

## **BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

### **PLANNING, HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL**

Tuesday, 6th September, 2016

**Present:-** Councillors Rob Appleyard (Chair), Colin Blackburn, Lisa O'Brien, Fiona Darey, Cherry Beath and Deirdre Horstmann (in place of Barry Macrae)

**Also in attendance:** Lisa Bartlett (Divisional Director, Development), Simon De Beer (Policy & Environment Manager), Tony Crouch. (World Heritage Manager) and Stephen Bird (Head of Heritage Services)

#### **13 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

#### **14 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Chairman drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

#### **15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

Apologies were received from Councillors Barry Macrae and David Veale. Councillor Deirdre Horstmann substituted for Councillor Macrae.

#### **16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Beath declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 10 as a member of the Board of Future Bath Plus.

#### **17 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN**

The Chair made a personal statement as follows:

At the last meeting of this Panel in July an item to note regarding an agreement between B&NES Council and Curo Group about development at Mulberry Park and the Foxhill Estate was on the agenda. I discussed this with the Vice-Chair, and it was agreed that he would take this item, as I had a disclosable interest as a non-executive director of Curo. After the public speakers and all members had spoken and after I had resumed the chair, I indicated that I thought that this was a good chance for both organisations, especially the residents, noting that as the tenants' advisory body was involved, this should give residents confidence that they will be listened to.

I realise that my comments caused concern to other Panel members and members of the public. Although I had correctly declared an interest, I should not have spoken. I have discussed the matter with the Monitoring Officer and have realised that though there was never any attempt to hide my interest, I should not have spoken and should have left the room. I therefore offer the Panel and members of the public my full and unreserved apology for my error and I leave it to the process of the Standards Committee to determine my sanction.

Finally I would like to indicate to the Panel that due to a governance review at Curo and having served on the Board for over seven years I am unlikely to continue on the new Board in October, as the maximum service is now set for 2 x 3 years, and therefore further conflicts of interest will be removed. I reiterate my apologies to the Panel and in doing so will indicate that I shall be standing down as Chair of the Panel and as a member of the Panel after the end of this meeting. I thank you very much for your support over the last twenty months. We have achieved a lot and I am very proud of what we have done and wish you success for the rest of the Council term.

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

Nicolette Boater had submitted two questions. The questions and the answers approved by the Panel are given in Appendix 1. She also made a statement on Bath's World Heritage status (Minute 22), a copy of which is attached in Appendix 2 to these minutes.

Rosemary Naish, Chair of Clutton Parish Council, was concerned that a recently couple of planned webcasts of committee meetings had not taken place because of insufficient equipment. She urged the Council to acquire sufficient equipment to enable all important meetings to be webcast. The Chair thanked her and said that he would pass her comments onto the Cabinet Member for Resources.

David Redgewell made a statement about bus subsidies and public transport. He said that local authorities were moving away from revenue support towards capital support for bus services. He felt strongly that this was not the way forward. He pointed out that many people no longer work regular 9 to 5 days and that public transport provision needed to recognise this. Public transport needed every pot of money that was available. He urged that public transport issues should be fully taken into account at the regional and local planning levels and in s106 agreements. The Chair said that he was sure that the officers present would note his comments. He suggested that the Cabinet Members present might discuss these issues with the Cabinet Member for Transport, and asked officers to draft a reply to Mr Redgewell.

## **19 MINUTES - 5TH JULY 2016**

Councillor Appleyard said in his declaration under item 4 “non-pecuniary” should be amended to “disclosable pecuniary interest”. Councillor O’Brien objected to this, saying that he had not declared a pecuniary interest. It was y the Panel agreed that the existing wording should remain.

Councillor O’Brien said that at the end of item 9 on page 14 it should be recorded that “The Chair made a statement.” This was agreed by the Panel.

