

Wednesday, 4th May, 2016

Present:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Councillor Tim Warren | Leader of the Council and Conservative Group Leader |
| Councillor Liz Richardson | Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning |
| Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones | Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Conservative Deputy Group Leader Bath |
| Councillor Charles Gerrish | Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency, Conservative Deputy Group Leader North East Somerset |
| Councillor Vic Pritchard | Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health |
| Councillor Anthony Clarke | Cabinet Member for Transport |
| Councillor Martin Veal | Cabinet Member for Community Services |
| Councillor Michael Evans | Cabinet Member for Children's Services |

90 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

91 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Senior Democratic Services Officer drew attention to the evacuation procedure as set out in the Agenda.

92 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

93 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

94 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

95 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 10 questions from Councillors and 2 questions from members of the public.

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

96 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

The Chair informed the meeting that all registered speakers asked to address the Cabinet before the relevant agenda item.

97 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 10th February 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the following amendment:

- Page 9, paragraph 5 should read: 'Councillor Charles Gerrish highlighted these Key Priorities within the budget....'

98 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

99 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

100 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

The Chair informed the meeting that Scrutiny Inquiry Day findings, conduct by the Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel (CTE PDS), would be considered under agenda item 'Receipt of information requested by Council on the Park & Ride/East of Bath Transport issues. Councillor John Bull would have an opportunity to address the Cabinet as the Chair of the CTE PDS Panel.

101 RECEIPT OF INFORMATION REQUESTED BY COUNCIL ON THE PARK & RIDE/EAST OF BATH TRANSPORT ISSUES

The Chair informed the meeting that he would first invite registered speakers to address the Cabinet. Councillor John Bull would then address the Cabinet as the CTE PDS Panel Chair.

Barry Henderson, Secretary of the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, read out a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website]* where he said that FOBRA had welcomed the integrated transport solution achieved in the Bath Transport Strategy, which was agreed by all parties on the Council in November 2014 and endorsed by the results of the general and local elections a year ago. There was a need for eastern Park and Ride which may not be

the most important part but was an essential part of the overall Strategy, and FOBRA asked the Cabinet to press ahead with it.

Andrew Lea said that the Cabinet should make a decision by taking into consideration correct information provided by their officers. However, according to Andrew Lea, officers had used an out of date data and had not acknowledge that capacity of existing Park and Rides were only at its highest due to predictable events. Andrew Lea added that Transport department had overlooked revised guidance by DEFRA and concluded that the Cabinet has moral and legal requirement to make their decision against Park and Ride east of Bath.

Annie Kilvington said that the Council had misinterpreted the law related to air quality management and added that planning department cannot accept an application if an emission exceeds legal limits. Annie Kilvington also said that the Council had not used data submitted by the Bathampton Meadows Alliance (Alliance) and urged the Cabinet to reject east of Bath Park and Ride report.

Tim Williams said that reports presented to the Cabinet had had omissions and shortcomings. Tim Williams also said that Park and Ride east of Bath had not been decided and that many towns and cities were moving away from Park and Ride concept. Tim Williams concluded his statement by saying that single Scrutiny Inquiry Day on the subject of Park and Ride was not enough and held at inconvenient time, and the report had failed to mention quite few important issues, including evidence from Alliance. Tim Williams asked the Cabinet to consider those issues before making their decision on the Park and Ride.

Christine Boyd said that report from the Local Development Framework (LDF) group had showed that the Park and Ride was unaffordable, taking into consideration that the whole project would cost the Council £12m. Christine Boyd also said that this would be poor value for money and it would take only 5% of traffic from London Road. Christine Boyd also commented that the Council had used out of date evidence and urged the Cabinet to make reasonable decision on this matter.

Nicolette Boater read out a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website]*.

Councillor Dine Romero said that she had recognised that there was a need in addressing air quality, pollution and traffic issues in the city which would require sustainable long term solution. Councillor Romero also said that there had been some talk on how standalone Park and Ride had been agreed in Transport Strategy and how bus scheme had been considered as an interim measure though this would need to be complementary to other measures without unacceptable impact on amenities, residents and on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Councillor Romero expressed her concerns with the Park and Ride consultation and asked the Cabinet to take more time to consider findings from the Scrutiny and LDF group.

