

## **BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

### **MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING**

Thursday, 20th January, 2011

Present:- **Councillors** Simon Allen, Sharon Ball, Tim Ball, Colin Barrett, Gabriel Batt, Cherry Beath, David Bellotti, Loraine Brinkhurst MBE, John Bull, Neil Butters, Bryan Chalker, Anthony Clarke, Victor Clarke, Nicholas Coombes, Paul Crossley, Gerry Curran, Sally Davis, Douglas Deacon, Ian Dewey, David Dixon, Peter Edwards, Andrew Furse, Terry Gazzard, Charles Gerrish, Ian Gilchrist, Francine Haerberling, Alan Hale, Malcolm Hanney, Nathan Hartley, David Hawkins, Lynda Hedges, Steve Hedges, Adrian Inker, Eleanor Jackson, Les Kew, Malcolm Lees, Marie Longstaff, Barry Macrae, Shaun McGall, Bryan Organ, Vic Pritchard, Caroline Roberts, Nigel Roberts, Dine Romero, Will Sandry, Brian Simmons, David Speirs, Roger Symonds, Martin Veal, Tim Warren, Chris Watt, Brian Webber, Brook Whelan, John Whittock, Stephen Willcox and Gordon Wood

Apologies for absence: Councillors Rob Appleyard, Chris Cray, Colin Darracott, Armand Edwards, Marian McNeir MBE, Carol Paradise and Shirley Steel

#### **63 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Chairman drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure set out on the agenda which was read out.

#### **64 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Alan Hale declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in the agenda item on the Joint Local Transport Plan (Report 7) because of his employment as Senior Road Safety Officer at South Gloucestershire Council.

#### **65 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OR FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

The Chairman:

1. Informed Council of the deaths which had taken place since the last Council Meeting of former Councillor Richard Maybury, Lambridge Ward and Dick King-Smith, noted local author of children`s books. The Council placed on record its appreciation of their service to the community and its condolences to their families and stood in silence as a mark of respect in their memory.
2. Referred to International Holocaust Memorial Day taking place on Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> January and encouraged everyone to participate in the local commemorative events. The Chairman informed Councillors that she would be lighting a memorial candle in the Guildhall foyer at 9am to remain lit through the day until close of business.
3. Asked everyone to turn off their mobile phone or switch it to silent to avoid disrupting the meeting and because of the possibility that if they remained

switched on they might interfere with the sound system in the Chamber or the videolink to the Banqueting Room.

4. Referred to the agenda item timings on the briefing sheet for this meeting which had been agreed with the Group Leaders and asked Councillors to keep contributions to debate brief and relevant and not to repeat what had already been said by colleagues.
5. Indicated that she proposed to waive Council Rule 37 so as not to permit Councillors seconding motions or amendments being able to reserve their right to speak until later in the debate, but to require all seconders, if they wished to speak, to do so when they had seconded the motion or amendment. The Council indicated its agreement.
6. Indicated that she did not propose to announce a comfort break unless the meeting was likely to continue well beyond 9pm.

## **66 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN**

There were no items of urgent business for this meeting.

## **67 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were three questions from members of the public as listed in the Appendix to these minutes. The questions asked and answers given in writing as circulated at the meeting are held on file in the minute book and published on the Council's website with the draft minutes of this meeting.

There were nine statements from members of the public as indicated below. Copies of the statements provided by the speakers which were circulated at the meeting are held on file in the minute book and published on the Council's website with the draft minutes of this meeting.

- (A) Mr David Redgewell on behalf of South West Transport Network made a statement urging the Council to support the Joint Local Transport Plan prepared in conjunction with neighbouring local authorities and to reinforce the efforts made by councils in the West of England to secure from Central Government support for more sustainable transport systems.

Mr Redgewell was thanked for his statement which it was decided would be taken into account during consideration of agenda item 7.

- (B) Mrs Agnes Melling made a statement urging that negotiations be opened with the bus companies as a matter of urgency to reinstate bus services over Pulteney Bridge, Bath. In response to a question from Councillor Caroline Roberts, Mrs Melling said that she had held meetings with the Cabinet Member in the autumn of 2010 and today and made him aware of the views of local residents and that the bus service passing the doctors' surgery was needed by residents in many parts of Bath.

Mrs Melling was thanked for her statement which was referred for consideration and response to the Cabinet Member for Service Delivery.

- (C) Ms Manda Rigby made a statement in support of a petition signed by 238 local residents asking for the reinstatement bus services over Pulteney Bridge, Bath. In response to a question from Councillor Terry Gazzard, Ms Rigby said that she was not aware that the Number 764 bus had been routed along Great Pulteney Street but she was aware that since 4<sup>th</sup> November 2010 the Number 4 bus had been routed along part of Great Pulteney Street and Edward Street but she was concerned that they did not serve the main part of Great Pulteney Street and dropped passengers outside the Sports and Leisure Centre in North Parade Road which was too far for people with limited mobility to walk to the shops. In response to a question from Councillor Caroline Roberts, Ms Rigby said that although consultation had been promised last September it was her experience that local residents did not consider this had yet taken place.

Ms Rigby was thanked for her statement which was referred for consideration and response to the Cabinet Member for Service Delivery.

- (D) Mr David Redgewell, South West Transport Network, read a statement on behalf of Mr George Bailey, Radstock Action Group, urging the Council to protect the Radstock to Frome railway line as part of the Joint Local Transport Plan. In response to a question from Councillor Eleanor Jackson, Mr Redgewell said that Mr Bailey had received a response from the West of England Partnership following the petition he had presented to save the railway line but it was not clear if this Council had responded.

Mr Bailey was thanked for his statement which it was decided would be taken into account during consideration of agenda item 7.

- (E) Ms Amanda Leon, Radstock Action Group, made a statement urging the Council to support the reinstatement of the Radstock to Frome railway line in line with the evidence presented by the Radstock Action Group as part of the consultation on the Joint Local Transport Plan.

Ms Leon was thanked for her statement which it was decided would be taken into account during consideration of agenda item 7.

