

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

These minutes are draft until confirmed as a correct record at the next meeting.

Wednesday, 13th February, 2013

Present:

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

145 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and announced that the meeting would be recorded and a web cast was available by means of a link from the Council's website.

The Chair announced that it was his intention to consider item 16 (Schools Expansion) at the beginning of the agenda because a large amount of public interest had been expressed in the issue.

146 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

147 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

148 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

149 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

150 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 11 questions from the following Councillors: Nigel Roberts (2), Brian Webber (2), Tim Warren (3), Geoff Ward, Martin Veal, Liz Richardson, Anthony Clarke.

There were 3 questions from the following members of the public: Joel Hirst, Simon Whittle, Evan Weinburg

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

151 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

Councillor Tim Warren read a statement on behalf of Councillor Colin Barrett and presented a petition of 300 signatures asking Cabinet to ensure that the Public Conveniences in Weston Village would not be closed.

The Chair referred the petition to Councillor David Dixon for a response in due course.

Councillor John Bull in a statement about Small Business Saturdays *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website]* asked the Cabinet to consider launching a scheme to encourage residents to use their local small businesses more often.

Councillor Liz Hardman in a statement about Children's Centre Funding *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website]* appealed to the Cabinet to protect the funding of children's centres in the area when it recommends its budget to Council.

The Chair assured Councillor Hardman that her comments would be taken fully into account during the budget process.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones in a statement about Victoria Art Gallery *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website]* presented a petition of 518 signatures asking the Cabinet not to introduce charges for the Victoria Art Gallery. He asked the Cabinet to exempt local residents from any proposed entry charge, perhaps by extending the combined ticket for the Baths and Fashion Museum to include the gallery. If the combined ticket price were raised in price by £1, that would bring £50,000 per year into the gallery.

The Chair referred the petition to Councillor David Dixon for a response in due course.

Barbara Gordon read a statement on behalf of Lin Patterson about the Campaign to Save Larkhall Public Toilets *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website]* and delivered a petition of nearly 500 signatures asking Cabinet not to close the facility.

The Chair referred the petition to Councillor David Dixon for a response in due course.

152 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

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

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 16th January 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and would be signed by the Chair.

153 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

154 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

The Chair announced that Resources PDS Panel had met on Mon 11th Feb and resolved to make some recommendations to Cabinet relating to the Budget. Copies of the Panel's recommendations had been placed into the public gallery before this meeting [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website*].

The Chair asked Councillor John Bull (Chair of the Panel) to introduce the Panel's recommendations. Councillor Bull explained the input from each Panel and asked Cabinet to take on board all of the comments.

The Chair assured Councillor Bull that all the comments received would be considered in the lead up to Budget Council.

155 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

The Chair announced that as part of the Council's budget cuts, the number of Cabinet meetings would be reduced to 8 per year (from 11). He anticipated as a result that more decisions would in future be taken by single-member decision.

156 PROPOSALS TO EXPAND SIX PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN KEYNSHAM, BATH, PEASEDOWN AND PAULTON

Councillor John Bull in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website*] appealed to the Cabinet to ensure that every child in Paulton would have a place at the primary school; and that the on-going road safety problems would be addressed by bringing forward anticipated funding to implement a traffic management scheme near the schools.

Councillor Liz Hardman in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 8 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to ensure that effective road safety and traffic management schemes would be in place before any expansion of Paulton school; to ensure that all Paulton children would have a place at a school in Paulton; and that funding for the expansion scheme would be maximised, whatever approach was adopted.

Rachel Rayner (Paulton Resident) in a statement said that there were road safety issues at Paulton school which must be addressed before expansion was considered; that the school facilities would be inadequate to support a 50% increase in children; and that she felt the consultation had been inadequate, particularly since section 9 of the report did not even mention the option of building a new school on another site.

Mich Moore (Paulton Schools Expansion Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 9 and on the Council's website*] disagreed with the contention made in the report that the existing site of Paulton Schools would lend itself to expansion. She felt that road safety issues in particular made the plans inadequate for the needs of local children. She appealed to Cabinet to direct resources towards building a new building on a new site which would provide a sustainable solution for the village.

Louise Bray (Chair, Church Valley Schools Federation) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 10 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to give an assurance that the Education and Inspections Act 2006 would be upheld, particularly in the matter of keeping village schools open, by protecting the rural schools in the area.

Councillor Dine Romero thanked the parents and head teacher of Paulton Infants School for meeting with her recently. She said that the main issues of concern were planning, transport and road safety and observed that the planning application had been withdrawn in order to address these issues. She assured Councillors Bull and Harman that schooling would be provided in Paulton for all Paulton children whose parents wished that. There were some reservations about new build, because the existing policy was that new build should be for a minimum of 2-form entry but a new build in Paulton could barely be single-form entry and would cost about £3M. She assured parents however that the s.106 funds would be fully used to improve the schools in Paulton.

Councillor Romero referred to the complaints about the short consultation period. She emphasised that the statutory consultation was yet to take place; but that the Cabinet wanted to be able to accommodate the increased numbers of children due to arrive at school in September 2013. She moved the proposals which she said would start the statutory consultation.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He pointed out that the Council had a statutory duty to respond to population trends and had made a point of consulting widely. The proposals were to move to further consultation on the plans. He believed that the 6 schools identified for expansion were the right ones. Parental choice would be widened and small schools would be protected by these proposals. Expanding these schools would enable them to support enhanced educational facilities such as SENCO support, school clubs, curriculum planning, small specialist classes etc. He acknowledged the need to address the traffic issues in Paulton when considering the proposal to expand the school.

On a motion from Councillor Dine Romero, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To PUBLISH a Statutory Notice proposing the expansion of Bathampton Primary school;
- (2) To PUBLISH a Statutory Notice proposing the expansion of Castle Primary school;
- (3) To PUBLISH a Statutory Notice proposing the expansion of Peasedown St. John Primary school;
- (4) To PUBLISH a Statutory Notice proposing the expansion of Weston All Saints C of E Primary school; and
- (5) To PUBLISH a Statutory Notice proposing the expansion of Paulton Infant school and Paulton Junior school.

157 FINANCIAL PLAN 2013/14 - 2015/16, BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2013/14

Della Simmons (parent of a child at First Steps Children's Centre) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 11 and on the Council's website*] referred to the proposed budget cuts to children's centres and presented a petition of

280 signatures asking for Cabinet to reconsider the proposed cuts to children's centres.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson in an *ad hoc* statement [a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 14 and on the Council's website] asked the Cabinet to reconsider the proposals to cut the budget for children's centres. She referred to the section on the Victoria Hall on page 56 of the papers and pointed out that there was still no business plan for saving the Hall, nor had there been any analysis of the consultation which had taken place in November 2012. Councillor Jackson then referred to the Affordable Housing section on page 55 of the report. She supported the allocation of £550K for this, but asked for more detail of how the money would be used.

Councillor Charles Gerrish in an *ad hoc* statement explained the concerns of the Conservative Group over some issues and gave notice that the Group would present some amendments to the Budget, although he did not anticipate that these would be significant. He particularly emphasised the need to address the problem of potholes.

Councillor Ben Stephens in an *ad hoc* statement congratulated the Cabinet for its prioritisation of supporting the local economy, in particular for entrepreneurs from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Peter Duppa-Miller (Secretary to the Town and Parish Councils Association) in an *ad hoc* statement thanked officers for keeping the association informed during the budget process.

Councillor Geoff Ward in an *ad hoc* statement expressed concern over the proposed 30% cut in public protection which he felt would leave the Council very vulnerable in an emergency. He also objected to the proposed cuts in pest control.

Councillor David Bellotti introduced the item. He referred to an additional paper which had been placed into the public gallery before the meeting [a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 12 and on the Council's website] which listed a number of small changes in wording and content of the published report. He moved an amended motion which included the points from the additional paper.

