

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, 13th July, 2017

Present:- **Councillors** Patrick Anketell-Jones, Rob Appleyard, Tim Ball, Colin Barrett, Cherry Beath, Jasper Becker, Sarah Bevan, Colin Blackburn, John Bull, Neil Butters, Anthony Clarke, Paul Crossley, Chris Dando, Fiona Darey, Matthew Davies, Sally Davis, Douglas Deacon, Emma Dixon, Michael Evans, Andrew Furse, Charles Gerrish, Ian Gilchrist, Lizzie Gladwyn, Bob Goodman, Liz Hardman, Steve Hedges, Deirdre Horstmann, Steve Jeffries, Les Kew, Marie Longstaff, Barry Macrae, Shaun Stephenson-McGall, Alison Millar, Robin Moss, Paul Myers, O'Doherty, Bryan Organ, Lin Patterson, Christopher Pearce, Vic Pritchard, Joe Rayment, Liz Richardson, Caroline Roberts, Nigel Roberts, Dine Romero, Samuel, Will Sandry, Mark Shelford, Brian Simmons, Peter Turner, David Veale, Martin Veal, Karen Walker, Geoff Ward, Tim Warren and Karen Warrington

Apologies for absence: **Councillors** Matt Cochrane, Francine Haerberling, Alan Hale, Eleanor Jackson, Paul May, Michael Norton, Lisa O'Brien, June Player and Chris Watt

13 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Joe Rayment declared an 'other' interest in item 8 (Uber) as a member of the GMB union and item 11 (Youth Justice Plan) as an employee of DHL.

15 MINUTES - 18TH MAY 2017

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Steve Hedges, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of 23rd March 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

The Chair made the customary announcements concerning mobile phones and webcasting the meeting. She asked Council to stand for a minute's silence in recognition of the recent tragic events in London, and the death last week of Maggie Roper, a prominent Bath philanthropist.

The Chair then thanked the retiring Cabinet Members, congratulated the new Cabinet Members and passed on thanks to William Harding, who has retired after over 40 years of service with the local authority. She concluded announcements by congratulating Children's Services on the outcome of their recent Ofsted inspection

which judged services to be overall “Good” and Adoption Services to be “Outstanding”.

17 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There were no items of urgent business.

18 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Statements were made by the following people;

Bob Hollindale addressed the Council and referred to a recent Transport for London report on Uber, raising various points of concern. In response to a question from Councillor Caroline Roberts about whether all Local Authorities follow the same procedure for licensing drivers, Bob responded that they did not and explained that B&NES required enhanced DBS checks, but that individuals who have been refused a badge in B&NES, could obtain one in another Authority area with less rigorous requirements and then operate in B&NES.

Geoff Seymour, a taxi driver in Bath since 2003, made a statement to Council outlining his view that Uber did not effectively support disabled customers. A copy of Geoff’s statement has been placed on the Minute book and is linked to the online minutes. Councillor Caroline Roberts asked Geoff if he had heard that Uber would not carry blind people with guide dogs, to which Geoff responded that he had indeed heard that. Councillor Liz Hardman asked Geoff about future taxi provision for disabled people in the area, to which Geoff responded that, if Uber took all the trade then it would be very limited. Councillor Colin Blackburn asked Geoff to clarify the point in the second paragraph of his statement stating that it wasn’t possible to contact Uber, as he had experience of doing so and there was choice about which vehicle to select. Geoff replied that he had meant that you can’t contact an operator.

Darth Speed made a statement against Uber, stressing a number of safety concerns. Councillor Caroline Roberts referred to Darth’s comment about the area being swamped with drivers from elsewhere and asked if that meant there weren’t enough drivers here. Darth replied that that wasn’t the case as the existing licensed drivers were left waiting for business.

Paul Roles made a statement against Uber, highlighting a number of concerns and examples of alleged illegal practices. He countered the term ‘non-contentious’ in the context of issuing the Uber licence and described a series of errors in the accompanying report. Councillor Caroline Roberts asked Paul to explain the term ‘greyball’ to which Paul responded that it was a device that hides a car from detection when it is banned in an area.

Andy Halliday made a statement requesting the Exhibition room at Bath Central Library be re-opened, and setting out a number of reasons to support his request. A copy of Andy’s statement has been placed on the Minute book and is linked to the online minutes. In response to a question from Councillor Dine Romero about any indication of when the room might be re-opened, Andy responded that he has recently been told it will be in the autumn. He added his concern that opportunities

for summer activities such as the Summer Reading challenge were being passed up due to lack of space, which could be made available right now. Councillor John Bull asked if Andy knew the reason for closure and whether he considered it justified; Andy explained the reasons but reiterated that arrangements could be made to open it up immediately. In response to a question from Councillor Sarah Bevan about the organisations that used the Exhibition room, Andy responded that it was used by a wide range of organisations including artists, photographers and charitable organisations.

David Redgewell made a statement calling for clear focus in working with the West of England Combined Authority. A copy of David's statement has been placed on the Minute book and is linked to the online minutes. Councillor Neil Butters asked about smart ticketing and David responded that smart cards were being introduced on the Severn Beach line and then rolled out more widely, but pressure needed to be maintained on First Bus. Councillor Sarah Bevan asked for more information on the Buses Bill so David outlined the powers given to the Combined Authority.

