

## BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

### CABINET

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

Wednesday, 16th July, 2014

#### **Present:**

Councillor Paul Crossley	Leader of the Council
Councillor David Dixon	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods
Councillor Simon Allen	Cabinet Member for Wellbeing
Councillor Tim Ball	Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning
Councillor David Bellotti	Cabinet Member for Community Resources
Councillor Katie Hall	Cabinet Member for Community Integration
Councillor Caroline Roberts	Cabinet Member for Transport
Councillor Dine Romero	Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Youth
Councillor Ben Stevens	Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development

#### **39 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair was taken by Councillor Paul Crossley, Leader of the Council.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. He announced his intention to hear item 15 (Community Infrastructure Levy) immediately after item 11.

#### **40 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

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

#### **41 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

#### **42 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

#### **43 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR**

There was none.

#### **44 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS**

There were 24 questions from Councillors and 4 questions from members of the public.

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

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

Elizabeth Derl-Davis in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website*] spoke of her love of libraries. She was concerned that the Radstock Library might be squeezed into a corner of the supermarket with no room for future expansion and asked Cabinet to reconsider its decision.

Lesley Mansell in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website*] expressed concern about the process which had led to the decision to move the library because the report had recommended moving the library before the consultation had been undertaken. She asked Cabinet to look carefully at the information available and highlighted that the move would result in a 25% loss of space.

Councillor Paul Crossley observed that the Council had not closed a single library, despite the fact that many other councils had felt obliged to do so.

Councillor David Dixon asked Lesley Mansell whether she was aware that an item to make the final decision on this matter was already on the Cabinet Forward Plan. Lesley Mansell said she believed the decision had already been taken.

Susan Charles in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website*] asked Cabinet to make provision for fully accessible warm water swimming for people of all ages and all levels of disability.

Councillor Simon Allen asked Susan Charles whether she was aware of the number of people who would require such facilities. Susan said that although she did not have numbers, it was evident that there was a long waiting list for use of the existing hydro therapy pool. A lot of these were young people.

Councillor David Dixon asked Susan Charles if she could forward to him the details of funding schemes she had referred to. Susan said she would arrange for this to be provided.

Alexander Jones-Grech, a young person, in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website*] said how much he loved swimming in the hydrotherapy pool at Three Ways, where he had learned to swim really well. It was the only exercise he got. He appealed to Cabinet to continue to provide warm water swimming.

Simeon Wakely, in a statement read by Susan Charles, supported the need for a warm water pool for all ages with dignified access.

Eamon McClelland (WWISE member) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website*] observed that many people were prevented from engaging in sporting activity. In a survey, 37% of disabled people said that they had met with barriers to exercise. He urged Cabinet to consider provision for those with disabilities.

## **46 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING 11TH JUNE 2014 AND SPECIAL CABINET MEETING 10TH JULY 2014**

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on Wednesday 11th June 2014 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Special Cabinet meeting held on Thursday 10th July 2014 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

There were none.

#### **48 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES**

There were none.

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

The Chair announced that at the time of printing the agenda, there had been no such decisions.

He observed however that Councillor Katie Hall had recently made decision E2677 Naming of Streets in Keynsham Redevelopment which had been Called-in. A meeting of the Planning, Transport and Environment Panel would in due course consider the Call-in.

#### **50 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE**

Councillor Tim Ball, in proposing the item, expressed disappointment that so few Councillors had attended this debate, which followed the adoption of the Core Strategy. He thanked Kaoru Jacques (Planning Officer) for the hard work and excellent technical ability she had brought to the task. He explained that the proposals would be presented to the Inspector and would then return to Cabinet in March 2015 following statutory public consultation. The rewards to the Council would be in the region of £12M-£17M.

Councillor Ben Stevens seconded the proposal. He referred to table 3.7.A of the document which demonstrated continued support for youth apprenticeships. He agreed with Councillor Ball that the adoption of the policy would bring tangible benefits to the community.

Councillor Paul Crossley said that following adoption of the Core Strategy at a recent Council meeting, it was possible for Cabinet to move ahead by adopting the Community Infrastructure Levy to enable communities to play a part in their own future. He observed that the Bath Western Riverside Supplementary Planning Document Appendix C was being updated to take the new arrangements into account. As an aside, he took the opportunity to congratulate Crest Nicholson for recently winning two building awards and he was delighted that the plans had included all kinds of buildings, including social housing.

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

- (1) To APPROVE the draft charging schedule and the draft Regulation 123 List for public consultation;
- (2) To APPROVE the revised draft Planning Obligations SPD for public consultation;
- (3) To APPROVE the timeline for the public consultation period on the above documents from 24/7/14 to 18/9/14;
- (4) To APPROVE the update to Appendix C to the Bath Western Riverside SPD for Development Management purposes; and
- (5) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director for Development in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning to:
  - a) make minor textual amendments to the consultation documents prior to publication; and
  - b) make minor amendments to the CIL draft Charging Schedule, revised Planning Obligations SPD and the Regulation 123 list following public consultation and submit to the Secretary of State for examination.

## **51 SCHOOLS CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2014/15 - IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS**

Councillor Dine Romero introduced the item by referring to the various elements of the planned investment. She was delighted to move the proposals.

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal. He felt that the proposals would increase pride in the schools. He was especially pleased to see the proposal to invest £170K on improving the kitchen facilities to enable the delivery of free school meals to all infant children. He knew that 43 school kitchens had been inspected over 5 months and all would be ready for September, following the proposed investment.

Councillor Tim Ball was delighted because St Michael's was in his ward and he knew that the children were excited about getting hot meals from September.

Councillor David Bellotti reminded Cabinet that there was a sound evidence base for the policy because young children who eat proper lunches perform better in the afternoon. In future, all youngsters would benefit in this way. He also pointed out that the policy would bring a saving of £400 pa for parents.

Councillor Paul Crossley thanked Ashley Ayre (Strategic Director, People) for drawing up the plans to deliver the scheme. He was delighted that the area had very good schools with excellent educational outcomes. He felt that the policy was one of the most exciting policy changes this government had implemented and he hoped to see it extended to Junior children in the future.

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

- (1) To APPROVE for inclusion in the 2014/15 Capital Programme:
  - (a) Capital Maintenance funding of £150,000 for improvements at Southdown Junior and Southdown Infant schools;
  - (b) Capital Maintenance funding of £50,000 for improvements at Peasedown St John Primary School;

(c) Capital Maintenance funding of £170,000 to add to funding received from the Government for works required to enable the provision of free school meals for all infant pupils from September 2014; and

(2) To AGREE the change in use of the Basic Need funding for Saltford Primary school to provide temporary classrooms whilst a permanent solution is developed.

## **52 YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN 2014 - 2015**

Councillor Dine Romero introduced the proposals by reminding Cabinet that the Council had a statutory responsibility to maintain a plan to prevent youth offending and re-offending. The plan had recently been approved by the multi-agency Youth Offending Service Management Board. She moved the proposals for Cabinet to recommend the Plan to Council for adoption as part of the Policy and Budget Framework and submission to the Youth Justice Board.

Councillor Katie Hall seconded the proposal and reminded Cabinet that the work being done with young people was of huge benefit. In the last 6 years, the number of people in the area entering the Youth Justice system had fallen from 179 to 80.

