

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

Wednesday, 8th February, 2012

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 10th to 16th Feb. These minutes are draft until confirmed as a correct record at the next meeting.

Present:

Councillor Paul Crossley	Leader of the Council
Councillor Nathan Hartley	Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Youth
Councillor David Bellotti	Cabinet Member for Community Resources
Councillor Simon Allen	Cabinet Member for Wellbeing
Councillor Tim Ball	Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning
Councillor Cherry Beath	Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development
Councillor Roger Symonds	Cabinet Member for Transport

142 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair was taken by Councillor Paul Crossley, Leader of the Council.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

143 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

144 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Councillor David Dixon

145 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

There were none.

146 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

147 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 3 questions from the following people: Councillors Michael Evans, Alan Hale, Geoff Ward.

[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.]

148 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

George Bailey read a statement on behalf of David Redgewell (South West Transport Network) relating to Planning and Transport Development. *[The statement is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website]*

Amanda Leon (Radstock Action Group) made a statement relating to the Radstock road scheme. *[The statement is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website]*

Cllr Eleanor Jackson made a statement relating to Victoria Hall and Radstock Development Funding, after which she presented a petition to Cabinet signed by over 400 residents asking that the Victoria Hall be kept open for community use. *[The statement is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website]*

The Chair referred the statement and petition to Councillor David Bellotti for his consideration and response in due course.

Pamela Galloway (Save Our 6/7 Buses) made a statement. *[The statement is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website]*

149 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor Nathan Hartley, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 11th January 2012 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

150 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

151 CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

There were none.

152 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

153 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT TO 31ST DECEMBER 2011

Councillor David Bellotti, in proposing the item, said that by 2015, instead of a borrowing requirement of £205M which had been the case previously, the Cabinet would have reduced this by more than £30M.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal.

On a motion from Councillor David Bellotti, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) TO NOTE the Treasury Management Report to 31st December 2011, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice; and

(2) To NOTE the Treasury Management Indicators to 31st December 2011.

154 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING, CASH LIMITS AND VIREMENTS - APRIL 2011 TO DECEMBER 2011

Councillor David Bellotti, in proposing the item, said that most budgets had underspent in the financial year, and the one overspent service (transportation) had extenuating circumstances. He was pleased with the progress made by Strategic Directors to keep spending under control.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal.

On a motion from Councillor David Bellotti, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To ASK Strategic Directors to continue to work with Portfolio Holders towards managing within budgets 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 as shown in the report;

(3) To NOTE the capital expenditure position for the Council in the financial year to the end of December, and the year-end projections detailed in the report;

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

(5) To NOTE the changes in the capital programme listed in the report.

155 FINANCIAL PLAN 2012/13 - 2014/15, BUDGET & COUNCIL TAX 2012/13

The Chair introduced Councillor John Bull, Chair of the Resources PDS Panel, who referred to the Summary of the Panel's Budget Recommendations to Cabinet *[a copy of which had been placed in the public gallery before the meeting, and is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 9 and on the Council's website]*. Councillor Bull drew the Cabinet's attention to each point in turn. He called in particular for the Cabinet to ensure rigorous monitoring of the effects of the Budget on vulnerable young people, because the Panel had been concerned that the Equalities Impact Assessment for Adult Social Care and Housing, People and Communities had not properly considered this.

Councillor Charles Gerrish made an *ad hoc* statement in which he expressed concern that the Heritage Services business plan had been based on the depressed visitor figures from the bad winter of 2010. He also asked Cabinet to delay any decision on the mobile library service until the consultation period had completed. He emphasised the Council's responsibility to isolated communities and vulnerable people. He suggested that the Council's recycling facilities should open and close

an hour later on Sundays, because more people would be likely to use it later in the day.

Councillor John Bull made an *ad hoc* statement in which he welcomed the allocation of extra funds for affordable homes and the funding for transferring Paulton Library to a community-run facility in a vacant shop. He expressed big doubts, however, about the proposed reduction in the social care budget.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson made an *ad hoc* statement in which she agreed that the quality of the equality impact assessments was a cause for concern. She referred to the cuts to the Equality Team and to the Policy and Partnerships Team, who were responsible for monitoring.

Councillor David Bellotti, in moving the recommendations, emphasised that the proposals would ensure a reduction in borrowing; a zero increase in Council Tax; improved services; and more local projects. He was grateful to Councillor Bull for the Resource Panel's contribution to the debate. He confirmed that the Cabinet recognised the need for regular scrutiny of all the higher risk savings in the Proposed Budget for 2012/2013 including the £825K for the residential care costs of adults with learning difficulties. The Cabinet would ask officers to ensure that the progress and delivery of all such high risk savings was included within the quarterly Budget Outturn Monitoring reports.

He felt that the observation made by Councillor Gerrish about the winter visitor figures was a fair comment, although the November figures had also shown the same picture so he was confident about the outcome. He promised to pass the idea about Sunday Recycling Opening times to the Divisional Director, Environmental Services, for his consideration because he agreed it was a good idea. He emphasised that the cuts being proposed for libraries was a quarter of the cut being made by central government to the Council's library funding. The Budget would protect libraries better than neighbouring authorities had been able to do.