Councillor Blackburn asked for it to be recorded that at the end of Cllr Appleyard's statement at the 5th July meeting he had had an exchange with a resident who had earlier presented to the panel. She was told she was not able to reply to the statement made as the panel was not a discussion forum. Cllr Appleyard had then stated "don't worry, we will look after you". Members agreed that Councillor Blackburn’s recollection was correct.

The minutes were approved subject to these amendments.

## **20 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE**

Councillor Liz Richardson, Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning, gave an update on matters within her portfolio.

Neighbourhood Plans: High Littleton and Hallatrow had recently submitted an application to become a designated Neighbourhood Planning Area. Twenty parishes were now involved in neighbourhood planning. Three Neighbourhood Plans have now been made.

She circulated an update on Housing Services, a copy of which is attached as Appendix 3 to these minutes.

The Chair requested Councillor Richardson to report back to the Panel on the number of homes whose construction had not commenced within 12 months of receiving planning permission.

Councillor Anketell-Jones, Cabinet Member for Economic Development, gave an update on matters within his portfolio.

- Bath Festivals Board was working very hard on the financial plan for the Bath Festival.
- There was a need for a coach park. A report on the management of coach parking had been commissioned by the Council.
- The Colonnades and Undercroft project had been approved by the Development Management Committee, but no work would be commenced until there was a committed tenant, as the cost was too great otherwise.
- He was keeping an eye on Bath University. He would like to see the interests of the University and the City coincide. There was considerable scope for the University to provide better information.

- Heritage Week: the City had about 18 visitor attractions which could be described loosely as “museums”; the focus of Heritage Week needs to be wider than just Roman remains.

Councillor Beath said that she was aware that the Royal National Hospital for Rheumatic Diseases was owned by the RUH, but wondered whether the Council had any plans to preserve and include it as part of a “Spa Quarter”. She thought it would be inappropriate if it became a hotel, for example. Councillor Anketell-Jones agreed and said that he hoped its historical local character could be preserved.

The Chair asked what was being done to publicise the fact that coaches could park at the First Group depot; there didn’t seem to be any signage indicating this. Councillor Anketell-Jones replied that communication between the coach companies and the Council was very good and that this information was provided to them. The Chair replied that the Council might be providing information to coach company head offices, but it might not be trickling down to the drivers. He wondered whether there was any communication on the ground between the Council and drivers; there was some inappropriate coach parking taking place. Councillor Anketell-Jones said that he would be happy to report back on this at a future meeting. He had not received any complaints about coach parking.

**RESOLVED** to note the updates from Cabinet Members.

## 21 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK UPDATES

The Divisional Director–Development and the Group Manager–Policy & Environment updated the Panel.

The Group Manager explained that the Local Development Framework is a group of documents which provides the main policies within which planning decisions must be taken in Bath and North East Somerset.

He reported that consultation on the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) would begin on 9 November. The JSP is a high-level plan setting out goals for housing, employment etc. within the West of England area. He said that a presentation about the JSP could be made to the November meeting of the Panel, if it wished. Closely aligned with the JSP is the Review of the B&NES Core Strategy; both will be on the Cabinet agenda on 19 October. The Cabinet will consider the Pre-Commencement Document, which sets out the scope and timetable for the Review. This will not be a full-scale review.

He reported that B&NES was in the top 4% of local authorities for adopted or made Neighbourhood Plans.

The Council has started to receive income from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). A review will take place in November to consider what infrastructure is needed to bring forward the growth outlined in the Core Strategy. A policy will be prepared setting out the criteria on how the income from CIL should be spent.

There will be a review of the Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) Supplementary Planning Guidance. The Chair asked how the allocation between student accommodation and accommodation for key workers would be determined. The Group Manager replied that it was a matter of deciding whether there was greater demand for family homes or for student accommodation and of monitoring the impact of multiple occupation on the housing stock.

Councillor Beath congratulated the Planning Service on their success with Neighbourhood Plans. She also said that housing completions in B&NES over the last seven years had been very good. She suggested that the Panel should receive a report on HMOs.

