

CABINET MEETING 13th July 2011

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

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

There were 11 notices of intention to make a statement at the meeting. Where the intention is to speak about an item on the Agenda, the speaker will be offered the option to speak near the beginning of the meeting or just before the Agenda item.

- Pamela Galloway, Save Our 6/7 Buses Campaign
Re: 6/7 Buses
- David Redgewell
Re: Transport Issues
- Amanda Leon, Radstock Action Group
Re: Roads in Radstock
- Pamela Galloway, Warm Water Inclusive Swimming and Exercise Network
Re: Sports Centre
- Major Tony Crombie, Bath Society
Re: Local Development Scheme Review (Agenda Item 12)
- Caroline Kay, Chief Executive, Bath Preservation Trust
Re: Local Development Scheme Review (Agenda Item 12)
- David Dunlop, The Bath Society and London Road Residents Association
Re: LDS - Flooding Risk Strategy and Bathampton Meadows (Agenda Item 12)
- Leslie Redwood, Bath Independent Guest Houses Association
Re: Visitor Accommodation Strategy (Agenda Item 16)
- David Greenwood, Bath Independent Guest Houses Association
Re: Visitor Accommodation Strategy (Agenda Item 16)
- Major Tony Crombie, The Bath Society
Re: Bath Transportation Package (Agenda Item 17)
- Peter Davis
Re: Bath Transportation Package (Agenda Item 17)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

01	Question from:	Councillor Steve Hedges
<p>In February 2011 I asked the then executive councillor the following questions. With increasing numbers of people on the waiting list, please could he answer the same questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What target has the Cabinet Member set for bringing empty homes back into use? That is, coming back into use by direct action from the Council, not by normal means. 2. Will he use the Council's compulsory purchase powers to deal with the worst offenders? 		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball
<p><i>1. Housing Services are using a target of 10 properties p.a. to be recovered through their direct actions.</i></p> <p><i>2. The Council's Empty Property Policy has not changed since my colleague asked his previous question in February, and as such, I can do no more that refer to the previous response by Vic Pritchard, former Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services & Housing who responded by stating that the Empty Policy confirms that:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>"Housing Services will....consider the use of enforcement action in the following circumstances:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>(1)The Council has made numerous attempts to engage with the owner, all reasonable offers of assistance have been made to the owner and these offers have not been acted upon; and</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>(2) There is no prospect of the house being brought back into use by the owner within a reasonable time period; and</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>(3) There is a housing need and/or the property is causing a significant problem in the local neighbourhood: and</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>(4) A cost-benefit analysis demonstrates that enforcement action is both financially viable and appropriate.</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><i>Enforcement action to bring the property back into use will only be taken when the above criteria is met. Enforcement action with significant financial implications will only be taken following a single member decision by the Executive Member for Adult Social Services & Housing. Should the case for enforcement action not be demonstrated then no enforcement action will be taken."</i></p> <p><i>As such this decision will be based upon the facts of the case whist having regard to the above policy statement and in light of the new decision making structures.</i></p> <p><i>In addition and as previously advised, Housing Services have been visiting each of the estimated 500 properties specified as empty according to Council tax records with the aim of prioritising future enforcement activities. The results of this exercise have been very informative and indeed suggest that we have substantially fewer empty properties than first thought. I will be providing more information on this, and our future actions in the near future.</i></p>		

02	Question from:	Councillor Nigel Roberts
<p>Last winter the cycle path Between Bath and Bristol was impassable due to the ice at the end of the path into Bath.</p> <p>The cycle path is a well used commuter link into Bath. Major transport routes into Bath are gritted, this route has nothing. The steepness of the path means it becomes impassable.</p> <p>Would the executive member arrange for a grit bin to be installed before the winter at the entrance to the path?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>The Bristol - Bath Railway Path is recognised as a valuable route for commuters and leisure users. Under the current arrangements grit bins are only provided on the public highway. The Bristol Bath Railway path is not an adopted highway and also fails to meet the gradient criteria to qualify for a grit bin.</i></p> <p><i>During the coming winter Path Wardens will be provided with a small quantity of salt in a bagged form. This will enable the path to be salted during severe weather.</i></p> <p><i>Criteria for grit bins is included in the Winter Maintenance Plan previously considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Panel for Safer and Stronger Communities. This Plan will be the subject to further consideration and a decision by the Cabinet before the onset of winter.</i></p>		