Councillor Bellotti explained that the proposals would protect front-line services, would deliver a zero Council Tax rise, and would invest in homes and jobs across the area. All this was against the background of government grants which, over 3 years, had reduced by £30M.

He was delighted that the proposed budget had avoided any cuts to bus services or the youth service. He was delighted that housing would continue to grow because of Bath Western Riverside and the Radstock Regeneration.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the budget proposal. He reminded the Cabinet that the Council had been able to maintain strong reserves by delivering over £25M in efficiency savings. This had enabled the Cabinet to protect front-line services.

Councillor Crossley gave an assurance to Councillor Liz Hardman that Cabinet would work with her to consider options for supporting Children's Centres. He thanked Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones for his suggestion of extending the joint venue ticket to include the VAG, and promised that the idea would be explored. He listed investments which were being made across the whole area despite the difficult decisions being taken.

Councillor David Dixon said he had been encouraged that teams from all over the Council had been coming up with ideas to improve their services on tighter budgets. He assured members that in an emergency the necessary funds would be made

available so that public protection would not be endangered. He reminded the Cabinet that all 8 of the Council's libraries were being kept open and had been enhanced by the addition of a new hub at Paulton and 3 community-based facilities in rural areas.

Councillor Tim Ball committed to take into accounts all the comments he had received. He observed that by getting empty houses back into use, £0.5M had been put back into the coffers for use in delivering worthwhile services.

Councillor Cherry Beath endorsed the comments already made about supporting small businesses. She highlighted the flood protection along the river, and the support for the Victoria Art Gallery.

Councillor Simon Allen said that the Cabinet was fully supportive of the government's aim to cap the cost for those needing adult social care. He observed that over the next 3 years the proposed budget would put over £260M into supporting the most vulnerable in the community, as well as supporting young people with disabilities into adulthood.

Councillor Roger Symonds explained that the budget aimed to protect road repairs and snow and flood responses. He was delighted that the plans included the redevelopment of Lansdown Park and Ride; and next year would see the redevelopment of Newbridge P&R. Investments in cycling and 20mph zones would continue.

Councillor Dine Romero echoed her commitment front-line services. She thanked Della Simmons and Councillor Liz Hardman for their observations about the Children's Centres which she would consider carefully.

Councillor David Bellotti in summing up observed that there was an ongoing debate about whether services should be universal or targeted. He pointed out that the proposed budget was for one year only, but was indicative for 3 years.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

To RECOMMEND to Council:

(1) That the Council approve:

a) The General Fund net revenue budget for 2013/14 of £123.359m with no increase in Council Tax.

b) That no Special Expenses be charged other than Town and Parish Council precepts for 2013/14.

c) The adequacy of reserves at Appendix 2 Table 9 with a risk-assessed level of £10.5m.

d) The individual service cash limits for 2013/14 summarised at Appendix 2 Table 5 and detailed in Annex 1.

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

(2) That the Council include in its Council Tax setting, the precepts set and approved by other bodies including the local precepts of Town Councils, Parish Councils and the Charter Trustees of the City of Bath, and those of the Fire and Police Authorities.

(3) That the Council notes the Section 151 officer's report on the robustness of the proposed budget and the adequacy of the Council's reserves (Appendix 2, Annex 2) and approves the conditions upon which the recommendations are made as set out throughout Appendix 2.

(4) That in relation to the capital budget the Council:

a) Approves a capital programme of £59.036m for 2013/14 and notes items for provisional approval in 2013/14 and the programme for 2014/15 to 2017/18 as shown at Appendix 2, Annex 3 including the planned sources of funding.

b) Approves the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy as shown at Appendix 2, Annex 4

c) Approves the Capital Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 2 Table 7.

(5) That the Council notes the approach to Community Assets as set out in Appendix 2, Annex 6 and supports the progression of the Quick Wins identified in this Annex.

(6) That the Council notes the Policy Development & Scrutiny review of Medium Term Service and Resource Plans and instructs the relevant officers to finalise these in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member and in light of feedback from the PD&S reviews, and in line with the approved cash limits.

(7) That the Council agrees the proposed pay policy statement as set out at Appendix 5.

and

To AGREE:

(8) That the Divisional Director – Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Resources, is authorised to make any necessary presentational improvements to the draft budget proposal for submission to Council; and

(9) That the following changes be made to the wording and content of the published report:

a) Page 21, final paragraph – to replace the word “significant” with the word “some”.

b) Page 23, first bullet – to replace “£33 million” with “£34 million”.

c) Page 51, final paragraph – to replace “provisional” with “Fully Approved”.

d) Page 53, insert following sentences before the title “Flood Risk Management” -
“The following projects have received approval for the use of £11.2m of Revolving Investment Funding from the West of England LEP to support the delivery of this infrastructure to enable development of sites within the Bath City Riverside Enterprise Area. This funding will be repaid from developer and related contributions once the relevant developments are completed.”

e) Page 110, to delete the existing proposal for a saving of £50k in 2013/2014 relating to Waste Recycling Centres and replace with “Waste Grant Funding will be used to protect existing recycling centre opening hours for the 3 year period of this MTSRP. There is therefore no impact to service delivery”.

f) Page 127, to add the following text as para 5.3 – “The savings identified in para 5.1 above are anticipated to be a net revenue saving position across all Council owned assets, after taking account of any costs which may arise as a result of the Community Asset “Quick Wins” identified in this paper.

g) Page 132, to add the following sentence after the existing paragraph under “Climate Change” – “The Council will also seek to recognise the potential impacts

of weather related events like flooding for Council service areas including Environmental Services, Sustainability and Emergency Planning.”

- h) To include an item in the proposed use of “One-off Headroom Allocations” funded by the Financial Planning Reserve as set out on page 39 as follows:
- £15,000 to protect the funding for the Wheels for All event for 2013/2014.

and to authorise the Section 151 officer to make such appropriate amendments to the figures presented in the Budget Report for Council, as necessary to recognise this change.

158 BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET CORE STRATEGY: PROPOSED CHANGES

David Redgewell in an *ad hoc* statement emphasised to Cabinet that doing nothing was not an option. He felt that the authority must accept that it needed to increase its housing and that the Core Strategy must reflect this.

Peter Duppa-Miller (Secretary to the Town and Parish Councils Association) in an *ad hoc* statement said that the association was eager to work with planning officers to adopt and implement the core Strategy. They felt that small amounts of new housing should be allowed in the washed-over green belt settlements.

Councillor Geoff Ward in an *ad hoc* statement agreed with Peter Duppa-Miller. He was concerned that rural areas appeared to be ruled out from even small housing growth simply by virtue of the public transport argument, when in fact most rural dwellers would use their cars to travel around.

Councillor David Laming in an *ad hoc* statement was delighted that attention was being paid to the river corridor. He reminded the Cabinet that new homes could be floating or mobile. The real need was for affordable housing.

Councillor Tim Ball introduced the item by thanking David Redgewell and Peter Duppa-Miller for their contributions to the debate. He thanked officers for working so hard to get the strategy back on course. He announced that many of the questions being raised would be answered when the issue was considered at the Full Council in March. He said that the strategy would revisit the housing numbers and the delivery mechanism.

Councillor Ball moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He reminded Cabinet that this was a key document which would enable the Council to plan and control development in the area. It had been regrettable that consensus could not be reached last autumn, but he was confident of agreement when it was brought back to Council.

Councillor Roger Symonds said that the strategy must be a balance between those who have cars and those who relied on public transport.

Councillor David Dixon said that the key to sustainable development was putting work near to homes. It was also about the provision of local shops. His priority was to deliver homes for people and families.

Councillor Cherry Beath said that the strategy would deliver healthy communities. She had been delighted to hear that Councillor Eleanor Jackson would welcome more homes in Radstock.

Councillor Tim Ball in summing up agreed that housing must be in the right place, to minimise travel.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To NOTE the progress on the work required on the Core Strategy to address examination Inspector's concerns.

