

Democratic Services

Guildhall, High Street, Bath BA1 5AW
Telephone: (01225) 477000 *main switchboard*
Direct Lines - Tel: 01225 394411
Web-site - <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk>

22 November 2016
Democratic_Services@bathnes.gov.uk

To: All Members of the Resources Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel

Bath and North East Somerset Councillors: Sarah Bevan (Chair), Bob Goodman (Vice-Chair), Christopher Pearce, Jasper Becker, Colin Barrett, Chris Dando and Andrew Furse

Chief Executive and other appropriate officers
Press and Public

Dear Member

Resources Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel: Wednesday, 23rd November, 2016

Please find attached a **SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA DESPATCH** of late papers which were not available at the time the agenda was published. Please treat these papers as part of the agenda.

Papers have been included for the following items:

5. TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR (Pages 3 - 20)

Yours sincerely

Michaela Gay
for Chief Executive

If you need to access this agenda or any of the supporting reports in an alternative accessible format please contact Democratic Services or the relevant report author whose details are listed at the end of each report.

This Agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council	
MEETING/ DECISION MAKER:	Resources Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel
MEETING/ DECISION DATE:	23rd November 2016
TITLE:	SMD E2900 – Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy
WARD:	Bath Wards and Bath Avon North
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM	
List of attachments to this report:	

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 A request to call in the SMD E2900 was considered by the Chief Executive and the Monitoring officer on 16th November 2016. The call-in was rejected or invalid, however it was agreed that Resources PDS Panel would be asked to consider two items raised by the call-in. This report addresses the agreed issues.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Panel is asked to;

- 2.1 Note the response to the issues raised below.

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)

- 3.1 Covered in the SMD E2900

4 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS AND BASIS FOR PROPOSAL

- 4.1 This report is for information only.

5 THE REPORT

- 5.1 There are 2 issues within the call-in on which further detail has been requested these are:

- (1) *Process: a decision, involving the sum of £300,000 and bringing total spending on preparation to over £1m, should be taken by the whole Cabinet in a public meeting, rather than using the SMD process (albeit involving two Cabinet members).*

(2) *Risk: insufficient weight has been given to the £800,000 revenue reversion risk outlined in paragraph 3.4 and 9.2, particularly given the well-documented costs and difficulties associated with all shortlisted sites for the P&R, including the risk of judicial review.*

5.2 **Issue No 1:** The Park and Ride capital scheme original budget was provisionally approved at £5.2m through the agreement of the Councils Budget in Feb 2014. Full approval of the £500k was agreed by Cabinet in Nov 2014 to begin scheme development work. The 2016/17 provisionally approved budget agreed at full Council in Feb 2016 for this project was £9.7m which included £4.7m of existing provisional budget and the addition of £5m 'as a result of additional costs anticipated around land acquisition and sites access challenges'¹ as identified in the report to Full Council Nov 2015.

5.3 Annex 1 gives detail of the P&R Scheme funding and expenditure, this allowed the enablement of the following:

- Development of transport modelling & site identification
- Consultation on possible sites
- Initial review and feasibility study of sites

5.4 A resolution, agreed at the Council meeting in November last year, requested that the Local Development Framework Steering Group (LDFSG) undertake a "review all the options for the location of an East of Bath P&R..." The LDFSG met on 4 occasions and were provided with details of nearly 20 possible sites as part of their work requested by Council. Supporting this work involved significant resources across a number of disciplines including engineering, planning and landscape expertise. Additional resources were required to support the Communities, Transport and Environment PDS Panel to undertake their review of 'integrated transport solutions east of Bath'.

5.5 As a result of the work undertaken during early 2016 a further £300k was released by a SMD E2834. This followed Council process for converting provisional approval to full as set out in the Council budget report: "*Items for Provisional Approval will require further Officer and Member scrutiny, including a formal Executive decision for Full Approval.*"

5.6 Cabinet in May 2016 considered the recommendations of the LDFSG and the outcome of the CTE PDS Panel's review. As a result of these recommendations further work has been undertaken as outlined in the SMD E2900. This allows detailed planning submission on a shortlist of sites, approaches to land owners and assessment of the capacity of these sites which will enable the project to be taken forward to site selection. Other than instructing property agents no further expenditure has been incurred on site acquisition.