Adam Reynolds addressed the Council about 20mph zones and calling on the new Cabinet Member for Transport and Highways to re-think the Council's policy on this. A copy of Adam's statement has been placed on the Minute book and is linked to the online minutes. Councillor Tim Warren asked if the criticism to which Adam referred was only from the political campaign group, 20's Plenty, to which Adam responded that was the only group who had complained that he knew of. Councillor Neil Butters asked Adam to say a little more about the health and community benefits he had mentioned and so Adam referenced a Bristol City Council report from 2012 which highlighted the increase in people walking and cycling. He also explained that 20mph gave more design freedom to Highways Officers to work within a space. Councillor John Bull asked about the method that had been used to seek the views of Bath residents in 2011, and Adam responded that he wasn't sure, but knew that a consultation had taken place. Councillor Sarah Bevan asked Adam what he considered were the main flaws in the report he had mentioned, to which he responded that it was that inaccurate comparisons were made to support the findings.

Andrew Mercer addressed the Council on behalf of the Bathampton Meadows Alliance and called on the Council to finish what they had started and take steps to safeguard the meadows in perpetuity. He advised that a proper traffic census was needed. Councillor Dine Romero asked Andrew if he thought the Cabinet still felt a Park & Ride was necessary to the east of Bath, to which he responded that the exact nature of the problem needed to be established through a traffic census, before a solution could be devised.

The Chair thanked all the speakers for their statements which would be referred to the relevant Cabinet Members. The Chair informed Councillors that some members of the public had chosen to make their statements later in the meeting when the relevant item was reached.

The Chair made reference to the questions and responses which had been circulated and are linked to the online minutes.

19 UBER TAXI LICENCE - ISSUES AND OPTIONS

The Council considered a report brought forward on a request from Council of 23rd March 2017 considering issues and options concerning Uber's private hire operator's licence.

During debate, the Chief Executive in his role as Head of Paid Service acknowledged the strength of feeling regarding this issue, but clarified that the term 'contentious' which had been mentioned by some of the public speakers, was terminology set out within Licensing regulations and when this application had been dealt with under delegated authority, the term 'non-contentious' had been used correctly within that context.

On a motion from Councillor Martin Veal, seconded by Councillor Colin Blackburn, it was

RESOLVED

1. To note the contents of the report;
2. To note that a new Government Working Group has been created to examine the employment practices of companies like Uber;
3. To note that the Transport Minister has said that local authorities may be unaware of the extent of their powers and their ability to use them and that there are problems with different local authorities interpreting their powers in different ways; and
4. To note that the guidance and advice given to local authorities by Government is to be clarified and therefore;
5. To remit to Licensing Committee to consider a further report on this issue in light of any new advice referred to above.

[Notes;

1. *The underlined wording in the resolution above was proposed by Councillor Joe Rayment and accepted into the substantive motion by the mover and seconder.*
2. *During debate, an unsuccessful amendment was moved by Councillor Caroline Roberts and seconded by Councillor Tim Ball to ask the Licensing Committee to carry out a further investigation. This amendment was lost, with 17 Councillors voting in favour, 34 Councillors voting against and 5 abstentions.*
3. *The substantive motion was carried with 55 Councillors voting in favour and 1 Councillor voting against.]*

20 PETITION FOR DEBATE - "SAVE OUR 6/7 BUS"

The Council considered an item which had been brought forward, following receipt of a petition entitled "Save our 6/7 Bus" containing approximately 2500 signatures.

Mike Parr addressed the Council and called into question the decision making process that had led to the withdrawal of the 6/7 bus service. He called on the Council not to kick this issue into the WECA long grass. A copy of Mike's statement

has been added to the Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Sarah Bevan asked for Mike's view of the respective social or commercial values of a bus service, to which he responded that Local Authorities have always provided subsidised services to meet social needs and the case in this instance was fully justified.

Pat Mason made a statement to Council calling into question the validity of the survey which supported the withdrawal of the bus services and calling on the Council to re-consider. A full copy of Pat's statement has been added to the Minute book and attached to the online minutes. In response to a question from Councillor Tim Warren's question about whether Dial-a-Ride was available, Pat replied that it was not.

Councillor Lin Patterson then formally opened the debate and made a statement in support of the petition.

On a motion from Councillor Mark Shelford, seconded by Councillor Jasper Becker, it was

RESOLVED

1. To note the concerns of the petitioners in respect of recent changes to the 6/7 bus service following a review of bus services in Bath undertaken by First Bus;
2. To note that the Bus Services Act gives more tools to local Transport Authorities, particularly Mayoral Combined Authorities, to engage with bus operators to improve bus services, including options such as enhanced partnerships, advanced ticketing and franchising arrangements;
3. To note that the West of England Combined Authority will be conducting a network-wide review of the local bus network to make recommendations on if and where any changes are needed to deliver a better network for the passenger and meet the transport and economic objectives of the West of England; and
4. To ask that, through the Leader, the West of England Combined Authority is requested to examine how services between Fairfield Park and Larkhall can be restored without detriment to the improved service now provided to Camden and improved reliability and rider numbers as part of its wider review of bus service provision throughout the West of England.

