

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, 15th September, 2016

Present:- **Councillors** Patrick Anketell-Jones, Tim Ball, Colin Barrett, Cherry Beath, Sarah Bevan, Lisa Brett, John Bull, Neil Butters, Anthony Clarke, Matt Cochrane, Paul Crossley, Chris Dando, Fiona Darey, Matthew Davies, Sally Davis, Emma Dixon, Michael Evans, Andrew Furse, Charles Gerrish, Ian Gilchrist, Bob Goodman, Francine Haerberling, Alan Hale, Liz Hardman, Deirdre Horstmann, Eleanor Jackson, Steve Jeffries, Les Kew, Marie Longstaff, Barry Macrae, Shaun Stephenson-McGall, Alison Millar, Paul Myers, Michael Norton, Lisa O'Brien, Lin Patterson, June Player, Christopher Pearce, Vic Pritchard, Joe Rayment, Liz Richardson, Caroline Roberts, Dine Romero, Will Sandry, Mark Shelford, Brian Simmons, Peter Turner, Tim Warren, Karen Warrington and Chris Watt

Apologies for absence: **Councillors** Rob Appleyard, Jasper Becker, Colin Blackburn, Jonathan Carr, Douglas Deacon, Donal Hassett, Steve Hedges, Paul May, Robin Moss, Bryan Organ, Nigel Roberts, David Veale, Martin Veal, Karen Walker and Geoff Ward

33 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

34 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Lisa Brett declared an 'other' interest as the Chair of the National FGM Centres Advisory Board. This declaration was made at the item.

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

The Chairman made the customary announcements regarding mobile phones, webcasting and Councillors accessing meeting papers on their ipads.

36 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There were no items of urgent business.

37 MINUTES - 21ST JULY 2016

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

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of 21st July 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

38 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Statements were made by the following people:

Fiona Powell made a statement concerning the proposed East of Bath Park & Ride and urging Councillors not to develop the site on the Bathampton Meadows within a World Heritage site. Full details can be read in the statement which has been placed on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. In response to a reference in Fiona's statement about the need for decision makers to be educated, Councillor Eleanor Jackson asked if Fiona was aware that Development Management Committee Members had received training on world heritage site status and implications. Fiona responded that she had not been aware, and was just checking. The Chairman thanked Fiona for her statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

Annie Kilvington made a statement against the proposed East of Bath Park & Ride, outlining the air pollution aspects. Full details can be read in the statement which has been placed on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Alison Millar asked Annie to expand on her point regarding bias. Annie explained the technical aspects of pollution monitoring and that this year B&NES had changed from using the local bias, which it had done for the last 10 years, to the DEFRA bias, leading to depressed figures. The Chairman thanked Annie for her statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

Susanne Hagen made a statement against the proposed East of Bath Park & Ride, calling for evidence to support the proposals. Full details can be read in the statement which has been placed on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. In response to a question from Councillor Tony Clarke about whether Susanne was aware that many Councillors had been invited, and taken up the offer, to visit the Batheaston Park & Ride site before, Susanne replied that she was keen to make sure everyone had seen the site. Councillor Millar asked why Susanne had described a field as a tourist attraction, to which she explained how visitors to her hotel from all over the world seemed to enjoy many aspects of the meadows as much as visiting the city. In response to a question from Councillor John Bull as to whether Susanne was aware that it would be Cabinet, not Council, making the decision, Susanne replied that she was aware. Councillor Sarah Bevan asked whether Susanne was aware of any update to the suggestion to improving signage to the Lansdown Park & Ride, she responded that she had heard on the previous Tuesday that this was one of their suggestions which would be implemented. The Chairman thanked Susanne for her statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

Tim Williams made a statement against the proposed East of Bath Park & Ride, outlining the air pollution aspects. Full details can be read in the statement which has been placed on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. In response to a question from Councillor Alison Millar about the school run, Tim replied that evidence suggested that the school run represented 40% of the traffic in Batheaston and Bathampton, although B&NES had done no formal study of this. Councillor Eleanor Jackson asked Tim if he felt that, if signage was improved from Midford to the Odd Down Park & Ride, there would still be a need for one at Batheaston; to which he replied that improved signage to Odd Down, and Lansdown Park & Ride sites, would definitely remove the need for an East of Bath Park & Ride,

for which he didn't see a need in any case. The Chairman thanked Tim for his statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

Sian James made a statement against the proposed East of Bath Park & Ride, outlining the air pollution aspects. Full details can be read in the statement which has been placed on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Alison Millar asked Sian if she considered that siting a Park & Ride at Bathampton would draw people from other Park & Ride sites, to which Sian replied that she had seen evidence to that effect, resulting in even less take up in other sites. Councillor Jonathan Bull asked Sian if she was aware of the report from the Communities, Transport & Environment Panel in May suggesting that better signage to the Lansdown site could result in a smaller site being proposed for the east of Bath. Sian replied that she was aware, and that improved signage and access would benefit Bath. The Chairman thanked Sian for her statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

Christine Boyd made a statement against the proposed East of Bath Park & Ride, and highlighted new emerging evidence for Councillors' attention. Full details can be read in the statement which has been placed on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Alison Millar asked Christine to explain why they could be confident that the figures regarding vacancies at other sites were accurate, to which Christine responded that these were figures drawn up by Andrew Lee, which had now been shown to be spot on. The Chairman thanked Christine for her statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

Andrew Mercer made a statement against the proposed East of Bath Park & Ride, pointing out that there was still no reliable demand forecast nor business case, and that a decision on the east of Bath Park & Ride should definitely not be made before the Planning Inspector had reported back. Full details can be read in the statement which has been placed on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Lin Patterson mentioned the reference to a smaller Park & Ride site and asked whether the campaign was trying to shift focus to the Lambridge site. Andrew responded that that was not the case, there were simply trying to protect Bathampton Meadows. The Chairman thanked Andrew for his statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

