

CABINET MEETING 9th May 2012

The following Statements and Questions had been registered by the time of publication.

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

There were 23 notices of intention to make a statement at the meeting. 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

- Cllr Patrick Anketell-Jones

Re: Urban Broadband

Re: Agenda Item 12 (World Heritage Site SPD)

- ~~Alan Langton (Trustee, Bath Preservation Trust)~~ (Not present at meeting)

Re: Agenda Item 13 (Travellers Sites)

- Cllr Judith Chubb-Whittle (Chair, Stanton Drew Parish Council)
- Cllr Ashton Broad (Whitchurch Parish Council)
- Cllr Maggie Hutton (Vice-Chair, Camerton Parish Council)
- Philip Townshend (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Clark Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Dr Christopher Ree (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Karen Abolkheir (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Liz Richardson (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Sue Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Jennie Jones (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Paul Baxter (Stanton Wick Action Group)
- Cllr David Veale
- Mary Walsh (Joint Chair, Whitchurch Action Group)
- Peter Duppa-Miller (Secretary, B&NES Local Councils Association)
- Cllr John Kelly (Publow with Pensford Parish Council)
- Cllr Tony Marwood (Chair, Clutton Parish Council)
- Christine Saunders
- Alison Ginty
- Suzanne Arnold
- Debbie Saunders
- Jacqui Darbyshire

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Nigel Roberts
<p>The works in James Street West, finally had a sign saying that the cycle lane was closed. However, this was right at the end of the path with no indication, as for car drivers, of a diversion. This will cause cyclists to have to turn round with an unnecessary lengthening of their journey. With the importance of encouraging cycling as environmentally sustainable transport, please could the executive councillor review how this situation could have been improved</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>The gas main replacement on James St West took up half the carriageway, meaning that westbound vehicles had to drive over the contra flow cycle lane. As a consequence it was necessary to close the cycle lane to ensure cyclists did not collide head-on with oncoming traffic. A sign was erected telling cyclists that the cycle lane was closed, and suggesting they dismount and follow the route on foot, on the footway, for approximately 100m, before remounting. This was considered the best option, as to divert cyclists via Charles Street and Monmouth Place would have caused them an unnecessary detour, as well as forcing them to use heavily trafficked roads.</i></p>		

M 02	Question from:	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
<p>When is the cabinet going to make up its mind about how it is going to administer that half million for 'economic development' in Radstock?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>The exact details of the proposals are still to be discussed. This provisional allocation is broadly intended to support the development of the 'street scene', encouraging property regeneration and attracting private investment.</i></p>		

M 03	Question from:	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
<p>Given that one of the two remaining NRR directors resident in Radstock is telling people that the NRR Company is hibernating as it has nothing to do, That the NRR has no staff, no address, no nothing as well as nothing to do as Linden Homes is managing the site, And that were it to make a success of the GWR railway lands development profits would be applied in Midsomer Norton according to its constitution Why doesn't B&NES together with the Homes and Communities Agency which has a financial claim on the site, apply a merciful euthanasia?</p>		

Answer from:	Councillor Cherry Beath
<i>I am not in a position to comment on the future of Norton Radstock Regeneration Company - it is a private limited company. However, I fully support the redevelopment of the former railway land.</i>	

M 04	Question from:	Councillor John Bull
-------------	-----------------------	----------------------

What are BANES doing to assist the Friends of Long Acre Hall in their aspiration to take over the building for use as a community centre?

Answer from:	Councillor David Bellotti
---------------------	---------------------------

