

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL

Tuesday, 16th September, 2014

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

Also in attendance: Steve Blackmore (Traffic Management Manager), Tim Hewitt (Regeneration Team Manager), John Wilkinson (Divisional Director, Community Regeneration), Richard Daone (Planning Policy Team Leader), Sue Green (Group Manager, Public Protection and Health Improvement), Amy McCullough (Public Health Speciality Registrar) and Nicola Courthold (Environmental Monitoring Technical Officer)

Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning: Councillor Tim Ball

Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Caroline Roberts

32 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

33 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

34 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillor Douglas Nicol had sent his apologies to the Panel. Councillor Gerry Curran was present as his substitute for the duration of the meeting.

35 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

36 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There was none.

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

Rachel Wilson, Co-Chair, Chew Valley Flood Forum made a statement to the Panel, a copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book and a brief summary is set out below.

The Chew Valley Flood Forum would like to raise the following concerns regarding the “Enhanced” Property Level Protection (PLP) scheme for 70 properties, currently in progress in Chew Magna.

There is a danger that the mistakes of the previous B&NES/Environment Agency (EA) PLP scheme in 2010/2011 are being repeated. Compromises are being made due to time and perhaps also cost pressures, and the new scheme may result in sub-optimal protection for householders. Expectations are fading that the scheme will be comprehensive and robust. The EA, who are project managing the scheme, is proposing legal agreements with householders that could be onerous and potentially confusing, and lack important details regarding contractor liabilities and product warranties.

The draft agreements state the EA “can not guarantee any aspect of the quality, condition or fitness for purpose of the PLP measures”.

The EA appears to be managing the project on a “re-active” and “catch up” basis. B&NES’s funding was available at the start of this financial year. The current estimate for first installations is November. We are not aware of project documentation such as scope, escalation process and timetable. There does not seem to be a clear process on Acceptance Criteria to enable sign-off of installed PLP products nor clarity about products not supplied by the chosen contractor e.g. who installs them, warranties, maintenance agreements.

We are not clear what B&NES’s involvement is in the project. However we feel that going forward it is essential to have a consultative/co-ordinating group, led by B&NES as the Lead Flood Authority, incorporating representatives from the EA, Bristol Water, relevant Parish Councils and CVFF, to consider all future matters relating to flooding and protective/preventative measures. This was proposed by B&NES many months ago, but, as yet, has not been implemented. If such a group was already in place, we feel sure the evident shortcomings with the project management of the current scheme would have been avoided.

John Wright, Co-Chair, Chew Valley Flood Forum addressed the Panel. He asked if the Forum could receive a cost breakdown of the £200,000 project budget from the Council and the Environment Agency.

The Chair proposed that the Panel assign a Lead Member and discuss the matter further with the Forum and the Environment Agency.

The Team Leader, Highway Maintenance commented that officers were willing to meet with the Forum and the Environment Agency to iron out any points.

The Chair asked if Councillor Liz Richardson would be the Lead Member for the Panel.

Councillor Richardson replied that she would.

Patrick Rotheram, Chairman, Vineyards Residents' Association made a statement to the Panel, a copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book and a brief summary is set out below.

Together with the Circus Area Residents' Association (CARA) we have been trying for a number of years now to get the Council to make improvements in the arrangements for residents parking in the northern part of the Central Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

As the attached map clearly demonstrates, the north Central Zone (coloured orange) is no closer to the commercial and civic city centre than most of the other Controlled Zones (the so-called 'Outer Zones').

Residents in this area are unfairly treated compared with residents in the Outer Zones. Although it is the most densely residential area in the city, there is almost no 'permit-holder only' parking. We do not get resident visitor permits. In the Outer Zones there is a minimum of 50% permit-holder only places and residents can buy day permits for their visitors. Similar arrangements should apply in the residential north Central Zone.

This may sound familiar, as we told you about it at your meetings in October 2012 and September 2103, having raised it formally with the Council as far back as 2005. We are wondering where to go next. The Council's recent parking survey underlined residents' dissatisfaction with the parking arrangements in the Central Zone. We have the support of both our Ward Councillors. Your Panel has asked for our case to be progressed. And yet nothing happens. Is this how the democratic process is meant to work? We ask for your help to finally get something done.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Councillor Caroline Roberts replied that she had previously discussed the matter with Mr Rotheram and that two new residents parking zones were being planned for Newbridge & Weston. She added that the Central Zone would be analysed very soon.

Councillor Les Kew asked how Mr Rotheram would like to see the matter resolved.

Mr Rotheram replied that he would like a proportion of spaces to be made available for residents only and that some visitor permits would be welcome. He added that one space per household would probably suffice.

Councillor Lisa Brett commented that there was an evidence of need and the will for political change and encouraged a decision to be taken as soon as possible.

Councillor Gerry Curran commented that the impasse on a decision may well be because the spaces have a value to the Council through revenue.

The Chair commented that the Bath Transport Strategy that encompasses the Parking Strategy would be discussed by the Panel in November and that answers to the points raised by Mr Rotheram would be sought in the interim.

David Redgewell, South West Transport Network made a statement to the Panel, a copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book and a brief summary is set out below.

He urged the Panel to do all they could to protect local bus networks.

He called for the Radstock to Frome bus route to be protected.

He stated that the Riverside Regeneration in Bath required strong bus links to Oldfield Park, the centre of Bath and Bristol.

He said that he was dissatisfied with the Enterprise Area Masterplan and that high quality buses were required to make them more attractive for the public to use. He suggested that bus priority lanes should also be in place.

He informed the Panel that the management arrangements at Bath Bus Station were not acceptable and that problems surrounding the café, toilets and general cleaning were not being dealt with appropriately.