He referred to Councillor Jenkins' comments about responsibility for equalities. He felt that all Council officers must take ownership of the equalities agenda, and that this must not be left to be a centralised team.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal and thanked all who had worked so hard to prepare the budget, particularly the Finance Department. He observed that all the surrounding Councils had needed to make cuts, but this Council had been able to make a balanced budget based almost entirely on efficiency savings. He was particularly pleased about the proposals to increase affordable housing; slowing traffic in built-up areas; improving local facilities; supporting young care-leavers; and supporting elderly independent living.

Councillor Roger Symonds expressed his delight that the grant to support the Bath Transportation Package had been confirmed late in 2011; the Budget proposals would allocate £1.6M to a reviewed Rossiter Road scheme; and that there was a continuing commitment to support community transport, particularly in vulnerable areas.

Councillor Cherry Beath said that the Heritage Business Plan showed how the increased profit will be achieved and sustained. She was delighted that there were significant regeneration investments in Radstock, Keynsham and London Road. She had also been delighted that the Cabinet's intention to get the best deal for Broadband Delivery had been achieved, which would be of most benefit in the rural areas.

Councillor Nathan Hartley welcomed the increasing number of apprentices and the decline in young people Not In Education, Employment or Training. He observed that the overall cuts in the budget had been less than 0.5%. In his own portfolio he referred to increases of £100K for children in care and £100K for young people leaving care. The proposals would protect targeted youth services and youth democracy. The dedicated schools grant had been about the same as last year.

Councillor Simon Allen observed that the proposal was for a balanced budget. Cuts had been made where necessary, so as to improve services where necessary. The cuts to Learning Disability Residential funding would be challenging, but were counterbalanced by increases in personal budgets.

Councillor Tim Ball observed that the whole framework of nationally funded local services was changing. He welcomed that appointment of a planning enforcement officer, which would enable planning officers to deal with planning applications more effectively. He referred to the £500K allocation for social housing, and money to bring unused housing back into use.

Councillor David Bellotti summed up by referring to the update document *[a copy of which had been placed in the public gallery before the meeting and is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 10 and on the Council's website]*. He was pleased to say that Cabinet had been able to clarify in that document that £32K would be allocated to support the 6/7 Bus Service. He talked the Cabinet through the document, including three typographical amendments to the budget proposals document.

He confirmed that, as required in the Localism Act, the Council would be asked as part of the Budget to confirm the authority's Pay Policy.

On a motion from Councillor David Bellotti, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To RECOMMEND that the Council approve:

(a) The General Fund net revenue budget for 2012/13 of £120.106m with no increase in Council Tax;

(b) That no Special Expenses be charged other than Town and Parish Council precepts for 2012/13;

(c) The adequacy of reserves, with a risk-assessed level of £10.5m;

(d) The individual service cash limits for 2012/13 as detailed in the report;

(e) That the specific arrangements for the governance and release of reserves, including invest to save proposals, be delegated to the Council's Section 151 Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources and the Chief Executive;

(2) To RECOMMEND that the Council include the precepts set and approved by other bodies including the Local Precepts of Town Councils, Parish Councils and the Charter Trustees of the City of Bath, and those of the Fire and Police Authorities in its Council Tax setting;

(3) To RECOMMEND that the Council acknowledges the Section 151 officer's report on the robustness of the proposed budget and the adequacy of the Council's reserves and approves the conditions upon which the recommendations are made as set out in the report;

(4) To RECOMMEND that in relation to the capital budget the Council:

(a) approves a capital programme of £37.471m for 2012/13 and notes items for provisional approval in 2012/13 and the programme for 2013/14 to 2016/17 as shown in the report, including the planned sources of funding;

(b) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy;

(c) approves the Capital Prudential Indicators;

(5) To RECOMMEND to Council that the Council notes the Policy Development & Scrutiny review of Medium Term Service and Resource Plans and 2012/13 Service Action Plans and instructs the relevant officers to finalise and publish their Medium Term Service and Resource Plans and Service Action Plans by end of March 2012, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member and in light of feedback from the PD&S reviews, and in line with the approved cash limits; and

(6) To AUTHORISE the Divisional Director – Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources, to make any necessary presentational improvements to the draft budget proposal for submission to Council.

156 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT & ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2012/13

Councillor David Bellotti, in proposing the item, emphasised that the council was very fortunate to have such high quality finance officers. He reminded Cabinet that proper Treasury Management underpinned the whole budget.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal.

On a motion from Councillor David Bellotti, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To RECOMMEND that Council approves the actions proposed within the Treasury Management Strategy Statement;

(2) To RECOMMEND that Council approves the Investment Strategy;

(3) To RECOMMEND that Council approves the changes to the authorised lending lists;

(4) To RECOMMEND that Council approves the adoption of CIPFA's revised Code of Practice on Treasury Management;

(5) To RECOMMEND that Council approves the revised Treasury Management Policy Statement;

(6) To NOTE the Treasury Management Indicators;

(7) To DELEGATE authority for updating the indicators prior to approval at Full Council on 14th February 2012 to the Divisional Director - Finance and Cabinet Member for Community Resources, in light of any changes to the recommended budget as set out in the Budget Report elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting.

157 THE COUNCIL'S VISION AND VALUES

Councillor Paul Crossley, in proposing the item, referred to the wide consultation which had fed into the new vision and values. All Councillors and middle Managers were invited to contribute and the Cabinet had taken on board a significant number of suggestions and observations from that consultation.

Councillor Nathan Hartley seconded the proposal and said that putting people first was a fine principle on which to base the Council's service decisions.