[Notes;

1. *During debate, a motion was moved by Councillor Lin Patterson and seconded by Councillor Joe Rayment containing the wording of the petition with a further request to the Cabinet Member for Transport & Highways to review the way in which the decision had been made. This was subsequently successfully amended to the resolution above.*
2. *The underlined wording in the successful resolution above was proposed by Councillor Rob Appleyard and accepted by the mover and seconder of the substantive motion.*
3. *The resolution above was carried with 30 Councillors voting in favour, 8 Councillors voting against and 17 Councillors abstaining.*

4. *The successful resolution above was carried with 55 Councillors voting in favour.]*

21 PLACEMAKING PLAN: COUNCIL TO CONSIDER INSPECTOR'S REPORT & ADOPTION OF THE PLACEMAKING PLAN

The Council considered the Inspector's examination of the B&NES Placemaking plan and a number of recommended modifications.

Robin Kerr, Chairman of the Federation of Bath Resident's Associations, made a statement regarding student housing and transport. A full copy of Robin's statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book and linked to the online minutes. Councillor Bob Goodman asked Robin if he considered the proposed reduction in HMOs from 25% to 10% to be the right decision to re-balance the effects of student housing on the community, to which Robin responded that he did and that it was in line with the national HMO lobby, however; it didn't address purpose built student accommodation, which they had asked to be included. He added that Universities needed to be asked to stop increasing student numbers. Councillor Tim Ball asked if Robin considered this plan to be fit for purpose, in the light of the criticisms he had raised. Robin responded that he had no wish to delay adoption of the Plan but that a rapid Core Strategy review was needed.

On a motion from Councillor Bob Goodman, seconded by Councillor Les Kew, it was

RESOLVED

1. To accept the main modifications listed in attachment 1, which the Inspector considers are needed to make the Plan sound in accordance with section 20 (5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended);
2. To agree the Minor Modifications listed in attachment 2 to the B&NES Placemaking plan, which are needed to ensure clarity, consistency and factual accuracy in the Plan;
3. To adopt the B&NES Placemaking Plan (Local Plan Part 2) as modified in (1) and (2) above, including for the purposes of section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act;
4. To agree the B&NES Policies Map is amended in line with (1) and (2) above;
5. To acknowledge that the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance listed in attachment 3 should supplement the B&NES Development Plan; and
6. To delegate responsibility to the Divisional Director for Development, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Development, to make minor textual amendments to the Placemaking Plan prior to publication.

[Notes;

1. *The above resolution was carried with 39 Councillors voting in favour, 13 against and 5 abstentions.*

2. *Following this item, a five minute adjournment was taken.]*

22 YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN 2017 - 2018

The Council considered this annual plan which sets out how youth services are to be composed and funded, how they operate and what functions will be carried out to prevent youth offending and re-offending.

On a motion from Councillor Michael Evans, seconded to Councillor Alison Millar, it was

RESOLVED unanimously to agree

1. That the Youth Justice Plan fulfils the requirements of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and can be submitted to the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales;
2. That the Youth Justice Plan is adopted as part of the Council's Policy and Budget framework and can be accommodated within the Council's budget; and
3. That the relevant Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel oversees progress and performance.

23 2016/17 TREASURY MANAGEMENT OUTTURN REPORT

The Council considered a report giving details of performance against the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Plan for 2016/17.

On a motion from Councillor Charles Gerrish, seconded by Councillor Brian Simmons, it was unanimously

RESOLVED

1. To note the 2016/17 Treasury Management report to 31st March 2017, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice; and
2. To note the 2016/17 Treasury Management Indicators.

24 STANDARDS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2016 - 2017

The Council considered the Standards Committee Annual report for 2016-17.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Nigel Roberts, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to note the work of the Standards Committee as set out in the Annual Report.

25 PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Council considered a report recommending an amendment to the Members' Planning Code of Conduct to allow Councillors with disclosable pecuniary interests the same rights as members of the public.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was unanimously

RESOLVED that the amendments to the Council's Constitution as set out in Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

26 DESIGNATION OF CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER (SECTION 151)

The Council considered a report seeking confirmation of the designation of the Strategic Director – Resources (Andrew Pate) as the Council's Section 151 Officer (Chief Financial Officer) with effect from 14th July 2017.

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

RESOLVED to designate the Strategic Director – Resources as the Council's Chief Financial Officer in accordance with section 151 of the Local Government Act with effect from 14th July 2017.

27 AGENDA MOTION FROM LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP - CLEAN AIR FOR BATH

The Council considered an agenda motion from Councillor Richard Samuel, which was debated.

