

## **BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

### **CABINET**

Wednesday, 9th May, 2012

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

#### **Present:**

Councillor Paul Crossley  
Councillor Nathan Hartley

Councillor David Bellotti  
Councillor Simon Allen  
Councillor Tim Ball  
Councillor Cherry Beath  
Councillor David Dixon  
Councillor Roger Symonds

Leader of the Council  
Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Youth  
Cabinet Member for Community Resources  
Cabinet Member for Wellbeing  
Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning  
Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development  
Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods  
Cabinet Member for Transport

#### **207 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

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

#### **208 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

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

#### **209 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

#### **210 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972**

There were none.

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

There was none.

#### **212 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS**

There were 18 questions from the following people: Councillors Nigel Roberts, Eleanor Jackson (2), John Bull, Tim Warren (2), Patrick Anketell-Jones (2), Vic Pritchard, Mathew Blankley, Anthony Clarke, Colin Barrett (2), Kate Simmons; and members of the public Sarah Moore, Katrina Davies, Mrs S Osborne, Liz Richardson.

*[Copies of the questions and response, 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.]*

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

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones, in a statement about Urban Broadband [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website*], noted the award by government of £100M to cities (including Bristol) and the additional £15M for smaller cities. He felt that the council must not be left behind in this race and called on the Cabinet to do the work necessary to submit an application to DCMS.

The Chair referred the statement to Councillor Cherry Beath for her consideration. There were a number of other speakers, all of whom made their statements at the relevant agenda item.

## **214 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

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

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 11th April 2012 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

There were none.

## **216 CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES**

The Chair announced that recommendations from the Resource PDS Panel would be considered at item 18 on the Agenda.

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

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

## **218 WORLD HERITAGE SITE SETTING SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

Councillor Tim Ball said that the proposals spoke for themselves and he moved the recommendations.

Councillor Cherry Beath seconded the proposal and gave her full support. She said the document was an important step in protecting the world heritage status of Bath.

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

- (1) To APPROVE the Draft City of Bath World Heritage Site Setting Supplementary Planning Document for public consultation as part of the process leading to adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document to policies BH.1 in the Bath and North East Somerset Council Local Plan and B4 in the Core Strategy once it is adopted; and
- (2) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director for Planning and Transport Development, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning, to make minor text changes and minor design changes to the layout, if required, and for the inclusion of the rest of the appendices and changes to the selection of photos to the Draft Supplementary Planning Document.

## **219 GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION**

Councillor Judith Chubb-Whittle (Chair, Stanton Drew Parish Council) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website*] expressed the view of the Parish Council that the site at Stanton Wick should be removed from the consultation list.

Councillor Ashton Broad (Whitchurch Parish Council) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 21 and on the Council's website*] asking for the Woollard Lane site to be removed from the consultation list.

Cllr Maggie Hutton (Vice-Chair, Camerton Parish Council) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website*] explaining why the Parish Council felt so strongly that the open site at Daglands in Camerton should be removed from the consultation list. She presented two petitions, one of 370 signatures from residents of Camerton, and one of 75 signatures from Camerton children together with their art, letters and poems asking for the site to be saved.

The Chair referred the petitions to Councillor Tim Ball for his consideration.

Philip Townshend (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Clark Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Dr Christopher Ree (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Karen Abolkheir (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 8 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Liz Richardson (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 9 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Sue Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 10 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Jennie Jones (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 11 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list. She presented a petition to Cabinet of 1161 signatures objecting to the inclusion of the site in the consultation.

The Chair referred the petition to Councillor Tim Ball for his consideration.

Paul Baxter (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 12 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Cllr David Veale in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 22 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to remove the Camerton play area from the consultation list. He felt that access onto the highway made the site unviable and the loss of the play area to the community would be too great.

Mary Walsh (Joint Chair, Whitchurch Action Group) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 13 and on the Council's website*] asking the Cabinet to remove the Woollard Lane site from the consultation list. She disputed the contention that the site was brown-field, and explained that it had historically been acknowledged as green belt.