Councillor Cherry Beath endorsed the proposals.

Councillor Crossley, in summing up, referred to paragraph 5 of the report and observed that the list of partners should be amended by adding "town and parish councils", so that it would now read, "the police, schools, the health service, town and parish councils, community organisations, local businesses, local people and communities".

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor Nathan Hartley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To AGREE the refresh of the Council's Vision;
- (2) To REPLACE the Council's previous eight priorities with three objectives that describe what it is trying to achieve and enable it to focus resources;
- (3) To UPDATE its values to reflect how the Council will operate and the kind of organisation it will be; and
- (4) To COMMUNICATE these developments to the public and staff.

158 QUALITY PARTNERSHIP SCHEME FOR CORRIDOR 6 OF THE GREATER BRISTOL BUS NETWORK

Councillor John Bull made an *ad hoc* statement expressing his concern that the recommendation in paragraph 2.2 of the report did not specify that the Divisional Director in making any changes must consult with the Cabinet member. He asked for this to be amended.

Councillor Paul Moss in an *ad hoc* statement brought the Cabinet's attention to the fact that the Midsomer Norton to Bristol bus service was listed in Schedule 1 of the report as being only one bus a day in each direction. He emphasised that this would be an ideal opportunity to improve the service.

Councillor Charles Gerrish made an *ad hoc* statement encouraging the Cabinet member to be robust in his negotiations with First. He felt that the Council should, as before, insist on a "maximum fare" clause in future agreements with First.

Councillor Roger Symonds introduced the item. He referred to the point made by Councillor Moss, and promised that he would address the issue of the frequency of services between Bristol and Midsomer Norton. He referred to the point made by Councillor Bull, and agreed that recommendation 2.2 should read "in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport". As a result, he moved a proposal which differed from the published recommendations.

Councillor Tim Ball said that he was delighted, to second the proposal.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor Tim Ball, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To AGREE that a quality partnership scheme be made covering the bus route corridor between Midsomer Norton and Bristol via Whitchurch;

(2) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director for Planning & Transport Development to determine in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport the appropriate standard of services in the quality partnership scheme; and

(3) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director for Planning & Transport Development to decide in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport on any revisions to the standards of services in the quality partnership scheme arising from the formal review process.

159 VOLUNTARY SECTOR FUNDING APPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY TRANSPORT 2012/3

Councillor Roger Symonds, in moving the recommendations, said that the proposals would increase or maintain all the awarded grants.

Councillor Simon Allen seconded the proposal and observed that the criteria and the grants being recommended fitted well with the Council's new vision of putting people first and encouraging independence.

Councillor David Bellotti supported the proposal. He referred to paragraph 3.5 of the report, which identified an amount of £42,500 grant from the government to assist with community transport services. He asked the Cabinet member to agree to bring any proposals on spending this grant back to Cabinet for approval.

Councillor Paul Crossley was delighted with the proposals and felt that they delivered an inclusive agenda.

Councillor Roger Symonds summed up. He assured Councillor David Bellotti that he would indeed bring back to Cabinet any proposals for spending the £42,500 community transport funding. He reminded Cabinet however that the funding was specifically given by government to be used for community transport development.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor Simon Allen, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE funding proposals laid out in appendix 2 of the report;

(2) To AGREE that new two-year service level agreements be entered into with the three dial-a-ride schemes in the Council's area;

(3) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director for Planning and Transport Development to reallocate funds, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, from approved projects that become unviable owing to the level of funding allocated or to a change in circumstances of the applicant group, should such situations arise during the year.

160 FOSTERING ALLOWANCES ANNUAL REVIEW

Councillor Nathan Hartley proposed the recommendations. He explained that it was never easy to recruit good foster parents; but that he was delighted that the Family Placements Team had been working so hard to attract new fosterers. He reminded Cabinet that Children and Young People were a key priority for the Council.

Councillor Cherry Beath seconded the proposal by saying how impressed she had been by the commitment shown by foster carers. The proposed rises were in line with the recommendations of the Fostering Network.

[Councillor Tim Ball in a personal statement explained that he had no interest to declare on this matter, because he and his wife claimed no allowances from this authority.]

On a motion from Councillor Nathan Hartley, seconded by Councillor Cherry Beath, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To INCREASE fostering age related allowances and permanence allowances in line with Fostering Network recommendations as set out in the report;
- (2) To AGREE that there will be no change in fostering fees, savings rates for children in care, or supported lodgings as set out in the report; and
- (3) To NOTE the current level of care leavers maintenance which is linked to Job Seekers Allowance as set out in the report.

161 RESPONSE TO SOMERSET COUNTY COUNCIL MINERALS PLANNING OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Councillor Charles Gerrish in an *ad hoc* statement welcomed the report. He explained his concerns about the approach of the Mendip Council, particularly the impact on the Council's highways of any increase in extraction in the Mendip area as a result of HGV movements.

Councillor Tim Ball, in proposing the item, acknowledged the comments made by Councillor Gerrish. He also referred to reported seismic events caused by hydraulic fracking in the north of England. His biggest concern was that extraction in the Mendip Hills might have an unforeseen impact on the source of Bath's spa waters.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He said that he had asked the two local MPs to sign an Early Day Motion to stop any extraction in Mendip, and that one had so far agreed. He emphasised the importance of preventing anything which might put at risk the exceptionally high quality of Bath's waters.