159 SUSTAINABLE CONSTRUCTION & RETROFITTING SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Councillor David Martin in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 13 and on the Council's website*] welcomed the document which he felt would be helpful to residents, builders and installers while at the same time reinforcing the Council's Green Deal initiative. He felt however that an opportunity had been missed to produce guidance for listed buildings.

Councillor Tim Ball proposed the recommendations. He thanked Councillor Martin for his observations and regretted that the proposals relating to listed building retrofitting were not ready to be published, but he anticipated being able to bring proposals forward later. He thanked officers, in particular Cleo Newcombe-Jones, for their hard work

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal and said that the document would improve the lives of many by enabling fuel efficiency and winter warmth in their homes.

Councillor Cherry Beath felt that the document was a huge step in the right direction and was another example of the Cabinet being willing to grasp nettles.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To ADOPT the Sustainable Construction and Retrofitting Supplementary Planning Document to supplement the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan, and then the Core Strategy once this is adopted;

(2) To AGREE that the Domestic Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy: Permitted Development Checklist will be made available on the Council's website;

(3) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director of Planning & Transport Development to make graphic and minor textual amendments to the documents prior to adoption;

(4) To SUPPORT the future adoption of local Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Guidance for listed buildings in the next 6 months, following a further review of the draft document with English Heritage (and other stakeholders); and

(5) To AGREE that discussions will be held with other Local Authorities (and other interested parties) with a specific interest in approving energy efficiency and renewable energy measures in listed buildings, together with the relevant Government departments (DCMS and DCLG), with a view to identifying conservation and building regulations policy constraints and ways to overcome them.

160 HIGHWAY ADOPTION CHARGES

Councillor Roger Symonds moved the recommendations. He explained that the intention was that the Council should no longer subsidise developers by charging less than it cost the council to provide the service.

Councillor Paul Crossley in seconding the proposals said that they would ensure that future roads would be built to Council standards, at no extra cost to the Council.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To INCREASE Supervision charges on S38, S106 and S278 works to include both technical approval and on-site supervision as set out in the report;

(2) To INCREASE the charges to cover staff time, in line with the income and costs of the previous five years and estimated income from the proposed increase as shown in the report;

(3) To IMPOSE At-cost charges for Structures officers, to include for technical approval and supervision of each highways structure element, such as culverts, retaining walls and bridges; and

(4) To AGREE that the basis for the fee changes be subject to a further review in 2013/14.

161 REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING, CASH LIMITS AND VIREMENTS - APRIL 2012 TO DECEMBER 2012

Councillor David Bellotti explained that the report demonstrated how the Council ran its affairs. He observed that Directors had made good progress in keeping within budget. The report also showed progress on the capital program.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal and welcomed the report. He drew particular attention to the capital expenditure allocated for St Gregory's and St Mark's Joint VI Form, and for Ralph Allen.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To NOTE the projected outturn position for 2012/13 and accompanying information provided in the report;

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

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

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

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

162 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT TO 31ST DECEMBER 2012

Councillor David Bellotti in moving the proposals explained that the paper was about the council's borrowings during the year. The authority had avoided any increase in its borrowings.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He said that the Council's investment policy emphasised security and liquidity.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To NOTE the Treasury Management Report to 31st December 2012, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice; and

(2) To NOTE the Treasury Management Indicators to 31st December 2012.

163 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT & ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2013/14

Councillor David Laming in an *ad hoc* statement asked for clarification about the status and amount allocated under the Revolving Investment Fund. He understood that an amount of £3M allocated for east of Bath flood compensation was now to be used for installation of step banks. He was concerned that the full £3M might be spent unnecessarily.

Councillor David Bellotti assured Councillor Laming that only the required funds would be spent, in line with the Cabinet's determination to void unnecessary expenditure. He reminded Cabinet that the RIF was a revolving fund precisely because it had to be repaid, so no benefit would come from any overspend. He asked officers to respond to Councillor Laming's enquiry.

He moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

To RECOMMEND to Council:

(1) That Council approves the actions proposed within the Treasury Management Strategy Statement in Appendix 1;

(2) That Council approves the Investment Strategy as detailed in Appendix 2;

(3) That Council approves the changes to the authorised lending lists detailed in Appendix 2 and highlighted in Appendix 3;

and

To AGREE:

(4) To NOTE the Treasury Management Indicators detailed in Appendix 1 and delegate authority for updating the indicators prior to approval at Full Council on 19th February 2013 to the Divisional Director - Finance and Cabinet Member for Community Resources, in light of any changes to the recommended budget as set out in the Budget Report elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting.

164 AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR SUPPORTED BUS SERVICES

David Redgewell in a statement said that the report was mostly good news but that there were still some issues. He particularly mentioned the Council's responsibility to market the services it provides by placing timetables at relevant places. He explained to Cabinet in some details which services he felt should be improved or provided differently.

The Chair asked all Cabinet members to confirm that they had read the Public Interest Test relating to Appendix A of the report. Cabinet members unanimously confirmed this.

The Chair then proposed that Appendix A should be exempt from publication by reason of the fact that it contained private information. This was seconded by Councillor David Dixon and agreed unanimously.

The Chair advised the Cabinet that he did not intend to exclude the public from the meeting unless a Cabinet member wished to refer to the contents of Appendix A during the debate. No Cabinet member indicated a wish to do this.

Councillor Roger Symonds in proposing the item thanked David Redgewell for his contribution. He said that the Cabinet would judge the proposals on usage of a service and the cost to deliver it. He was delighted that the proposals would deliver the same service as the previous year, but for £108K less; and he congratulated officers on achieving this. He observed that in addition, the number 6/7 bus had been included in the proposals.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal and said that an excellent deal had been negotiated. The bus operators had shown a willingness to work with the Council to deliver the services.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that Appendix A is an exempt item and is not for publication, by virtue of paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

On a motion from Councillor Roger Symonds, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(2) To NOTE the tender prices received;

(3) To AGREE the award of contracts as proposed;

(4) To CONFIRM the continued support for enhanced frequency on service 6/7 to Larkhall and Fairfield Park; and

(5) To CONFIRM the changes to contract services.

The meeting ended at 9.14 pm

Chair _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

CABINET MEETING 13th February 2013

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

Where the intention is to speak about an item on the Agenda, the speaker will be offered the option to speak near the beginning of the meeting or just before the Agenda item.

Statements about issues NOT on the Agenda

- Cllr Colin Barrett (read by Cllr Tim Warren)
Re: Petition – Provision of Public Conveniences in Weston Village
- Cllr John Bull
Re: Small Business Saturdays
- Cllr Liz Hardman
Re: Children's Centre Funding
- ~~George Bailey (Radstock Action Group)~~
~~Re: Transport Issues~~
- Cllr Patrick Anketell-Jones
Re: Petition - Victoria Art Gallery
- Lin Patterson (Campaign to Save Larkhall Public Toilets)
Re: Petition - Larkhall Public Toilets (To be read by Barbara Gordon)

Re: Agenda Item 16 (Schools Expansion)

- Cllr John Bull
- Cllr Liz Hardman
- Louise Bray (Chair of Governors, Church Valley Schools Federation)
- Rachael Rayner (Paulton resident)
- Mich Moore (Paulton Schools Expansion Action Group)

Re: Agenda Item 12 (Budget Report)

- Della Simmons (Parent of a child at First Steps Children's Centre) - Petition

Re: Agenda Item 13 (Core Strategy)

- David Redgewell

Re: Agenda Item 14 (Sustainable Construction & Retrofitting SPD)

- Cllr David Martin

Re: Agenda Item 20 (Supported Bus Services)