On a motion from Councillor Mark Shelford, seconded by Councillor Tony Clarke it was

RESOLVED unanimously

1. To note that national air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide are exceeded at several locations within Bath and North East Somerset, particularly along the A4, A36 and A37. This pollution caused by vehicles needs to be reduced;
2. To note the risks to human health posed by traffic pollution in Bath and North East Somerset are of serious concern and action is required to reduce the risk;
3. To approach Central Government to seek to secure a Clean Air Zone for the city and other locations subject to excessive pollutants as part of the revised national air quality plan, so that suitable studies can be undertaken to bring forward concrete action plans to address air pollution;
4. That, in the alternative, the Council shall commit current available funding as part of the 2018-19 budget and seek additional funding, possibly in partnership with the West of England Combined Authority, and any other sources to undertake a comprehensive study to inform a Clean Air Policy and

Plan for Bath and North East Somerset. Such studies would include comprehensive traffic censuses along the main traffic corridors to provide fully up to date data upon which to develop evidence based solutions to reduce traffic levels; and

5. To commit to continuing to work through the West of England on a package of transport improvements such as Clean Air Zones, traffic management measures, bus and rail improvements and key infrastructure projects identified within the Joint Transport Study that could make a particular contribution to reducing traffic and improving air quality on transport corridors where air quality is known to be subject to excessive pollutants.

[Notes;

1. *At the commencement of this item, a motion to suspend constitutional rule 4a, 48 to continue the meeting until 10.10pm was moved by Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero and unanimously approved.*
2. *Points 1 – 4 of the resolution above formed the original motion from Cllr Richard Samuel, which was subsequently amended with the addition of point 5 and carried with 29 Councillors voting in favour, 24 Councillors voting against and 2 abstentions.*
3. *Councillor John Bull requested the removal of words “such as the A36-A46/A4 link road” which had formed part of Councillor Mark Shelford’s amendment. Their removal was accepted by the mover and seconder of the substantive motion.]*

28 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The Chair made reference to the questions and responses which had been circulated and are linked to the online minutes.

The meeting ended at 10.10 pm

Chairman

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL 13th JULY 2017

PUBLIC STATEMENTS

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1. Bob Hollindale | Item 8 – Uber |
| 2. Geoff Seymour | Item 8 – Uber |
| 3. Darth Speed | Item 8 - Uber |
| 4. Paul Roles | Item 8 – Uber |
| 5. Mike Parr | Item 9 – 6/7 bus |
| 6. Pat Mason | Item 9 – 6/7 bus |
| 7. Robin Kerr | Item 10 – Placemaking plan |
| 8. Andy Halliday | Libraries |
| 9. David Redgewell | Rail & bus investment |
| 10. Adam Reynolds | 30mph speed limits outside schools |
| 11. Andrew Mercer | Bathampton Meadows Alliance – working with Council going forward |

This page is intentionally left blank

Hello my name is Geoff Seymour and I have been driving taxis /private hire vehicles in bath since 2003,

In 2007 I purchased a wheelchair access vehicle because I noticed that there was a gap in the market and since then I've replaced my taxi twice with wheelchair access vehicles

Uber do not offer a service for wheelchair users outside of London Birmingham and Manchester,

You cannot pre book a vehicle so as to guarantee the car will be accessible to your needs

Disabilities are not all the same and often users need alternative vehicles such as a lower access car or a higher access car

If they Perhaps might require a larger vehicle so as to carry a fold up wheel chair or a walking frame they would have to order a multi seater vehicle (Uber xl) which would cost them considerably more as these generally meant to carry 5-7 people ,where if they could speak to a operator the correct standard vehicle could be dispatched

Often passengers require the driver to go up to their door or into the premises were they are waiting so the driver can assist them to the car and as you cannot phone text ,email, or even fax Uber it is impossible to convey any special requirements to the driver

Disability work probably only accounts for about 15% of my overall takings so I'm often plying for hire on Baths taxi ranks, but I'm afraid to say that at the rate business is being affected by the significant increase in taxis/private hires operating in our city since the influx of drivers from other areas who predominantly work for Uber in Bath that I simply will not be able to afford to replace my current vehicle in 3 years' time with another accessible one as I'm sure you are aware wheelchair access vehicles are considerably more expensive than standard cars

If multinational companies using drivers and vehicles not licensed by banes that are solely app based are allowed to continue to decimate our local businesses the public will soon have no access to accessible vehicles at all

Statement by Mike Parr: Save the 6-7 Bus Campaign Petition

BANES Council Meeting 13th July 2017

Good evening I am making a statement in support of the Save the 6-7 Bus Campaign petition.

I would like to start by quoting a promise Council Leader Tim Warren made after the 2015 local elections.

“There is an overriding theme running through everything we plan to do – and that is ensuring the interests of residents come first”. “Does this proposal truly serve the interests of local residents? That will be the litmus test we will apply to all decisions in the Council”.

As far as 2,400 local residents who signed the petition are concerned the council has not lived up to these values.

If the council is to truly serve our interests then it should engage with us **before** decisions are made.

In the case of the removal of the subsidy for the 6&7 bus service this did not happen.

The decision was made behind closed doors. It was an officer decision and no ward councillors in the area affected were notified and the decision was not officially registered until 4 months after the decision was made and 3 months after the new routes came into effect. No reports regarding the decision are on public record.

However we believe that the decision was unconstitutional and unlawful as it should have been treated as a “key” decision and be taken by a cabinet member or cabinet and therefore be subject to notification, consultation and scrutiny.