He asked for bus shelters to be cleaned and maintained more regularly as one situated in Timsbury was in the process of falling down and a number in the area were suffering from graffiti.

Councillor Gerry Curran commented that the cleaning of the bus station must be sorted out by First or Multi as soon as possible. He added that toilet facilities were available within Southgate.

Mr Redgewell replied that those facilities closed early in the evening, the toilets at the bus station can only be accessed when the ticket office is open and a ticket was required to enter the train station to use their toilets.

Councillor Les Kew said that ownership of the bus station must be identified and aligned so that these issues can be rectified.

Councillor Ben Stevens, Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development suggested that First be approached to sign up to the BID (Business Improvement District).

Councillor Eleanor Jackson addressed the Panel on behalf of a number of residents of Frome Road, Radstock. She informed them that the garden of 120 Frome Road was in a dangerous condition and that action was required to clear it and make it safe.

Councillor Jackson then read aloud from a letter and email from residents.

She said that the garden had been increasingly deteriorating over a number of years. The pile of rubbish was between 4 feet and 8 feet high in some places and towered over neighbouring properties. It resembles a landfill site and comprises of buried vehicle parts & bodywork, tyres, plastic, oil drums, gas cylinder, wood, glass, roofing materials and ton upon ton of building rubble.

The increased weight caused by the landfill has led to severe problems for the immediate neighbouring properties. A 6ft high boundary fence is being continually forced over and into the adjoining property one side (no.122), whilst on the other, a dividing concrete boundary wall has cracked and is leaning into the adjoining property at a precarious angle (no. 118).

We have the safety of our children, families and property at the forefront of our minds, but can add to that the eyesore we have to live with everyday and the negative effect on our own property values.

The young children of our terrace are unduly penalised by not being able to use the full perimeter of their own properties by having “no go” areas due to the unstable nature of the adjoining site and growing increase of rodent infestation.

Through the summer we have had to keep our doors closed as the rats are so comfortable in their surroundings that they venture close to our homes and are not deterred even when the children are out and running about.

A Section 215 notice was served upon the property in August 2013, but as yet no work regarding the clearance of the garden has commenced. A number of start dates have been given, but they have all come and gone.

In May 2014 asbestos was found on the site.

Ultimately, what we require is a guarantee and timetable for the works to be completed, one that can be relied upon without further excuse. We feel that we have been patient enough and now ask the Council to grab the bull by the horns and appoint some strong leadership to the project.

Councillor Gerry Curran has a contractor been found that is willing to undertake the clearance works including asbestos.

Councillor Jackson replied that there was and that they should have commenced with the work on 12th September, but had not.

Councillor Curran said that he would work with Councillor Tim Ball, Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning identify a start date and would notify Councillor Jackson. He added that it was a huge environmental health problem that needed to be resolved quickly.

Councillor Ball asked Councillor Jackson to email him the full details so that he could make enquiries.

The Chair asked that the Panel be also notified of any progress made.

38 MINUTES - 8TH JULY 2014 AND 25TH JULY 2014

The Panel confirmed the minutes of the two previous meetings as a true record and they were duly signed by the Chair.

39 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE

The Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning, Councillor Tim Ball addressed the Panel. He informed them that the Core Strategy having been formally agreed by Council has not been challenged.

Councillor David Martin asked when the Core Strategy would be published in its final form.

The Planning Policy Team Leader replied that it is anticipated within the next month a final 'designed' document would be published in hard copy form and online.

Councillor Liz Richardson asked if a developer was raising a challenge on three sites regarding the matter of five year land supply.

Councillor Ball replied that a challenge had been received, but that legal advice had been received that this was not the correct route for the developer to take.

The Planning Policy Team Leader updated the Panel on the current position and that a response from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government is awaited.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Councillor Caroline Roberts addressed the Panel. She said that she was expecting to receive a presentation on the Bath Transport Strategy in two weeks and that work on the Keynsham Transport Strategy was ongoing.

She informed them that the final three 20mph zones were due to be installed and that this would conclude the current programme.

She announced that the problem surrounding late night bus tickets between Bath and Radstock had been rectified and an agreement reached between the service providers.

40 ENTERPRISE AREA MASTERPLAN

The Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development, Councillor Ben Stevens introduced this item to the Panel. He spoke of how the Masterplan was to act as a document that integrates a vast majority of the Council's current strategies to tackle aspects such as homes, employment and wildlife.

The Regeneration Team Manager then gave a presentation to the Panel, a copy of which can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

The Opportunity

- “Bringing Bath’s Riverside to Life”
- 98 hectares of land, c36 hectares of developable brownfield land
- Potential for 9000 new jobs and 3400 new homes, to deliver Core Strategy targets
- Concentrating on key growth sectors: creative industries, professional financial and business services, information technology and software development
- Key sites together can increase GVA, average incomes and levels of employment in the Bath economy by around 12%

Achievements to date

- Delivering Quality Outputs:
 - Bath Riverside
 - 300 new Homes (150 Affordable Homes) since 2011
 - +£2m New Homes Bonus
 - +£1m S106 monies
 - Bath Quays Waterside
 - Strong Partnership with Environment Agency formed
 - Connecting Bath to its Waterside – good public support
 - Protecting existing properties at risk + enabling development
 - Innovation Quay and EDF Business Case
 - LEP Programme Entry

What is the Masterplan enabling

- Positive Engagement with partners & beyond:
 - LEP, HCA, EA
 - Landowners
 - Developers
 - Property Agents and Occupiers
 - Realising funding e.g. DECC (HNDU)
 - Sustainable Energy – ‘renewable’ sources. E.g. River Avon & hot springs
- Co-ordinated Strategy & robust Policy Base:
 - Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan
 - Economic Strategy
 - Transport Strategy – ‘Getting Around Bath’
 - Green Infrastructure Strategy and Community Plan

- River Strategy
- Leisure Strategy

Relationship to Planning Policy

- Provide an exciting and enduring vision
- Guide redevelopment of Council owned land
- Clear direction of travel for funders, partners, developers and investors
- Is not a statutory planning document
- Forms part of the evidence base for the Placemaking Plan
- Placemaking Plan will undergo public consultation, ensuring robust, evidence based policy framework for Development Management decisions.