- David Redgewell

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Nigel Roberts
<p>I have asked for works to be carried out to the Upper Bristol Road, for the last two years, next to the allotments. The pavement has a large run off from the allotments, this freezes in the cold weather causing a large expanse of Ice. Please could the executive councillor explain what is going to happen?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>There is no record of previous reports to our Highways team regarding this matter. The report has been investigated and officers in the Highways team have asked colleagues in Property Services to take action to prevent further discharge of water onto the highway.</i></p>		
M 02	Question from:	Councillor Nigel Roberts
<p>The crossing at Windsor Bridge with Upper Bristol Road, has no indication to pedestrian of the movement of cars, please could the executive councillor investigate ASAP, before there is a serious injury?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>The Windsor Bridge/Lower Bristol Road junction is due to be improved as part of the Bath Package works. This will include improved pedestrian facilities. This proposal needs to be considered alongside other proposals throughout the district.</i></p>		
M 03	Question from:	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>With regard to the proposed experimental Traffic Regulation Order for the Circus Area have estimates been made of the number of vehicles which –</p> <p>(a) currently enter Bennett Street from Lansdown Road with a view to rat-running via Gay Street to Queen Square?</p> <p>(b) will in future use Bennett Street in order to access the Circus Area because they will no longer be able to enter via Gay Street?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>Yes in respect of (a) Estimated 270 vehs 12 hour (excluding cycles) and in respect of (b) Estimated 215 vehs 12 hour (excluding cycles)</i></p>		

M 04	Question from:	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>In the Central Zone there has been an experimental scheme whereby members of certain residents associations have been permitted to purchase visitor parking permits at a daily rate of £5. Is the scheme still in being? What has been the take-up? What proposals (if any) are there to extend the scheme to more people and/or review the price?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>I can confirm that the scheme is still in place as a trial whilst consideration is given to the long term strategy and changes to zone arrangements to improve access for all road users, including residents and their visitors. Since the trial commenced we have issued a total of 1259 individual permits to a total of 85 properties showing a limited take up and need.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore it is unlikely that the scheme will be extended or the price increased until the larger review is undertaken.</i></p>		

M 05	Question from:	Councillor Tim Warren
<p>It was recently announced that the Council would be submitting a new planning application to deliver the planned 250 new parking spaces at Newbridge Park and Ride, resulting in a delay to the start of construction work to expand the site. Can the Cabinet Member please detail how much it will cost the Council to submit a new planning application, and what cost implications this delay may have on the Council's contract with the company delivering the Park and Ride expansion?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>It will cost the Council approximately £250,000 to submit a new planning application for the 250 spaces at Newbridge. Within this budget is an allowance to cover the appointed contractor's costs for the delay in their work caused by this decision. The precise amount has yet to be agreed due to contractual negotiations and in any event will be confidential between the parties. The additional £250,000 referred to above will be met from the Project's contingency budget and will not cause an increase to the Capital cost of the Bath Transport Package as previously agreed by Council.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
Can he please tell me whether the contractor's costs will be a significant amount?		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<i>I do not yet know myself what the figure will be.</i>		

M 06	Question from:	Councillor Geoff Ward								
<p>In January 2011 the Council published its Empty Property Policy, aimed at bringing more empty homes back into use through the use of both advice and assistance to property owners as well as enforcement action. How many times since May 2011 has the Council made use of an Empty Dwelling Management Order or other enforcement action to bring an empty property back into use?</p>										
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball								
<p>As you mention the empty property policy aims to bring empty properties back into use through both advice and assistance and, as a last resort, enforcement action. Since introducing the policy the Council has worked hard with owners identified on the Council Tax record to ensure that empty properties are brought back into use, or if already in use appropriately recorded.</p> <p>This work has been very productive and has reduced the number of properties empty for 6 months or more from 530 (June 2010) to 433 (June 2012). As a result the Department of Communities & Local Government confirmed that this has generated the following New Homes Bonus funding for the Council:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Financial Year</th> <th style="text-align: center;">New Homes Bonus</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2011/12</td> <td style="text-align: center;">£193,979</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2012/13</td> <td style="text-align: center;">£333,104</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2013/14 onwards</td> <td style="text-align: center;">£527,083 p.a.*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Based upon no variation in empty properties, that is, no recovery outcomes nor an increase in empties.</p> <p>Since the end of 2012 the Council have also offered limited financial incentives, including loans to assist eligible owners to bring properties back into use. Once eligible owners have had the chance to seriously consider the offers of financial assistance a report will be presented to Cabinet, expected in Summer 2013, seeking a formal steer on future enforcement action in accordance with the Empty Property Policy.</p> <p>Hence at this stage I can confirm that no formal CPO or EDMOs have been served. However, it should be noted that the Council has served two section Town and Country Planning Act 215 enforcement notices on empty properties. These require the owners to undertake works to resolve problems affecting neighbours. These notices do not directly require the owner to bring the property back into use, however serving such notices can be the catalyst needed to make the owner bring the property back into use. In one case, the property was then sold and the new owner intends to bring it back into use. The second notice has only recently been served.</p> <p>The policy states enforcement action with significant financial considerations, such as EDMOs, will be taken by member decision. While no EDMOs have been made to date, a report will be brought to Cabinet for approval to proceed with enforcement action which may include EDMOs.”</p>			Financial Year	New Homes Bonus	2011/12	£193,979	2012/13	£333,104	2013/14 onwards	£527,083 p.a.*
Financial Year	New Homes Bonus									
2011/12	£193,979									
2012/13	£333,104									
2013/14 onwards	£527,083 p.a.*									
Supplementary Question:										
<p>Thank you for your full reply. Does the Cabinet member regret not yet being able to use his powers?</p>										
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball								

On the contrary, I am pleased that so far I have not needed to use the enforcement powers. Many empty properties have already been brought back into use as a result of the policy, but there are still some difficult cases ahead which may need enforcement and I will not hesitate to use these powers if it proves necessary, in order to ensure these properties are brought back into use

M 07	Question from:	Councillor Tim Warren
<p>What has the change been to the estimated number of people who cycle to work in B&NES over the past two years?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>The most reliable data for cycling to work is the national census, which takes place every 10 years.</i></p> <p><i>In 2001, 2.4% of Bath & North East Somerset's employed residents stated that they travelled to work by bicycle. By 2011, the number of people cycling to work had increased by 33% to 3.0% of work trips.</i></p> <p><i>The Council undertakes annual monitoring of traffic and cycle flows in Bath city centre between 7am and 7pm. This survey records all cycling trips and does not identify work journeys separately. In 2010, the survey recorded 1,670 cycles travelling across Bath city centre, rising to 2,450 in 2012. This is an increase of 47%. Between 2001 and 2012 Bath city centre cycle flows increased by 104%.</i></p>		

M 08	Question from:	Councillor Tim Warren
<p>Now that the P&R at Newbridge is being significantly delayed, can the cabinet member please confirm if he will be making a decision to delay the car parking restrictions proposed for the Victoria Park area?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>Royal Victoria Park is registered by English Heritage as a Park of National Historic Importance and should not be used as a long stay car park for commuters. The changes to the parking arrangements within Royal Victoria Park will encourage a turnover of spaces allowing families, visitors and residents greater access to the facilities for the benefit of all. Occupancy surveys of the park conducted in 2008 suggest that only 40% of the vehicles surveyed were commuters. However they accounted of over 75% of the available spaces. Furthermore another 9% of vehicles surveyed confirmed that they were unable to park and therefore left without stopping.</i></p> <p><i>Commuters and those wishing to park for extended periods are able to use the appropriate long stay options within the car parks in the city including the nearby Charlotte Street car park where there is usually ample capacity. Those wishing to use Park & Ride can find capacity at Odd Down sites where the recent expansion has been completed and at Lansdown in the very near future where the extension will also be opened.</i></p>		