Peter Duppa-Miller (Secretary, B&NES Local Councils Association) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 14 and on the Council's website*] said that the West of England Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment 2007 was out of date and should be reviewed. He felt that further suitable non green-belt land should be identified to the far south of the area.

Cllr John Kelly (Publow with Pensford Parish Council) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 23 and on the Council's website*] said he was horrified and angered by the inclusion of the Stanton Wick site which he felt was totally unsuitable.

Cllr Tony Marwood (Chair, Clutton Parish Council) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 15 and on the Council's website*] asking Cabinet to remove the Clutton open space from the consultation list.

Christine Saunders (a resident of Whitchurch) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 16 and on the Council's website*] asked Cabinet to remove the Woollard Lane site from the consultation list.

Alison Ginty (a resident of Camerton) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 17 and on the Council's website*] appealed to Cabinet to remove the Camerton play park from the consultation list. She reminded Cabinet that the play park had been developed by local people and that it was the only safe play area in the village.

Suzanne Arnold in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 18 and on the Council's website*] appealed to Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Debbie Saunders (a resident of Stanton Wick) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 19 and on the Council's website*] referred to the extremely low matrix score achieved by the Stanton Wick site and asked Cabinet to remove it from the consultation list.

Jacqui Darbyshire (a past resident of Stanton Wick) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 20 and on the Council's website*] appealing to Cabinet to remove the Stanton Wick site from the consultation list.

Tracey Cuthbert (a resident of Twerton Travellers Site) in an *ad hoc* statement explained that she felt part of the community and had no problems with the local community. Her daughter was at the local school and they had found the Head, staff and other children very helpful and friendly. She felt that gypsies and travellers can be valued members of a local community.

Councillor Jeremy Sparks in an *ad hoc* statement supported the concept of suitably managed sites. He felt however that Stanton Wick would not be a suitable site because there were highway concerns and no local shops or facilities. He felt the site had only been shortlisted because of its size.

Councillor Tim Warren in an *ad hoc* statement expressed grave concerns that the list was unbalanced and that some of the sites did not meet government guidelines. He asked Cabinet to reconsider the list.

Councillor Vic Pritchard in an *ad hoc* statement said he was against the Stanton Wick site. The Cabinet proposals were based on an out-of-date government directive and a Regional Spatial Strategy which was now defunct. He felt that Cabinet should review the requirements now it had more freedom.

Councillor Tim Ball introduced the item by reminding Cabinet that the Council had been guilty of failing in its duty for not identifying sites after so many years. He emphasised that the proposals would be the beginning of at least 8 weeks of consultation. The Cabinet was determined to consult as widely as possible on the proposals. He emphasised that if a site were shown not to be suitable, he would not allow it to stay on the list at the end of the consultation. He explained that there would be another Cabinet report in September, then a government inspector would make comments, then a final decision would be made by Cabinet in December. He made brief mention of the key points about each site. Finally, he said that after visiting all the sites he had been struck that the Camerton play park space was totally inappropriate, so that site would be removed from the list before consultation. He explained therefore that the proposal he was moving was different from the one published in the report.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal and emphasised that what was being proposed was that the Council would start the statutory consultation process.

Councillor David Dixon said he understood why residents were turning out in large numbers about the proposals. He felt it was because in the past the Council had not appeared to be listening to residents – but he assured those present that the Cabinet was determined to listen to what the community was saying during the consultation process.

Councillor Nathan Hartley thanked all those who had spoken. He reminded the Cabinet of the obligation to identify gypsy sites in the area. He thanked Tracey Cuthbert for her statement and for making him welcome when he visited the Lower Bristol Road site. He knew that many people had a particular interest in home to school transport issues, and confirmed that gypsy children had exactly the same rights as other children. He responded to one comment that secondary schools had been excluded from the matrix by saying that many gypsy children's attendance past the age of about 12 is sporadic; the law specifically protects gypsy parents from prosecution because it is recognised that many gypsy children start training in the family business at that age. He referred to a chart, which had been put into the

public galley before the meeting [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 24 and on the Council's website*] which he had asked to be prepared and which showed the places available and the walking distances from each proposed site to each of the nearest primary and secondary schools. He expressed support for the recommendations.

