

## **BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL**

### **MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING**

Thursday, 14th November, 2013

Present:- **Councillors** Simon Allen, Patrick Anketell-Jones, Rob Appleyard, Sharon Ball, Tim Ball, Colin Barrett, Cherry Beath, David Bellotti, Sarah Bevan, Mathew Blankley, Lisa Brett, John Bull, Neil Butters, Bryan Chalker, Anthony Clarke, Nicholas Coombes, Paul Crossley, Gerry Curran, Sally Davis, David Dixon, Peter Edwards, Michael Evans, Paul Fox, Andrew Furse, Charles Gerrish, Ian Gilchrist, Francine Haerberling, Alan Hale, Katie Hall, Liz Hardman, Nathan Hartley, Steve Hedges, Eleanor Jackson, Dave Laming, Malcolm Lees, Marie Longstaff, Barry Macrae, David Martin, Loraine Morgan-Brinkhurst MBE, Robin Moss, Douglas Nicol, Bryan Organ, June Player, Vic Pritchard, Liz Richardson, Manda Rigby, Caroline Roberts, Nigel Roberts, Dine Romero, Brian Simmons, Kate Simmons, Jeremy Sparks, Ben Stevens, David Veale, Martin Veal, Tim Warren, Chris Watt and Brian Webber

Apologies for absence: **Councillors** Gabriel Batt, Douglas Deacon, Les Kew, Paul Myers, Will Sandry, Roger Symonds and Geoff Ward

#### **38 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Chairman drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out on the agenda.

#### **39 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Rob Appleyard declared an 'other' interest in item 9 – Citizens Advice Bureau – as a trustee of the organisation.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson declared an 'other' interest in item 9 – Citizens Advice Bureau – as having received advice services in the past.

Councillor Charles Gerrish declared an 'other' interest in item 9 – Citizens Advice Bureau – as a trustee of the SWAN Advice network

Councillor Michael Evans declared an 'other' interest in item 9 – Citizens Advice Bureau – as a trustee of the SWAN Advice network

#### **40 MINUTES - 12TH SEPTEMBER 2013**

On a motion from Councillor Eleanor Jackson, seconded by Councillor Bryan Organ, it was

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of 12<sup>th</sup> September 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, once a minor textual amendment had been done.

#### **41 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OR FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

The Chairman made the customary announcements regarding mobile phones and a comfort break.

He passed the condolences of Council to Councillor Sally Davis following the recent death of her husband.

The Chairman also congratulated Councillor Francine Haeberling on her birthday.

#### **42 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN**

There were no items of urgent business.

#### **43 REPORT OF URGENT DECISIONS**

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor Tim Warren, it was

**RESOLVED** to note the urgent decisions taken by the Chief Executive (in consultation with Group Leaders) since the last meeting of Council, in accordance with the Urgency rules within the Constitution (Part 4 (G), rule 3) which were;

1. To approve, for a period of six months from the date of this meeting, the non-attendance at meetings of Council and its Committees, due to illness, of Councillor Batt;
2. To authorise the acquisition of property potentially of use in connection with proposals for additional Park & Ride facilities; and
3. To approve capital expenditure of £80k in connection with the enhancement of leisure provisions at South Wansdyke Sports Centre.

#### **44 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

Statements were made by the following people.

- David Redgewell made a statement about the duty to develop and maintain a Regional Transport Strategy and asked for the Cabinet Member's help in preserving regional partnerships. The statement was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport. A copy of the statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book and linked to the electronic record.
- Gareth Herincx made a statement on behalf of the South of Bath Alliance and presented a petition of 1305 signatures entitled "Protect South Stoke Plateau from 300 new homes". In response to a question from Councillor Paul

Crossley asking if Mr Herincx was aware that last year, Councillor Tim Ball had presented a housing strategy to Council which contained no extension into the green belt but which had been defeated by this Council, Gareth responded that he was aware of that, and was also aware of the significant pressure from central government to build houses. A copy of the statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book and linked to the electronic record. The statement was referred to the Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning and the petition was referred to the Core Strategy Planning Inspector.

- Robert Hellard, Vice-Chair of South Stoke Parish Council, made a statement calling on the Council to recognise the statutory protections that exist on the South Stoke site. In response to a question from Councillor Tim Ball enquiring whether the Parish Council would consider part funding if consultants were brought in to expedite the South Stoke Conservation Area appraisal, Mr Hellard responded that although he couldn't answer definitively for the Parish Council without a meeting, it was possible that they'd be able to contribute to achieve a prompt resolution of the problem. A copy of the statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book and linked to the electronic record. The statement was referred to the Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning.
- Leonie Robertson made a statement and presented a petition from parents, carers and staff of St Andrews Church of England Primary school highlighting the problems crossing Lansdown Road at the junction with Julian Road and Guinea Lane and calling for a zebra crossing to be installed as soon as possible. In response to a question from Councillor Caroline Roberts enquiring if Leonie was aware that the local Ward Councillors had been seriously lobbying for this and they hoped to include it in the budget, Ms Robertson responded that she was aware, but they'd had promises before so were really keen to see it being put into action. The statement and petition were referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport. A copy of the statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book and linked to the electronic record.

#### Concerning item 9 on the agenda

- Lin Patterson made a statement as an independent former user of the CAB, concluding with a song! A copy of the statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book and linked to the electronic record.
- Dr Michelle Farr from the University of Bath spoke on behalf of a research team that had spent 2 years looking into the impact of the CAB in B&NES. In response to a question from Councillor Eleanor Jackson about whether the research could be made available to Members, Dr Farr responded that it had only recently been submitted to the funders for a peer review and she hoped it would be available at the beginning of January. She invited Members to contact her directly with any specific queries. A copy of the statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book and linked to the electronic record.

- Jillian Tempo, a volunteer advisor for 9 years, made a statement in support of the CAB. A copy of the statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book and linked to the electronic record.
- Lin Patterson read a statement from Emily Aseri about the support she had received from the CAB. A copy of the statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book and linked to the electronic record.
- Philip Knowles, a Bath resident for over 20 years and volunteer advisor and supervisor at CAB, spoke in support of the free impartial service that it provides. He said that clients go to the CAB as they have nowhere else to go and he couldn't envisage how it would work for clients to visit different agencies for each issue they faced. In response to a question from Councillor Tim Warren about how many people volunteered for the CAB, Mr Knowles responded that it was more than 120 but he wasn't the right person to have the exact figure. *[This was subsequently confirmed by Richard Samuel as being 150.]*
- Joe Scofield made a statement in support of the CAB, expressing concern as to whether the level of service provided by the CAB could be replicated via other agencies. A copy of the statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book and linked to the electronic record.
- John James, a volunteer advisor at the CAB for 13 years, made a statement highlighting that, in addition to the invaluable advice services provided by the CAB, they also played a key role in improving policies that affect people's lives – an area of work that needed to continue.
- Shelagh James spoke as a private citizen of Bath for 40 years who had witnessed the help and support the CAB had provided, particularly with the staff and students of Bath College.
- Thomasin Gillow made a statement describing various difficult times in her life when she had called upon the CAB to help her through traumatic experiences. Due to this support, her situation had improved considerably and she was now working and things were generally much better. She called on the Council to continue funding the CAB.
- A statement from Victoria Creeghan-Davies was read by Gillian Whitehead. The statement described how her life had changed beyond recognition in the last 2 years through becoming disabled and a series of extremely challenging experiences. She had received conflicting advice from the agencies she had approached and had had lots of problems with benefits which were not resolved until she went to the CAB who sorted it all out.