5.7 The expenditure to support progress on the scheme will allow options to be considered with the further development of plans that present a range of shortlisted sites. This will support a decision meeting early in the New Year.

5.8 **Issue No 2:** At each point when a decision has been taken on this project the risk of a reversion to revenue of the Capital costs has been highlighted. The Council has a robust project management procedure which will manage this and other risks. Members should recall that one of the outputs of this work is the creation of a Multi-modal transport model which will inform the Council's broader transport interventions east of Bath, particularly the options for removing through traffic.

¹ See paragraph 3.2 of report to Council 12/11/15.
Printed on recycled paper

As a result, not all of these costs will be borne by the P&R and could be apportioned, in due course, to other capital projects. Initial estimates suggest up to 50% (c£600k) of the expenditure may be at risk, if the P&R option was not brought forward creating a revenue reversion cost. Finally, undertaking a comprehensive review of options east of the city, as explained in paragraph 5.2 and 5.3 above, will minimise the risk of a successful Judicial Review.

6 RATIONALE

6.1 See above

7 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

7.1 Report for information.

8 CONSULTATION

8.1 The Cabinet Member, Chief Executive, Monitoring Officer and Strategic Directors were consulted in preparing this report.

9 RISK MANAGEMENT

9.1 This is covered in the SMD 2900.

Contact person	<i>Peter Dawson 01225-395181</i>
Background papers	SMD E2900 SMD E2834 Cabinet report E 2712 November 2014
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

ANNEX 1 – SCHEME BUDGET APPROVALS & EXPENDITURE

TC8829S - Park & Ride Bath East Capital Funding Approvals

Provisional Approved Budget	Total
Full Council February 2014	£5,200,000
Full Council February 2016	£5,000,000
Total	£10,200,000

Full Approval & Project Deliverables	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	Total	Comments
Cabinet report E2712 November 2014	£350,000	£150,000		£500,000	Development of transport model including surveys
SMD E2834 January 2016	£0	£300,000		£300,000	Public consultation on possible sites
SMD E2900 September 2016			£300,000	£300,000	Initial review of sites following November Council
Total	£350,000	£450,000	£300,000	£1,100,000	

TC8829S - Park & Ride Bath East Expenditure

Supplier	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	Total	Comments
Internal Fees (Staff Costs)	£0	£103,874	£57,505	£161,380	Project management, attendance at Public consultation in September 2015
Internal Planning Advice	£0	£0	£15,956	£15,956	
External costs					
Mott Macdonald	£290,762	£287,883	£57,932	£636,578	Expenditure includes surveys, model development, consultation, highway design and environmental work.
Mediaclash	£0	£5,250	£0	£5,250	
White Young Green	£0	£0	£102,650	£102,650	Environmental Planning
Other	£0	£4,928	£14,320	£20,123	Project Management, roadside interviews and visitor mapping
Total	£290,762	£401,936	£248,363	£941,936	

Bath & North East Somerset Council

DECISION MAKER:	Cllr Clarke, Cabinet Member for Transport Cllr Gerrish, Cabinet Member for Resources	
DECISION DATE:	On or after 29 th October 2016	EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE
		E 2900
TITLE:	Funding Approval for the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy	
WARD:	Bath Wards and Bath Avon North	
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM		
List of attachments to this report: none		

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 Approval is sought to draw down a further £300,000 from the provisional capital budget to provide continued support for the study to improve access to Bath and remove through traffic from the city. The original budget was approved by the November 2014 [Cabinet report](#) on the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet Members are asked to agree:

- 2.1 Approval to release a further £300,000 to support continued study work.
- 2.2 Note that the revenue reversion risk is increasing as highlighted in the resource implications.