The property at 3 and 4 Longacre has been empty and unused for a long time and is owned by the Council. The property at 2 Longacre (Caroline House) is owned by the Council but subject to a lease granted by the Council with over 30 years to run. 2 Longacre has also been empty and unused for a long time. All those properties are in very poor condition and contribute to a depressing street scene in the London Road. Separate to consideration of those properties the Council decided that London Road generally was in desperate need of regeneration and £750K was allocated in this year's capital programme budget for that purpose. This regeneration scheme is being managed in the Council by Major Projects and they are working very closely with local residents and local councillors. Many of the residents who are Friends of Longacre Hall are engaged with the Council on this regeneration scheme. The Council put 3 and 4 Longacre on the open market last summer and received a number of bids. One bid was from RE: Generate which referred to Community Groups they had consulted. Their proposal included a community facility in the properties mentioned. In considering this bid very carefully the Council noted that there were already at least four other community facilities, with capacity available and a local track record of good governance, very close to this property. These include the Somer Community Housing Trust, the Riverside Centre and two Churches. It was decided to accept another bid, which was from the private sector, and sell 3 and 4 Longacre because this will guarantee regeneration of those properties and will also provide much needed housing. The Council is currently in negotiation with the leaseholders of 2 Longacre regarding the future of that property. We expect to see some progress regarding 2 Longacre very soon. This way forward clearly provides the best opportunity to regenerate the London Road area and also provides the best value for money for the Council and residents.

Supplementary Question:	
--------------------------------	--

Is there any prospect of some community use at No 2, Longacre?

Answer from:	Councillor David Bellotti
---------------------	---------------------------

We will first need to resolve the issue of the 30-year lease before that can be considered.

M 05	Question from:	Councillor Tim Warren
<p>At the Full Council meeting of July 2011, it was agreed that Council: 'instruct officers to work on alternatives to Bathampton Meadows P&R, possibly involving rail, as part of our future Transport Strategy'.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide an update on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • progress with finding alternatives to the Bathampton Park & Ride site; • progress with developing a new Transport Strategy; • when a report is likely to be presented to Full Council for consideration of both of the above? 		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p>Bathampton P&R: <i>A high level consultant brief has been prepared for issue to a multi-disciplined independent team of experts to consider alternative sites for an eastern park and ride.</i></p> <p>Transport Strategy: <i>The 18th September has now been set aside for a Transport Conference with the purpose of creating a forum to hear from local people, businesses, employers, transport stakeholders & interest groups. This important step will create the platform for the views expressed to shape the developing Transport Strategy.</i></p> <p>Reports to Council: <i>Eastern Park and Ride: A report will be provided after the consultants have produced their independent report on the siting of an eastern park and ride. The process is likely to take between 3 and 4 months and once options have been presented these will be considered by Cabinet in the first instance.</i> <i>Transport Strategy: The views expressed at the Transport Conference will need to be captured according to topic; these will then be collated into a report outlining what people told us. This exercise will need to be completed first before we look to the next steps of formulating this into policy</i></p>		

M 06	Question from:	Councillor Tim Warren
<p>During the construction of the new Keynsham town centre it will be even more important for the Council to do whatever it can to support Keynsham High Street and make life easier for local traders through this inevitably difficult period.</p> <p>Many local businesses have called a period of free short-stay parking to be introduced in the town to support this aim.</p> <p>Would the Cabinet Member therefore look into the possibility of introducing two hours of free parking part of in Ashton Way car park, whilst introducing chargeable longer-stay parking in part of Ashton Way to help fund the free short-stay parking?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>The implementation of free parking in Keynsham is not currently being considered during the redevelopment of the town centre. Short term chargeable parking allows for a</i></p>		

high turnover of spaces which is essential to support the businesses and the economic vitality and viability of the town. Consideration, however, is being given to the duration of stay within each car park as part of the regeneration project to ensure that there is a balance of short and long stay parking available to all visitors in both the short and long term.

M 07	Question from:	Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones
Noting the CPO report on the Cabinet Agenda, can the Cabinet Member please provide an update on discussions held with Topland over the future of the Keynsham Riverside site, the council's current thoughts on the future use of the site and any preferences it has, and when Keynsham residents will next be given the chance to give their views on the what they would like to see at the site?		
Answer from:		Councillor David Bellotti
<p><i>Discussions are proceeding between the Council and Topland, but the content of those discussions cannot be disclosed due to commercial confidentiality.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has considered several options with regard to the future use of the current Riverside building, but all are dependent upon the outcome of the current negotiations with Topland.</i></p> <p><i>There will be full consultation with all Keynsham residents and stakeholders at the appropriate time.</i></p>		

