

# BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

## CABINET

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

Wednesday, 13th June, 2012

### 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

### 1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

### 2 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

### 3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

### 4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

There were none.

### 5 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

### 6 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 4 questions from the following people: Councillors John Bull, Brian Webber, Tim Warren, Patrick Anketell-Jones.

*[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.]*

## **7 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS**

Judith Chubb-Whittle (Chair, Stanton Drew Parish Council) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website*] argued that there were a number of unanswered questions and that the selection process for possible sites had been deeply flawed.

Clarke Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website*] urged the Cabinet to find a lasting solution which would not bring harm to local communities.

Rosemary Collard (Snapdragons Nurseries Ltd) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website*] in which she asked the Cabinet to reconsider the inclusion of the Ellsbridge House site which she explained was unsuitable for a number of reasons.

All the other registered speakers opted to make their statements at the relevant agenda item.

## **8 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

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

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> May 2012 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **9 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET**

There were none.

## **10 CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES**

Councillor Malcolm Hanney, a member of the Planning, Transport and Environment PDS Panel, introduced the Panel's recommendations which had been distributed with the Agenda pack.

Councillor Tim Ball responded by thanking all those who had attended to make their point about the issue. He thanked the Panel for their consideration and for the recommendations they had made. He assured the Panel that their comments would be taken fully into consideration at the September Cabinet, when the issue was scheduled for further debate.

## **11 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

There were none

## **12 ROSSITER ROAD SCHEME DESIGN**

Richard Wales (Chair, Rossiter Road Sub-Committee, The Widcombe Association) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website*] supported the proposals unreservedly. He also supported the replacement of the traffic signals by a mini roundabout.

Donald Thomas (Greenway Residents Association) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website*] broadly supported the scheme but asked for some changes to be made which he said would not prejudice Widcombe Parade but would minimise the impact on Lyncombe Hill and Greenway Lane.

Councillor Charles Gerrish in an *ad hoc* statement supported the proposals in principle but expressed some concerns, especially over the contention that there would be “only 10%” increase in traffic. He asked whether the issues relating to the HGV ban and traffic changes on Dorchester Street had been fully considered.

Darth Jarrett (Chair of the Bath Taxi Drivers association), in an *ad hoc* statement, said that he could foresee problems around Widcombe if stopping places were blocked by members of the public and the taxi driver had no way of getting back to the spot.

Councillor Roger Symonds responded to Councillor Gerrish’s comments by confirming that the Cabinet had considered the possibility of increased extra traffic flows in coming to its preferred scheme. He also assured Councillor Gerrish that the HGV aspects of the scheme were an 18-month trial, and would be evaluated after that period. He thanked the steering group for their hard work in preparing the proposals.

Councillor Symonds responded to the reservations about Greenway Lane by saying that the primary aim of the proposals had been to improve the Widcombe Parade environment; and it was not the Cabinet’s intentions to create a rat run in the Greenway Lane area. He promised to look again at this aspect of the detailed scheme.

He said that the proposal he was making to Cabinet was different from the printed recommendations in that he was moving the first option in paragraph 2.3; and he was adding a clause which would ask the steering group to reconvene to see the project forward.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He was delighted to see the issues tackled at last. He felt that the proposals would improve traffic flows around Widcombe Parade and the whole surrounding area.

Councillor David Bellotti said he was hopeful that a scheme would be implemented which would benefit the area including local businesses. He reminded the Cabinet that they had inherited the problems but had limited funds with which to resolve them. He thanked the Widcombe Association for the 5 key points they had contributed to the debate and observed that Cabinet had adopted all 5 of them. He felt that the problem of rat runs would be reduced by the traffic calming measures being proposed. He emphasised that by working closely with local residents, the Cabinet had come up with a scheme which would remove 80% of the traffic from Widcombe Parade.

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

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that The Rossiter Road Scheme is progressed in line with the Steering Group's recommendations namely that:

(i) A 4 vehicle "drop off" layby is provided in Rossiter Road to provide improved access to Bath Spa Railway Station;

(ii) Cars and light traffic travelling east should be allowed to access Lyncombe Hill direct from Rossiter Road by a revised junction arrangement;

(iii) The mature tree behind Claverton Buildings could be retained by redesigning the approach to the new signal controlled junction at the western end of Widcombe Parade (subject to detailed design);

(2) To NOTE that the above resolution accords with the recommendations from the report on public consultation attached as Appendix 1 to the report;

(3) To AGREE that the proposed traffic signals at the White Hart junction be replaced with mini roundabouts, and note that the risk of increased congestion is mitigated by works that would facilitate the installation of traffic signals at a late date should they prove to be necessary.

(4) To ASK the Steering Group to reconvene in order that it can be involved in further progress of the scheme.

### 13 VICTORIA BRIDGE

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones in an *ad hoc* statement welcomed the indication that option 1 (to rebuild the bridge) was preferred. He asked what the likely contributions might be from external funding.

Councillor Roger Symonds replied that there would be some external funding, which might pay for the ramp. He introduced the report by explaining that there had been 9 options (listed in paragraph 5.4), which had been narrowed down to 4 for the purposes of the report, and of which option 1 was his preferred option. He congratulated officers that the bridge had now been reopened after the emergency repairs, and said that the proposals he would make would ensure the long term future of the bridge. Completion of the rebuild, if agreed by Cabinet, was anticipated in April 2014. He moved an amended motion to the effect that option 1 would be adopted.

Councillor Cherry Beath said she was very happy to second the proposals. She felt that Cabinet was addressing a difficult issue for the city. The bridge was a beautiful landmark but also was an essential route for pedestrians and cyclists.

Councillor Roger Symonds summed up by saying that some extra funding had been introduced to ensure accessible access from the towpath onto the bridge.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor Cherry Beath, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE the project funds to progress the project in the capital programme, with funding as outlined in the report;

(2) To AGREE that option one best meets the requirements of the brief for a permanent re-opening of the Bridge; and

(3) To APPROVE the Project Programme as set out in the report.

## 14 LONDON ROAD REGENERATION

Lawrence Buabeng (Chair, Snow Hill Skills and Enterprise Initiative) in a statement [a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website] appealed to the Cabinet to focus on enhancing skills and fitness projects in Snow Hill as well as dealing with the built environment in London Road.