Councillor Darey asked about the impact of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 on affordable housing targets. The Divisional Director replied that this would depend on Regulations issued under the Act, which were awaited.

Councillor Blackburn asked whether data was available on the occupiers of houses in multiple occupation. He was concerned that the availability of accommodation for professionals was being eroded by the growth in student accommodation. The Group Manager said that the planning system could not distinguish between the types of occupant of HMOs.

**RESOLVED** to note the updates.

## **22 WORLD HERITAGE STATUS - 2ND INSCRIPTION**

The World Heritage Manager presented this item. A copy of his PowerPoint presentation is attached as Appendix 4.

**RESOLVED** to note the report.

## **23 ARCHIVE CENTRE**

The Chair noted that this item had been on the Panel's workplan for some time.

The Head of Heritage Services presented the report. He informed the Panel that the South West Committee of the Heritage Lottery Fund would consider the Council's bid for funding for the Archway Centre on 20 September and that the National Trustees would meet on the 26<sup>th</sup> September, and would notify the outcome on the following afternoon.

He said that archives had been a "Cinderella" service for many years. They were founded in 1967 and were at first with the Chief Executive, then they were transferred to the Council Solicitor, then to Democratic Services and then to Libraries. In the course of a reorganisation some years ago he had volunteered to accept them in Heritage Services, which already employed professional archivists. Unfortunately new space had not been found to house them. They are lodged in the basement of the Guildhall and very much "out of sight, out of mind". User surveys

consistently show that users of the Bath archives have the highest satisfaction rates of any local authority archive users in the South West. Yet, as noted in the report, many other local authorities are ahead of Bath in implementing ambitious schemes to house their archives. Those other schemes give good examples of synergies and economies of space achieved by appropriately co-locating different facilities. He thought that the way forward for the Bath archives and local history centre was to find a larger project within which they could be based. He did not think that in the current financial climate a new standalone building would be provided. He was liaising with Councillor Anketell-Jones and the Regeneration Team about potential opportunities.

Councillor O'Brien suggested that the archive could be located in an old building, perhaps King Edward's School. The Head of Heritage Services replied that the problem was that land values in central Bath were very high. Devon Archives were located on an industrial estate on the outskirts of Exeter, close to a park and ride and a junction on the M5. He would certainly not rule out moving outside of the city centre.

Councillor Horstmann asked whether the Royal Hospital for Rheumatic Diseases had been considered as a possible location. The Head of Heritage Services said that it had crossed his mind. At present it belonged to the NHS Trust, but they were seeking to dispose of it. It did have a lot of open space inside it. He was conscious that other parties were taking an interest in the building; a number of things might be able to come together there.

## **24 PANEL WORKPLAN**

The Panel considered the forward workplan.

Councillor Beath suggested that the Panel should have an update on the JSP and Local Development Framework and on the coach park. The Chair suggested that it would be appropriate to consider coach parking in November before the Christmas Market was held. Councillor Anketell-Jones agreed that he could report back on coach parking at the November meeting.

The workplan was noted.

The meeting ended at 3.37 pm

Chair(person) .....

Date Confirmed and Signed .....

**Prepared by Democratic Services**

Question from Nicolette Boater to the 6.9.16 PHE PDS Panel meeting  
with regard to item 10 on its agenda

1. Will the amendments and deletions made to the consultation draft of the WHS Management Plan (referred to in paragraph 5.6 of the item 10 decision report) be made transparent prior to its presentation to 15.9.16 Council for approval?
2. The online questionnaire used in the June/July 2016 consultation on the draft WHS management plan invited comments in response to 6 different questions yet the summary of these comments as reported in Appendix 1 reduces these to 84 bullet point "issues" organised by thematic priority and in so doing masks both the complexity and inter-related nature of several of these concerns. Therefore, will a summary of the comments made in response to each of the six questions (and ideally where a complex point is being made a direct quote) also be made publicly available prior in time to inform the 15.9.16 Council meeting?