Core Values

- **Quality** – of life, of place, of developers, of occupiers
- **Enterprise** – fostering knowledge, inventiveness and creativity
- **Design** – inspirational public realm, connectivity of streets, spaces and bridges, integration of form and streetscape, respect for the character of “Bathness”
- **Heritage** – architectural, urban design and landscape excellence in a World Heritage setting
- **Green** – green building, green infrastructure, walking and cycling, biodiversity and ecology
- **Water** – at the heart of Bath’s identity, River Avon, spa water, Kennet and Avon Canal
- **Health and Wellbeing** – promoting leisure, the outdoors, socialising and promenading
- **The Big Idea:** Rediscovering and reconnecting the River, to bring Bath Riverside to Life!

Next Steps

- Cabinet 12 November 2014
- Co-ordinated Strategy:
 - Economic Strategy – key driver
 - Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan
 - Transport Strategy
 - River Strategy
 - Enterprise Area Masterplan – delivery mechanism
- Co-ordinated Delivery:
 - Bath Riverside
 - Bath Quays Waterside
 - Innovation Quay
 - Transport Strategy “Getting Around Bath”

Councillor Lisa Brett asked if there was an evidence of need for businesses wanting to come and work in Bath.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that they had been contacted by numerous companies over recent years enquiring about available office space. He added that the accommodation needs to be of a certain standard though and the current available properties are not appropriate. He said that the sites of the Quays and Manvers Street were the most wanted.

Councillor Lisa Brett asked what the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) view on the project was.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that the LEP and HCA (Homes & Community Agency) were happy that all plans were being worked on together. He added that officers meet with the LEP regularly and had worked on the Strategic Economic Plan together.

Councillor Lisa Brett asked how funding for the project would be enabled.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that funding would be unlocked via the LEP.

Councillor Lisa Brett asked if the Masterplan would have a positive effect on the traffic flow of the City.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that the Transport Strategy was key to this problem, with elements such as Park & Ride Expansion, Rail Electrification and Priority Bus Routes the main factors.

Councillor Les Kew commented that he wished to see any development at Manvers Street designed as a whole and not piecemeal.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that he agreed with Councillor Kew's comments, but due to the multiple land owners of the site it might not be possible to build out the whole development all at once.

The Chair asked how much say the Council would have regarding developments.

The Divisional Director for Community Regeneration replied that the Masterplan seeks to have a view on individual sites whilst having other areas in mind.

Councillor Roger Symonds asked if elements of the Masterplan would change once the Bath Transport Strategy is in place.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that the Masterplan may need a refresh in around a year, but that the Bath Transport Strategy had been worked on alongside the Masterplan.

Councillor Roger Symonds asked if the use of buses, walking and cycling would be promoted within the Masterplan in an attempt to improve air quality.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that those modes of travel were to be encouraged.

Councillor Roger Symonds asked if any update could be given on the Craneworks project and the future of the Sainsbury's site at Green Park.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that he considered the Craneworks project to be a fabulous idea and had met with them to discuss it. He added that they had been encouraged to discuss the project further with BMT as they have their plans for the area as well. He said that the Sainsbury's site was difficult and hard to deliver upon due to land ownership.

Councillor Gerry Curran commented that the Masterplan was a very exciting project, but that he shared the concerns of Councillor Kew regarding Manvers Street and that he wanted the development there to be employment led. He added that the underground car park should be maintained and possibly expanded.

He said that he felt that the City needs a central coach park and should the current one be relocated he would like the Council to purchase another site, possibly the Beazer building on the Lower Bristol Road.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that it is a great opportunity to develop Manvers Street and discussions were required with Royal Mail. He added that they would look to retain the parking where they could.

Councillor David Martin asked how quality of building design would be maintained.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that the recent Unesco document emphasised the need for this and so it would be raised very early on with developers.

Councillor David Martin asked how employment would be encouraged through the Masterplan.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that an environment would be created for businesses to thrive, particularly the creative industries.

Councillor David Martin asked how Bath would compete with Bristol to secure businesses.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that Bath had its own unique offer and he was aware that many companies would like to have a base in the City. He added that Bath and Bristol were partners in the LEP and should be able to work alongside each other. He said that the local creative and digital cluster was the third biggest in the country behind London & Manchester.

The Regeneration Team Manager added that the quality of design was to be seen in the buildings of the Holburne Museum and the Spa.

Councillor David Martin asked if sustainable energy and low carbon buildings would feature in development discussions.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that sustainability had played a part in the new Council offices in Keynsham and that we would look to control that again on our own sites.

The Planning Policy Team Leader re-iterated that the Masterplan will not carry significant weight in the process of determining planning applications. The Placemaking Plan will, as it goes through the preparation process, have increasing weight. The Placemaking Plan will address in greater detail issues around the quality of development within the Enterprise Area. In addition, the Placemaking Plan provides the opportunity to re-visit renewable energy/sustainable construction policies following recent Ministerial Statements that post-date the Core Strategy Examination Inspector's Report.

The Chair thanked everyone for their contributions to the discussion.

