

Democratic Services

Riverside, Temple Street, Keynsham, Bristol BS31 1LA

Telephone: (01225) 477000 *main switchboard*

Direct Line: 01225 394458

Web-site - <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk>

Date: 24th February 2014

E-mail: Democratic_Services@bathnes.gov.uk

To: All Members of the Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel

Councillor Marie Longstaff

Councillor Lisa Brett

Councillor David Martin

Councillor Douglas Nicol

Councillor Liz Richardson

Councillor Roger Symonds

Councillor Les Kew

Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning: Councillor Tim Ball

Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods: Councillor David Dixon

Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Caroline Roberts

Chief Executive and other appropriate officers

Press and Public

Dear Member

Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel: Tuesday, 4th March, 2014

You are invited to attend a meeting of the **Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel**, to be held on **Tuesday, 4th March, 2014 at 9.30 am** in the **Council Chamber - Guildhall, Bath**.

The agenda is set out overleaf.

Yours sincerely



Mark Durnford
for Chief Executive

If you need to access this agenda or any of the supporting reports in an alternative accessible format please contact Democratic Services or the relevant report author whose details are listed at the end of each report.

This Agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

NOTES:

- 1. Inspection of Papers:** Any person wishing to inspect minutes, reports, or a list of the background papers relating to any item on this Agenda should contact Mark Durnford who is available by telephoning Bath 01225 394458 or by calling at The Guildhall, Bath (during normal office hours).
- 2. Public Speaking at Meetings:** The Council has a scheme to encourage the public to make their views known at meetings. They may make a statement relevant to what the meeting has power to do. They may also present a petition or a deputation on behalf of a group. Advance notice is required not less than two full working days before the meeting (this means that for meetings held on Wednesdays notice must be received in Democratic Services by 4.30pm the previous Friday)

The public may also ask a question to which a written answer will be given. Questions must be submitted in writing to Democratic Services at least two full working days in advance of the meeting (this means that for meetings held on Wednesdays, notice must be received in Democratic Services by 4.30pm the previous Friday). If an answer cannot be prepared in time for the meeting it will be sent out within five days afterwards. Further details of the scheme can be obtained by contacting Mark Durnford as above.

- 3. Details of Decisions taken at this meeting** can be found in the minutes which will be published as soon as possible after the meeting, and also circulated with the agenda for the next meeting. In the meantime details can be obtained by contacting Mark Durnford as above.

Appendices to reports are available for inspection as follows:-

Public Access points - Riverside - Keynsham, Guildhall - Bath, Hollies - Midsomer Norton, and Bath Central, Keynsham and Midsomer Norton public libraries.

For Councillors and Officers papers may be inspected via Political Group Research Assistants and Group Rooms/Members' Rooms.

- 4. Attendance Register:** Members should sign the Register which will be circulated at the meeting.
- 5. THE APPENDED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS ARE IDENTIFIED BY AGENDA ITEM NUMBER.**
- 6. Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

When the continuous alarm sounds, you must evacuate the building by one of the designated exits and proceed to the named assembly point. The designated exits are sign-posted.

Arrangements are in place for the safe evacuation of disabled people.

**Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel - Tuesday,
4th March, 2014**

at 9.30 am in the Council Chamber - Guildhall, Bath

A G E N D A

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair will draw attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out under Note 6.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point in the meeting declarations of interest are received from Members in any of the agenda items under consideration at the meeting. Members are asked to indicate:

(a) The agenda item number in which they have an interest to declare.

(b) The nature of their interest.

(c) Whether their interest is **a disclosable pecuniary interest** or an **other interest**, (as defined in Part 2, A and B of the Code of Conduct and Rules for Registration of Interests)

Any Member who needs to clarify any matters relating to the declaration of interests is recommended to seek advice from the Council's Monitoring Officer or a member of his staff before the meeting to expedite dealing with the item during the meeting.

5. TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THIS MEETING

At the time of publication no notifications had been received.

7. MINUTES - 14TH JANUARY 2014 (Pages 5 - 16)

8. CABINET MEMBER UPDATE

The Cabinet Member(s) will update the Panel on any relevant issues. Panel members may ask questions.

9. POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS - URBAN GULLS (Pages 17 - 38)

Following extensive research and consultation via a Scrutiny Inquiry Day on 27 November 2013, the PTE panel developed a set of recommendations for change. These were posed to the relevant Cabinet members who have worked closely with service manager to develop their response. This report introduces these responses, the full details of which are outlined at Appendix one.

10. POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS - ALCOHOL HARM REDUCTION STRATEGY (Pages 39 - 50)

The Scrutiny Inquiry Day was held on the 10th October 2013. Cabinet members have been asked to consider the recommendations of the scrutiny inquiry day. Their response now returns to each of the respective PDS Panels for the consideration of members.

11. NETWORK RAIL ELECTRIFICATION BRIEFING (Pages 51 - 52)

A briefing note has been prepared for the Panel for information only.

12. PANEL WORKPLAN (Pages 53 - 56)

This report presents the latest workplan for the Panel.

The Committee Administrator for this meeting is Mark Durnford who can be contacted on 01225 394458.

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL

Tuesday, 14th January, 2014

Present:- Councillors Marie Longstaff (Chair), Lisa Brett (Vice-Chair), David Martin, Douglas Nicol, Liz Richardson and Geoff Ward (In place of Les Kew)

Also in attendance: David Trigwell (Divisional Director for Planning and Transport), Matthew Smith (Divisional Director for Environmental Services), Peter Dawson (Group Manager, Planning Policy & Transport), Cathryn Humphries (Neighbourhood Environment Manager), Kelvin Packer (Service Manager for Highways & Parking), Richard Smith (Senior Public Transport Officer) and Liz Richardson (Policy Development & Scrutiny Lead Officer)

Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning: Councillor Tim Ball
Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods: Councillor David Dixon

45 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

46 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

47 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillor Roger Symonds and Councillor Les Kew had sent their apologies to the Panel. Councillor Geoff Ward was present for the duration of the meeting as a substitute for Councillor Kew.

Councillor Caroline Roberts, Cabinet Member for Transport also sent her apologies to the Panel.

48 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

49 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There was none.

50 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THIS MEETING

Mr David Redgewell wished to address the Panel regarding agenda items 9 and 11 and chose to speak directly before those items were debated.

51 MINUTES - 20TH NOVEMBER 2013

The Panel confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting as a true record and they were duly signed by the Chairman.

52 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE

Councillor David Dixon, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods addressed the Panel.

Waste – He announced that there had been an increased uptake in the gull proof waste sacks in New King Street and that no enforcement action had yet been required. He added that some members of public in the street had set up a local waste management committee.

Trade Waste – He informed the Panel that the Council had secured a three year contract from March to collect trade waste.

Public Conveniences – Healthmatic commenced their contract with the Council in January and have said they will liaise with Ward Councillors that have public conveniences in their area. He added that they have offered to retain all of the automatic toilets that are currently in place.

Recycling – He said there had been a slight dip in recycling figures last year, but it looked like those were improving for this year. He added that recycling recovery rates were looking to be in excess of 70%.

Food Waste – He said that good progress had been made in this area with regard to flats and schools, but felt a general reminder of the service might be required at some point as participation wasn't as high currently as it had been.

Council's MOT Testing Facility – He wished to remind the Panel of this service that the Council now provides and the fact that they refer customers to garages approved by their 'Buy with Confidence' scheme. He added that it was hoping to be able to provide tests for Motorbikes from the end of March 2014.

Licensing – He welcomed the involvement of the Panel in the upcoming Statement of Principles (Licensing Policy).

Public Protection – He wished to make the Panel aware of the business support element of this work area in terms of food hygiene ratings.

Urban Gulls – In advance of the agenda item later in the meeting he said that he was pursuing Property Services to take up the offer of the egg replacement service.

Councillor Liz Richardson asked if it was true that the Council could no longer recycle leaves.

The Divisional Director for Environmental Services replied that leaves collected from the road could no longer be recycled and must be sent to landfill. He added that leaves collected from parks & green spaces however could still be recycled.

Councillor Lisa Brett asked if the Council still retained capacity to carry out enforcement work.

Councillor Dixon replied that licensing enforcement was funded and so would continue as normal and that street trading was incorporated within the team.

Councillor Lisa Brett asked how the Council compared in the national figures for recycling.

Councillor Dixon replied that he had not yet seen the figures for this year, but was aware that all authorities will have faced significant challenges in this area with regard to funding.

Councillor Geoff Ward wished to commend the work of the Council staff that keep the streets clean. He also asked how the budget cuts of previous years were impacting on the department.

Councillor Dixon replied that a great deal of the work within Public Protection was statutory services that could not be cut. He added that there was now a focus on education rather than enforcement.

The Divisional Director for Environmental Services added that a large amount of the cuts were delivered in a reduction of staff which has led to multi-agency teams being set up. He said that he would not want to have staffing reduced further.

Councillor Geoff Ward asked if the department were able to keep up with the frequency of inspecting with regard to food hygiene.

Councillor Dixon replied that they were.

Councillor Geoff Ward asked if the new contract for public conveniences would achieve better value for the Council.

Councillor Dixon replied that he felt that the Council's relationship with the contractor was key and their ambition to seek innovative solutions to keeping sites open.

Councillor Geoff Ward asked if the number plate recognition system now used at Waste Management sites had affected the number of people using the sites.

Councillor Dixon replied that there had been a decrease in users of the sites and that this had been expected. He added that the advantage to this was that queuing times were therefore shorter.