On a motion from Councillor Dine Romero, seconded by Councillor Katie Hall, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To RECOMMEND that Council agrees that the Youth Justice Plan fulfils the requirements of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and can be submitted to the Youth Justice Board; and

(2) To RECOMMEND that Council agrees that the Youth Justice Plan be adopted as part of the Council's Policy and Budget Framework and can be accommodated within the Council budget.

## **53 AMALGAMATION OF SOUTHDOWN INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS INTO A PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Councillor Dine Romero moved the proposal to amalgamate the two schools. She observed that the schools had already federated; they had a single Governing Body and a single Head Teacher. Amalgamation was the next natural step, which would provide a stable and secure transition from Key Stage 1 to Key Stage 2. The plans included a small expansion from 315 to 420 pupils.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He explained that he had been a Governor at the Infants school until September 2013 and he felt it was a fantastic school. The proposals would work very well and he knew that the community was very supportive of the move.

On a motion from Councillor Dine Romero, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE the publication of a statutory notice proposing the closure of Southdown Junior school and the expansion and change in upper age range of Southdown Infant school in order to create an all through 420 place primary school.

## 54 REVENUE & CAPITAL OUTTURN 2013/14

Councillor David Bellotti introduced the item by observing that the Council had operated within its budget for the 3<sup>rd</sup> consecutive year. Not only that, but it had been possible to put £149K into unearmarked reserves. This was alongside that fact that the Cabinet had not increased Council Tax during the 3 years. He thanked the officers who had managed their budgets so well.

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal. He felt he must observe that the suggestion put by Councillor Brian Webber in question #M22 of the Q&A document would be a false economy.

Councillor Tim Ball referred to the increase in planning applications over the period. He thanked Development Control staff for coping with the increase, and pointed out that staffing levels in this very important team were now back to the levels prior to being slashed by the previous administration.

Councillor Paul Crossley said that not only had the previous 3 years been within budget, but the current year was also well on track to being within budget. He listed a number of projects which the Cabinet had delivered across the area.

Councillor David Bellotti summed up by saying that the Cabinet had taken care to spend the available funds on those things which were the Council's priorities.

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

### **RESOLVED** (unanimously)

- (1) To NOTE the revenue budget outturn underspend of £83,000 for 2013/14;
- (2) To APPROVE the revenue carry forward proposals and write-off requests;
- (3) To AGREE transfers to Earmarked Reserves;
- (4) To APPROVE the revenue virements for 2013/14;
- (5) To NOTE the resulting reserves position and that unearmarked reserves remain at the target level of £10.5m;
- (6) To NOTE the provisional outturn of the 2013/14 capital programme and funding;
- (7) To APPROVE the capital rephasing and write-off of net underspends;
- (8) To NOTE the adjustments to the 2013/14 to 2018/19 capital programme; and
- (9) To NOTE the final capital programme for 2013/14.

## 55 CYCLE/PEDESTRIAN SCHEMES 2014/15 TRO

Councillor Caroline Roberts moved the proposals. She emphasised the Cabinet's view that walking and cycling could work well together and therefore the schemes were being considered as a whole. She briefly introduced some of the schemes being proposed and recommended them to the Cabinet for adoption.

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal. He referred to the success of the Two Tunnels project. He asked if some consideration could be given to the repair of potholes in cycle tracks, which in his experience could cause damage and inconvenience to riders.

Councillor Paul Crossley referred to a suggestion he had received by tweet, asking for the Council to invest £16 per head for cycling infrastructure. He responded that the Council continued to seek new ways to improve cycle and pedestrian schemes but that he was not able to give a cost per head. He thanked Councillor Nigel Roberts, who had done some of the preparatory work on the proposals.

Councillor Tim Ball welcomed the proposals which would be money spent where it should be spent. He felt that there was a need to de-clutter the pavements and asked that further thought be given to this.

Councillor Caroline Roberts summed up by saying that there were other funding sources which would be used to improve schemes such as Seven Dials.

On a motion from Councillor Caroline Roberts, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE the Funding Allocation breakdown across cycling and walking for 2014/15;

(2) To APPROVE the £250k budget for cycling and walking schemes for 2014/15 for which provisional funding approval was included within the Council's February 2014 budget report;

(3) To DELEGATE the Divisional Director Environmental Services and the Service Manager Highways to alter the programme, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, as may prove necessary during 2014/15. Any alterations will be within the overall budget allocation and take into account any additional funding streams that become available.

## **56 FIT FOR LIFE STRATEGY**

Councillor David Dixon introduced the item by emphasising that fitness must not be only about leisure centres but was about lifestyle. He said that the proposals before Cabinet would build on the work done by the Get Active Partnership. He moved that Cabinet adopt the Fit for Life Strategy.

Councillor Simon Allen seconded the proposal. He felt that the strategy would reap benefits for years to come. He agreed that the proposals were not just about facilities but about lifestyle choices. He regretted that 10% of the entire NHS budget was spent treating diabetes when 20 minutes activity per day would be more beneficial.

Councillor Dine Romero welcomed the investment in sports facilities but agreed that the important thing was to foster the normalisation of getting and staying fit through lifestyle. She welcomed the fact that the strategy would link into other strategies and other partners.

Councillor Paul Crossley said that the proposals were essentially about enjoyable ways of staying well. He referred to Appendix 6 of the Strategy which showed that Bath & NE Somerset outperformed the national average in every performance measure. He also welcomed the news that the smoking cessation agenda was working and that smoking had been reduced to 16%.

Councillor David Dixon summed up by welcoming the "Park Runs" recently started by a member of the public and felt that this was an example of how the strategy worked best.

On a motion from Councillor David Dixon, seconded by Councillor Simon Allen, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To ADOPT the 'Fit for Life' strategy.

The meeting ended at 8.15 pm

Chair \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Prepared by Democratic Services**



## CABINET MEETING 16<sup>th</sup> July 2014

### REGISTERED SPEAKERS

Where the intention is to speak about an item on the Agenda, the speaker will be offered the option to speak near the beginning of the meeting or just before the Agenda item.

#### **Statements about issues NOT on the Agenda**

- Elizabeth Derl-Davis  
Re: Sale of Radstock Building
- Cllr Lesley Mansell (Chair, Radstock Town Council)  
Re: Radstock Library
- Susan Charles (Chair, WWISE)  
Re: Plans for new Keynsham Leisure Centre
- Alexander Jones Grech (young person)  
Re: Plans for new Keynsham Leisure Centre
- Simeon Wakely (young person) – Read by Susan Charles  
Re: Plans for new Keynsham Leisure Centre
- Eamon McClelland (WWISE member)  
Re: Plans for new Keynsham Leisure Centre