Murray Jones (Chair of the community arm of the Council's London Road Regeneration Project) in a statement observed that of the 12 members of the gateway group, 3 were from Snow Hill so he felt there had been very diverse representation from local communities. He acknowledged that funds would be limited to achieve what everyone had been hoping for. His group had been working with the Council and was pleased that progress was being made.

Councillor Lisa Brett in a statement said she felt the proposals would help to create new jobs and opportunities for local people. The top 3 concerns of people in the area were traffic, parking and the built environment and the proposals would make a huge contribution to these concerns.

Councillor Tim Warren made an *ad hoc* statement in which he emphasised the importance of regenerating this gateway into the city. He reminded Cabinet however that the problem of pollution on the London Road would remain to be dealt with.

Councillor Cherry Beath in proposing the item thanked the speakers for their contributions. She replied to Lawrence Buabeng by saying that she was aware of his tireless work to improve the skills and opportunities for people in Snow Hill. She said that the proposals being considered by Cabinet would only be a first step and that in this instance it was the built environment that was being tackled. Improving skills would be for a subsequent initiative. She offered to meet with Lawrence to discuss these issues.

Councillor Beath reminded Councillor Tim Warren that the Cabinet had been in power for only a year, but had at last made progress on some of the longstanding issues for the London Road area. She emphasised that the objectives had been defined by public consultation; they were to arrest the decline of the area by giving attention to the street facades and to traffic flow. She moved proposals which were slightly amended from the published report.

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal. He welcomed the much needed investment and observed that 3 of the worst buildings were in fact owned by the Council, two of which had been brought back into use already. He emphasised that the London Road was a gateway to the city and was the first impression gained by many visitors. He hoped that the proposals would be one step in encouraging the local community.

Councillor Roger Symonds agreed. He emphasised that the proposals were not aimed at improving the transport problems, but said that Cabinet was actively considering the options for addressing this. He gave credit to his predecessor, Councillor Charles Gerrish, for addressing the HGV issues.

Councillor Tim Ball said that the dilapidated buildings had been depressing but he was delighted that they would now be dealt with.

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

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE the project framework and the Governance structure; and

(2) To AUTHORISE the Strategic Director of Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development to approve individual allocations of the budget.

## 15 SALTORD STATION BUSINESS CASE

Duncan Hounsell (Saltford Station Campaign) in a statement thanked the Cabinet for listening to the people of Saltford. He mentioned the work done by Peter Dawson (Group Manager, Planning Policy & Transport) in getting to this point. He presented a petition to Cabinet supporting the re-opening of Saltford Station.

The Chair referred the petition to Councillor Roger Symonds for his consideration and response in due course.

David Redgewell (South West Transport Network) made a statement in which he emphasised the importance of working with other west of England authorities and the urgency of pressing the case for the station while the opportunity still remained.

Councillor Francine Haeberling in an *ad hoc* statement said she was delighted that a business case was being prepared. Her ward residents were in favour of re-opening the station but had some questions. There were concerns about the possible increase of traffic on the Bath Road, and of parking problems because the station car park might not be large enough. There were also concerns about the difficult turning and accident black spot at the bottom of the hill.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson was delighted to see the progress being made, but reminded Cabinet that the Radstock/Frome railway line also needed to be re-opened urgently. She asked Cabinet to include this in its forward planning.

Councillor Roger Symonds thanked the 2000 petitioners, which he said proved that people do want railways. He thanked the campaign group for their work. He responded to Councillor Haeberling by saying that the 3 problems she mentioned would only be problems on the way to success. He agreed with David Redgewell that the opportunity to raise the issue while the new franchise was being negotiated must not be missed. He reminded David that Saltford was now on the west of England agenda. To Councillor Eleanor Jackson, he responded that the Saltford opportunity must be taken immediately, but the Radstock/Frome line must be for future consideration. He moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He welcomed the collaboration between the local community, Parish Council and Unitary authority on this issue.

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

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE a budget of £100,000 to undertake a High Level Option Assessment as set out in the report, to be funded from the Council's Revenue Budget Contingency; and

(2) To AGREE that any further requests for funding will be considered following completion and consideration of this Assessment.

## 16 VARIOUS ROADS, BATH 2011, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Councillor Tim Warren in an *ad hoc* statement commended the report and said that the consultation had been excellent.

Councillor Roger Symonds in proposing the item said that he had been determined to make progress on these orders, and thanked Chris Major (Head of Parking Services) for dealing with the large number of proposals.

Councillor Symonds observed that the recommendation was that some of the proposals would be modified and some withdrawn. He was asking Cabinet to agree the list as published, with the exception that the West Avenue/South Avenue Triangle scheme be “withdrawn” so that issues raised in the last few days could be considered and new proposals could be brought to him as a Single Member Cabinet decision in due course.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal on the basis of Councillor Symonds’ assurances that the Triangle proposals would only be paused, and not lost.

Councillor Tim Ball observed that the proposals were further evidence that the Cabinet was listening to local people, even when late objections were received. He too felt that this must only be a pause.

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

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that the proposals are implemented, modified or withdrawn as below:

(i) Prohibit and restrict parking in lengths of road in Bath.

Ayr Street / Stuart Place: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the junction.

Bedford Street: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the turning head.

Beechen Cliff Road: That the proposals are modified to reflect the feedback from the public consultation by removing the proposal to implement Double Yellow Lines on the south side of the road. The Double Yellow Lines proposed for the northern side of the road are implemented as advertised.

Bradford Road / Greendown Place: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the junction and increase availability of parking by reducing the Single Yellow Line restriction in this location to Monday to Friday rather than the existing Monday to Saturday.

Bruton Avenue: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the junctions.

Caledonian Road: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the junction.

Claremont Buildings: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve traffic movement by protecting the turning head.

Church Street: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received to increase road safety and traffic flow.

Englishcombe Lane / Sabin Close: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the junction and improve traffic safety in Englishcombe Lane.

Fairfield Park Road: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety.

Frankly buildings / Tynning Lane / Snow Hill: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the junctions and improve traffic flow and safety on Tynning Lane.

Gloucester Road / Bailbrook Lane: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the junction.

Gloucester Road / Alice Park: That the proposals are withdrawn and not implemented at this time due to public objections to the proposals. The support from some residents in the area is also acknowledged and location will be reassessed and a revised proposal will be advertised in due course.