- (F) Mr Martin Broadbent, Chair of the Greenway Residents Association, Bath made a statement urging the Council to remove the Beechen Cliff Lower School Playing Field from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) before the Core Strategy is submitted to the Government for examination. In response to a question from Councillor Francine Haeberling, Mr Broadbent said that the Residents Association was aware that the SHLAA was a list of sites with no legal weight attached to their identification, but that residents were concerned that as long as it remained on the list it would give potential developers the opportunity to use that in evidence for a planning application and so it should be removed to allow that possibility. In response to a question from Councillor David Bellotti, Mr Broadbent said that the Association was aware that Beechcroft Developments had submitted an application for development of 22 houses on

this site in 2005 or 2006 which was reduced to 18 houses and that they were aware of the offer price.

Mr Broadbent was thanked for his statement which was referred for consideration and response to the Cabinet Member for Service Delivery.

- (G) Ms Lin Patterson, Save our 6&7 Buses Campaign, made a statement urging the Council to make available adequate funding to resource the re-establishment of the Public Transport Liaison Panel for Bath and North East Somerset and to support a 30 minute bus service on the Number 6 & 7 route connecting Larkhall and Fairfield Park with the city centre. In response to a question from Councillor David Speirs, Ms Patterson said that she had learnt today that the Cabinet Member had reached agreement with two of the three main bus operators to go ahead with the proposals.

Ms Patterson was thanked for her statement which was referred for consideration and response to the Cabinet Member for Service Delivery.

- (H) Major Antony Crombie, the Bath Society, made a statement urging the Council to reconsider the Bath Transportation Package proposals and to withdraw them from the Joint Local Transport Plan. In response to a question from Councillor Caroline Roberts, Major Crombie said that he was aware that the proposed rapid transit route was on a former railway and not a former roadway.

Major Crombie was thanked for his statement which it was decided would be taken into account during consideration of agenda item 7.

- (I) Major Antony Crombie, the Bath Society, made a statement urging the Council to consider a site at Bath Western Riverside for the development of a stadium for Bath Rugby Club instead of the Bath Recreation Ground and to stop the proposed land swap involving the Firs Field, Combe Down and the Recreation Ground because of the covenants restricting uses on both sites. In response to a question from Councillor Paul Crossley, Major Crombie said that, whilst he was not aware that Bath Rugby Club had originally played at the Recreation Ground in the nineteenth century on a pitch with a wooden stock palisade around it, he understood why the Club were keen to remain there but he thought that a site at Bath Western Riverside would be much more suitable for the scale of development needed.

Major Crombie was thanked for his statement which was referred for consideration and response to the Cabinet Member for Resources.

## **68 JOINT LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN 3**

The Council considered a report on the Joint Local Transport Plan 3, covering the period 2011 to 2026, which had been developed in partnership with Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire Councils under the guidance of the West of England Joint Transport Executive Committee and which was required to be approved and adopted by the Council for submission to the Secretary of State.

On a motion proposed by Councillor Charles Gerrish and seconded by Councillor Francine Haeberling it was **RESOLVED** that the final draft of the Local Joint Transport Plan 3 be approved and adopted for submission to the Secretary of State subject to, the addition to Box 11 (a) on page 132 of the words “exploration of further possibilities to revive rail transport especially where this would enhance economic regeneration (e.g. reopening the Radstock to Frome railway line).”

(Notes: 1. The above resolution was carried by a majority of 29 votes to 26 with 1 Councillor abstaining from voting. A recorded vote was requested under Council Rule 45 and taken as follows:

**For the resolution:** Councillors : Colin Barrett, Gabriel Batt, Marie Longstaff, Bryan Chalker, Anthony Clarke, Victor Clarke, Sally Davis, Douglas Deacon, Peter Edwards, Terry Gazzard, Charles Gerrish, Francine Haeberling, Alan Hale, Malcolm Hanney, David Hawkins, Les Kew, Malcolm Lees, Barry Macrae, Bryan Organ, Vic Pritchard, Brian Simmons, Martin Veal, Tim Warren, Chris Watt, Brian Webber, Brook Whelan, John Whittock, Stephen Willcox and Gordon Wood (29)

**Against the resolution:** Councillors : Simon Allen, Sharon Ball, Tim Ball, Cherry Beath, David Bellotti, Sarah Bevan, Loraine Morgan-Brinkhurst, John Bull, Neil Butters, Nicholas Coombes, Paul Crossley, David Dixon, Andrew Furse, Ian Gilchrist, Nathan Hartley, Steve Hedges, Lynda Hedges, Adrian Inker, Eleanor Jackson, Shaun McGall, Caroline Roberts, Nigel Roberts, Dine Romero, Will Sandry, David Speirs and Roger Symonds (26)

**Abstained from Voting:** Councillor Ian Dewey (1)

**Absent:** Councillors Rob Appleyard, Chris Cray, Gerry Curran, Colin Darracott, Armand Edwards, Marian McNeir, Carol Paradise and Shirley Steel (8).

2. The wording underlined in the above resolution was carried on an amendment from Councillor Eleanor Jackson which was accepted by the mover and seconder of the motion.

3. An amendment was moved by Councillor John Bull seconded by Councillor Eleanor Jackson to remove the Bath Transportation Package (BTP) from the Joint Local Transport Plan (JLTP), which was further amended by Councillor Caroline Roberts to remove from the JLTP the segregated bus rapid transit scheme in Bath and to initiate a review of the scope and need for the Bath park and rides as currently planned in the BTP. That amendment was not carried with 27 Councillors voting in favour, 29 Councillors voting against and 1 Councillor abstaining from voting.)

## 69 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

There were six questions from Members of the Council as listed in the Appendix to these minutes. The questions asked and answers given in writing as circulated at the meeting are held on file in the minute book and published on the Council's website with the draft minutes of this meeting.

Councillor Dine Romero made a statement about the proposed closure of Culverhay School, Bath urging that the decision be reconsidered and that a non-denominational co-educational school be established on the site to answer the demand from local parents for this educational opportunity for their children. In response to a question from Councillor John Bull, Councillor Romero said that if Culverhay School was closed there would not be enough space at Ralph Allen School or Beechen Cliff School to meet the needs of local parents without temporary classrooms being provided. The statement was referred to the Cabinet Member for Children`s Services for consideration and response.

Councillor Paul Crossley made a statement urging that the Council`s policy on the provision of grit bins in residential areas be reviewed in the context of the recent severe weather and making a number of suggestions as to how this provision could be improved for the future. The statement was referred to the Cabinet Member for Service Delivery for consideration and response.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

Chair(person) .....

Date Confirmed and Signed .....

