

Democratic Services

Riverside, Temple Street, Keynsham, Bristol BS31 1LA
Telephone: (01225) 477000 *main switchboard*
Direct Lines - Tel: 01225 394458
Web-site - <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk>

Your ref:

Our ref:

Date: 18th July 2011

E-mail: Democratic_Services@bathnes.gov.uk

**To: All Members of the Planning, Transport and Environment Policy
Development and Scrutiny**

Councillor Marie Longstaff
Councillor Caroline Roberts
Councillor Malcolm Hanney
Councillor Geoff Ward
Councillor Neil Butters
Councillor David Martin
Councillor Douglas Nicol

Councillor Tim Ball - Cabinet Member: **Homes and Planning**
Councillor David Dixon - Cabinet Member: **Neighbourhoods**
Councillor Roger Symonds - Cabinet Member: **Transport**

Chief Executive and other appropriate officers
Press and Public

Dear Member

**Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny: Tuesday, 26th
July, 2011**

You are invited to attend a meeting of the **Planning, Transport and Environment Policy
Development and Scrutiny**, to be held on **Tuesday, 26th July, 2011** at **2.00 pm** in the
Brunswick Room - Guildhall, Bath.

*Members of the Panel are asked to be present at 1.00pm by the Chairman to have a pre-
meeting.*

The agenda is set out overleaf.

Yours sincerely

Mark Durnford
for Chief Executive

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

This Agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper

NOTES:

- 1. Inspection of Papers:** Any person wishing to inspect minutes, reports, or a list of the background papers relating to any item on this Agenda should contact Mark Durnford who is available by telephoning Bath 01225 394458 or by calling at the Riverside Offices Keynsham (during normal office hours).
- 2. Public Speaking at Meetings:** The Council has a scheme to encourage the public to make their views known at meetings. They may make a statement relevant to what the meeting has power to do. They may also present a petition or a deputation on behalf of a group. Advance notice is required not less than two full working days before the meeting (this means that for meetings held on Wednesdays notice must be received in Democratic Services by 4.30pm the previous Friday)

The public may also ask a question to which a written answer will be given. Questions must be submitted in writing to Democratic Services at least two full working days in advance of the meeting (this means that for meetings held on Wednesdays, notice must be received in Democratic Services by 4.30pm the previous Friday). If an answer cannot be prepared in time for the meeting it will be sent out within five days afterwards. Further details of the scheme can be obtained by contacting Mark Durnford as above.

- 3. Details of Decisions taken at this meeting** can be found in the minutes which will be published as soon as possible after the meeting, and also circulated with the agenda for the next meeting. In the meantime details can be obtained by contacting Mark Durnford as above.

Appendices to reports are available for inspection as follows:-

Public Access points - Riverside - Keynsham, Guildhall - Bath, Hollies - Midsomer Norton, and Bath Central, Keynsham and Midsomer Norton public libraries.

For Councillors and Officers papers may be inspected via Political Group Research Assistants and Group Rooms/Members' Rooms.

- 4. Attendance Register:** Members should sign the Register which will be circulated at the meeting.
- 5. THE APPENDED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS ARE IDENTIFIED BY AGENDA ITEM NUMBER.**
- 6. Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

When the continuous alarm sounds, you must evacuate the building by one of the designated exits and proceed to the named assembly point. The designated exits are sign-posted.

Arrangements are in place for the safe evacuation of disabled people.

**Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny - Tuesday, 26th
July, 2011**

at 2.00 pm in the Brunswick Room - Guildhall, Bath

A G E N D A

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair will draw attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out under Note 6.

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

Members who have an interest to declare are asked to:

- a) State the Item Number in which they have the interest
- b) The nature of the interest
- c) Whether the interest is personal, or personal and prejudicial

Any Member who is unsure about the above should seek advice from the Monitoring Officer prior to the meeting in order to expedite matters at the meeting itself.

5. TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THIS MEETING

At the time of publication no notifications had been received.

7. BATH TRANSPORT PACKAGE (Pages 7 - 14)

The Panel will receive an amended version of the report that went to Council on 14th July 2011 for them to discuss.

8. GREEN SPACES STRATEGY UPDATE (Pages 15 - 40)

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on progress against the action plan contained in the Green Space Strategy which was adopted in March 2007 and to inform the panel of the proposed revised timetable for the review of the strategy.

9. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) / S.106 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS (Pages 41 - 44)

National changes to Local Government finance mean that Local Authorities will be increasingly dependent on locally generated income including Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The CIL regulations that came into force on 6th April 2010 allow local authorities to raise fund from developers undertaking new building projects in their area to provide key infrastructure needed as a result of development.

10. FOOD WASTE RECYCLING COLLECTIONS UPDATE (Pages 45 - 48)

11. CABINET MEMBER RESPONSE TO COMMERCIAL WASTE COLLECTION OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY SINGLE INQUIRY DAY (Pages 49 - 58)

The single inquiry day brought together representatives from commercial waste collection companies, local businesses and Council officers. A report from the meeting was produced with a number of recommendations that were presented at the last Safer Stronger Communities Panel meeting on the 24th March 2011 that contained 8 recommendations for the then Cabinet Member for Service Delivery.

The recommendations from this report appeared on the Weekly List on 27th May 2011 for the newly appointed Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods to respond within six weeks.

12. CABINET MEMBER UPDATE

This item gives the Panel an opportunity to ask questions to the Cabinet Member(s) and for them to update the Panel on any current issues.

13. SUSTAINABLE GROWTH AGENDA (INC HOUSING)

The Panel will receive a briefing on this item from the Development & Major Projects Director.

14. PANEL WORKPLAN (Pages 59 - 72)

This report presents the latest workplan for the Panel (Appendix 1) as well as

information to help Panel members identify any additional items for the workplan.

The Committee Administrator for this meeting is Mark Durnford who can be contacted on 01225 394458.

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council		
MEETING:	Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel	
MEETING DATE:	26th July 2011	EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE:
TITLE:	Bath Transport Package – Best & Final Bid to DfT <i>(This report is an amended version of the document issued to Council on 14th July 2011)</i>	
WARD:	Various	
List of attachments to this report:		

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 By the 9th September 2011 the Council has to submit a Best & Final Bid to DfT for the funding of the Bath Transport Package (BTP). The Council meeting on 14th July is the last opportunity to amend the transport policy to reflect what is likely to be included in the Best and Final Bid.
- 1.2 Following the Comprehensive Spending Review Department for Transport (DfT) have indicated that they wish to reduce costs, enhance value and improve deliverability of major transport schemes. DfT also wish to increase Local Authority contribution. In January DfT requested an ‘expression of interest’ from the Council for the Bath Package which proposed removing some parts of the package. Following recent Council elections further work has been undertaken to reduce the cost of the Package. This has resulted in the removal of the BRT and the A4 P&R from the BTP. The removal of these proposals are departures from the Council’s existing transport policy as set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet agrees that the following elements of the BTP should not be included in the Best & Final Bid to DfT and that these changes to the BTP are recommended to Full Council on 14th July 2011:

- 2.1 The Bus Rapid Transit Segregated Route.
- 2.2 The A36 Lower Bristol Road Bus Lane.
- 2.3 The A4 London Road Lambridge Bus Lane.
- 2.4 New A4 Eastern P&R (1400 spaces), plus bus lane priority on the A4/A46 slip road.
- 2.5 And in addition reduce the size of the P&R expansion at Newbridge.

As a result the BTP would comprise of the following elements:

- 2.6 Upgrades to bus stop infrastructure on 9 service routes, including real time passenger information.
- 2.7 Expansion of Odd Down P&R by 250 spaces, of Lansdown P&R by 390 spaces and of Newbridge P&R by 250 spaces on a suitable alternative.
- 2.8 Variable Message signs on the main approaches to Bath, and within the city centre.
- 2.9 City centre works: High Street improvements and timed access restrictions (currently ongoing).
- 2.10 Works to support BWR including a bus rapid transit system serving the site.
- 2.11 As a result of the above the Cabinet agree to formally withdraw the CPOs agreed at its meeting on 3rd September 2008 and subsequently served to allow for the implementation of the BTP. The Cabinet agree and recommends to Full Council that the Council contribution towards the BTP would be no more £17.8m as set out in section 3 below. The schemes costs as recommended in this report have been reduced from £58.8m to £34.3m.
- 2.12 Cabinet agree and recommends to full Council that the final submission to DfT be approved by the Strategic Director Service Delivery and Chief Executive in consultation with the portfolio holder, the S151 officer and monitoring officer, and with a report back to cabinet only if necessary notably if there is a material change in the financial costs or scope of the scheme which go beyond the parameters set out in this report.
- 2.13 Cabinet recommend to full Council additional borrowing of £3M to fully finance the costs of the Council contribution of up to £17.8M with an additional annual revenue cost of approximately £190K which will need to be included in revenue budgets for future years following completion of the scheme.
- 2.14 Cabinet note the revenue reversion risk as set out in paragraph 3.3 and the potential need to fund the costs of project work on aspects of the scheme which are no longer going ahead from reserves with the appropriate financing to be dealt with in a later report to cabinet and Council as appropriate and if the need arises.

In addition the Cabinet agrees and recommends to Full Council to instruct officers to:

- 2.15 work on alternatives to Bathampton Meadows P&R, possibly involving rail, as part of our future Transport Strategy
- 2.16 work with the Highways Agency to improve signage on the A46 to direct more traffic to an extended Lansdown Park and Ride
- 2.17 talk to Wiltshire Council about measures to remove some of the through traffic along the London Road and other cross border transport issues
- 2.18 evaluate measures to remove HGVs from London Road - this 10% of traffic creates 40% of the pollution

- 2.19 examine how we can obtain substantial "modal shift" from the private car to rail in recognition of potential for rail expansion with the electrification of the GWR and the awarding of an extended rail franchise
- 2.20 evaluate options to address the problems caused by a lack of affordable home to school transport
- 2.21 consider measures to make the whole area much more cycle friendly - we have already secured Govt funding through the Regional Sustainable Transport Fund to link Batheaston to NCR 4 on the canal towpath, thereby taking many cyclists off the London Road and encouraging others to get out of their cars and cycle into Bath.

3. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1 In January this year the Council submitted an 'expression of interest' to DfT which indicated that we would be prepared to make a local contribution for the BTP of £17.8m and this was subsequently earmarked in Council budgets as part of the budget setting report 2011/12. The Council contribution is included at this level within the current approved Capital Budget (Hard Coded and Italics) and included the revenue implications of the borrowing costs which are estimated to be £657,000 per annum. There is one exception to this which is set out in paragraph 3.3 below. In submitting our Best & Final Bid later this year the Council needs to reconsider the amount of its own contribution in the light of the significantly reduced scope and cost of the project i.e. without the BRT and A4 P&R. The context also includes the substantially reduced levels of Government capital grants available since the last national Comprehensive spending Review together with the increase in the level of competition for the available monies. Further detail is set out in the report.
- 3.2 As is indicated above DfT have emphasised that the projects in the Development Pool are in a highly competitive process where DfT wants to fund as many schemes as they can but can only do so if Local Authorities maximise their contributions. At a meeting with the Leader and Don Foster MP, Norman Baker Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Transport, indicated his expectation that the local funding contribution to be committed in the Best & Final Bid would match the figure already stated in the Expression of Interest i.e. £17.8m. It is for the Council to decide what contribution to offer to DfT and given the reduced scope of the project (and net reduction in cost to DfT) a reduced Council contribution of less than £17.8m might be acceptable however this would appear to increase the risk of DfT rejecting the funding bid.
- 3.3 In the event of DfT not approving the scheme there would be a potential revenue reversion risk of commitments to date of up to £6.5m. This is a worst case scenario. There is a revenue reversion risk of up to £3.8m due to the deletion of the A4 P&R and the BRT (£1.3m & £2.5m respectively). Any revenue reversion would immediately fall as a charge to the Council's general fund balances which would then have to be repaid, if not financed through alternative means, from the annual Council budget over a period of not more than three years.
- 3.4 The scheme previously included a self financing element in respect of the new park and ride. The exclusion of this from the scheme to be submitted to the DfT means that there is less revenue available to support borrowing costs. The net impact of this is that £3M of capital expenditure requires additional revenue support in the region of £190K per annum based on a Council contribution of £17.8M.

3 CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- *Promoting the independence of older people*
- *Improving life chances of disadvantaged teenagers and young people*
- *Sustainable growth*
- *Improving the availability of Affordable Housing*
- *Addressing the causes and effects of Climate Change*
- *Improving transport and the public realm*

4 THE REPORT

- 4.1 Following the comprehensive spending review DfT confirmed that they wished to continue to fund the BTP by placing it within a 'Development Pool' with other projects. The number of projects was significantly increased earlier this year following submission of Expressions of Interests. (There is about £1bn available with all scheme costs in the pool totalling £1.5bn). There will be no other source of capital funding for Transport Improvements of this scale until the next Comprehensive Spending Review commencing 2015/16. Key to obtaining DfT approval will be the affordability of the project, its appraisal (value for money) and deliverability. Finally DfT have emphasised the competitive nature of this bidding round and are seeking to reduce the size of their contribution by increasing other sources particularly from Local Authorities.
- 4.2 The first stage of this review culminated in the Expression of Interest to DfT in January 2011. This excluded the A36 Bus Lane and Lambridge Bus lane from the BTP. The costs of these elements outweigh the benefits they deliver, and their removal will improve the benefit cost ratio for the remaining BTP. The A36 Bus Lane is a part of a long standing improvement line, which it is recommended we continue to protect through planning policy, and can be implemented in the future should resources allow. The Lambridge Bus lane was particularly expensive (£1.2m for 190 metres) due to diversion of statutory services and the need to build an extension to the Lambrook Culvert. While the loss of this small bus lane is regrettable it is not considered justifiable in the current financial climate.
- 4.3 **BRT:** DfT have continued to challenge all elements of schemes especially when they are particularly expensive. The new administration has indicated their wish to delete the BRT from the BTP. The removal of the BRT segregated route which was subject to most objections would greatly improve the deliverability of the reduced BTP, a key DfT criteria. It would also reduce the cost of the project significantly. As a result the P&R service would have to continue to use the existing route along the Newbridge Road. This would reduce the reliability of this service and increase journey times as traffic levels increase. However DfT have now published new forecasts on which projects in the Development Pool will have to be modelled. This indicates that traffic levels will not grow as fast as previously predicted (as a result of the current economic downturn) and the running the P&R on Newbridge Road would not adversely impact on the benefit cost ratio for the BTP as a whole.
- 4.4 **Newbridge P&R expansion:** The original BTP proposed that Newbridge P&R should be doubled in size from 500 to 1,000 spaces. Last year an application to register some of the land on which this expansion would take place as a Town and Village Green (TVG) was made. The Inspector's report into this informal hearing is expected to be published soon and will then be considered by the Council's Public

Rights of Way Committee. If this land is registered as a TVG it will prevent the implementation of the full expansion of the P&R. However as indicated above in paragraph 4.3 growth forecasts have been revised by DfT and a smaller expansion of the Newbridge P&R (less than the original 500 new spaces) would meet the likely demand in the short to medium term. The original expansion of Newbridge P&R also included a new traffic signal controlling access to and from the site. This required acquisition of a small parcel of land. However, should a negotiated settlement not be reached, a slight modification to the scheme design would allow implementation without acquisition of 3rd party land, and without material affect to operations or scheme benefits. It is recommended that this element is retained within the bid, on the assumption that CPO is not pursued for its delivery.

- 4.5 **A4 P&R site:** The site was selected after a thorough review of the alternatives and remains a deliverable location for this much needed facility. The new administration has indicated their wish to delete this element from the BTP. Its deletion from the BTP at this time might raise questions from DfT (and others) on the Council's core strategy for delivering economic and housing growth on key brown field sites in the city itself. There is a risk that DfT might, as a result, not fund the remaining elements of the project. However, given the relatively small amount of DfT funding required for the remaining elements, if the facility is not included, in our bid we might still be successful in December. Alternative P&R sites are being considered but it is not possible to include a credible or deliverable option within the bid in the very short timescale remaining.
- 4.6 **Bus Lane A4/A46 roundabout:** in the absence of the A4 P&R it is not clear that the bus lane on the A4/A46 roundabout can be justified as a stand alone proposal and it is not recommended to be included in the package.
- 4.7 **Third Party contributions:** The BTP assumed 2 sources of local contributions firstly £2.2m from BWR and secondly £2.9m from the P&R operator by way of new buses. We will still need the contribution from Crest Nicholson to help provide a public transport solution to the development of this key site to reduce its impact on the local road network. The alternative transport interventions will need to be agreed with Crest Nicholson to secure these funds.
- 4.8 The contribution by way of new buses may now need to be reviewed. The reduction in the growth in the number of P&R spaces from 2,400 to 870 as now proposed may not allow this element of the project to be delivered. In addition there were a number of improvements to the highway proposed particularly in the city centre to assist in implementing the cross city P&R service which we need to review in developing our Best & Final Bid to DfT. This may further reduce the cost of the project.
- 4.9 **Deliverability and timescale:** The recommendations set out above presents an opportunity to implement the BTP **without the need for CPO or public inquiry**. This not only allows the BTP to be offered to DfT as a project 'ready to go' for which full approval could be given it but it would also significantly reduce costs to the Council by avoiding direct costs of CPO and inquiry, and the inflationary cost of delaying construction. The cost of the CPOs themselves would be avoided and earlier delivery would also avoid risks from inflation. These costs are estimated at £1.5m for a medium delay, excluding the baseline costs of construction.

5 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 5.1 DfT have made clear that they cannot afford all the projects within their Development Pool and that Local Authorities are in a competition for a limited amount of funding. Key criteria for DfT are the deliverability of the project, its benefit cost ratio and its affordability. The project has been significantly reduced in scope to comply with these criteria but there remains a risk that the project has changed to such an extent that it may not attract DfT funding.
- 5.2 As mentioned in paragraph 5.5 above we are reviewing the options for a new P&R to the east of the city. Sites have been considered in the past and one of the major constraints on locating a P&R further from the city is that operating cost will rise while patronage will fall, reducing revenues. In any event the development of a new P&R would need to be funded by the Council, without DfT support, as we cannot identify a deliverable site for this bid other than the previously approved site on the A4. In addition we would need to seek further planning permission(s) and acquire any such site.

6 EQUALITIES

- 6.1 We have provided to DfT an assessment of the Social and Distributional Impact of the proposed BTP albeit with the A4 P&R included. This gives an assessment of the impact on the package on low income and/or vulnerable groups. We will have to review this assessment when submitting our Best & Final Bid to DfT in September.
- 6.2 The initial assessment showed that the BTP will continue to provide improved access to the city for those on low incomes by improvements to the bus network. The expansion of P&R sites will improve access from rural areas to the city and its facilities.

7 RATIONALE

- 7.1 The transport problems faced by the City of Bath are well known. The Council has for many years implemented a policy of reducing traffic entering the city by providing P&R facilities while reducing the availability of parking in the city itself. The BTP, albeit in its reduced form, will continue this successful policy by expanding P&R facilities which are often at capacity. In addition the development of Showcase Bus routes as part of the package will continue to develop a high quality public transport network within the city.

8 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 8.1 The major option currently available to the Council is to retain the A4 P&R and associated bus lane within the BTP. The inclusion of this element would bring additional P&R capacity back up to over 2,200 for the city as a whole allowing projected demand to be met. These elements can be delivered without CPO or other statutory procedures. This would significantly reduce the amount of traffic entering the city from the east along an existing heavily congested corridor. It would also allow more city centre car parks to be redeveloped as part of the Council's core strategy. Removing the A4 P&R proposal reduces the cost of the project by £5.5m.

9 CONSULTATION

9.1 Cabinet members; Section 151 Finance Officer; Chief Executive; Monitoring Officer

9.2 The BTP has been the subject of considerable consultation over the last 3 years or more since DfT gave it initial approval in October 2007. Detailed discussions have been undertaken in developing the bid since the elections in May with Cabinet members. An informal workshop was held in June to discuss options taking the project forward.

