Decision Register Entry

Executive Forward Plan Reference

E2169

Single Member Cabinet Decision

Bath Business Improvement District - Final Proposal for Ballot

Decision maker/s	Terry Gazzard
The Issue	 When a Business Improvement District is proposed for an area, the Local Authority has a responsibility to ensure that: the proposal contains the information as required in BID Regulations (2004) the BID proposal does not conflict with any of its strategies and plans for that area. that the BID proposer has undertaken a satisfactory level of consultation with the relevant business community. The local authority must also sign a baseline services agreement with the BID proposer, which sets out the standard services provided by the local authority within the BID area. The local authority must also sign an operating agreement with the BID proposer, which governs the process for collecting the levy.
Decision Date	7-Sep-10
The decision	 The Cabinet Member agrees that: The Business Improvement District proposal by Future Bath Plus is formally endorsed by the Council, as it meets regulatory requirements, does not conflict with Council plans, and the proposers have undertaken a satisfactory level of consultation; The relevant Strategic Directors continue to negotiate the baseline and operating agreements with Future Bath Plus, and these agreements are then signed by the relevant Strategic Directors in consultation with the Cabinet members for Development and Regeneration and Customer Services.
Rationale for decision	Without formal sign-off from the Council on the BID proposal, Future Bath Plus cannot take their proposal to a business ballot. The role of the Council is to ensure that sufficient consultation has occurred, that the proposal does not conflict with any Council policies or plans, and the proposal meets the expectations of the BID Regulations. The business community will be able to decide at ballot whether or not to introduce a compulsory levy, based on the details contained within the proposal.
Financial and budget implications	FIELD_DECISION_RSRCE
Issues considered	Social Inclusion; Customer Focus; Sustainability; Human Resources; Property; Young People; Equality (age, race, disability, religion/belief, gender, sexual orientation); Human Rights; Corporate; Health & Safety; Impact on Staff; Other Legal Considerations

Consultation undertaken	Published in WL 27-Aug-10
How consultation was carried out	WC Cab Int SP CX Mon 151
Other options considered	None
Signatures of Decision Makers	
Date of Signature	