The Chairman indicated the above statements would be taken into account during the subsequent debate.

The Council noted the questions and responses from members of the public that had been circulated at the meeting.

## 45 PETITION FOR DEBATE - CITIZENS ADVICE BUREAU

The Council had received a petition with sufficient signatures (over 4500) to trigger a debate at Council. The title of the petition reads - 'Please reconsider the plan to reduce the budget for advice services currently provided by CAB-BANES by 60% from next April.'

Richard Samuel, lead petitioner, spoke in support of the petition. In response to a question from Councillor Tim Ball asking by how much volunteer numbers would reduce if the cuts were implemented, Richard Samuel responded that the relationship between employed staff and volunteers was an absolute so there was no question that a reduction in staff would lead to a dramatic reduction in volunteers. In a response to a question from Councillor John Bull about the tendering process, Mr Samuel responded that he was aware that the Council had to make difficult financial decisions and he had been working with the Council examining why the continuation of the service was being reviewed; however, he didn't think that information was in the public domain. In response to a query from Councillor Bryan Chalker as to whether the Bath CAB branch was the first to be established in the country in 1939, Mr Samuel responded that it was certainly one of the first. A copy of the statement is attached to the Minute book and linked electronically to the minutes.

On a motion from Councillor Simon Allen, (seconded by Councillor David Bellotti) and then amended by Councillor Vic Pritchard, (seconded by Council Tim Warren), it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) as set out below;

### **This Council:**

- Recognises and supports the work of the Citizens Advice Bureau and other organisations within Bath and North East Somerset who provide invaluable advice services to residents throughout the B&NES area, particularly during times of financial hardship.
- Recognises the importance of high-profile generalist advice services which are easily accessible to people from all backgrounds from across the area and can act as a 'triage' service as necessary.
- Is concerned that the level of proposed budget reductions to the Council's tendered advice services puts at risk the generalist service currently available to residents.
- Is concerned at the fragmented nature of advice services available to residents and at the potential for duplication within the advice services currently offered and supported by the Council.

- Is concerned at the lack of a published strategy by the Council in relation to advice and information services.

**Council resolves:**

1. To request that Cabinet ask officers to produce and publish an Advice and Information Services Strategy which details the Council's approach, including its aims and objectives, to the provision of both general and specialist advice and information services over the coming years.
2. To request that the Advice and Information Services Strategy addresses any issues with duplication and overlap of Council commissioned advice services and details the resource requirements necessary to deliver the Strategy.
3. To request that the recommendations of the Advice and Information Services Strategy are taken into account in the Cabinet's budget proposals for 2014/15, with consideration given to providing additional resources to deliver the Advice and Information Services Strategy if necessary.
4. To request that Cabinet therefore pause the current tender process until an Advice and Information Services Strategy has been produced and reviews the proposed budget for the advice services contract once the new Strategy has been published and its resource requirements known.

*[Notes:*

1. *Councillor Simon Allen had moved a motion, seconded by Councillor David Bellotti, to the effect of noting the work thus far on the advice and information service review but resolving that any change to proposals be dealt with as part of the budget setting process and to continue the proposed procurement exercise in the interim. The motion was replaced by the successful amendment.*
2. *Voting on Councillor Vic Pritchard's amendment was 55 for, 0 against, 3 abstentions.*
3. *Voting on the substantive motion was unanimous.*
4. *During debate, a motion to call for a recess before going to the vote was moved by Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, but lost].*

**46 HEALTH & WELLBEING STRATEGY**

The Council considered a report seeking approval for the final Health & Wellbeing Strategy.

On a motion from Councillor Simon Allen, seconded by Councillor Tim Ball, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

1. To approve the Bath and North East Somerset Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy, subject to the addition of the following words (italicised) into Theme 2, page 5 section entitled 'Improved Services which support and encourage independent living and dying well' - "*Community Transport plays a key role in reducing health inequalities of communities*"; and

2. To note the Equality Impact Assessment carried out on the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

*[Note; The underlined wording in resolution 1. above was proposed as a minor adjustment by Councillor Vic Pritchard and accepted by the mover and seconder of the motion.]*

#### **47 THE LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME (LCTS) 2014-15**

The Council considered a report regarding the Local Council Tax Support scheme and its continuation into its second year.

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

**RESOLVED** (50 for, 6 against)

1. To agree that the existing Council Tax Support Scheme, as set out in appendix 1 to the report, is approved for 2014/15 with adjustments made to reflect national uprating and other necessary technical changes; and
2. That these adjustments be delegated to the S151 officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources.

#### **48 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT TO 30TH SEPTEMBER 2013**

The Council considered a report giving details of performance against the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Plan 2013/14 for the first six months of 2013/14.

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

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

1. To note the Treasury Management report to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2013, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice; and
2. To note the Treasury Management Indicators to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2013.

#### **49 MOTION FROM LABOUR GROUP - THE LIVING WAGE**

The Council considered a motion from the Labour group.

On a motion from Councillor John Bull, (seconded by Councillor Liz Hardman), and then amended following a proposal by Councillor David Bellotti, (seconded by Councillor Andy Furse), it was

**RESOLVED**

That Council:

1. Recognises that paying the Living Wage can have benefits but believes that it is a 'LIVING INCOME' that is most important for every individual and family;
2. Notes that since the last general election the minimum wage has risen from £5.80 per hour to £6.31 per hour;
3. Notes that no council employee receives less than £6.45 per hour;
4. Notes that since the last general election the tax threshold has risen and will stand at £10,000 p.a. in 2014 making everyone in work £700 p.a. better off;
5. Notes that both political parties in Government are considering their manifestos for 2015 including raising the tax threshold to the minimum wage;
6. Notes that it is the Government's view that employers should be encouraged to pay above the minimum wage providing they are profitable and when it is not at the expense of jobs;
7. Notes that the cost of implementing a living wage would be around £320K. Further budget savings would be needed to be made to cover this cost and that would probably lead to some job losses and service cuts.