Councillor Roger Symonds referred to Councillor Gerrish's comments about Heavy Goods Vehicles. He explained that he was already speaking to Somerset County Council about this matter. He proposed an amendment which would add the words "Cabinet agrees that the Council will monitor the traffic of Heavy Goods Vehicles passing from Somerset into North East Somerset".

Councillors Tim Ball and Cherry Beath both accepted the amendment.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor Cherry Beath, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To AGREE that the assessment as set out at Appendix 1 of the report will form the basis of the response to the consultation on the Minerals Core Strategy Options Paper to be forwarded to Somerset County Council by 12th February 2012 to help inform the preparation of Somerset County Council's draft Minerals Core Strategy; and
- (2) To AGREE that the Council will monitor the traffic of Heavy Goods Vehicles passing from Somerset into North East Somerset.

[Clause 2 above was added as a result of an amendment proposed by Councillor Roger Symonds and accepted by the proposer and seconder of the primary motion.]

162 HOME IMPROVEMENT AGENCY - RECOMMISSION

Phil Gait (Chairman, Care and Repair) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website*] asking Cabinet to reject the proposals because he felt they were unworkable and because of the impact they would have on vulnerable people.

Councillor Simon Allen, in proposing the item, said that the role of the Home Improvement Agency had developed, and was now seen as pivotal in helping older and vulnerable people to remain independent. The need would continue to grow, and the HIA must develop to meet that need. He stressed that the proposed contract would deliver flexibility and local expertise right to the point where it was needed.

Councillor Tim Ball seconded the proposal. He stressed that there was a local aspect to the proposals, which was essential.

Councillor David Bellotti referred to paragraph 3.2 of the report, in which estimated savings of 12% had been identified. He explained that any savings achieved might not necessarily be invested back into the same service.

Councillor Allen acknowledged the point made by Councillor Bellotti.

On a motion from Councillor Simon Allen, seconded by Councillor Tim Ball, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that Bath & North East Somerset continues to participate in the joint competitive procurement process to secure a new West of England Home Improvement Agency contractor; and

(2) To CONFIRM the delegated authority of the Programme Director for Non-Acute Health, Social Care and Housing, in her capacity as chair of the Supporting People & Communities Board, to exercise her judgement in concluding the contractual processes associated with this commission.

163 VARIOUS ROADS, KEYNSHAM TRO

Councillor Charles Gerrish read a statement by Councillor Alan Hale [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website*]. In the statement, Councillor Hale explained that residents of Dapps Hill had not responded in great numbers to the consultation about the proposed residents parking because they felt that they had made their feelings known in previous consultations and by means of an earlier petition. He asked Cabinet to bear this in mind when considering the Dapps Hill proposals.

Councillor Charles Gerrish made a statement on his own behalf in which he welcomed the proposals, particularly those relating to his own ward. He was concerned about enforcement on Saturdays and Sundays.

Roger Busby (Resident, Dapps Hill) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 8 and on the Council's website*] appealing to the Cabinet to proceed with the Dapps Hill Residents Parking Zone, despite the low response to the public consultation.

Councillor Roger Symonds, in proposing the item, referred to the 5-year backlog of traffic orders. The proposals before Cabinet showed a determination to deal with this. He explained that the Council had a statutory duty to consult on the proposals, and said that in the case of Dapps Hill, the statutory response had been

inconclusive. He did agree however that he would look again at that proposal in a year's time.

In response to Councillor Gerrish's comment, he confirmed that the Council did issue tickets on Saturdays and Sundays. Local Councillors could also ring, to express concern, if they felt it necessary.

Councillor Cherry Beath seconded the proposals which she felt were reasonable. She welcomed the commitment to look again at Dapps Hill in a year's time.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor Cherry Beath, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To IMPLEMENT the following Traffic Regulation Orders because no objections were received by the statutory deadlines:

(a) No Waiting at Any Time in Access Road to Tesco from Bristol Road, Access Road to Chandag Junior School, Chandag Road, Cranmore Avenue, Courtlands, Charlton Park, Charlton Road, Caernarvon Road, Caernarvon Close, Derwent Grove, Durley Hill, Dapps Hill, Holmoak Road, Kennet Road, Access Road to Tintagel Close (Kelston Road), Lambourn Road, Lockingwell Road, Northern Access Road to Wellsway School, Oak Tree Walk, Old Bristol Road, Queen's Road, Severn Way, St Ladoc Road.

(b) No Loading in Chandag Road

(c) No Waiting Mon-Fri, 8am-5pm in Chandag Road

(d) Limited Waiting Mon-Sat, 8am-6pm (2 hours) in Chandag Road

(e) Loading Bays in Chandag Road, High Street

(f) Disabled Bay in West View Road Mon – Fri, 8am – 6pm

(2) To MODIFY the School Keep Clears Chandag Road TRO so that the times are 8am – 6pm Monday to Friday only

(3) To ABANDON the schemes for Residents Permit Parking (Mon-Sat, 8am-6pm) in Chandos Road, Dryleaze, Summerleaze, Priory Road, Dapps Hill, St Clements Road.

164 GREEN INVESTMENT BANK

Councillor Paul Crossley proposed the item. He was delighted that the local area had thriving green, silicon and environmental industries. There were a number of very good reasons why the Green Investment Bank should be located in Bristol.

Councillor Cherry Bath seconded the proposal.

Councillor Roger Symonds was delighted, because this had been in his Party's manifesto commitment.

