

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

Wednesday, 3rd November, 2010

The decisions contained within these minutes may not be implemented until the expiry of the 5 working day call-in period which will run from 5th to 11th Nov. These minutes are draft until confirmed as a correct record at the next meeting.

Present:

Councillor Francine Haeberling	Leader of the Council
Councillor Malcolm Hanney	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Resources
Councillor Terry Gazzard	Cabinet Member for Development and Major Projects
Councillor Charles Gerrish	Cabinet Member for Service Delivery
Councillor David Hawkins	Cabinet Member for The Council as Corporate Trustee
Councillor Vic Pritchard	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services and Housing
Councillor Chris Watt	Cabinet Member for Children's Services

110 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair was taken by Councillor Francine Haeberling, Leader of the Council.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

111 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the evacuation procedure as set out in the Agenda.

112 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

113 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

Councillor Malcolm Hanney declared that with respect to Item 13, he had a personal but non-prejudicial interest as Chair of the PCT.

114 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

115 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 12 questions from the following people:

Members of the public: Manda Rigby

Councillors: Nigel Roberts (2), Cherry Beath (2), Ian Gilchrist, Eleanor Jackson, Nicholas Coombes(3), Marian McNeir (2)

[Copies of the questions and response, including supplementary questions and responses if any, have been placed on the Minute book as Appendix 1 and are available on the Council's website.]

116 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

Barbara Gordon (Save Our 6-7 Buses), made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the minutes as Appendix 2*] appealing to Cabinet to reinstate the Public Transport Liaison Panel. Councillor Charles Gerrish thanked Barbara for her statement.

Councillor Dr Eleanor Jackson made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 but not available on the web*] in which she appealed to the Cabinet to reverse the cuts to the youth service in Norton Radstock. She submitted a petition of 94 signatures in support of her statement. The Chair referred the statement and petition to Councillor Chris Watt for his consideration.

Agnes Melling made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4*] asking the Cabinet to ensure that it consulted with all those affected before making a decision about the closure of Pulteney Bridge to traffic. She felt that the 6-month trial without buses over the winter period would leave the old and infirm struggling to cope. The Chair referred the statement to Councillor Terry Gazzard for his consideration.

Councillor Gazzard asked Agnes Melling whether she was aware of the cracks in the bridge and whether she had seen photographs which he felt would convince her of the urgency. Agnes said that at the meeting in September the impression given had been that the bridge was safe.

Stefan Difinitzio (Youth Parliament) made a statement saying how important youth services were to him and his peers. He told the Cabinet that the Keynsham Time Out Centre was hardly funded and the funding to Radstock Youth Centre was very small but was going to be cut further. He appealed to the Cabinet to reconsider their proposals. The Chair referred the statement to Councillor Chris Watt for his consideration.

Manda Rigby made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5*] in which she asked the Cabinet to use its influence to persuade the bus company to reinstate its services across Pulteney Bridge while the future of the bridge was being considered and while further consultation and traffic modelling was undertaken. The Chair referred the statement to Councillor Terry Gazzard for his consideration.

117 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETINGS

On a motion from Councillor Francine Haerberling, seconded by Councillor Vic Pritchard, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 21st July 2010 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 18th August 2010 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

118 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

119 CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REFERRED BY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BODIES

There were none

120 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

The Cabinet agreed to note the report

121 SMART ECONOMIC GROWTH IN B&NES (INCLUDING REGENERATION DELIVERY PLANS)

Councillor Paul Crossley made an *ad hoc* statement in which he expressed his appreciation and respect for the work of the Economic Development Council. He asked when a proposed timeline would be made available. He observed that the report made no mention of the Local Education Partnership, nor the demise of the Regional Development Agency. There was passing reference to the threats and opportunities resulting from the possible loss of the Ministry of Defence from Bath. The Bath Western Riverside project and the Norton Radstock Regeneration had only passing mentions.

The Chair invited the Divisional Director (Development & Regeneration) to make a statement. He apologised to Cabinet that there were a small number of factual errors in appendix 2 of the published papers and said that steps were in hand to ensure that these were corrected. However, there was no change to the overall sense of direction recommended in the report.

Councillor Terry Gazzard introduced the item by saying that the report described the plans for developing the vision. It would lead to real action. Real change was taking place in the economy and it would be necessary to be prepared for the future. The proposals would build on the economic strengths of the area and would create 8500 to 9000 new jobs by 2026 in high growth areas such as technology. The proposals were in line with the Council's economic priorities.

Councillor Vic Pritchard referred to paragraph 1.7 of the report, which he felt summed up the proposals and made him pleased to second the proposal.

Councillor Chris Watt fully endorsed Councillor Pritchard's comments and he particularly welcomed the proposals for the Somer valley. In reference to Councillor Crossley's comments about the Regional Development Agency, he said that the RDA had not delivered any benefits and was therefore irrelevant to the discussion in hand.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney responded to Councillor Crossley's mention of the Local Education Partnership by saying that the Council did have plans to benefit from the LDA and to ensure that it attracted fair funding from government. He reminded the Cabinet that the proposals regarding the Commercial Estate were not new but had been discussed for a number of years.