A “key decision” is defined in law as one which is likely to result in the local authority making significant savings **or** be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards. Those taking “key decisions” will do so in accordance with the requirements of the Access to Information and Executive Procedure Rules (Articles 13.4 and 13.5).

There were 'significant savings' according to the council (£39,000 per annum), and three wards were affected by the route changes (Lambridge, Walcot and Abbey).

The removal of the subsidy resulted in a significant change to the routing and scheduling of the bus routes which now no longer connect areas of Lambridge and Walcot wards.

Fairfield Park does not now have a direct two-way direct connection to its local centre unlike other areas in Bath that have a bus service.

These changes have had a significant and detrimental impact on the local community.

We ask the Council to live up to its promise to put resident’s interests first by addressing the public transport problem in the NE of Bath and reconsider its decision to remove the subsidy in an open and transparent way.

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT BY PAT MASON FOR THE SAVE OUR 6-7 BUS CAMPAIGN COUNCIL MEETING THURSDAY 13 JULY 2017

I'm here to speak about the petition of the Save Our 6-7 Bus campaign, which was organised in response to the withdrawal of the subsidy. This Council debate has been long postponed owing to four elections. However, the daily misery for our community continues. The 2400 plus signatures were collected over a few weeks last Autumn from forms distributed to local shops and businesses in Larkhall and the London Road, and on a few bus journeys. There would have been many more signatures but the forms were collected early in the attempt to get the matter on a Council Agenda.

We believe the speed with which people responded to the Petition and attendance at a standing room only Public Meeting showed the strength of feeling and support for the old bus route more than a Council Survey which was conducted before the fourth bus was withdrawn. We believe the Survey was flawed for many reasons. One of our Campaigners did some extensive research showing this and is willing to present it again to the Council. On this flawed evidence it was decided that the subsidy "did not represent value for money". Is this decision based on commercial or social values? Surely a subsidy that promotes all the aims of the Council is value for money, i.e. social resilience, promotion of local independent shops and reducing congestion on the roads? It is hard to disentangle the social and commercial values of the subsidy in that, in the long term, there will be costs in terms of isolation and loneliness leading to ill health, damage and loss to the independent shops and businesses, pollution due to increased car use. It is very hard for people in our area to see the council promotion of a month for "indie shops" when they are oblivious to the damage done to those in our locality.

The Council says that the Survey shows that the changes affect only a small number of people but the evidence of the Petition disproves this. Even residents who do not need the bus signed because they were aware of the damage to their community. The council claims that the changed route is effective because people can take two buses but, again, a number of our Campaigners have proven that this can take an hour for a 10 minute journey plus the cost of two buses. Our route struggles to be fully commercially viable because its steep hills and narrow streets necessitate smaller vehicles which of course carry fewer passengers. We hope the Council will reconsider all the information available and realise that our bus subsidy is necessary to provide an essential front-line social service which also affects our local economy.

This page is intentionally left blank

Placemaking Plan adoption - speaking notes for Council meeting 13 July 17

I am the Chairman of the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, with 34 members across Bath, including both Students' Unions. We have been contributing to this Placemaking Plan since it first appeared, 4 years ago, particularly in the areas of student housing and transport, about which I need to speak to you tonight, not because we think adoption should be delayed any longer – 4 years is quite enough! – but to remind ourselves of some important unfinished business.

Student Housing:

Housing, particularly affordable housing, is in crisis here, and student housing forms a large part of that problem, particularly as our universities refuse to offer campus accommodation to more than a fifth of their students, and hence the vast majority have to find beds in the city (and I remind you that students now form over a quarter of Bath's population – a higher proportion than almost any other university town). For years, we have been pressing our Council to take it seriously and introduce a student housing policy, but to no avail. Meanwhile, the problem gets worse. I therefore find it incredible, that the Inspector decided to kick the student housing issue into the long grass, and that this fact is not even mentioned in the summary list of modifications. She proposes deletion of whole swathes of draft text and reversion to the out of date wording of the Core Strategy. This effectively sets back the cause of getting to grips with Bath's acknowledged student housing problems by years.

Transport:

Now to Transport, which is FoBRA members' top priority: hence our support for the Bath Transport Strategy, which you approved, overwhelmingly, in November 2014. The Placemaking Plan calls for a city centre free of all but essential traffic, which is great, but do you have any intention of doing this? What is the point of it all, if the Council doesn't actually implement its policies - for example, the Core Strategy policy is to have a car-free city centre, so why isn't there yet any plan to reduce the traffic? Moreover, during the Placemaking Plan Public Hearings last Autumn, Council Officers denied that there was any intention to prepare such a plan, thus fatally undermining an important aspect of the Strategy, an Eastern P&R, so is it, like so many Council Policies, just empty words?

Secondly, the reference to Parking Standards in the Placemaking Plan is utterly opaque. Does it mean they will be flexed up, down or a bit of both? What is the aim? What does it hope to achieve? Is it in accordance with the Bath Transport Strategy, where the concept is laid down of using parking control to free the city centre of traffic, unhealthy pollution and congestion; and of moving people onto other transport modes? There are plenty of examples of historic cities elsewhere in Europe which have shown how to do it. However, the newly published document: "Our Plan to Get Bath Moving" is not one of them, as it promises **more** short term parking, and hence **more** traffic, not less.