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)

- 3.1 The Council in February 2014 approved a provisional budget of £5.2m to develop a transport solution for the east of Bath.
- 3.2 Of this budget £500k was approved by Cabinet in November 2014 and £300k by way of a Single Member Decision in January 2016. This has now been largely committed on works, including that agreed by Council at their meeting in November, to review options for the P&R through work. Following the report to Cabinet in May 2016 further work has been commissioned to refine the site options including commissioning planning and property agents.
- 3.3 This request seeks to approve a further £300k of the remaining £4.4m provisional budget to fund the progression of this important work.

- 3.4 Should a Park & Ride not ultimately be developed then this funding, along with the initial £800k, would be at risk of revenue reversion. The value attached to this risk is now significant, although some of this work will contribute to the business case for a new link road to the east of the city, therefore reducing the revenue reversion risk to potentially less than 100% of the spend. In the event that there is ultimately a recommendation not to proceed with this project the funding of the revenue reversion costs will need to be considered by Council.

4 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS AND BASIS FOR PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Sustainability, planning. Further consideration will be given once projects identified by this work have been fully evaluated.

5 THE REPORT

- 5.1 Approval was given in November 2014 for work to develop options for a P&R east of the city. This work has also supported the review of options to remove through traffic from the city of Bath. This has included the development of a new transport model which will provide an analytic basis for the business case for both a new P&R and for the link road east of the city. This latter work is being taken forward with Wiltshire County and Highways England.
- 5.2 The project originally planned for the selection of a site during the summer of 2015, and this was referred to in the report last November. The extended public consultation undertaken in September and the Council resolution in November have extended this process beyond the expected programme and further resource is required to continue the project.
- 5.3 Earlier this year there were 4 meetings of the Local Development Framework Steering Group which completed an extensive review of possible sites for a P&R east of the city. This included significant work on landscape impact and continued development of the transport model to review the likely demand for the use of these sites as P&R.
- 5.4 The funds released in this report will allow the project for the P&R to be taken forward to site selection. The work now includes the appointment of land agents to negotiate options for site acquisition, planning agents to develop pre-application submissions and landscape architects to contribute to this strategy.
- 5.5 A cabinet meeting later this year should be in a position to make a firm decision on which site should be promoted as a P&R, at this point a fuller budget and business case will be made be available for approval.

6 RATIONALE

- 6.1 Continuation of the work of this project is essential and will play a critical role in the development of the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy and support the Council's Core Strategy

7 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 7.1 None.

8 CONSULTATION

8.1 Cabinet member, Monitoring Officer, Section 151 Officer and the Strategic Director Place have been consulted on this report.

9 RISK MANAGEMENT

9.1 A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.

9.2 There remains a significant risk that if no site is brought forward for a P&R the costs spent to date and those approved now might have to be written back to a revenue budget as no assets will have been created. Any reversion would create a significant additional budget pressure for which there is no mitigation available at the moment.

Contact person	<i>Peter Dawson 01225-395181</i>
Background papers	<i>Bath Transport Strategy – available on public website.</i>
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

This page is intentionally left blank

Single Member Cabinet Decision

Executive
Forward Plan
Reference

E2900

Funding Approval for the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy

Decision maker/s	Cllr Clarke, Cabinet Member for Transport Cllr Gerrish, Cabinet Member for Resources
The Issue	Approval is sought to draw down a further £300,000 from the provisional capital budget to provide continued support for the study to improve access to Bath and remove through traffic from the city. The original budget was approved by the November 2014 Cabinet report on the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy
Decision Date	31 st Oct 2016
The decision	The Cabinet Members agree to release a further £300,000 to support continued study work
Rationale for decision	Continuation of the work of this project is essential and will play a critical role in the development of the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy and support the Council's Core Strategy
Financial and budget implications	The Council in February 2014 approved a provisional budget of £5.2m to develop a transport solution for the east of Bath. Of this budget £500k was approved by Cabinet in November 2014 and £300k by way of a Single Member Decision in January 2016. This has now been largely committed on works, including that agreed by Council at their meeting in November, to review options for the P&R through work. Following the report to Cabinet in May 2016 further work has been commissioned to refine the site options including commissioning planning and property agents.
Issues considered (these are covered in more detail in the report)	Sustainability; Planning
Consultation undertaken	Cabinet colleagues Section 151 Finance Officer; Monitoring Officer
How consultation was carried out	By email and meetings
Other options considered	None
Declaration of interest by Cabinet Member(s) for decision, including any dispensation	<i>None</i>

granted:	
Any conflict of interest declared by anyone who is consulted by a Member taking the decision:	None