41 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE

The Planning Policy Team Leader introduced this item to the Panel. He informed them that the timeline for the public consultation on the draft charging schedule, the draft Regulation 123 List and the revised draft Planning Obligations SPD was from 24/7/14 to 18/9/14.

He explained that the draft charging schedule was due to be submitted for Examination in October 2014 and that comments from the Panel would be welcome by 8th October 2014.

Councillor Liz Richardson asked if the Panel could be sent a summary of the consultation responses.

The Planning Policy Team Leader replied that he would email a summary of key issues raised in the consultation by the end of September.

42 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME REVIEW

The Planning Policy Team Leader introduced this item to the Panel. He informed them that a Single Member Decision was upcoming on this matter.

He explained that the main changes from the previous Local Development Scheme related to:

- Preparation programme for the Placemaking Plan
- Preparation programme for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations DPD
- Reference to overall programme for West of England Joint Planning Strategy

With regard to the Placemaking Plan the Draft Plan would be published for consultation in September 2015 and it is anticipated that the plan would be adopted in September 2016.

On the matter of the Gypsy and Traveller DPD he stated that there is delay in reaching the Draft Plan stage. This is due to the need to undertake joint working with neighbouring authorities on both;

- assessing the level of need, ensuring there is no duplication, and
- exploring and agreeing the spatial strategy response to the need across the wider area ensuring that the most sustainable locations for new sites are identified, and that reasonable options outside the Green Belt are explored before considering Green Belt sites.

B&NES has been and continues to work with West of England and other adjoining Local Authorities on both these aspects.

Councillor David Martin commented that a high amount of activity was planned between now and March 2015 and asked if the department had enough resources in place.

The Planning Policy Team Leader replied that sufficient resources were available through the Planning Policy team and LDF budget to meet the work programme set out in the LDS, but that this would need to be kept under review with respect to work associated with involvement in the West of England Joint Planning Strategy.

The Chair asked when the Single Member Decision due was to be made.

The Planning Policy Team Leader replied that it was due next week, but that to allow for comments from the Panel it could be deferred for a small amount of time. He asked for their comments by the end of September.

43 AIR QUALITY IN B&NES

Patrick Rotheram, Transport Lead, Federation of Bath Residents' Associations made a statement to the Panel. A copy of which can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

The entire main road network in Bath, and many lesser streets, is in the Bath Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), which by definition means that there are unhealthy and unlawful levels of air pollution. Some 10,000 people live in the Bath AQMA and are suffering the effects of air pollution over the legal limit. This is a really serious issue, and we want the Council to get serious about dealing with it. Monitoring and studying doesn't cut it.

There has been much concern recently about the harmful effects of fine particulates (PM2.5). These are not currently monitored in Bath and are not covered in the report. We are sceptical about the predicted drop in pollution levels between 2012 and 2015. NO2 levels have remained fairly constant over the past ten years and show little sign of dropping. What factors is the prediction based on? Latest evidence is that diesel cars cause more pollution so increasing numbers of diesel cars will make matters worse, not improve them.

Sadly it is realistic for the study to assume that B&NES can't do anything which would directly result in HGV being diverted onto existing roads in Wiltshire, which is the reason why the other Options appear not to be viable. The logical conclusion is that the only way to reduce pollution from HGV is to provide a new alternative route avoiding Bath, eg an A36-A46 link.

The 'Actions taken in B&NES to improve air quality to date' (page 219) is misleading. None of these plans contain measures which will make a significant reduction in traffic and air pollution in Bath. The only measure in the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) which has any serious potential for reducing pollution is the LEZ, and the present report makes it clear that this can be introduced only in a limited central area. A transport strategy aimed at reducing traffic volumes in residential areas and across the city is essential.

Councillor Lisa Brett commented that the Council is given so little power by Government on this matter. She added that the Council were not allowed to impose a weight restriction on Cleveland Bridge and that she supported a link road for the A36 – A46.

The Senior Public Protection Officer and Public Health Speciality Registrar gave a presentation to the Panel. A copy of which can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

Low Emission Zone Feasibility Study

- DEFRA funded focus on Bath Air Quality Management Area.
- Traffic, emissions & dispersion modelling; consultation; (HGV/bus and coach operators, neighbouring authorities and Highways Agency); and CBA.

Scenarios

- **Do Nothing:** No changes assumed except Rossiter Road scheme and the effect of growth 2012-15
- **Option 1:** HGV: Only Euro-class 5 or better for the A4 London Road and Bathwick Street - 24hr restriction
- **Option 2:** HGV/Bus: Only Euro-class 5 or better for London Road and Bathwick Street - 24hr restriction
- **Option 3:** HGV: Only Euro-class 5 or better for London Road and Bathwick Street - between 3pm and 10am, lesser standard permitted between 10:00am-3:00pm
- **Option 4:** HGV/Bus: Euro-class 5 or better for 'Central Area' - inside A36

Key learnings

- Option 4 HGV/Bus central area most viable which would also benefit London Road/Bathwick Street area from improved fleet.
- Option 2 (London Road and Bathwick Street) not yet possible due to Highway Agency & neighbouring authority objection to any restrictions on the PRN plus failed 18t weight limit

- Cost incurred by HGV operators in Bath to comply to Euro 5 in 2015 on London Road / Bathwick Street circa £10million

International evidence base: confirms the link between air pollution and poor health

- Robust evidence base; including a series of large international reviews.
- While air pollution is never the single cause of death, it is a factor which can contribute to and exacerbate underlying health problems.
- Short-term exposure effects: inflammatory effects on the respiratory system, increased medication use, increase in hospital and emergency admissions (WHO, 2004).
- Long-term exposure can contribute to permanent reductions in lung development, cardiovascular disease and cancers, and a subsequent reduction in life expectancy (WHO, 2004, 2013).
- Impact of poor air quality unequal.
- The wider cost of air pollution from transport (in urban areas) alone is between £4.5 and £10.6 billion (accidents £8.7 billion, physical activity £9.8 billion)