**Prepared by Democratic Services**

## APPENDIX

**QUESTIONS ASKED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AT COUNCIL MEETING  
20<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2011**

<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>QUESTION FROM</b>	<b>QUESTION TO COUNCILLOR(S)</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
1	Mrs J A Rendall	Malcolm Hanney	Recreation Ground Trust and Firs Field, Combe Down
2	Mr Bob Wilkins	Malcolm Hanney	Sites Considered by Council for `Land Swap` in connection with Bath Recreation Ground
3	Mr Ian Barclay	Malcolm Hanney	Constraints on Ownership of Firs Field, Combe Down

**QUESTIONS ASKED BY COUNCILLORS AT COUNCIL MEETING  
20 JANUARY 2011**

<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>QUESTION FROM COUNCILLOR(S)</b>	<b>QUESTION TO COUNCILLOR(S)</b>	<b>SUBJECT</b>
1	Paul Crossley	Chris Watt	Cabinet Member Decision on Culverhay School
2	Nigel Roberts	Chris Watt	Culverhay School Value Added Performance Measurement
3	Nicholas Coombes	Charles Gerrish	Food Waste Collection Service
4	Will Sandry	Charles Gerrish	Road Improvements and Street Lighting Repairs in Oldfield Ward
5	Will Sandry	Vic Pritchard	Police Cover in Oldfield Ward on Friday and Saturday Nights
6	Brian Webber	Charles Gerrish	Replacement and Repair of Lamps at West End of North Parade Bridge, Bath

This page is intentionally left blank



**STATEMENT OF DAVID REDGEWELL TO COUNCIL MEETING 20TH  
JANUARY 2011 ON BEHALF OF SOUTH WEST TRANSPORT NETWORK**

**1) Electrification Gains** : The proposed electrification of the SW Main Railway line would be key to enabling the Greater Bristol Metro improvements taking place. This to include new stations at Saltford, Corsham and Wootton Bassett, plus rolling stock and capacity improvements across the entire travel to work area - which most importantly includes parts of the adjacent counties of Somerset, Wiltshire and Gloucestershire. It is for this reason that it is imperative that all LTP3 and Strategy Documents across the wider Greater Bristol area - from Swindon to Weston, Taunton to Gloucester, Warminster to Portishead, are synchronised and all make provision for such improvements to take place in the period to 2026.

**2) Guided Bus Threat**: The present suggestion by N.Somerset of a busway, in place of the popular Portishead rail link is a most sad and retrograde step. It should be remembered that Guided Bus schemes are extremely limited in their appeal, are environmentally more intrusive, and the costs of that undertaken at Cambridge have risen to £181 million - a staggering three times its original estimated cost.

**3. Move from MAA to ITA**: SW Transport Network's members, an amalgam of groups who have long lobbied for public transport improvements across the Greater Bristol area, remain committed to pressing the WoEP authorities to advance beyond the MMA to an ITA, which would enable them to gain greater control of both bus and rail timetables for the benefit of residents across the wider travel to work area.

**4. Balance of Commuter Flows**: In this connection, we would remind Members that the passenger flows tend to be at or near equilibrium. The long held view in the Wiltshire authority, that increased employment provision would cut out-commuting, has not been born out in practice. Indeed the numbers of those travelling from Bath into West Wiltshire for work are similar to those travelling from West Wiltshire into Bath.

**5) Wider benefit of TransWilts Rail Service**: Both Banes and the WoEP have long supported improved rail services within their Local Plans and Strategies, and it is heartening to find that the Swindon Authority is also supportive of proposed improvements, to include the TransWilts Line, linking as it could Swindon with both Westbury and Frome - (with its possibility of a link to Radstock), totally removing the necessity of travelling via Bath for a connection.

**6) Importance of Synergy between LTP & Strategies**: All local authorities across the wider travel area must work together to ensure the public transport travel experience is improved. Please note that unless money is made available before 31st March 2011 for the long planned station improvements at Keynsham and payment made to Network Rail/First Properties, funding for that long-awaited improvement will be lost.

**7) Comparative Length of Bus/Rail Journeys:** A copy of the map showing the discrepancy in journey times between rail and bus options, was drawn up for the Bath/Chippenham/Trowbridge triangle and has been supplied to the Cabinet Member. A similar exercise would indicate similar huge time savings in other peripheral areas. Which would any sane person opt for when considering their daily commute? The latest Sustainable Travel guidance issued by Norman Baker MP also advises a study of each town or village in order that direct and sustainable travel paths to their railway stations may be proposed and put forward to his Department for funding.

**8) The Bath Package; Transport Hub; Showcase Bus Route; BRT;** The new, but incomplete, transport interchange (Bus Station unheated; doors malfunctioning; lifts not in place; extension unbuilt) will have, radiating from the Interchange, nine showcase bus routes across the city, low floor, including real time information, bus lanes and new waiting shelters, eventually! This was the nub of the bid, along with a rapid transit route, envisaged with modern, clean-fuel, hybrid vehicles such as used in French cities (or Docklands light railway) to serve the regeneration site of Western Riverside. (It is our view that vehicles suitable for Showcase Bus Routes would not be suitable for a modern BRT system).

**9) Funding Unclaimed** : Money was granted by DfT to purchase electric hybrid vehicles (nine double-decker buses, eight for Ratala PLC and one for Banes). However, we are concerned that the funding for these vehicles has not yet been claimed. It would seem therefore, any review of the rapid transit link from Bathford to Newbridge, including looking at new technologies and different routing, will prove difficult to sustain. Arguments for clean-fuel vehicles, ultralight rail, electric buses, trams, could be scuppered if previous funding offered for vehicles has not been claimed in time.

**10) Newbridge Interchange:** To be used for both bus and rail access (as first recommended by Avon CC) together with an evaluation of Saltford Station and re-evaluation of the route of the Rapid Transit system along the Lower Bristol Road from Newbridge to Windsor Bridge. The scheme must be suitably modern and serve the regeneration zone of Western Riverside, threading through from Southern to Northern Quay, and ending at Bath Spa Interchange.

**11) Rail as Economic Driver:** Rail has always been the spine of the public transport network required for the Greater Bristol Travel to Work Area. However, a glance at the "pteg" website and their Report "Rail in the City Regions" provides evidence of the enormous increase in the percentage of commuter travel which can result from an electrification of a line - 75% of daily commuter traffic achieved. Just imagine the percentage of commuters (and car traffic reductions) which could result from the Greater Bristol Metro electrification improvements across our City Region. All Councils and all shades of MP should unite and work together to ensure residents do benefit at last from this long-awaited Scheme.