Councillor Geoff Ward asked if an officer within the department had responsibility for monitoring buskers.

Councillor Dixon replied that an officer was working on this particular area and that it was work they were looking to explore.

Councillor Tim Ball, Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning addressed the Panel.

Gypsy & Traveller Sites – He informed them that two planning applications would soon be debated by the Development Control Committee on this matter. One site would be in Batheaston and the other would be in Twerton. He said that the Twerton site would have space for 13 / 14 pitches.

He added that a list of sites would still be held while the process remains on-going.

Core Strategy – He said that the Inspector had accepted the Council's proposed housing figures of 13,000 and that around three weeks of hearings were now expected to take place from March 25th 2014. He added that he was hopeful of the strategy being fully adopted later this year.

The Chair asked if he knew when the Gypsy & Traveller site allocation for the West of England would be announced.

Councillor Ball replied that he expected that to be announced in the Autumn.

Councillor Charles Gerrish asked if there were contingency plans for any displacement of people from the Twerton Gypsy & Traveller site.

Councillor Ball replied that only three families were on site currently and the plan was to develop the site with them in residence. He added that no site exists within the authority on which they could be placed while the development takes place.

The Chair thanked them both for their updates on behalf of the Panel.

53 BATH TRANSPORT STRATEGY UPDATE

Mr David Redgewell, South West Transport Network addressed the Panel.

He said that part of the strategy must include bus priority measures on the Lower Bristol Road. He also called for bus shelters to be improved across the Council and said that residents should not be allowed to veto this work, such as dropped kerbs or shelters.

He said that he expected the Council's transport links to be debated heavily at the Core Strategy hearings and urged work to be pursued on an East of Bath Park & Ride and Saltford Train Station as soon as possible.

He also asked the Panel to read and comment upon the West of England Strategic Economic Plan.

The Chair asked for clarification as to whether the Panel could comment upon the Plan.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that the West of England Joint Scrutiny Committee were due to debate the Plan later in the month and advised that Councillor Brett was a member of the committee and so Panel members could feed their comments through to her. He added that LEP funding would be sought as a result of the Plan.

Councillor Brett commented that she was happy to convey comments from the Panel to the Joint Scrutiny Committee.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport introduced the item to the Panel. He explained that the Joint Local Transport Plan was still in existence and that this piece of work would focus on Bath issues because of its planned growth. He added that it would look to identify key investment areas, such as car parking, bus improvements and cycle provision.

He commented that the Council had only scratched the surface of their Public Realm work and said that as a significant number of residents walk to work, could this made any easier for them?

He informed them that a vision would be produced as part of this work and that consultation across all relevant departments was key.

He stated that transport solutions were required in the advent of 9,000 new jobs within the city and that the Council would work with a number of agencies, including First Bus to identify improvements.

The Chair asked when any consultation on the strategy would take place.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that it was planned to take place in the Spring in conjunction with the Enterprise Masterplan.

Councillor Geoff Ward if the vision of the strategy was going to be big enough. He also commented that rail links to London must be improved and that the strategy must gain cross Council support.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that he did think the vision would be big enough and emphasised that this strategy was to be more precise about the work required for Bath.

Councillor Liz Richardson commented that rural residents need help in travelling to Bath as adequate public transport is not available.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that work will focus on the important areas within the Council and that bus services should improve as a result.

Councillor David Martin acknowledged the large amount of work required for the strategy and asked if the resources were available to undertake it.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that enough resources were available and that having the correct infrastructure in place will enable the planned growth.

The Group Manager for Planning Policy and Transport added that the Strategic Economic Plan would enable funding to the LEP to develop long term plans.

Councillor Lisa Brett commented that she welcomed the one Council approach, but asked if that had meant any tensions had needed to be managed.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that he was not aware of any current tensions and added that officers had a clear message from Councillors of the work required through the debates on the Core Strategy.

Councillor Lisa Brett called for projects to be listed and lined up ready to go once the strategy had been finalised.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that a list of projects will be made within the document when it is published.

Councillor Lisa Brett commented that all Councillors should be briefed on their equality responsibilities in relation to bus stops.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that most bus stops have been updated without any problems and that the Council's consultation process was judged to be sound in one case that had been the subject of a Judicial Review.

Councillor Charles Gerrish commented that he was concerned this work would delay in planning a strategy for Keynsham. He added that he felt there was a huge hole in the West of England Strategic Economic Plan as it contained no transport proposals for the planned growth of the area.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that work relating to Keynsham was not being delayed as part of this process and that work involving the Somer Valley would follow on after that.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones commented that he had concerns over the levels of congestion that may arise through expected level of growth.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that the intention is to provide opportunities for the public to travel in a number of different ways. He added that more homes will be available closer to the city and therefore have a positive effect on congestion.

Councillor Geoff Ward commented that he was concerned that Transport policies were driving the Housing Strategy of the Council and called for more of a focus along the guidelines of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework).

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that work was being driven by the Economic Strategy and that the NPPF supports sustainable growth.

Councillor Anthony Clarke said he was pleased that the needs of the city had been recognised, but also called for support to the rural residents.

Councillor Dave Laming commented that the NPPF supports sustainable integrated development and that integrated communities must also be created.

The Chair thanked the officers for addressing the Panel and repeated the view from a previous meeting that the Panel would like to see the results of the work carried out by the consultants before it is consulted upon.

54 URBAN GULLS - DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Policy Development & Scrutiny Lead Officer introduced the item to the Panel. She stated that over 50 people attended the meeting held in November and represented a wide range of sources. She added that a great deal of information was received on the day and workshops were undertaken in the afternoon to provoke suggestions of what to do next.

She said that in the time since the meeting officers had met with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Panel to form the recommendations presented today.

She added that the lead Cabinet Member for the review, Councillor David Dixon had agreed to a shorter response time of 4 weeks in an attempt to speed up the process of delivery.

Councillor Lisa Brett said that the Council should promote the legal rights and responsibilities that businesses and property owners have in relation to gulls.

The Policy Development & Scrutiny Lead Officer replied that recommendation 4.2 could be strengthened.

The Chair thanked her for all her hard work and said that she felt more informed at the conclusion of the day. She added that she wanted the work to be seen as very much a joint responsibility document.

The Policy Development & Scrutiny Lead Officer replied that she could elaborate that point further in recommendation 5.1.

Councillor Geoff Ward stated that it must be a co-ordinated plan that involves residents, traders and property owners. He added that the risk of economic damage to the city should not be taken lightly. He also asked for officers to log calls from the public on incidents involving gulls.

Councillor David Martin commented that he felt it was a very good report and asked for the recommendations to be strengthened slightly.

Recommendation 1.1 – Replace ‘Encourage’ with Require.

Recommendation 2.1 – Replace ‘Encourage’ with Urge.

He also questioned whether the section of the report entitled Resource Implications should say none and felt that some level of funding would be required over the next six months.

The Divisional Director for Environmental Services replied that following this meeting talks will take place with the Cabinet Member and officers regarding the recommendations and then a better idea will be known regarding the funding of any future work.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones asked if a licence was required for either individuals or the Council to intervene personally with the gulls.

The Neighbourhood Environment Manager replied that land owners were able to apply for such a licence.

Councillor Lisa Brett commented that it was her understanding that no licence was required if you operate within the terms of the General License.

The Chair summed up by saying that the recommendations would be strengthened following comments from the Panel and it would be emphasised that joined up action is required. She added that the information relating to licences should be made available to the public.

The Policy Development & Scrutiny Lead Officer said it was intended that the Cabinet response would be back by February 14th and then discussed at the next Panel meeting on March 4th.

55 CROSS BOUNDARY BUS SERVICES (WILTSHIRE / SOMERSET)

Mr David Redgewell, South West Transport Network addressed the Panel. He spoke of his concern that bus services were stopping at the border to the Mendip hinterland and that some services were looking to be changed by neighbouring authorities. He cited the lack of a Sunday service to Shepton Mallet Hospital as one particular problem.

The Senior Public Transport Officer introduced this item to the Panel. He explained that the report had been written at the request of the Panel to inform them of the current provision of services across the Council and its borders into Wiltshire & Somerset.

He informed them that the tender for the 267 service between Bath – Frome via Midford was currently out to tender. He added that a proposal has been made to remove that last service in the evening to Frome and that Parishes were contacted on the matter in August 2013. He stated that an option to keep the service as it is still remained.

Councillor David Martin asked how the analysis of sections 5.5 and 5.6 of the report are done.

The Senior Public Transport Officer replied that various models had been used and data such as car ownership in the area concerned, level of social housing and number of concessionary passes in use were used in the analysis.

Councillor Liz Richardson commented that she would like to see hub type services in place as she found it difficult to travel to Keynsham.

The Senior Public Transport Officer replied that if a hub service were put in place for instance to the A37, access to it is good, but the return journey is much more difficult. He added that direct services are put in place with regard to user preference.

He also said that an opportunity for services to expand in the Chew Valley area exists over the next 12 -18 months.

Councillor Lisa Brett suggested the Panel could be part of the decision making process as set out in section 6.1 of the report with regard to making recommendations to Cabinet on cross-boundary bus services.

The Chair thanked him for the report on behalf of the Panel and said they would discuss Councillor Brett's comment further under their workplan agenda item.

56 FLOOD DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT

The Service Manager for Highways & Parking introduced this item to the Panel. He spoke of the actions taken since the last meeting in November 2013 that were listed in the report and the fact that the Chew Valley Flood Forum (CVFF) had canvassed 69 properties for feedback on the installed flood barriers. He stated that they had received 35 returns and of those, 20 properties identified defects.