**Therefore Council resolves:**

1. Not to implement the Living Wage at this time, but to work towards it as and when the Council can afford it;
2. To support the Government policy of raising the tax threshold;
3. To remove spinal points 4, 5 and 6 of our pay scales putting the staff on those spinal points onto spinal point 7 as this would help our lowest paid, subject to consultation and agreement with staff and unions including how it is implemented and subject to the 2014/15 budget procedure;
4. To keep low pay under annual review during each future budget round.

*[Notes;*

1. *The original Labour motion, which was subsequently amended, asked the Council to agree in principle that all employees should be paid the Living Wage, to refer this to the Employment Committee, to consider any financial implications in the MTSRP process, to sign up for accreditation as a LW employer, to use its influence to urge other local employers to follow suit and, in the meantime, to remove spinal points 4, 5 and 6 and transfer any staff on those grades onto spinal point 7.*



2. *Voting on the amendment from Councillor David Bellotti was carried with 34 for, 5 against and 11 abstentions.*
3. *Voting on the substantive motion was 48 for, 2 against.]*

**50 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

One question was submitted by Councillor Nicholas Coombes to Councillor Dine Romero. A response was circulated, placed on the Minute book and has been linked to the electronic record.

The meeting ended at 10.10 pm

Chair(person) .....

Date Confirmed and Signed .....

**Prepared by Democratic Services**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Public Questions for Council 14<sup>th</sup> November 2013**

(NOTE: The following questions and answers will be published on the Council's website as soon as possible after the meeting and linked to the published draft minutes of this meeting.)

### **1. Question from Leonie Robertson**

I am a parent of two boys who attend St Andrew's Primary School on Northampton Street. We live in Alpine Gardens and to walk to our local school we have to cross Lansdown Road at the junction with Julian Road and Guinea Lane.

Many other families attending St Andrews, in particular, from Snow Hill, also cross at this junction which is very busy at rush hour. There is a steady stream of speeding cars, all very impatient to get onto Guinea Lane to queue onto The Paragon/London Road. Therefore, it is very difficult to cross Lansdown Road and extremely dangerous.

In order to cross the road, we usually have to wait until another family comes along so that we can stop the traffic and cross the road en masse. I can feel my anxiety levels rising greatly when we cross the road and I am very concerned about what we are teaching our children – that it is okay to cross the road in oncoming traffic – when clearly it is not.

Even parents with children in year 6 have to walk their children to school because of the dangers of crossing Lansdown Road, at a time when they want to encourage their children to be more independent in preparation for the move to secondary education.

There are many families who use this route to St Andrews and I know many more would walk to school more often if it were safe to do so. We should be encouraging people wanting to walk to school because of the obvious health benefits. This is a huge safety and environmental issue and I understand that this has been a particular problem since Walcot Infants was closed over 4 years ago and yet no still no provision has been made to cross Lansdown Road safely.

I am informed that a pedestrian / traffic study carried out by the council's Design and Projects team highlighted the Julian Road/Guinea Lane junction on Lansdown Road as having sufficient footfall to justify the installation of a zebra crossing, but that budget constraints mean it might not be carried out until 2015.

Can the Council confirm that it will be prioritised and allocated funding in the forthcoming budget and, if not, how they can justify their position?

### **Answer from Cabinet Member for Transport**

A pedestrian crossing at the junction of Lansdown Road and Guinea Lane is one of a number of schemes being considered for funding in 2014/15. It is intended that, following consultation, the final list of schemes will be confirmed at the Council's budget meeting in February 2014.

## **2. Question from Phyllis Gay**

After a meeting with Mr Dave Dixon last June we were told that a Grant had been earmarked for Writhlington Village Hall to replace the leaking roof. This grant would come from money allocated to Radstock under the Regeneration Scheme. When it rains we have to place containers around the Hall to catch the rain and if it gets any worse we shall have to consider closing a very well used Community Hall as we have not got the funds to finance replacing the roof. Why is it that we are still waiting for this grant to be released?

Our local Cllrs have been unable to make any progress so far and as a last resort we are appealing to you.

### **Answer from the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development**

In April 2013, as part of the £500,000 Radstock Capital Funding, £50,000 was allocated for “investment in to additional community facilities.” The funding was to be “awarded through a competitive bidding process” with bids assessed against a set of criteria and scored through the use of a scoring matrix. This requirement to award the funding through the basis of a competitive bidding process does remain and a formal invitation to bid will be advertised in the local press by the end of November. This will set out the criteria upon which applications for funding will be assessed, establish any terms and conditions attached to the funding and invite applications for funding. The applications will then be assessed and successful applicants notified as soon as practically thereafter.

*Statement from South West Transport Network  
for the next BANES Cabinet, PTSE and full Council meetings  
for South Gloucestershire next PTSE, full Council and Cabinet  
meetings  
West of England Partnership Scrutiny and Transport Board  
meetings*

## Duty to develop and maintain a Regional Transport Strategy

*We are extremely concerned about the implications which arise from recent developments in Somerset which have called into question the future of the Severnside Rail Partnership and the Heart of Wessex Community Rail Partnership. The loss of these Community Rail Partnerships through withdrawal of funding would be extremely damaging to future development of rail services in the Severnside area. We must ensure that funding for Community Rail projects is maintained and that all the regional Councils lend their full support to developing the potential of existing as well as proposed new lines in the region. Allowing these partnerships to fail would make a mockery of localism.*

*These partnerships have also been a catalyst for bus/rail integration such as the Taunton-Minehead bus/rail link, the Highbridge to Burnham, Brean and Weston link and the WsM station to Cheddar and Wells link and WsM station to Bristol Airport. (The last two of these are about to be withdrawn, which marks a significant step backwards).*

David Redgewell

**South West Transport Network** – Tel 07814 794953

This page is intentionally left blank

Mr Chairman, councillors, ladies and gentlemen...

I'm honoured to be representing the 1,300 people who took the trouble to sign our petition - most of whom also wrote impassioned comments. The vast majority are from Bath, but there are many others from the UK and the rest of the world including America, New Zealand and Mexico - an indication that the preservation of Bath's green belt is of national and international interest.