On a motion from Councillor Terry Gazzard seconded by Councillor Vic Pritchard it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that the 'story' be used as a coherent narrative that records the journey between 2005 and the present and sets aspirations for the future;

(2) To ADOPT the Local Economic Assessment as required by the 2009 Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act. This will also provide an evidence base for our economic interventions and the emerging Core Strategy.

(3) To ASK the Director of Major Projects in consultation with the Leader of the Council to work with consultants to amend some minor inaccuracies in the report;

(4) To NOTE the growth aspirations to create 8,500 – 9,000 net new jobs as the Cabinet's Economic Strategy in B&NES to 2026 and the interventions to deliver these, in particular those set out in the Regeneration Delivery Plans and that these be confirmed and completed together with the 'story' by the Strategic Director for Development and Major Projects in consultation with Cabinet members following confirmation of the Council's agreement to this level of growth when it makes its decision on the Core Strategy at Council in December.

[At this point Councillor David Hawkins joined the meeting]

122 FUTURE COUNCIL

Councillor John Bull made a statement reminding Cabinet that a number of years earlier, the previous Minister Nicholas Ridley had envisioned that councils would merely hand out contracts. He felt that this day was closer as a result of the actions of the current government. He asked the Cabinet to ensure that all proposals to cut services were debated openly and fairly.

Councillor Paul Crossley made a statement in which he pointed out that the report acknowledged that change was already ongoing. He felt that the Cabinet should have consulted on their proposals sooner.

Peter Duppa Miller (Secretary to B&NES Local Councils Group and Clerk to Combe Hay Parish Council) made an *ad hoc* statement explaining that the North East Somerset Town and Parish Councils Association was keen to engage with the Council by developing the provision of local services by local councils. He said that Combe Hay Council, for example, was prepared to man a local library service if adequate funding could be negotiated with the Council.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney introduced the proposals. He explained that the country had inherited a deficit of £157Bn and that while bankers, business and government should all share their portion of the blame, what was important now would be to live within our means. He agreed that it was necessary to reduce the Council's management structure but observed that it was the existing management which had delivered the high performing Council under the leadership of Cabinet. He felt that the market had begun to recover, so there were opportunities to benefit from this. He regretted that there had been no credible alternatives from other Groups on the

Council. There would be specific proposals to Council in November but what was needed from Cabinet was to provide a steer. He welcomed the offer from Peter Duppa-Miller, which was very welcome.

Councillor Francine Haeberling seconded the proposal. She thanked Councillor Hanney for his hard work in preparing the report.

Councillor Chris Watt said that one of the most significant changes would be the way in which education was delivered. He assured the Cabinet that the transition was being carefully managed and that the proposals would protect vulnerable people.

On a motion from Councillor Malcolm Hanney seconded by Councillor Francine Haeberling it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To NOTE the report on a response to public sector finance pressures;

(2) To CONFIRM the strategic steer in the report relating to key areas of the Council's business;

(3) To NOTE that a report and proposals will be submitted to Council relating to certain immediate issues (such as the Joint Health & Social Care Provider and the Commercial Estate);

(4) To ASK the Chief Executive to continue to prepare options for a revised management structure in the light of the proposals.

123 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING, CASH LIMITS AND VIREMENTS - APRIL 2010 TO JULY 2010

Councillor Paul Crossley made an *ad hoc* statement expressing his respect for the contribution made by the Council's existing management. He particularly wished to congratulate Glen Chipp for his excellent achievements under difficult circumstances. Councillor Crossley asked that Cabinet ensure that the use of the Financial Challenge Reserve would be subject to proper scrutiny.

Councillor Malcolm Hanney in proposing the item agreed with Councillor Crossley that the management of the Council had shown real leadership, particularly by living within budget to ensure that the Council would be in good shape to benefit from the economic recovery. He assured Councillor Crossley that the Chair of the Corporate Performance and Resources Overview and Scrutiny Panel could ask for information about the reserves at any time.

Councillor Chris Watt seconded the proposal.

On a motion from Councillor Malcolm Hanney seconded by Councillor Chris Watt it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To ASK Strategic Directors to continue to work towards managing within budget in the current year for their respective service areas, and to manage below budget where possible by not committing unnecessary expenditure, through tight budgetary control;

(2) To NOTE this year's revenue budget position;

(3) To NOTE the Council's capital expenditure position in the financial year to the end of September and the year end projections detailed in the report;

(4) To AGREE the revenue virements listed for approval;

(5) To NOTE the listed changes in the capital programme;

(6) To APPROVE the additions to the 2010/11 Capital Programme;

(7) To NOTE the efficiencies forecast for 2010/11.