Local exploratory work and key learning

- Identifying groups within the AQMAs that may be more vulnerable to the negative impacts of poor air quality:
 - Specific concentrations of older people, lower income residents, young and transient renters.
 - Estimated 26,500 employees within this zone.
 - Next step: identifying physical locations where more vulnerable groups may congregate e.g. care homes, nurseries; work with them to reduce their exposure.
- Hospital admissions within a 100 metre buffer of the AQMAs:
 - BUT, limitations with the data, findings not robust.
- As international evidence base is strong, suggest we accept the position that air pollution does contribute to poor health, rather than further investing in proving a direct local relationship, and use this as the basis for further prevention and control measures.
- Measures to improve air quality will benefit a number of health and wellbeing indicators, and can bring about benefits for the economy, environment, and climate change adaptation and mitigation.

Councillor Roger Symonds asked if poor air quality could cause ill health rather than add to it.

The Public Health Speciality Registrar replied that poor air quality contributes to poor health outcomes, and that certain groups, such as unborn & young children and older people, are more vulnerable to the negative effects of air pollution.

Councillor Anthony Clarke addressed the Panel. He asked if the taxis within the City in the main were the most appropriate type of vehicle.

The Group Manager for Public Protection and Health Improvement replied that on the whole the taxis in use were modern vehicles.

Councillor Anthony Clarke commented that he felt that risk levels should be more widely identified.

The Public Health Speciality Registrar replied that NO2 levels were higher than target levels within the AQMAs and that the level of risk is dependent on the area in which you work and live. She added that there is some (Public Health Framework) modelling data that shows that (human-made) Particulate Matter 2.5 contributes to mortality locally, but that this was lower in relation to the national average. There are uncertainties in the estimations.

The Group Manager for Public Protection and Health Improvement commented that the Air Quality Action Plans for Keynsham and Saltford remain outstanding. She added that it was anticipated that adoption of these outstanding plans was likely to be in mid-2015 due to the time needed for approval, consultation and the democratic reporting process.

She stated that the Environmental Monitoring team was currently working with the Transportation team on developing draft Action Plans prior to public consultation.

The Panel noted the report and the Chair asked for a further report to the Panel as part of the consultation process.

44 PROPOSED FORD SIGNAGE DE-CLUTTERING - CHEW STOKE SOUTH

The Traffic Management Manager introduced this report to the Panel. He explained that the Traffic Signs and General Directions (TSRG) recommends ford signage adjacent the site on each approach and advises of advanced signing at appropriate locations in order for approaching vehicles to change direction in advance and avoid the hazard.

He said that following the issue being raised at the May Scrutiny Panel by Councillor Pritchard a site meeting took place to discuss the locations of signing within his Ward. Given the Coroners recommendation and TSRG advice it is not recommended to remove the ford signing adjacent each ford. However given the rural nature and objection to sign clutter it is recommended that advanced signing is removed where a road is not deemed to be strategically important, a rat run or has significant volumes of traffic.

Councillor Vic Pritchard addressed the Panel. He thanked the officer for his work on the matter since May, but asked for four further signs to be removed as the water levels were minimal and the local residents were so appalled by them.

The Panel approved the officer recommendation that, the identified advanced ford signage is removed as per the attached schedule.

Following the submission to the Panel from Councillor Vic Pritchard, Councillor Les Kew proposed that the Panel recommends to the Cabinet Member for Transport that four further ford warning signs be removed from the two fords at Stowey Bottom and near Stowey Mill and that measuring level staffs be installed. There are two signs for each approach hence a total of four signs for the two specified fords.

The recommendation was seconded by Councillor Gerry Curran.

The Panel voted by a majority in favour of Councillor Kew's recommendation.

45 PANEL WORKPLAN

The Panel approved the current workplan as printed.

The meeting ended at 2.00 pm

Chair(person)

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

B&NES Planning, Transport and Environmental Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel

Meeting 16 September 2014

The Chew Valley Flood Forum would like to raise the following concerns regarding the “Enhanced” Property Level Protection (PLP) scheme for 70 properties, currently in progress in Chew Magna.

There is a danger that the mistakes of the previous B&NES/Environment Agency (EA) PLP scheme in 2010/2011 are being repeated. Compromises are being made due to time and perhaps also cost pressures, and the new scheme may result in sub-optimal protection for householders. Expectations are fading that the scheme will be comprehensive and robust. The EA, who are project managing the scheme, is proposing legal agreements with householders that could be onerous and potentially confusing, and lack important details regarding contractor liabilities and product warranties. The draft agreements state the EA “can not guarantee any aspect of the quality, condition or fitness for purpose of the PLP measures”.

The same firm that fitted the original PLP has been awarded the current contract on the basis that it is the only contractor currently on the EA’s preferred contractor list and a new competition would delay installation into next year. There are concerns about inviting the same contractor back into the community, where nearly 30% of the 31 properties that flooded experienced water ingress under flood boards during the floods in 2012. We are being told by the EA that the firm’s products have improved. However we have yet to see any evidence that this firm’s products and installation work are the best in the market, based on findings from the EA’s national pilot schemes.

Confidence has been further eroded by the following:

- a) the firm intends to use contractors for the installation who will have had 4 days in-house training and may not have had any previous experience
- b) only a selection of homes will be wet-tested following installation. The expectation was that all homes would be wet-tested – as would happen if the flood boards had been bought privately from the firm.
- c) initial feedback from the community on the site surveys that have been conducted is mixed regarding clarity on what products will be installed and how.