M 08	Question from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard
The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment determines that 11% of the population of B&NES have caring responsibilities. Do you believe this to be a true and accurate figure?		
Answer from:		Councillor Simon Allen
<p>The 11% figure is derived from a local public perception survey of the resident adult population conducted in April 2009. These are people who self-define as a carer, by answering the following question:</p> <div data-bbox="229 1666 1366 1832" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"><p><i>A carer is a person who looks after someone, relative, friend or neighbour, who through illness or impairment is unable to look after him / herself. That person may be an adult or a child or young person.</i></p><p><i>Do you consider yourself to be a carer?</i></p></div> <p>The question was, at the time, considered best practice for deriving a crude figure for the overall population.</p> <p>In responding specifically to Cllr Pritchard's question; I would certainly not say that this is a definitive number but is, however, the best figure available to us at the time and helps to provide context as to the role carers are currently playing in the area.</p> <p>Whilst we believe that survey-based research is probably the best method we have of</p>		

understanding the position of the entire population, I would note, though, that this figure was identified in the recent Health and Wellbeing Board workshop as being an area for further development as we take the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) forward. As a result we have started examining other mechanisms (such as examining contextual data from GPs or revising the wording in surveys) to improve the accuracy of that number.

Further Information on Carers is provided by way of further context as follows:

B&NES JSNA

The (draft) JSNA includes the following statements on carers:

- There are 1462 carers known to the Council (adult social care data)
- There are currently 155 young carers registered with the Young Carers Service in this area. This is 0.52% of the 0-15 year population compared with 2.1% estimate nationally
- 23% of secondary school survey respondents and 12% of primary school respondents said they cared for family members after school on the day before the survey (SHEU survey of school pupils)

Demographic Trends

It is estimated that unpaid Carers provide up to 70% of care in the community and save the national economy an estimated £87 billion a year.

As people live longer and the prevalence of physical disability, illness, dementia, and so on, increases, the number of people in the community needing care is inevitably going to increase. The Government is estimating that there will be a 30% increase in the number of people with a caring role by 2026, rising to 50% by 2041.

Research suggests that Carers are more likely than the general population to suffer from health problems, and it is estimated that nearly one in four Carers themselves have health problems or disabilities.

The 2001 Census of Population reported that of the 6 million people in the UK who were providing unpaid care two-thirds of these Carers were of working age, combining paid work and care. 58% of Carers are women and the over 65s account for around a third of all Carers providing more than 50 hours of care a week.

Carers in the South West region

In 2001 there were 492,451 carers in the South West region of England (10% of the region's population compared with 10% across England as a whole).

16% of men and 24% of women aged 50-64 were carers

Two fifths of carers aged 75 or over provided 50 or more hours care per week

Carers who provided 20 or more hours of care per week (30% of all carers in the region) were reported to be more likely to:

- Live in social housing
- Live in a household with no working adult
- Live in a household with a person with a limiting long-term illness

Demand for care in the South West Region is growing

Between 2008 and 2030 it is expected that in the region:

- The number of people aged 85+ will more than double to 308,100, increasing from 2.8% of the population to 4.9% (compared with an increase from 2.2% to 3.9% in England as a whole)
- The number of people with a limiting long-term illness (LLTI) will increase by two fifths, from almost 946,000 to over 1.3 million.
- More than twice as many people aged 65 or over will have dementia: over 118,000 people

- The number of carers will increase by over 114,000 or 22%, compared with 15% in England as a whole.

Carers' health and wellbeing

The 2001 Census showed that in the South West region :

- 53,399 carers were themselves in poor health (11% of all carers, compared with 13% of carers in England)
- 18,653 carers in poor health provided 50 hours or more of care per week (35%)
- Up to 50 years of age, people in poor health were more likely to be carers than people whose health is good or fairly good
- Carers in poor health were more likely to provide 50 or more hours of care per week than other carers.

