

## **BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

### **CABINET**

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

Monday, 14th November, 2016

#### **Present:**

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

#### **46 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

#### **47 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Senior Democratic Services Officer drew attention to the evacuation procedure.

#### **48 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

#### **49 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

#### **50 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR**

There was none.

#### **51 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS**

There were 33 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.]*

## **52 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS**

Christine Boyd made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website*] related to east of Bath Park and Ride.

Christine Boyd also made a statement on behalf of Andrew Mercer [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website*] related to east of Bath Park and Ride.

Annie Kilvington made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website*] related to east of Bath Park and Ride.

Jo Hargreaves made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website*] related to Bath Community Academy.

Duncan Hounsell (Chair of the Keynsham & Salford Liberal Democrats) made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website*] related to WoE Joint Spatial Plan.

Cllr Ian Gilchrist, Cllr Jasper Becker and Sarah Carney presented a petition to the Cabinet objecting to First Group's re-routing of the U1 along Upper Oldfield Park, which has commenced without any consultation with the residents (*note: the petition has been passed to the relevant Council department and copies of the petition and statements are available on the Minute Book in Democratic Services*).

Nicolette Boater made a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website*] related to Funding Approval for the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy

## **53 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> October 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **54 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET**

There were none.

## **55 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES**

There were none.

## **56 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

## **57 CONSIDERATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WEST OF ENGLAND COMBINED AUTHORITY**

Ian Bell (Bath Business Community) said that Bath Business Community were very keen to see the Devolution deal accepted. It was the right thing to take the deal through the consultation with public and stakeholders, and the deal would give some certainty to the whole area. Ian Bell concluded his statement by saying that some members of the Bath Business Community did not like the word, or concept, of Mayor though they had congratulated the Council on successful negotiations with the government in terms of the deal.

Councillor Robin Moss said that he was disappointed that the decision on Devolution would be taken by the Cabinet, and not the Council. Councillor Moss felt that this was a major change in partnership work with other Councils, and for that reason the decision should be taken by the Full Council. Councillor Moss concluded his statement by saying that, in general, Labour Group had approved principles of the Devolution.

Councillor Dine Romero expressed her concerns that, taking into account the importance of the matter, a short report on the Devolution was only available in the last few days. Councillor Romero also expressed her concerns that only small portion of the population took part in the consultation. Councillor Romero concluded her statement by suggesting that the Combined Authority should have a Chair and not a Mayor.

David Redgewell address the Cabinet as per his statement sent in advance of the meeting [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website*].

Trevor Osbourne also welcomed the Devolution deal and the retention of business rates. Trevor Osbourne did express his concern on the fact that Bristol was built through trade and Bath through culture, and that we must recognise that two cities would have different needs. Trevor Osbourne also expressed his concern on business rates retention in Bath by highlighting that culture, further education, voluntary sector, charity and small independent traders do not pay business rates.

Councillor Tim Warren said this was a key moment on what had been a long journey for the Council, and its neighbours, to ensure we get the best possible deal from Government for our residents now and for the future. The paper had set out the draft order for the creation of the new West of England Combined authority which would be the vehicle for us receiving and delivering many of the powers and funding we had been lobbying and negotiating for over the last months. The area had achieved the best deal, one that far outweighs any other devolution deal done elsewhere in the country. In terms of protections for our area, we had secured more safeguards than any other deal in the country. This wasn't an easy journey because Devolution involves central government giving up control on things and that was not easy for it to do. There was still a lot of work to be done so that we benefit from the deal.

Councillor Tim Warren moved the recommendations.

Councillor Charles Gerrish seconded the motion by supporting the Leader and by recognising his role in making this happen and in achieving what was the best deal available. The area would benefit from 100% Business Rates Retention Pilot; based on the budgeted level of business rates income in 2016/17, it was estimated that an additional £18.9m would be retained by the West of England authorities in 2017/18 as a result. For B&NEs this would be in the region of £2m plus additional revenue

next year. Councillor Charles Gerrish welcomed the fact that the deal would open discussions over the potential for a significant new Housing Investment Fund, and that the Government had committed to working with B&NES and Highways England to look at options to link the A36 and A46.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones commented that the Devolution deal would shape the WoE for the delivery of economic development. The area would need the development of infrastructure, with Metro West being one of the key projects for its delivery.

Councillor Liz Richardson said that we should embrace, and not be concerned with the change. Councillor Liz Richardson also said that, from her portfolio perspective, the most positive thing from the Devolution deal was about the new Housing Investment Fund.

Councillor Anthony Clarke expressed his support to the Devolution deal, in particular with co-working arrangements with other authorities on transport matters.

Councillor Martin Veal said that nobody would want to see return to Avon, hence why so many safeguards had been put in place. Councillor Martin Veal praised Councillor Tim Warren for his contribution in securing the best deal and added that this would make WoE the powerhouse that other authorities in the country would envy.

Councillor Paul Myers also supported the deal by saying that this would improve partnership working with neighbouring authorities, which would be of benefit to our residents.

Councillor Michael Evans also supported the deal by highlighting that the Combined Authority Mayor would be directly accountable to the public.

Councillor Vic Pritchard commended the work of the Leader and officers for getting the best deal in the country. However, Councillor Vic Pritchard expressed his concern that only 0.19% of the population took part in the consultation. Councillor Vic Pritchard said that he would abstain from voting on this matter.

Councillor Tim Warren concluded the debate by saying that this was a long and difficult process and there was still work to do, and the Council had not taken the issues this agenda creates lightly, but in the interests of the area and residents.

**RESOLVED** that the Cabinet agreed to:

- 1) Note the Summary of Consultation Responses report, and the Representations submitted to the Secretary of State ;
- 2) Note the principles in the Governance Scheme are delivered subject to the variations detailed in Appendix B
- 3) Subject to the safeguard in recommendation 2.5 below give consent to the establishment of the West of England Combined Authority

- 4) Appoint the Leader of the Council as this Council's Member of West of England Combined Authority;
- 5) Delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of Council, the authority to take all decisions, to make all necessary appointments, arrangements and provide written confirmation to the Secretary of State consenting to the making of the Order creating a West of England Combined Authority;
- 6) Delegate authority to the Monitoring Officer to make all consequential amendments to the Constitution.

## **58 ENGLISHCOMBE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Councillor Liz Richardson said that The Localism Act 2011 had reformed the planning system to give local people new rights to shape the development of the communities in which they live. The Act had provided for a new type of community-led initiative known as a Neighbourhood Development Plan which sets out the policies on the development and use of land in a parish or 'Neighbourhood Area'. The Council had a duty to assist communities in the preparation of Neighbourhood Development Plans and orders, to take a Plan through a process of examination and referendum, and to bring the Neighbourhood Plan into force. In line with the Neighbourhood Planning Protocol (version dated 9th September 2015) the decision to make the Plan was for the Council's Cabinet.