Grosvenor Place: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the junction.

Hayesfield Park: That the proposals are implemented as advertised. Objections were received to the proposal due to the loss of parking spaces but it is considered that the restrictions are necessary to ensure access and improve safety.

Junction Road: That the proposals are modified so that the Double Yellow Lines are implemented from the junction of Shaftsbury Road for a distance of 5 metres in a north easterly direction to protect the junction visibility and then reduce the proposal so that the Double Yellow Lines recommence at a point 27 metres from the junction for a 14.5 metres travelling in a north easterly direction to protect the entrance and garages rather than as a continuous restriction. This provides the best compromise between safety, access and allowing parking in the area.

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

Monksdale Road: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety and traffic flow by extending the existing Double Yellow Line restriction.

Newbridge Hill: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety and traffic flow by extending the existing Double Yellow Line restriction.

Ragland Street / Ragland Lane: That the proposals are modified to reflect the feedback from the public consultation so the restrictions are implemented on the adopted length of Ragland Street from its junction with Ragland Lane for a distance of 6.5 metres in a northerly direction on the eastern side and from its junction with Ragland Lane for a distance of 4.5 metres in a northerly direction on the western side of the road. On Ragland Lane south side from a point 110 metres east of its junction with Solsbury Way for a distance of 3.8 metres in an easterly direction. The modified restrictions give improved visibility at the junction of Ragland Street to improve road safety whilst recognising the pressures of parking in the area.

Shaws Way / Newton Road: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the junction by extending the existing Double Yellow Line restriction and installing additional Double Yellow Line restrictions on the opposite side of the junction.



St Michaels Road / St Johns Road: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the junction and the entrance to the cemetery.

Third Avenue / King Edward Road: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety at the junction by converting the existing Single Yellow Line Restriction to a Double Yellow Line restriction on to the northern side of the junction and installing an additional Double Yellow Line restriction on the southern side of the junction.

Lane Behind Crescent Gardens: That the proposals are withdrawn and not implemented at this time due to public objections to the proposals. The area will be monitored and reassess in the future.

Lower Bristol Road / Wood Street: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received. The changes will improve road safety by converting the existing Single Yellow Line restriction to a Double Yellow Line.

West Avenue / South Avenue / Triangle: That the proposals be withdrawn so that further late information could be considered and so that a Single Member Cabinet decision can be made as soon as possible in response to all the relevant consultation responses.

Warminster Road: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received to the specific Double Yellow Lines within the proposal which protect accesses to properties and garages. .

(ii) Limit waiting in lengths of road in Bath

Beckford Road: That the proposals are withdrawn and not implemented at this time due to public feedback. The area will be reassessed in due course.

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

Warminster Road: That the restrictions are implemented as proposed to improve the ability of parents to park by the school and discourage all day parking by commuters.

## **17 REVIEW OF TAXI LIMITATION POLICY FOLLOWING AN UNMET DEMAND SURVEY**

Darth Jarrett (Chair of the Bath Taxi Drivers Association), in an *ad hoc* statement alerted the Cabinet to the fact that when new licences became available, these were often snatched up by fleet operations. He felt however that there was no need for new licences to be created because there were already too many taxis in the area.

David Redgewell asked the Cabinet to deal with the urgent need for new taxi ranks, particularly at the station.

Councillor Roger Symonds in proposing the item pointed out that the unmet demand report did not propose any increase in licences. He referred to the unmet demand Survey which in section 7.2 listed a number of significant issues and he promised that these issues would actively be addressed.

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal. He thanked Dartth Jarrett for his contribution and expressed particular thanks to Ken Taylor, the outgoing Chair of the Bath Taxi Drivers Association. There was common agreement on this.

Councillor Dixon said that prompt progress would be made on the issue of taxi rank provision.

Councillor Tim Ball said that he supported the proposals, but had some concerns. He asked Councillor Symonds to report back to Cabinet when the 2014 unmet demand survey had been completed because he felt that Cabinet would need to look closely at future surveys.

Councillor Symonds, in summing up, pointed out that unlike many other cities, the Council was determined to continue regulating taxi provision in the city.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that the Council continues with the policy of regulating the number of hackney carriage vehicle licences in zone 1 (Bath) and continues with the limitation of hackney carriage vehicle licences in zone 1 (Bath) to 122; and

(2) To ASK the Strategic Director (Place) to conduct a further survey into the unmet demand in zone 1 (Bath) in 2014.

## **18 RADSTOCK NURSERY ACCOMMODATION**

Councillor Eleanor Jackson in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 8 and on the Council's website*] said that she had been delighted when the governors of St Nicholas school had agreed to locate the new nursery centre on the school's land. She commended the council for ensuring the continuity of provision. Her concern was that the new site would entail a hill climb for some mums with buggies but she accepted that there was little option.

Councillor Nathan Hartley thanked Councillor Jackson for her comments. The proposals before Cabinet were fully funded and would underline the Council's commitment to investing in communities. He thanked the Governors of Trinity School for their help in previous years, He was now delighted that the need to find a new home had been met, and that the Governors of St Nicholas School had been able to make premises available so that the nursery provision could continue. He mentioned in passing his intention to bring to July Cabinet a further paper which would increase the opportunities for under-2 year olds.

Councillor Hartley moved a proposal which was slightly amended from the published report so as to emphasise the fully funded nature of the proposals.

Councillor Simon Allen said he was very pleased to second the proposal. He acknowledged Councillor Jackson's comments about the climb up the hill, but pointed out that the report did say that transport could be provided if required.

Councillor David Bellotti observed that the government had made the very welcome decision to allow parents to use their 15 hours over two days, if they preferred, as well as the previous scheme which only allowed it to be used over three days.

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

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE a Capital budget of £486k for inclusion in the 2012/13 Capital programme to allow the necessary works to be undertaken;

(2) To AGREE that the project cost of £486k in 2012/13 and will be funded using part of the £2.255m Schools Capital Maintenance Grant 2011/12, which has been carried forward to 2012/13 in the budget report for provisional approval; and

(3) To NOTE that as the capital project will be fully grant funded there will be no grant revenue impacts on the Council.