I'm also representing the South of Bath Alliance which provides a voice for the communities surrounding South Stoke plateau – all opposed to the housing plans - that's South Stoke village, Combe Hay village, the roads to the north including Southstoke Road, Midford Road, Old Frome Road – and Sulis Meadows

And finally, I'm here as a resident of Bath who is proud of our city's status as a UNESCO World Heritage Site and accepts the need for more housing - but doesn't believe bulldozing the green belt is the only solution

South Stoke plateau is meant to have the highest level of protection. Not only is it part of the Cotswold Area of

Natural Outstanding Beauty, it's also designated green belt - which in this case should provide a buffer between the historic village of South Stoke and the city of Bath. The nationally important Wansdyke Scheduled Ancient Monument also runs through the plateau, while it's also ecologically important to threatened species including skylarks and greater horseshoe bats. Housing on the plateau would also jeopardise the delicate ecology and natural spring water routes that flow through the nearby Horsecombe Valley

It seems to me that this proposal is being driven by profit and convenience. PROFIT for the landowner and developers and CONVENIENCE because it makes up the housing numbers and it's a nice flat piece of agricultural land..

We say there is no need to destroy Bath's green belt if the density of housing on brownfield - especially the three MoD sites - was increased slightly. Incidentally, the MoD Foxhill site is a couple of minutes' drive from the plateau and has been earmarked for 800 houses - potentially putting a large strain on our already strained infrastructure.

A few months ago Adam Fergusson gave a talk in Bath to mark the 40th anniversary of the publication of his book, *The Sack of Bath*. I don't need to remind anyone here



today that he was the man who blew the whistle on the planning vandalism that took place in this city during the 60s and 70s. In his speech, Mr Fergusson warned of a second Sack of Bath and concluded by saying the green belt should be “non negotiable”.

Bath isn't just about its historic centre - its setting makes it unique too. If the green belt is allowed to be breached at South Stoke AND Weston we fear there's a real danger that Bath could lose its valuable status as a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

This page is intentionally left blank

**BANES COUNCIL MEETING**  
**November 14<sup>th</sup> 2013**  
**Agenda Item 8**

Chairman, Councillors

I am Robert Hellard from South Stoke Parish Council.

Your officers have just published a schedule of Core Strategy Amendments, which includes a requirement for 300 homes and a map entitled “Strategic Green Belt Site Allocations” for the South Stoke Plateau. This defines your intended urban extension to Bath and a new boundary for the Green Belt, south of the city. The area illustrated is more than twice the size of the existing Sulis Meadows estate, where 360 houses fit with ease.

This map at last acknowledges Bath’s World Heritage status and the important presence of the Wansdyke but fails absolutely to consider the importance of the Cotswold AONB and the conservation village of South Stoke. It quietly slips in a “potential access from South Stoke Lane”, which is barely more than a single track. This map and its loosely defined intentions fail to address the Inspectors requirement to allocate the intended housing and still leaves the future of this wonderful Cotswold Plateau at the mercy of negotiation with a “willing Developer”.

Mysteriously you have failed to adopt the Conservation Area appraisal for South Stoke which was in final draft form in 2009 and ready for adoption in 2011- I quote from your officer’s letter of May 2012 – “It will minor editorial tweaks...but should otherwise be ready to take to cabinet”. This together with the AONB status of this site, could and should inform this debate.

This Council should finally recognise the importance of the statutory protections that exist on this site and be brave enough to plan our future development in association with Neighbouring Councils, from where sustainable transport links already exist, rather than be bullied by eager landowners into accepting this “Green field first” policy.

Councillors, you now need to take control and work for us, your electors. Your predecessors bear eternal shame for the “Sack of Bath”, over which they presided.

How would you like to be remembered?

Robert Hellard.

Vice Chairman of South Stoke Parish Council.

This page is intentionally left blank

Question for BANES Full Council Meeting 14<sup>th</sup> November 2013

Background:

I am a parent of two boys who attend St Andrew's Primary School on Northampton Street. We live in Alpine Gardens and to walk to our local school we have to cross Lansdown Road at the junction with Julian Road and Guinea Lane.

Many other families attending St Andrews, in particular, from Snow Hill, also cross at this junction, which is very busy at rush hour. There is a steady stream of speeding cars, all very impatient to get onto Guinea Lane to queue onto The Paragon/London Road. Therefore, it is very difficult to cross Lansdown Road and extremely dangerous.

In order to cross the road, we usually have to wait until another family comes along so that we can stop the traffic and cross the road en masse. I can feel my anxiety levels rising greatly when we cross the road and I am very concerned about what we are teaching our children – that it is okay to cross the road in oncoming traffic – when clearly it is not.

Even parents with children in year 6 have to walk their children to school because of the dangers of crossing Lansdown Road, at a time when they want to encourage their children to be more independent in preparation for the move to secondary education.

There are many families who use this route to St Andrews and I know many more would walk to school more often if it were safe to do so. We should be encouraging people wanting to walk to school because of the obvious health benefits. This is a huge safety and environmental issue and I understand that this has been a particular problem since Walcot Infants was closed over 4 years ago and yet no still no provision has been made to cross Lansdown Road safely.

I am informed that a pedestrian / traffic study carried out by the council's Design and Projects team highlighted the Julian Road/Guinea Lane junction on Lansdown Road as having sufficient footfall to justify the installation of a zebra crossing, but that budget constraints mean it might not be carried out until 2015.

Can the panel confirm that it will be prioritised and allocated funding in the forthcoming budget and, if not, how they can justify their position?

I will attend the meeting and will bring a petition signed by parents, carers and staff of St Andrew's Church of England Primary School.

Leonie Robertson, Alpine Gardens, Bath, BA1 5PE

This page is intentionally left blank

Lin Patterson

I am here representing myself as an independent, former user of CAB, in my own capacity. CAB has no idea what I will be presenting here.

It does not need a psychotherapist like me to see that this Cabinet particularly and other councillors generally, did not go into politics to collude in the dismantling of our culture. It must hurt.

I choose to respect this cabinet as being composed of talented and principled people who want to do the right thing. And I believe you will have anticipated a backlash and have access to contingency or other funds so the diabolical choices between public toilets, Children's Centres and Citizens Advice Bureau can at least be postponed.

Time is what we need in hopes that the political landscape might change and present different choices. I think you have the skill, good judgement and practical ability to do that. If so, we will support you. You are surrounded by people, people who would uphold you, sustain and defend you, with voices to point the way.

In the next very brief only 35 seconds of my allotted time here, you have the opportunity to listen to a different way of expressing this for 35 seconds. Please bear with us. Hear us.

Keep our C-A-B,  
Save our C-A-B,  
Fund our C-A-B toda-a-a-a-ay.  
O-o-oh free and for all,  
Port in the storm,  
Fund our C-A-B **TODAY!**

This page is intentionally left blank



Good evening. I'm Dr Michelle Farr. I'm speaking on behalf of a University of Bath team that have spent two years researching the impact of the CAB in BANES. This was funded through the South West Forum Proving Our Value programme and Big Lottery.

Our research is complete. It is currently undergoing a peer review process. An advance statement has been circulated.

