

## **BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

### **CABINET**

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

Wednesday, 9th September, 2015

#### **Present:**

Councillor Tim Warren	Leader of the Council and Conservative Group Leader
Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones	Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Conservative Deputy Group Leader Bath
Councillor Charles Gerrish	Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency, Conservative Deputy Group Leader North East Somerset
Councillor Vic Pritchard	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health
Councillor Anthony Clarke	Cabinet Member for Transport
Councillor Martin Veal	Cabinet Member for Community Services
Councillor Michael Evans	Cabinet Member for Children's Services

#### **20 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

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

#### **21 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

Senior Democratic Services Officer drew attention to the evacuation procedure as set out in the Agenda.

#### **22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor Marie Longstaff had sent her apologies for this meeting.

#### **23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

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

The Chair said that Queen Elizabeth II would be the longest serving monarch for this country as from 5.30pm today and invited everyone present to stand for a few moments as a mark of respect to the Queen.

The Chair also said that he would make a full statement at the Council meeting on 10th September on the issue of Syrian refugees. The plight of Syrian refugees has touched everyone nationally and internationally and it is vital that all parties in the Council, together with partner organisations and residents, work collectively with the

Government to help those in need. The Chair thanked Councillor Joe Rayment for bringing this issue up before the Full Council.

## **25 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS**

There were 11 questions from Councillors.

*[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.]*

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

Councillor Alison Millar, in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website*] read to the Cabinet, said that residents to the east of Bath had not been given an opportunity for a real input into the decision on the park and ride. Councillor Millar also said that Batheaston Parish Council had tried to form a view in order to represent the interests of their residents but they had no information on the access to the site or capacity. Councillor Millar suggested that the people of Bath should be allowed to submit their views on a fourth site.

Sally Harris, in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website*] read to the Cabinet, said that she has been delighted that meetings of the Council, Cabinet and some other bodies had been webcast on the Council's website and also, that the effort to have meetings at different locations in order to engage local people is admirable. However, more could be done to enable people to participate especially in Cabinet meetings. One way of having more people engaged would be to hear their statements/views at the end of the meeting. Sally Harris commented that she has understood the rationale behind Cabinet meetings starting at 4pm but that move has made it less easy for women to participate at meetings of the Cabinet due to afterschool childcare. Sally Harris also commented that the Council's website had been difficult to navigate and that accessibility could be improved.

Adrian Dolan (on behalf of the Walcot Street Traders and Residents Association), in a statement to the Cabinet (*available on Cabinet's webcast*), said that the Single Member Decision, made earlier this year, to offer the site at 97-101 Walcot Street to the Genesis Trust by way of a Community Asset Transfer has been fundamentally flawed. The Walcot Street Traders and Residents Association had asked the Cabinet to conduct an independent enquiry to investigate whether this transfer had followed the correct Government guidelines. The Group had also asked for an independent appraisal and site evaluation and that any work of planning applications in connection with this matter is put on hold.

Councillor Dine Romero expressed her concern that, in the statement, the Walcot Street Traders and Residents Association made accusations against some former and current Councillors. Maria Lucas (Council's Monitoring Officer) commented that

the statements made were potentially defamatory, but had been made previously and therefore already in the public domain (*this was confirmed by Adrian Dolan*).

Peter Heywood (Chair of Genesis Trust Bath) said the Trust had wanted a permanent base in central Bath for many years and he was grateful to the Council for the opportunity. The premises would provide a coordinated space in a single building where the Trust could help their clients to gradually build their skills and confidence through a range of connected activities and then step out of benefits into the job market. The Trust would not be disruptive to Walcot Street.

The Chair allowed Councillor Liz Hardman to put forward two questions to Councillor Anthony Clarke.

Councillor Liz Hardman asked the following questions:

1. A Road Safety Scheme in Paulton is being funded by s106 payments arising from the Polestar development. Some measures to slow traffic have been installed but more remains to be done. It is understood that the funding is to be released in tranches as dwellings on the site are occupied but neither the Parish Council or the Ward Councillors have yet received an up to date breakdown of money spent so far and what is still available to spend. We have been told in writing by Richard Hayes in Finance on June 9 that £8000 is left from the last allocation and a further £53,000 was paid over to BANES in March by the developers. Yet on August 12 the local Traffic Management officer told us that Highways still had no funding to carry out further works. Would it be possible asap matter of urgency to provide the Parish Council and Ward councillors with a breakdown of spending up to now and the funding currently available so that we can begin considering what other road safety measures can be funded for Paulton?

2. As a separate scheme from the above two drop-off points in roads close to Paulton Junior and Infants schools have been planned by BANES officers and the Parish Council at least three years ago to ease congestion at the beginning and end of the school day. The finalisation of these has involved buying or leasing land from Curo. Please could we have an update on the progress of these measures, since they contribute to the School Travel Plans which are currently being submitted?

