

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

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

Wednesday, 1st February, 2017

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

67 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

68 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Senior Democratic Services Officer drew attention to the evacuation procedure as set out in the Agenda.

69 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

70 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Paul Myers and Michael Evans declared an Other interest in agenda item 'Budget and Council Tax 2017/18 and Financial Outlook 2017/18 to 2019/20' as they were members of the Midsomer Norton Town Council.

71 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

72 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 24 questions from Councillors and 1 question 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.]

73 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

Kathleen Hovland presented a petition to the Cabinet asking the Council, and their contractors, to ensure the status of the swimming pool as a competitive, as well as a community pool by providing an ASA (Amateur Swimming Association) compliant 8 lane width pool with gallery extension. Kathleen Hovland also read out the statement in support of the petition (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*).

Pat Mason read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where she expressed her concerns on the withdrawal of the subsidy for the 6/7 Bus Route.

Rosemary Naish (Chair of Clutton Parish Council) read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where she expressed her concerns about the safety of the access to the Maynard Terrace.

Councillor Karen Warrington (Clutton Ward Councillor) also expressed her concerns about the safety of the access to the Maynard Terrace and asked the Cabinet to work with developers on this matter.

David Redgewell read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where he expressed his concern over potential loss of bus services.

Sue Porter addressed the Cabinet on behalf of 31 residents from Lyncombe Vale Rd and Rosemount Lane in Widcombe. The residents expressed their concerns on the traffic in these roads, in particular to free parking which had created serious road safety issues. Sue Porter also said that residents had asked the Council in 2006 to register this as Residents Parking Zone (RPZ) but that no resolution had happened so far.

Nicholas Beach addressed the Cabinet with the continual problems that residents of Perrymead in Widcombe had suffered from the free parking, and asked the Cabinet to introduce RPZs in that area.

Councillor Ian Gilchrist (Widcombe Ward Councillor) addressed the Cabinet by supporting the residents who expressed their concerns on traffic and parking related issues in Widcombe Ward. Councillor Gilchrist said that residents had been waiting for 10 years for the Council to implement some measures in terms of the RPZs, and

that had not happened yet. Councillor Gilchrist concluded his statement by asking the Cabinet to consider Widcombe residents requests for the RPZs when setting up the budget.

Councillors Karen Walker and Sarah Bevan (Peasedown St John Ward Councillors) read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) with the Peasedown St John residents' 'wish list' for the forthcoming Council budget.

Councillor Dine Romero read out a statement on behalf of Councillor Alison Millar. Councillor Alison Millar said that she had received many representations from the residents living East of Bath since the Cabinet made their decision on the Park and Ride East of Bath. Most of the people were amazed that the Cabinet went ahead with the decision which would 'blight' Meadows. Councillor Alison Millar also said in her statement that 13 opposition Councillors had signed the Call In on Cabinet's decision from 25th January. Councillor Dine Romero concluded the statement from Councillor Alison Millar by saying that some had said that there was poor evidence from the Council on the need for Park and Ride East of Bath.

Councillor Dine Romero asked an ad hoc question - what was the total cost of the Park and Ride project.

74 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 14th November 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

75 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

76 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

The Chair invited Councillor Sarah Bevan, as Resources PDS Chair, to address the Cabinet.

The Chair informed the meeting that the Cabinet had received a copy of draft minutes of the last Resources PDS meeting along with the summary of findings from other PDS Panels.

Councillor Sarah Bevan read out the following statement to the Cabinet:

'At Resources PDS panel on Monday 30th January we discussed the proposed budget after receiving an overview from Tim Richens and Andrew Pate.

No decisions or resolutions were passed, but members did raise some queries and views, as Cllr Gerrish will recall.

As you will all be aware, in the case of critical views raised by members, the PDS panel, whilst listening to and addressing those views with officers, awaits any party political points from the relevant political groups to be raised by their own groups, with Cabinet and at Full Council.

So I'm presenting the following comments as the view of the panel as a whole:

The panel were interested in how the new business rates retention scheme might work. They noted the benefits from being in the pilot for the next two years but wondered if those benefits would continue beyond that. The panel understood that as the method of funding local government - with full business rates retention - has not yet been agreed meaning it's difficult to say. So this adds to the risks towards the end of the three year plan.

Business rates appeals is another risk that was noted. This is now a local risk not a government risk.

The fact that this Council does not get recompensed for the costs of the city hosting an increasing number of students has been highlighted by the panel before - and is an issue for future funding systems. It was noted that this has recently been fed back to government for consideration by the leader of the Council as well as in response to routine consultations.

Although the panel had a number of questions no changes were proposed. As in previous years there were requests for more information including about libraries. It was noted that each PDS panel may want to use the budget as a reference when developing their own workplans.

On libraries it was noted that consultation is taking place starting with Bath for which materials have been posted on the web site, or will be, later today I'm told.

The panel also looked at the notes from the Community Area Forums and the other PDS panels. It supported the idea of the Forums receiving the notes which summarise the answers to the questions they raised and receiving further feedback. Better attendance at their future meetings with wider public engagement was also encouraged.

An equalities analysis was noted and the importance of this understood. The analysis highlighted a number of areas for concern but the work to minimise impacts was well received. On social care it was also noted that there wasn't a cut in funding but that the 2% proposed precept would not come close to covering the demand pressures arising from the changes in the local population.

The minutes of the panel have been published if you would like further information.

Finally I'd like to thank the Cabinet member Charles Gerrish for regularly attending the panel and answering our questions and also the officers for the work they have done.'

77 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

78 REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING, CASH LIMITS AND VIREMENTS – APRIL TO DECEMBER 2016

Councillor Charles Gerrish introduced the report by saying that this report had presented the financial monitoring information for the Authority as a whole for the financial year 2016/17 to the end of December 2016. The report outlined the Council's current financial position for the 2016/17 financial year to the end of December 2016 by Cabinet Portfolio. It also shown that the current forecast outturn position was an overspend of £1,039,000 or 0.37% of the gross expenditure budget (excluding Schools). Strategic Directors would need to work towards managing within budget in the current year for their respective service areas, using action plans to achieve this, including not committing any unnecessary expenditure and stringent budgetary control.

The forecast outturn position 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.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Michael Evans seconded the motion by highlighting pressures within his Cabinet portfolio (Children Services) with forecast of £1,488,000 overspend, which was due to a number of pressures.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed:

1. Strategic Directors need to work towards managing within budget in the current year for their respective service areas, using action plans to achieve this, including not committing any unnecessary expenditure and stringent budgetary control.
2. This year's revenue budget position as shown in Appendix 2 is noted.
3. The capital expenditure position for the Council in the financial year to the end of September and the year-end projections detailed in Appendix 3 are noted.
4. The revenue virements listed for approval in Appendix 4(i) are agreed, and those listed for information are noted.
5. The changes in the capital programme listed in Appendix 5(i) are noted.

79 BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2017/18 AND FINANCIAL OUTLOOK 2017/18 TO 2019/20

Vishaka Robinson gave a statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) speaking against central library move proposals.

Daniel Carey gave a statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) expressing his concern on the consultation for the central library move proposals.

Mary English gave a statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) speaking against central library move proposals.

Dionne Pemberton gave a statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) speaking against central library move proposals.

Paul Stansall addressed the Cabinet by saying that Lewis House, as proposed new venue for the library, was not the right use class in planning terms for that purpose. Paul Stansall also expressed his concerns in terms of the health and safety of the Lewis House, in particular that escape stairs contravene building regulations.

Luke John Emmett addressed the Cabinet by saying that cultural organisations (i.e. Bath University) would be affected with any arts cuts, which would be detrimental to the area. The cuts in arts would also create negative impact on the economy. Luke John Emmett also said that £1 invested in arts returns between £2 - £7 of income.

Jacob Bishop-Ponte addressed the Cabinet by expressing his concerns on cuts in youth services. Jacob Bishop-Ponte believed that youth services would disappear in near future because of those cuts and that responsibility put on Town Councils was not reasonable. Jacob Bishop-Ponte concluded his statement by saying that the budget had let down young people.

Councillor Andrew Furse asked how £5.9m of spent on libraries would create £800k of savings. Councillor Andrew Furse also said that the budget cuts would have an impact on young and vulnerable people, that cuts to arts would be significant and that there would be a shift in frontline services.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson gave a statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) speaking against the budget cuts.

Councillor Joe Rayment said that to him it looked like that the Cabinet had not had meaningful consultation with the public about the budget, and that the budget had been set at the last minute.