*There are 2*

Important issues: ~~concern~~ the move from universal to targeted advice and the high level of funding cuts. The Council must ensure that it takes into account its legal duties with respect to equalities, risk management and public health inequalities. Our research shows that the CAB prevents homelessness, helps to alleviate anxiety, depression and mental health problems, prevents in-patient psychiatric care and suicide, and alleviates poverty through income gain for the most vulnerable. These cover many outcomes in the BANES health and well-being strategy.

How can Councillors be certain that these proposed funding cuts do not put the most vulnerable at risk? We would like to invite any interested Councillors to meet at the University to discuss further how our research can help to inform evidence-based policy.

The Council has calculated that advice focusing on vulnerable populations will cost 55% less than universal provision

- However 59% of BANES council funded CAB clients are below the poverty line. Vulnerable groups need extended intensive support. Their common response for improvement was that they needed more support, not less.
- For eighty clients we interviewed the present value of outcomes was over £500,000 over a 5 year period. For £1 invested in CAB full advice we estimate a return of £50 back in economic and social value.
- The CAB in this BANES local authority funding contract is potentially generating approximately £18 million total value for its stakeholders per year. This figure covers only part of the full CAB service.

The Council will retender a service that will focus on vulnerable people

- However our results illustrate the importance of early intervention and prevention
- Only intervening when clients are at their most vulnerable, negates the vital importance of early preventative work. It is a less cost effective way of providing advice.

The Council suggests referral to the DWP in cases of being diagnosed with a serious illness and being unable to work.

However it is often DWP decisions that the CAB supports clients in overturning. 20% of our client sample sought advice to appeal decisions about Employment Support Allowance (ESA) and Disability Living Allowance (DLA).

- At least 75% of ESA appeals and 67% of DLA appeals were successful.

The Council suggests there are other agencies that clients can access.

- However many clients expressed that they had nowhere else to turn.
- Some agencies listed refer clients to the CAB. They often cover one area of advice but many clients had complex interrelated issues.

In the light of these findings and the council's statutory duties we urge the Council to reconsider its decisions.

This page is intentionally left blank

(1)

Jillian Tempo

I've been a volunteer advisor for a total of 9 years; currently volunteering 2 sessions per week

\* The value of our volunteer force is calculated to be £400,000 p.a. (on the basis of each hour at minimum wage). That means that no funding is needed for that £400k of value. But we require paid staff for supervision, specialist knowledge case monitoring & management. 'Cut 50% of our budget and we'd have to cut 50% volunteer hours.'

\* And we do a good job for our community. Our quality of advice is in the top 3% of bureaux nationally.

\* [ Last year we gained for our clients £5.1 million in benefits & charity grants  
We helped wipe off £1.9m of debt  
And we restructured nearly £400,000 of debt into affordable payments  
Most of these savings - £5.5 million - are released into the local economy ]

(2)

\* It costs an average of £53 to advise a client. But the average cost of advising our clients who are threatened by ~~the~~ homelessness is £84.

They're people in crisis - often who have had to borrow money, then chosen to pay the persistent loan shark rather than council tax or rent arrears.

£84 it costs us to avoid homelessness.

How much does it cost the council once they've lost their home?

\* The question I'd really like an answer to is: Just who is considered vulnerable and who is not?

[ Certainly the elderly, those with physical disabilities and mental health issues.

What about those on benefits and the many in this area in low paid jobs and in debt? ]

\* (But) what I've learned in the last couple of weeks <sup>(3)</sup>  
is that so many ~~people~~ diverse people supporting  
us against these cuts  
consider themselves to have been dependent on the  
advice CAB has given in the past or believe  
they are likely to be vulnerable and need our  
advice in future.

\* When any of us go through difficult times, it's unlikely  
we can class our crisis as a single issue.  
My client going through relationship breakdown  
needs signposting to web-based information and to a  
mediator  
but also needs advice on benefits, housing a debt -  
possibly employment and children's issues.  
We're trained to work holistically, preventatively.

(F)  
If all these single issue agencies are duplicating  
the advice CAB gives, why are 1200 people a  
month choosing to come to us?

Why are we so busy in the One Stop Shop when  
other agencies are less so?

I suspect our clients come to us because we can  
handle their multiple issues

### **Statement to Full Council 14-11-13**

In July of this year my husband and I found a new larger place to live as we are expecting a baby at the start of January. Our fixed term contract on the current rented property was coming to an end on 7th September. On 5th August we gave written notice. The letting agents responded to say that we were too late to give notice and we should have given notice by the end of July. I later telephoned them to say I was going to drop in to Citizens Advice regarding this as I believed we had given sufficient notice. Within a few hours of this I received a revised email from the letting agents confirming that our last day of our tenancy would be 7th September.

On 7th September with the help of family and friends, the flat was cleaned from top to bottom. It was left in a much better condition than we had originally found it. Some 3 weeks passed before we finally heard about receiving back our deposit on the flat. I had telephoned at least 3 or 4 times trying to chase this up. I received an email to say that they would be deducting £50 from our deposit for 'light cleaning'. I wrote a lengthy email back explaining how the flat had been left in an exceptional condition compared to how it had been found originally and that I would like to dispute the amount they wished to deduct. I received confirmation of my email and was told they would look into this. I waited a week and as I had not heard back I emailed them to say that I was going to seek some advice from Citizens Advice on the matter and that same day I received an email from the letting agents apologising and stating that they would not be deducting anything from our deposit and within hours of this our full deposit was transferred into my bank account.

On both of these occasions I did not have to actually go to the Citizens Advice Bureau but the mention of them alone was enough to resolve my issues. I of course would have sought advice had these issues not been resolved so quickly and in the past have had to use the CAB on a number of occasions.

I have recommended the CAB to family and friends and I know many have had issues and concerns resolved through using the drop-in service.

(Her statement went on to describe how CAB previously helped with a marriage visa and debt management.)

Emily Aseri

This page is intentionally left blank

I felt obliged to say something tonight, as I volunteer for CAB as a receptionist. So I engage with the kinds of people who come in for help.

I see two main problems with the Council's proposal to cut advisory services.

Firstly, the Council hasn't *demonstrated* that the many thousands of hours of face-to-face work and admin that the CAB performs for vulnerable people, can be replicated by other agencies.

I see the long hours of work the CAB Advisors devote to clients, and I *know* it's mainly with vulnerable people and that it's *all* indispensable.

To point out that *other* agencies perform face-to-face work, isn't the same as saying that these agencies can carry *the same workload* or put in all those thousands of hours of work as the CAB does. If other agencies *can* do it, they must have an awful lot of spare time on their hands now.

Secondly, I believe some clients will slip through the net. We've already seen a comment in the local paper from Stone King solicitors, predicting a shortfall in legal help.