Draft Response (Tony Crouch) 5 September 2016

1. Yes. The endorsement draft of the WHS Management Plan will be published on-line as an appendix to the Full Council report. This will be available with Full Council papers from Wednesday 7 September.
2. The report to Full Council will include a link to a 'Statement of Community Involvement' which will be published on-line together with the endorsement draft of the WHS Management Plan. The Statement of Community Involvement lists all of the consultation responses in full, together with notes explaining the response to these. This document is approximately 160 pages long, hence the summary of issues presented to the panel. The Statement of Community Involvement sets out changes to the plan made in response to consultation.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Statement to the 6.9.16 Planning, Housing and Economic Development  
Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel meeting**

Thank you Chair.

As one who relocated from London for the all round quality of life in Bath and the surrounding countryside, I am pleased that this PDS Panel is taking a keen and continuing interest in managing and making the most of this city's prized World Heritage status. I am also impressed with the Management Plan and the associated consultation document – not least for its insights into the nature of Outstanding Universal Value, and perception of the challenges and opportunities associated with the preservation of the World Heritage site and its setting for future generations.

However I have a few concerns as regards the sections in the update report on today's agenda relating to the revision of the 2016-22 Management plan in light of responses to the summer consultation:

- The line of argument in paragraph 5.6 of the update report portrays the P&R East issue as, and only as, a transport issue. However, whilst P&R East may well have a role to play in delivering some important transport objectives, it is also an environmental and social issue with potential adverse and long lasting effects on such as flood resilience, air quality and community wellbeing.
- Furthermore, the Management Plan's deference of transport matters to the 2014 Bath Transport Strategy does not exempt it from its responsibilities to protect the World Heritage site and setting for future generations. Indeed the Management Plan includes "The green setting of the City in a hollow in the hills" as one of six headline attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, and asserts in its vision statement that there is a "strong presumption against development that would harm the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site itself or its setting".<sup>1</sup>
- Given that all but one of the potential P&R East sites evaluated earlier this year by the LDF Steering Group and from which Cabinet has indicated that a decision will be "made later this year", lie within the World Heritage Site setting, it is unsurprising that around 2/3 of consultation respondents expressed concern about P&R East (albeit the summary in Appendix 1 of the update report is not clear as to why and/or from what perspective). For this is indeed an imminent and major example of "the principal challenge in this plan to deliver a further phase of considerable growth and change whilst sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value for which the site was inscribed".<sup>2</sup> (Hence my questions, ahead of seeing the post consultation revised version of the Management Plan, as to the rationale for amending or deleting the references to P&R East.)

Why am I taking timeout today to draw your attention to such specific nuances of interpretation you might be wondering? Here's why. Although only voted for by 38% of the electorate, the current Council administration has an unusually large working majority, and if it so wishes, is thus well-positioned to implement a narrow party-political agenda regardless of its impact on future generations and wider stakeholder groups. The 2016-22 Management Plan is an important safeguard to prevent this happening.

*Nicolette Boater, B.A.(Oxon.), M.Phil.  
Strategist, Economist and Policy Analyst  
adding lasting value at the public private interface*



---

<sup>1</sup> See page 6 of the Consultation draft of the 2016-22 Management Plan.

<sup>2</sup> See page 7 of the Consultation draft of the 2016-22 Management Plan.

Housing Services Update  
Planning, Housing and Economic Development PDS  
September 2016

---

## General Update

---

### **Low-cost Homeownership Event**

Housing Services have organised a drop-in event for the public to promote low-cost home ownership options in Bath and North East Somerset. The event will be held between 2-7pm on 26<sup>th</sup> October in the Community Space in Keynsham. All of our housing association partners who are developing shared ownership homes in the area will be in attendance, as well as private developers promoting the use of Help-to-Buy to discount the purchase of a brand new home and Help to Buy South, the Government's appointed Help-to-Buy agent who administers the register of households seeking low cost home ownership. Two independent financial / mortgage advisors will also be in attendance to answer questions and carry out initial affordability assessments for visitors wishing to understand if they can afford low cost home ownership. Between 12-13.30 B&NES staff will be invited to attend a preview of the public event as part of a week of promotion of housing options.

