

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

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

Wednesday, 10th April, 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

165 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

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

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

The Chair announced his intention to hear the following items early in the agenda:

- Agenda Item 22: Radstock Capital Funding
- Agenda Item 26: Expansion of 6 schools
- Agenda Item 23: Home To School Transport Review
- Agenda Item 14: Bus Priority Measures

166 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

167 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

168 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

169 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

170 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 24 questions from the following Councillors: Anthony Clarke (2), Nigel Roberts, Eleanor Jackson, Brian Webber (4), Vic Pritchard (2), Tim Warren (5), Francine Haerberling, Geoff Ward (4), Charles Gerrish (2), Patrick Anketell-Jones (2).

There were 2 questions from the following members of the public: Alderman Terry Reakes, Anne Robbins.

[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.]

171 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

Councillor John Bull in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website]* appealed to the Cabinet to adopt the Living Wage as a minimum salary for Council employees in the Council budget for 2014/15. He observed that the estimated cost to the Council would be about £160,000.

The Chair referred the statement to Councillor David Bellotti for a response in due course.

Gerald Chown in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website]* challenged the decision to exclude the top half of Widcombe Hill, from the consultation process on 20mph speed limits. He presented a petition of 71 signatures.

The Chair referred the petition to Councillor Roger Symonds for a response in due course.

Rosie McKeown, Laura Harrison and Katie Purchase (student members of the Envision Project, Chew Valley School) together made a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website]* in which they asked the Cabinet to take action on the high price of bus tickets for young people and the lack of regular routes from Chew Valley into the surrounding town areas. They presented a petition of 104 signatures.

The Chair said that he and Councillor Roger Symonds would make arrangements to meet with the students and the project manager of the envision Project, to explore ways in which the Council could help.

Dan Farr (Make Fares Fair) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website]* asked the Cabinet to support his e-petition about the reliability and cost of buses in the area, which had already attracted 4000 signatures. He asked Cabinet to work with bus operators to reduce bus fares.

Karen Abolkheir (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website]* asked the Cabinet to provide an update on the progress of the DPD and a definitive timetable for resolution of site provision so as to avoid a situation in which a possible planning appeal might rely on the lack of progress with the DPD.

Clarke Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website]* explained that he was not satisfied with the procurement process and the brief to the consultants

engaged to produce the update of the needs assessment for pitches for gypsy and travellers. He asked Cabinet to investigate the process of commissioning the report.

Paul Baxter in a statement reminded the Cabinet that the case for provision of pitches on the former colliery in Stanton Wick had never been made and asked why the application had been resubmitted.

172 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 13th February 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

173 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

174 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

The Chair welcomed Councillor Sally Davis (Chair of the Early Years, Children and Youth PDS Panel) to the meeting.

Councillor Davis in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to these minutes as appendix 8 and on the Council's website*] said that the Panel had felt that the cost neutral figures would favour recommendation 2.3c but she now believed that the facts did not support that recommendation.

The Chair observed that this issue would be considered in an item later in the agenda.

175 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING AND SPECIAL URGENCY DECISIONS TAKEN IN THE PREVIOUS YEAR

The Chair referred to the two reports. He observed that in addition to the Single Member Decisions listed, Councillor Cherry Beath had recently responded to the River Corridor Report of the Economic and Community Development PDS Panel and the response had been published in the Weekly List on 5th April.

The Chair welcomed Councillor Robin Moss (Chair of the Panel) to the meeting and invited him to speak. Councillor Moss asked the Cabinet to give serious consideration to how it would administer replacing cash payments with a voucher scheme.

The Cabinet agreed to note the two reports.

176 RADSTOCK CAPITAL FUNDING

Councillor Eleanor Jackson in a statement expressed some concerns about the delays and uncertainty about deciding and announcing how the £500K would be used. She was unhappy that the Economic Forum had many members who were not from the area and who might not have the best interests of the area in mind.

Amanda Leon (Radstock Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 9 and on the Council's website*] congratulated the Council on identifying key works which required urgent attention in Radstock. She emphasised the importance of the proposed public realm improvements and stressed the need for ongoing maintenance of the fabric of the town. She expressed reservations about the unaccountable nature of the Economic Forum.

George Bailey (Radstock Action Group) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 10 and on the Council's website*] asked for an explanation for the decrease in the published allocation for Frome Road improvements; and the increase in the published allocation for the Economic Forum. He said that the Forum was undemocratic and that no list of members existed. He observed that the widening of Morley Terrace and the Haydon 20mph speed limit both appeared to have been forgotten.

Lesley Mansell (Chair, Radstock Town Council) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 11 and on the Council's website*] welcomed the Capital Funding and asked for more partnership working between B&NES and the town Council to ensure that local people would have a real say in the changes.

Councillor Peter Edwards in an *ad hoc* statement said that he was intrigued by the order in which the matter had been progressed; he felt that the needs should be identified first, then the funds should be allocated later to meet those needs.

Councillor Robin Moss in an *ad hoc* statement said that he was dissatisfied that local traders, manufacturers and local people had not been adequately consulted.

Councillor Cherry Beath in proposing the item, said that the funds had been allocated in the previous year's budget, including funding for Victoria Hall. The consultation feedback from the community had been given full consideration. One suggestion from the community had been additional heritage signage, which had been included in the plans. The Economic Forum had held some lively debates and it was anticipated that the Forum would help in the administration of the funding. Councillor Beath was delighted that the plans would bring regeneration to Radstock and one of the first indications of that would be the public realm improvements.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He was pleased to see the plans for regeneration of the town and refurbishment of Victoria Hall. He thanked the local community for their contribution to the debate. In response to George Bailey he explained that the earlier figures had been estimates which had been firmed up by later thinking. He emphasised that local people could apply for funding and he welcomed the engagement of the community in the regeneration of their own town.

Councillor Simon Allen welcomed this good news for Radstock. He acknowledged that people had questions about the working of the Economic Forum, but the emphasis was on ensuring that the plans were workable and had the support of local people.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE the allocation of the remaining £340,000 of capital funds as follows:

(a) Economic Development

- £135,000 to support the work of the Radstock and Westfield Economic Development Forum.
- £15,000 towards the provision of Heritage signage in Radstock.

(b) Community Facilities

- £50,000 for investment into additional community facilities. The recipients of this investment are to be identified through a competitive bidding process.

(c) Streets, Highways and Public realm

- £140,000 for investment into streets, highways and public realm initiatives to enable projects identified by Highways/Traffic Management and facilitate initiatives suggested through the community consultation process.

(d) The Radstock & Westfield Economic Development Forum oversees and manages the delivery of an economic development action plan of interventions, aimed at increasing economic and social/ community growth in Radstock and Westfield. The forum is made up of local and B&NES Councillors, business representatives, Radstock Town Team, Writhlington School and Norton Radstock College

(e) In order to ensure a fair and equitable distribution of the funds, Officers recommend that a clear set of criteria, terms & conditions and an appropriate scoring matrix are developed with the Radstock and Westfield Economic Development Forum, and a competitive, open bidding process is administered by officers to distribute the Economic Development allocation over the next year.

(f) Officers also recommend that the £50,000 towards additional community facilities should also be awarded through a competitive bidding process. A clear set of criteria, terms & conditions and an appropriate scoring matrix will also need to be developed to support this process.

177 DETERMINATION OF STATUTORY NOTICES TO EXPAND SIX PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN KEYNSHAM, BATH, PEASEDOWN ST JOHN AND PAULTON

Councillor Liz Hardman in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 12 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to ensure that full consideration would be given to the 34 respondents, 93 e-petitioners and 102 leaflets delivered to Council officers about this issue. She acknowledged that additional places would be needed for the new school year and supported the principle that all Paulton children should have the choice of attending a primary school in the town if they wish. She agreed with the majority of respondents who were very concerned about the road safety and increased traffic problems if the expansion of the infant school. She felt that only if new school travel plans were in place could any expansion take place. She noted that the Governing Bodies of the two Paulton schools were supportive of the proposals, subject to a robust solution to the highways issue, and she supported their position.

Councillor John Bull in a statement welcomed the acceptance of the Governors of both Paulton schools for the proposals but he asked for more thought to be given to finding a solution of the traffic problems. He asked the Cabinet to agree to take over the funding of the 20mph scheme for the town, so that the Town Council could then reallocate the funds to resolve the road safety issues arising if the schools were expanded.

Kirsty Withyman in a statement made on behalf of Paulton Schools Expansion Action Group [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 13 and on the Council's website*] made a number of points about the proposals, particularly about play area space, accessibility, road safety, school ethos and school resources. She urged the Cabinet to consider more progressive solutions and asked them not to shoe horn more pupils into the existing space.

The Chair welcomed to the meeting Gary Yoxall (Chair of Governors, Paulton Infants) and Jim Crouch (Chair of Governors, Paulton Junior).

Gary Yoxall said that the school recognised the increased local demand for places at the school and that the Governors were in principle supportive of expansion, subject to planning and with detailed consideration of the road safety issues and if updated travel plans were in place. He agreed with the points made by Councillor John Bull.

Jim Crouch emphasised that the road safety issues were the major concern and that a holistic approach was required to ensure these problems were dealt with before the schools were expanded.

Lisa Loverage, a parent of a child at Weston All Saints School, reminded Cabinet that without an updated Travel Plan the expansion of the school should not be considered.

Eliza Grey reminded Cabinet that Paulton was almost as big as Radstock, and should be given the same consideration.

Councillor Dine Romero moved the proposals which she said were to accommodate existing growth, not hypothetical growth. All the Governing Bodies have indicated support. She fully acknowledged that the road safety issues must be resolved so that the planned expansions would be feasible. These would be dealt with through the planning process in the proper way. She assured parents, governors and teachers that all the expansion plans would be subject to acceptable and workable travel plans.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal which he said were necessary to enable the Council to meet its statutory responsibilities. Parents would be enabled to access good and outstanding education at their local school. He acknowledged that in Paulton there were real traffic issues to be resolved but he emphasised that the priority was the provision of education for local children.

In response to the statement made by Lisa Loverage, Councillor Crossley referred to paragraph 5.13 of the report which showed that her point had already been fully considered and that the traffic concerns about expansion at Weston All Saints would be considered as part of the planning process. Parents would have opportunities to comment on the plans prior to this.

Councillor Roger Symonds responded to the request made by Councillor John Bull by saying that it was not possible to divert monies allocated in a s.106 agreement. He explained that in any case a zone outside the school would be costly for the Parish Council to undertake. He was pleased that the Governors at the Paulton schools wanted Travel Plans.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To APPROVE the proposal to expand Bathampton Primary school;
- (2) To APPROVE the proposal to expand Castle Primary school;

- (3) To APPROVE the proposal to expand Peasedown St. John Primary school;
- (4) To APPROVE the proposal to expand Weston All Saints C of E Primary school;
and
- (5) To APPROVE the proposal to expand Paulton Infant school and Paulton Junior school.

178 HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT REVIEW 2012

Raymond Friel (Executive Headteacher, St Gregory's and St Marks) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 14 and on the Council's website*] said that the proposals before Cabinet would save very little and might prove costly in other ways. He urged the Cabinet to follow the recommendation of the PDS Panel which was that the subsidy should be retained.

Councillor Sarah Bevan in a statement declared that she was a parent of a child at a faith school, but that her interest was not pecuniary. She felt that the impact of the proposals would be critical for some families and reminded Cabinet that faith based schools were a central hub for many minority families.

Councillor Liz Hardman in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 15 and on the Council's website*] said that she was a member of the PDS Panel whose recommendations had been to retain the subsidy but to find some ways of reducing the cost to the Council budget. She observed that some of the advertised savings would not be realised because some children would still qualify for subsidised travel to the schools to which they moved. Many of the affected families lived outside the city of Bath and the proposals could be represented as Bath centred. She asked Cabinet to adopt the recommendation of the Panel.

Brendon Rouse (Chair of pastoral council, St Mary's) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 16 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to continue the subsidy for home to school transport and explained some of the consequences he believed would follow if the subsidy were removed.

Councillor Gabriel Batt in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 17 and on the Council's website*] explained that the catchment area for St Gregory's School was very wide, extending way outside the authority's boundaries. It was never intended to be a local school. He felt that if the subsidy were removed, then Catholic families who live more than 3 miles away would struggle to get their child to the first school of their choice.

Cindy Stocking (Acting Head, St Benedict's Catholic School, Midsomer Norton) in an *ad hoc* statement reminded Cabinet that for her pupils, it was a natural progression to go on to St Gregory's School but that if the subsidy were removed that would become too difficult for many parents to afford.

Councillor Tony Clarke in an *ad hoc* statement said that for many people, denominational school transport was a front-line service. He felt that savings could be made by looking carefully at the providers of the service and by making it more efficient.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson in an *ad hoc* statement was concerned that if the number of Christian children at these schools was reduced, the ethos of the schools would be lost. The Ofsted ratings of the schools spoke for themselves.

Councillor Dine Romero introduced the item by thanking the PDS Panel for the hard work which had gone into their report. Her response to the recommendations had been published separately. She noted that both Councillor John Bull and to Raymond Friel had both suggested that if the proposals went ahead, the faith schools would attract more pupils from within Bath to compensate for their reduced numbers from further afield, and that this in turn would put pressure on the other Bath schools; but she did not agree with their analysis because the other schools in Bath were all already full and the demographics showed increasing numbers of secondary pupils in future years. She said that in an ideal world, all children would travel to school free, but she was determined to protect the authority's other statutory responsibilities. She reminded the Cabinet that in her response she had accepted all but one of the Panel's recommendations.

Councillor Romero explained the implications of the various options available to Cabinet. She announced that it was her intention to propose to Cabinet that they adopt option 3(d) but with an additional protection for families with children currently in receipt of home to school transport subsidy, so that those families would continue to receive the subsidy for their additional children. But families whose first child arrives at school from September 2014 would not receive the subsidy. The wording of her proposal was displayed on the screen for clarity.