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor Cherry Beath, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To SUPPORT the bid for the Green Investment Bank to be located in Bristol

(2) To WORK with the Local Enterprise Partnership, the business community and Bristol City Council to promote the opportunities afforded by locating the Bank in Bristol

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

CABINET MEETING 8th February 2012

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

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

There were 7 notices of intention to make a statement at the meeting. Where the intention is to speak about an item on the Agenda, the speaker will be offered the option to speak near the beginning of the meeting or just before the Agenda item.

Statements about issues NOT on the Agenda

- David Redgewell (South West Transport Network)
Re: Planning and Transport Development
- Amanda Leon (Radstock Action Group)
Re: Victoria Hall and related issues
- Cllr Eleanor Jackson
Re: Victoria Hall and Radstock Development Funding

Re: Agenda Item 21 (Home Improvement Agency)

- Phil Gait (Chairman, Care and Repair)

Re: Agenda Item 22 (Keynsham TROs)

- Cllr Alan Hale
- Cllr Charles Gerrish
- Roger Busby (Resident, Dapps Hill)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Michael Evans
Would the cabinet member please explain why provision for the zebra crossing on Radstock Road Midsomer Norton (A362) at Welton Primary School does not appear on the capital register, in spite of the public being informed in a PACT meeting in 2011 that it was to go ahead?		
	Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds
<i>A proposal for a zebra crossing on A362 Radstock Road outside Welton Primary School is listed on the Traffic & Safety Task Register, which is a list of schemes to be considered and prioritised for possible future funding. However, formal pedestrian</i>		

crossings, including zebras, can only be justified where certain numerical criteria relating to pedestrians crossing the road are fulfilled. Counts at this location have shown that, outside of school entry and exit times, very few people cross the road here. Those accessing the school are well catered for by the existing School Crossing Patrol. As a result a formal zebra crossing cannot be justified at this location, at the present time. There is some lunchtime pedestrian activity associated with the nursery in the school, therefore it is proposed to extend the Crossing Patrol duty hours to cover this period. With regard to the information released at the PACT meeting, I am unaware of who said what, however it is possible that there has been some confusion between the Task Register and the Capital Works Programme. As stated above, this proposal is on the Task Register, but is not on the current Capital Works Programme

M 02	Question from:	Councillor Alan Hale
In the light of the answer to Cllr Gerrish's question MO6 to the Cabinet meeting on November 11th 2011 and following a conversation with the Taylor Wimpey Managing Director Nigel Holland and Land and Planning Director Greg Wilkinson on January 30th in which both men expressed a willingness to consider providing a temporary haul road for development traffic from Charlton Rd to the K2 site thus avoiding the impending misery for residents of Park Road Keynsham and other approach roads, can the Cabinet Member please explain whether the council has and will reopen negotiations with appropriate landowners to establish a suitable route?		
	Answer from:	Councillor Tim Ball
<i>The arrangements for the management of construction traffic are the responsibility of the developer however there appears to be merit in the option to avoid Park Road. I will ask officers to contact the developer and investigate the practicalities and the required permissions for an alternative temporary access route onto Charlton Road.</i>		

M 03	Question from:	Councillor Geoff Ward
In respect to the report identifying Bathampton/Batheaston meadows as a site for flood compensation/relief for the city, is it envisaged that any earthworks would be needed to achieve the relief volumes required and what assessment has been made on their visual impact?		
	Answer from:	Councillor Tim Ball
<i>Bath Compensatory Storage Study Phase 1 Report (Nov.2011) by WYG Engineering sets out a preliminary investigation into potential compensatory storage upstream of the city centre. The provision of compensatory storage will be created by reducing or re-profiling the existing ground level. All areas of excavation will be subject to sympathetic reinstatement thereby minimising visual impact. The compensatory storage area will be</i>		

normally dry. It will be designed to fill and drain when needed ensuring the continued use of the land for agricultural and other purposes and avoiding the areas become water logged for longer periods.

WYG Engineering is now preparing the Phase 2 report for the Council and this will include the consideration of the visual impact. The public consultation to identify the preferred site planned for spring this year.

I am happy to sit down with Councillor Ward and discuss this matter further with him at any time during to consultation process

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

There were none

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT – David Redgewell (Read by George Bailey)

STATEMENT FROM SOUTH WEST TRANSPORT NETWORK REGARDING AGENDA ITEM 10 CABINET MEETING 8th FEBRUARY 2011

From reading the background papers, it would seem that youth, and the importance of equality of opportunity, are key to this agenda item. Better public transport provision is especially important to young people whose movements are often disregarded when consultants are appointed to study particular aspects of transport provision. Those living in a household without access to a car are hugely disadvantaged when it comes to choice of school or access to after school activities if frequent bus and rail provision is unavailable compared to those whose parents may add considerably to city centre congestion by undertaking pdj's - "parent double journeys".