He added that the CVFF continues to work with officers and is proactively endeavouring to obtain a return from the remaining properties to establish a complete picture. He informed the Panel that in December 2013 a constructive meeting was held with the supplier of the flood barriers to discuss the extent of, and costs of any remedial works, as well as providing a maintenance scheme for residents. It is anticipated that a further meeting will take place in February 2014.

He explained to the Panel that a meeting took place in Chew Stoke in December 2013 to brief the community on the outcome of the flood investigation. A survey of the sources of surface water flooding and a number of improvement works to the highway drainage system have been identified and as a result a works order for improvements has been issued to our Contractor. These works will be completed prior to 31 March 2014.

He reminded the Panel of the concern expressed by the CVFF that surface water run-off from farm land was a contributory factor to flooding and that officers were requested to contact the NFU to discuss whether contour ploughing etc. could make a difference.

He said that in order for a meaningful dialogue with the NFU officers had reviewed the impact of farming on flooding, as well as the flood investigation results for Chew Stoke and had concluded that farming had a negligible impact on the flooding due to the degree of ground saturation present, intensity of the storms and rapid response nature of the catchment.

He added that drainage staff are planning to hold a meeting with the NFU to discuss farming and land management issues in February 2014.

He informed the Panel that a meeting had also been scheduled with Cllr Charles Gerrish, the Council's representative on the Wessex Flood Defence Committee, to review the proposed actions for inclusion in the operational Highways and Drainage Service Plan 2014/15. He added that there is already a proposal for an additional £200k investment planned for flood mitigation/enhanced PLP. Officers will brief the relevant Cabinet Members once the action plan is formed and any required funding will be sought through the normal budget approval process.

Councillor Charles Gerrish wished to thank the work of the Service Manager for Highways & Parking and associated officers for all their work on this matter. He also wanted to highlight the need to inspect bridges on a more regular basis

The Service Manager for Highways & Parking thanked him for his comments and said he was aware of the need to pursue this work.

Councillor Liz Richardson also wished to offer her thanks to the team and the Environment Agency as no domestic flooding had occurred over the past couple of weeks in her local area. She also asked how the meetings of the Flood Risk Board would take place.

The Service Manager for Highways & Parking replied that they would take place in two parts. The first would be a technical meeting with representatives from the Environment Agency, Bristol Water, River Regeneration Trust etc. and the second part of the meeting would be public engagement.

Councillor Geoff Ward asked who would be leading on plans to address problems within Bathford, Bathampton and Batheaston.

The Service Manager for Highways & Parking replied that the Environment Agency would lead on this and then discuss it with officers.

The Chair thanked him for the update and all his work on behalf of the Panel.

57 PANEL WORKPLAN

The Chair introduced this item to the Panel. She said that they would discuss the Cabinet Response to the Urban Gulls recommendations and review the Alcohol Harm recommendations at their March meeting.

She also stated that it was the Panel's intent to debate Council's Statement of Principles (Licensing Policy) at their July meeting.

She said that further discussion would be had at the agenda planning meeting between her and the Vice-Chair to see how matters relating to public conveniences, the Bath Transport Strategy and Cross Boundary Bus Services could be pursued.

The meeting ended at 12.40 pm

Chair(person)

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council		
MEETING/ DECISION MAKER:	Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel	
MEETING/ DECISION DATE:	4 March 2014	<small>EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE:</small>
		E 2616
TITLE:	Urban Gulls scrutiny inquiry – Cabinet Member response to the panel’s recommendations of 14 January 2014	
WARD:	All	
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM		
List of attachments to this report:		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appendix one – Urban Gulls recommendations response table – Cabinet Members’ responses 		

1. THE ISSUE

- 1.1 Numbers of urban gulls in Bath have increased by almost five times since 1998. This is a highly controversial issue amongst residents, business owners, visitors and public services and responsibility is often placed solely on the council. The purpose of the review has been to engage all groups in taking joint responsibility for the issues and causes of high numbers of urban gulls, in particular through:
- educating on the causes, solutions and other relevant information about gulls
 - finding short, medium and long-term solutions to tackle the issues of the gulls themselves and the features that attract them
 - determining what national Government are doing and could do to assist councils to tackle the problem.
- 1.2 Following extensive research and consultation via a Scrutiny Inquiry Day on 27 November 2013, the PTE panel developed a set of recommendations for change. These were posed to the relevant Cabinet members who have worked closely with service manager to develop their response. This report introduces these responses, the full details of which are outlined at Appendix one.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 **This report recommends that PTE panel members review and discuss the responses provided by the Cabinet members to the panel's recommendations for change regarding urban gulls outlined at Appendix one.**

3. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)

- 3.1 A key consideration for the Cabinet members in determining their response to the recommendations has been resource requirements, in particular financial implications.
- 3.2 Where relevant, resource implications are acknowledged in the responses in two main ways:
- where a recommendation is accepted and there is a recognised resource requirement, the potential impact of this requirement and/or the potential solution has been included in the response
 - where a recommendation is deferred or rejected due to (at least in part) resource issues, the barrier to delivery is explained.
- 3.3 This work will be undertaken within existing resources and there will be no additional financial impact. Any exception to this will require managing of a budget to absorb these costs or a potential further decision in line with the council's budgetary processes.

4. STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS AND BASIS FOR PROPOSAL

- 4.1 There are three main pieces of legislation which have informed the approach to the review and the development of the recommendations, including:
- Environmental Protection Act 1990 – which outlines the duty of care to manage waste responsibly and prevent statutory nuisance
 - Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 - which makes it illegal for anyone to litter in a public place
 - Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 – which protects all species of bird from unlawful killing or disturbance.
- 4.2 All recommendations and the Cabinet responses fulfil the requirements of the council's and other legal and gull conservation duties.

5. THE REPORT

- 5.1 At the last panel meeting on 14 January, the PTE panel agreed a set of 22 recommendations for change to support the vision of reducing the urban gull population in Bath and the impact that their presence has on local places and people. These recommendations were framed under six high-level themes, including:
1. Limit gulls' access to food waste
 2. Increase use of effective gull intervention methods
 3. Carry out effective enforcement against those who break the rules
 4. Improve education and engagement with businesses, residents and visitors
 5. Undertake further research and utilise shared learning
 6. Work with the Severn Estuary Gull Action Group to lobby Government to take more action.
- 5.2 The vast majority of the panel's recommendations were posed to Cllr Dixon, Cabinet member for Neighbourhoods. However, two recommendations were more relevant to other portfolios. Therefore, Cllr Bellotti, Cabinet Member for Community Resources, and Cllr Tim Ball, Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning and Ben Stevens, Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development, have also provided responses.
- 5.3 Full details of the Cabinet member decision on each recommendation, the timescales for implementation (where relevant) and the rationale for the decision are outlined at Appendix one. A summary of the response collated by an 'accept', 'defer' or 'reject' response is below.

Accepted recommendations

(To be implemented (or already being implemented) by the council and/or partners in the near future)

- 1.1 Require all businesses to take responsibility for adequately containing food waste through the use of gull-proof sacks and cooperating with waste collection times.
- 1.2 Educate residents on waste and recycling procedures and obligations and assert the use of food caddies or galvanised bins in all cases.
- 1.5 Work with owners of guest houses and self-catering holiday apartments to advocate more accessible and better information for visitors about correct disposal of food waste.
- 1.6 Work in partnership with the Business Improvement District (BID) to campaign a) commercial waste collectors to supply gull-proof sacks to all businesses and b) businesses to commission responsible commercial waste collectors.
- 2.3 Lead by example by treating the council's own buildings with appropriate intervention methods, and share experiences and good practice.
- 3.1 Enforce stronger penalties for littering in identified 'hot spots' such as parks, car parks and around outdoor seating area.
- 3.2 Broaden use of online and other communications tools by the enforcement team to include recognition of responsible businesses and actively share performance information on penalties and convictions to broadcast a strong message to the public on enforcement against persistent offenders. This will also enable the service to better monitor trends.
- 4.1 Plan and deliver a strengthened and consistent communications campaign to educate the public and enforce a more coordinated approach.
- 4.2 Provide clear and consistent guidance on individuals' and businesses' rights and responsibilities to tackle urban gulls, through a) a 'one-for-all' leaflet with top 10 tips for how to lessen individual and business impact on gull numbers, b) specific guidance to target residents, businesses and visitors using the notion of 'respect our city', and c) ensuring business and property owners, and residents are made aware of their legal rights and responsibilities under the general licence issued by Natural England.
- 4.3 Train public protection officers on options for businesses and building owners to tackle gulls to share whilst on routine inspections.

- 4.4 Recognise excellence through new gull champions – those who are passionate about the need to work together to tackle the gull problem and lead by example.
- 5.2 Build on the existing link to the Severn Estuary Gull Action Group to improve shared learning on best practice and work across boundaries for a more joined up approach.
- 6.1 Lobby Government, via the LGA, to tackle urban gull issues at national level by providing advice and support to councils, informed by a national study of good practice.
- 6.2 Lobby for clearer definitions in law on littering, in particular in relation to food waste, and better defined rules on offender enforcement within the ASB Bill.