The referendum took place on the 15th September 2016, and there was a 25.9% turnout of the overall Neighbourhood Area electorate. A majority (91%) were in favour of using the Englishcombe NDP to help decide planning applications in the Neighbourhood Area.

Councillor Liz Richardson moved the recommendations.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones seconded the motion by welcoming the Englishcombe NDP as the 4<sup>th</sup> plan adopted in Bath and North East Somerset.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to make and bring into force the Englishcombe Neighbourhood Development Plan, as part of the Development Plan for the Englishcombe Neighbourhood Area, in accordance with Section 38A(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011).

## **59 REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING, CASH LIMITS AND VIREMENTS – APRIL TO SEPTEMBER 2016**

Councillor Andrew Furse addressed the Cabinet by expressing his concerns in overspend at some services within the Council, in particular in Children Services, Support Services and Community 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. The report had presented the financial monitoring information for the Authority as a whole for

the financial year 2016/17 to the end of September 2016. The report had highlighted any significant areas of forecast over and under spends in revenue budgets, and the Council's current revenue financial position for the 2016/17 financial year to the end of September 2016 by Cabinet Portfolio. The current forecast outturn position was for an overspend of £941,000 which equates to 0.30% of gross budgeted spend (excluding Schools). Strategic Directors would work to manage their budgets within the overall allocations approved by the Council, and this would include the development of appropriate mitigating actions as the financial year progresses.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul Myers seconded the motion by welcoming that the forecast outturn position had included the requirement for the delivery of £12.644m savings as part of the approved budget for 2016/17, a significant element of which had been confirmed as delivered. 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.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed:

- 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 September and the year end projections are noted.
- 4) The revenue virements listed for approval are agreed, and those listed for information are noted.
- 5) The capital virements listed for approval are agreed, and those listed for information are noted.

## **60 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT TO 30TH SEPTEMBER 2016**

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that the Full Council had received and noted this report on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2016.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Vic Pritchard seconded the motion.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed:

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

The meeting ended at 3.45 pm

Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Date Confirmed and Signed \_\_\_\_\_

**Prepared by Democratic Services**

This page is intentionally left blank



## CABINET MEETING 14<sup>th</sup> November 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**

- Park and Ride
  - Christine Boyd
  - Andrew Mercer (Christine Boyd read out his statement)
  - Annie Kilvington
- The future of Bath Community Academy and the Community
  - Jo Hargreaves
- Joint Spatial Plan
  - Duncan Hounsell (Chair of the Keynsham & Salford Liberal Democrats)
- Petition – buses in Upper Oldfield Park
  - Cllr Ian Gilchrist
  - Cllr Jasper Becker
  - Sarah Carney
- Funding Approval for the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy
  - Nicolette Boater

#### **Statements about issues on the Agenda**

- Devolution
  - Ian Bell
  - Cllr Robin Moss
  - Trevor Osborne
  - David Redgewell

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

<b>M 01</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
<p>In the Supplementary Agenda Dispatch for the Resources PDS Panel dated 9 February 2015, under the item Budget &amp; Council Tax 2015/16 and Medium term Financial Outlook, page 33 it states that there is a 'Radstock and Westfield Implementation Plan for Full Approval of £100,000 and Provisional Approval of £50,000 to 'support the regeneration of Radstock town Centre by supporting Norton Radstock Regeneration to create a community service hub at new premises adjacent to Victoria Hall and developing proposals for the next phase of regeneration in the town centre'</p> <p>Has this money been spent? If so, what has it been spent on, given that there is no sign of a community hub adjacent to the Victoria Hall? Secondly, why should only Radstock benefit? Would it not be a good idea to spend this money, and make provision in the 2016/17 budget for improvements in Westfield, starting with the purchase of St Hugh's Church to be a library hub like Paulton's, and a youth club, and the adjacent Shambles for retail premises and offices, there being adequate parking on the site?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>The funds referred to by Cllr Jackson have not been formally committed and are being held pending:</i></p> <p><i>(1) the outcome of the bid to NHS England by the Hope House doctors surgery which could enable an integrated healthy living centre and community hub</i></p> <p><i>(2) completion of discussions between the Town Council and NRR about a smaller community facility close to Victoria Hall and</i></p> <p><i>(3) completion of the Linden Homes central area scheme to assess the need for complimentary enhancements in Fortescue Road area.</i></p> <p><i>A community hub linked to a new surgery, and potentially incorporating the library, has been discussed at RAWDAG (Radstock &amp; Westfield Development Advisory Group – B&amp;NES ward members and local council representatives from the area) plus the Somer Valley Forum. The surgery and the CCG have presented ideas which have been well supported. These local meetings noted the proposals and in discussions welcomed the potential to create a new integrated and financially sustainable library, children's centre, health visitor base and doctors surgery in accessible and up to date premises. Other complimentary healthy living facilities in the new centre may also be possible. Although this has become the leading idea for a community hub in Radstock it is dependent on significant NHS funding just allocated but subject to due diligence. The integrated healthy living concept in one building is seen as a key strength of the NHS bid.</i></p> <p><i>It is planned to continue to keep RAWDAG informed about the bid and the alternative options as above, whilst also taking into account other emerging ideas, such as those mentioned by Cllr Jackson.</i></p>		

<b>Supplementary Question:</b>		
Have officers, or the Cabinet, actually talked to the planning department on this proposal; would you be prepared to consider alternative plans to what have you given in the answer?		
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Charles Gerrish	
<i>I will reply in 5 working days.</i>		
<b>M 02</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Karen Walker
<p>With the review of the Councils Waste Collection Service underway - I would like to ask the Cabinet Member for Community Services to ensure that the Council looks thoroughly at the ways it plans to collect its recyclable waste, ensuring that we are not just going to continue to collect as we have in the past without considering other methods.</p> <p>Recycling is going to be the main collection service and we need to ensure that the process we use is fit for purpose. Please ensure that you take this opportunity to review the collection process and options for the Recycling Service.</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Martin Veal	
<p><i>In reviewing the options the Council looked at recycling collections nationwide, and financially modelled several different collection methods. The method chosen is the one that represents the best solution to the Council, in terms of cost and achieving high levels of recycling, with a quality product that can be sold at market rates, without the need to pay fees to 3rd party sorting plants.</i></p> <p><i>The collection options have been reviewed extensively. The system that the Cabinet have agreed is similar to those operated successfully for many years in Bristol, North Somerset, South Gloucestershire and Somerset County, and is based upon a blueprint agreed by the Welsh Assembly Government as being the preferred collection system for Wales on grounds of cost &amp; quality.</i></p> <p><i>However, if Cllr Walker has any specific concerns or suggestions in relation to collections in her ward that she feels need to be looked at I would be happy to look into them with officers.</i></p>		
<b>M 03</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Karen Walker
<p>Following my question to Cabinet on 9 September 2015. I would like to again ask that the Cabinet Member for Transport looks at altering the flow of traffic on the A367 into Bath.</p> <p>Currently the people commuting into Bath from Peasedown St John and beyond frequently have to que up Dunkerton Hill in the morning. I do believe with some work we could improve this situation.</p>		

At the present time there is no incentive for commuters to use this park and ride, they even have to que unnecessarily because of the current layout; they actually have to drive past where they will be parking to be able to turn into the Park & Ride. The entrance is at the wrong end.