The EA appears to be managing the project on a “re-active” and “catch up” basis. B&NES’s funding was available at the start of this financial year. The current estimate for first installations is November. We are not aware of project documentation such as scope, escalation process and timetable. There does not seem to be a clear process on Acceptance Criteria to enable sign-off of installed PLP products nor clarity about products not supplied by the chosen contractor e.g. who installs them, warranties, maintenance agreements.

The impression given is that we should not challenge or raise concerns as this will cause delay. Whilst we would have wished to have the PLP in place well before winter (the 2012 flooding occurred in September and November) we are also concerned that pressure on the contractor to meet deadlines that may not be achievable, could adversely affect the quality of the PLP installation.

We are not clear what B&NES’s involvement is in the project. However we feel that going forward it is essential to have a consultative/co-ordinating group, led by B&NES as the Lead Flood Authority, incorporating representatives from the EA, Bristol Water, relevant Parish Councils and CVFF, to consider all future matters relating to flooding and protective/preventative measures. This was proposed by B&NES many months ago, but, as yet, has not been implemented. If such a group was already in place, we feel sure the evident shortcomings with the project management of the current scheme would have been avoided.

Chew Valley Flood Forum

Officer response:

The Environment Agency as project lead and the Council as Lead Local Flood Authority, whilst disappointed the Chew Valley Flood Forum did not approach the Project Team direct with their concerns, have provided the Forum with a formal response to the individual issues they have raised. Further information will be provided when available, but they wish to assure the Panel and the Forum that they are committed in working together to reach an arrangement on this project to the benefit of all the parties involved in so far as reasonably practicable.

This page is intentionally left blank

MetroWest, Economic Strategy for Transport and the Duty to Co-Operate in the South West of England

Under the Duty to Co-operate we are concerned that the Secretary of State is imposing a large number of new homes and a quantity of employment land in the Greater Bristol and Bath city region and the adjoining areas, Wiltshire, Swindon, Somerset and Gloucestershire. This is being done without reference to public transport infrastructure and improvements across the sub-region. We already lag well behind such centres as Greater Manchester, West Yorkshire and Newcastle/Gateshead, (the last of which includes large rural areas, like our own region). We are looking to the local authorities to ensure that realistic, future-proof public transport strategies are put in place in advance of the large increase in population. Any other option will lead to gridlock and economic and social damage.

The final plans for Phase One of MetroWest are due to be completed later this year and concurrently to work their way through the Network Rail GRIP stages 1 to 9. As of writing, there remain serious questions about some elements of the plan. In particular, the retrenchment over the siting of Portishead station is very concerning as this will undoubtedly have a serious negative impact on future take-up of rail services. We need to know if pressure has been brought to bear on Network Rail and the ORR to look at a "Stop and Proceed" arrangement into the station, similar to the Barnstaple branch. If the ORR is not prepared to see sense in this, we must at least

South West Transport Network **Statement** for

BaNES Cabinet on 10 September

BaNES Full Council on 11 September

BaNES Transport Committee on 16 September

ensure that the station is both as close as possible to the town centre and as user-friendly as can be afforded. In addition to optimum siting, the plan must include bus-rail interchange facilities and become the focus for transport in the town. The station site adjoining the Lidl car park provides easy pedestrian access to the town centre and shopping facilities, as well as the opportunity for convenient and visible bus/rail/taxi integration.

We have not yet seen evidence of a realistic MetroBus/MetroRail interchange at the proposed Ashton Gate station or integration with the Stadium, though we understand that this is currently out for consultation with the MetroBus plans. Under the duty to co-operate between North Somerset and Bristol City Council, we need clear planning around the Portishead railway line and associated infrastructure.

The current proposed service pattern for the Portishead line still does not include stops at Bedminster or Parson Street which for a headway of 17 minutes end-to-end as against 22 minutes does not seem to be especially critical, especially when set against bus timings and rush-hour car journey timings of an hour or more. There is also the question of integration with the Weston and Taunton line which the current service plan ignores. And finally, it should be pointed out that stopping trains in Bedminster and Parson Street provides gateway access from otherwise ill-served areas of South Bristol. In addition this helps towards the City Council's regeneration planning of South Bristol as per their core strategy and BaNES core strategy.

With the final adoption of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan, it is essential that a clear and defined provision is made for station sites on the Henbury

South West Transport Network **Statement** for

BaNES Cabinet on 10 September

BaNES Full Council on 11 September

BaNES Transport Committee on 16 September

Loop around Henbury, Filton (at North Platform) and Charlton Halt, and protect sites at Hallen and Chittening for future halt/s — which are likely to be required in the next phase of the Metro to meet huge future development in housing and employment (Sevenside Plan). A bus network solution alone to this access issue will not do and will end up trapped in yet more gridlock. Park-and-Ride and Bus-Rail interchanges must also be built into the plans to ensure the maximum benefit to the local populace and the greatest uptake of services.

In the case of Charlton Hayes, it would be highly beneficial to the development of the emergent community if the building of the station and transport interchanges preceded the construction of the area (in very much the opposite way to how Bradley Stoke was allowed to develop without any public services).

It is also imperative that work is commissioned with Network Rail for extra holding sidings for freight trains around Hallen/Chittening, and to the north of Bristol Parkway.

The signalling on the Henbury line also needs to be upgraded as part of the Thames Valley Signaling Centre when Bristol signal box is transferred to Didcot.