Councillor Dine Romero expressed her concerns that the budget would create long term adverse impact on youth service, and that it would affect young and most vulnerable residents. Councillor Dine Romero also said that would have to pay more for services from the Council and that there would be expensive consequences to these cuts.

Councillor Paul May said that the administration care about services for residents. The whole budget process had been quite stressful due to the level of cuts in funding from the central government. Councillor Paul May thanked everyone involved in the process.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that answers to comments from Councillor Furse were included in the Q&A sheet for this meeting. Councillor Charles Gerrish also said, in response to comments from Councillor Dine Romero, the Council would continue to provide other than digital access to Council services, although the Council would need to recognise that there was a pressure from the central government for digitalisation.

Councillor Charles Gerrish thanked Councillor Paul May and all officers involved for their support in setting up the budget. Councillor Charles Gerrish also thanked everyone who made their comments on the budget.

Councillor Charles Gerrish introduced the report by saying that this was one of the most challenging budgets ever. Councillor Charles Gerrish welcomed these detailed plans to invest in the area, as part of a balanced budget that would continue to protect essential frontline services and focus on the priorities that matter the most to local people. The Cabinet had taken due regard for equality in its decisions by carrying out equality analysis, as per Equality Impact Assessment. An Equality Analysis on budget proposals had been included in Appendix 6.

The Cabinet set out the following:

- Its medium term financial planning assumptions which set the basis for the draft budget proposal for 2017/18.
- Its draft budget proposal for 2017/18.

The report provided the detail of the second year of the Directorate Plans and recommended revenue and capital budgets for 2017/18, together with capital commitments for future years, and a level of Council Tax for 2017/18.

The budget proposal had been built on the prudent financial management of the Council and had been designed to maintain front line services as far as possible whilst recognising the significant financial challenge facing the public sector. The budget also focussed on delivering important manifesto commitments, growing income and further increasing the efficiency of Council services.

The budget proposals included:

- A net £2.0m or 1.7% decrease in the non-schools budget to £112.796m
- An increase in the DSG estimated at £5.3m with total funding of £128.8m (including academies). The majority of the additional funding relates to the additional resources provided to accommodate increased pupil numbers in our schools, and the changes announced in relation to additional resources for early years to enhance the provision for 2, 3 and 4 year olds. Taking account of this, the overall total represents a cash freeze per pupil compared to the previous year.
- An increase in the Council's level of Council Tax, comprising a 2% Adult Social care precept and a 1.50% general increase in order to help protect frontline services. This excludes Police, Fire and Parish precepts.

Whilst significant savings and additional income generation proposals totalling £14.7m were included in our proposed budget, it was also recommended that Council Tax is increased by 1.5% in 2017/2018 in order to avoid cuts to frontline services. The proposed band D Council Tax for Bath & North East Somerset Council next year is £1,284.33 (£1,240.90 in 2016/2017), an increase of £3.62 per month for a Band D property.

The proposed net revenue budget for Bath & North East Somerset Council next year, 2017/2018, was therefore £112.796m, a net cash decrease of £1.983m on the previous year. This included the impact of significant reductions in government funding amounting to 15.8% (£5.7m) for 2017/2018.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations as printed in the report with the following addition:

- To reduce by £30k the saving from the review of the Dog Warden Service (page 137) in 2017/18.
- To reduce by £50k the savings from the Parks service (page 136), in 2017/18.
- To provide £50k of additional funding to the Catering Service Budget to meet the increasing inflationary costs of food faced by Catering Service.

Councillor Tim Warren seconded the motion. Councillor Tim Warren also thanked everyone who were involved in the budget and everyone who spoke at the meeting today. Despite to unprecedented cuts in funding from the central government, the Cabinet had identified specific investment priorities, as part of the commitment to delivering three core aims, to ensure the Council:

- Is efficient and well run;
- Invests in the future of the area; and
- Puts the interests of residents first

Councillor Tim Warren also said that this budget would help in continuing delivery of key priorities including improving transport, creating homes and jobs, supporting young and older people alike, and investing in cleaner, greener and healthier communities.

The rest of the Cabinet unanimously welcomed the budget by highlighting key aims and priorities within their portfolio, as per report.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to recommend:

1. That the Council approve:
 - a) The General Fund net revenue budget for 2017/18 of £112.796m and the associated Council Tax increase of 1.50% plus a further 2% precept for Adult Social Care, as set out in Appendix 2.
 - b) That no Special Expenses be charged other than Town and Parish Council precepts for 2017/18.
 - c) The adequacy of reserves at Appendix 2 Table 10 with a risk-assessed level of £13.5m.
 - d) The individual service cash limits for 2017/18 summarised at Appendix 2 Table 6 and detailed in Annex 1.
 - e) That the specific arrangements for the governance and release of reserves, including invest to save proposals, be delegated to the Council's Section 151 Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency and the Chief Executive.
2. That the Council include in its Council Tax setting, the precepts set and approved by other bodies including the local precepts of Town Councils,

- Parish Councils and the Charter Trustees of the City of Bath, and those of the Fire and Police Authorities.
3. That the Council notes the Section 151 officer's report on the robustness of the proposed budget and the adequacy of the Council's reserves (Appendix 2, Annex 2) and approves the conditions upon which the recommendations are made as set out throughout Appendix 2.
 4. That in relation to the capital budget the Council:
 - a) approves a capital programme of £56.083m for 2017/18 and notes items for provisional approval in 2017/18 and the programme for 2018/19 to 2021/22 (including invest to earn) as shown at Appendix 2, Annex 3 including the planned sources of funding .
 - b) delegates implementation, subject to consultation where appropriate, of the capital programmes set out in Annex 3i to Annex 3iii to the relevant Strategic Director in Consultation with the appropriate Cabinet Member.
 - c) Approves the CIL allocations as set out in Appendix 2 and the proposed arrangements for agreeing the use of CIL for the unparished area of Bath.
 - d) approves all other delegations as set out in the budget report.
 - e) approves the revised Minimum Revenue Provision Policy as shown at Appendix 2, Annex 4 with the changes to become effective immediately.
 - f) approves the Capital Prudential Indicators as set out in Appendix 2 Table 8.
 5. That the Council agree the Council's proposed pay policy statement as set out in Appendix 5.
 6. Authorise the Council's Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency, to make any necessary changes and presentational improvements to the draft budget proposal for submission to Council.
 7. To reduce by £30k the saving from the review of the Dog Warden Service (page 137) in 2017/18.
 8. To reduce by £50k the savings from the Parks service (page 136), in 2017/18.
 9. To provide £50k of additional funding to the Catering Service Budget to meet the increasing inflationary costs of food faced by Catering Service.

80 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT TO 31ST DECEMBER 2016

Councillor Charles Gerrish introduced the report by saying that this report had given details of performance against the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Plan 2016/17 for the first nine months of 2016/17. Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Tim Warren seconded the motion.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed:

1. The Treasury Management Report to 31st December 2016, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice, is noted
2. The Treasury Management Indicators to 31th December 2016 are noted.

81 TREASURY MANAGEMENT & INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2017/18

Councillor Andrew Furse commented that this was an improvement from previous years.

Councillor Charles introduced the report by saying that this report fulfils the Council's legal obligation under the Local Government Act 2003 to have regard to both the CIPFA Code and the CLG Guidance. The suggested strategy for 2017/18 was based on the Treasury Officers' views on interest rates, supplemented with leading market forecasts provided by the Council's treasury advisor.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Tim Warren seconded the motion.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to:

1. Recommend the actions proposed within the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (Appendix 1).
2. Recommend the Investment Strategy as detailed in Appendix 2.
3. Recommend to February Council for approval that decisions to borrow from the Local Government Association (LGA) Bond Agency, as detailed in Appendix 1, are delegated to the Chief Finance Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency.
4. Note the Treasury Management Indicators detailed in Appendix 1 and delegate authority for updating the indicators prior to approval at Full Council on 14th February 2017 to the Chief Finance Officer and Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency, in light of any changes to the recommended budget as set out in the Budget Report elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting.

The meeting ended at 6.40 pm

Chair _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

CABINET MEETING 1st February 2017

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.