03	Question from:	Rae Harris
<p>'My Question is in two parts, and concerns an exceptional Planning Policy report (B&NES Riverside Footpath Feasibility Study by New Leaf Studio, revised at June 2007 but not yet released to the public) and two Section 106 Agreements where the Council will be a signatory as the freeholder and can therefore influence the negotiations without compromising the Development Control process (Planning Applications 09/01970/FUL and 09/01987/FUL for Walcot Yard, Walcot Street, City Centre, Bath BA1 5BG):</p> <p>(1) how soon can action be taken to implement the Riverside Footpath Feasibility Study, initially between Pulteney Bridge and Walcot Yard, which could probably be managed as part of the Council's Public Realm/ Public Movement Regeneration Project?</p> <p>(2) a key element of the report - and one that could be the catalyst for a new chapter in the continuing economic and community regeneration of the Walcot Street area - is that the Riverside Walkway in Walcot Yard should not only connect to the neighbouring properties but should also provide a link to Walcot Street itself. As freeholder, what can the Council do to ensure that all these links are included in the S106 Agreements currently being negotiated?</p> <p>It will undoubtedly be a help to the Council that Edward Nash, whose firm Nash Partnership is architect/agent for both the above planning applications, is also Chair of the Council's Committee tasked with making better use of the river.'</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball

(1) The Walcot Riverside Footpath has been a long standing Council aspiration, and over the course of the past thirty years various elements have either been implemented or legally safeguarded where opportunities have arisen. A relatively small number of gaps remain in the route that once completed would result in a continuous riverside path from Pulteney Bridge to the open space at Walcot Gate. The Scheme is included in the adopted B&NES Local Plan

The completion of this project was identified most recently in the Council's adopted Public Realm and Movement Strategy (PRMS). Whilst the riverside path was not included in the agreed 5 year capital programme for the implementation of the PRMS, it is being considered for inclusion in the extended 10 year capital programme, currently identified for implementation in 2014/15 & 2015/16. Clearly this would be subject to the availability of capital receipts and a political decision to proceed. It is also possible that the funding for the completion of the riverside path could be undertaken on the back of a major development, such as of the Cattlemarket Site, if and when this might occur.

(2) Circular 05/2005 deals with planning obligations and provides detailed guidance on what can be included as part of a Section 106 legal agreement. It sets out five tests that must be met before a particular obligation can be entered into. These include that the requirement is necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms, that it is directly related to the proposed development and that it is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.

The applications referred to by the questioner are for developments close to, but not immediately adjoining, the riverside walkway. Against this background, officers are seeking to negotiate with the applicants and their agents to secure the maximum benefit possible in relation to the riverside walkway in this area, bearing in mind the tests in the Circular and the aspirations to complete the walkway and provide further links to Walcot Street.

04	Question from:	Councillor Will Sandry
<p>Following the debate I initiated on behalf of the community in Oldfield Park, and the other communities in Bath effected by large numbers of homes in multiple occupation (HMOs); Council resolved (unanimously) on the 16th November 2010:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>"To request that the Cabinet Member for Service Delivery investigates further the practicalities and budgetary implications of introducing the Article 4 Direction and, if deemed practical and financially viable seek to implement such a Direction."</i></p> <p>Following May's election, the implementation of an Article 4 direction is within your portfolio. Please could you outline the progress made?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball
<p><i>An assessment of the practicalities and budgetary implications of introducing an Article 4 Direction relating to Houses in Multiple Occupation in B&NES has been undertaken. The Preparation of an article 4 Direction will cost around £45,000 and the budget to proceed with this work has been identified as set out in the report to Cabinet (Item 22 Revenue Budget Contingency 2011/12 - Allocation of Funding). Progress on the preparation of the Article 4 Direction will be reported to Cabinet.</i></p>		