Judy Bailey made a statement against the Bathampton Park & Ride and stressing the importance of the world heritage status. Full details can be read in the statement which has been placed on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. In response to a question from Councillor Alison Millar about whether Judy had met anyone who supported the proposal for a Park & Ride on the Bathampton Meadows, Judy replied that she had not, and in fact huge concern about it had been expressed. The Chairman thanked Judy for her statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

Sam Worrall - Gypsy, Traveller and Boater Outreach & Engagement Officer - made a statement on behalf of the boat community of the river and the Kennet & Avon Canal. She raised difficulties that had arisen from the new Canal & River Trust guidelines and the need to move every 14 days, and the effect of this on the boating community who were registered with schools, libraries, GP surgeries etc. She offered to meet Councillors to discuss further how this diverse community could be

supported. Councillor Tim Warren expressed an interest in taking up Sam's offer. Councillor Will Sandry asked specifically about the effect on children's education and Sam explained that the need to move up to 20 miles made school attendance particularly difficult. Councillor Eleanor Jackson referred to the task & finish review done by the Housing & Major Projects Scrutiny Panel on Boat Dwellers and River Travellers in July 2013 and asked Sam if she'd like to bring an update back to Scrutiny, which Sam was happy to do. In response to a question from Councillor Sarah Bevan about whether they had made contact with the Council's Strategic River Group, Sam explained they had, B&NES had been very supportive and they were working together on improving services along the riverbank. The Chairman thanked Sam for her statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Community Services.

David Dixon made a statement in support of the Vegmead initiative, outlining the considerable volunteer hours that had been put in to this over the last 5 years. Councillor Tim Warren asked whether Dave was aware that the decision to continue with Vegmead had been taken some time ago, to which Dave responded that that hadn't been clear from a conversation with Councillor Martin Veal earlier in the week. Councillor Lisa Brett asked whether Dave knew if the community group considered that the communication between them and the Council had been adequate, to which Dave responded that in his view it had been appalling and the group were still unclear of the latest position. Councillor Eleanor Jackson asked whether the group were working with, or would consider working with Bath in Bloom. Dave responded that on a business level he had been working with Bath in Bloom for many years. Councillor Sarah Bevan asked whether there had been any comment from Transition Bath and Dave responded that there had been little communication with Transition Bath over what's happening with Vegmead. Councillor Lin Patterson asked whether it was now clear that Vegmead could stay in Hedgemoor Park to which Dave replied that the Council's position still wasn't clear. The Chairman thanked David for his statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Community Services.

Rosemary Naish, Chairman of the B&NES group within ALCA, prefaced her statement with a declaration of interest as an applicant in a Judicial Review against the Council regarding neighbourhood planning. She made a statement about the need for the Council to be mindful of neighbourhood plans when making planning decisions. Full details can be read in the statement which has been placed on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Liz Richardson thanked Rosemary for her role as national Champion for neighbourhood planning, and asked Rosemary if she thought it would be beneficial to put in place an officer briefing every time there was a new neighbourhood plan; Rosemary responded that she thought it would be very useful. Councillor Liz Hardman asked for an explanation of the 50% dissatisfaction statistic from Rosemary's statement, to which Rosemary responded that that was based on the parishes being 52% of the electorate and, at their AGM meeting the previous evening, they had all commented that the process wasn't working for them. Councillor Sarah Bevan asked whether parish councils found the neighbourhood planning process off-putting; Rosemary responded that they did not, as evidenced by nearly half of them having done it. The Chairman thanked Rosemary for her statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning.

Susan Charles, Chair of the Warm Water & Inclusive Swimming Exercise Network, updated Councillors on the provision of warm water swimming. She explained that Greenwich Leisure had indicated they would be incorporating provision for warm water swimming, and that the WWISE Network were very grateful for the overwhelming support they had received from the recent round of Council meetings. Councillor Sarah Bevan asked about the timescale for this to which Susan replied that she hadn't had an answer for this yet. Councillor Lin Patterson asked what had been the biggest obstacles in achieving an outcome, to which Susan replied that communication had broken down in 2015 when the Administration changed and that was why the Network had brought the issue back to the Council's attention. The Chairman thanked Susan for her statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Community Services.

Tracey Harding made a statement on behalf of David Redgewell from the South West Transport Network. She made a case for B&NES to maintain the subsidy to the 267 bus service, and mentioned there had been no consultation about withdrawing this. In response to a question from Councillor Tim Warren about whether the consultation should be done by the Bus Company, Tracey responded that she understood B&NES were cutting the subsidy so B&NES should consult on that. Councillor Neil Butters asked if Tracey considered that the B&NES economy profited from those people coming into the area on the 267, to which she responded that the amount of night-time spend per person, compared to the approximate £1.89 per head of subsidy definitely suggested that the city profited from this. Councillor Liz Hardman asked if Tracey was aware there was no bus service from Paulton to Bristol on a Sunday; Tracey responded that it would be David Redgewell who would be better placed to respond on that point. Councillor Lin Patterson asked for Tracey's view on how their campaign work was progressing and whether Councillors were receptive, to which she responded that she hoped so, and they were looking at the possibility of some match funding for evening services. The Chairman thanked Tracey for her statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

John James made a statement about the recent changes to the 6 and 7 bus services, the detrimental effect this had had on the community of Fairfield Park, and calling for this service to be reinstated. He mentioned a petition of over 1000 signatures which had been collected over 3 weeks asking for this. Councillor Dine Romero asked what had been the response from the Cabinet Member, to which John replied nothing as yet, although he understood that he would be coming to talk to their Planning group. Councillor Joe Rayment asked if John was aware that the Labour Group had tried unsuccessfully to call for an emergency debate on bus services at this Council, to which John replied that he wasn't aware. Councillor Lin Patterson asked about any personal knowledge of people suffering as a direct result of this change, to which John responded that he wasn't the best person to ask about that. The Chairman thanked John for his statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