**STATEMENT OF AGNES MELLING TO COUNCIL MEETING**  
**20TH JANUARY 2011 IN SUPPORT OF PETITION TO REINSTATE THE**  
**BUS SERVICE OVER PULTENEY BRIDGE, BATH**

As Councillors you will be well used to receiving petitions from the public. It is the usual practice to “note” a petition. I ask you to take note of this petition and actually do something about the present situation. We are asking you to return to residents the bus service which without consultation you took away from them in September. As the bus companies refuse to offer a loop service around Laura Place, a solution would involve small buses going over the bridge.

In September Residents expressed their views that the bus service should be re-instated. Instead an embargo was announced. Nothing was to happen until April whilst the situation was assessed. - but we all know that politicians will be electioneering then .

In the mean time residents continue to endure inconvenience and difficulty. I give you one example.

Mary lives in Henrietta St. She is over 85 and has angina. A few years ago Mary was well enough to walk to her doctors’ surgery at the top of Great Pulteney St.(GPS ). Later she found that getting the bus from Laura Place to the doctor’s a big help in avoiding the long cold walk that is GPS.

**In September you took that bus away.** There was no replacement of any kind at Laura Place Mary has now to get a taxi in both directions at a cost of about £8. This situation is so unfair and unjust. Does it cost any of you £8 to visit the doctor?

But to be fair Cllr Gazzard did warn residents that this would happen.

“You can’t have a bus, you will have to get a taxi” was the message

The removal of the bus service was a deliberate move against vulnerable people.

**The re-instatement cannot wait** Residents have had enough.

In November the no 4 was re-routed to provide a bus service for the area, In actual fact it serves very little of the area.

It comes into GPS from the Holborne Museum, travels 100yds into Edward St to a bus stop. It goes nowhere near the Laura Fountain end of the street

The No4 takes you to the city centre and drops you off opposite the Sports Centre on North Parade Bridge, Not very convenient if you want shops, banks the P. O.

The present situation is totally unsatisfactory. It is a half hour service, that finishes around 6pm with no service on Sundays.

One fears that the whole problem has been forgotten and left on the back burner. This is just not acceptable. A significant improvement in the bus service is needed NOW . The present situation is an insult to older citizens We are asking you to immediate open up negotiations with the Bus companies. To keep the already open Bridge open and to acknowledge that the needs of older residents far outweigh the need for a very small open space that will always have emergency vehicles and taxis passing over it.

It is worth noting that the majority over 55% of signatories have come completely unsolicited from patients at the Pulteney Surgery.

**STATEMENT OF MANDA RIGBY TO COUNCIL MEETING 20TH JANUARY 2011 IN SUPPORT OF PETITION TO REINSTATE THE BUS SERVICE OVER PULTENEY BRIDGE, BATH**

I am here to follow up from a public meeting held in September, and a subsequent appearance at Cabinet.

I won't take my whole 3 minutes, I just want to reiterate that the current situation with a lack of buses on Pulteney Bridge is causing real distress, specifically to older and more vulnerable residents.

We have presented a petition which came about fairly organically, and was not widely circulated, so I hope this shows the strength of unsolicited feeling about the issue.

There has to be a position which suits the majority of people and solves whatever problems the closure of the bridge is meant to solve.

I am asking council to do the full consultation which Cllr Haerberling promised, and working together, between us all, it must be possible to work out a solution

My starter for 10 is to model what would happen if the pavement on the bridge was widened, and a one way alternate system implemented. This would solve the perceived problem of danger to pedestrians on the bridge, slow down the traffic to minimise impact on the structure, whilst not depriving people of public transport.

Its a thought, it may not work, but can we have more of them please and in the interim restore some buses going over the bridge.

Thank you

**STATEMENT OF GEORGE BAILEY ON BEHALF OF RADSTOCK ACTION GROUP TO COUNCIL MEETING 20TH JANUARY 2011 ABOUT JOINT LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (to be read by David Redgewell)**

**RAIL AND BUS IN THE GREATER BRISTOL AREA INCLUDING MENDIP, SEDGEMOOR, BATH, WILTSHIRE, AND DORSET**

**The Joint Local Transport Plan (B&NES)**

- Rail provides the best method of meeting the objectives of the JLTP.
- It contributes to economic growth for business access and tourism. Good transport links encourage regeneration.
- Climate Change can be offset by reducing dependence on private, inefficient transport.
- Again, taking traffic from roads reduces dangers and pollution.
- Older people find rail easy to use, with easy access.
- Disadvantaged young people can travel to centres of education with relative ease

**Rail**

- Electrification – This is much welcomed, but must include local services as well as main lines. Such upgrading of local services would improve both frequency and vehicles. It is important to lobby for services to continue through Bath to Bristol and Bristol Parkway to Cardiff.
- Suburban Services – Gap-fill electrification permits many local through services, such as through Henbury and the Chippenham / Melksham Trowbridge / Westbury line.
- Protection – Former routes should be protected for future use (e.g Frome - Radstock). It is apparent that private vehicle use will be more and more expensive and the public will want to use what should then be a cheaper form of transport: as it happens, it will also be more environmentally –friendly.
- Station Improvements – Better interchange with ‘bus services, CCTV, disabled ramps, etc. to simplify travelling and for passengers to feel safer. Money made available for improvements to Keynsham must be spent by 31<sup>st</sup> March, otherwise it will be lost. Bath and North East Somerset with South Gloucestershire should agree to pay the sum to NR / First Properties to protect it.

**Bus**

- Services are being dismantled, including the 20 in Bath and the 12 Bath / Haycombe. The X31, 173 Wells / Bath and the 376 Wells / Bristol are all candidates for reduction.
- If services are cut, or even routes removed, how do you get to work? Only by using the car, if one is available.

## **Other**

There is growing concern that funding for hybrid electric vehicles is being sent back to the Government. This is thought to give the wrong signals as there is then little chance of persuading the Government to “buy-in” to projects such as Ultra Light Rail (hoped for the Bristol Harbour)

## **Conclusions**

- Rail is the best form of mass – transit.
- Buses can readily fill gaps where it is not practical for rail to visit villages.
- Loss of staff will cause not only personal hardship, but also difficulty to rebuild a centre (e.g. the highly skilled department working for the future of transport)
- All services must be protected as far as possible, because, as has been found post-Beeching, it is far harder to reinstate any service when it has previously been removed.