Councillor John Bull, Chair of the CTE PDS Panel, said that the Scrutiny Inquiry Day had looked at integrated responses to transport difficulties and opportunities to the east of Bath. Councillor Bull also said that he was surprised that members of Alliance did not favour the report. All evidence received on the day from large number of contributors had been included in the Scrutiny report. The report also contains what had been discussed at various workshops on the day. Councillor Bull explained that there was a lot of interest in linking A36 and A46, in upgrading A350, rail and transport via River Avon.

Councillor John Bull commented that the case for 1,600 spaces at the Park and Ride east of Bath was not made. The report suggested that there should be more publicity of Lansdown Park and Ride considering that existing Park and Ride sites had not been fully used at the moment. Councillor Bull concluded his statement by saying that there was no need for a large Park and Ride site east of Bath just for people who work in Bath.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones asked Councillor John Bull if there was a need for a smaller Park and Ride.

Councillor John Bull responded that, according to data from Alliance, only 25% of all Park and Ride sites were used in the period up to 9.30am. These figures would need to be validated, and if correct then there would be a case for smaller Park and Ride site.

Councillor Geoff Ward (Bathavon North) said that this issue had been challenging and urged the Cabinet to make the right decision. Councillor Ward highlighted natural beauty of Bathampton meadows and asked the Cabinet to explore all other options before making their final decision.

Councillor Liz Richardson said that the Local Development Framework (LDF) group report was a summary of a thorough process. The LDF group was not asked to look at the reasoning for having Park and Ride but to consider site options taking into account five objectives (as set out in the report). The LDF group had made a decision that Cabinet Members who were part of the group should be substituted by other Council Members. The LDF group meeting were open to Ward Members affected. The LDF group had started with seven sites to explore and ended up with a total of twenty one sites to consider. Through the sequential process some of those sites were not deemed to be viable. Councillor Richardson thanked everyone who contributed to the report and asked the Cabinet to note the report.

Councillor Anthony Clarke accepted report from the Scrutiny Inquiry Day and the LDF group. Councillor Clarke said that the Scrutiny had asked some specific questions in the report and answers to those questions would be provided by Councillor Clarke and team off officers at one of the future CTE PDS Panel meetings. Councillor Clarke also thanked to all those involved in the process.

Councillor Anthony Clarke informed the meeting that the Cabinet have received a large amount of information through the CTE PDS Panel and the cross-party LDF group reports and from the community. Further detailed analysis is required of each site, and Cabinet have decided not to use the provisional date set for 18th May to allow this work to be completed. A revised date would be announced in the near future and the revised timetable would not impact upon the overall timeframe for the project.

Councillor Tim Warren also thanked CTE PDS Panel and the cross-party LDF group for their report and also to every single individual and organisation for their contribution in this matter. Councillor Warren highlighted that there was huge transport problem in Bath and the Cabinet would look into all data and evidence in order of making right and future proof decision which would set long term solution.

The Cabinet **NOTED** the reports outlining the findings and conclusions from the Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel Inquiry Day and the sites review undertaken by the LDF Steering Group; in order to help their deliberations in determining the recommended solution to the transport issues to the east of Bath.

102 YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN

Councillor Michael Evans thanked the author of this report. Councillor Evans informed the meeting that the Council has a statutory obligation to publish a Youth Justice Plan. The principal, statutory aim of the youth justice system was to prevent youth offending by 10-17 year olds. The Youth Justice Plan reviews the positive progress made last year in work with young people at risk of offending and re-offending and with their parents/carers and victims and sets out how services are to be resourced and delivered in 2016-17. Actions in the work plan would contribute to making Bath and North East Somerset a safer place and to helping young people work towards more positive, crime-free outcomes.

Councillor Michael Evans moved the recommendations.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones seconded the motion by saying that he was happy to support adoption of the Youth Justice Plan. As lead partner, the Council would continue to support the work of all agencies involved in the youth justice system, to prevent young people from offending. Councillor Anketell-Jones was particularly pleased to see the positive reduction in the number of young people coming into the youth justice system for the first time.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Cabinet recommends adoption of the Youth Justice Plan as part of the Council's Policy and Budget Framework and notes this can be accommodated within the Council budget.

The Cabinet also recommends the Youth Justice Plan to Council as fulfilling the requirements of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and agrees it can be submitted to the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales.