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

<b>M 01</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Nathan Hartley
<p>In 2001, the late Kate Scully set up DAFBY (Democratic Action for B&amp;NES Youth) to aid and support young people living in the district. Her aim was to ensure that every single young person felt empowered to shape their own futures, and to have the confidence to get involved with the decision-making-processes. After working with hundreds of teenagers, through the project, and her work over a number of decades previously with the Duke of Edinburgh Award she was awarded an MBE from Her Majesty The Queen. Unfortunately, Kate passed away in 2011. She was adamant that her work should carry on and that every single young person living in Bath and North East Somerset should continue to receive the opportunities they need to make a difference in their lives. At her funeral I spoke on behalf of hundreds of young people whose lives she had touched over the years. Without Kate, many of us wouldn't be doing what we are doing today. Can the Cabinet please give details as to the current status of DAFBY? Does the group still exist? If not, what consultation has been done with young people and Kate's family on any change to the name or role of the group?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Dine Romero
<p><i>The Council and Children's Service remains fully committed to the participation of children and young people in its work, but the ways in which we do that are constantly evolving.</i></p> <p><i>The 2011–2014 Participation contract was awarded to the Children's Society who sub-contracted to Off the Record to run DAFBY, among other things albeit at a reduced budget from that which was available when Kate Scully was with us.</i></p> <p><i>During the term of the participation commission, young people's commitment to attending DAFBY dwindled, in spite of many efforts to revitalise it, with the result that only one or two young people remained as members of the group.</i></p> <p><i>After the UKYP elections in February 2014, young people from school councils and other groups who had put forward manifestos as potential candidates, expressed a wish to be part of a youth forum. The Youth Forum, run by Off the Record, supports the member of UK Youth Parliament. Representatives from the Youth Forum also sit on the B&amp;NES Equalities Group.</i></p> <p><i>Kate Scully did a fantastic job at engaging young people through DAFBY and for a period of time they were a very active and influential group. Nevertheless, Kate had a full-time post to support DAFBY and we are in a very different financial climate and have been for some time. This does not mean that young people's engagement in issue based work has gone away. There are a number of ways that they can be involved.</i></p> <p><i>1. The existing members of DAFBY are being supported through the Youth Forum (supported by Of the Record) and B&amp;NES Young People Equalities Group through the Local Authority The B&amp;NES Equalities Group has considerable influence over equalities issues affecting young people. All schools and youth groups are encouraged to run (Equalities) E-teams. Currently about 25 of them do. A grant of £100 is awarded to any</i></p>		

*school or young people's group that applies for an E-team grant. The annual pupil parliaments represent a dynamic dialogue that children and young people have with officers and members. Their views are listened to and acted upon, and outcomes from the pupil parliaments annually form key themes for us to focus on.*

*2. Participation work is not a static thing. Our means of engaging with, and listening to, the voice of children is constantly evolving. Groups sometimes reach the end of their life span or metamorphose into another form. A lot of participation work is now targeted at seldom heard and minority groups, eg children in care, BME and young people with disabilities. The most important driving force has to be whether, by involving young people in participation work, we are making a positive difference to the lives of children and young people in B&NES, which we believe we are.*

<b>M 02</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Nathan Hartley
<p>On July 6th First Bus introduced a new fares structure for the local area. Many parts of the district, including the city of Bath largely benefit from the changes with passengers seeing a decrease in fare prices.</p> <p>Peasedown St John, and the rest of the Somer Valley, hasn't been as lucky. With the deletion of return fares, many residents living in Peasedown St John will now have to pay £7 to travel to, and from Bath. The new single fare is £3.50p.</p> <p>Does the Cabinet support these changes?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Caroline Roberts
<p><i>First has advised us that the adult single bus fare on their services between Peasedown St John and Bath is now £2.50. Passengers making a return trip would have to buy a single ticket for each direction, making a total outlay of £5.</i></p> <p><i>Many residents of Peasedown St John also have the option of using the Somerbus service to and from Bath. Somerbus charges £2.50 adult single or £3.50 return between Peasedown St John and Bath.</i></p> <p><i>The Council provided comments to First as part of its review of fares but was not consulted on the final proposals. First made it clear that, although most passengers would see reductions, some fares would increase.</i></p> <p><i>The Cabinet welcomes many aspects of the review, especially the significant reductions in fares for young people up to the age of 21. It is however concerned at the impact of the loss of return tickets on travel costs for bus users on the corridor between Midsomer Norton and Radstock and Bath, and also bus users travelling between the Wiltshire towns and Bath. Officers have raised this issue with First.</i></p>		

<b>M 03</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Liz Hardman
<p>For response by Cllr Dine Romero.</p> <p>You will be aware of the proposal to relocate Radstock Library to Radco. You will also be aware that the existing library is used by the adjoining Children's Centre and that,</p>		

indeed, an area of the library was refurbished using Sure Start funding to provide break-out space for the Children's Centre. In light of the proposed relocation of the library, what plans do you have for ensuring that the space used by the Children's Centre is re-provided either within the existing library building or elsewhere in Radstock?

To what extent does the proposed relocation of Radstock Library present us with an opportunity for the wholesale redevelopment of the existing library and youth centre, to provide a modern purpose-built centre for children and young people?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Dine Romero

*Thank you for your interest in the move of Library services into the Radco building and any potential implications for the continued use of this building by the Children's Centre. As you will be aware, the Children's Centre currently uses part of the building not only for break-out space and additional office/desk space.*

*At present there are no plans for the Children's Centre to stop using this space as it is valuable in terms of the effective running of the centre. We are currently exploring options with colleagues in the Youth Service and other parts of the Council and local community to see if there are viable options in regard to different forms of shared usage that could be both strategically and economically viable, and that would allow the Children's Centre to continue to use this building.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Thank you for your reply. I am delighted that the building will continue to be used. Will she confirm that the Budgeted level of Children's Services will continue to be provided in the centre of Radstock.

**Answer from:**

Councillor Dine Romero

*We will continue to deliver services up to the agreed budget. I'm delighted that I anticipate that the children's services delivered out of the library building in Radstock will have more space than before.*

**M 04**

**Question from:**

Councillor Nathan Hartley

Can the Cabinet give details as to the logic behind the creation of the new roundabout on the junction between Red Hill and Tunley Road in Camerton? What statistics have been used to justify its instalment?

Peasedown St John residents have expressed bemusement and frustration as to why the Council would prioritise this over the much needed, and long called for, roundabout at the junction of Bath Road/A367 by-pass, Peasedown St John.

The case for a roundabout at the southern end of Peasedown has been well-made for at least 10 years:

- in 2006, almost 800 residents signed a petition asking for a roundabout to be built.
- in 2008, £35,000 in s106 money was secured to build a roundabout here. If it's not built by 2023 the money will be given back to the developer

- both district councillors for Peasedown St John made the campaign for this roundabout their key election pledge in 2011, and as a result received huge majorities. Peasedown residents would be thrilled to know why a new roundabout in Camerton was prioritised over one for Peasedown.

**Answer from:**

Councillor Caroline Roberts

*Both the Camerton and Peasedown St John roundabouts are very worthwhile projects which have positive benefits for their respective communities.*

*The main reason the Camerton scheme scored so well in prioritising work for inclusion in the current programme is that it is considered to offer a better return for the investment.*

*Taking into account the Section 106 contributions, the cost of the Camerton roundabout is £45,000 compared with the proposed roundabout at Peasedown St. John (at an estimated £250,000 to £300,000).*

**M 05**

**Question from:**

Councillor June Player

With the Students moving out during the past months the Ward of Westmoreland has been looking utterly disgraceful, due to so many HMO's being vacated, and rubbish incorrectly recycled is being dumped on the pavements and or front gardens thus attracting creatures. This results in our pavements and gardens not only looking disgusting but also smelling and attracting many flies. This current situation happens every year, and each year the Council says it is working with the University to educate the students and deal with the situation. Clearly this is not working. The residents have had enough of having to put up with this. What does the Cabinet propose to do to ensure this doesn't happen any longer?