She confirmed that the burden of administration would fall on the Council, not on the schools, and that her proposals did not take away parental choice.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal and said that Councillor Romero's proposal to protect the future siblings of existing pupils was very fair. He did not feel that the proposals would impact the take-up of places at the schools.

Councillor David Bellotti said that the issue had been a hard one to consider. All of the surrounding Councils had begun to take steps to resolve the difficulties and this Council must also deal with it. He did not share the view expressed by some that the proposals would negatively impact on pupil numbers in other schools in Bath, because there were new developments at Bath Western Riverside and on the MOD sites which would increase student numbers. He reminded Cabinet that the government had reduced funding to the authority by 40%, which had to be saved by facing some very difficult issues. It had been possible to limit the cuts to front-line services to £3M and to avoid raising Council Tax.

Councillor Bellotti did however acknowledge the dilemma of some large families with an existing child at a faith school; so he welcomed the proposal to protect those families by continuing the subsidy for subsequent siblings.

Councillor Roger Symonds referred to paragraph 2.2 in the report. He committed to ensure that the two safe routes to school mentioned there would be pursued as a priority.

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

RESOLVED

- (1) To AGREE that the Council should continue to seek to encourage more sustainable methods of home to school transport, particularly an increase in cycling;
- (2) To AGREE that the Council should encourage the promotion of safe cycling routes to school as an alternative to using the car where there is a safe route to do so and that the feasibility of establishing the following two routes should be investigated.:-

a) Between Bishop Sutton and Chew Valley School.

b) Between Compton Dando and Marksbury.

(3) To AGREE with effect from September 2014 a phased withdrawal of subsidised home to school transport services for new starters attending denominational schools from September 2014 who would not qualify under other home to school policy subsets, (e.g. as a low income family) save in the case of children with siblings currently at the school. This option would not affect students who currently attend the school, only new pupils joining in September 2014. The anticipated savings from this withdrawal would be seen over a number of years can be found in the table in 3.2.5.

(4) To AGREE to maintain the budget to provide transport for Children in Care [circa £70,000] for the foreseeable future; and

(5) To ASK Passenger Transport Services to review home to school transport routes on a termly basis to ensure best value for money and that home to school transport bus routes are as efficient and effective as possible. This should also include liaising with parents/carers of students who have Special Educational Needs to consider whether it is appropriate for them to receive independent travel training and a personalised transport budget to arrange their own transport which may be more suitable for their needs, similar to the system used at Coventry City Council.

179 BUS PRIORITY MEASURES IN DORCHESTER ST, MANVERS ST AND PIERREPOINT ST., BATH

Councillor Brian Webber in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 18 and on the Council's website*] said that the rationale for the partial closure of Dorchester Street was baffling. He observed that the proposal would leave the road fully open to traffic during the morning and evening rush hours. He appealed to Cabinet to take no action until proper figures were obtained to bear out the assumptions in the report.

David Redgewell (South West Transport Network) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 19 and on the Council's website*] fully supported the proposed closure. He pointed out however that the existing bus shelter was in the wrong place and must be moved if serious accidents involving pedestrians were to be avoided.

Brook Whelan in an *ad hoc* statement warned the Cabinet that if the proposals went ahead hundreds more cars would be forced into Widcombe and the A36. He urged Cabinet to take no action until a prediction of traffic impacts had been conducted.

Councillor Ben Stevens in an *ad hoc* statement said he was pleased that the Cabinet was about to take this brave step but he was very concerned about the possible impact on traffic volumes in Widcombe and was disappointed that this was being tackled before the Rochester Road scheme was in place.

Councillor Tim Warren in an *ad hoc* statement observed that the proposals would not affect peak time traffic but it would affect tourist traffic. He felt that it would not make a good pedestrian scheme.

Councillor Roger Symonds introduced the item. He emphasised that the proposals would improve bus punctuality and congestion. He reminded Cabinet of their priorities for transport: foot, bike, bus, car. The proposals were fully in line with these priorities. He referred to the statement made by Councillor Ben Stevens by saying

that he was unable to give absolute assurances about the impact on traffic flows in Widcombe and elsewhere in the city, but he promised that the proposals would be reversed if the impact proved to be unacceptable. He assured Councillor Stevens that he was determined that the Rochester Road scheme would be completed. He agreed with David Redgewell and confirmed that the bus shelter was in the process of being moved to a safer location.

Councillor Symonds explained that the proposal he would move would be different from the recommendations as printed in the report; in recommendation (1) the prohibition would be in place from 10am to 6pm, not 4pm as printed. He moved the amended recommendations.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal which he said would bring great benefit to the city and to the transport interchange. The bus interchange in particular would become one of the best in the country. He explained that it was not yet possible to include the West Way traffic in the proposals because that would be vulnerable to criticism that it was entrapment.

Councillor Tim Ball observed from personal experience how difficult it was to cross the road near the bus station.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order be implemented under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 for a maximum period of 18 months to evaluate the impact of prohibiting the driving of vehicles except buses and taxis in an eastbound direction on Dorchester Street between 10am and 6pm and allowing right turn only out of Manvers St car park;

(2) To AGREE that the eastbound carriageway of Dorchester Street be designated as a bus lane for the purposes of civil enforcement using CCTV cameras under the Transport Act 2000; and

(3) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director for Environmental Services to make changes to the Experimental Order in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport and also delegated authority to use the Council's bus lane enforcement powers.

180 BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET PLACEMAKING PLAN ISSUES & OPTIONS - UPDATE REPORT

Peter Duppa-Miller (Secretary of the Town and Parish Councils Association and Clerk to Combe Hay Parish Council) in an *ad hoc* statement assured Cabinet that the Parish Councils were extremely eager to support the proposals in a practical way.

Councillor Tim Ball in proposing the item explained that this paper was a progress report and would lead up to the launch of the Plan at the May Cabinet. The Council was working closely with Town and Parish Councils and with local communities. He thanked Peter Duppa-Miller for his warm endorsement of the proposals.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposals which he felt would facilitate development of key areas and would safeguard the ethos of the area.

Councillor Cherry Beath welcomed the proposals which she said would draw on the progress made by the Council under the Localism Act, and would involve communities and Parish Councils. There had been a real need for the proposals.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To NOTE that the preparation of the Placemaking Plan will be formally launched in May 2013 with the publication of the Launch Document.

181 COMMENTS ON SOMERSET MINERALS PREFERRED PLANNING OPTIONS CONSULTATION

Councillor David Martin in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 20 and on the Council's website*] welcomed the Cabinet's response to the Somerset consultation. He expressed unease about unproven and potentially high risk processes, and the potential for damage to the deep water sources supplying the hot springs in Bath.

George Bailey had registered to speak but had not been able to stay for the item. He had however submitted his statement. The Chair instructed that the submission be treated as having been tabled at the meeting [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 24 and on the Council's website*].

Councillor Charles Gerrish in an *ad hoc* statement said that he too was concerned about the impact of the Somerset proposals. He felt that the onus should be on the applicant to prove that there would be no impact on the hot springs before being allowed to proceed. He agreed wholeheartedly with the proposed response.

Councillor Tim Ball thanked the previous contributors for their support. He confirmed that Cabinet would strongly resist the Somerset proposals. The hot springs were the economic life blood of the city and must be protected. He moved the recommendations as published.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He welcomed the cautious approach being taken and shared the continuing concern expressed by many.

Councillor Cherry Beath agreed with the points made by the previous contributors and emphasised the protecting the hot springs was critical for the economic wellbeing of the whole area.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that the assessment forms the basis of the response to the consultation on the Minerals Plan Preferred Options Paper to be forwarded to Somerset County Council to inform the preparation of Somerset County Council's Pre-submission Minerals Plan.

182 HIGHWAY STRUCTURAL MAINTENANCE CAPITAL PROGRAMME FOR 2013/2014

Peter Duppa-Miller (Secretary of the Town and Parish Councils Association) in an *ad hoc* statement welcomed the list of 72 proposed works. He asked the Cabinet to agree the proposals.

Councillor Roger Symonds gave credit to the highways officers who were the key players in maintaining this key asset over the years. He moved the proposals.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He observed that the proactive approach avoids having to make reactive repairs which would cost more in the long run. It also protected riders from injury and damage to their bikes and cars. He was delighted to note that pothole complaints had reduced by 90%.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE the Highway Structural Maintenance Programme for 2013/14; and

(2) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director, Environmental Services and the Service Manager, Highways to alter the programme, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, as may prove necessary during 2013/14 within the overall budget allocation.

183 GREATER BRISTOL METRO PROJECT

Duncan Hounsell (Saltford Station Campaign) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 21 and on the Council's website*] said that the Campaign group was delighted to hear that the Council was imminently about to commission the High Level Output Assessment funded by Cabinet at its June 2012 meeting. He asked for his group to be kept informed of progress. The group was also delighted that Cabinet was about to agree funding of £124K towards the Metro West project, which would include half-hourly services for Keynsham, Oldfield Park and Bath Spa and which would be a pre-cursor for these same services for Saltford.

David Redgewell in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 19 and on the Council's website*] expressed concern. He felt that the legal mechanisms and the timescales were out of synchronisation. The report should therefore be updated.

Councillor Roger Symonds in proposing the item, observed that the proposals were specifically about Metro West and did not refer to specific stations. However, the intention was to build or improve stations all along the line.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal by observing that the proposals were an opportunity to improve services from Bristol. He acknowledged that there were risks involved, but felt that they were worth taking in order to achieve the partnership working which was essential to the project.

Councillor David Dixon welcomed the potential impact on Keynsham and Oldfield Park. It was essential to provide alternatives to the car. He had himself been occasionally frustrated by the long wait for trains between Keynsham and Bath.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To APPROVE the capital expenditure of £124,000 in 2013/14 as this authority's contribution to the preparation costs for this financial year for the rail improvements promoted by the West of England Metro West Rail Project (subsequent contributions will be subject to further approvals);

(2) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director for Planning & Transport Development in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport to finalise the Joint Working Agreement to cover this project; and

(3) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director for Legal and Democratic Services to enter into the Joint Working Agreement on behalf of the Council.

184 BATH TRANSPORT STRATEGY

David Redgewell in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 19 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to ensure adequate consultation about the proposals. Although he supported the proposals, he reminded Cabinet that bus usage was increasing and that more passengers were disabled. He also wished to highlight the issue of high fares.

Councillor Roger Symonds observed that the thinking for this item had begun with a conference the previous September. Although there had been limited stakeholder presence, the debate had been started. The strategy was not about a few isolated streets, but was an integrated approach. In moving the proposals, he observed that he was happy to support the commitment to approximately £140K of work in due course.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He welcomed the clear, deliverable strategy.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To SUPPORT the need for a Bath Transport Strategy as set out in the report; and

(2) To APPROVE funds of approximately £140,000 to complete this work in due course.

185 B&NES PROCUREMENT STRATEGY - 2013 TO 2018

Councillor David Bellotti introduced the item by pointing out to Cabinet that the proposals were hugely different from the existing strategy. He was determined to ensure that the community received best value. He quoted as an example the Keynsham Regeneration project, for which the Cabinet had insisted on selecting a company with green credentials, which would engage with local businesses when sourcing its own purchases. This had brought money into the local economy. The basic principle he was proposing was that for any purchase under £25K, local businesses must be given the first opportunity to quote. The principles were explained in paragraph 5 of the report. He moved the proposals.

Councillor Paul Crossley in seconding the proposal welcomed the exciting change to procurement principles which he felt would set an example to authorities all over the country. He congratulated Jeff Wring (Divisional Director, Risk & Assurance) for devising the new approach.

Other Cabinet members expressed their keen support for the new strategy because of its benefits to the local economy and the example it would set to other businesses.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To ADOPT the Procurement Strategy for the period 2013 – 2017;
- (2) To AGREE that the five key principles laid out in the strategy should guide all procurement activities over this timeframe; and
- (3) To AGREE that the actions outlined in the strategy are to be implemented with effect from April 2013 and updates on progress will form part of the corporate performance management arrangements and also be subject to Cabinet review.

186 REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF OLYMPICS AND CULTURAL OLYMPIAD EVENTS AND PROJECTS 2012

Councillor David Dixon introduced the item by showing part of a 10-minute DVD [*a copy of which can be seen on the Council's website as a link from the minutes*] to which he provided a brief commentary. He explained that all the activities which took place over the whole period had cost only £1 per participant. The events had been a great source of pride for the whole area. He moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He thanked the teams all across the Council who had worked together with communities to celebrate the Olympics, Paralympics and Jubilee.

Councillor Cherry Beath said that the celebrations had been a tremendous occasion. She was pleased that during that 2-week period, the drop in tourism had been relatively small.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To AGREE that the achievements of the Council and its partners and communities should be acknowledged and celebrated; and
- (2) To ENCOURAGE Officers to build on the achievements of 2012, improving cross-departmental working on events and using the success of 2012 projects to strengthen work with local communities.

187 HERITAGE SERVICES BUSINESS PLAN 2013-2018

Councillor Cherry Beath introduced the report which showed how the service would generate more income with reduced costs. It was a cohesive strategy for improvement. She drew attention to the plans for the Roman Baths Learning Centre; a Visitor Management System; and the Assembly Rooms dilapidation project. She moved the proposals to note the report and to approve the capital budgets for the 3 projects.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He fully supported protecting the heritage assets of the area.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

- (1) To APPROVE the Heritage Services Business Plan 2013-2018; and
- (2) To APPROVE the capital budgets for the Visitor Management System, Roman Baths infrastructure and Assembly Rooms dilapidations projects in the Council's Capital Programme for 2013/14 and 2014/15.