124 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT TO 30TH SEPTEMBER 2010

Councillor Malcolm Hanney proposed the item. He felt that the report showed clearly that the financial management had been performed very well.

Councillor Charles Gerrish seconded the proposal.

On a motion from Councillor Malcolm Hanney seconded by Councillor Charles Gerrish it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To NOTE the Treasury Management Report to 30th September 2010, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice;

(2) To NOTE the Treasury Management Indicators to 30th September 2010;

(3) To ASK the Divisional Director, Finance, to submit the Treasury Management Report and attached appendices to November Council.

The meeting ended at 6.10 pm

Chair _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

CABINET MEETING 3rd Nov 2010

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

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

There were 5 statements at the meeting.

- Pamela Galloway, Save Our 6-7 Buses
Re: 6-7 Buses
- Cllr Dr Eleanor Jackson
Re: Radstock Youth Club (and to submit a petition)
- Stefan Difinitzio (Youth Parliament)
Re: Youth Services
- Agnes Melling
Re: Pulteney Bridge
- Manda Rigby
Re: Pulteney Bridge

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

01	Question from: Councillor Nigel Roberts
<p>A number of bins have gone missing in Odd Down and other parts of Bath, we have repeatedly asked for them to be replaced, some requests stretch over 6 months. Who is making the decision not to replace these bins? A bench has gone missing from Rush Hill, who has made the decision not to replace this?</p>	
	Answer from: Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>I am aware that a number of litter bins have gone missing over recent months; it is believed that these are being stolen for their scrap metal value. The Council is liaising with the Police over this matter and is taking steps to ensure that bins are installed in a manner so as to avoid such thefts in the future.</i></p> <p><i>An officer manages the day to day installation of litter bins and reviews any requests for new ones. A judgement is made on whether the installation of a bin will help to reduce litter levels in the immediate area, having consideration of the number of bins that are already in the area. With respect to Odd Down, the Council has recently replaced a bin in Old Frome Road and assessed a request for a bin in Odins Road (where there is a play area nearby that already has a bin</i></p>	

in it). Officers were not hitherto aware of a missing bench on Rush Hill but will investigate this matter.

I would ask that Cllr Roberts liaises with Joanna Brain, (Street Scene Officer) to discuss any bins that are missing from Odd Down so that any necessary replacements can be installed.

Officers will in the near future be reviewing our policy for the installation of litter bins to ensure that the most appropriate bins are located in the right places. This will also involve consideration of installing bins for recyclable materials in appropriate locations.

02

Question from: Councillor Cherry Beath

The Public Realm and Movement Strategy refers to a “feasibility and design study leading to the closure of Pulteney Bridge to buses and taxis” (page 57). Has such a study been made, and if not, could the Cabinet member explain why draft proposals to close the bridge were published before the study was begun?

Answer from: Councillor Terry Gazzard

A traffic modelling study was carried out on a proposal to close Pulteney Bridge at the time the Public Realm and Movement Strategy was being developed.

03

Question from: Councillor Cherry Beath

Why is the closure of Pulteney Bridge currently under consideration, when it is listed under “second generation” projects in the Public Realm and Movement Strategy?

Answer from: Councillor Terry Gazzard

Pulteney Estates Residents’ Association sought to progress the closure of Pulteney Bridge at the earliest opportunity

04

Question from: Councillor Ian Gilchrist

Can the Cabinet Member for Customer Services please find out and report what is happening with the proposed re-location of the pedestrian crossing on Wells Road? This was the subject of a petition approximately two years ago, following a fatality, and agreement from officers following a pedestrian survey, that the current crossing should be moved about 80m down the hill.

Answer from: Councillor Charles Gerrish

The investigation following the petition requesting relocation of the existing crossing on A367 Wells Road, recommended that a scheme be identified, and then subject to prioritisation for possible inclusion within a future Traffic and Safety works programme.

Accordingly, a nominal scheme to remove the existing Pelican crossing, and install a new Puffin crossing at a site further east, has been placed on the Task Register, and will need to be considered alongside other schemes for inclusion in a future Capital Works Programme.

Supplementary Question:

Is the Cabinet member aware that data from the Widcombe Speed Watch scheme shows that Wells Rd has the worst speed record of the roads being monitored, and whether this would cause him to ask officers to raise the priority for this scheme?

Answer from: Councillor Charles Gerrish

Officers would be happy to view the Speed Watch figures, and liaise with the Police to consider whether any remedial measures are appropriate. Unfortunately the priority of the scheme is unlikely to be affected by this information.

05

Question from: Councillor Eleanor Jackson

Why is Radstock Youth Club taking a cut of 60% not 40% as elsewhere?

Answer from: Councillor Chris Watt

The changes to the youth service are being implemented after a thorough review of the service and extensive consultation with staff and also with wider stakeholders.

There are no set percentage cuts such as 60% or 40%; changes are being made on the needs and demand in each area. The changes will however ensure that the Youth Service is able to do much more than provide services direct to young people and include a clear focus on building local capacity to provide a range of opportunities for young people.