Councillor Anthony Clarke responded that he would talk to responsible officers on this matter and provide answers.

## **27 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 8th July 2015 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

There were none.

## 29 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

There were none.

## 30 MAKING NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS: AMENDMENT TO COUNCIL'S NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING PROTOCOL

Councillor Tim Warren said that the Localism Act 2011 has reformed the planning system to give local people new rights to shape the development of the communities in which they live. The Act provides for a new type of community-led initiative known as a Neighbourhood Development Plan which sets out the policies on the development and use of land in a parish or 'neighbourhood area'. The Council has a duty to assist communities in the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans and Orders.

Councillor Tim Warren moved the recommendations.

Councillor Charles Gerrish seconded the proposals by saying that this was good news for communities and it was important that the Council was responsive to the needs of local communities and supported them in developing their Neighbourhood Plans.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that the Cabinet **APPROVED** the amendments to My Neighbourhood: A Neighbourhood Planning Protocol for Bath & North East Somerset to:

- 1) Clarify that the decision to make (bring into force) a Neighbourhood Plan once it has passed its referendum should be made by Cabinet;
- 2) Clarify the process of issuing a Decision Statement following Independent Examination; and
- 3) Delegate authority to the Divisional Director – Development to issue a Decision Statement once a Neighbourhood Plan has been made; and
- 4) Clarify the process of approving Neighbourhood Area applications for Parish & Town Councils, where the boundary of the proposed Neighbourhood Area is different to the Parish/Town Council boundary; and
- 5) Make minor factual alterations

## 31 STOWEY SUTTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Councillor Tim Warren said that he was pleased that Stowey Sutton Neighbourhood Development Plan had successfully passed the referendum. He also said that significant community resources had been included into the Stowey Sutton Neighbourhood Plan preparation, including substantial volunteer time.

Councillor Tim Warren moved the recommendations.

Councillor Vic Pritchard seconded the proposals by saying that he was delighted that the Cabinet would have the opportunity to approve the very first Neighbourhood Plan in the area. Stowey Sutton Parish Council would now be able to receive 25% of Community Infrastructure Levy payments for development within their Neighbourhood Area, rather than the typical 15%.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that:

The Cabinet make and bring into force Stowey Sutton Neighbourhood Development Plan as part of the Development Plan for the Stowey Sutton Neighbourhood Area, in accordance with Section 38A(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 ("the 2004 Act") (as amended by the Localism Act, 2011).

### **32 REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING, CASH LIMITS AND VIREMENTS – APRIL TO JULY 2015**

Councillor Dine Romero made an ad hoc statement by expressing a few concerns. Councillor Romero asked the following: would the Cabinet be committed to Phase 1 of the Grand Parade and Undercross scheme; reasons for dropping Phase 2 of the scheme; and, what has happened to Phases 3 and 4.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that this report monitors how the Council has performed against the financial targets set in February 2015 through the Budget setting process. The Budget Management Scheme requires that the Cabinet consider the revenue and capital monitoring position four times per year. The Council was still committed to Phase 1 of the Grand Parade and Undercross scheme and they were awaiting a revised planning application. There were no detailed schemes for Phase 2 and it would be inappropriate to allocate capital at this stage. For Phases 3 and 4 – there were no capital provisions in previous budgets.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Michael Evans seconded the proposals by saying that the revenue budget for 2015/16 includes delivery of £9.7m of savings. Councillor Evans also said that Strategic Directors would work to manage their budgets within the overall allocations approved by the Council, which would also include the development of specific mitigating actions as the financial year progresses.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that:

- 1) Strategic Directors should continue to work towards managing within budget in the current year for their respective service areas, and to manage below budget where possible by not committing unnecessary expenditure, through tight budgetary control.
- 2) This year's revenue budget position is noted.
- 3) The capital expenditure position for the Council in the financial year to the end of July and the year-end projections are noted.
- 4) The revenue virements listed for approval are agreed.
- 5) The changes in the capital programme are noted.

### **33 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT TO 30TH JUNE 2015**

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that this was a routine report and that investment returns continue to be ahead of the benchmark rate. The Council continues not to hold any direct investments in countries within the Eurozone.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Michael Evans seconded the proposals by saying that investment rates continue to reflect the Bank of England's policy on maintaining low interest rates. The Council's Treasury advisors had estimated that there would not be an interest rate rise until Q2 of 2016.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that:

- 1) The Treasury Management Report to 30th June 2015, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice, is noted
- 2) The Treasury Management Indicators to 30th June 2015 are noted.

