

CABINET MEETING 16th July 2014

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

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

Statements about issues NOT on the Agenda

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Answer from:

Councillor Dine Romero

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

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

Supplementary Question:

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

Answer from:

Councillor Dine Romero

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

M 04

Question from:

Councillor Nathan Hartley

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

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

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

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

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

Answer from:

Councillor Caroline Roberts

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

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

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

M 05

Question from:

Councillor June Player

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

Answer from:

Councillor David Dixon

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

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

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

Supplementary Question:

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

Answer from:

Councillor David Dixon

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

M 06

Question from:

Councillor Dave Laming

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

Answer from:

Councillor Caroline Roberts

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

M 07

Question from:

Councillor Dave Laming

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

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

Answer from:

Councillor Caroline Roberts

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

M 12	Question from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
-------------	-----------------------	----------------------------

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

Answer from:

Councillor David Dixon

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

M 13

Question from:

Councillor Charles Gerrish

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

Answer from:

Councillor David Bellotti

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

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

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

The objective remains to secure the regeneration of this site and it is hoped that once the administrator has made a little more progress it will be possible to announce plans.

The Council will be wishing to encourage the demolition of these life expired Riverside office buildings, and redevelopment of this site, in a way that is suitable for its edge of town centre location. The Council has already agreed to use its relevant statutory powers to achieve this if the need arises.

Supplementary Question:

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

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

Answer from:

Councillor David Bellotti

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

M 14

Question from:

Councillor Charles Gerrish

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

Answer from:

Councillor Caroline Roberts

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

Supplementary Question:

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

Answer from:

Councillor Caroline Roberts

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

M 15

Question from:

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones

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

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

Answer from:

Councillor David Bellotti

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

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

Supplementary Question:

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

Answer from:

Councillor David Bellotti

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

M 16

Question from:

Councillor Anthony Clarke

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

Answer from:

Councillor Caroline Roberts

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

M 17

Question from:

Councillor Anthony Clarke

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

Answer from:

Councillor Caroline Roberts

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Answer from:

Councillor Caroline Roberts

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P 01

Question from:

Karen Walker
Vice Chairman, Peasedown St John Parish Council

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

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

Answer from:

Councillor Caroline Roberts

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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