Councillor Simon Allen thanked all the speakers. He acknowledged that there was a lot of detail to take in, and that there would be more to come. He promised an open and honest consultation. He had attended a meeting in his ward at which about 150 people had expressed their opposition, and he asked everyone to take part in the consultation. He himself was supportive of the proposals.

Councillor Cherry Beath said that the debate proved that people felt passionate about their communities. It was precisely this kind of debate which would ensure that the right sites would be eventually chosen. Her main concern was to get assurances about the wellbeing of local communities and about the suggestions of contamination on some of the sites.

Councillor David Bellotti thanked Councillor Ball for making it clear that this would be only the beginning of the consultation period and that sites could and would be withdrawn if they were shown to be unviable; other sites would be added as they were suggested. He emphasised the huge risk of taking no action – which might end in a costly legal battle as had been seen in the news. He explained that if the Council had no identified sites, it would not be possible to clear an illegal encampment. But if the Council had designated sites, then it was possible to clear an illegal encampment. He observed that travellers were real people, with real needs which the Council had a duty to support.

Councillor Roger Symonds responded to some of the comments about the pressure on the local transport infrastructure at some of the proposed sites. He guaranteed that transportation officers would properly appraise the viability of each site to make sure that local road systems could support any proposed sites.

Councillor Tim Ball summed up by thanking all the speakers. He confirmed that at the end of the process he did not expect all the sites to go forward because the Cabinet would listen to all the comments made during the consultation.

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

(1) To NOTE that an Issues and Options consultation was carried out between 21 November 2011 and 16 January 2012 during which the broad site assessment criteria were consulted on and a Call for Sites conducted. The response to that consultation is set out in the Consultation Statement (Appendix 3) and formed the basis for the technical site assessment (Appendix 2);

(2) To NOTE that the list of preferred sites in the report was derived from the longer list of sites considered in the technical assessment (Appendix 2);

(3) To AGREE that the Preferred Options document (Appendix 1), which includes the list of preferred sites in para. 5.8, is taken forward for public consultation;

(4) To AGREE that the public consultation on the preferred sites is undertaken over an extended period of 8 weeks to run from mid-May 2012 to maximise the period over which comments can be submitted;

- (5) To NOTE that an initial report on the Preferred Options public consultation will be made to Cabinet in September 2012, which may include an assessment of additional sites coming forward;
- (6) To NOTE that the list of preferred sites will be reviewed in light of the public consultation and as part of the preparation of the draft Plan which is due to be considered by Cabinet in December 2012 for formal public consultation;
- (7) To AGREE that only new sites will be considered for inclusion and not those already rejected through the initial site assessment;
- (8) To NOTE that the Council will seek to review and update the 2007 needs assessment in liaison with the West of England partner authorities;
- (9) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director of Planning & Transport, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning, to make minor textual amendments prior to publication of the Preferred Options document; and
- (10) To NOTE as an erratum to paragraph 5.8 of the report that the site at Camerton is deleted from the list and that it could accommodate only 8 not 9 pitches.

## **220 COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT FUND**

Councillor Paul Crossley in proposing the item thanked the officers of Policy and Partnerships for their hard work in preparing the arrangements for the fund. He was delighted that the main recommendations for use of the fund had come from the community.

Councillor Nathan Hartley seconded the proposal. He also was delighted with the proposals. He announced the launch of a brand new fund of £100K, to be used to ensure that the young people we work with have a better chance of fulfilling their goals and aspirations. £60K of the fund was earmarked to fund groups and initiatives that support young people to get involved with positive activities and £40,000 was for young people who were struggling to find training or employment. He was confident that the fund would make a huge difference in a number of young lives.