188 WEST OF ENGLAND LEP - REVOLVING INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

Councillor Charles Gerrish in an *ad hoc* statement welcomed the opportunity for the Council to maximise its income. He observed however that only £5.1M had been identified for flood mitigation, and this did not include any consideration of the effects down-stream in places such as Keynsham, where the flood plain there could be very adversely affected if the water flow was speeded up by the Bath flood mitigation.

David Redgewell in a statement welcomed the proposals which he said had been 10 years in preparation. He felt the proposals would enable another key part of the river regeneration. He was however disappointed that transport, equalities, housing and employment issues had not been mentioned at all in the report.

Councillor Cherry Beath thanked the previous speakers for their contributions. She observed that the flood mitigation measures would support local jobs, encourage the economy and provide affordable housing. She reassured Councillor Gerrish that measures for flood mitigation in Keynsham were being considered. She moved the proposals which would enable the first phase of the regeneration of the sites.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal. He said that the points raised by Councillor Gerrish would receive a response and assured him that the present proposals would not impact negatively on Keynsham. The use of this funding would enable the Council to bring forward its regeneration of the river corridor and the public walkways would totally revolutionise the area.

Councillor David Bellotti said that the visual improvement of the area would be evident very quickly and welcomed the use of the fund to achieve this.

Councillor Tim Ball said in response to Councillor Gerrish's concerns that the Environment Agency had been involved in the plans from the very start and would ensure that there were no negative impacts down river. He was delighted by the prospect that the gas tower would at last be removed.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AUTHORISE the Strategic Director for Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development and Strategic Director for Resources to enter into contracts with the LEP for RIF funding agreements (including drawdown and repayment schedules subject to the Council's Capital Governance approval process for the first 3 priority scheme bids):

(a) Decommissioning and decontamination of the Windsor Gas Station: to enable removal of the HSE restriction on development at Bath Western Riverside and other sites in the Windsor Bridge area.

(b) The construction of a new road and pedestrian bridge to replace the Destructor Bridge at BWR: to provide access to the BWR western site.

(c) The provision of flood mitigation works for the enterprise area, comprising river and landscape works between Churchill Bridge and Midland Bridge.

(2) To AUTHORISE the Strategic Director for Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development and Strategic Director for Resources to enter into Contract with Crest (by extending the current Corporate Agreement) to use RIF for decommissioning of the Gas Holder on the basis of a policy based loan at an appropriate market rate for a maximum of five years on the grounds of economic development; and

(3) To APPROVE the schemes set out above as Capital Projects in the 2013/14 Capital Programme to covert from in-principle to fully approved now the business case for the investment has been completed.

189 SCHOOL TERM AND HOLIDAY DATES 2014-15 ACADEMIC YEAR

Councillor Dine Romero explained that it was a statutory responsibility for the Council to decide and publish its term dates. There would be 190 school days plus 5 inset days, in terms of more equal lengths.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To ADOPT the School Term and Holiday dates for the 2014-15 academic year;

(2) To ACKNOWLEDGE that good school attendance and the link with good outcomes for children and young people; and

(3) To SUPPORT schools in encouraging parents to take holidays out of term time.

190 PRIMARY SCHOOL ADMISSIONS CRITERIA 2014-15 ACADEMIC YEAR

Councillor Dine Romero explained that it was a statutory responsibility for the authority to publish the criteria and operate them consistently across the authority. She explained the principles involved and moved the adoption of the criteria.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposal.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To ADOPT the primary admission criteria for the 2014-15 academic year.

191 CAPITAL PROJECT APPROVALS AND UPDATES - SCHOOLS SCHEMES

Councillor Dine Romero explained the 3 projects which it was intended to support with capital funding. She moved the recommendations as printed in the report.

Councillor David Bellotti seconded the proposal.

Councillor Paul Crossley welcomed the range of schools into which the capital funds would be invested.

Councillor Tim Ball was particularly pleased to note the funding for St Michael's School special needs facility and appealed to Cabinet to bear in mind that children with special needs must not be excluded from the benefits enjoyed by other children.

On a motion from Councillor Dine Romero, seconded by Councillor David Bellotti, it was

RESOLVED (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that the projects put forward for approval are in line with Children's Services capital programme priorities; and

(2) To APPROVE Capital allocations for inclusion in the Capital Programme 2013/14 for projects at the following schools:

- Chew Magna Primary School
£208,000 – Replacement of temporary classrooms
- Bathampton Primary School
£30,000 – Land purchase
- St Michaels C of E Junior School
£143,000 – Remodelling of special needs facility

The meeting ended at 10.28 pm

Chair _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEETING 10th April 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 John Bull
Re: The Living Wage
- Gerald Chown
Re: Petition: 20mph Speed Limits
- Rosie McKeown (Envision Project, Chew Valley School)
Re: Public Transport Fares
- Laura Harrison (Envision Project, Chew Valley School)
Re: Public Transport Fares
- Katie Purchase (Envision Project, Chew Valley School)
Re: Public Transport Fares
- Dan Farr (Make Fares Fair)
Re: Bus Fares
- Karen Abolkheir (Stanton Wick Action Group)
Re: Dec 2012 ORS updated Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment
- Clarke Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group)
Re: Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment
- Paul Baxter
Re: Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment

Re: Agenda Item 13 (Somerset Minerals Plan)

- Cllr David Martin
- George Bailey

Re: Agenda Item 14 (Bus Priority Measures, Bath)

- Cllr Brian Webber
- David Redgewell

Re: Agenda Item 16 (Greater Bristol Metro Project)

- Duncan Hounsell (Saltford Station Campaign)
- David Redgewell

Re: Agenda Item 17 (Bath Transport Strategy)

- David Redgewell

Re: Agenda Item 21 (WoE LEP Revolving Infrastructure Fund)

- David Redgewell

Re: Agenda Item 22 (Radstock Capital Funding)

- Cllr Eleanor Jackson
- Amanda Leon (Radstock Action Group)
- George Bailey (Radstock Action Group)
- Lesley Mansell (Chair, Radstock Town Council)

Re: Agenda Item 23 (Home to School Transport)

- Raymond Friel (Head, St Marks School)
- Cllr Sarah Bevan
- Cllr Liz Hardman
- Brendon Rouse (Chair of pastoral council, St Mary's)
- Cllr Gabriel Batt

Re: Agenda Item 26 (Schools Expansion)

- Cllr Liz Harman
- Cllr John Bull
- Kirsty Withyman
- Gary Yoxall (Governor, Paulton Infants School)
- Jim Crouch (Chair of Governors, Paulton Junior School)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Anthony Clarke
When will the Council's latest assessment of the suitability of sites for an eastern Park and Ride be published and a preferred site be selected?		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>We have now received 2 reports reviewing a number of possible sites for a new P&R to the East of Bath. One looking at the potential for a new station at Bathampton the other looking at a number of bus based options. It is true to say that there are no easy answers and any proposal we bring forward will be a compromise. We have yet to select a preferred site but would hope to later in the year.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
Thank you for your reply. Can the Cabinet member confirm whether the sites being explored for Bath are within the authority's boundaries?		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
Yes.		

M 02	Question from:	Councillor Nigel Roberts
Coach parking at Odd Down playing fields has cause a number of issues for those that live locally with traffic not following the correct routes through narrow streets, with the new cycle facility and potentially a 4G pitch, please could there be an assurance that the car park will not be used for parking this year?		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>My understanding is that development work at Odd Down Playing Fields is likely to prevent use of the car park at the time of year when it has previously been used to accommodate coaches which bring visitors to the Christmas Market. Highways Officers will shortly be considering traffic management arrangements for the market when they assess the proposals for this year's event and this will need to take account of the proposed development work.</i></p>		

M 03	Question from:	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
I would like to ask Cllr Symonds at the next cabinet meeting what a crossing over the A362 in Writhlington would cost.		
Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds	
<p><i>It is difficult to calculate an accurate cost for a crossing without investigating the proposed site in detail but a signalled crossing on the A362 would cost a minimum of £75,000 and could be costlier depending on site constraints.</i></p> <p><i>Cost is not the only factor which needs to be taken into account when considering formal crossings. Department for Transport guidelines decree that formal pedestrian crossings can only be provided at specific locations where significant numbers of pedestrians cross a road with high traffic flows. The A362 carries the requisite high flows, however no locations where sufficiently high numbers of pedestrians cross have been identified.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
Has it occurred to the Cabinet member that the reason for the request is because of the danger of cars approaching round the bend at speed, and that a crossing would enhance safety and would encourage more children to walk to school?		
Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds	
<i>I will consider all the points made. I am aware of the issue and I know the crossing point. I will investigate the possibilities.</i>		

M 04	Question from:	Councillor Brian Webber
Residents of the Vineyards, Bath, have reported to the Council their concerns about the condition of the footway, railings, railings base and roadside walls of the vaults below the footway. Council officers have carried out preliminary investigations. Please may I know where matters currently stand on establishing what needs to be done and on whom responsibility rests for carrying forward any remedial measures? £10,000 has been earmarked in the 2013/14 Highways Structural Maintenance Capital Programme for work at the Vineyards. What is this for?		
Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds	
<p><i>Preliminary investigations indicate that reconstruction works are required to some sections of the vault end walls together with resetting of the footway slabs and handrail. Responsibility for the maintenance and repair of the vault end walls rests with the respective property owners whilst responsibility for the footway surface and railings rests with this Council in its capacity as Highway Authority. The £10,000 capital allocation is to prepare a detailed cost estimate and programme of remedial works for construction during 2014/15. Prior to implementation it will however be necessary to agree an apportionment of cost between the private owners affected and the Council.</i></p>		

M 05	Question from:	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>79A St John's Road, Bath, is an overgrown derelict site adjacent to Bridgemead care/nursing home. Not for the first time, vegetation from the site is obstructing the footway and has been reported to the Council. Please may I know what steps the Council is taking to remove the obstruction and to persuade the site owner to tidy up and secure his land?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>Officers have established the ownership of the land and have arranged for the offending vegetation to be cut back. Officers will contact the landowner to request that action is taken to secure the site and safeguard the public.</i></p>		

M 06	Question from:	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>What was the total cost (approximate, if necessary) of the refurbishment and conversion of the buildings now largely occupied by The Roman Baths Kitchen?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>The capital cost of the refurbishment and conversion of the buildings now largely occupied by The Roman Baths Kitchen was shared with the Council's caterer, Searcy's. The Council's share of these costs totalled £1.13 Million.</i></p>		

M 07	Question from:	Councillor Brian Webber
<p>Is the Council now receiving any income from its agreement with the Thermae Bath Spa (after allowing for any ongoing inspection or maintenance responsibilities which the Council may retain)? If so, how much (approximate, if necessary)?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Cherry Beath
<p><i>The Council does receive a net annual income from its agreement with the Thermae Bath Spa (after allowing for ongoing inspection or maintenance responsibilities which it retains). This is expected to total in excess of £400k in the financial year just ended (2012/13).</i></p>		

M 08	Question from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p>During the Full Council budget debate you stated that the Council's reserves were required for investment in Children's Services and Adult Social Care. What proportion of the Council's reserves are to be earmarked for adult social care and children's services this year and how much are anticipated to be allocated for this purpose in future years?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor David Bellotti
<p><i>I think you must be referring to comments I made that the Local Government Association has published information which shows by 2020 Council's will only have funds to provide for Adults Services and Children's Services.</i></p> <p><i>The Council in our budget approved in February this year has taken steps to avoid this outcome and enable us to provide other services beyond 2020. We have approved a budget for one year and an indicative budget for a further two years. We are facing a 40% cut in government funding over the next three years but because of our prudent financial management frontline service reductions will be limited to around £3M on average for the next three years which is equivalent to about 1.3% of our total budget each year. We have set a zero council tax increase for the second year running.</i></p> <p><i>One of the reasons we have achieved this outcome is that the Council has reduced the borrowing requirement set by the previous Council administration and identified considerable savings and efficiencies.</i></p> <p><i>All earmarked and general reserves are clearly set out in the budget papers approved by Council in February this year.</i></p>		

M 09	Question from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p>When will the Cabinet Member bring forward proposals relating the amendment tabled by myself on changes to Council Tax discounts and benefits at the November Council Meeting?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor David Bellotti
<p><i>I think you are referring to item 62 of the November 2012 Council Meeting on Council Tax Technical Changes for Discounts and Exemptions, although I can find no mention of your name as the proposer of any amendment.</i></p> <p><i>I can confirm that in line with the minute of that meeting the Council factored into its budget approved by Council in February 2013 all the financial implications of the decisions taken at the November 2012 Council meeting.</i></p> <p><i>The policy is in force from April 1st 2013.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
<p>The Cabinet member says that he can confirm that the Council factored in all the</p>		

financial implications. This is not in fact what happened. Will you keep your promise that you would explain this “after 1st April” and will you confirm how much of the Council Tax discount exemption you will put into a contingency fund for those suffering hardship as a result of the changes?

Answer from:

Councillor David Bellotti

I'm delighted to confirm that we have no need of a contingency fund. The finances allowed for the inclusion of a hardship fund within the amount budgeted for the changes and this is already operational.

M 10

Question from:

Councillor Tim Warren

Can the Cabinet Member please provide the latest timetable for the delivery of the Rossiter Road project?

Answer from:

Councillor Roger Symonds

The Council is committed to the works associated with the highway changes and public realm improvements in Widcombe Parade. The project current in the design phase. On completion of the detailed design a detailed construction programme will be developed. It is anticipated that construction will commence in 13/14 and be complete in 14/15.

M 11

Question from:

Councillor Tim Warren

Has the Cabinet Member yet held any discussions with the Local Enterprise Partnership or Bristol City Council relating to the idea of creating a Park and Ride for the A37, and if so, what was the outcome of these discussions? Will the inclusion of an A37 Park & Ride be considered when the JLTP is next refreshed?

