

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

These minutes are draft until confirmed as a correct record at the next meeting.

Wednesday, 7th September, 2016

Present:

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

24 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

25 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the evacuation procedure as set out in the Agenda.

26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Martin Veal had sent his apologies for this meeting.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones left the meeting at 5pm due to other engagements.

27 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

28 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

29 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 25 questions from Councillors and 3 questions from members of the public.

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

30 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

Rosemary Naish (National Neighbourhood Planning Champion) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website]* said that policies in all three made plans in B&NES had been breached in recent decisions.

Keith Betton (Chair of Stowey Sutton Parish Council) said that the Cabinet had approved Stowey Sutton Neighbourhood Plan (NP) in September 2015. Stowey Sutton Parish Council had considered 19 planning applications since October 2015 and planning officers made reference to NP in only one application. Keith Betton said that the Council, Parish Councils and community had invested considerable time to support the NPs. The Council had had a legal duty to make reference to NPs when considering planning applications. Keith Betton asked the Cabinet to ensure that officers give the NPs the importance that they deserve when they consider planning applications.

Councillor Karen Warrington in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website]* said that some planning decisions had ignored the NPs and asked that appropriate training regarding Neighbourhood Plans is undertaken for all officers and Members who were involved with any planning decision-making.

Councillor Alison Millar in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website]* said that the Cabinet should consider a number of points before making their final decision on Park & Ride and that the Meadows were no place for a park and ride - especially one that cannot be justified as a solution to Bath's traffic problem.

David Redgewell in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website]* spoke about public transport cuts, budgets and on transport impact that the Devolution deal would have on the area.

31 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 13th July 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

32 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

33 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

There were none.

34 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

35 APPROVAL OF THE FOXHILL REGENERATION AND DEVELOPMENT CHARTER

David Bevan in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website*] expressed his concern to changes in the Charter and asked the Cabinet to hear comments from the residents of Foxhill before approving this Charter.

Councillor Cherry Beath gave an ad-hoc statement by saying that the Charter would be a very useful tool in working with Curo, though the document as such was a high level document. Councillor Beath said that Foxhill residents were not against the development but that they felt that the development would need to blend in with the area.

Councillor Bob Goodman gave an ad-hoc statement supporting the Charter but also supporting residents' views on the development.

Councillor Liz Richardson thanked everyone who was involved in drafting the Charter. The Foxhill Regeneration Charter had been developed over a series of 3 workshops between November 2015 and January 2016 run by ATLAS with Cabinet, Ward members and senior officers from the Council and the Curo Senior Management team. The purpose of the workshops and the resulting Charter was to establish a baseline of understanding of the issues surrounding regeneration of Foxhill, the opportunities for intervention created by the development of Mulberry Park, and to agree a set of underlying ambitions for the area.

Councillor Liz Richardson moved the recommendations.

Councillor Tim Warren seconded the motion by welcoming this joint Charter. The charter sets out shared ambitions for both the development of Mulberry Park and the regeneration of the existing Foxhill estate and would give a framework for continued engagement with Curo and the community. Councillor Warren also said that he would be looking forward to seeing how the Charter evolves and develops over time as the Housing Zone progresses.

The rest of the Cabinet also supported the Charter, in particular that it had undergone a period of independent consultation with the community and stakeholders and had also been supported twice at the Council's Planning, Homes and Economic Development Scrutiny Panel.

RESOLVED (unanimously) the Cabinet agreed that:

- 1) The consultation outcomes for the Foxhill Regeneration and Development Charter are noted;
- 2) The Foxhill Regeneration and Development Charter 2016 is approved;
- 3) The Charter is reviewed and updated periodically and changes be approved by Single Member Decision.

36 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT TO 30TH JUNE 2016

Councillor Paul Crossley made an ad-hoc statement by saying that report had given an interesting review of the European state post EU referendum. Councillor Crossley asked for detailed analysis on the post EU referendum impact on the Council and also detailed analysis on our economy in regards of Hinkley Point.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that he would ask the relevant officers to include this information in a future report.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that this was a routine report which sets out the satisfactory position of the Council. Councillor Gerrish highlighted that the average rate of investment return for the first three months of 2016/17 was 0.50%, which was 0.09% above the benchmark rate. Councillor Gerrish also summarised borrowings and returns; strategic and tactical decisions; future strategic and tactical issues and budget implications.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Michael Evans seconded the motion by saying that investments returns continue to be ahead of the benchmark rate; investment rates continue to reflect the Bank of England's policy on maintaining low interest rates, which decreased to an historical low in August; and, the Council continues to not hold any direct investments in countries within the Eurozone.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed:

- 1) The Treasury Management Report to 30th June 2016, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice, is noted;
- 2) The Treasury Management Indicators to 30th June 2016 are noted.

37 REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING, CASH LIMITS AND VIREMENTS – APRIL TO JULY 2016

Councillor Robin Moss asked the following questions: was the Council up to date with Sirona and other health providers within Adult Social Care and Health area; clarification on use of Adult Social Care and Health reserves; and, details on capital spending in improving services and revenue.

Councillor Paul Crossley asked about the progress on Bath Quays.

