

**Democratic Services**

Riverside, Temple Street, Keynsham, Bristol BS31 1LA

Telephone: (01225) 477000 *main switchboard*

Direct Line: 01225 394458

Web-site - <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk>

Date: 7<sup>th</sup> January 2013

E-mail: [Democratic\\_Services@bathnes.gov.uk](mailto:Democratic_Services@bathnes.gov.uk)

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

Councillor Marie Longstaff  
Councillor Caroline Roberts  
Councillor Geoff Ward  
Councillor Ian Gilchrist  
Councillor David Martin  
Councillor Douglas Nicol  
Councillor Liz Richardson

Cabinet Member for Homes & Planning: Councillor Tim Ball  
Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Roger Symonds  
Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods: Councillor David Dixon

Chief Executive and other appropriate officers  
Press and Public

Dear Member

**Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel: Tuesday, 15th January, 2013**

You are invited to attend a meeting of the **Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel**, to be held on **Tuesday, 15th January, 2013 at 2.00 pm** in the **Council Chamber - Guildhall, Bath**.

The agenda is set out overleaf.

Yours sincerely



Mark Durnford  
for Chief Executive

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

*This Agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper*

## NOTES:

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

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

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

Appendices to reports are available for inspection as follows:-

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

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

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

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

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

**Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel - Tuesday,  
15th January, 2013**

**at 2.00 pm in the Council Chamber - Guildhall, Bath**

**A G E N D A**

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

2. EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

Members who have an interest to declare are asked to:

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

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

5. TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

At the time of publication no notifications had been received.

7. MINUTES: 13TH NOVEMBER 2012 (Pages 7 - 20)

8. CABINET MEMBER UPDATE

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

9. URBAN GULLS (Pages 21 - 24)

The Panel has requested an update regarding action being taken to mitigate the impacts of urban gulls in Bath and North East Somerset.

10. CORE STRATEGY UPDATE (Pages 25 - 30)

The B&NES Core Strategy examination has been suspended in response to concerns raised by the Inspector primarily about the sufficiency of the District's housing land supply. This enables the Council to undertake further work on the Core Strategy including a review of the District's housing need. This review is underway and will lead to changes to the Core Strategy to be considered by Council in February or March 2013.

11. GYPSY & TRAVELLER SITES UPDATE

The Panel will receive a verbal update on this item from the Policy & Environment Manager.

12. PLACEMAKING PLAN UPDATE (Pages 31 - 34)

The Placemaking Plan complements the Council's Core Strategy by setting out the development aspirations and the planning requirements for the delivery of key development sites, and updating and reviewing the planning policies used in the determination of planning applications. This paper sets out the objectives of the Placemaking Plan and broadly outlines the key phases in its production.

13. BATH TRANSPORT CONFERENCE OUTCOMES (Pages 35 - 46)

The Panel at their meeting in October asked for a report on the conference held in September 2012 on the need for a Transport Strategy for Bath. This report outlines the agenda for the conference, the main outcomes and the next steps.

14. HIGHWAYS AGENCY - COUNCIL INVOLVEMENT ON SPEED LIMITS (Pages 47 - 48)

15. 20MPH SPEED LIMIT UPDATE (Pages 49 - 54)

A briefing note was tabled at the Planning Transport and Environment PDS Panel on 11th September 2012 giving details of funding and consultation issues, and outlining the progress to date. This current report is to give a further update on progress.

16. WORKPLAN (Pages 55 - 66)

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank

**BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL**

**PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL**

Tuesday 13th November, 2012

**Present:-** Councillors Marie Longstaff (Chair), Caroline Roberts (Vice-Chair), Geoff Ward, Ian Gilchrist, David Martin, Brian Webber and Nathan Hartley (In place of Douglas Nicol)

**Also in attendance:** David Trigwell (Divisional Director for Planning and Transport), Matthew Smith (Divisional Director for Environmental Services), Andy Strong (Public Transport Team Leader), John Crowther (Service Manager for Neighbourhood Services), Jon Evans (Service Manager for Transport and Performance Improvement), Carol Maclellan (Waste Services Manager), Chris Major (Head of Parking Services) and Sue Green (Service Manager for Public Protection)

Cabinet Member for Transport: Councillor Roger Symonds

**68 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**69 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Chairman drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

**70 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Councillor Douglas Nicol had sent his apologies to the Panel, Councillor Nathan Hartley was present as his substitute for the duration of the meeting.

**71 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

**72 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN**

There was none.

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

Pamela Galloway, Save Our 6-7 Buses campaign team addressed the Panel, a copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

'When we registered to speak here today, we were set to campaign until March. This is because, in June, we were horrified to hear on good authority, and I quote: "that in light of the many difficult financial decisions facing B&NES Council next year, it was going to be very hard for Councillors to justify continuing to subsidise the 6&7 Buses." That was followed by months of repeated statements by the Executive Member and other councillors that no commitment could be made until at least February to continue our bus subsidy. One councillor has recently termed our campaign "scare-mongering". What would you have done in our position? We re-launched the campaign to preserve the vital 30 minute frequency to keep our community vibrant and our elderly from becoming isolated.'

'It is with great relief that we learned at last week's Budget Fair, that a "myth was being dispelled" and that bus subsidies would not be cut. Although the Save Our 6-7 Buses campaign team, along with hundreds of residents in our area, suspect that the campaign was crucial in ensuring this, we are very grateful to the Cabinet for relegating the threat to a myth.

Since the Budget Fair we have had further assurances that the subsidy for our bus service is in the Cabinet's proposed public transport budget but, as other bus services are affected, this is subject to a Consultation with stakeholders. We, and the members of the community, look forward very much to giving our input to this Consultation.

We also had assurances at the Budget Fair and again since that the cabinet's proposed public transport budget is not under threat from any Central government cuts that might be announced in Dec.

We would like to thank the councillors and officers who have worked so hard to allocate funds within a limited budget. We realise there are a few hurdles yet to be overcome but we will continue to monitor any new developments and remain alert to any potential threats. Let us hope that the campaign will not have to be revived between now & February, or again in a year's time.'

The Chairman asked if she had seen the latest consultation document.

Pamela Galloway replied that she had and had emailed Cllr Symonds and Andy Strong to ask for it to be placed on the main consultation area of the website.

Amanda Leon, Radstock Action Group addressed the Panel, a copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

'The papers for this afternoon's meeting reflect the difficult situation faced by the council. We appreciate the current financial problems and would like to highlight some of the issues from the point of view of one component town, particularly as we feel that money could be saved by joined-up thinking.

Recently, Radstock has been subject to a very large number of road works, largely to do with water service improvements and resurfacing. At the same time, B&NES has been debating the future of the Victoria Hall, has commissioned a study



regarding the future of the railway link to Frome and has put out for consultation the proposals for spending £500,000 in the town. Meanwhile, with the at least temporary collapse of the Core Strategy, there are signs that developers will be taking advantage of the absence of planning overview to be making speculative proposals which could damage the character and long-term future prospects of the whole Somer Valley, particularly Radstock and Midsomer Norton.

There are positive signs – B&NES has finally accepted that many of the pedestrian routes are unsafe and speeding on local roads is a danger to all residents and road users. Funds have been earmarked to make welcome improvements to roads and pavements, though we question why these funds are not coming from Highways as they should. The Radstock and Westfield Economic Development Forum, having started up as a means of consulting local people and businesses about the future economic development of the town, has become a secretive group with very little local presence but B&NES wants to give it £100,000 of our money, without any public statements of what it is for.

Parking has become ever more difficult, bus services are expensive and of diminishing reliability, thus ensuring that more and more people either can't go out at all or use their cars to get to work.

We suggest that the budget could be used far more effectively and money saved, if only B&NES would look at the overall picture. Our overarching concern is that, whatever the intentions of the major Resource Plan you are considering today, plus the bus tender issues, on the ground there is a total lack of joined up thinking. And it is places like Radstock which experience the ensuing chaos and uncertainty.

Finally, we welcome the intention to save library services and are currently looking with interest at the proposal to move the Radstock library to the restored Victoria Hall. We also welcome the commitment to the Victoria Hall, and the support that has been given to Youth Services in the past year and we request that this spirit of listening is cultivated and that the council enters into a more regular and structured dialogue with people in Radstock to ensure joined up thinking is introduced.'

George Bailey had submitted a number of questions to the Panel that had been given a written response, a copy of these can be found on the Panel's Minute Book.

The Chairman asked if he wanted any further clarification on the answers he had received.

George Bailey asked what future road works were planned that warranted the movement of the Oak Tree.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that a scheme of road improvements had been agreed by the Cabinet, subject to planning permission. He added that the main reason for proposing to move the tree was that it is not thriving in its current position and that to move it in the timescales proposed gave it the best chance of survival.

Councillor Brian Webber addressed the Panel, a copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

'On 8 October 2012 the Panel received a presentation on the Council's parking strategy and the recent survey of residents' views on the controlled parking zones in Bath. The Panel asked for an update in May 2013.

Members commented on the presentation, but the Panel did not really give the officer a clear menu of issues for consideration, analysis and report back. I would like to suggest the following and invite the Panel to endorse them and remit them to officers for consideration.

The overarching strategy of encouraging people to visit Bath while reducing the need to travel into the city centre by car is obviously right. The work to identify an acceptable site for a Park and Ride to the east of the city and the enlargement of the existing Park and Ride sites need to be progressed with maximum vigour. The forecasts of the supply of/demand for Park and Ride spaces are presumably kept under review. Has there been any change from the forecasts in the February 2012 draft Parking Strategy? It is frequently complained that it is cheaper for a car with a full load of passengers (eg a family) to park in the city centre than to use the Park and Ride. Is the balance of charges right? If not, are any changes envisaged and what would be the financial implications for the Council?'

'Is it the Council's view that the primary purpose of the public highway is the safe and convenient movement of traffic, and that the use of the public highway for parking vehicles is a privilege and not a right? There are a number of ostensibly 2-way streets in Bath (and possibly other towns), which are reduced to single-lane carriageways without passing places because vehicles are parked solidly on both sides of the street (especially in the evenings). Has the Council a systematic plan for dealing with this problem by introducing into these streets double yellow lines at appropriate intervals, and, if so, has this been factored into the estimates of on-street parking capacity?'

The parking zones have been created piecemeal and vary in size, times of operation, balance of supply and demand. The northern mainly residential part of the Central Zone ('Lower Lansdown') was privileged to be included when that was the only Zone, but it is now disadvantaged because it is surrounded by new Zones in which Central Zone residents can no longer seek spaces. Elsewhere, some residents have been left without any on-street parking marooned in isolated 'pockets' between Zones.

The Zone boundaries need to be reviewed. Ideally, Zone boundaries should be natural; have few entry points (in order to minimise signage); be large enough to give residents a wide choice of streets in which to park, but small enough to enable residents to park reasonably near their homes; and have broadly the same ratio of permit holders to spaces.

Could residents of the Central Zone, who are not entitled at present to purchase visitor permits because of the shortage of on-street parking spaces, be permitted to purchase visitor permits exercisable in adjacent Zones?

There may be other aspects of controlled parking zones, which Panel members feel should be examined.'

The Chairman asked if he would like his statement to be submitted to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

Councillor Webber replied that he would.

David Redgewell addressed the Panel. He stated that he was concerned that the Council may be missing out on opportunities regarding the railway and that he was also surprised at the lack of the mention of the Greater Bristol Bus Network within the Medium Term Service & Resource Plan (MTSRP).

He said that the Council had been encouraged by Government Ministers to work closely with Somerset and Wiltshire yet he could find no evidence of that within the MTSRP. He added that cross boundary working was essential.

He also questioned when a report on matters concerning the West of England / Joint Scrutiny suggested by former Councillor Malcolm Hanney would be delivered to the Panel.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that the MTSRP was an overarching budget led report and did not go down into the level of detail specified by Mr Redgewell. He added that he would be happy to supply a further report if required.

He also stated that the Council is well placed for its future plans and that the Department for Transport has acknowledged that we have raised our game over the past few years.

The Chairman thanked all of the speakers for their contributions.

#### **74 MINUTES - 8TH OCTOBER 2012**

The Panel confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting as a true record and they were duly signed by the Chairman.

#### **75 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE**

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Councillor Roger Symonds addressed the Panel. He informed them that he had met with the Councils of Wiltshire and Somerset alongside the Highways Agency to discuss the A46 and the use of HGV's. He said that the talks had been quite positive on how to improve some issues in the area.

He stated that through the work of the Bath Transport Package upgrades to bus stops and shelters were in progress and that the extension to the Odd Down Park & Ride would be in place by the opening of the Christmas Market. He added that it was hoped that the extension to the Lansdown Park & Ride would be ready by March 2013.

The Chairman asked if he could estimate when a Transport Strategy for the Council would be ready.

Councillor Roger Symonds replied that any strategy should be linked to the Public Realm & Movement Strategy and felt that one could be in place within six months to a year.

Councillor Geoff Ward commented that a resident within his ward was unaware that her home was on the site of the proposed interchange for the East of Bath Park & Ride.

Councillor Roger Symonds replied that it was his understanding that the home owner had been approached and that he would follow up on the matter.

The Chairman thanked him for his update.

## **76 BUS TENDER PROCESS**

The Public Transport Team Leader introduced this item to the Panel. He informed them that a tender process was carried out recently for contracts that expire in March 2013, with a total annual value of roughly £450k. He added that in respect of certain contracts, operators advised the Council that they would operate them on a commercial basis after March 2013, so they were not put out to tender. For the remainder, bids were received from 7 operators and the average number of bids per contract was 2.

Analysis of the tenders and consideration of the value of the contracts that would be run commercially shows that the Council would make a saving of £108k per annum. This is a reflection both of competition in the local bus market and the growth of revenue on Sunday bus services, linked to the higher level of retail activity on that day.

The tender also provides an opportunity to improve Service 12 (Bath Bus Station to Haycombe Cemetery), on which the infrastructure is being upgraded as part of the Bath Transport Package, by restoring a peak hour timetable and converting it to low-floor bus operation.

Officers have been asked to consider ways in which revenue support can be provided to maintain the current half-hourly daytime intervals on two core bus corridors:

- (i) Services 6 and 7 (Bath Bus Station to Fairfield Park and Larkhall) – there has been very strong support from the local communities for these services and patronage has grown substantially since half-hourly services were restored in October 2011. However, the more frequent service is not commercially viable yet.
- (ii) Service 1 (Ensleigh to Combe Down) – patronage has declined as MoD staff have relocated from the sites at Ensleigh and Foxhill. If development of the sites is approved, it is likely that patronage will

grow as new dwellings become occupied. A “Section 106” contribution may be sought from any developer to support the bus service at that stage but, in the meantime, a half-hourly interval is not commercially viable.

To fund the measures outlined above it would be necessary to make further savings in the bus revenue support budget, over and above the level indicated. Officers have drawn up a package of options with a total value greater than the savings needed and it will be put out to consultation.

The consultation package will identify those supported services that are not well-used, those that offer poor value for money and those for which there are reasonable alternatives on other bus or train services. Consideration will be given to the opportunities for community transport providers to expand their flexible, demand-responsive services.

It is intended to carry out the consultation between 9 November and 14 December 2012. A summary of the responses will be appended to a Report for decision by the Cabinet in February 2013. A Report will be presented to the Cabinet Member for Transport for a single-member decision in December 2012 to recommend award of many of the new contracts and thus realise the savings from those in April 2013.

The Chairman commented that she felt that the consultation document could be construed as misleading as it was quite wordy and that it did not really stress the importance of the matter. She asked if the 6 / 7 service was still part of this consultation process.

The Public Transport Team Leader replied that he was optimistic that First would eventually pick up these services.

Councillor David Martin asked if he could explain part of the report that referred to ‘community transport’.

The Public Transport Team Leader replied that three dial-a-ride services currently operate within the Council and whether consideration could be given for them to replace some services through either current or additional resources.

Councillor Roger Symonds wished to congratulate the Public Transport Team Leader and associated staff for their work on this matter. He added that main public weekday services between 8.00am – 6.00pm should be at least every 30 minutes.

The Panel **RESOLVED** to;

- (i) Note the report
- (ii) Request that the structure of the introduction to the consultation document and its location on the website be amended.

## 77 PLACE DIRECTORATE - MEDIUM TERM SERVICE & RESOURCE PLAN

Councillor Eleanor Jackson addressed the Panel, a copy of the statement can be found on the Panel's Minute Book, a summary is set out below.

'There are plenty of good reasons for coming along this afternoon and addressing the issues raised by the Medium Term Service Plan and Budget debate. In the plan we have proposals to reduce the amount of money spent on road maintenance, although previous cutbacks mean inferior materials are used now, and potholes are continually re-appearing. Yet thousands of pounds will be needed to top up the HCA grant for an unwanted new road through the centre of Radstock. We have pledged to re-negotiate contracts, though I am fairly sure Malcolm Hanney made these as tight as possible. We also face job losses which inevitably will reduce services to the public, though given the level of interrogation you face when you report a missed collection, I am pretty sure that already they only take action when it is their fault. You sing to Mr Pickles' tune on weekly collections, when the re-cycling is only necessary once a fortnight according to the Timsbury budget fair meeting.'

'Speaking on behalf of the Labour Group I want to draw you attention to the potholes in the policy, and name just a few of our objections:

Charging for car parking in B&NES car parks in important rural retail centres and Keynsham, which we know from sound research, will devastate the fragile high street economy.

The Labour Group will oppose all such moves because Cllr Bellotti's argument that this will get people out of their cars is fallacious given the present state of the bus service. Shoppers will simply go to Frome or Brislington or Cribbs Causeway....

Failing to provide adequate lighting in streets and car parks, so that people dare not go out at night could have a crippling effect on the night time economy.

Cuts in the Planning Department are always a mistake because applications are then not handled within the time limits, cases go to the planning inspectorate for non-determination and we land up with an unsightly, unwanted and uncontrolled development, or even worse, costly judicial reviews.'

'Trying to find toilets in Bath before 9am and after 6pm is a nightmare. Cutting public conveniences is not only a false economy, it means we are deterring tourists. The 'grey pound' is vital to our retail economy but the council is driving it away. The Labour Group is committed to campaigning for more toilets, not less.'

'Much here is half digested bright ideas – haven't the Lib Dems heard of elderly people being ripped off by private sector pest control people? - Whereas the B&NES officers who dealt with rats and wasps in Radstock recently won only highest praise. This sort of thing generates far more goodwill towards the Council than glossy publications. Much is woolly wishful thinking, as on revenue projections. Most is Bath centric and this is unacceptable.'

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport introduced this item to the Panel. He explained that a range and complexity of services were included within the Plan, especially within Environmental Services. He reminded the Panel that where they wish to either increase expenditure or reduce savings targets, alternatives should be proposed.

He stated that all Local Authorities were facing a significant change in the way they operate and that B&NES needs to be innovative and support the priorities it has set itself. He added that a balance had to be struck between the statutory services required under national legislation and the ones deemed to be discretionary.

He suggested that services across the West of England should be more integrated.

He highlighted the three main priority work areas for the Service as follows:

- Core Strategy
- Gypsy & Traveller Site Provision
- Placemaking Strategy

He also spoke of the need to review the management structure of Planning and Transport to ensure that the structure reflects the current priorities of Place Directorate. This would involve close working with Environmental Services to deliver efficient management of services.

Councillor Geoff Ward commented that he felt too much officer time had been spent on the Gypsy & Traveller work because it lacked a clear process to be followed from the start.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that the rules regarding site provision for Gypsies & Travellers changed part way through the process and therefore it became apparent that we needed to start again. He added that with regard to the Core Strategy the Council was now entering a short, sharp period of time when cross party support was going to be vital.

Councillor David Martin asked what implications were there for the service in relation to the Localism Act and Neighbourhood Plans.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that there had been some indication from local groups that they wish to make progress in this area.

Councillor David Martin asked why external contractors were being used to process planning applications.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that the application fees accounted for around half of the budget re: the planning process and as such when the capacity reached a certain level it allowed them to employ external contractors rather than have a full team of staff in place. This was regarded as a flexible budget approach.

The Divisional Director for Environmental Services highlighted some of the elements from within his area of the Plan.

### **Public Protection**

- Save £320,000 over the next two years.
- Reorganise Licensing and Environmental street-based inspection and enforcement staff into multi-functional teams which focus on geographical areas to better co-ordinate staff resources and match times of demand.

### **Neighbourhoods Services**

- Cease providing pest control services where these are provided by Private Sector.
- Cease in-house plant production.
- Concentrate the resources available for public conveniences at locations where there is little alternative provision. This will result in a reduction in a number of Public Conveniences provided.

### **Waste Services**

- Introduce “residents only” permits at Recycling Centres;
- Adjust opening times at Recycling Centres to reflect low use at certain times of the week and create financial headroom.
- Revert back to not collecting refuse at Bank Holidays and catch up in subsequent weeks.
- Confirmation of Government funding to support weekly collections is expected.

### **Highways Maintenance**

- Achieve financial efficiencies through the renegotiation of the highway maintenance contract to secure a rate freeze.
- Verge maintenance programme to be restored.
- LED street lights programme due for completion in March 2013. This will reduce some of our energy costs.



## Parking Services

- Freeze charges in the majority of our existing off-street car parks.
- Increase income to cover the cost of maintaining car parks and parking enforcement across by the district by introducing parking charges into car parks which are currently free of charge;
- Revise charge rates at premium on street locations and increase charges in evenings in order to provide additional funding to invest in environmental and highway initiatives and support the local economy.

The Service Manager for Public Protection, Food & Trading Standards addressed the Panel.

- **Air and Water Quality** – The team are involved in the Low Emission Zone work, declaring air quality action zones required by law where air quality is poor and air quality presents issues.
- **Food Safety and Standards** – Annually 1 million people suffer from foodborne illness in the UK at a cost to the economy of £1.5bn – the number of food businesses in B&NES now exceeds 2000, up 24% in the last 3 years, and up 6% in the last 6 months. For the team infectious disease notifications are increasing which the team investigate. Prevention is a key part of this role because a high % of food poisoning is caused in the home
- **Health & Safety** – Workplace accidents continue to increase - major injuries reported are up by more than 50%
- **Licensing** – This service is required to be cost neutral. The team issue some 3,500 licenses pa,
- **Trading Standards** – Work on under-age sales, and have a key role in safeguarding the vulnerable in particular rogue trader and doorstep crime initiatives. In B&NES we have experienced a 100% increase in rogue trader incidents and distraction burglaries in October.

Savings target – A 30% cut is required through external challenges however the Panel should be aware that Licensing are required to be cost neutral which means that savings made from the process should be returned to the applicant. Savings are not therefore equitable across the service.

Councillor Geoff Ward commented that he was worried by this proposed level of cuts. He asked what would happen if the Council were challenged over its level of resources.

The Service Manager for Public Protection replied that the Council would maintain its legal duty of service. She added that a neighbouring authority had been criticised recently for its lack of resources.

Councillor Geoff Ward asked how the Council would deal with a potential outbreak of food poisoning.

The Service Manager for Public Protection replied that it could potentially struggle if one occurred.

Councillor Geoff Ward asked given the number of new food outlets and the proposed reduction in officers, how would inspections be carried out.

The Service Manager for Public Protection replied that new and poorly rated businesses would be prioritised to minimise the risk of exposure.

The Service Manager for Neighbourhood Services addressed the Panel.

- **Pest Control** – This service will be re-shaped / reduced and will be means tested.
- **Parks Management** – This service will be streamlined. The Nursery will embark on a different way of plant procurement. Community involvement will be further encouraged.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson asked if the Council would consider entering a mutual grass cutting process with Curo.

The Service Manager for Neighbourhood Services replied that he had recently met with the Chief Executive of Curo regarding the confusion over the ownership of some areas of land to ensure both parties were clear. He added that consideration was being given to the possibility of some land swaps to aid this matter.

The Chairman asked if the Panel could be informed which public conveniences were being proposed for closure.

The Divisional Director for Environmental Services replied that he could not provide that information at the present time as the list was at a tentative stage currently.

Councillor Brian Webber asked if it was an advantage to the Council for Bath to be classified as a World Heritage Site despite the costs associated with developing a Management Plan.

The Divisional Director for Planning and Transport replied that he believed it was an accolade to be proud of and was seen as a benefit to the Council.

The Service Manager for Transport and Performance Improvement addressed the Panel.

- **MOT Service** – Expand this work area for fleet vehicles and the public.
- Utilise the in house passenger fleet / possible additional dial-a-ride service.

The Head of Parking Services addressed the Panel.

- **Car Parks** – introduce parking charges into car parks which are currently free of charge.
- **On Street Parking** – Introduce parking charges in Victoria Park.
- **Staff** – Smarter deployment

Councillor Geoff Ward commented that he still concerned at the lack of a proper Parking Strategy.

The Divisional Director for Environmental Services replied that the service now understands its business better than it did 18 months ago. He stated that the service had currently maxed out on its income potential, hence the proposals within the plan.

The Waste Services Manager addressed the Panel.

- **Recycling Centres** – The sites at Welton and Pixash Lane would close for 2.5 days each week. Staff at these sites would then work on rotation.

Councillor Geoff Ward proposed the following recommendation:

The Planning, Transport & Environment Panel have concerns over some of the proposals with the Medium Term Service & Resource Plan and it asks the relevant Cabinet Member(s) to look again at these particular areas;

- (i) Public Protection – What risk would there be to the public and the Council if the staffing levels were reduced as proposed?
- (ii) Public Conveniences – Would the number of available toilets be deemed adequate enough and in the most suitable locations to residents and visitors if the closure proposals were approved?
- (iii) Car Parks – Does the proposal to remove the free parking provision in some areas of the Council pose a significant risk to the viability of local businesses?

Councillor Brian Webber seconded the recommendation.

Three members of the Panel voted in favour of the recommendation, four voted against it and there were no abstentions. The recommendation therefore was not carried.

The Chairman thanked everybody for their participation in the debate.

**78 PANEL WORKPLAN**

The Chairman introduced this item to the Panel.

Some members expressed their concern over the potential number of items listed for January 2013.

The Chairman said that in conjunction with the Vice-Chair and the lead Director they would attempt to streamline it during their discussions at the Agenda Planning Meeting.

The meeting ended at 6.10 pm

Chair(person) .....

Date Confirmed and Signed .....

**Prepared by Democratic Services**

<b>Bath &amp; North East Somerset Council</b>	
<b>MEETING:</b>	Planning Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel
<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	15 January 2013
<b>TITLE:</b>	Urban Gulls
<b>WARD:</b>	ALL
<b>AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM</b>	
<b>List of attachments to this report: None</b>	

## **1 THE ISSUE**

1.1 The Panel has requested an update regarding action being taken to mitigate the impacts of urban gulls in Bath and North East Somerset.

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

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

2.1 Note the report and presentation

2.2 Provide any recommendations for future work having regard to the proposals identified in the MTRSP for the pest control service

### **3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1 The work undertaken by the Pest Control team with respect to urban gulls was estimated to cost approximately £6k in 2011/12. This includes the commissioning of a report on the size and location of the gull population, the flying of a bird of prey, an egg replacement programme for accessible roofs and Officer resourcing in dealing with customer enquiries. This work is funded by a budget of approximately £3.5k and supported by other income generation within the pest control service.

### **4 THE REPORT**

- 4.1 The Panel will be provided with a presentation which will explore the following areas:

#### **The urban gull population in Bath and North East Somerset:**

The Council has monitored the gull population using a consultant ornithologist since 1995. The most recent survey suggests that the growth of the population continues to decrease for the 3<sup>rd</sup> successive year- the current rate is 5.8%. Whilst Bath city centre has historically been the area where the population has been concentrated, there is evidence to suggest that the number of breeding pairs here is decreasing, whilst other areas outside of the centre are now experiencing increases.

#### **What are the Council's statutory obligations with respect to urban gulls including information on the legal constraints placed upon the Council?**

The Council has no statutory responsibility to deal with urban gulls, however the issue continues to have a high profile with residents and businesses.

It is often suggested that the Council could carry out a programme of culling urban gulls. Even if the legislation allowed for this, the practicalities of shooting gulls in a busy city centre which is visited by hundreds of tourists every day are such that this option is unviable. In addition, it is very unlikely that a sufficient level of culling could be achieved to make any long term impact as other birds would soon take up the vacated territories.

#### **What work has been ongoing and what has been the impact of this?**

In addition to officer time, the Council spends money on ornithologist's advice, the flying of a bird of prey prior to the breeding season and an egg replacement programme carried out under a general licence issued by Defra.

During 2012/13 there has also been greater focus on food waste containerisation and a trial of using gull-proof bags by residents in the city centre. This trial has proved successful in helping to keep the streets cleaner and many participants have commented on how the bags have helped in reducing the mess created by animals and birds trying to scavenge household waste.

The slowing of the gull population growth could suggest that these measures have collectively, over a period of time, been making a positive impact. It is also considered that the redevelopment that has taken place in the Southgate and Bath Western Riverside areas of the city have had an impact in reducing breeding pairs

in these areas due to disturbance caused by demolition and building works. Whilst however there is a general reduction, displacement of breeding pairs is now taking place outside of the city centre.

## **The future**

Unfortunately there is no simple solution to the impact of urban gulls. The methods that the Council currently employ are similar to those being used in other local authorities within the region. As this is an issue for cities and towns throughout the Severn Estuary, a more effective response may be to adopt a co-ordinated strategy involving affected local authorities. This might then mitigate the risk that interventions by one local authority to displace gulls may have a detrimental effect on surrounding local authorities.

A further possibility is to support research into finding out the location of the main food sources for gulls. This knowledge would enable limited resources to be targeted in the right places. An application for government funding for research was made in 2010 but this was unsuccessful. Don Foster MP has recently voiced an ambition for funding to come from alternative public and private sector sources.

Unless prevented by legislative changes, it is currently intended to continue the existing interventions to control and monitor the population of gulls in Bath. However these interventions could be affected in the future by the proposals within the Medium Term Service and Resources Plan savings regarding the pest control service.

Additional funding could be made available from the award recently made by the government's Weekly Collections Support Scheme (which is designed to support weekly refuse collections). Subject to Cabinet approval, c. £60K may be used to roll out the use of re-usable bags which would help prevent scavenging of food waste by gulls and reduce cleansing costs.

## **5 RISK MANAGEMENT**

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

## **6 EQUALITIES**

6.1 An EqIA has been completed. No adverse or other significant issues were found.

## **7 CONSULTATION**

7.1 Consultation will be carried out by way of this report.

## **8 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION**

8.1 Customer Focus; Other Legal Considerations

## **9 ADVICE SOUGHT**

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

<b>Contact person</b>	Cathryn Humphries, 01225 477645
<b>Background papers</b>	None
<b>Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format</b>	



<b>Bath &amp; North East Somerset Council</b>	
MEETING:	Planning, Transport & Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel
MEETING DATE:	15 <sup>th</sup> January 2013
TITLE:	B&NES Core Strategy Update
WARD:	ALL
<b>AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM</b>	
<b>List of attachments to this report:</b>	
none	

## **1 THE ISSUE**

- 1.1 The B&NES Core Strategy examination has been suspended in response to concerns raised by the Inspector primarily about the sufficiency of the District's housing land supply. This enables the Council to undertake further work on the Core Strategy including a review of the District's housing need. This review is underway and will lead to changes to the Core Strategy to be considered by Council in February or March 2013.
- 1.2 The other concerns raised by the Inspector relate to the affordable housing policy, clarity on the planning policy for the Recreation Ground, the District Heating policy and the number of pitches required to accommodate the travelling community.

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning, Transport & Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel is asked to note and comment on the progress on the review of the Core Strategy.

### **3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1 The work on the Core Strategy and other planning documents is funded by the Local Development Framework budget. However provision was made by Cabinet in September 2012 to draw down on up to £100k to fund the additional work required on the Core Strategy. This extra funding is required to cover specialist advice and also to ensure the work is completed in as short a time frame as possible.

### **4 THE REPORT**

- 4.1 The key elements of work underway on the Core Strategy are to;

- (1) review the housing requirement, and
- (2) assess the options to increase housing land supply, including the identification of suitable and deliverable sites.

- 4.2 The other main areas of work are to respond to the Inspector's concerns that;

- (3) the existing blanket requirement that 35% of all new housing sites should be 'affordable housing' does not reflect the viability evidence across the district,
- (4) the Council's planning policy for the Recreation Ground set out more clearly,
- (5) the District Heating policy is unjustifiably onerous, and
- (6) the Core Strategy should update the number of pitches required to accommodate the travelling community.

#### **Review of the housing requirement**

- 4.3 The work underway entails;

- reviewing the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) in order to the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that is likely to be needed over the plan period to meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change;
- consideration of the housing delivery shortfall from the existing B&NES Local Plan;
- establishing a 5 year housing land supply with a 20% buffer;
- assessing options to enable flexibility in housing supply in the event that there is any delay to existing sites or growth is greater than anticipated,
- ensuring a 15 year plan period following adoption
- responding to the need for affordable housing and how this influences the total housing requirement.

- 4.4 A key aspect of population and housing growth relate to the level of increase in student numbers and the level of economic growth. Economic growth generates additional employment and hence additional housing need. B&NES, being part of the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), has committed itself to ambitious growth targets.

## Housing Land Supply

- 4.5 NPPF para 47 states that local planning authorities should ensure that their Plans meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area. All sources of supply will need to be reviewed including bringing in empty properties back into use, windfall sites and student accommodation. A key task will be a review of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which is a comprehensive record of the District's housing land supply, primarily sites.
- 4.6 Regarding the assessment of new locations, the NPPF (para 182) requires that the Council will need to demonstrate that it has chosen the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives based on a proportionate evidence base. Sites will be assessed against the requirements of the NPPF and the seven Core Strategy objectives. This includes issues such as environmental impact; deliverability; minimising the need to travel; maximising the use of sustainable transport modes, capacity. The Sustainability Appraisal will be a key tool in comparing options. Other factors to consider are summarised below.
- 4.7 *Infrastructure:* New development must be aligned with provision of infrastructure. The B&NES Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) assesses the quality and capacity of infrastructure within B&NES (including transport, water supply, waste water energy telecommunications, utilities, waste, health, social care, education and flood risk), and its ability to support development. The IDP identifies as far as possible the needs and costs of infrastructure, sources of funding, timescales and responsibilities for delivery and gaps in funding.
- 4.8 *Commuting patterns:* Any new development locations should be those which reduce the need to travel and maximise the opportunities to travel by sustainable modes of Transport. Any changes to the Core Strategy should not exacerbate unsustainable commuting patterns, both within the district and across boundaries.
- 4.9 *Green Belt Review:* Before taking land out the Green Belt, all non-Green Belt options must be considered. In the event that options in the Green Belt need to be considered, a Green Belt review will be required. This will assess the extent to which different locations serve the purposes of the Green Belt as outlined in national policy (NPPF, para 80) and amplified in the draft Core Strategy (table 8). The conclusions of this Green Belt assessment will then need to be balanced against other sustainability considerations.
- 4.10 *Deliverability:* The revised strategy must be deliverable and must facilitate the need to ensure that the district has a 5 yr supply and appropriate buffer (NPPF para 47). Whilst the SHLAA review will take into account the Inspector's concerns about flexibility regarding individual sites, the Council will also need to ensure that there is broad flexibility in the overall strategy and the need for contingency. The NPPF makes it clear that pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking, and requires that sites are deliverable.
- 4.11 The timetable for making changes to the Core Strategy is set out below;

<i>Review housing requirement (SHMA)</i>	<i>Sept to Jan 2013</i>
<i>Develop changes to strategy</i>	<i>Now to Jan 2013</i>
<i>Council agrees changes to Core Strategy</i>	<i>Feb or March 2013</i>
<i>Consult &amp; consider comments</i>	<i>March -April 2013</i>
<i>Resume hearings (Confirm date with Inspectorate)</i>	<i>June 2013</i>
<i>Inspector's Report (Confirm date with Inspectorate)</i>	<i>Oct 2013</i>
<i>Adopt</i>	<i>Dec 2013</i>

#### **4 RISK MANAGEMENT**

- 5.1 A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance. Of particular note is that, despite the changes being made to the Plan, it cannot be guaranteed that the plan will be found sound. Therefore, every effort is being to ensure the Inspector's concerns are addressed in a rigorous way, the changes are substantiated by robust evidence and statutory procedures are closely adhered to.
- 5.2 Until the Core Strategy is amended and adopted, the Council cannot demonstrate a five year land supply and hence is vulnerable to losing appeals on opportunistic planning applications in unsustainable locations.

#### **6 EQUALITIES**

- 6.1 An Equalities Impact Assessment was undertaken and the main issues arising are:
- The further work to be undertaken by the Council to address concerns raised by the Inspector includes an NPPF compliant assessment of the full housing requirement for B&NES. This will identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that is likely to be needed over the plan period which addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community. This will achieve a positive outcome for all equalities groups.
  - As stated in the risk management section above there is a limited risk that the Inspector might still not find the Core Strategy sound and that it will have to be withdrawn. In this scenario there would be potential for adverse impacts for all equalities groups through non-delivery of the many positive impacts of the Core Strategy. Examples include provision of less affordable homes, no policy on housing mix, and no policies promoting a mixed economy.
  - The time available prevents the Council from undertaking extensive public engagement in a way that it would normally do on significant changes. Therefore care will be taken in consultation in March/April 2013 to ensure the vulnerable and target groups have the opportunity to comment on the changes.

## 7 CONSULTATION

- 7.1 *Ward Councillor; Cabinet Member; Parish Council; Town Council; Other B&NES Services; Service Users; Local Residents; Community Interest Groups; Stakeholders/Partners; Other Public Sector Bodies; Section 151 Finance Officer; Monitoring Officer*
- 7.2 Any changes agreed by Council will be subject to at least 6 weeks public consultation in accordance with its Neighbour Planning Protocol. The public comments received on the consultation will be presented to the Inspector at the hearings when they resume in June/July 2013. The limited time available will curtail the extent of community engagement that the Council normally seeks to undertake on such issues but there will be further opportunity for public involvement in the development of site proposals through the Placemaking Plan. Anyone who makes an objection can appear at the hearings and present their case to the Inspector.
- 7.3 The Council also needs to work adjoining authorities in the consideration of any changes to its Core Strategy.

## 8 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

- 8.1 *Social Inclusion; Customer Focus; Sustainability; Human Resources; Property; Young People; Corporate; Other Legal Considerations*

## 9 ADVICE SOUGHT

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

<b>Contact person</b>	<i>David Trigwell (Divisional Director - Planning and Transport, Planning and Transport Development 01225 394125)</i>
<b>Background papers</b>	<i>Draft Core Strategy 2010</i> <i>Inspector's preliminary Conclusions (Ref ID/28)</i> <i>B&amp;NES Response to ID/28 (BNES/39)</i> <i>Inspector's agreement of suspension ( ID/29)</i> <i>National Planning Policy Framework 2012</i>
<b>Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format</b>	

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Bath &amp; North East Somerset Council</b>	
MEETING:	Planning, Transport & Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel
MEETING DATE:	15 <sup>th</sup> January 2013
TITLE:	Placemaking Plan - update
WARD:	ALL
<b>AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM</b>	
<b>List of attachments to this report: None</b>	

## **1 THE ISSUE**

- 1.1 The Placemaking Plan complements the Council's Core Strategy by setting out the development aspirations and the planning requirements for the delivery of key development sites, and updating and reviewing the planning policies used in the determination of planning applications. It is focussed on creating the conditions for better places, and on providing greater clarity to enable the right developments to be delivered.
- 1.2 Within the context of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the Placemaking Plan will ensure a robust and up to date planning policy framework is in place for the period up to 2031. It will be adopted as a Development Plan Document, thereby providing the significant weight in the determination of planning applications.
- 1.3 This paper sets out the objectives of the Placemaking Plan and broadly outlines the key phases in its production.

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

The PTE Scrutiny Panel is asked to note:

- 2.1 That the Placemaking Plan is a key Council document that will help to bring forward much needed development and will enable the Council to be in a stronger position to negotiate and achieve better quality development in the appropriate locations. It will help the Council to robustly defend against inappropriate development that could negatively impact on valued assets or cause harm to interests of acknowledged importance.
- 2.2 The proposed timetable for the different phases of the Placemaking Plan, and considers how it should be engaged in its production.

### **3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 3.1 The development and production of the Placemaking Plan will be funded from within existing council approved budgets.
- 3.2 The adoption of the Placemaking Plan will help to enable the Council to secure local infrastructure enhancements required for development to proceed, and to secure financial contributions towards more strategic projects. Without the Placemaking Plan it will be difficult to secure such benefits, leaving the Council exposed to meeting financial shortfalls.
- 3.3 One of the core aims of the emerging Placemaking Plan is to enable the development of sites to meet housing and employment need. It will do this by providing clarity on the planning and design requirements for sites, which will provided greater certainty on achieving development. This will help to achieve financial contributions to the Council through the Community Infrastructure Levy and New Homes Bonus.

### **4 THE REPORT**

*4.1 Although work on the Placemaking Plan has been underway for some time, its progress has been delayed by the need to suspend the Core Strategy examination and by the need to produce three Concept Statements for Bath's MoD Sites.*

*4.2 The Placemaking Plan Launch Document is currently being produced, with public consultation intended to take place this spring. The intention of the Launch Document is to stimulate debate and discussion about the vision and detailed planning and design requirements for the development areas and sites throughout the district, and to consider the development management policy changes that are required to ensure Bath and North East Somerset has a robust and up to date planning policy framework for the future.*

*4.3 The aims of the Placemaking Plan are to:*

- a. facilitate the delivery of key development sites by providing the necessary level of policy guidance and site requirements to meet Council objectives (e.g. Economic Strategy, and the City of Ideas)*
- b. safeguard and enhance the quality and diversity of places in B&NES and identify opportunities for change.*
- c. set out the housing supply and other development commitments to meet development needs to 2026.*
- d. be prepared in a collaborative way to ensure that it responds to the aspirations of local communities.*
- e. address how infrastructure requirements will be met and other obstacles to delivery of development sites will be overcome. It will update the B&NES Infrastructure Delivery Plan*
- f. be prepared in alignment with the production of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)*



4.4 The key stages in the production of the Placemaking Plan are broadly as follows:

Launch Document	Spring 2013
Issues and alternative options consultation	Autumn 2013
Preferred Options stage	Winter 2013-14
Publication of draft Plan	Summer 2014
Submission to Secretary of State	Winter 2014-15
Hearings	Early Spring 2015
Receipt of Inspector's Report	Late Spring 2015
Adoption	Early Summer 2015

4.5 The production of the Placemaking Plan will entail close working with a wide range of different communities throughout Bath and North East Somerset. Whilst these communities now have the option of producing their own Neighbourhood Plans, as introduced by the Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework, it is envisaged that the Placemaking Plan will be seen by many of these communities as an alternative and more attractive option.

4.6 For these communities, including Parish and Town Councils, engagement in the Placemaking Plan will be a less onerous process than producing their own Neighbourhood Plans, whilst still achieving similar outcomes. For the Council, it will enable a better use of its resources, and ensure comprehensive District wide coverage of planning policy. The Planning Policy team have already been working with the Parish and Town Councils towards this end, with a second workshop planned for 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2013.

## **5 RISK MANAGEMENT**

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

## **6 EQUALITIES**

*a) An EqIA has not been completed as yet, but will be undertaken in parallel with the production of the launch document.*

## **7 CONSULTATION**

7.1 *Section 151 Finance Officer; Chief Executive; Monitoring Officer*

7.2 Consultation, engagement and collaboration on the Placemaking Plan will be undertaken in a wide variety of ways throughout the process towards its adoption. A Consultation and Communication Plan will be produced in parallel with the production of the Launch Document.

## **8 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION**

8.1 *Customer Focus; Sustainability; Young People; Other Legal Considerations*

## 9 ADVICE SOUGHT

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

<b>Contact person</b>	<i>Stephen George (01225) 477524</i> <i>Stephen_george@bathnes.gov.uk</i>
<b>Background papers</b>	<i>None</i>
<b>Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format</b>	

<b>Bath &amp; North East Somerset Council</b>	
<b>MEETING:</b>	<b>Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel</b>
<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> January 2013
<b>TITLE:</b>	Outcome of Bath Transport Conference September 2012
<b>WARD:</b>	Bath Wards
<b>AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM</b>	
<b>List of attachments to this report:</b>	
<b>Appendix A: List of Conference Attendees</b>	
<b>Appendix B: Full transcripts of individual stakeholder contributions</b>	

## **1 THE ISSUE**

1.1 The Panel at their meeting in October asked for a report on the conference held in September 2012 on the need for a Transport Strategy for Bath. This report outlines the agenda for the conference, the main outcomes and the next steps.

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

The Panel is asked to note the report.

## **3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

3.1 The work to develop the strategy is a key priority for the service and will be undertaken by existing staff within the service with minimal use of external consultants. This should be accommodated within existing budgets.

## **4 THE REPORT**

4.1 On 18<sup>th</sup> September 2012 a conference was held to hear what stakeholders' priorities were for a Transport Strategy for Bath. Peter Hendy gave the key note speech which showed how London had successfully developed its wider planning and economic strategies and demonstrating how the City's Transport Strategy provided a key element identify supporting infrastructure for the delivery of the wider vision.

4.2 Those who attended are listed in the attached table at Appendix A. Key stakeholders were asked to provide their three priorities. Full transcripts of their individual contributions are attached at Appendix B.

#### 4.3 The priorities given by each of the key stakeholders were:

##### **FOBRA**

- Reducing through traffic (HGV ban, use of alternatives eg an A36-A46 link and A420)
- Keeping unavoidable through traffic moving on the designated through route (A36)
- Reducing traffic in the centre (eg Queen Square)

##### **Chamber of Commerce**

- P&R on each side of the city
- More and better buses
- Focused development around the railways station – opportunities provided by electrification.

##### **Bath Preservation Trust**

- Comprehensive modelling
- Over-arching strategy but not necessarily one 'grand' solution (see Buchanan)
- Incremental strategic change in agreed direction
- Strong leadership

##### **Bath Cycle Campaign**

- Listen
- Learn
- Join things up!
- Do!

##### **Public Health:**

- Important to increase level of physical activity
- More active life styles have a very positive BCR
- Evidence of these benefits now well established in academic literature

##### **First Bus:**

- Need to show DfT we have a clear plan for the future
- Buses are important to local shopping centres
- Information, information, information!

#### 4.4 There is a recognised need for a clear and succinct articulation of what the Council's transport Strategy should be for Bath. The strategy is key to delivering:

- Economic growth and sustainable development set out in the Councils Draft Core Strategy.
- the development of the Key sites owned by the Council
- Reduced congestion on key routes throughout the City.
- Improved freight delivery in the City.
- Enhanced the quality of life and wellbeing of those who live, work and visit the City.
- Improved Air Quality
- Improved transport opportunities for the community.
- Make a positive contribution to climate change.
- Support the delivery of key sites in the Bath City of Ideas Enterprise Area.
- Support the delivery of the Council's Public Realm and Movement Strategy

#### 4.5 The Council has a very good record in delivering many elements of transport policy although there are some outstanding issues that still need to be addressed. The controlled parking zones in the city have been key elements in reducing traffic and supporting the Council's very successful Park and Ride offer. The implementation of the Bath Transport Package will significantly increase the amount of spaces available for Park and Ride service. The continued investment in local bus facilities through the Greater Bristol Bus Network major scheme and

now the Bath Package will support the continued increase in bus patronage. While the improvements to local rail services through the new Franchise for Great Western Railways and with electrification of the mainline improvement will support the continued growth in rail use into and out of the city.

4.6 There are however some elements of a Bath Strategy which have yet to be finalised or solutions identified. The need for a Park and Ride site to the east is a clear priority, Air Quality remains a serious concern and the intrusive nature of HGVs travelling through the city are issues that need to be addressed.

4.7 Next Steps: Following the conference and subject to resources being available, particularly following finalisation of the Core Strategy where key staff are currently committed, a work programme to develop a new Transport Strategy for Bath will be put in place. It is planned that the Strategy should be subject to public engagement later in the year prior to being finalised and published.

## 5 RISK MANAGEMENT

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

## 6 EQUALITIES

Equalities considerations will be undertaken during the development of the Strategy.

## 7 CONSULTATION

7.1 Further consultation on the strategy will be undertaken in the course of its development.

<b>Contact person</b>	Peter Dawson 01225-395181 peter_dawson@bathnes.gov.uk
<b>Background papers</b>	
<b>Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format</b>	

## Appendix A

### Attendance at Transport Conference

Dorian	Baker	Transport Consultant	Transport Consultant
David	Beeton	Chairman	WHS Steering Group
Ian	Bell	Executive Director	Chamber of Commerce/Executive Director
Sandy	Bell	General Manager	Chamber of Commerce/General Manager
Nick	Brook-Sykes	Chief Executive	Bath Tourism Plus
Henry	Brown	Chairman	FOBRA
John	Bull	Councillor	Bath & N. E. Somerset Council
Neil	Butters	Councillor	Bath & N. E. Somerset Council
Edward	Chorlton	Bath Transport Commission	
Anthony	Clarke	Councillor	Bath & N. E. Somerset Council
Adrian	Clarke	Transportation Policy Team Manager	BANES
Simon	Coombes		Valley Parish Alliance
Andrew	Cooper	City Centre Manager	Bath Future Plus
Charles	Curnock	Footprint Project Director	Bath Abbey
Martin	Curtis	Managing Director	Bath Bus Company
Richard	Daniel		Transition Bath
Justin	Davies	Regional Managing Director	First Group
Barbara	Davies	Head of Infrastructure and Place	WoE LEP
Adrian	Davis	Public Health Consultant	Public Health Consultant
Peter	Dawson	Group Manager	BANES
Malcolm	Dodds	Chairman	Bath City Cycle Campaign
Jeremy	Douch	Technical Director	Mayer Brown
Peter	Duppa-Miller	Secretary to Local Councils Association	Parish Liaison
Gordon	Edwards	Director	TravelWatch
Richard	Fry	National Chairman	Road Hauliers Association
Stephen	George	Senior Planning Policy Officer	BANES
Mike	Greedy	Rail Passenger Manager	First Great Western
Don	Grimes		B& NES Green Party
Nick	Helps	Senior Transport Planner	BANES
Marc	Higgins	Business Development Manager	Sport & Active Leisure
Fergus	Hobbs		Landowners Forum
Roger	Houghton	Transition Bath	
Duncan	Hounsell		Saltford Station campaign
Andy	House	Head of Estates	RUH
Patrick	Hutton	Chairman	Bath Heritage Watchdog
Caroline	Kay	Chief Executive	Bath Preservation Trust
John	Knight		Bath Taxis
Angela	Ladd	Chair/Federation of Small Businesses	Small Business Focus
Pat	Lunt	Chair	Bath Bus User Group
Ken	McCulloch	Property & Facilities Manager	Future Publishing
Owen	McNeir	Development & Marketing Director	Bath Festivals Trust
Derek	Merkl		Bath Bid
Peter	Metcalfe		Transition Bath

David	Metcalfe	Executive Group Member	Cultural Forum for the Bath Area
Mark	Millar	Chief Executive	Future Publishing
John	Myers		It's a wonderful life
James	Page	Estates Manager	Bath Spa University
Caroline	Roberts	Councillor	Lib Dem Group
Patrick	Rotherham	Transport Lead	FOBRA - Transport Lead
Rhodri	Samuel	Regeneration Manager	BANES
Rab	Smith	Transportation Policy Team Leader	BANES
Robin	Spalding	Environmental Monitoring Officer	BANES
Robert	Spriggs	Transport Director	Callidus Group
Sean	Stephenson	Estates Manager	City of Bath College
Gareth	Stevens	Regional Development Manager	First Group
David	Stuart	Historic Areas Advisor	English Heritage
Malcolm	Summerville	Estates Manager	RNHRD
Laurence	Swan		Bath Bid
Roger	Symonds	Cabinet Member for Transport	BANES
Ken	Taylor		Bath Taxi Owners Federation
Ed	Thomas	Head of Communications	Arriva Trains UK Limited
Vaughan	Thompson	Director/Place Studio	Place Studio
Michael	Thompson	Facilitator	Design Connect
Martin	Tressider	Senior Project Manager	Multi Development UK Ltd
David	Trigwell	Divisional Director	BANES
Jon	Usher	Local Network Co-ordinator	Sustrans
Richard	Wales	Chairman Widcombe Assoc.	FOBRA - Widcombe Association
Tim	Warren	Councillor	Bath & N. E. Somerset Council
Martyn	Whalley	Director of Estates	University of Bath
Nigel	Williams	Press/Publicity	Cycling Bath

## Appendix B

### Transcript of stakeholder contributions:

<b>Residents</b>	Patrick Rotheram - FOBRA
<b>Business</b>	Ian Bell, Chamber of Commerce
<b>Heritage</b>	Caroline Kay, Bath Preservation Trust
<b>Cyclists</b>	Malcolm Dodds, Bath Cycle Group
<b>Health</b>	Adrian Davis, Public Health
<b>Buses</b>	Justin Davies, First Group

#### 1/ **RESIDENTS - Patrick Rotheram**

I hope this is the start of a very important process for the city.

So what's the problem?

Traffic

Dominating the WH Site and through congestion, visual degradation, noise and smell

Traffic damaging historic buildings through vibration and air pollution damaging the health of residents and visitors.

Typical Bath traffic images show everyday traffic. This is a ridiculous situation in a world heritage site.

A good example of how other places do it better – La Rochelle.

On to air pollution. The Council's Air quality action Plan – 'nicknamed the 'corridor of death' slide shows the nitrogen dioxide concentrations in Bath. Anywhere that red or darker is above the legal health safety limit set by WHO, EU Commission and British government legislation.

These are estimated levels but the picture is clear enough. These levels of air pollution are seriously damaging to health. Some 8,500 people live in the affected area and they are likely to suffer lung and heart problems and in some cases, early death as a result of air pollution. It's not getting any better. The Air Quality Action Plan already covers the entire road network in Bath. It recently had to extend it to the surplus area in the last plan. These are ten year charts of pollution and it shows they are not improving and there is no downward trend, though maybe even an upward one.

Th is despite a reduction in some actual traffic numbers

And I think what we are seeing is the congestion due to bottlenecks. Research is beginning to show that modern diesel cars produce more NO<sub>2</sub> – so technology is not going to save us from this

#### **So what needs to happen?**

Well we think it needs to start with a vision of what Bath ought to b like. Our vision: the city centre largely traffic free with the PRMS fully implemented, which will give us vibrant public places. We would like to see reduced through traffic to reduce traffic in he city as a whole, and overall a high quality environment with good air quality.

#### **How do we get to there from here?**

We need an integrated transport plan for the whole city. This should include specific, measurable objectives not just statements of policy or intent. York is an excellent example as a similar sort of city and their Plan is a model in my view.

What it needs to cover?

Echoing what Peter Hendy said, it needs to be based on land use and development as envisioned in the core strategy. We need to protect the heritage assets and cover all aspects of transport including parking, as every parking space in the city creates a vehicle to come and use it.

And critically it needs to allow access. Access for all types of people who come into the city – traders, workers, residents, deliveries – everything that makes he city work.

I would like to suggest a few key objectives of a plan. One is to take out through traffic. The Council is attempting to get an HGV ban for lorries over 18 tonnes on Bathfleet Street which has been opposed by Wiltshire. We will see what happens but particularly we need to look at the use of alternatives for coming through Bath such as an A40/A36 Link. And why is the A420 not our Northern Bypass. It's an underused road with very little population along it.

Secondly, where we do have to have through traffic, it needs to be kept moving on the designated through route – the A36 Lower Bristol Road. There is no transport plan for all the development that is foreseen for the Western Riverside development in the Core Strategy.

Lastly – reducing traffic in the city centre. I show an example of Queen's Square. Queen's Square is where all the traffic in Bath intersects. It happens to also be the roots of Georgian Bath and it needs to be tackled. Bristol has shown the way with Queen's Square in Bristol turned from a major through route to a marvellous oasis in the middle of town. It wouldn't require huge infrastructure spending to achieve that.



## **Conclusion**

We need a Transport Plan. UNESCO Guardian of our World Heritage Site status say we should have one. Let's get on with it.

## **2/ BUSINESS Ian Bell Chamber of Commerce**

Without commerce there is nothing. In the words of the great Jacob Rees-Mogg the MP for North East Somerset "Without business we would still be living in mottle and daub houses". And without transport of course, there is no commerce. So the business community very rightly concerned, as the residents are, about this topic. And of course transport touches every aspect of our lives.

We as Peter has already been talking, are very interested in generating economic growth for a whole variety of reasons.

More better jobs so that as many people in our community can live the sorts of lives they actually want to live That requires a variety of things including places for those jobs, and places for those people to live.

Where are those places going to be? That is going to be significant as far as transport is concerned. Some of them may be close by. Some people can walk in but doubtless we will still rely on a good number of people coming into the city to work from outside.

So there are a lot of questions to be asked and I fell back on our old friend Rudyard Kipling. He said of his six honest serving men, that they taught him all he knew..

"Their names are What and Why and When  
And How and Where and Who."

So, what are the journeys that people need to make? Why are they making them? When are they travelling? How are they travelling? Where are they going and who are they?

So, Bath is, and will continue to be in future, the economic engine of the district. You can talk about growth happening in Radstock, Midsommer Norton and the rural areas, but when it comes to Bath, it will be the economic engine. And so when it comes to things like office space demand for the centre of Bath, that is where we all want to be . And of course it is line with concept of Bath as a city of Ideas. Great idea. And those businesses who represent that sort of idea here want to be there in modern, well-connected offices with good wifi, fast broadband and so on.

And, they want to be close to the railway station because they want fast and reliable links in and out of Bristol, for workers and for customers, and of course good links up and down to London. Ironically, if we reduce the amount of existing office space, developers are more likely to come forward with schemes that produce those kinds of offices. But our question then would be, where would they go? One of the good places they might go would be Avon Street Car Park close to the station and in the centre of Bath. But we would be mad to do that if we did not give people an alternative and attractive way of getting into the city. That means it calls for Park & Rides on all sides of the city. All large capacity working for longer hours, seven days a week. And serviced by reliable and frequent buses. The buses buses need to be clean, attractive, modern, and ideally with things like wifi on bard. I know there are plans to bring that into place in different areas.

One of problems is that we have an element of uncertainty since the work on the Core Strategy will take longer than hoped. But there are still some things that are certain. We have got an Enterprise Area along the riverside. What should we be doing to get that moving? In our opinion there is no time to lose as the Enterprise Zone in Bristol is almost up and running and it will suck in inward investment like a huge black hole. We need to get out attractive story straight and transport is an important part of that.

Inward investors like fast trains to London, but they also like proximity to Bristol Airport and we currently don't make that journey as easy as it might be. Visitors like being able to drive up to the door of their hotels even if it is only to drop off their luggage and that is not always possible. Shoppers like to buy things but they could b put off at the prospect of lugging their purchases around with them all day. Might there be a way for dropping things off for collection at the Park and Rides? Business is already starting to make use of the Freight Consolidation Centre doing something to reduce the number of big lorries coming into the city centre. We can be smarter about ways of doing that.

And of course, businesses themselves can think about transport plans, helping with walking, bikes and car clubs. They all have a part to play. But we really cannot ignore the law of the personal car. And in the short

to medium term we have to factor that behaviour into our thinking. Those behaviours might change over time, but it will take some time.

Trains also have a part to play but that means a huge investment in the electrification of the line which is going to speed up journeys between here and London. That won't make it easier, we think, to increase the number of local services because we have put in millions to reduce the time between major urban centres people don't want Thomas the Tank Engine trundling along and slowing down the fast expresses.

Those are long-term aspirations and here and now we need to look at ways to make improvements we can afford, we can make applications for sub-regional financial support and we should already be thinking about our next bid for national funding. Bath's Transportation Package 2 if you like.

Above all as other people have said, let's not go for a quick fix, but a long-term strategic programme that we can all support.

### **3/ HERITAGE**

#### **Caroline Kay**

I would just like, as a starter, to say that mention was made in a question earlier of people being against economic development. I want to make absolutely clear that if anyone was thinking that was the Trust, that is not the case. We work as, Mr Hendy suggested earlier, with the need for sustainable development, but you need to do it well and you need to have the consensus of the community to take it with you.

You will be unsurprised that I might take an historical perspective. There is nothing new to pictures of traffic jams in Bath. Here are two from the 30's and 60's. In the Thirties the Plan was the so-called 'Bath Bill' which didn't go through and which involved knocking down large parts of the upper Georgian Town to let the motorcar go through. In the Sixties there was the 'Buchanan Plan'.

Here we have Christmas traffic jam in 1981 – Avon Street Car Park full at 10:30 in the Morning. Park and Rides were the 1980's solution. And there is Dorchester Street in 2001. And we all know the major development around Dorchester Street has solved all the problems! Nothing is really new about transport problems. And the problem is not Bath. The problem is the car and its relationship with Bath. If we think what we have in Bath which is a Roman city overlaid with a mediaeval city with Georgian city stuck on the top of that, it is not surprising there are challenges, but my thesis would be that a number of the reasons that earlier big schemes went wrong is that they tried to pretend that Bath was not Bath. They tried therefore radically to change Bath in order to achieve a transport objective. This is one of my favourite quotations:

*"Many people in Bath will be expecting straightforward understandable proposals for highway improvements and car parks – proposals which will solve all the City's traffic problems within a reasonably short period of time. Unhappily there is no prospect whatever of such expectations being gratified."*

That is about the second paragraph of the 180 page report by Buchanan in 1965. It is a very good, intelligent read. Come to the Bath Preservation Trust's archive and see that and all the related papers. But what Buchanan is mostly remembered and for what came out of that report was the Buchanan tunnel. This sat around not happening for about seven years; caused a great deal of controversy – here is an artist's impression of where the Western exit of the tunnel would come out across Royal Avenue – and you can see why it caused problems. There is however, a lot of sense in what Buchanan has to say, and I don't see that quotation as a council of despair. I see it as a sensible warning against thinking that any one personal politician at one time will come up with the one magic solution that will make it all alright.

So we have heard what the problems are and from a heritage perspective there is the pollution which affects people and buildings. There is congestion which primarily affects people's enjoyment and access of the heritage city and the significant effect of cars and lorries sitting still and vibrating. If you doubt that go and look at what's happening at the north end of Pultney Bridge where there are some cracks opening because of buses sitting rumbling at the traffic lights.

So what do you do about that? We need to really good modelling and I can't believe it's beyond the engineers' capacity at Bath University to develop something that you can feed live data into. And then you have to listen to what that modelling says. The Eastern Park & Ride proposals which were a large number of supporting documents might have achieved certain things, but it was certainly clear from the modelling information that one of the problems it wasn't going to solve was the congestion on the London Road. Because the London Road is at saturation, it said that would carry on and hold some cars but it wouldn't solve the congestion on London Road. So the politicians need not to overstate what the modelling says.

Then you need an overarching strategy but the point of the Buchanan quote is that it is not necessarily one grand solution that is going to make it all better.

And then I was really interested in the points about political consensus. You really need to be able incrementally to be able to implement that strategic change in that agreed direction and you need strong leadership to do it.

#### **4/ CYCLISTS**

##### **Malcolm Dodds**

I am Chair of Cycle Bath, Bath's cycling campaign and I wanted to start with some pictures. These are some pictures of what cycling in Bath should be like. I think this is the test. If you felt happy to cycle around Bath with your child on the back of the bicycle you would know that Bath was a place for cycling. The cyclists I am showing look, calm and elegant. They look safe and relaxed. They look like they belong in the city centre.

A few years ago the Bath Cycling Campaign produced the 'Bath Cycling Manifesto'. I want to emphasise that making things better for cyclists in Bath is a package. It's not one of the elements I am showing. It is all of them. I want to draw your attention to a couple of them:

- *Improve the environment for cycling – convenient, attractive, safe infrastructure*

I put more emphasis on convenient and attractive.

More than ten years ago there was a great plan for improving cycling in Bath. Here it is. A network of cycle routes that cover the city and took people from the suburbs into the city centre. Ten years on, how much is there of that on the ground?

Another perspective about pace:

- *Make sure policies encourage cycling and remove barriers – and get resourced and implemented*

I gave a talk for a group of Councillors more than five years ago. And this is one of the slides I used five years ago and unfortunately, I think the problems there are just as pertinent today as they were five years ago.

So here we are - the Bath Cycling Manifesto:

- Get more people cycling in Bath, conveniently, frequently, safely – providing a viable alternative to car use
- *Improve the environment for cycling – convenient, attractive, safe infrastructure*
- Provide residents with encouragement to cycle more by developing confidence and skills and providing information and incentives
- *Make sure policies encourage cycling and remove barriers – and get resourced and implemented*

These aren't actually our four priorities but if you want to sum up what cyclists want in Bath these do as good a job as anything.

I was very interested in one of Peter Hendy's slides which showed how TfL can measure what progress is being made. I think that is a real weakness in the Council's transport policy. I have chosen a flat route measure of what has happened over the last year in terms of change to the cycling, but if you look across a broader range of measures, rag rate them you can see that red dominates.

These are our priorities. There are four rather than three. I want the Council to listen to what cyclists who live in and actively cycle in Bath think about cycling and listen to our experience. I want the Council to learn from other places. Bristol, Oxford, Cambridge, York. The photographs I used earlier were taken in Padua in the summer. Historic Italian city, mediaeval road layout, cobbled stones. And yet the city centre is a fantastic place to cycle.

Join things up but above all, 'do'.

## 5/ HEALTH

### Adrian Davis

I work for the public health Directorate in Bristol representing across the Sub-Region. I am a specialist on transport and health and I have been trying to help out across the sub-region in terms of where we go with transport policy. The first thing to say is that if we don't support the health of population, it costs society huge amounts of money. We know from the CBI that we lose about £17.4bn per year through absenteeism. About a third of that absenteeism is due to things like the common cold. Why is that? Because such a high percentage of the population are physically inactive. About 95% of the adult population don't do enough physical activity to look after their health. People's immune function is lower and they are more susceptible to things like the common cold and people do not turn up to work in large numbers as a result.

You cannot see transport as an isolated entity. It is part of public policy and has to be integrated with other areas of public policy. I want to flag up in the academic literature, for the last 20 years, increasingly in the last 15, from across the world, where we have turned our attention to look at the relationship between transport and health shows that you really need to increase the amount of walking and cycling we have in our country.

Places like Padua always come with a fact that they have about 30% share for things like cycling it is often higher. We are so far behind, not least because what happened with the Buchanan report and interpretation that we should make more room in our cities for cars.

The benefits of increasing walking and cycling far outweigh the dis-benefits and that includes the risk of injury which we must take into account.

The point about increasing walking and cycling levels, and one of the critical aspects is there is a huge suppressed demand for walking and cycling. But the number one that stops you as a parent or as you yourself is the fear. Transport leads to enormous amount of fear when they think about walking and cycling so they just don't do it. If they have the option they get in the car even for short journeys. Year after year if you look at the National Travel Survey, you see that levels of walking and cycling go down and the number of short trips by cars increases inexorably.

The value for money question cannot be ignored. We know that there is unequivocal economic justification for investment to facilitate walking and cycling. Yet, if we look back in history since Buchanan we know it has largely been ignored and I am glad that Peter Hendy talked about the big push in London to promote cycling. It makes sense for the economy of cities and for the health and well-being of citizens.

When we talk in technical jargon we talk about BCRs – Benefit-to-cost-ratios. This shows that if you are investing £1 in transport schemes almost invariably the best schemes for BCR are walking and cycling schemes. Why? Because they reduce the burden on the national health service and they reduce the burden on society. People live longer and live healthier lives.

The last point is if we are thinking about the Council alone and as Peter Hendy mentioned, you need to involve a lot of stakeholders, and others involved in developing a transport strategy. But Councils in general, not being specific to Bath here, are very silo orientated. We need leaders of Council and Executives in charge of the various portfolios to understand that if we do things in transport they have implications for other areas and other areas also need to think about transport.

Just an example. I chose education. We need to understand the importance of physical activity for our children. I come back to my point about fear as the reason why so many children are shuttled around in cars. Parents fear for the safety of their children and yet we need to get our children to be more physically active. The win-win situation in education is that we now have very strong scientific evidence that there is a causal relationship between physical activity and academic performance. It is not a correlation. It is a causal relationship. The more physical activity you do the better the human body works. Education departments should be supporting transport that promotes a more physically active lifestyle.

I have been talking from a public health perspective. I could have shown many other slides that show other perspectives. I wanted to pick three that focus on the uplift of physical activity through active travel. It is the most obvious way to increase the appallingly low levels of physical activity we have. If you don't think that links to transport, I am not quite sure what you would need to convince you as this is the obvious way. Chief Medical Officers across the developed world say that the number one way to get the population physically active is to root in physical activity. Walking and cycling for short journeys including walking and cycling linked to public transport for longer journeys. It is not a total solution, but is a solution that has been ignored for fifty years.

## 6/ BUSES

### **Justin Davies**

The whole point of the conversation today is about forming a long-term partnership for a strategy and getting things right for Bath. I think that is very, very important. There is a lot of change taking place in the wider economic picture and especially in my industry and for everyone involved in it. That is going to mean there better and different funding solutions becoming available. The only way it is possible to mine those is by having good strong partnerships and being able to show the Department of Transport you have a clear plan about what you want to deliver over the longer term and indeed, in the short term and that you actually deliver it. The only way to do that is to do that together.

Buses are extremely important for the local economy. They carry the vast numbers of public transport customers. We carry the people. Buses are also very important of people getting into shopping centres and places like that. Something like 22-25% of people arriving into a shopping centre arrive by Bus. Therefore we are important and that is excluding the Park and Ride system.

We can support the reduction of congestion, but equally, we have to be given the space to do our job in. If we don't have the space to do our job, then we can't achieve what we need to be. That is to be reliable and punctual each and every time we try to make a journey. And I believe that Bath quite clearly has a unique opportunity given the type of city that it is and given the number of people who want to visit this historic place. Both to enjoy the sights and to come and work – to come and engage with economic activity. What we need to do is ensure that the people who come in here not understanding what they can do and how they can easily link their journeys, are able to do that in a way that enables the city to breath; that enables the city to expand and develop, and which also ensures that when they go away from the city, they have a view of the city that is a positive one. And one that enables them to say, "That is what is good about Bath".

If I listen to people who go to Cambridge and other places they tell me how easy it was to get in by Park & Ride, or other forms of bus service. And that is what we need Bath to be about. We need people talking in a positive aspect.

How do we power that future. We can do that in many different ways. We have got to make sure that everyone can purchase a ticket easily and travel around in as easy a way as possible. There are all sorts of smart ticketing that are, or are about to be available.

The key here is to make sure that you buy the long-term solution and not the short-term solution. You don't buy the Betamax, you buy the proper version. That is very important. Let's make sure we do that.

We have already extended the Park & Ride service recently. The opportunity is to grow that more and more. How do we make that in such a way that everyone wants to use it, both local and national, and it becomes a talking point for people about Bath? The bus is integral to the future success of Bath and I have three mantras. These are information, information and information. People need to know what they can do with public transport, how they access it and where they can get it from. In electronic form, paper form or whatever form we can give it to people.

Lastly, but not least, how do we buy and how do we power the future? We will shortly be introducing hybrid buses into Bath on the Park and Ride services. The vehicles that I buy probably have a fifteen year life. We need to get it right now about how we are going to power our buses in future. Are we going to be an electric city or some other form of propulsion system. But, if we grasp that opportunity here in Bath it becomes another talking point of the success of Bath and that is what we can achieve if we have a good, proper transport policy for this place.

This page is intentionally left blank

**BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL**

**PLANNING, TRANSPORT & ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT  
AND SCRUTINY PANEL**

**Tuesday, 15<sup>th</sup> January 2012**

**Highways Agency – Council involvement on speed limits**

The Highways Agency is an executive agency of the Department for Transport (DfT). Their role is to help support the sustainability of the UK's economy by operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network in England on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport.

The strategic road network in England is some 4,300 miles long and is made up of motorways and trunk roads. While only two per cent of all roads in England by length, it carries a third of all traffic by mileage and two thirds of all heavy goods vehicle mileage, making it the economic backbone of the country.

In recognition of its important role in the transport network, the West of England partner authorities have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Highways Agency for the purpose of promoting effective co-ordination and co-operations between the two organisations, with meetings held on a regular basis. For more details click on the link below:

<http://www.westofengland.org/media/206984/signed%20mou%20ha%20and%20wep.pdf>

The Highway Agency is the Highway Authority with responsibility for setting speed limits on the strategic road network including the A46 and the A36 to east and south of Bath (Fig 1)

The Highways Agency consults the Council on new speed limits proposed on the A46 and A36 Trunk Roads in Bath and North East Somerset as part of the Speed Limit Order statutory order making process under the 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act.

Approximately 5% of road casualties in B&NES occur on the Trunk Road network. A route safety study on the A36 Trunk Road was completed in December 2008 by the Highway Agency and a 50mph speed limit recommended on the Bath – Claverton section, but the speed limit has not been implemented to date due to lack of available funding.

An A46 Route Safety Study was undertaken by the Highway Agency in 2011 and recommended signing and road marking improvements and high friction surface on the route. No changes to the speed limit on the A46 are proposed. The Council has recently met the Highways Agency to support the early introduction of road safety measures on the A46 at which the Highways Agency agreed to erect Vehicle Activated Signs displaying the double bend sign with the text 'SLOW Down' or 'SLOW' and widened hatched centre lines at Hartley Bends to help reduce traffic speeds on the route subject to funds being available.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **20mph Speed Limits in Residential Roads – Update**

**Briefing Note for Planning Transport & Environment P D S Panel,  
15 January 2013**

**Author: Nick Jeanes, Team Leader Traffic & Safety**

### **1. Background**

1.1 On 11<sup>th</sup> April 2012 Cabinet approved a 2 year programme to implement 20mph limits in residential roads throughout Bath & North East Somerset. A funding item of £500,000 was allocated for this work, and a nominal timescale indicated, which showed the project being rolled out progressively through 14 defined areas within the urban areas and larger villages, and a 15<sup>th</sup> phase to cover residential roads in all the smaller villages, to be completed by the end of 2013.

1.2 A briefing note was tabled at the Planning Transport and Environment PDS Panel on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2012 giving details of funding and consultation issues, and outlining the progress to date. This current report is to give a further update on progress.

### **2. Progress to Date**

2.1 Although there was some delay in initiating the scheme due to cost issues, the first area Traffic Regulation Order (Twerton/Southdown) became operative on 24 September 2012, and the remaining area TROs are now being progressed as proposed. Appendix 1 shows the current status of all the areas. This document is also on a generic 20mph Speed Limit page on the Bath & North East Somerset website, which can be found via 'T' on the website A-Z. It is regularly updated and will form the basis of future updates on the 20mph project.

2.2 Due to the requirements of the Traffic Regulation Order process and a larger than anticipated response to the consultation only areas 1 and 2 (Twerton and Peasedown) will be completed on site during 2012/13. The remainder of the programme is scheduled to complete in the order listed during 2013/14.

2.3 The consultation results from Areas 3, 4 and 5 have indicated support for the new speed limit and officers are currently designing the scheme and drafting the TRO.

2.4 The consultation results from Areas 6 and 7 are currently being evaluated.

### **3. Funding**

3.1 Accounts for the first phase of the project (Area 1) are yet to be received.

3.2 It was previously established that the £500,000 funding made available for the scheme would not be enough to implement it in full. Accordingly, a sum of £70,000 has been indicated in the draft 2013/14 Transport Capital Programme, however this has yet to be approved.

#### **4. Spreading the 20 Message**

4.1 The previous report highlighted the need to influence driver behaviour through education and publicity initiatives. The use of softer measures similar to those proposed by Bristol City Council has been investigated, but no conclusion drawn at the present time. However it is recognised that many professional drivers who use the residential network can be canvassed, and reminded of, the new speed limits as they are introduced, including bus drivers, taxi drivers, and, importantly, the Council's own fleet drivers and Officers. The Traffic & Safety Team will be working with these sectors to ensure the correct message is conveyed to them. Currently, Road Safety Officers are liaising with local driving instructors to ensure they are aware of the 20mph roll-out programme, and are instructing learner drivers appropriately.

#### **5. Monitoring**

5.1 It is proposed to carry out 'after' surveys of both vehicle speeds and injury accident records, to compare with data collected before each 20 TRO is introduced. The speed surveys will be carried out approximately 6 months after each 20 area becomes 'live', and accident comparisons carried out 1 year and 3 years after implementation, which is the norm for traffic schemes. This information will be reported in due course. It is also proposed to carry out customer satisfaction surveys, however the form and timescale for these has not yet been established.



This page is intentionally left blank

Scheme ref	AREA	Leaflet distributed	Leaflet return date	Proposal supported	Order advertised	Deadline for responses	Cabinet decision	Speed limit operational
1	Twerton	13/02/12	02/03/12	Yes	07/06/12	28/06/12	01/08/12 Proceed	24/09/12
2	Peasedown St John	26/07/12	24/08/12	Yes	30/11/12	20/12/12		
3	Newbridge/Weston/ Lansdown(part)/ Kingsmead(part)	15/08/2012	17/09/12	Yes				
4	Keynsham	28/08/12	10/10/12	Yes				
5	Westmoreland/Oldfield/ Lyncombe(part)/ Widcombe(part)	20/09/12	10/10/12	Yes				
6	Midsomer Norton	12/10/12	07/11/12					
7	Radstock/Westfield	21/11/12	21/12/12					
8	Walcot/Lansdown/ Lambridge(part)	10/12/12	14/01/13					
9	Abbey/Kingsmead(part)							
10	Batheaston/Bathampton/ Bathford							
11	Odd Down/Combe Down							
12	Saltford							
13	Lyncombe(part)/ Widcombe(part)							
14	Bathwick							
15	Other residential areas in rural villages							

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Bath &amp; North East Somerset Council</b>	
<b>MEETING: PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT &amp; SCRUTINY PANEL</b>	
MEETING DATE:	<b>15<sup>th</sup> January 2013</b>
TITLE:	<b>WORKPLAN FOR 2013/14</b>
WARD:	All
<b>AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM</b>	
<b>List of attachments to this report:</b>	
Appendix 1 – Panel Workplan	

**1 THE ISSUE**

- 1.1 This report presents the latest workplan for the Panel (Appendix 1).
- 1.2 The Panel is required to set out its thoughts/plans for their future workload, in order to feed into cross-Panel discussions between Chairs and Vice-chairs - to ensure there is no duplication, and to share resources appropriately where required.

**2 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 The Panel is recommended to
  - (a) consider the range of items that could be part of their Workplan for 2013/14.

**3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

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

## 4 THE REPORT

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

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

4.2 The workplan helps the Panel

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

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

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

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



- 4.4 There are a wide range of people and sources of potential work plan items that Panel members can use. The Panel can also use several different ways of working to deal with the items on the workplan. Some issues may be sufficiently substantial to require a more in-depth form of investigation.
- 4.5 Suggestions for more in-depth types of investigations, such as a project/review or a scrutiny inquiry day, may benefit from being presented to the Panel in more detail.
- 4.6 When considering the workplan on a meeting-by-meeting level, Councillors should also bear in mind the management of the meetings - the issues to be addressed will partially determine the timetabling and format of the meetings, and whether, for example, any contributors or additional information is required.

## 5 RISK MANAGEMENT

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

## 6 EQUALITIES

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

## 7 CONSULTATION

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

## 8 ADVICE SOUGHT

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

<b>Contact person</b>	Michaela Gay, Democratic Services Officer. Tel 01225 394411
<b>Background papers</b>	None
<b>Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format</b>	

This page is intentionally left blank

**Planning, Transport and Environment Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel Workplan**

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Director	Report Author	Format of Item	Requested By	Notes
<b>26<sup>th</sup> July 2011</b>	Bath Transport Package	GC	Peter Dawson	Report		
	Green Spaces Strategy Update	GC	Graham Evans	Report		
	Community Infrastructure Levy / Section 106	GC	Simon de Beer	Report		
	Food Waste Recycling Collections Update	GC	Carol Maclellan	Briefing		
	Cabinet Member Response to Commercial Waste Collection Single Inquiry Day	GC	Lauren Rushen	Report		
	Sustainable Growth Agenda (inc Housing)	JB	John Betty	Report		
	Cabinet Member Update			Verbal		
<b>13<sup>th</sup> Sept 2011</b>						
	Bath Parking Strategy	GC	Adrian Clarke	Report	Panel on 26/7/11	
	Integrated Transport Authority	GC	Peter Dawson	Presentation		
	Subsidised Bus Services	GC	Andy Strong	Briefing		
	Draft Core Strategy	GC	David Trigwell / Simon de Beer	Report	Panel on 26/7/11	
	Emerging Provision Strategy for Public Toilets	GC	Matthew Smith / Kate Hobson	Report		
	Cabinet Member Update					

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Director	Report Author	Format of Item	Requested By	Notes
<b>8<sup>th</sup> Nov 2011</b>						
	Cabinet Member Update					
	Community Infrastructure Levy / Section 106 Update	GC	Simon de Beer	Verbal	Panel on 26/7/11	
	Gypsies & Travellers Plan: Issue & Options Consultation & "Call for Sites"	GC	Simon de Beer	Report		
	Local Sustainable Transport Fund	GC	Adrian Clarke	Presentation		
<b>6<sup>th</sup> Dec 2011</b>						
	Article 4 Direction (Student Housing – HMO)	GC	Simon de Beer	Report		
	Medium Term Service and Resource Plans	GC	Glen Chipp	Report		
<b>17<sup>th</sup> Jan 2012</b>						
	Cabinet Member Update					
	Planning & Transport Development – Service Action Plan	GC	David Trigwell	Report		
	Environmental Services – Service Action Plan	GC	Matthew Smith	Report		
	Introducing 20mph Speed Limits	GC	Adrian Clarke	Report	Panel on 26/7/11	
	Climate Change Strategy	AP	Jane Wildblood	Presentation	Panel on 26/7/11	

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Director	Report Author	Format of Item	Requested By	Notes
<b>13<sup>th</sup> March 2012</b>						
	Cabinet Member Update					
	Community Infrastructure Levy / Section 106 Update	GC	Simon de Beer / David Trigwell	Verbal Update		
	Waste Strategy Review and Action Plan	GC	Carol Maclellan	Verbal Update		
	Neighbourhood Planning Protocol: Options for consultation	GC	Simon de Beer	Report		
	MOD sites Concept Statements	JB / GC	David Bone / Simon de Beer	Report		
	Travel Smart Cards	GC	Peter Dawson	Presentation		
<b>15<sup>th</sup> May 2012</b>						
	Cabinet Member Update					
	Procedure and Criteria for the Designation and Review of Local Wildlife Sites	GC	Lucy Corner	Report		
	Core Strategy Update	GC	David Trigwell	Presentation		
	Sustainable Construction & Retrofitting Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	GC	Cleo Newcombe-Jones	Report		
	Gypsy & Traveller Sites Plan	GC	Simon de Beer	Report		
	MOD sites Concept Statements	JB / GC	David Bone / Simon de Beer / Stephen George	Report		

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Director	Report Author	Format of Item	Requested By	Notes
<b>26th July 2012</b>						
	Cabinet Member Update					
	Travel to Work Review – Terms of Reference	GC	Donna Vercoe	Report		
	Allotments Management Plan	GC	John Crowther / Graham Evans	Report		
	Parking Charges Update	GC	Matthew Smith	Report		21/2/12 Agenda Plg
	Transport Strategy	GC	Adrian Clarke	Presentation	Panel on 13/9/11	
	London Road Congestion	GC	Peter Dawson	Presentation		28/9/11 Agenda Plg
	MOD sites Concept Statements	JB / GC	David Bone / Simon de Beer / Stephen George	Verbal Update		
<b>23<sup>rd</sup> August 2012</b>						
	Gypsy & Traveller Sites Plan: Pre-Consultation Results	GC	Simon de Beer	Report		
	Core Strategy Update	GC	David Trigwell	Report		
	Neighbourhood Planning Protocol	GC	Simon de Beer	Report		
	Green Infrastructure Strategy	GC	Simon de Beer	Report		

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Director	Report Author	Format of Item	Requested By	Notes
<b>11<sup>th</sup> Sept 2012</b>						
	Cabinet Member Update					
	Gypsy & Traveller Sites Plan	GC	Simon de Beer	Verbal Update		
	MOD sites Concept Statements	GC	David Bone / Simon de Beer / Stephen George	Report	Panel on 26/7/12	
	World Heritage Site Supplementary Plan	GC	Simon de Beer	Report		
	20mph Speed Limits Update	GC	Nick Jeanes	Briefing	Panel on 15/5/12	
<b>8<sup>th</sup> Oct 2012</b>						
	Cabinet Member Update					
	Community Infrastructure Levy & Review of the Planning Obligations Supplementary Plan	GC	Simon de Beer / David Trigwell	Verbal Update		
	Sustainable Construction & Retrofitting Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)	GC	Cleo Newcombe-Jones	Verbal Update		
	Article 4 Direction & Supplementary Policy	GC	David Trigwell	Report		
	Transport Strategy	GC	Peter Dawson	Presentation		
	Parking Strategy	GC	Adrian Clarke	Presentation		

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Director	Report Author	Format of Item	Requested By	Notes
<b>13<sup>th</sup> Nov 2012</b>						
	Cabinet Member Update					
	Bus Tendering Process	DT	Andy Strong	Report		
	Medium Term Service & Resource Plans	DT	David Trigwell	Report		
<b>15<sup>th</sup> Jan 2013</b>						
	Cabinet Member Update	DT				
	Urban Gulls	DT	Cathryn Humphries	Presentation / Briefing	Panel – Sept 2012	
	Core Strategy Update	DT	David Trigwell	Report		
	Gypsy & Traveller Sites Plan Update	DT	Simon de Beer	Verbal Update		
	Placemaking Plan Update	DT	Simon de Beer	Report		
	Bath Transport Conference Outcomes	DT	Peter Dawson	Report	Panel – Oct 2012	
	Highways Agency – Council involvement on speed limits	DT	Adrian Clarke	Report	Panel – Sept 2012	
	20mph Speed Limit Update	DT	Kelvin Packer	Report	Panel – Sept 2012	
<b>13<sup>th</sup> March</b>						
	Cabinet Member Update					



Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Director	Report Author	Format of Item	Requested By	Notes
	Commercial Waste Collection Single Inquiry Day - Update	DT	Carol Maclellan	Report	Panel on 26/7/11	
<b>15<sup>th</sup> May</b>						
	Cabinet Member Update					
	Parking Strategy	DT	Adrian Clarke	Report	Panel – Oct 2012	
<b>Future items</b>						
	West of England / Joint Scrutiny	DT		Report	Panel – July 2012	
	Allotments Management Plan / Draft Strategy	DT	John Crowther / Graham Evans	Report	Panel on 26/7/12	

This page is intentionally left blank