Answer from:

Councillor Roger Symonds

There have been no discussions with the LEP (or Bristol City Council) in recent years on the possibility of developing a new P&R on the A37. Such a proposal could be considered in the preparation or refresh of the Joint Local Transport Plan

M 12

Question from:

Councillor Tim Warren

In answer to a question from myself the Cabinet meeting last March, you agreed to begin discussions with First Bus on the possibility of creating a discounted season or

monthly pass for the Park and Ride services as well as a cheaper Group Pass. Can you please provide an update on progress with these matters?

Answer from:

Councillor Roger Symonds

We have regular quarterly meetings with First Group about the Park & Ride Service and raised this with them at our meeting in March. First have extended their season tickets to include the Bath P&R services, although for most users the 10 journey tickets will remain the best value option. First are currently considering the introduction of a Family Ticket, and are undertaking further work to understand how many children are traveling in family groups, as the Council needs to understand what would happen to the current entitlement that allows up to 5 children to travel free with a paying passenger. There is a particularly complicated issue to consider when a holder of a Concessionary Pass (those eligible by age or disability) wishes to travel with children, and we would need to understand what charge, if any, would be made in these circumstances.

M 13

Question from:

Councillor Tim Warren

Has the Cabinet Member yet decided what project the Council will bid for from the Government's recently announced Pinchpoint funding?

Answer from:

Councillor Roger Symonds

The Council submitted a bid for highway improvements associated with the Radstock Regeneration project to both reduce congestion in the town and facilitate development. We are currently waiting to hear from the DfT whether the bid has been successful.

M 14

Question from:

Councillor Francine Haeberling

When does the Cabinet Member anticipate undertaking a public consultation of Salford residents' views on proposals for reopening Salford Train Station?

Answer from:

Councillor Roger Symonds

The work to undertake a the High Level Option Assessment of the case for re-opening Salford Station will now be commissioned and I would anticipate a consultation with residents being undertaken later this year. The work has not been possible to commence while there was uncertainty over the future of the Great Western Franchise the timetable for which has only recently been confirmed.

M 15	Question from:	Councillor Geoff Ward
<p>In respect to the Woolley Valley Golden Valley Paddocks planning issue, what have been the costs so far of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. B&NES legal representation at the failed Judicial Review; 2. Award of costs for the failed Judicial Review; 3. External planning Consultancy fees? <p>What is your estimate of man days for the Planning Officers and Management time undertaken so far?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball
<p>1. £59,225 2. £54,000 3. £10,000 'estimated' for cost on external consultants/legal advice. Estimated because of on-going case. We do not currently have detailed timesheets and so we cannot give a figure.</p>		

M 16	Question from:	Councillor Geoff Ward
<p>When does the Cabinet Member anticipate bringing forward proposals relating to the extension of the Green Belt, as agreed during Core Strategy Full Council debate?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball
<p><i>The decision made by Full Council on 4th March 2013 was "To request that Cabinet consider a review of the Green Belt to the south of the district, with a view to extending the Green Belt to incorporate areas currently south of the Green Belt boundary". This review is now underway and can be timetabled to report back to the June Cabinet meeting after being considered by the LDF Steering Group in May. In addition, the option to extend the Green Belt southwards can be raised during the forthcoming public consultation events, especially those in the south of the District. Any comments received, along with the results of the review, can be presented to the Inspector for consideration during the examination hearings.</i></p>		

M 17	Question from:	Councillor Geoff Ward
<p>According to the Council's best estimates, how many HMOs existed in Oldfield Park, Westmoreland and Widcombe in April 2011 and April 2012 and how many exist in these areas today, broken down by ward?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Ball
<p><i>The Planning Department started to investigate the issue of HMOs in Bath following a Cabinet decision in June 2011. At this stage we began to collate data from various service areas e.g. Housing and Council Tax. We did not collate data for April 2011 as</i></p>		

this is before the start of the project. We tend to collate data for September each year. In September 2011, we published an Article 4 Direction for HMOs Feasibility Study p23-24 which summarised the data we had collated to date. The data is available by super output area (shown on maps in the report) and is summarised for the wards in question below:

Area	No. Student Houses	No known HMOs	Total number of dwellings
<i>Oldfield Park North</i>	151	164	515
<i>Westmoreland</i>	130	124	590
<i>Westmoreland West</i>	129	105	619
<i>Oldfield Park West</i>	115	112	586
<i>Lower Twerton East</i>	90	93	514
<i>Oldfield Park</i>	95	80	628
<i>Widcombe St Marks</i>	83	11	557

At September Cabinet 2012, we reported estimate HMO numbers in these three wards to be within the range 700 – 1400. This uncertainty is due to the fact that small HMOs do not currently have to register with the Council (as they fall below the mandatory licencing thresholds in terms of size or number of floors) and that not all HMOs are student HMOs (and therefore are not Council Tax exempt). According to the 2012 Housing Conditions survey HMOs in these wards make up almost 1/3 of the total number of HMOs in B&NES.

Housing Services published an evidence report for Additional Licencing of HMOs in September 2012

(<http://consultations.bathnes.gov.uk/consult.ti/additionallicensing/consultationHome> Appendix 7)

Table 1 on page 10 outlines the latest data on HMOs by Ward. In relation to the three wards in question it states that:

- Westmoreland – 412 HMOs known to Housing Services of which 62 mandatory licenced and 310 Council tax exempt*
- Oldfield – 312 HMOs known to Housing Services of which 54 mandatory licenced and 323 Council tax exempt*
- Widcombe – 421 HMOs known to Housing Services of which 62 mandatory licenced and 310 Council tax exempt*

There is a great deal of further data available this evidence report. Our data is constantly being improved and refined as we undertake further work in this area.

Next steps in relation to HMO monitoring data

If we proceed to implement Additional Licencing of HMOs we will then hold very accurate data on all HMOs in these three wards – in particular our data will be improved in relation to smaller HMOs not picked up under mandatory licencing and non-student HMOs not picked up by the voluntary accreditation scheme or Council Tax exemption. It is this enhanced data set which will be used to assist with the determination of

Planning Applications triggered by an Article 4 Direction and the implementation of a percentage threshold policy (via the HMO Supplementary Planning Document) should this be introduced.

Formalised monitoring arrangements would need to be put in place alongside these items should the Council decide to implement the Additional Licencing/Article 4 Direction.

M 18	Question from:	Councillor Geoff Ward
Can the Cabinet Member please provide a timetable for the production and approval of the B&NES Placemaking Plan, following publication of the Launch Document in May?		
	Answer from:	Councillor Tim Ball
<i>The programme for the preparation of the Placemaking Plan, including its scope and key milestones, will be set out in the 8th May Cabinet Report on the Launch Document.</i>		

M 19	Question from:	Councillor Anthony Clarke
What public consultation took place before a decision was taken to make the minimum time for visitor parking in Bath Residential Parking zones 4 hours? When was this decision taken?		
	Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds
<i>Consultation commenced with the parking survey that was sent in May 2012 to over 25,000 households within Bath. This included sections on the system which was due for replacement and a comments section to provide feedback on any issues they felt relevant. The general themes from that consultation were used to develop the specification for a new system.</i>		
<i>Data from the previous system regarding the length of all visitor stays made in the last 12 months were also used to inform decision making.</i>		
<i>The preferred (best value) replacement system could, at the time of purchase, only configure visitor stays as ½ or full days although a module has since been developed which has the ability to activate in hours in time (which would be at an additional cost should it be purchased).</i>		
<i>The decision to implement the preferred system was taken by the Divisional Director for Environmental Services in conjunction (and after consultation) with me on 29th January 2013. I have agreed that the 4 hour minimum stay will be reviewed after the 3 months of operating the new system.</i>		

M 20	Question from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p>Could the Cabinet member please explain the response from Council Connect on 27 March to a request from local a resident regarding a damaged bench at the bus stop on Charlton Road near Lockingwell Road, Keynsham? The bench has been removed but the resident has been told it will not be replaced this year (13/14) because there are no funds. This seat is regularly used by elderly bus users and this action does not seem to fit with council policy to encourage use of public transport or care for more vulnerable members of the community - how can there be no funds for this replacement at the start of a financial year?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor David Dixon
<p><i>Thank you for raising the issue, the bench is owned by this Council and funding for replacement is now available in the new financial year 2013/2014.</i> <i>I have asked officers to prioritise this bench for replacement and to liaise with the Town Clerk for Keynsham Town Council to ensure that the replacement is in keeping with other benches along Charlton Road, some of which are owned by Keynsham Town Council.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
<p>Can the Cabinet member explain why local residents were told there was no budget available, and why have you only identified a budget for this after I submitted the question?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor David Dixon
<p><i>I'm not aware of conversations held with your residents. I can however confirm that a budget is available for this work.</i></p>		

M 21	Question from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p>Why have not highways taken action to remove railing near parking area serving 184 Charlton Road Keynsham? This railing was damaged by a car accident on 22 March, a member of cleansing team has moved it so it does not block the pavement but it remains in situ. A resident has again been told it will not be replaced - why is this the case? The railing must have been positioned initially for safety reasons, therefore does this action reflect a change in approach to pedestrian safety?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>Highways officers have arranged for the damaged railing to be removed. There is no change in approach to road safety. An officer from Traffic and Safety will assess the site to determine whether the railing was serving a meaningful purpose. If the railing is considered to benefit the safety of pedestrians it will be replaced.</i></p>		

M 22	Question from:	Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones
When will the next stage of public consultation take place on the future of the Riverside office site in Keynsham and what form will this consultation take?		
Answer from:	Councillor Cherry Beath	
<p><i>As part of the redevelopment of the Keynsham Town Hall site B&NES has undertaken some initial design work on the potential master plan for the Riverside site. B&NES are now in detailed discussion with the owner of the Riverside lease to investigate options for redeveloping the site. Once these discussions have been concluded it is proposed the Community Focus group will be re engaged to clarify the community issues with a wider public consultation being completed prior to any planning application.</i></p>		

M 23	Question from:	Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones
Can the Cabinet Member provide an update on when the coverage map and roll-out timetable for the B&NES BDUK project is to be published?		
Answer from:	Councillor Cherry Beath	
<p><i>The CDS partners are working to ensure that as much information as possible is made available, but we do have to work to make sure that expectations are appropriate. We don't want businesses or residents to make investment decisions based on information that could well change. For example, BT will make a detailed survey of each area before finalising the rollout plans. At around 120 days prior to the milestone for when service can begin to be provided to premises, BT will make the details public via the Openreach broadband checker, as they do with any rollout. CDS also respects the commercially confidential nature of some of the information, and some information we may not be able to release.</i></p>		

M 24	Question from:	Councillor Tim Warren
How much additional revenue does the Council anticipate it will raise from altering the minimum stay for visitor permits in Residents Parking zones to four hours?		
Answer from:	Councillor Roger Symonds	
<p><i>The Council does not anticipate it will raise any additional revenue from altering the minimum stay for visitor permits in Residents Parking zones to 4 hours. The period of 4 hours was selected as this length of time will ensure that the costs associated with</i></p>		

administering the permit and activation of the stay are covered and the existing level of revenue will be maintained.

This assumption was made using data based on activations from the previous system over the last 12 months. The decision to implement the 4 hour minimum will be reviewed after the system has been operating for 3 months and data from the new system will be used to confirm whether the hourly minimum can be reduced without impacting on revenue. Should the data show that the assumptions made do not reflect the current position then the minimum stay will be reduced.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P 01	Question from:	Alderman Terry Reakes
<p>I note in the press that Clutton now have a pedestrian crossing installed on the A37, which I applaud. However, after years of campaigning by myself, Cllr Eleanor Jackson and others there is still no pedestrian crossing on another busy road, the A362 Writhlington Radstock. I ask again Roger why is this state of affair allowed to continue, it is shameful. I have copied in Jacob Rees Mogg MP for North East Somerset, whilst it is not strictly his remit he may wish to give an opinion and suggest a way forward. I have included previous emails to remind you of how long it is since I brought this issue before Banes. You will see from the correspondence below it was 2004. Attachments relate to accidents and traffic flow on the A362 Frome Road. Incidentally could you tell me what would it cost to install a pedestrian crossing on the A362?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>There are currently signalled crossings on the A362 Frome Road, at Manor Road, Writhlington, and at Radstock Town Centre. Department for Transport guidelines decree that formal pedestrian crossings can only be provided at specific locations where significant numbers of pedestrians cross a road with high traffic flows. The A362 carries the requisite high flows, however no locations where high numbers of pedestrians cross have been identified. If the Alderman could suggest a site where a crossing would be well used, the Council will carry out counts to establish the numbers of pedestrians crossing, and whether a formal crossing could be justified.</i></p>		

P 02	Question from:	Anne Robins
<p>E2439 Bus Priority Measures</p> <p>I have read this proposal with interest and would request a written response to the following.</p> <p>First I am relieved to see that some of the concerns of residents of the Empire have been addressed in that we shall still be able to exit the city by an alternative route (ie Dorchester St) during current 'bus gate hours' when it is not appropriate or possible to use North Parade.</p> <p>However I would appreciate clarification on what contingency arrangements have been made for residents to enter the city by car and reach our homes and underground parking during the proposed new Dorchester St eastbound restriction hours of 10am-4pm when, as inevitably will happen on occasion, North Parade is inaccessible. Paragraph 6 on Risk Management does not mention such risks nor the contingency arrangements proposed.</p> <p>For example in December 2012 on at least 2 occasions North Parade was closed to traffic by police managing an incident and an accident. On at least one other occasion that same month there was gridlock on North Parade for more than 20 minutes. I was affected on all 3 dates, twice when dealing with medical arrangements for my husband. I have been told by the lead officer that during the accident mentioned above the 'bus gate' restriction was lifted; however I was not made aware of that by the police at the time.</p> <p>Therefore will residents be able to assume that if North Parade is closed through accident or incident (or is subject to gridlock for, say, at least 15 minutes) during the Dorchester St eastbound restriction times of 10am-4pm that we can access our homes and parking by driving through the existing 'bus gate' or the new Dorchester St restriction without penalty?</p> <p>If we cannot make this general assumption, how will we be able to find out when the 'bus gate' restriction has been lifted so that we can plan how to reach our homes?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Roger Symonds
<p><i>Incidents on the highway, such as on North Parade are rare, but when they occur these incidents are managed jointly between the police and the Council's Traffic Manager who will decide whether bus gate restrictions need to be lifted on a case by case basis. As incidents on North Parade would mainly affect city centre residents travelling to their homes, one option may be to park temporarily in local car parks (eg leisure centre or cricket ground car park) until temporary restrictions are lifted.</i></p>		

This page is intentionally left blank

REQUEST TO IMPLEMENT THE LIVING WAGE AT BANES COUNCIL

On behalf of the Labour Group I wish to urge Cabinet and council to adopt the Living Wage as a minimum salary for Council employees as part of the Budget settlement for 2014/15.

