

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL

Tuesday, 16th September, 2014

Present:- Councillors Marie Longstaff (Chair), Lisa Brett (Vice-Chair), David Martin, Liz Richardson, Roger Symonds, Les Kew and Gerry Curran (In place of Douglas Nicol)

Also in attendance: Steve Blackmore (Traffic Management Manager), Tim Hewitt (Regeneration Team Manager), John Wilkinson (Divisional Director, Community Regeneration), Richard Daone (Planning Policy Team Leader), Sue Green (Group Manager, Public Protection and Health Improvement), Amy McCullough (Public Health Speciality Registrar) and Nicola Courthold (Environmental Monitoring Technical Officer)

Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning: Councillor Tim Ball

Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Caroline Roberts

32 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

33 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

34 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillor Douglas Nicol had sent his apologies to the Panel. Councillor Gerry Curran was present as his substitute for the duration of the meeting.

35 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

36 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There was none.

37 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THIS MEETING

Rachel Wilson, Co-Chair, Chew Valley Flood Forum made a statement to the Panel, a copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book and a brief summary is set out below.

The Chew Valley Flood Forum would like to raise the following concerns regarding the “Enhanced” Property Level Protection (PLP) scheme for 70 properties, currently in progress in Chew Magna.

There is a danger that the mistakes of the previous B&NES/Environment Agency (EA) PLP scheme in 2010/2011 are being repeated. Compromises are being made due to time and perhaps also cost pressures, and the new scheme may result in sub-optimal protection for householders. Expectations are fading that the scheme will be comprehensive and robust. The EA, who are project managing the scheme, is proposing legal agreements with householders that could be onerous and potentially confusing, and lack important details regarding contractor liabilities and product warranties.

The draft agreements state the EA “can not guarantee any aspect of the quality, condition or fitness for purpose of the PLP measures”.

The EA appears to be managing the project on a “re-active” and “catch up” basis. B&NES’s funding was available at the start of this financial year. The current estimate for first installations is November. We are not aware of project documentation such as scope, escalation process and timetable. There does not seem to be a clear process on Acceptance Criteria to enable sign-off of installed PLP products nor clarity about products not supplied by the chosen contractor e.g. who installs them, warranties, maintenance agreements.

We are not clear what B&NES’s involvement is in the project. However we feel that going forward it is essential to have a consultative/co-ordinating group, led by B&NES as the Lead Flood Authority, incorporating representatives from the EA, Bristol Water, relevant Parish Councils and CVFF, to consider all future matters relating to flooding and protective/preventative measures. This was proposed by B&NES many months ago, but, as yet, has not been implemented. If such a group was already in place, we feel sure the evident shortcomings with the project management of the current scheme would have been avoided.

John Wright, Co-Chair, Chew Valley Flood Forum addressed the Panel. He asked if the Forum could receive a cost breakdown of the £200,000 project budget from the Council and the Environment Agency.

The Chair proposed that the Panel assign a Lead Member and discuss the matter further with the Forum and the Environment Agency.

The Team Leader, Highway Maintenance commented that officers were willing to meet with the Forum and the Environment Agency to iron out any points.

The Chair asked if Councillor Liz Richardson would be the Lead Member for the Panel.

Councillor Richardson replied that she would.

Patrick Rotheram, Chairman, Vineyards Residents' Association made a statement to the Panel, a copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book and a brief summary is set out below.

Together with the Circus Area Residents' Association (CARA) we have been trying for a number of years now to get the Council to make improvements in the arrangements for residents parking in the northern part of the Central Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

As the attached map clearly demonstrates, the north Central Zone (coloured orange) is no closer to the commercial and civic city centre than most of the other Controlled Zones (the so-called 'Outer Zones').

Residents in this area are unfairly treated compared with residents in the Outer Zones. Although it is the most densely residential area in the city, there is almost no 'permit-holder only' parking. We do not get resident visitor permits. In the Outer Zones there is a minimum of 50% permit-holder only places and residents can buy day permits for their visitors. Similar arrangements should apply in the residential north Central Zone.

This may sound familiar, as we told you about it at your meetings in October 2012 and September 2103, having raised it formally with the Council as far back as 2005. We are wondering where to go next. The Council's recent parking survey underlined residents' dissatisfaction with the parking arrangements in the Central Zone. We have the support of both our Ward Councillors. Your Panel has asked for our case to be progressed. And yet nothing happens. Is this how the democratic process is meant to work? We ask for your help to finally get something done.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Councillor Caroline Roberts replied that she had previously discussed the matter with Mr Rotheram and that two new residents parking zones were being planned for Newbridge & Weston. She added that the Central Zone would be analysed very soon.

Councillor Les Kew asked how Mr Rotheram would like to see the matter resolved.

Mr Rotheram replied that he would like a proportion of spaces to be made available for residents only and that some visitor permits would be welcome. He added that one space per household would probably suffice.

Councillor Lisa Brett commented that there was an evidence of need and the will for political change and encouraged a decision to be taken as soon as possible.

Councillor Gerry Curran commented that the impasse on a decision may well be because the spaces have a value to the Council through revenue.

The Chair commented that the Bath Transport Strategy that encompasses the Parking Strategy would be discussed by the Panel in November and that answers to the points raised by Mr Rotheram would be sought in the interim.

David Redgewell, South West Transport Network made a statement to the Panel, a copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book and a brief summary is set out below.

He urged the Panel to do all they could to protect local bus networks.

He called for the Radstock to Frome bus route to be protected.

He stated that the Riverside Regeneration in Bath required strong bus links to Oldfield Park, the centre of Bath and Bristol.

He said that he was dissatisfied with the Enterprise Area Masterplan and that high quality buses were required to make them more attractive for the public to use. He suggested that bus priority lanes should also be in place.

He informed the Panel that the management arrangements at Bath Bus Station were not acceptable and that problems surrounding the café, toilets and general cleaning were not being dealt with appropriately.

He asked for bus shelters to be cleaned and maintained more regularly as one situated in Timsbury was in the process of falling down and a number in the area were suffering from graffiti.

Councillor Gerry Curran commented that the cleaning of the bus station must be sorted out by First or Multi as soon as possible. He added that toilet facilities were available within Southgate.

Mr Redgewell replied that those facilities closed early in the evening, the toilets at the bus station can only be accessed when the ticket office is open and a ticket was required to enter the train station to use their toilets.

Councillor Les Kew said that ownership of the bus station must be identified and aligned so that these issues can be rectified.

Councillor Ben Stevens, Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development suggested that First be approached to sign up to the BID (Business Improvement District).

Councillor Eleanor Jackson addressed the Panel on behalf of a number of residents of Frome Road, Radstock. She informed them that the garden of 120 Frome Road was in a dangerous condition and that action was required to clear it and make it safe.

Councillor Jackson then read aloud from a letter and email from residents.

She said that the garden had been increasingly deteriorating over a number of years. The pile of rubbish was between 4 feet and 8 feet high in some places and towered over neighbouring properties. It resembles a landfill site and comprises of buried vehicle parts & bodywork, tyres, plastic, oil drums, gas cylinder, wood, glass, roofing materials and ton upon ton of building rubble.

The increased weight caused by the landfill has led to severe problems for the immediate neighbouring properties. A 6ft high boundary fence is being continually forced over and into the adjoining property one side (no.122), whilst on the other, a dividing concrete boundary wall has cracked and is leaning into the adjoining property at a precarious angle (no. 118).

We have the safety of our children, families and property at the forefront of our minds, but can add to that the eyesore we have to live with everyday and the negative effect on our own property values.

The young children of our terrace are unduly penalised by not being able to use the full perimeter of their own properties by having “no go” areas due to the unstable nature of the adjoining site and growing increase of rodent infestation.

Through the summer we have had to keep our doors closed as the rats are so comfortable in their surroundings that they venture close to our homes and are not deterred even when the children are out and running about.

A Section 215 notice was served upon the property in August 2013, but as yet no work regarding the clearance of the garden has commenced. A number of start dates have been given, but they have all come and gone.

In May 2014 asbestos was found on the site.

Ultimately, what we require is a guarantee and timetable for the works to be completed, one that can be relied upon without further excuse. We feel that we have been patient enough and now ask the Council to grab the bull by the horns and appoint some strong leadership to the project.

Councillor Gerry Curran has a contractor been found that is willing to undertake the clearance works including asbestos.

Councillor Jackson replied that there was and that they should have commenced with the work on 12th September, but had not.

Councillor Curran said that he would work with Councillor Tim Ball, Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning identify a start date and would notify Councillor Jackson. He added that it was a huge environmental health problem that needed to be resolved quickly.

Councillor Ball asked Councillor Jackson to email him the full details so that he could make enquiries.

The Chair asked that the Panel be also notified of any progress made.

38 MINUTES - 8TH JULY 2014 AND 25TH JULY 2014

The Panel confirmed the minutes of the two previous meetings as a true record and they were duly signed by the Chair.

39 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE

The Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning, Councillor Tim Ball addressed the Panel. He informed them that the Core Strategy having been formally agreed by Council has not been challenged.

Councillor David Martin asked when the Core Strategy would be published in its final form.

The Planning Policy Team Leader replied that it is anticipated within the next month a final 'designed' document would be published in hard copy form and online.

Councillor Liz Richardson asked if a developer was raising a challenge on three sites regarding the matter of five year land supply.

Councillor Ball replied that a challenge had been received, but that legal advice had been received that this was not the correct route for the developer to take.

The Planning Policy Team Leader updated the Panel on the current position and that a response from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government is awaited.

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Councillor Caroline Roberts addressed the Panel. She said that she was expecting to receive a presentation on the Bath Transport Strategy in two weeks and that work on the Keynsham Transport Strategy was ongoing.

She informed them that the final three 20mph zones were due to be installed and that this would conclude the current programme.

She announced that the problem surrounding late night bus tickets between Bath and Radstock had been rectified and an agreement reached between the service providers.

40 ENTERPRISE AREA MASTERPLAN

The Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development, Councillor Ben Stevens introduced this item to the Panel. He spoke of how the Masterplan was to act as a document that integrates a vast majority of the Council's current strategies to tackle aspects such as homes, employment and wildlife.

The Regeneration Team Manager then gave a presentation to the Panel, a copy of which can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

The Opportunity

- “Bringing Bath’s Riverside to Life”
- 98 hectares of land, c36 hectares of developable brownfield land
- Potential for 9000 new jobs and 3400 new homes, to deliver Core Strategy targets
- Concentrating on key growth sectors: creative industries, professional financial and business services, information technology and software development
- Key sites together can increase GVA, average incomes and levels of employment in the Bath economy by around 12%

Achievements to date

- Delivering Quality Outputs:
 - Bath Riverside
 - 300 new Homes (150 Affordable Homes) since 2011
 - +£2m New Homes Bonus
 - +£1m S106 monies
 - Bath Quays Waterside
 - Strong Partnership with Environment Agency formed
 - Connecting Bath to its Waterside – good public support
 - Protecting existing properties at risk + enabling development
 - Innovation Quay and EDF Business Case
 - LEP Programme Entry

What is the Masterplan enabling

- Positive Engagement with partners & beyond:
 - LEP, HCA, EA
 - Landowners
 - Developers
 - Property Agents and Occupiers
 - Realising funding e.g. DECC (HNDU)
 - Sustainable Energy – ‘renewable’ sources. E.g. River Avon & hot springs
- Co-ordinated Strategy & robust Policy Base:
 - Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan
 - Economic Strategy
 - Transport Strategy – ‘Getting Around Bath’
 - Green Infrastructure Strategy and Community Plan

- River Strategy
- Leisure Strategy

Relationship to Planning Policy

- Provide an exciting and enduring vision
- Guide redevelopment of Council owned land
- Clear direction of travel for funders, partners, developers and investors
- Is not a statutory planning document
- Forms part of the evidence base for the Placemaking Plan
- Placemaking Plan will undergo public consultation, ensuring robust, evidence based policy framework for Development Management decisions.

Core Values

- **Quality** – of life, of place, of developers, of occupiers
- **Enterprise** – fostering knowledge, inventiveness and creativity
- **Design** – inspirational public realm, connectivity of streets, spaces and bridges, integration of form and streetscape, respect for the character of “Bathness”
- **Heritage** – architectural, urban design and landscape excellence in a World Heritage setting
- **Green** – green building, green infrastructure, walking and cycling, biodiversity and ecology
- **Water** – at the heart of Bath’s identity, River Avon, spa water, Kennet and Avon Canal
- **Health and Wellbeing** – promoting leisure, the outdoors, socialising and promenading
- **The Big Idea:** Rediscovering and reconnecting the River, to bring Bath Riverside to Life!

Next Steps

- Cabinet 12 November 2014
- Co-ordinated Strategy:
 - Economic Strategy – key driver
 - Core Strategy and Placemaking Plan
 - Transport Strategy
 - River Strategy
 - Enterprise Area Masterplan – delivery mechanism
- Co-ordinated Delivery:
 - Bath Riverside
 - Bath Quays Waterside
 - Innovation Quay
 - Transport Strategy “Getting Around Bath”

Councillor Lisa Brett asked if there was an evidence of need for businesses wanting to come and work in Bath.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that they had been contacted by numerous companies over recent years enquiring about available office space. He added that the accommodation needs to be of a certain standard though and the current available properties are not appropriate. He said that the sites of the Quays and Manvers Street were the most wanted.

Councillor Lisa Brett asked what the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) view on the project was.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that the LEP and HCA (Homes & Community Agency) were happy that all plans were being worked on together. He added that officers meet with the LEP regularly and had worked on the Strategic Economic Plan together.

Councillor Lisa Brett asked how funding for the project would be enabled.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that funding would be unlocked via the LEP.

Councillor Lisa Brett asked if the Masterplan would have a positive effect on the traffic flow of the City.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that the Transport Strategy was key to this problem, with elements such as Park & Ride Expansion, Rail Electrification and Priority Bus Routes the main factors.

Councillor Les Kew commented that he wished to see any development at Manvers Street designed as a whole and not piecemeal.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that he agreed with Councillor Kew's comments, but due to the multiple land owners of the site it might not be possible to build out the whole development all at once.

The Chair asked how much say the Council would have regarding developments.

The Divisional Director for Community Regeneration replied that the Masterplan seeks to have a view on individual sites whilst having other areas in mind.

Councillor Roger Symonds asked if elements of the Masterplan would change once the Bath Transport Strategy is in place.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that the Masterplan may need a refresh in around a year, but that the Bath Transport Strategy had been worked on alongside the Masterplan.

Councillor Roger Symonds asked if the use of buses, walking and cycling would be promoted within the Masterplan in an attempt to improve air quality.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that those modes of travel were to be encouraged.

Councillor Roger Symonds asked if any update could be given on the Craneworks project and the future of the Sainsbury's site at Green Park.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that he considered the Craneworks project to be a fabulous idea and had met with them to discuss it. He added that they had been encouraged to discuss the project further with BMT as they have their plans for the area as well. He said that the Sainsbury's site was difficult and hard to deliver upon due to land ownership.

Councillor Gerry Curran commented that the Masterplan was a very exciting project, but that he shared the concerns of Councillor Kew regarding Manvers Street and that he wanted the development there to be employment led. He added that the underground car park should be maintained and possibly expanded.

He said that he felt that the City needs a central coach park and should the current one be relocated he would like the Council to purchase another site, possibly the Beazer building on the Lower Bristol Road.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that it is a great opportunity to develop Manvers Street and discussions were required with Royal Mail. He added that they would look to retain the parking where they could.

Councillor David Martin asked how quality of building design would be maintained.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that the recent Unesco document emphasised the need for this and so it would be raised very early on with developers.

Councillor David Martin asked how employment would be encouraged through the Masterplan.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that an environment would be created for businesses to thrive, particularly the creative industries.

Councillor David Martin asked how Bath would compete with Bristol to secure businesses.

Councillor Ben Stevens replied that Bath had its own unique offer and he was aware that many companies would like to have a base in the City. He added that Bath and Bristol were partners in the LEP and should be able to work alongside each other. He said that the local creative and digital cluster was the third biggest in the country behind London & Manchester.

The Regeneration Team Manager added that the quality of design was to be seen in the buildings of the Holburne Museum and the Spa.

Councillor David Martin asked if sustainable energy and low carbon buildings would feature in development discussions.

The Regeneration Team Manager replied that sustainability had played a part in the new Council offices in Keynsham and that we would look to control that again on our own sites.

The Planning Policy Team Leader re-iterated that the Masterplan will not carry significant weight in the process of determining planning applications. The Placemaking Plan will, as it goes through the preparation process, have increasing weight. The Placemaking Plan will address in greater detail issues around the quality of development within the Enterprise Area. In addition, the Placemaking Plan provides the opportunity to re-visit renewable energy/sustainable construction policies following recent Ministerial Statements that post-date the Core Strategy Examination Inspector's Report.

The Chair thanked everyone for their contributions to the discussion.

41 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE

The Planning Policy Team Leader introduced this item to the Panel. He informed them that the timeline for the public consultation on the draft charging schedule, the draft Regulation 123 List and the revised draft Planning Obligations SPD was from 24/7/14 to 18/9/14.

He explained that the draft charging schedule was due to be submitted for Examination in October 2014 and that comments from the Panel would be welcome by 8th October 2014.

Councillor Liz Richardson asked if the Panel could be sent a summary of the consultation responses.

The Planning Policy Team Leader replied that he would email a summary of key issues raised in the consultation by the end of September.

42 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME REVIEW

The Planning Policy Team Leader introduced this item to the Panel. He informed them that a Single Member Decision was upcoming on this matter.

He explained that the main changes from the previous Local Development Scheme related to:

- Preparation programme for the Placemaking Plan
- Preparation programme for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations DPD
- Reference to overall programme for West of England Joint Planning Strategy

With regard to the Placemaking Plan the Draft Plan would be published for consultation in September 2015 and it is anticipated that the plan would be adopted in September 2016.

On the matter of the Gypsy and Traveller DPD he stated that there is delay in reaching the Draft Plan stage. This is due to the need to undertake joint working with neighbouring authorities on both;

- assessing the level of need, ensuring there is no duplication, and
- exploring and agreeing the spatial strategy response to the need across the wider area ensuring that the most sustainable locations for new sites are identified, and that reasonable options outside the Green Belt are explored before considering Green Belt sites.

B&NES has been and continues to work with West of England and other adjoining Local Authorities on both these aspects.

Councillor David Martin commented that a high amount of activity was planned between now and March 2015 and asked if the department had enough resources in place.

The Planning Policy Team Leader replied that sufficient resources were available through the Planning Policy team and LDF budget to meet the work programme set out in the LDS, but that this would need to be kept under review with respect to work associated with involvement in the West of England Joint Planning Strategy.

The Chair asked when the Single Member Decision due was to be made.

The Planning Policy Team Leader replied that it was due next week, but that to allow for comments from the Panel it could be deferred for a small amount of time. He asked for their comments by the end of September.

43 AIR QUALITY IN B&NES

Patrick Rotheram, Transport Lead, Federation of Bath Residents' Associations made a statement to the Panel. A copy of which can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

The entire main road network in Bath, and many lesser streets, is in the Bath Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), which by definition means that there are unhealthy and unlawful levels of air pollution. Some 10,000 people live in the Bath AQMA and are suffering the effects of air pollution over the legal limit. This is a really serious issue, and we want the Council to get serious about dealing with it. Monitoring and studying doesn't cut it.

There has been much concern recently about the harmful effects of fine particulates (PM2.5). These are not currently monitored in Bath and are not covered in the report. We are sceptical about the predicted drop in pollution levels between 2012 and 2015. NO2 levels have remained fairly constant over the past ten years and show little sign of dropping. What factors is the prediction based on? Latest evidence is that diesel cars cause more pollution so increasing numbers of diesel cars will make matters worse, not improve them.

Sadly it is realistic for the study to assume that B&NES can't do anything which would directly result in HGV being diverted onto existing roads in Wiltshire, which is the reason why the other Options appear not to be viable. The logical conclusion is that the only way to reduce pollution from HGV is to provide a new alternative route avoiding Bath, eg an A36-A46 link.

The 'Actions taken in B&NES to improve air quality to date' (page 219) is misleading. None of these plans contain measures which will make a significant reduction in traffic and air pollution in Bath. The only measure in the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) which has any serious potential for reducing pollution is the LEZ, and the present report makes it clear that this can be introduced only in a limited central area. A transport strategy aimed at reducing traffic volumes in residential areas and across the city is essential.

Councillor Lisa Brett commented that the Council is given so little power by Government on this matter. She added that the Council were not allowed to impose a weight restriction on Cleveland Bridge and that she supported a link road for the A36 – A46.

The Senior Public Protection Officer and Public Health Speciality Registrar gave a presentation to the Panel. A copy of which can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

Low Emission Zone Feasibility Study

- DEFRA funded focus on Bath Air Quality Management Area.
- Traffic, emissions & dispersion modelling; consultation; (HGV/bus and coach operators, neighbouring authorities and Highways Agency); and CBA.

Scenarios

- **Do Nothing:** No changes assumed except Rossiter Road scheme and the effect of growth 2012-15
- **Option 1:** HGV: Only Euro-class 5 or better for the A4 London Road and Bathwick Street - 24hr restriction
- **Option 2:** HGV/Bus: Only Euro-class 5 or better for London Road and Bathwick Street - 24hr restriction
- **Option 3:** HGV: Only Euro-class 5 or better for London Road and Bathwick Street - between 3pm and 10am, lesser standard permitted between 10:00am-3:00pm
- **Option 4:** HGV/Bus: Euro-class 5 or better for 'Central Area' - inside A36

Key learnings

- Option 4 HGV/Bus central area most viable which would also benefit London Road/Bathwick Street area from improved fleet.
- Option 2 (London Road and Bathwick Street) not yet possible due to Highway Agency & neighbouring authority objection to any restrictions on the PRN plus failed 18t weight limit

- Cost incurred by HGV operators in Bath to comply to Euro 5 in 2015 on London Road / Bathwick Street circa £10million

International evidence base: confirms the link between air pollution and poor health

- Robust evidence base; including a series of large international reviews.
- While air pollution is never the single cause of death, it is a factor which can contribute to and exacerbate underlying health problems.
- Short-term exposure effects: inflammatory effects on the respiratory system, increased medication use, increase in hospital and emergency admissions (WHO, 2004).
- Long-term exposure can contribute to permanent reductions in lung development, cardiovascular disease and cancers, and a subsequent reduction in life expectancy (WHO, 2004, 2013).
- Impact of poor air quality unequal.
- The wider cost of air pollution from transport (in urban areas) alone is between £4.5 and £10.6 billion (accidents £8.7 billion, physical activity £9.8 billion)

Local exploratory work and key learning

- Identifying groups within the AQMAs that may be more vulnerable to the negative impacts of poor air quality:
 - Specific concentrations of older people, lower income residents, young and transient renters.
 - Estimated 26,500 employees within this zone.
 - Next step: identifying physical locations where more vulnerable groups may congregate e.g. care homes, nurseries; work with them to reduce their exposure.
- Hospital admissions within a 100 metre buffer of the AQMAs:
 - BUT, limitations with the data, findings not robust.
- As international evidence base is strong, suggest we accept the position that air pollution does contribute to poor health, rather than further investing in proving a direct local relationship, and use this as the basis for further prevention and control measures.
- Measures to improve air quality will benefit a number of health and wellbeing indicators, and can bring about benefits for the economy, environment, and climate change adaptation and mitigation.

Councillor Roger Symonds asked if poor air quality could cause ill health rather than add to it.

The Public Health Speciality Registrar replied that poor air quality contributes to poor health outcomes, and that certain groups, such as unborn & young children and older people, are more vulnerable to the negative effects of air pollution.

Councillor Anthony Clarke addressed the Panel. He asked if the taxis within the City in the main were the most appropriate type of vehicle.

The Group Manager for Public Protection and Health Improvement replied that on the whole the taxis in use were modern vehicles.

Councillor Anthony Clarke commented that he felt that risk levels should be more widely identified.

The Public Health Speciality Registrar replied that NO2 levels were higher than target levels within the AQMAs and that the level of risk is dependent on the area in which you work and live. She added that there is some (Public Health Framework) modelling data that shows that (human-made) Particulate Matter 2.5 contributes to mortality locally, but that this was lower in relation to the national average. There are uncertainties in the estimations.

The Group Manager for Public Protection and Health Improvement commented that the Air Quality Action Plans for Keynsham and Saltford remain outstanding. She added that it was anticipated that adoption of these outstanding plans was likely to be in mid-2015 due to the time needed for approval, consultation and the democratic reporting process.

She stated that the Environmental Monitoring team was currently working with the Transportation team on developing draft Action Plans prior to public consultation.

The Panel noted the report and the Chair asked for a further report to the Panel as part of the consultation process.

44 PROPOSED FORD SIGNAGE DE-CLUTTERING - CHEW STOKE SOUTH

The Traffic Management Manager introduced this report to the Panel. He explained that the Traffic Signs and General Directions (TSRG) recommends ford signage adjacent the site on each approach and advises of advanced signing at appropriate locations in order for approaching vehicles to change direction in advance and avoid the hazard.

He said that following the issue being raised at the May Scrutiny Panel by Councillor Pritchard a site meeting took place to discuss the locations of signing within his Ward. Given the Coroners recommendation and TSRG advice it is not recommended to remove the ford signing adjacent each ford. However given the rural nature and objection to sign clutter it is recommended that advanced signing is removed where a road is not deemed to be strategically important, a rat run or has significant volumes of traffic.

Councillor Vic Pritchard addressed the Panel. He thanked the officer for his work on the matter since May, but asked for four further signs to be removed as the water levels were minimal and the local residents were so appalled by them.

The Panel approved the officer recommendation that, the identified advanced ford signage is removed as per the attached schedule.

Following the submission to the Panel from Councillor Vic Pritchard, Councillor Les Kew proposed that the Panel recommends to the Cabinet Member for Transport that four further ford warning signs be removed from the two fords at Stowey Bottom and near Stowey Mill and that measuring level staffs be installed. There are two signs for each approach hence a total of four signs for the two specified fords.

The recommendation was seconded by Councillor Gerry Curran.

The Panel voted by a majority in favour of Councillor Kew's recommendation.

45 PANEL WORKPLAN

The Panel approved the current workplan as printed.

The meeting ended at 2.00 pm

Chair(person)

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services