05	Question from:	Nigel Fenwick
<p>The path from St Gregory's to Southstoke and The Cross Keys has been used for years by walkers, it passes alongside the Wansdyke, an ancient scheduled monument. The footpath is recognised by the council as an officially designated footpath, and in parts is owned by the council.</p> <p>In recent years the path has become impassable in places after rain (for at least six months of the year), and due to raised drain covers presents the very real potential for serious injury to the many pedestrians using the amenity.</p> <p>Please could the executive councillor, explain what is going to be done in the future to allow this footpath to remain open at all times of the year in a safe and useable condition please?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor David Dixon
<p><i>I met Mr Fenwick and Councillor Nigel Roberts to discuss the concerns about this matter. Subsequently, officers have recently met Mr Fenwick and walked this section of path, which immediately borders the Wansdyke scheduled Ancient Monument, together with him. From this meeting there are three actions currently planned or taking place:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Sensitive vegetation management including cutting back overgrowth to widen the path (now that the nesting season is over) and making safe the ground around raised drain covers to spread the intensity of use in order to alleviate pressure on the current narrow section which is prone to becoming muddy after heavy rainfall.</i> <i>• A report has been commissioned from the Land Manager of the Cotswold AONB (which borders the path of the Wansdyke in this location) to make recommendations to improve long-term accessibility and safe passage along the path throughout the year, whilst ensuring the necessary protection measures to ensure the conservation of the Wansdyke as a scheduled Ancient Monument. The report will assess the level of work required and costs involved.</i> <i>• Dealing with fly tipping and other issues. A number of private properties in Mendip Gardens, together with properties under the management of Knightstone Housing Association, adjoin the Wansdyke. Work is required to ensure that they are aware of the importance of the Wansdyke and to minimise the risk of any unauthorised excavation or dumping of vegetation and green waste along the Wansdyke or adjoining path. There is also a periodic problem with fly-tipping taking place along this stretch of path. Addressing these issues will be a case winning 'hearts and minds' to ensure wider understanding and care, so that the Council is not left to face the costs of removing litter and dumped green waste and take enforcement action against unauthorised fly-tipping. In addition to these measures, there is an opportunity to work with nearby St. Gregory's school and the local community to raise educational understanding and awareness over the value and importance of the Wansdyke and ensure it is conserved and cared for by all who live nearby and use the path as a passage out into the adjoining green space and countryside.</i> 		

06	Question from:	Councillor Francine Haerberling
----	-----------------------	---------------------------------

I have been interested to hear some of the positive statements made by Cabinet members recently regarding the possibility of reopening various local train stations, such as Saltford, Box and Corsham, following on from the Government's plan to electrify the Great Western Mainline. Can the Cabinet Member please provide further information on what discussions have so far been held with the Department for Transport (or other relevant rail authorities and operators) on this possibility and what indications have been given on the potential for these reopenings to take place.

Answer from: Councillor Roger Symonds

We will be invited by DfT to comment, through our joint arrangements with the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership (WoE LEP), on the new Great Western Franchise specifications in the run up to the tendering of this new franchise early next year. DfT have confirmed that they would need to see a Business Case for any enhancements to this specification i.e. opening of new railways stations etc. and "... that any additional services which local authorities may wish to secure above the base specification would need to be funded by the local authorities." A compelling business case might mean that the requirement could be put into the 'base specification'. In addition the DfT has asked us, again through the WoE LEP, to consider how the detailed design of the GW electrification might provide 'passive provision' for future enhancements to local services. They have confirmed, again, that the provision of enhancements themselves will have to be paid for by third parties. No discussions have yet taken place on the provision of the new stations mentioned in this question.

07 Question from: Councillor Tim Warren

Can the Cabinet Member please provide an update on how negotiations are progressing with bus operators over the Quality Bus Partnerships for Corridor 6 and Corridor 3 of the GBBN, and confirm that there will be an expectation of service improvement as part of these partnership agreements, particularly with regard to securing a more frequent service for the Radstock/Midsomer Norton to Bristol corridor (Corridor 6).

