

**QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED OF EXECUTIVE  
COUNCILLORS AT THE COUNCIL EXECUTIVE  
MEETING 30<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2004**

**1. Question from Councillor Charles Gerrish**

The high pressure 'hot wash' machine is seen as an effective method of removing ingrained chewing gum stains from pavements, as evidenced in Milsom Street.

Could these machines also be used in Keynsham High Street – perhaps on a half yearly basis?

This would serve to not only reduce the incidence of unsightly marking on the pavement but also remove greasy stains from locations near some of the takeaways on the High Street?

**Answer to be given by Executive Councillor Rosemary Todd**

This machine could be used in areas such as Keynsham High St although at present the budget is only sufficient for experimental work - we cleaned Milsom St because of a highly visible gum problem as an experiment. We are now acquiring a second (replacement) machine for graffiti removal which will increase our capacity to undertake such works, but this will be subject to budget approval (from the Urban Public Realm priority budget) as current budgets do not allow for such work

Assuming funding is agreed, we will assess all high footfall areas and treat priority areas first. We envisage that pressure cleaning will include Keynsham High St and other similar areas, although the frequency of future cleaning will be determined by need and available resources

In the meantime, we will continue to wash Keynsham High Street as per the current schedule and clear grease from around street furniture.

**2. Question from Councillor Sarah Webb**

What provision will be made for the current users of the Ham Gardens Public Conveniences, the largest in the city and the only 24 hour facilities, when the area is being redeveloped?

**Answer to be given by Executive Councillors Colin Darracott and/or Rosemary Todd**

The current public conveniences at Ham Gardens provide 24 hour access to all toilet users. This facility will be demolished as part of the proposed Southgate redevelopment, with 3 enhanced replacement facilities being

provided in the final scheme. New facilities in the shopping centre itself will be open during shop opening hours and those in the Transport Interchange will be open for 21 hours a day 365 days a year.

The Master Plan and detailed phasing of the development are not yet fully developed. However, the potential need for alternative toilet facilities during the Southgate construction period has been recognised, and the Council will endeavour to reduce to a minimum the disruption that will arise through the closure of Ham Gardens during the major redevelopment period. This may be through a combination of discussion and negotiation with the Developer regarding temporary facilities adjacent to the site and a review and assessment of all alternative facilities that will be available at the relevant time. This will include Council owned public conveniences and other facilities, that will become available in the future as a result of the Public Convenience Provision Strategy that is currently being planned and implemented.

### **3. Question from Councillor Sarah Webb**

In respect of the Bath/ Bristol to South Coast Study:

1. As part of the proposed feasibility and assessment work, will the Executive Member consider the effects of the increase in freight traffic on the Limpley Stoke section of the A36 if an A36 / A46 link were built?
2. As part of the proposed feasibility and assessment work, will the Executive Member re-examine the surprising conclusion that 'dualling' the A350 will not reduce traffic on the A36/ A46?

Questions have been raised that the traffic going north west would find this as a preferable alternative despite being longer. Such traffic was not considered in the WSP study?

### **Answer to be given by Executive Councillor Sir Elgar Jenkins**

1. Yes
2. The GOSW/WSP study did fully consider the south to north-west strategic traffic movements. It found that the dualling of the A350 between Warminster and the M4 Motorway would achieve only a marginal reduction in traffic on the A36 in Bath. This conclusion will be examined in detail in the feasibility and assessment work.

### **4. Question from Peter Davis, Chair, Highways Committee, Batheaston Parish Council)**

Officers hope and expect their feasibility and assessment work to include a wide range of options. Will the Executive Member accordingly consider clarifying and strengthening recommendation 2.1 to read?;

*2.1 Officers will undertake further feasibility and assessment work on the range of potential measures as listed in paragraphs 4.1, 4.4 and 7.*

Rationale:

Para 4.1 as it stands merely reflects the GOSW broad recommendations to proceed to a full appraisal of a Link Road, and does not explicitly include other related work to improve traffic in and around Bath which B&NES might want to do.

There are incontrovertible facts which demonstrate potentially fatal flaws in GOSW's study, which cast doubt on the adequacy of relying solely on it, and which it would be imprudent not to re-examine.

In particular, it is essential to review critically the role of alternative routes, mostly through Wiltshire, which might affect the size, timing and even necessity of a Link Road.

It is also unclear as to whether traffic management measures (such as HGV restrictions on Cleveland Bridge) could be described as "demand management" and therefore included in the appraisal work as the recommendation stands.

We would not seek to alter the wording or intent of the Officers' report substantially in order to accommodate all our concerns, but would be content to make explicit the wider brief which we believe they should, and do, need. The specific inclusion of paras 4.4 and 7 in recommendation 2.1 does this, without detracting from other paragraphs not needing such highlighting.

**Answer to be given by Executive Councillor Sir Elgar Jenkins**

The GOSW recommendations actually go much further than just taking forward the appraisal of the link road. They recommend a range of alternative measures for further evaluation.

It is our intention that the full range of potential measures is examined in the assessment work to be carried out. This will include options for HGV management in Bath, as well as examining in detail options for diverting through traffic onto other strategic routes, as Cllr Davis suggests.

As our intentions are therefore clear in this regard, I do not feel any need to amend the recommendation.