Bath deserves better. Please do your duty.

Final(2) dated 13 July 17

INTRODUCTIONS -"CLOSED"

This is the sign that has been hanging over the Exhibition room for the last 8 months , and I am here to plead for it's re-opening. I base this on the recent month's activity to relocate all Archive, some Local Studies reference and all Manuscripts from their Podium based store rooms and areas of the main floor to the Guildhall. I am asking that a serious review of these empty spaces happens with a definite intention of moving reserve stock books currently housed-for last 5 months- in the Exhibition Room to these vacant spaces.

This would result in freeing up the Community room for hire for events and returning it to its proper purpose. Many key events in the city have been held elsewhere due to the room remaining shut, and despite appeals to consider alternatives stores to date, nothing has happened. This new vacant space opportunity at the Podium signals I believe time for a rethink and action resulting in income-to date over £5,800 plus sales commissions has been lost, plus many people disappointed including front line staff at the Library who cannot stage Summer Reading Challenge events on the scale they have previously done. This also impacts on footfall of visitors to the Library. Re-opening our room with positive marketing to promote its existence, and all it has to offer, would be a great step forward in re building good community spirit. Please will somebody start this initiative, and instead of reasons for not doing anything can we please address the positiveness of the solution, rather than creating obstacles. The room has so much to offer to so many.

Thank You Andy Halliday

This page is intentionally left blank

SWTN, Railfuture and Bus Users UK are very concerned about cutbacks to the electrification programme to Chippenham with no date for completion to Bristol via Bath or Filton Bank. The lack of investment in Temple Meads apart from 2 platforms for alteration within the IEP programme, the stopping of works at Lawrence Hill bridge and station, the lack of progress on platform extensions at Bath Spa, lack of a step free access programme at Stapleton Road, Lawrence Hill, Nailsea and Weston-Super-Mare (on hold until 2019). It is very important that we continue with the MetroWest project

The lack of progress on funding of East Junction, lack of scope for rolling stock from the Thames Valley and the loss of 9 units to Centro in May 2017 we need a clear rolling stock policy for the Greater Bristol area including the 11-15 HST's. The interface with South West Trains and how these projects fit in with MetroWest phases 1& 2.

The new station site does not provide a transport interchange as supported by Railfuture, TFGBA and Friends of Bristol Suburban Railways and the four rail unions.

We ask the Council to reconsider the Filton North station site as this was rebuilt only a few years ago. Clearly the plan needs to link with the rail service through Henbury North to Avonmouth and Severn Beach and the new Cribbs Causeway development whatever that plan may be following the planning inspectors report.

We expect the plan to be fully designed with bus stops, shelters and raised kerbs and mobility impaired pavements and services including the public realm strategy included in interchanges.

We are very concerned that MetroWest Phase 2 Henbury loop and Gloucester line are progressed as a top priority for the Bristol Mayor and Metro Mayor including Ashley Down, Charfield, Stonehouse and Gloucester.

The Henbury loop should also be included with Filton North, Henbury for Cribbs Causeway, Avonmouth and Portway Park and Ride. Our top priority is to see the Portishead railway line reopened for 100 million pounds including stations at Portishead and Pill protecting the site at Ashton Gate.

We need value engineering at Network Rail and these projects must be submitted for CP6. Saltford, St Annes and Corsham should be looked at as part of the study by Bristol City Council. The Metro Mayor needs to make a submission to Government for extra funding.

It should be noted that Lawrence Hill, Stapleton Road, Patchway, Pilning, Nailsea and Backwell and Parson Street are not disabled accessible nor is Weston Super Mare and Cheltenham without lifts.

On integration, we are very concerned after discussions with Transport Focus and First Group (RAIL and BUS DIVISIONS), Network Rail about bus/rail ferry integration at Temple Meads within the Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone scheme. We note that Cambridge North station is fully integrated with local and MetroBus unlike Bedminster at present.

Integration should be at the heart of what WECA does. The project has the support of Chris Grayling and Jeremy Corbyn nationally.

David Redgewell, South West Transport Network, TSSA and Director of Bus Users (UK)

This page is intentionally left blank

Adam Reynolds statement

The council's Traffic Regulation Order Team released a report reference 16-026 on 2nd of November 2016. This report relates to the speed limits that will be implemented on new road infrastructure at the Enleigh North Development up on Lansdown, Bath. A new residential area with a new school.

The officers presented two scenarios to the, then member for transport, Cllr Clarke. One where all the new road network and the existing Granville Road would be made 20mph, and one where the new road network would be made into 30mph.

Cllr Clarke chose to implement 30mph and stated within the TRO, and I quote: "I will not support 20 mph in Granville Road, and at most would only allow advisory 20 mph on the estate, with green roundels, and even that would require a degree of coercion."

In May 2017 B&NES Council released a report on their recent 20mph area schemes. This report has been roundly criticised for its exceptionally poor statistical methodology and complete bias, ignoring health and community benefits that 20mph zones bring.

"20's Plenty analysis (available here <http://www.20splenty.org/banes-report>) states: Whilst we believe that assessing the results of 20mph limits is important in order to better implement ongoing schemes and formulate local authority policy, this must be done in a reasonable, balanced and objective manner.