The infrastructure is in place, although I realise that some re-modelling of the road network would be needed, I understand from Officers that they have been looking into some options. I would like to urge the Cabinet Member to move this scheme forward and allocate Officer time and funds to make it happen for ALL the residents in the Somer Valley.

**Answer from:** Councillor Anthony Clarke

*Funding has been allocated in this year's Capital Programme to assess proposals, with an aim of testing and implementing improvements in the coming financial year.*

**M 04 Question from:** Councillor June Player

What steps is the Cabinet Member for Community Services going to take to change the 3day a week recycling and rubbish collection services in the Ward of Westmoreland to one day a week collection days? We currently have three different collection days per week depending on which streets residents live in. This results in there being mess all week somewhere throughout this ward. This is made worse due to containers then being left out to be kicked/blown about in the streets throughout the week as well as dropped mess.

The introduction of the new Waste and Recycling Scheme for 2017 is the ideal opportunity to bring this about and reassure Westmoreland residents that the Council is serious with their commitment to cleaning up their ward. Please do not let the opportunity for one day collections throughout Westmoreland Ward to slip by.

**Answer from:** Councillor Martin Veal

*As part of the new waste and recycling service in 2017 every route in the District will be revised. We understand the issues currently in Westmoreland ward and will bear this in mind when optimising routes, but at this stage we do not know exactly where the collection day boundaries will be. They will be based on the most operationally efficient routes.*

**M 05 Question from:** Councillor John Bull

Should the Cabinet decide to apply to the Government to become part of a Combined Authority , with a Metro Mayor, will Cllr Clarke pledge to investigate the introduction of two new powers allowed to such devolved authorities, namely Franchising of Bus Services and the declaring of Clean Air Zones where air quality breaches the required standards?

**Answer from:** Councillor Anthony Clarke

*The potential of franchising of Bus Services is being investigated as part of the JSP that is being developed for the West of England. It is possible that the recent High Court judgement will lead to the release of further funds for Clean Air Zones from the Central Government, and the Council will investigate this possibility.*

**Supplementary Question:**

You may be aware that the Bus Services Bill went through the Parliament, and as amended it will allow Local Authorities to own arm's length bus services. Would you investigate that possibility for this Council?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Anthony Clarke

*We will be considering the whole issue of bus management.*

**M 06**

**Question from:**

Councillor Eleanor Jackson

To what extent has the Council's policy as defined by the resolution passed at council a year ago to assist veterans been implemented, and how many individuals have availed themselves of this service?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Tim Warren

*The Government's Armed Forces Covenant is about fair treatment for the armed forces community. Community Covenants are local statements of mutual support between civilian and military communities, which are signed by local councils, military representatives, charities and other partner agencies. Bath and North East Somerset Council signed its Community Covenant in 2013.*

*On 23rd March 2016, Council resolved:-*

*To appoint an appropriate existing officer to act as a single point of contact for all service leavers in B&NES. This would include making veterans aware of local service charities and offering advice on issues including employment, housing, healthcare, and benefit entitlements. This officer would have the power to commit the council to actions and would monitor and review the community covenant.*

*Following this resolution, discussions took place with the Council's Customer Services team, who deal with enquiries on the issues set out in the resolution. As a result, Council Connect now provides the initial point of contact for armed forces veterans. Under this process, when enquirers identify as veterans, they are assigned a Senior Customer Services Officer, who will act as a co-ordinator for the package of help and support needed.*

*The benefits of this approach are that:*

- The range of issues veterans face are varied and sometimes complex. Our Customer Services Officers, together with the Welfare Support team, are best placed to obtain the help and advice veterans need. They also have the networks in place to*

*make referrals to specialist agencies where necessary.*

- Whether they contact us on the telephone, through e-mail or in person at one of our One Stop Shops, the Council's Customer Services team will be able to provide veterans with the help they need. This system also means that veterans will be able to "tell their story" once only and not be passed "from pillar to post".*
- The Customer Services team will also be able to take action required, and identify any key issues directly with the Council's lead officer for the Community Covenant, who can consider this when monitoring and reviewing the covenant*

*Since March 2016, our Welfare Support Team have helped an armed forces veteran facing financial difficulties, arranging for home visits. A separate enquiry was also received from an armed forces family which related specifically to a school placement and this was resolved to the satisfaction of the family.*

*A challenge for both local authorities and central government is that there is limited information on the veteran population and there is currently a campaign to have questions about armed forces service added to the census. The Royal British Legion did have a presence in the Council's One Stop Shops during 2014 and 2015 but decided not to continue with this due to the lack of direct enquiries.*

*The Council is therefore working to increase knowledge of the help we can provide to veterans. The West of England Rural Network's Village Agents have been identifying veterans in Bath and North East Somerset and North Somerset through their direct engagement with members of the community, particularly the older population. The Village Agents identified that having undertaken National Service qualifies individuals and their families for a range of support. This highlighted an opportunity to assist those who had not previously considered themselves as having had a military career.*

*The Village Agents developed this into a funding bid to the national Community Covenant Fund and in March 2016, their 'Rural Hidden Heroes' project was awarded £18,600 from this fund to:-*

- Identify gaps in service provision in isolated rural areas*
- Facilitate service providers to deliver their work more effectively*
- Map who and where the beneficiaries live*
- Encourage veterans to have pride in their military connections*
- Establish social events to bring those with military connections together*
- Signpost to appropriate partners and assist with navigating complex medical and social systems*

*Veterans identified through the work of the Village Agents will also be invited to attend the Council's Armed Forces Flag Raising Ceremony each June.*

*Bath Rugby Foundation have also been awarded £20,000 from the Community Covenant fund in October 2016 to establish a Military Coaching Academy based in Wiltshire. They will train and mentor ex-service and transitioning personnel in Wiltshire allowing them to develop new careers in sport and community engagement.*