**Answer from:**

Councillor David Dixon

*The Waste Campaigns team carried out the Student Move Out campaign for 2014 in partnership with the Student Community Partnership, undertaking more activity than ever before and door knocking many properties in several wards (including Westmorland), giving specific detailed advice about how students should manage their waste when leaving the property.*

*In addition we have put significant extra resource into cleaning up this area - we have sent a refuse collection crew around the area on non-collection days to clear any waste presented and reduce the chances of the sacks being ripped apart (by both humans and animals). We have reinstated the ward sweeper and have expanded his responsibilities to ensure that mess and split bags are cleared up promptly and we have also arranged extra presence by the mobile cleansing teams.*

*Despite all of our efforts, there continues to be a problem and we are now considering what else we can do. Options for further exploration include requiring containerisation, issuing Section 46 enforcement notices (which may ultimately result in a prosecution) and putting more visible notices on lampposts (as we have in New King Street) to inform residents when refuse collections will take place. We will continue to work proactively with the Student Community Partnership to develop these ideas.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Will the Cabinet member arrange a meeting with me and officers from Environmental Services to discuss this very damaging issue?

**Answer from:**

Councillor David Dixon

*Yes, I will arrange a meeting. This is also an issue in Oldfield and Widcombe and I am eager to resolve it.*

**M 06****Question from:**

Councillor Dave Laming

There has been much talk over many years about a Park and Ride and Park and Rail scheme for the East side of Bath, which to date have not been achieved. I would like to ask the Cabinet to recommend that the Strategic River Group investigate the possibility of Park and Sail schemes East and West of Bath.

**Answer from:**

Councillor Caroline Roberts

*I support better use of the river. A Park & Sail would be a useful option for commuters and I do not rule it out. I welcome the suggestion that this be referred to a River Strategy Group although the suggestion would be complementary to a Park & Ride, not an alternative. A possible Park & Sail from the west might also be included in the considerations. I hope Councillor Laming will ensure that he submits his proposals to the Transport Strategy consultation.*

**M 07****Question from:**

Councillor Dave Laming

Following the recent announcement that the proposed Park-and-Rail scheme in Bathampton could cost up to £34million can the Cabinet provide details of:

A) why the cost is expected to be so high?

B) the full financial breakdown in costs?

C) any potential problems or 'blockages' to implementing the scheme? For instance, will any Compulsory Purchase Orders be needed to ensure the site needed to erect the Park-and-Rail is accessible, big enough and positioned in such a location that has the support of residents living nearby?"

**Answer from:**

Councillor Caroline Roberts

*The costs are expected to be this high because of the engineering required for the proposal, in particular building a new access under the mainline railway line and the new car park in the area adjoining the relocated Trowbridge line. Detailed costings have however not yet been estimated and an up to date financial breakdown is not*

*available. The project would require both land and detailed statutory consents, including approvals from Network Rail and the Highways Agency. We are about to commission consultants to undertake a detailed appraisal of the options for a new Park & Ride to the east of Bath and this will allow a detailed project plan to be developed. This plan will outline the risks involved in the project and would develop proposals to mitigate any problems or 'blockages'.*

<b>M 08</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Geoff Ward
<p>Why do many of the lay-bys on gateway roads into our City continue to be litter strewn on an ongoing basis. Surely this cannot be an acceptable situation considering our World Heritage status and the fact that this might be the first impression for road traveller visitors to our City. Is there any initiative that the Administration might consider which would ensure these lay-bys are more often clean and tidy rather than more often eyesores?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Caroline Roberts
<p><i>We are currently carrying out a thorough review of our cleansing and enforcement service and have appointed an interim manager to lead on this. We are reviewing work schedules, operating hours and levels of plant and equipment and staffing. We will be consulting on new staffing structures in September and have ordered new mechanised equipment. All our vehicles will be fitted with tracking devices so that we can more effectively route the vehicles to respond to complaints as they come in and to ensure our work is as productive as possible.</i></p> <p><i>We are also reviewing our litter bin provision and have a significant capital investment programme this year to replace worn out bins, install at new sites and make sure that the bins are the appropriate size for the location in order to maximise efficiencies.</i></p> <p><i>All these initiatives will lead to litter being cleared more quickly.</i></p> <p><i>We are also enhancing our enforcement resource so that we up skill more staff generally to carry out enforcement activity against offences such as fly tipping, litter dropping and waste on the highway.</i></p> <p><i>We would urge Councillors and members of the public to report incidents of littering and fly tipping through Council Connect so that our staff can respond promptly</i></p>		

<b>M 09</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Geoff Ward
<p>In view of the Environmental Services budget cuts which saw the whole of the budget for analytical work including food, water, and other investigatory sampling initiatives, are there currently any proactive sampling activities being undertaken and what are the cost? Have there been any investigations in the last 12 months and what was the cost? Does the Administration not consider it is exposing our residents to risk by not undertaking some level of sampling to deter food safety risk and food fraud?</p>		

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor David Dixon
<p><i>A budget has been retained within the service for sampling of around £10K p.a. to meet the costs of commercial analysis. This is used for reactive work which covers a range of areas presenting to the service, including customer complaints.</i></p> <p><i>We have a contract with Worcester and Somerset Scientific Services which defines agreed prices for all the sampling we require which is non-microbiological.</i></p> <p><i>The service continues to have a programme of sampling (which is covered by the budget above and by funding from the FSA) which this financial year includes pro-active work around imported food, food labelling – meat speciation and allergens in non pre-packed food from caterers. Detailed costs are not available at this stage because lead officers will have a dialogue with the laboratory at the time of sampling to determine the precise tests required.</i></p> <p><i>Officers continue to use Adenosine Tri-Phosphate (ATP) swabs to determine cleanliness levels in premises which are poor.</i></p> <p><i>Public Health England (PHE) laboratories provide, free of charge, microbiological analysis of samples associated with incidents of disease and they provide us with an allocation for proactive work. In 2013/14, this included 11 microbiological samples, and a detailed examination of a number of meat samples taken following a customer complaint which required significant follow up.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, for 2014/15 we have committed to 15 on-farm feed audits (which will be funded by the Food Standard Agency) and a programme of approx. 20 High risk and 180 medium risk food audits (not externally funded).</i></p>	

<b>M 10</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Geoff Ward
<p>I commend the efforts of Officers to focus resources on improving food safety in those businesses which score low during statutory inspections but could the Cabinet Member demonstrate that we have the resources and capacity within the existing budget to sustain the inspection programme based on the Food Standards Agency risk rating matrix?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor David Dixon	
<p><i>In 2013/14, officers worked extremely hard to deliver the appropriate number of high risk interventions and as a result 100% of those due were completed. The officers prioritised high risk interventions – where premises are in poor condition or serve the vulnerable.</i></p> <p><i>In 2013/14, 842 interventions were completed in respect of low risk premises plus an additional 299 low risk premise questionnaires and telephone surveys – the alternative enforcement process. This meant that 1141 of the 1336 interventions that were due were achieved. 1791 of the year-end total 1963 premises were assessed to be broadly compliant (91%).</i></p> <p><i>This data has been formally reported to the Food Standards Agency through the Local Authority Monitoring System.</i></p> <p><i>It should be noted that the LAEMS recording process does not take account of alternative enforcement activity. This authority is however consistent in its approach to</i></p>		