Up to the 2013/14 budget cycle 25 local authorities had implemented the Living Wage for their workers. This number has now risen to 50, since they set this year's budget, including our neighbours in South Gloucestershire..

The Living Wage is intended to be the minimum wage which will cover the basic essentials in life and is calculated at £8.55 for London and £7.45 for other parts of the UK. The calculation is updated by the Centre for Social Policy at Loughborough University. The principle as support from Ed Miliband and more surprisingly from the prime Minister and Boris Johnson.

The Living Wage has been found to be good for **business**. 80% of employers implementing it found the quality of their employees' work improved, absenteeism fell by 25%, and two thirds found recruitment and retention improved.

It is good for **individuals and families** there is less need to work very long hours or hold more than one job. Those on the Living Wage were also found to be more flexible with regard to working practices.

It is good for **society**. It is estimated that it has lifted 45,000 families out of poverty and their take-up of benefits has decreased, saving money for the whole country.

We have investigated the cost of implementing the Living Wage in BANES Council and are told it would be about £160,000 – less than the cost of the salaries of two of our strategic directors. However it is not simply about behaving responsibly to BANES employees. If the Wage is implemented by the Council this will act as a model for other local employees, encouraging them to adopt it as well. It will be remembered that when the Labour Government proposed a Minimum Wage in 1997 businesses protested strongly that it was unaffordable. However it is now an accepted part of our social structure and we in the Labour Group believe the Living Wage will achieve the same status.

I would like to end with a brief quotation from a recipient of the Living Wage, a cleaner and youth worker;

Before, I had to work two jobs to put food on the table and pay the rent. I had no time for my family or my community. When the Living Wage was introduced I was able to prioritise the one job and that means I've been able to be there for my family and set up a youth group in my community.

John Bull.

Gerald Chown

Presented to BANES Cabinet Meeting on 10 April 2013

We represent residents living on, or with access to, the top half of Widcombe Hill. We fully support the Council's policy of introducing 20mph speed limits in residential areas. We, therefore, strongly challenge the decision to exclude the top half of Widcombe Hill from the Consultation process on 20mph limits.

Our reasons are as follows:-

1. The proposed 20mph Zone 14 includes the lower part of Widcombe Hill but not the top half. Existing traffic calming measures in the lower part already restrict speed there. It is higher up the Hill, where there is no traffic calming, where speed is even more of a problem and a danger to residents.
2. Over many years there have been regular, serious accidents on this top part of the Hill, caused by speeding traffic. This has been particularly the case at the Macaulay Buildings bend on Widcombe Hill.
3. There are young children living in the Macaulay Buildings houses on the Hill and in Clarence Terrace, which is also on the Hill.
4. Drivers and passengers exiting cars in residents' parking bays outside Macaulay Buildings and Clarence Terrace are especially vulnerable to speeding passing traffic. Residents' cars parked in these bays regularly suffer minor damage from traffic passing at too high a speed.
5. Vehicular accesses from the Macaulay Buildings cul-de-sac, from Prospect Road and from all the houses on the Hill have difficult sight-lines and are dangerous when traffic is speeding up or down the Hill.
6. The top half of Widcombe Hill is steep and narrow and speeding traffic is a danger to the large number of Bath Skyline walkers and to walkers and cyclists going to and from the University of Bath.

We are, therefore petitioning you to include the top half of Widcombe Hill in the forthcoming Consultation process for the introduction of 20mph speed limits.

Our Petition has 71 signatures, representing 87.5% of the homes on, or with access to, the top half of Widcombe Hill.

I, or one of my two colleagues here, will welcome any questions you may have.

This page is intentionally left blank

Statements made by Student members of Envision Project, Chew Valley School

Rosie McKeown

- We are year 12 A level students aged 17, that are part of the Chew Valley Envision team. We have been meeting every week since September and have generated a number of issues involved with transport in our local area that we intend to change.
- We all feel strongly about the considerably high prices of bus tickets and the lack of regular routes from the Chew Valley into the surrounding town areas, as we are dependant on this service for social means and because of the lack of job opportunities in the Chew Valley area. The job market is very competitive and we need to show that we have experience in the work place to help us get jobs in the future. The Chew Valley only offers a handful of jobs, if we are able to reach the surrounding town areas then we would have access to a much wider range of jobs or even voluntary positions.
- We feel that, as students, we shouldn't have to pay such high prices, and shouldn't have to depend on our parents for lifts; young people prefer independent especially throughout A level years. We think this is particularly important because this is the most vital stage in our lives to learn about the world around us

Laura Harrison

- Not only does Bath offer job opportunities, it is a large city with lots happening, where we can broaden our minds and develop as young adults. We are told time and time again to stand out from the crowd, and Bath offers a number of activities and opportunities that will help us learn about culture, self-help and volunteering. Bus prices are so high and bus runs are so scarce, not only to Bath but to other towns as well, so because of this we feel isolated in our community and depend on our parents. Students rarely have the option to depend on driving themselves, as it is very expensive in terms of petrol and car ownership. And of course won't even be possible

without a job! A prime example of this is our last speaker, she couldn't make it here today because her parents are away and simply couldn't rely on the bus service to get in and out of Bath.

- Having such a bad transport system will undoubtedly lead to several more cars being on the road which is a contributing factor to the increasing impact on the environment, and with energy resources being such a scarce commodity surely you would think governments would want to choose greener alternatives to travelling?
- Another issue that needs to be addressed is the age boundary at which we are considered 'an adult'. First buses consider an adult to be 15. We don't believe that this is an appropriate age to be labelled as an adult as the conventional age is 18.

Katie Purchase

- We have recently created a petition to support our ideas and have had an extremely positive response and have managed to gather over 100 supporters. We have also created an online survey for students to voice their opinions and suggestions on transport. 100% of students aged 15-18 agreed that bus prices are unfair or too expensive. One response was as follows:
- 'It is ridiculous that a child aged 15 is supposed to pay over £5 for an adult bus ticket. Most people who are classed as 'adults' at 15 do not have jobs, therefore cannot afford costly bus tickets. It is a fact that at 18 you become an adult, so why is it any different for the bus services? The cost from Pensford (which is a short car journey from me) is about £5 for a child's ticket on a First bus which I believe to be way too much, especially since adult tickets are way higher. Why would people who have cars choose to use an expensive bus at about £7, when driving in and parking would be the same, maybe less? The cost of the buses are too expensive and for people to continue to use them, they should be reduced slightly in price, so it is affordable for young people and adults'

- We have come here today to show that we are fed up with paying so much for public transport and that being classed as an adult at 15 is unfair. We would like to advise the council to subsidise local transport for young adults and we suggest an introduction of a student card valid within the Chew Valley area.
- We have had our story covered by the Chew Valley Gazette, and our community and parish council have both shown their support. Thank you for listening.

This page is intentionally left blank

I would firstly like to thank the council for allowing me to make this statement today, and I would especially like to thank Leader of the Council and Liberal Democrat Group Leader Cllr Paul Crossley for his help in enabling me speak to you all.

For years, I complained about Bristol buses lack of reliability and ever increasing fares to my family but I never did anything about it. Then, in November last year, I decided to finally do something about it, and I started an e-petition that has attracted nearly 4,000 signatures so far!

I'm proud my petition has been endorsed by Bristol's Mayor George Ferguson, and was unanimously supported by Bristol city council at a recent meeting. This cross-party support has led to First Bus announcing a review of their fare prices and I hope we can work together to achieve the same here.

Bath is a beautiful and historic city - let down by its bus services that scored well below the national average in a nationwide survey of passengers by the watchdog body Passenger First.

Several people have told me it's cheaper and more convenient for them to drive then pay £2.60 for a two-mile journey by bus into town. Where is the sense in that?

I also read that the cost of using park and ride services in Bath are set to up from this month, with some tickets increasing by more than twice the rate of inflation.

This unfortunately means more people drive into town adding to the city Centre's congestion problems, encourages In-active lifestyles and I don't need to tell you the health issues air pollution causes & the damage it does to the environment.

I feel strongly that bus tickets across the West are too high, and that we need to work with bus operators to get them to cut so we get more people out of their cars & using public transport.

I'm here tonight to launch a petition to deliver what the residents of this wonderful city want, and that's to Make Fares Fair! I call on all the members of the cabinet to support my e-petition.

Many thanks

This page is intentionally left blank

My name is Karen Abolkheir and I am a member of the Stanton Wick Action Group.

My representations today cover the status of the Council's Gypsy Traveller Development Plan Document.

Cabinet will recall that on 9 May 2012 6 sites were listed in the Council's Preferred Options DPD to go forward for consultation. 3 sites were subsequently removed at the September 2012 Cabinet meeting leaving a 17 pitch provision for a 42 pitch requirement. Last year's DPD for Stanton Wick provided for 20 pitches, nearly 48% of the requirement for the district.

Cabinet will be aware that a planning application was received in January seeking permission for 12 pitches on the shale & tip of the Old Colliery Stanton Wick – nearly 43% of the current requirement for the district on an area that can accommodate 72 pitches.

We have serious concerns over the pre-application consultation and the fact that the application, which does not meet the required levels to be registered, was registered and with a substantially lower application fee than should be applied. We ask that the Cabinet fully investigate the circumstances of the pre-consultation process together with the registration and fee calculation of this application.

Since the Cabinet meeting last September there appears to be very little progression of the Gypsy Traveller DPD. Cabinet were due to debate an updated DPD last March, postponed subsequently to this coming May and we have recently learned that the DPD will now not be debated until the June Cabinet meeting.

Following any resolutions from Cabinet there is a requirement for consultation with communities on the proposed Gypsy Traveller sites and we understand that the DPD will be adopted in Spring 2014, some 16 months later than the Council's target date.

Members of the community are extremely concerned regarding the lack of progress and the possible appeal grounds this may provide to the owner/applicant at Stanton Wick - namely lack of provision for the identified need.

We question why progression of the Lower Bristol Road site has not been reported back to Cabinet, especially as at the September Cabinet, resolution (5) proposed as an amendment by Councillor Allen stated:

‘ AGREE that whilst the Council is progressing the DPD in light of the absence of any authorised permanent sites within the District the Council should progress a planning application at Lower Bristol Road for gypsy and traveller pitches. ‘

Thus there is no reason to wait for an update on the status of Lower Bristol Road – please can you provide a formal update at the next Cabinet meeting especially in light of the deferment of the DPD.

We also request that Cabinet provides for a full and detailed update on progress of the DPD together with a definitive timetable for the resolution of site provision in such time as may be required to ensure that any planning appeal may not rely on the lack of progress with the DPD.

We question the dramatic increase in the number of yards required for Travelling Showpeople and request a statement as to the Council's proposals to identify and authorise yards to meet this need.

We trust Cabinet will understand our concerns and the need for investigation into the process surrounding the Planning Application, for a statement on the progress of the Lower Bristol Road site and an update on the DPD.

Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank

My name is Clarke Osborne; I am a resident of Stanton Wick and represent the Stanton Wick Action Group

I would like to bring the Cabinets attention to the report commissioned by the Council to update the needs assessment for the provision of pitches for Gypsy and Travellers and yards for Travelling Showpeople.

The report was produced by Opinion Research Services and was published on the Council web site on 2nd March despite being dated December 2012. I have provided copies for the Cabinet together with a printed copy of this presentation.

Our attention was drawn to this report as contrary to reporting on the assessment of need, it has gone further to report on opinions of apparently selected individuals from the Gypsy community as to their preference to specific sites. It is unlikely to be coincidental that the expression of site preference is almost exclusively focused on Stanton Wick, a site personally promoted by Maggie Smith-Bendell, the Council's Gypsy consultant and now promoter of a planning application for the same site.

The report raised suspicion of both the process of procurement and the brief to the consultants.

We have yesterday received response to our questions of the Council (issued under FOI Act) together with a copy of the brief. These documents are also copied for you.

The answers have confirmed our concerns in that both the commissioning of the report and the report itself require thorough investigation.

Specifically in respect of the commissioning of the report I draw your attention to the period between the advertisement for tender first advertised on Saturday 10th August and awarded on 21st August, only 7 working days later. We are advised that ORS were the only organisation to respond – quite understandable given the time allowed. We believe you should question the undue haste and the reason an appointment was made without an alternative quotation. The report cost over £13,000

In respect of the brief we consider you should question who specifically drafted the brief and in particular the justification for adding the requirement as noted in brief paragraph 3.7 which seeks report on the preferences of the travelling community as to where in the district they would want to live and their preferred ownership and management arrangements. Such request is outside of the brief of a Needs Assessment which focuses on the number of units of accommodation that are needed within the district and in some aspect those requirements which cross over district boundaries. The brief has been interpreted by ORS an experienced organisation as asking and noting responses from targeted individuals as to their specific site preference, and guess who is quoted, yes, Maggie Smith Bendell and guess where she quotes, yes, Stanton Wick.