Answer from: Councillor Roger Symonds

Formal consultation on the quality partnership scheme for the Greater Bristol Bus Network Corridor 3 (Bath to Bristol) is in progress at the moment. The draft document sets a minimum requirement for the current level of service to be provided. First recently increased the frequency of their Service X39 in the morning peak hours on this corridor. It is intended that the scheme will start in November 2011 when the road improvement works at Brislington have been completed. Consultation on Corridor 6 (Midsomer Norton to Bristol) has not started yet because the infrastructure works are not programmed for completion until March 2012. Bristol City Council will be acting as "lead authority" on that corridor and will carry out the consultation with bus operators in conjunction with B&NES Council.

Operators are being encouraged to make full use of the new and improved facilities on all the GBBN corridors. A more frequent direct service between Midsomer Norton and Bristol has been one of the aspirations for Corridor 6 for many years but, hitherto, no operator has been willing to provide such a service on a commercial basis. The quality partnership schemes for the GBBN corridors will set the minimum standards of service provision. They will be supplemented by voluntary partnership agreements which will set a framework for service improvements.

08	Question from:	Councillor Tim Warren
<p>Can the Cabinet Member please explain the reason for the current delay to approval of the Transport Capital Programme and advise whether alterations are currently being made to the Capital Programme or to the previously announced criteria for including items in the Programme? If any alterations to the criteria are to be made, please also advise when Members will be briefed on these alterations and any impact this delay may have on the Council's relationship with its contractors?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>A review of the capital programme is currently being carried out in the light of recently adopted Joint Local Transport Plan 3 objectives to improve walking, cycling and public transport and the cabinet's own transport priorities. There are also budget pressures to address a result of the higher cost of delivering the 2010/11 capital programme. The review will include discussions with the Council's contractors to ensure any changes cause the minimum of disruption to delivery. Following the review, a consultation with ward members is expected to commence within the 7 days.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
<p>Can the Cabinet member tell us whether the delay is causing any problems with the contractors?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>I am not aware of any such problems but I will investigate promptly whether any action is necessary to avoid any possible problems.</i></p>		

09	Question from:	Councillor Tony Clarke
<p>Can the Cabinet Member please detail how the Youth Service Community Enablement Fund is to be distributed this year and to what organisations?</p>		

Answer from:	Councillor Nathan Hartley
<p><i>I am sure you will be pleased to know that The Youth Service have now appointed the new Voluntary Sector Development worker, her contact details are: Vicky Britton, Voluntary Sector Development Worker, Bath & North East Somerset Council. E: victoria_britton@bathnes.gov.uk P: 01225 396916 M: 07530263214 That means that we are now in a position to send out the Youth Enablement grant pack to all groups/individuals that request one. Groups are asked to request a pack from Vicky direct. That way Vicky can keep and record of all groups who have requested information and follow up with support / help as required. The funding will be allocated against the criteria as stated in the Pack to all groups who meet the criteria on a first come first served basis, although some funding is going to be held back for the 2nd and 3rd rounds to ensure that money is allocated as fairly as possible. Grants awarded will be in the region of £5000. If groups require larger amounts of funding we will support them to find other sources of funding and Vicky will be happy and able to help support them through the process. Although there was a press release sent out jointly with Policy & Partnership (which is where we have the names on a waiting list) in approx. May of this year, Vicky will also be sending out another press release next week to promote it again now the pack is ready. She has already made contact with all of the known voluntary sector groups both those well established and those smaller embryonic groups that we are aware of as well. The first panel meeting will be meeting in September which will give people a few weeks to put their application together. Details of the panel is in the pack.</i></p>	

10	Question from:	Councillor Tony Clarke
<p>Can the Cabinet Member please detail what provision is to be made to mitigate the impact of any future teacher strikes, particularly in Primary Schools where parents have particular difficulty in making alternative childcare arrangements.</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Nathan Hartley
<p><i>It is expected that schools are open for all 190 days of the school year unless there are exceptional circumstances that require closure and that in these circumstances partial closure rather than full closure should be considered if at all possible. Detailed advice is given to schools in relation to potential strike action that may involve their staff. This includes undertaking a risk assessment so that any closure or partial closure ensures the health and safety of children attending school and is proportionate to the reduction in staffing available. Staff participating in strike action are acting in breach of their contract of employment. Head Teacher must ensure that employees are notified of this and that their action will result in a break in their service and the deduction of a day's pay for each strike day. However where strike action takes place it is not always possible for schools to replace striking staff. For example, Regulation 7 of the Conduct of Employment Agencies and Employment Businesses Regulations 2003 (SI 2003/3319) precludes the provision of</i></p>		