#### **34 97/101 WALCOT STREET**

The Chair, under Chair's discretion and agreement from the Cabinet, invited Councillor Lisa Brett to read a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website]* on behalf of Jay Risbridger (Director of The Green Stationery Co).

The statement said that the proposed development had been in a poor state of repair for the past twenty six years. The regeneration of the property and the proposed social enterprise would be something that the Walcot community would be very proud of in the future, and invited the Cabinet to ensure this project proceeds as planned, without any further delay.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that this decision had been made under the previous Administration, as a Single Member Decision, in February 2015. The application of this policy was in line with guidance to Local Authorities on asset transfers. The idea was to help secure community benefits in line with Council priorities and objectives by transferring property at a peppercorn rental, in exchange for arrangements designed to secure community benefits in line with Council objectives. The proposed Lease and Building Agreement were currently under negotiation and the transaction is subject to the Genesis Trust obtaining planning permission for the works and proposed use of the premises.

Councillor Charles Gerrish added one more recommendation to the set of recommendations, which is to 'Request that a further report is brought back to cabinet within the next 4 months to consider and approve that the provisions in 5.7 have been satisfied'.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones seconded the proposals.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones thanked the officers for the detailed report and also thanked Councillor Gerrish for bringing this item before the Cabinet. The Council would continue to work to fulfil the agreement for the community asset transfer to the Genesis Trust, which would include social objectives expected to be delivered as part of the transfer terms, and what types of services would be provided.

Councillor Vic Pritchard commented that it was unfortunate that the previous Administration had rushed with the decision. Nevertheless, Councillor Vic Pritchard has shown full support to the agreement for the community asset transfer to the Genesis Trust.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) to:

- 1) Note that the transfer was approved under the Community Asset Transfer policy by the previous Administration
- 2) Note the transfer facilitated the release of 1-3 James Street West for development generating both a capital and revenue income
- 3) Note the community benefits as currently assessed under the transfer
- 4) Note the range of uses that are considered inappropriate for the environment
- 5) Note that the transfer is subject to Genesis obtaining planning permission.
- 6) Request that a further report is brought back to cabinet within the next 4 months to consider and approve that the provisions in 5.7 have been satisfied.

### **35 YOUR CARE, YOUR WAY: DRAFT COMMISSIONING INTENTIONS & MARKET ENGAGEMENT APPROACH**

Councillor Vic Prichard said that the Council would have to operate under financial constraints and highlighted the potential impact on health and social care. Recent policy changes and guidance would enable commissioners to explore different ways of delivering services. The Your Care, Your Way review would provide a choice of four potential models for the delivery of community care and health services. Phase 1 engagement launched in January this year had had feedback from different sources as one of the best public engagements. Phase 2 would run from 10<sup>th</sup> September until 30<sup>th</sup> October.

Councillor Vic Pritchard moved the recommendations.

Councillor Martin Veal seconded the proposals and said that the Council have been committed to working closely with NHS colleagues and others to improve the health and wellbeing of local residents. Councillor Veal was pleased to see the amount of engagement with local people and stakeholder groups in developing these plans.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that everyone should recognise that this was a launch of an important consultation which should engage as many people as possible in order to get a true picture on what is the best way forward.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) to:

- 1) Approve, for consultation, the document 'Proposals to Review Community Services Consultation Document NHS Bath and North East Somerset CCG and Bath & North East Somerset Council'.
- 2) Approve the Market Engagement Approach set out in the report.

### **36 TRANSFORMING FIRS FIELD INTO A CENTENARY PARK**

Councillor Dine Romero read a statement on behalf of Councillor Cherry Beath [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website*]. Councillor Beath said that she has been delighted to see the proposal for Firs Field to gain an official designation as a Centenary Field. The Field has been much loved and has been a focus for the Combe Down community. This official

designation would give the field added protection and it would publicly honour its links with the First World War.

Councillor Veal said that Fields in Trust has launched a new initiative called Centenary Fields, to protect and preserve the UK's war memorial fields, parks and green spaces that include war memorials and other valued green space with significance to World War I. Designated sites would be protected in perpetuity through a legal deed of dedication between the Council and Fields in Trust. Following discussions with officers and local consultation with the Friends of Firs Field, it has been proposed that Firs Field would be ideal for this programme.

Councillor Martin Veal moved the recommendations.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones seconded the proposals.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones thanked officers from the Parks team for putting together this report and said that Centenary Fields was an important initiative to preserve the UK's war memorial fields, parks and green spaces, especially as Harry Patch, known as the 'Last fighting Tommy' grew up in Combe Down.