My branch of CAB would close under the cuts. And I'm not confident that all the vulnerable people I see will automatically find help elsewhere. Because there are people who are illiterate or have learning difficulties, or arrive in a state of emotional breakdown, who aren't so easy to signpost elsewhere. It's no good assuming for example, that *illiterate* people will find websites and helplines.

Some clients are *accustomed* to getting help from the CAB and will work with specific Advisors whom they know by name. It's easy for bureaucrats at the Guildhall to assume these clients will just come over to *Council desks* at One Stop, but it's not so certain in reality.

This page is intentionally left blank



150 volunteers

## Address to BANES Council meeting 14/11/13

- Introduce self
- Thank Council for the opportunity to address.

We are protesting against an extraordinary proposal by the Council to reduce funding for local advice services by £225000 or 55%.

•This first appeared in the Council's budget last February when a much smaller cut was proposed. Many of you may not have been aware of it even as the detail was buried deep in the finance report papers.

We believe the current decision has been based on misconceptions and poor evidence and minimal consultation and it is clear that until tonight the Council has never even had the opportunity to discuss the proposal.

•Tried to negotiate and suggest alternative approaches. These were all rebuffed leaving us with no choice but to raise our petition and appeal to the Full Council

•So far 4500 have signed our petition calling on the Council to reconsider its decision demonstrating an enormous strength of local opposition to Cllr Allen's decision made on your behalf.

• It is clear that the Council is out of tune with local opinion.

### How has the decision been justified?

The Council says that :-

- 1.It cannot afford to fund what it describes as "generalist advice". It wishes to see more services more closely directed to the most vulnerable. The inference is that the CAB does n't do that.
2. There is duplication as other advice agencies doing the same job.
3. The CAB has large reserves that could help absorb the cut

I will deal with these in order.

### Services already directed to those that need them

CAB sees around 8000 people a year from throughout BANES. Or expressed another way 1 in 10 of the local electorate.

Overwhelmingly those clients have multiple problems relating to debt, employment, benefits & housing. It is rare that our clients present with a single simple issue.

An independent analysis of our work by the University of Bath shows that 59% of clients have an income of below the poverty line. 30% have annual incomes of under £7500.

**We are the only Nationally backed externally audited organisation providing advice on multiple issues that also gives a single independent point of access.**

**So what do we want you to do tonight.**

**We want you to:-**

- Stop the tender process**
- Restore the budget to a realistic level for the future.**
- Agree to rethink your approach and examine the future strategy for advice and customer access**

**Ask a cross party group of Councillors to look at the details and report back to the Council before any changes are made.**

**Conclusion**

**•As your local CAB - here in the City since 1939 - we are fighting for the restoration of the budget so that a proper job can be done at this critical time.**

**We are fighting for the poor and vulnerable clients we see every working day who are also your constituents.**

**•We need your help and support to help us do the job properly.**

**Thank you.**

## **COUNCIL 14/11/13**

### Item 13 – Motion from Labour Group – officer advice note

To assist Council in its discussion of the motion, the following information is offered:-

#### 1. Constitutional/Process issues

1.1. Full Council is responsible for the setting of the 2014/15 budget on the basis of recommendations to be prepared by Cabinet.

1.2 Matters relating to the terms and conditions of staff are delegated to the Employment Committee to consider; the Committee in deciding on such matters can only do so within the approved budget framework. Matters relating to procurement are the responsibility of Cabinet.

1.3 Accordingly the Council at this meeting – if supportive in principle of the proposals – can go no further than to resolve to consider the proposals and refer them to the Employment Committee and receive a report (in the case of Council employees) as part of the 2014/15 budget process to Full Council. A decision on procurement aspects will be for Cabinet to make rather than Council.

1.4 Attached to this note are -

A. Advice prepared by the Chief Financial Officer and Head of Human Resources on the issues raised in the motion and

B. Copy of a survey prepared by the South West Employers on the approach taken by Councils in the South West.

Vernon Hitchman  
Monitoring Officer

Tim Richens  
Divisional Director – Business Support

William Harding  
Head of Human Resources

This page is intentionally left blank

# LIVING WAGE— Briefing Note NOVEMBER 2013

- **What is Living Wage – what it is derived from and by whom**

The idea behind a Living Wage is very simple: That a person should be paid enough to live decently and to adequately provide for their family. At its heart is an ethical argument for preventing in-work poverty and ensuring workers are not exploited through low wages. This requires a wage that takes into account the area-specific cost of living, as well as the basic expenses involved in supporting a family.

It is suggested that a 'Living Wage' campaign is necessary because the National Minimum Wage is too low to address these issues.

A key issue when looking at individual organisations paying Living Wage is to ask if they have facilitated it for both in-house and contracted-out staff. An employer which seeks accreditation from the Living Wage Foundation must ask external contractors to commit to paying the Living Wage and encourage other employers in the area to do so. This will clearly have cost implications other than those associated with staff salaries

- **How much it is, how calculated and how often reviewed**

There are currently two widely accepted standards for the Living Wage. One for London and another for all parts of the UK outside of London.

## **The London Living Wage**

Since 2005 the London Living Wage (LLW) has been calculated annually by the Living Wage Unit of the Greater London Authority (GLA). **The LLW currently stands at £8.55/hour.**

## **The Living Wage Outside of London**

The tools for calculating the living wage outside of London are provided by the Minimum Income Standard (MIS) research project based at Loughborough University and funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. The MIS provides a well-researched measure of how much a worker needs to earn to avoid the effects of poverty, such as ill health, poor levels of child development and social exclusion. **This is currently calculated at £7.45 an hour.**

**Note: National minimum wage is set at £6.31 per hour for adults**

- **What status does it have, who supporting etc**

Originally an inner London phenomenon, the LW has now spread elsewhere and 40% of LAs paying the LW are outside London (One Society 2012 survey).

It's more of a 'movement' than something with a status, widely supported by a variety of organisations. There is a view that it benefits not only the employees but also the local economy – one in ten of the LAs surveyed by One Society acknowledged the benefit of paying a living wage to the local economy.

- Several LAs recognise that many of their staff and contractors are recipients of their services and in-work poverty may create a cost to them.
- The IFS estimates that below living wage pay costs the taxpayer £6billion a year in benefits and lost revenue.
- In addition, the Marmo report estimates the impact of poverty related ill health at £5.5billion a year.
- And a recent Unicef report identified low wages and the consequent need to work long hours, potentially in several jobs, as a significant factor in a poor quality of child welfare and family life in the UK
- Implications for other local employers – i.e. LA's draw staff from other employers; Community Leadership e.g. Newcastle on Tyne

# LIVING WAGE— Briefing Note NOVEMBER 2013

- **Coverage in different sectors/ view of LG employers**

20% of LAs are paying the LW, another 8% are considering it.  
7% require contractors to pay the LW and a further 10% are considering it.