We would particularly draw the attention of Members to the following matters :

- 1) Service Delivery: All nine lines out of Bristol/Bath should remain at present levels at least.
- 2) Level of Rolling Stock: Six extra trains is insufficient
- 3) Modern Depot: There is a need for a modern depot in either the Ashton Gate area or Westbury, Wiltshire.
- 4) New Local Service: A local electric service from Swindon to Cardiff, to serve new stations at Wootton Bassett, Corsham, Saltford and Ashley Down
- 5) Revenue Protection: Emphasis to be given to revenue protection issues with installation of gatelines at Weston, Trowbridge and Chippenham. Cuts to numbers of Revenue Protection Officers should be resisted both for the protection of the travelling public and to guard against vandalism, graffiti, etc., and support present levels of British Transport Police in the Bristol area.
- 6) Accessibility Issues: In Merseyside they have recently successfully introduced the concept of a "café/corner shop" within stations. These not only sell rail tickets, but act as an information point, serving a variety of goods plus hot/cold drinks and refreshments. These are linked to accessible toilets and waiting area.
- 7) Integration: Ensure integration of rail services with bus and ferry services at Bristol and with bus services in other areas.
- 8) Bus Grant: With the recent cutting of bus operators' grant, operators have delayed purchase of the accessible vehicles specified across the Greater Bristol and Wiltshire areas.

We also wish to draw Members' attention to the £5m fund presently available, announced by Norman Baker, to be used in the procurement of low-floor vehicles and interchanges. We feel it may be possible for the Council to make a bid for funding in relation to both Filton and Dolphin Square.

David Redgewell
SW Transport Network

(G Bailey) I would add that in the Radstock / Midsomer Norton area the real-time displays do not necessarily work and timetables posted are out-of-date At Bath, the interchange doors do not work and development seems to have stalled.

A statement by Amanda Leon, member of Radstock Action Group, to B&NES Cabinet 8 February 2012

'It is a complicated knot of roads that have been tied here over the centuries. It was proving difficult today to find anyone who had confidence the council's plan would untangle that knot'. David Woodland for ITV West Country Tonight on Tuesday 7 February 2012.

My intention had been solely to ask Cabinet to listen to our responsible request to discuss the possibility of being allowed, as a group of highly qualified and responsible individual volunteers, to keep the Victoria Hall open for current users.

However, such is the scale of devastation and the lack of responsible planning and communication relating to the council's latest incursions into the town, I feel that I have no option but to allude to the bigger picture – a picture of which Victoria Hall forms a significant part; a picture in which the Victoria Hall will be put beyond the reach of the community as Radstock is converted into an isolated, marooned patch at the centre of a traffic system designed to speed through traffic on its way.

Today, two members of B&NES Property Services were in Radstock measuring up some undisclosed aspects of the Victoria Hall. It would have been inappropriate to interrogate them on what exactly was going on and why. Given the fact that members of the community have already volunteered to keep the hall open, would it not have been a good idea to invite us all to a meeting to explore how this could become a reality?

Being under siege is an unspeakable experience. Physical siege provoked by muddy roads; the destruction of swathes of trees in the centre of the 'best preserved mining town centre' in the country; unannounced closure of well-used footpaths; the taking out of service of light-controlled pedestrian crossings; huge trucks and endless noise from wanton corporate vandalism as B&NES flattens the natural features of the railway land. And emotional and intellectual siege provoked by a constant stream of misinformation and absence of information; remarks about what outsiders (in this case B&NES) are going to do to our town; a complete disregard for normal procedures¹; total silence from the council when we ask even the most reasonable questions²; broken undertakings³.

¹ On whose authority and under what agreement from elected members following which procedures, were all the trees felled? Where is the Safety Audit for the current road proposals?

² Very early on Monday 6 February, we emailed the leader of the Council asking what was happening – we didn't even receive an acknowledgement. B&NES issued a press Release at 17.22 after irreversible damage had been done. They did not copy us in, but we received it all the same from a sympathetic councillor (and, for the record, it was not Cllr Jackson).

³ Assurances that unless houses were built there would be no road

The well-being of those who live and/or work in the town is at stake. At the very least, given the situation I have outlined above, I would ask that B&NES works with people to ensure that the facilities offered by the Victoria Hall are maintained.

We understand precisely that no long-term commitment is possible immediately, but we would like to see that when a group of volunteers steps up with a reasonable offer of community involvement, approaches our 'listening' council, that their offer is welcomed and processed so that at least some semblance of continuity can be maintained in Radstock.

Please allow us to keep the Victoria Hall open. We will act responsibly. We want to work with B&NES as the owner of the building.

Although the Victoria Hall has limped along since 2000 in limbo between B&NES and NRTC, it has flourished as the heart of community life and is well used by community groups, the silver band, a Pentecostal church and businesses every night of the week and at weekends. It is the only large community space capable of holding big meetings and with a proper kitchen could host many more parties and celebrations than it does at present. To board it up now would mean the dispersal, or even the end of some of these groups because there are no alternatives nearby. It needs LTC, proper management and committed volunteers, and a group has come together as 'The Victoria Hall Interim Management Committee' and has written to Tom McBain in Property Services offering to run the hall for a year as a trial period.

At issue is the future of the Susan Hill School of Dance, with 120/500 clients using the hall every Saturday, the Forerunners Church on Friday evening and the dog obedience classes on Mondays. In addition there must be about 50-60 under 18s using the snooker hall, as well as some middle aged serious players. These are activities which draw people into Radstock and provide vital custom for the shops and small businesses, not to mention Radco. There is also the Secret Garden project behind the Victoria Hall which engages young people in a 'healthy eating vegetable growing project.'

It may well prove that there is a reverter on the site, as with other central Radstock buildings, or a covenant mirroring the one laid on Lady Waldegrave's first community hall on the site, built in 1866, which will constrain future use, but what is needed now is action.