10 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

10.1 Resources; Property;

11 ADVICE SOUGHT

11.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer (Divisional Director – Legal and Democratic Services) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

Contact person	Peter Dawson x 5181
Sponsoring Cabinet Member	Councillor Symonds
Background papers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Major Scheme Business Case (MSBC) for BTP• Council approval March 2006 for submission of (MSBC)• Planning approvals & supporting documents• Expression of Interest• JLTP2 & 3
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council		
MEETING:	Planning Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel	
MEETING DATE:	26 July 2011	AGENDA ITEM NUMBER
TITLE:	Green Spaces Strategy Update	
WARD:	ALL	
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM		
<p>List of attachments to this report:</p> <p>Appendix 1 – Green Space Strategy Executive Summary</p> <p>Appendix 2 – Updated Green Space Strategy Action Plan</p> <p>Appendix 3 – Strategy Review programme</p>		

1 THE ISSUE

1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update on progress against the action plan contained in the Green Space Strategy which was adopted in March 2007 and to inform the panel of the proposed revised timetable for the review of the strategy.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel is asked to:

2.1 Note and comment on the update provided and agree that

2.2 The Green Spaces Strategy will be reviewed and revised in accordance with the appended programme.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 There are no direct financial implications associated with the presentation of this report.

4 THE REPORT

4.1 The Green Space Strategy was adopted as a corporate strategy of the council in March 2007. The strategy was developed following extensive technical research and community consultation. It established new local standards for the amount,

distribution and quality of green space within the district and included a detailed action plan to ensure progress was made in implementing the strategy.

- 4.2 An executive summary of the strategy can be found at Appendix 1 and the updated action plan can be found at Appendix 2.
- 4.3 The Green Spaces Strategy was adopted in March 2007, with an action plan covering the 5 year period up to 2012, and is therefore due to be reviewed and updated.
- 4.4 With the national census being completed in 2011 it was considered sensible to make use of the most up to date information to inform any changes to the strategy. The timeline for this review, Appendix 3, reflects this.
- 4.5 The Green Spaces Strategy will be reviewed and revised in accordance with the appended programme and informed by the outcomes of the review of the Local Development Framework including the preparation of the Green Infrastructure Strategy.

5 RISK MANAGEMENT

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

6 EQUALITIES

A equalities impact assessment has not been carried out as this report is for update purposes only.

7 CONSULTATION

7.1 *Section 151 Finance Officer; Monitoring Officer*

- 7.2 This update report is for information only. Full and proper consultation was undertaken at the time of the development and adoption of the strategy in 2006 and 2007.

8 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

- 8.1 Social Inclusion; Customer Focus; Sustainability; Human Resources; Property; Young People; Human Rights; Corporate; Health & Safety; Impact on Staff.

9 ADVICE SOUGHT

9.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer (Council Solicitor) and Section 151 Officer (Strategic Director - Support Services) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

Contact person	Graham Evans, Parks & Estate Manager. Ext 6873
Background papers	Bath & North East Somerset Green Space Strategy
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

This page is intentionally left blank

Green Space Strategy for Bath and North East Somerset

Executive Summary

Introduction

Bath & North East Somerset Council has been reviewing green space provision across the district to ensure that the supply and quality matches the needs of the community. This has included finding out about people's use and expectations of different types of green areas, including parks and gardens, spaces for less formal activities, recreation grounds, natural areas (woodland, natural and semi-natural areas), allotments and children and young people's facilities.

Having completed a comprehensive assessment and audit of these types of green spaces, the Council has now drafted a Green Space Strategy for consultation with the local community and stakeholders.

Why do we need a green space strategy?

There are external pressures for the authority to produce a strategy including:

- The Audit Commission Best Value Review Inspection Report on Leisure Time in Bath & North East Somerset
- The government guidance contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 (PPG17)

There are also internal drivers within the authority including

- To ensure that the standards and levels of provision across the whole district are better understood and addressed
- To ensure that standards of quality are addressed across all green spaces

How have we produced the strategy?

This has involved a number of distinct pieces of work:

- Consultation – what are people's needs from green spaces
- Quantity audit – how much space is there in the district?
- Quality audit – what is the quality of the spaces?
- Mapping the distribution of spaces and how far they are from people
- Policy review – what national and local guidance is there?

What have we found?

Consultation

- 95% of those who took part in our on-street survey had visited a green space in the last 12 months
- Those who live in Keynsham and Bath are more satisfied with green space provision than those who live in Norton Radstock
- The results of the consultation indicate that there can almost never be enough green space provision
- There was a very low perceived need for managed natural green space amongst Parish Councils

Quantity

We have analysed all of the green space provision in a number of ways

- Firstly by type of space which we have classified as 'formal' (parks, gardens, open spaces and recreation grounds), 'natural' (woodland, natural, semi natural and access land) or allotments
- Secondly geographically – comparing urban and rural provision at settlement, ward and parish levels. By urban we mean Bath, Keynsham and Norton Radstock, and by rural we mean all other parishes.

We have then combined these to look at how much of each type of space is located where. Using population data we have then been able to look at how much space there is per person across the district.

We found that

- in terms of formal spaces, Norton Radstock has only 2/3 of the amount of space when compared to Keynsham
- the rural parishes combined have around 3/4 the amount of formal space when compared to Bath, with 13 parishes having no provision at all
- Bath has the highest hectareage per 1000 population at 1.64 with Norton Radstock the lowest at 0.98
- the parish average is 1.18 ha / 1000 population with Corston parish having the highest at 4.31 ha / 1000 population, significantly higher than any other area

- in the rural parishes access to natural spaces tends to be via general access to the countryside

In terms of allotments we found that

- the area where the hectareage of allotments per 1000 population is greatest in Bath at 0.22 ha / 1000 population with the parish average only slightly below this figure at 0.20 ha / 1000 population.
- Norton Radstock is significantly lower than this at 0.06 ha / 1000 population and Keynsham having only 0.11 ha / 1000 population.

Quality

We assessed the quality of almost 200 spaces across the district including formal and natural spaces and allotments. We used a method derived from the national quality standard, the Green Flag Award and advice from CABE Space, the government's advisor on architecture, urban design and public space.

We found that:

- Overall natural spaces scored higher than formal spaces and allotments scored below both
- Almost all sites fail to perform to their potential in terms of the educational benefits that can be derived from them
- Formal sites within Bath have the highest average quality at 53 with Norton Radstock scoring the lowest at 47. Parish and Keynsham formal sites score between the two at 52.
- Bath scores the highest average for allotment sites at 50 with Parish areas scoring the lowest at 44
- Keynsham scores the highest average for natural sites at 64 with Norton Radstock the lowest at 54.

Distribution of Green Space

As a starting point we developed a hierarchy of urban green spaces based on their size, their significance and the facilities they should provide. The hierarchy is based on 4 levels:

- District (serving the urban settlement and their rural catchment)
- Neighbourhood
- Local
- Doorstep

We have given each level of the hierarchy a 'catchment' based on what we consider to be a reasonable walking distance.

We found that:

- There are relatively few parts of Bath and Keynsham that do not have formal green space within a reasonable walking distance
- In Norton Radstock there are larger parts of the area that do not have formal green space within a reasonable walking distance, exacerbated by the fact that there is no district level space
- In the rural parishes there is a mixture of provision, with many residents not having formal green space within a reasonable walking distance

For natural green spaces, whilst there were some small parts of the urban areas beyond a reasonable walking distance, overall the coverage was very good.

For allotments the picture was not so good with many parts of the district being beyond a reasonable walking distance of an allotment site.

Policy Review

A policy review has been carried in order to understand the current national and local policy context. Key documents within each of these areas have been summarised and reviewed and their relevance to the Green Space Strategy discussed both in terms of planning and service delivery aspects.

National policy and guidance on the production of green space strategies has been considered and has informed the development of the strategy. Other local policy documents have been reviewed which set out the local planning context, formal designations, such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and other relevant constraints and opportunities.

What have we done with the information / assessments?

We have now brought together the consultation and mapping work to develop proposed local standards for the three different types of green space. The standards are set out below and focus on:

- Quantity of green space

Type of Green Space	Standard (m ² per person)
Formal	15
Natural* ¹	15
Allotments	3

Notes on table

*1 In the rural parishes a standard for natural provision was not developed as they have access to natural spaces via the countryside

- Distribution and quality

As referred to earlier we have produced a hierarchy of provision and some of the key factors are set out in the table below. Please see the notes below the table to see how the hierarchy will be applied to the rural parishes.

Formal Green Spaces

Hierarchy level	Walking distance (m)	Walking time (minutes)	Size (hectares)	Facilities
Doorstep	400	5	>0.1	N/A
Local	600	7.5	>1.0	Formal equipped play
Neighbourhood	1000	12.5	>2.0	Formal play and youth provision
District	N/A* ¹	N/A* ¹	>10.0	As above plus a venue for major outdoor events

Notes on table

*1 District level sites serve the urban settlement and their rural catchment

In the rural parishes it is often not possible to have the full range of site levels or for the sites to be the minimum sizes indicated. However, as parish sites tend to have either a neighbourhood function (i.e. serving the whole parish and sometimes neighbouring parishes with little or no provision) or a local function (i.e. serving a local area of a larger parish) these are the catchments that will be applied as appropriate to each site.

Natural Green Spaces

Hierarchy level	Walking distance (m)	Walking time (minutes)	Size (hectares)	Features
Neighbourhood	1000	12.5	>2.0	Significant nature interest and opportunities for volunteer involvement)

District	N/A* ¹	N/A	>10.0 (and most significant natural space in each urban area)	As above plus significant opportunities for educational activities
----------	-------------------	-----	--	--

These standards have already been used to inform the amount of green space provided in relation to new housing developments and will continue to do so in the future. They will also be used to

- Identify areas of shortfall in existing provision that may not be addressed by development and will need to be resourced in different ways
- Help support bids for external funding

Recommendations and Action Plan

The green space strategy has analysed existing green space provision, the community's views on this and has set out proposed standards for the future. The strategy also sets out recommendations and an action plan for the delivery of these new standards. The actions come under 5 main headings as follows:

1. Strategic Management – issues of a strategic nature with implications beyond this Council's own green spaces
2. Service Management – issues relating specifically to the management of this Council's own green space network
3. Site Management – issues relating to the management of individual sites
4. Community Issues – issues with a particular focus on community interest
5. Resources and Opportunities – issues around funding and other potential resources

Appendix 2

Updated Green Space Strategy Action Plan July 2011

The table below sets out the action plan for the improvement of green spaces within Bath & North East Somerset. **This updated plan records progress up to the 4th year of the 5 year strategy.** In addition to addressing the recommendations coming directly from the strategy it also addresses some wider issues that came to light during the preparation of the strategy.