M 09	Question from:	Councillor Mathew Blankley
<p>In your answer to the question I tabled at the last Cabinet meeting, you stated that in order for plans to reopen Salford Station to progress '<i>a feasibility study will first be needed to assess the impact of a new station on the rail network, amongst other factors.</i>'</p> <p>Will the Cabinet therefore commit to undertaking the necessary feasibility study, noting that the Council has agreed to fund such a study on the proposed Frome to Radstock rail link?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>I am happy to confirm that we have already commissioned Halcrow to review the feasibility of re-opening Salford Station. I have asked officers to prepare a report to the next Cabinet setting out a programme for taking this work forward</i></p>		

M 10	Question from:	Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones
<p>Has the Council, or will it soon, undertake an audit of the fibre-optic broadband network already laid within Bath (or due to be installed imminently)?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>We haven't undertaken an audit of the fibre-optic broadband network already laid within Bath (or due to be installed imminently). However, we are aware that a company called City Fibre own a fibre-optic network in the city.</i></p>		

M 11	Question from:	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p>I am very disappointed to see that the Lansdown residents parking proposals have still not been published. It has been promised on numerous occasions in the past year that these proposals would be published for agreement by the Cabinet Member, most</p>		

notably an undertaking given to Cllr Lees that proposals for residents parking zones in Bath would be published by the 18th November last year.

Given the abysmal level of consultation, transparency and information provided to local residents over the status of these plans, can the Cabinet Member please provide a firm date on which the Lansdown proposals are finally to be published and considered by Cabinet?

Answer from:

Councillor Roger Symonds

The Traffic Regulation Order Forward Plan has now been supplied to all Councillors. The forward plan sets out the schedule for each stage of the Traffic Regulation Order process in all areas currently on the waiting list. It is also recognised that some areas and schemes that are currently included on the forward plan may not be deemed appropriate and could be replaced by bringing forward more suitable schemes.

Supplementary Question:

Thank you for your reply. Can you explain why the Cabinet is going to the expense of re-examining the Sion Road scheme, when it was only resolved 18 months ago and there has since been agreement with Bath Spa to reinstate the yellow lines?

Answer from:

Councillor Roger Symonds

All schemes on the forward plan are being reassessed before they are progressed to ensure they are still relevant due to the length of time since the initial assessment was undertaken. This ensures that if the traffic or road conditions have changed so any alterations to the needs of the scheme can be considered before advertising

M 12

Question from:

Councillor Colin Barrett

Verge Maintenance and Bedding

Please can you inform me when the cutting of grass verges was last carried out in Weston Village and what are the frequencies? When are the flower tubs outside Brookside House and the roundabout at the bottom of Lansdown Lane going to be planted, and will they also be planted in the future with both Spring and Summer plants?

Answer from:

Councillor David Dixon

Highway verges within Weston are normally cut with a motorised triple mower at the Council's standard cutting frequency for urban areas of between 2 to 3 weeks. However, due to the recent wet weather and heavy ground conditions the mowing team is currently behind schedule. This position will be caught up as soon as ground conditions improve.

The flower tubs will be planted with summer bedding at the normal time of June/July. Regular winter planting of containers was stopped at least 5 years ago during a savings

round.

The Council was intending to plant the roundabout with a permanent planting of ground cover roses. However Councillor Malcolm Lees has come forward with a group of local volunteers, to plant and maintain the roundabout with annuals. This is a welcome offer and is much appreciated. On-going planting and maintenance of this roundabout will not be provided by the Council in future, unless additional resources are found.

M 13	Question from:	Councillor Colin Barrett
<u>Parking Weston Village</u> Can the Cabinet Member inform me when the proposed Parking Zones will be implemented in Weston Village; i.e. Manor Road, Lucklands Road and Weston Park? Residents have been waiting for these requests to be implemented since June 2011 and have raised this matter with me on numerous occasions.		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<i>The Traffic Regulation Order Forward Plan has now been supplied to all Councillors. The forward plan sets out the schedule for each stage of the Traffic Regulation Order process in all areas currently on the waiting list. It is also recognised that some areas and schemes that are currently included on the forward plan may not be deemed appropriate and could be replaced by bringing forward more suitable schemes. Consideration of the schemes for Weston Village are scheduled for the first quarter of 2013.</i>		