*low risk premises with the other 5 local unitaries who attend the local food liaison group which is chaired by B&NES (Bristol, N Somerset, Swindon, S Gloucestershire and Wiltshire).*

<b>M 11</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p>In Council's budget agreed in February 2013 a sum of £150,000 was set aside in order for the Council to investigate the possibility of introducing a Tourism Levy. Can the Cabinet Member please confirm how much of this sum was ultimately spent and whether the Cabinet still now intends on pursuing the introduction of a Tourism Levy, and if not then how the £1m annual saving assumed from this levy in the MTSRP by 2015/16 will instead be achieved?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor David Bellotti
<p><i>As part of the 3 Year Financial Plan within the 2013/2014 Budget, the Council approved the introduction of a Visitor Contribution Scheme. The scheme itself was to be considered on a voluntary basis most likely taking the form of an "Opt-Out" payment as part of the entrance costs and charges for a range of tourism based attractions and accommodation within the City.</i></p> <p><i>The budget set a target of £1M recurring income to be achieved by the end of 2015/201. Subsequent to the feasibility and planning work starting to develop this Visitor Contribution Scheme, the Government has introduced the Consumer Contracts (Information, Cancellation and Additional Payments) Regulations 2013 as a Statutory Instrument 2013/3134. These regulations came into force on 13th June 2014.</i></p> <p><i>The Regulations effectively rule out payments, contributions or donations based on an "Opt-Out" approach, requiring customers to "Opt-In" to any additional payment.</i></p> <p><i>Based on modelling of the possible implications for a Visitor Contribution scheme in Bath, the yield from an "Opt-Out" scheme reduces from 75% to less than 20% for an "Opt-In" approach.</i></p> <p><i>When taking account of likely administration and collection costs, the "Opt-In" approach was likely to present only a limited opportunity for income generation and is therefore considered unviable on the basis originally envisaged. The Council will continue to explore other opportunities which may be available including working with other councils, however these are unlikely to yield the level of income originally anticipated.</i></p> <p><i>As part of usual Council Budget process, every year we ask Directors to manage below budget where this can be achieved and last year we made significant improvements on the budget in the areas of debt finance and visitor income at the Roman Baths. As this year progresses we expect to manage the Council within the overall budget set once again and this will take account of any income shortfall from this project.</i></p> <p><i>The project spend was approximately £68K.</i></p>		

<b>M 12</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Charles Gerrish
-------------	-----------------------	----------------------------

When will the Council be able to confirm the outcome of the bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund for restorations and improvements at Sydney Gardens?

**Answer from:**

Councillor David Dixon

*A bid to Heritage Lottery Fund for the improvement of Sidney Gardens was included in the February round. Some areas for improvement were identified by the Heritage Lottery Fund so a resubmitted bid will be made next year. The areas for improvement include engagement with the community and how they might use the facility; and considerations about future management arrangements.*

**M 13**

**Question from:**

Councillor Charles Gerrish

In 2011 the Cabinet Member indicated that it was the desire of this administration to bring forward proposals to redevelop the Keynsham Riverside site alongside the Town Centre regeneration project, rather than as separate schemes. Can the Cabinet Member confirm when proposals for the future of the Riverside site will be published by the Council and will the Cabinet commit to presenting a number of options to the public for consultation?

**Answer from:**

Councillor David Bellotti

*The Keynsham town centre scheme is progressing well and is on schedule to create a new library and one stop shop, retail, community facilities and Council offices. The old Riverside offices will be vacated during October and will be handed back to the landlord (more accurately the head lessee) by the end of 2014.*

*The new offices and facilities will become operational during October when staff will move in and adopt new ways of working to make better use of space and technology as part of the Council wide workplaces project. This project will benefit the delivery of services as part of a One Council approach as well as saving money.*

*The Administration remains committed to ensuring that Riverside offices, once vacated by the Council, are not permitted to fall into a state of disrepair. Work is taking place with Topland, the head lessee, but has been complicated by the relevant company in the Topland Group going into administration. This new circumstance provides challenges and opportunities.*

*The objective remains to secure the regeneration of this site and it is hoped that once the administrator has made a little more progress it will be possible to announce plans. The Council will be wishing to encourage the demolition of these life expired Riverside office buildings, and redevelopment of this site, in a way that is suitable for its edge of town centre location. The Council has already agreed to use its relevant statutory powers to achieve this if the need arises.*

**Supplementary Question:**

It is very disappointing that the lessee has gone into liquidation. With reference to the last sentence of your reply, it seems to me that the length of time taken to invoke statutory powers might be quite extended. Would the Cabinet member consider starting

action now, alongside negotiations, so that in the event of discussions failing the Council would already have made some progress by the other means?

**Answer from:**

Councillor David Bellotti

*There is no delay. We have always said we will deliver this redevelopment after the town centre scheme. It is possible that the current situation might be to the Council's advantage and that we can come up with an even better solution. For this reason, I see no need to take Councillor Gerrish's advice about taking early statutory powers.*

**M 14**

**Question from:**

Councillor Charles Gerrish

Why were 34 spaces in Ashton Way car park closed off by Wilmott Dixon (the Town Centre contractors) without advice to local Members or information to the public?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Caroline Roberts

*The Ashton Way car park is being used as a storage compound for materials for the new building. The Council have unfortunately been put in a very difficult position with our preferred location falling through last minute and the Ashton Way car park being the only suitable alternative available at very short notice. To delay the delivery and storage of materials would result in the delay of contractors undertaking the required works and delaying the overall project completion which is not beneficial for the regeneration of the town as a whole. The Council's Project Delivery team was requested to inform all relevant stakeholders through their normal communications channels. Additionally, notices are to be placed on the compound informing the public of alternative parking in the Civic Centre car park.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Will the Cabinet member apologise that not all stakeholders were advised?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Caroline Roberts

*On the contrary, I believe it did happen. If however there were any oversights in the communication process, then yes I would apologise for that.*

**M 15**

**Question from:**

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones

In the Cabinet paper relating to the Council's plans for the Grand Parade Undercroft and Colonnades dated 8th May 2013, it states that the planning application would be submitted by November 2013, with work commencing in Spring 2014, to be completed by Christmas 2014. It appears that the timeframe for this project has slipped somewhat.

Does the Council still expect work to be completed and open for business by this Christmas, and if not can the Cabinet Member please confirm what the current anticipated start and completion dates now are?

**Answer from:**

Councillor David Bellotti

*The Planning Application has now been submitted and registered by the Local Planning Authority.*

*A construction contract will be awarded following granting of planning consent and securing pre-let agreements for the restaurants. The project has made good progress but now awaits a planning decision in August, and subject to that process, remains committed to new facilities opening in the first half of 2015, with most of the works completed by Spring 2015.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Can the Cabinet member confirm that both access points are being retained?