Any changes to the Green Spaces Strategy will be informed by the emerging Green infrastructure Strategy which is being developed within the Local Development Framework. The Green Infrastructure Strategy will provide a coordinated, cross boundary approach to managing and enhancing the natural places and corridors with cultural assets of the District in order to achieve multiple benefits.

Each action identifies the principal council priority that the action addresses. It should be noted that in many cases the actions address a number of council priorities but only the principal one is shown in this update.

The table goes on to identify when each action was or is due to be delivered, the principal benefit or outcome from the action, along with the lead service area and those partners and stakeholders involved.

The activities have been categorised into the following action areas:

1. Strategic Management – issues of a strategic nature with implications beyond the Council's own green spaces
2. Service Management – issues relating specifically to the management of this Council's own green space network
3. Site Management – issues relating to the management of individual sites
4. Community Issues – issues with a particular focus on community interest
5. Resources and Opportunities – issues around funding and other potential resources

Ref.	Actions – 1. Strategic Management	Principal Council Priority	When Delivered or To Be Delivered	Principal Parks & Green Spaces Benefit / Outcome	Lead Service	Partners
1,1	Adopt B&NES Local Plan which contains policy for the provision of recreational open space	Sustainable growth	October 2007	Protection of existing green space and requirement for appropriate provision of new green space associated with new development.	Planning Service	Various internal & external partners inc. Parks Service
1.2	Preparation and adoption of necessary Local Development Documents to facilitate the delivery of the Green Space Strategy beyond life of B&NES Local Plan (beyond 2011). To be resolved as part of future reviews (annual) of council Local Development Scheme (LDS).	Sustainable growth	2007 – 11 and ongoing	Parks and green space issues have featured heavily in the preparation of the Core Strategy and Sustainable Communities Strategy as well as work on Urban Extensions and other Local Development Documents. Significant Parks Officer time has been invested in this. The Council submitted the Core Strategy to the Planning Inspectorate for independent examination on 3rd May 2011.	Planning Service	Parks Service Other Providers
1.3	Preparation and adoption of Supplementary Planning Document for Developers Contributions to enable developer contributions toward GSS through planning process.	Sustainable growth	July 2009	Greater certainty over the requirement of developer's contributions for green space provision. This is now material consideration to all new planning applications.	Planning Service	Parks Service Other Council Services
1.4	Ensure that the "Guide to the Provision of Green Space in Bath & North East Somerset" (Appendix F of the strategy) is a material consideration in the	Transport & public spaces	2007 to July 2009	The guide assisted in evidencing the requirement for developer's contributions for green space until the Contributions SPD (see 1.3 above) was adopted. Between 2007	Parks Service	Planning Service Other Providers

	determination of planning applications			and Nov. 2009 green space contributions totalling £300,337 have been secure via section 106 agreements.		
1.5	Preparation of a green space design guide setting out how new spaces should be designed and managed	Transport & public spaces	Not currently planned for development	With the significant reduction in development activity this action has been put on hold. Once completed the guide will inform potential developers of the design and management standards required for new green space within the district.	Parks Service	Planning Service
1.6	Consider the preparation of a district wide Tree and Woodland Strategy and promote the value of using trees to create green corridors and links between green spaces	Climate change	Not currently planned in this form	It is likely that the work involved in developing a tree & woodland strategy and the desired outcomes will be delivered via a proposed Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Planning Service	Parks Service Other Providers Other Organisations
1.7	Consider the preparation of a district wide Landscape Strategy to take full account of the visual benefits of all green spaces regardless of accessibility	Sustainable growth	Not currently planned in this form	This action has been partially delivered via a World Heritage Site Setting study and input into the Public Realm & Movement Strategy. The proposed Green Infrastructure Strategy will also contribute to this.	Planning Service	Parks Service Other Organisations
1.8	Prepare and regularly maintain a central record of allotment plot waiting lists for the whole district, in order to detect trends and inform the LDF process	Sustainable growth	Ongoing	Since 2007 the provision of new allotments has been a requirement of all assessments of residential development applications.	Parks Service	Other Providers
1.9	Undertake a review of existing equipped children's play areas to address the recommendations in	Better lives for young people	2007 – 0912	A review of play areas in Bath helped in the distribution of the £2.5M Play Pathfinder funding. It	Parks Service	Other Providers Children's

	the strategy and to determine whether it would be more effective to remove smaller areas that are within the catchment of larger areas, and concentrate resources on the larger areas			also helped in ongoing negotiations with Somer Community Housing Trust over the future management of areas leased by them from the council. As a result 3 sites were transferred back to the authority in March 2011		Services
1.10	Work with partners to develop the concept of 'free play' within green spaces	Better lives for young people	On-going	The delivery of this has been principally through the Play Pathfinder project where new and innovative approaches to play provision are being tried.	Children's Services	Parks Service Other Providers Voluntary Sector
1.11	Undertake a review of existing facilities for young people in the urban areas and produce a strategic plan for the future provision of facilities within neighbourhood green spaces	Better lives for young people	To be considered to conjunction with Early Years & Extended Services	Play Pathfinder has delivered significant improvement to facilities for young people as well as children. Following completion of the project it is considered necessary to review provision and develop a strategic plan to address any deficient areas.	Parks Service	Youth Service Other Providers Children's Services
1.12	Investigate the possibility of securing the joint use of some school grounds to help achieve the new local standards for green space provision	Better lives for young people	Ongoing	Opportunities are being taken to influence the design of new and refurbished schools to improve access to green space in those areas outside of school hours.	Children's Services	Parks Service Independent Schools
1.13	Establish a Bath & North East Somerset Green Space Providers Forum to provide support to other green space providers e.g. Parish Councils and social housing providers	Transport & public spaces	Not currently planned for development	Support is provided to all other providers who manage children's play areas and regular contact is made and advice is freely available to all public allotment providers.	Parks Service	Other Providers

1.14	Undertake sample site assessments using the Green Flag Award criteria to compare scores with the system used in GSS	Transport & public spaces	No longer applicable	A new quality assessment system for parks & green spaces has been developed and implemented using the green flag award methodology.	Parks Service	
1.15	Prepare a strategic approach towards future entries into the Green Flag Award scheme	Transport & public spaces	2007 and on-going	The LAA stretch target of a geographic spread of entries of strategically important sites has resulted in the achievement of 6 Green Flag awards	Parks Service	Planning Service Other Providers
1.16	Work with local communities to enable them to make their own entries into Britain in Bloom	Transport & public spaces	2007 and on-going	Bath, Keynsham, Midsomer Norton and Radstock all making credible entries into the competition. Timsbury, Oldfield Park and others making Neighbourhood entries	Local Communities	Parks Service Other Services
1.17	Review and update the mapped and statistical information used to develop the Green Space Strategy	Sustainable growth	Planned for when new Census data is released	Maintaining accurate and up to date information is essential as it is the principal data relied upon to derive developer's contributions towards new green space provision.	Parks Service	
1.18	Annually review the Green Space Strategy Action Plan and report on progress to O&S Panel	N/A	2008 and on-going	Provides a mechanism for reviewing and reporting progress as well as planning future work.	Parks Service	
Ref.	Actions – 2. Service Management (Parks Service)	Principal Council Priority	When Delivered or to be delivered	Principal Parks & Green Spaces Benefit / Outcome	Lead Service	Partners
2.1	Preparation of a marketing framework to ensure that green	N/A	Now planned for	A greater understanding of the importance and many benefits of	Parks Service	Communications &

	spaces continue to be acknowledged as contributing to and adding value to the council's corporate priorities		winter 2012	green spaces from physical and mental health to education and social cohesion.		Marketing
2.2	Investigate whether there is scope for closer working and a reduction of duplication between the roles of Officers in different Services involved in the provision and management of B&NES Council owned green spaces	Transport & public spaces	Under review	Greater efficiency and concentration of appropriate 'estate management' skills within one service area.	Parks Service	Property Services Planning Services
2.3	Preparation of an access policy for green spaces, in consultation with groups and individuals, to ensure equality of provision for all	Transport & public spaces	2007	Full accessibility assessments of a range of green space types have been undertaken. This has resulted in investment of £80K in an accessible allotment facility in Bath with a further £40K to be invested in an accessible community growing space outside Bath in 2010. In addition, a range of access improvement plans have been prepared for green spaces.	Parks Service	Support Services Groups Individuals
2.4	Development of staff training programmes to ensure that the appropriate management and maintenance skills exist to care for our green spaces.	Transport & public spaces	2008	Apprenticeship scheme developed and in place achieving national recognition as an example of best practice from CABI Space, the Government agency for parks and green spaces.	Parks Service	
2.5	Work closely with Property Services to identify investment	Transport & public space	2008 and on-going	Quarterly liaison meetings held to ensure that capital and revenue	Parks Service	Property Services

	and funding needs for green space infrastructure. Use this to help sites meet the proposed quality standard of 60/100.			funding for property maintenance is directed towards the most critical areas to ensure customer satisfaction and safety.		
2.6	Preparation of an interpretation and information framework to enhance the benefit visitors gain from green spaces and the contribution they make towards the Councils life long learning objectives	Transport & public spaces	2008 and on-going	Interpretation signage provided within Royal Victoria Park. Keynsham Memorial Park provided during Summer 2010. Interpretation Centre opened in Bath Botanical Gardens summer 2009 for public, schools and group use.	Parks Service	Legible City Group
2.7	Preparation of a green space events framework. Events are invaluable as they draw people into green spaces, link communities and provide interest and variety.	Transport & public spaces	Planned for 2010/11	Awaiting preparation and adoption of Corporate Events Strategy. Corporate Cultural Strategy adopted 2011	Parks Service	
2.8	Preparation of guidance and a clear procedure for decisions on whether people can buy Council land for their own use.	Transport & public space	Draft guidance produced 2010	Guidance will ensure the procedure is fair and transparent, and that land is only declared surplus after a rigorous process is followed.	Parks Service	Property Services
Ref.	Actions – 3. Site Management (B&NES owned sites)	Principal Council Priority	When Delivered or To Be Delivered	Principal Parks & Green Spaces Benefit / Outcome	Lead Service	Partners
3.1	Preparation of management plans to guide the management and development of District,	Transport & public spaces	2007 and on-going	Clear documented management plans for principle green spaces have helped ensure improvement	Parks Service	Planning Service Specialist