I request cabinet firstly, to make a commitment not to sell it for offices or some other private purpose. Paul Crossley has done this privately.

Secondly, to instruct officers to work with the community to ensure a viable future perhaps on the model of the Old Town Hall in MSN, perhaps co-run by the Museum but in all cases to ensure that the vibrancy of night life in Radstock remains, and it provides for recreation and education as originally intended. I would agree with Cllr Bellotti that a long-term sustainable future needs to be organised for the 'jewel in the crown' of Radstock. It could be done for £20,000 less rental revenue. Surely with all the millions ebbing and flowing through the Budget, approx. £15,000 can be found. (excepting rates)

Mini-Budget based on 2010/11 Budget.

Electricity	£5,000	(RTC's computer equipment set against rising costs)
Gas/heating oil	£4,500	
Heating/hygiene	£ 4,000	
Insurance	£ ,750	(is this the true figure?)
Equipment	£ ,500	(Maintenance. (? piano tuning)
Property maintenance	£ 3,000	
Licences	£ 50	
Water rates	£1, 200	
Total	£19,000	Revenue in 2010/11 would be c £5,000

Cllr Eleanor Jackson, Radstock.

This page is intentionally left blank

Save Our 6-7 Buses Statement - Cabinet Meeting Wed 8th Feb, 2012

It has been almost 2 years since the bus service in north east Bath was first cut. In response to public demand, one of the first acts of the current council was to find contingency funds to partly reinstate the service. Contingency funding is providing an additional bus, creating a 30 minute frequency which has been deeply appreciated by the thousands of bus users in our area. This contingency funding was limited to the year October 2011 to October 2012.

But we are concerned that unless the funding for our service is incorporated into the standard transportation budget, it will be vulnerable to further cuts.

1. Our urgent and primary concern tonight is to hear the Cabinet confirm that future funding for our 30 minute service is assured.
2. In addition, we ask that the Save Our 6-7 Buses campaign team is consulted in good time when changes to fares, frequency or routes are proposed by bus companies for our area
3. We remind the councillors of two things: that there has been a commitment to providing low-floor buses, which seems not to be being applied to additional buses
4. We are awaiting a date for the second Public Transport Liaison Group meeting where current feedback can be given between users and providers of transport.

But first and foremost, please respond to our need for continuity of funding for our 30 minute bus service.

Thank you.

Delivered by Pamela Galloway

For the Save Our 6-7 Buses team

Written by Lin Patterson

10 Brookleaze Buildings

Larkhall, Bath, BA1 6RA

01225 311163

This page is intentionally left blank

Resources Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel, 6th February 2012 – Budget Report Comments

Children's Services (page 1 or Annex 5)

- The Panel noted the absence of detailed financial plans for 2013/14 onwards in this area. The Panel noted the uncertainties associated with the fundamental review of the LEA role in response to the creation of Academies and the new system of Local Government finance

Adult Social Care and Housing, People and Communities – Saving Items (page 3 of Annex 5).

- The Panel had serious concerns about the proposed savings in the unit cost of registered residential care for adults with learning difficulties;
- The Panel were concerned that the Equalities Impact Assessment did not look at the global effect of the proposed savings on adults with learning difficulties.
- The Panel noted that the level of savings would be clarified and the robustness of the proposal would be reviewed. They further noted that there would be close monitoring arrangements in this area.
- The Panel had some concerns about savings in 'Personal Budgets' as they felt this would remove choice.

Increase in Heritage net profit

- The Panel had some reservations over the income trends in this area and asked if they were over optimistic. The Panel noted that officers would check the figures in the latest monitoring report and be sure that the budget reflected any downward trends.

Highways – Drainage and Gully Cleansing (page 17 of Annex 5)

- The Panel had some concerns regarding cuts to this service as they felt that the effects on road maintenance would be likely to offset any saving if not well managed and prioritised.

Waste Services – Reduce hours at Recycling Centres (page 18 of Annex 5)

- The Panel were concerned about a reduction in hours to this service and suggested that the centres opened later and closed later on Sundays.

End Mobile Library Service (page 20 of Annex 5)

- The Panel asked officers to review the figures on this and obtain more clarity from the department as different figures had been referred to elsewhere. The clarity of the Equalities Impact Assessment on this service was noted.

Reduce spend on leisure activity and local leisure events (page18 or Annex 5)

- The Panel noted that more work was needed on the Equalities Impact Assessment in this area. There were questions about the balance between activities to create tourism footfall and activities to increase local participation plus a concern about the reference in the service action plan to do with the expected impact of service cuts on people with low incomes.

AGENDA ITEM 14 – Financial Plan 2012/2013 – 2014/2015, Budget & Council Tax 2012/13

WORDING CLARIFICATIONS

- Page 4** **The £1.3m for “Other priority improvements” includes:**
- **£130K Capital Borrowing Costs for St Gregorys 6th Form Improvements**
 - **£38K Listening Council**
 - **£32K 6/7 Bus Service**
 - **£22K Street Cleaning**
 - **£100K Community Infrastructure Levy**
- The balance includes support for the revenue costs of various new capital schemes including London Road Regeneration, Creative Hub, Beechen Cliff Woodland, Radstock Regeneration, Affordable Housing etc.**
- Page 86** **Victoria Bridge item – 2nd paragraph – final sentence to be replaced for clarification with “The aim of this will be to reduce the net cost to the Council by maximising external funding, including developer S106 contributions”.**
- Page 92** **“Norton Radstock Regeneration” typing error should read “Radstock Regeneration”.**
- Page 105** **“Other Miscellaneous Budgets “to be replaced for clarification with “Corporate Budgets including Capital, Audit and Bank Charges”.**

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT Phil Gait, Chair, Somerset Care & Repair

Thank you Chairman.