## **19 JOINT LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3: THREE YEAR DELIVERY PLAN 2012/13 TO 2014/15**

David Redgewell in an *ad hoc* statement emphasised the need for an Equalities Impact Assessment and also the importance of ensuring effective scrutiny by the West of England.

Councillor Roger Symonds in proposing the item acknowledged that some buses did not conform to the low floor requirements, but said that often the alternative was to have no bus at all. He observed that Bristol had originally offered to provide a scrutiny service but had withdrawn, so this needed to be re-addressed. He reminded Cabinet that the JLTP3 had been agreed in 2011, and now it was necessary to agree a 3-year delivery plan. He moved the recommendations, with the addition of a funding proviso at clause (2).

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal.

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

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE the Joint Local Transport Three Year Delivery Plan 2012/13 to 2014/15; and

(2) To AGREE that any funding indicated for 2013/14 and beyond will be subject to the medium term service and resource planning process including consideration and approval as part of the annual budget by the full Council in February 2013.

## **20 STREET LIGHTING - CONVERSION OF LED STREET LIGHTS**

Councillor Roger Symonds in proposing the item explained to Cabinet that experimental schemes had indicated real savings without risking safety.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal.

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

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE the budget of £2m for this project for spend in 2012/13;

(2) To AGREE the programme to convert all main road lights to LED source during 2012-2013; and

(3) To AGREE the use of optimised multi-staged dimming profiles for use on both main roads and within residential streets to maximise savings and ensure such localities remain lit to appropriate levels.

## **21 PROCEDURE FOR DESIGNATION OF LOCAL SITES IN BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

Councillor Tim Warren in an *ad hoc* statement insisted that the Site of Nature Conservation Interest at Stanton Drew must be maintained.

Councillor Tim Ball in proposing the item said that the paper endorsed what the Council had already been doing for a number of years.

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal, saying that it was important that the Council should have criteria in place to designate such sites.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE the procedure for designation of Local Sites in Bath & North East Somerset.

*[The Chair at this point explained that the **SUSTAINABLE MODES OF TRAVEL TO SCHOOL STRATEGY** had been deferred to a future Cabinet meeting in order that the report can take account of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund bid]*

## **22 CORPORATE PLAN**

Peter Duppa-Miller (Secretary of the Local Councils Association), in an *ad hoc* statement assured the Cabinet that Parish Councils were ready and eager to work with the Council to pursue the aims of the Local Plan.

Councillor Paul Crossley reminded the Cabinet that the new administration had adopted new underpinning principles and the Local Plan now reflected that. He moved the adoption of the updated Plan, for recommendation to full Council.

Councillor Nathan Hartley seconded the proposals and said that he looked forward to what would be achieved as a result.

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

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that the Corporate Plan 2012/15 be recommended to Council on 19 July for approval.

The meeting ended at 8.55 pm

Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Date Confirmed and Signed \_\_\_\_\_

**Prepared by Democratic Services**

## CABINET MEETING 13<sup>th</sup> June 2012

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

### REGISTERED SPEAKERS

There were 9 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**

- Judith Chubb-Whittle (Chair, Stanton Drew Parish Council)  
Re: Travellers Site Proposals
- Clarke Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group)  
Re: Travellers Site Proposals
- Rosemary Collard (Snapdragons Nurseries Ltd)  
Re: Travellers Site Proposals

#### **Re: Agenda Item 12 (Rossiter Road Scheme)**

- Richard Wales (Chair, Rossiter Road Sub-Committee, The Widcombe Association)
- Donald Thomas (Greenway Residents Ass'n Action Group Traffic Subcommittee)

#### **Re: Agenda Item 14 (London Road Regeneration)**

- Lawrence Buabeng (Chair, Snow Hill Skills and Enterprise Initiative)
- Murray Jones (Chair of the community arm of the Council's London Road Regeneration project)
- Councillor Lisa Brett

#### **Re: Agenda Item 15 (Saltford Station Business Case)**

- Duncan Hounsell (Saltford Station Campaign)
- David Redgewell (South West Transport Network)

#### **Re: Agenda Item 21 (Radstock Nursery Accommodation)**

- Cllr Eleanor Jackson

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

<b>M 01</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor John Bull
<p>A number of free 20 minute parking spaces are to be lost as a result of the redevelopment of the Town Hall site in Keynsham. Residents and visitors need to know that Keynsham remains open for business. Therefore, in order to ensure that during a period of immense disruption, people are still able to park for free for 20 minutes in the town centre would the Cabinet member please give me assurances that these spaces will be reinstated elsewhere in a central part of the town?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>No plans have been put in place to reinstate free parking spaces within Keynsham during the redevelopment works. However, the 4 current 30 minute free bays within Ashton Way car park will remain. Additionally, we are planning to increase the time limit within Ashton Way car park from the current 2 hour maximum stay to 4 hours to help with the flow of traffic within the town as requested by the redevelopment project group.</i></p> <p><b>Further statement made by Councillor Beath at the meeting:</b>  <i>I would like to add that I will conduct a further review of this and will contact Councillor Bull to discuss the issues he has raised.</i></p>		

<b>M 02</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>In the Draft Bath Parking Strategy (version 10 February 2012) it says at the commencement of section 8 that there are 1848 privately controlled non-residential car parking spaces within the Central Zone and Zone 1. These are spaces not available for general public use. Where are they all? Which are the 5 biggest sites?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>The Council undertook a survey of private non-residential parking spaces in Bath during August 2009. Type of spaces included: customer car parks, staff car parks, hotels, bed and breakfast accommodation, pubs, schools, churches, public buildings (including law courts, police station &amp; fire station) and sports facilities (including the Recreation Ground and rowing club). Car parks which charge a fee for public use were excluded. The five largest private non-residential car parks recorded were: Sainsburys, Homebase, Royal Mail, Palace Yard Mews and Henrietta Mews. The total count has now been revised to 1,707 spaces, to exclude some spaces that are used by residents. It is accepted that Sainsburys and Homebase are actually within zone 6, but for the purpose of this survey, they were included within the Central area count. I can ask officers to provide a map showing the locations if that would assist.</i></p>		