	Neighbourhood and Local Green Spaces. All management plans will have a simple annual review and update process built in			plans are developed with local groups and residents. This has helped the distribution of over £40K LAA pump priming money and £10K Ward Member initiative funding.		Groups Local Communities
3.2	Assessment of all green spaces to ensure that they contribute as much as possible to local biodiversity and sustainability, taking account of their primary use. The assessment will be made at the time of preparing / reviewing the site management plan and any scope for changes will be fed into site improvement plans.	Sustainable growth	2007 and on-going	At key sites independent ecological surveys have been undertaken and management recommendations implemented. This has resulted in many changes on the ground for example reduced regular grass cutting resulting in increased biodiversity benefit.	Parks Service	Planning Service Environment Team, Specialist Groups Local Communities
3.3	Undertake regular assessment and review of green spaces to assess quality, safety, progress against management plan and in order to prepare improvement plans. All assessment will take the form of the Green Flag Award	Transport & public space	2008 and on-going	A new quality assessment system for parks & green spaces has been developed and implemented using the green flag award methodology. This has been suspended due to staff resources.	Parks Service	
3.4	Consideration of the feasibility of 'self management' of appropriate green spaces as and when opportunities arise. With experience, determine whether a proactive approach to self management is in the wider community's interest.	Sustainable growth	As opportunities present themselves	The feasibility of a self-managed allotment site has been investigated but the interest of the proposed group declined. However, this remains an aspiration for any site.	Parks	Interested parties

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Ref.	Actions – 4. Community Issues	Principal Council Priority	When Delivered or To Be Delivered	Principal Parks & Green Spaces Benefit / Outcome	Lead Service	Partners
4.1	Preparation of a consultation framework for B&NES owned green spaces	Feeling safer	Planned for 2011/12	Clarity over the extent and type of consultation that will be undertaken in differing circumstances will assist in greater public involvement in decisions relating to green spaces and ultimately their sense of ownership / community pride.	Parks Service	
4.2	Preparation of a Friends Groups and Volunteers framework to ensure increased involvement in green spaces by the local community	Feeling safer	Planned for 2011/12	The encouragement of community involvement in green spaces through Friends Groups or volunteering will lead to a greater sense of ownership / community pride.	Parks Service	Planning Service Policy & Partnerships Existing Groups
4.3	Reduce the perception and effects of crime and anti-social behaviour in green spaces working closely other agencies	Feeling safer	On-going	Addressing the outcomes of PACT meetings and concerns received via Neighbourhood Watch schemes and other bodies has helped us change some people's perceptions.	Parks Service	Police Policy & Partnerships Other Agencies
4.4	Investigate and promote transport links to and between green spaces. The hierarchy of provision tells us which sites are of local, neighbourhood and district significance and public transport and car parking	Transport & public space	Planned for 2012	Improving access to green spaces will ensure that there is greater equity in provision and ensure everybody has access to the numerous benefits of green space, for example physical and mental health, social and educational	Parks Service	Transportation

	provision should reflect this			benefits. Review in conjunction with Green Infrastructure Strategy		
4.5	Investigate and promote cycle and pedestrian links to and between green spaces. All green spaces serve as Doorstep and Local Green Spaces and thus safe cycle and pedestrian access is important to all	Transport & public space	Planned for 2012	Improving cycle and pedestrian links will not just improve access but will also help in taking steps to tackle climate change and provide the opportunity for more healthy means of accessing recreational facilities. Review in conjunction with Green Infrastructure Strategy	Parks Service	Transportation
4.6	Investigate the benefits of making provision for environmental education within green spaces. Benefits could include greater community involvement, volunteers, and recruits into the service, reduced vandalism and greater value placed on green space provision by the general public	Transport & public spaces	2009	The creation of the Interpretation Centre at the Botanical Gardens in Bath has resulted in a multi-purpose facility for schools and groups wanting to have an educational base in an inspirational setting. Schools will use the facility to deliver many aspects of the curriculum from the sciences to art and creative writing. Community use of the facility will bring similar benefits and help to sustain the facility.	Parks Service	
Ref.	Actions – 5. Resources & Opportunities	Principal Council Priority	When Delivered or To Be Delivered	Principal Parks & Green Spaces Benefit / Outcome	Lead Service	Partners
5.1	Preparation of a register of all external funding opportunities available for works within green spaces	Transport & public spaces	2009	A good knowledge of funding opportunities helps to bring additional resources into the service. However, most funding is available to the voluntary groups that we work closely with.	Parks Service	

5.2	Preparation of a register of volunteer groups and other bodies e.g. conservation groups, Community Action, Youth Offending Team and Probation Service that may be able to provide volunteer labour towards projects in green spaces	Transport & public space	2009 + 2011	The Parks & Green Spaces Service works closely with B&NES Youth Offending Team, Avon Probation Service, British Trust of Conservation Volunteers (BTCV) and other local groups and individuals. During the period Jan to May 2009 over 2,000 hours were volunteered in parks and green spaces.	Parks Service	
5.3	Assessment of opportunities within green spaces for additional income by the negotiation of appropriate concessions or sponsorship, with income secured used to fund progress towards achieving the new local standards for green space provision either at that site or elsewhere	Transport & public spaces	2008 and on-going	<p>Sponsorship of 5 roundabouts was achieved in 2008 with net income of approx. £10K p/a. Formal applications for a second phase of sponsored roundabouts will shortly be made again with a further anticipated net income of £10K p/a.</p> <p>Significant service improvement has been achieved through the agreement of a new catering concession at Alice Park in Bath along with a 10 fold increase in income and further service improvements has been achieved from the catering concession in Keynsham Memorial Park. Concessions are being considered for further venues along with further appropriate sponsorship</p>	Parks Service	Property Services

				opportunities.		
--	--	--	--	----------------	--	--

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 3

Green Space Strategy Review draft Project Plan 2011/13

Timeline key milestones

TIMELINE	June 2012	July	August	Aug/Sept	October	November	December	January 2013	February	March 2013
MILESTONES	Data collecting, research, analysis	Partial Census Data release	Draft proposed changes	Internal consultation within B&NES		Enter into Cabinet Forward plan	Review responses to consultation	Policy Development and Scrutiny	Cabinet	Adopt revised Green Space Strategy
	Green Infrastructure Strategy due		Review maps and quantities	Drafting revisions	Public consultation concluded		Drafting revisions	Final revisions		
								Draft Report to Cabinet		

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council	
MEETING:	Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny
MEETING DATE:	26 th July 2011
TITLE:	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) / s.106 Planning Obligations
WARD:	ALL
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM	
List of attachments to this report:	
None	

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 National changes to Local Government finance mean that Local Authorities will be increasingly dependent on locally generated income including Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The CIL regulations that came into force on 6th April 2010 allow local authorities to raise fund from developers undertaking new building projects in their area to provide key infrastructure needed as a result of development.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The Panel is asked to note that the programme and arrangements for the preparation of CIL in B&NES

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 Following changes to Local Government finance, economic and housing growth will be increasingly important in the generation of local income. Consequently facilitating new development will be a key mechanism in limiting future budget reductions.
- 3.2 CIL enables local planning authorities to raise funds from developers undertaking new building projects in their area. The funds can be used for a wide range of infrastructure that is needed as a result of development. This includes the infrastructure costs likely to be incurred by the Council and other bodies who are delivering infrastructure which will benefit the development of their area such as the Environment Agency for flood defence. However, CIL does not cover the costs of providing revenue services such as waste collection and social care which will inevitable arise from such developments. The regulations scale back the way section 106 agreements operate from April 2014.
- 3.3 Between July 2009 and March 2011 the Council has secured £13 million in s.106 agreements agreed alongside planning consents given. This excludes in-kind

contributions such as affordable housing, on-site works, energy strategies/travel plans etc. Based on housing planned through the Core Strategy, CIL and scaled backed Planning Obligations has the potential to approx raise £36 million over the plan period up to 2026. However, the funds generated by CIL will dependent on the viability assessments. CIL can also be levied from commercial development such as retail, hotels and office development. The potential revenue depends of the level to which CIL is set for each of these uses. A nil tariff can be set if the viability assessments justify.

- 3.4 The preparation of CIL will be part funded through the LDF budget and other sources of funding are the New Growth Point funding / Invest to Save bid. Delay of the adoption of CIL will limit the developer contributions that can be sought, particularly if it is delayed beyond March 2014.
- 3.5 The estimated cost of producing the CIL Charging Schedule is approximately £40,000 in the current year and a similar amount in 2012/13. This excludes internal officer resource. The local planning authorities can retain up to 5% of the receipts to cover the administrative costs including the cost of producing CIL.

4 THE REPORT

Overview

- 4.1 CIL enables local planning authorities to raise funds from developments in their area. The new system has been introduced to overcome the inadequacies of s106 agreements and once a local authority has undertaken the necessary work to put CIL into place it offers a more transparent and simplified system. Implementation of CIL is dependent on the adoption of the Core Strategy. An Infrastructure Delivery Programme is also required which has already been prepared in B&NES.
- 4.2 Adopting a CIL would provide:
 - An additional income stream for infrastructure for the local authority
 - A fixed rate tariff system which unlike s106 gives certainty to the development industry
 - A simplified and cost effective system of securing funding from development.
 - Finance for 'live' infrastructure projects that have been prioritised by the Council and local communities.
- 4.3 CIL provides for strategic infrastructure requirements across the District. From April 2014, Planning Obligations (s.106) will be scaled back to address specific site issues and pooled contributions will be limited. CIL and Planning obligations will therefore become complementary.
- 4.4 Charging schedules will set out the charging rates in the area based on increased floor space eg. £ per square metre. Charging authorities will use that evidence to strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding infrastructure from the levy and the potential effects of the levy upon the economic viability of development across their area. CIL charging schedule is subject to an independent examination.
- 4.5 In addition, CIL will be prepared in conjunction with the Placemaking Plan which provides detailed the planning policy framework to guide development on sites.