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor Nathan Hartley, it was

### **RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE the provisional funding allocations in relation to the Performance Reward Programme Main Grant Fund and that conditional offers be made with regard to the projects identified, subject to successful negotiations on grant agreements as set out in the report;

(2) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director, Policy and Partnerships, in consultation with the Council Leader and Section 151 Officer, to sign funding agreements that have been finalised according to this process, put in place performance management arrangements and reallocate any sums returned to the fund in accordance with the prioritisation assessment agreed by the LSP Board;

(3) To AGREE the proposed funding allocations in relation to the Fund for disadvantaged communities, regeneration and localism projects, including the £60,000 allocation for equalities projects recommended by the LSP Board following its deliberations on the Main Grant Fund;

(4) To DELEGATE authority to the identified Divisional Directors, in consultation with relevant Cabinet members and the Section 151 Officer, to manage the budgets allocated under the Fund for disadvantaged communities, regeneration and localism projects;

(5) To AGREE the funding profile for the Ward Councillors Initiative as follows:

2012-13: £3000 for each member

2013-14: £3000 for each member

2014-15: No allocation

(6) To AGREE the allocation of £100,000 from the Fund for disadvantaged communities, regeneration and localism projects for a new Future Fund.

## **221 THE GUILD CO-WORKING HUB**

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones in an *ad hoc* statement welcomed the initiative. He noted that the area was in competition with a number of larger cities such as Bristol. He felt that the proposed hub would be an excellent start – but that it would only be a test-bed which would inform other developments such as Bath Quays and Bath Western Riverside.

Councillor Cherry Beath in proposing the item said that there was clear evidence of demand for the provision. The area had high levels of self-employment, with many looking for work space, but that cost was a major factor. She referred to a letter of support which she had received, signed by the Chair of Creative Bath and the two Universities. She strongly supported the development, and congratulated John Wilkinson (Economic Enterprise & Business Development Manager) for the work he had done in getting third parties involved.

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal.

Councillor Paul Crossley said that he was excited that the Council was working with a range of businesses and manufacturers to set up the hub.

Councillor Cherry Beath summed up by observing that the proposed arrangements would be for a community interest company.

On a motion from Councillor Cherry Beath, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE that up to £500,000 capital provisionally allocated in the 2012/13 budget be used to redevelop an area in the Guildhall to become a Co-Working Hub;

(2) To AGREE that the final layout of the Co-Working Hub will be agreed by Council officers in conjunction with the Cabinet members for Sustainable Development and Community Resources;

To AGREE that a lease be granted by the council to a Community Interest Company to deliver the Co-Working Hub. The specific details of the governance arrangements will need to be agreed by the Council's Section 151 officer in consultation with the Cabinet member for Sustainable Development and Community Resources.

## **222 KEYNSHAM TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION AND WORKPLACES PROGRAMME – RIVERSIDE SITE ASSEMBLY AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER**



Councillor David Bellotti in proposing the item said that the issues were straightforward. He referred to paragraph (2) of the proposals and explained that the Council needed the powers because it could not in all conscience leave the secondary site to degenerate next to the site which was being renewed. The Cabinet intended to bring forward plans for the secondary site in due course.

Councillor Cherry Beath seconded the proposal and gave her full support to the plans and the need to use the CPO powers if necessary.

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

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AUTHORISE the Chief Property Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources to take all necessary steps to make, as necessary, a CPO or CPOs under Section 226(1) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 for the acquisition of land and/or the creation of new rights pursuant to Section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 (or any such other legislation may be appropriate for the delivery of the scheme) in respect of acquisition of land and/or rights within the indicative area shown on the attached site plan for the Riverside office block and its environs, Temple Street, Keynsham to bring forward the area for redevelopment following the Council's vacation in 2014.

The Chief Property Officer is authorised, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources, to take all necessary steps in the process of making, confirmation and implementation of any CPO, including the publication and service of all notices, and the presentation of the Council's case at Public Inquiry.

(2) To AUTHORISE the Chief Property Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources, to acquire interests in land and new rights within any CPO either by agreement(s) or compulsorily and approve agreement(s) with land owners setting out the terms of the withdrawal of objections to the Order, including where appropriate seeking exclusion of land or new rights from the Order and or making arrangements for re-housing or relocation of occupiers;

(3) To AGREE that any use of the CPO powers is subject to authorisation from the S151 Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources in respect of the anticipated financial implications of the authorisation.