### **Health and Housing Event**

Housing Services and the Public Health team are working together to deliver a housing-focussed event as a follow-up to the recent Health Inequalities Enquiry day. This is being held on 28 September at the Somerdale Pavilion, Keynsham and will bring together officers from different service areas within the housing associations working in B&NES, providers of community-based and voluntary sector providers and Council teams to share best practice and forge new working relationships to improve the health and well-being of people living in affordable homes in Bath and North East Somerset.

### **Homesearch Website**

The Councils Homesearch website has been fully upgraded. The site enables people to register and "bid" for Social Housing as well as obtain advice on other Housing Options. The new site can now be accessed easily on a smartphone for people who do not have access to computers. It is accessible in large print, as well as other languages and is able to provide more information on housing and partner organisations.

### **Housing Fraud Prosecution**

Partnership working between The Royal Borough of Greenwich, Curo and the Housing Options Team has exposed a customer who fraudulently secured social housing within Bath and North East Somerset. Investigations, aided by the Housing Options Team revealed an existing tenancy with Greenwich. The tenant has pleaded guilty to all 5 charges.

### **Housing Advice Drop-In**

To meet an increasing demand for Housing Options advice in the Midsomer Norton/Radstock area, an additional weekly advice service has been arranged. Housing Advisers are now available for people dropping in on Thursday mornings between 9-12, as well as the existing all day Tuesday service.

## Rough Sleeping

Discussions have been held with staff at Julian House regarding the number of people sleeping in tents at various public sites in Bath. Their outreach team has noticed an increase and is concerned that these are being issued free of charge, which often means rough sleepers are not likely to use the available accommodation and support services that prevent homelessness. This will be discussed at the next Homelessness Partnership meeting in September and monitoring of the situation will continue.

## Key Projects Update

---

### Foxhill Housing Zone, Combe Down

The Foxhill Housing Zone is the combined development areas of the former Foxhill MoD site, now known as Mulberry Park, and the Foxhill estate which is proposed for regeneration alongside the development of 700 homes at Mulberry Park.

- The new Foxhill Housing Zone project Co-ordinator will be in post by the end of September. Susan Hayter joins us from consultants Balfour Beattie where she is currently working on major estate regeneration projects in Woking with a focus on leading engagement with stakeholders and the Local Authority.
- Curo have commenced pre-app discussions with the Council over masterplanning for the redevelopment of an area comprising approximately 500 homes on the Foxhill estate. Key issues for consideration include densities, heights, provision of affordable housing and the relationship of new homes with retained homes on the estate.
- Curo are holding a public exhibition around the proposed outline planning application on 12/09/16 and will have invited all residents potentially affected by the proposals to a 1-2-1 interview prior to the exhibition.
- The planning application for the Community Hub is due to be determined in October. Start on site is planned for Spring 2017 and completion in time for the new school term in September 2017.
- The first occupations of the open market units will be end January 2017, the bus route will be operational into the site by June 2017 and we will see completion of the first affordable housing plots next summer.
- Cushman Wakefield have been commissioned to carry out an independent viability assessment of the various regeneration options for Foxhill. They have now collected enough data from Curo to begin to develop a base line of financial data, against which the options modelling will be carried out. Work is focussing on the delivery of affordable housing, in particular exploring how much rented provision can be secured.
- Members might like to explore some of the YouTube clips Curo have created to promote Mulberry Park. These can be accessed from the [Mulberry Park](#) website and will show you time lapse photography of construction work as well as virtual footage of the new homes being delivered in phase 1.