20's Plenty for Us refute the findings and conclusions in the report and advise members that the report is so compromised that it would not be reasonable for them to make any decisions based on the report."

It should be noted that the government is undertaking a national analysis of 20mph zones and their impact on collision rates, health, and community cohesion which should be available by the end of the year.

In 2011 the residents of Bath were consulted and the premise of Bath having 20mph residential zones was established. I would have hoped that Cllr Clarke would have respected that consultation. I would have had no problem if the council had consulted the people of Bath and a new policy of 30mph residential zones was established.

However we are in a bright new era, with Cllr Shelford at the helm. So I would ask him to do three things:

- 1) Recognise that the council's 20MPH report is flawed and should not be acted upon, and to await the national report due by the end of the year.
- 2) Recognise the will of the people of Bath. They chose to have 20mph zoning in 2011 and without consulting them again, this should be the defacto standard for all new residential developments.
- 3) Recognise that Traffic Regulation Order Team presented an option to Cllr Clarke that went against the established 20mph residential zoning requirement. Officers should be strong enough to go against the political ideology of the cabinet member for transport IF this goes against current policy.

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL 13th JULY 2017

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

P	01	Question from:	Andrew Mercer
<p>Now that the east of Bath park and ride has been shelved, please state how much has been spent on the east of Bath park and ride to date and how much of this comes from the 500K released in January?</p>			
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford & Charles Gerrish	
<p>Following the Council 2014/15 provisional budget approval of up to £5.2m for the development of an East of Bath Park & Ride; expenditure against this scheme has been approximately £1.13m to date; (of which £841,519 has been under the current administration, including £231,332 of internal fees and recharges); this also includes £30k from the £500k approved in January.</p>			
P	02	Question from:	Andrew Mercer
<p>Now that the east of Bath park and ride has been shelved, please state how much of this spending remains in the capital budget and will need to be written off?</p>			
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford & Charles Gerrish	
<p>This expenditure is currently capital and at risk of revenue reversion, however should a further capital scheme or schemes be developed that give an alternative option (or options) the risk of revenue reversion will be reduced. It should also be noted that the expenditure undertaken so far has primarily been related to traffic modelling and feasibility studies which can therefore be used as evidence to support any alternative proposals that come forward related to addressing congestion, air quality and the economic benefits of reducing traffic entering the city from the east. The full resource implications are set out within the Cabinet report available on the Council website within the agenda for the 19th July Cabinet meeting.</p>			
P	03	Question from	Christine Boyd
<p>The last time B&nes scrapped a park and ride on Bathampton Meadows in 2011 they allocated a budget of 5.2m to be spent on 'ALTERNATIVES to park and ride on Bathampton Meadows.' Please confirm that the council has used this budget to fund park and ride on the meadows when it should have been used for alternatives.</p>			
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford & Charles Gerrish	
<p>The Council 2014/15 budget gave provisional approval of up to £5.2m for the East of Bath Park & Ride, following this full approval was given for the amounts required to develop site options for consideration by the Council.</p>			
P	04	Question from:	Christine Boyd

If the above (qn P03) is incorrect, please specify the budget this has come from and when it was approved?		
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford & Charles Gerrish
Please refer to the above response.		
P	05	Question from: Dionne Pemberton
How much did the Modern Integrated Library & Customer Services video on BATHNES website cost to produce?		
Answer from:		Councillor Martin Veal
£1,125 was the total cost for the video.		
P	06	Question from Dionne Pemberton
What is the total spend to date on promotional materials for the integrated library service (inclusive of 2 x posters in the library, website updates, design & production of printed materials & a video)?		
Answer from:		Councillor Martin Veal
£7,930 is total spend to date.		
P	07	Question from: Fiona Powell
It is clear, even from the time of the public consultation, that access to East P&R site B could not have been from the A4 bypass without deviating from road safety standards. Why was this risk not fully bottomed out before almost £2m of public money has been spent on the wider project and who will be held accountable for this waste of money?		
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford
At the time of writing the Cabinet report in January 2017, officers believed it could be possible to achieve an acceptable junction design required by Highways England as specified in the technical standards. However, as explained in that report, additional technical work would need to be undertaken and that work has since been done and officers have concluded that they are not able to recommend that safe access can be achieved. It was necessary to do this work, to enable a conclusion to be reached.		
P	08	Question from: Fiona Powell
What are the planned timings for delivering the next Air Quality Action Plan?		
Answer from:		Councillor Martin Veal

The formal consultation on the review of the Bath Air Quality Action plan will be launched within the next month. The consultation will last for 12 weeks (as required in the statutory guidance) before the plan is agreed, finalised and brought to Cabinet for a decision on adoption. Subject to the timings of the democratic process, it is likely that adoption will take place early in 2018.

P	09	Question from	Caroline Ambrose
----------	-----------	----------------------	-------------------------

B&NES 2020 Corporate Strategy for 2020 states: "We want to make sure that residents' views and needs are at the heart of everything that we do. Sometimes in the past we have delivered services with limited engagement local people. We want to change this."