M 09	Question from:	Councillor Martin Veal
<p>Will the Cabinet Member publish the proposed reduced mobile library timetable in advance of the Council budget meeting so that residents and councillors are able to make an informed judgment on the adequacy of the reduced service?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor David Dixon
<p><i>It has been essential to develop the Community Library pilots at New Oriel Hall, Larkhall, Combe Hay and Chew Stoke before work began on the mobile library timetable. The mobile library staff are currently reviewing the mobile library timetables. Following the budget decision in February, there will not be any changes to the mobile service until later in the year due to staff consultations etc, enabling time to consult on any proposals.</i></p> <p><i>Library users were last surveyed via questionnaire and public meetings January/February 2012 as to their views about the service and the way forward. The option to reduce to one mobile rather than both was suggested in these meetings. We are taking that forward.</i></p>		

M 10	Question from:	Councillor Liz Richardson
<p>I recently received a copy of the new Visit Bath booklet. I would like to congratulate Bath Tourism Plus on a well-designed, attractive, quality publication, with lots of useful information about attraction in Bath, Wiltshire and the Cotswolds.</p> <p>However, upon looking through the booklet I was dismayed to see that there was scant mention of the attractions in the Chew Valley and Mendips. There are many attractions available in this part of the authority, including the lakes, picturesque walks, and attractive villages. The lack of mention of these within the tourism booklet currently sends the wrong signal about the Council and Bath Tourism Plus's commitment to promoting the North East Somerset and the rural economy.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet Member please explain what will be done to rectify this in future publications?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>The Visitor Guide is just one part of Bath Tourism Plus range of promotional information and does a very specific job: it aims to position the city and surrounding area and encourage readers to find out more. It is a 'pre-arrival' piece of print, which gives a flavour of what our area can offer and tempts the reader to find out more. It is not a definitive Guide.</i></p> <p><i>It complements the visitbath website and App, both of which are very much more detailed and content-rich. To put this in perspective, the website attracts 3million visits a year, whilst the Guide has a print run of some 80,000. The guide encourages readers to visit the Visitor Information Centre (we welcome 500,000 visitors a year) which has lots of information about places to visit beyond the city centre. Bath Tourism Plus are</i></p>		

also currently developing a 'post arrival' piece of print which will encourage visitors to discover the rural areas.

Bath Tourism Plus are devoting resource and support to Cllr Paul Myers who, on behalf of the Somer area is developing ideas to drive more visitors. They would welcome other initiatives from parish councils and look to support them. Cycling and walking are part of this, and this will develop further as the Two Tunnels project is completed.

M 11	Question from:	Councillor Anthony Clarke										
<p>If the Council proceeds with plans to prevent cars using Dorchester Street and Manvers Street as a through-route, what is the current estimate of the traffic impact (in percentage and numerical terms) on Pulteney Road, Rossiter Road and Widcombe Parade?</p>												
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds										
<p><i>The table below gives an indication of the impact of restricting cars from using Dorchester Street and Manvers Street as a through route. As a result of this preliminary analysis and given the range of options available it was concluded that a more detailed understanding of traffic flows was needed using a traffic model to assess the impact of measures in Dorchester St on the wider highway network including the proposed Rossiter Road Traffic Management Scheme.</i></p> <p><i>The detailed analysis will also review the effectiveness of enforcing possible traffic management measures following the recent review of bus gate signage in the city by the Traffic Penalty Tribunal.</i></p>												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Road</th> <th>Likely change in traffic levels depending on the measure introduced</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dorchester St</td> <td>Reduction of between 44 and 59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Manvers St</td> <td>Reduction of between 36 and 54%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>North Parade</td> <td>Reduction of 6% or an increase of 16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pulteney Rd (South)</td> <td>An increased in traffic of between 20 and 27%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Road	Likely change in traffic levels depending on the measure introduced	Dorchester St	Reduction of between 44 and 59%	Manvers St	Reduction of between 36 and 54%	North Parade	Reduction of 6% or an increase of 16%	Pulteney Rd (South)	An increased in traffic of between 20 and 27%
Road	Likely change in traffic levels depending on the measure introduced											
Dorchester St	Reduction of between 44 and 59%											
Manvers St	Reduction of between 36 and 54%											
North Parade	Reduction of 6% or an increase of 16%											
Pulteney Rd (South)	An increased in traffic of between 20 and 27%											

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P 01	Question from:	Joel Hirst
<p>Can the Cabinet confirm B&NES Council commitment to ensure rural areas including the villages of Newton St Loe, Englishcombe, Combe Hay, Tunley and Camerton will benefit from early priority for Superfast Broadband. Can the Cabinet also confirm the current timelines for implementation of Superfast Broadband to our rural areas in B&NES?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>This Administration has been proactive in joining The BDUK project 'Connecting Devon and Somerset' with a view to making improved broadband a priority for rural areas . The contract with BT was signed on 29th January 2013 and surveying work on the project will start immediately. The first locations to be upgraded will be announced during Spring 2013. We will have a better idea then of where these particular villages fit within the programme.</i></p> <p><i>In terms of timescale, the programme will deliver high-speed fibre broadband to around 90 per cent of premises by the end of 2016 and will ensure a minimum of 2Mbps broadband speeds for all. This will make B&NES one of the best connected areas in the UK.</i></p>		

P 02	Question from:	Simon Whittle
<p>The Chew Valley Broadband Group has been formed to press for improved broadband service for users connected to the West Harptree, Temple Cloud, Chew Magna and Compton Dando (Pensford) exchanges. It has the support of at least 5 Ward Councillors and a growing number Parish Councils.</p> <p>Q: Could you please provide an update on the plans and timescales for superfast broadband roll-out in our area? Some residents in villages such as Bishop Sutton, whose employers encourage "teleworking" are forced to commute to Bristol and Bath 5 days per week because the service is both slow and unreliable. This does not contribute to sustainable communities.</p> <p>Q: How will you be working with BT and CDS to ensure that we are not isolated and left behind during this and future technological advances? We pay the same monthly fees as other users and get very poor value for money.</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>With the contract between BT and the Connecting Devon and Somerset programme now signed, detailed survey work is currently being undertaken. There is no detail</i></p>		

currently publicly available on the rollout, or on which areas will get the superfast (24 Mbps) and which will get the minimum 2 Mbps, however following the survey Connecting Devon and Somerset will be looking to share this information as far as possible. As a result of delays at a national level with State Aid and the procurement framework, the 90% coverage of superfast broadband is now due to be completed by 2016. The Connecting Devon and Somerset programme does also commit to all areas being upgraded to superfast broadband by 2020.

P 03	Question from:	Evan Weinburg
<p>I am aware that BaNES has committed 1M pounds to the Connecting Devon and Somerset project, but am unable to find any details as to how this money is to be spent , what governance is being placed against it and want to understand how a Parish Council or Village Association can interact with its leaders.</p> <p>Please explain,</p> <p>(a) how BaNES governs the money provided to the Connecting Devon and Somerset project and what metrics (other than percentages of premises connected) will be used to understand how the money will positively effect the development and sustainability of the area.</p> <p>(b) how do we interact with the decision making mechanism governing roll out.</p> <p>(c) What is being done to ensure that none of the rural (but very close to city) locations in BaNES will not be left behind once the Connecting Devon and Somerset project has finished.</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p>B&NES has committed £690,000 for capital works and £175,000 revenue over 3 years to a maximum total of £865,000.</p> <p>B&NES have signed up to the Connecting Devon and Somerset Programme who have a governing responsibility for the spend, the targets and the outputs. B&NES have a Senior Officer on the Programme Board of Connecting Devon and Somerset, to which the Programme Director reports in detail on risk, contracts, outputs and spend. Parish Councils currently receive regular briefings via the Parishes Liaison Committee and a small number of Parishes are engaging more directly with the programme where they want to explore other options including private funding and the Rural Communities Broadband Fund.</p> <p>Detailed cost benefit modelling is employed (the return on investment for maximum coverage) to determine the roll-out and the final speeds and coverage. There is no detail currently publicly available on this, or on which areas will get the superfast (24 Mbps) and which will get the minimum 2 Mbps. However, detailed survey work is currently being undertaken and Connecting Devon and Somerset will be looking to share this as far as possible once this is completed. In the meantime, please sign up to the Connecting Devon and Somerset newsletter at www.connectingdevonandsomerset.co.uk</p>		

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT ON SMALL BUSINESS SATURDAYS**Cllr John Bull**

It is apparent that many small businesses (especially retail businesses) are facing tough times. This was highlighted by an appeal by retailers in the Bath Chronicle last month to work together, in order to survive, underlining that in Bath especially, but also elsewhere in the area, small businesses give town centres a distinctive feel and should attract shoppers interested in something other than the multiples and supermarkets. The winter weather sometimes demonstrates this – unable to use their cars in the snow people often discover their local shops, maybe for the first time.