Councillor Charles Gerrish responded to questions from Councillors Moss and Crossley by saying that; the report would incorporate any external issues within Adult Social Care and Health budget; use of Adult Social Care and Health reserves was

always within the budget; and, the Council was half way into the Bath Quays South project, with the residential part in waiting to be resolved within planning services.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that the report was presented as part of the reporting of financial management and budgetary control required by the Council. Councillor Gerrish also said that for revenue budgets which were forecast to be overspent, the Divisional Directors would be expected to seek compensating savings to try and bring budgets back to balance. The report had highlighted any significant areas of forecast over and under spends in revenue budgets and outlines the Council's current revenue financial position for the 2016/17 financial year to the end of July 2016 by Cabinet Portfolio. The current forecast outturn position is for an overspend of £2,219,000, which equates to 0.72% of gross budgeted spend (excluding Schools). There had been an overspend forecast at this stage in each of the past four financial years. The Council's financial position, along with its financial management arrangements and controls, were fundamental to continuing to plan and provide services in a managed way, particularly in light of the medium term financial challenge. Close monitoring of the financial situation had provided information on new risks and pressures in service areas, and appropriate management actions were then identified and agreed to manage and mitigate those risks.

Councillor Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul Myers seconded the motion by saying that, like many others across the country, this Council would be facing a tough financial situation. This year, in addition to the financial pressures prepared for, the Council would be also faced with a number of new challenges, such as increases in the cost of managing Housing Benefit and Welfare Reform. Despite all these pressures, this Council remains committed to helping our most vulnerable residents. The Cabinet would continue to monitor Council expenditure very closely, and if pressures continue into mid-year the Cabinet would take action to bring the budget back into line at the year-end.

RESOLVED (unanimously) the Cabinet agreed that:

- 1) Strategic Directors should continue to work towards managing within budget in the current year for their respective service areas and develop an action plan of how this will be achieved, including not committing any unnecessary expenditure and stringent budgetary control;
- 2) This year's revenue budget position is noted;
- 3) The capital expenditure position for the Council in the financial year to the end of July and the year end projections are noted;
- 4) The revenue virements listed for approval are agreed;
- 5) The changes in the capital programme are noted.

The meeting ended at 5.25 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

CABINET MEETING 7th September 2016

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

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

Statements about issues NOT on the Agenda

- Rosemary Naish (National Neighbourhood Planning Champion) on the subject of Neighbourhood Planning
- Keith Betton (Chair of Stowey Sutton Parish Council) on the subject of Neighbourhood Planning
- Councillor Karen Warrington on the subject of Neighbourhood Planning
- Councillor Alison Millar on general transport matters
- David Redgewell on Public Transport cuts, Budgets and Devolution

Statements about issues on the Agenda

- David Bevan on Approval of the Foxhill Regeneration and Development Charter

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Nigel Roberts
<p>With the new student house being opened on the wellsway, 35 rooms and no provision has been made for cars, could the executive member as a matter of urgency look at what can be done to reduce problems in existing roads. This is already a problem due to overflow parking from St. Martin's hospital.</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>The highway and parking implications of the development were assessed under planning application 13/04683/FUL. There were measures included within the decision to assist in promoting public transport usage from the development and also controls on parking. The development will contribute £28,000 towards subsidising bus services in particular the 20 A/C. The future occupants of the building will have a clause in their letting agreement which prevents them from parking a vehicle within 2km of the site. This will stop occupiers from running a car from the property. The permission was also subject to a travel plan secured by a planning condition which promotes sustainable methods of transport.</i></p>		
M 02	Question from:	Councillor Robin Moss
<p>I note that Virgin Healthcare (VH) have been designated as preferred bidder for the upcoming Community Care (CC) contract.</p> <p>1) What elements of the current CC contract is it anticipated that VH will be delivering, & what elements, if any will, Sirona be retaining?</p> <p>2) Is it anticipated that all currently delivered & planned services be continued? If not, what elements of work may potentially be lost?</p> <p>3) What role will B&NES councillors have in the final decision process?</p> <p>4) It is reported in the press & social media that VH have said that they do not intend to take any profit from this contract. Was this commitment part of the 'preferred bidder' information submission?</p> <p>5) What independent research & evaluation has been undertaken into the previous service delivery records of both VH & Sirona, & how will previous experience & delivery be part of the final decision process?</p> <p>6) I understand that evidence was taken from a number of 'community consultees'. Is this information either in the public domain, or accessible for examination?</p>		

Answer from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p>1) <i>The Council is still in a procurement process. The preferred bidder stage is carried out prior to the contract award so that the CCG and the Council can assure themselves that the preferred bidder's appointment would be safe, appropriate and result in the required services being delivered on time and in budget. Should this not be possible, the CCG and the Council can return to the shortlist and begin discussions with the second place bidder in order to secure a satisfactory outcome. It is anticipated that the final arrangements will be clarified in the report to be presented to full Council.</i></p> <p>2) <i>See above</i></p> <p>3) <i>A report will be presented to full Council for approval before the contract can be signed.</i></p> <p>4) <i>This is part of the discussion and will be included in any report.</i></p> <p>5) <i>The Council has spoken to a number of other commissioners that have awarded contracts to both of the bidders, as well as partners and sub-contractors that work with them. This was scored as part of the procurement process.</i></p> <p>6) <i>Our programme of engagement and consultation reached thousands of local people and professionals across B&NES. Reports from over 80 engagement events are available at www.yourcareyourway.org including a detailed report on the findings from our formal consultation in autumn 2015.</i></p> <p><i>Our team of community champions have all had direct experience of community services as service users or carers so they really understand what needs to change and what would make a real difference to their lives. They will continue to be involved in all areas of the preferred bidder discussions to ensure the priorities of local people are delivered.</i></p>	
Supplementary Question:	
As part of the report for the Full Council meeting, can we ensure that current Virgin Health Care's record in Wiltshire will be taken into account?	
Answer from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard
Yes, certainly.	
M 03	Question from: Councillor Robin Moss
<p>Thank you for your positive response to my open letter about the chance to scrap this unwanted elected Mayor.</p> <p>Please can you update as to the current lobbying that you are involved in, and what progress we are making with the current administration.</p>	