Ensure that the West of England Partnership / Shadow LEP are fully prepared to take over all the transport powers of the RDA.

**STATEMENT OF AMANDA LEON ON BEHALF OF RADSTOCK ACTION GROUP TO COUNCIL MEETING 20TH JANUARY 2011 ABOUT JOINT LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN**

The good news is that 'The JLTP3 is a living document and will be reviewed and updated throughout its life' (JLTP3 p.7:1.5.4). Regardless of what happens today, Radstock Action Group hopes that BANES will continue to input into the plan.

Unfortunately, comparing this with the Core Strategy Transport Modelling Technical Note, it is clear that BANES is prepared to take a less imaginative and active role in planning transport than is required. This is connected with the Bath-centric principles which are apparent in all aspects of BANES response. This package has to last till 2026 and includes working with other partners frequently referred to in the plan, not to mention the point made that we should remember 'that transport doesn't just stop at the border' (JLTP3 p.14:1.2.2).

We are very disappointed that BANES in the paper presented to this meeting has paid virtually no attention to the thrust of the RAG submission to the consultations on the JLTP, having failed to mention that rail must be part of the equation for the future and our suggestions on dealing with the current transport crisis in the area.

The BANES approach refers predominantly to impending higher levels of traffic congestion in Bath, and problems between Bath and Bristol. There is virtually no mention anywhere of the Somer Valley area, or rural areas, and we fail to understand how this can be justified, given the stated JLTP3 Corporate Priorities in the BANES Agenda paper – priorities which BANES hasn't challenged. The JLTP3 will not make 'Bath and North East Somerset a better place to live, work and visit' (Agenda Item 7, p.1:4.1) without the active commitment of the authority to promoting sustainable solutions for the entire area it covers.

BANES planning obsession with increased car use is not matched by any solutions which could encourage alternative means of transport. This is reflected in the Core Strategy Transport Modelling Technical Note which makes it clear that proposals considered by BANES had, in the view of the tests and modelling, in most cases only marginal impact on the central problems. Unfortunately, there has been very limited modelling and testing for Radstock and the wider Somer Valley area. The key driver for policy has been transformed to a drop in the number of homes built and jobs created. This fails to address is the fact that the transport and road infrastructure in Radstock and the surrounding area is no longer able to cope. Talk of change in highway delay and network speeds (Page 5 of unnumbered Technical Note document) is already hopelessly out of date and irrelevant as far as our area is concerned. Assertions suggesting that bus services are improving are untrue, they are getting worse. There simply has to be an imaginative leap forward to adopting rail as the most efficient and sustainable mass transit system available. BANES must include the reinstatement of the line between

Radstock and Frome, at the very least as an aspiration, and encourage the inclusion of a more detailed statement in the JLTP3.

Radstock Action Group recently spoke to the West of England Partnership and was encouraged that they recognise that the support from local people for the rail reinstatement is a good starting point for further discussions that we have requested. They identified such 'localism initiatives' as congruent with the objectives of the WEP and we hope that our discussions with them will continue to be received positively. We want BANES to add its voice to this dialogue, in support of our aims in connection with public transport.



**STATEMENT OF MARTIN BROADBENT ON BEHALF OF GREENWAY  
RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION TO COUNCIL MEETING  
20TH JANUARY 2011 ABOUT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND  
AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT IN CORE STRATEGY**

My name is Martin Broadbent, and I am Chairman of *Greenway!*, the residents' association for the area around Beechen Cliff in Bath. Residents in this area are fearful for the Beechen Cliff School Lower playing field.

A developer has been in pursuit of this playing field for about ten years. However, there are powerful reasons why it should stay as it is. It is not only needed by the school, but is used by the local community; it makes the setting for the Georgian terrace of Devonshire Buildings, and plays a key role in the green open spaces which give its character to our precious World Heritage City.

Hence, in the course of the Local Plan process of 2006 -7, the Council made decisions three separate times that this land should be retained as open space and as playing fields. There was no doubt about the Council's view on the matter. Residents were therefore astonished, when the draft Core Strategy was published last month, to find that a key evidence document prepared for it, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, had judged this land as suitable for early housing development. The reasoning in the Assessment ignores the evidence presented by the Council itself to the Local Plan Inquiry, and is plainly seriously in error.

We are told that the Assessment is not part of the formal Development Plan, but merely an evidence document. That is no reason to treat this document lightly. We are in an uncertain time for planning, with the old local plan system being replaced by something new. Housing land is valuable, and there are those who will not scruple to push hard at a gate which is only lightly latched. The Government's Chief Planner last year advised that, though regional planning was being abolished, the evidence documents behind it can still be material in decisions; that principle will surely apply to this Housing Assessment. If not, then why was it written in the first place? Faced with a developer arguing it as proof that the Council had considered this land anew, and judged it suitable for development, what is the Council, or an appeals Inspector, to do other than grant permission?

On behalf of the residents of Lyncombe and Widcombe, about 70 of whom came to a meeting on a dismal night last week, I ask the Council that Lyn6, the lower Field be removed from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment before the Core Strategy is submitted to the Government for examination.

**STATEMENT OF LIN PATTERSON TO COUNCIL MEETING**  
**20TH JANUARY 2011 ABOUT SAVE OUR 6 & 7 BUSES CAMPAIGN**

We are here today to follow through on two issues. One is the revival of a Public Transport Liaison Panel (PTLP) which will be “a focus for the interchange of views between the Council, public transport operators and users.” This could make a valuable contribution to the Council’s work on climate change by being responsive to peoples’ need for public transport and enabling people to make better use of the bus service that’s available. The full Council needs to back its Executive Member for Services in this endeavour.

Regarding the PTLP, your Executive Member has stipulated one of the four preconditions<sup>1</sup> necessary is that it be adequately resourced. We are aware that the Cabinet Budget meeting is in 2 weeks’ time. We ask you to approve adequate funding for this Panel which will cover public transport for the whole of B&NES.

We question whether meeting the suggested twice a year will fulfil its consultative purpose and the needs of the public. It is to be hoped that once the PTLP is set up the frequency can be reviewed as to whether it can properly fulfil its function. For it to meet, say, 3 times a year, the administration of it must be streamlined. Please note that this question has been raised.