### Energy at Home

- The Energy at Home scheme is open to all residents and offers free energy efficiency advice and information and a home energy assessment and installations service.

- Since its launch in September 2014 to June 2016 calls to the advice service have steadily increased to a total of around 2,200 households alongside 21,000 website views and around 1,050 referrals for energy assessments and installations.
- The delivery provider has carried out 236 installations of energy efficiency and heating measures and has further orders to complete this year.
- The Energy at Home scheme still offers a range of grants to support energy efficiency improvements and free or low cost Energy Performance Assessments. Households at risk of fuel poverty can apply for a Warm Homes Grant delivered by Energy at Home and Housing Services in partnership with National Energy Action and Sirona Care and Health.
- Details of all schemes are available from Energy at Home on 0800 038 5680 or [www.energyathome.org.uk](http://www.energyathome.org.uk).

### **Affordable Housing Programme**

- 26 affordable homes were delivered in Q1:
  - The Meadows, Keynsham = 12
  - Bilbie Green, Keynsham = 4
  - Old Print Works, Paulton = 6
  - Knobsbury Lane, Writhlington = 4
- The following 57 affordable homes are forecast for delivery in Q2:
  - Old Print Works, Paulton = 8
  - Bilbie Green, Keynsham = 16
  - The Meadows, Keynsham = 9
  - Somerdale Keynsham = 7
  - Pipehouse Lane, Freshford = 4
  - Brookside Drive, Farmborough = 13
- Current forecasts suggest the overall completion of more than 160 homes by the end of the financial year.
- Commuted Sums in lieu of on-site housing provision have been accepted on the MoD site at Ensleigh South and on a small rural development in Farmborough. In both instances, the units secured through initial planning permissions were not attractive to our Registered Provider partners and in both instances, other rented and shared ownership provision has been secured in the immediate neighbourhood. These sums were agreed following independent scrutiny of development finance and will be ring-fenced to enable the delivery of affordable housing elsewhere in Bath and North East Somerset.

## Q1 Performance

---

### What we have done well...

- 100%** Homelessness decisions were made within 33 days.
- 100%** Equalities Impact Assessments are in place.
- 96%** Customers are satisfied with our services. We have exceeded the 90% customer satisfaction target. Putting the customer first and having high standards for the quality and timeliness of services is very important to us.
- 36%** Advice and prevention approaches were successful in preventing or relieving homelessness compared to the target of 33%.
- 32** Weeks average time from receipt of referral in Housing Services to completion of disabled facilities adaptations compared to a target of 36 weeks.
- 20** Households in temporary accommodation. This is fewer than the expected figure of 27. The Housing Options Team remain focused on early intervention to prevent homelessness.

### How we will improve...

- 168** New affordable homes delivered since April 2015. There was slippage of 29 completions into quarter 2 and beyond. We still expect to meet the annual target. It should be noted that delivery is dependent upon the delivery programme of private sector housing construction companies.
- 84%** Homesearch applications made active within 10 working days. The computer system is being upgraded and staff have spent a lot of time training and testing it. This is now complete so performance should improve in quarter 2.
- 80%** Housing complaints tend to be complex and not easily satisfied. For example 3 housing complaints were taken to stage 2 (fully exhausted/ no further action) this quarter. One complaint took longer than the target 15 working days but was resolved without escalation to stage 2.