The results of a recent survey of the intentions of councils in the South West in respect of payment of the Living Wage is available

Some private sector employers ( finance, legal, retail and media) are also committed to paying the Living Wage – arguably more as a PR exercise than in pursuit of any 'fair wage' initiatives given the base level salaries in these areas.

*The LGAs view is*

*that nationally the employers are very unlikely to implement the 'Living Wage' for 3 main reasons. First, they will see it as a local matter for councils to decide whether they wish to implement it, second it would cost a significant amount of money and for many councils the cost would be prohibitive and third the issue goes beyond just our own workforce and has implications for procurement and commissioning more widely within councils.*

*That said, members are concerned about the position of lower paid workers in LG and have that in mind in their approach to any national wage settlements.*

- **Local issues – i.e. what is our current minimum who gets this roles and numbers.**
- **What would it cost to implement here**

Excluding apprentices: Our lowest salary is £12,435 ( £238 per week or £6.44 and hour) .

Employees on grades T through to R (our 3 lowest pay grades) fall below the Living Wage which equates to £14,373 pa

Around 800 staff (inc. schools) are currently paid below the LW- the greatest number of these are in schools Post which are not paid at LW level include

CLEANER  
SPORTS ASSISTANT  
PARK & RIDE ATTENDANT  
SCHOOL MEALS SUPERVISORY ASSISTANT  
CATERING ASSISTANT  
SCHOOL CROSSING PATROL

The total cost of implementing the LW would be around £310k. This includes a maximum allowance for 'on-costs' (Employers National Insurance and Pension Contributions) assuming staff are in the Local Government Pension Scheme. For the non-schools pay bill the cost is around £210k, for schools the cost would be in the region of £100k. The apparent disparity in cost arises from hours worked i.e. a large number of part-time staff in schools working very few hours.

These costs relate only to uplift the wages of those currently falling below the LW.  
If this is a Council decision there is potential that schools will need to be compensated for their additional pay costs. Their funding is distributed through an agreed formula and distributional impacts would require consideration as well as the position in relation to Academies.

# LIVING WAGE— Briefing Note NOVEMBER 2013

Implications remain for differential and pay line/strategy.

Implications for implementing National Award would also need consideration.

- **What are the other potential implications of implementation/ how might they be avoided)**
  - Introducing the LW would give all the staff on grades S-R a salary increase.
  - This would effectively take staff off the National Pay Spine and careful consideration about how to implement this would be necessary in order not to compromise the Council's position in respect of national pay bargaining
  - Serious consideration also need to be given to existing differential and the continuing impact on pay points adjacent to the 'LW rate' As the LW is reviewed each year, implementation may encroach further up the pay scale.
  - There are concerns that the introduction of the LW could give rise to equal pay claims as staff graded differently would attract the same salary. However, in order to succeed, with such a claim, the claimant would need to show that the discrepancy in salary was due to gender. As this would clearly not be the case, claims could be successfully resisted. Further advice and some discussion with LAs who have implemented would be advisable before making any decisions.
  - There are also concerns about the timing of such an initiative in the current financial climate and the context of staff cuts.
  - There will be increases in salary cost for some services already looking at reducing salary costs
  - There will be an increase in the cost of services provided at a charge by the council – principally cleaning and catering .Schools would be most significantly affected
  - There would be increases in the cost of services provided by external contractors if this aspect of the LW were implemented If external contractors did not implement the LW then
  - They could undercut the council if there was competition on procurement possibly resulting in loss of jobs
  - They might be disinclined to bid for contracts if a staff TUPE exercise were necessary, potentially conflicting with the new procurement policy and initiatives. This needs to be considered against the 'Think Local ' aspects of the Procurement Strategy
  - The potential for generating conditions on which equal pay claims could be mounted needs to be carefully managed
  - The impact on the pay line and the potential for the LW to affect staff at higher levels within the grades must be carefully considered

SCP	Band	Hay Points	April 2011-12	Living Wage	April 2013-14
4	T	50-69	12, 145		12,266
5	S	70-80	12, 312		12,435
6			12, 489		12,614
7	R	81-97	12, 787		12,915
8			13, 189		13,321
9			13, 589		13725
10			-	£14,373 pa	
11	Q	98-112	14, 733		14,480
12			15, 039		15,189
13			15, 444		15,598

## LIVING WAGE— Briefing Note NOVEMBER 2013

- **What are the potential implications related to procurement of service**

Further consideration is needed in relation to the request seeking contractors to also pay the LW. We could not insist on contractors paying the LW, although some recognition could be specified within award criteria to those paying it. There could also be associated cost implications.

○



### Survey Re Living Wage (November 2013)

Authority Name	Progress Towards the Living Wage					Other / comment
	Implemented	Firmly committed	Firmly decided not to commit	Considering	Other	
Unitary 1 Bath & North East Somerset Council				x		The Labour Group has submitted a motion to the November meeting of Council proposing that we should commit.
Unitary 2 Swindon Borough Council			x			We are currently looking at our pay strategy going forward and the Living Wage is one option. A clear decision has been made not to implement the Living Wage at this point in time. Clearly, this does not mean that the decision will not be reviewed at some stage in the future but that is the current position.
Unitary 3 Wiltshire Council				x		The independent group have proposed a motion to adopt the LW and this will be considered at full Council w/c 11/11/13. However a management team/Cabinet response will identify the financial impact (approx £800K) and suggest that this is too great to implement now but it is something to be borne in mind as the authority progresses with its job family work.
Unitary 4 Plymouth City Council		x				

Authority Name	Progress Towards the Living Wage					
	Implemented	Firmly committed	Firmly decided not to commit	Considering	Other	Other / comment
Unitary 5 North Somerset Council				x		A Living Wage Working Party has now been set up, to consider the implementation of the Living Wage.
Unitary 6 Borough of Poole				x		Unison have asked for the subject to be discussed at our next JICC meeting later this month (Nov 2013)
Unitary 7 South Gloucestershire Council	x					We have implemented payment of the Living Wage (£7.45 ph) from 1 October 2013 and have committed to pay the new rate announced today (£7.65 ph) wef 1 April 2014. We have not yet signed up to become an accredited Living Wage employer.
Unitary 8 Cornwall Council				x		This matter is being actively considered by members in November 2013 before the matter is potentially referred to the Chief Executive with a view to trying to find a way to implement the Living Wage despite the budget difficulties
Unitary 9 Bristol City Council				x		<p>A copy of the official statement about this issue, outlined in our pay policy statement, is copied below for information:</p> <p>1. In addition to any national pay award from April 2013 and subject to overall affordability, the council is prepared to consider some form of non-consolidated pay award to the lowest paid (up to the living wage threshold). However, this will only be taken forward if agreement can be reached with the Single Status Trade Unions on reforms to</p>