The Council has good experience in the commissioning of reports and of the requirements of a needs assessment and we question, as before, if undue and conflicted influence has

been provided by the Gypsy and Travelling community, which of course would be reprehensible and very damaging to community relations.

We find the resulting report to be confused and weak and ask you the Cabinet to question how this report was accepted by the Council and the consultants paid their fee. You will note that the report is not evidenced based and reports third party conversations, telephone interviews without proper identification of those interviewed and on some occasions supposition of what someone would have said if they were at home.

We therefore ask the Cabinet to investigate the commissioning and acceptance of this report by their officers and to report their findings in due course. We think the Cabinet have been badly served in this instance. We feel that the evidence base is not robust or accurate to satisfy the inspector who will review the DPD as part of the Core Strategy.

We ask that the Council reassure us that no weight can or will be placed in respect of the reported preferences for the Stanton Wick site and to confirm that the Council has firmly rejected the Stanton Wick site as a possible site within the DPD and will not under any circumstances review that decision.

Statement to Cabinet on April 10th 2013

As Chair of the Early Years, Children & Youth Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel I endorse the findings of the Home to School Transport Review.

I would like to thank all contributors to the various sessions & activities undertaken which included a smaller group of Councillors, Officers & Stakeholders who used various research methods from both primary & secondary sources. This helped us to understand the issues & many very valid points were raised which we took on board as we completed the review.

I endorse the findings of the HTST Report which were initially presented to the full EYC&Y PDS Panel in January.

The Panel emphasised the need to clearly identify the cost neutral figures for Cabinet as they felt these would favour recommendation 2.3c but as you can see the facts now included do not support the recommendation as we had hoped.

The report was accepted by the Panel with the recommendations as presented to Cabinet tonight and at the March Panel meeting we noted that Cllrs Romero, Crossley & Symonds had accepted our recommendations.

Cllr Sally Davis

This page is intentionally left blank

£500,000 for Radstock

Amanda Leon, Radstock Action Group B&NES Cabinet 10 April 2013

Radstock Action Group congratulates B&NES on identifying key works which require urgent attention in Radstock and urges Cabinet to agree the proposals at this meeting.

However, we suggest that the fanfare about £500,000 for Radstock misses the point. The works proposed are all items which are much more about regular maintenance and improvement than a major investment in the regeneration and future of the town. All you need do is compare with the scale of proposals for Keynsham.

We wish to make two points:

1. The £140,000 earmarked for 'Streets, Highways and the Public Realm' is essential to maintain and improve safety for everyone in Radstock. We hope that such highways expenditure which should be a part of any normal budget will recur in future years. Such payments are not to be regarded as windfalls, they are essentials for maintaining the fabric of the town.
2. Radstock and Westfield Economic Forum remains an unaccountable, unrepresentative body which has been awarded £135,000, as opposed to £100,000 which was the sum originally allocated. Please could we have exact details of what this will be spent on.

Many local groups were invited to the initial meeting which took place in August 2011 and undertakings were made to circulate minutes, convene the next meetings and so on. Since this time, the Forum has become invisible to people in Radstock. We have regularly invited Duncan Kerr, as the B&NES leader on this matter, to meetings and put our point of view, and he has always been helpful and positive. But there is never any follow up. We were told in the period leading up to the initial meeting, that 'The aim is to focus on producing a person-centred economic action plan, aimed at increasing economic and social/community growth' and that B&NES 'would bring together an action plan to consult on and bring back to the group in Sept/Oct'. But this has not happened. Local and widespread involvement is essential for the regeneration of the town. This includes in relation to the Victoria Hall on which £160,000 will be spent.

We urge B&NES to take seriously the tourist potential of the town when considering how to foster regeneration – we have repeatedly made the case and hope that this matter will be properly addressed.

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT TO CABINET 10th APRIL 2013
Re: £500,000 Announced for Radstock

Naturally we are pleased that there will be expenditure on Radstock, but some questions have arisen.

- In the original Press Release, there was £150,000 purely to improve the Frome Road. Now, it appears that the total amount allocated to all Highways projects is only £140,000: why the decrease?
- The amount for the Radstock and Westfield Economic Forum has increased from £100,000 to £135,000 and there is also £15,000 for signage. Why the increase? Perhaps I am mistaken, but this Forum is totally undemocratic and no list of members exists.
- It would appear that the widening of Morley Terrace, the implementation of a 20 mph zone in Haydon and the widening of the pavement in Clandown have been forgotten.

I believe that the extra £50,000 allowed to the Economic Forum has been taken from the Highways allocation. I welcome being proved mistaken.

George Bailey
Radstock Action Group

This page is intentionally left blank

Radstock Capital Funding

Radstock Town Council welcomes the capital funding which is desperately needed and has been a long time coming. We are becoming a dormitory town for Bath with around 80% of residents working outside the area. Meanwhile, we have some of the worse figures for child poverty and higher than the national average rates for benefit claimants.

I would like to see more partnership working between B&NES and Radstock Town Council to ensure that local people have a real say in any improvements or changes.

I spoke at a Scrutiny meeting a few weeks ago and raised concerns about the length of time taken to formulate any plans associated with this funding. My first question is when the funding was allocated in February 2012 why did the consultation not happen until October 2012 and why was this only given 4 weeks for responses? This did not allow much time for residents to formulate a considered response.

The short timescale may account for the low number of responses. Having said that, I risk sounding like a broken record in coming to this Cabinet meeting to say once again that we are inundated with surveys and consultations to the point of complete overkill. It is important that more than one method is used to gather meaningful responses.

Another concern is that the results of the consultation have not been shared with either Radstock Town Council or the Radstock and Westfield Economic Forum. These were promised at the last meeting of the forum. My second question is what is the analysis of the responses and why have these not been made available as requested and promised at the last Radstock and Westfield Economic Forum meeting?

There seems to be a general lack of transparency and genuine consultation throughout this process which does not promote good partnership working.

I have said many times that I am concerned about the piecemeal approach to Radstock. The NRR development will take up one of the largest sites in the centre of the town and mean changing the road layout. There are few spaces in Radstock for other developments, especially those for small businesses or affordable accommodation for young homeless people. There is a need for a bigger vision in Radstock, which includes job creation for local people and support for local businesses and anything which contributes towards that is a bonus.

£500,000 is a small amount of money and it is important that this is used as effectively as possible. So what will be the specific, measurable improvements resulting from this funding be?

It's not correct to say that there is no other vision for the town. A number of ideas have been discussed with councillors over the last two years. Meanwhile, Radstock Town Council is working on a longer term strategy and we welcome input from B&NES councillors and officers on this.

My final question is how will B&NES continue to involve Radstock Town Council and the community in future on the allocation of this funding?

The council looks forward to positive outcomes from this funding and would like to see other sources of funding identified to regenerate the town.

Thanks
Cllr Lesley Mansell
Chair Radstock Town Council

This page is intentionally left blank

As ward councillor for Paulton, I would like to reflect some of the views of residents regarding the proposed expansion of our Primary Schools. Although representations were received from 34 respondents, an e petition of 93 signatories and 102 leaflets delivered to B&NES officers, must also be considered to illustrate the depth of feeling engendered by the proposed expansion. For many, we are at a critical tipping point, with not enough critical mass to support a full new school and a school site where access is too limited for the proposed expansion.

We are all agreed that pupil numbers will rise in the forthcoming years, so clearly additional places are needed. We support the principle that all Paulton children of Primary School age should have the choice of attending school in Paulton, should they so wish. What residents do not want to see is Paulton Schools becoming a hub to attract pupils from other local villages and from nearby housing developments such as Monger Lane, in Midsomer Norton.

Many residents' preferred option would be building a new school in a different location. Both schools' governing bodies in conjunction with B&NES officers have reviewed this alternative and rejected it. Building a new single form entry Primary School on the new housing estate, with the proposed numbers would be costly and would probably lead to mixed age group teaching.

So the site at Paulton Infant and Junior Schools is the option under consideration. The actual site itself at the Infant School where the building will take place and **I'm not meaning the road access**, does lend itself to expansion as no playground space will be lost. It is fairly central to the village. The main problem with it is access.

There are other concerns about falling standards with a much larger intake. However the governing bodies of both schools have assured us that they are capable of adapting and absorbing the increased numbers without compromising educational standards. As a governor of Paulton Infant School for the past 17 years, I do believe them.

The main issue with expansion as outlined by all the representations received, be they on paper, email or leaflet is to do with road safety and increased traffic problems on a site that is already too congested. If this expansion goes ahead as it needs to to offer school places for Paulton children, traffic management solutions must be given top priority. This would include a detailed review of the existing highly congested road conditions around the schools. New school travel plans need to be developed and a robust solution to the highways issue must be in place before the expansion takes place.

To conclude, I support the Governing Bodies of both schools in accepting the principle of expansion, as long as there is a planning application which will provide detailed solutions to the traffic issues

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF PAULTON SCHOOLS EXPANSION ACTION GROUP.

I am here to represent the views of parents and local residents who have become aware of the proposed expansion of Paulton Infants and Junior School. The Facebook Group 'Paulton Schools Expansion Action Group' has now grown to 370 members and what I am about to say is reflected in the comments posted by these people.

The statement made on behalf of this group at the Cabinet meeting on 13th February 2013 still applies, but in addition I would like to highlight the following points.

Consultation Returns

Firstly, it is felt that the Summary of Statutory Notice Representations Received (in the Summary Appendix) is misleading in the actual number of objections raised. The headline figure suggests that 34 representations were made (with 27 objections) but does not count the 93 signatures on the e-petition and the 102 returns of the leaflet. The Council must recognise that some parents / residents who are daunted by constructing an argument themselves, elected to sign the e-petition or return the leaflet to register their objections.

Outside Area

The Officers Response (in the Summary appendix) states that there will be 'no reduction in outside play space as a result of the new buildings'. However, this fails to address the fact that there will be more children sharing the same amount of space - therefore it will become more crowded. It also fails to take into account the findings by Ofsted that identified 'the lack of resources and activities to stimulate children's ideas'. This is in part due to the extremely limited space allowed to the infants in its current form. This would be recorded as a "requires improvement" using the current Ofsted framework. The current space is already at saturation point for 60 children – this cannot cope with additional numbers and is likely to impact on future Ofsted inspections.

Accessibility

The Department for Education's Guide that details the statutory regulations requires that decision makers have regard to guidance issued by the Secretary of State when they take a decision on proposals (Statutory Guidance – Factors to be Considered by Decision Makers) This goes on to detail that for Travel and Accessibility for all, in considering proposals for the reorganisation of schools, Decision Makers should satisfy themselves that accessibility planning has been properly taken into account. Facilities are to be accessible by those concerned, by being located close to those who will use them, and the proposed changes should not adversely impact on disadvantaged groups, have the effect of unreasonably extending journey times or increasing transport costs, or result in too many children being prevented from travelling sustainably due to unsuitable routes. This still needs to be determined prior to any decision to expand.

Traffic and Highways

Traffic management is considered important to those that live in the immediate vicinity as having an impact on their own property. This is also a significant concern with regards to the safety of those people who are at increased risk of incident when walking to and from the school.

The road network is already at capacity and there is no local capacity for additional parking on the adjacent road network without serious impact on the highway safety in the vicinity. Parents are already operating their own recognised "park & stride" to the school as it becomes increasingly dangerous to even get a vehicle near to the school. This is to the detriment of residents in the adjoining roads.

The Officers Response highlights the implementation of a Park & Stride system and yet there is strong feeling that there is nowhere else for people to park.

Any decision must take into account the need to escort all children both to and from the classroom door which is already at saturation point based on the current intake.

School Ethos

The character and Ethos of the school will be impacted by any expansion. Given the likelihood of a new Head Teacher for the infants school in the foreseeable future, there is concern that there will be too much change happening at the same time and standards will suffer.

Paulton Infants school has a good reputation as being a Good Community School and by expanding it there is a risk that the personal attention and sense of identity afforded to each child will be lost.

Non- Classroom Resources

The school hall is already of insufficient size to accommodate current requirements. A 30% increase in headcount should mean that the hall and other non-classroom areas be increased to the same proportion. Parents question how can this be achieved in the current footprint. Anything less than an expanded hall will be inadequate to accommodate families at festival times to support children's learning and development.

There is also a lack of space in shared areas for example the IT area. In this day and age of technology children are only able to use the computer area once a week.

The size of shared areas will remain disproportionately small for the overall size of the school. An additional class in each year will impact on shared resources for which there is already an inadequate space and availability.

Whilst currently all pupils have equal access to these resources, this equal share will be further diluted by the need to share the same resources with a larger number of children.

We urge the cabinet to think 'Smarter' and consider more progressive solutions than to shoe horn more pupils into the existing schools.

Statement to B&NES Cabinet on Wed 10 April 2013 by Raymond Friel, Executive Headteacher of St. Gregory's Catholic College and St. Mark's Church of England School, Bath, regarding Denominational Transport

Members of the Cabinet

You have before you this evening a number of options regarding Denominational Transport which are intended to achieve savings in the Council's overall budget. I appreciate the challenge you face and understand that we all have to play our part, but I will argue this evening that removing the subsidy for denominational transport could save very little and could in the end prove to be very costly in political terms.