<b>M 03</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Tim Warren
<p>The Council recently launched what it describes on its website as a 'major parking survey' in Bath, which it has distributed to households in the city and made available online. Can the Cabinet Member please explain the purpose of this survey, what it aims to achieve, and what outcome is likely to result?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>The purpose of the survey is to gain an up-to-date understanding of car parking demand and related issues from residents and businesses within the study area. This area comprises the existing controlled parking zones and adjacent areas, where overspill parking may occur. The data collected will provide the Council with a robust evidence base for informing future decisions on the provision and control of parking across the study area.</i></p> <p><i>The survey has been designed to be an evidence gathering exercise and does not promote any particular course of action. However, the data collected will highlight issues of concern to residents and businesses, together with the strength of these concerns. It will also enable options to be assessed, before further consultation on any individual proposal is taken forward.</i></p>		
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>		
<p>The Cabinet member has not replied to the second part of my question.</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>My response was reasonably clear: "The survey does not promote any particular course of action". The outcome is that we will have a better parking policy.</i></p>		

<b>M 04</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones
<p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide the latest void numbers and percentages for Council-owned shop premises in Bath (including the dates these figures were collated), separated into primary and secondary positions? How many of these premises have been vacant for twelve months or more?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor David Bellotti
<p><i>The Council actively manages 224 retail units within Bath City Centre. As at 15th May 2012, the Council has 14 vacant retail units (representing 6.25% of the total units). The void units can be separated into three categories, as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Prime retail (60 units) – 4 (6.67% of total units)</i></li> <li><i>• Secondary retail (76 units) – 5 (6.58% of total units)</i></li> <li><i>• Tertiary retail (88 units) – 5 (5.68% of total units)</i></li> </ul>		

*Only one of the retail units has been vacant for greater than 12 months.  
Two of the units are not readily available on the open market, with proposals to create separate residential works on the upper floors.*

## **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC**

There were none



**Judith Chubb-Whittle,**

**Chair of Stanton Drew Parish Council**

**SUBMISSION STATEMENT TO CABINET 11<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2012**

**UNDER ITEM 7**

Firstly thank you to Councillors who attended the consultation roadshows to answer my parishioners' questions.

However, there are many answers still awaited.

You & we agree that the matrix is deeply flawed. Even a secondary unspecified screening process delivered a flawed result. Yet with demonstrable negligence some sites were still put forward on the preferred list.

According to PPT 2012, you are required

1. *To reduce tensions...*

**This has clearly not happened so far.**

2. *To enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health...*

**How can they do at GT 2, an unhealthy, unsafe, remote site?**

3. *Identify and update annually, a supply of deliverable sites...*

At Cabinet meeting 9 May 2012 it was suggested that you reassess the need for sites and investigate suitable land i.e. **outside the GREEN BELT** far south of the district.

**Have you done this?**

**Has the Cabinet understood the consequences of not taking into account the Scrutiny Panel's recommendation?**

4. *Protect local amenity and environment,*

**Please explain how development of light industrial employment will safeguard the SNCI & protected wildlife species from light & noise pollution and further hazardous contamination?**

5. No **very special circumstances** will be demonstrable especially where MOD sites are available. [*You would lose some 106 levy of course if you replaced some social housing with a couple of pitches*].

**Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development.** GT2 is **DESIGNATED** Green Belt, the description '**brownfield**' for the buildings. They are still **Washed over GB**.

6. *Strictly limit new traveller sites...away from existing settlements...do not dominate the nearest settled community ...avoid placing undue pressure on the local infrastructure e.g. water supply, poor highways connections, health etc.*

**You agree Stanton Wick is the nearest settlement. At the Pensford you said you liked the site because of size, an easy creation of an out-of- Bath ghetto.**

**Explain how adoption of GT2 will not contravene this policy?**

7. *Promoting opportunities for healthy lifestyles...what, on an arsenic contaminated site??*

**Do you realise that remediation costs will be HUGE?**

Figures of 600 lorry loads out of the site with contaminated soils, 600 lorry loads into the site with new soils, and a cost of **£1.8 million** – just for the dumping of the contaminated soils.

**How much will highways remediation cost?**

**Therefore the site is unsustainable at your projected numbers.**

Firstly the **assault on the Green Belt with Stowey Quarry** and now the **Stanton Wick Green Belt**.

**BaNES – Making Bath [but not necessarily North east Somerset] an even better place to live, work and visit.**

When I sat before you for the first time on May 9<sup>th</sup>, I was one of 14 people who gave 3 minute presentations in respect of the site in Stanton Wick. As you will no doubt recall those presentations offered great detail on the planning reasons why this site should not be on your list of Preferred Sites. The presenters also posed many questions regarding your acquisition, appraisal and selection process.

In addition you were handed a petition representing an overwhelming majority of the residents in Stanton Wick, Stanton Drew, Pensford and Publow.

In addition you and your officers have now been presented with over 150 questions.

It is important for me to note here that none of the presentations made or questions asked related to any matter concerning race, inequality or comment on the Gypsy and or Traveller communities or way of life. This was not deliberate, it was natural. Our concerns are around the choice and process that brought this clearly inappropriate and undeliverable site to your preferred list. You will understand why I feel the need to make this point.

Following the May 9<sup>th</sup> Cabinet meeting and in the absence of any real response from the Council, we presented at the Scrutiny Committee on 15<sup>th</sup> May. You are aware of the resolution that was made at that meeting. It was disappointing for us that no member of the Cabinet attended the meeting.

Following the lack of any response from the Cabinet to the resolution, our complaints we think, encouraged a number of members of the Council to call a special meeting of the full Council for next Monday 18<sup>th</sup> June.

In the ensuing period we and many residents have attended two presentations or exhibitions in Stanton Drew and Pensford and have had the opportunity of engaging with officers and with, in part, Paul Crossley, Tim Ball and Cherry Beath.

We have also had some of the 150 questions answered, many which give rise to further questions.

We have also had the opportunity of residents discussing directly with Paul Crossley at a very well attended public meeting in Pensford. Unfortunately no Councillor attended the two similar public meetings in Stanton Drew.

None of these meetings or discussions has left any resident with any confidence in your ability and intent to ensure an open and honest appraisal of sites or to really consult with them

You have seemingly ignored the 69 tolerated pitches in BaNES within your appraisal – those very pitches where Gypsy and Travellers want to be.

You are already aware of all the discussions and the questions and answers and you are I hope, now fully aware of your residents very serious concerns.