The rest of the Cabinet endorsed the proposals.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that subject to discussion with the Charities Commission, that Cabinet recommends to the Council that it enter into a legal deed of dedication giving Centenary Field designation to Firs Field; that Cabinet recommends to the Council that the Leader of the Council agrees, on behalf of the Council as corporate trustee, to include the land held on trust within this designation, on the basis that Centenary Field designation will appropriately serve the aims of the trust created.

### **37 LEISURE CONTRACT - CAPITAL APPROVALS AND RESERVE USE**

Councillor Tim Warren said that this contract has been agreed with the new leisure company that would run leisure centres in Bath and North East Somerset. It would improve facilities for local residents and support the delivery of Fit for Life Strategy.

Councillor Tim Warren moved the recommendations.

Councillor Charles Gerrish seconded the proposals by saying that the contract with the GLL would deliver an estimated £17m of investment to modernise and upgrade the Council's leisure centres, starting with Bath Leisure Centre.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously):

- 1) To fully approve the element of current capital budget of £7.635m for Bath Leisure Centre Refurbishment.
- 2) To fully approve the capital budget of £2.0m for potential Council costs associated with the delivery of the contract.
- 3) To fully approve the capital budget of £2.0m for Bath Recreation Ground Trust capital works.
- 4) To extend the use of the Invest to Save reserve to up to 6 years (rather than the previously approved 4 years) to optimise the smoothing of Council and



Leisure Operator costs, and that this be repaid over a period of up to 10 years.

- 5) To increase the Leisure base budget by £175kpa to cover the ongoing cost of the annual payment to the Bath Recreation Ground Trust thus increasing the financial pressure on the Council which will need to be considered as a commitment as part of the 2016/17 budget.

### **38 CONSIDERATION OF THE INTRODUCTION OF A PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER TO BAN THE AMPLIFICATION OF BUSKING IN ABBEY GREEN, ABBEY CHURCHYARD AND KINGSTON PARADE**

Councillor Dine Romero made a statement in which she said that the Liberal Democrat group have welcomed the approach towards amplified busking though the group has had a concern on how the whole city would be controlled with the continued use of Community Protection Notices (CPNs) and engagement with the Busker Stakeholder Group.

Councillor Martin Veal said that this report has brought forward the findings of the consultation exercise carried out on the proposal to introduce a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO), prohibiting the use of amplifiers by street entertainers in specific areas of Bath city centre; Abbey Church Yard, Kingston Parade and Abbey Green. At this time a PSPO has not been considered justifiable in light of the consultation responses which demonstrate that the statutory test of 'detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality is persistent and unreasonable' has not been met. However, it has been considered that the practice of issuing CPN warning letters and CPN's to individuals should continue.

Councillor Martin Veal moved the recommendations.

Councillor Tim Warren seconded the proposals.

Councillor Tim Warren said that he was pleased that by working with the buskers and local people there has been great improvement with the situation.

The rest of the Cabinet endorsed the proposals.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) to:

- 1) In the light of the very close response numbers for and against, not to introduce a Public Space Protection Order to ban amplification of busking at this stage.
- 2) Endorse the continued use of Community Protection Notices (CPNs) and engagement with the Busker Stakeholder Group.
- 3) Review this decision in December 2015.

The meeting ended at 5.20 pm

Chair \_\_\_\_\_

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

Prepared by Democratic Services



## CABINET MEETING 9<sup>th</sup> Sep 2015

### 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**

- David Redgwell (South West Transport Network)  
Re: Metro West bus
- Cllr Alison Millar  
Re: East of Bath park and ride
- Sally Harris  
Re: On the subject of diversity and accessibility
  
- Cllr Lisa Brett on behalf of Jay Risbridger  
**Re: Agenda Item 15 ('97/101 Walcot Street')**
- Eric Howard (Walcot Traders and Residents Association)  
**Re: Agenda Item 15 ('97/101 Walcot Street')**
- Cllr Dine Romero on behalf Cllr Cherry Beath  
**Re: Agenda Item 17 ('Transforming Firs Field into a Centenary Park')**

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

<b>M 01</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Nigel Roberts
<p>When Odd Down was completed there was intention to have access from the Red Lion roundabout area. A fence there is continually repaired and then cut again. Please could the Cabinet Member for Transport find the funding to complete this vital access.</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>A request for a permanent gate in the land adjacent to Guinness Housing Association at the lower end of Odd Down Sports Ground was made at the start of the redevelopment. Permission was therefore sought from the landowner to erect a permanent gate; however, this request was refused.</i></p> <p><i>Property Services has sought to find an alternative location and has identified a potential site off the Wellsway but this is accessed via a private driveway. However, the Registered Title (No ST222294) gives unfettered right for the Council to use the roadway. The legalities around this are currently being addressed with the private landowner</i></p> <p><i>The estimated cost for supply and fitting of the gate is estimated at £1,000.</i></p>		