Answer from:	Councillor Tim Warren	
<p><i>The West of England has sent to the Secretary of State all the representations it has received in relation to Mayoral Combined Authority with the report of the public consultation but also minutes of Council meetings, notes from area forum sessions and the session with PDS members.</i></p> <p><i>In addition I have written to the Secretary of State stating that were the government to remove their requirement for an elected Mayor this would be welcomed by the majority of people in Bath & North East Somerset, and have requested a meeting with the Secretary of State at which I will re-state this position.</i></p>		
M 04	Question from:	Councillor Robin Moss
<p>Following the consultation on the WoE Devolution deal will Full Council be consulted on the final decision?</p> <p>If the Cabinet will be taking this decision alone can you confirm that the usual rules on 'call in' will apply if the required number of Councillors make the appropriate request.</p>		
Answer from:	Councillor Tim Warren	
<p><i>The Council on 29th June 2016 agreed that the Chief Executive was authorised to subsequently submit to the Secretary of State;</i></p> <p><i>i. the Governance Scheme;</i></p> <p><i>ii. the consultation responses received (or an appropriate summary); and</i></p> <p><i>iii. any further consultation response that the Council itself may wish to make to the Secretary of State for the Department of Communities and Local Government; and that any resulting Order would be referred to Cabinet for approval.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has been advised by the DCLG that the Parliamentary timetable requires the Order to be agreed by the relevant Councils by mid October 2016. Unless the order is approved by that date, there will not be sufficient time for the Parliamentary processes to take place. I am advised by the Monitoring Officer that the call-in exception (Rule 5), as set out in the Constitution at Part 4 D (1), therefore applies.</i></p> <p>RULE 5 – EXCEPTIONS TO “CALL-IN”</p> <p><i>The rights under this Procedural Rule shall not apply in the following circumstances:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• when the executive decision is urgent as defined in the Urgency Procedure Rules within this Constitution;</i> <i>• the effect of the call-in alone would be to cause the Council to miss, or fail to comply with or fulfil, a statutory deadline or duty;</i> <i>• a decision taken under the General Exception and Special Urgency Access to Information Rules [Part 4B, rules 15 and 16].</i> 		
Supplementary Question:		
<p>One of the exceptions to Call In would be that the effect of the Call-In alone would be to cause the Council to miss, or fail to comply with or fulfil, a statutory deadline or duty.</p>		

Would it make more sense to make sure that we timetable our response to the consultation so the Full Council do get their say and the response would go to Central Government, via Cabinet, in timely fashion?

Answer from:

Councillor Tim Warren

This matter has been before the Full Council twice, with a number of briefing sessions for Councillors along with a number of public consultations. We didn't think it was necessary to bring this item again before the Full Council. We have heard views elected Members; we want to hear from the public now.

M 05

Question from:

Councillor Robin Moss

Bus services in North East Somerset.

As you are aware the cuts in First Bus services in NES are causing grave concern, as they are making it more difficult for people to get to work, to attend medical appointments and will disrupt family and social lives.

Is the current administration talking to First Bus about these proposed cuts, and assessing the potential impact they will on our communities?

Answer from:

Councillor Anthony Clarke

I am highly aware of this issue and I have received many comments from residents, Parish & Town Councils and Ward Members. First has a very dominant position locally - with a market share of over 80% in Bath & North East Somerset - so decisions that the company makes in respect of its service provision can have widespread repercussions for residents who rely on buses for transport. Also, they can lead to demands for the Council to make funding available to buy back commercial services that are being withdrawn. In respect of the reductions made this month, officers were able to secure some very limited replacement facilities from other operators at a low additional cost to mitigate the impact. There is no obstacle to any other bus operator replacing the withdrawn facilities on a commercial basis. Apart from Abus, who are now operating a new peak hour bus between the Chandag area of Keynsham and Bristol City Centre, none have done so.

The Bus Services Bill which is currently going through Parliament may give a better framework for bus service planning in the future. I hope it will encourage bus operators to work in closer partnership with the Council by taking a more "holistic" approach to their services, for example by accepting that an evening bus service between a city centre and a residential area is an integral part of that bus service rather than an optional add-on which will only be provided if public money is forthcoming. I hope the Bill will also give powers to local authorities to require bus operators to provide detailed patronage and revenue data in respect of buses they consider to be no longer viable.

I hold quarterly meetings with First's Managing Director and the next one will take place on 5th October. I will be raising these points at the meeting. In addition, officers are in

regular contact with First and other operators and will continue to look for solutions.

M 06 **Question from:** Councillor Lisa Brett

In December 2015, the Cabinet member for Transport stated that further works to the London Road would be delivered in the new calendar year. It is now September 2016. Can the Cabinet member please confirm when further works to the London Road will be undertaken? Specifically, when will the paving outside Anglo Terrace be replaced?

Answer from: Councillor Anthony Clarke

The surfacing programmes have been delayed by the bad weather earlier in the summer, and this has resulted in rescheduling of some planned works. Officers have advised me that we are securing the materials and resources to ensure the works outside Anglo Terrace will be completed this calendar year, as previously indicated. Officers have completed the work to implement the experimental Traffic Regulation Order and will report back to me by the end of December 2016 on what, if any, further work is advisable.

M 07 **Question from:** Councillor Neil Butters

What plan does the Cabinet member have to ensure there is an adequate flow of water in the cascade and pools in the Botanic Gardens in Royal Victoria Park and restore these features to their former glory? What is the timescale for this plan?