Public –

1. Kathleen Hovland (200 signatures petition regarding Keynsham Leisure Centre facilities)
2. Pat Mason – Save our 6/7 bus
3. Vishaka Robinson – about the planned changes to the library service
4. Sue Porter – about traffic and parking in Widcombe
5. Nicholas Beach - about traffic and parking in Widcombe
6. Dan Carey - about the planned changes to the library service
7. Mary English - about the planned changes to the library service
8. Jacob Bishop-Ponte (Member of Youth Parliament Bath) - about the planned changes to the library service
9. Rosemary Naish – about Road Safety
10. Dionne Pemberton – about the planned changes to library services
11. David Redgewell – about bus services
12. Luke John Emmett - about the proposed arts cuts

Councillors –

1. Cllr Sarah Bevan (as Resources PDS Chair)
2. Cllrs Karen Walker and Sarah Bevan (as Ward Cllrs) - Budget
3. Cllr Ian Gilchrist - about traffic and parking in Widcombe
4. Cllr Andrew Furse – speaking on all 4 items
5. Cllr Robin Moss – Budget
6. Cllr Eleanor Jackson – Budget
7. Cllr Karen Warrington – about Road Safety in Clutton

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor John Bull
<p>Could the Cabinet Member for Transport confirm that the Parking Review planned to lead to savings in the transport budget for 2017/18 will not rule out any possibilities, including imposition of parking charges at BANES car parks which are free at present, such as Midsomer Norton, Radstock and Paulton?</p>		
	Answer from:	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>This administration has a manifesto commitment to maintaining the existing free parking enjoyed at community car parks throughout our area, and we intend on keeping this commitment.</i></p>		
M 02	Question from:	Councillor Lisa Brett
<p>What is the scope of the £200K included in budget papers for changes to the London Road?</p>		
	Answer from:	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>Highway works were undertaken on the London Road in 2015. Experimental TROs were introduced in late 2015 and permanent TROs now need to be implemented. A wide variety of comments have been received from residents and interest groups. These have highlighted a number of issues that will need to be addressed to enable a permanent TRO to be implemented.</i></p>		
M 03	Question from:	Councillor Neil Butters
<p>When can we expect completion of the surface dressing of the Wellow-Peasedown road?</p>		
	Answer from:	Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>We can confirm that there is a Phase 2 of the Wellow Lane maintenance improvement works in the 2017/18 capital programme which is going through final budget approval at the moment. We have not engaged with our Contractor yet but all being well we would hope to have this phase of the scheme completed before the end of the Calendar Year. As and when timings are known there will be advance consultation with local ward members, the parish council and residents.</i></p>		
M 04	Question from:	Councillor Andrew Furse

Residents parking for Lower Weston – west of zone 12 or zone 12 extension westwards to include Audley Close, St Johns Rd and Hungerford Rd. Will the cabinet member introduce an initial consultation in 16/17 budget on whether the council will introduce residents parking in this area for 17/18?		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<i>We are currently awaiting the results from the Parking consultation undertaken at the end of last year, which officers are currently assessing, and no so specific budgetary commitment has been made to particular projects until this has been fully analysed. We have a manifesto commitment to provide Residents' Parking Zones (RPZ) where there is demand and clear support from residents, and so I am happy to consider requests for such schemes and how they could best be progressed in terms of consultation and engagement with residents. There are occasions, however, where alternative measures to manage and improve residential on-street parking may be more appropriate than RPZs and can be worth exploring with residents on a case by case basis. If there are more immediate problems with vehicles parking in such a way that causes an obstruction or presents a safety issue then we can investigate and if appropriate provide yellow line restrictions where necessary, and I suggest contacting Paul Garrod in the Traffic Management Team to discuss this should that be the case.</i>		
M 05	Question from:	Councillor Andrew Furse
Pavement widening opposite Ustinov theatre. This is the section of pavement that should be widened and over the past few years both Cllr Pearce and I have visited and seen the need. I would argue that the displacement of parking bays has already occurred. The design outline has already been undertaken. Will the cabinet member set aside capital to ensure this widening occurs?		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<i>Widening the footway would involve the removal of parking which is a factor that would need to be considered, and whilst these works are not currently proposed in the 2017/18 capital programme I will request a review of the scheme, to include the costs of construction and any traffic regulation orders that maybe required.</i>		
M 06	Question from:	Councillor Andrew Furse
Mini roundabout at the top of Marlborough Buildings and its junction with Julian Rd - will the cabinet ensure a budget line for preliminary design for this traffic improvement and implementation for build is introduced and able to be implemented?		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<i>I recognise that this is a priority project for residents of Kingsmead and as such we are proposing a budget allocation of £70k in the 2017 /18 capital programme to enable this project to be taken forward.</i>		
M 07	Question from:	Councillor Andrew Furse

Weston Road - residents have called for both traffic calming and a safer pedestrian crossing close to King Edwards Prep school and the junction with Weston Lane. Will the cabinet ensure there is capital provision for both design and build in this forthcoming budget?

Answer from:

Councillor Anthony Clarke

There is a scheme in the current Capital Programme linking Weston village with the city centre that will incorporate both traffic calming and junction improvements. All Ward Councillors were sent the proposals and subject to the Traffic Regulations. Orders completing the statutory process, the actual works are likely to start in April/May 2017

M 08

Question from:

Councillor Dine Romero

What is the total area of floor space of Bath Library currently (including all public and staff areas, display areas, family rooms etc.) and what total area of floor space will be available for the proposed new library at Lewis House?

Answer from:

Councillor Martin Veal

This question suggests that the key issue is the size of the library rather than the service and facilities it provides to residents – whether it is fit for the future, has a long term home, is properly integrated with other services such as the Council's multi-agency one stop shops, is using the latest technology or whether it is sustainable in today's world.

We are currently at the beginning of a process that will shortly include public engagement over the proposals for Lewis House, and the amount of space available will be clearly indicated as part of the information we will put on the web, in Bath library and also the Bath One Stop Shop.

The Modern Libraries and Workplaces programme is seeking to achieve a modern approach with better integration of information and services that will enable our library service to be sustainable for the future and meet with changing ways in which people use the library

There is also intended to be plenty of space for books, browsing and study. Alongside this there will be better technology so there can be increased awareness of the 3M books on offer through Libraries West.

In addition, the University of Bath is developing study facilities opposite Lewis House and we are keen to explore opportunities to work together. The same applies to local schools and the college.

In terms of space it is intended that 3 floors of Lewis House will be dedicated to the library and one stop shop.

We could then progress to fully link these new library and one stop shop facilities to the existing contact centre and communication hub, based in the same building, plus the back office facilities for related services (including those provided by partner advice agencies), and thereby start to deliver the full customer benefits that are available.

Given this integration of service, it is difficult to make a full like for like comparison of floor space in the way you suggest.

However, notwithstanding the above, the best comparisons relating to floor space are as follows:

Bath Central Library is currently located in the Podium and consists of space which is

used in a number of traditional ways. Public accessible space which includes:
 General Library and study space (including local history and local study space) of 1512m²
 Exhibition Space of : - 87m²
 Then there is other back office spaces including:-
 Back office storage space of :- 257 m²
 Staff offices and workroom space of:- 325 m²
 Total space of : - 2,181m².
 Lewis House which is the proposed site for the new modern library including One Stop Shop services is made up of 5 floors;
 Each floor has an approximate floor area of 440m²
 The detailed design of the public space for the new service is yet to be finalised, with consultation on designs scheduled to start on imminently. It will be spread over 3 floors giving around 1320m² of public space.
 The 4th floor area of approximately 440m² will be for staff serving across the three floors.
 On the lower ground floor a space of 59m² will be used as work space for receiving and despatching items for the building; with the mobile library having specific access to park at the entrance to this facility.
 The Guildhall Archive Service is planning to merge with local studies and refurbishment to that space is currently ongoing. This will generate an additional 189m² of space for this combined service.
 So, on this basis, which is the best like-for-like comparison we can provide based upon the information you request, there is potentially an 8% reduction in the total space available, albeit the space becomes multi-purpose and improved. The intention is to use better space planning and layouts and work with partners like the University to ensure that the space can if anything be better, better designed and better used.

M 09

Question from:

Councillor Dine Romero

Why have residents in central Bath still not been informed officially that fortnightly residual waste collections will not be implemented for those areas where there are a lot of flats, HMOs and converted heritage buildings?

Answer from:

Councillor Martin Veal

Every household will receive individual letters at the same time as their Council Tax bills detailing their new collection service (whether bins, bags, fortnightly or weekly). This will go out in early-mid March. We will also publish full detail on the website. We are working through the specific detail of which properties will still receive a weekly collection and the type of receptacle they will be given to inform these letters. We will publish as soon as we have finalised the information for everyone.

Supplementary Question:

Exactly which areas will not have fortnightly residual waste collections?

Answer from:

Councillor Martin Veal

I will send you a map of the areas which will still receive a weekly collection.

M 10	Question from:	Councillor John Bull
-------------	-----------------------	----------------------

Can you tell me what plans you have for branch libraries in the event that your "local community solutions" do not develop in the way you currently anticipate?