<b>M 07</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Colin Blackburn
<p>With the Council proposing to introduce wheelie bins into the City of Bath I was horrified to hear from the Council Officers that the colour being proposed for the wheelie bins was black.</p> <p>With our City famous for its Bath stone coloured buildings, surely we can do better than this. We owe it to the residents of Bath, as part of these planned service changes, to try and make these large unsightly objects as less obtrusive as possible to the street scene.</p> <p>I would like to ask the Cabinet Member for Community Services if he has looked into colour options and how did he come up with black over another colour such as beige/stone which would be more in-keeping with the colour of many of the homes and streets within the City.</p> <p>It has been stated that the new waste services policy will not be a 'one size fits all' proposition across BANES. This is a clear area where that policy can be applied to the benefit of our World Heritage City.</p> <p>Please let us not waste this opportunity to try and improve the service for our customers, we must be more creative with our thinking.</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Martin Veal
<p><i>We are still working through which properties in the city will be suitable for wheeled bins. Many in the city centre itself will not be suitable for bins. The large wheeled bin manufacturers do not produce domestic sized bins in a beige colour. They are manufactured from recycled polymer dyed.</i></p> <p><i>The black bins wear well and look smarter for longer – the colour hides minor scuffs etc. Black is the most popular colour used globally for residual waste and is commonly used throughout this country. People understand that black is for rubbish. Other colours are generally used for recyclables. Replacement bins can be readily obtained at the best price as the colour is commonly manufactured. Black represents the best value option for the Council for the reasons stated.</i></p>		
<b>M 08</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Lisa Brett
<p>Could the Cabinet member please confirm that Southbourne Gardens Road is going to be adopted by the Council and, if so, when will this take place?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>Southbourne Gardens Road will be adopted. Currently there are outstanding issues which the developer is to resolve prior to adoption. I am unable to provide a date but would anticipate early to mid 2017.</i></p>		
<b>M 09</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Andrew Furse

1. What initiatives are planned to help residents with limited storage manage their waste and recycling in light of the introduction of fortnightly waste collections?
2. What new types of recyclables will residents be able to recycle in 2017?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Martin Veal

1. *We have been clear from the start that the Council will not be taking a 'one size fits all' approach to these changes, and will fully engage with residents over the plans.*

*With regards to recycling, residents will continue to use green boxes for recyclables, and food waste caddies to recycle their food waste. Whilst the vast majority of households are assessed to have adequate storage for a wheeled bin, the Council does recognise that this will not be suitable for all households in all areas due to a lack of storage, and in these instances we will work with residents on a suitable alternative, such as the heavy-duty sacks which have already proved popular in parts of Bath.*

*As previously stated, the Council will be engaging with residents to assist them with these changes in the coming months prior to the new system being implemented.*

2. *B&NES already collects the most comprehensive range in the UK. We need to ensure residents use the scheme to the maximum potential. The following recyclables are all collected now.*

- *Garden waste*
- *Food waste*
- *Plastic bottles, pots, tubs and trays (nb: only black plastic can't be recycled as there is no market for this).*
- *Glass*
- *Paper*
- *Cardboard*
- *Aluminium and steel cans*
- *Aerosols*
- *Foil*
- *Tetrapaks*
- *Textiles*
- *Batteries*
- *Small electrical and electronic items*
- *Spectacles/mobile phones/used engine oil.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Are you aware that some of residents' waste and recycling storages are small?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Martin Veal

*Yes, I am aware how small some of them are, and we will be considering the size of every single waste and recycling storage.*



<b>M 10</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Andrew Furse
<p>Could the Cabinet member confirm there are no plans to permanently suspend any of the four crossings on Dorchester Street?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>We will be reviewing improvements to Dorchester Street and the adjacent areas as part of next year's programme or work. There are currently no firm plans to suspend any crossings in this area.</i></p>		
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>		
<p>Are there any plans to suspend any crossing in this area, and is the Cabinet Member confident that pedestrian safety will not be compromised by the permanent suspension of any of the crossings, given that they each serve a natural 'desire line'?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>There are no firm plans but there are plans for us to assess more carefully where the crossing points should be and how they should be managed. When we turned the Dorchester Street crossing lights out, the traffic has improved then there were serious congestions. We are unable to put in smart traffic lights because there are too many crossings.</i></p>		
<b>M 11</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Neil Butters
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Could the Cabinet Member please advise when the 20 mph speed limit in Hinton Charterhouse will be implemented? Also the proposed village entry gates?</li> <li>2. Is the Cabinet Member satisfied that enough is being done to ensure that traffic signs are kept clear of foliage and are visible for motorists, bearing in mind that signs often have safety, as well as information, purposes?</li> <li>3. When will the Real Time Information Indicators, now behind schedule, be installed in Dorchester Street?</li> <li>4. Is the Cabinet Member satisfied with regard to the reliability of the current Real Time Information Indicators, and if not, what pressure is he bringing to bear to improve the situation?</li> <li>5. What progress has been made with regard to looking afresh at the 20A/C bus route, including the possibility of breaking it up, to improve reliability and punctuality?</li> <li>6. What efforts are being made to address the continuing problems with regard to coach parking?</li> <li>7. Does the Council plan to formally adopt the Bath Cycle Network 'Tube' Map, as proposed by Adam Reynolds, given that this seems to have widespread support? If so, how will it be used?</li> <li>8. Is the Cabinet member aware of the joint initiative between the West Midlands Police Traffic Unit and Birmingham City Council cycling traffic officers outlined in this article <a href="https://trafficwmp.wordpress.com/2016/09/09/junction-malfunction-and-a-new-dawn/">https://trafficwmp.wordpress.com/2016/09/09/junction-malfunction-and-a-new-dawn/</a> (sent to him on 21 September by Adam Reynolds)? Does he consider that such an initiative, if replicated in B&amp;NES, could improve safety for cyclists on our roads?</li> </ol>		

9. Will Network Rail's electrification LBAs be brought before the Development Management Committee? If not, is the Cabinet member satisfied that a sufficient overall view re possible harm to the World Heritage Site will be taken by Officers, as well as an individual view with regard to specific structures?
10. Is the Cabinet member satisfied with progress over the past 18 months with regard to easing traffic congestion and also improving air quality in Bath?
11. Recently further repairs to the access road to Wellow Station Road Car Park have been carried out and yet again to a less than satisfactory result. Would Cabinet now consider instructing Parking Services/Property Services and their Contractor NKS to carry out a more permanent repair to this valued asset so as to avoid the Authority having to continually pay for less than appropriate and ineffective on-going maintenance?
12. I understand that the MetroWest Phase1 GRIP 3 Timetable Analysis remit specification only proposes a sensitivity test for "inclusion of call at the proposed Salford Station". Was it an officer or a Cabinet member who made the decision to exclude Salford Station at the outset from the substantial study?
13. Has any Cabinet member contacted GWR and/or Network Rail directly seeking progress of the timetable analysis in relation to Salford?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Anthony Clarke