Answer from: Councillor Tim Warren (in absence of Councillor Martin Veal)

The original spring water supply to the Victoria Park ponds has been lost due to natural changes in the spring water flows. The council has undertaken repairs and cleaning to the ponds and introduced pumps to restore the cascade for events. The council has also commissioned a study into available spring water sources in the area to look at the viability of re connecting the ponds to a new supply.

M 08 **Question from:** Councillor Dine Romero

What percentage of the combined populations of B&NES, Bristol and South Gloucestershire responded to the public consultation survey on the West of England Devolution Deal?

Answer from: Councillor Tim Warren

The public consultation survey received 2011 responses. 87% of respondents gave a full or partial postcode to enable matching to local authority area. The remaining 13% are categorised as 'missing postcode'. The table below sets out the individual and combined totals.

<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>% of population</i>
----------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	------------------------

<i>Bath & North East Somerset</i>	471	23%	184874	0.25
<i>Bristol, City of</i>	685	34%	449328	0.15
<i>South Gloucestershire</i>	531	26%	274661	0.19
<i>Sub total</i>	1687	83%	908863	0.19

<i>North Somerset</i>	33	2%		
<i>Wiltshire</i>	15	1%		
<i>Other LA's</i>	18	1%		
<i>Missing postcode</i>	258	13%		

Total **2011**

Table 1: Responses by local authority based on postcode given. Other LAs include Cardiff, Forest of Dean, Lewisham, Mendip, Monmouthshire, Newport, Sedgemoor, Stroud, Swindon and Winchester. Population estimates source: ONS 2015 Mid-Year Population Estimates.

Supplementary Question:

Can you clarify that it was only 0.19% of overall population that responded to the consultation?

Answer from: Councillor Tim Warren

Yes. Bath & North East Somerset figures are slightly higher because we did slightly more work than other Councils.

M 09 **Question from:** Councillor Tim Ball

Who will be involved in the “three months of intensive testing and discussions” between the Council, the CCG and Virgin Care which are currently ongoing ahead of the final decision to award the Your Care, Your Way contract for community health and adult care services?

Answer from: Councillor Vic Pritchard

The preferred bidder stage is carried out prior to the contract award so that the CCG and the Council can assure themselves that the preferred bidder's appointment would be safe, appropriate and result in the required services being delivered on time and in budget. Should this not be possible, the CCG and the Council can return to the shortlist and begin discussions with the second place bidder in order to secure a satisfactory outcome.

Workstream leads from the CCG and the Council will be working to ensure that every section of the contract is robust and that arrangements are in place for the safe and effective transition of services from 1 April 2017. These workstreams include commissioning, communications, workforce, estates, finance and IT.

M 10	Question from:	Councillor Andrew Furse
<p>Holy Trinity Church in Kingsmead is currently for sale. This is a large building, with a history of varied uses, which could be an asset to the community as well as an income-generating asset to the Council. It could potentially accommodate a multi-purpose venue with office space for cultural, social, charity and community uses. Has the Cabinet member given any consideration to whether the Council could buy this building, or assist a consortium of local groups to do so?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>The cabinet is aware of this property and has asked officers to carry out a high level feasibility assessment of the costs of conversion to form a mixed use community facility. Any decision to proceed will require a detailed review of the business case to ensure it can generate sufficient income to repay the capital costs.</i></p>		
M 11	Question from:	Councillor Dine Romero
<p>1. With regard to the Cabinet decision “Review of the Council's waste & recycling collection service (13 July 2016)”, could the Cabinet member please publish a list of the streets in Bath and North East Somerset which are considered suitable for wheelie bins and so will receive them next year?</p> <p>2. With regard to the Cabinet decision “Review of the Council's waste & recycling collection service (13 July 2016)”, could the Cabinet member please publish a list of the streets in Bath and North East Somerset which are NOT considered suitable for wheelie bins and so will receive (or continue to use) gull proof bags next year?</p> <p>3. With regard to the Cabinet decision “Review of the Council's waste & recycling collection service (13 July 2016)”, will streets which currently have black bag collections more than once per week have their services cut next year?</p> <p>4. What consideration was given to holding a pilot scheme before introducing fortnightly waste collections across the district?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Martin Veal
<p><i>The changes we are making to waste collections from next year will help the Council meet the objectives of increasing recycling rates and reducing street waste – both of which I am sure will be welcomed and supported across the Council.</i></p> <p><i>As part of the lead-up to implementing these changes, a comprehensive information and awareness-raising campaign will take place. The Council will be holding roadshows at supermarkets and in villages and towns, and will have detailed information for residents. Assessments are currently being undertaken to ascertain the suitability of particular homes, streets and areas for wheeled bins, and all residents will be written to, to let them know if their property is suitable for a wheeled bin or a gull proof bag nearer the time. The suitability depends on the property type and location.</i></p> <p><i>The collection system the Council will be implementing from next year is commonplace</i></p>		

throughout the country and is therefore a tried and tested methodology. We will still be collecting all recyclables and food waste weekly. This leaves a very small amount of waste for storage and collection if residents use our recycling service to its maximum potential. Our waste technical officers have worked in districts where fortnightly collections with wheeled bins are the norm, and we work closely with our neighbours in the West of England and Somerset who operate such services. The value of a trial in a small portion of the district would therefore be limited and would not tackle the financial pressures the Council is facing as the grant we have benefitted from for weekly collections ends next year.

M 12	Question from:	Councillor Lisa Brett
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Could the Cabinet member please give an update on his plans for the 'Vegmead' community garden in Hedgemead Park?