The second issue is the need for Council support to create a 30 minute service on the circular route connecting Larkhall and Fairfield Park in north east Bath with Bath centre. Residents can be left behind by full buses who pass them by full to capacity because of the poor 40 minute frequency.

We have been told by a First Bus Director that the bus company’s Halcrow report does not allow for an improvement to the 6-7 route and the only hope for improvement must come from Council support. We understand when the Executive Member explained he needed to wait until it becomes clear what other routes will be adversely affected by cuts before deciding how to allocate his budget. But we ask does this mean it is acceptable if other routes in Bath also are reduced to 40 minutes? Is this the coming standard? If not, why should the 6-7 densely populated area with many elderly continue to suffer the worst frequency and be asked to wait?

While we appreciate the difficulties involved in doing your job representing the whole of B&NES, our job is to keep this issue to the fore. We ask the Council to support a provisional amount to be negotiated and set aside in the new budget for a ‘de minimus’ arrangement with the bus operator for a trial period, only making up what minimal loss they incur with the additional bus. This should not be as large an amount as First quoted<sup>2</sup>, due to the apparent consistent ridership along the route, which will hopefully increase with a better service.

---

<sup>1</sup> The other conditions: that it cover the whole of B&NES; that the bus operators support it; and that it does not duplicate any other meeting.

<sup>2</sup> various figures have been quoted by First, from £65,000 - 85,000, but this needs to be negotiated

## **Public Questions for Council 20<sup>th</sup> January 2011**

(NOTE: The following questions and answers will be published on the Council's website as soon as possible after the meeting and linked to the published draft minutes of this meeting.)

### **1. Question from Mrs J A Rendall**

Is Firs Field, Combe Down, the only site being considered regarding the proposed land swap by the Council in connection with the Recreation Ground Trust?

#### **Answer from Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Resources**

The Council (in its corporate capacity) is not holding discussions with Bath Rugby and / or the Council (in its Recreation Ground Trustee capacity) on any land in its ownership other than Firs Field and land at or adjacent to the Recreation Ground.

### **2. Question from Mr Bob Wilkins**

Bath Recreation Ground :-Firs Field Proposed Land Swap. Could the Council provide the following information: How many sites in and around Bath were considered for the land swap, where were they, and what were the criteria used to select the most appropriate site?

#### **Answer from Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Resources**

The Friends of Firs Field requested Village Green status for Firs Field in February 2009. The Council advised that the land did not qualify for Village Green status. The principles that supported this view / decision were agreed with the Friends of Firs Field.

However, the Council responded to the Friends of Firs Field's proposal for long term protection of the Open Space in a positive way by virtue of the 'land swap' proposal which would offer a similar level of safeguard alongside resolution of the Recreation Ground issues relating to the Leisure Centre and Bath Rugby. The proposal was the subject of consultation with local residents during 2009.

While consideration was given within the Council to other possible areas of land these were not progressed given the positive discussions held regarding Firs Field.

### **3. Question from Mr Ian Barclay**

In the 15 April 2009 Council press release "Council moves to resolve Recreation Ground impasse" it was announced that, in principle, the Council had agreed to transfer Firs Field Combe Down to the Recreation Ground Trust.

In the Council's "Firs Field Proposal" note to Combe Down residents dated 24 July 2009 it is stated "Land Holding 1. The Blue Land is held corporately by the Council and Counsel's advice is that this land is not subject to any further ownership constraints."

In coming to this conclusion, please would you explain how this statement has taken into account the following:-

- The Land Register - Schedule of Personal Covenants states - "The Council hereby for themselves and their successors covenant with the grantor that the Council its successors or assigns will for ever hereafter support maintain and improve the said land hereby conveyed as and for the purpose of a Public Recreation Ground."

and

- In 1920, the Council acquired the land by way of gift. The Council's power to accept, hold and administer a gift of this nature is to be found in Section 139 of the Local Government Act 1972. The intention of the gift was that the land should be used as a Public Recreation Ground and it appears that Section 139(1)(b) is the relevant sub-section and that the intended beneficiaries are the inhabitants of Combe Down.

Will these two "constraints" be included in any possible formal proposal for a land swap?

**Answer from Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Resources**

The Council has taken Counsel's advice in relation to Firs Field land ownership (both 'blue' and 'pink' land) and has set out clearly for the community the legal position.

**Council Meeting 20th January 2011**

**Briefing Note Prepared by Divisional Director Planning & Transport Development**

**Removal of the BTP from the JLTP3**

The BTP is a significant element in the JLTP3. To make such a fundamental change at this stage would have the following implications:-

- The JLTP could not be adopted at this point and it would require review/rewriting and this would cause some disruption to partner authorities in the rest of the West of England partnership.
- It would also cause difficulties and some loss of credibility at a time when the West of England are in a bidding process for five transport schemes that may attract a very large government grant.
- Funding for BTP is highly likely to be lost because this Council's transport policy would no longer support the BTP.
- DfT have indicated that there are no funds available for further capital projects until at least 2014/15.

Without the BTP it will be extremely challenging to deliver planned housing, economic development including jobs, and improvements to congestion and air quality as set out in the Council's draft Core Strategy.

This page is intentionally left blank

**STATEMENT OF COUNCILLOR DINE ROMERO TO COUNCIL MEETING 20<sup>TH</sup>  
JANUARY 2011 ON FUTURE OF CULVERHAY SCHOOL**

Councillors,

I am reading this statement to you in response to the notice given for the closure of Culverhay School, so I would like it recorded as such, to inform the decision.

It has been said that this decision for closure is based on surplus places. But in Bath we only have about 10% surplus places. This offers a reasonable degree of flexibility, allowing for parental choice, and future population growth. As a council we have an expectation of 2000 new homes in the Western Riverside, plus the houses likely to be built at the 3 MOD sites, this will lead to larger numbers of children.

Our problem in Bath is actually that this “surplus” is focused in very specific areas, around Culverhay, St Marks and Oldfield Schools.

None of these schools are failing schools, as all have been classed as at least good by Ofsted. However none are popular with their natural catchments as they stand at present. Yet, two have been allowed to remain open and to transform, but not, so far, the third.

Culverhay has not been fighting to stay open as it is, a boys’ school; but has been fighting to become a non-denominational co-educational school. This is what 72% of the respondents to the initial consultation asked for. It is what the school itself has wanted to be for the last 20 years. It was in anticipation of this, that the current head teacher was appointed.