**223 NEWBRIDGE AND WESTON - PARKING RESTRICTIONS TRO**

Councillor Roger Symonds in proposing the item explained that there had been a backlog of yellow line proposals, and that officers from the Transportation Division had worked hard to bring them to this point. He observed that his recommendation was to implement some of the proposals as advertised, but in some cases to overturn or to amend the proposals.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the motion.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

To AGREE that in regard to the advertised proposals below that the proposals are implemented, modified or withdrawn as below:

(1) proposal to prohibit parking in lengths of Apsley Road, Burleigh Gardens, Cedric Road, Chelsea Road, East Lea Road, Manor Road, Meadow Gardens, Newbridge Gardens, Newbridge Hill, Newbridge Road, Partis Way, Penn Gardens, Penn Hill Road, Penn Lea Road, South Lea Road, Westfield Park, West Lea Road and Weston Park;

**Apsley Road**: That the Double Yellow Line (DYL) junction protection in Apsley Road from Newbridge Road is implemented as advertised. That the proposal for DYL on the west side of Apsley Road from Newbridge Hill is modified to reduce the length of DYL to commence at a point 94 metres south of the junction of Newbridge Hill, extending for a distance of 20 metres in a south westerly direction into the western cul-de-sac, in response to public feedback.

**Burleigh Gardens**: That the proposal to implement DYL on the east side from its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 190 metres in a southerly then westerly direction encompassing the turning head in the western spur of Burleigh Gardens is modified to implement DYL on the east side from its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 11 metres in a southerly direction. Then DYL on the south side of Burleigh Gardens from a point 150 metres south westerly from the eastern kerbline of its junction with South Lea Road in a westerly direction for a distance of 44 metres, encompassing the turning head in the western spur of Burleigh Gardens to allow traffic movement.

That the DYL on the west side of the road from the junction from its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 11 metres in a southerly direction is implemented as advertised for junction protection purposes.

**Cedric Road**: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

**Chelsea Road**: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

**East Lea Road**: To implement DYL on the junction on the east side from its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 19 meters as advertised to ensure traffic flow and road safety issues are resolved. To modify the proposal on the western side of East Lea Road to DYL from the junction of South Lea Road for a distance of 19 meters then reduce restriction to Single Yellow Lines in operation 10am till 4pm Monday to Friday only for a distance of 155 meters in response to public feedback on the issues faced in the location.

**Manor Road**: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

**Meadow Gardens**: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

**Newbridge Gardens**: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

**Newbridge Hill**: That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

**Newbridge Road**: That the proposals for DYL at the junction with Apsley Road are implemented as advertised to protect the junction. That the proposals for DYL at the junction of Westfield Park are modified and reduced from a point 8 meters west of its junction with Westfield Park for a distance of 28 metres in an easterly direction.

**Partis Way:** That the proposal to implement DYL on the west side of Partis Way from its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 20 metres in a southerly direction is implemented as advertised.

That the proposal to implement DYL on the east side of Partis Way from a point 5 metres south of its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 182 metres in a southerly direction is modified to DYL from a point 5 metres south of its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 15 meters in a southerly direction then Single Yellow Lines from a point 20 metres south of its junction with South Lea Road for a distance of 167 metres in southerly direction in operation 10am till 4pm Monday to Friday only.

That the proposal to implement DYL on the west side of Partis Way from its junction with Newbridge Hill for a distance of 43 metres in a northerly direction is modified and reduced to 20 metres in length.

That the proposal to implement DYL on the east side of Partis Way from its junction with Newbridge Hill for a distance of 209 metres in a northerly direction then easterly direction encompassing the turning head in the eastern spur of Partis Way is modified to DYL on the east side of Partis Way from its junction with Newbridge Hill for a distance of 20 metres in a northerly direction for junction protection purposes, then Single Yellow Lines in operation 10am till 4pm Monday to Friday only on the east and south side of Partis Way, in response to public feedback on the issues faced in this location, from a point 20 metres north of its junction with Newbridge Hill for a distance of 132 metres in a northerly then easterly direction and DYL in the turning head in the eastern spur of Partis Way on the south side from a point 152 metres north easterly of its junction with Newbridge Hill for a distance of 55 metres encompassing the turning head for traffic flow purposes.

