIC(CURRENTLY WE ARE LUCKY TO SEE 20 CARS ALL DAY) YES IT REALLY IS THAT QUIET.

ALTHOUGH I HAVE SPOKEN REGARDING MY CHILDREN OBVIOUSLY THIS APPLIES TO ALL LOCAL CHILDREN INCLUDING THE ONES UNFORTUNATE ENOUGH TO END UP ON THIS MOST UNSUITABLE SITE.

This page is intentionally left blank

Firstly, the comments and observations contained in this statement only represent the thoughts my husband and I.

I am saddened that as a resident of Stanton Wick, I have not been notified or invited to join any previous discussions regarding the proposed Travelers site, unlike BANES, the landowner and Traveler representatives

Due to the extremely low and dubious score achieved regarding the site suitability exercise, I am very concerned that even at this early stage, there appears to be a desperation on the part of BANES to see this site become there answer to a contentious issue, whilst showing little or no regard to the Travellers true requirements and government planning criteria. BANES appears to have its own agenda

I believe the Call for Land from private owners was a mistake that could lead the Council to become embroiled in a huge number of driving issues regarding the reasons behind such an offer, including neighborly disputes.

Clearly at present, the bulk of this land has a very low value, as after all it is made up of an industrial dumping ground, liable to be heavily contaminated. The planning consent held by the owner covers only around 10 percent of the total proposed travelers site. It also contains a raft of costly conditions including the remediation of arsenic contamination. Others pointing toward fine restoration details clearly suggest that this building has an architectural value. The conversion of this site in my view would run into many hundreds of thousands of pounds, which given the current financial climate would

have a significant effect on the sites true current value as it stands.

The site is advertised at present for £1.25 million, which in my opinion clearly constitutes a paper exercise.

As mentioned the Planning consent referred to by the officer in her appraisal only covers an area of around 10 percent of the total site which is made up of 2 separate land registry titles. The fact that the current planning consent has been linked by BANES to suggest that it covers the whole site is at best a mistake, at worst a totally misleading statement. Indeed, it is debatable to suggest that most of the land could even be called brown field due to its undeveloped state.

The consulted travelers involved obviously have there own view as to why this site seems so attractive but they deserve a sustainable quality of life that must override all other considerations that bare no relationship to the written criteria contained in the West of England Gypsy Travellers Accommodation Assessment and the site scoring matrix. Why else carry out such exercises.

A syndic could easily be forgiven for thinking that BANES, the land owner and the consulted travelers all have motives to propel the sites popularity, most of which will not be found in any written policy or criteria. Fortunately, I have full faith in the central government policies regarding this issue and as a BANES taxpayer insist on their proper interpretation and implementation. If this is not the case, a judicial review will no doubt result.

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement Against The Old Colliery Site, Stanton Wick being Suitable as a site for Gypsies and Travellers

Councillor Ball, Fellow Cabinet Members, Mr Trigwell, we were all (bar Ms Beath) at this meeting two months ago.

At that time, we listened to the emotive words of **two** residents from Oldfield Park who described the huge detrimental change in their area that has occurred during the last 10 years as it has become increasingly populated by students. We also heard a passionate description from Councillor June Player about the destruction of the local community spirit and, I quote from your minutes that she

‘ was despondent about the lifestyle clashes which made life unhappy for some families.’

I do empathise, I too would not wish to be totally surrounded by students, but this has happened due to natural market forces. Measures have now become available to you that are designed to curb the density of these HMO properties and it should be noted by all present today , that the Cabinet voted unanimously to implement these measures to protect ‘The City of Bath’ from further studentification. It should also be noted that two of the four wards most affected by studentification are Twerton (Mr Ball’s ward) and Westmoreland (any guesses ?I’ll help you -Mrs Ball’s ward !).

I lived in Stanton Wick for nineteen years, it is a tiny hamlet of 26 houses in green belt. If you vote to continue to include this site on your preferred list, for reasons that are increasingly obvious to anyone who hears of the full facts, I feel able to accuse you all of duplicity. This site does not present as suitable on planning policy or history grounds and if you vote to pursue this option you will perhaps unwittingly be conniving with a man whose greed, malevolence and dishonourable behaviour is without doubt.