Signatures of Decision Makers	
--------------------------------------	--

Date of Signature	
--------------------------	--

Subject to Call-in until 5 Working days have elapsed following publication of the decision

90 GETTING AROUND BATH TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Robin Kerr (Chairman, Federation of Bath Residents' Associations) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website*] made a number of points relating to traffic congestion and air pollution and supported the rapid implementation of the strategy which he said was vital and long-awaited.

Adam Reynolds (Chair, Cycle Bath) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 8 and on the Council's website*] appealed to the Cabinet to invest £10 per head of population into cycling on a yearly basis.

Councillor David Dixon asked Adam Reynolds why he had suggested £10 per head. Adam said he felt that £10 would be a starting point but that Bristol invested £16 per head per year.

Councillor David Bellotti asked Adam Reynolds whether he knew the sum of the Council's investments in cycling in the last year had in fact been more than £10 per head. Adam said he had hoped for a commitment to annual investment, not for a single year. Councillor Bellotti asked whether Adam was aware that the Cabinet could not commit to expenditure under future administrations and Adam acknowledged that he had not been aware of that.

Councillor Tim Ball asked Adam Reynolds whether he felt that all cyclists should undertake training. Adam acknowledged that there were some bad cyclists, as there were some bad motorists.

Professor Donald Thomas (Greenway Residents Association) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 9 and on the Council's website*] urging greater emphasis on pollution in residential areas.

Steve Bradley (Liberal Democrat Prospective MP for Bath) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 10 and on the Council's website*] urged the Cabinet to pursue the Park and Ride proposal for the east of Bath; to make progress on the options available for relief for the east of Bath; and to continue its commitment to the MetroWest project.

Councillor Anthony Clarke in an *ad hoc* statement expressed disappointment that only a limited area was being covered by the proposals and asked that they be seen as the first of a number of building blocks.

Councillor Caroline Roberts moved the proposals. She referred to the Transport strategy which had been held in 2013; the Planning, Transport and Environment PDS Panel had scrutinised the Plan; the Local Development Forum steering group had given it cross-party consideration; and now the Cabinet was being asked to recommend the Plan to Council for adoption.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He felt it was an exciting Plan with a wide consensus of agreement. He had been particularly impressed by the comments made by Professor Donald on air quality. He also welcomed the challenge made by Adam Reynolds over the issue of cycling provision.

Councillor Crossley emphasised that the MetroWest project would be key to delivery of the Strategy and he was pleased to hear the support from local Residents Associations. He reminded the meeting that attention would next be given to the Transport Strategy for Keynsham, although that responsibility would fall to the next administration.

Councillor Tim Ball said that the administration had successfully introduced the Core Plan, Enterprise Area Masterplan and now was about to agree the Bath Transport Strategy. He agreed with the points made by Adam Reynolds because he too had youngsters who could not cycle on the roads because of bad drivers.

Councillor Dine Romero supported the proposals which she said were a work in progress but which contained some exciting solutions to the needs of the city.

Councillor David Dixon said that it would never be possible to solve completely the problems of Bath's transport system; but under the present administration superb progress had been made. He anticipated an ongoing debate about through traffic and the link road to the east of the city. He was determined to look at more adventurous, sustainable good quality solutions.

Councillor Caroline Roberts summed up by emphasising that the Strategy would meet the needs of all users of the city.

On a motion from Councillor Caroline Roberts, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)



- (1) To ENDORSE the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy and recommends that it be adopted by Council on 12th November 2014; and
- (2) To APPROVE the capital budget of £350k in 2014/15 and £150k in 2015/16) towards the development of the Park & Ride to the east of Bath.