Scope of the CIL

- 4.6 The Core Strategy plans for the delivery of 11,000 new homes and 8,700 jobs up to 2026. Based on housing alone, CIL and s.106 agreements have the potential to raise approximately £36 million over this period but this is dependent entirely on the viability assessments rates agreed and. This takes account of the fact that Affordable Housing is currently exempted from making CIL contributions (35% of anticipated housing delivery).
- 4.7 In addition, there is the potential for CIL to be levied from commercial development such as retail, hotels and office development.
- 4.8 Key issues to be addressed through the preparation of CIL include;
- Whether to vary the levy geographically across the district
 - Whether to vary the levy according to use eg some authorities are proposing a nil charge for commercial use
 - Whether to prioritise the spend on infrastructure geographically or on particular uses.
- 4.12 Reports will be brought back to O&S for consideration at appropriate stages.

Timetable and milestones

- 4.13 The programme for CIL is set out in the draft Local Development Scheme (background paper p.21) but is dependent on the adoption of the Core Strategy. Work on CIL will also be aligned with the Placemaking Plan.

Commence	July 2011
Public consultation on Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule	March-April 2012
Public consultation on Draft Charging Schedule	September 2012
Submission	December 2012
Hearings	March 2013
Adoption	Sep 2013

Project governance

- 4.14 Whilst led by the Planning Service, preparation of CIL will need to be undertaken corporately. The governance structure and preparation arrangements are set out in the latest version of the Local Development Scheme 2011-2014.

5 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 5.1 A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.
- 5.2 Adopted CIL will secure funds for infrastructure and provide developers and communities with greater certainty. The key risk of not ensuring progress are;

- Failure to adopt the Core Strategy in time prevents adoption of CIL which will severely limit the developer contributions that can be sought.
- Luck of certainty for funding arrangement – particularly to obtain external experts to undertake viability assessment.

6 EQUALITIES

- 6.1 CIL will be subject to Equalities Impact Assessments and will be considered throughout the preparation. Particular consideration will need to be given to the impact on different parts of the community.

7 CONSULTATION

- 7.1 These corporate implications of this report and the governance arrangement have been considered by Cabinet. Further consultation will be taken through the preparation of CIL in accordance with the governance arrangements.

- 7.2 Charging authorities must consult local communities and stakeholders on their proposed rates for the levy. Key public consultation are;

- Consultation on a Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule – March/April 2012
- Consultation on a Draft Charging Schedule – September 2013

8 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

- 8.1 Social Inclusion; Customer Focus; Sustainability; Human Resources; Property; Young People; Human Rights; Corporate; Impact on Staff; Other Legal Considerations

9 ADVICE SOUGHT

- 9.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer (Divisional Director – Legal and Democratic Services) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

Contact person	David Trigwell (Divisional Director Planning & Transport) Tel: 01225 394125
Background paper	B&NES Local Development Scheme 2011-2014 http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/mgConvert2PDF.aspx?ID=6516
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

Bath & North East Somerset Council		
MEETING:	Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel.	26th July 2011
TITLE:	Food Waste Recycling Collections Update	
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM		
WARD:	All	

1.0 UPDATE BRIEFING NOTE

1.1 Food waste collections began Monday 4 October, with a high tonnage of food waste collected from that first day - about 20 tonnes per day on average. A total of 2,389 tonnes of food waste was collected to the end of March 2011. This helped us reach an overall recycling rate for the year of 46%, our highest yet.

1.2 The food waste is being transported on a daily basis to New Earth Solutions in-vessel composting plant at Sharpness in Gloucestershire in sealed bulk containers from May Gurney's depot in Keynsham. Contamination levels have been low - ie residents have been using liners or newspaper, not plastic bags, which adversely affect the composting process. The process takes only a week before a high-nutrient compost is produced for use on agricultural land. Further information can be found at www.newearthsolutions.co.uk.

1.3 This plant has been undergoing some maintenance works throughout June/July and in the mean time our food waste has been diverted to a similar plant in Dorset through our contractor's contingency arrangements. This is at no extra cost to the Council.

1.4 Participation monitoring was carried out in March 2011 and this showed that 59% of residents are using their food waste caddies and bins. The more residents who use the new collections, putting out as much of their food waste as possible on a regular basis, the more cost-effective and efficient the scheme. The containers also help reduce bird and animal scavenging of black bags. In areas of high take up there has been a noticeable difference where scavenging has previously been a problem.

1.5 As anticipated there has been some drop-off of daily tonnage collected in the first few weeks. This is due to some people realising how much food they were throwing away, and cutting back. This has been shown to happen in other parts of the country due to people changing their buying behaviour. We have been continuing to carry out roadshows emphasising the Love Food Hate Waste message.

1.6 The results of the first few months are very encouraging but we are confident that there is even more food waste our residents can put out in their new containers. We are planning a comprehensive communications campaign in areas of lower participation to ensure we increase the number of households taking part.

1.7 Start-up packs for residents include the two containers plus a roll of 52 compostable liners and a full instructional leaflet. May Gurney continue to make deliveries of start-up packs to houses with multiple flats and other households as requested. Some households have asked for additional bins; others have opted to share the larger outside container between flats or small households. We are happy to work with residents to find the best solutions for them.

2.0 COMMUNICATIONS

2.1 Our Communications team worked hard at many roadshows, events and talks to groups in the build-up to raise awareness amongst the public and this was much appreciated by those people they've talked to. They have been able to give good help and advice to residents to make sure they're using their bins successfully.

2.2 Most people have now run out of their initial supply of liners and the campaigns team have been focussing on showing people how to line their caddies with newspapers if they don't want to buy their own liners. There is a video on our website showing a really easy way to do this successfully.

2.3 We sourced 36 local liner stockists (including major supermarkets) and online stockists. The list is on our website and we can advise residents of nearest stockists at our road shows.

2.4 We have been giving out rolls of free liners at road shows for those willing to complete our food waste recycling survey - this is proving popular - so far about 350 surveys have been completed. We have only about 400 rolls of liners left in stock now.

Key finding from these surveys show:

- The average number of bags put out each week is 2
- 42% of people compost at home
- Virtually everyone throws away vegetables. The second most popular food is bread. Raw meat is rare.
- There is a mix of shops where the liners are purchased from but on the whole they are the major supermarkets
- 71% of people have already finished their liners – but only 35% of people have bought new ones
- There is a lot of scope for trying to encourage the use of newspaper as only 33% of people have given it a go.

Anecdotal evidence from road shows:

Negatives:

- Lack of storage space
- Tried it but now run out of liners so stopped.

- Liners are expensive
- Worried about smells in summer
- Don't have food waste – give it to the dog/chickens etc

Positives:

- It's easy
- They hardly put out any rubbish now
- Street tidier from animal/bird attacks
- Think more about what they are putting out

3.0 NEXT STEPS

3.1 We continue to work with May Gurney to continue the successful bedding in of the collection service, and to ensure that it is operating as effectively as possible. We are monitoring the collections so that prompt and efficient action can be taken to resolve any issues and address any residents' queries.

3.2 The residents surveys show that we need to do more to encourage the use of newspaper for people who don't want to buy their own liners so that people stay engaged in the scheme.

3.3 We will carry out a comprehensive door knocking programme in areas of lower participation so that we encourage further uptake.

3.4 We are in the process of developing the options for the households that we have not been able to offer the service to at the moment. These are mainly blocks of flats with Mini Recycling Centres (MRCs) and the city centre streets which use green sacks for their dry recycling collections. We will present options and costs to the Council's Waste Board in the Autumn for decisions on how to take this forward.

3.5 We are working with our partner May Gurney to develop a food waste recycling service for schools and would hope to be a position to offer this as a comprehensive waste and recycling package from September 2011.

3.6 We are forecasting a total year end recycling rate of 54% in 2011/12 based upon our current performance. Food waste collections will contribute significantly towards this overall performance improvement.

Carol Maclellan

Waste Services Manager

July 2011

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council	
MEETING:	Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel
MEETING DATE:	26 th July 2011
TITLE:	Cabinet Member Response to Commercial Waste Collection Overview and Scrutiny Single Inquiry Day
WARD:	ALL
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM	
<p>List of attachments to this report:</p> <p>Appendix 1 Response from the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods (Councillor David Dixon)</p> <p>Appendix 2 Report from the Commercial Waste Collection Overview and Scrutiny Single Inquiry Day</p>	

1 THE ISSUE

1.1 On the 18th February 2011, the Safer and Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel held a single inquiry day to look at how to improve commercial waste collection in Bath and North East Somerset.

1.2 The single inquiry day brought together representatives from commercial waste collection companies, local businesses and Council officers. A report from the meeting was produced with a number of recommendations that were presented at the last Safer Stronger Communities Panel meeting on the 24th March 2011 that contained 8 recommendations for the then Cabinet Member for Service Delivery.

1.3 The recommendations from this report appeared on the Weekly List on 27th May 2011 for the newly appointed Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods to respond within six weeks.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel is asked to:

2.1 Discuss the Cabinet Members response to the recommendations

2.2 Agree to receive an update on outcomes of the single inquiry day including recommendation 6 which has been deferred.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 The review was conducted within the budget available to the Panel.

4 THE REPORT

This report contains the Cabinet Member’s response to 8 recommendations from the Commercial Waste Collection Overview and Scrutiny Single Inquiry Day.

The final report was originally presented at the Safer Stronger Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel on the 24th March 2011.

Since the elections, this issue now falls within the remit of the Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel. A copy of the report presented to the SSC Panel is attached for Councillor’s information.