You are aware of the serious flaws in the process and in the selection of the sites in Stanton Wick, Keynsham and Radstock. Your own Officers, on multiple occasions, have stated that the selection process is flawed.

You are aware of the breach of Government Guidance and of your own policy statements that has occurred during this Preferred Site Selection process. Your Councillors and Officers have provided contradictory comments implying an imprecise and inconsistent understanding of planning regulations

You are aware of the serious harm caused by the process that you have commissioned and managed

And, you are aware of the real possibility that claim could be made against the Council for the consequences of negligence.

We realize that there is political motivation behind your urgency with this process. We the residents of Stanton Wick, Stanton Drew, Pensford and Publow ask you not to allow this to get in the way of good planning, open local government and the proper attention and care deserved by your ratepayers.

We urge you to consider the recommendation of your own Scrutiny Committee and call a temporary halt to this process, to re asses, to re set the criteria and scoring matrix, to extensively advertise for possible sites and to openly re-engage in the consultation process.

We urge you not to be focused on easy solutions at any cost, but to engage with all of your communities and with your adjacent authorities to find an open, honest and lasting solution that will not bring harm but will bring harmony.

## **Rosemary Collard, Snapdragons Nursery**

Statement regarding land near Ellsbridge House, Keynsham, one of the Council's preferred Gypsy and Traveller Sites.

We exchanged contracts on Ellsbridge House, better known locally as Norton Radstock Veterinary College, in December 2011 and completed the sale in January 2012. We were completely unaware of the proposed use of the site and nothing was revealed in the solicitor's search even though the purchase took place during the public consultation period.

Towards the end of April, we heard from a local journalist, that the adjacent woodland was being considered as a possible travellers' site. The proposals were shortly due to be announced to the public. This was the first intimation we had of the Council's plans for this site. On the same day, a neighbour of Ellsbridge House was alerted to the proposal by a BBC journalist who knocked at his door wanting to know how he felt about it. This neighbour subsequently contacted us.

We immediately contacted the B&NES Planning Department and were told that there was a Cabinet meeting on 9th May where seven possible sites would be discussed and that following this meeting there would be an eight-week public consultation period beginning towards the end of May. During this conversation we were not informed that we could have any input at the cabinet meeting. In fact, we were given the impression that this was a purely internal affair for cabinet members. We were told that the list of seven sites being considered on 9th May had been released into the public domain at the very early stages of the process of choosing sites so that the public was involved and that the process was transparent. Subsequently, we have discovered that Ellsbridge House had, by that time, already been short-listed from an initial 23 sites and that the process had been begun in November 2011.

On Monday 14th May we heard from another source about the DPD Meeting at the Guildhall the next day. We realised that the public could attend this meeting, but were unaware that we would be able to speak. Once we reached the meeting it became apparent that we would be able to represent ourselves, but the opportunity to be prepared in expressing our concerns at this stage would have been welcomed.

We really believe that Snapdragons Nursery will be a valuable asset to the area and, indeed to B&NES Council itself. We will be providing many additional childcare and out of school places, supporting working parents. In addition, the government has announced its intention to provide additional free places for disadvantaged two-year olds and the opening of this setting will help the local authority and the Early Years team to fulfil this objective. We will also be creating 40-50 new local jobs at all skills levels, including apprenticeships. The proximity of Wellsway School will mean that we are able to offer workplace experience for young adults. Our plans for forest school and other on-site training offer opportunities for the wider community. All our

nurseries aim to use local suppliers for all their food needs and other service, for example gardening and maintenance.

We have a recruitment evening later this month for this nursery and over 30 people have applied for positions. This is exciting for us and should be viewed very positively in light of Keynsham's forthcoming regeneration project.

However, this excitement is being overshadowed by some of our concerns relating to the possible Gypsy and Traveller site.

Our main concerns are:

The shared access onto this site. If we have shared access the point at which the land next to Ellsbridge House is accessed, would be very difficult, if not impossible to secure, leaving the site vulnerable to trespassers and loose animals. At present we use a barrier that the college used to use and that does give us some protection. Being able to secure the property is of paramount concern to us because we have a duty to safeguard the children in our care and because the site is unoccupied at weekends and overnight. If a new access from the highway were to be created, the bus stop which serves the pupils of Wellsway School would need to be relocated. There is currently no existing boundary at all between Ellsbridge House and the land in question as it sits on the main driveway to the house and so substantial fencing would be required to secure the sites. According to land registry documentation, the site boundary for the plot of land next to Ellsbridge House used by the council's planning consultants in the site assessment report is wrong and part of the land belonging to Ellsbridge House has been included. As this area constitutes a considerable proportion of the proposed site, the number of plots considered viable would need to be reassessed.

The site is referred to on the documents as Ellsbridge House Management and Community Education Centre. This is no longer the case. It is now Snapdragons Nursery and Out of School Club. As a children's day nursery, we are highly regulated by Ofsted and part of our protecting and safeguarding children responsibility means that all staff need to have a CRB and that all visitors to the site need to be signed in or escorted. I also have to be sure that no children can be photographed or videoed. This is further reason why the boundary issue is so sensitive to us. The land in question is densely wooded with mature trees and so does not appear to be suitable without extensive tree surgery and excavation work to prepare it for any form of dwelling. However, it would provide a wonderful natural environment for learning outdoors and we had approached Property Services to express our interest in buying or renting this woodland. Unfortunately, we received no response. Ellsbridge House is a Grade II listed building and therefore we had to get consent to carry out alterations. Everything has had to be done to maintain the integrity of the building and this includes part of the gardens surrounding the building. Indeed plans for the new police centre being built to the rear of Ellsbridge

House, had to take account of its impact on the house and appropriate landscaping formed part of the planning regulations. When we first advertised the nursery we had in excess of 60 registrations/enquiries. Since the announcement of the proposed site in April, we have had less than 10. We also received some concerned enquiries. I did mention this to a Planning Consultant who suggested I could pass any concerned parents onto her and she would answer their queries.