Nora Gee made a statement also concerning the 6 and 7 buses and the difficulty this had caused to her ability to get about. She expressed concern about how people would manage the steep hill during winter. Councillor Anthony Clarke responded to Nora that he had asked for a meeting with First Bus to see what could be done. Councillor Liz Hardman asked about how much consultation had taken place with residents, to which Nora responded that Councillor Lin Patterson had conducted

several meetings about the issue. Councillor Lin Patterson enquired whether the Dial-a-Ride service would be any help and Nora explained that she had looked at that but that with the existing demand for the service (which was only provided between 10am and 12 noon), and the need to book a week in advance, that wouldn't help a great deal. The Chairman thanked Nora for her statement which was referred to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

39 KELSTON PARISH MEETING: CONFERRING OF PARISH COUNCIL POWERS TO BORROW MONEY

The Council considered a report requesting parish council powers to be conferred on the Kelston Parish Meeting at their request. In the light of extra information received after the publication of the agenda, an update report and revised recommendations had been circulated. The update information is set out below;

The Council was informed on 14th September 2016 that the 69 "Target properties" in Kelston and 39 "Target properties" in North Stoke have been identified for the Connecting Devon and Somerset (CDS) programme. These are all of the properties in the two Parishes areas and include some businesses. These must be included in the Phase 2 Programme tender for Connecting Devon and Somerset, which is due to start in January 2017 and be completed by the end of 2017. Kelston is in the North Somerset and B&NES part of the tender.

The programme ensures that the installation of the broadband is free. While the Parish Meeting can still request the conferring of powers to borrow money for their own broadband solution, this is another option available for delivering high speed broadband to Kelston. CDS have made it clear that applicants who receive the £500 grant for the Broadband Voucher Scheme for those below 2Mbps will still be able to benefit from the Phase 2 works as and when it is rolled-out.

In addition, Kelston Parish Meeting have requested that the Council confer full parish council powers to them, not just for borrowing.

On a motion from Councillor Paul Myers, seconded by Councillor Alison Millar, it was

RESOLVED unanimously

1. to make an order under Section 109 (1) of The Local Government Act 1972 Act (1972 Act) to confer on the Kelston Parish Meeting the powers of a parish council which are required to deliver the Kelston broadband project as set out in the report; and
2. to delegate to the Monitoring Officer the finalising of the Order in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Chair of the Kelston Parish Meeting.

40 WORLD HERITAGE SITE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Council considered a report seeking endorsement of the draft replacement City of Bath World Heritage Site Management plan and a recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Economic Development that it is approved for submission to UNESCO.

On a motion from Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, it was

RESOLVED unanimously

1. To endorse the draft replacement City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan and recommend to the Cabinet Member for Economic Development that it is approved for submission to UNESCO.
2. To note that further minor editorial changes may be made to the document, as agreed with the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, prior to submission.

41 CORPORATE AUDIT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

The Council considered the annual report of the Corporate Audit Committee which details its work over the last year.

On a motion from Councillor Brian Simmons, seconded by Councillor Andy Furse, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to note the Annual Report of the Corporate Audit Committee.

42 AGENDA MOTION FROM THE CONSERVATIVE GROUP - PROTECTING WOMEN AND GIRLS IN BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET FROM FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION (FGM)

The Council considered a motion from the Conservative group which was moved by Councillor Anthony Clarke, seconded by Councillor Lisa Brett and

RESOLVED that

Council notes:

- That performing FGM in the UK and taking a child abroad to undergo FGM are both illegal: Female Genital Mutilation Act 2003 and The Serious Crime Act 2015 (which has significant provisions to tackle FGM).
- The World Health Organisation has condemned FGM for many years. In 2016 the United Nations defined FGM as child abuse.
- It is estimated that 103,000 women aged 15-49 with FGM, born in countries in which it is practised, were living in England and Wales in 2011. In addition there were an estimated 24,000 women aged 50 and over with FGM born in FGM practising countries and nearly 10,000 girls aged 0-14 born in FGM practising countries who have undergone or are likely to undergo FGM.
- Experts, including professionals and the third sector, believe that FGM will only be eradicated in the longer term by changing practice and custom in

communities where it happens. This requires working with and empowering members of these communities to change their views towards FGM.

- That FGM can cause a range of serious health problems including severe pain and emotional /psychological trauma, in some cases, death.

This Council resolves to:

- Commit to raising general awareness of FGM throughout the B&NES area;
- Encourage all schools in the area to teach sex and relationship education and raise awareness of violence against women and girls, including FGM;
- Encourage health establishments, youth groups and the wider community to raise awareness of FGM;
- Ensure the multi-agency approach to this serious issue, along with the comprehensive integrated violence against women and girls strategy, is supported and prioritised within existing resources;
- Ensure mandatory reporting by professionals, if FGM is suspected or disclosed;
- Acknowledge the thousands of years of cultural and traditional beliefs which lie behind FGM and pledge support for individuals seeking to reform their own community practices;
- Welcome the report of the Home Affairs Select Committee, on 15th September which;
 - Recommends mandatory PHSE
 - Recommends introducing stronger sanctions for failure to meet mandatory reporting responsibility
 - Recommends that the FGM unit is given the remit, powers and budget to become the sole source of government policy for safeguarding at risk girls and eradicating FGM
- Call on our local Members of Parliament to also welcome this report and to pressure Ministers to implement the recommendations.