Deferred recommendations

(To potentially be implemented or rejected following further research, discussion and/or consideration of the allocation of resources)

- 2.1 Urge building owners and/or occupiers to undertake their own egg replacement by providing free replacement eggs and promoting relevant information and advice.
- 2.4 Further explore the 'Australia' model of developing nesting areas outside of the city centre, with a view to developing a pilot site if viable. These sites include nesting platforms to encourage nesting in locations where it is easier to oil/prick eggs.
- 5.1 Promote and lead a joined up approach to tackling the gull population through development of a cohesive gull strategy that includes: the true extent of the gull problem and how people suffer as a result; defined rights and responsibilities for the council, the public and businesses; the short, medium and long term vision; an overview of what is already being done; themed objectives and actions for improvement; defined benchmarks for success; timetable for evaluation and review; and the approval of Natural England.

Rejected recommendations

(To be halted with immediate effect with no further research or discussion required)

- 1.3 Introduce night-time refuse collections to limit the length of time food waste is left on the streets.
- 1.4 Pilot red plastic refuse sacks to ascertain whether this discourages gulls from attempting to get waste and, if successful, roll out to all appropriate city residents.
- 2.2 Campaign for gull-proofing of new buildings through the B&NES planning application process and planning guidance.
- 5.3 Discuss the impact of landfill with other local councils and options to limit gulls' access to food at these sites.
- 6.3 Campaign for a further reduction of food waste to landfill, with the specific aim of covering or closing exposed landfill sites and reducing the food source for gulls.

6. RATIONALE

- 6.1 Full details of the decision on each recommendation, timescales for implementation (where relevant) and the rationale for the decision are outlined in Appendix one.

7. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 7.1 The recommendations put forward by the panel have been considered as potential opportunities for improvement and change and responded to accordingly by the relevant Cabinet members. This has been an extremely comprehensive process informed by a range of sources and supported by service officers with expert knowledge in the field.

8. CONSULTATION

- 8.1 The responses to the recommendations have been provided by the following Cabinet members:
 - Cllr David Dixon, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods
 - Cllr David Bellotti, Cabinet Member for Community Resources

- Cllr Tim Ball, Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning
- Cllr Ben Stevens, Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development

8.2 The responses have been informed by the expertise of the following service officers:

- Matthew Smith, Divisional Director for Environmental Services
- Sue Green, Service Manager – Public Protection
- Cathryn Humphries, Team Manager - Health and Environment (Licensing and Environmental Protection)
- Aled Williams, Environmental Protection Manager
- Sarah Alder, Waste Strategy and Contracts Manager
- Lisa Bartlett, Group Manager – Development Control
- Andrew Pate, Strategic Director for Resources
- Derek Quilter, Divisional Director – Project Management
- Richard Long, Estates Manager

8.3 In addition, the following organisations/individuals have been consulted throughout the review and have provided the evidence and/or ideas used to develop the recommendations.

- Local people and organisations, including:
 - the Business Improvement District and 91 SMEs from across B&NES
 - 30 members of the public
 - the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations
 - the Bath Faith Forum
- B&NES staff and members, including those mentioned above and others with an interest in gulls and conservation, and
 - section 151 officer
 - the Monitoring Officer
- National organisations, including:
 - The Department for Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)
 - the RPSB
- Experts, including:
 - Peter Rock, Ornithologist
 - Pest control organisations
- Other neighbouring and national councils
- Other organisations, including:
 - Avon Fire & Rescue Service
 - local and other universities and colleges, and their students

9. RISK MANAGEMENT

9.1 A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the council's decision making risk management guidance.

Contact person	<i>Liz Richardson, liz.richardson2@bathnes.gov.uk, 01225 39(6053)</i>
Background papers	<i>Scrutiny Inquiry Day agenda and papers and PTE PDS discussion of review report and draft recommendations – both available on the 'council and democracy' pages of the website</i>
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX ONE - Urban Gulls recommendations response table – Cabinet member responses (February 2014)

Review Title: Urban Gulls
Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel: Planning, Transport and Environment
Panel Chair and Vice Chair: Cllr Longstaff and Cllr Brett
Policy Development & Scrutiny Project Lead Officer: Liz Richardson
Supporting Service Officers: Sue Green, Cathryn Humphries, Aled Williams, Sarah Alder, Richard Long and Lisa Bartlett

Process for Tracking PD&S Recommendations - Guidance note for Cabinet Members

The enclosed table outlines all the recommendations arising from the Urban Gulls Policy Development & Scrutiny review. Individual recommendations are referred to the relevant named Cabinet Members (or whole Cabinet in the case of a whole Cabinet referral) as listed in the '**Cabinet Member**' column of the table. Cabinet members are requested to seek help from your relevant service officers within your portfolio to help complete the rationale for your response. Full details of the review have been shared with the relevant officers and they should be in touch to support you to respond. The named member(s) are asked to complete the last three columns of the table as follows:

Decision Response

The Cabinet member(s) has the following options:

- **Accept** the panel's recommendation
- **Reject** the panel's recommendation
- **Defer** a decision on the recommendation because a response cannot be given at this time. This could be because the recommendation needs to be considered in light of a future cabinet decision, imminent legislation, relevant strategy development or budget consideration.

Implementation Date

- For an 'accept' response, give the date that the recommendation will be implemented
- For a 'defer' response, give the date that the recommendation will be reconsidered
- For a 'reject' response this is not applicable so write n/a.

Rationale

Use this space to explain the rationale for your response and implementation date. For accepted recommendations, please give details of how they will be implemented.

APPENDIX ONE - Urban Gulls recommendations response table – Cabinet member responses (February 2014)

Urban Gulls: a scrutiny inquiry

Recommendations of the PTE PDS panel to the relevant Cabinet members for consideration

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
<p>1. Limit gulls' access to food waste</p> <p>1.1 Require all businesses to take responsibility for adequately containing food waste through the use of gull-proof sacks and cooperating with waste collection times</p> <p>1.2 Educate residents on waste and recycling procedures and obligations and assert the use of food caddies or galvanised bins in all cases</p> <p>1.3 Introduce night-time refuse collections to limit the length of time food waste is left on the streets</p> <p>1.4 Pilot red plastic refuse sacks to ascertain whether this discourages gulls from attempting to get waste and, if successful, roll out to all appropriate city residents</p> <p>1.5 Work with owners of guest houses and self-catering holiday apartments to advocate more accessible and better information for visitors about correct disposal of food waste</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Accept</p> <p>Accept</p> <p>Reject</p> <p>Reject</p> <p>Accept</p>	<p>In hand</p> <p>From March 2014</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>From April 2014</p>	<p>Work already in-hand through on-going campaigns and enforcement and through the BID.</p> <p>Education and enforcement activity will take place with promotional activities and a door knocking campaign in specific locations. External funding will be used to increase this activity.</p> <p>Commercial waste collections are already taking place in the evening and these are being extended to include food waste recycling.</p> <p>Re-useable sacks for residents have already been provided to specific roads where traditional dustbins would not be suitable. Further areas are being planned. There is no resource available for alternatives to this.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Environmental Services (NES) will work with Public Protection & Health Improvement (PPHI) jointly to develop this. NES to develop information so that Public Protection Officers can deliver messages when carrying out routine food hygiene interventions</p>

APPENDIX ONE - Urban Gulls recommendations response table – Cabinet member responses (February 2014)

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
1.6 Work in partnership with the Business Improvement District (BID) to campaign: a) commercial waste collectors to supply gull-proof sacks to all businesses b) businesses to commission responsible commercial waste collectors.	Cllr Dixon	Accept	In hand	Already in hand
2. Increase use of effective gull intervention methods 2.1 Urge building owners and/or occupiers to undertake their own egg replacement by providing free replacement eggs and promoting relevant information and advice 2.2 Campaign for gull-proofing of new buildings through the B&NES planning application process and planning guidance 2.3 Lead by example by treating the council's own buildings with appropriate intervention methods, and share experiences and good practice	Cllr Dixon	Defer	April 2014	Resource implications - Service to investigate the possibility of selling dummy eggs at cost through OSS and provide appropriate H&S advice at time of collection. In the meantime, publicise and make information available on Public website.
	Cllr Stevens / Cllr Ball	Reject	-	National Planning Policy Guidance makes it clear that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Whilst local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outputs, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding overall scale and massing. Planning can include some advice and guidance on our web site to encourage developers to consider the campaign for gull-proofing of new buildings when developing their schemes. Officers can also refer to this advice when providing pre application advice.
	Cllr Dixon / Cllr Bellotti	Accept	-	There is an enthusiasm to use fire gel as an alternative to other physical measures on buildings, and procure egg replacement to supplement this and fill the gaps in coverage. The main issue is gaps in coverage and this

APPENDIX ONE - Urban Gulls recommendations response table – Cabinet member responses (February 2014)

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
<p>2.4 Further explore the 'Australia' model of developing nesting areas outside of the city centre, with a view to developing a pilot site if viable. These sites include nesting platforms to encourage nesting in locations where it is easier to oil/prick eggs.</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Defer</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>will need to be addressed. If there is a small budget issue, this can be achieved. If the figures are greater than thought, we will need to look at what can be done.</p> <p>Further evidence is required to demonstrate the effectiveness of this suggestion</p>
<p>3. Carry out effective enforcement against those who break the rules</p> <p>3.1 Enforce stronger penalties for littering in identified 'hot spots' such as parks, car parks and around outdoor seating area</p> <p>3.2 Broaden use of online and other communications tools by the enforcement team to include recognition of responsible businesses and actively share performance information on penalties and convictions to broadcast a strong message to the public on enforcement against persistent offenders. This will also enable the service to better monitor trends.</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Accept</p> <p>Accept</p>	<p>April 2014</p> <p>May 2014</p>	<p>Local Authorities can set the fixed penalty amount within a range of £50 to £80. The default amount is £75 and this is the current level of FPN's in B&NES</p> <p>The Cleansing Enforcement Officers have been equipped with mobile devices. It is possible for them to use social media to promote areas of good practice and publicise actions taken with advice from Communications and Marketing</p>
<p>4. Improve education and engagement with businesses, residents and visitors</p> <p>4.1 Plan and deliver a strengthened and consistent communications campaign to</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>Feb 2014</p>	<p>Officers will work with the Communications and Marketing team to plan and deliver this campaign</p>