1. *This scheme is due to be installed within the next month and the village entry gates will be included as part of the works.*
2. *The Highway Maintenance team do try to keep the vegetation cut back as much as possible. The cutting is included in cyclic cutting programme in some cases. When reports are received these are inspected and dealt with as appropriate to maintain highway safety. If you have any particular concerns about specific locations please report them to myself or officers.*
3. *Unfortunately, there have been considerable practical difficulties in getting real time information units installed at the bus stops in Dorchester Street. It will be necessary to dig further trial holes in Dorchester Street to establish how a power supply can be provided and this will inevitably involve some disruption of this very busy road. It was necessary to delay this work until after the North Parade work was completed to avoid making the traffic situation worse and now the Christmas embargo will cause a further delay until January 2017. If the exploratory work is successful, I envisage that displays will be installed in early 2017. I am anxious that this work be completed as soon as possible. In the meantime, real-time predictions are available to smartphones by using the Travelwest Bus Checker app.*
4. *Successful operation of the real-time information system is vital to give bus passengers accurate information on how services are running and to give bus operators data to help manage their operations. The system relies on several processes happening in the background and a problem in any one of these can affect the output. Faults in the display units themselves are passed on to our contractor to follow up and there is a financial incentive for the contractor to rectify faults promptly. The contractor has been challenged to address the faults reported over the past few months. Bus operators are responsible for ensuring their vehicles are equipped with the necessary*

equipment and that it is working. Some operators have had difficulty in achieving the target of 90% of their vehicles “tracking” and they are being encouraged to improve their performance. Procurement of a new real-time information contract to succeed the current one is being carried out by Bristol City Council on behalf of the four West of England councils. The opportunity will be taken to learn from the operation of the current contract in formulating the new one and I have asked officers to give a high priority to improving the overall performance of the system under the new contract

5. The process of review of the 20A/C service is now planned for later next year. Although we have a lot of the data required there are still some outstanding elements we need to review in greater depth, and with the notice requirements for the contract we are not in position to develop alternatives for April 2017 as was originally planned. The need to improve punctuality is accepted unfortunately service 20A/C has been seriously affected recently by the construction work at the Mulberry Park access roundabout in Combe Down and the temporary closure of North Parade with its knock-on effects on Manvers Street and Dorchester Street.

6. The Council recognises the role coaches play in helping reduce the number of individual cars entering the city. The council is currently developing a long term plan for coaches in the city and this will be completed early in 2017 furthermore a comprehensive review of coach management is underway. In the meantime, as the new road layout at Corn Street crosses the old coach park the remaining coach spaces operate on a pick up and drop off basis, with longer stay parking available at Weston Island. The Council has entered into an agreement with First Bus to provide daytime parking at the Weston Island facility due to the availability of the site, facilities available and its capacity, in addition return travel back into the city centre is provided by First Bus for the driver free of charge whilst the coach strategy assesses the options available.

The Council’s Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) continue to monitor and record, with photographic evidence wherever available, instances where coaches are identified as parking in contravention of parking restrictions or inappropriately on the highway. Where they are in contravention a Penalty Charge Notice (PCN ) is issued. Where they are not a letter is sent to the operator outlining their responsibilities as a responsible coach operator. To date there have been 115 instances recorded and each of these results in correspondence, with evidence, to the operator bringing the drivers actions to their attention. This is also copied directly to the Traffic Commissioner for the West of England who has the authority to take action against licenced Public Service Vehicle (PSV) operators.

7. We have our own cycle maps which provide a good level of information for cyclists to navigate around Bath and North East Somerset, though I am always happy to consider new proposals and how we could make members of the public more aware of the availability of these maps.

8. I am aware of this initiative. However, it is one of many that have been suggested to me. It is for that reason that I am supporting the formation of B&NES Cycling, Walking and Accessibility Forum to advise me and my officers of locally applicable initiatives that are worthy of introduction.

9. All Network Rail applications will be dealt with following the Council's adopted scheme of delegation. Officers will assess any proposals in the context of the World Heritage Site as well as in relation to the impact on specific structures. Officers are working closely with Network Rail in the development of their proposals with a view to safeguarding the World Heritage Site and the specific structures affected. Cllr Warren and I have regular meetings with Network Rail and GWR and have used these opportunities to emphasize the heritage issues, and not least by reminding them that the Railway is an integral part of the heritage of Bath & North East Somerset

10. Both traffic congestion and air quality continue to be real challenges within Bath. There are no overnight solutions, but to address this issue we must continue to implement and update the plans set out in the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy, including investment in our transport infrastructure to reduce the number of cars entering the city and support for initiatives that encourage greater user of sustainable transport modes such as walking and cycling, whilst also looking for ways to improve the flow of traffic around the city.

At the same time, we will look to the additional powers and influence that could be available through the Devolution agreement with Central Government to press for powers to address these problems, such as Clean Air Zones.

11. (An answer from Cllr Charles Gerrish) Surveyors will attend site to re-assess the surface of the car park. In the event the Surveyors consider that the previous works have been undertaken to a less than satisfactory standard then we will seek a remedy from the Contractor. However, if it is the view that the site is in need of complete resurfacing then consideration will be given as to whether the nature of the deterioration is such that the work warrants introducing into this year's capital programme. Otherwise, the capital planned maintenance programme is prioritised by way of condition and priority status and given its budget is limited the resurfacing work will be considered against all other Council assets within that programme on the basis of priority. In the meantime however Property & Project Delivery will ensure the car park is maintained in a condition that keeps it fit for purpose (an answer from Cllr Charles Gerrish).

12. This was an officer decision taken at the MetroWest Phase 1 project board. I and the Leader have met with both GWR and the Saltford Parish Council to understand the technical challenges with this work. It is very frustrating that it is still not clear that a timetable is possible that would support a new station at Saltford. This difficulty has been discussed with the Parish Council on a number of occasions. A new station to serve the communities in and around Saltford is included within the Joint Transport Vision published by the West of England; this is something for which I have personally argued.

13. As noted above I regularly meet with GWR and at the last six or so occasions I have specifically requested that time-tabling work should be undertaken. Officers have also requested the information.