Given this combined activity in the future there may well be more activities in the Radstock area than currently not less.

Supplementary Question:

Thank you for the interesting reply. The Cabinet member said in his reply that the focus was to "build local capacity" – could he clarify this and also could he agree to give a year's grace so that local communities can prepare themselves and get things in place to provide these opportunities to young people?

Answer from:	Councillor Chris Watt
<p><i>There has already been a year of grace, because these changes were flagged up a year ago to local communities. The intention is that local voluntary groups will come forward with proposals to run local youth clubs which could be supported by the Council with pump-priming funds.</i></p>	

06	Question from:	Councillor Nigel Roberts
<p>Please could the Executive member report on what the Council is doing to ensure that the Wansdyke through Odd Down is safeguarded and that the footpath that runs along the Wansdyke is passable for walkers.</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>The section of the Wansdyke earthwork that runs through Odd Down and South Stoke is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. This is a national designation placing legal restrictions and obligations on the relevant land owner, which are enforced by English Heritage (on behalf of DCMS). Due to ongoing management problems and anti-social behaviour affecting this section of the Wansdyke, the council's Archaeological Officer has hosted meetings of the local ward councillors (including Cllr Roberts), South Stoke parish councillors, English Heritage, interested local residents, the Police, PROW Officers and Parks Officers. As a result of these meetings English Heritage are keen to establish a monument management strategy/plan for this stretch of the monument, and with the agreement of the above working group have produced a brief for the management plan.</i></p> <p><i>Further progress was made this year when ownership of the Odd Down section of the monument and adjacent public open space was transferred from Crest to the Council's Parks Department, while the South Stoke section remains in private ownership. As part of the adoption of Sulis Meadows, including The Wansdyke, a commuted sum was provided to fund the maintenance of the grass, trees shrubs and vegetation. The Archaeological Officer and Arboricultural Officer will meet on site over the winter period with English Heritage to agree the management regime that provides the best protection for the monument. The condition of the footpath associated with the monument is also being looked at as part of ongoing discussions between English Heritage and the Council's PROW Officers. However, as a result of the Government's spending review English Heritage are about to lose 32% of their budget and we are now uncertain whether they will still be able to support this project. The Archaeological Officer has contacted English Heritage on this issue and will coordinate another working group meeting once the situation becomes clearer. In the meantime the Council's Parks Officers and PROW Officers will continue working with those concerned to resolve the ongoing problems affecting the monument and footpath.</i></p>		

07

Question from:	Councillor Nicholas Coombes
Is there any evidence to support the reported suggestion that Pulteney Bridge is suffering structural damage from carrying traffic?	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>On 28th October a limited visual inspection of the basements below No. 17 Argyle St. (The Bridge Café) was carried out by a Senior Structural Engineer in conjunction with Property Services. There was evidence of previous structural repairs at, and close to, the support of the end gable wall of the building above. This long standing repair had failed again which resulted in further movement and opening of the cracks previously filled with mortar.</i></p> <p><i>A temporary scaffolding system will be erected in the basement to support the reinforced concrete floor slab and external façade to facilitate permanent works at a later date.</i></p>	

08

Question from:	Councillor Nicholas Coombes
<p>The closure of Pulteney Bridge will lead to bus and taxi traffic being displaced to other routes around Bath. Could the Cabinet member confirm what work was done on traffic modelling before the publication of the closure TRO? Is it not correct that the traffic modelling which has been carried out only envisages the closure of the bridge as part of a package including changes to the layout of the bus gate?</p>	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>The traffic modelling work carried out as part of Public Realm and Movement Strategy investigated a variety of traffic management measures including the closure of Pulteney Bridge. The overall effect on the wider transport network of extending the bus gate and closing Pulteney Bridge was not found to be significant, because of the relatively low number of vehicles crossing the bridge. More detailed traffic modelling of the junction of North Parade and Pulteney Road subsequently carried out on the impact of closing Pulteney Bridge on alternative routes confirmed this.</i></p>	
Supplementary Question:	
<p>My question asked for confirmation that the traffic modelling carried out only envisaged the closure of the bridge as part of a package in conjunction with other proposals (eg to the operation of the bus gate). Could the Cabinet member now confirm to us that the closure of Pulteney Bridge was always considered in conjunction with other proposals, not as a stand-alone proposal?</p>	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish

The closure of Pulteney Bridge and proposals in the High Street are entirely separate traffic management proposals and are not dependent on each other. Public realm improvements for the High Street are being taken forward as part of the Bath Transportation Package and linking the two projects has never been considered.

Proposals for High Street and Pulteney Bridge are identified as separate schemes in the Public Realm and Movement Strategy (P74).