103 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN 2015 - 2019

Councillor Michael Evans said that Local Authority would still retain the legal responsibility for pupil place planning in its area. In order to do this effectively the Local Authority would have to identify where new school places would be required as a result of underlying population growth or pupils generated from new housing development, how much additional provision would be required and when. This additional provision might be provided via Basic Need funding from the Government or Developer Contributions or CIL as a result of new housing developments. The Plan would serve as a useful planning tool to identify areas and levels of need, when investment in places would be needed and also to inform discussions with Developers.

Councillor Michael Evans moved the recommendations.

Councillor Tim Warren seconded the motion by saying that he was happy to support this plan to increase primary school provision in the district as part of the £7 million

investment in local primary schools. The Council would constantly review school place provision to ensure meeting the needs of local parents and children over the coming years. The Council must ensure the right number of school places in the right locations to meet the needs of a growing population and the demands created by new housing development, whilst at the same time supporting parental preferences.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that two new schools would open in September 2017 and asked for a clarification on whether those two schools would have just reception classes or they would be whole schools. Councillor Gerrish also asked if the Head of the School would be appointed for those two schools before they open.

Councillor Michael Evans responded that, for both schools, school structure would be as a whole. The Local Authority would take into consideration birth dates and anticipated needs though it would be expected that both schools would start from Reception and Year 1 classes first, and grow over years. Councillor Evans also said that Heads of both schools would be appointed before schools open.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet:

1. Approved the proposed strategy for the provision of school places within the 2015 – 2019 plan period.
2. Approved the proposed strategy for the provision of school places over the longer term within the Core Strategy plan period.

104 97/101 WALCOT ST : GENESIS TRUST

Councillor Dine Romero asked for an assurance that this Cabinet was satisfied that the original decision, that had been made by previous Administration, was properly made and in accordance with Council's procedures. Councillor Romero also said that this project demonstrated that the value of services to be delivered by Genesis was equal to, or greater than the rent abatement and that the cost benefit ratio demonstrated clear overall benefit to the public.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that on 9th September 2015 the Cabinet resolved to request that a further report be brought back to Cabinet to consider and approve that the provisions in the original report were satisfied. The original decision that had been made by previous Administration, was properly made and in accordance with Council's procedures. The value of services to be delivered by Genesis was equal to, or greater than the rent abatement. The cost benefit ratio demonstrated clear overall benefit to the public. The capital input of £100,000 was approved and included in the 2014/15 Corporate Capital Estate Planned Maintenance cost plan and this has been carried forward into 2016/17. Councillor Gerrish welcomed the expansion of the Genesis Life Skills project and also establishment of a new 'social enterprise' project named 'Acacia'.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Vic Pritchard seconded the motion by saying that he was happy to support the grant of a lease to the Genesis Trust, particularly in light of the further information provided within this report. The benefits that the Genesis Trust would be delivering to the community were incredibly worthwhile and the Council is pleased to support

this by offering a rental concession. The cost/benefit analysis had demonstrated a clear overall benefit to the public.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to:

- 1) Reconfirm authority, first approved in the Single Member Decision E2741 dated 11th February 2015, that the Corporate Property Officer be authorised to enter into an agreement for lease leading to grant of a lease based on the agreed heads of terms. The structure of the transaction has been amended however and the contract will be a direct lease to commence from date of exchange.
- 2) Note that:
 - a. Assessment work undertaken has demonstrated that the value of services as a result of the Community Asset Transfer if externally procured is at least equal to or greater than the value of the rent abatement (£20,000pa)
 - b. A separate cost/benefit analysis has demonstrated a clear overall benefit to the public purse from the asset transfer project
- 3) Adopt and agree the Social Objects to be delivered as a result of the Community Asset Transfer and to note the arrangements for monitoring and review
- 4) Note the range of uses that are considered inappropriate for the environment as stated in the Social Objects part of the report.

The meeting ended at 5.20 pm

Chair _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEETING 4th May 2016

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

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

Statements about issues on the Agenda

- Barry Henderson (secretary of FOBRA) re: Park and Ride
- Andrew Lea re: Park and Ride
- Annie Kilvington re: Park and Ride
- Tim Williams re: Park and Ride
- Christine Boyd re: Park and Ride
- Nicolette Boater re: Park and Ride
- Cllr Dine Romero re: Park and Ride
- Cllr Dine Romero re: 97/101 Walcot St Genesis Trust