Do as you have done for the student matter, reduce the density of what is not wanted en masse , spread the gypsy sites out around the Authority in small groups onto areas where their overt **‘lifestyle clashes’** can do minimal social harm or cause very limited financial loss to the existing tax paying residents

So as a Banes rate payer, I ask you to save my money that would be spent on legal costs by taking this further. My former neighbours and friends in Stanton Wick, conveniently 12 miles from Bath, do not deserve this treatment but I know for sure that if you choose to fight them, they will fight this every step of the way.

Is this Democracy or Hypocrisy?

Thank you –Jacqui Darbyshire

My name is Ashton Broad, Chairman of Whitchurch Parish Council and I am presenting a statement agreed by the Parish Council.

In the latest Communities and Local Government Planning policy for traveller sites it clearly states under Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt 14.

‘Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.’

We therefore have concerns that several of the preferred sites are situated within the Green Belt, which we feel should be preserved at all costs. We do not think that there are very special circumstances to even consider any of the sites within the Green Belt.

We question how the criteria for the sites has been used, as we have found several discrepancies in the marks awarded to individual sites. i.e. points being awarded for safe access to public transport when there are no footpaths. We find it difficult to understand how some sites have been allocated as brownfield when they are clearly in the Green Belt. Is the council able to change a site from Green Belt to brownfield without notifying anyone?

Why has the council used the scoring matrix to then find that many of the sites were unsuitable in the first place? We find it inconsistent that brownfield sites with a high number of points have been excluded from the final list of suggested locations. We would like more information on these rejected sites.

We are also concerned that the previous history of the sites has obviously not been taken into consideration and question whether enough in depth studies have taken place by the council.

There seems to be inconsistency in many of the council’s planning decisions as site GT.1 has been refused by B&NES on four previous occasions in line with other local planning applications in the area, as it is set in the Green Belt and on this basis and on behalf of Whitchurch Parish Council I ask that this site be withdrawn from the list of sites considered as appropriate for public consultation.

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement – Cllr David Veale

Gipsies and Travellers Site Allocation Development Plan Document

The Daglands Open Space Camerton

Thank you Chairman for allowing me to make this statement to the Cabinet.

1. This statement is not particularly detailed, but is intended to provide my full support to those submitted by representatives of the Parish.
2. It is understood that BANES has a responsibility to provide these sites as included in the submitted Core Strategy, which is at this time under consideration. I understand the commitment in this document is to allocate 22 pitches.
3. To be realistic wherever the sites are to be located the public reaction/perception will not be good. All the sites will be judged for one reason or another as not being suitable.
4. I understand the documents produced have been done so in good faith. For my part however the reasons for the inclusion of particular sites has not been done so with the same consistency and/or base lines. In addition it would appear as if the sites under consideration at this time have been adopted as a result of individual opinions rather than policies and guide lines. An example being that integration of travellers in the community would be more likely if site A was adopted as opposed to site B.
5. The choice of the Daglands play area is in itself most unfortunate. As it will deprive the local children of this important facility and furthermore the proposed use will attract more youngsters. The removal of this play area will be in contradiction to the policy of Sport England which you will be aware is intending to invest over 1 billion pound to encourage young people to maintain a sporting habit and improve health.
6. The main entrance to the site is not sufficient to allow free passage to the type of vehicles expected. It is understood that alternative more suitable access is not available.
7. The site topography i.e. steep slopes and uneven ground will result in excessive development costs.
8. The highway access within the estate is far from suitable with parked vehicles and the presence of children. In addition the extra traffic at the junction with the main highway would further aggravate an already dangerous route.

In conclusion, the recent meeting convened by the Parish Council, resulted in the School Hall being filled to capacity. I would confirm the debate was sound and constructive expressing the general concerns of the residents. In addition in common with other councillors I have been inundated with emails expressing similar views. Given the above I would request that you consider the submissions from Camerton and urge the Cabinet to delete the site from your proposals when the opportunity arises.

Thank you again for listening to me.