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

We have started consultation with the local community forums in each of the B&NES Council areas to collect ideas, as well as initial discussions with other stakeholders such as Parish Councils and user groups, and the response so far has been broadly positive and constructive. However, we don't believe there is one model that works everywhere and we believe this will be reflected in the final service model. There are examples of how the community led model has worked well, both within our area and in other local authorities to the benefit of service users. We also have funds available as part of the proposed capital sum allocated in the budget proposal to the Modern Libraries project to allow us to support these changes.

There is one new example that is perhaps further ahead, which is the community led scheme for a new healthy living centre in Radstock; including children's centre, health visitors, teaching kitchen, pharmacy, doctors' surgery, library and information point. This proposal has the potential to benefit from substantial external funding and lower running costs. The local consultation on this will commence in the next few weeks.

This example demonstrates the need to think differently, to maximise the benefits from external funding, integrate services and support local community led solutions. It also highlights the potential benefit from joining the government sponsored One Public Estate programme which is also planned so that external support and funding can assist further.

You will also be aware that the Midsomer Norton library is planned to be relocated into the One Stop Shop at the Hollies and is in that respect intended to be similar to Keynsham where this model already exists and is very successful.

M 11	Question from:	Councillor Lisa Brett
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Will the administration commit to maintaining accessible high quality early years nursery provision for children with special educational needs?

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

The Council is committed to continuing to promote quality and inclusion in all nurseries and early years settings. We deliver an outreach SEND service to support early years settings through a team of qualified SENCO's. We also support settings through Inclusion Funding for 2,3 and 4 year olds with special educational needs. This was championed as best practice in a recent government consultation on early years funding, B&NES has been doing this for some time. On top of this we also award Transition Supporting funding for those children with high needs transferring into reception year at school.

We commission specialist provision at Bath Opportunity Playgroup. Schools Forum has recently approved increases in the budget for both Inclusion Funding and the specialist

provision. The specialist provision has been reviewed and is being re-commissioned for September 2017 and one of the key aims is to increase accessibility beyond Bath.

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

If Parish, Town Councils and community groups show no interest in taking over delivery of Youth Services due to be cut will the Cabinet commit to revisiting this budget saving to ensure services are provided?

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

We are confident that alternative models of provision can be developed, as they already have been in some areas, and interest is already being shown. We have a statutory duty to ensure that positive activities are available for young people and we will fulfil that duty. We expect to engage with young people and local communities as the work progresses and will keep the Children's PDS panel updated.

M 13	Question from:	Councillor Lisa Brett
-------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

If employers show no interest in paying for young adults to have improved employment opportunities will the Cabinet commit to revisiting this budget saving to ensure services are provided?

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

We are confident that alternative funding models can be secured to deliver an ongoing service and continue to ensure support for priority groups of young adults (eg care leavers and those who have faced mental health problems). This can be achieved through the use of developer contributions to targeted recruitment and training, in line with adopted Council policy.

M 14	Question from:	Councillor Liz Hardman
-------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Are you getting a positive response from community organisations to your plans for them to take over the running of some Children's Centre buildings?

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

Yes, we are already in a constructive dialogue with local organisations in respect of a number of the relevant children's centres buildings and will continue to bring updates to the Children's PDS panel as more definite plans evolve and we are able to share further information.

Supplementary Question:

Is there a plan B if very few community organisations come forward, and BANES still have to pay the cost for some of the Children's Centre buildings?

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

There are currently negotiations over Weston Children's Centre which would need to be resolved. The other dialogues look quite secure.

M 15	Question from:	Councillor Liz Hardman
-------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Can you explain what the impact will be of the £500K of cuts you have offered up from the Youth Connect service? What exactly will the statutory service provided by the Council look like once these cuts have been made?

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

The Council's statutory duty is to secure positive leisure-time activities for young people. The description of this specific proposal is about reviewing and exploring options and encouraging and enabling other organisations to play a greater role in delivering those activities. The proposed savings are not expected to begin to be delivered until 2018/19 (and then only a partial saving) so that there is time for the review and exploration to take place to determine the final model. It is therefore not possible to be specific at this stage about the impacts or about what the ongoing Council service will look like. The intention, as stated, is to minimise any impact on outcomes and to continue supporting high-quality youth activities for young people.

Many of the services within my portfolio have a statutory basis and are highly specialist functions. For some, the way in which they are delivered is heavily prescribed. We have considerably more flexibility in the manner in which this particular statutory duty is delivered and there is therefore scope for us to look at working with local communities to enable positive activities for young people to be delivered in a different way, and we will be seeking to engage young people to inform the review process.

Supplementary Question:

I have been informed that there will be no Youth Services workers left by March 2018, and that the work of Youth Services will disappear. What will happen with the pool of highly skilled professional workers if that is the case?

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

There are no proposed actions on the Youth Centres until the next financial year. I do not have information that there would be 100% redundancies.

M 16	Question from:	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
-------------	-----------------------	----------------------------

How are you planning to use the 2% social care precept and what difference will it make to the previously published service plan?

Answer from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard
---------------------	--------------------------

Starting from a net budget for Adult Social Care & Health of £57.9m, we have projected growth pressures of up to £4m for 2017/18 particularly as a result of demographic change and inflationary pressures including the National Living Wage. We believe we

can realistically deliver savings of £2.4m through efficiencies and growth avoidance as set out in the budget papers. This leaves the service with a funding gap of £1.6m. The Adult Social Care precept at 2 per cent will cover this gap and enable us to continue meeting our duties to assess and provide services in line with our existing plans.

Supplementary Question:

You have made a statement to the Guardian on 4th January. Are you suggesting that we will raise the threshold of eligibility for adult social care in order to cut the deficit?

Answer from:

Councillor Vic Pritchard

Our intention is not to cut eligibility. Our intention is to engage in the preventative agenda so people do not have to require the level of care they have in subsequent years.

M 17

Question from:

Councillor Eleanor Jackson

Have the proposed reductions in the budget for adult social care and the assumptions made to justify those assumptions been agreed with and confirmed by providers both in the private and public sectors? Are private residential care owners confident that, under the proposed plans, they can provide a quality service, they have enough space for local authority funded residents and they will remain solvent?

Answer from:

Councillor Vic Pritchard

For the sake of clarity the budget for Adult Social Care is increasing not reducing.

The proposed savings proposals for adult social care have been very carefully considered and take in to account analysis of current activity and associated expenditure, learning and experience from other areas and, also knowledge and understanding of the needs of our local people and communities and their aspirations.

*Proposals have been informed by the extensive engagement with not only the people and communities of B&NES but also with staff and providers delivering health and care services in this area which undertaken as part of the **your care, your way** community services review. Commissioners of adult social care are also currently undertaking a Fair Price of Care exercise with the full engagement of all care home providers. The findings from this exercise will be implemented in a way that balances impact on the care home market and, also, best use of public resource in meeting the social care needs of individuals.*

The proposals do not include a reduction in fees paid to care home providers and, indeed, plans take account of inflationary pressures in the care sector. Rather, proposals focus on:

- Avoiding unnecessary admitting people to residential care or nursing care until and unless they really need to move to a care home setting. There is strong evidence that if people move into a care home before they need to this “over-prescription” can reduce an individual’s confidence and skills and have the unintended consequence of building dependency rather than maintaining*

<i>independence.</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Maximising independence by focusing on individuals' strengths, interests, abilities and networks and investment in preventative support that enables people to live as long as possible in their own homes.</i>• <i>Efficient systems and processes, including to support making payments to care providers in a timely way and in collecting income from contributions from those individuals who have the means to contribute towards the cost of their care in line with national guidance and regulations.</i>• <i>New approaches to commissioning and contracting care services, including incentives to care providers to deliver good quality outcomes.</i>• <i>Effective brokerage of placements and packages of care to achieve improved value, which includes the quality of the service being delivered.</i>		
<i>I can assure Councillor Jackson that the Council is committed to ensuring the continued provision of good quality care services and recognises that a sustainable care sector as well as longer-term financial sustainability for the Council is key to achieving this.</i>		
Supplementary Question:		
Your answer presupposes everyone should look after their own health and wellbeing, and they do not get to the stage of needing adult social care; however for some of us it is too late?		
Answer from:		Councillor Vic Pritchard
<i>That is your interpretation to my answer. We will and have to look after our own health and wellbeing. There is strong evidence that if people move into a care home before they need to, this can reduce an individual's confidence.</i>		
M 18	Question from:	Councillor Dine Romero
Could the Cabinet member please provide a breakdown of the £800k expected savings from the Modern Libraries Review, indicating what proportions relate to: the proposed move of Bath Library; the proposed move of Midsomer Norton Library; proposed changes to other branches; and what proportions relate to [for each location]: reduced staff costs; reduced operational costs; and additional income?		
Answer from:		Councillor Charles Gerrish
<i>The Modern Libraries and Workplaces project is at a relatively early stage and, as I have mentioned in another answer, this is a three year programme that is only just beginning, starting with local consultation.</i>		
<i>This investment will, as far as possible, reflect the feedback whilst also achieving a more sustainable and modern library service.</i>		
<i>At this stage the capital estimates are provisional and only put forward for provisional approval (approval in principle) as it standard practice at the time of the capital programme.</i>		
<i>The £800,000 annual savings target is planned to be delivered by year 3 (2019/20) through developing new ways of working across the whole of Customer Services.</i>		

The savings will be delivered by combining the management, support and staff costs of the services of about £800,000, income generation of around £200,000 through the letting of office space, and it is also anticipated that some further building costs and operating costs will be saved as a result of working with communities and developing community led solutions for local libraries of about £100,000. The changes in ways of working apply to the whole service so it is difficult to apportion them between sites, albeit similar changes have already been successfully made in Keynsham. Note also that these savings are partially offset by the capital financing charge referred to in another of my answers, which is how the final figure of an £800k savings target has been arrived at.