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| M 01 | Question from: | Councillor Nigel Roberts |
| <p>At the time that the planning application was being processed for the old Radway petrol station on the Wellsway I was concerned and articulated that having a student development with only one disabled parking space would not work. I was assured that the issue of parking would be enforced by way of condition.</p> <p>The road now has a number of cars that appear to come from the development, please could the Executive Councillor now indicate what the next steps will be?</p> | | |
| Answer from: | | Councillor Liz Richardson |
| <p><i>Planning permission was approved subject to a legal agreement to restrict future occupiers of the development from parking within 2km of the site. The development is now complete but the building is not occupied and so there are no occupants in residence to link to parking in nearby roads and the requirement of the legal agreement is not triggered.</i></p> <p><i>Should there be a breach of the legal agreement or planning permission in future the Planning Enforcement Team will investigate in line with the Council's adopted policy.</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|
| M 02 | Question from: | Councillor Nigel Roberts |
| <p>Please could the Executive Councillors give an update on the Keynsham and Bristol Riverside path and planned new bridge funded by Somerdale development?</p> <p>Which department is leading on this development?</p> <p>What works are being done to provide routes to this bridge?</p> | | |
| Answer from: | | Councillors Liz Richardson and Anthony Clarke |
| <p><i>It is planned that the Council's Project Delivery team will lead on commissioning and delivering the bridge. Cycle/pedestrian routes will be incorporated in the Somerdale site between Station Road and the river as part of the development.</i></p> | | |
| M 03 | Question from: | Councillor Nigel Roberts |
| <p>Do we use glyphosate-containing pesticides in any of the parks in Bath and north East Somerset?</p> | | |
| Answer from: | | Councillor Martin Veal |
| <p><i>Yes. The Council has a detailed pesticide policy, which is reviewed and updated in light</i></p> | | |

of new directives and guidelines as necessary and details all non-approved active ingredients in pesticides. Glyphosate is an approved chemical for use in the UK and is an active ingredient in most of the pesticide we use.

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| M 04 | Question from: | Councillor Liz Hardman |
| In the light of the forced Academisation of all schools, how will the LA fulfil its statutory duties in providing school places, when it has no control over the admission policies of Academies? Academies therefore do not have to admit some children within their catchment areas which could present huge problems for our LA. | | |
| Answer from: | | Councillor Michael Evans |
| <p><i>Academies have a higher degree of autonomy in many aspects compared with maintained schools and that includes responsibility for their own admission policies, provided that those policies comply with the School Admissions Code. However the LA will continue to foster a close working partnership with schools in the authority whatever their form of governance. We currently retain good working relationships with our schools and academies and to date have generally been able to agree expansion plans where needed, as set out in the Primary and Secondary School Organisation Plan 2015-19. When necessary the LA will be able to commission new schools. Two new schools will open in September 2017 and further new schools are in the pipeline.</i></p> | | |
| Supplementary Question: | | |
| It is known, from the past, that it was difficult to place more difficult children in academies. Does Local Authority have a plan to tackle placements of more difficult children knowing that academies have their own admission criteria? | | |
| Answer from: | | Councillor Michael Evans |
| <p><i>There are several things within the White Paper in terms of Local Authority gaining responsibilities and powers to enforce placement. The White Paper is open for consultation and I will consult the officers to make several points in the consultation, amongst which an issue you raised could be one of them. I think it is important that academies should be as open as possible, though there is a balance and a judgement to be made.</i></p> | | |

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| M 05 | Question from: | Councillor Robin Moss |
| Regarding Education White Paper: | | |
| Considering the disquiet being expressed by local authorities of all political persuasions across the country to the forced acadamisation of schools, have you made any comment to the DfE or the minister about these proposals? | | |

Have you consulted with local schools (teachers, governors & parents) about their views on these proposals?

Are you considering supporting and/or enabling a local multi academy trust?

Do you share my concerns that the control of local schools is being taken away from local communities, for example the new primary school in Keynsham will be run by an educational organisation based in Ireland?