We welcome the local electrification study of the Greater Bristol Metro and Filton Bank and the proposed new stations at Ashley Down and Horfield/Lockleaze, but this needs to be broadened to ensure that the study

South West Transport Network **Statement** for

BaNES Cabinet on 10 September

BaNES Full Council on 11 September

BaNES Transport Committee on 16 September

encompasses not only EMUs but tram-train operation for Henbury, the Severn Beach Line and Portishead once the 165 units are cascaded.

For future transport strategy, extensions to Taunton, Frome, Westbury, Warminster, Swindon and Gloucester/Cheltenham should be put on the agenda.

Under the duty to co-operate and the SHMA which would include BaNES, North Somerset, South Gloucestershire, Bristol, Mendip and western Wiltshire, the various transport boards which cover the Bristol and Bath travel to work area need to work together and dovetail their planning on transport and land use in the way that Newcastle and Gateshead work together or the various authorities in Greater Manchester. Using these examples, the way forward for this area would be a Combined Authority and Transport Board.

Within BaNES the emphasis needs to be on ramps and CCTV at Keynsham, a new station at Saltford, CCTV at Oldfield Park and new stations at Bathampton and Corsham with appropriate bus-rail interchanges and onward links to serve the new development areas within the core strategy (for instance from Keynsham to Whitchurch, South Bristol Hospital and the proposed Whitchurch Park-and-Ride).

The Somer Valley development which will see a large increase in residential and employment provision within Radstock, Midsomer Norton and Chilcompton, means that there is increasing pressure to provide a rail link to Radstock along the existing trackbed with a station in the town centre linking to a high quality bus/rail interchange within the NRR land. This is subject to

South West Transport Network **Statement** for

BaNES Cabinet on 10 September

BaNES Full Council on 11 September

BaNES Transport Committee on 16 September

discussion between Norton-Radstock Regeneration Ltd, BaNES, the North Somerset Railway Ltd and the Somer Valley Trust. There is a clear duty of co-operation between BaNES, Mendip and Somerset County Council over the planning of this area. There is some urgency here to protect the Radstock line and the Frome to Wells and Shepton Mallet rail corridor as consultation on the Mendip Core Strategy, which includes public transport as well as housing and economic development, finishes on 4 August.

The inclusion of stations at Charfield (for Wotton-under-Edge), Stonehouse Bristol Road (Bristol-Gloucester line) and Royal Wootton Bassett need to be built into neighbouring local authority and LEP economic plans. To this end, we would like to see evidence of this joint working in progress under the duty to co-operate.

A clear plan for the delivery of new stations and lines needs to be drawn up. With the IEP being constructed through the Bristol area (on a timeplan driven by the DfT and the Welsh Government), timescales for construction or passive provision of local stations and related infrastructure need to be clear and coordinated with the IEP. If this is not done, the local rail project is likely to be marginalized, and therefore difficult and increasingly expensive to achieve. Even with Network Rail's confirmation of four-tracking at Filton Bank and the extra platforms at Bristol Parkway and Temple Meads and East Bristol Junction, the rest of the Metro is not included beyond Phase One.

Intermodal interchanges need to be prioritised at Bristol Temple Meads, Bristol Parkway, Filton Abbey Wood, Lawrence Hill, Clifton Down, Weston-super-Mare, Yatton, Nailsea and Backwell, Bath Spa and Oldfield Park. In the

South West Transport Network **Statement** for

BaNES Cabinet on 10 September

BaNES Full Council on 11 September

BaNES Transport Committee on 16 September

case of Temple Meads, “Intermodal” should include ferry services as well as local and Metro buses. Any new ferry services at Bath or along the Bristol Channel should also be dovetailed into the MetroWest system.

Beyond the major projects, the duty to co-operate needs to take account of the specific requirements of several local areas.

The rural hinterland to Bristol and Bath and within the counties of Somerset and Gloucestershire has transport networks and requirements which are significantly different from the urban areas, and need to be recognized and protected as such to allow access to jobs and services. Two examples would be maintaining bus services south to Wells, Street and Shepton Mallet and north to Dursely and Gloucester because these supply long-distance commuter and leisure services into and out of the city.

Tourism is a major determinant in the economic survival of the West Somerset coast and the Quantocks. The West Somerset Railway is an iconic tourist attraction, currently owned and underwritten by Somerset County Council.

We believe that one future option for this asset, given the fact we are almost certainly heading into a period of increasingly extreme and unpredictable weather due to climate change, would be to transfer ownership of the permanent way and associated infrastructure to Network Rail (who have both the wherewithal and the experience to deal with contingency and emergency planning) with a long-term lease back to the West Somerset PLC.

South West Transport Network **Statement** for

BaNES Cabinet on 10 September

BaNES Full Council on 11 September

BaNES Transport Committee on 16 September

It should also be pointed out that Somerset County Council have themselves supported a bid through the Heart of the South West Transport Board and LEP to reopen the route to network trains along with the Okehampton line. This would allow for a year-round seven-day a week service to run through from Bristol/Taunton to Minehead, opening up the line to serve other economic drivers beyond pure tourism.

South Bristol has traditionally been the poor relation in local planning and it would benefit the area enormously to create a local enterprise zone centered on Hartcliffe and Filwood hopefully including MetroBus/MetroRail links to Parson Street, Ashton Gate and Keynsham. A future option which would also benefit the area would be a Park and Ride facility at Flax Bourton on the Weston rail line. As the government inspector has directed North Somerset to include a great deal more new homes in its Core Strategy, we would support allocations along the rail corridor at Yatton, Nailsea and Backwell, Flax Bourton and Pill.

On the overall strategy we are very concerned that the current plan displays an over-emphasis on aerospace and related industries, which may well not remain as major employers in the Greater Bristol city region. At the same time there appears to be a lack of focus on tourism which is not only one of the largest employers but also likely to see growth in the coming decades.