Residents group Save Bath Libraries have been asking for the Councillor for Communities to engage with residents for over six months. Our emails dating back to January are unanswered. Questions raised in public statements at council meetings dating back to February are still awaiting responses. Our petition of February 14th signed by 1% of the electorate has had to be escalated to the Council Leader to flag that residents are yet to have the council meeting which they were promised would take place prior to any subsequent consultation so that Councillors are able to understand and represent' views to council officers. In all this time, we have just had one meeting with the Council Leader to ask him when engagement will start if the Councillor for Communities does not engage and three months on, the Councillor for Communities has yet to meet with us. Can the Councillor for Communities explain why he has not engaged with residents?

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

Officers have been working on the draft Business case since consultation on the proposal for an integrated Library and One Stop Shop ended: during this period we have listened to concerns raised by the public in relation to the suggested venue. Answers have been provided for a large number of freedom of information requests as well as e-mails and letters.

The Council leader has agreed to a meeting with this group and this was held on the 11th July as part of the Bath Deserves Better meeting. It is important to stress that at this stage that our draft business case is not looking at the detailed design of a new modern library and one stop shop facility; it is merely consulting residents on their preferred option for its chosen venue. We have stated in responses to Save Bath Library group that it was always our intention to develop a detailed business case on the options available before entering the next phase of consultation and we are committed to further engagement at the appropriate time with a cross section of our communities to ensure we bring forward a design that is inclusive and representative of community needs.

P	10	Question from:	Caroline Ambrose
----------	-----------	-----------------------	-------------------------

Residents group Save Bath Libraries have a great list of ideas and options for Bath Central Library. Given the widespread public concern about the lack of consultation before December's announcement of proposals, will the Councillor for Communities guarantee to a deadline to meet with residents as a matter of urgency to ensure residents views and ideas are included in any list of options being worked on by Council officers?

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

On the 11th July 2017, Cllr Tim Warren met with members of Save Bath Library and provided details regarding the next phase of consultation and set out future plans for engagement on the new Modern library programme for Bath. These details are set to be debated at Cabinet on the 19th July and the details can be obtained from the published papers.

COUNCIL 13TH JULY 2017

COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Joe Rayment
<p>What is the estimated revenue reversion risk of any decision not to proceed with the East of Bath Park and Ride?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillors Shelford & Gerrish
<p>The resource implications are included within the report to Cabinet now available on the Council website within the 19th July Cabinet agenda. This sets out that, should a scheme not be developed, the expenditure to date which could be at risk of revenue reversion is approximately £1.1m, however some of the work undertaken as part of this expenditure may contribute to developing some of the alternative options set out in the Cabinet report thereby reducing the figure associated with this risk. It should also be noted that, as set out in the Cabinet report, the expenditure undertaken so far has primarily been related to traffic modelling and feasibility studies which can therefore be used as evidence to support any alternative proposals that come forward related to addressing congestion, air quality and the economic benefits of reducing traffic entering the city from the east.</p>		
M 02	Question from:	Councillor Joe Rayment
<p>What provision has been made within the Council's budget to meet the costs of this revenue reversion?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillors Shelford & Gerrish
<p>The Council holds general reserves recognising that in year financial risks may occur. In the event of revenue reversion this would be a one off charge to the Council's revenue budget; if this could not be funded from existing revenue budgets there would need to be a recommendation to drawdown general reserves subject to Council approval.</p>		
M 03	Question from:	Councillor Joe Rayment
<p>When one half of the public is women and one third of the Council is women, why do women only represent 10% of the B&NES Cabinet?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Warren
<p>Members are appointed to the Cabinet based on merit and their availability to undertake the role. We are fortunate to have many talented councillors on the Council – both male and female - however I am sure you will appreciate that not all Councillors are in a position to commit all the time needed to undertake all the duties required of a Cabinet Member due to other commitments, or simply prefer to contribute to the Council in other ways. I do believe though that as political groups we should all do what we can to increase the overall gender balance on the Council and that the necessary support is offered those Members who wish</p>		

to take on greater duties within the Council.

M 04	Question from:	Councillor Joe Rayment
-------------	-----------------------	------------------------

You are quoted as saying “Some of those homeless do so (i.e. sleep in shop doorways) because it’s a lifestyle choice”. What evidence do you have that homelessness is a lifestyle choice when the latest rough sleeping count of 26 was conducted on a night when Julian House was full?

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

Unfortunately my comments were taken out of context. The reasons why people sleep rough are varied and often complex. In some cases the individual may have lost their home through no fault of their own and require assistance to find a new home at a price they can afford. However, at the other end of the scale there are individuals who sleep rough who, for a variety of reasons, choose not to engage with support services that are offered by the Council and our partners. Indeed I have also been advised that there are currently around 6 individuals who the Council is aware have homes but are sleeping rough. Of the 26 individuals identified as sleeping rough during the last formal homelessness count, I am informed that 23 of these individuals were known to the Council and had previously been offered – but declined – various support and help in finding shelter. It is important to note that this is not to lessen the problem but rather to highlight the complexities around the issue. No one should be required to sleep rough and we will continue to work with our partners to provide support and assistance to enable rough sleepers to secure a sustainable home.