**Supplementary Question:**

Is the Cabinet Member satisfied that the Christmas Market will not see a repeat of the gridlock that plagued Bath in October?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<i>There are significant mitigation plans to assist with coach parking over the Christmas Market period, including additional parking outside the city.</i>	
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>	
In the WoE paperwork the precise location of the Salford station appears to be drawn in west of current location. Was that an error?	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<i>The present position is that we don't have the timetable set yet. Until we get that information we will not devote officers' time to this matter. We don't feel it would be justified to take this project further on before we receive more information from the train industry.</i>	
<b>M 12</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Ian Gilchrist
Is Cllr Clarke aware of the difficulty that emergency vehicles can have getting through the Rossiter Rd lights especially at peak times, and have any solutions been considered? I refer to an email recently received from one of my residents (a retired doctor) in Widcombe, "We notice emergency vehicles are experiencing difficulties getting through traffic along Rossiter Road. I am suggesting a very simple solution involving traffic lights. I have explained this suggestion to the Ambulance team and driven round in an ambulance car. The staff say the suggestion is a good one."	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<i>It is important that drivers react in a sensible manner and when safe to do so give emergency vehicles safe right of passage, as most do. I would be happy to ask officers to investigate any particular incidents and would encourage any suggestions such as these to be passed on for further consideration.</i>	
<b>M 13</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Caroline Roberts
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the Cabinet member aware of the concerns over speeding traffic on Kelston Road? Residents and Oldfield School report many near misses due to speeding traffic. Will he commit to introducing measures to lower traffic speeds on this road before a pedestrian is hit and seriously injured or killed?</li> <li>2. Could the Cabinet member please give an update on and timetable for the review of 20 mph speed limits in residential areas and the introduction of speed reduction measures, where required?</li> <li>3. Will the Cabinet member reconsider the decision he made at the beginning of this administration to cancel the consultation on residents parking in Newbridge? Will he give local residents the opportunity to consider this option?</li> </ol>	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Anthony Clarke

1. *The Road Safety Engineers monitor our roads and data frequently to ensure that they are as safe as possible and to prioritise schemes that need to be implemented. I and officers would be happy to discuss the concerns raised by Cllr Roberts and undertake a site visit with her.*

2. *I will consider reviewing within the next financial year.*

3. *The Council is shortly due to commence a comprehensive review of parking throughout the Authority. Following this I will be in a better position to see how Residents' Parking Zones should be administered. I would like to remind Cllr Roberts that I did not cancel the consultation, but came to a decision based on the outcome of consultation. We also spoke at the time, where I said that I might consider more modest schemes if support among the community could be demonstrated, and this position has not changed.*

<b>M 14</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Steve Hedges
-------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

1. What communications has the Cabinet member had with Cabot Learning Federation with regard to Bath Community Academy?
2. What steps has he taken to ensure the continuity of education for pupils of Bath Community Academy?
3. If in the end Bath Community Academy is forced to close, against the wishes of children, parents and the local community, can he assure me that the site will be retained for educational use?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Michael Evans
---------------------	--------------------------

1. *Discussions with Cabot Learning Federation have been with the Strategic Director for People and Communities and senior Children's Service staff. As Cabinet Member I have been full apprised of these discussions. The issue here is that the Council has no formal role in decisions about BCA, my Officers have sought to offer support to CLF and BCA through this process. My Officers are in touch with all agencies and I anticipate that I will meet with both CLF and the Regional Schools Commissioner in due course.*

2. *The Council has met with Cabot Learning Federation and the Regional Schools Commissioner's staff on a number of occasions to understand the circumstances in place from their perspective. We have provided advice and information including demand for future places and population growth, the place-planning impact of planned housing development, the operation of admissions within the Greater Bath Consortium area, the level of vacancies across secondary schools within the GBC area, the potential options for the transfer of students if a decision is reached to close BCA as initially proposed by CLF.*

*With the agreement of colleagues within CLF, Officers have also undertaken liaison with the other secondary schools within the GBC and supported direct discussions between CLF and these other schools about the situation and options so that local children are provided for in local schools.*

*The Council has supported direct work in BCA on attendance and absence management and has a range of services that can be deployed to support students*

at the request of CLF. We also provide services for students with SEND and those who require alternative provision and would work to ensure that all vulnerable students are well supported in any transitions which result from the decisions of the Regional Schools Commissioner.

3. *If a decision to close BCA is taken the Council will do everything it can to support students and the school in managing this change to minimise disruption to learning. I recognise that a closure would represent a significant loss to the community and you have my commitment that the Council would work with the RSC, CLF and other local partners to explore other educational uses for the site recognising that it also contains leisure provision and is adjacent to primary health care facilities. My Officers have clearly communicated this commitment to all partners; however, it is important to state that decisions on school provision are now made by the RSC and Department for Education.*

<b>M 15</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Dine Romero
-------------	-----------------------	------------------------

1. Could the Cabinet member confirm how many staff are employed by the West of England Partnership and Local Enterprise Partnership?
2. Is it correct that B&NES administers the payroll etc. for the WEP and LEP?
3. What mechanism is used for the four West of England Councils to share these costs?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Charles Gerrish
---------------------	----------------------------

1. *There are currently a total of 24 staff employed on behalf of the West of England Office and Local Enterprise Partnership. This includes 8 staff directly related to B&NES Council's roll as Accountable Body who are wholly externally funded.*
2. *B&NES acts as lead employer for all WoE Staff and as such all staff are on the B&NES payroll. All related costs and overheads are fully charged to the WoE budget.*
3. *A WoE budget is agreed before the beginning of each Financial Year and approved at a meeting of the LEP Executive. This includes the level of forecast contribution requested from each of the four WoE authorities which is then invoiced by B&NES. The contributions are based upon 25% for each WoE authority and in 2016/17 this amounts to £149,800 each. The majority of costs are funded by specific Government grant and grant recharges.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Will this group of staff be forming the core of the forthcoming combined authority force?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Charles Gerrish
---------------------	----------------------------

*To the best of my knowledge there is no intention to employ additional staff, so I assume that the current staff structure will remain.*

**Supplementary Question:**

What mechanism will be used by the combined authorities to share these costs?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Charles Gerrish

*The current level of funding is set out as per my answer. The document refers to future contribution from each authority based on population.*

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

**P 01**

**Question from:**

Keynsham, Saltford, and Farmborough Liberal Democrat branch

1. The Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study 2006 concluded that a by-pass at Saltford would have no strategic benefit and create additional traffic in Bath. What has changed since 2006 for your administration to include a by-pass at Saltford in the West of England Partnership's emerging Joint Spatial Plan and Transport Study?
2. The land south of Broadmead roundabout, Keynsham, has been earmarked for strategic housing development in B&NES Core Strategy. Is a necessary consequence of this that the route of any future southern Saltford by-pass would pass nearer Copse Road, Grange Road and Manor Road (lane) in Saltford?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Anthony Clarke