APPENDIX ONE - Urban Gulls recommendations response table – Cabinet member responses (February 2014)

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
<p>educate the public and enforce a more coordinated approach</p> <p>4.2 Provide clear and consistent guidance on individuals’ and businesses’ rights and responsibilities to tackle urban gulls, through:</p> <p>a) a ‘one-for-all’ leaflet with top 10 tips for how to lessen individual and business impact on gull numbers</p> <p>b) specific guidance to target residents, businesses and visitors using the notion of ‘respect our city’</p> <p>c) ensuring business and property owners, and residents are made aware of their legal rights and responsibilities under the general licence issued by Natural England</p> <p>4.3 Train public protection officers on options for businesses and building owners to tackle gulls to share whilst on routine inspections</p> <p>4.4 Recognise excellence through new gull champions – those who are passionate about the need to work together to tackle the gull problem and lead by example</p>	Cllr Dixon	Accept	April 2014	This guidance will be produced and made available through the OSS and on the public website.
	Cllr Dixon	Accept	April 2014	This will be completed through a training session delivered to the relevant officers
	Cllr Dixon	Accept	April 2014	The service will recognise those residents/businesses that have taken proactive steps in dealing with the gull problem and publicise this work to the wider community.
<p>5. Undertake further research and utilise shared learning</p> <p>5.1 Promote and lead a joined up approach to tackling the gull population through development of a cohesive gull strategy that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the true extent of the gull problem and 	Cllr Dixon	Defer	April 2014	Natural England will be contacted and advised of this recommendation

APPENDIX ONE - Urban Gulls recommendations response table – Cabinet member responses (February 2014)

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
<p>how people suffer as a result</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • defined rights and responsibilities for the council, the public and businesses • the short, medium and long term vision • an overview of what is already being done • themed objectives and actions for improvement • defined benchmarks for success • timetable for evaluation and review • approval of Natural England <p>5.2 Build on the existing link to the Severn Estuary Gull Action Group to improve shared learning on best practice and work across boundaries for a more joined up approach</p> <p>5.3 Discuss the impact of landfill with other local councils and options to limit gulls' access to food at these sites.</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Accept</p> <p>Reject</p>	<p>April 2014</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Officers and Members will attend these meetings to hear of good practice and help to promote a more joined up approach to the problem</p> <p>This is the responsibility of the Environment Agency (EA). EA will be contacted and advised of this recommendation</p>
<p>6. Work with the Severn Estuary Gull Action Group to lobby Government to take more action</p> <p>6.1 Lobby Government, via the LGA, to tackle urban gull issues at national level by providing advice and support to councils, informed by a national study of good practice</p> <p>6.2 Lobby for clearer definitions in law on littering, in particular in relation to food waste, and better defined rules on offender</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Accept</p> <p>Accept</p>	<p>From April 2014</p> <p>From April 2014</p>	<p>Documents will be prepared for the Cabinet member so that he can raise this with the LGA</p> <p>Documents will be prepared for the Cabinet member so that he can raise this with the LGA</p>

APPENDIX ONE - Urban Gulls recommendations response table – Cabinet member responses (February 2014)

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
<p>enforcement within the Anti-Social Behaviour Bill</p> <p>6.3 Campaign for a further reduction of food waste to landfill, with the specific aim of covering or closing exposed landfill sites and reducing the food source for gulls.</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Reject</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>The Council will encourage other members of the Severn Estuary Gull Action Group to follow their lead and ensure their food waste is sent to composting facilities rather than landfill</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Updated - Urban Gulls recommendations Cabinet member responses (April 2014)

Review Title: Urban Gulls
Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel: Planning, Transport and Environment
Panel Chair and Vice Chair: Cllr Longstaff and Cllr Brett
Policy Development & Scrutiny Project Lead Officer: Liz Richardson
Supporting Service Officers: Sue Green, Cathryn Humphries, Aled Williams, Sarah Alder, Richard Long and Lisa Bartlett

Process for Tracking PD&S Recommendations - Guidance note for Cabinet Members

The enclosed table outlines all the recommendations arising from the Urban Gulls Policy Development & Scrutiny review. Individual recommendations are referred to the relevant named Cabinet Members (or whole Cabinet in the case of a whole Cabinet referral) as listed in the '**Cabinet Member**' column of the table. Cabinet members are requested to seek help from your relevant service officers within your portfolio to help complete the rationale for your response. Full details of the review have been shared with the relevant officers and they should be in touch to support you to respond. The named member(s) are asked to complete the last three columns of the table as follows:

Decision Response

The Cabinet member(s) has the following options:

- **Accept** the panel's recommendation
- **Reject** the panel's recommendation
- **Defer** a decision on the recommendation because a response cannot be given at this time. This could be because the recommendation needs to be considered in light of a future cabinet decision, imminent legislation, relevant strategy development or budget consideration.

Implementation Date

- For an 'accept' response, give the date that the recommendation will be implemented
- For a 'defer' response, give the date that the recommendation will be reconsidered
- For a 'reject' response this is not applicable so write n/a.

Rationale

Use this space to explain the rationale for your response and implementation date. For accepted recommendations, please give details of how they will be implemented.

Updated - Urban Gulls recommendations Cabinet member responses (April 2014)

Urban Gulls: a scrutiny inquiry

Recommendations of the PTE PDS panel to the relevant Cabinet members for consideration

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
<p>1. Limit gulls' access to food waste</p> <p>1.1 Require all businesses to take responsibility for adequately containing food waste through the use of gull-proof sacks and cooperating with waste collection times</p> <p>1.2 Educate residents on waste and recycling procedures and obligations and assert the use of food caddies or galvanised bins in all cases</p> <p>1.3 Introduce night-time refuse collections to limit the length of time food waste is left on the streets</p> <p>PTE PDS (4 March 2014) Cllr Dixon has explained his position further and informed the panel that there are several barriers to this being achieved including planning permission on the refuse sites, health and safety issues of working at night and public disapproval. Cllr Dixon remains firm that this recommendation should be rejected. The panel wish to commission a piece of work by officers to investigate the steps and likely costs that would be involved to overcome the barriers.</p>	Cllr Dixon	Accept	In hand	Work already in-hand through on-going campaigns and enforcement and through the BID.
	Cllr Dixon	Accept	From March 2014	Education and enforcement activity will take place with promotional activities and a door knocking campaign in specific locations. External funding will be used to increase this activity.
	Cllr Dixon	Reject	-	Commercial waste collections are already taking place in the evening and these are being extended to include food waste recycling.
	Cllr Dixon	Reject	-	Response unchanged

Updated - Urban Gulls recommendations Cabinet member responses (April 2014)

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
<p>1.4 Pilot red plastic refuse sacks to ascertain whether this discourages gulls from attempting to get waste and, if successful, roll out to all appropriate city residents</p>	Cllr Dixon	Reject	From April 2014	Re-useable sacks for residents have already been provided to specific roads where traditional dustbins would not be suitable. Further areas are being planned. There is no resource available for alternatives to this.
<p>PTE PDS (4 March 2014) This recommendation was considered as gull-proof sacks, rather than basic sacks which are usually black or white. This recommendation will be rewritten to make this point clearer such as: <i>“Make red refuse sacks available for residents and businesses to purchase and actively encourage them to do so...”</i>. Cllr Dixon is going to discuss this change with officers and reconsider whether the recommendation can be accepted or deferred.</p>	Cllr Dixon	Reject		Response unchanged
<p>1.5 Work with owners of guest houses and self-catering holiday apartments to advocate more accessible and better information for visitors about correct disposal of food waste</p>	Cllr Dixon	Accept	In hand	Neighbourhood Environmental Services (NES) will work with Public Protection & Health Improvement (PPHI) jointly to develop this. NES to develop information so that Public Protection Officers can deliver messages when carrying out routine food hygiene interventions
<p>1.6 Work in partnership with the Business Improvement District (BID) to campaign: a) commercial waste collectors to supply gull-proof sacks to all businesses b) businesses to commission responsible commercial waste collectors.</p>	Cllr Dixon	Accept	In hand	Already in hand

Updated - Urban Gulls recommendations Cabinet member responses (April 2014)

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
<p>2. Increase use of effective gull intervention methods</p> <p>2.1 Urge building owners and/or occupiers to undertake their own egg replacement by providing free replacement eggs and promoting relevant information and advice</p> <p>2.2 Campaign for gull-proofing of new buildings through the B&NES planning application process and planning guidance</p> <p>PTE PDS (04 March 2014) The panel have asked that the wording of this recommendation be changed to state that ‘Planning WILL include advice and guidance on our website...’ and “Officers WILL also refer to this advice when providing pre-application advice”, to replace the word ‘can’ and make the action more definite.</p> <p>2.3 Lead by example by treating the council’s own buildings with appropriate intervention</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Ball / Cllr Stevens</p> <p>Cllr Ball</p> <p>Cllr Dixon / Cllr Bellotti</p>	<p>Defer</p> <p>Reject</p> <p>Accept (request)</p> <p>Accept</p>	<p>April 2014</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Resource implications - Service to investigate the possibility of selling dummy eggs at cost through OSS and provide appropriate H&S advice at time of collection.</p> <p>In the meantime, publicise and make information available on Public website.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Guidance makes it clear that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Whilst local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outputs, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding overall scale and massing. Planning can include some advice and guidance on our web site to encourage developers to consider the campaign for gull-proofing of new buildings when developing their schemes. Officers can also refer to this advice when providing pre application advice.</p> <p>The panel’s request has been accepted, but the response remains unchanged</p> <p>There is an enthusiasm to use fire gel as an alternative to other physical measures on buildings, and procure egg</p>