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

When officers visited the site earlier in the year, the area appeared to be largely abandoned and not a particularly suitable location. However I am pleased that the community has confirmed that it can commit to maintaining the site. We will therefore work with the community to establish agreed standards, as part of our comprehensive management plan for Hedgemead Park. If the site proves to be a success then that will be a great result – if not we can review in 12 months' time and look at other options with the community then.

M 13	Question from:	Councillor Rob Appleyard
-------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

The appointment of Ashley Ayre as interim Chief Executive is welcome; however what is the timetable and process for the recruitment of a permanent Chief Executive?

Answer from:	Councillor Tim Warren
---------------------	-----------------------

I intend to put in place a recruitment process in March 2017 with a view to securing an appointment from 1 September 2017. This will avoid a process during the Autumn and Winter period when we will be busy with the budget process. I will also liaise with Group Leader colleagues about the process in the New Year.

M 14	Question from:	Councillor Andrew Furse
-------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

Now that the Destructor Bridge deck is in place, when will the towpath near the Bridge be re-opened to the public? What are the planned opening dates for the road across the bridge and installation of full pedestrian crossing with its junction on the Upper Bristol Road?

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

Crest Nicholson has informed the Council that the bridge project is envisaged to be complete in about a month's time. The towpath should be reopened within that timescale. The Council is continuing to work with Crest to confirm arrangements for the

formal opening and the associated off-bridge pedestrian improvements.

M 15 **Question from:** Councillor Paul Crossley

The Mineral Hospital has the capacity to be transformed into a complex that enhances the City of Bath, its economic vitality and wellbeing to benefit all our residents. It is a building that has strong emotional significance for many residents, many of whom would not support a conversion to either student accommodation or luxury apartments. What is the Leader doing to ensure that the MIN evolves into a building for the 21st century that meets the needs of the whole community?

Answer from: Councillor Tim Warren

I agree that the Mineral Hospital is an important historic site in the heart of the city, and that the future use of the building will therefore be of great interest to residents throughout Bath and the wider area.

The Cabinet Member for Economic Development has therefore formed a task-group with officers to look at a range of options for the buildings, and I am sure he would welcome input from across the Council.

M 16 **Question from:** Councillor Paul Crossley

In May 2014 the Council was on the verge of agreeing terms with BMT for the development of the Bath Quays. Plans were in place for flood mitigation works and development on the North bank and a new bridge was earmarked to link the two. I am delighted that the new Cabinet is implementing the schemes it inherited in relation to North Quays and the bridge. However 18 months on can the Leader give an update on the development on the South Quays for housing, creative space and a new HQ for BMT and indicate when can we expect a planning application?

Answer from: Councillor Tim Warren

Plans are progressing well for Bath Quays South. The public have the chance to look at emerging plans for the scheme on the 8th, 9th and 10th September and we are progressing towards the submission of a planning application in the Autumn in line with the programme. Negotiations with key stakeholders are still underway.

M 17 **Question from:** Councillor Paul Crossley

I am delighted that the new Cabinet is continuing with plans and ideas to redevelop the Undercroft area of the Guildhall on Grand Parade. It is good that the planning has now been approved. Can the Leader provide more details on the possibility of part of the development being used for a museum development?

Answer from: Councillor Tim Warren

The recent planning application is for the change of use of vault and undercroft spaces to restaurants (A3) and/or Museum use (D1). It includes works to allow pedestrian

access via lower Boat Stall lane and the Colonnade and to facilitate future access to Slippery Lane.

Officers are now working with agents to identify tenants for the new development. Only when the scheme has a viable business case will approval be granted to commence the conversion works.

M 18	Question from:	Councillor Paul Crossley
-------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

The Co-working hub is one of the most successful business schemes to have been started by the previous administration. It is now seeking to expand. What steps are being taken to support the co-working hub to deliver this expansion?

Answer from:	Councillor Tim Warren
---------------------	-----------------------

We continue to work with The Guild, supporting them to build on their success. There are a number of current opportunities for new facilities across Bath and North East Somerset which could provide an opportunity for The Guild to bid for to enable their expansion and the Council continues to support them in this.

M 19	Question from:	Councillor Paul Crossley
-------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

Does the Cabinet have any plans under consideration for the regeneration of “Bog Island”?

Answer from:	Councillor Tim Warren
---------------------	-----------------------

Given the significant number of regeneration projects both underway and in the pipeline, there are no current Council-sponsored plans for the regeneration of Bog Island. However, we keep this under constant review and should any proposals come forward these could be considered in the normal way. However opportunities to link with wider Highway improvement schemes will be kept under review.

M 20	Question from:	Councillor Dine Romero
-------------	-----------------------	------------------------

What support is the Council giving to ensuring relevant education provision for the local population, and the wider population of Bath and NE Somerset will be available from the BCA site on Rush Hill?

Answer from:	Councillor Michael Evans
---------------------	--------------------------

Bath and North East Somerset has 12 other secondary schools, all of which are rated by Ofsted as Good or Outstanding, as well as 3 Studio Schools, so if BCA closes there will be high quality alternative school options available for the local population. Officers have had initial conversations with the Cabot Learning Federation, which runs BCA, about a range of positive potential future options for the site, but the closure proposal is at a very early stage and so there are no firm plans yet. Cabot has announced to parents that it is considering the closure of the school but will need to gain approval

from the DfE's Regional Schools Commissioner for any such closure proposal. We will continue to work proactively with Cabot and other potential users of the site and we anticipate it will have an ongoing role as a key site for educational facilities to serve residents of Bath and North East Somerset.