1. *A southern orbital bypass for Saltford is identified as one of the ideas in the Emerging Transport Vision, which has been developed through the West of England Joint Transport Study(JTS). This is not a firm proposal, rather it is included for consultation. The present engagement process runs until Friday 16 December 2016, and any stakeholder comments are welcome.*  
*The Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study (GBSTS) said that a Saltford Bypass "... would relieve the congestion from traffic passing through the village but would involve high construction costs due to the terrain through which it would pass. ... the scheme's economic performance does not justify its inclusion in the strategy, although it produces some local relief, the strategic benefits are limited."*  
*The JTS is suggesting that a bypass could allow public transport improvements through the village, as well as providing an improved link between Bath and Bristol. As well as further housing growth in Keynsham, Bath and Bristol over the past decade, other factors will have changed over the last 10 years, not least air quality*



*within the village, which rightly suggests we should revisit this issue in this strategy*

2. *The precise route of a Salford Bypass would need to be considered in a detailed study in the event of this aspect of the strategy being brought forward, and this sort of speculation about the exact route suggested by the question would not be responsible.*

**P 02**

**Question from:**

Andrew Mercer

The Bathampton Meadows Alliance film, 'Becoming a Ghost Town' shows that Odd Down park and ride is so underused that 6ft tall bushes are growing from some of the parking bays.

Please give the total cost of expanding Odd Down by 230 spaces in 2012?

Please give the total cost of the expansion of Newbridge, by 248 spaces, in 2013 and Lansdown by 400 spaces, in 2015?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Tim Warren

<i>Location</i>	<i>New spaces</i>	<i>Cost (with 20% design and management fees)</i>
<i>Odd Down</i>	<i>230</i>	<i>£1,000,713.60</i>
<i>Lansdown</i>	<i>390</i>	<i>£1,277,290.80</i>
<i>Newbridge</i>	<i>250</i>	<i>£2,122,912.80</i>

*This does not reflect the original cost of building the existing P&R sites.*

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Christine Boyd Statement to cabinet 14.11.2016**

Last year I decided to take a look at how a council could have possibly got to position where it believed a huge park and ride was the answer to its transport problems.

The trail quite quickly led me back to the 2014 transport strategy, but when I tried to get back further the evidence dried up.

What I found was that the transport strategy itself had not been well evidenced, and quite worryingly it relied upon a hypothetical assumption that the take up of P&R could be doubled, but without any indication of how that could be achieved.

This was then compounded by an unsupported belief that P&R did actually work and would take cars off the road at the right time of day, when congestion is at its worst. But it is now known that take up of P&R occurs mainly in the middle of the day and that commuters don't use P&R.

It actually shook my belief system when I realised that the assumptions fed into the model were unsupported – they had been made up.

I had reached the uncomfortable conclusion that you had inherited a Transport Strategy from the last administration that could never work.

This is not, by the way, a criticism of any Councillor; you did not have the information that is available today when you adopted the Strategy in 2014. But now you do!

Few people were ready to listen to this a year ago, but now the city is stalling, despite the fact that additional P&R has been provided.

The assumptions that were used to support the Transport Strategy have resulted in an oversupply of P&R spaces that no one wants to use. And even if they did, it is now known that this would do very little to help congestion.

This is the uncomfortable truth. I am appealing to you now to review your strategy before it is too late.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Andrew Mercer Statement to Cabinet 14.11.2016 (presented by Christine Boyd)**

### **Willful Blindness: Why we ignore the obvious at our peril**

Last week Andrew Mercer promised to give you a book; *Willful Blindness: Why we ignore the obvious at our peril*, by Bath author, Margaret Heffernan.

Willful blindness is where a person seeks to avoid liability for a wrongful act by intentionally keeping himself unaware of the facts. Is this going on in Bath?

The evidence you thought you had to support a park and ride to the east has evaporated with the publication of new reports for the planning inspector.

A large park and ride can no longer be justified

And yet you ignore these facts and carry on with a plan that is irrational and therefore potentially unlawful.

You risk a planning application being refused by your own planning committee, or else certain judicial review.

You end up in a place where the Enterprise Area is at risk, because development on this scale must be supported by a credible transport plan and you have not sought an alternative to P&R

And finally you risk your administration being marred by failure and the pendulum of control swinging back to the Liberal Democrats, as has happened at every other election since BANES was created.

You promised to stop Bath stalling; but now the evidence shows that P&R won't solve the congestion problem.

Are you going to continue with the unworkable Transport Strategy; or are you going to keep your word and demand officers find a viable alternative?

The clock is ticking. You don't have a policy or a site and so can't make a Cabinet decision this year. It will then take three to four months to get a planning decision and at least six months before a judicial review can be heard. It may be 2018 before you have the answer – and by that time it will be too late to find an alternative plan if it all goes wrong.

Why risk a park and ride plan failing again, when you could break the mold and go for something that is achievable and effective?

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Annie Kilvington's Speech to B&NES Cabinet**

**14 November 2016**

"What can I possibly say?" said I to my family over Sunday Roast last night. "...that I haven't said already, and that will make people stop and think?" My 15 year old son suggested a 3 minute "No P & R Bro" rap but I decided instead to call my sister Meg in Christchurch New Zealand. Meg has a doctorate in social and environmental policy, and brokering honest, responsible engagement between public body decision takers and other stakeholders is her day job.

Having cursorily ascertained that she and her home were still all the right way up after the latest major earthquake there a few hours earlier, I quickly moved onto *my* problem. "You are depressed" she diagnosed. Tick. "You are depressed because you feel impotent." Tick Tick. "You feel impotent because your council confuses its power to do this thing with its right to do this thing". Pause, while I digest this. My lightbulb moment.

Because this is at the heart of this isn't it. You can do this thing. You can go back to your desks, put the decision on the Forward Plan, convene an urgent Cabinet meeting for 24 December hoping we are all not watching, and vote to develop the Meadows. You could go on and vote to put a consolidation centre there also, and heck, once you've done that, why not just go and infill the remaining gaps between Bathford and Bathwick with housing.

You have the power to take these dreadful decisions. But neither the facts or the law countenance them, and you don't have the right to take them because as custodians of one of the World's greatest cities, you have a duty to preserve and enhance it for those of us lucky enough to live here today, and for those many millions who will follow us.

The law affords the Meadows the highest possible protection and development of the green belt setting must be refused unless it can be clearly and convincingly established that the harm of the destruction of the Meadows will be outweighed by the public benefit. As you sit here today, the only evidence you have received from your advisors is that no such public benefit exists. Pollution and congestion will be undiminished by this proposal. A wrong choice now will condemn our children and theirs to live with a changed climate, depleted resources and without the green space and biodiversity that contribute both to our standard of living and our quality of life.

Acting as you do as counsel for both the prosecution and defence of this proposal you have to be sceptical. Has the presumption of untouchability of the Green Belt been rebutted by evidence of the highest calibre? Because from the public gallery, your defence counsel appears struck dumb and the prosecution juggernaut proceeds unchallenged. Unless the case for the defence is made as strongly as the case for the prosecution, you cannot hope to discharge your duty to those who follow us.