Updated - Urban Gulls recommendations Cabinet member responses (April 2014)

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
<p>methods, and share experiences and good practice</p> <p>2.4 Further explore the 'Australia' model of developing nesting areas outside of the city centre, with a view to developing a pilot site if viable. These sites include nesting platforms to encourage nesting in locations where it is easier to oil/prick eggs.</p> <p>PTE PDS (4 March 2014) The panel have asked for timescales as to when this exploration will be undertaken. Cllr Dixon has stated he is going to discuss with UWE students as a possible research project and will feed back to the panel about this at a later date.</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Defer</p> <p>Accept</p>	<p></p> <p>Not known as yet</p>	<p>replacement to supplement this and fill the gaps in coverage. The main issue is gaps in coverage and this will need to be addressed. If there is a small budget issue, this can be achieved. If the figures are greater than thought, we will need to look at what can be done.</p> <p>Further evidence is required to demonstrate the effectiveness of this suggestion</p> <p>This issue has already been referred (February 2014) to UWE as a possible model for a student research project. It is, of course, possible that no students will chose this topic. The panel will be updated in September 2014.</p>
<p>3. Carry out effective enforcement against those who break the rules</p> <p>3.1 Enforce stronger penalties for littering in identified 'hot spots' such as parks, car parks and around outdoor seating area</p> <p>3.2 Broaden use of online and other communications tools by the enforcement team to include recognition of responsible businesses and actively share performance information on penalties and convictions to broadcast a strong message to the public on enforcement against persistent offenders.</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Accept</p> <p>Accept</p>	<p>April 2014</p> <p>May 2014</p>	<p>Local Authorities can set the fixed penalty amount within a range of £50 to £80. The default amount is £75 and this is the current level of FPN's in B&NES</p> <p>The Cleansing Enforcement Officers have been equipped with mobile devices. It is possible for them to use social media to promote areas of good practice and publicise actions taken with advice from Communications and Marketing</p>

Updated - Urban Gulls recommendations Cabinet member responses (April 2014)

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
This will also enable the service to better monitor trends.				
<p>4. Improve education and engagement with businesses, residents and visitors</p> <p>4.1 Plan and deliver a strengthened and consistent communications campaign to educate the public and enforce a more coordinated approach</p> <p>4.2 Provide clear and consistent guidance on individuals' and businesses' rights and responsibilities to tackle urban gulls, through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) a 'one-for-all' leaflet with top 10 tips for how to lessen individual and business impact on gull numbers b) specific guidance to target residents, businesses and visitors using the notion of 'respect our city' c) ensuring business and property owners, and residents are made aware of their legal rights and responsibilities under the general licence issued by Natural England <p>4.3 Train public protection officers on options for businesses and building owners to tackle gulls to share whilst on routine inspections</p> <p>4.4 Recognise excellence through new gull champions – those who are passionate about the need to work together to tackle the gull problem and lead by example</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Accept</p> <p>Accept</p> <p>Accept</p> <p>Accept</p>	<p>Feb 2014</p> <p>April 2014</p> <p>April 2014</p> <p>April 2014</p>	<p>Officers will work with the Communications and Marketing team to plan and deliver this campaign</p> <p>This guidance will be produced and made available through the OSS and on the public website.</p> <p>This will be completed through a training session delivered to the relevant officers</p> <p>The service will recognise those residents/businesses that have taken proactive steps in dealing with the gull problem and publicise this work to the wider community.</p>

Updated - Urban Gulls recommendations Cabinet member responses (April 2014)

Recommendation	Cabinet member	Decision response	Implement. date	Rationale
5.2 Build on the existing link to the Severn Estuary Gull Action Group to improve shared learning on best practice and work across boundaries for a more joined up approach	Cllr Dixon	Accept	April 2014	Officers and Members will attend these meetings to hear of good practice and help to promote a more joined up approach to the problem
5.3 Discuss the impact of landfill with other local councils and options to limit gulls' access to food at these sites.	Cllr Dixon	Reject	-	This is the responsibility of the Environment Agency (EA). EA will be contacted and advised of this recommendation
<p>PTE PDS (4 March 2014) The panel were concerned that this recommendation had been noted as 'reject', whereas it should be deferred and the council can therefore be proactive in working with the EA.</p>	Cllr Dixon	Reject		March update – no change
<p>6. Work with the Severn Estuary Gull Action Group to lobby Government to take more action</p>				
6.1 Lobby Government, via the LGA, to tackle urban gull issues at national level by providing advice and support to councils, informed by a national study of good practice	Cllr Dixon	Accept	From April 2014	Documents will be prepared for the Cabinet member so that he can raise this with the LGA
6.2 Lobby for clearer definitions in law on littering, in particular in relation to food waste, and better defined rules on offender enforcement within the ASB Bill	Cllr Dixon	Accept	From April 2014	Documents will be prepared for the Cabinet member so that he can raise this with the LGA
6.3 Campaign for a further reduction of food waste to landfill, with the specific aim of covering or closing exposed landfill sites and reducing the food source for gulls.	Cllr Dixon	Reject	-	The Council will encourage other members of the Severn Estuary Gull Action Group to follow their lead and ensure their food waste is sent to composting facilities rather than landfill

Bath & North East Somerset Council		
MEETING:	Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel	
MEETING DATE:	4th March 2014	EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE:
		E 2566
TITLE:	Alcohol Harm Reduction Scrutiny Inquiry Day	
WARD:	All	
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM		
List of attachments to this report:		
Appendix 1 Recommendations Response table		

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 In March 2012, the Government launched its Alcohol Strategy that included new powers for local authorities from April 2012. Licensing and health bodies became responsible authorities under the Licensing Act 2003. They are now notified of applications or reviews; and can instigate a review of a licence. From Oct 2012, local authorities' were given powers to introduce Early Morning Restriction Orders (to restrict alcohol sales if a problem) and the Late Night Levy (from businesses to cover the cost of policing and local authority action).
- 1.2 In April 2012, the cabinet adopted the refreshed B&NES Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy. The key themes were: health & treatment, community safety, crime and disorder, children and young people as well as partnership working. A steering group was tasked with responsibility for implementation.
- 1.3 The purpose of the Scrutiny Inquiry Day ('SID') was to provide the opportunity to formulate policy approaches with relevant experts and stakeholders on:
- (1) The B&NES Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy (with a view to refreshing its desired outcomes); and
 - (2) To consider the new powers being introduced through the Government's Alcohol Strategy.

The SID was held on the 10th October 2013.

- 1.4 Cllr Brett, Vice Chair of the Planning, Transport & Environment (PTE) Panel led a steering group with councillors representing four PDS panels: Early Years, Children & Youth (EYCY), Planning, Transport & Environment (PTE), Economic & Community Development (ECD) and Wellbeing.
- 1.5 The Planning, Transport & Environment PDS Panel may be aware that the Health and Wellbeing Board previously identified alcohol as a key priority within the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (that was agreed by Council on 14th November 2013).
- 1.6 Members of all four relevant PDS Panels were invited to attend the Wellbeing Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel on the 22nd December 2013 to comment on the draft report, recommendations and equalities impact assessment. Minor amendments were made to refresh the report and recommendations table.
- 1.7 Cabinet members have been asked to consider the recommendations of the scrutiny inquiry day. Their response now returns to each of the respective PDS Panels for the consideration of members.

2 RECOMMENDATION

At the Planning, Transport & Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel on the 4th March 2014, the Panel are asked to:-

- 2.1 Consider the recommendations response table completed by the Cabinet Member for Wellbeing, Simon Allen; Cabinet Member for Community Resources, David Bellotti; Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development, Ben Stevens; Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, David Dixon and the Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children & Youth, Dine Romero as detailed in Appendix 1 to this report. To discuss in particular the recommendations flagged as falling within the Planning, Transport & Environment PDS Panel's remit.

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)

- 3.1 The review was completed within the resources available to the four Policy Development and Scrutiny Panels involved in this joint scrutiny work; namely Early Years, children & Youth (EYCY), Planning, Transport & Environment (PTE), Economic & Community Development (ECD) and Wellbeing.
- 3.2 A key consideration for the Cabinet members in determining their response to the recommendations has been resource requirements, in particular financial implications.

Where relevant, resource implications are acknowledged in the responses in two main ways:

- (1) where a recommendation is accepted and there is a recognised resource requirement, the potential impact of this requirement and/or the potential solution has been included in the response
- (2) where a recommendation is deferred or rejected due to (at least in part) resource issues, the barrier to delivery is explained.

The work to be carried out as a result of accepted recommendations will be undertaken within existing resources and there will be no financial impact.