The community of St. Gregory's school benefits the most from the current policy, with 194 students being transported at a subsidised rate. St. Gregory's was not established as a Bath school but as a school in the Diocese of Clifton, intended to serve a very wide catchment area which covers all of B&NES and beyond. In 2007, when the Council introduced a charging policy for denominational transport, the number of Catholic children attending St. Gregory's fell by 100 in the five years following, because many Catholic families could not afford the transport costs. Because St. Gregory's is an outstanding school with an excellent reputation, these 100 places were filled by children from the Bath area and the school remains oversubscribed. Having spoken to many parents with children at our partner primary schools I have no doubt that there will be a further decrease in the number of Catholic students and a subsequent increase in the number of Bath children if the subsidy is removed altogether. What the Cabinet members need to consider is the impact on other schools in Bath. There are many surplus places in the city and at least three schools operating at well below capacity. If more Bath children are drawn to St. Gregory's, small schools in the city will suffer as a result and we could be looking at a scenario which I know this Cabinet finds unacceptable: the prospect of unplanned and politically unpopular school closure. If you turn St. Gregory's into a Bath school by removing the subsidy, it will place intolerable strain on the secondary school system.

The next point to consider is the extent of actual savings to be made if the subsidy is removed. As we now know from the backing papers to Item 24 on proposals for term dates for 2014/15, there is the very real prospect of a saving in the transport budget of around £130k by determining the same 190 school days for most schools in the Authority. This could easily cover the proposed savings from denominational transport for the next three years. There is also much more work to be done on calculating the cost to the Council of those Catholic families who would send their children to their nearest appropriate school instead of St. Gregory's if the subsidy were removed. I'm not aware that any work has been done to calculate this cost. Many of our current and prospective families live in the villages outside of Bath and would still be beyond the statutory walking distance to their nearest school. The Council would have to pay for this and the subsequent proposed saving would be diminished further.

Another major point to consider is the impact of families from minority ethnic groups. As I have said in public many times, the Polish, Filipino and increasingly Kerala Indian communities are drawn naturally to Catholic schools. We have the highest populations of children from these communities and we are set up to meet their needs with academic and pastoral support. If the subsidy is

removed, many of them could not afford to send their children to St. Gregory's, the school which they consider their natural home. They would then be spread throughout the Authority in schools which, while they would do their utmost to look after them, would simply not be set up in the same way to meet their needs. I am also bound to say that the Equalities Impact Assessment which was published with the agenda for this meeting does little to assure them, other than to say that if the subsidy were to be removed the subsequent published material would be available in various translations. I would respectfully suggest that the Equalities Impact Assessment needs to be re-visited.

In summary, I would urge Cabinet to follow the recommendation of the O&S Panel which met on 28 January and voted almost unanimously not to remove the subsidy. There is an exemplary partnership in this Authority between the Council and faith schools, as witnessed by the significant investment in the new sixth form. I very much hope that partnership continues and you allow our families to access the faith-based education which is so important to them by continuing to support subsidised transport.

Raymond Friel

5 April 2013

Home to School Transport

Cllr Liz Hardman

As a member of the Early Years, Children and Youth Panel I would like to ensure that the Cabinet is aware of the recommendations we made at our meeting January and re affirmed at our subsequent panel meeting on March

Our panel was asked by the then Cabinet member for Early years, children and Youth, Nathan Hartley to consider undertaking a review of Home To School Transport in order to make some financial reductions as part of the 2013/2014 budget setting process.

Bearing in mind the financial constraints facing the Council, our Panel recognised that doing nothing was not an option and that the school transport system needs to be more efficient.

A steering group was set up of which I was a member and we reported our findings to our panel in January..... The most controversial element was Home to School Denominational Transport and as the steering group, we put forward 4 recommendations which you will see are on pages 253 and 254 of your notes.

At our panel meeting in January..... almost unanimously, we recommended that the cabinet adopt recommendation 3c. This is where the denominational subsidy is kept but it is reduced. We confirmed this decision again at our March meeting.

The rationale behind keeping the subsidy is that many of the savings would be on paper only. Many of the pupils who currently are transported to Faith schools would need to be transported to other schools, free of charge, thus incurring extra costs for the Council.

As a ward councillor for Paulton, some of my residents attend Faith Schools such as St Gregorys in Bath. At the present time they and other pupils in surrounding villages have the opportunity to attend a faith school in Bath. If we remove the subsidy, we as a Council are in danger of being accused as being too Bath centred. We are not offering to pupils in North East Somerset the same choices as those offered to Bath residents

Finally the impact on Faith schools such as St Gregorys should the subsidy be removed would be enormous. You only have to look at the figures from when charging for transport was introduced in 2008. The numbers attending St Gregorys from outside Bath fell from 321 to 228. A drop of almost a 100 pupils. The numbers attending from the city of Bath rose in the same period from 436 to 542 pupils. Well over a 100 pupils. The impact on these numbers should the subsidy be removed would be even greater

To conclude, the majority of the Early Years , Children and Youth panel, having looked at all the evidence have made their decision that the denominational subsidy, should be retained, although reductions in the amount should be made. This would enable considerable savings to be made whilst at the same time giving parents from outside of Bath the choice of sending their child to a secondary Faith school. On my panel's behalf I put this recommendation to you

**B&NES Cabinet meeting discussing the transport subsidy for Catholic families.
Wednesday 10th April at 6.30pm at the Guildhall in Bath.**

Speaker: Brendan Rouse Chair of St Mary's Parish Pastoral Council

A Catholic School is not just one with a God-centred Mission Statement supported by all its teachers, it's made by the faith and actions of the pupils. If the balance between the ratio of Catholics to non-Catholics changes too much, will we really be confident that the Journey of Faith of our children will be as strongly served as the current cohort of students.

I am a teacher at St John's Catholic Primary and parent of two boys in Years 2 and 5 at St Mary's Catholic Primary. We live more than 3 miles away from St Gregory's and therefore the subsidy cut will affect us.

I want to send my children to a Catholic School.

Why?

My boys and their contemporaries have already started their Journey of Faith in a Catholic Primary where they witness 'Christ in everything' in the same way they do at home and at Church. For example we pray together at home and at Catholic school the day is punctuated by prayer.

Last week I took part in the Good Friday walk of witness. We were jeered at by some young men in a car. Society is quick to mock Christianity. In a Catholic School we may still have our questioning and 'Doubting Thomas' moments, but with the majority of fellow students being Catholic and where all the teachers are asked in their applications if they will: (quote): "**be sympathetic and supportive of the Catholic character of the school and be able to support this fully**" (end quote), with this I would expect appropriate Catholic guidance and support to underpin their emerging faith. Children and especially teenagers often need to look beyond just their parents for spiritual guidance and being surrounded by a positive Christian cohort is invaluable.

The fact that St Gregory's offers assemblies with Christian content and inspiration, retreats and Liturgical services are important for our youngsters to re-examine their journey of faith. As these are often led by our Parish Priests the continuity of our teaching at home/church/school is strengthened. These are especially important for many Catholics who do not make it to Mass every Sunday.

On Good Friday and Easter Sunday St Mary's Church was full. About 50 children in each mass took part in the Children's Liturgy services. About 20% of these were from Kerala who have a very strong and living Catholic faith. As many of these families live or work near the RUH which is over 3 miles from St Gregory's, they like us will be negatively affected by these cuts. Their cultural Catholic explicitness would add further value to the Catholicity of St Gregory's.

Finally, I ask the council to continue its support for a transport subsidy as without it many families will not be able to afford to send their children to St Gregory's. St Gregory's is an 'Outstanding' school and any places will be quickly filled by non-Catholic students which will have knock-on effects to other schools in Bath. A Catholic School is not just one with a God-centred Mission Statement supported by all its teachers, it's made by the faith and actions of the pupils. If the balance between the ratio of Catholics to non-Catholics changes too much, will we really be confident that the Journey of Faith of our children will be as strongly served as the current cohort of students.

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Cllr Gabriel Michael Batt, Conservative, Bathavon North Ward.

Address to Bath & North East Somerset Cabinet, Wednesday 10th April 2013.

"Home to School Transport Review" Agenda item 23 (*May be brought forward*)

Leader of the Council, Cabinet members. Thank you for allowing me to address your meeting.

When St. Gregory's was founded some 33 years ago it was not intended to be a secondary school for Bath children but a school **in Bath** for the children of Clifton Diocese. With a catchment area to the East at Chippinham, to the North at Chipping Sodbury, to the South at Wells and Shepton Mallet, and to the West at Coalpit Heath and Kingswood. It was never intended to be a local school in terms of geographical neighbourhood. The catchment area was defined by Clifton Diocese to serve primarily the Catholic Christian Community. Currently 25% of the pupils attending the college are not Catholic children, however they add a dimension to the college to the benefit of all staff and pupils.

From its inception St. Gregory's has been a very successful school, continually oversubscribed and regularly been rated outstanding by Ofsted. It will be opening a 6th form in the Autumn of this year.

There is a long standing social contract between Catholic Schools and local Government to fund transport to Catholic schools because of the distances involved. If the subsidy is removed, Catholic families who live more than 3 miles away will struggle to get their child to the school of their first choice. This will undoubtedly lessen the numbers of children from the outline areas. Because St. Gregory's is an outstanding and popular school this shortfall in school numbers will be taken up by children from Bath to the detriment of other secondary schools in Bath.

Catholic parents already pay through their taxes for the education of their children. All catholic and other faith schools have to pay 10% of all capital costs, which is funded by their church giving. They are in fact paying for part of their children's education twice.

At a very well attended meeting, recently held at the school for parents of children at St. Gregory's and the feeder catholic schools in the catchment area, governors and others discussed this subject. Also present, and I was very pleased to see, Cllr Dine Romero, Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Youth, I am sure she would have seen and heard the depth of feeling from those parents attending, just how important St. Gregory's is to them and their children.

When the Liberal Democrat Party was formed shortly after St. Gregory's was created they said at that time that all children should travel to school by bus and not car and that school transport should be free, I would like to think that is still the policy of the Liberal Democrat Party.

Members of the cabinet, society should not discriminate against minorities.

Thank you for your attention.

cc Col Spring.

Clr Webber

Leader, thank you for this opportunity to speak.

I find the purpose and rationale of the proposed partial closure of Dorchester Street completely baffling. It cannot eliminate the conflict of pedestrians and vehicles; if anything, by speeding up the flow of eastbound buses and taxis it will put unwary pedestrians at greater peril.

What is the point of partially closing the street between 10 am and 4 pm, while leaving it fully open at the beginning and end of the working day when the street is most congested? Even allowing for the fact that personal observation can be misleading, I am struck how often in the middle of a weekday I can count the number of cars in Manvers Street on the fingers of one hand. On Sundays their absence is even more noticeable.

More eastbound traffic will be sent via the A36, which allegedly has spare capacity during the middle of the day. But that may change when Rossiter Road is made two-way. Would it not be prudent to defer the experiment at Dorchester Street until after the Rossiter Road scheme has been implemented? In any case, even now, the school run and congestion at Widcombe School starts well before 4 pm.

More traffic will be forced to enter the city centre via North Parade Road, which is heavily used by pedestrians - adults and children - passing along the narrow pavements to and from the Leisure Centre.

I know that the report says that it will be easier for vehicles to exit the east end of North Parade Road because there will be less through-traffic. However, the whole notion of closing Dorchester Street has been predicated on the belief that many cars use Dorchester Street as rat-run between Pulteney Road and Southgate Street. I have never seen any figures to bear that out.

The report asserts that the proposed closure will entail only modest inconvenience for residents and businesses between the train station and the High Street. Evidently, they do not agree.

Two final remarks. What a circuitous journey people from the south and west of Bath will need to make in order to meet or drop off passengers at the train station. And secondly, how will the no-left-turn out of Manvers Street car park be enforced? It is hardly welcoming to Bath to make use of that car park more difficult and then to make up the lost revenue from penalty tickets for failing to notice the ban on entering Dorchester Street from the west.

All in all, the proposed closure seems to be the wrong solution to an overstated problem. Sometimes the optimum solution is to do nothing

This page is intentionally left blank

Public Transport Policy and Public Realm Policy in Greater Bristol and Bath City Region, against the background of Public Spending Cuts by the DfT as a result of Rail-Franchising Remodelling.

There is a great deal of concern amongst the travelling public about proposed changes to the bus, rail and ferry networks. Whilst we welcome the Bristol Mayor's decision to review the Bus Rapid Transit network through the harbour and over Princes Street Bridge, the Park and Ride proposals at Stapleton/Frenchay and the route from Bristol Parkway to Cribbs Causeway and Henbury, our main concern is to see the Greater Bristol Bus Network maintained and funded within the city region and into Somerset, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire.

Since the last BANES Cabinet meeting the council has taken the decision to save a number of key bus routes serving Bristol, Bath and Somerset. These include the 376 (Bristol to Yeovil via Knowle, Whitchurch, Wells, Glastonbury, Street, Yeovil, Bridgwater and Taunton) which is actually funded as far as Wells by the City of Bristol. Off-peak services on 338/339 (Bristol to Bath via Temple Meads, Brislington, Keynsham and Saltford), the 178 service (Bristol to Radstock and Bath via, Old Market, Temple Meads, Brislington, Timsbury, Paulton, Midsomer Norton, Radstock and Bath) and the limited 636 (Keynsham to Whitchurch via Stockwood) have also been saved, though the future of this last service could be further enhanced by merging it with the 515 from Stockwood to the South Bristol Hospital.

Future Bristol City Council proposals in their zero budget-setting process for 2014-15 also threaten a number of routes in the East of the city including the 533 (Keynsham to Mangotsfield via Hillfields and Kingswood) and the 507 (Keynsham to Southmead via Longwell Green, Kingswood, Hillfields and Fishponds, Eastville, Lockleaze and Horfield).