Answer from:

Councillor Michael Evans

1. *I have not personally commented to Ministers about the proposals in the White Paper as my views align broadly with those of the government, i.e. Local Authorities should continue to play a role in the local schools system, in terms of place planning, admissions, SEND provision, transport, being a parent champion and working with schools to raise standards, whilst recognising that academies deliver long term educational benefits to current and future pupils.*

2. *Informally I have gathered views through my role as a school governor and in meetings I have had with head teachers at my request, and with some primary school governors at their request. Formally, a series of briefings with Head Teachers and Chairs of Governing Bodies has taken place about the future shape of the education and school system in B&NES bearing in mind the move towards academies, a national funding formula for schools and the creation of new agencies to carry out functions previously performed by Local Authorities. The White Paper will be a focus for the next round of briefing meetings with schools.*

3. *I have asked Officers to initiate a dialogue with those schools that have not moved towards becoming an academy to see how they can be supported in doing so. If, following discussion of the White Paper, the government further encourages the formation by Local Authorities of spun-out sponsoring trusts, I would be in favour of actively exploring this option.*

4. *I am pleased that the Regional Schools Commissioner is considering sponsors from a wide pool and look forward to the possibility of sponsors from other excellent educational regimes, contributing towards the drive for excellence in our schools. The Local Authority will continue to foster a close working partnership with all our schools, whatever their governance, and all schools will be monitored by Ofsted for performance and safeguarding, with parents being better informed than they are at present, as envisaged in the White Paper Educational Excellence Everywhere.*

M 06

Question from:

Councillor Robin Moss

As a part of B&NES initiative to crack down on fly tipping, what support is being given to Parish & Town Councils to identify & prosecute fly tipping?

Answer from:

Councillor Martin Veal

Martin Shields, Divisional Director Environmental Services is already scheduled to attend the next Parish Liaison meeting on the 11th May and he will be discussing this issue with them. We would welcome working with our Parish and Town Councils to help

us tackle the problem of fly tipping and the blight this brings to our local communities. We will also be discussing this issue at the Area Forum meetings to ensure we use every opportunity available to engage with local people. In the meantime, any urgent issues should be reported to Council Connect or to Carol Maclellan, Group Manager Neighbourhood Environmental Services who will provide the appropriate advice and support.

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| M 07 | Question from: | Councillor Tim Ball |
|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|

Again I raise questions over the suitability of some local roads to be able to accommodate large buses due to the poor condition.

In Twerton we have large buses using badly broken up roads from 6am in the morning until past midnight.

Residents are complaining of the extra noise of these buses rattling the broken concrete slabs that many roads are made of and the further breaking up of the surface.

It would be a shame if the bus company could not run buses on part of this route due to the condition of the road. This is not just a problem with pot holes that need filling this is the fabric of the roads breaking up.

1) Will the Cabinet Member in light of the increased usage with large buses carry out a full study and audit of the number 5 bus route through Twerton and take action to install repairs to the road surfaces in Kekston View, Wedgewood Road, North Way and Poolemead Road?

2) Will the Cabinet Member agree to meet me in Twerton with First Bus to see the problem first hand for himself, and possibly take a bus Ride at the same time?

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Answer from: | Councillor Anthony Clarke |
|---------------------|---------------------------|

There are inherent problems with rigid concrete roads across the whole of Bath. Our highways team have been in discussions with Councillor Ball on the roads in question, at the moment none are considered in bad enough condition to feature on any structural maintenance programmes in the very near future, the team will however look at options to improve the situation around damaged joints and rocking slabs and schedule any wider repairs needed on isolated areas. Our area highway inspector who visits the roads on a routine basis will address any safety defects as and when they arise.

I would be willing to accompany Councillor Ball on a visit to Twerton.

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| M 08 | Question from: | Councillor Lisa Brett |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|

Council-maintained schools continue to outperform academies in Ofsted inspections, according to the LGA.

LGA data shows that “inadequate” council-maintained schools are more likely to improve if they stay with their local authority, rather than being forced to convert to an academy, as 98% of council-maintained schools improved in their first Ofsted inspection after being rated “inadequate”, compared with 88% of academies.

Could Cllr. Evan indicate if he is willing to instruct officers to undertake a cost benefit analysis of establishing a Primary School Academy Trust under B&NES Control?