5 RISK MANAGEMENT

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

6 EQUALITIES

Equalities issues were considered by the Panel as part of their work in formulating their recommendations at the end of this inquiry process.

7 CONSULTATION

7.1 *Ward Councillor; Parish Council; Town Council; Overview & Scrutiny Panel; Other B&NES Services; Service Users; Local Residents; Community Interest Groups;*

8 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

8.1 *Customer Focus; Sustainability; Property;*

9 ADVICE SOUGHT

9.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer (Divisional Director – Legal and Democratic Services) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

Contact person	<i>Lauren Rushen- Policy Development and Scrutiny Officer- 01225 394456</i>
Background papers	<i>None</i>
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

Review Title: Commercial Waste Collection Overview and Scrutiny Single Inquiry Day

Overview & Scrutiny Panel: **Safer and Stronger Communities Panel**

Panel Chairman: **Marie Longstaff (previously Cllr Caroline Roberts)**

Overview & Scrutiny Project Officer: **Lauren Rushen**

Supporting Service Officer: **Carol Maclellan**

Process for Tracking O&S Recommendations - Guidance note for Cabinet Members

The enclosed table lists all the recommendations arising from the above Overview & Scrutiny Review. Individual recommendations are referred to the relevant named Cabinet Members (or whole Cabinet in the case of a whole Cabinet referral) as listed in the '**Cabinet Member**' column of the table. In order to provide the O&S Panel with a Cabinet response on each recommendation, the named Cabinet member (or whole Cabinet) is asked to complete the last 3 columns of the table as follows:

Decision Response

The Cabinet has the following options:

- **Accept** the Panel's recommendation
- **Reject** the Panel's recommendation
- **Defer** a decision on the recommendation because a response cannot be given at this time. This could be because the recommendation needs to be considered in light of a future Cabinet decision, imminent legislation, relevant strategy development or budget considerations, etc.

Implementation Date

- For 'Accept' decision responses, give the date that the recommendation will be implemented.
- For 'Defer' decision responses, give the date that the recommendation will be reconsidered.
- For 'Reject' decisions this is not applicable so write n/a

Rationale

Use this space to explain the rationale for your decision response and implementation date. For accepted recommendations, please give details of how they will be implemented.

Recommendations from Commercial Waste Collection Overview and Scrutiny Single Inquiry Day

Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
Recommendation 1: Continue to work with the Business Improvement District (BID) to help scope a quality recycling and disposal service for BID members to procure.	David Dixon (previously Charles Gerrish)	Accept	In progress	
Recommendation 2: Produce an information leaflet and web information detailing commercial waste collection and recycling services provided in the district that we know about, working with other Council departments as appropriate.	David Dixon (previously Charles Gerrish)	Accept	March 2012	This will help inform all businesses across the district of the range of recycling collection services available for them to make better-informed decisions to save costs.
Recommendation 3: Review the potential for an accreditation scheme for trade waste providers and makes future recommendations on this.	David Dixon (previously Charles Gerrish)	Accept	March 2012	This will be linked to the above and can be developed to provide key information (such as Environment Agency waste carrier's licence no) on waste collection companies to give confidence that a company's waste will be dealt with properly.
Recommendation 4: Review the times that trade waste can be left on the street for collection after consultation with business and in view of impending traffic restrictions.	David Dixon (previously Charles Gerrish)	Accept	March 2012	The BID Group have commissioned work around commercial waste analysis which will include feedback on this. The Access Restrictions (Bath Package) will be reviewed and progressed later this year.
Recommendation 5: Review its enforcement practices in relation to waste on the highway and refreshes its guidance on this.	David Dixon (previously Charles Gerrish)	Accept	March 2012 (links to above)	This is in progress by Environmental Protection, in conjunction with Waste Services.
Recommendation 6: Reviews the potential for further storage of bulk bins to enable increased recycling capacity for businesses and makes proposals on this.	David Dixon (previously Charles)	Defer	Review Sept 11	Relies on footway obstructions policy being adopted by Council. For decision Sept 2011

Commercial Waste Collection Overview and Scrutiny Single Inquiry Day (Safer and Stronger Communities): Cabinet Response Table

Recommendation	Cabinet Member	Decision Response	Implementation Date	Rationale
	Gerrish)			
Recommendation 7: Produce a brief for a waste analysis of commercial waste and determines costs to do this.	David Dixon (previously Charles Gerrish)	Accept	In progress by the BID Group for the city centre.	This work should be reviewed and any further work needed for the rest of the district to be scoped and costed.
Recommendation 8: Produce a costed proposal for a commercial food waste collection throughout the district and works with its domestic recycling partner, May Gurney, to scope a proposal.	David Dixon (previously Charles Gerrish)	Accept	March 2012	Collection of food waste from restaurants and cafes etc is key for environmental reasons plus to help improve the streetscene and deter seagull scavenging.

This page is intentionally left blank

Safer & Stronger Communities Overview & Scrutiny Panel, 24th March 2011

Report back on Scrutiny Inquiry Day held 18th Feb 2011 into Commercial Waste Collections within B&NES.

1.0 Background

At its meeting on the 18th November the Overview and Scrutiny Panel agreed to undertake a review of commercial waste collection services with the aim being to find out what waste collection services businesses in Bath & North East Somerset would like, what issues they face, what is on offer currently, and how to encourage more commercial businesses to recycle. The Panel agreed to undertake a Scrutiny Inquiry Day into this issue which was held on the 18th February.

Representatives were invited from a wide range of organisations representing businesses throughout the district, Councillors, and Council departments. Jane Stephenson, the CEO of Resourcefutures facilitated the day. There were 17 attendees in total with a strong bias towards city centre businesses. Presentations were given by the Council and by Resourcefutures detailing current practices and examples of commercial waste recycling services throughout the country. Workshops were then held to scope the issues that businesses face, along with recommendations for further investigation and some possible solutions to issues. Waste collection contractors were also invited to give details of their services and key issues affecting them. 4 contractors gave presentations.

2.0 Recommendations

There are several areas to be taken forward for further review and action. Initial recommendations to the Overview and Scrutiny Panel are as follows:

That the Council:

- a) continues to work with the Business Improvement District (BID) to help scope a quality recycling and disposal service for BID members to procure
- b) produces an information leaflet and web information detailing commercial waste collection and recycling services provided in the district that we know about, working with other Council departments as appropriate
- c) reviews the potential for an accreditation scheme for trade waste providers and makes future recommendations on this
- d) reviews the times that trade waste can be left on the street for collection after consultation with business and in view of impending traffic restrictions
- e) reviews its enforcement practices in relation to waste on the highway and refreshes its guidance on this
- f) reviews the potential for further storage of bulk bins to enable increased recycling capacity for businesses and makes proposals on this
- g) produces a brief for a waste analysis of commercial waste and determines costs to do this
- h) produces a costed proposal for a commercial food waste collection throughout the district and works with its domestic recycling partner, May Gurney, to scope a proposal

3.0 Findings:

The workshops generated many issues and ideas which could be grouped in to the following themes:

- Information and Quality Standards
- Receptacles, Storage & Collection Points
- Streetscene (including timings of collections, night time economy and enforcement)

Below is a brief summary of some of the discussions and possible solutions.

3.1 Information and Quality Standards:

It was clear that businesses generally lacked an understanding about what happens to their waste once it has been collected and the standards that waste collection companies must adhere to. It was felt that the Council had a more proactive role to play in helping business identify good contractors (such as via an accreditation scheme) and to raise awareness about what actually happens to the waste.

There is a lack of information about the recycling services on offer to companies. It was felt that the Council may have a role to play in helping publicise what is on offer and promoting best practice in the waste hierarchy (reduce / reuse / recycle / recover).

The number of contractors and vehicles in the city centre causing congestion and pollution when collecting was cited as a key concern. It was felt that by setting quality standards and by businesses joining together to procure waste collection services (e.g. through the Business Improvement District) then the number of vehicles and pollution potential could be reduced.

There is a clear knowledge gap in terms of what businesses are actually producing both in type and quantity of waste. In order to plan a cost effective recycling service, some analysis of the composition of trade waste and the quantities available was recommended.

3.2 Receptacles, Storage and Collection Points

Although business are keen to recycle more, the need for storage space for containers and increased segregation are concerns.

Increased segregation of waste would require more storage space for bags and bins and a lack of space is a key concern to businesses. It was noted that some businesses already dispose of their waste in other people's bins or in litter bins illegally and that this is difficult to enforce against.

Split bags and scavenging by birds and animals is of particular concern in terms of visual impact of the current waste collection services.

Food waste recycling was raised as an issue for further development in order to reduce scavenging by gulls in particular and the desirability of taking this dense material out of the residual waste stream. Although there is a clear desire to recycle food waste, there was no clear steer as to whether businesses would be willing to pay

more to benefit from this service. Realistic costings for a food waste collection service should be developed to enable informed decisions to be taken.

3.3 Streetscene Timings:

The existing restrictions set out the times during which waste can be left out on the highway for collection. These are not helpful for businesses that work late into the evening such as theatres, restaurants, pubs and clubs. The Council's enforcement rules are that waste can only be left on the street for collection between 6am -10am and 4:45pm - 10pm. Fixed Penalty Notices (fines) can be issued to businesses who leave their waste out beyond these times. Sacks left on the street have a visual impact and cause litter due to scavenging by birds and animals.

Although operators are aware of the timings for collection, if for some reason the waste does not get collected, it is the businesses themselves who are liable for payment of the Fixed Penalty Notice, although in many cases they may be unaware of any issues the contractor has had (e.g. vehicle breakdown).

The collectors have also commented that these timeslots can be tight for them to achieve their work in, particularly when they are collecting different waste streams for recycling.

The Council is currently consulting on restricting traffic within the city between the hours of 10am and 6pm. If these restrictions are implemented then collectors would not be able to begin their work until after 6pm in the evening.