HOUSING SERVICE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS 16/17		2015/16				2016/17		Year to date cumulative	Direction of travel (Q1 vs Q4)
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1			
<b>Customer</b>									
Customer complaints (responded to within corporate timescales)	Target	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%	87%		
	Actual	100%	50%	100%	50%	80%	80%	↑	
Customer satisfaction	Target	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%		
	Actual	97.9%	97.7%	100%	96.1%	96.2%	96.2%	↑	
Staff Sickness	Target	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%		
	Actual	2.8%	3.2%	1.7%	0.7%	1.6%	1.6%	↓	
Telephone response (responded within corporate timescales)	Target	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%		
	Actual	88.4%	86.5%	86.6%	87.5%	87.8%	87.8%	↑	
Equality Impact Assessment	Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
	Actual	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	→	
Invoices paid within 30 days	Target	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%		
	Actual	97.6%	86.7%	81.7%	90.8%	Data not available	Data not available		
<b>Customer Service Standards</b>									
Customer satisfaction	Target	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%		
	Actual	97.9%	97.7%	100%	96.1%	96.2%	96.2%	↑	
Customers treated fairly	Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
	Actual	97.9%	97.7%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	→	
Homelessness decisions	Target	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%		
	Actual	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	→	
Performance information published	Target	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed		
	Actual	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed		



HOUSING SERVICE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS16/17		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Year to date cumulative	Direction of travel (Q1 vs Q4)
<b>Finding and Keeping Housing</b>								
Homelessness cases prevented	Target	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	33%	
	Actual	38.1%	41.7%	37.2%	35.8%	35.8%	35.8%	↑
Homelessness decisions	Target	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	
	Actual	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	→
Temporary accommodation	Target	24	24	24	24	27	27	
	Actual	18	26	15	21	20	20	↑
Homesearch applications registered within 10 days (New indicator for 2016/17)	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	90%	
	Actual	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	83.6%	83.6%	
Percentage of permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches occupied	Target	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	
	Actual	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	→
<b>Improved Homes</b>								
Time to complete adaptations - Average time from receipt in Housing Services to practical completion of the work in weeks	Target	31	31	31	31	36	36	
	Actual	21	27	27	28	32	32	↓
Number of homes improved (cumulative) (New indicator for 2016/17)	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100	
	Actual	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	125	125	
Percentage of validated HMO License renewals determined within 12 working weeks (New indicator for 2016/17)	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	85%	85%	
	Actual	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100.0%	100.0%	↓
Long term (2+ years) empty properties brought back into use (cumulative)	Target	12	25	37	50	6	6	
	Actual	8	22	31	62	20	20	
<b>More Homes</b>								
Deliver 465 new affordable homes over a 3 year period 2015-2018 comprising both intermediate & social homes for rent cumulative	Target	8%	16%	24%	33%	41%	41%	
	Actual	2.3%	17.9%	24%	30%	36%	36%	↑

This page is intentionally left blank

# WORLD HERITAGE UPDATE

Planning, Housing & Economic Development, Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel September 2016

**Tony Crouch** BA(Hons), MSc, MRTPI, IHBC  
**City of Bath World Heritage Manager**

# Update items:

1. City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan 2016-2022
2. The Great Spas of Europe project
3. The World Heritage Interpretation Centre





# World Heritage Site Management Plan

The need for the Plan

The current position

Priorities:

1. Managing Development
2. Transport
3. Public Realm
4. Interpretation & Education
5. Environmental Resilience

Consultation

Next steps:

- Full Council on 15<sup>th</sup> September
- Despatch to DCMS by end of September
- DCMS then send to UNESCO



# Great Spas of Europe

DCMS Technical evaluation hurdle successfully cleared.

In:

1. Bath
2. Baden-Baden (Germany)
3. Bad Ems (Germany)
4. Bad Kissingen (Germany)
5. Baden bei Wien (Austria)
6. Frantiskovy Lazne (CZ)
7. Karlovy Vary (CZ)
8. Marianske Lazne (CZ)
9. Motecatini Terme (Italy)
10. Spa (Belgium)
11. Vichy (France)

Out:

1. Luhacovice (CZ)
2. Wiesbaden (Germany)
3. Bad Homburg (Germany)
4. Bad Ischl (Austria)
5. Bad Pyrmont (Germany)

Nomination likely to be 2018

Project management needs to be strengthened.





# World Heritage Interpretation Centre, York Street



This page is intentionally left blank