I am speaking as the Chair of B&NES Care and Repair and on behalf of the vulnerable residents of B&NES – as Chair, unlike most residents of B&NES, I know some details of the proposed West of England HIA and the likely impact it will have on the vulnerable residents of B&NES.

The paper before you paints a rosy, but unrealistic, picture of the benefits of one HIA for the four authorities in the West of England partnership.

I did ask the Wellbeing Policy and Development Scrutiny Panel in November to scrutinise this decision but they did not ask any detailed questions on their report before refusing to conduct such a review.

It is not possible for me to cover, in three minutes, the major issues in this paper and the questions that should be answered before you can be in a position to agree the recommendation. That is why, before this meeting, I asked each of you if you could contact any Cllrs that you know in Devon, Somerset and Gloucester to learn from their experience of their recent large HIA contract. I suggested Cllrs rather than Commissioners as some of these decision makers are still in a state of denial. I am sure that some of you will now know that, for example

- The Devon countywide HIA has collapsed, and as the local District agencies had disbanded there is now no HIA service in operation.
- South Somerset Scrutiny is investigating why their Handy Person service is providing less than half the contracted visits and why many of those visits are unsatisfactory.
- Gloucester City has reopened its Agency because of the number of complaints and the poor quality service from the new provider
- In Mendip the local Agency is undertaking a great number of grant works because the new provider cannot cope with the volume of work. In this case the local Authority are paying twice for the same service – is this economies of scale?

There may be successful large HIAs in compact urban areas, but the above indicates that the model proposed by the consultant from Foundations will not work in the West of England.

Why is there no mention of the experience of these counties in your report tonight?

The option to procure separate provision is rejected in section 9.2 because it is “unlikely to deliver value for money improvements that accrue from working collaboratively”.

If you investigate this, as I have mentioned above, you will see that the WoE HIA is unlikely to deliver value for money improvements as well.

However, I believe that working collaboratively with an organisation, such as B&NES Care and Repair, which has a proven track record for excellent service to customers, a proven track record for obtaining grants to help vulnerable residents in other ways (such as the Radstock Garden project) and innovative approaches to delivering cost effective services will continue to deliver value for money. (As an aside, I must mention that this includes working with Norton Radstock College to help them with their apprenticeship schemes)

I ask you to reject the recommendation before you tonight. Thank you for listening.

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT: Cllr Alan Hale (delivered by Cllr Charles Gerrish)

Since before my first election now almost five years ago, the residents of Dapps Hill in Keynsham have been fighting to achieve a Residents Parking Zone. Their experience is that the roads around their home have become a car park for commuters to the town and anecdotally they believe that the majority of cars parked are those of council employees working in Riverside.

The Residents Parking Zone scheme was consulted on late last year and it is regrettable with hindsight and new knowledge, that few people wrote in to support the scheme. I have to be honest that I like them took the consultation notices to mean that the council intended to action the scheme but the consultation offered an opportunity for those who did want to object to do so and in the event two or three did so.

However those less than a handful of objectors pales into insignificance when set against the number of people who have filled in a number of surveys over the past five years, one survey being mine. There has also been a petition which was circulated and signed by the vast majority of the residents of Dapps Hill. Petition and surveys clearly showed that an overwhelming majority of people living in Dapps Hill wished to see the arrival of a residents parking zone.

All surveys and the petition were lodged with the Parking Services Manager Dorothy Miley and so there is a clear history of the wish for a Residents Parking Zone and I suspect that the residents who had on more than at least two occasions expressed their view in writing believed that there was no need to reiterate their views.

Again I shall be open and honest with you in saying that I held a similar view having been instrumental in supporting the residents over four years and writing on their behalf both to the Parking Manager and the Director. I have also had correspondence with Chris Major the new manager and so he is aware of the history. I currently await a response to my most recent email to him.

I write to you now asking that in your deliberation next week that you consider the history of this aspiration and support the Residents Parking Zone for Dapps Hill based on the paperwork held in Parking Services expressing the residents wishes. To implement limited waiting in Dapps Hill would only further frustrate the residents by preventing them from relatively close access to their homes during the day.

Thank You.

Alan Hale

Cllr Keynsham South.

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & NE Somerset Cabinet Meeting 8th February 2012

Agenda item 22: Various roads, Keynsham TRO

I am a resident of Dapps Hill, having lived there for the last 12 years. Over the last five years the majority of the residents have been seeking to have Dapps Hill declared a Residents Parking Zone. This has been demonstrated by several surveys that have been undertaken during this period, the results of which have been passed to the Parking Manager

We were eventually told by our local Councillor that our request was at last being dealt with and this was confirmed when notices were placed in the street. Most of us took this to be the confirmation for which we had waited so long. We did not realise that it was yet another consultation, hence the very low response.

I now understand that, as a result of that low response, the officers of the Council are proposing not to go ahead with the declaration of the Residents Parking Zone. If this is so, it strikes me as a case of Maladministration.

Roger Busby
12 Dapps Hill
Keynsham
BS31 1ES

This page is intentionally left blank