[Notes;

- 1. The underlined wording in the resolution was proposed by Councillor Joe Rayment and accepted into the substantive motion by the mover and seconder of the motion.*
- 2. The above resolution was passed with one Councillor abstaining, and the remaining Councillors voting in favour.]*

43 AGENDA MOTION FROM THE CONSERVATIVE GROUP - MODERN SLAVERY

The Council considered a motion from the Conservative group which was moved by Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Lisa Brett and

RESOLVED unanimously that

This council notes:

- That Prime Minister Theresa May has committed the UK Government to leading international efforts to defeat modern slavery, and last year as Home Secretary introduced the Modern Slavery Act 2015.
- That Slavery and Human Trafficking are crimes in the UK and considered illegal (Modern Slavery Act 2015).
- That worldwide it is predicted by the Global Slavery Index that there are 45.8 million people in some form of slavery (study in 167 countries, 2016).
- That slavery takes many different forms (forced labour, human trafficking, servitude, slavery) and may be present in a range of sectors (sex industry, service and hospitality industry, farming etc)
- That The UK Government estimates there are some 13,000 victims of trafficking in the UK:
 - In 2015 3,266 victims were identified and assisted (a 40% increase from 2014).
 - In 2015 289 offences linked to slavery and trafficking were prosecuted.
 - Over the last 5 years local Anti-Slavery organisation Unseen (based in the South West) has worked with over 200 victims of trafficking and slavery.
 - Slavery and trafficking are likely to be occurring in our locality and we have a duty to work in partnership with other agencies to raise awareness of this issue, identify and protect those vulnerable persons involved as well as tackle those perpetrating and facilitating this crime.
 - Under the Modern Slavery Act (2015) businesses are required to look at their own supply chains and submit an annual statement.

Council resolves to:

- Commit to working towards the eradication of human trafficking and slavery in BANES. We strive for a community where awareness of all forms of human trafficking and modern slavery is commonplace and that across all sectors people work collectively and steadfastly to eradicate its existence in our community, identify and prosecute the perpetrators of this crime and identify and support victims.
- Raise awareness of Modern Slavery amongst all employees and partners how it presents and what they need to do should they come across it.

- Ensure a multi-agency approach to this issue and to engage with and support the work of The Anti-Slavery Partnership locally and regionally.
- Implement the Transparency in Supply Chain provisions of the Modern Slavery Act to prevent Modern Slavery from occurring in its own supply chain, noting that the Council's Contract Standing Orders already recognise the importance of preventing Modern Slavery.
- Call on local Members of Parliament to press the Government to ensure our police force, border staff and Local Authorities receive adequate resources to stamp out modern slavery.

[Note: The underlined wording in the resolution above was proposed by Councillor Liz Hardman and accepted into the substantive motion by the mover and seconder.]

44 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

Councillor Alison Millar made a statement (taken earlier in the meeting with the agreement of the Chairman) concerning the proposed Park & Ride site on Bathampton Meadows. She commented that no solid business case had been made to convince people of the need for this, and that anticipating future need did not constitute special enough circumstances to justify building a Park & Ride on green belt land. She suggested the funding could be used for other projects that would benefit the whole of the city.

The Council noted the question from Councillor Will Sandry and response, which had been circulated to the meeting.

The meeting ended at 9.20 pm

Chairman

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

COUNCIL MEETING 15th SEPTEMBER 2016

STATEMENTS & QUESTIONS

STATEMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. Fiona Powell | East of Bath Park & Ride |
| 2. Annie Kilvington | East of Bath Park & Ride |
| 3. Susanne Hagen | East of Bath Park & Ride |
| 4. Tim Williams | East of Bath Park & Ride |
| 5. Sian James | East of Bath Park & Ride |
| 6. Christine Boyd | East of Bath Park & Ride |
| 7. Andrew Mercer | East of Bath Park & Ride |
| 8. Judy Bailey | East of Bath Park & Ride |
| 9. Sam Worrall | Boaters' concerns on Canal & River Trust guidelines |
| 10. David Dixon | Vegmead |
| 11. Rosemary Naish | Neighbourhood planning |
| 12. Susan Charles | Warm water swimming |
| 13. Tracey Harding | Transport issues |
| 14. John James | 6/7 bus route |
| 15. Nora Gee | 6/7 bus route |

QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

P 01	Question from:	Duncan Hounsell
Cllr Clarke (Transport) has said that the council's priority is to trial a one-way system in Keynsham High Street. Why is not the more popular and environmentally friendly option of full pedestrianisation being trialled first?		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
The Council recognises and supports the desire among residents and councillors in Keynsham to improve the pedestrian environment on Keynsham High Street. However, the Council must also balance this with the need to keep traffic moving in the town and		

consider any knock-on impact on the town's highway network, and as such the advice of the Council's professional Highways officers supported by the comprehensive Keynsham Transport Strategy is that the most sensible approach is to first trial a one-way system so that the success and impact of such a scheme can be gauged before considering any further proposals. As such, no costs have been assessed for full pedestrianisation at this time. I also note that in the 2012 Keynsham Town Plan, whilst 54% of respondents supported pedestrianisation, a greater number - 62% of respondents – stated they would support a one-way system if full pedestrianisation was not deemed viable.

P 02	Question from:	Duncan Hounsell
-------------	-----------------------	------------------------

What is the projected further cost of trialling full pedestrianisation in Keynsham High Street following expenditure on the one-way trial?

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

No costs have been allocated for a trial of full pedestrianisation as this is not supported by the traffic modelling.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Will Sandry
-------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Further to the outbreak of cyptosporidiosis linked by Public Health England to Swindon's Oasis pool which is operated by Greenwich Leisure Ltd (GLL).

A report in the current edition of Private Eye (Eye 1426) claims that Swindon Council and GLL kept the pool open to the public for three weeks after being warned that there was a problem with the water and also referenced deficiencies in water testing procedures at GLL operated Chesham leisure centre in 2014 which lead to hospitalisations.

Does the Cabinet member have confidence in the water testing, treatment systems and reporting mechanisms at the public swimming pools GLL operates on behalf of Bath and North East Somerset Council?

Answer from:	Councillor Martin Veal
---------------------	------------------------

Officers have reviewed the pool water sampling regime operated by GLL and are satisfied that a robust routine sampling scheme is in place.

- Councillor Alison Millar has registered to make a statement

Fiona Powell Speech for Full Council Sept 15th 2016

- Councillors, as a group of professionally-minded residents, we have never been given the chance to debate the topic of an East P&R with you. However, the time we spend breaking down the evidence means that we really do understand it. We ask you to listen with an open mind today and think independently as you move forward.
- [You will spot a common theme of a face mask among some of us – many have been prevented from speaking tonight since you changed the rules and we are here in solidarity with city centre and Batheaston residents who see no improvement in their illegal air quality in the offing because a P&R may only ease future congestion. What a mockery that makes of the Transport Strategy now, predicated as it is on removing vehicles from the city's core.]¹
- In preparation for today you will have read the new World Heritage Site Management Plan. When I quote the following definition from it – I am incredulous that we are still having to defend the Meadows.