I am sure you can appreciate that starting up a new business with the uncertainty of the plans for the adjacent land hanging over us is very worrying. We have invested a substantial amount of money in the purchase of the property and associated fees and are now in the middle of refurbishment which is a very costly exercise because of the regulations we have to adhere to when caring for children and being an employer and the additional regulations in respect of listed buildings. What started out as being an exciting project and one which we hoped would be seen as offering additional services and employment for Keynsham has now turned into fighting for the survival of this business which could ultimately impact on the success of the rest of our business. We have been trading in Wiltshire and Bath since 1998. We care for over 1000 local children and employ about 150 local staff. I must say that at the moment I feel very let down by the people who should be supporting local businesses during these uncertain times.

If anyone has not visited this site, I would be very happy to meet you personally at Ellsbridge House.

Many thanks for taking the time to read through this and I look forward to hearing your responses.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Richard Wales CABINET 13/06/1**

Councillors are aware that the Widcombe Association was formed over 30 years ago to campaign for this scheme. We have long since ceased to be a single issue organisation and are now the largest, and most active, residents' association in Bath with a membership of 422 households (comprising 723 individual members) and 53 businesses, including the majority of those located in Widcombe Parade. I am Chairman of the Association's Rossiter Road sub-committee, which has 5 members, all Widcombe residents and well qualified to address the issues involved. They include the former Professor of Civil Engineering at the University of Bath, another Civil Engineer who was the Director for Wales of the Planning Inspectorate, and the President of the Institute of Transport and Logistics, whose day job is Transport Commissioner for London. Over the years, to support our own expert knowledge we have commissioned, at the Association's expense, reports from highways engineers and air quality consultants.

In our view, a key factor in bringing this scheme to the point of decision has been the establishment of the Steering Group, which has, for the first time in 30 years, provided a proper forum for discussion and communication. My colleague, Mike Wrigley, a planning consultant, who lectures at Bath University on transport planning, and I, represent the Association on the Group.

From the Association's point of view, the key corporate objective of this scheme is the last one listed in the paper, to "improve the Widcombe Parade environment". Therefore we strongly support the proposal to use mini-roundabouts, in place of traffic signals, at the White Hart junction. Also we welcome the proposal to introduce an access into Lyncombe Hill for cars for cars and light vehicles travelling from the west. This is strongly supported by members living in the lower parts of Lyncombe Hill and adjoining streets and indeed, by others living higher up in Greenway , such as our Chairman Paddy Doyle. The present requirement to "go round the block" causes serious inconvenience and is a source of unnecessary air pollution. Finally, we endorse, fully, the recommendation in Appendix 1, "that advice is sought from public realm designers as part of the detailed design process".

Overall, we are delighted by this proposal and welcome it unreservedly. On behalf of the Association, I urge the Cabinet to approve the scheme and agree that the proposed traffic signals at the White Hart junction are replaced with mini roundabouts.

This page is intentionally left blank

## TRAFFIC AND POLLUTION IN LYNCOMBE HILL, GREENWAY LANE & LANES ADJOINING

Professor Donald Thomas - Greenway Residents Association — Traffic Sub-Committee

### The Problem

1. In its minutes, the 2012 AGM of Greenway Residents' Association was "broadly supportive of the scheme to reduce traffic in Widcombe Parade" but "feared increased traffic in Lyncombe Hill and Greenway Lane," undermining work which the council has recently carried out.
2. The B&NES 2011 Rossiter Road consultation process proposed a 10% traffic increase in these minor roads. Greenway has carried out traffic counts for the past seven years, its reports praised and endorsed by the council. The latest puts vehicles at the top of Lyncombe Hill 50% above consultation figures.
3. In 2011 B&NES monitored Lyncombe Hill air-quality. Nitrogen dioxide in vehicle exhaust rose beyond the European Union legal limit for the protection of human health in each of the last three months. Add to this the increasing diesel exhaust, which was identified by the World Health Organisation yesterday [12 June 2012] as causing lung cancer definitely, and bladder tumours probably.
4. Rossiter Road plans reduce westbound Claverton Street dual carriageway to one lane as it passes Lyncombe Hill to Wellsway gyratory. The inner lane would be a dedicated slip-road directing increased traffic into Lyncombe Hill. Some house-front doors and windows are as close as 4 feet to hundreds of daily exhaust pipes. So are many schoolchildren from Beechen Cliff and Widcombe.

### An Alternative

1. The dual carriageway should be retained across the foot of Lyncombe Hill, perhaps saving money. For south and west, drivers should be signed to follow this route to the gyratory. They are more likely to do so if they see two lanes free ahead of them, one presumably for Exeter/Bristol and one for the city centre, rather than a pinch-point to negotiate. On the Claverton Street approach there are no road-level house-fronts, far fewer pedestrians. Being open to the north, fumes clear more easily.
3. Rossiter Road plans are a self-proclaimed response to traffic pollution in Widcombe Parade — rightly so. Widcombe Association hired Air Quality Consultants Ltd. to help its case. Any attempt to argue that this is all about "traffic" and not pollution defies the evidence. But neighbouring residential roads should not incur the blight of increased traffic and nitrogen dioxide exhaust fumes which the House of Commons

2010 audit, citing EU Topic Centre, puts at 51,000 UK deaths a year. This is twenty times more than deaths from road accidents, plus a £20 billion annual “ill-health” bill.

It need not be like this. We ask for three things. None compromises Widcombe Parade.

1. Retain two signed lanes westbound across Lyncombe Hill — e.g. 1. Exeter/Bristol 2. City Centre. The uphill turning into Lyncombe Hill to remain as at present, presumably saving money. For 37 years, I have found it traffic-calming rather than hazardous. Indeed, the council has recently installed a look-alike construction at the junction of Wellsway and Old Wells Road.
2. Signage to discourage rat-running to Wellsway via Lyncombe Hill and Greenway Lane.
3. Further measures to protect residents and pedestrians in these minor roads and lanes from the latest B&NES traffic count of over 2,000 vehicles a day.

The Rossiter Road plan should not - and need not - disadvantage its neighbours. They should feel able to welcome it but it in turn must respect them.

**Public speech – Guildhall – June 13 2012**

**SNOW HILL SKILLS AND ENTERPRISE INITIATIVE**  
**(supported by BANES Racial Equality Council)**

**LAWRENCE BUABENG MA(RCA)**

I have attended this cabinet meeting, with the support of members of the community, in order to appeal on behalf of Snow Hill residents, with regard to the proposed regeneration of the London Rd.