An idea from President Obama which we might adopt is a designated Saturday or Saturdays on which efforts are made by national and local authorities to encourage people to use local small businesses. (In America, this is a Saturday in early December). This is done through publicity, celebrity endorsements and other means to raise the profile of these firms and to get more customers through their doors. This will then, it is hoped, induce people to visit these shops and other establishments at other times.

The Labour Party nationally has taken this idea to the coalition Government who are considering it. In the meantime there is no reason why BANES should not launch a similar scheme off its own bat, and the Labour Group here would be happy to pass on details. In Paulton, my ward, many, many shops have closed in recent years as a result of supermarkets opening and customers travelling elsewhere. This may produce lower prices in some cases but is hard on the infirm, elderly and those without cars, who have less and less choice locally. It also creates a sad appearance with empty and boarded up shops and a deserted High Street. Let us hope we can prevent this happening elsewhere.

This page is intentionally left blank

Children's Centres – Statement from Cllr Liz Hardman

B&NES Children's Centres and Early Years have been targeted for one of the largest budgetary cuts, losing £2,337,000 over the next three years, or in other words, 40% of their budget. It is planned to cut £273,000 in 2013/14, £228,000 in 2014/15, rising to a massive £1,836,000 in 2015/2016. There will be a complete restructuring of services to move to a wholly targeted model. Children's Centres will cease all council funded "universal" access services, with services targeted upon the most deprived children and families. The cuts will lead to the loss of 30 full time jobs with the result that there will be huge cuts in the services they provide.

Whilst it is absolutely essential that the most needy families should receive our services, research has shown that where there are universal services, far more needy families are reached. These families do not feel "stigmatised". Evidence from the Children's Centres tells us that 50% of their referrals come from these universal services.

So what services are offered? Firstly a universal service for all children with their parents/carers under school age. These range from parenting groups, to a drop-in baby clinic, to a careers service, to a support group for families with children with special needs, a young parents' group and opportunities for pre-school speech and language therapy and much more.

They are working in partnership with health visitors, social workers, the CAB and job centres attracting these services to the Children's Centres so that families can readily access these services.

Social care thresholds are high. Children's Centres do the essential work which helps to prevent families requiring more help and support and costing more money further down the line.

So let me end with some figures: In B&NES the number of families seen from April 1st 2011 to March 31st 2012 were 3,374. For the same period, almost two thirds of the total estimated number of children aged 0-4, living in the 30% most deprived areas across B&NES have been seen by Children's Centre services.

On behalf of the Labour Group I'd like give notice that if these cuts remain in the budget proposal, the Labour Group will be moving an amendment seeking to put a brake on these cuts.

We would look at taking money as a one-off from reserves and from unexpected funding that we have received in the final settlement from the New Homes Bonus. We would pay the money back into reserves from cuts to other services that haven't borne the same level of reductions, for example Major Projects. We'd also like to see an increase in the income generated by the Children's Centre buildings.

On behalf of the Labour Group, I would urge you to support us in trying to prevent these cuts.

The Administration has promised us that it will be protecting frontline services. Tell me: How can cuts of this scale to services used by the youngest and most vulnerable members of our community possibly be considered anything other than a huge cut to a frontline service?

Statement to Cabinet 13th February 2013**Cllr Patrick Anketell-Jones**

Victoria Art Gallery

Bath and North East Somerset residents, rate payers and Discovery Card holders, must be exempted from all visitor charges to the exhibition gallery in the Victoria Art Gallery.

The cost of running the Victoria Art Gallery has always been paid out of the general rate and every visitor has enjoyed free access. This Spring, the Council is going to impose entry charges and those charges will fall* on BANES residents. It is a charge too far because residents have already paid through their rates an entry charge amounts to double taxation. It is unfair and defeats the purpose of having a public gallery. Please, do not say the Gallery will remain free just because the upstairs permanent collection will not be charged. That is a disingenuous position. We all know* it is the Lower Gallery that attracts the greatest number of visitors, that excites the public imagination, that makes the greatest contribution to contemporary culture.

We fully understand the Council's requirement, in response to the harsh economic climate, to reduce public expenditure. The Council is expected to absorb a 3 year 10% reduction to its budget and that cut is being spread as evenly as possible throughout the administration so why is the Victoria Art Gallery being hit with a 3 year, 60% cut?

The Conservative Group has an alternative proposal. We do not object to charging non resident visitors even though this will diminish footfall. Many people I spoke to on the steps of the Gallery confirmed that an entry charge will stop them from going in and they could not understand why the Council is pursuing this course when so many other cities have dropped gallery charges. ***Now, here is a proposal is worth considering. A combined ticket for the Roman Baths and the Fashion Museum could also include the Victoria Art Gallery with the price of the ticket increased appropriately. If the price was put up by as little as one pound the gallery would receive around £50,000. per annum.

This gallery is a local and unique cultural asset. It has a thoughtful curator and attracts widespread support. It is there to educate, illuminate, inspire, challenge and sometimes infuriate. The quality, variety and integrity of its exhibitions maintain the gallery in high public esteem. It stands on its own strengths and it must not, as the MTSRP recommends, be turned into a crowd pulling visitor attraction that brings in money to serve the Treasury before it serves the people.

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement to Cabinet Delivering Petition to Save the Larkhall Public Toilets

13/02/13

I am delivering a petition with nearly 500 signatures demanding the Larkhall toilets stay open. For at least 125 years there have been public toilets in Larkhall Square, and possibly even earlier than 1888¹. Why? Because they are needed.

The need for this facility has only increased over time with the population increase, particularly in the elderly range. Statistics show Lambridge ward with around 25% over the age of 60 and growing.² However, the toilets serve the whole population: young people, disabled people, mothers, shoppers, visitors, delivery drivers, cab drivers and workmen. This is a basic, essential provision. Chances are, the reason it has not been a statutory requirement to provide toilets is that in any previous age it would have been unthinkable to dispense with them.

The impact on the integrity of the village would be incalculable and severe. Shops would see reductions in trade since shoppers who need a toilet quickly would stay away. There is no viable alternative to these toilets. The community hall is accessible only until 3pm on weekdays. Many, including women and children, would not go into the Larkhall Inn. The small Cafe is totally unsuitable as the single cubicle is on the far side, requiring crossing all the crowded tables. People are reluctant to use commercial premises where they make no purchase, which is another reason why we have public toilets.

It has been said, "There are difficult choices to be made. Supporting bus services or providing loos for instance."³ Yes, the council has been under intense pressure from the national government to make cuts. But these cuts to essential services should be resisted when the argument for making them springs from priorities and values that are not in the interest of the majority and when we see almost daily reports of society becoming more unequal⁴, with only weak efforts to counteract this.

The people of Larkhall have risen up to say clearly and overwhelmingly to the council to drop this mistaken measure.