**Answer from:**

Councillor David Bellotti

*The publicly available planning application shows all the access points. I refer him to that.*

**M 16**

**Question from:**

Councillor Anthony Clarke

Can the Cabinet Member please confirm what the final total expected cost will be of completing the Rossiter Road/Widcombe Parade project?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Caroline Roberts

*The Rossiter Road project has started on site as planned. Allowing for statutory undertakers service diversions and associated highway improvement works, the estimated construction cost is £1.9m including contingencies.*

**M 17**

**Question from:**

Councillor Anthony Clarke

When will the Cabinet Member publish the results of the Dorchester Street Bus Gate experiment?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Caroline Roberts

*A report considering the outcomes of the trial and the lessons learnt is in production and will be published in due course.*

<b>M 18</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>Parking for 3 hours on the meters in Gay Street and Brock Street, Bath, is now permitted, whereas it used not to be. Prima facie, it is counter to the Council's policy of encouraging visitors to use the public car parks for longer stays. How did the change come about? Does the Cabinet Member intend to review it?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Caroline Roberts
<p><i>The change came about to ensure that the times advertised aligned with the legal order. Historically, the times advertised did not agree with the Order and this was highlighted during the assessment period for the tariff review. As the tariff was increased via the Notice of Variation process the duration of stay could not be changed as it is not permitted. Therefore the original underlying durations had to be used.</i></p> <p><i>The central area of Bath is due for a full review commencing in the first quarter of next year. This, and many other issues, will be addressed with Local Members at this time.</i></p>		

<b>M 19</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>Parking in Daniel Street is devoted to holders of residents permits, except that between 11.30 am and 2.30 pm anyone may park there free for up to 1 hour. At whose behest and for what reason was this element of free parking provided? Is it still appropriate?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Caroline Roberts
<p><i>All Traffic Regulation Orders are implemented after a full public consultation including consultation with Local Members. The parking arrangement in Daniel Street was agreed at Full Council on 30/03/2006 with the relevant Traffic Regulation Order sealed on this authority. Unfortunately no records now exist on why this was requested.</i></p> <p><i>The central area of Bath is due for a full review commencing in the first quarter of next year. This, and many other issues, will be addressed if requested at this time. To ensure that consideration is given, Daniel Street has been added to the review list collated by the Traffic and Safety Team.</i></p>		

<b>M 20</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>There is a stretch of Beckford Road where free parking is permitted without limit of time. Might it be of more benefit to users of Sydney Gardens if the time was reduced to, say, 4 hours?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Caroline Roberts

*Possibly. The central area of Bath is due for a full review commencing in the first quarter of next year. This issue can be addressed if requested at this time. To ensure that consideration is given, Beckford Road has been added to the review list collated by the Traffic and Safety Team.*

<b>M 21</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>The Placemaking Plan process will, I understand, be associated with the preparation of refreshed development control management policies to replace the policies currently saved from the Local Plan. When is it expected that drafts of the refreshed policies will be published for public comment?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Tim Ball
<p><i>The Executive Forward Plan schedules a Placemaking Plan options document to be agreed by Cabinet at its meeting in November 2014 for public consultation. This will set out options, and in some cases preferred options, for revised Development Management policies. The draft Plan, containing proposed revised Development Management policies, is then scheduled to be published for consultation in mid-2015.</i></p>		

<b>M 22</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>Would it save the Council money if the flimsy easily ripped toilet paper provided in the Guildhall was replaced by paper of a higher quality? Would the replacement of paper hand towels by high blast electric dryers be a saving in the longer run?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor David Bellotti
<p><i>The cost of the toilet rolls supplied for the Guildhall (and other Council premises) are approx. £21 per pack (we would use approx. 100 packs per year in the Guildhall, £2,100 p a ) – we have not to date received any other complaints about the quality of the paper. A higher quality paper would around £27.50 per pack for a comparable amount (which would give an annual spend of £2,750 for the Guildhall). When the other buildings are added into this equation the difference in annual spend would be in the region of £6 – 8,000 per annum.</i></p> <p><i>I understand that in the long term (5 – 10 years) electric hand dryers could potentially be cheaper than supplying paper towels. The Council will keep this under review taking into account those people with manual dexterity challenges who find machines difficult to use, the reliability of the machines themselves, the important energy reduction issues resulting from our choices as well as the cost.</i></p>		

<b>M 23</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>Are there any published or readily available figures to show how Bath &amp; North East Somerset Council's spend on the cleansing of footways and roadside kerbs compares with that of other authorities? The City of Westminster is often mentioned as a paragon of street cleansing. Do we know whether that authority spends significantly more per capita than B&amp;NES?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor David Dixon
<p><i>We have previously carried out this comparison when reviewing city centre cleansing and at the time we spent significantly less per capita than the City of Westminster. In comparison to cities similar to Bath (such as Oxford, Chester and York) it was found that we are high relatively performing and low cost. We have also previously visited the City of London (and they have visited us) to make comparisons with their operations which, like Westminster, are much larger and far more heavily resourced than our own. We are now in the process of reviewing our cleansing operations to ensure that we maximise productivity. We will, as part of this, carry out some cost comparisons through this work working with the Association of Public Service Excellence (APSE). We aim to have new operational practices and structures in place (after consultation) by the end of the calendar year.</i></p>		

<b>M 24</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p>In her capacity as Cabinet member for Transport could she approach North Somerset to establish what is happening to the traffic lights on Broad Oak Hill, Dundry (a primary arterial route for the residents of Chew Valley) which have been in place since Christmas with no visible activity for over 4 months? It has become apparent that N Somerset are intending to close this road from 14-18 July. No diversionary routes have been advertised as of 9 Jul. Has there been liaison between N Som and B&amp;NES Highway team about this and has N Som been made aware of the adverse impact and inconvenience this action will have on the constituents of its neighbouring authority?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Caroline Roberts
<p><i>We have had contact from North Somerset regarding the closure. Having checked their closure details, we are satisfied that there will not be an adverse effect on our road network. Should it be felt necessary for additional signage to be installed once the closure is in effect, this will be arranged. We have had no contact regarding the temporary signals, but our officers will raise the issue with North Somerset to ensure that their works are not detrimental to us.</i></p>		
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>		
I am not satisfied by the response. Does the Cabinet member feel that it is appropriate		

for signage to be erected over a week-end advising of a Monday closure of Broad Oak Hill? Does she realise that this road has been subject to road closure since Christmas but no work has been done?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Caroline Roberts

*I have an appointment to see Nigel Ashton, the Leader of North Somerset Council, tomorrow. I will raise this issue with him then. I was not aware of the situation described by Councillor Pritchard and I wonder why he could not have approached me earlier so that we could work together to resolve it. It must be made clear that the situation being complained about has arisen in a neighbouring authority, not inside this Council's boundaries.*

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

**P 01**

**Question from:**

Karen Walker  
Vice Chairman, Peasedown St John Parish Council

When Bath and North East Somerset Council introduced the new 20mph to Peasedown St John a few years ago it was broadly welcomed by the community, and supported fully by the Parish Council. At the time though, assumptions had been made that physical changes would be brought to the road infrastructure - such as speed tables, chicanes and traffic islands being introduced which would 'assist' drivers in keeping to the new limit. Two years later, no changes have been made. Residents are becoming increasingly disillusioned with the scheme and would like to see new road infrastructure introduced.