Authority Name	Progress Towards the Living Wage					
	Implemented	Firmly committed	Firmly decided not to commit	Considering	Other	Other / comment
						<p>the pay and grading system and in particular payment arrangements for nonstandard working hours (for council employees).</p> <p>2. Developing a reward strategy which will be put in place by April 2014 and will:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Address low pay by introducing the “Living Wage” in a sustainable, and affordable way;</li> <li>● strengthen the link between pay levels and consistent contribution;</li> <li>● is underpinned by requirements to recruit and retain talent needed to drive organisational performance;</li> </ul>
Unitary 10 Torbay Council				x		
Unitary 11 Bournemouth Borough Council			x			
County 1 Devon County Council			x			The position in Devon is firmly decided not to commit; still being challenged by the opposition but rejected on the basis of cost.
County 2 Dorset County Council				x		
County 3 Gloucestershire				x		For context, the proposal to introduce LW for GCC employees (including Schools) has now gone via an Overview & Scrutiny Committee and then to Cabinet (late October 2013).

Authority Name	Progress Towards the Living Wage					
	Implemented	Firmly committed	Firmly decided not to commit	Considering	Other	Other / comment
						It will be considered as part of the 2014/15 budget setting process early in the New Year. The likely scenario is a 'Living Wage Supplement' as there is no current appetite for full accreditation to the Living Wage foundation (primarily due to the contractor/procurement related issues).
County 4 Somerset County Council			x			Our unions raised it for discussion at our October 2013 County Consultative Conference in the context of the consultation on National Green Book Pay Claim for 2014/15. The point was noted. No further action, pending local consultation and outcome of the national negotiations.
District 1 Exeter City Council				x		The intention is to implement a living wage from 1 January 2014 (subject to Council approval; a report is going to committee in December 2013 with ) It is more likely than not that this will be approved.
District 2 Cotswold District Council			x			Very few (20) are employed under the Living Wage amount – 19 of these are in Leisure and are subject to an imminent TUPE transfer.
District 3 Cheltenham Borough Council			x			Only employ apprentices below Living Wage, no other staff
District 4 Forest of Dean District Council			x			But are uplifting cleaners' pay.
District 5 East Devon District Council	x					Implemented 1/11/13 for all employees, including apprentices.

Authority Name	Progress Towards the Living Wage					
	Implemented	Firmly committed	Firmly decided not to commit	Considering	Other	Other / comment
District 6 Mid Devon District Council					x	It was mentioned by Members some time ago and I was asked to explain the difference between the Living Wage and the Minimum Wage. However it has gone no further than that and we have no current plans to go anywhere with it.
District 7 North Dorset District Council	x					
District 8 Sedgemoor District Council	x					
District 9 Stroud District Council	x					Implemented the LW from September for our staff but will not apply for accreditation as Living Wage employer due to pending EU legislation re contractors
District 10 South Hams District Council				x		
District 11 West Devon District Council				x		
District 12 South Somerset District Council					x	Working towards the living wage by eliminating the lower spine points. Our lowest spine point for staff (other than apprentices, and some casual posts) is scp 9.
District 13 Teignbridge District Council			x			
District 14 Tewkesbury Borough				x		We have a general aspiration to implement it, but would prefer it if this was implemented by NJC and the

Authority Name	Progress Towards the Living Wage					Other / comment
	Implemented	Firmly committed	Firmly decided not to commit	Considering	Other	
Council						pay spine was agreed nationally.
Districts 15 & 16 West Dorset District Council & Weymouth and Portland Borough Council					x x	Reports have been put to both sets of Members within the past 3 months and they confirmed that the living wage principle 'should be considered as an area for development in future pay policy'.
District 17 West Somerset Council				x		Councils at West Somerset Council and Taunton Deane Borough Council have a recommendation going to Council on 12 November to move to the Living Wage as part of the shared services project.
Districts 18 & 19 Christchurch Borough Council and East Dorset District Council					x x	Our councils have not considered the application of the living wage and have no plans to do so
Districts 20 Torridge District Council					x	Other than to mention it when talking to Councillors about pay pressures etc., TDC has not formally considered adopting this because of the upward resulting pressure that could result.
District 21 North Devon District Council				x		We are currently researching the implications of introducing the living wage. These will then be considered by our senior management team.
District 22 Gloucester City Council	x					We implemented the Living Wage on 01 November 2013. Please note that this was not for zero hours employees.
District 23 Taunton Deane Borough Council				x		Taunton Deane is still considering implementing this - it has been raised by UNISON and is likely to be considered as part of a review of terms and conditions

Authority Name	Progress Towards the Living Wage					Other / comment
	Implemented	Firmly committed	Firmly decided not to commit	Considering	Other	
						of employment next year.  (Councils at West Somerset Council and Taunton Deane Borough Council have a recommendation going to Council on 12 November to move to the Living Wage as part of the shared services project.)
District 24 Mendip District Council				x		Currently all staff are paid at or above the LW.
District 25 Purbeck District Council					x	At Purbeck we have not looked at this. The only staff we have that earn under the living wage (£7.65) are our casual staff that work at the Sports Centre. These are young people who are still at school. Otherwise all staff earn over this hourly rate.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	

Plus:

Fire 1 Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Service			x			No plans to implement the Living Wage. However only one grade includes points below the LW and all staff currently employed on this are at the top of the grade and above the LW.
--	--	--	---	--	--	---

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Councillor Questions for Council 14<sup>th</sup> November 2013**

(NOTE: The following question and response will be published on the Council's website as soon as possible after the meeting and linked to the published draft minutes of this meeting.)

### **1. Question from Councillor Nicholas Coombes**

With demographic pressures and planned development, there is likely to be an increased demand for places at Bathwick St Mary's Primary, which is already a popular and well regarded school. How is the council assisting the governors in expanding the school?

### **Answer from Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Youth**

In line with the Council's Concept Statement for the development of the MOD Warminster Rd site, the expansion of Bathwick St Mary's Primary is the preferred option to cope with the pupils generated from that development and other future planned developments in the central /city area and N E area of North Bath. A feasibility study to identify the options for providing a 210 place extension to Bathwick St Mary's which would double the size of the school has been completed. This identifies how much of the MOD land would be required to accommodate the extension including play areas. The study is with the developer with a view to agreeing as part of a Section 106 agreement, an allocation of land and a financial contribution to reflect the number of pupils generated by the development. A response from the developer is awaited.

This page is intentionally left blank