The traffic modelling study considered a number of ideas emerging from the Public Realm and Movement Strategy and, for efficiency and cost effectiveness, the idea of extending the bus gate in the High Street and idea of closing Pulteney Bridge were modelled together. The overall impact of both these measures on the highway network were not considered to be significant. The conclusion drawn was that the impact of the closure of Pulteney Bridge on its own would not have a significant impact.

This conclusion was confirmed by detailed junction analysis of the Pulteney Road/North Parade junction, which modelled the closure of Pulteney Bridge on its own.

The idea to extend the bus gate in the High St is not being taken forward and is not necessary in order to implement the closure of Pulteney Bridge.

09

Question from:	Councillor Nicholas Coombes
Will B&NES request an emergency order to return full bus service to Great Pulteney Street while the Pulteney Bridge closure TRO is considered?	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<i>The Council has already secured an agreement from First Bus to re-route the No. 4 service via Great Pulteney Street and will continue discussions regarding other affected services.</i>	
Supplementary Question:	
Can the Cabinet member say whether in his view the mitigation measures are enough to support the needs of local people?	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<i>As I said, further conversations are still ongoing.</i>	

10

Question from:	Councillor Marian McNeir
Could the cabinet member comment on the value of the arts to the local economy	

and the growth prospects for this sector, especially given that the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership submission refers to the creative and media sector as a key sector?

Answer from: Councillor Terry Gazzard

The value of the cultural and creative industries to the district

Recent research shows that Bath and North East Somerset has strengths in what are called the “Creative Industries” – including publishing, television and radio, animation, and film and video.

The South West Regional Development Agency (SWRDA) estimates that the Creative Industries generate some £220m (2008) in GVA in Bath and North East Somerset. (Value added is the difference between the value of goods and services produced and cost of raw materials and other inputs that are used in production. Gross Value added therefore is the sum of all the value added by activities that produce goods and services). The GVA for Creative Industries compares locally with the Financial sector’s contribution of £158m and £349m from the Distribution and Retail sector.

The research suggests Bath and North East Somerset has the highest proportion of Creative Industries among all Upper Tier Local Authorities in the South West – higher even than Bristol.

Under the South West Regional Development Agency’s definition of the Creative Industries (which includes arts, crafts, media, and architectural and engineering activities), Bath and North East Somerset contains:

- A total of 6,700 people reliant upon the Creative Industries for their livelihood employed in 700 business units with 4,200 employees*
- 2,500 further individuals in self employment*
- 3,200 separate ‘enterprises’*
- Media market leaders such as Future Publishing and Touch Productions are based in Bath*
- Creative Bath, a business network for those involved in the creative industries, which now has 935 individual members.*

The creative industries in B&NES achieve an annual turnover in excess of £800 million (GWE Business West Research, Feb 2010).

According to a recent report by GWE Business South West, commissioned by Creative Bath:

- The proportion of employment in B&NES in the Creative Industries at 5.4% is more than twice the South West regional proportion at 2.5% and significantly higher than the national average of 3.0%.*
- The Creative Industries in B&NES already account for 8.3% of all employing units, well above the regional average of 5.2% and the national average of 5.8%.*
- There are more businesses and employees in B&NES in the Creative Industries than in Tourism.*

Research into the economic impact of cultural businesses, commissioned by Bath Area Cultural Forum from Dr Peter Dawson of the University of Bath (2010), shows that:

- The economic value of cultural activities in B&NES is estimated to be at the very least £157 million every year.*
- Cultural activities generate at a minimum over 6,000 jobs for the local*

economy.

The Council specifically aims to grow the proportion of jobs in those activities falling within the Creative Industries which are the most productive. These activities (including publishing, and architectural and engineering activities) are generally contained within the broad Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) industries of "Information and Communication" and "Professional and Scientific". Our aim, articulated in the Economic Strategy, is to grow the proportion of jobs in B&NES within these two industries from a current 13% of the economy to 20% of the economy by 2026.

Bath Area Cultural Forum has 70 + members (organisational memberships) and the Council provided support to set up (officer time and modest financial support of £3,500 p/a over past two years)

The Council's investment in culture and the arts

Future Bath Plus has been set up as public / private partnership between the Council and local businesses. FBP has strong interest in the support & development of cultural activity, especially through the FBP Public Events Panel which has an overview of major festivals and events.

Council funding for Arts Development 2009-10 was £646,000, which levered a further £1,384,000 coming into the district from other external sources (ratio: 1:2.14).

Arts organisations in receipt of contracts or grant funding achieved this leverage from commercial sponsorship, box office earnings, donations & charitable giving, and bids to trusts & foundations.

It should be noted that this figure is based solely on the information which the Council can collect from funded arts organisations. If organisations which are not Council-funded were to declare their leverage figures as well, the total would be greatly in excess of £1.384m.

The Council has also given significant support to (for example) Theatre Royal Bath (£100k) and Holburne Museum (£200k) for building re-development projects.