South West Transport Network Statement to BANES Cabinet on 10 April and the West of England Partnership and West of England Transport Board May meetings :: issued 6 April 2013

with the support of the BristolGayVillage.org

There is a real need to find funding for these services and others across the city region. On this matter we welcome the Bristol Mayor's new working relationship with First Group, A-Bus, Wessex and the other operators. We are particularly concerned about the investment in the 4, 5, 36, 309, 310, 311, 327, 329 and 354 routes where the current bus stock are non-low floor, which in the case of the 4 and 5 routes provide the main services to Frenchay and Blackberry Hill hospitals respectively. These routes and the 36 (serving large parts of South Bristol) along with service 6 (to Kingswood) also have very low frequencies in the evening and (worse still), limited to no service on Sundays. If we are to persuade people to use these routes, the service frequency needs to be radically improved and the vehicle quality must be brought up-to-date. The Mayor will need to work with operators on marketing (in the style of London Transport campaigns led by the Mayor), customer service, accessibility, high quality cleaning programs, revenue protection, policing, real-time information, maps and timetable displays across the city region jointly with BANES, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire.

As a matter of long-term strategy the bus network needs to be seen to serve the new hospitals at Southmead and Frenchay which will require continued support from the City Region if it is to be carried forward in action.

The City Region needs to maintain support for the night bus network and consider improving access to these services by routing them through significant areas of the night-time economy: Temple Meads, Old Market (the Gay Village), Cabot Circus, the Centre and College Green. Furthermore, providing a night service between Bristol and Bath via Keynsham seems to be such an obvious addition to the network that it deserves urgent consideration.

More work needs to be done on fares, -- ticketing, youth fares, travel cards and ticketing integration across bus, rail and ferry modes. This in part may be achieved by taking direct control of the government's bus operator grant (currently centrally managed and planned by the DfT).

South West Transport Network Statement to BANES Cabinet on 10 April and the West of England Partnership and West of England Transport Board May meetings :: issued 6 April 2013

with the support of the BristolGayVillage.org
Page 146



We are very concerned about the need to protect local rail services and to protect the local subsidy to First Great Western for the Severn Beach line and the associated subsidy on the Severn Beach to Taunton services and the Bristol to Bath, Trowbridge, Westbury, Warminster and Frome services. It is important to continue with the plans for building new stations at Salford Parkway and Bathampton (as part of a 30 minute service between Bristol and Westbury serving Keynsham and Oldfield Park) and at Shirehampton Parkway in 2013 whilst maintaining and improving services across Bristol between Cardiff and Taunton – particularly adding extra stops at Pilning, Patchway, Filton Abbey Wood,, Stapleton Road, Lawrence Hill, Bedminster, Parson Street, Nailsea and Backwell, Yatton (for Clevedon), Worle, and Weston Milton, In the long term this service will require quadruple tracking between Temple Meads and Parson Street, extra stations at the new Stadium (in addition to the station at Ashton Gate on the Portishead line) and Flax Bourton.

We believe the City Region and the West of England Partnership should also be putting pressure on the Department for Transport and the West of England Transport Board for electrification of local lines: Bath to Westbury and Newbury (supported by Wiltshire County Council), Bristol to Weston and Taunton, Bristol to Pill and Portishead, the Severn Beach line, the Henbury loop, and the Bristol to Parkway, Yate, Gloucester and Cheltenham line. It is also important that all City Region planners and strategists be aware that following the withdrawal of freight services on the branches to Thornbury, Berkeley and Westerleigh (as well as the short spur to Avon Street) the West of England Partnership needs to protect these routes from any closure proposals by Network Rail, and any track recovery plans such as have been visited on lines in the Tyneside area and around Nottingham.

We urge the City Region local authorities to continue with the CCTV program on the line between Clifton Down and Severn Beach, between Bedminster and Parson Street and between Bristol and Bath. In addition we hope work will continue with BANES, FGW and Network Rail to complete the disabled ramp and CCTV at Keynsham (as this grant has been allocated by the DfT) as well as pressing ahead with plans to install ramps at Lawrence Hill, Stapleton Road and Parson Street stations.

South West Transport Network Statement to BANES Cabinet on 10 April and the West of England Partnership and West of England Transport Board May meetings :: issued 6 April 2013

with the support of the BristolGayVillage.org



The award of a contract extension to First Great Western carrying through to August 2016, does not include any provision for the Greater Bristol Metro other than a non-frustration clause. In the light of this, negotiations need to be pursued with the Department for Transport over priced options for the Greater Bristol Metro involving new services (specifically including routes from Portishead and Severn Beach via Bristol Temple Meads and Bath through to Bathampton Trowbridge, Westbury, Warminster and Frome in conjunction with Wiltshire County Council) and reopening of stations/opening of new stations as part of the City Deal. All these Metro Plan Developments are outside the scope of the franchise/concession and must therefore be pursued directly with the Secretary of State and the DfT.

David Redgewell

(with support from
Martin St Amant, Bristol Gay Village Org and Equalities Issues,
Norman Brown, Save our Buses
and George Bailey, South West Transport Network)

.....

Ongoing Issues regarding the Bath and West of England Bus Network which will need to be addressed over the next few months (in the case of South Gloucestershire services this is a matter requiring immediate resolution).

Whilst we welcome retention of the Bristol-Bath services (338 and 339), we are still concerned that the Sunday evening service is being withdrawn from the Park Estate section of the route, and we are also unhappy that the service 12 is being withdrawn on Sundays which leaves parts of Oldfield Park and Twerton without bus services,

South West Transport Network Statement to BANES Cabinet on 10 April and the West of England Partnership and West of England Transport Board May meetings :: issued 6 April 2013

with the support of the BristolGayVillage.org
Page 148



which is especially significant as a problem since this is an area of the city with some of the highest levels of social deprivation with all the attendant issues of lack of access to affordable transport.

It is also a matter of grave concern that services 375, 376 and 377 will no longer provide any onward journeys beyond Wells on any evenings. This inhibits social access to the night time economy from Glastonbury, Street and Shepton Mallet, and equally people from villages in the southern part of BANES cannot visit Glastonbury or Street for an evening meal or other social events. This matter has been raised with the night time economy businesses in Bristol, including Bristol Gay Village Org, Destination Bristol and the Purple Flag Group, as well as the Radstock Public Transport Forum (where it was also raised as an issue especially with respect to the lack of links between Radstock and Midsomer Norton and onward services to Glastonbury, Street and Shepton Mallet which makes access to the two respective hospitals impossible outside office hours).

The following services need to be retained: 267 Bath to Frome evenings and Sundays, 264/265 Bath to Warminster via Bathampton and Trowbridge evenings and Sundays, 507 Keynsham to Southmead via Kingswood, 533 Keynsham to Mangotsfield via Kingswood, 42 Keynsham to Bristol via Kingswood. All these services provide significant social benefits to the outer suburban areas of greater Bristol and Bath, and if they are currently underused, this is really a function of the lack of realistic and enthusiastic marketing by BANES and the other West of England Partnership authorities. This needs to be addressed. The excellent operating partnership between BANES, First Group, A-Bus, Wessex, Bath Bus Company and Somerbus (to say nothing of the other small operators), should be built on by investing effort and focus on marketing and promotion.

The subject of the Keynsham to South Bristol Hospital link needs to be resolved between Bristol City Council, BANES and the NHS in Bristol. There are currently two services (515 and 636) which operate on very much the same route, but are not coordinated in timetable nor do they provide a link between the Hospital, Whitchurch Village and Keynsham.

South West Transport Network Statement to BANES Cabinet on 10 April and the West of England Partnership and West of England Transport Board May meetings :: issued 6 April 2013

with the support of the BristolGayVillage.org



With South Gloucestershire now retendering services 332 (Bristol to Bath via Hanham and Kelston), 620 Bath to Yate, Tetbury and Stroud and 319 Bath to Cribbs Causeway and UWE via Kingswood, 308 Bristol to Gloucester, 310 and 311 Bristol to Dursley via Thornbury, 84 and 86 Yate to Wotton, Nailsworth and Stroud, there needs to be greater coordination between BANES, Gloucestershire and South Gloucestershire for these contracts which will be awarded in September. It is worth noting that these services all require to be converted to low-floor vehicle operation to comply with the forthcoming DDA regulations which become binding in 2015/2017.

Please also bear in mind that all service provision for public transport contracts requires a realistic equalities impact assessment and evidence of discussion with hard-to reach groups including BME, LGBT and disability groups.

.....

As a footnote we would like to voice our support for the closure of Dorchester Street/Manvers Street to all traffic except buses, coaches, taxis and private vehicles bound for the railway and coach station. We are also very happy about the work done in remodelling the booking hall and retail units and would like to see the bus stops outside the station brought back into use as soon as possible.

South West Transport Network Statement to BANES Cabinet on 10 April and the West of England Partnership and West of England Transport Board May meetings :: issued 6 April 2013

with the support of the BristolGayVillage.org
Page 150

South West Transport Network Statement to BANES Cabinet on 10 April and the West of England Partnership and West of England Transport Board May meetings :: issued 6 April 2013

with the support of the BristolGayVillage.org

This page is intentionally left blank

SOMERSET MINERALS PLAN

I welcome the recommended response in the Cabinet paper to the Somerset Minerals Plan Preferred Options.

There is considerable unease in B&NES about the prospect of extracting Shale Gas through the process of fracking operations in the Mendips.

I share the unease about this unproven and potentially highly risky method of squeezing the last drops of what is a non-renewable fuel in a sensitive part of the country. Although this method of fuel production appears to be welcomed by the Government with the introduction of new regulations, the special situation of the Bath hot springs and water supply needs to be recognized.

As reported in the Cabinet paper, the Council has obtained expert advice on this matter. The advice suggests that there is the potential for damage to the deep water sources that supply the hot springs in Bath. These springs are a crucial part of the tourist attraction that sustains thousands of jobs in the city. The geology of the area around Bath is very complex and the impacts on water supply routes are completely unknown.

The County of Avon Act requires Council consent for any excavation below certain depths, and it is essential that there are tight controls over potentially damaging activities near the hot springs. However the controls currently do not cover activities outside specific geographical areas, including the Mendip District Council area.

I hope that our officers will work closely with colleagues in Somerset to ensure complete safeguarding from the adverse impacts of fracking operations. Our ancient waters should not be at the mercy of planning decisions outside the Council area.

In the early 1800s, William Smith, the father of English geology, produced the first large scale geological map of Bath and the surrounding area. I am sure that he would be horrified to learn of the prospect of fracking operations to release Shale Gas from the underlying strata.

Cllr David Martin

Member Champion for Energy and Climate Change

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet 10 April 2013

George Bailey Item 13 Somerset CC Consultation

I am pleased that this Authority appreciates the commercial value which is attached to the Springs and is ready to diplomatically fight for its protection. However, I would be happier if this Cabinet could assure inhabitants elsewhere in the district that it will be equally strenuous when assessing dangers to health and the environment caused by “fracking” before issuing permissions.

This page is intentionally left blank

I am Duncan Hounsell of the Salford Station Campaign.

“The Salford Station Campaign is an active, well organised and popular group” Who says? Answer: The newly formed West of England Local Transport Body in its assessment of the “New Rail Stations Package” which includes Ashton Gate, Corsham and Salford.

The West of England Local Transport Body (LTB) (comprising B&NES Council, Bristol City Council, North Somerset Council, South Gloucestershire Council and the Local Enterprise Partnership) formed in March as a prerequisite to receiving devolved major transport funding from the Department for Transport. One of the functions of the new body is to prioritise local major transport schemes within the available budget. At its meeting on 13 March 2013, it prioritised schemes against criteria of affordability, minimum cost threshold, and deliverability. The top two priorities agreed were the Greater Bristol Metro phases 1 and 2. **The “new stations package” (including Salford station) has also reached the agreed project shortlist.** Construction at Salford is estimated by the LTB to take place in the period 2018/19 to 2023/24 but earlier should other funding opportunities become available and subject to business case. The new stations will form part of the Greater Bristol Metro or “Metro West” project as it is to be called.

The Metro West rail project which includes Salford Station (subject to business case) is included in Network Rail’s Business Plan for Control Period 5 (2014-2019) and Network Rail Specifications (Western). **This is the first time that a station at Salford has appeared in public rail industry documents and marks a major turning point in gaining recognition for the proposal. A station at Salford also appears in the “refresh” or update of the West of England Partnership’s Joint Local Transport Plan (JLTP3).**

It was in June last year that **B&NES Cabinet agreed a budget of £100,000 to undertake a High Level Output Assessment for Salford Station to develop the business case and take Salford to GRIP level 2 of Network Rail’s 8-stage process for railway development.**

There has been a short delay in commissioning this work because of uncertainties around the awarding of the GW Rail Franchise, and changes to the Core Strategy. We know now that FGW is running the service until July 2016 and the **Station Campaign Group is delighted to hear from your Transport Department that it is commissioning the work on Salford** and we wish to be kept informed of progress. Cllr Paul Crossley responded to the call from the **Salford Environment**

Group last November for an informed **public consultation** among Saltford residents and Saltford businesses to follow the consultant's work. **Saltford Station can be seen as a "stand-alone" project** as well as part of Metro West and we want the project taken through the GRIP stages as quickly as possible so that any new Government funding can be accessed as the Government seeks to promote economic growth with capital spending. **We are delighted that you are set to approve, this evening, expenditure of £124,000 as B&NES contribution to the development of Phase 1 of the Metro West project** which includes half-hourly rail services for Keynsham, Oldfield Park and Bath Spa and which will also be a **pre-cursor for these same services for the residents of Saltford within walking distance of their homes. Metro West, including a Saltford Station, is the most exciting public transport project for decades.** Your objectives to produce a modal shift from car to rail, to support economic growth, and to provide future sustainable transport are commendable. You are on-track, on time, and with green lights showing. Thank-you for your support for Metro West and Saltford Station.