This page is intentionally left blank

PUBLOW WITH PENSFORD PARISH COUNCIL

**OBJECTION TO PROPOSAL BY BATH AND NORTH EAST
SOMERSET COUNCIL TO DEVELOP SITE AT THE OLD COLLIERY
STANTON WICK**

SUBMISSION TO CABINET MEETING TO BE HELD ON 9 MAY 2012

**SPEAKER: JOHN KELLY, PUBLOW WITH PENSFORD PARISH
COUNCIL**

My name is John Kelly and I am a member of Publow with Pensford Parish Council

The residents of our parish are unanimous against the proposal to include Stanton Wick as a proposed site for Gypsies and Travellers.

We support Stanton Drew Parish Council in this matter. We also support the Stanton Wick Action Group.

We are alarmed, we are horrified and we are angry about what would appear, at the very least, to be non adherence to due process by Bath and North East Somerset Council. The inclusion of Stanton Wick contradicts what BANES have published previously. It is obvious that the Stanton Wick site is totally unsuitable yet somehow has been selected or more accurately preselected by BANES. The evidence confirms this.

In the Council's own document, Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD), the scoring mechanism is quoted as '..... a sequential approach to indicate the most suitable and sustainable sites. High scoring sites will be put forward as preferred options for allocation in the next consultation document' Stanton Wick is not a high scoring site –it scored low – it scored only a hopeful 10. The highest score was 45 and the average score 20. It came 17th out of 23. Why is it even being considered?

In the same document, the Council said and I quote 'Gypsy and Traveller sites are normally considered inappropriate development of Green Belt land'. Stanton Wick is on the Green Belt. So why is it even being considered?

In the same document, the Council said and I quote 'Developments should respect the scale of the environment and not dominate the nearest settled community.....' The nearest settled community would be dwarfed and dominated many times if the proposal goes ahead. Why is it even being considered then?

There is another example of Stanton Wick being targeted by BANES. A planning application by neighbouring Filers Coaches was rejected as 'inappropriate' in the Green Belt yet this application involved fewer vehicles, fewer vehicle movements and much fewer people. The local road system is again I quote BANES 'unsuitable to accept additional traffic'. Why is this site even being considered?

The inevitable conclusion therefore is that BANES have preselected the Stanton Wick site. Why? I do accept that BANES did not proactively seek out suitable – to all parties – land. They merely waited for sites to come to them. But in no way should Stanton Wick be the scapegoat for BANES' lack of professionalism.

I therefore urge the Cabinet to reject this deeply flawed and it has to be said profoundly biased proposal.

Site	Site Size (ha)	Estimated Pitch Provision	Nearest Primary School	Number of Places	Number on Roll as at January 2012	Nearest Co-educational Secondary School	Number of Places	Number on Roll as at January 2012
Radstock Infant School Canteen, Radstock	0.05	2	Trinity (approx. 0.3 miles)	210	200	Writhlington (approx. 1.3 miles)	1225	1209
Land near Ellsbridge House, Keynsham	0.3	-	Chandag I & Chandag J (approx. 0.8 miles)	180 272	172 262	Wellsway (approx. 0.8 miles)	1050	1053
Parcel 7100, Woollard Lane, Whitchurch	0.51	2	Whitchurch (approx. 0.6 miles)	210	193	Broadlands (approx. 3.2 miles)	1085	762
Station Road, Newbridge	0.3	1 TS	Newbridge (approx. 0.4 miles)	420	438	Oldfield (approx. 1 mile)	960	715
Lower Bristol Road, Twerton	0.72	15 Transit	Newbridge (approx. 1 mile)	420	438	Oldfield (approx. 1.1 miles)	960	715
The Daglands open space, Camerton	0.47	-	Camerton (approx. 0.3 miles)	70	22	Writhlington (approx. 3.2 miles)	1225	1209
Old Colliery Buildings, Stanton Wick	2.5 (10.12)	15 & 5 Transit	Stanton Drew (approx. 1 mile)	70	48	Chew Valley (approx. 4.1 miles)	980	973

Number of Places has been determined by multiplying the Planned Admission Number by 7 in the case of primary schools, 3 for infant schools, 4 for junior schools and 5 for secondary schools.

Distance measured by walking route. All measurements are approximate.

This page is intentionally left blank