11

Question from:	Councillor Marian McNeir
What match funding, deriving from grants by the Council, is given to arts organisations locally?	
Answer from:	Councillor Terry Gazzard
Council funding for Arts Development 2009-10 was £646,000, which levered a further £1,384,000 coming into the district from other external sources. The Council's Arts Development team does not currently require arts organisations to report on the sources of their additional income, ie. whether from local businesses or from elsewhere. We ask arts organisations to report two figures: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Total income p/a (turnover)• Total leverage funding 'Leverage' has the following definition:	

This is the total amount of funding your organisation obtained in grants and donations from sources other than the Council - such as Arts Council England, other public funding bodies, charitable trusts and foundations, individual and corporate sponsorship, donations or bequests. This should be expressed as a total sum in pounds. Note: this figure excludes earned/box office income.

We do not ask organisations to break-down the total leverage into separate amounts for the different sources or types of income.

However, Officers can make the following observations based on their knowledge of local arts organisations:

- Four local arts organisations currently receive core funding from Arts Council England, totalling £455,132 in 2010-11
- Other arts organisations received one-off project funding from Arts Council England £159,451 in 2009-10
- (note this also includes awards to individual artists)
- Smaller organisations will tend to attract corporate donations or sponsorship primarily from local businesses, and from private/individual donors. Businesses include for example, solicitors, accountancy firms, retailers of all types.
- Larger organisations will tend to additionally attract corporate donations or sponsorship from national businesses
 - this reflects the fact that larger organisations have the staffing capacity to devote to fundraising, whereas smaller organisations are usually reliant on one or two part-time members of staff (and sometimes are run solely by volunteers)
 Businesses include for example, national press/media publications, retailers of all types, financial services/products businesses.
- Organisations of all sizes/scales have had successes with applications to the Lottery and to charitable trusts and foundations.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

12

Question from: Manda Rigby

(a) I understand that there is now going to be a six month period before a final decision on the closure of Pulteney Bridge to traffic is made. I'd like to know what will be done during this time, to be assured that the full public consultation Cllr Haerberling promised will be carried out, to know what was therefore done prior to this initial TRO if it now appears a further 6 months work needs to be done and, most importantly, will the council use emergency powers to restore the bus service to its status quo before First moved their routes during this time?

(b) Can you let me know the results of the partial consultations done previously and, given the fact that PERA has now distanced itself from fully supporting the

closure, and the Juice bar has both changed hands and the previous owners said their petition showing in favour of the closure was based on 2 bits of misinformation, that the bridge was being destroyed by the traffic and that there would be full pedestrianisation allowing them to put tables and chairs across the bridge, can you let me know who actually now supports the proposal in its current form?

Answer from: Councillor Charles Gerrish

(a) Cllr Haeberling is awaiting requested names of individuals for her to meet. The Traffic Regulation Order was published in draft form for consultation allowing the Council to consider the issues raised and where possible find ways of resolving any objections before deciding whether to proceed with the Traffic Regulation Order or modify it.

The Council is currently addressing two of the main issues raised out of the consultation process which are the loss of bus services and delays on alternative routes as a result of diverting buses and taxis onto alternative routes.

Service 4 will be diverted via Great Pulteney Street and Edward St from 14th November 2010 to improve bus access. Minor work is also being undertaken on Pulteney Road to improve the flow of traffic at peak times. The Council will evaluate the impact of these improvements over the next 6 months.

The routing of commercial services is a decision for First. The Council does not have any emergency powers to direct First to route commercial services over Pulteney Bridge.

Prior to carrying out a comprehensive consultation, the draft Traffic Regulation Order the Council carried out detailed informal consultations with a wide range of stakeholders.

(b) In November 2009 prior to advertising the draft Traffic Regulation Order, informal consultations were carried out with a wide range of stakeholders to consider the following issues:

- Impact on city centre access for emergency vehicles;*
- Longer route via North Parade and higher cost for taxi/public hire operators*
- Longer route via North Parade and higher cost for bus operators;*
- Loading and unloading restrictions for business affected by the proposals;*
- Delays in North Parade/Manvers St affecting buses and taxis following the opening of the first phase of Southgate.*

In general, resident groups and businesses in the pedestrianised area were supportive of the proposed closure, including the Pulteney Estates Residents' Association (PERA).

PERA's update position as stated in their email of 22nd October 2010 is that the bridge should be closed to buses and taxis, but additional bus services should be provided along Great Pulteney Street to Laura Place and back again.

Statement by Barbara Gordon

Appx 2

Statement by the Save Our 6-7 Buses Campaign to B&NES Cabinet

3 November, 2010

As a result of the Save Our 6-7 Buses campaign, the link between Larkhall and Fairfield Park was reinstated in August. This was indeed a success. However, where we previously had a regular 20 minute service, we were left with an unsatisfactory, irregular, 40 minute service, which has caused much confusion and, at times, overcrowded buses. The campaign team are meeting with Justin Davies, the South-West Managing Director of First Bus on 22nd November, to try to have an additional bus put on the route, to get as near to a half-hourly service as possible. First have previously said this would require Council assistance, with implications for next year's Transport budget.