4 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS AND BASIS FOR PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Equalities issues were considered by the Panel as part of their work in formulating the scope of this proposed investigation and further equalities work was undertaken during the course of consultation. For the full Equalities Impact Assessment for this work see the link in Background papers below.
- 4.2 The Council has a statutory duty to promote the health & wellbeing of the inhabitants of its area and reduce inequalities amongst its population. This PDS scrutiny work seeks to present evidence of how alcohol harm impacts local communities. The work also seeks to identify those initiatives that would help reduce alcohol harm.
- 4.3 Under the Crime & Disorder Act 1998, the Council has to have regard to the need to reduce crime and disorder in exercising any of its functions. In seeking to reduce the impact of alcohol harm, the Council will be meeting this obligation.

5 THE REPORT

- 5.1 The full report for this review can be found through the link in the background papers below.

6 RATIONALE

- 6.1 Appendix 1 provides the Recommendations Response Table for this work

7 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 7.1 None

8 CONSULTATION

- 8.1 Ward Councillors; Cabinet Member; Parish Councils; Town Councils; Policy Development and Scrutiny Panels; Staff; Other B&NES Services; Local Residents; Community Interest Groups; Stakeholders/Partners; Other Public Sector Bodies; Section 151 Finance Officer; Chief Executive; Monitoring Officer
- 8.2 The Council's Monitoring Officer (Divisional Director – Legal and Democratic Services) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

9 RISK MANAGEMENT

A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.

Contact person	Emma Bagley/ Liz Richardson ext: 6410 / 6053
Background papers	<p>Scrutiny Inquiry Day Report: http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s28027/App%201%20Alcohol%20SID%20Report%20041113.pdf</p> <p>Equalities Impact Assessment http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s28029/App%203%20EIA%20Alcohol%20SID%20041113.pdf</p> <p>Minutes of Wellbeing PDS Panel meeting 22nd November 2014: http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=460&MId=3329&Ver=4</p>
<p>Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format</p>	

Review Title: Alcohol Harm Reduction

Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel: A joint review by ECD, EYCY, PTE and Wellbeing PDS Panels led by Cllr Brett, and reporting to Wellbeing PDS Panel

Panel Chair and Vice Chair: Cllr Pritchard and Cllr Beath

Policy Development & Scrutiny Project Officer: Emma Bagley / Liz Richardson

Supporting Service Officer: Cathy McMahon, Sue Dicks, Andrew Jones and Kate Murphy

Process for Tracking PD&S Recommendations - Guidance note for Cabinet Members

The enclosed table lists all the recommendations arising from the above Policy Development & Scrutiny Review. Individual recommendations are referred to the relevant named Cabinet Members (or whole Cabinet in the case of a whole Cabinet referral) as listed in the '**Cabinet Member**' column of the table. Cabinet members are requested to seek help from your relevant service Officers within your portfolio to help complete the Rationale for your response. A copy of this has also been forwarded to your appropriate Lead Officer. In order to provide the PD&S Panel with a Cabinet response on each recommendation, the named Cabinet member (or whole Cabinet) is asked to complete the last 3 columns of the table as follows:

Decision Response

The Cabinet has the following options:

- **Accept** the Panel's recommendation
- **Reject** the Panel's recommendation
- **Defer** a decision on the recommendation because a response cannot be given at this time. This could be because the recommendation needs to be considered in light of a future Cabinet decision, imminent legislation, relevant strategy development or budget considerations, etc.

Implementation Date

- For 'Accept' decision responses, give the date that the recommendation will be implemented.
- For 'Defer' decision responses, give the date that the recommendation will be reconsidered.
- For 'Reject' decisions this is not applicable so write n/a

Rationale

Use this space to explain the rationale for your decision response and implementation date. For accepted recommendations, please give details of how they will be implemented.

<p>d. parents by public health working together with schools. (EYCY / Wellbeing)</p>		<p>d. Accept</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>currently commissioned as the mechanism for engaging with workplaces on health issues. Proposal for Council to pilot this approach to promoting staff wellbeing. In addition campaigns to promote sensible drinking amongst adults and training for professionals will be co-ordinated via Alcohol Harm Reduction Steering Group within existing resource.</p> <p>To be discussed and planned at Young People's Substance Misuse Group</p>
<p><u>Improved and more frequent alcohol screening mechanisms</u></p> <p>2 (A) Develop and implement a quick screening method within front line services (including primary care such as pharmacies and waiting rooms - although potential scope for acute settings too). (B) Build on the existing AUDIT tool by exploring a potential 'app', scratch cards, themed bar mats or self-assessment pro-forma. (Wellbeing)</p>	<p>Cllr Allen</p>	<p>(A) Defer (B) Accept</p>	<p>Nov 14</p>	<p>(A) Business case to be drawn up for further investment in primary care /pharmacy to undertake screening for target populations (B) Increased social marketing around alcohol issues will support Rec 1c above. Align launch with Alcohol Awareness Week Nov 14</p>
<p><u>Targeted interventions that deal with adverse effects of alcohol</u></p> <p>3.1 Build on in-situ interventions and street treatments in order to tackle isolated instances of inebriation in the night time economy. Support the ACPO initiative of 'drunk-tanks', and express an interest in hosting a pilot service in B&NES. (Wellbeing)</p> <p>3.2 To provide 'wet house' supported</p>	<p>Cllr Allen</p>	<p>3.1 Reject 3.2 Defer</p>	<p>March 15</p>	<p>Current evidence regarding incidents in the NTE does not support need for drunk tanks. Approach does not encourage individual responsibility or culture change. We will continue to monitor local NTE data and national initiatives.</p> <p>B&NES Council Public Health & Drug and Alcohol team are currently working</p>

<p>accommodation for patients requiring longer term health and social care rehabilitation or interventions. This recommendation to be implemented where there is the demand and an evidence base for this (Wellbeing)</p> <p>4 Encourage improved workplace health by developing a simple toolkit that local employers can use in the workplace. This initiative seeks to raise awareness about alcohol use in employees and colleagues. (Wellbeing)</p>		<p>4. Accept</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>with Alcohol Concern and other partnerships across the country to explore approaches to working with ‘treatment resistant drinkers’. This work will provide a range of options for working with this group that partners can consider, some of which may be suitable for new funding models like Social Impact Bonds.</p> <p>See 1c above re; Workplace Wellbeing Charter model</p>
<p><u>Greater emphasis on prevention of alcohol harm through national policy</u></p> <p>5 Health to be embedded as an alcohol licensing objective. The government to be lobbied about incorporating this into licensing legislation via the LGA. (PTE)</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>March 2014</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon accepts this recommendation. Licensing will work with Public Health to draft submission for the leader to send.</p>
<p><u>A local licensing policy that considers a broader range of issues and impacts</u></p> <p>6 Refresh the B&NES licensing policy to acknowledge prevention of alcohol harm with such inclusions as:</p> <p>a. Incorporate health into licensing policy at a local level;</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>a) Accept</p>	<p>July 2014</p>	<p>a) Yes – could be included in consultation on new policy (Spring 2014). Licensing Officers already researching other areas of good practice.</p>

<p>b. A vision of what B&NES' night time economy will look like (including an overview of cultural expectations). This high-level vision to be supplemented by district level aspirations (such as Bath, Keynsham, Midsomer Norton, Radstock etc.);</p> <p>c. Early Morning Restriction Orders in areas based on resident demand;</p> <p>d. Appraisal of Cumulative Impact (CI) zones;</p> <p>e. Consideration of 'dry streets' where a community wishes to exclude licensed alcohol traders completely; and</p> <p>f. The option of including a condition in a license around minimum unit pricing, high strength alcohol restrictions and/or irresponsible promotions where the evidence suggests this would be appropriate. (PTE/ ECD)</p>		<p>b) Accept</p> <p>c) Reject</p> <p>d) Accept</p> <p>e) Reject</p> <p>f) Accept</p>	<p>New Policy on forward plan. Currently July 2014.</p> <p>d) No details on timescales yet.</p> <p>f) July 2014</p>	<p>b) Key elements would fit in strategy and could certainly be supported in an introduction to policy. Suggest area/district aspirations should be treated in a similar manner. Clear links between strategy and policy to be reinforced through this. Date of Policy to Council may slip owing to consultation length</p> <p>c) Requires an evidence base to progress and formal consultation process. There is a very clear statutory requirement to demonstrate the need. (Likely resource requirement 1 x 1.0 FTE for 6 months).</p> <p>d) Already in train Jon Poole and Natalia Urry (Policy and Strategy) are researching.</p> <p>e) Insufficient information and evidence.</p> <p>f) Yes – could be included in consultation on new policy. Could be based on Newcastle and/or Wakefield model.</p>
---	--	---	--	---

<p><u>More accessible training that emphasises issues and effects of alcohol harm</u></p> <p>7.1 Establish and deliver a local Best Bar None training scheme for trade staff. (PTE)</p> <p>7.2 B&NES to express an interest in applying a business rate rebate to those premises successfully participating in the Best Bar None scheme. (PTE)</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Bellotti</p>	<p>7.1 Defer (Resource required)</p> <p>Reject</p>		<p>Model exists. Would need resource to take forward. Likely to require 1 x 1.0 FTE for 6 months and thereafter 1 day per week.</p> <p>All local authorities were given discretionary powers to remit business rates in the Localism Act. A rebate should be in the interest of local council tax payers. It would be wholly funded by the council.</p> <p>There would be some administrative costs depending on the nature of the scheme as there would need to be manual reports and inputs. There are 382 properties which could be effected and this does not include any shops. A 5% discount on business rates would cost the Council £558k per annum.</p> <p>The suggestion is therefore rejected on grounds of loss of income to the Council, administrative costs and it would be selecting one business sector for special treatment above others.</p>
<p><u>Improved engagement at local level though more positive and proactive information sharing and publicity</u></p> <p>8 Improve the information available to residents about making complaints and contributing to licensing reviews.</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>8) Accept</p>	<p>Sept 2014</p>	<p>a) Recommend becomes part of Customer Services workstream project (improving information for customers).</p>