Girls want to attend this school, their parents want them to, it is their most local school. When the Friends of Culverhay surveyed parents of nearby primary schools, the parents of 555 children were in favour of a non-denominational co-educational school on the site. Please confirm the validity of this survey, with your own consultation, don’t just close Culverhay!

Currently 95% of boys going to Culverhay walk. Increasing the numbers attending this local school will help achieve our council goals around reductions in car travel and community sustainability. Other non-denominational schools are at least 50minutes walk away. There are no direct bus routes.

60% of Bath’s children live to the South of the river. The original consultation acknowledged this, and suggested a co-ed school on the Culverhay site. It has been said many times that this is the best site for a secondary school in Bath.

Culverhay serves the area in Bath that has the greatest social, economic and educational need. This is recognised nationally as a fact.

Culverhay has the greatest CVA score within Bath. The educators at Culverhay are increasing their student's attainment beyond the national baseline and to a greater extent than any other school in Bath. The boys have the third highest level of GCSE A\* - C within BANES.

There are many reasons why Culverhay should be given the same chance that other schools have been given to re-invent themselves, and provide even better education and learning experiences, but I only have 3 minutes!

Please allow a non-denominational co-educational school on the Culverhay site!

Please note that the community wishes to register an interest in the buildings and land at Culverhay School.



**STATEMENT OF COUNCILLOR PAUL CROSSLEY TO COUNCIL  
MEETING 20<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2011 ON GRIT BINS AND THE COUNCIL`S  
POLICY ON NEIGHBOURHOOD GRITTING**

Council, after a long period of mild winters we have now had severe weather spells over the last two winters. Climate Change may mean that weather patterns will be far more variable in future years.

This Council has a gritting policy of clearing the main roads and the bus routes and gritting pavements in areas of need. It also keeps grit bins it has provided full.

However there are simply not enough grit bins and the policy of providing grit bins to residential streets is so restrictive that it becomes almost impossible to get a new one allocated.

What is clear from the bad weather this winter and also last winter is that communities are quite prepared to get out and clear their local pavements and streets if they are provided with the means. Providing more grit bins and grit, whilst it clearly has a cost implication, will benefit the economy as a whole as it will ease the ability of people to get to work, school or the shops and will mean less damage from slips and falls etc.

I would like the Cabinet Member responsible for highways to look again at the Council's grit policy and consider whether any of the following suggestions could be put into practice:

1. Providing more grit bins
2. Providing some gritting wheelbarrows to designated residents such as neighbourhood watch co-ordinators or volunteer 'snow wardens' as a trial to measure the effectiveness as compared to manual spreading using a spade
3. Committing to put grit piles or builders' drop bags out in locations not covered by grit bins in very bad weather
4. Working with the trade to publicise the ability for residents to buy packs of grit at the start of winter for their own personal driveways from various outlets
5. Addressing the myth that a resident who attempts to remove snow becomes liable for any slip/fall damage by a person walking on a cleared area – in November, the council promised to publish a self-help leaflet of winter advice, why has this not been done?
6. Building community cohesion and celebrating streets and communities that come together to clear snow away

## 7. Looking at the needs of isolated houses/communities

The new coalition government is promoting Big Society – one aspect of which is communities helping themselves and helping each other. By changing the winter grit policy to enable Communities to clear away snow B&NES can take a lead in building up the Big Society and improving self help. A small outlay on this project will bring in big dividends for us all as a community. By providing the correct tools for the job less grit is used. By ensuring residents are aware of outlets to buy grit for private use it will reduce the taking of grit from public bins for private driveways. These measures will provide a service that will benefit every Council Tax payer in the Authority.

## **Councillor Questions for Council 20<sup>th</sup> January 2011**

(**NOTE:** The following questions and answers will be published on the Council's website as soon as possible after the meeting and linked to the published draft minutes of this meeting.)

### **1. Question from Councillor Paul Crossley**

Will the Cabinet Member agree to take the final Single Member Decision on Culverhay School at an open public meeting at which members of the public will be able to address him directly, given the controversial nature of the decision and the interest from a wide section of the public?

### **Answer from Cabinet Member for Children's Services**

The final decision on the closure of Culverhay School will follow a long and comprehensive process which has been fully and openly scrutinised at every stage including:

- March/May 2010 - six week public consultation on the future of Secondary Education in Bath. Four public meetings in Bath as part of this consultation.
- 21st July 2010 - Cabinet meeting to decide the result of the consultation.
- 10<sup>th</sup> August – Overview and Scrutiny panel meeting to review the Cabinet decision to consult on closure of Culverhay.
- 18<sup>th</sup> August – Cabinet meeting to review decision.
- 24th September to 29th October 2010. Five week public consultation on the possible closure of Culverhay. Approximately 13,000 copies of consultation document distributed. Two public meetings.
- 25th November 2010 Cabinet meeting to decide the result of the consultation.
- 14<sup>th</sup> December 2010 Call-in of decision of 25th November to Overview and Scrutiny panel at a public meeting, call-in dismissed by the panel.
- December/January 2010/11 statutory notice and public consultation period.

There has already been much public scrutiny of this process and decision. Therefore in line with statutory processes and existing practice it is not anticipated that the final decision will be taken in a public meeting.

### **2. Question from Councillor Nigel Roberts**

Would Cllr Watt like to join me in congratulating Culverhay School on being named the school with the highest value added in Bath and North East Somerset?

## **Answer from Cabinet Member for Children`s Services**

Councillor Roberts is probably referring to Contextual Value Added in his question, which is a particular measure of performance that has been much criticised. Based on a range of socio-economic factors such as whether children have free school meals the measure can have the effect of expecting lower levels of progress from different groups of pupils. The recently published Education White Paper 'The importance of Teaching' was very clear on this point

*"We will put an end to the current 'contextual value added' (CVA) measure"*

*"It is wrong to have an attainment measure which entrenches low aspirations for children because of their background. For example, we do not think it is right to expect pupils eligible for free school meals to make less progress from the same starting point as pupils who are not eligible for free school meals."*

*"We should expect every child to succeed and measure schools on how much value they add for all pupils., not rank them on the make-up of their intake."*

On this measure Culverhay is not the highest performing school in Bath and North East Somerset, it is the second highest.

In terms of Actual Value Added Culverhay is the lowest performing school in the Local Authority.