Supplementary Question:

The education provided that is valued at BCA is not necessarily offered elsewhere, in other mainstream schools. Will you give a commitment to ensure?

Answer from: Councillor Michael Evans

The BCA is a mainstream secondary school and as you know we have mainstream school provision. As far as the closure of BCA is concerned – it is not in our hands

M 21 **Question from:** Councillor Lisa Brett

Work has now begun on new housing at the former MoD site on Warminster Road. What progress is the Council making in getting the extension to Bathwick St Mary's primary school built?

Answer from: Councillor Michael Evans

A feasibility study has been commissioned and architects appointed to carry out the design works. A number of meetings have taken place with the School and Diocese and they will be included in future meetings to determine options for expansion. Once the most appropriate and cost effective solution has been determined, this will then be put forward for Cabinet approval. There is sufficient surplus capacity of pupil places within this school planning area until 2019, when it is anticipated the new provision will be required.

Supplementary Question:

Can you confirm that the extension provided for the school would become two form entry and what is the expected timescale for extension completion?

Answer from: Councillor Michael Evans

We are at the stage of the feasibility study, and once the most appropriate and cost effective solution has been determined we will know if it will be two form or one and a half form entry. The extension is scheduled for completion by 2019.

M 22 **Question from:** Councillor Alison Millar

Why are rural bus services being cut to the East of Bath when the Council has stated that they were going to protect them? Does the Cabinet agree that if you reduce or curtail such services, the logical consequence is that people will be forced into their cars thereby increasing pressure on the roads?

Answer from:	Councillor Anthony Clarke	
<p><i>I am not aware of any cuts to rural bus services to the East of Bath but if Cllr Millar contacts me about a specific bus service, I will follow it up.</i></p> <p><i>I can confirm that there have been no cuts to rural bus services to the East of Bath that are operated under contract to Bath & North East Somerset Council. There was a change to the commercial bus services operating between Bath and Chippenham in April 2016 when the former competitive operation of two buses per hour each by Faresaver and First was replaced by a service of three buses per hour operated by Faresaver. At the same time, the two companies entered into agreements on ticketing and access to Bath Bus Station. These agreements were facilitated by B&NES officers to ensure compliance with competition law and, in my view, are to the overall benefit of passengers because they do away with some of the negative effects of competition but retain the benefits.</i></p>		
M 23	Question from:	Councillor Alison Millar
<p>Why are the proposed devolution agreement and the potential to gain some control back of buses not inspiring this administration to reconsider implementing an expensive park and ride, that won't work, and to re-evaluate the transport strategy with regard to buses?</p>		
Answer from:	Councillor Anthony Clarke	
<p><i>As part of the devolution proposals, we will be working with Bristol & South Gloucestershire to look at options for improved bus services using new powers proposed in the Bus Services Bill that is currently going through Parliament. However I do not think that this should or could be to the exclusion of continuing to develop and improve our P&R services. The need for a P&R east of Bath has been well established and agreed over a number of years as a key element of an integrated transport solution to the problems we face within Bath.</i></p>		
M 24	Question from:	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
<p>What is the Cabinet going to do to protect the interests of residents in sheltered accommodation in rural areas?</p>		
Answer from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard	
<p><i>Councillor Jackson will know that residents of sheltered accommodation will have a spectrum of needs with many requiring no or little in the way of support from the Council. However, there will be some residents who are also in receipt of a range of care and health services and for whom the Council would be more actively involved. It is difficult to give a more specific answer due to the generic nature of the question and I would be happy to have a further discussion with Councillor Jackson if there are specific concerns relating to a particular resident or group of residents.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		

Would our most vulnerable residents in sheltered accommodation be hit with the rise of the cost in alarm systems; would withdrawal on BANES subsidy from the provision of sheltered housing impact residents in those accommodations?

Answer from:

Councillor Vic Pritchard

No vulnerable individual will be affected diversely as we would be making services more efficient.

M 25

Question from:

Councillor Eleanor Jackson

Are you prepared to resolve the 82 Tynning – Radstock bus service on Saturdays?

Answer from:

Councillor Anthony Clarke

Bus service 82 was operated by Somerbus as a commercial service but the Council provided some revenue support on a de minimis basis. Some months ago, the proprietor of Somerbus decided to scale down his operations and he tried for some time to find another local bus operator to take over this service.

The only operator willing and able to take on the service was Frome Minibuses but they were unable to commit to providing a Saturday service. Small bus operators in the area are finding it difficult to get drivers willing to work on Saturdays at the moment, so the operators are unable to commit to taking on additional Saturday operations. Frome Minibuses are now running the Monday to Friday service on the same timetable as that operated formerly by Somerbus.

I have asked officers to follow up a helpful suggestion made by Cllr Jackson that bus service 424 (also operated by Frome Minibuses but under contract to Somerset County Council) could be amended on Saturdays to cover parts of the route of service 82 and thereby offer some limited replacement. Officers will discuss this suggestion with Frome Minibuses and Somerset County Council.

Supplementary Question:

Is Cabinet Member aware that bus timetables are not available online and wrong timetables are being posted on bus stops in Radstock.