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Answer from: | Councillor Michael Evans |
| <p>1. <i>The Academies programme is a continuation of a movement towards school-led educational improvement which began with the Local Management of Schools long ago, found expression in the sponsored Academies of the last Labour government, was expanded considerably under the Liberal Democrat/Conservative Coalition government with converter academies, and is now being brought to what can be considered in some ways a conclusion by the current government.</i></p> <p>2. <i>Data from the DfE indicates that primary converter academies previously rated as outstanding were more likely to retain that rating than local authority maintained schools previously rated as outstanding, that primary converter academies previously rated as good were more likely to subsequently be rated as outstanding than local authority maintained mainstream schools and were also less likely to achieve a lower rating, and primary converter academies previously rated as satisfactory were more likely to improve that rating than local authority maintained schools. The same comparisons hold true for secondary schools, except that secondary converter academies previously rated as outstanding were only marginally more likely to retain that rating than local authority maintained mainstream schools. However, it is important to recognise that in a changing landscape with more schools choosing to become academies every year it is difficult to draw reliable conclusions from any particular set of figures.</i></p> <p><i>Officers have begun to draft a report on the implications of the recently published White Paper. In addition a scoping paper on a review of the Council's education functions is under development to reflect (i) the White Paper (ii) the move to a national funding formula for schools and (iii) the increasing pace of academy conversion and the development of Multi Academy Trusts. Recent indications that the Government may allow successful Local Authorities to develop MAT proposals are welcome and my Officers will initiate a discussion with schools about the appetite for such a development once the proposals are clear. I would point out that such a MAT if established could not be "under B&NES control" as you describe but rather the LA would be one partner in such a local MAT and would seek to ensure a strong aspirational governance to enable all children to achieve their full potential.</i></p> | |

| | | |
|---|----------------|---------------------------|
| M 09 | Question from: | Councillor Rob Appleyard |
| What is the average cost of a pothole repair to the Council and how many potholes has the Council repaired in the last 12 months? | | |
| Answer from: | | Councillor Anthony Clarke |
| <i>For this year to date, members of the public have reported 866 Carriageway potholes and 22 Footway potholes. For the same period we have filled 1345 Carriageway potholes and 29 Footway potholes.</i> | | |

In respect to average costs there are a lot of variables to consider but current average repair cost is estimated as £30 per pothole.

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| M 10 | Question from: | Councillor Tim Ball |
|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|

Can the Cabinet Member please either dismiss or confirm rumours circulating that there could be a cut to subsidised bus services in the Bath area?

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Answer from: | Councillor Anthony Clarke |
|---------------------|---------------------------|

The Council is currently undertaking a Strategic Review of Transport with the aim of considering the Council's entire transport spend and ensure that it is proportionate and value for money. This includes ensuring best possible value for passengers from the level of investment required to support each service, for example where the service is nearing commercial viability and could be taken on by the operator without, or with a reduced, subsidy or where other public transport options, such as community based transport options, could potentially be more effective.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|---|
| P 01 | Question from: | Rosemary Naish (Chair - Clutton Parish Council) |
|-------------|-----------------------|---|

We welcome the Chew Valley Transport Strategy consultation that is currently under way. We recognise that the building of 60mph trunk standard bypasses is probably not economically feasible, to alleviate the congestion problems, but can the Cabinet member give us assurance that serious consideration will be given in the Chew Valley Transport Strategy review to providing some affordable local loop bypasses, built to lower standards and aimed at achieving smooth flow of 30-40mph, which is also the best formula for minimising pollution, as there is no mention of this possible alternative strategy in any of the consultation material.

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Answer from: | Councillor Anthony Clarke |
|---------------------|---------------------------|

I will ask officers to consider this option as part of the work to develop the strategy for the Chew Valley and include your suggestion in the report on the consultation.

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|---|
| P 02 | Question from: | Cllr Judith Chubb-Whittle (Chair Stanton Drew Parish Council) |
|-------------|-----------------------|---|

Stanton Drew Primary School is federated with Bishop Sutton Primary School in the Chew Valley.
Chew Valley North (Stanton Drew group) is scheduled to be oversubscribed whilst

Chew Valley South (Bishop Sutton group) is scheduled to have spare capacity. Whitchurch is full, which may push children to Chew Valley North. St Keyna is looking pretty full with new development along Charlton Road, which may also push children towards Chew Valley North.

The capacity of schools is based on a figure for Reception entry. No class should be larger than the entry to reception. The total maximum capacity is 7 times reception entry with the proviso on class limit.

The strategic documents that Cabinet consider tonight only look to the end of the nose. Is it only about numbers for BANES or can the Cabinet member assure me and other rural parishes like mine that there has or will be a fundamental review of school place delivery in Chew Valley and elsewhere in terms of school buildings/environments fit for purpose/21st century? Or should we suspect that would be for an academy group if the head is sufficiently visionary?

Answer from:

Councillor Michael Evans

The Schools Organisation Plan is our forward look at projections of need for school places and takes into account population growth, known housing developments and the feasibility of schools expanding their intakes – so this plan IS primarily about numbers and how we satisfy our duty to ensure sufficient school places. Issues relating to condition of school buildings are considered through the Schools Capital Programme and the conversations are joined up through the Schools Capital and Organisation Team, so that opportunities are taken to combine expansion plans with works to upgrade existing facilities where practical.