M 14	Question from:	Councillor Kate Simmons
Can the Cabinet Member please provide reassurance that the Council continues to believe that any new leisure centre in Keynsham built as a result of the redevelopment of the Riverside site should remain within the town centre, and that residents will be fully consulted on options for a new location if one is required?		
Answer from:		Councillor David Dixon
<i>As part of the workplaces project the Council has undertaken to look at the potential redevelopment options for the Riverside site. All options will include the requirement to retain a leisure centre for Keynsham. Prior to any detailed proposals being developed the project will undertake a consultation exercise on all emerging options.</i>		

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P 01	Question from:	Sarah Moore
<p>I was pleased to see the Liberal Democrat cabinet allocated money to provide a playing field for Oldfield Park Junior School. I would like to ask the cabinet member responsible for Early Years, Children and Youth the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the purchase of the various land now gone through? 2. When will the field be made available for use by the children? <p>I feel it is vital for young people's health and wellbeing to have access to a safe local outside area on which they can carry out various sports and other activities on a regular basis and would therefore ask if this can be provided as quickly as possible.</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Nathan Hartley
<p><i>1. The purchase has now been completed and the land is in Council ownership.</i></p> <p><i>2. A works programme is being developed which will need to take into account several issues e.g. removal of unsuitable materials from site, necessary ecology restrictions, seeding and planting seasons. This may mean the school may not access to the actual team games area until 2013 but we will be working closely with the school to bring into use as much of the field as possible as early as possible which will include habitat and grassed play areas.</i></p>		

P 02	Questions from:	Katrina Davies
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please confirm the accepted level of traveller % to local resident % that has been agreed / approved in previous suggested sites. My understanding is that 25 people live in Stanton Wick against some proposed 200 travellers. Is there no % that is considered an unacceptable level of dwarfing on a local community? 2. Please confirm how many children are expected within the travellers that are intended to use the site and what schooling they are being offered? My understanding is that Pensford School had 14 places this year, all of which have been taken. I am unsure how many places would / could be available in Stanton Wick / Drew but cannot imagine there are many. How will the travelling children have the amenities they require if local schools do not have places available? 3. Please confirm what steps have been taken and how additional teaching resources have been funded and made available for any additional children that will be attending local schools? It is possible that children of a travelling community who have gaps in their education and / or move schools will need additional assistance in order to maintain acceptable / expected levels of attainment, what are the calculated projections of the learning needs of the traveller children and how have these needs been considered and addressed? If this is the case how many additional teachers will be available to them and how are the costs of this being met? Are there any plans to expand the local schools to accommodate? And if not why not, if this is 		

necessary? If you are unaware of how many children will need placement - how can you consider it to be a suitable site without this information?

4. Please confirm which GP surgeries will be expected to deal with the registration of an additional circa 200 people and how this will impact on abilities of the surgeries to deal with timely local appointments. Are additional GPs being brought into the area and if so how many and how will this be funded?
5. Please confirm the Highways responses to date regarding significant traffic on these currently infrequently used roads, if the highways are yet to comment please confirm when they will do so and where the responses can be accessed . Please confirm how the additional strain on these roads will be monitored and how the roads will be maintained and funded for this maintenance? Please confirm what the thought process has been regarding access issues on these narrow roads and what systems are being put into place to deal with the same and how this is being funded?
6. Please confirm the levels of ecology awareness that have been undertaken to date. Has the site being inspected for endangered species / flora / fauna etc How has the wildlife and countryside act been adhered to? Are there any veteran trees on the site? Has a bat survey been undertaken? Please provide a copy of the ecological reports to date or advise where these may be viewed?
7. Please confirm the statistics available in relation to levels of crime (pre and post) in previous localities where travellers sites have been set up and whether or not the same has increased post traveller site set up? If these statistics suggest that crime in local areas has increased please confirm - what level of funding will be put in place to deal with the extra policing and safety and how this will translate on a day to day basis? If these statistics are not available please confirm why not as surely this needs to be considered in order to know whether (if any) additional policing is necessary?
8. Please confirm what refuse will be available to the travellers and how this will be funded?
9. Please confirm what level of council tax banding the travellers will be expected to pay and what proof of payment will be available. Please also confirm what the penalty for non payment will be and how this will be enforced?
10. Please confirm how you will deal with unauthorised expansion should this situation occur and how this will be monitored in order to stop such a situation from occurring?
11. I have been advised that the site is a brown site in a green belt but that it has been previously rejected planning permission. Please confirm if this is accurate - why the previous planning was rejected and why this new planning / development differs and is being considered?