Single Member Cabinet Decision

Executive Forward Plan Reference	E2834
---	--------------

Funding Approval for the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy

Decision maker/s	Cllr Clarke, Cabinet Member for Transport Cllr Gerrish, Cabinet Member for Resources
The Issue	Approval is sought to draw down a further £300,000 from the provisional capital budget to provide continued support for the study to improve access to Bath and remove through traffic from the city. The original budget was approved by the November 2014 Cabinet report on the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy.
Decision Date	1 st February 2016
The decision	The Cabinet Members agrees that a further £300,000 be approved to support continued study work.
Rationale for decision	Continuation of the work of this project is essential and will play a critical role in the development of the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy and support the Council's Core Strategy
Financial and budget implications	The Council in February 2014 approved a provisional budget of £5.2m to develop a transport solution for the east of Bath. Of this budget £500k was approved by Cabinet in November 2014. This has now been spent on works, including consultation. This request seeks to approve a further £300k of the remaining £4.7m provisional budget to fund the progression of this important work, specifically following requests arising from the report taken to November Council. Should a Park & Ride not ultimately be developed then this funding, along with the initial £500k, would be at risk of revenue reversion. However as this work will contribute to the business case for a new link road to the east of the city the revenue reversion risk may be not be 100% of the spend.
Issues considered (these are covered in more detail in the report)	Sustainability; Corporate; Other Legal Considerations
Consultation undertaken	Cabinet member, Monitoring Officer, Section 151 Officer and the Strategic Director Place have been consulted on this report.
How consultation was carried out	By email and one to one discussion
Other options considered	None
Declaration of	<i>None</i>

interest by Cabinet Member(s) for decision, including any dispensation granted:	
Any conflict of interest declared by anyone who is consulted by a Member taking the decision:	<i>None</i>
Signatures of Decision Makers	 <hr/> Cllr Clarke, Cabinet Member for Transport  <hr/> Cllr Gerrish, Cabinet Member for Resources
Date of Signature	<i>3 February 2016</i>
Subject to Call-in until 5 Working days have elapsed following publication of the decision	

101 RECEIPT OF INFORMATION REQUESTED BY COUNCIL ON THE PARK & RIDE/EAST OF BATH TRANSPORT ISSUES

The Chair informed the meeting that he would first invite registered speakers to address the Cabinet. Councillor John Bull would then address the Cabinet as the CTE PDS Panel Chair.

Barry Henderson, Secretary of the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, read out a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website]* where he said that FOBRA had welcomed the integrated transport solution achieved in the Bath Transport Strategy, which was agreed by all parties on the Council in November 2014 and endorsed by the results of the general and local elections a year ago. There was a need for eastern Park and Ride which may not be the most important part but was an essential part of the overall Strategy, and FOBRA asked the Cabinet to press ahead with it.

Andrew Lea said that the Cabinet should make a decision by taking into consideration correct information provided by their officers. However, according to Andrew Lea, officers had used an out of date data and had not acknowledge that capacity of existing Park and Rides were only at its highest due to predictable events. Andrew Lea added that Transport department had overlooked revised guidance by DEFRA and concluded that the Cabinet has moral and legal requirement to make their decision against Park and Ride east of Bath.

Annie Kilvington said that the Council had misinterpreted the law related to air quality management and added that planning department cannot accept an application if an emission exceeds legal limits. Annie Kilvington also said that the Council had not used data submitted by the Bathampton Meadows Alliance (Alliance) and urged the Cabinet to reject east of Bath Park and Ride report.

Christine Boyd said that report from the Local Development Framework (LDF) group had showed that the Park and Ride was unaffordable, taking into consideration that the whole project would cost the Council £12m. Christine Boyd also said that this would be poor value for money and it would take only 5% of traffic from London Road. Christine Boyd also commented that the Council had used out of date evidence and urged the Cabinet to make reasonable decision on this matter.