**Penn Gardens:** That the proposal is modified and the DYL are reduced in length on the north side to extend a distance of 15 metres in an easterly direction from its junction with Penn Hill Road to increase residential parking availability whilst protecting the junction for safety reasons.

**Penn Hill Road:** That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objections were received.

**Penn Lea Road:** That the proposals are withdrawn and not implemented at this time due to public objections to the proposals.

**South Lea Road:** To implement DYL on north side junctions with West Lea, East Lea and Penn Lea Roads as advertised to ensure traffic flow and road safety issues are resolved. To modify the proposal on the south side of South Lea Road from DYL to Single Yellow Lines in operation 10am till 4pm Monday to Friday only in response to public feedback on the issues faced in the location apart from the following junctions; with West Lea Road where DYL will be implemented from its junction with West Lea Road for a distance of 23 metres in an easterly direction, from its junction with Burleigh Gardens where DYL will be implemented from a point 8 metres west of its junction with Burleigh Gardens for a distance of 29 metres in an easterly direction and Partis Way where DYL will be implemented from a point 8 metres west of its junction with Partis Way for a distance of 8 metres in an easterly direction for junction protection purposes.

**Westfield Park:** To modify the advertised restrictions of DYL on both sides of Westfield Park from its junction with Newbridge Road for a distance of 18

metres in a southerly direction to a reduced length of 10 metres extending from its junction with Newbridge Road in a southerly direction in response to public feedback. This will strike the best possible balance between junction protection and availability of parking.

**West Lea Road:** To implement DYL on East side for a distance of 9 meters as advertised to ensure traffic flow and road safety issues are resolved. To modify the proposal on the western side of West Lea Road to DYL from the junction of South Lea Road for a distance of 9 meters then reduce restriction to Single Yellow Lines in operation 10am till 4pm Monday to Friday only for a distance of 211 meters in response to public feedback on the issues faced in the location.

**Weston Park:** That the proposals are implemented as advertised as the changes will increase road safety at the junction.

(2) proposal to restrict parking in lengths of Lucklands Road, Purlewent Drive and Chelsea Road:

**Lucklands Road:** That the proposals are withdrawn and not implemented at this time.

**Purlewent Drive:** That the proposals are withdrawn and not implemented at this time.

**Chelsea Road:** That the restrictions are implemented as proposed as no objections were received.

(3) proposal to introduce prohibition of loading /unloading in lengths of Cedric Road:

That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objection have been received.

(4) proposal to vary the residents' parking places in Cedric Road:

That the proposals are implemented as advertised as no objection have been received.

(5) proposal to remove 2 disabled parking bays in Chandler Close:

That the proposal is implemented as advertised. Chandler Close will still retain 3 disabled bays for use by residents whilst increasing the availability of parking of all.

## **224 CABINET RESPONSE TO RESOURCES PDS WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Chair welcomed Councillor John Bull (Chair of the Resources PDS Panel), and invited him to introduce the Panel's recommendations.

Councillor John Bull explained that a cross-party group of four members of the Panel had worked on the report. They had interviewed a number of officers. The broad conclusions had been that there was not great abuse of the system. They had identified clear criteria for the use of consultants in the Council although it was not always evident whether they had been applied.

He referred to the advice of the National Audit Office that agency accounts could be an efficient way of engaging consultants where necessary, because this would enable the Council to dip in and out of the agency provision as required.

He made two particular recommendations:

- (i) Council expenditure on consultants is of such public interest that it should be identified in Service Action Plans;
- (ii) The Resources PDS Panel should be given an analysis from the Staff Satisfaction Survey relating to working with consultants.

Councillor David Bellotti thanked Councillor Bull and his Panel for their work in bringing this to Cabinet's attention, and agreed that this was a very timely debate. He had arranged to attend the forthcoming Panel meeting, at which he would give a response to the Panel. He assured the Panel that he would listen to their views and would report back to Cabinet.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chair \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Prepared by Democratic Services**