At the Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel meeting on 23rd September we announced the formation of the Bath Bus Users Group, (Bath BUG,) in which we have joined forces with other bus users across Bath. At that meeting the Bath BUG called for B&NES to reinstate the Public Transport Liaison Panel and for the Bus Users Group to have representation.

We are very pleased to note the response from the Cabinet Member for Service Delivery supporting the Panel's recommendation that the Public Transport Liaison Panel be reinstated. We are now in a position to respond to the first proviso that it must be supported by public transport operators. On October 7th the Bath BUG held an open meeting which was attended by senior management of all the Bath bus operators and they unanimously expressed a willingness to support our group and work with us.

We appreciate that following the National Spending Review there will inevitably be cuts in funding which may affect the transport budget. However, we believe a Public Transport Liaison Panel could save Council time and through better consultation avoid the recent problems caused by changes to several city bus routes.

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT TO THE CABINET

3RD NOVEMBER 2010

PULTENEY BRIDGE

I want to speak to you this evening as a resident of the Pulteney Bridge area.

It is a good area to live, as it is conveniently placed for amenities, shops, the post office, banks, the library, a doctors' surgery and a supermarket. Because of this many people have chosen to "downsize" to the area after retirement.

However, as the years pass by, retired people become unable to manage the walk into the centre. On a retirement income they now need a convenient bus to help them to get to, and more especially back from the bank, the shops and the Post Office. But with not so much as a word the Council has taken the convenient buses away.

This is the Council that says on its internet that, "It will listen to and consult with those affected by its policies"

Residents made it very clear at the very well attended September public meeting what they wanted. Many people thought that Cllr. Haerberling had undertaken to start again and do the job properly..

But what they have decided on is a six month trial without the buses. This can only be interpreted as the Council wishing to see how the old and infirm residents of the Pulteney Area can manage without a bus service over the difficult winter months.

Every issue in Abbey Ward is also a city issue, and local Councillors have a special duty to look after their residents and see that their needs are not overlooked.

So what is the great gain for the city that is to be won at the expense of the older less mobile residents?

An "open space" over the Bridge. A space no more than 65yds long that will always have emergency vehicles, bikes, horses and taxis (unless you are planning to further penalise us) going across it.

Yes, the bridge is historic, safe and attractive from the river, but very ordinary otherwise. It is not suited to be developed as an open space. Is this is more important than the welfare of the older residents

The Bridge was built in the 1760s to provide access TO the city from the Pulteney estate. Do not go down in history as the Cabinet who 250 years later reversed it.

Agnes Melling

**STATEMENT TO CABINET NOV 3RD
MANDA RIGBY
REF THE PROPOSED CLOSURE OF PULTENEY BRIDGE**

Hello, I am talking to you this evening representing the 150 people who came to a public meeting about the closure of the bridge to traffic, and also the large number of people who did not attend the meeting because of the lack of buses to get there, but who also contacted me to express their opinion.

I appreciate that there are many complex and interconnected issues relating to the bridge closure. These include protecting Bath's heritage, pedestrian safety on the bridge and traffic management. I welcome the fact that the Council will now take "at least six months" to undergo a proper consultation, but regret that this was not done prior to September 5th, the proposed date for the bridge closure.

The current situation however is the worst of all worlds. The buses have re-routed, yet the bridge is still open to taxis. This being the case, in no way can this period be seen as a valid trial of full bridge closure, all it will serve to do is deny those in Abbey, Bathwick and beyond any acceptable public transport into Central Bath.

If the council is now acknowledging it needs to do far more consultation and traffic modelling before it can make a final decision, please may I urge it to return the buses to the status quo prior to Sept 5th whilst it does so?

First buses re-routed because they told the bridge was going to be closed (and this was before the TRO consultation had even started) and I am sure if the will is there, they could be persuaded by the council to revert to previous timetables and routes for the next six months, and even do this using emergency powers, not the normal 56 days notice.

Residents unanimously wanted this at the public meeting, tourist buses and others are increasingly complaining about North Parade congestion, and this is before the extended 3 week Christmas market impacts Bath at the end of this month.

Whatever the final outcome may be, and there are some innovative compromise solutions being talked about, don't let the residents down by inconveniencing them unnecessarily whilst due thought is now given to this issue

Thank you

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet Meeting Resolution

**Executive
Forward Plan
Reference**

E2195

Smart Economic Growth in B&NES (including Regeneration Delivery Plans)