Finally, the lack of a combined transport authority for the city region is a severe hindrance to the delivery of high quality public services and also to giving local projects the clout and authority they need in the face of

South West Transport Network **Statement** for

BaNES Cabinet on 10 September

BaNES Full Council on 11 September

BaNES Transport Committee on 16 September

competition from treasury-driven planning and national strategies. When projects are brought to completion, the lack of an ITA means that maintenance is not necessarily followed through. Bristol Bus Station, Bath Bus Station and Cribbs Causeway are all good examples, where the fracturing of responsibility means that information services, toilets and cafés tend to be discoordinated rather than integral to the running of the facility. In all of the transport planning for our region, the lack of a transport authority with real powers is probably the greatest barrier to delivery.

David Redgewell

South West Transport Network – Tel 07814 794953

Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel, 16 September 2014

Statement by Patrick Rotheram, Chairman, Vineyards Residents' Association

1. I am the Chairman of the Vineyards Residents' Association. Together with the Circus Area Residents' Association (CARA) we have been trying for a number of years now to get the Council to make improvements in the arrangements for residents parking in the northern part of the Central Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).
2. The northern part of the Central Zone (the area north of Queen Square, George Street and Paragon) is predominantly residential in character. That fact is recognised in the 'Bath City-wide character appraisal', which is a Supplementary Planning Document. For historical reasons this area is in the Central CPZ, which was originally created in the 1970s to discourage parking in the central area.
3. The Central CPZ is now completely surrounded by the Outer Zones, where parking for non-residents is strictly limited. Visitors therefore head into the centre and drive around looking for a space, adding to the congestion and pollution in the heart of the city. The original idea of the CPZ has been turned on its head and there is close to 100% occupancy of parking bays in this area.
4. As the attached map clearly demonstrates, the north Central Zone (coloured orange) is no closer to the commercial and civic city centre than most of the other Controlled Zones (the so-called 'Outer Zones').
5. Residents in this area are unfairly treated compared with residents in the Outer Zones. Although it is the most densely residential area in the city, there is almost no 'permit-holder only' parking. We do not get resident visitor permits. In the Outer Zones there is a minimum of 50% permit-holder only places and residents can buy day permits for their visitors. Similar arrangements should apply in the residential north Central Zone.
6. This may sound familiar, as we told you about it at your meetings in October 2012 and September 2103, having raised it formally with the Council as far back as 2005. We believe that the Panel was sympathetic to our case, and indeed this time last year the Chair concluded by saying that you wanted to see work progressing on residents' parking outside the collective work on the parking strategy.
7. I expect that it will not have escaped your notice that another year has passed and still you have not seen a parking strategy. I have to tell you that nothing has happened on our residents' parking issues either. We are still waiting for Parking Services to come up with changes that address the unfair arrangement for residents in our area.
8. We are wondering where to go next. The Council's recent parking survey underlined residents' dissatisfaction with the parking arrangements in the Central Zone. We have the support of both our Ward Councillors. Your Panel has asked for our case to be progressed. And yet nothing happens. Is this how the democratic process is meant to work? We ask for your help to finally get something done.

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel, 16 September 2014 - Item 12, Air Pollution

Notes by Patrick Rotheram, Transport Lead, Federation of Bath Residents' Associations

Good morning. I'm speaking on behalf of FOBRA, which has some 5000 members across the city. We are pleased to see this report on the health implications of air pollution, as air pollution is one of our members' top concerns.

The entire main road network in Bath, and many lesser streets, is in the Bath AQMA, which by definition means that there are unhealthy and unlawful levels of air pollution. Some 10,000 people live in the Bath AQMA and are suffering the effects of air pollution over the legal limit. This is a really serious issue, and we want the Council to get serious about dealing with it. Monitoring and studying doesn't cut it.

There has been much concern recently about the harmful effects of fine particulates (PM2.5). These are not currently monitored in Bath and are not covered in the report.

The study barely mentions the damage that air pollution does to buildings and the related economic cost. But this is surely an important matter in a World Heritage Site in which the heritage comprises fragile limestone buildings which are highly susceptible to air pollution.

We are sceptical about the predicted drop in pollution levels between 2012 and 2015. NO2 levels have remained fairly constant over the past ten years and show little sign of dropping. What factors is the prediction based on? Latest evidence is that diesel cars cause more pollution so increasing numbers of diesel cars will make matters worse, not improve them.

Even if this reduction was really happening, air pollution in 2015 would still be above the legal limits across the city.

On a positive note, we are pleased to see that funding is being sought for an LEZ in central Bath (Option 4).

Sadly it is realistic for the study to assume that B&NES can't do anything which would directly result in HGV being diverted onto existing roads in Wiltshire, which is the reason why the other Options appear not to be viable. The logical conclusion is that the only way to

reduce pollution from HGV is to provide a new alternative route avoiding Bath, eg an A36-A46 link.

Air pollution in Bath is mainly due to road traffic. The only way to reduce it is by reducing traffic volumes. The only way of doing that is through a comprehensive transport plan. We don't need more exploratory work or another literature survey, we need action. We want the Council to get on with the transport strategy, and hope the Panel will support the strategy when it comes before them shortly.

The 'Actions taken in B&NES to improve air quality to date' (page 219) is misleading. None of these plans contain measures which will make a significant reduction in traffic and air pollution in Bath. The only measure in the AQAP which has any serious potential for reducing pollution is the LEZ, and the present report makes it clear that this can be introduced only in a limited central area. A transport strategy aimed at reducing traffic volumes in residential areas and across the city is essential.