Lin Patterson
10 Brookleaze Buildings
Larkhall
Bath, BA1 6RA
01225 311163
Delivered by Barbara Gordon

¹ Bath Map surveyed 1883, printed 1888

² <http://openlylocal.com/wards/4699-Lambridge> accessed 7/02/2013

³ Cllr David Dixon, private email to Lin Patterson 6/02/13

⁴ Living Standards, Poverty and Inequality in the UK: 2012, by the Institute of Fiscal Studies, <http://www.ifs.org.uk/comms/comm124.pdf> accessed 7/02/13

This page is intentionally left blank

Resources PDS Panel Resolution – 11th February 2013

It was **RESOLVED** that:

1. The Panel expressed concerns about the movement away from universal access with regard to Children's Centres. The Panel request that this issue be considered by the Cabinet on 13th February 2013 as well as being scrutinised by the Early Years, Children and Youth PDS Panel; and
2. The Panel noted the conclusions and resolutions from the other PDS Panels and refer them on to the Cabinet on 13th February 2013 for consideration. The Panel noted in particular:
 - That the Housing and Major Projects PDS Panel ask the Cabinet to consider whether investment in the Public Realm and Affordable Housing should be shown within the Medium Term Service and Resource Plan for future years, following 2013/14; and
 - That the Economic and Community Development PDS Panel asked that the Council have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and that the latest statement from the Prime Minister be circulated. Also that the ECD Panel asked for a report on how a Tourism Levy will work in practice; and
 - That the Planning, Transport and Environment PDS Panel had raised the issue of car parking charges and noted that this had been resolved; and
 - The resolutions of the Wellbeing PDS Panel. On their request for the budget being presented earlier, the Panel noted that in the three year plan approach to the budget, Panels could raise issues and add them to their workplan where there are concerns (there was no need to wait until the Medium Term Service and Resource Plans were updated in Autumn 2014);
 - That the concerns raised by this (Resources PDS) Panel in the November 2012 meeting had been addressed in that the Democratic Services savings had been greatly reduced and that, following a presentation on the effect of the proposed savings in Property, the savings would not jeopardize income.

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT ON PAULTON SCHOOLS EXPANSION

Cllr John Bull

My colleague Liz Hardman and I are aware of considerable concern arising from the consultation initiated at the end of January. There was some criticism by parents of the way in which the actual consultation was carried out but most of the objections concerned the prospective size of the schools (particularly the infants) and the consequences for road safety and access if the schools were expanded on the same site. We would like to make three requests of the BANES Cabinet member to alleviate these fears.

1. We would like a commitment that every Paulton child of primary school age will be able to attend a school in the village. I believe that most of the objections received also took this as given.
2. BANES needs to be sure that it has the maximum funding available to carry out any expansion. Although some of the additional pupil numbers arise from the building on the former Polestar printworks site, some are also due to the rise in the birthrate over the past four years. The Government's Basic Need capital funding is for just this purpose and we ask that BANES secures the maximum amount from this source, supplementing it from its own capital reserve. This may then provide enough money to build on another site in the village and this should be explored. The idea has its downsides ; a new school would need to be a primary , since four separate junior and Infant schools in Paulton would be nonsensical ,and would presumably be single –form entry. We would have some concern about rival schools in an area the size of Paulton , with all the difficulties about deciding admissions policies etc.

One idea that could be considered is moving the Junior school to a new site , with the Infants remaining where they are.

3. Finally , there is an on-going road safety problem that must be addressed, whether numbers expand on the present site or not. The roads around the schools are narrow, with few opportunities for parking , causing congestion and potential road safety hazards at the start and

end of the school day. There is a village traffic scheme drawn up, to be funded from the Polestar s.106 money but this will not be available until a certain number of houses are occupied. We ask BANES to fund this scheme as soon as any school expansion is in place and to supplement it with other measures to ensure children attending the school are safe.

To sum up, we have three requests :

1. Support the principle of all primary age paulton children attending a school in Paulton if their parents wish it.
2. Ensure the maximum funding from all sources is available and explore the possibility pf alternative sites.
3. Bring forward funding to implement traffic management measures round the existing schools.

Paulton Schools' Expansion

Cllr Liz Hardman

My fellow ward councillor, John Bull and myself would like to represent to the Cabinet some of the concerns felt by Paulton residents regarding the expansion of both schools. Parents do feel the consultation process is being rushed through with a decision already made regardless of what residents think.

Paulton Junior and Infant schools are outstanding so it is understandable that parents are concerned about the effects of expansion on educational standards and opportunities. In order to make sure that these standards are maintained, we would urge B&NES to ensure that it gets the maximum funding available not only from S106 money paid for by the property developers, but also from the Government's Basic Need Capital Funding.

The schools need to expand, not only because of the new housing developments, but because of the increase in the birth rate in Paulton. We support the provision of extra Primary School places in Paulton, because we believe that every Primary age child should have the opportunity to attend school in Paulton, should their parents wish it.

However, many of the concerns are that expansion will cause huge extra problems for traffic and parking. I realise that access to the school site and traffic management issues are part of the planning application process and are separate from the consultation process. However, this is an urgent consideration as B&NES Highway officers have already objected to the proposed enlargement plan for the Infant School. We would therefore ask B&NES to ensure traffic improvement schemes are in place before any enlargement occurs.

We could see new opportunities in the expansion of pupil numbers with an opportunity to resolve the problems of traffic congestion. A new school could be built well away from the present site, if there was enough funding for this. Another idea could be the siting of the Junior School in a different location.

To conclude:

- We would like traffic management schemes in place if the existing schools are to be expanded prior to their expansion.
- We want all Paulton children of Primary age to have the opportunity to attend school in Paulton if they so wish
- We would like to see the maximum funding available for expansion, be it on the same site or on other sites

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEETING 13TH FEB 2013

Mich Moore

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF PAULTON SCHOOLS EXPANSION ACTION GROUP.

I am here on behalf of 'Paulton Schools' Expansion Action Group', a group of concerned parents and residents from Paulton.

We object to the proposed expansion of the two Paulton schools, on the following grounds:

Reason 1 Road Safety

Section 5.4 of the report states that the site lends itself to expansion. We believe that this is simply not true.

The proposals for improved pedestrian and traffic access to the school remain inadequate to support the proposed expansion. The proposals are impractical and inappropriate to a primary school. Furthermore, they will only appease the current volume of traffic and do not provide a solution to the proposed expansion.

Roads such as Park Road and Ham Lane further a field than those considered by the proposals will also be affected. The plans do not show any consideration for residents or safety in these areas.

Reason 2. on-site facilities

Within the school, the expansion would place extra pressure on existing shared facilities – the halls, IT suites, libraries and playspaces.

Already at full capacity, the expansion plans do little to accommodate the increase in numbers in these spaces, which are fundamental to the recognized high standard of teaching. Staggered use of the facilities will add to the breakdown of the community feel of the school.

We also question Section 9 of the report where options explored do not include building a new school and we oppose the objections put forward against this option

Objection 1 - insufficient pupil numbers

Despite promises laid down by the parish council in the 2010 community action plan, the village continues to grow with new developments in progress and in planning. A sustainable solution, which will cater for the impending growth of the village, needs to be sought.

The sustainable, and safe solution is not to expand but to build.

Objection 2: insufficient capital funding

The Action group appreciate that a new development is not cheap, but together with the residents of Paulton, we would like to see a return for our higher council tax band. We question whether

- section 106 money

- Paulton's share of the £2 million New Homes Bonus scheme
- additional council tax receipts generated by the increased homes in the area
- plus the sale of the current schools site

really can't go a long way to funding such a development.

We want to see our money put back into our community.

While a new site will not change the scale of the school, it does give banes the opportunity to provide adequate facilities and spaces for its staff to maintain the nurturing environment and high quality of early years teaching that they have worked so hard to achieve. Something they may struggle to maintain within the restraints of the proposed expansion.

You will also be giving the residents of Paulton, particularly those around the Plumtre Road area, a better and safer quality of life.

We urge this Cabinet to abandon plans to expand the existing Schools in the village and direct resources towards a new facility that will provide a sustainable solution for our village.