<b>M 02</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Karen Walker
<p>I would like to ask the Cabinet Member for Transport to look into altering the flow of traffic on the A367 into Bath.</p> <p>Currently the people commuting into Bath from Peasedown St John and beyond frequently have to que up Dunkerton Hill in the morning. I do believe with some work we could improve this situation.</p> <p>The bus lane which starts on the plateau of the A367 is currently used for buses, taxis and bikes. I would like to see this lane moved to the middle and include the cars using the Park &amp; Ride. This is how it works at Brislington with great effect. The traffic going into town would therefore use the outside lane.</p> <p>At the present time there is no incentive for commuters to use this park and ride, they even have to que unnecessarily because of the current layout; they actually have to drive past where they will be parking to be able to turn into the Park &amp; Ride. The entrance is at the wrong end!</p> <p>I acknowledge that some works on the layout would be necessary but do feel it is a</p>		

project worth looking at a taking forward for the benefit of our residents.

I would like to ask the Cabinet Member to seriously consider this option and undertake to review as to how the layout and access could be improved.

**Answer from:**

Councillor Anthony Clarke

*Design work has been carried out on a scheme to relocate the inbound bus lane on the A367 at Odd Down to the centre lane and for it to be available for P&R users . The modelling showed some time savings for buses and cars. However, it gave rise to problems at the roundabout junction at the P&R site entrance – where inbound buses would have to move from the centre lane to the single northbound traffic lane on the A367 exiting the roundabout. There is also the issue of traffic using the “rat run” from Dunkerton via Combe Hay to bypass the queue on the A367 and gain priority on the roundabout. It was concluded that further work would be necessary to get a workable design that would pass a safety audit.*

*The possibility of an additional southern entrance to the Odd Down P&R site was first considered as part of the initial proposals for the Greater Bristol Bus Network (GBBN) scheme some years ago. It would have involved land acquisition and was not pursued at the time because of the likely cost and uncertainty over development of the adjacent Fullers Earth Works site. Also, it would have been necessary to make some changes to the layout of the P&R site itself, to prevent traffic using it as a through route. This problem occurs at the Brislington P&R site in Bristol and is mitigated there by selective closures of some of the internal access lanes during the peak hours. The idea was looked at again more recently in conjunction with the work referred to in the previous paragraph and the conclusion was that a signalised junction with the A367 would be necessary at a new southern entrance/exit. Currently there is insufficient budget to undertake a scheme of this magnitude and is not identified as a priority scheme.*

**M 03**

**Question from:**

Councillor Neil Butters

At the Cabinet meeting of 8th July 2015, the Leader committed to publishing the results of the independent transport projects review. Also, the names of the consultants engaged, and the costs. All this was to be published in a timely fashion. What progress has he to report? When can we expect to see it?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Tim Warren

*We are using the services of another public sector provider at limited costs to cover expenses. We will share the terms of reference before the end of September and will report later in the Autumn.*

**M 04**

**Question from:**

Councillor Neil Butters

How can the Cabinet member justify omitting environmental impact and minimising both visual effect and journey time from the ‘Objectives for the Park and Ride Scheme’ listed in the Council press release of 25 August 2015?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>The environmental and visual impact of the scheme is important consideration, and will be set out within the consultation documents under the section entitled 'Environmental Considerations'. Journey times for those using the new P&amp;R facility will be improved and again this will be an important consideration when deciding how to take this project forward.</i></p>	

<b>M 05</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Alison Millar
<p>Can the Cabinet member clarify whether the three sites which are being taken forward for consultation as possible locations for an East of Bath park and ride were chosen as a result of the traffic modelling report by Mott McDonald? If so, why we are not able simply to see the report?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Anthony Clarke	
<p><i>The sites that are being taken forward for the public to comment on are those which have been deemed by officers to be both viable and meet the objectives of a P&amp;R east of Bath. The Transportation Model developed by Mott MacDonald has confirmed that there is an unmet demand for about 1,400 P&amp;R spaces. Their work will be published in the next couple of weeks. This is an important conclusion which helped inform the selection of the potential sites.</i></p>		
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>		
<p>Why the opinions of the Parish Councils from east of Bath have not been sought in relation to potential Park and Ride sites?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Anthony Clarke	
<p><i>Our consultation is offering residents of Bath and North East Somerset to say which site they would prefer. The Parish Councils are perfectly welcome to put in their opinion.</i></p>		

<b>M 06</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Alison Millar
<p>Can the Cabinet member explain why this administration is denying local residents in Bathavon North the opportunity to air their views on the park and rail option for the East of Bath, when so many travel to Bristol/Reading/London for work, often each day, and when that option could make a real difference to their journey times? I would like to ask the Cabinet Member to seriously consider this option and undertake to review as to how the layout and access could be improved.</p>		

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p>Careful consideration was given by members and officers to the site previously proposed as a 'Park &amp; Rail' facility, adjacent to the Bathampton rail junction, but was ultimately ruled-out on the grounds of cost and deliverability. The key issues associated with this proposal were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was not supported by key partners including Network Rail.</li> <li>• It was an expensive option and will have a much longer delivery time.</li> <li>• Moving the railway line to create space for the multi-storey car park would: require the loss of a Listed Bridge; impact on a Site of Special Scientific Interest and require the loss of new housing currently being built.</li> <li>• The multi-storey car park required would be very visual and this would be difficult to mitigate through landscaping.</li> </ul>	
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>	
<p>Was the Cabinet Member for Transport aware that plans for the Bathampton Park and Rail were put together so the car park would be lowered and not at all visible from three villages, which would be better option than one of the sites put forward?</p>	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p>Lowered car park is, in many respects, the least important issue to putting the Park and Rail at that site. It would take an extremely long time to go with that option and this authority cannot wait longer in reducing traffic coming from east of Bath.</p>	
<b>M 07</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Dine Romero
<p>Would the Leader of the Council confirm that both he and the Cabinet continue to support the Council's opposition to fracking in all areas that may affect the geothermal waters of Bath?</p>	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Tim Warren
<p>The Leader and the Cabinet support the Council resolution of 11th July 2013 in relation to the potential threat to the hot springs of Bath from geothermal operations and unconventional gas extraction within Bath &amp; North East Somerset and the wider zone of influence for the hot springs.  <a href="http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=10112">http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=10112</a></p>	
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>	
<p>Is the Leader still concerned that the Government might decide to take such decision out of Council's control?</p>	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Tim Warren
<p>I would be concerned but I don't believe that would happen.</p>	

<b>M</b>	<b>08</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Lisa Brett
Can the Cabinet member please confirm when the options paper relating to the funding commitment of £1m for youth and community facilities in Walcot will be published?			
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Charles Gerrish	
<p><i>The Capital item of £1M for youth and community facilities in the London Road area of Bath was Provisionally Approved by the Council in February 2014 subject to consideration of a detailed business case. To date no such Business Case has been presented and I have therefore asked Officers to establish if any appropriate options are available by Dec 2015.</i></p>			
<b>M</b>	<b>09</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Tim Ball
Can the Cabinet member confirm by how much the public health budget in B&NES will be cut as part of the government in-year cuts?			
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Vic Pritchard	
<p><i>The most likely answer to this question is £544k. This is the figure corresponding to the preferred option in a Department of Health consultation that closed on August 28th and which, at the time of writing (3rd September) has not yet been finalised by Government. This option is an across-the-board 6.2% cut, taking into account both the current budget of approximately £7.5 million and the extra money that will come to the council from the 1st October when we take on the commissioning of 0-5 children's services, which will add approximately £1.3 million in 2015-16 and twice that recurrently from 1 April 2016 onwards.</i></p> <p><i>Since time is so short to make in-year cuts, it seems fairly unlikely that a more refined calculation at a national level could now be done as a basis for changing this figure, whether based on distance from notional target allocations or on which councils have greater reserves. But even if there was some change, the BaNES budget is exactly at its target level and so again it shouldn't make much difference.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has responded to this consultation, and has added its voice to many other councils and health organisations around the country in protesting that this cut undermines important preventive work and will be particularly difficult to manage in year with most public health money committed in commissioning contracts.</i></p> <p><i>This cut has been presented as a one-off measure, but beyond that no clear statement has been made as to whether it will, or will not be made into a recurrent saving.</i></p>			
<b>M</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Tim Ball
Can the Cabinet member confirm how in-year public health funding cuts will be implemented in B&NES and which programmes will be cut to meet the savings required?			



<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p><i>Although the scale of the cut is not yet certain, a plan has been made on the basis of a 6.2% cut equating to £544k. Great care has been taken to minimise the damage that this will cause in loss of services to residents of B&amp;NES.</i></p> <p><i>A plan has been put forward by the public health team, by which it will find savings of just over £200k within this financial year. Discussions are underway about the remaining sum being taken from Council reserves on a “one-off” basis, however, this has not yet been finalised as we await a final figure from Government.</i></p> <p><i>The great majority of this saving will be realised without direct loss of services but there will be some restrictions in access to two exercise-based services. Once the final overall budget position is clear and we know exactly what service changes will need to be made further details can be provided by myself or Bruce Laurence, the director of public health.</i></p> <p><i>The approach taken to this in year reduction seeks a balance between the need to make a good contribution to an unexpected extra cut to the Council’s budget, while protecting important preventive services, particularly those to some of our more vulnerable residents, and enabling the public health team to meet a range of service and budgetary pressures.</i></p> <p><i>It is also worth noting that we will protect the full budget for the children’s 0-5 services (health visiting and family nurse partnership) that we are inheriting from NHS England, as these are extremely important universal and targeted services providing support to all our families with young children.</i></p>	

<b>M 11</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Cherry Beath
<p>Can the Cabinet Member clarify whether or not the New Conservative Administration is fully in support of Curo's plans to develop Mulberry Park on the former Foxhill MoD Site, and regenerate parts of the Foxhill Estate?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Marie Longstaff	
<p><i>The Cabinet supports the aspiration to deliver a regeneration project at Mullbery Park and Foxhill which has the support of residents, benefits the whole community and includes high quality housing and community facilities as well as open spaces and appropriated accompanying infrastructure. However, the Cabinet believes that this can only be achieved if Curo and all those involved work in close partnership with existing residents and the wider local community. The Cabinet will therefore continue to provide support and assistance in this process.</i></p>		

This page is intentionally left blank



## Statement to cabinet on weds 9<sup>th</sup> September

### Alison Millar

I'm having a strong sense of deja vu. Yet again residents to the east of Bath are being bullied by the Council and told they are being given a real input into the decision on the park and ride - when in reality there is none.

What a ridiculous consultation. Only three sites each within 500 yards of each other. All with major flaws. All ruining Bathampton Meadows.

People are very cynical about politicians and now I know why. Four months ago, a Tory cabinet member absolutely promised me that there would be no car park on the Meadows. Today we are being offered a choice of three, all on the Meadows.

The survey is well hidden on the Council's website. No posters were available for us to exhibit locally and to inform the very many elderly people in my locality who don't have computers that they need to attend one of only two consultation dates if there is any hope of stopping this Council obliterating the meadows with concrete for good.

I went to Batheaston Parish Council last night and they are **incandescent** with rage. They are trying to form a view in order to represent the interests of residents there. With no information as to access to the sites, capacity - or anything useful - and a month

to do it in. The clerk rang a very senior officer to be told the place to find information is the Chronicle website!! It beggars belief. This council is opening itself up to yet another JR on this subject. SO much for speed in getting this plan completed.

And what of the alternative plan for a relief road and Bathampton Parkway station? Locals were delighted to know that it involved a hidden car park with up to 3000 cars and the possibility, long term, of commuting into Bath and Bristol by train. People still ask me if that is going ahead. First Great Western have asked that and so has a business enterprise interested in building the car park

So why are we being denied the chance to get people's views on that as a fourth option? I keep hearing the word cost - but the council was never to have funded it all as private enterprise would have been involved. If Stonehenge is being granted a tunnel to fix its problems, why can't our very own World Heritage City be granted a more suitable and less intrusive solution?

So much has been bleated on about this being a real consultation with the Council having no preferred option. Well I'm afraid it appears to be just the opposite - and smacks of the new administration being fixed on literally ticking boxes and getting that car park anywhere, just to say it has been built, and quickly.

As for the conservative plans for a bridge from the bottom of Bathford Hill across to the A36 which they are being very cagey about – would not a tunnelled link be so much more in keeping with the local area?

This is a golden opportunity to fix the problem of transport to the east and for good. Instead, if this administration gets its way we will end up with a cheap sticking plaster solution which is not future proofed, which will divide Bath and most importantly which will not provide the transport solution we desperately need. Let the people of Bath have their views on a fourth site which is driven by sustainable considerations and make this a proper consultation.

This page is intentionally left blank

I'd first of all like to say thank you for allowing me to be here today to make this statement, and to Patrick particularly who told me about the process of engaging with the cabinet in this way and who encouraged me to come along and to speak on this.

I've been delighted to see the council promoting the webcasts of these Cabinet meetings online, via their website and on twitter, and clearly trying to reach out to people so that meetings are opened up to the residents of Bath and North East Somerset to whom the council and its cabinet are accountable.

The effort to move the meeting around to different locations within the area is also an admirable one, given the necessity of giving local people the opportunity to engage in democracy and challenge the decisions made by the council's supreme decision making body.

However, I think there is more that could, and should, be done to improve accessibility at these Cabinet meetings, not least to enable the participation of people and perspectives that seem currently underrepresented within the cabinet, as well as amongst our elected councillors, of whom 70% are male.