The Council is reliant on capital from government grants (for Capital Maintenance and Basic Need growth) and from developers where appropriate, to improve, expand or build schools. There is currently no source of capital for major modernisation or re-building schemes.

The projected need for reception places in the Chew Valley North area suggests a shortfall of 6 places by 2019, so the options for addressing this will be looked at in the intervening period. There may be appropriate ways to manage this within existing school sites. There are already emerging plans to create capacity in Keynsham and prevent additional pressure from this direction.

In future, if all schools become academies, it will be for the academy (or Multi-Academy Trust) to consider site condition issues, but we will expect to continue to work with schools to jointly consider the best ways to meet demand for school places, as we do now.

B&NES Cabinet Wed 4 May 2016 at 2pm in Keynsham Civic Centre

Cabinet to consider reports outlining the findings and conclusions from:

- The Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel Inquiry Day;
- The Local Development Framework Steering Group Sites Review;

To determine a recommended solution for the transport issues to the east of Bath.

Good afternoon. I'm Barry Henderson, Secretary of the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, who represent several thousand residents.

As you consider these controversial matters, we urge you to keep in mind that it isn't only about flora, fauna and views around Bathampton and Batheaston. It is also about the health and life expectancy of people from there - and others - living, working in and visiting Bath. A responsible balance must be struck.

The so-called 'corridor of death' caused by traffic pollution in and through the City has been declared an 'Air Quality Management Area' because the levels of pollution are over (in some places 50% over) the legal limit - which the World Health Organisation considers a serious health threat. There could hardly be a more urgent issue.

We welcomed the integrated transport solution achieved in the Bath Transport Strategy, agreed by all parties on the Council in November 2014 and endorsed by the results of the general and local elections a year ago.

Fourteen thousand cars a day enter or leave the city at Walcot that could potentially be using an eastern park-and-ride. Currently they have no alternative to driving right into the city centre to park. During the years of debate, this traffic has increased by 20%.

Traffic in Bath urgently needs to be reduced now and the Bath Transport Strategy implemented with a comprehensive transport *plan*. Established park and rides to the north, west and south are successful and popular.

We need an eastern park and ride. It may not be the most important part but is an essential part of the overall Strategy, and we urge you determine today to press ahead with it.

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement to the 4.5.16 Cabinet meeting of Bath and North East Somerset Council

Thank you chair.

Both professionally and as a South Bath resident, I care deeply about the enduring economic and environmental wellbeing of our diverse communities, and have since the 2014 launch of the Bath Transport Strategy been vocal about the importance of getting the right transport infrastructure in place to support this.

So last November I was shocked to see the questionable rationale, thin evidence, and deeply flawed consultative process, with which the newly elected Conservative administration, in its haste to address the daunting transport challenges Bath faces, seemed intent on intruding into the globally cherished East of Bath landscape.

However I applaud the more informed and consensus-building approach implicit in these item 12 reports and that you, the Cabinet, are taking more time to deliberate before deciding whether and where to build Park & Ride East.

Whilst there is serious weakness in the scrutiny process, overall I believe the Scrutiny Panel's recommendations are well founded and persuasive. Here's why:

1. By exposing the key assumptions, improving the data and highlighting the uncertainties, the Alliance has done an excellent job in challenging the need for a 1600 space Park & Ride. Similarly, albeit from a wider geographic and longer time perspective, Professor Parkhurst cautioned against reliance on Park & Ride usage projections derived from the Treasury's transport modelling approach.
2. Although an up to date evaluation of the risks associated with building on the flood plain is still lacking, the LDF report, as supplemented by the Alliance's work on air quality, evidences the major costs, difficulties and adverse environmental impacts associated with potential Park & Ride East sites.
3. The complex, changing and controversial nature of this decision and the consequent scope for unintended consequences and/or irreversible environmental damage, demands a more piecemeal approach, where incremental changes in accordance with the vision and range of measures identified in the Transport Strategy, are holistically planned and rigorously monitored.

So I implore you, the Cabinet, to build on the emerging consensus, and whilst being honest about what you don't know, further develop the policy coherence and evidence base before making any decision that will shape the economic and environmental wellbeing of our diverse communities for decades to come.

This page is intentionally left blank