This page is intentionally left blank



Jack Latkovic senior democratic services officer BaNES council

Jo Morrison BaNES.

THE FUTURE OF BATH COMMUNITY ACADEMY.  
Speaker Ms Joanne Hargreaves, parent from BCA. 10.11.16

An effective system operates and is well established at BCA. The school situated on the South West side of Bath is a requirement for the surrounding community. If BCA is condemned for closure, this could be seen as an unjust act that will effect the already over populated schools in this city.

Housing estates in the area are being built and future families will need a school close to their homes. Schools in Bath are under pressure. Teachers are becoming less able to manage over sized classrooms and individual needs.

BCA took direct action this year, to ban the use of mobile phones, which has already limited bullying, via text, face book and other online outlets. BCA staff operate to a high standard and provide a valuable education. A BCA pupil who was rewarded for 100 per cent attendance last year, said to me yesterday, Einstein quoted 'Creativity is intelligence having fun'. Our phoenix project's give us our own choices, allowing students to learn having fun. It is adding experience and the actual doing, that makes our learning grow.

Ofsted took the decision to close BCA on the 26 per cent exam results of 2015. This years exam results 2016, show a significant climb to 56 per cent.

The children show a progressive attitude toward attendance and have the same goals for the academic year 2016-17, even with the unjust pressure of closure, which was presented to them as an unrewarding, disappointing thought right at the beginning of the summer holiday, where pupils and staff should have been able to relax and reflect upon their rising achievements.

The whole community has faced unsavoury remarks, turmoil, and exclusion by the system to de-value its existence. The true experience of BCA has been completely overlooked and this has disrupted the stability of our children's well being.

The special needs section and child protection both function at an outstanding level, reducing anxiety, to ensure its best individual care. It is evident that BCA has its area's of deprivation and anti-social behaviour, like any other school, but this is strongly assisted by the school and the adult community who work together, to prevent problems, wherever possible.

This reduces health and safety risks and the area needs its familiar devotion of staff and families to help control and maintain it to our best ability.

Society has its dynamics, not everyone will fill the expected mould or fashion... So can we please think again as a city that works together for a meaningful and worthwhile cause that benefits the futures of the school children of Bath?

Thank you Jo Hargreaves.

This page is intentionally left blank

My name is Duncan Hounsell. I have been arguing against the idea of a local Saltford bypass for many years. In the Conservative party leaflet "Saltford Matters – Transport Special" issued last year, Ward councillor Francine Haeberling writes "Conservatives will ensure that the possibility of a Saltford bypass is within the West of England's long term transport plans." A southern bypass hugging Saltford to the south is now included in the emerging West of England Partnership's Joint Spatial Plan and Transport Vision.

We know that the land south of the Broadmead roundabout, Keynsham, is earmarked for development as part of the Core Strategy and a planning application from MackTaggart and Mickel Homes for 250 dwellings is being processed. Adjacent land is safeguarded for future housing development. Next to that land there is the distributor gas pipeline that crosses the A4. All that means that any local Saltford bypass inevitably has to pass close to Grange Road and Copse Road. If the bypass idea is included in the Joint Spatial Plan that decision will produce "planning blight" for a generation in Grange Road, Montague Road, Manor Road and other roads even if the bypass is never eventually built .

As well as passing through green belt, a southern Saltford bypass would inevitably lead to housing infill including at Manor Road where local Conservatives opposed the recent Crest-Nicholson planning application which was eventually stopped only by the intervention of a Conservative secretary of state. Lack of passing trade will kill the businesses and shops on Bath Road in Saltford

The Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study 2006 concluded that a Saltford bypass did not provide **strategic** benefits, would cost £90 million pounds in today's money, and create additional traffic in Bath. Yet here we are again. This time, the proposal goes with the idea of a Light Rapid Transport scheme (bus then tram) running along the Bath Road through Saltford. What is the point of that when it would run parallel to Brunel's wonderful railway and the awaited MetroWest half-hourly commuter trains? We have the X39 bus already. Instead, why not a tramway on the Midland Railway Path shared with the cyclists?

A Saltford bypass is nowhere near as popular as claimed by Cllr Haeberling and certainly not when a route is given. The independent and elected Saltford Parish Council has voted unanimously against this local bypass. B&NES traffic counts show that the volume of traffic on the A4 through Saltford is now 7% below the peak in 2002.

Cllr Charles Gerrish said that he had reservations about the proposals for Saltford at your last Cabinet meeting. Listen to him. Save green belt, save Saltford's thriving local economy, save Saltford. Go back to the officers. Take this bypass out of the draft Joint Spatial Plan and never let it return.

END

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Statement to the 14.11.16 Cabinet meeting of Bath & North East Somerset Council**

Thank you Chair.

My eye was caught by a Single Member decision, due for implementation tomorrow, which under the guise of being “critical” to the Bath Transport Strategy, approves further public money for site-specific investigations of an East of Bath Park and Ride, bringing the total capital spend on the project to over a million pounds and thereby adding to the already considerable risk this project poses to revenue budgets.

However from a policy development perspective, more concerning is the gamble this decision implies with the long-term wellbeing of our locality. I say “gamble” rather than “calculated bet” because nowhere in this decision report (as with those on this subject to last November's Council and to Cabinet in May and July of this year), is there a convincing rationale and evidence on how the potential benefits justify the well-documented costs, risks and uncertainties associated with the provision of additional Park and Ride capacity east of Bath.

Nor is there a demonstration of how the project meets either the 7 objectives agreed in the 2014 Bath Transport Strategy or the 4 overarching strategic priorities laid out in the West of England's Joint Spatial Plan consultation document, let alone a comparison of how the project compares with other potential investments aimed at these priorities and objectives.

The speed and often covert way with which this project has been progressed since last November's highly contentious Council meeting, also raises concerns about the fairness and adequacy of the associated consultative and scrutiny processes. However as there remains a possibility that this yet to be implemented decision might be called-in for further consideration, suffice it to say, that I hope that on this occasion the scrutiny process will facilitate open and rigorous consideration of the full range of issues and perspectives relevant to an infrastructure investment shaping the economic and environmental wellbeing of our communities for decades to come.

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



This page is intentionally left blank

## **Statement from SWTN on public transport cuts, budgets and devolution - Bristol City Council, BANES and South Gloucestershire Councils meetings on Devolution in November 2016**

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.

Any powers should allow for any new tram/light rail routes in Greater Bristol and Bath, transport interchanges, control of bus stations, one brand for bus and rail services and powers under Section 21 of the proposed 2017 Transport Act to operate buses similar to what BANES does now with full consultation on budgets.

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