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council	
MEETING: PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT & SCRUTINY PANEL	
MEETING DATE:	26th July 2011
TITLE:	WORKPLAN FOR 2011/12
WARD:	All
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM	
List of attachments to this report:	
Appendix 1 – Panel Workplan	
Appendix 2 – Information to help to identify Workplan Items	
Appendix 2 – Workplan suggestion form	

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 This report presents the latest workplan for the Panel (Appendix 1) as well as information to help Panel members identify any additional items for the workplan (plus a suggestion form for workplan items).
- 1.2 The Panel is required to set out its initial thoughts/plans for their future workload, in order to feed into cross-Panel discussions between Chairs and Vice-chairs - to ensure there is no duplication, and to share resources appropriately where required.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The Panel is recommended to
- (a) consider the range of items that could be part of their Workplan for 2011/12 and into 2012/13
 - (b) agree a first draft of their Panel Workplan 2011/12 and into 2012/13.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 All workplan items, including issues identified for in-depth reviews and investigations, will be managed within the budget and resources available to the Panel (including the designated Policy Development and Scrutiny Team and Panel budgets, as well as resources provided by Cabinet Members/Directorates).

4 THE REPORT

4.1 The purpose of the workplan is to ensure that the Panel's work is properly focused on its agreed key areas, within the Panel's remit. It enables planning over the short-to-medium term (ie: 12 – 24 months) so there is appropriate and timely involvement of the Panel in:

- a) Holding the executive (Cabinet) to account
- b) Policy review
- c) Policy development
- d) External scrutiny.

4.2 The workplan helps the Panel

- a) prioritise the wide range of possible work activities they could engage in
- b) retain flexibility to respond to changing circumstances, and issues arising,
- c) ensure that Councillors and officers can plan for and access appropriate resources needed to carry out the work
- d) engage the public and interested organisations, helping them to find out about the Panel's activities, and encouraging their suggestions and involvement.

4.3 The Panel should take into account all suggestions for work plan items in its discussions, and assess these for inclusion into the workplan. Councillors may find it helpful to consider the following criteria to identify items for inclusion in the workplan, or for ruling out items, during their deliberations:-

- (1) public interest/involvement
- (2) time (deadlines and available Panel meeting time)
- (3) resources (Councillor, officer and financial)
- (4) regular items/"must do" requirements (eg: statutory, budget scrutiny, etc)?
- (5) connection to corporate priorities, or vision or values
- (6) has the work already been done/is underway elsewhere?
- (7) does it need to be considered at a formal Panel meeting, or by a different approach?

The key question for the Panel to ask itself is - can we "add value", or make a difference through our involvement?

4.4 There are a wide range of people and sources of potential work plan items that Panel members can use. The Panel can also use several different ways of working to deal with the items on the workplan. Some issues may be sufficiently substantial to require a more in-depth form of investigation. Further details about sources, ways of working and investigations are given in Appendix 2.

4.5 Suggestions for more in-depth types of investigations, such as a project/review or a scrutiny inquiry day, may benefit from being presented to the Panel in more detail using the form at Appendix 3.

4.6 When considering the workplan on a meeting-by-meeting level, Councillors should also bear in mind the management of the meetings - the issues to be addressed will partially determine the timetabling and format of the meetings, and whether, for example, any contributors or additional information is required.

5 RISK MANAGEMENT

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

6 EQUALITIES

6.1 Equalities will be considered during the selection of items for the workplan, and in particular, when discussing individual agenda items at future meetings.

7 CONSULTATION

7.1 The Workplan is reviewed and updated regularly in public at each Panel meeting. Any Councillor, or other local organisation or resident, can suggest items for the Panel to consider via the Chair (both during Panel meeting debates or outside of Panel meetings).

8 ADVICE SOUGHT

8.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer (Divisional Director – Legal and Democratic Services) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

Contact person	Mark Durnford, Democratic Services Officer. Tel: 01225 394458
Background papers	None
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel Workplan

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Director	Report Author	Format of Item	Requested By	Notes
26th July 2011	Bath Transport Package	GC	Peter Dawson	Report		
	Green Spaces Strategy Update	GC	Graham Evans	Report		
	Community Infrastructure Levy / Section 106	GC	Simon de Beer	Report		
	Food Waste Recycling Collections Update	GC	Carol Maclellan	Briefing		
	Cabinet Member Response to Commercial Waste Collection Single Inquiry Day	GC	Lauren Rushen	Report		
	Cabinet Member Update			Verbal		
	Sustainable Growth Agenda (Inc Housing)	JB	John Betty	Briefing		
13th Sept 2011						
Future items						
	Parking Strategy	GC	Adrian Clarke	Report		
	Travel Smart Cards	GC				
	Sustainable Transport Fund	GC				
	Independent Transport Commission					

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Director	Report Author	Format of Item	Requested By	Notes
	Neighbourhood Planning	GC	Simon de Beer			
	Placemaking Delivery DPD	GC	Simon de Beer			
	Joint Local Transport Plan 3	GC				
	Climate Change	GC				
	World Heritage Site – SPD Management Plan	GC	Simon de Beer			

Workplan sources and ways of working (adapted from “How to be an Effective Scrutiny Member” training 2011)

Sources of Panel activities/work plan suggestions

» **People**

- Whole Panel
- Cabinet member suggestions,
- SDG/officer suggestions,
- members of public
- community/voluntary groups
- Non-panel Councillors

They don't all have to be sat in the room, but seek their views and input

» **Wide range of issues and subjects**

Seek suggestions/ideas from

- The Cabinet's Forward Plan,
- corporate plan/priorities,
- range of corporate and service policies, strategies and plans – when are they due to be reviewed/refreshed?
- sustainable community strategy (if something is to be achieved in 20years – ask how? where could OS be involved?)
- new ways of working (eg: multi-organisation projects) – have they worked, are they successful? What can be learned?
- Service plans and performance information
- New government legislation, consultation or guidance
- Suggestions from public, media issues, neighbourhood, voluntary and community sector organisations
- Issues from audit or inspection reports

Ways of Working

- » Types of Workplan/Agenda items
 - » Formal report
 - » Presentation
 - » Verbal briefing/update
 - » Q&A session/interview
 - » In-depth investigation

- » By who?
 - Cabinet members,
 - Member champions,
 - Council officers,
 - “partner” organisations, such as NHS, Police, and local organisations,
 - residents/community groups ,
 - young people (DAFBY, Youth Parliament)
 - and others?

Planning

- » **Medium to longer term**
 - Medium to longer term: 12 – 24 months
 - later stages can be more about “sketching in” regular items, outcomes of planned reviews/following up items etc

- » **Flexibility – room for planned and reactive work**
 - Planning = good; don't forget to add the regular work, such as budget/service plans
 - but also leave space and flexibility for issues arising

Setting Boundaries

» **Self discipline: time, energy, capacity**

Be self-disciplined – don't say yes to everything suggested !!

- As a Panel, do you have the time, energy, capacity? This is where planning over a longer timescale can help
- Not all Panel members can be at all meetings, involved in reviews, sitting on a policy development group – need to share and schedule who's involved and when
- Identify the timescale (even if roughly) for when something is to be examined/ reviewed - Members can identify in advance where and when they can best be individually involved
- Check: is officer support available? For example: an investigation that needs lots of financial info during March may not be easy to support.

» **Challenge yourselves**

Be a “critical friend” to your own plans.....

- Is this the best use of our time?
- What could we influence or change? Is it the right time to do it?
- Could we be duplicating work already underway (eg: through the audit or change programme)?

» **Avoid “for information” or “to note” as much as possible**

Could this be done another way -

- E-mailed document or link to the intranet (CIS) (save paper and server capacity?)
- A separate dedicated briefing from officers?
- Could 1 or 2 Councillors be commissioned to look into something report back to the Panel at the next work planning session?

» **Key question: does OS “add value”? Can it make a difference?**

- Are you going to influence change/improvement?
- Can you have a tangible effect via your observations, comments, recommendations.....and subsequent changes?

Making a difference can also be through holding public discussions -

- clarifying reasons – the what, why and how,
- enabling community views to be heard,
- bringing together a range of involved organisations that may not have met before in the right forum,
- exploding myths and misunderstandings?

In-depth Investigations

Methods:

Review/projects

- structured projects that take place over several months, with a sub-section of the Panel forming a Steering Group;
- use a range of processes and tools to gather evidence about the subject
- produce a final report about the project culminating in the strongly evidenced conclusions and recommendations
- Cabinet response to agree/defer/reject recommendations then brought to Panel

Scrutiny Inquiry Days

- Recent development in B&NES, although used in other Councils.
- A participative, consultative way of working
- Range of organisations interested in a certain issue (eg: Trade Waste collections) invited to meet informally with the Panel
- main part is a type of “workshop” or facilitated sessions
- develop shared “Action Plan” that all organisations sign up to
- report of day taken to formal Panel meeting, to agree any recommendations that are to be made to Cabinet.

These types of investigation are supported by high standard established project management processes provided by the Policy Development & Scrutiny Team

Service-led policy review & development

This is a potential new way of working, based on the Councillor involvement model recently used in work on the Local Development Framework. Details are still to be discussed and finalised, but based on previous practice, this could involve ;

- A sub-group of Panel members meet and work with service officers on a review or development of policy
- Members provide comments and suggestions at regular intervals during the process
- Different to a project/review (as above) as its an on-going overview of the development of the policy, rather than a more objective Panel-led and directed investigation,
- Needs to be included in workplan to ensure Panel capacity
- It has not yet been identified how the Members report back to Panel on how they've "added value" by their involvement in the policy development process.

This page is intentionally left blank

**BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL
POLICY DEVELOPMENT & SCRUTINY PANEL:
WORK PLAN SUGGESTION FORM**

Your name: _____

Suggested Workplan item: _____

Which Panel: _____

Topic Outline: Please include a brief outline about the topic you are suggesting and any reasons for it to be prioritised.

You may want to consider including information about whether your topic

- impacts on more than one section of society, or multiple wards in B&NES,
- is an issue of public concern,
- has any particular timescales to be carried out or completed by
- is a poor performing/overspending service area, and
- what you think can be achieved from scrutiny involvement.

Type of Topic: Do you think your item should be

- A) Agenda item at a future panel meeting (When? _____)
or
B) An In-depth investigation
- a. Project/review
 - b. Single Inquiry Day
 - c. Service-led policy review & development

Please return completed forms to scrutiny@bathnes.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank