

Democratic Services

Lewis House, Manvers Street, Bath, BA1 1JG
Telephone: (01225) 477000 *main switchboard*
Direct Lines - Tel: 01225 394358 Fax: 01225 394439
Web-site - <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk>

Date: 15 March 2016
E-mail: Democratic_Services@bathnes.gov.uk

To: All Members of the Council

Chief Executive and other appropriate officers
Press and Public

Dear Member

Council: Wednesday, 23rd March, 2016

You are invited to attend a meeting of the **Council** to be held on **Wednesday, 23rd March, 2016** at **6.30 pm** in the **Council Chamber - Guildhall, Bath.**

The agenda is set out overleaf.

Refreshments will be available for Councillors from 5pm in the Aix-en-Provence Room (next to the Banqueting Room) on Floor 1.

Yours sincerely

Jo Morrison
Democratic Services Manager
for Chief Executive

Please note the following arrangements for pre-group meetings:

Conservative	Brunswick Room, Ground Floor
Liberal Democrat	Kaposvar Room, Floor 1
Labour	Labour Group Room, Floor 2
Independent & Village Voice	Independent Group room
Green	Small meeting room, Floor 2

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 Jo Morrison who is available by telephoning Bath 01225 394358.

2. **Details of decisions taken at this meeting** can be found in the minutes which will be circulated with the agenda for the next meeting. In the meantime, details can be obtained by contacting as above. Papers are available for inspection as follows:

Public Access points:- Reception: Civic Centre - Keynsham, Guildhall - Bath, The Hollies - Midsomer Norton. Bath Central and Midsomer Norton public libraries.

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

3. **Recording at Meetings:-**

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 now allows filming and recording by anyone attending a meeting. This is not within the Council's control.

Some of our meetings are webcast. At the start of the meeting, the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be filmed. If you would prefer not to be filmed for the webcast, please make yourself known to the camera operators.

To comply with the Data Protection Act 1998, we require the consent of parents or guardians before filming children or young people. For more information, please speak to the camera operator

The Council will broadcast the images and sound live via the internet www.bathnes.gov.uk/webcast An archived recording of the proceedings will also be available for viewing after the meeting. The Council may also use the images/sound recordings on its social media site or share with other organisations, such as broadcasters.

4. **Spokespersons:** The Political Group Spokespersons for the Council are the Group Leaders, who are Councillors Tim Warren (Conservative Group), Dine Romero (Liberal Democrat Group), Robin Moss (Labour Group), Sarah Bevan (Independent & Village Voice Group) and Jonathan Carr (Green Group)

5. **Attendance Register:** Members should sign the Register, which will be circulated at the meeting.

6. **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. They may also ask a question to which a written answer will be given. **Advance notice is required not less than two full working days before the meeting. This means that for meetings held on Thursdays notice must be received in Democratic Services by 5.00pm the previous Monday.** Further details of the scheme can be obtained by contacting Jo Morrison as above.

7. THE APPENDED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS ARE IDENTIFIED BY AGENDA ITEM NUMBER.

8. 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.

9. **Presentation of reports:** Officers of the Council will not normally introduce their reports unless requested by the meeting to do so. Officers may need to advise the meeting of new information arising since the agenda was sent out.

Council - Wednesday, 23rd March, 2016 at 6.30 pm in the Council Chamber - Guildhall, Bath

AGENDA

1. EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chairman will draw attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out under Note 8.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point in the meeting declarations of interest are received from Members in any of the agenda items under consideration at the meeting. Members are asked to complete the green interest forms circulated to groups in their pre-meetings (which will be announced at the Council Meeting) to indicate:

(a) The agenda item number in which they have an interest to declare.

(b) The nature of their interest.

(c) Whether their interest is **a disclosable pecuniary interest** *or* **an other interest**, (as defined in Part 2, A and B of the Code of Conduct and Rules for Registration of Interests)

Any Member who needs to clarify any matters relating to the declaration of interests is recommended to seek advice from the Council's Monitoring Officer or a member of his staff before the meeting to expedite dealing with the item during the meeting.

4. MINUTES - 16TH FEBRUARY 2016 (Pages 7 - 16)

To be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair(man)

5. TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

If there is any urgent business arising since the formal agenda was published, the Chairman will announce this and give reasons why he has agreed to consider it at this meeting. In making his decision, the Chairman will, where practicable, have consulted with the Leaders of the Political Groups. Any documentation on urgent business will be circulated at the meeting, if not made available previously.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OR FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

These are matters of information for Members of the Council. No decisions will be required arising from the announcements.

7. QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

The Democratic Services Manager will announce any submissions received. The Council will be invited to decide what action it wishes to take, if any, on the matters

raised in these submissions. As the questions received and the answers given will be circulated in written form there is no requirement for them to be read out at the meeting. The questions and answers will be published with the draft minutes.

8. SUBMISSION OF THE BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET PLACEMAKING PLAN FOR PUBLIC EXAMINATION (Pages 17 - 42)

The Council is preparing the Placemaking Plan which is a statutory planning document. The Plan complements the adopted Core Strategy by setting out detailed planning policies up to 2029. This report seeks Council approval of the Draft Placemaking Plan for submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

9. CREATION OF A CHARITABLE TRUST BOARD TO MANAGE CHARITABLE TRUSTS (Pages 43 - 56)

The Council is sole trustee for a number of Trusts including the Alice Park Trust in Bath. There has been a lack of clarity in how the Council has previously dealt with these Trusts. The creation of the Trust Board will in future ensure the clear separation of the Council's interest as sole trustee of these charities and the Council's interests as a Local Authority.

10. NOMINATION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN DESIGNATE (Pages 57 - 58)

This report invites the Council to nominate a Vice-Chairman for May 2016 – May 2017.

11. MOTION FROM THE LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP - HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (Pages 59 - 60)

12. MOTION FROM THE LABOUR GROUP - BUDGET SAVINGS (Pages 61 - 62)

13. MOTION FROM THE LABOUR GROUP - OFFICER POINT OF CONTACT FOR RETURNING WAR VETERANS (Pages 63 - 64)

14. MOTION FROM THE LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP - UK MEMBERSHIP OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (Pages 65 - 66)

15. QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The Democratic Services Manager will announce any submissions received. The Council will be invited to decide what action it wishes to take, if any, on the matters raised in these submissions. As the questions received and the answers given will be circulated in written form there is no requirement for them to be read out at the meeting. The questions and answers will be published with the draft minutes.

The Committee Administrator for this meeting is Jo Morrison who can be contacted on 01225 394358.

Protocol for Decision-making

Guidance for Members when making decisions

When making decisions, the Cabinet/Committee must ensure it has regard only to relevant considerations and disregards those that are not material.

The Cabinet/Committee must ensure that it bears in mind the following legal duties when making its decisions:

- Equalities considerations
- Risk Management considerations
- Crime and Disorder considerations
- Sustainability considerations
- Natural Environment considerations
- Planning Act 2008 considerations
- Human Rights Act 1998 considerations
- Children Act 2004 considerations
- Public Health & Inequalities considerations

Whilst it is the responsibility of the report author and the Council's Monitoring Officer and Chief Financial Officer to assess the applicability of the legal requirements, decision makers should ensure they are satisfied that the information presented to them is consistent with and takes due regard of them.

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday, 16th February, 2016

Present:- **Councillors** Patrick Anketell-Jones, Colin Barrett, Cherry Beath, Jasper Becker, Sarah Bevan, Lisa Brett, John Bull, Neil Butters, Jonathan Carr, Anthony Clarke, Matt Cochrane, Paul Crossley, Chris Dando, Fiona Darey, Matthew Davies, Sally Davis, Douglas Deacon, Emma Dixon, Michael Evans, Andrew Furse, Charles Gerrish, Ian Gilchrist, Bob Goodman, Francine Haerberling, Alan Hale, Liz Hardman, Donal Hassett, Steve Hedges, Deirdre Horstmann, Eleanor Jackson, Steve Jeffries, Les Kew, Marie Longstaff, Barry Macrae, Paul May, Shaun McGall, Robin Moss, Paul Myers, Michael Norton, Lisa O'Brien, Bryan Organ, Lin Patterson, June Player, Christopher Pearce, Vic Pritchard, Joe Rayment, Liz Richardson, Caroline Roberts, Nigel Roberts, Dine Romero, Mark Shelford, Brian Simmons, Peter Turner, David Veale, Martin Veal, Karen Walker, Geoff Ward, Tim Warren, Karen Warrington and Chris Watt

Apologies for absence: **Councillors** Rob Appleyard, Tim Ball, Colin Blackburn, Alison Millar and Will Sandry

82 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chairman drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure, as set out on the agenda.

83 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Steve Hedges declared an 'other' interest in item 9 (Budget & Council Tax) as an employee of a care home.

84 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OR FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Chairman made the customary housekeeping announcements regarding the webcast, mobile phones and meeting procedures.

He congratulated all those who had received honours in the Queen's New Year's list.

He further congratulated the Council on being 'Highly Commended' (finishing 2nd) at the recent 'Employee Engagement Awards 2015' in the Project of the Year Award and passed on congratulations to the teams who had been shortlisted for three awards this year at the LGC Awards;

- Business Transformation – Workplaces
- Team of the Year – Early Years 'Dealers in Hope'
- HWB Board of the Year

The Chairman reminded Members of the forthcoming events and encouraged them to attend (and in any case, respond regarding their intentions);

- Civic Reception – 17th March
- Parish Councillors' Reception – 20th April
- School Governors' Reception – 6th May

85 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There were no items of urgent business.

86 MINUTES - 12TH NOVEMBER 2015 & 17TH DECEMBER 2015

On a motion from Councillor Eleanor Jackson, seconded by Councillor Tim Warren, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the 12th November and 17th December be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

87 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

David Redgewell made a statement which, whilst supporting most of the transport proposals in the budget, called on the Council to protect revenue budgets for rural, evening and weekend services in support of the Buses Bill. A copy of David's submission is attached to the online record. [This statement was made at the start of the Budget report (item 9).

88 BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL CORPORATE STRATEGY 2016-20

The Council considered a report presenting the Bath and North East Somerset Council Corporate Strategy 2016-20 for adoption. The priorities of the Corporate Strategy are intended to provide context to and guide Council activity and budget planning over the next four years.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones, it was

RESOLVED to adopt the Bath and North East Somerset Council Corporate Strategy 2016-20.

[Note; The above motion was passed with 49 Councillors voting in favour and 11 against.]

89 BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2016/17 AND FINANCIAL OUTLOOK 2016/17 TO 2019/20

The Council considered a report presenting the Cabinet's revenue and capital budgets for the 2016/17 financial year together with a proposal for a Council Tax level for 2016/17.

In addition to the report circulated with the agenda, all Councillors also received;

- Appendix 7: Resolution for setting Council Tax for 2016/17

- Updated recommendations and changes to budget report figures to reflect the provision in the Final Settlement for local government of Transitional Grant funding for the Council
- Draft minutes of the Resources Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel meeting held on 8th February with the Panel's comments on the budget proposals.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, it was **RESOLVED** that the Council suspends Council rule 42, Content and Length of Speeches, for the duration of this debate so as to enable variations to be permitted to the length of speeches by the Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency, the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green Group Leaders and Independent & Village Voice Spokesperson and the Chair of the Resources Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel.

On a motion from Councillor Charles Gerrish, seconded by Councillor Tim Warren, it was

RESOLVED that

1. That the Council approve:

- a. The General Fund net revenue budget for 2016/17 of £115.729m and the associated Council Tax increase of 1.25% plus a further 2% for Adult Social Care, as set out in Appendix 2.
- b. That no Special Expenses be charged other than Town and Parish Council precepts for 2016/17.
- c. The adequacy of reserves at Appendix 2 Table 10 with a risk-assessed level of £10.5m.
- d. The individual service cash limits for 2016/17 summarised at Appendix 2 Table 6 and detailed in Annex 1.
- e. The allocations of the Transitional grant of £936k in 2016/17 as follows:
 - (i) Adjustments to Existing Budget Proposals
 - £25K - Widening of Gull Strategy trial and additional enforcement work.
 - £62K – Increase transition support for Freight Consolidation from 6 to 12 months.
 - (ii) New Provision
 - £50K – Support and advice for B&NES Council financial planning and a submission to government - to inform planned changes to local government finance nationally, including a new system of needs assessment and tariffs, which will be offsetting business rates retention proposals.

(iii) Service Transition Support

- £799K – Corporately held transition funding to assist in the delivery of savings targets and other pressures as required in year and as a contingency relating to income growth targets in 2016/17.
- f. That the specific arrangements for the governance and release of reserves, including invest to save proposals and transition funding, be delegated to the Council's Section 151 Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency and the Chief Executive.
2. That the Council include in its Council Tax setting, the precepts set and approved by other bodies including the local precepts of Town Councils, Parish Councils and the Charter Trustees of the City of Bath, and those of the Fire and Police Authorities.
 3. That the Council notes the Section 151 officer's report on the robustness of the proposed budget and the adequacy of the Council's reserves (Appendix 2, Annex 2) and approves the conditions upon which the recommendations are made as set out throughout Appendix 2.
 4. That in relation to the capital budget the Council:
 - a. approves a capital programme of £58.213m for 2016/17 and notes items for provisional approval in 2016/17 and the programme for 2017/18 to 2020/21 as shown at Appendix 2, Annex 3 including the planned sources of funding
 - b. delegates implementation, subject to consultation where appropriate, of the capital programmes set out in Annex 3i to Annex 3iv to the relevant Strategic Director in Consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member.
 - c. approves all other delegations as set out in the budget report.
 - d. approves the Minimum Revenue Provision Policy as shown at Appendix 2, Annex 4
 - e. approves the Capital Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 2 Table 8.
 5. That the Council agree the Council's proposed pay policy statement, including the provision in respect of minimum pay rates in 2016/17 as set out at Appendix 5 delegating implementation arrangements to the Employment Committee where appropriate.
 6. That the Council notes the issues raised in Appendix 6 and agree that the proposals in the budget properly reflect the Council's duties under the Equalities Act 2010.

7. That the Council approves the technical resolutions that are derived from the budget report, and all figures in that report, including the precepts for towns, parishes and other precepting bodies as set out in Appendix 7.
8. That the Council notes that it administers a welfare support fund to assist vulnerable claimants with exceptional short-term needs, including exceptional difficulty in meeting Council Tax obligations. This currently has an annual budget of £270k;
9. That the Council resolves to allocate an additional £50,000 from the Government's Transition Fund to the welfare support scheme as a one-off transition measure to assist with increasing demand that may arise during the transition to universal credit over the coming year.

THE COUNCIL APPROVES THE BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX FOR 2016/17 AS INDICATED ABOVE AND ACCORDINGLY RESOLVES:

10. That the 2016/17 expenditure is funded as follows:

	Total £
2016/17 Gross Expenditure	320,120,200
2016/17 Income (service income and specific grants)	194,086,432
Core Funding:	
Revenue Support Grant	14,422,624
Retained Business Rates*	32,427,964
Use of Reserves	1,335,880
2016/17 Gross Income	242,272,900
Council Tax Requirement (excluding Parish Precepts)	77,847,300

* Before Tariff Payment

11. a) That it be noted that on the 18th December 2015 the Divisional Director of Business Support (as authorised section 151 officer) agreed 62,734.60 Band D property equivalent as the Council Tax Base for the year 2016/17 in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 made under Section 35(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

b) The amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amount of its Council Tax Base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate is given as Annex 1 (1).

[Annex 1 (1) gives Band D Tax base by parish]

12. That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the 2016/17 financial year in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992, as amended:

- a. **£322,429,096** (=£320,120,200 (gross expenditure) +£2,308,896 (Parish precepts)) being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the 1992 Act.

[This is the gross expenditure incurred in performing functions and charged to the revenue account, contingencies for revenue, any financial reserves to be raised, financial reserves to meet prior year deficit not yet provided for, any amounts transferred from its general fund to its collection fund in accordance with section 97(4) of the Local Government Finance 1988 Act, and any amounts transferred from general fund to collection fund under section 98(5) of 1988 Act.]

- b. **£242,272,900** (gross income including use of reserves) being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the 1992 Act.
[This is the income estimated to accrue which will be credited into the revenue account for the year in accordance with proper practices, any amounts transferred in the year from the collection fund to the general fund in accordance with section 97(3) of the 1988 Act, any amounts which will be transferred from the collection fund to the general fund pursuant to a direction under section 98(4) of the 1988 Act and will be credited to the revenue account for the year, and financial reserves used to provide for items in Section 31A(2)]
- c. **£80,156,196** being the amount by which the aggregate at 12(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 12(b) above calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the 1992 Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
- d. **£1,277.70** being the amount at 12(c) above divided by the amount at 11(a) above, calculated in accordance with Section 31B of the 1992 Act, as the basic amount of Council Tax for the year.
[This is the average Council tax including B&NES and parish precepts]
- e. **£ 2,308,896** being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the 1992 Act.
[This is the total of parish precepts]
- f. **£1,240.90** being the amount at 12(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 12(e) above by the amount at 11(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the 1992 Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item relates.
[This is the B&NES Council tax only excluding parish precepts]
- g. The amounts given by adding to the amount at 12(f) above the amounts of special items or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 11(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with section 34(3) of the 1992 Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate are given at Annex 1 (3).
[Annex 1 (3) gives the Band D Council tax for each area including the parish precepts]

- h. The amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 12(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the 1992 Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands are given in Annex 1 (4).

[Annex 1 (4) shows the B&NES and parish Council Tax for all bands.]

Precepting Authorities

13. That it be noted that for the year 2016/17 the Police & Crime Commissioner for Avon and Somerset has determined the amount in precepts issued to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below:-

14. Avon and Somerset Police

Valuation Bands

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£118.84	£138.65	£158.45	£178.26	£217.87	£257.49	£297.10	£356.52

15. That it be noted that for the year 2016/17 Avon Fire Authority met on 5th February 2016 to determine the amounts in precepts issued to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of the dwellings shown below:-

16. Avon Fire Authority

Valuation Bands

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£45.29	£52.83	£60.38	£67.93	£83.03	£98.12	£113.22	£135.86

17. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts 14, 16 and 12(h) above, the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the 2016/17 financial year for each of the categories of dwellings shown, as listed in Annex 1 (5).

18. On average (for a Band D, 2 adult household) the Council Tax for 2016/17 will be as follows:

<i>Reference Band D 2015/16 £</i>		£ Band D 2016/17	% Increase on 2015/16
1,201.85	Bath and North East Somerset Council	1,216.87	1.25
-	- Adult Social Care*	24.03	-
35.99	Average Parish Precept	36.80	2.25
66.60	Avon Fire Authority	67.93	2.00
174.78	Avon and Somerset Police	178.26	1.99
1,479.22	Total Tax Charged	1,523.89	3.02

[Overall annual increase in average Band D Council Tax is £44.67]

** The Adult Social Care charge represents a 2% increase in the Bath & North East Somerset Council Tax*

19. The Council's basic amount of Council Tax for 2016/17 is not determined to be excessive in accordance with principles approved under section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992.

[Notes;

- 1. Resolutions 8 and 9 were proposed by Councillor Chris Watt, and accepted into the substantive motion by Councillors Charles Gerrish and Tim Warren.*
- 2. The successful motion was carried with 41 Councillors voting in favour and 19 voting against;*

Councillors voting in favour – Patrick Anketell-Jones, Colin Barrett, Jasper Becker, Sarah Bevan, Tony Clarke, Matt Cochrane, Fiona Darey, Matthew Davies, Sally Davis, Doug Deacon, Emma Dixon, Michael Evans, Charles Gerrish, Bob Goodman, Francine Haeberling, Alan Hale, Donal Hassett, Deirdre Horstmann, Steve Jeffries, Les Kew, Marie Longstaff, Barry Macrae, Paul May, Paul Myers, Michael Norton, Lisa O'Brien, Bryan Organ, Chris Pearce, June Player, Vic Pritchard, Liz Richardson, Mark Shelford, Brian Simmons, Peter Turner, Martin Veal, David Veale, Karen Walker, Geoff Ward, Tim Warren, Karen Warrington, Chris Watt

Councillors voting against – Cherry Beath, Lisa Brett, John Bull, Neil Butters, Jonathan Carr, Paul Crossley, Chris Dando, Andy Furse, Ian Gilchrist, Liz Hardman, Steve Hedges, Eleanor Jackson, Shaun McGall, Robin Moss, Lin Patterson, Joe Rayment, Nigel Roberts, Caroline Roberts, Dine Romero.

90 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT & INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2016/17

The Council considered a report presenting the Treasury Strategy for borrowing and an Annual Investment Strategy setting out the Council's policies for managing its investments.

On a motion from Councillor Charles Gerrish, seconded by Councillor Paul May, it was

RESOLVED

1. To approve the actions proposed within the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (Appendix 1 of the report); and
2. To approve the Investment Strategy as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.

[Note; The above motion was approved with 45 Councillors voting in favour, 11 against and 2 abstentions.]

91 NOMINATION OF CHAIRMAN DESIGNATE FOR 2016/17

This report allows Council to indicate which Councillor is likely to take over as Chairman from the Annual General meeting in May. This allows advance planning of the Chairman's diary but will still require a formal election to take place at the May meeting.

The Council noted that a Liberal Democrat Councillor would be nominated as Vice-Chairman at the March Council meeting.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, it was unanimously

RESOLVED that Councillor Alan Hale be designated as Council Chairman for the Council year 2016/17.

The meeting ended at 9.07 pm

Chairman

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council	
MEETING	Council
MEETING	23rd March 2016
TITLE:	Submission of the Bath & North East Somerset Placemaking Plan for public examination
WARD:	All
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM	
<p>List of attachments to this report:</p> <p>Appendix 1: Submission B&NES Placemaking Plan</p> <p>Appendix 2: Schedule of limited changes</p> <p>Appendix 3: List of Adopted Core Strategy Policies that will be superseded upon adoption of the Placemaking Plan</p> <p>Appendix 4: Key Issues arising from the consultation on the draft pre-submission plan</p> <p>Appendix 5: Key issues raised in representations by Bath Spa University and the University of Bath</p>	

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 The Council is preparing the Placemaking Plan which is a statutory planning document. The Plan complements the adopted Core Strategy by setting out detailed planning policies up to 2029. This report seeks Council approval of the Draft Placemaking Plan for submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

2 RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That Full Council

- (1) agree that the B&NES Draft Placemaking Plan (Appendix 1) is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination;
- (2) agree the list of limited changes in Appendix 2 as part of the submitted plan
- (3) authorise the Divisional Director for Development to present the Council's case at examination;
- (4) invite the Inspector to recommend any modifications which may be necessary to make the Plan sound; and
- (5) agree the Plan for Development Management purposes.

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)

- 3.1 Preparation of the Placemaking Plan is funded from the LDF budget and is resourced by the Planning Policy Team.
- 3.2 Preparation of land-use planning policies will inevitably have an impact on the value of land & buildings, which in turn would impact Council Tax and Business Rates. However, impacts to Council Tax and Business Rates cannot be taken into consideration as part of the assessment and preparation of the Planning Policies.

4 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS AND BASIS FOR PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The Draft Placemaking Plan has been prepared in compliance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (“the 2004 Act”) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (“the Regulations”). Once adopted, it will be a statutory Development Plan Document (“DPD”).
- 4.2 Preparation of the Draft Placemaking Plan has also accorded with national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) and guidance in the National Planning Practice Guidance (“NPPG”). In particular, the Council has sought to ensure that the plan is sound in that it (inter alia);
- Has been **positively prepared** – the plan seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits;
 - Is **justified** – the plan is the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
 - Is **effective** – the plan is deliverable; and
 - Is **consistent with national policy** – the plan enables the delivery of sustainable development
- 4.3 The Draft Placemaking Plan has been subject to a fully integrated Sustainability Appraisal (“SA”) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (“SEA”) in line with the requirements of the SEA Regulations (The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004). It has also been subject to an integrated Habitats Regulation Assessment (“HRA”) in line with the requirements of Regulations 102-105 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the Habitat Regulations).
- 4.4 The Draft Placemaking Plan will be used for Development Management purposes but will not have the full statutory force of section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 until any objections received have been addressed via the examination process and the plan is adopted. In light of the stage of preparation the plan has reached, it will be an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Policies with no objections will carry greater weight.
- 4.5 The Housing & Planning Bill 2015 is likely to have implications for some of the policy approaches in both the Placemaking Plan and the Core Strategy but it is premature to seek to pre-empt the Bill’s enactment and so any issues arising will need to be addressed via the examination process.
- 4.6 At the examination, the Inspector will decide whether the Plan is legally compliant. This means whether:

- it is in the current Local Development Scheme (LDS);
- the process of community involvement is in general accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement;
- it complies with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations) 2012;
- the Sustainability Appraisal or Habitat Regulation Assessment Report has been undertaken effectively; and
- it complies with the Duty to Co-operate (DtC)

4.7 The Placemaking Plan provides a district-wide suite of planning policies for B&NES, complementing and delivering the strategic framework in the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy forms Part 1 of the B&NES Local Plan and the draft Placemaking Plan is Part 2. The Plans have been combined for clarity but it is only the Placemaking Plan part which is the subject of this report. In a few instances, some policies/text of the Core Strategy has been amended through the preparation of the Placemaking Plan. These policies or text are intended to supersede the policy or text in the adopted Core Strategy (Regulation 8(5) of the 2012 Regulations). These superseded policies are part of the Placemaking Plan document in Appendix 1 and are also listed in Appendix 3 to this Report.

5 THE REPORT

Background

5.1 The Placemaking Plan is a key Council strategy because it complements the Core Strategy by setting detailed planning frameworks for the district and specific sites and provides planning weight to other Council strategies. The Draft Placemaking Plan was subject to public consultation between 16th December 2015 and 3rd February 2016. This report outlines the key issues that were raised through the consultation and outlines the next steps in the Placemaking Plan preparation process.

Representations on the Draft Placemaking Plan

5.2 Through the consultation around 500 representations were submitted on the draft plan. These representations relate to many aspects of the plan. A number of key issues were raised in terms of the plan and/or the number of stakeholders/respondents including those summarised in the schedule attached as Appendix 4. The schedule also highlights the recommended course of action for the Council.

5.3 In considering the issues raised on the draft plan the Council needs to be satisfied that the plan is sound/legally compliant and that it can be submitted for examination. However, the Council may consider that as a result of the representations received limited changes are required.

Next steps

5.4 The current timetable for the next steps in preparing the Placemaking Plan is set out below. The next step is submission for formal examination.

Council agree to submit Draft Plan for Examination	23 rd March 2016
Submission of Plan and supporting documentation to PINS	Mid- April 2016

Examination Hearings	July or September 2016
Receive Inspector's Report	October/November 2016
Adoption	December 2016

5.5 Planning inspectorate guidance on examining local plans makes it clear that any significant changes should preferably be the subject of both a sustainability appraisal and public consultation prior to submission of the plan. Where this is the case the inspector will treat the changes as part of the submitted plan. However, where consultation has not taken place the inspector will determine how to treat them as part of the post-submission pre-hearing stage.

5.6 Any proposed changes to the draft plan will need to be discussed with the Planning Inspectorate. It may be possible for limited changes to be submitted alongside the draft plan without prior public consultation. However, if the council considers that significant changes are needed to the plan, these will need to be subject to a 6 week formal public consultation prior to submission for examination. This would result in a delay to the above timetable. This will substantially delay the adoption to at least the spring of 2017

Key Issues

5.7 An assessment of the key issues arising from the representations is summarised in Appendix 4 and listed below.

- a Procedural issues
- b Housing supply and allocation of alternative or additional development sites
- c Highways Agency reps re transport issues in Bath
- d Environment Agency issues
- e New Policy LCR3A that residential development will only be permitted where primary school has capacity or can expand is not justified
- f Policy LCR6A on Local Green Spaces
- g Policy ST7: parking standards
- h Historic England concerns
- i Policy H7 Housing standards
- j Policies on to renewable energy; design; environmental issues
- k University Campus expansion
- l Bath – university expansion/student accommodation & HMOs
- m Bath Park & Ride (Policy ST6)
- n Bath (site specific issues)
- o Keynsham sites
- p Somer Valley sites
- q Rural Areas sites

5.8 The most significant issue relates to **housing land supply** and objections seeking the allocation of alternative or additional sites for development. Some argue that the Placemaking Plan should be planning for a greater level of housing development for the following reasons:

- There is a strategic context for significant future housing needs as demonstrated via the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the Wider Bristol Housing Market Area (West of England Joint Spatial Plan)
- The Core Strategy requirement of 13,000 homes is not a 'cap' and nor are the individual 'policy area' requirements – other suitable/sustainable sites should be allocated in excess of this figure
- The need to better take account of market signals
- The need for more flexibility in the Plan
- Sites identified in SHLAA will not deliver housing as expected

- There is an over reliance on brownfield sites

- 5.9 The District's housing land supply has been reviewed based on an up-to date assessment of commitments and permissions. Whilst there is risk to delivery of some of the sites which are relied upon to deliver the 13,000 core strategy housing requirement, this is offset by other sites forthcoming. It is not considered that the risk is so great as to warrant the identification of new housing sites at this stage and that the appropriate time to review is as set out in the Core Strategy i.e. a 5 year review in 2019/20 to ascertain whether the 13,000 is still the appropriate housing target and whether any changes in the spatial strategy are required to ensure its delivery. A partial review of the Core Strategy will also be undertaken as set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme.
- 5.10 However, it should be noted that there is a risk that the Inspector may conclude differently & require the Council to identify additional sites and subject them to public consultation before he concludes the examination. This will lead to a delay to the adoption of the plan by around 2 or 3 months.
- 5.11 The other key issue arising relates to **student accommodation**. Residents groups consider that the Plan does not adequately control/limit growth of the Universities. They state that the Plan should not include student expansion projections/numbers as these are subject to change and they should be included in a separate Student Accommodation Strategy. Off-campus student accommodation provision should be strictly controlled and further accommodation should be focussed 'on-campus' only. Growth of HMOs needs to be better managed/controlled across the city as a whole e.g. limiting annual growth to a specified number or setting a lower proportion of properties so that HMOs can be limited to specific locations.
- 5.12 In a general sense the Universities and student accommodation providers consider the Plan is too restrictive and that it should better facilitate the changing aspirations and growth of the Universities e.g. through in city capacity or looking at more creative solutions. The University of Bath emphasise that it is a major driver of educational opportunity and economic growth in the City and District, and the Plan's policy framework for Bath should be more flexible in supporting its continued success. The Universities/accommodation providers consider that the Plan should seek to meet student accommodation/university growth as a priority (not sub-ordinate to meeting housing/employment needs) and Policy B5 needs amending to positively enable off-campus provision, particularly outside the Enterprise Area/city centre. Site allocations/Policy B5 should be more flexible in allowing an element of student accommodation on key sites and smaller stand-alone sites e.g. through reference to improving viability.
- 5.13 Both Universities through their representations have updated their growth projections. Whilst for Bath Spa University this means that the number of students in need of accommodation is reduced from that set out in the Draft Plan it should be noted that both Universities only express their projections up to 2020/2021, and the Placemaking plan deals with the period up to 2029. It is considered that the policy framework set out in the Draft Placemaking Plan remains valid and therefore, no changes are recommended at this stage. More detailed analysis of the Universities representations and their implications is set out in Appendix 5.

Changes

- 5.14 It is considered that no significant changes are required to make the plan sound as a consequence of the public representations. However, issues relating to housing land supply is the most prominent issue that was raised and will be dealt with through the Examination.

- 5.15 In addition to these areas it is considered that some changes of limited scope are required to improve the submitted plan (see Appendix 2). These changes arise primarily from representations by statutory consultees and are limited to the following policies:
- District-wide policies on renewable energy and transport infrastructure proposals to refer to considering impact on heritage assets
 - District-wide design policy to ensure development takes account of local identity and history
 - Policy relating to re-use of rural buildings (including non-designated buildings) to be amended to ensure proposals take account of historic significance/value
 - Policy RA3 to be amended to ensure the policies of the plan as a whole are clearer with respect to considering proposals for shops in villages
 - Policy ST8 (Airport/Aerodrome Safeguarding Areas) – whole of policy needs to be included in the submitted plan

6 RATIONALE

- 6.1 The English Planning system is a Plan-led system. This means that planning applications for development must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that each Local Authority should produce a Local Plan for its area and emphasises the importance of having it up to date. The Placemaking Plan will be Part 2 of the Local Plan for the Council's area.

7 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 7.1 In terms of process, submission of a Local Plan for independent examination is requirement of the 2004 Act and the 2012 Regulations. The Council does not have discretion to depart from this process. The timetable for preparing the plan must accord with the Local Development Scheme.
- 7.2 In deciding its preferred spatial strategy, the Council has assessed the reasonable options. It has chosen the most appropriate strategy in light of the evidence, as guided by the sustainability appraisal.

8 CONSULTATION

- 8.1 Preparation of the Placemaking Plan has entailed extensive community engagement, both formal and informal pursuing a range of consultation and engagement methods as set out in the [Neighbourhood Planning Protocol](#) (the Council's Statement of Community Involvement).
- 8.2 The Placemaking Plan Launch document was published for consultation in July 2013 and the Options document was published for consultation in November 2014. Around 1,000 comments were received each on the Launch document and Options document.
- 8.3 Alongside these more formal consultations, the Council has continued to work closely with the Town and Parish Councils, community groups, local representatives and latterly the Bath City Forum in order to draw up a policy framework which takes into account local aspirations and concerns. The Council has also liaised with statutory consultees (such as Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency) as necessary to address any issues raised. This front loaded approach is aimed at resolving as many issues as possible early in the

process in the preparation of the Placemaking Plan and it is underpinned by evidence to ensure the Plan is 'sound' when submitted for Examination.

- 8.4 The consultation on the Draft Placemaking Plan between December 2015 and February 2016 was formal and focussed. Consultees were invited to comment on whether the Draft Placemaking Plan meets the four tests of 'soundness' (positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy) and is legally compliant as required by the NPPF para 182. The broad programme of engagement activities previously undertaken as part of the Placemaking Plan Launch document and Options document consultation by virtue of Regulation 18 of the Regulations was not repeated at this stage.
- 8.5 The publication of the Plan for consultation is prescribed in Regulation 19 of the Regulations which entails making the Draft Placemaking Plan and other documents publicly available together with formal notification of Consultees. Nevertheless the Council also publicised the consultation on the Draft Placemaking Plan more widely and in line with the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol. Consultation on the Draft Plan resulted in around 700 representations being submitted.
- 8.6 The Council's Monitoring Officer, section 151 Officer and the Place Strategic Director have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

EQUALITY ACT 2010

- 8.7 Duties are placed upon the Council by the above legislation including in relation to the Section 149 Public Sector Equality Duty. These duties have been fully recognised by officers in the preparation of the Draft Placemaking Plan.

HUMAN RIGHTS

- 8.8 The Draft Placemaking Plan has been prepared in accordance with a statutory process which has included extensive consultation and Council is being asked to submit the plan for examination by an independent Planning Inspector. It is therefore considered that it is unlikely that this would involve any direct interference with any individual's human rights.

9 RISK MANAGEMENT

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

Contact person	<i>Lisa Bartlett 01225 477550, Simon de Beer 01225 477616</i>
Background papers	<p><i>Key Policy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>B&NES Core Strategy 2014</i> • <i>National Planning Policy Framework</i> • <i>National Planning Practice Guidance</i> • <i>Extant Supplementary Planning Documents – such as the Planning Obligations SPD, HMO in Bath SPD, Sustainable Construction & Retrofitting SPD etc.</i> <p><i>Other Key Council Policy</i></p>

- *B&NES Economic Strategy*
- *B&NES Housing & Well-being Strategy*

Evidence Base supporting Draft Placemaking Plan, available via the link below:

http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/Placemaking-Plan/draft_pmp_evidence_base.pdf

Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format

APPENDIX 1: SUBMISSION PLACEMAKING PLAN

The Draft Placemaking Plan can be found at the link below:

<http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/services/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/placemaking-plan/placemaking-plan-pre>

APPENDIX 2: SCHEDULE OF LIMITED CHANGES

Note: in the changes below additional text is underlined and deletions are shown as a strike through.

Volume	Plan ref	Change	Reason
1	Policy RA3	<p>POLICY RA3 COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SHOPS</p> <p>Proposals for the development of community facilities or shops will be acceptable within and adjoining all villages, provided that they are of a scale and character appropriate to the village and meet the needs of the parish and adjoining parishes.</p>	In order to ensure Policy RA3 and Policy CR4 provide a clear policy framework in accordance with the NPPF
1	Policy SCR4	<p>POLICY SCR4: COMMUNITY RENEWABLE ENERGY SCHEMES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The positive benefits of community energy schemes will be a material consideration in assessing renewable energy development proposals. 2. The preference is for schemes that are led by and directly meet the needs of local communities, in line with the hierarchy and project attributes below: Community Led Energy: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Project part or fully owned by a local community group or social enterprise b) Local community members have a governance stake in the project or organisation e.g. with voting rights 3. In the case of renewable energy proposals within the Green Belt, where community benefits are proposed to meet the “very special circumstances” test, the following criteria will be considered: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The contribution to achieving the targets set out in Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy to increase the level of renewable electricity and heat generation in the district; b) The contribution that will be made to local and national renewable energy and carbon reduction targets; c) Social and economic benefits. For example, local job creation opportunities; raising the quality of life in rural areas through diversification of agricultural land and generating an alternative income for farmers; d) The temporary nature of the renewable energy development and the ability to restore land to its original condition at the end of the project’s life; e) Contributions to improving the biodiversity, public amenity and soils in the vicinity of the scheme. 4. <u>In all cases schemes will only be permitted if there is no unacceptable impact on the significance of a designated and non- designated heritage asset.</u> 	New clause (4) added to ensure that the impact on heritage and environmental assets is a key consideration in any community led renewable energy schemes requiring planning permission (Historic England).

1	Policy D1	<p>POLICY D.1: GENERAL URBAN DESIGN PRINCIPLES</p> <p>The following general design principles will be applied, particularly for large scale development proposals or Masterplans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Places should be designed for people – to be safe, comfortable, varied and attractive. They should offer opportunities for interaction and delight. b) Development should enrich the character and qualities of places and should contribute positively to locally distinctiveness, <u>identity and history</u>. c) Development should make connections – by foot, cycle, public transport and by car – in that order. Streets and Spaces must be legible and easy to move around. d) Development should work with the landscape structure and should contribute positively to the characteristics of the settlement e) Places should be mixed use and should respond to context f) Buildings and spaces must be flexible and adaptable g) Buildings and spaces should be designed to be energy efficient (e.g. consider natural light and passive heating and cooling) <p>Developments that reflect these general urban design principles will be supported.</p>	Amend clause b. to ensure the policy wording better accords with the NPPF (Historic England).
1	Policy D8	<p>POLICY D.8: LIGHTING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Proposals for artificial lighting will only be permitted where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) they would not give rise to an unacceptable level of illumination into the sky, open countryside, urban areas or villages; b) it can be demonstrated that additional lighting on site will have no detrimental impact on visual and residential amenity, <u>the historic environment</u> or local ecology; c) any adverse impact of lighting proposals in all new development, including light spill and energy use, is minimised through design or technological solutions (including the use of SMART lighting techniques) or by controlling the hours of use; d) safety is not compromised in low lit or dark public area. 2) Development will be expected to reduce or at best maintain existing light levels to protect or improve the darkness of rivers, watercourse or other ecological corridors in particular to protect or provide a functional dark route for European protected species. New external lighting facilities with light spill to these features must be dimmable. <p>Lighting in public areas should be designed to a suitable level of illumination in accordance with BS 5489-1 2013 and where appropriate, ensure consistency with Bath Lighting Strategy and <u>other relevant guidance</u> and where necessary the hours of operation will be controlled by the use of</p>	Amend clause b. to ensure the policy wording better accords with the NPPF (Historic England).

		conditions.	
1	Policy HE1	<p>POLICY HE1: HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</p> <p><u>Safeguarding Heritage Assets</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Within the scope of Core Strategy Policies B4 and CP6, development that has an impact upon a heritage asset, whether designated or non-designated, will be expected to enhance or better reveal its significance and/or setting, and make a positive contribution to its character and appearance. 2) The District's historic environment shall be sustained and enhanced. This includes all heritage assets including the Bath World Heritage Site, historic buildings, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens, landscape, archaeology and townscapes of importance. 3) Development affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset and its setting will be expected to make a positive contribution to its character, appearance and significance. 4) Applications affecting the significance of any heritage asset will be required to provide sufficient information to demonstrate how the proposals would contribute to the asset's conservation. 5) The Historic Environment Record, including Conservation Area Character Appraisals and Management Plans will be used to inform the consideration of future development including potential conservation and enhancement measures. 6) Great weight will be given to the conservation of the District's heritage assets. Any harm to the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset must be justified. Proposals will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal; whether it has been demonstrated that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain the existing use, find new uses, or mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; and whether the works proposed are the minimum required to secure the long term use of the asset. 7) If such harm can be fully justified, where relevant the Council will require archaeological excavation and/or historic building recording as appropriate, followed by analysis and publication of the results. 8) In addition, the following will apply to specific asset types as listed below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) <u>City of Bath World Heritage Site</u> Development within the City of Bath City World Heritage Site will be expected to comply with Policy B4 of the Core Strategy and all other relevant supplementary information and guidance; and help support the delivery of the World Heritage Site Management Plan. b) <u>Listed buildings</u> 	Criteria 1) and 3) combined to help streamline the policy for effectively (Historic England).

		<p>The significance of listed buildings is required to be sustained and enhanced. Appropriate repair and reuse of listed buildings will be encouraged.</p> <p>Alterations, extensions or changes of use, or development in their vicinity, will be expected to have no adverse impact on those elements which contribute to their special architectural or historic interest, including their settings.</p> <p>c) <u>Conservation Areas</u></p> <p>Development, including any proposed demolition, within or affecting the setting of a conservation area will only be permitted where it will preserve or enhance those elements which contribute to the special character or appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The Council will look for opportunities from new development within conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance.</p> <p>d) <u>Archaeology</u></p> <p>Scheduled monuments and other non-designated archaeological sites of equivalent significance should be preserved in situ. In those cases where this is not justifiable or feasible provision should be made for their excavation and recording. The appropriate publication and curation of the finds/archive will be required.</p> <p>e) <u>Registered Historic Parks and Gardens</u></p> <p>Development will be expected to respect the design, character, appearance and settings of registered historic parks and gardens and to safeguard those features which contribute to their significance and are integral to their character and appearance.</p> <p>f) <u>Lansdown Registered Historic Battlefield</u></p> <p>Development will be expected to respect the character, appearance and setting of the Lansdown battlefield, safeguarding those features which contribute to its significance.</p> <p>g) <u>Non-designated heritage assets</u></p> <p>Proposals affecting non-designated heritage assets, including unscheduled archaeology, unlisted buildings and local parks and gardens, should ensure they are conserved having regard to their significance.</p>	
1	Policy HE2	<p>POLICY HE2: SOMERSETSHIRE COAL CANAL AND THE WANSDYKE</p> <p>Development adversely affecting the physical remains and/or historic routes of the Wansdyke or Somersetshire Coal Canal, as defined on the Policies Map, and/or their setting, will not be permitted unless it can demonstrate appropriate mitigation and/or enhancement consistent with Policy HE2.</p>	Amend Policy HE2 to cross refer to Policy B3a (Historic England).

		For the section of the Wansdyke lying within the Land adjoining Odd Down, Bath Strategic Site Allocation, Policy B3a will also apply.	
1	Policy RE6	<p>POLICY RE6: RE-USE OF RURAL BUILDINGS</p> <p>Conversion of a building or buildings to a new use in the countryside outside the scope of Policies RA1, RA2 and GB2 will only be permitted, provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) its form, bulk and general design is in keeping with its surroundings and respects the style and materials of the existing building 2) the building is not of temporary or insubstantial construction and not capable of conversion without substantial or complete reconstruction or requires major extension 3) the proposal would enhance visual amenity and not harm ecological function (e.g. bat roost) 4) the proposal does not result in the dispersal of activity which prejudices town or village vitality and viability 5) where the building is isolated from public services and community facilities and unrelated to an established group of buildings the benefits of re-using a redundant or disused building and any enhancement to its immediate setting outweighs the harm arising from the isolated location 6) the development would not result, or be likely to result, in replacement agricultural buildings or the outside storage of plant and machinery which would be harmful to visual amenity; 7) in the case of buildings in the Green Belt, does not have a materially greater impact than the present use on the openness of the Green Belt or would conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. 8. <u>The integrity and significance of buildings and farmsteads of architectural and historic interest and of communal, aesthetic and evidential value are safeguarded consistent with Policy HE1</u> 	To ensure that the architectural and historic interest of rural farm buildings and farmsteads not formally designated are recognised and their integrity and significance are safeguarded (Historic England).
1	ST1	<p>POLICY ST1: PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL</p> <p>In order to ensure delivery of well-connected places accessible by sustainable means of transport, planning permission will be permitted provided the following principles are addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) reduce the growth and the overall level of traffic and congestion by measures which encourage movement by public transport, bicycle and on foot, including traffic management and assisting the integration of all forms of transport; 2) reduce dependency on the private car; 3) give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities; 4) provide and enhance facilities for pedestrians, cyclists 	Include additional clause to accord with national policy for the historic environment (Historic England).

		<p>and the mobility impaired including segregated provision that is fit for purpose;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5) safeguard, enhance and extend the network of public rights of way and cycle routes; 6) reduce the adverse impact of all forms of travel on the natural and built environment; 7) ensure development does not prejudice the efficient functioning and acceptable development of the railway network; 8) promote the use of car clubs and electric cars; 9) ensure access to high quality public transport facilities is achieved by improving existing and providing new public transport facilities which would increase the proportion of journeys made by public transport; and 10) support and promote measures which reduce the levels of traffic pollution in the interests of improving health and quality of life and reducing harmful impacts on the built and natural environment; <u>and</u> 11) <u>Schemes should safeguard affected heritage assets and the historic environment.</u> 	
1	ST3	<p>POLICY ST3: TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <p>Within the context of Core Strategy Policy CP6(1) the development of transport infrastructure will only be permitted provided that the following requirements have been met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no unacceptable impact on <u>heritage and environmental assets</u> including the World Heritage Site and its setting, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Natura 2000 sites (SACs/SPA); 2. The visual and functional impact of the scheme and any associated surface treatment, street furniture, signing, road markings, roadside verges and lighting upon the character of the area is minimised; 3. The impact of noise and other forms of pollution on surrounding land uses from traffic likely to be generated by the proposal is minimised; 4. The needs of pedestrians including those with impaired mobility, cyclists and horseriders are met; 5. The need for provision in appropriate cases of street furniture which aids security of premises without adversely affecting pedestrian circulation; 6. The environmental benefits to be secured through implementation of the scheme and any additional traffic management or calming measures needed to maximise those benefits should be clearly articulated; 7. The quality, patronage and efficiency of public transport operations must not be compromised; 8. The response time of emergency services must not be compromised; and 9. The acceptable provision for the transportation of 	<p>Change made to clause 1 to acknowledge the relevance of considering all heritage assets and not just the World Heritage Site (Historic England).</p>

		<p>materials to and from the site or disposal of spoil during construction.</p> <p>All highway infrastructure will be required to comply with national guidance and standards set out in 'Manual for Streets', 'Manual for Streets 2 - wider application of the principles', the 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges' and any subsequent updates to these documents.</p>	
1	ST6	<p>POLICY ST6: PARK AND RIDE</p> <p>1) Development of new or expansion of existing Park and Ride sites will be permitted provided:</p> <p>(a) that there is no unacceptable impact on environmental <u>and heritage</u> assets and amenity including the World Heritage Site and its setting, the Cotswolds AONB and Natura 2000 sites (SACs/SPA);</p> <p>(b) that there is no unacceptable impact on surrounding road network and its capacity to safely accommodate potential traffic generation; and</p> <p>(c) provision is made for the needs of those with impaired mobility and for the safety and security of all users; and</p> <p>(d) in the case of Park and Ride development in the Green Belt, it can as necessary be demonstrated that there are not any more suitable or more sustainable alternative sites outside the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land in it.</p> <p>2) Applicants will also be required to demonstrate that the scheme complies with all other relevant national and local planning policies that affect the site and its location.</p>	<p>Change made to clause 1a) to acknowledge the relevance of considering all heritage assets and not just the World Heritage Site (Historic England).</p>
1	Policy ST8	<p>POLICY ST8: AIRPORT AND AERODROME SAFEGUARDING AREAS</p> <p>Within the airport/aerodrome safeguarding areas as defined by the Civil Aviation Authority as shown on the Policies Map any development that would prejudice air safety or adversely affect the operational integrity of an aerodrome or airport <u>will not be permitted.</u></p>	<p>Final part of the policy omitted from published Draft Plan in error.</p>
1	M5	<p><i>Replace term 'Energy Minerals' with 'Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons'</i></p>	<p>Replace all references in the Plan to Energy Minerals' with 'Conventional and Unconventional Hydrocarbons' to align with national policy (Coal Authority).</p>

APPENDIX 3: LIST OF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES THAT WILL BE SUPERSEDED ON ADOPTION OF THE PLACEMAKING PLAN

- B1 Bath Spatial Strategy**
- B3 Strategic Policy for Twerton and Newbridge Riverside**
- B5 Strategic Policy for Bath's Universities**
- KE2 Town Centre/Somerdale Strategic Policy**
- SV1 Somer Vale Spatial Strategy**
- SV2 Midsomer Norton Town Centre Strategic policy**
- RA1 Development in the Villages meeting the listed criteria**
- RA2 Development in Villages outside the Green Belt not meeting Policy RA1 Criteria**
- CP4 District Heating**
- CP7 Green Infrastructure**
- CP12 Centres and Retailing**

APPENDIX 4: SCHEDULE OF KEY ISSUES RAISED THROUGH CONSULTATION ON DRAFT PLACEMAKING PLAN

No.	Plan ref	Respondents	Issue	Recommended Action
a	Whole Plan	Various developers	<p>Plan preparation process/scope:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combining Core Strategy & Placemaking Plan at this stage and amending some parts of Core Strategy has resulted in a disjointed document and confusion as to what is being consulted upon and how this relates to the Local Development Scheme and/or some assuming all of the Core Strategy is available for comment • SA is inadequate • Duty to cooperate statement has not been produced – legal compliance issue • Consultation documents changed during consultation period and respondents not all advised – process therefore, flawed • Maps included in Appendices not all at a scale where boundary changes/new boundaries are clear • Major & minor textual errors in Plan, including missing part of Policy ST8, that need to be corrected 	<p>Relationship between Core Strategy & Placemaking Plan to be clearly articulated for the Inspector.</p> <p>DtC statement to be prepared.</p> <p>Note on consultation process to be prepared for Inspector.</p> <p>Include whole of Policy ST8 in schedule of focussed changes to submit alongside the Plan.</p>
b	District-wide strategy/ housing supply and place based sections	Various developers/ land owners	<p>Housing land supply and allocation of alternative or additional sites for development:</p> <p>Developers have raised the following issues in suggesting that the Placemaking Plan should be planning for a greater level of housing development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strategic context of very significant future housing needs as demonstrated via SHMA for Wider Bristol HMA (JSP) • impending related review of the B&NES CS's housing requirement • Core Strategy requirement of 13,000 homes is not a 'cap' and nor are the individual 'policy area' requirements – other suitable/sustainable sites should be allocated in excess of this figure • need to better take account of market signals • need more flexibility in the Plan • sites identified in SHLAA will not deliver housing as expected • over reliance on brownfield sites <p>In order to address these issues a range of sites are proposed for allocation (mainly in Keynsham and Somer Valley), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uplands, Keynsham • Land west of Keynsham (around 200 dwellings to contribute towards local need and strategic requirement identified via JSP) • Broadleaze Nursery, east of Keynsham (to meet local housing need, in particular for affordable housing) • Larger scale development between 	<p>The housing land supply based on the most recent progress in bringing forward sites has been reviewed. It is concluded that there is risk to delivery of some of the sites which are relied upon to deliver the 13,000 core strategy housing requirement, but this is offset by other sites forthcoming. It is not considered that the risk is so great as to warrant the identification of new housing sites at this stage and that the appropriate time to review is as set out in the Core Strategy i.e. a 5 year review in 2019/20 to ascertain whether the 13,000 is still the appropriate housing target and whether any changes in the spatial strategy are required to ensure its delivery. However, it should be noted that there is a risk that the Inspector may conclude differently & require the Council to identify additional sites, subject them to public consultation before he concludes the exam. This will lead to a delay to the adoption of the plan by at least around 2 to 3 months.</p>

			<p>Keynsham and Saltford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate/develop safeguarded land to east of Keynsham now • Rymans Engineering, Radstock • Land North of Kilmersdon Road, Manor Farm, Haydon, Radstock • Land parallel with Five Arches Greenway, Radstock • Land at Tynning Hill, Radstock • Land off Bath Old Road, Radstock • Land at Smallcombe Road, Clandown, Radstock • Rear of 46 Radstock Road, Midsomer Norton • Land to east of Church Road, Peasedown • Paulton Printing Works (releasing Care Retirement Community land) • Land north of Temple Inn Lane, Temple Cloud • Land at Wells Road, Hallatrow • Former Garden Nursery, Temple Cloud 	
c	Whole plan & spatial strategy	Highways England	Generally supportive of the spatial strategy and site allocations and promotion of sustainable means of transport. Potential concern around amount of development within Bath, particularly focussed in the Enterprise Area, and potential for negative impact on strategic road network. Need to ensure all necessary transport infrastructure measures are identified in the Placemaking Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Programme.	No change – further work being undertaken prior to Examination
d	Whole plan	Environment Agency	Generally supportive of the Plan with regard to environmental issues and specifically flood risk/implementation of the sequential approach, taking account of climate change, and associated policy/site requirements. Some broad suggestions that the Plan could be improved through the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cross references to flood emergency planning/response • include references to pertinent regulatory frameworks in relation to water supply/quality • greater prominence to considering water source protection across the District • cross references to national guidance on contamination assessments • review nature conservation policies (which are supported by EA) in context of national biodiversity toolkit 	No changes to Plan at this stage required for soundness – consider issues at Examination and whether minor changes to improve the Plan could be made
e	Policies RA1 & RA2 (rural strategy)	Various developers	Changes to Policy RA1 (reference to requirement for a primary school) & inclusion of Policy LCR3A stating that residential development will only be permitted where primary school has capacity or can expand is not justified/in accordance with the NPPF and will negatively affect housing delivery in the rural areas and may mean Core Strategy requirements for rural areas cannot be met.	No change – consider issues through Examination
f	Policy LCR6A and specific Local Green	Landowners and residents	Local Green Space (LGS) - The process of and approach to designating LGS in terms of the application/interpretation of the NPPF is questioned i.e. has the Council designated LGS that is 'demonstrably special' and meets the criteria?	No change – consider issues through Examination

	Spaces		<p>Many representations relating to individual spaces:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proposing previously nominated or new spaces should be designated, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beechen Cliff school land at Breaches Gate East Keynsham land south of Staddlestones, Midsomer Norton LGS18 designation (land at Whitelands/Tynning, Radstock) should be extended to include all land referred to as the “Green batch” Proposing new spaces for designation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> undeveloped land on northern part of University of bath campus Proposing that designated spaces should not be designated, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Millers Walk, Bathampton Adj. Bramble Cottage, Farmborough Parkers Mead, East Harptree Land south of Lower Road, Hinton Blewett 	
g	Policy ST7: parking standards	Various, including developers & FOBRA	<p>Parking standards - implications of changing approach to parking standards not adequately tested e.g. in terms of traffic generation, especially in Bath. Need to ensure Parking Standards support delivery of Bath Transport Strategy. Sharp distinction between inner and outer parking areas in Bath is unacceptable as results in major difference in standards either side of boundary line within the Enterprise Area. Zero parking standard for student accommodation unacceptable as Universities also discourage car parking/use.</p>	No changes to the Plan should be made at this stage. Issues to be considered through Examination.
h	District-wide Policies SCR2-4, D1 & D6, RE6, HE1 & 2, ST1,3 & 6	Historic England	<p>In order to closely accord with the NPPF the Plan's policies relating to renewable energy development; design; re-use of rural buildings; and transport infrastructure should be amended to refer to considering and mitigating impact on heritage interests & assets.</p>	Make limited changes to some Policies (see Appendix 2) – submit alongside Draft Plan
i	Policy H7 (Housing standards)	Registered Housing Providers & other developers	<p>Housing Accessibility & Space Standards for affordable housing have been inappropriately ‘passported’ into the Planning Obligations SPD. The application of standards to both affordable and market housing needs to be robustly evidenced (in terms of need and viability).</p>	No change – further work being undertaken prior to submission/ Examination
j	District-wide Policies, including those relating to renewable energy; design; environ	Various	<p>Variety of issues raised on District-wide Development Management policies – developers consider some policies too prescriptive/restrictive and not in line with NPPF, others consider some aspects of policies require definitions and clarification.</p>	No change – consider issues through Examination

	mental issues			
k	Bath - strategy	FOBRA and other stakeholders	<p>The strategy should be more explicitly articulated and clearer regarding the limits to University expansion i.e. housing and employment spaces are the first priority; retail and hotel developments are a lower priority; and the expansion of the universities for academic and student accommodation should be limited to on-campus development within the existing site boundaries without any further intrusion into the Green Belt and the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>Others consider the strategy fails to meet needs/demands that it should prioritise e.g. for student accommodation, key worker housing, HMOs.</p>	No change – consider issue through Examination
l	Bath – university expansion/ student accommodation	Universities FOBRA, student accommodation providers and residents	<p>Approach of the Plan to University expansion, provision of student accommodation and implications for the city:</p> <p><u>Universities/student accommodation providers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the Plan is too restrictive and that it should better facilitate changing aspirations of Universities e.g. through looking at more creative solutions • University of Bath is a major driver of educational opportunity and economic growth in the City and District, and the Plan should play a critical role in supporting its continued success • The Plan should be based on meeting student accommodation/university growth as a priority (not sub-ordinate to meeting housing/employment needs) and Policy B5 needs amending to positively enable off-campus provision, particularly outside EA/city centre • Site allocations/Policy B5 should be more flexible in allowing an element of student accommodation on key sites and smaller stand-alone sites e.g. through reference to improving viability <p><u>FOBRA/various residents</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the Plan does not adequately control/limit growth of the Universities • The Plan should not include student expansion projections/numbers as these are subject to change – they should be included in a separate Student Accommodation Strategy • Off-campus student accommodation provision should be strictly controlled and further accommodation should be focussed on-campus only • Growth of HMOs needs to be better managed/controlled across the city as a whole e.g. limiting annual growth to a specified number or setting a lower proportion of properties that can be HMOs tailored to specific locations 	No change – consider issues through Examination
m	Bath Park &	Various, including	A clear and robust case for East of Bath P&R (considered alongside and related to other	No change to the Plan. Collate relevant evidence on P&R and

	Ride (Policy ST6)	Historic England, FOBRA and BPT	transport measures) needs to be set out and the impact of a P&R on all heritage assets will need to be thoroughly assessed (including using the ICOMOS guidance). Policy on P&R should better reflect need to balance protection of Green Belt/AONB against public benefits of P&R including to WHS through removing traffic. Less specific references to Park & Ride as being the solution to transport problems in the city should be made, thereby enabling other solutions further out from the city e.g. park & link to be considered.	other East of Bath transport measures for submission and discussion at Examination.
n	Bath (site specific issues)	Various stakeholders, including developers & land owners	Range of specific issues raised on sites allocated for development. Key issues raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB2 (the Rec) – should make clear that additional car parking should not form part of development on this site • SB4 (Quays North) – should make provision for hotel uses and cultural/arts venue. Alternative solution for coach parking/drop needs to be identified. • SB7 (Sydenham Park/Green Park station) – policy too prescriptive in terms of uses and the design principles are too onerous. Sainsbury's supportive of option involving their relocation but only if they stay on the wider site • SB8 (Westmark part of Western Riverside) & SB16 (Burlington Street) – policies should allow for student accommodation • SB11 (MoD Foxhill) – concern about impact of development on AONB 	
o	Keynsham	Various residents & developers	Issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to ensure re-provided Leisure Centre meets current/future needs • Infrastructure, including transport network, unable to cope with new development – ensure specific transport improvements identified & delivered • Site specific issues e.g. employment floorspace in Somerdale and refer to Broadmead Peninsula opportunities 	No change – consider issues through Examination
p	Somer Valley	Various residents & developers	Issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision for Radstock – refer to Radstock-Frome railway • Policy SV1 too restrictive by limiting housing to within HDB • Objection to safeguarded land for educational purposes at Norton Hill as undeliverable and land at White Post (in association with housing development) being pursued by Education Funding Authority • Enterprise Zone references need to be accurate • Site specific issues e.g. policy requirements for Old Mills allocation and Welton Bibby & Baron site and Former St. Nicholas Primary School 	No change – consider issues through Examination
q	Rural Areas	Various residents, developers &	Issues raised are primarily site specific. Key issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timsbury - land East of St Mary's Primary 	No change – consider issues through Examination

		Parish Councils	<p>School (SR15) – potential for access improvements to the school should be better facilitated as this was one of the major reasons for allocating the site. Extent of development area shown and dwelling capacity is too great; need to protect more land as LGS and concern about loss of views/viewing point; harm to rural character; and dangerous access onto North Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timsbury – land south of Loves Hill should have been allocated as more suitable/less constrained than SR15 and enables housing needs to be met (also subject of a current planning application for 45 dwellings) • West Harptree – Leacroft House site (SR2) should not be limited to 17 dwellings given sustainability of village and site location • West Harptree is a RA1 village and additional site should be allocated • East Harptree – Pinkers Farm (SR5) should not be allocated or some policy criteria are too onerous • East Harptree – land at Ashwood, Church Lane should be allocated as it is more suitable/deliverable & less constrained than either site allocated in the Draft Plan and housing will help keep village facilities viable • Land at Hinton Blewett should be allocated for development (19 dwellings) to help address local need for affordable housing • Temple Cloud – two sites put forward for allocation to help meet strategic requirement and both also considered to be in sustainable locations and technical work shows suitable/deliverable 	
--	--	-----------------	---	--

APPENDIX 5: KEY ISSUES RAISED IN REPRESENTATIONS BY BATH SPA UNIVERSITY AND THE UNIVERSITY OF BATH

1. Consultation responses from both Universities provide new information on their current footprint within the city and their future growth plans. Related to this, further research on HMO changes since the Article 4 Direction came into force reveals some emerging trend, of relevance to this issue and plan monitoring and review.

Bath Spa

2. Bath Spa has undertaken an analysis of term time addresses to assess how many of its students actually take-up accommodation in the city during term time. The headline figure is that 57% of students take-up a bedspaces in a University Hall, Private Hall or HMO. To give that some context, 87% of all students are full-time, and 71% are full time undergraduates. Therefore, one cannot use these as reliable proxy for reality. Further, when forecasting the future it is reasonable to assume that only around 57% of new students will generate accommodation demand in the city in the aforementioned categories. A small number also rent privately outside of the HMO stock in Bath.
3. The University's growth plans for the future have matured since Placemaking Plan Options stage and have reduced. The current aspiration is to grow from around 7,100 in 2012/13 to around 10,700 in 2020/21. That is an increase of around 3,600. The previous forecast was for growth around 4,500, but the Bath Spa Global programme is now expected to generate far fewer new students by this time. This reduction in growth (in a component that would have been very much 'in need' of accommodation in city), combined with a new understanding of the student accommodation footprint, means that the shortfall in accommodation to 2020/21 (taking into account growth and considerable new supply to date) to enable the aspiration is now reduced to around 1,000, as opposed to around 2,500, as stated in the Draft Plan. Nevertheless, the plan period continues to 2029 and although institutions don't plan beyond 5 years, some further growth can be expected to be aspired to. As a reminder, during the preparation of Core Strategy there was no growth plan.
4. The shortfall could reduce to 750 if Bath Spa students were to claim a half share of free to market accommodation that has been built/permitted, but they are not keen for this to be budgeted for as the accommodation type comprises studios (expensive/isolated) as opposed to communal living (cheaper/less isolated). However, some students will inevitably occupy this space and thus it needs to be taken into account.
5. The University would like to secure the supply gap (of 750-1,000) within new dedicated accommodation, as this provides security of supply, rather than relying wholly on HMO growth (which is now subject to more planning control than previously). A wholly HMO led approach to deliver 1,000 more bedspaces would require around 250 more properties over the next 5 years. That is not deliverable at the current post Article 4 Direction rate of permissions (see subsequent paragraphs), and in combination with competition from the University of Bath and from other markets for those properties that are permitted to convert. Nevertheless, there will continue to be some more HMOs that are secured by Bath Spa students. National Planning Practice Guidance recognises the role of the HMO sector as performing part of the solution for student accommodation. However, Plan's must also take account of local circumstances.

6. Alternatively, the need (or most of it) for around 1,000 more bedrooms could be secured in dedicated accommodation (equivalent to 2 more Green Park House type developments or 3 more Lower Bristol Road type developments or 6 more James Street West type developments). There is scope for the redevelopment of aging on-campus accommodation at the south end of Newton Park, but due to the sensitivities the net gain would likely be minor.
7. Whilst there is some flexibility in the Plan (particularly outside the Bath Enterprise Area) to enable some of the gap in supply, there is no guarantee that it will be secured by Bath Spa students. Further flexibility in Bath or elsewhere would come at the expense of the supply of land for housing to meet conventional needs, and as set out in the Draft Placemaking Plan that would need to be compensated for, as 'planned for' land supply delivers around 13,000 dwellings. Once, again this analysis of demand and supply is only up to 2020/21 and any further aspiration could present additional risks to conventional housing land supply.
8. No change to the Draft Plan's policies relating to this matter is recommended, although some of the evidence base will need to be updated prior to submission. The examining Inspector may require flexibility in the Plan to enable Bath Spa to meet its growth aspiration to 2020/21 in full. This may result in the need to consider sites to provide compensatory provision of conventional housing as referred to in the Draft Plan.

University of Bath

9. The representations of the University of Bath show that the headline picture for the University of Bath in term of numbers has not really changed. From 2012/13 to 2020/21 the aspiration is to grow by 4,500 students from 14,455 to 19,000. As of 2015/16 it is at 16,300. As previously stated by the University the share of total numbers of students being in accommodation need will likely rise from about 73% to 78%. Once, again these numbers are only to 2020/21. Draft Placemaking Plan Policy B5 and the supporting text to it in relation to the University Bath's growth aspiration, the associated accommodation needs and supply remain valid.
10. Their representations extol the value of the institution in principle and to the city and seek to, as one would expect, achieve a favourable town planning framework. It wants more flexibility within the city to achieve its goals which would effectively mean that current objectives for housing and employment land may have to be met in a slightly different way e.g. using Green Belt land at Bath or Green Belt or non-Green Belt land further afield.
11. That desire to establish the room for manoeuvre is also reflected in their representations that seek to push back, in part, the new policy framework covering the campus itself – which is subject to a significant number of environmental issues.
12. The University has also prepared a revised masterplan responding to the Placemaking Plan. Further assessment needs to be undertaken of the capacity to accommodate growth on-campus, including the proportion of new floorspace that could be used for student accommodation and academic space. This is critical in considering the impact on the policy approach for the city and the University's request for greater flexibility in the policy framework. This will be an issue for discussion at the Examination.
13. It is recommended no change to the plan is made prior to submission and the issues outlined above are debated by all relevant stakeholders at the Examination. The examining

Inspector may seek to enable the University of Bath to meet its aspirations in full, with the flexibility within the city, which would have the same consequences as set out for Bath Spa.

Houses in Multiple Occupation

14. The number of HMOs permitted since July 2013 is set out below. Note that there will be a time lag between 2015/16 permissions and these properties coming to market, being occupied and any Council tax exemption being applied for. The share for 2015/16 occupied by students will increase as will the overall rolling share. It might reasonably be expected that both will be around 50-55% once the lag ends and this will continue to be monitored.

	Permitted HMO conversions	Council tax exempt	% Council tax exempt (student HMOs)
2013/14 (9 months)	18	8	44%
2014/15	37	20	54%
2015/16 (11 Months)	41	15	37%
Total	96	43	45%

15. This highlights that around half of HMOs permitted are not for students and this needs to be taken into account in reviewing the HMOs SPD. Further, the Draft Placemaking Plan currently requires compensatory provision for the growth in Council tax exempt HMOs that result from planning permissions and a reasonable, annual estimate for these currently would be 15-20 per annual, against an annualised housing target for Bath of 388.

Bath & North East Somerset Council	
MEETING	Council
MEETING DATE:	23 March 2016
TITLE:	Creation of a Charitable Trust Board to manage Charitable Trusts
WARD:	All
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM SAVE FOR APPENDIX B WHICH IS LIKELY TO BE TAKEN IN EXEMPT SESSION	
<p>List of attachments to this report:</p> <p>Proposed Trust Board Terms of Reference – Appendix A</p> <p>EXEMPT INFORMATION Advice on the Alice Park Trust – Appendix B paragraph 12(b) of schedule 12A LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972</p>	

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 The Council is sole trustee for a number of Trusts including the Alice Park Trust in Bath. There has been a lack of clarity in how the Council has previously dealt with these Trusts. The creation of the Trust Board will in future ensure the clear separation of the Council's interest as sole trustee of these charities and the Council's interests as a Local Authority.
- 1.2 Once created with the terms of reference proposed the Trust Board will be able to:
- (i) Independently determine that the past use of assets by the Council as Local Authority has been correctly accounted for, and
 - (ii) In the case of the Alice Park to independently determine the proposal for a skateboard park to be constructed on the site and if so to independently consider the options and manage the terms, conditions and safeguards appropriate to its construction
- 1.3 Following Local Government reorganisation, counsel advises that the trustees of the Alice Park Trust are all the members of the Council but to provide clarity counsel advises passing a resolution pursuant to s.280 of the Charities Act 2011 whereby the appointment of the Council as sole corporate trustee is confirmed

- 1.4 The Creation of the Trust Board will also enable the Council, to investigate and consider the other assets it holds as sole charitable trustee and acting in that capacity to further delegate to the Board powers to manage those other assets subject to further reports to Council.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 The Council establish the Trust Board as a committee of the Council
- 2.2 The Council approve the proposed Terms of Reference of the Trust Board
- 2.3 Subject to the Charter Trustees written agreement the Council resolves under s.280 of the Charities Act 2011 that Bath and North East Somerset Council is the sole corporate trustee of the Alice Park Trust
- 2.4 The Council authorises officers to investigate and subsequently report on the enlargement of the Trust Board's Terms of Reference to include the Trusts detailed in paragraph 5. 4

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)

- 3.1 The Trust Board will be a committee of the Council and will therefore need to be resourced by officers and financed to enable it to obtain independent advice subject to the power to recoup administration costs from the assets of the Trust(s).

4 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS AND BASIS FOR PROPOSAL

- 4.1 Where a Council is the sole trustee of a charity, it is the corporate body, acting in accordance with its usual procedures, which is the trustee. While ongoing management may be delegated to a committee and officers, responsibility for decision making and oversight rests with all councillors. The Terms of Reference of the Trust Board therefore require that it reports to full Council on an annual basis after it has filed all annual reports for the charitable trusts that it manages on behalf of the Council with the Charity Commission.
- 4.2 The management of the Trust(s) should be kept separate, as far as possible, from the business of the Council and equally the finances of the Trust(s) must be kept separate from those of the Council. The assets must be accounted for separately and income and expenditure needs to be channelled through discrete cost centres. The Council may top up the finances of the Trust(s) but no funds should pass from the Trust into the Council's own accounts although, in appropriate cases, the Council may recover the cost of administering the Trust(s)
- 4.3 It is proposed that if members resolve to establish the Trust Board, the Trust Board should in turn delegate its operational management functions to a sub-committee formed specifically for each charitable trust in Schedule 1 of the Terms of Reference of the Trust Board. In that way the Council can ensure the assets of each Trust are separately considered and administered and a distinct audit trail will be created.

5 THE REPORT

Demonstrating independence

- 5.1 The Charities Commission has advised the Council that in order to demonstrate that in future the assets of the Trusts are separately managed the Council should form a Trust Board to independently manage the assets and to demonstrate a clear separation of its functions as sole trustee of the charitable assets and its other assets held in its capacity as a Local Authority.
- 5.2 The creation of the Trust Board, as a committee of the Council, and sub committees to manage each Trust will demonstrate the decisions taken on their behalf, as sole trustee, are being independently taken in accordance with each Trust's objects and the duties it owes pursuant to the Charities legislation.
- 5.3 It is proposed that the Trust Board once constituted would be independently trained by a firm of solicitors specialising in charities legislation. It would also receive advice on regulating each Trusts accounts with the Charities Commission.

Other Charitable Trusts

5.4 The Council has present responsibility for the following:

- 5.4.1 Weston Recreation Ground
- 5.4.2 4, The Circus
- 5.4.3 Free Fields (Rainbow Woods)
- 5.4.4 Beechen Cliff
- 5.4.5 Newbridge Meadows (Queen Elizabeth the Second Fields)
- 5.4.6 Blackstones
- 5.4.7 Innox Park
- 5.4.8 Lansdown Playing Field
- 5.4.9 Post Office Museum
- 5.4.10 Former Radstock Infant School

5.5 The legal basis for its involvement with these trusts is presently unknown. It is proposed that the legal basis is investigated and that where possible the responsibility for operational management of these Trusts is also delegated to the Trust Board to be managed in accordance with their charitable objects and any duties the Council owes pursuant to the charities legislation. Any subsequent proposals will be subject to investigation and full reports to Council together with any recommended amendment to the terms of reference of the Trust Board.

6 RATIONALE

6.1 A Trust Board and sub committees for each Charity, for which the Council is sole trustee, with a limited number of sub-committee members which have delegated

to them the management decisions necessary to run each Trust is the most appropriate and cost effective way of dealing with the Charitable Trusts. It is envisaged that initially the Trust Board and the sub-committee for the Alice Park Trust will need to meet on a frequent basis to train members, resolve any issues with the Charity Commissioners, and consider the current proposals for the skateboard park.

6.2 It is envisaged that going forward the Trust Board will be able to manage other charitable Trust assets detailed in Paragraph 5.3.

7 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

7.1 Full Council could retain the decision making functions in relation to the Trust's assets and the Other Trusts (para 5.3) but this would be unwieldy and time consuming

8 CONSULTATION

8.1 The proposed Trust Board has been consulted upon with the Charities Commission, Leader, Chief Executive and S.151 Officer.

9 RISK MANAGEMENT

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

Contact person	Michael Hewitt, Solicitor, 01225 395125
Background papers	The Conveyance dated 17 December 1973 (1973 Conveyance) creating Alice Park Trust the Endowment for Alice Park Trust the Scheme of the Charity Commission dated the 17 December 1973 (the Scheme)
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

Terms of reference for a Charitable Trust Board

Background

A Charitable Trust can be established by a benefactor in their lifetime through a deed of trust or after their death through their will. Charitable Trusts have a charitable purpose as defined by the Charities Act and exist for the benefit of the public.

The Council's current responsibilities

The Council is responsible for the Trust detailed in Schedule 1, namely the Alice Park Trust having been appointed as sole Trustee by a Charity Commission Scheme in 1973, but subject to clarification of the status of the Trusts in Schedule 2. The legal basis and management responsibility for the Trusts listed in Schedule 2 are either independently managed but the land is owned/held by the Council or the Council's responsibility for management has still to be determined.

Governance principles

The constitution of a charitable trust is called its governing document. This will derive from the provisions of the original trust deed or will. It will specify the charitable purpose (objects) of the trust and set out arrangements for its governance and administration. Trust law completes the governance framework for Trusts, providing certain statutory powers for trustees. The Charity Commission is the regulator for charitable Trusts and their operation.

As the trustee, the Council's role is to provide leadership and direction for the charity in line with its governing documents. Its overriding duty is to act in the best interests of the charity at all times. In this role, the Council must not be influenced by the interests of other parties or organisations (including the Council as a whole). It must make independent decisions and be seen to do so.

Without specific arrangements in place, it is difficult to distinguish the role of trustee for the charity from that of managing the wider Council. The creation of a Charitable Trust Board, concerned solely with the interests of the charity Trusts, would facilitate the separation of these roles. The Charity Commission has indicated that it would regard such an arrangement as a satisfactory way forward.

Proposed Charitable Trust Board

It is important to remember that the Council corporately is the trustee of the charitable trust (Schedule 1). This structure cannot be changed by the Council.

The Charitable Trust Board will be a committee of the Council and members of a Charitable Trust Board would not be trustees but nominated councillors (and possibly others who are co-opted onto it) which shall have delegated to it the operational management of the charitable trust (Schedule1) but with the Council as trustee retaining overall responsibility for the charity and its affairs.

Charities exist to provide benefit to the public and any Trust Board should fulfil the requirements of public accountability. This is principally achieved through the reporting regime and by making information publicly available. As a committee of the council the Trust Board would be subject to the Council's full range of procedures for Council committees and meetings

A Trust Board would be expected to be well informed about the needs and wishes of its beneficiaries. To achieve this end it could engage with interest groups and representatives of local residents and undertake consultation on plans and significant projects.

It would be possible to include in a Trust Board one or more individuals from outside the Council. Such a person could bring relevant skills or experience to the Board but the over-riding requirement would be that they apply independent and objective consideration in the best interests of the trust. Representatives of special interest or residents groups would not be appropriate because of the potential for conflicts of interest.

Since the Council is the sole trustee of the charities listed in Schedule 1 it could only delegate powers to a committee of the Council, i.e. a group of councillors. An independent person co-opted onto the Board would not have voting rights.

In the light of the above, it is considered that a Trust Board created as a committee of the council and consisting of a small number of councillors plus an independent person would be an appropriate arrangement. Constitutionally, the Board would create a sub-committee to manage each of the charities listed in Schedule 1 and act as an advisory board to the Council in respect of the charities listed in schedule 2.

The Council is responsible for a number of other charitable Trusts within its area (see Schedule 2). These are typically areas of open land or buildings. In most cases, the Council is the sole trustee, responsible for both managing the trust and holding the title to the land. In some cases, the title of the land is held by the Official Custodian. In the case of the Recreation Ground, the Council holds the title of the land but its management is the responsibility of an independent trustee body. Where possible and subject to further changes to the proposed ToR below the Board and sub-committees will have delegated to it/them the operational management functions in respect of those Trusts listed in Schedule 1 or where that is not possible will act in an advisory role to the Council in respect of those Trusts listed in Schedule 2

Proposed terms of reference

The purpose of the Charitable Trust Board is to facilitate the management of the charitable Trust for which the Council is the sole trustee; independently, in accordance with their governing documents and in the best interests of the charity.

In respect of the charities listed in Schedule 1 the Charitable Trust Board shall have the following powers delegated to it.

The Role of the Board is to exercise the powers delegated to it for the management of the trust, namely;

- to manage the charity in pursuit of the charitable purposes,
- to manage the finances of the charity and ensure its solvency,
- to ensure the charity acts within the governing documents,
- to ensure the charity deals with their regulatory and public accountability obligations, and
- to identify and manage potential conflicts of interest.

In respect of the charities listed in Schedule 2 the Charitable Trust Board shall investigate the governing documents of each charity and recommend to Council the inclusion of any Charity suitable for incorporation into Schedule 1 and until such time as the Council decides to delegate its functions in respect of such Trust to the Charitable Trust Board it shall advise the Council as trustee on;

- the strategic direction of those Trusts,
- the financial resources needed to operate those Trusts;

The Charitable Trust Board shall, in respect of all Trusts, ensure compliance with the Charity Commissions registration and reporting requirements and periodically consider if Trust's assets could be consolidated and more efficiently /effectively used in conjunction with another Trust. Where appropriate it should consult on consolidation proposals with the Charity Commission and interested parties and make any recommendations for consolidation in its annual report to Council.

The Board will comprise:

- Five councillors
(to include the Cabinet member responsible for Community Services and at least one councillor who is not a member of the controlling group but who's appointment is determined by the controlling group), and
- One independent person with suitable skills, experience or interests to be appointed by the Board from applicants who wish to be considered following advertisement of the role.

The Board will elect a Chair and Vice-Chair. Decisions will be by a majority of the councillors present. Quorum will be three councillors.

D r a f t

The Board shall have the power to create a sub-committee for each charity listed in Schedule 1 to ensure that each charity shall be separately administered. Each sub-committee shall consist of at least 3 councillors and co-opted non-voting members consisting of the ward councillor(s) for the area where any land subject to the Trust is situated and any other non-voting members who may be able to assist it in its work. The Trust Board and each sub-committee shall undertake its duties through meetings as required and will meet at least twice annually.

In any meeting, the affairs of each Trust will be considered separately and in relation to the purpose and governing document of each Trust.

Each sub-committee will report annually to the Trust Board after submitting any annual report to the Charity Commissioners and the Trust Board shall thereafter provide an annual report to Council on the financial standing of each Trust and update the Council on the work undertaken by each Trust in the preceding year

Support for the Board and sub-committees as necessary will be provided through the relevant Council sections. Lead advisors will be identified for each charitable Trust in Schedule 1.

D r a f t

Schedule 1
Charitable Trust for which the Council is sole trustee

The Alice Park

Schedule 2
Charitable Trust for which the Council is responsible

Weston Recreation Ground
4, The Circus
Firs Field
Free Fields (Rainbow Woods)
Beechen Cliff
Newbridge Meadows (Queen Elizabeth the Second Fields)
Blackstones
Innox Park
Post Office Museum
Former Radstock Infant School

Access to Information Arrangements

Exclusion of access by the public to Council meetings

Information Compliance Ref: 290/16

Meeting / Decision: Full Council

Date: 16 February 2016

Author: Michael Hewitt

Report Title: Creation of a Charitable Trust Board to manage Charitable Trusts

Proposed Trust Board Terms of Reference – Appendix A

EXEMPT INFORMATION - Advice on the Alice Park Trust – Appendix B

The Report contains exempt information, according to the categories set out in the Local Government Act 1972 (amended Schedule 12A). The relevant exemption is set out below.

Stating the exemption:

5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

The public interest test has been applied, and it is concluded that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosure at this time. It is therefore recommended that the Report be withheld from publication on the Council website. The paragraphs below set out the relevant public interest issues in this case.

PUBLIC INTEREST TEST

If the delegated officer wishes to consider a matter with press and public excluded, it must be satisfied on two matters.

Firstly, it must be satisfied that the information likely to be disclosed falls within one of the accepted categories of exempt information under the Local Government Act 1972.

The officer responsible for this item believes that this information falls within the following exemption and this has been confirmed by the Council's Information Compliance Manager.

The following exemptions are engaged in respect to this report:

5. Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

Secondly, it is necessary to weigh up the arguments for and against disclosure on public interest grounds.

Factors for disclosure:

- Further public understanding of the issues concerned.
- Promote accountability and transparency by the Council for the decisions it takes.
- Allow individuals and companies to understand decisions made by the Council affecting their lives and assist individuals to challenge those decisions.

Factors against disclosure:

It is important that public authorities be allowed to conduct a free exchange of views as to their legal rights and obligations with those advising them without fear of intrusion. Without such confidence, there are risks of lack of openness between client and lawyer and threats to the administration of justice. This thereby enables a public body to have confidence that legal issues are being discussed fully. There is an important public interest in such confidence.

As a result, the Council considers that the public interest is in favour of not holding this matter in open session at this time and that any reporting on the meeting is prevented in accordance with Section 100A(5A)

By virtue of paragraph(s) 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council	
MEETING:	COUNCIL
MEETING DATE:	23 rd MARCH 2016
TITLE:	ANNOUNCEMENT OF VICE CHAIR(MAN) DESIGNATE FOR 2016/17
WARD:	ALL
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM	
List of attachments to this report: None	

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to invite the Council to name a Councillor as Vice Chair(man) of the Council (Designate) for the next Council Year beginning in May 2016.
- 1.2 The Council, at its Annual Meeting on 12th May 2016, will still be required formally to elect Councillors to be the Chair(man) and Vice-Chair(man) of the Council for the forthcoming Council Year.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Council names a Councillor to be treated for forward planning purposes as Vice Chair(man) of the Council (Designate) for the 2016/17 Council Year.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

3.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

4 CORPORATE PRIORITIES

4.1 Because of the pivotal role of the Chair(man) and Vice Chair(man) of the Council in the community, the nomination of the Councillors who will hold these offices from May 2016 will contribute towards the achievement of the Council’s vision of Bath and North East Somerset as a distinctive place with vibrant communities.

5 THE REPORT

5.1 The role of the Chair(man) of the Council has increased significantly in recent years. The number of civic engagements and requests for the presence of the Chair(man) at local events throughout the area continues to rise year on year. In addition, the Chair(man) supports a number of awards and functions which require advance planning.

5.2 In the absence of the Chair(man), or when there is a clash of events, the Vice Chair(man) will represent the Council on behalf of the Chair(man).

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

6.1 No risk assessment related to this issue is required because the decision as to whether to make a nomination at this stage in the Council Year rests solely with the Council and does not affect the legal requirement for the Chair(man) to be elected at the Annual General Meeting in May.

7 EQUALITIES

7.1 The wide range of community groups who seek civic involvement in their activities through inviting the Chair(man) to their events will be helped in their diary planning by having Councillors named as Chair(man) and Vice-Chairman Designate at this stage. It will also assist the Councillors with their preparations for the year.

8 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

8.1 The Council’s civic and corporate community interests.

9 ADVICE SOUGHT

9.1 The Chief Executive, the Monitoring Officer and the Section 151 Officer have had the opportunity to provide input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

Contact person	<i>Jo Morrison, Democratic Services Manager, telephone 01225 394358</i>
Background papers	<i>None</i>
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

Motion from the Liberal Democrat Group

To be moved by Cllr Cherry Beath

Houses in Multiple Occupation:

The Council:

1. Notes the forthcoming review of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) in Bath, as announced earlier this month; the discussions held at the Planning, Housing and Economic Development PDS Panel of 5 January 2016; and policies relating to student accommodation in the draft Placemaking Plan for B&NES as well as the Article 4 Direction and Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on HMOs of 2013.
2. Recognises the importance of the contribution made by Bath's Universities and students to the economy, employment and culture in Bath and the wider area.
3. Notes that the Universities' growth plans may bring up to 9,200 additional students to Bath but that there are limited options for purpose-built student accommodation due to planning constraints, the lack of available sites and the need to prioritise the delivery of strategic planning requirements.
4. Recognises that not all HMOs are occupied by students and that HMO accommodation is an important source of affordable housing, particularly for younger people.
5. Notes that the remit given to the Bath City Forum is narrow and does not cover areas of North East Somerset that may suffer from any knock-on effects of increased HMO's or further restrictions on HMO's in Bath.
6. With regard to the forthcoming review of the Supplementary Planning Document on HMOs in Bath and in the interests of maintaining balanced communities, the Council calls for consideration to be given to:
 - a. Amending the threshold after which applications for new HMOs would be refused from 25% to 20%.
 - b. Introducing an additional provision which would prevent permission for purpose-built student accommodation being granted in areas which are already defined by the SPD as having more than 25% of the housing stock as HMOs.
7. The Cabinet is also asked to consider introducing mandatory licensing of landlords across B&NES in order to improve housing standards for tenants in rented accommodation.

This page is intentionally left blank

Full council Meeting 23rd March 2016

Budget Savings

Cllr Robin Moss

Labour Group to move:

The Council notes:

- The lack of detail in many of the proposals for 'savings' and income generation in the recent budget.

The Council Calls:

- On officers to present to the appropriate Scrutiny panels a more detailed breakdown of how these savings' and income generation schemes are to be achieved, under each Directorate Plan, where these amount to more than £100k.

This page is intentionally left blank

Council 23rd March 2016

Appoint an officer as point of contact for returning war veterans

Lead Member - Cllr. Eleanor Jackson

Labour Group to move:

The council notes:

- For some military service-leavers, the transition back into civilian life can be distressing and difficult.
- After living an ordered military life, getting to grips with various agencies and accessing services or benefits can be disorientating. Finding work in a new sector can be hard when dealing with the emotional and physical transition into civilian life.
- The difficulties associated with this transition can often result in homelessness, mental illness, alcoholism, post-traumatic stress or unemployment.
- Bath and North East Somerset Council has a good track record of upholding the commitment to the community covenant, which complements the military covenant.
- However, there are still people living locally who have not received sufficient support.

The Council believes:

- Veterans face unique challenges and deserve full support on their return after risking their lives to defend our country.

The Council resolves:

- To appoint an appropriate officer to act as a single point of contact for all service leavers in B&NES. This would include making veterans aware of local service charities and offering advice on issues including employment, housing, healthcare, and benefit entitlements. This officer would have the power to commit the council to actions and would monitor and review the community covenant.

This page is intentionally left blank

Motion from the Liberal Democrat Group

To be moved by Cllr Paul Crossley

UK membership of the European Union:

- The Council considers that UK membership of the European Union has many benefits for the residents and businesses of Bath and North East Somerset. It is especially important to the growing scientific research base and high technology and consultancy sectors that are helping to generate and create jobs in our area.
- The Council welcomes the reforms to Britain's relationship with the EU our Prime Minister David Cameron has negotiated and believes that continuing as an EU member state will allow us to further improve the Union in the coming years whereas an exit would end our ability to make or influence any reforms to the EU.
- Therefore this chamber endorses the principle that remaining a member of the EU is in the long term benefit of our community and supports the UK remaining in the EU.

This page is intentionally left blank