Nicolette Boater read out a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website]* where she felt that last November there was questionable rationale, evidence, and flawed consultative process in addressing transport challenges in Bath. However, she applauded the more informed and consensus-building approach by involving the CTE PDS Panel in the process. Overall, Nicolette Boater believed the Scrutiny Panel's recommendations were well founded and persuasive. Nicolette Boater asked the Cabinet to further develop the policy coherence and evidence base before making any decision that will shape the economic and environmental wellbeing of the community.

Councillor Dine Romero said that she had recognised that there was a need in addressing air quality, pollution and traffic issues in the city which would require sustainable long term solution. Councillor Romero also said that there had been

some talk on how standalone Park and Ride had been agreed in Transport Strategy and how bus scheme had been considered as an interim measure though this would need to be complementary to other measures without unacceptable impact on amenities, residents and on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Councillor Romero expressed her concerns with the Park and Ride consultation and asked the Cabinet to take more time to consider findings from the Scrutiny and LDF group.

Councillor John Bull, Chair of the CTE PDS Panel, said that the Scrutiny Inquiry Day had looked at integrated responses to transport difficulties and opportunities to the east of Bath. Councillor Bull also said that he was surprised that members of Alliance did not favour the report. All evidence received on the day from large number of contributors had been included in the Scrutiny report. The report also contains what had been discussed at various workshops on the day. Councillor Bull explained that there was a lot of interest in linking A36 and A46, in upgrading A350, rail and transport via River Avon.

Councillor John Bull commented that the case for 1,600 spaces at the Park and Ride east of Bath was not made. The report suggested that there should be more publicity of Lansdown Park and Ride considering that existing Park and Ride sites had not been fully used at the moment. Councillor Bull concluded his statement by saying that there was no need for a large Park and Ride site east of Bath just for people who work in Bath.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones asked Councillor John Bull if there was a need for a smaller Park and Ride.

Councillor John Bull responded that, according to data from Alliance, only 25% of all Park and Ride sites were used in the period up to 9.30am. These figures would need to be validated, and if correct then there would be a case for smaller Park and Ride site.

Councillor Geoff Ward (Bathavon North) said that this issue had been challenging and urged the Cabinet to make the right decision. Councillor Ward highlighted natural beauty of Bathampton meadows and asked the Cabinet to explore all other options before making their final decision.

Councillor Liz Richardson said that the Local Development Framework (LDF) group report was a summary of a thorough process. The LDF group was not asked to look at the reasoning for having Park and Ride but to consider site options taking into account five objectives (as set out in the report). The LDF group had made a decision that Cabinet Members who were part of the group should be substituted by other Council Members. The LDF group meeting were open to Ward Members affected. The LDF group had started with seven sites to explore and ended up with a total of twenty one sites to consider. Through the sequential process some of those sites were not deemed to be viable. Councillor Richardson thanked everyone who contributed to the report and asked the Cabinet to note the report.

Councillor Anthony Clarke accepted report from the Scrutiny Inquiry Day and the LDF group. Councillor Clarke said that the Scrutiny had asked some specific questions in the report and answers to those questions would be provided by

Councillor Clarke and team off officers at one of the future CTE PDS Panel meetings. Councillor Clarke also thanked to all those involved in the process.

Councillor Anthony Clarke informed the meeting that the Cabinet have received a large amount of information through the CTE PDS Panel and the cross-party LDF group reports and from the community. Further detailed analysis is required of each site, and Cabinet have decided not to use the provisional date set for 18th May to allow this work to be completed. A revised date would be announced in the near future and the revised timetable would not impact upon the overall timeframe for the project.

Councillor Tim Warren also thanked CTE PDS Panel and the cross-party LDF group for their report and also to every single individual and organisation for their contribution in this matter. Councillor Warren highlighted that there was huge transport problem in Bath and the Cabinet would look into all data and evidence in order of making right and future proof decision which would set long term solution.

The Cabinet **NOTED** the reports outlining the findings and conclusions from the Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel Inquiry Day and the sites review undertaken by the LDF Steering Group; in order to help their deliberations in determining the recommended solution to the transport issues to the east of Bath.

This page is intentionally left blank