<p>Refresh existing information about licensing contacts and processes in the B&NES Connect magazine and on the B&NES website.</p> <p>Consider a 24hr answerphone line to gather evidence from residents about licensing concerns. Promote a direct telephone line within licenced premises if a customer wants to raise a concern or report issues. (PTE)</p>		<p>Accept</p> <p>Defer</p>	<p>Sept 2014</p>	<p>b) As above</p> <p>Needs consideration as to whether this is part of the wider “report it” customer services workstream which is aiming to simplify the reporting process and reduce telephone lines into Council for customer contacts. Not just an issue for licensed premises – applies to other issues.</p>
<p><u>Communities that are safer from alcohol harm</u></p> <p>9.1 Build on existing work to prevent anti -social behaviour. Contain early issues through strong and clear enforcement presence in B&NES. Continue existing measures such as street marshals and police presence in ‘hot spots’; as well as appropriate licensing enforcement action. Encourage greater information sharing between the police and council (e.g.101 and street marshal data) to guide enforcement. (PTE/ECD)</p> <p>9.2 Extend existing initiatives, or foster new approaches in encouraging collective working between all alcohol traders (both on and off-trade). Encourage communication between businesses to allow them to work together optimally and, take a firm approach on sale of alcohol to people inebriated (legislation places licensees responsible for selling alcohol in this manner). (PTE/ECD)</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p> <p>Cllr Dixon / Cllr Stevens</p>	<p>Reject</p> <p>Defer</p>		<p>Refer to Police Crime Commissioner</p> <p>Links to Best Bar None initiative and training for Licencees and staff. Resource implications.</p>

<p><u>Communities that are safer from outcomes of alcohol harm</u></p> <p>10.1 Encourage more integrated community safety work by rolling out further Community Alcohol Partnerships (CAPs) where underage drinking is a problem and residents want a CAP. (ECD)</p> <p>10.2 Tackle alcohol-fuelled domestic violence and abuse by exploring ways of introducing a CAP style model of integrated working across B&NES.</p> <p>To develop existing work by the council as part of the public service transformation network. Funding could potentially be earmarked through the community budget that covers this area of work. (ECD)</p>	<p>Cllr Dixon</p>	<p>Reject</p> <p>Reject</p> <p>Reject</p>		<p>Community Safety is now a role for the Police Crime Commissioner.</p> <p>Models already in place via the Multi-agency risk assessment conference (MARAC) ,safeguarding board and connecting families. Integrated Victim Service (PCC) includes domestic violence.</p> <p>There is now a twice yearly meeting being set up of the AG/LSAB/LSBC/HWB and Police and Crime Commissioner to ensure that Strategy of all the above groups is aligned</p> <p>DV Community Budget work is underway led by Andy Thomas through the PSTN and H&W</p>
---	--------------------------	--	--	---

Briefing Note relating to Network Rail's Proposals to Electrify the Great Western Main Line.

1. The Scheme

Network Rail's overall project is to electrify the existing Great Western Main between London and Bristol including Bath as well as Newbury and Oxford Maidenhead in the east, through to Cardiff in the west and on to Swansea. No new railway will be constructed. The Scheme also includes the electrification of the Didcot to Chester Line (DCL) as far as Oxford and the Berkshire and Hampshire Line (BHL) as far as Newbury.

2. Why electrify?

The project will enable the route for a new fleet of Intercity Express Trains. The project promises more seats and more reliable trains. Network Rail indicate that electrification will also deliver a reduction in emissions and carbon locally. The project has been designed to stimulate economic growth across the region with improved connectivity between towns and cities. Network Rail indicate that when the project is delivered it will improve reliability and lower maintenance and operating costs.

Network Rail have pointed out that this project will enable Great Britain to catch up with the rest of Europe. Network Rail suggest that in 2005 Great Britain only exceeded the Czech Republic, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Greece, the Republic of Ireland and Albania in its percentage of the network which was electrified.

3 Other related projects

Network Rail suggest that the electrification project relates well to other investments. These include Reading Area Station, Bristol Area Re-Signalling, Filton Four Tracking, Maidenhead to Paddington station enhancements and Access for All enhancements.

4. Key Objectives for Bath and North East Somerset

Network Rail's stated key objectives for Bath and North East Somerset are as follows:-

- Respect the sensitivity of the Great Western railway through the Bath World Heritage Site.
- Respect Residents, Businesses and all Stakeholders impacted by the project – work closely with BANES Environmental Health Officers.
- Respond to the landscape character of the city by careful consideration of the location of the overhead line equipment.
- Achieve the necessary electrical clearances and safety requirements to protect the Public from overhead line equipment in ways that minimise the physical and visual impacts on sensitive listed structures.
- Treat Sydney Gardens as a 21st century electrification set- piece worthy of Brunel's theatre of railway.

5. Planning and other statutory consents

Network Rail as a railway operator is able to carry out significant development without the need for planning permission. This is by virtue of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order. This allows railway operators to carry out development “on their operational land, required in connection with the movement of traffic by rail.” However this “permitted development” right does not extend to work involving listed buildings. B&NES has the largest concentration of Listed structures on the route. Your Officers have been liaising with Network Rail as they prepare their submissions for Listed Building Consent.

There may be the need for some planning permissions if any of the work relates to non-operational railway land. Network Rail have agreed that the scale of the work requires the submission of an Environmental Impact Statement. This is due to be submitted shortly. The implementation of the project will also be likely to require temporary road closures and night work where the advice of the Council’s public protection officers will be needed.

6. Work Programme.

Network Rail’s anticipated sees work associated with this project commencing in August this year and continuing until April 2016. Within that period the work will involve service alterations anticipated between 19th July 2015 and 31st August 2015. It is understood that these service alterations will include the provision of alternative and bus/coach services. Network Rail have committed to undertake advance communication with First Great Western and this Council regarding this work. They have also agreed to undertake public consultation in conjunction with this Council. Officers will be working with Network Rail as the project progresses.

David Trigwell
Director Planning and Transport Development

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT PDS FORWARD PLAN

This Forward Plan lists all the items coming to the Panel over the next few months.

Inevitably, some of the published information may change; Government guidance recognises that the plan is a best assessment, at the time of publication, of anticipated decision making. The online Forward Plan is updated regularly and can be seen on the Council's website at:

<http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/mgPlansHome.aspx?bcr=1>

The Forward Plan demonstrates the Council's commitment to openness and participation in decision making. It assists the Panel in planning their input to policy formulation and development, and in reviewing the work of the Cabinet.

Should you wish to make representations, please contact the report author or Mark Dumford, Democratic Services (01225 394458). A formal agenda will be issued 5 clear working days before the meeting.

Agenda papers can be inspected on the Council's website and at the Guildhall (Bath), Hollies (Midsomer Norton), Riverside (Keynsham) and at Bath Central, Keynsham and Midsomer Norton public libraries.

Planning, Transport and Environment PDS Forward Plan

Bath & North East Somerset Council

Anticipated business at future Panel meetings

Ref Date	Decision Maker/s	Title	Report Author Contact	Strategic Director Lead
PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT & SCRUTINY PANEL - 4TH MARCH 2014				
14 Jan 2014	PTE PDS			
Before 14 Feb 2014	Cllr Ben Stevens, Cllr David Dixon	Policy Development and Scrutiny Recommendations - Urban Gulls	Cathryn Humphries, Liz Richardson Tel: 01225 477645, Tel: 01225 396053	Louise Fradd
4 Mar 2014	PTE PDS			
E2616				
Before 14 Feb 2014	Cllr David Dixon, Cllr Dine Romero, Cllr Simon Allen			
4 Mar 2014				
13 Mar 2014	PTE PDS	Policy Development and Scrutiny recommendations - Alcohol Harm Reduction Review	Emma Bagley, Councillor Vic Pritchard Tel: 01225 396410,	Ashley Ayre Louise Fradd
21 Mar 2014	ECD PDS			
24 Mar 2014	Wellbeing PDS			
E2566	EYCY PDS			
4 Mar 2014	PTE PDS	Network Rail Electrification Briefing		Louise Fradd
PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT & SCRUTINY PANEL - 6TH MAY 2014				

Ref Date	Decision Maker/s	Title	Report Author Contact	Strategic Director Lead
6 May 2014	PTE PDS	Core Strategy Update	Simon De Beer Tel: 01225 477616	Louise Fradd
PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT & SCRUTINY PANEL - 8TH JULY 2014				
8 Jul 2014	PTE PDS			
13 Nov 2014	Council	Council's Statement of Principles (Licensing Policy)	Cathryn Humphries Tel: 01225 477645	Louise Fradd
FUTURE ITEMS				
Page 55	PTE PDS	Bath Transport Strategy	David Trigwell Tel: 01225 394125	Louise Fradd
	PTE PDS	Keynsham Transport Strategy		Louise Fradd
10 Apr 2013	Cabinet			
July 2014 E2439	PTE PDS	Bus Priority Measures in Dorchester St, Manvers St and Pierpoint St., Bath	Adrian Clarke Tel: 01225 395223	Louise Fradd
The Forward Plan is administered by DEMOCRATIC SERVICES : Mark Durnford 01225 394458 Democratic_Services@bathnes.gov.uk				

This page is intentionally left blank