The staff savings are estimated to mean about 25 fewer jobs across both libraries and the remainder of customer services over the 3 year period and to be achieved mainly through staff turnover, thereby keeping redundancies to a minimum.

Supplementary Question:

What other options, if any, have been considered regarding moving the central library?

Answer from:

Councillor Martin Veal

I will reply in 5 clear working days.

M 19

Question from:

Councillor Dine Romero

Could the Cabinet member please provide a breakdown of the £6M capital funding for the Modern Libraries & Workplaces project, indicating what proportion relates to: the proposed move of Bath Library; the proposed move of Midsomer Norton Library; proposed projects involving other libraries and workplaces?

Answer from:

Councillor Charles Gerrish

As with the majority of projects in the draft capital programme, capital figures at this stage are only indicative for provisional approval and will be subject to the Council's formal process of approval early in the new financial year.

Capital costs relating to the project have been estimated as follows but are subject to more detailed property work with the aim that some of the estimates can be reduced:

- £2.2m for the refurbishment of Modern Library facility at Lewis House
- £200k for the re-location of Midsomer Norton Library
- £160k towards Community Library developments
- £2.2m towards workplace requirements (including partners' accommodation for leasing opportunities)
- £1.24m contingency

It should be noted that the revenue savings target in the budget proposals already take account of – and are net of – the cost of servicing this capital investment. In addition, there are a number of external funds that the Council will be able to help community groups to bid for and the One Public Estate programme is an additional potential source of funds to support this project.

M 20

Question from:

Councillor Dine Romero

What is the cost of borrowing the £6M capital for the Modern Libraries & Workplaces project?		
Answer from:		Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>The Council's capital programme is funded through a combination of capital receipts, service-supported borrowing, Section 106 and CIL funding, and other external grant funding. This is also the case with the Modern Libraries and Workplaces programme, where it is anticipated that some of the costs will be funded through planned capital receipts and potentially some S106 funds to support community library opportunities. The revenue cost of servicing the remaining capital investment may be in the region of £300,000, but this is already taken account of within the savings target and as this is currently an item for provisional approval the aim will be to reduce capital costs further as more detailed estimates are developed.</i></p>		
M 21	Question from:	Councillor Robin Moss
At last year's budget-setting meeting it was implied that there was still work to be done on the detail of the budget. Can I ask the Cabinet Member whether ultimately the business cases for delivery of the 2016-17 budget confirmed the assumptions made at the time?		
Answer from:		Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>Agenda item 12. "Revenue & Capital Budget Monitoring, Cash Limits and Virements – April to December 2016" also on the agenda for Cabinet provides an update on the delivery of the Council Budget for 2016/17 up to December 2016. The Council is making good progress in delivering upon the vast majority of the savings and income targets set at the time of the budget, including the further Management & Service Review savings which were required. The budget outturn report will be presented to Cabinet in the usual way after the end of the financial year.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
Can we see copies of subjects to the business cases, as those would give details on potential budget cuts and impact on the budget?		
Answer from:		Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>If your question is referring to year 2016/17 then all that information is available from our officers. If your question is about capital items, which are provisional and yet to be approved, the business case will come forward when these items are ready for approval.</i></p>		
M 22	Question from:	Councillor Robin Moss
What consultation have you undertaken to establish the level of support in our communities for your proposed level of increase in Council Tax?		

Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>Over the past two months the Council has undertaken the usual process of engagement over its budget plans, including 5 budget briefing and discussion sessions with the Area Forums, as well as feedback on the Service Plans at the public PD&S Panel meetings, including the full budget proposal at the Resources PD&S. The majority of feedback at the forum meetings related to the need to protect priority services as far as possible and to continue investing in projects that have a community or economic benefit to our area and which could provide future income for the Council.</i></p> <p><i>The level of Council Tax proposed will therefore allow the Council to deliver a balanced budget whilst at the same time protecting the majority of front-line services, including increased spend on adult care, whilst continuing to invest in important local priorities such as transport, economic growth and affordable housing.</i></p> <p><i>At the same time, with inflation predicted to rise over the course of this year as the lower value of the pound feeds through to the wider economy, we believe it is important to keep the level Council Tax charged to our residents as low as possible.</i></p> <p><i>Despite the very challenging budget circumstances we are faced with, current indications suggests that the Council Tax rise we are proposing is likely to be one of the lowest in the region and among the lowest in the country. The highest rise we are aware of currently proposed in the West of England is in Bristol, where the Mayor is proposing a total rise of 4.99%.</i></p>	
Supplementary Question:	
How can you have a consultation exercise and then follow it with budget proposals, which include a Council Tax increase, and not give time to people to comment on these?	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<i>We have not changed the process around consultation.</i>	
M 23	Question from: Councillor Joe Rayment
Do you propose to release full information about the impact of last year's budget savings in advance of the Council's 2017-18 budget-setting meeting?	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>Agenda item 12. "Revenue & Capital Budget Monitoring, Cash Limits and Virements – April to December 2016" also on the agenda for Cabinet provides an update on the delivery of the Council Budget for 2016/17 up to December 2016. The Council is making good progress in delivering upon the vast majority of the savings and income targets set at the time of the budget, despite some specific challenges and in-year</i></p>	

pressures in certain areas such as Children's Services. The budget outturn report will be presented to Cabinet in the usual way after the end of the financial year.

Supplementary Question:

Is this information available to Members of the Council before the budget meeting?

Answer from:

Councillor Charles Gerrish

The additional funding provided for the welfare fund was not required. Also, I was informed that there was a reduction in the number of claims under Council Tax benefit relief.

M 24

Question from:

Councillor Joe Rayment

What representations have you made to the Government about the speed and scale of reductions in Government funding at a time when the Council faces increasingly complex challenges in meeting the needs of a growing number of vulnerable and older people needing social care support?

Answer from:

Councillor Tim Warren

The Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency and I met with Ministers last year about the speed and scale of reductions in funding and this produced £1.8m of extra funding across 2016-17 and 2017-18 for this Council. Through the LGA we continue to lobby Government which has led to extra one-off funding for Adult Social Care in 2017-18 as well as the ability to levy an additional ring-fenced precept for Adult Care to support these pressures. This Council continues to deliver good quality Adult Social Care services and has strong joint plans with the Clinical Commissioning Group to maintain these into the future.

On a more general level our work to deliver the West of England Devolution Deal will bring substantial capital and revenue funding into the area and for 2017-18 has already delivered £2.5m of extra Business Rate income which helps protect front line services. I will continue to lobby Government on Children's and Adult Care services, Housing and infrastructure and on the unique challenges faced by an authority that is home to two world class and expanding universities.

Supplementary Question:

Was the Leader of the Council aware of the cuts in funding from Central Government?