World Heritage Sites are 'places of Outstanding Universal Value to the whole of humanity'. 'Outstanding Universal Value' means cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries.

Now quick quiz - who can tell me what OUV number 5 is?

That's it - the green setting of the city in a hollow in the hills

And Attribute 47 within this?

Fingers of green countryside which stretch right into the city

And the first line of the Vision?

The Outstanding Universal Value of the City of Bath World Heritage Site will be conserved and enhanced for this and future generations

And a bonus point – what does the Core Strategy say about OUVs?

There will be a strong presumption against development that would harm the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site itself, or its setting.

Right – so let me summarise. You must not develop a park and ride on the Meadows.

¹ Note: this was not used on the night because we had said in our press release that we would wear masks and were approached before the meeting by the Council who said that masks would not be allowed. When I then showed these to the outgoing Chief Exec, she said that the Council had thought that we were planning to speak with full anonymous face masks on, which was not the case. We had small paper dust masks that you wear on a bike or building site to prevent breathing in pollution/dust and had planned to take them off as soon as seated in order to speak.

- In the midst of this mess, I found myself raising a small smile when I read in the previous draft:

There is also a continuing need to train, educate and influence decision makers which, as previously described, have a very short life compared to the historic buildings which they are stewards of.

You got it – a short life. The final Management Plan points out 'Local elections take place every four years and can result (as they did last year) in a widespread change of local politicians' and goes on to reflect that 'key decision makers may benefit from training'

We think this is an understatement and are formally requesting tonight that all members of the Cabinet and of the Development Control Committee receive training on the importance of the world heritage site and on the Setting Supplementary Planning Document ahead of considering any decision to site a park and ride to the east of Bath.

We also expect this decision to be after the planning inspector has presented back her report. To do otherwise would be poor practice indeed.

Annie's Speech for Full Council Meeting 15 September 2016

Council Leader, Before I start – please have to hand the single page map I left on chairs.

1. Good evening. I too am here tonight because I am concerned that you do not have a clear or balanced set of evidence before you to make a decision about a potential East P&R. Please listen with an open mind to what I have to say.
2. The Council has acknowledged that an East of Bath Park & Ride won't ease congestion or pollution, yet air pollution shortens the lives of more than 50,000 people a year and the latest UWE research out this month tells us that the existing vehicle fleet is being replaced so slowly that reduced vehicle use is the only sure way to bring about improvement in air quality. All the time we prioritise road users, the implications for social equity are immense because households in poorer areas suffer more air pollution, while contributing less to the problem.
3. Back in 2009, Motts looked at the impact on air quality if a P&R were built on Site F. They decided to consider the cumulative impact on air quality not just of an Eastern P & R, but of other elements of the BTP, such as extensions to Newbridge. The implication seems to have been that sacrificial areas of worsened air quality could be tolerated if there were net improvements elsewhere. As a concept, legally questionable, for residents in worsened areas, quite possibly morally repugnant.
4. But let's stick with it for a moment, however flawed the theory might have been, what they actually modelled is quite interesting. See the chart in front of you. Orange means the existing AQMA, Green means things get better with the BTP in place, red means it gets worse. What must jump out at you, is just how much red Motts drew around Bathampton and Batheaston, with a presumed park and ride in place on Site F.
5. Fast forward 7 years. NO2 readings have gone from 33 to 38 in parts of Batheaston. 2015 figures will be artificially depressed, in part by the lengthy closure of the A36 last year but mostly by the legally inexcusable change in the choice of bias applied to the raw readings, which have seen NO2 levels tumbling across the whole City, without any improvement in the underlying raw data. With the real figures as your new baseline, what must Motts modelling show second time around? The results can only be worse.
6. So please, spend your £12 million on affordable, equally accessible to all public transport, and a real commitment to active travel. Please don't hide behind manufactured statistics to magic this problem away; we are part of a national air quality problem of epidemic proportions.

My name is Susanne Hagen and I represent Batheaston Parish Council. In 2015 I together with 13 other residents formed Batheaston Forward, listened to the many complaints about the former Parish Council, their lack of communication and unwillingness to modernise, to think laterally and above all to listen.

As a result 14 out of 15 councillors lost their post and we took over. Since then communication has been at the forefront of everything we do. When we receive a planning application to consider for approval or amendment, the responsibility lies on us to make sure we can make an informed decision. We visit the site in question and often communicate with the applicant to fully understand what he or she is aiming to do. We are elected but not paid and do this because we see the value in improving the area as a whole for us, visitors and future generations to come.

You are elected as we are but receive a salary for that purpose. Whether from Bath or further afield, it is your responsibility to inform yourselves so that you can make one of the most important decisions ever made for the villages of Batheaston, Bathampton, Bathford and for the city of Bath. This is far from a party political issue but one which will change lives forever for people and future electors. You have to be able to justify to yourself, you make the decision, not the officer who has pulled this 30 year old ill conceived scheme of concreting over one of Bath's largest tourist attractions out of a drawer.

You will also take the consequence. We keep hearing you have stacks of evidence, where is it? You refute valid official evidence as true and then provide none of your own as was again exemplified on Tuesday evening at our Parish Council meeting. From the start there has been a determination to go for site F without any dialogue, evidence or justification. With one post hoc rationalisation after another and no willingness to engage with the electors, who reside within the boundaries of the new constituency of Bath post 2018 and with over 13 000 opposing signatures so far, Batheaston Parish Council has invited you to come on a tour of the sites.

You all received an email from me on Monday and so far only a quarter have responded. Only by evaluating the different sites close at hand will you

understand the impact on people's lives, and especially the Bathampton primary school children, who will be subjected to the noxious gases.