Date of Meeting	3-Nov-10
The Issue	<i>This report outlines the ways in which the smart growth agenda will strengthen the local economy, promote high value employment and encourage investment. The Regeneration Delivery Plans respond to the particular characteristics of the sub-economies, and outline actions to deliver commercial premises and achieve sustainable growth.</i>
The decision	<p>On a motion from Councillor Terry Gazzard seconded by Councillor Vic Pritchard it was RESOLVED (unanimously)</p> <p>(1) To AGREE that the 'story' be used as a coherent narrative that records the journey between 2005 and the present and sets aspirations for the future;</p> <p>(2) To ADOPT the Local Economic Assessment as required by the 2009 Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act. This will also provide an evidence base for our economic interventions and the emerging Core Strategy.</p> <p>(3) To ASK the Director of Major Projects in consultation with the Leader of the Council to work with consultants to amend some minor inaccuracies in the report;</p> <p>(4) To NOTE the growth aspirations to create 8,500 – 9,000 net new jobs as the Cabinet's Economic Strategy in B&NES to 2026 and the interventions to deliver these, in particular those set out in the Regeneration Delivery Plans and that these be confirmed and completed together with the 'story' by the Strategic Director for Development and Major Projects in consultation with Cabinet members following confirmation of the Council's agreement to this level of growth when it makes its decision on the Core Strategy at Council in December.</p>
Rationale for decision	To safeguard health and wellbeing by ensuring the economy is strengthened in a way that preserves what is best about B&NES
Other options considered	B&NES is in competition with other areas in a difficult economic climate, and if we do not grasp the challenge and adopt the principle of smart economic growth, our residents and businesses will not be able to take advantage of potential economic growth and wealth creation
The Decision is subject to Call-In within 5 working days of publication of the decision	

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet Meeting Resolution

Executive Forward Plan Reference	E2196
---	--------------

Future Council

Date of Meeting	3-Nov-10
The Issue	<i>Development of Strategy in Response to Coalition Government plans and Public Sector Finances</i>
The decision	<p>On a motion from Councillor Malcolm Hanney seconded by Councillor Francine Haerberling it was RESOLVED (unanimously)</p> <p>(1) To NOTE the report on a response to public sector finance pressures;</p> <p>(2) To CONFIRM the strategic steer in the report relating to key areas of the Council's business;</p> <p>(3) To NOTE that a report and proposals will be submitted to Council relating to certain immediate issues (such as the Joint Health & Social Care Provider and the Commercial Estate);</p> <p>(4) To ASK the Chief Executive to continue to prepare options for a revised management structure in the light of the proposals.</p>
Rationale for decision	In order to emerge stronger from the public sector finance pressures, the Council needs to make strategic decisions about how it will manage its key business. This requires a firm lead from the Cabinet, which is given in the report.
Other options considered	The Council must agree its approach to national financial pressures to position itself to benefit from the recovery.
The Decision is subject to Call-In within 5 working days of publication of the decision	

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet Meeting Resolution

Executive
Forward Plan
Reference

E2129

Revenue and Capital Budget Monitoring, Cash Limits and Virements - April 2010 to July 2010

Date of Meeting	3-Nov-10
The Issue	<i>This report presents the first monitoring information for the Authority as a whole for the financial year 2010/11 to the end of July 2010. The report also includes a number of budget transfer requests for both revenue and capital that require Cabinet agreement or are reported for information purposes as prescribed by the Budget Management Scheme</i>
The decision	<p>On a motion from Councillor Malcolm Hanney seconded by Councillor Chris Watt it was RESOLVED (unanimously)</p> <p>(1) To ASK Strategic Directors to continue to work towards managing within budget in the current year for their respective service areas, and to manage below budget where possible by not committing unnecessary expenditure, through tight budgetary control;</p> <p>(2) To NOTE this year's revenue budget position;</p> <p>(3) To NOTE the Council's capital expenditure position in the financial year to the end of September and the year end projections detailed in the report;</p> <p>(4) To AGREE the revenue virements listed for approval;</p> <p>(5) To NOTE the listed changes in the capital programme;</p> <p>(6) To APPROVE the additions to the 2010/11 Capital Programme;</p> <p>(7) To NOTE the efficiencies forecast for 2010/11.</p>
Rationale for decision	The report is presented as part of the reporting of financial management and budgetary control required by the Council
Other options considered	None
The Decision is subject to Call-In within 5 working days of publication of the decision	

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet Meeting Resolution

Executive
Forward Plan
Reference

E2164

**Treasury Management Monitoring Report to 30th
September 2010**

Date of Meeting	3-Nov-10
The Issue	<i>This report gives details of performance against the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Plan 2010/11 for the first 6 months of 2010/11</i>
The decision	On a motion from Councillor Malcolm Hanney seconded by Councillor Charles Gerrish it was RESOLVED (unanimously) (1) To NOTE the Treasury Management Report to 30th September 2010, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice; (2) To NOTE the Treasury Management Indicators to 30th September 2010; (3) To ASK the Divisional Director, Finance, to submit the Treasury Management Report and attached appendices to November Council.
Rationale for decision	The Prudential Code and CIPFA's Code of Practice on Treasury Management requires regular monitoring and reporting of Treasury Management activities
Other options considered	None

The Decision is subject to Call-In within 5 working days of publication of the decision

This page is intentionally left blank