I presented a speech to the cabinet on the 12<sup>th</sup> June 2008 entitled – “**An Alternative Vision for the London Rd and Snow Hill Area**”- a community led regeneration scheme, the main thrust of which, was to bring back into use, a number of disused shop fronts on the London Rd. The idea was to bring physical, as well as ,social regeneration together in order to create real and sustainable opportunities for disadvantaged local people. The overall objective was to provide, in due course, cost effective community amenities, through the development of social enterprises.

We have worked with various organisations in recent years, including the **Bath Preservation Trust**, where we assisted with a public survey at **No. 1 Royal Crescent**, prior to its refurbishment. They have also won a **national RTPI award** for their **London Rd and Snow Hill Energy Efficiency Strategy**, which is a by-product of the **SHSEI / BPT Heritage and Regeneration Strategy**, developed in conjunction with their Education and Outreach officer Tom Boden, and presented to trustees in 2009

In spite of all our efforts to improve the locality, the **SHSEI** members have been marginalised and excluded from the whole process. The **SHSEI committee** has now been usurped by **The London Rd Gateway Action Group**, and to add insult to injury, Snow Hill residents have been excluded from the **Draft Area of Focus: London Rd Regeneration**. Before there was any money on the table, it was the initial petition and campaigning of Snow Hill residents, that has brought us to where we are today. It is, therefore, a minor travesty to find that, yet again, they have been forgotten about, despite recent and costly consultations.

**The Snow Hill Community Consultation** back in 2002 was not followed through because of lack of funding; whilst the **SHSEI Community Survey(2010)**, conducted on the advice of **Joan Geany (Local Improvement Advisor)**, has been completely ignored.

The sincerity of the BANES vision statement is questionable. What does the Council actually mean when it claims that it is a local authority “**where everyone fulfils their potential... with citizens that actively engage**”?

Bath Council aspires to be a “**listening Council, with active citizens that reaches every community and culture...where people actively lead the delivery of improvements in their community**”, and try to “**reduce inequality between communities**”.

The Council also claims to support the creation of “**activities and opportunities to help young people make a positive difference to their lives and communities... where people have developed their skills and use them to improve their community**”, and where “**everyone has the opportunity to participate in sports, leisure and cultural activities**”.

**The 2010 SHSEI Community survey revealed the fact that:**

45% of residents interviewed described themselves as unemployed.  
16% said that they were in full time employment.  
9% were self employed.

**When asked what would make it easier for them to find employment or return to education:**

56% stated that acquisition of skills and experience and qualifications would help.  
51% said easier access to education and training.  
30% wanted help to start their own business.

**When asked if they would be interested in the various listed activities or services:**

74% were keen on opening, reconstructing and maintaining the community garden behind Caroline House.  
77% liked the idea of a local heritage and regeneration centre for exhibitions about the areas past, present, and future.  
73% supported film making workshops for local residents.  
68% wanted work or training opportunities in stone, metal, and wood.  
60% opted for art and design.  
55% ticked the furniture restoration box.

We have attended this Cabinet meeting in order to put forward two requests:

Firstly, that the Council lives up to its oft mentioned mantra of social inclusion, bringing Snow Hill within the boundary of the Draft Area of Focus. No additional cost need be incurred, because to Somers credit, it has already provided new kitchens, bathrooms, and front doors. To be included, would be a symbolic gesture indicating that we are all in this together, as opposed to the all too familiar 'us and them' scenario.

Secondly, given the 5 years work in the development of the **SHSEI** with Council officers, we are formally requesting that out of the 750K budget, at least 50K be made available to the **SHSEI** social regeneration projects for disadvantaged locals (7.5% of budget)

.The intended schemes would help to enhance, as well as, animate physical regeneration efforts. The funds would be used to deliver two lead projects:

1. **SKILLS/CRAFT GALLERY**- exhibitions, IT access, skills tutorials
2. **BOXING CLUB** - fitness training for all

The new Council controlled regeneration group on the London Rd (LRGAG) constitutes 'community empowerment by proxy' - a contradiction in terms, and as such tantamount to 'disempowerment by the back door. We may have been 'hoodwinked' and dealt a 'slight of hand, but we have by no means, been 'taken in' by this semblance of people power. It has to be noted that Snow Hill residents, at this moment in time, feel **used, betrayed and neglected**. I am hoping ,that with the rekindled support of Cabinet members present, we are able to reverse this unfortunate state of affairs.

**Cabinet 13 June 2012 Item 21 Radstock Nursery Provision.**

First, I must declare a personal interest. Not because I am a grandmother yet, but because I am an LEA governor at St Nicholas CE Primary School, and I am delighted to be able to inform you that on 28 May the governors and head enthusiastically welcomed the proposal to locate the new nursery centre on the area vacated by our own nursery school after the school roof was repaired. We feel it will complement our own provision and help create a 'children's campus' with the families benefitting from the old glebeland location by the Kilmersdon river. Trinity's loss will be our gain.

However, it will be a loss which I feel most keenly because of the levels of deprivation in the Tynning area, with a steep hill for mums and dads to push a pushchair up and down, and dangerous narrow pavements or no pavement at all in places between Walnut buildings and the centre of Radstock. I note in the Equalities Assessment no appreciation of the problems of these families, the original beneficiaries of the former Labour government's scheme. Although there will still be parenting classes, I gather, a reduced availability is not a good idea, especially for families with children close together of an age, so that one could be in St Nicholas' centre, and the other in Tynning.

The council is of course to be commended for maintaining the centre, when far too many across the country have been closed, leaving only about 144 still supported by unitary authorities. There is a dreadful dearth of nursery provision in Radstock ward – indeed although there are play schemes, a Playbus and 'tots and toddlers groups' run by the NCT, there is no private provision at all except for a few child minders, which is not the same thing Yet Radstock ward has an exceptionally young population compared with B&NES statistics generally, and a high birth rate.

It is deplorable that we should be in this situation at all, created as it is by the Academies Act. Indeed, you might ask, what if St Nicholas School were to be become an academy, as the Diocese seems to want, not to mention the previous administration. As a governor since 2006, I can say with confidence that nothing short of a personal visit from Michael Gove himself, and blackmail on the scale seen in London and Birmingham, would induce the governors to vote for this, so you can be confident that the re-location will be a success.

Cllr Dr Eleanor Jackson.

This page is intentionally left blank