Statement to Cabinet 13th Feb 2013**Louise Bray**

I would like to seek Cabinet's assurance, that in the light of its intention to expand the primary schools of Peasedown St. John and Paulton, it will uphold the Education and Inspections Act of 2006 re-inforced in 2008 and still enacted, of the presumption in favour of keeping village schools open. Will the Council give full support to the highly inclusive village schools of Camerton, Shoscombe and Wellow as this expansion could make these schools more vulnerable to the fluctuations of birth rate experienced in rural communities. Historically our schools have a wide catchment from the villages and hamlets which surround them, communities without schools such as Combe Hay, Hinton Charterhouse and Carlingcott. Our schools are also supported by a catchment from Peasedown who have families in our villages but are unable to find affordable accommodation within them.

Whilst I fully understand the need of an expanding population, I would as Chair of Governors of Church Valley Federation, respectfully point out that we can provide two thirds of the spaces needed by Peasedown St. John this September. In times of financial constraint is this not a consideration against additional costs of expansion. St. Julian's Wellow was the first school in BANES to receive an outstanding Ofsted in May 2012 under tightened regulations, and our schools have been previously oversubscribed. This has worked against us as unfortunately, although regulations have changed, we have been told by a number of parents they have been nervous of putting us as first choice in case they did not get a place.

Returning to the Education and Inspections Act of 2006, it seems that there is a conflict of interest between the market forces dictated by Westminster, developers planning policy and what is actually enshrined in parliamentary law. I would like to see the council ensure that there is a future for our children in the heart of our rural communities. We struggle to maintain beautiful old buildings that are listed, but offer our children an education that on top of a full National Curriculum gives an innate understanding of the value of a sustainable rural heritage that is 'England's green and pleasant land'. Welly walks that mean real mud, growing vegetables, forest schools -dens and campfires, respect for our crops and farmers, hatching chickens and feeding lambs, the importance of our hedgerows and wildflowers... where to find Bath asparagus, how to weave willow. But also respect for the industrial landscape that this has in part replaced the mines and railways of Somerset that provided for the people of Bath. If you do not want separation of town and country, but a working countryside for the C21st century rather than a playground for the town, I ask the council to think carefully about how you protect our rural schools, and the very special place they have long held in our nation's hearts.

This page is intentionally left blank

Hello, my name is Della Simmons, I am a parent who uses stay and play groups and the nursery at First Steps Children's Centres. I believe the potential cuts you are proposing to make will have drastic devastating effects on the people of Bath.

I am originally from Nottingham where I was in Care and there was nothing like this available for me as a child and I ended up going down a very slippery path. I moved to Bath to make a new life for me and my children. I wanted to fit into the community and I didn't want my children to be treated differently because of the mistakes I had made in the past.

We would be lost without the Children's Centres – I am very grateful for what First Steps has done for me and my family.

Therefore I am presenting a petition signed by people, asking you to reconsider the proposed cuts to children's centres across Bath and North East Somerset. This petition is not only presented from the mums and dads that use the children's centre services, it is also on behalf of the people and children of Bath and North East Somerset.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEETING – WEDNESDAY 13 FEBRUARY 2013**Agenda Item 12 – MTSRP & Budget Report
Proposed Changes to Wording and Content**

1. Page 21, final paragraph – to replace the word “significant” with the word “some”.
2. Page 23, first bullet – to replace “£33 million” with “£34 million”.
3. Page 51, final paragraph – to replace “provisional” with “Fully Approved”.
4. Page 53, insert following sentences before the title “Flood Risk Management” -
“The following projects have received approval for the use of £11.2m of Revolving Investment Funding from the West of England LEP to support the delivery of this infrastructure to enable development of sites within the Bath City Riverside Enterprise Area. This funding will be repaid from developer and related contributions once the relevant developments are completed.”
5. Page 110, to delete the existing proposal for a saving of £50k in 2013/2014 relating to Waste Recycling Centres and replace with “Waste Grant Funding will be used to protect existing recycling centre opening hours for the 3 year period of this MTSRP. There is therefore no impact to service delivery”.
6. Page 127, to add the following text as para 5.3 – “The savings identified in para 5.1 above are anticipated to be a net revenue saving position across all Council owned assets, after taking account of any costs which may arise as a result of the Community Asset “Quick Wins” identified in this paper.
7. Page 132, to add the following sentence after the existing paragraph under “Climate Change” – “The Council will also seek to recognise the potential impacts of weather related events like flooding for Council service areas including Environmental Services, Sustainability and Emergency Planning.”
8. To include an item in the proposed use of “One-off Headroom Allocations” funded by the Financial Planning Reserve as set out on page 39 as follows:
 - £15,000 to protect the funding for the Wheels for All event for 2013/2014.

and to authorise the Section 151 officer to make such appropriate amendments to the figures presented in the Budget Report for Council, as necessary to recognise this change.

This page is intentionally left blank

As I was saying to the PDS Panel on resources on Monday night (11 February), it is essential that this Council really listens to people and takes on board all the objections to cuts to Children's Centres, and Youth Services, as spelt out by Cllr Hardman, and by speakers from the public here tonight. I asked then if this was a 'listening council' and if you could hear the outrage about the cuts to children's services and the howls from Radstock about the threat to the youth service, and the injustice and inefficiency of a so called 'targeted service'.

Now I want to ask if you are an 'acting council'. It seems to me, to quote the General Confession of the Book of Common Prayer, that 'we have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and there is no 'health' in the Budget.

- 1) p56 Cabinet Papers. Victoria Hall. A year since it closed but all that has happened is that a decision has been made to retain it as a community building. I welcome that, but where is the business plan, the architect's plan and most import of all, there is no analysis available of the community response to the public consultation. How can you plan a community facility without analysing what the community has said?
- 2) P55 £500,000 in 13/14 and 14/15 for 'affordable housing' –one cheer- but it is very vague as to what is actually going to be delivered. Tracking it through the PDS papers, it seems that it will only be spent on the Bath Western Riverside project – which is not acceptable to those of us living 'out in the sticks' in N E Somerset. Empty houses are not an issue in my ward if it is to be used on the Empty Homes Policy. I have one potential site for development and one on the border. Here once again we have a Bath-centric policy.
- 3) Finally can I make a plea that we have no more white rabbits like Cllr Bellotti's half million for Radstock regeneration –and not a penny spent yet.
- 4) A promise is a commitment and a commitments means delivery now, not in some dim distant future – when the electorate will hold you to account for not getting anything done.

Thank you, Chair, for letting me speak.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEETING 13 FEBRUARY 2013

Agenda item 14: Sustainable Construction and Retrofitting Supplementary Planning Document

The Supplementary Planning Document is very welcome, as it will be extremely helpful to residents, builders and installers alike. It reinforces the Council's messages about energy efficiency and will support the implementation of the Green Deal in the district. Officers have worked very hard to produce this excellent document.

However, there remains the matter of producing guidance for listed buildings. I would like the guidance to deliver what we need – that is, sensitive whole house energy efficiency improvements in listed buildings, such as appropriate double glazing.

For the review that is proposed, the Council Planning Policy team should work with colleagues in the Sustainability team, and with all the public stakeholders involved in last year's consultation – including Bath Preservation Trust, Transition Bath, Curo and the Council's Environmental Sustainability Partnership. And using the original public consultation draft.

In my ward there are over 150 listed buildings, and I am well aware of the needs of these residents to improve the energy performances of their houses. I have been asked several times "what is Council guidance on this".

There is a significant level of public support for a progressive and enabling approach to retrofitting of listed buildings. Clearly getting the balance right between energy measures and heritage conservation is crucial.

But to quote NPPF (para 94) "planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change".

I think we have an opportunity for the Council to be a leader amongst local authorities in best practice this topic. I know of several other local authorities – Brighton, York – which are looking to us to develop the progressive advice that was put forward in the draft document last summer.

I hope that the Cabinet will take account of my comments and that with public feedback and involvement we can take this topic forward for a more radical approach to retrofitting of energy efficiency measures in listed buildings. Leading to greater clarity and objectivity.

Cllr David Martin

This page is intentionally left blank