*temporary workers to perform the duties normally performed by a worker who is taking part in a strike or other industrial action.
In the recent strike on 30th June 49 Bath and North East Somerset Schools were open 27 were partially open and 20 were closed.*

11	Question from:	Councillor Bryan Chalker – WITHDRAWN
-----------	-----------------------	--------------------------------------

12	Question from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard
-----------	-----------------------	--------------------------

Can the Cabinet Member please provide an update on the Council's application for Homes and Communities Agency funding to support the provision of new hostel facilities in Bath.

Answer from:	Councillor Tim Ball
---------------------	---------------------

Bids to the HCA under the Homelessness Change Programme were required to be submitted by Registered Providers - the Local Authority is acting in an enabling role in pursuing its aim to secure new hostel facilities in Bath and has not applied on its own behalf. Two bids were submitted by potential RP partners that would if successful undertake the project. Each bid will be scrutinised by the HCA and hopefully one will be supported to provide a viable development partner by which to undertake and deliver the project.

The HCA have been concentrating on its National Affordable Housing Programme as a priority and has not progressed with its other investment programmes. It is anticipated that these bids, including the Homelessness Change Programme, will be dealt with later in the year. As further information becomes available I will update you and others accordingly, unfortunately at this time there is nothing I can add.

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

The previous administration committed £3M to new hostels – a commitment which you inherited. Will you confirm this?

Answer from:	Councillor Tim Ball
---------------------	---------------------

*(Response provided following the meeting)
I am very supportive of finding a solution to improving our direct access homeless provision. The HCA have recently announced that their decision on the "Homeless Change" bids has now been delayed until the end of September. I will therefore use this time to ensure, particularly in light of the current financial environment, that we do all we can to find a suitable solution to this issue.*

13	Question from:	Councillor Sarah Bevan
<p>Could the cabinet member for transport allow funding for a bus shelter at the most well used bus stop in Peasedown, to encourage more use of public transport, especially among vulnerable residents, who might be put off due to the current lack of shelter from adverse weather conditions?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>The bus stop lies on a GBBN showcase bus route and a request for funding for a bus shelter will be made to the GBBN Project Board.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
<p>Thank you for your reply. When will the outcome of the request for funding be known and how much will it cost?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>(Response provided following the meeting) The next GBBN Board meeting on 10th August 2011. We have submitted a change request for the cost of this shelter, £4,500, at this location. I will let you know if we do obtain funding for this shelter.</i></p>		

14	Question from:	Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones
<p>The uncertainty over the future of the regeneration of Keynsham town centre is clearly a cause of concern for local residents. Following the announcement that no further consultation is to take place until the autumn to allow the cabinet to reassess the scheme, could the Cabinet Member please offer reassurance to the residents of Keynsham that any plans the Cabinet brings forward will still include:</p> <p>a) new Council offices to provide an anchor for the centre and ensure a level of footfall that will attract retailers and deliver significant reduction in office accommodation costs and the Council's carbon footprint; and</p> <p>b) a new library, a One Stop Shop for access to public services and display space for items of national historic importance.</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>The Council remains fully committed to the regeneration of Keynsham town centre as part of a wider approach to attracting private sector investment that will create new opportunities, new jobs, and greater prosperity for residents. I can confirm that the administration's plans are for a scheme for the Temple Street site that will kickstart the delivery of the regeneration strategy for Keynsham. Our ambition is to put Keynsham on the map as a complementary commercial location to Bristol and</i></p>		

Bath, with a strong retail offer focused on the High Street, enabling people to live and work in the town, and significantly reducing out commuting. We are also working with Kraft to ensure development at Somerdale responds to this strategy.

The proposals for the Town Hall site include new retail space, new streets and spaces, a library and one-stop-shop as well as new, more sustainable, Council offices.

We're listening to the Keynsham Business Association to hear what's important for retailers in Keynsham, as well as taking advice from our Retail advisors DTZ. We recognise the need to anchor the southern end of the town centre. It's likely that there will be a range of retail units that offer the opportunity for national chains as well as independent retailers.

The One Stop Shop offers the opportunity to bring a variety of public services under one roof and we're working with key partners such as health and parts of the voluntary sector, and also other key public sector partners to ensure the new building meets their needs. The library and one stop shop is planned to contain space that is available for community use as well as the opportunity to display some of Keynsham's historic artefacts.

We are concerned about the future use of Riverside. During the previous administration, a worked up plan for Riverside was not completed and we will be looking to help facilitate alternative uses for this site. We believe this is important for Keynsham.

Officers have been working with local stakeholders since the beginning of the year to shape the emerging proposals through setting up a Community Focus Group as well as holding two rounds of stakeholder workshops. The timescale for the wider consultation is intended to allow the new Cabinet to consider options about the best way to deliver a well thought out scheme that will support the regeneration of Keynsham, including the Riverside building, and provide the best possible value for money for the local taxpayer.

Supplementary Question:

Will the Cabinet member give an assurance about the provision of new retail space in Keynsham?

Answer from:

Councillor Cherry Beath

The question is a repeat of the original question and my original reply answers it, so I have nothing to add.

15

Question from:

Councillor Tim Warren

In view of the fact that the Cabinet's position over the future of an East of Bath Park and Ride remains unclear, can the Cabinet Member please provide details of what alternative East of Bath Park and Ride sites are currently being investigated by the Council, having regard to the statement by the Leader of Council that two sites within Wiltshire are under consideration. What consultation and/or discussion has taken place on this with Wiltshire Council and what indications have been given by Wiltshire Council as to the likelihood of a Wiltshire Park & Ride proving acceptable to Wiltshire Council and its residents?

Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>Officers meet with Wiltshire County on a regular basis to discuss transport policies and priorities. The potential for new P&R site were discussed at the most recent meeting but officers from Wiltshire were unable to give an indication on the likely merits of individual proposals.</i></p> <p><i>Meetings have taken place between the Leaders of both councils and a meeting of Transport Cabinet members has been arranged. This will be the first of regular contacts. These meetings will involve a number of cross border issues, besides P&R and rail services. Discussions will include bus services and HGV routes.</i></p>	

16	Question from:	Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones
<p>Has there been any consultation with the Council's Transport Commission or Urban Regeneration Panel on the revised BTP bid and/or are there any plans to seek the views of the Transport Commission and the Urban Regeneration Panel before the final bid is submitted in September?</p>		
Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds	
<p><i>There have not been any direct consultations between the Transport Commission and the Urban Regeneration Panel on the revised BTP bid. The Transport Commission will be asked to give its views on the BTP prior to its submission to Government in September.</i></p>		

17	Question from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish																				
<p>Can the Cabinet Member please provide a breakdown of the costs of the component elements of the proposed revised best and final Bath Transport Package bid as set out in Cabinet Report E2281 and the proposed funding sources for each element (e.g DfT, Council or third party).</p>																						
Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds																					
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>June</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>Update</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Bid preparation costs</td> <td style="text-align: right;">7,952,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 40px;">Property net</td> <td style="text-align: right;">990,487</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">Main scheme</td> <td style="text-align: right;">19,241,777</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 40px;">City Centre</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1,616,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 40px;">Other Works</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>1,500,000</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">31,300,765</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 40px;">Vehicles</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>2,950,000</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>34,250,765</u></td> </tr> </table> <p>The funding for the revised scheme costs are subject to ongoing discussions, as part of formulating the best and final bid to the DfT for the 9th September 2011</p>				<u>June</u>		<u>Update</u>	Bid preparation costs	7,952,000	Property net	990,487	Main scheme	19,241,777	City Centre	1,616,500	Other Works	<u>1,500,000</u>		31,300,765	Vehicles	<u>2,950,000</u>		<u>34,250,765</u>
	<u>June</u>																					
	<u>Update</u>																					
Bid preparation costs	7,952,000																					
Property net	990,487																					
Main scheme	19,241,777																					
City Centre	1,616,500																					
Other Works	<u>1,500,000</u>																					
	31,300,765																					
Vehicles	<u>2,950,000</u>																					
	<u>34,250,765</u>																					