A little learning is indeed a dangerous thing.

I look forward to hearing from the rest of you, confirming you in truth know the area or to book up an appointment. What is about to happen is nothing short of an environmental crime, damaging the status of Bath forever. Under your auspices I hope you don't allow this. You have the chance to stop this act of vandalism and to make a modern difference and be forerunners.

Tim Williams

Speech to Council - 15 September 2016

Like my colleagues, I too am concerned that you have clear and balanced evidence before you make your decision on a P & R. Please listen carefully to what I have to say.

It has been clear to us for a long time, there is NO substantiated case for an East P & R. In the Chronicle the Council agrees - it says "the Council hopes that an East P & R will ease future congestion".

The question remains, by how much and when?

For no answer to this can be found in any Council report, and the Council cannot even tell us how much demand there will be for this P&R in the next 3-5 years.

The Mott McDonald report, published this Spring only gives a demand figure for 2029 - 13 years away – and how accurate/credible is that?

Also:---

Empirical Council evidence clearly shows that the highest demand for P & R is at midday - yet the Mott report projects it to be at 4.00 in the afternoon. There is NO explanation for this change! The pattern of use of the current P & R's has not changed in 5 years. What magic brings this new pattern about. If it is based on assumptions, you know what happens when you ASS U ME.

Will changes in City Centre parking places lead to this pattern? Well no, their use follows the same pattern as the P & R's, so the pattern in the Mott report is perverse.

Also, and with no explanation the Mott report projects an increase of 900% in the use of the RUH buses. Where on earth did that come from! The healthcare trend is to treat closer to home, and the RUH have just increased their parking by 300 places! Not only that the RUH had no input into these forecasts.

You may hear officials saying that "all bases are covered" as they are using Webtag, the process used to seek funds for projects such as this. That could not be further from the truth. The first stage of the process is

to produce a paper assessing the best solution. Pretty fundamental really, but have you seen this paper? We have not seen it! We don't think it exists!

Even the planning inspector, as part of the place holding plan review, has asked "what other options have you considered?". BANES response is:

- A new railway station based P & R
- Continuing to encourage transfer to existing bus services
- Support for improved rail services

That's all,,,,,,? Where is:

- Enhancing public bus services
- Funding quality bus corridors
- Properly quantifying and tackling the school run
- Creating proper, safe corridors for cyclists
- Congestion charging
- Charging for work place parking
- Working with businesses to explore flexible/home working
- and so on.....

All in all quite pitiful and certainly not a credit to the City of Bath.

We have challenged and discredited the need for a P & R time and time again, and yet still more attempts are being made to justify it. It is not needed.

As you consider your decision on this controversial topic make sure you are very clear about the actual facts. You are in danger of making a decision with the wool pulled over your eyes.

I urge you protect to our heritage, don't concrete over our - Bath's Green Belt.

Sian James statement to B&NES Council 14Sept 2016.

I am here tonight because I remain concerned that you do not have a clear set of objectives before you as you come near to a decision about an East P&R. Please listen with an open mind to what I have to say:

You have stated, in your own papers produced for the Planning Inspector, that the original justification for the P&R had 6 objectives, so I have reviewed your papers against your objectives.

First objective - Congestion – your own papers state that morning rush hour on the London Road will not improve – at best it will stand still. Your SRN paper says that by **2029** the P&R **might** take **around 100 cars** off the London Rd. 1.6 cars per minute – that doesn't sound much.

For the P&R to help the rush hour – the target users have to be commuters – however **most** currently park elsewhere for free so are unlikely to use P&R.

And you **still** don't have any **data** about what drives the congestion, who is going where, or whether people would actually use an East of Bath P&R.

To reduce congestion around car parks – you need to reduce the number of spaces offered. Please tell us the latest? Are they reducing or increasing? Each week we hear something different! What is the truth?

And of course the P&R will only impact 50% of the congestion anyway!

By developing in Bath you are planning for congestion to get WORSE, P&R will hardly make a dent in it – your own experts tell you this, but that is not what you are admitting to your electorate/residents.

Second objective- Environment – Remember Bens Corridor of Death? if congestion doesn't significantly improve – pollution won't either. Pollution isn't mentioned in the Inspectors report.

Third - Reduce car use into the city – this will only reduce IF you remove car parking spaces.

Fourth & Fifth: To reduce carbon emissions & To improve connectivity – aren't these both reliant on **significant** reduction in congestion.

So - According to YOUR papers **5 of the 6** objectives for P&R will not be met. But of course the 6th one will – supporting economic development. BUT – if congestion is worse than now – even a P&R for shoppers won't be attractive if the buses are just stuck in traffic on the London Road!

According to the Chronicle you now only HOPE that an East P&R will alleviate future congestion. That's not very convincing.

So - What is your objective for P&R now? Is it still reducing congestion and pollution, which is what us, the residents, want. It doesn't appear to be.

Your original consultation clearly misled people into thinking that an East P&R will solve all the problems of congestion and pollution on the London Road. It wont.

You have stated that you have 6 objectives for an East P&R – you should be presenting metrics as to how your proposals meet these objectives – this is sorely lacking.

Sorry – but this is £12million plus of tax payers money – our money – and we want a **real significant difference in congestion and pollution** – not just a tiny insignificant difference, perhaps, in 2029. Bath deserves better, our Green Belt deserves better.

Note:

Objectives of P&R (from BNES/PMP/002/20 Q3. Is Provision of an East of Bath Park & Ride justified?)

1. To reduce congestion within the city & around car parks
2. To improve the environment
3. To reduce car use & improve % of public transport journeys
4. To reduce carbon emissions from transport
5. To improve connectivity to support regions growth
6. To support city's economic development

This page is intentionally left blank

I am here tonight because I am concerned that are not aware of the new evidence emerging about P&R and because you may have forgotten about the past. Please listen carefully to what I have to say.

In 2009 members of the Development Control committee were told that;

- Odd Down Park and Ride was up to 85 % full and
- by 2011 there would be demand for 1300 spaces.