Answer from:

Councillor Tim Warren

Yes, I was aware of the impact of funding from the Central Government.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P 01	Question from:	Keynsham, Saltford, and Farmborough Liberal Democrat branch
<p>1. The 2015 traffic counts for the A4 Bath Road Saltford show a "5-day" average of 27747 vehicles a weekday (both directions combined). This represents a 12% fall from the peak count of 31075 in 2002. The awaited final figures for 2016 look set to be about the same as those for 2015. To what does B&NES Highways department attribute this significant and welcome drop in weekday traffic volume?</p> <p>2. Saltford's AQMZ action plan suggests that the annual mean level of nitrogen dioxide will meet the EU target level by 2019 without additional intervention according to DEFRA methodology. Does B&NES Council remain optimistic about this date being met?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p>1. <i>My officers have not undertaken a specific study on this corridor to establish the reasons for this apparent change. However, it can be noted that there has been an increase in the number of buses running through Saltford in the past few years. Bath Bus Co introduced their service A4 between Bath and Bristol Airport and this competes with First's services for local passengers between Keynsham, Saltford and Bath. It started hourly, but now runs half-hourly indicating a public demand for the service.</i></p> <p><i>Any reduction in traffic movements, even if only representing a snapshot, is to be welcomed, but we must also prepare for - and plan for - future demand, and in particular the significant growth in jobs and housing that will be taking place in the West of England in the years ahead.</i></p> <p><i>The Joint Transport Vision published prior to Christmas therefore seeks to present various options and ideas for how this future growth can be managed. As well as new and improved road infrastructure to meet the anticipated growth in traffic volumes, this vision seeks to continue with the long-established policy of promoting modal shift from the car to public transport with improved bus, 'MetroBus', Park & Ride and rail services, as well as promotion of walking and cycling as sustainable and healthy modes of transport.</i></p> <p>2. <i>B&NES Council remains optimistic about this date being met.</i></p>		

This page is intentionally left blank

BANES Cabinet meeting February 1st 2017

Riverside petition brought by Kathleen Hovland with 231 signatures, including staff in 3 Keynsham surgeries

Contact Details hovlandk@blueyonder.co.uk Tel. 01179867018

Between 2014 and 2016 there were many discussions, between councillors, pool staff and coaches, around proposed planning that existed, for an 8 lane pool with gallery extension, and was likely to materialise. £15m in funding was proposed. At the consultation in 2016 in the Space and the Leisure Centre there was no detail, were no drawings, on the main swimming pool plans, nor any documentation provided: changes to the main pool and its environment were not disclosed, e.g. deepening and levelling and the introduction of poolside showers and unisex changing facilities. Had they been disclosed there would have been a significant response from a number of people. I sent a Freedom of Information request for information on documents and detail provided. I have never received any drawings with measurements or detail. It was erroneously assumed by pool users attending the consultation who were aware of these developments, that - in the absence of all information and detail, - this was a 'given' and would happen. Accordingly, the number of responses to the plans, - as there were no plans shown to be consulted on, were smaller than might have been expected but there would have been a larger number of responses than you stated by BANES. Leaflets providing BANES Leisure Team address to write to and GLL forms were definitely handed to pool users and taken by them for feedback: e.g. a large number of lane swimmers in the morning, including a member of BANES staff who signed this petition.

*level of funding
has reduced
to £7m*

The consultation process was flawed; there is need for an 8 lane width pool and an enlarged gallery for community and competitive use. The swimming pool was overlooked as the consultation focused on studios, halls and the proposed residential complex. There is public concern that the pool's status as a competitive venue, despite the excellent legacy of training swimmers for local nation and international success would be lost. I contacted ASA Facility Officers: Mr Freeman Wright and Richard Lambourn. Mr Lambourn met with BANES council and GLL. He emailed confirmation that BANES would pay for a certificate of length and provide electronic timing for the pool. Please ensure that funding is guaranteed.

*our aspect
of
swimming
club*

The public concern remained that the pool would not be widened and that welfare concerns would not be a priority. This petition was drafted in the summer with input in particular from Mr Paul Sims and for the following reasons:

- Contrary to statements from a BANES officer we have not campaigned for a 50m pool. Swimming club parents request a 25m pool. Schools and swimming club require the existing gallery space to be maintained the required size agreed with Mr Lambourn to meet ASA requirements, without a recess that was proposed apparently after his visit. There should be funding to meet this need. Schools are also hard pushed for space at galas.
- There are signatures from 3 surgeries over concerns about current well-being needs. Currently they are not being considered; 50% reduction vouchers are

offered for halls or studio activities e.g. badminton but I understand from a councillor who requested vouchers that they were refused for swimming; reflecting perhaps a climate that is not sufficiently supportive.

Concern is expressed that the population is growing and that the pool and gallery are cramped. The population of Keynsham will increase by 30% by 2020. There is strong support among parents and pool users for a widened 8 lane pool and an enlarged gallery, compliant to updated ASA standards, that will have to hold 250 people for competitions above level 2. There is already a squash for Keynsham school and Keynsham Swimming club galas that only involve local children or pool events like Sports Relief. Please provide funding to meet future need.

The area behind the pool is the home of goldfinches, rarer winter visitors such as teal and widgeon in addition to the duck population. Elvers and small trout are fished by children, It should be conserved as a nature area and should not be landscaped. Please vire funding allocated to landscaping for the swimming pool provision.

.

At the September 2015 consultation alternative sites for the Leisure Centre were proposed. £15m was allocated.

This level of funding should be provided for the Leisure Centre Riverside Location. £7 million is allocated. Keynsham residents are short changed.

Earlier proposals were in place to move the courts to the Wellsway area; to flood part of the leisure centre to create a larger pool. As recently as August 2015, the Olympic deputy coach who, then, worked in the centre, said that there would be an enlarged gallery and pool.

No explanation has been offered as to why these plans have been abandoned.

The proposed plan shows an increase in studios, racket sport courts and a learner pool. Excellent. But it need not be at the expense of and to the detriment of the main pool.

Information about detail is often impossible to obtain. The detail on changes come by the grapevine; unisex changing rooms, pool side showers? Withdrawn when the information was known. Deepening the main pool to one level? Detail is not available.

The Leisure Centre Team and management are not considering separately the pool user letter campaign and are not providing information.

If the gallery is non ASA compliant for galas it will mean the end of Keynsham pool being used competitively. At Swimming Club and school galas, marathon and sports relief events spectators are crammed against the walls.

It is necessary to enlarge the swimming pool to 8 lane width to facilitate simultaneous use by swimmers of varying abilities. Today's approach to health has increased the take up on exercise. In plain English, the lanes are too cramped for the future, growing population: inadequate for members, health, casual and lane swimmers when Aqua Swim, Swim for 50+. Adult Better Swim School and health classes are held. It is stressful for staff.

Planners in B&NES should protect the local, national and international interests of Keynsham pool users and support, in particular the Keynsham Swimming Club that trained youngsters like Siobhan O'Connor, Tom Sinclair, Amelie Maughan. Jess Podger and Ben Lawton are members of Keynsham Swimming Pool who gain national and international success.

Given the richness of the local talent and need; if the swimming pool space is capacious enough, the pool is 8 lane width it will be well-placed within the community to meet a modern, expanding population.

Keynsham Leisure Centre Pool: Petition for community and competitive pool with 8 lane width and gallery extension

The Leisure Centre refurbishment is a once in 40 year's opportunity for Keynsham to review its swimming pool and pool facilities ensuring that local people get the best for now and for the future, remembering that Keynsham's population is expected to increase by one third by 2020.

A full and frank consultation is needed to ensure that all those interested in the Leisure Centre services are contacted and invited to join the discussions along with members of the public at open, minuted public meetings.

The minimum target for the refurbishment should be to continue to provide all the services that Keynsham has enjoyed through the Centre to date. They will need to be upgraded to keep abreast of ongoing (Amateur Swimming Association) compliance standards, standards required by legislation and sports bodies, and to maintain the best possible standards for Centre users whether they are potential world class athletes or health or casual users.

Services that have fallen away, such as the provision of competition standard swimming facilities should be restored to match the standards that have historically been offered in Keynsham; creating a starting point for the many national and international athletes who started here. The opportunity they had must never be lost for the people of Keynsham.

The leisure facilities in Keynsham need to be exemplary as they have always been in the past, promoting health and opportunity for all. Please don't lose this opportunity to revive the already weakening service levels.

The population needs services of which Keynsham can rightly be proud.

STATEMENT TO CABINET MEETING 01-02-17 BY PAT MASON FOR THE SAVE OUR 6/7 BUS CAMPAIGN

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Cabinet.

I am here to speak about the withdrawal of the subsidy for the 6/7 Bus Route. The basis for its withdrawal was a Survey conducted by the Council, which has been proved to be flawed, and created the impression that the subsidy was not value for money.

The withdrawal of the subsidy has resulted in First Bus having to abandon the circular route which connected Fairfield Park with Larkhall and the London Road and cutting the number of buses from 4 to 3. It has also resulted in a reduced service for Fairfield Park where it is most needed. First Bus has struggled to run the new route and have, in an e-mail, admitted that the routes 'lack resilience'.