In an age of supposed equal(ish) opportunity, it is both disappointing and, frankly, not acceptable that steps are being taken which make it LESS easy for women to participate with cabinet activity rather than the other way round. While I understand entirely the rationale behind the earlier time of , and sympathise with the cabinet members themselves who often find the meetings lasting well into the evenings with no-one turning up, it seems that an undeniably problematic idea given the disproportionate number of women who, at this time, are more likely than their male counterparts to be engaged in school-run related childcare. In terms of engagement from the younger generations who are also woefully underrepresented at meetings, the 4pm start time is an immediate barrier considering the fact that anyone wishing to attend, like myself, is required to take holiday leave in order to be present.

I would suggest that measures which could counterbalance this shift in start time might include giving people the opportunity to make 'general' statements and questions like this one later in the meeting as well (or instead of) at the start, so that those who are trying to juggle a working life and/or a family can still have their voice heard and directly engage if arriving later.

It seems vital, too, that publicity for these meetings is extended beyond just the reach of the council's website (the footfall on which I'd be interested to hear, particularly in terms of the breakdown of demographics) which, in itself, is difficult to navigate. Actively inviting relevant groups/representatives/individuals to attend seems a potential avenue into improving the transparency of cabinet activity, as would basic creative promotion using more social media platforms which are less likely to put people off learning about the democratic process.

I am in sympathy with much of what I've been told about how many are actually 'interested' enough to come along, but I can't help but feel that there is more to it than that, and that that reasoning is a convenient justification for not making an attempt to improve accessibility, regardless of if what truth there might be to it. Speaking only for myself, as one individual, I am interested. Despite being young, despite being female, despite not wanting to spend my whole night trying to make sense of discussions that may well go over my head, I'm interested. At least in as far as I want to see how this decision making body is operating, how we can hold them to account if we feel the need to, and how residents of B&NES can have their voice heard by those with the power to enact change.

As far as the cabinet's remit on the website suggests, their primary legal duty to consider when making decisions, is 'Equalities', which comes first in a list that includes 'crime and disorder', 'human rights' and 'public health'. No matter how practical a decision the rescheduling of these meetings might have been, I struggle to see how the consideration of equal access has been adequately factored in, and I would like to see it done soon.

This page is intentionally left blank



Statement to Bath&NES Cabinet

Keynsham 09.09.2015

From

Mr Jay Risbridger, Director The Green Stationery Co,

Studio one, 114 Walcot Street, Bath BA1 5BG.

Re: Asset Transfer for Genesis development project at 97/101 Walcot Street.

I have run a business directly opposite the proposed development for the past twenty six years. During that time the property has always been in a poor state of repair, which has had a negative impact on footfall in the immediate vicinity. So I have been very pleased that the property is to be redeveloped to a high standard. I have been even more encouraged that, rather than selling the property to a commercial developer, the council has entered into an arrangement with a social enterprise. Walcot street has always had an alternative social outlook and this project is very suited to our community, especially as it also aims to teach craft skills. I would like to add that the negative comments about the project made by the self-styled "Walcot Street Arts Quarter Business and Residents Association" do not represent the views of many of the residents and traders I have spoken to in the street. In fact this "association" has never consulted the local community about this issue or even about its own formation and has never been given any mandate to represent Walcot street, traders or residents. I believe the regeneration of the property and the proposed social enterprise will be something the community will be very proud of in the future. Can I ask the cabinet to ensure this project proceeds as planned without any further delay.

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT TO CABINET FROM CLLR CHERRY BEATH, Liberal Democrat Combe Down Ward.

"I am delighted to see the proposal for Firs Field to gain official designation as a Centenary Field on the Agenda today. As you know this was an initiative led by the previous Liberal Democrat Administration, and one I have championed from the beginning, working with Officers and the Friends of Firs Field over a number of months. The Friends of Firs Field appreciate and support this proposed designation.

This status is a fitting tribute to, and reminder, of those who gave their lives in the Great War. The history of Firs Field is particularly poignant. In 1919 a number of discharged soldiers requested that a memorial Church Army Hut be built on the field in memory of their comrades who had died in the fighting. It was the local vicar, Reverend SweetApple, acting on behalf of residents, who arranged for the purchase of the field by public subscription. And later the stone Memorial was erected.

Many local residents remember Harry Patch, known as the 'Last fighting Tommy', who grew up in Combe Down. In 2011 his Coffin was driven at the request of his relatives, through the village not its way to the Monkton Combe graveyard. The streets were lined with residents paying their respects. Harry Patch notably took part in the service to unveil the war memorial on Firs Field on 28th May 1921.

All through the Stone Mine stabilisation Project, and during the work site placed on the Firs Field, care was taken to preserve the Memorial, amidst the busy engineering site for numbers of years. The field is much loved locally and is a focus for the Combe Down community. Residents greatly value the origins of the field and the fact that local people gave subscriptions towards the purchase. This official designation will give the field added protection and will publicly honour its links with the First World War."

This page is intentionally left blank