With less money being spent by the council in Peasedown St John, and with cuts to some of our key services, will Bath and North East Somerset Council now start to provide much needed investment? Introducing traffic calming measures in Wellow Mead, Eckweek Lane and Under Knoll would be a welcomed start.

**Answer from:**

Councillor Caroline Roberts

*It has been clear throughout that the scheme is confined to delivering signs and road markings only, in the expectation that attitudes towards speeding in residential areas will change. This is clearly stated on the Council's 20mph speed limit webpage (see link).*

*<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/streets-and-highway-maintenance/road-safety/traffic-schemes/20mph-speed-limits-residential->*

*It is not proposed to introduce additional infrastructure to reduce traffic speed, However officers will re-consider any locations where speed limits are not being observed*



<b>P 02</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Karen Walker Vice Chairman, Peasedown St John Parish Council
<p>When will Bath and North East Somerset Council release the £15,000 s106 money for traffic calming in Braysdown Lane, Peasedown St John?</p> <p>Despite lobbying for the past 12 months, support from residents, the Parish Council and a consultation carried out by Cllr Nathan Hartley, the Local Authority are still withholding the money.</p> <p>Recently, the Traffic and Safety Department wrote to all residents proposing a scheme drawn up by the parish council, residents, and Cllr Hartley - only to announce that they are not going to progress with it.</p> <p>This money does not belong to Bath and North East Somerset Council. It belongs to Peasedown St John.</p> <p>If the council has no intention of spending it, or wants to wait another 12 months before any action is taken, will it consider transferring the money to Peasedown St John Parish Council, who are better placed to look after it and ensure it remains earmarked for our village?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Caroline Roberts
<p><i>The Authority has a considerable programme of highway works to deliver in 2014/15. I have requested the officers to review and report back to me the impact of emergency works, such as Kelston Road repairs, on the overall programme.</i></p> <p><i>I regret that the impact of such urgent works is delaying other schemes. I am however happy to confirm that the Council will progress a scheme for Peasedown in accordance with the terms of the Section 106 agreement and cannot spend the money elsewhere.</i></p> <p><i>The actual date for a scheme in Peasedown will be determined following my review of the officer's programme.</i></p>		

<b>P 03</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Malcolm Cupis
<p>I have received three enquiries from members of the public regarding bollards outside the Theatre Royal on Monmouth Street.</p> <p>The enquiries relate to the bollards having apparently been made permanent.</p> <p>Could the Cabinet member please explain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why as this action been taken?</li> <li>2. Who took this decision?</li> <li>3. When was the decision taken?</li> <li>4. What consultation took place?</li> <li>5. Is the change now considered permanent?</li> </ol>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Caroline Roberts
<p><i>1. Why as this action been taken? The action was taken as a result of a request to help the Theatre Royal with loading and unloading. The Theatre was unable to access the</i></p>		

loading dock on the rear of the Theatre due to vehicles being parked and therefore had no option but to load on the Highway, causing obstruction and risk to the public. Therefore a trial was implemented to see if the solution of using the bollards, which had been used intermittently for over 10 years, full time resolved the issues being faced.

2. Who took this decision? Officers discussed various options available to them and implemented the trial.

3. When was the decision taken? The trial was implemented in November 2013.

4. What consultation took place? As this was a trial solution, the Council used its powers to suspend the parking in the area to help the movement of traffic and reduce risk to the public. Any permanent solution requiring a change to the Traffic Regulation Order would follow the full statutory processes as set out, including full public consultation. Using a trial approach allowed assessment of the impacts before any permanent change is made.

5. Is the change now considered permanent? No. Further work is continuing in regard to this matter, residents will receive communication in the near future. Various other highways improvement schemes such as the Seven Dials project may however impact on the highway in this location and further changes to the road layout may be necessary.

<b>P 04</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Malcolm Cupis
<p>I have recently been approached by an elderly resident of New King Street who is complaining that a bench that she previously used at the end of New King Street has been removed and has said that she would like it to be restored.</p> <p>Could the Cabinet member please explain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why was the bench removed?</li> <li>2. Who took this decision?</li> <li>3. When was the decision taken?</li> <li>4. What consultation took place?</li> </ol>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor David Dixon
<p><i>The bench and bins was removed at the request of local residents to avoid attracting groups of people in the evenings. The area now looks tidy and bright. We have taken steps to put some hanging baskets in place.</i></p>		

## **BANES LIBRARY STATEMENT**

Libraries are important to me. I've been privileged to research in many wonderful libraries including the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library in Dorchester, Massachusetts, the British Museum Archives and the library in Bath. Admittedly Bath Library shares its building with a supermarket, but it occupies an entire floor with an outside entrance. The library in Radstock, where I live, won't be so lucky. Our disabled friendly, purpose built library building with its numerous windows was designed to provide maximum natural light to house our library books and computers. These will be squeezed into approximately  $\frac{3}{4}$ s of the space they now occupy within the RADCO supermarket. There will be no outside entrance. Anyone wishing to borrow a book will have to pass through the store. Nor will there be room for future expansion even though numerous housing developments are likely to raise our population. We're promised longer opening hours, which sounds good, provided it includes the services of professional librarians. Volunteers and self-service are certainly no improvement.

Worst of all, the people and Town Council of Radstock seem to be the last to know about this momentous change. When we found out we mounted a petition, signed by several published local authors among many others. This is an arbitrary decision passed down as a fait accompli. Please reconsider! Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank

B&NES Cabinet Meeting 16<sup>th</sup> July 2014 Radstock Library

Lesley Mansell Chair Radstock Town Council

Chair Councillors

I'm very concerned about the process regarding the proposed move of the library in Radstock into the Co-op.

This is an issue which affects the whole of Bath and North East Somerset not just Radstock.

I would ask all councilors to look very carefully at the information provided regarding this proposed move.

The consultation process due to end this Friday 18<sup>th</sup> of July asks what people would like to see in the library in it's new location residents have not been asked if they want to see the library moved.

Yet I have been sent a report recommending that the Radstock library is moved into the Co-op before the consultation finishes. I have great concern that this decision was made before you have had the facts presented to you.

This really does undermine the parish charter and has grave implications for the work planned by B&NES on Connecting Communities across the whole of the area.

This puts the council into a difficult position as residents loose confidence in the consultation process.

How will this council ensure that all consultations are carried out professionally and that they are meaningful and not just a paper exercise?

Radstock Town Council was also told that the move is needed to save money. 2 members of staff have already been made redundant. So how does this help regeneration?

We were also told there would be a saving. The report I have shows that very little is to be gained financially from such a move. It will cost £60,000 alone just to move the library.

I have now heard that the building won't be sold this means that it will take around 8 years to recoup the cost of the move.

What is B&NES doing to draw more funding into the area?

There is Government funding for training, some of that could be used to fund services in the library.

Radstock Town Council were also told that the benefit of moving was to have longer opening hours, however, what is known is that the post office, which has moved into a space next to that earmarked for the library, is finding it is rarely busy and that footfall is spread over the longer opening hours. Somewhat similar to pubs with longer opening hours.

What is also missed is that libraries provide more services than changing books.

Again, this affects the whole of B&NES and in particular areas with high levels of deprivation of which Radstock is one. Research shows that young people's reading levels have gone down by 25%.