Answer from:

Councillor Tim Ball

Thank you very much for this question which raises a number of important matters. The Cabinet will be deciding at this meeting whether to take forward a Preferred Options paper for public consultation in May.

These questions will be taken forward and considered as part of the formal consultation process. A formal decision will be needed to be taken by Cabinet after the Consultation process has been completed.

P 03	Questions from:	Mrs S Osborne
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Cabinet Minutes dated 10 November 2010 (presumably 2011) Agenda Item 8 specified consultation with local residents. Please explain why this did not occur. 2. Please justify why this greenbelt development is proposed contrary to Planning policy for traveller sites Policy E, and when all other planning applications in Stanton Wick have had to adhere to greenbelt/brownfield regulations and process, including reinforcement by Judicial Review. 3. Explain how 'very special circumstances' could be applied when the site fails on nearly all criteria test. Policy B11. 4. Please quantify the budget available and from what source, to achieve deliverability (I understand the £1.8m is in respect of the transit site): - <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Servicing site with adequate water supply and electricity (it doesn't have these), and full sewerage b. remediation of contaminated land. c. investigating and making safe all mineshafts and working (collapsed shaft has been infilled this week) d. provision of a safe walking route (there is none, only a muddy ramble) e. highways making adequate and safe. f. building education block and other on site work. g. investigating the bats and their habitat and making suitable provision to safeguard. h. investigating the extent of the adder population and suitable provision to safeguard. 5. Explain how safeguarding requirements will be met on an ongoing basis above these redundant mine workings. 6. Explain specifically how 'undue pressure' on local infrastructure and services will be avoided, particularly highways and schools. Policy B 11f. 7. Explain how this large and overwhelming site will promote peaceful and integrated co-existence given your own site assessment notes that 'the site would not directly assist the aim of social integration' Policy B 11a C and H 23. 8. Explain what constitutes a 'hazardous' site such that a matrix assessment mark of '0' would apply. 9. Explain how this site satisfies gypsy criteria on size, location to services and road network and land quality. 10. Where has the predominance of unauthorised gypsy sites been in the last 5 years? 		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball
<p><i>Thank you very much for this question which raises a number of important matters. The Cabinet will be deciding at this meeting whether to take forward a Preferred Options paper for public consultation in May.</i></p> <p><i>These questions will be taken forward and considered as part of the formal consultation process. A formal decision will be needed to be taken by Cabinet after the Consultation process has been completed.</i></p>		

P 04	Questions from:	Liz Richardson
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the detailed site assessment report - undated - unreferenced - I note that section 6.2, f: states "use of the site MUST have NO harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers". Please can you provide a definition of the word "amenities" in this context. 2. In the detailed site assessment report - undated - unreferenced - Appendix 3 I note the reason for rejection of GT3 - can you justify why GT2 should not also have the same reasoning applied. 3. In the site statement for GT2 - it says "land to the immediate north of Wick Lane is not particularly sensitive" - I'm sure you do not intend this to mean Pensford. Please can you highlight the land area you mean, since Wick Lane runs predominantly North South. 		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball
<p><i>Thank you very much for this question which raises a number of important matters. The Cabinet will be deciding at this meeting whether to take forward a Preferred Options paper for public consultation in May.</i></p> <p><i>These questions will be taken forward and considered as part of the formal consultation process. A formal decision will be needed to be taken by Cabinet after the Consultation process has been completed.</i></p>		