Answer from:

Councillor Anthony Clarke

No, I wasn't aware. I will investigate this issue and respond to you in time.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P 01	Question from:	Dr David Martin
<p>PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AT THE JUNCTION OF NORTH ROAD WITH WARMINSTER ROAD, BATHWICK</p> <p>In November 2014, local residents submitted a petition requesting improved pedestrian safety measures at this junction. Over 80 people signed the petition, drawing attention to the difficulties pedestrians have in crossing the road. It was illustrated that pedestrians have to look three ways simultaneously to cross because of the layout and shape of the junction and because turning traffic approaches the junction at speed. Several practical solutions were put forward by local residents to improve the situation. With further housing developments now taking place on the nearby ex-MoD site, traffic and pedestrian conflicts can only increase in this area. What progress has the Council made in tackling this problem and when can local residents expect remedial action?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>Officers investigated the improvements and visited the location. It is recognised pedestrians need to be vigilant when crossing the North Road junction towards the City. Despite there having been no recorded pedestrian accidents in the last 10 years a safety improvement scheme remains on the "task register" for consideration as part of the capital programme for potential future prioritisation.</i></p>		
P 02	Question from:	Keynsham and Saltford Liberal Democrats
<p>How will B&NES Council measure the success, or otherwise, of the Keynsham High Street one-way trial? If the one-way trial is judged by B&NES Council to have been successful, would that be the end of the local Conservative Party's call for a trial of full pedestrianisation?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>As part of the Keynsham High Street one way experiment a detailed programme of monitoring is proposed to be undertaken which will seek feedback from stakeholders, residents and visitors to Keynsham on their experience of the high street during the trial and their views on the future development of the scheme</i></p> <p><i>The experimental one way system will need to be put in place for an adequate amount of time to allow drivers to become accustomed to the change and ensure that the monitoring reflects the likely change in network conditions over the longer term.</i></p> <p><i>With respect to the latter part of your question, I am unable to speak on behalf of local ward members in Keynsham with regards to their views on full pedestrianisation. However, the priority for the Council at this time is to progress the one-way trial of the High Street to determine if there are any detrimental impacts on traffic flows.</i></p>		

P 03	Question from:	Cyril Mitchard
To what extent were B&NES consulted on the proposed changes to the new First Bus timetable?		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>Bus operators are under no obligation to consult or give advance information on proposed changes to their commercial bus services. The requirement of the law is that they register changes with the Traffic Commissioner 8 weeks before implementation and a copy of the information sent to the local transport authority.</i></p> <p><i>In the case of the changes that First made to its commercial bus services on 4th September 2016, officers met First in April and May 2016 and were advised that First planned to make major changes in September 2016 – including renumbering most of their Bath city services. Some of the detail was provided, including some draft timetables, and this was shared with the Cabinet.</i></p> <p><i>Officers asked First to reconsider some of the proposals – such as the withdrawal of service 379, which has been supported for 4 years with public money in the expectation it would become viable. It became clear when the final timetables were received that some comments had been taken on board – and I am grateful to First for that – but there was no movement on the big issues.</i></p> <p><i>In my view, bus operators need to do much more to consult their customers and take account of their views and needs when reviewing the route network. I hope that the Bus Services Bill, currently going through Parliament, will create a framework under which consultation and service planning can be much improved.</i></p>		

Within this local authority there are 3 made Neighbourhood Plans, one that is having a referendum next week, plus another 16 parishes in various stages of neighbourhood planning, and two parishes that have asked me to speak to them about Neighbourhood Planning. To save your fingers going at overtime that's 22 out of the eligible 52 councils.

Doing a Neighbourhood Plan doesn't cost B&NES anything, in fact the support grants from DCLG means you actually make money out of them, but it is a huge investment of time and effort by the people doing them, so they have a real feeling of ownership once the plans are made.

I have recently polled 35 National Neighbourhood Planning Champions, from all over the country, and while B&NES scores well for the number of Neighbourhood Plan designations it has, it was by far and away the worst for compliance to made plans. So far policies in all three made plans in B&NES have been breached in recent decisions.

Within Clutton there have been 3 such applications. Two I can't discuss for legal reasons, but in the third the applicant & his agent paid for pre-application advice and the officer never mentioned the Neighbourhood Plan even though two of the policies affect his application.

PPG para 006 of The Neighbourhood planning section says:

"A neighbourhood plan attains the same legal status as the Local Plan once it has been agreed at a referendum and is made (brought into legal force) by the local planning authority. At this point it becomes part of the statutory development plan."

But The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, goes further as it says in section 38(5)

"if to any extent a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to become part of the development plan".

I will continue to support local groups, for all the reasons stated in the Council Connect magazine, as I still believe that Neighbourhood Planning & localism are a good thing.

Finally I would like to congratulate Liz Richardson, as it was announced today that the Chew Valley NP has made it into the NALC Project of the Year Finalists list – so there is something of Neighbourhood Planning in B&NES to be proud about.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today regarding Neighbourhood Plans.

I know that this Administration is very supportive of Neighbourhood Plans (NPs) and many of you have Parishes that are progressing NPs, but I am here today to ask you to actively champion NPs within the Planning Process in BaNES.

The reason for my request is the increasing number of examples within the Authority where it appears that the NP has been ignored or policies overturned against the predominant, and sometimes overwhelming, support of the wishes of the Local Community. I am unable to discuss examples due legal issues but I would be happy to provide them privately. All I can say is that BaNES is publicising NPs in an article in Council Connect, referencing my community's NP and I have 2 examples in my own village.

Local volunteers have committed time, residents have engaged in the process and taxpayers have provided grants. Time, effort and money has been utilised to compile these plans.

When plan has reached the external examination stage it actually carries limited weight in the planning process. On completion the Plan has been examined against the NPPF and the Core Strategy twice, once by the internal BaNES team and once by an external independent inspector. When the NP is made it becomes the latest part of the Development Plan and where there is conflict between the Core Strategy and the NP, the NP should take precedence. When any other planning documents are adopted then they will take precedence in the event of conflicting policies.