That forecast was wrong. Today, at the busiest time there are just 664 cars at Odd Down. – DC committee you were duped!

Don't take my word for it. This is the latest report ch2m it says that;

- Odd Down utilisation is 53% or 59% if you take out Sundays
- spare capacity is very high at Odd Down – more than 500 spaces
- Maximum capacity exceeded 90% on only 3 occasions during the Xmas market period

Funnily enough this is what Andrew Lee told you in February, so please can you stop saying that you don't agree with BMA figures. They are your figures now.

There is in fact much more that we can agree upon in this new report

We agree with ch2m that

- The number of P&R spaces required, and when they will be required, is dependent on how quickly the EA is developed.
- That there is an existing spare capacity in P&R of more than 1000 spaces, and
- because of this you will not need an east of Bath P&R till sometime between 2019 and 2022 - IF AT ALL

We agree with ch2m that

- you must monitor the network and the take up of P&R going forward, and

- you must put effort into shifting travel mode to walking/cycling and buses.

Ch2m concludes that if all the planned development goes ahead you will not need more than 300-400 spaces to the east by 2029

We believe that if you find temporary parking for peak events like the Christmas Market you can reduce this by at least another 100 spaces.

We agree with Ch2m that

- it is 'interesting' that the Mott MacDonald's 'do nothing' scenario says that if you don't build a P&R to the east the shortfall by 2029 will be just 122 spaces.

So Councillors, you now have 2 reports telling you the same thing, that there is no need to do anything now, other than

- monitor traffic and P&R take up and,
- focus on walking, cycling and buses

I am glad we have finally reached agreement on this.

I am here tonight because I am concerned that you are still not listening.

Last November I wrote to you with my concern that you were about to take an unlawful decision to put 1400 P&R spaces on Bathampton meadows.

I was concerned that a decision at that time would not have been supported by policy or evidence and that because of this you could not make a reasonable decision that would withstand legal challenge.

I told you that as a businessman I could never take such an important decision without a business case and that I certainly could not raise finance on this basis.

So what has changed?

Well quite a lot, you now accept that

- P&R is not as popular as you believed – you have lots of spare capacity
- congestion and emissions will not improve in the future with or without more P&R
- an east P&R will only take 5% of traffic off the London Road in the morning peak
- You now have evidence that you don't need anything like 1400 spaces to the east – and in fact may not need an east P&R at all

And what has not changed?

- You still have not asked anyone whether they would use an east of bath P&R, so don't have a reliable forecast of demand from the east
- As far as we know you still don't have a business plan so cant raise finance, and
- You still don't have policy – The planning inspector is in town considering if a P&R to the east is justified and if it is okay to make a planning application for a site to the east when the location this is not specified in the place making plan.

YOU ABSOLUTELY CANNOT make any decision until she has reported back – and that is not expected until December at the earliest.

Now that you agree with the BMA on so many fronts is it not time to begin a genuine dialogue as we requested last February and deliver something that we can all support.

This page is intentionally left blank

Judy Bailey
Bathampton Meadows Alliance
15.9.16

BANES council is rightly interested in promoting tourism in Bath. It is a major part of our local economy. Our World Heritage Status is something that we are justifiably proud of, and this status is not only awarded for the more obvious attractions of the Georgian terraces and the Roman Baths.

Bath has a distinctive garden feel. The surrounding countryside is drawn into the city visually and sometimes physically. This is a result of the Georgian architectural idea of planting buildings and cities in the landscape to achieve picturesque views and forms.

Government guidance on protecting the Historic Environment and World Heritage is set out in National Planning Policy Framework. Policies to protect, promote, conserve and enhance World Heritage properties, their settings and buffer zones are also found in statutory planning documents.

According to the core policy found in The Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan, any developments which would harm the qualities justifying the status of the World Heritage property, or its setting, will not be permitted.

Bath is an attractive destination and we are all incredibly lucky to call the city our home. Moreover, The 'Destination Marketing Strategy' for Bath aims to promote growth in the value of tourism rather than in volume. The green setting of Bath adds to the quality of the experience.

I attended a Visit Bath meeting at the Hilton Hotel on the 1st of September. In talking to other delegates I was heartened to note that more than half of the tourism businesses in Bath, were of the same opinion as myself, namely that a huge car park on the meadows is in fact an extremely bad idea for tourism in Bath. Given that the reason tourists come here is to see and experience our cultural assets, it is short sighted and blinkered to think that a monstrosity of this scale is the answer in so sensitive a site.

This huge blight is not something that the residents of the east want, or should 'take for the team'. This countryside/ city divide is a nonsense and we are not diametrically opposed parties, but neighbours and friends. We all visit and enjoy both the city and the countryside.

Just think of fun days out that tourists and residents alike enjoy...boating from the Boat Station on Forester Rd out to the Bathampton Mill, enjoying the peace and quiet of the river, and this will be spoilt. Think of cycling out to The George, Bathampton on a sunny day, think of walking the Skyline Walk or Little Solsbury or Brown's Folly. All these activities, promoted by the Tourist Information Office in Bath, will be spoilt by a giant car park, one that BANES council now know will not provide the reduction in traffic and air pollution that were their original aims.

I found out at the tourism meeting that the Park and Ride is now being promoted as a strategy to alleviate FUTURE traffic problems as the council acknowledge that it will not cure the current ones. It was acknowledged that people's shopping habits have changed, since more people are shopping on the internet. Cllr Tim Warren said that shopping is not the main activity that people come to Bath for.

I put it to you, they come to Bath for their leisure time, to enjoy its beauty and that means both the city and the countryside. They bring economic gain to Bath and we mess with the setting of our rare jewel of a city at our peril.

I am here as the Chairman of the B&NES group within the Avon Local Councils Association, ALCA. In B&NES these town and parish councils make up 52% of the total electorate in B&NES.