This measure takes the Standard Attainment Test (SAT) score achieved by children at age 11 and compares this with their performance at GCSE. All children are expected to make good progress with this measure. For example those who achieved a Level 3 at aged 11 would be expected to gain a GCSE grade D or above; all those who achieved Level 4 at aged 11 would be expected to gain a GCSE grade C or above etc.

This measure shows that Culverhay was the lowest performing school in Bath and North East Somerset in 2010, with only 47% of pupils making the expected progress in English and only 35% making the expected progress in Maths. In the majority of Bath and North East Somerset secondary schools over 70% of pupils make the expected level of progress.

Using the most commonly accepted measure of attainment (5 GCSE at A\* to C at GCSE) Culverhay is again the lowest performing school with 31% of pupils achieving this standard. The Local Authority average is 61%.

The Authority has higher expectations of our schools and higher ambitions for local children's outcomes and as such is working towards 80% achieving 5 A-C including English and Maths.

### **3. Question from Councillor Nicholas Coombes**

1. Residents of my block of flats were informed by letter that we would not be able to use the kitchen waste collection service and a container was not provided. How many households have been excluded from the kitchen waste collection service in Bath and North East Somerset?
2. Some residents have been provided with kitchen waste containers which they did not require, either as they already composted or did not intend to use the service. How

many containers have been returned and how many households have requested them removed?

#### **Answer from Cabinet Member for Service Delivery**

1. The first main rollout of food waste recycling collections last autumn covered approx 73,000 households across the district. We are unable to offer the standard kerbside food waste collection to 4,237 properties in total. This breaks down to blocks of flats with a Mini Recycling Centre (3,260), city centre properties (890) which receive a green sack kerbside recycling service and a few other locations assessed as not suitable (87). We are in the process of starting to plan a second phase rollout of food waste collections which will look at the options we can offer to all these properties.
2. There have been 80 requests to date logged and actioned via Council Connect for food waste containers to be collected. During September when the delivery of the start-up packs was going on, 1,098 sets were not delivered by the crews at the request of residents.

#### **4. Question from Councillor Will Sandry**

##### **1. Moorland Road / Livingstone Road / Herbert Road Junction**

Following this year's budget allocation for a study on improving this junction for pedestrians, does it remain your intention to allocate funds to improve the junction in this coming financial year? At the recent Oldfield PACT Meeting, this was again a top community priority for improvement.

##### **2. First, Second and Third Avenues**

During the construction of the new St John's School on Oldfield Lane, First, Second and Third Avenues were heavily used by HGV construction traffic which resulted in a deterioration of the road surface. Whilst major potholes have been filled, the overall condition of the road surface remains poor in the view of some members of the community. If not already undertaken, please could these roads be assessed to ensure that they have the correct priority for resurfacing?

##### **3. Street Light Repairs**

I reported Street Light No. 2 on St. Kilda's Road as defective via the new "Reportit" function on the Council's Website (<https://www.bathnes.gov.uk/reportit/Default.aspx?category=StreetLighting>) on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2010.

The light was not repaired and I had cause to re-issue my request, this time to Council Connect as a direct email on 4<sup>th</sup> January 2011 and I note that as of tonight (12<sup>th</sup> January 2011) the light is repaired. Thank you. I would note that it may have actually been repaired earlier this week (but not before or during the weekend).

I recognise that there was poor weather and three bank holidays during the time period; however, even considering this, the response falls well below the Council's published standards, so my question is twofold:

- a. Is there a problem with the new "reportit" function on the Council's website that Members should be aware of?
- b. Is there a problem with the relationship between the Council and our street lighting contractor that Members should be aware of?

### **Answer from Cabinet Member for Service Delivery**

1. A preliminary design has been developed for Moorland Rd/Livingstone Rd/Herbert Road Junction and is currently awaiting funding from the LTP capital programme.
2. Highway Inspections are carried out on a 6 monthly frequency on First, Second and Third Avenues and any safety defects identified are repaired to maintain highway safety.

The Highways maintenance team receives many requests for roads to be resurfaced and the roads selected for the programme are prioritised on the usage, safety and asset management needs. The Highway Inspector has inspected these roads inside the last three months and they will be considered for possible inclusion in a future resurfacing programme.

3. The defect was reported to Highway Electrical via the "Reportit" system on 13th December 2010. The contractor visited the site and installed a new lamp and the light was left in working order. A further fault report was received on 5th January 2011. The contractor attended the site again on 10th January and this time replaced the photocell (controller). The light has been in working order since this second repair.

The contractor will incur a financial penalty as a result of failing to effectively repair the light at the first attempt. Monthly performance indicators show that 99.5% of repairs are completed at the first visit. Officers monitor performance closely and have worked very successfully with the contractor over a number of years.

### **5. Question from Councillor Will Sandry**

Is there any truth in the rumour that the Police have recently withdrawn dedicated Beat Officers and PCSOs from the suburbs to cover the City Centre Beat on Friday and Saturday nights?

Night time antisocial behaviour (particularly on Friday and Saturday nights) was a PACT priority for Livingstone Road and the streets around. Oldfield residents and I would be concerned if the reallocation of Police Officers meant that this issue, raised by the community, could not be addressed.

### **Answer from Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services and Housing**

I have raised your question with the District Commander Chief Superintendent Gary Davies and the following is his response to me:

"The operational deployment of police officers and PCSO's who are part of the neighbourhood teams is based on them remaining on their area for 95% of their operational time. From time to time in support of specific initiatives we brigade resources from various areas to provide high visibility as part of a police operation in a specific area and this causes an abstraction which has always been the case and recognised in setting the abstraction commitment."

**6. Question from Councillor Brian Webber**

Is it hoped to reinstate the missing lamp at the west end of North Parade Bridge, Bath? If so, what would be the approximate cost of the works? What would be the approximate annual cost of the electricity to illuminate all four lamps?

**Answer from Cabinet Member for Service Delivery**

It is hoped to replace the missing lamp and reconnect the supply to enable all four lamps to work. However, the manufacturer has provided a quotation of £7,100 for supplying a new lamp. The electricity consumed by these four lights, in total, would cost approximately £80 a year.

This work is technically complex as the cables are contained behind structural cladding on the bridge and extensive civil engineering works are needed to provide a supply to the four lights in compliance with current electrical safety standards. This element of the work has not been costed and trial holes would be required to determine the exact nature and full costs of the project.

This page is intentionally left blank