It appears that Officers are not taking into account the weight and material nature of NPs. Nor are the views of Parish Councils, or the local communities taken into account. This is a grave injustice.

I would urge the Cabinet to ensure that appropriate training regarding Neighbourhood Plans is undertaken for all officers and members who are involved with any planning decision-making. I would also urge Cabinet to ensure that the Parish Council's views regarding planning are given the appropriate weight, bearing in mind that these PC's are responsible for the Neighbourhood Plans and therefore have an insight into the intent and reasons behind their policies, rather than allow officers to 'interpret' policies, which they have already examined. Please help the Neighbourhood Plans to stand as a testament to the hard work & commitment of their local communities. People have given freely of their time to educate themselves in order to protect their local environment. Please support them in order to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan isn't just a meaningless, timewasting and costly non-project which is contrary to planning law.

Thank you.

SEPTEMBER STATEMENT TO CABINET

Cllr Alison Millar

We are slowly but surely edging ever closer to that fateful day where the future of the environment to the east of our beautiful city will be decided. Local residents await that day with much trepidation as it is clear which way the wind is blowing.

Whilst I commend this cabinet for having delayed the process and for taking the time for a review of various options on sites open to them, please consider the following points before you make a disastrous decision that will blight the eastern green valley approaches to Bath forever:

- The Council has stated in its transport strategy that we need 2,889 park and ride spaces by 2029 - but that we already have 2,777. That means in fact we only need 122 further spaces over the next 13 years! Within that time frame car use will certainly change
- How can it be that as recently as 2013 in the Bath Echo, Cllr Warren robustly defended the green belt concept and stated (and I quote) “The Council must make it clear that we will absolutely not accept any further threat to our area’s Greenbelt. Government policy is clear on the issue of protecting Greenbelt, and the Inspector must abide by it.” The Meadows is in the greenbelt – any development will TOTALLY affect the openness of the green belt and it will be inappropriate. How you can justify building on the greenbelt for the sake of 122 spaces.?

- We all know that the plan would negatively affect air pollution levels to the east – without bringing benefits to offset it. Should we not as a council be spending this public money on taking measures that will improve the health of ALL of our residents? We should as a city be at the forefront and demonstrate innovation in our transport systems in and around our city. We should not use outdated methods which although held so dear within the Council's transport department, are not of this century.
- Buses are a major issue - people are going to be driven to their cars by the lack of support for eastern bus routes such as the number 4 from Bathampton which has had its service recently curtailed. The answer to this is to find other measures which will tackle the problems we are dealing with and not resort to tarmac.

To justify this development on the basis of some vague need that officers feel *might possibly* arise because of Bath and North East Somerset's future economic development is woeful. That is the way it comes across currently.

In closing, The Sunday Telegraph has this year named the meadows as one of the top 10 beauty spots in the country which is threatened by development. Cabinet members, do you want your legacy to be the destruction of these meadows to build a car park when the evidence genuinely does not support it and when there is such continued vehement opposition from residents in Bath and beyond Please reread all the materials you have been given once again, do the right thing and - and don't let this be viewed by history as a project comparable to the Sack of Bath.

The meadows truly are no place for a park and ride - especially one that cannot be justified as a solution to Bath's traffic problem. It will be a catastrophe if one is built there - and it will be down to you.

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

By David Beaven. Resident of Foxhill.

Changes to the Charter have been made by the Council and Curo.

In Part 3 of the Charter (“Conclusions and Recommendations”) Recommendation 3 states “working with residents and stakeholders”.

Also, The Executive Forward Plan, ref: E2877, para 1.2 , states “The draft charter has undergone a period of independent consultation with the community and stakeholders”.

Foxhill Residents Association do not agree that this has taken place.

I enclose with this statement, a copy of a letter from secretary Nola Edwards, to Councillors Liz Richardson and Tim Warren , which outlines the frustration felt by the Association and residents.

We are thankful for the 3 way meetings, chaired by Councillor Liz Richardson, but are disappointed that many requests for minutes to be taken has not been accepted.

I include parts of a statement, also by Nola Edwards, made to the meeting on 14th July 2016.

“I don’t feel that we are being listened to or that our concerns are being taken seriously.

To restate what has been said so often, we object to the following :-

The number of social homes available for rent being reduced.

Tenants being forced to move.

Tenants being forced out of Foxhill estate, which will be the inevitable consequence of demolishing more rented homes than are rebuilt.

An increase in population density on Foxhill estate.

A corresponding increase in traffic.

An increase in pollution and a loss of green space.

Spending years living on a building site.

Homeowners being left in limbo while reserved matters are staggered over many years.

The number of relatively expensive private homes being built in Foxhill, drastically changing the demographic of our neighbourhood.

None of these issues have been addressed”.

All attendees at the meeting were given the complete text and a copy sent to Councillor Tim Warren.

A full copy of the text is included with my statement.

CPO's. This continues to concern many residents.

At the 3 way meetings it has been discussed on a number of occasions.

It was agreed, that a written statement on the Council's position should be sent to all home owners. But oh; no minutes!

Finally, I would like to draw the Cabinets attention to a paragraph in the Charter, “Quality of Place”.

It states :- “Establish and respond to a clear set of place making ‘rules’ including appropriate building heights, densities and design guidelines”.

This, for me is one of the most important disclosures of the Charter.

The exhibition of the Master plan for Outline Planning is taking place on 12th September.

I believe you are invited to a preview at Curo's premises.

My plea to you is that come to the exhibition and hear the comments of the residents of Foxhill.

My final plea is that approval of the Charter should be postponed until after the exhibition.

Thank You for the opportunity to speak to you.