Libraries play a valuable role in stimulating interest and raising horizons for young people. The support of the trained library staff is crucial as they make a difference to young people who are not in education, employment or training.

Many young people, alienated by their experiences in school will not wish to undertake formal college training either. The library can make a huge difference in their current lives, in the future and change the impact they have in our society.

All libraries should be looking to expand with a range of new services which will also meet the needs of the growing population due to the proposed house building.

If this move goes ahead it will have around 25% less space at a time when it should be expanding.

Residents are concerned that another public building, which is an asset to the community and has a central place within it, could be lost. Again, this could affect the whole of the district.

I ask that the decision be delayed until after the consultation is finished and the information has been presented.

✓

## Presentation to B&NES Cabinet meeting – July 16th 2014

### Susan Charles, Chair Warm Water Inclusive Swimming & Exercise Network.

You will have already heard from us at the Council meeting last week about the need for fully accessible warm water pools to be included in the contract currently being negotiated for a large leisure provider to run the B&NES leisure facilities for up to 30 years. We are here at this meeting because you are the decision-makers – you can decide what goes in that contract.

It is absolutely vital that an integral part of that contract is the provision of fully accessible warm water pools at 32°C, with changing facilities suitable for all ages and all levels of disability. Such pools fit well within your Vision as a Council. They will also assist in the delivery of your Health & Wellbeing Strategy, your Children and Young People's Plan and now your Fit for Life Strategy. Furthermore they will have the potential of enormous savings to the NHS & Social Service budgets, and ~~will~~ finally they will ensure that at long last B&NES has leisure facilities which are truly inclusive and available to all members of the community.

Let's remind ourselves of who will benefit

- Disabled children and young people who can't go swimming at the moment once they are too old for learner pools and can't stand or be lifted & changed on the floor
- Severely disabled young people & adults who've had the benefit of exercise in warm water at special schools. Their exercise opportunities are limited so without access to suitable pools they are more likely to deteriorate & need more support from Social Services
- People who've had hydrotherapy but are unable to continue exercising in warm water to maintain the benefits. They recycle through the NHS needing more treatment & lose their independence so are likely to need more social Service support.
- People recovering from illness or injury including injured servicemen. Exercising in warm water on a regular basis would greatly aid their long term recovery.
- People with long term health conditions who need water at 32°C to relieve pain & to keep warm enough to be able to exercise & swim. Without the opportunity to exercise they lose their mobility & their independence and again need more NHS treatment & Social Services support
- The increasing number of elderly who are struggling to maintain their independence in their later years. Regular access to warm water would help them maintain their mobility, improving their quality of life and reducing their isolation.

All these people would have the chance to become healthier & fitter, manage their own conditions and stay independent, thus improving their quality of life and saving enormous amounts of the NHS & Social Services budget.

They need to know there will be no compromise. Warm water pools at 32°C with changing facilities to suit all ages and all levels of disability need to be available to them on a regular basis at an affordable price in their local community

We cannot afford to stand by & see yet another generation, or even more, deprived of the opportunity to fully participate in their local community.





## **My message to the Council about why I need a warm water pool**

My name is Alexander, I am 10 Years old. I was born with a painful form of dwarfism that affects my bones and joints. Most of the time I have to move around in my wheelchair.

I would love to be able to run around or play football or cricket with all my friends at school but I can't, this makes me feel very sad.

I wanted to learn to swim with my friends at our local pool but the water was too cold and made my legs really hurt.

I started to go to the Get Wet Set swimming lessons in the hydrotherapy pool at Three Ways school, the water was nice and warm and made my joints less achy, it took a long time but I also learnt to swim really well Hooray!

I would love to be able to go swimming with my friends but the water in our local pools is too cold. I can use the learner pool at Longwell Green, Bristol but I'm 10 now and usually it's filled with babies and much younger children. In a couple of years I won't even be able to swim there.

I can't really join in with most sports, I couldn't even do wheelchair basketball because my arms are really short; but when I'm in the water I'm like a fish, I'm the same as everyone else in the water. It's the only proper exercise I get.

I would love to be able to swim in a normal pool like my friends do. I hate to think that after trying so hard to learn to swim that I won't be able to swim anymore when I'm a man, just because the water is not a little bit warmer.

I love swimming please please help us turn the heat up!!

Alexander Jones- Grech  
From Bath Swim Therapy

2 mins

This page is intentionally left blank

## Notes for statement to Bath & NE Somerset Council

Cabinet

Economic & Community Development Panel

Community Resources

Requirement for public authorities to develop and publish an Equalities Strategy.  
EHRC

In particular: The Public Sector Equality Duty came into force across Great Britain on 5 April 2011. It means that public bodies have to consider all individuals when carrying out their day-to-day work – in shaping policy, in delivering services and in relation to their own employees.

It also requires that public bodies:

- have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination
- advance equality of opportunity
- foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities

The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) requires authorities to ensure their procurement process promotes equality and achieves wider social benefits and opportunities.

Public Authorities spend £236B annually on buying goods, building works and supply of services. Such amounts require them to comply with best guidance document ....  
**Buying Better Outcomes -Mainstreaming Equalities considerations in procurement.**

The guide states that it is ***“a way for a public authority to deliver its broader strategic objectives, in addition to the core purpose of a contract and value for money”***

Also in relation to equalities provision ***“It is important that they are considered upfront before the procurement process starts”***

The means to do so is through engaging with stakeholders i.e service users, to ensure that no one sector is affected disproportionately.

*Reference the proven need of previous 3 speakers!!*

For some years, Access B&NES have been working with the council, Aquaterra, the Bath Spa Trust and all available authorities to endeavour to deliver a facility suited to the needs of a large sector of the population of Bath and NE Somerset. They have

consulted disabled individuals and groups on behalf of these authorities. They are representing the outcomes of such consultation work today.

An estimate of those disabled people unable to participate in moderate sport and leisure nationally because of access barriers, is growing and currently stands at between 3.7% and 5.7% of all disabled respondents. (ODI Taking Part survey 2005 - 2009) In the same survey adults in the North and South West of England report the highest levels of restriction to participation in Life Areas of leisure and education.

As the levels of higher age range are rising and disabled persons numbers are growing (Life Opportunities Survey 2009 -2011, ODI). Restrictions are also increasing, i.e. over 37% of disabled people met with barriers to participation in sport and leisure. Swimming is a sport or activity most disabled people could benefit from and participate in. (See Fit for Life Strategy supporting evidence)

Bath &NE Somerset Council's Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy will include indicators as to how they will remove these barriers. Under the themes "Fit for Life" and "Active Lifestyles" the JH&W Strategy will address the problems of transport, leisure facilities and design of the built environment to enable full participation by anyone. Swimming and therapeutic bathing i.e. warm pool, saunas and jacuzzi facilities should be inclusive and available to all. Fit for Life has reference to a Developers Checklist. Is the requirement for the Small Warm Pool part of this?

After all, the summary statement in the Fit for Life strategy (just completing now) is that it is intended to:

***"support and improve the health and wellbeing of the population by ensuring sustainable, high quality sport and physical activity infrastructure and opportunities to enable residents to live active lives, helping to prevent ill health, reduce social isolation and maintain independence for longer"***