Supplementary Question:	
<p>Thank you for your efforts in providing this response. I am concerned that the "Main Scheme" costs of £19.2M could hide a lot of detail. Please could the Cabinet member provide a breakdown of this figure? Could he also confirm that the £1.6M listed for "City Centre" is the same as that shown in paragraph 2.9 of the report?</p>	
Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>(Response provided following the meeting)</i> <i>The following table provides a breakdown of the figures in my original reply:</i></p>	
July 2011 Scheme Estimate	<u>June Update</u>
Bid	7,952,000
Property net	990,487
Main scheme	18,851,777
<i>Enabling Works & Stat Fees</i>	265,201
<i>Newbridge</i>	2,103,682
<i>Odd Down</i>	832,227
<i>Upgrade to existing P&R route</i>	637,000
<i>Landsdown</i>	831,025
<i>On Street Improvements</i>	641,524
<i>Bus stops & RTI</i>	4,587,292
<i>Ticket Machines</i>	175,000
<i>VMS</i>	803,250
<i>Design/Management Costs (Fees)</i>	1,610,432
<i>Land assembly fees</i>	44,200
<i>Site Supervision Costs</i>	857,872
<i>Statutory Utilities/Service Diversions</i>	1,254,295
<i>CCTV Installation</i>	429,125
	15,072,124
<i>Risk</i>	2,685,144
<i>Inflation</i>	1,094,509
	18,851,777
A4 P&R	0
City Centre	1,616,500
BWR Transport Scheme	1,890,000
	31,300,765
<i>Vehicles</i>	2,950,000
	34,250,765
<p><i>The £1.6m does indeed refer to the cost of the City Centre improvements in paragraph 2.9 of the report.</i></p>	

18	Question from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p>The Leader of Council made a welcome commitment at the last Full Council meeting regarding the Cabinet's intention to include a Council Tax freeze in next year's (2012/13) budget proposals. Can the Cabinet Member please confirm what the revenue cost of such a freeze would be over the period 2012-2015, and offer reassurance that front-line services and services to vulnerable residents will not be reduced as a result of this commitment?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor David Bellotti
<p><i>The estimate amount currently included in the Medium Term Financial Planning assumptions, which this Administration inherited from the old Administration, is for a 2.5% increase in Council Tax for 2012/13 which amounts to £2.016M. The old administration was also planning a further 2.5% rise in each of the following two years. The Government has funded this current year's freeze in Council Tax and I can confirm that the new Cabinet will aspire to a budget next year (2012/13) which will include a Council Tax Freeze but will take into account the Government settlement. This aspiration will be factored in as part of the overall prioritisation of resources, including the contribution from efficiency, change programme and service level savings. The new Cabinet will do its best to avoid reductions in front line services and services to vulnerable people, such as the cuts to youth provision which the previous administration made whilst at the same time unnecessarily increasing reserves for pensions.</i></p>		

19	Question from:	Ian Barclay
<p>Please could the Executive Member provide an update on the Locally Important Buildings SPD since the consultation draft was published in April 2008, and a future programme for the protection of locally important buildings, including an account of national and local developments in this area since April 2008</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball
<p><i>The Cabinet has assessed the list of outstanding planning documents that need to be prepared and has sought to progress those of highest priority. The Cabinet is aware of the importance of this SPD but in light of the imminent departure of the MoD from their sites in Bath, resources need to be devoted instead to the formulation of a more detailed planning framework for each of these sites. These will provide clear development principles that will help to ensure high quality and responsive development that delivers the corporate priorities of the Council. The locally important historic buildings SPD will form part of a future work programme.</i></p>		