Within a month of the new route coming into operation 2400 plus local residents had signed a Petition, available in the shops in Larkhall and on the buses, and attended a 'standing room only' Public Meeting. Councillor Clarke, and James Freeman from First Bus Company, will have witnessed the strength of feeling at this Meeting. We believe that the Petition and Meeting are better evidence of the demand for the subsidised service than the flawed Survey. A member of our Campaign, well versed in such matters, can provide facts and figures of why the Survey is flawed. We feel it is vital that erroneous facts are not carried forward which damage funding and resources in the future.

We believe the Council has made a hasty and mistaken decision, not based on proper facts, which has resulted in hardship and distress for a large number of local residents. The two months during which the new service has operated has been long enough for this to become apparent, and for us to ask for the urgent reinstatement of the subsidy. The original decision was viewed by Cabinet as a minimal amount and matter and the subsidy withdrawn under delegated powers. Surely the subsidy could be reinstated under the same powers? This would give time for further investigation and consultation, and give a proper service until new powers over transport are available under Devolution. Reinstating the Subsidy would form a valuable bridge to the future.

Pat Mason

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet speech 1/2/17

I would like to start by stating very clearly that this is not about stopping the development of Maynard Terrace. That battle has been fought & is now over. This is about making sure that the access to this site is safe. Currently it is a difficult junction, but has no reported accidents, it is essentially safe. But two independent road safety consultants have said that the proposed plans will make the junction less safe.

Clutton Parish Council has commissioned a full road safety audit from a nationally recognised firm; we will shortly be presenting you with that audit report. When you get that report please remember that all Highways departments have a statutory duty to provide safe highways. I am sure you would not want to be negligent in your responsibilities by knowingly allowing a reduction of safety?

In the 2013 planning appeal the inspector shared the concerns of the parish councils road safety experts about the proposed design but said that they could be addressed, her exact words, para 22-25 were “ *Expert witnesses who gave evidence on behalf of the Parish Council expressed concern about the siting of the necessary signage and road markings, as well as the drainage of the junction, visibility, and the road surface of Clutton Hill, but accepted at the inquiry that such concerns were capable of being addressed at the detailed technical design stage. I share that view.This would enable the additional vehicular and pedestrian movements likely to be generated as a result of the proposed new housing to be satisfactorily accommodated, without any adverse impact on highway safety or the capacity of the road network.*” She clearly expected further refinement of the layout. To allow it to go ahead without those improvements will be abandoning common sense and your statutory duty to provide safe highways.

You have recently had to make some difficult, unpopular and courageous decisions- but you made these based on facts. I am asking you to soon to make another decision, but it shouldn't be difficult because it will be based on facts and your statutory duty, and I can assure you it that a decision to ensure that the new junction configuration is at least as safe as the current configuration will be a very popular decision.

Thank you for listening to me.

This page is intentionally left blank

BANES Cabinet 1st February 2017

SWTN, Railfuture and Bus Users UK wish to make the following points :-

We are very concerned over the loss of bus services if the Council's in the proposed combined authority cut bus services especially in East Bristol, Bath and Keynsham where routes under threat could include service 16 UWE - Hanham, 18A Emersons Green - Shirehampton via Bristol Parkway, 17 Keynsham - Southmead Hospital , 19/10A Bath - Cribbs Causeway, 36 South Bristol, 37 Bristol - Bath. Many of these routes are evening and Sunday services.

500 group services in Bristol and rural buses in BANES re: service 267.

We would urge the cabinet and council not to cut services or local rail investment at a time when we are trying to build MetroBus and MetroRail.

We are also very concerned about services 50 & 51 in South Bristol City Centre - Whitchurch and South Bristol Hospital and a need to find a solution for the replacement service 6 & 7 in Bath using the Swainswick shuttle.

We are worried over the loss of PCSO's on the transport network in Bristol and money for Ashley Down and Portway Park and Ride stations in the capital programme and the need to maintain funding for tourism initiatives in Bristol and Bath.

Thanks

David Redgewell

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement to B&NES Cabinet – 1st February 2017

Cllr Karen Walker and Cllr Sarah Bevan

2017/18 Budget – Will Peasedown St John be included?

Dear Cabinet Members

Each year we see millions of pounds being spent on numerous projects across the local authority.

All of which are carried out with the desire to invest in our communities and to improve the quality of life of our residents.

We're grateful that the council uses a budget setting and discussion process that allows all councillors to contribute and make representations on behalf of their constituents.

This is what we have done on behalf of the residents of Peasedown, with the financial requests we're about to outline first taken to the Resources Scrutiny Panel last November.

Each week, we spend time out in the community knocking on doors, meeting residents, and finding out what their desires and aspirations are for Peasedown St John.

This is their 'wish list' for the forthcoming council budget:

- Braysdown Lane safety improvements at the Braysdown Lane/Bath Road junction (*this includes the road surface to be coloured red, bollards on the pavement to stop pavement parking, and dropped kerbs to help pedestrians cross*)
- £5,000 for a new bus shelter at Ashgrove (to replace the previous shelter that was damaged after a road-traffic accident)
- £5,000 to move the bus stop on Dunkerton Hill to a location further down the road, which will make it easier for bus drivers to stop.
- Wellow Lane/A367 'cycle path' improvements

- £30,000 for a car park on the Recreation Ground – which will massively alleviate some of the parking problems in our community.
- £30,000 for play park improvements in the Eckweek Road Play Area. These are long overdue.
- £10,000 to implement a 20mph speed limit in Carlingcott

Please do consider these financial requests from Peasedown St John residents for the 2017/18 council budget.

Future of Peasedown Youth Centre

We'd also like to take this opportunity to update the Cabinet and officers on what we've been doing to address the proposed youth service cuts.

To ensure that our youth centre remains open for many more years to come, we have found an alternative provider who not only knows the youth centre and the wider community well – but has a business plan already in place to ensure we continue to have the best possible provision of youth services for our village.

Last Saturday we met with Revd Matthew Street, the Vicar of St John's Church.

The church is the ideal local organisation for the council to work with on any future transfer of the building or the services provided within it. They already run a number of events and youth activities from the building each week, and thus (in light of proposed council cuts to the youth service) we believe is best-placed to take over the running of the youth centre.

We look forward to working with Revd Street and the Cabinet over the coming months to negotiate any changes that may occur.

Yours,

Cllr Karen Walker and Cllr Sarah Bevan

Independent, Peasedown St John

No Politics, just Peasedown

Cabinet meeting on 1st February 2017

Vishaka Robinson

Good afternoon – I'm here to talk to you about bath central library.

I'd like to start with a direct quote from Councillor Martin Veal, who as you are probably aware is the B&NES Cabinet member who holds the brief for Community Services, which includes Bath's Central Library.

"Your perception of a library is about a book; well my perception is not like that. My perception of a library is more about access to information. Less than 10% of people who come to the current library are either returning books or taking books out. 52% are actually getting access to the internet through computers so as long as we provide a good wifi service and a good broadband service access to computers etc we will cater to the 50% that still come in".

I want to talk to you about these figures. I've read this 9% stat in numerous media from the Bath Chronicle to the BBC and it states on the B&NES website that only 9% of Bath Central Library users want to renew or borrow books while 52% want to book a computer.

When I first heard it I thought no wonder they want to get rid of most of the books in our library and make it more like an internet café. It's a shame I guess but - no one is really borrowing books.

But dig a little deeper and you see that this data is purposefully misleading. The research behind these figures relates only to main desk inquiries. It excludes the kiosk near the entrance, the self-service machines and the children's desk. If you have been to the library you will know that you are actively encouraged to use the self-service machines.

So it seems this new digital strategy for the library has been decided solely on the basis of this incomplete and misleading research.

So please allow me to give you the correct data According to the BANES Voicebox Survey in 2015, 70% of users use the library for borrowing books, 35% borrow for their children only 16% of users said they used the computers. This data is consistent with the UK-wide findings of the 2016 UK Government's longitudinal Taking Part survey.

Can you explain why this flawed methodology has been used? And given that it is misleading how you can now justify these changes.

I'd also like to bring to your attention to how crucial libraries are to young people and even more so to those who are disadvantaged. For children in Bath who do not attend a private school our marvellous library is a brilliant leveller.

And when I say library I mean one which is crammed with books (not computers). A library does not belong sandwiched in between a police station, jobcentre, building control and social services to name a few. It's a key part of society, a valuable community space and a crucial element of our children's education.

And don't forget that in our library we have a study space for 100 an invaluable resource for the city's students, plus a family room that hosts classes and offers a place for nursing mothers to feed. In short we have a library that is meeting the needs of Bath's young people and it would be a disservice to them to change it without careful consideration.

The Institute of Education's 2015 survey found that "reading for pleasure was found to be more important for a child's cognitive development between ages 10 and 16 than their parents' level of education.