Those of you who have parishes in your wards will know that for this first tier of government the main concerns seem to be the three P's, Parking, Poo and Planning. Having visited 22 councils in the last couple of months I can confirm that though Dog Poo and parking are discussed, but they are trivial compared to Planning. Planning affects everyone and it's a long term effect, what is built now is likely to be around for decades, so people really care, it can change lives and communities permanently. The councils I've visited recently aren't NYMBYs, they know development is vital, and because it matters so much to them they want to be informed and consulted properly but unfortunately their perception is that this is not happening, and this is one of the reasons why so many parishes are getting involved in Neighbourhood planning. Within this local authority there are 3 made plans, 1 that is having a referendum today, 16 more parishes are at some stage of the neighbourhood planning route and 2 more that are now seriously considering doing a neighbourhood plan. To save your fingers going at overtime that's 22 out of the eligible 47 councils.

But having a Neighbourhood Plan does not guarantee that the system will work better. In my parish, Clutton, one applicant this year paid for pre-application advice, but the officer never mentioned the Made Neighbourhood Plan, let alone the fact that 3 of the policies in it would affect his application. I am aware of other examples of this sort but this is not the time or place to mention them.

We know that the planning department has a heavy workload, but it must be very demoralising working in a department where over 50% of the area you are responsible for think you not doing as good a job as you could. Nor can it be as effective or efficient as it should be for the council tax payers of B&NES.

Although it's a political syllogism – something should be done to get this working better.

Rosemary Naish

This page is intentionally left blank

Whilst we welcome the Devolution deal the issues about transport powers are a concern on how it will be possible to operate and franchise a bus network that does not cover the four unitary authorities in terms of a franchise or a quality partnership where buses operate between UWE - Portishead and Clevedon would be outside the agreement. Similarly bus services through Hotwells, Clevedon and Weston would have to operate under the permit system under the Buses Bill or would require a separate quality partnership covering North Somerset by the new combined authority to cover North Somerset either as an advanced quality partnership or an enhanced quality partnership. It would also require a different agreement for a multi-journey, multi-operator and multi-modal ticketing scheme and North Somerset would still require referral to the Traffic Commissioner for services whereas the Metro-Mayor would have full control over the bus services through contracts or partnerships. Of course this would also apply to a Planning or Transport Commissioner.

On rail it would be very difficult to arrange improvements to services without the full Portishead line being in the deal and the line from Gloucester to Weston-Super-Mare. This would make station improvements very difficult or to seek rail powers for Metro-West with the franchise and Network Rail. Access for All programmes could be carried out at Lawrence Hill, Stapleton Road, Patchway, Pilning, Filton and Parson Street but would leave the situation of station improvements in North Somerset outside the power of the combined authority. This would affect bus/rail interchange improvements at Weston-Super-Mare and Nailsea and Backwell and also electrification of the line between Bristol to Taunton.

If a new rail authority is set up as part of the combined authority, then while improvements would take place at Bath, Keynsham and Temple Meads, Filton, Patchway and the Henbury loop North Somerset would remain outside the combined authority area and rail investment programmes would still have to be agreed with the DfT. Similarly, decisions on housing and planning matters on South Bristol expansion or Weston-Super-Mare, Clevedon or Portishead and the MetroBus extensions to Clevedon and Weston would again be outside the control of any planning, transport authority commissioner or Metro-Mayor. Delivering a new interchange at Weston would be more difficult.

Currently, the Bristol Port and airport remain outside of the combined authority which makes improving public transport to Bristol airport and reopening the Henbury loop very difficult as the port is in three authorities - Bristol, South Gloucestershire and North Somerset.

Bus Service Reductions from 4th September 2016

Passenger groups are concerned about the following loss of services :-

- 2 Stockwood - City Centre (no night buses)
- 17A Keynsham - Southmead via Hillfields and Cadbury Heath (now retained from November 2016)
- 37 Bristol - Bitton - Bath (no service to Bitton or RUH) now planned to be restored to its original route from November 2016)
- 38 Bristol - Keynsham - Bath (Sundays and evenings)
- 48/49 No night buses beyond Downend and Staple Hill

51 Bristol - Knowle - Whitchurch
178 Bristol - Radstock via Keynsham (no estate service evenings and Sundays)
173 Radstock - Chillcompton (no Sunday service)
207 Thornbury - Berkeley (loss of service)

Whilst we are pleased to see some services retained from September and November we are still concerned about the level of services in Kingswood and Keynsham along the routes of the 17A (now 19B) and 38/178 around the Keynsham estates with no evening and Sunday services after 9pm and a limited service around the Chandag Estate, together with the 6 & 7 around Larkhall, Bath.

The larger budget for buses and public transport in BANES, Bristol and South Gloucestershire is alarming. Whilst we welcome the bid for sustainable money from Government the loss of bus service support money is of great concern especially on the Bristol - Radstock corridor through Brislington and Whitchurch.

David Redgewell South West Transport Network, TSSA and Director of Bus Users (UK)
Martin Cinamond (South West Transport Network)
Nigel Bray (Railfuture Severnside)
Jenny Raggett (TFGBA)
John Hassell Bus Users UK

COUNCIL MEETING 15th SEPTEMBER 2016
QUESTIONS & STATEMENTS - COUNCILLORS

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Will Sandry
<p>Further to the outbreak of cyprosporidiosis linked by Public Health England to Swindon's Oasis pool which is operated by Greenwich Leisure Ltd (GLL).</p> <p>A report in the current edition of Private Eye (Eye 1426) claims that Swindon Council and GLL kept the pool open to the public for three weeks after being warned that there was a problem with the water and also referenced deficiencies in water testing procedures at GLL operated Chesham leisure centre in 2014 which lead to hospitalisations.</p> <p>Does the Cabinet member have confidence in the water testing, treatment systems and reporting mechanisms at the public swimming pools GLL operates on behalf of Bath and North East Somerset Council?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Martin Veal
<p>Officers have reviewed the pool water sampling regime operated by GLL and are satisfied that a robust routine sampling scheme is in place.</p>		

- Councillor Alison Millar has registered to make a statement

This page is intentionally left blank