They also found that combined effect reading books often, going to the library regularly and reading newspapers at 16 was four times greater than the advantage a child gained from having a parent with a degree."

So to summarise: Our current library is brilliant, the people of Bath use it in huge numbers and I think its remarkably good value for money. The rush to change it and to rustle-up false data to justify an unnecessary move is an injustice people of Bath. I urge you to rethink this move. Having spent the last two weeks poring over countless documents relating to it I cannot fathom why you would shut this library – the logic and even the sums they just don't add up.

Thank you

Bath Central Library – Cabinet Meeting 1 February 2017

Questions to Cabinet – Daniel Carey

1. Meaningful consultation: the Cabinet will be aware of its duties under the Libraries and Museums Act and its equality duties under Equality Act 2010. The jury is out as to whether these are being complied with in relation to the decision to close the central library. But my question is about one of the overarching legal duties the Council is required to observe in all its decisions to alter services: the “Best Value” duty under section 3 Local Government Act 1999. This is the duty to consider overall value, including economic, environmental and social value, when planning changes to service provision. Most importantly, section 3 of the Act imposes a mandatory duty on councils to consult with service users on its proposed changes. The courts are very clear what that consultation duty consists of: the Council must provide sufficient detail to enable meaningful responses; it must consult when proposals are at a formative stage; and it must provide consultees sufficient time to respond. In this case there can be no doubt that there has been no consultation on the decision to close and relocate the library. The “Modern Library Design Feedback” consultation started today does not even pretend to do so. Still less has there been sufficient detail provided on the plans – even after today’s consultation, the public are still in the dark as to the justifications for this change save unjustified costs figures. None of this information has been provided at a formative stage, as required.

My question therefore is this: will the Cabinet agree that it cannot go ahead with these proposals until it has consulted properly on them in compliance with its best value duty? And if not, can it explain how it has complied with its consultation duty in this case or why it is willing to act unlawfully to push them through?

2. Fait accompli: what steps have already been taken towards implementing the proposed changes to library provision? In particular, has the Council given notice under its lease of the Podium property and if so when was this done? What will replace the library in the Podium and what stage has this reached? Where is the decision recorded if it was done under delegated powers?

This page is intentionally left blank

Dear Mr Veal and Cabinet members. My name is Mary English I am a local writer and author of 15+ non-fiction titles 3 of which are on the shelves of our library and I am a member of The Society of Authors. I am also a happy user of Bath Central Library. My mother Jean English researched her book *The History of The English Family in Bath 1770-1890* using the library's extensive family research archives. My sister Lucy English is a reader at Bath Spa Uni and lectures on their Creative Writing MA. 3 of her books are also available at our library and her students use the 100 well equipped study areas it provides. My Great, great, great uncle Edmund English in 1844 wrote *Views of Lansdown Tower, Bath, the Favourite Edifice of the late William Beckford Esq* with beautiful illustrations by Mr Willes Maddox 3 copies of which reside in the archives and can be viewed just by asking at the front desk.

I know about books, publishing, reading and libraries.

The move of our library will involve more than just shifting books from one location to another. It will destroy the well thought-out and purpose built foundations of not just a library but a thriving vibrant community of library users, readers, Lego fans, film buffs, crafters, baby bouncers and volunteer job searchers. Over 41 thousand people visit our library every month. That's over 1,300 people every day, that walk or push their buggies or their wheelchairs through the automatic doors into a haven of calm and friendly surroundings. No-one has ever complained about the services that Bath Central Library offers.

No-one has ever asked council to down-grade it, change it, move it or re-situate it.

Imagine how us library fans are going to feel when our safe, centrally placed, well-equipped, well-staffed library is moved, changed and relocated.

I quote from 3 comments on our 5,000 signature petition to leave the library where and how it is:

Toni says: It's more than just a great library. It is a community hub for the people of Bath. Lovely uplifting atmosphere and great selection of books. I love going to our library .

Sally says: I've brought up 3 children, over a 20 year period, borrowing books from Bath library. It has enabled them to be voracious readers. I am also a primary teacher and appreciate the value of having such a resource on our doorstep. I often recommend it to the children I teach because it makes reading accessible to all.

Paul says: my whole family are regular users and it is a vital resource everyone needs XXX *I have also heard the views of a retired member of library staff who said: "I saw so many families coming to our Children's areas over the years and so many thanked us for the life-line Bath Central Library provided. So many people still come in day in day out for whom this safe comfortable library means a lot. I am proud of the diverse nature of our users, now over 1300 per day. This great City Central Library provides a wonderful service, a move I feel decimates this, and it saddens me and others who worked with me building what we have."* The friendships, and familiar home-from-home will die an untimely and unnecessary death and I am hopeful you will not allow this to happen, will you?

This page is intentionally left blank

February 1, 2017

Dear Councilors,

This morning, February 1st, BANES council finally allowed for the first public consultation regarding plans to relocate the Bath Central Library to the One Stop Shop. That announcement states, “This planned move will contribute to **an annual saving of £800,000.**”

This is a figure I’ve heard many times already. It has been quoted everywhere from the Bath Chronicle, the BBC and ITV.

In Councilor Veal’s own words to the Bath Newseum on 17th January “by transforming the library service into a modern library it enables us to save **800K a year**. So over 4 years you can work the sums out for yourself. It is a significant amount of money.”

Well I did work out the sums, and I’m afraid they simply do not add up.

According to the Public Reports Pack for the 1st February 2017 Council meeting, on page 146: £800,000 is hoped to be saved but not per year, however over three years, 100K in 17/18, 0 in 18/19, and the remaining 700K in 19/20 for a total over 3 years of £800K.

So that’s a saving of a little over £260,000 per year across Bath and North East Somerset.

Agreed?

Ok, that’s not an insignificant amount especially given the budget shortfall council needs to address. So far, so good? But here’s where it gets confusing and I’d like the cabinet to please walk me through this.

ON PAGE 93, appendix II of the public reports pack, there is a request for provisional approval of £5.953 MILLION POUNDS to “re-design Library services as described in the Strategic review of the service. It aims to replicate the Keynsham model for joint OSS and library service in Bath and Midsomer Norton...”

So, relocating the library will **cost** us £5.93M. The next column in cabinet’s buget

projects borrowing and capital costs, the number there being £5.95 MILLION. Finally, cabinet lists grants and external funding of £358,000. (As a side question, I'd like to know if council has already secured these grants and funding or is this just a projection?)

To summarize: council proposes to spend £5.5 Million pounds over 5 years to relocate the single, Bath central library, in order to save the council £260,000 per year in library services across BANES.

And as the council states they are moving council offices into the existing Central library space, then you can't say, as you do in the budget, that you will save on rent as you will still need to pay O+H developers the same rent.

Why mess with the city's much-loved, purpose-built library if it's not going to save us any money - it's going to cost us money. *A lot of money.*

Why exclude the public from this conversation?

Why are you choosing to jeopardize our library service and spend public funds to a degree that suggests gross incompetence?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dionne Pemberton

Cabinet meeting on 1st Feb 2017

Cllr Eleanor Jackson

It is very difficult to avoid sounding like an Old Testament prophet when responding to the Budget proposals:

Woe to you, children, because the play areas you love in familiar children's centres which assist your development so much, will disappear, without even a key under the mat for volunteers to use.

Woe to you, young people. If you turn to the youth services because you need help and support in your personal relationships, and something *constructive* to do in your leisure time, 7/10 of the role models you admire, will have gone.

Woe to you, young disabled people profiting from activities at day centres and gardening projects in Radstock, your transport will disappear and probably the volunteer led opportunities .

Woe to you if you are indulging in dodgy behaviour or have poor eating habits– the public health budget is drastically cut.

And so on. I have already dealt with adult social care, but that is what concerns me most. A society is judged by its care for the sick and the elderly, and ours is falling short. Ideology is pursued concerning care in the community, without acknowledging how much deficiencies in mental health provision are creating homelessness. (see The Big Issue 30 January) All across the board, there is a shocking lack of consideration of equalities issues. This administration seems bent on selling off the family silver, such as the Library buildings in MSN and Radstock, the children's centre buildings, the land in Waterloo Road etc. etc, without any consideration of Ken Clarke's dictum that you can only sell off the family silver once. This administration, despite being in government nationally, is failing to build for the future.

Much of the budget is aspirational – we all eat sensibly, stop smoking, invest our savings wisely and plan for our pensions, and stop our relationships fracturing so that one party is left homeless.

I want a budget in real terms, which leaves our children and young people saying, 'Yes, I can', seeing visions and dreaming dreams they can achieve.

This page is intentionally left blank