

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

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

Wednesday, 19th July, 2017

Present:

Councillor Tim Warren	Leader of the Council and Conservative Group Leader
Councillor Charles Gerrish	Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency, Conservative Deputy Group Leader North East Somerset
Councillor Vic Pritchard	Cabinet Member for Adult Care, Health and Wellbeing
Councillor Paul Myers	Cabinet Member for Economic and Community Regeneration
Councillor Karen Warrington	Cabinet Member for Policy and Transformation
Councillor Paul May	Cabinet member for Children and Young People
Councillor Mark Shelford	Cabinet Member for Transport and Highways

97 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. The Chair informed the meeting that Councillor Martin Veal had resigned from the post of Cabinet Member for Community Services due to personal reasons.

The Chair also welcomed the new Members of the Cabinet.

98 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

99 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Bob Goodman has send his apologies for this meeting.

100 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

101 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

The Chair informed the meeting that he had agreed to take one urgent item (Park and Ride East of Bath) at agenda item 12.

102 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 28 questions from Councillors and 5 questions from members of the public.

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

Cabinet Q&A

103 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

David Redgewell read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where he highlighted transport issues in the West of England Combined Authority.

Dione Pemberton read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where she expressed her concerns against Modern Libraries options for Bath consultation.

Caroline and Kiki Ambrose read out their statements (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where she expressed their concerns against Modern Libraries options for Bath consultation.

Gillian Kirk read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where she expressed her concerns against Modern Libraries options for Bath consultation.

Fiona Carne read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where she expressed her concerns against changes to rubbish collection.

Ben Palmer read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where he expressed his concerns against adoption of the HMO Policy.

David Redgewell

Dionne Pemberton

Kiki and Caroline Ambrose

Gill Kirk

Fiona Carne

Ben Palmer

104 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 12th April 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

105 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

106 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

There were none.

107 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

108 PARK & RIDE EAST OF BATH

Annie Kilvington read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where she welcomed the report though she expressed her concerns that the report had not highlighted objections from a number of organisations and individuals.

Christine Boyd read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where she welcomed the report though she expressed her concerns on the lack of survey and detail of where the traffic is going and why.

Andrew Mercer read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where he welcomed the report though he expressed his concerns that the views of the stakeholders were not taken on board and that project planning had failed.

Nicolette Boater read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*).

Patrick Rotheram read out the statement (*attached as Appendix and available on the Minute Book at Democratic Services*) where he expressed Federation of Bath Residents' Associations concerns on the future of transport in Bath.

Councillor Andrew Furse said that, as per bullet point 2.5 of the report, there was no capital scheme attached to revenue revision and this money would need to be seen as revenue expenditure. Councillor Andrew Furse expressed his concerns that the revenue would be attached to other balances which would put the Council in difficult situation.

Councillor Richard Samuel said that he was astonished to find out that there was no survey held on asking drivers why they come to the city. Councillor Richard Samuel also said that for such expensive scheme there should be a survey on drivers' behaviours and urged the Cabinet to conduct such survey before any further plans.

Councillor Alison Millar welcomed the decision though she also expressed her concerns that there was no relevant traffic survey. Councillor Alison Millar also urged the Cabinet to enforce long term protection of that area so the residents would not get stressed out with another or similar proposal.

Councillor Geoff Ward said that he was delighted with the Cabinet decision not to go ahead with Park and Ride East of Bath. Councillor Geoff Ward recognised that this was a difficult decision and congratulated the Cabinet on it, and asked the Cabinet to enforce a long term protection of that area and give Site F under control of Parish Council.

Councillor Neil Butters said that Liberal Democrat Group was delighted with the decision not to go ahead with Park and Ride East of Bath, though years of unnecessary work put into this scheme could have been avoided long time ago. Councillor Neil Butters urged the Cabinet to listen next time what the majority of residents want.

Councillor Mark Shelford thanked everyone who addressed the Cabinet on this matter. Councillor Mark Shelford also said that he would make sure that correct data would be used for transport in Bath scheme and had stressed that it would be absolutely fundamental for an early stakeholder engagement in the process. Road safety would be a priority for the scheme and alternative transport scheme would involve an input from the West of England Combined Authority.

Councillor Mark Shelford moved the recommendations as printed.

Councillor Tim Warren seconded the motion by thanking Councillor Mark Shelford on moving the recommendations. Councillor Tim Warren also said that a lot of work had been done since January 2017, which had been outlined in the report.

Councillor Vic Pritchard said that some people were delighted though there were some people who would be disappointed with the decision. Councillor Vic Pritchard said that the Cabinet should thank the officers on work that they had put in.

Councillor Paul May said that he was delighted that transport to school issues would be considered in the scheme.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to:

1.1 Cease progressing site B as a possible location for a Park & Ride site to the east of Bath for access safety reasons and because it has not been possible to negotiate the purchase of the land within a reasonable timescale; and to cease progressing site F because of potential access safety issues.

1.2 Continue to implement new opportunities emerging from the Joint Transport Plan for the West of England and new mayoral transport powers associated with the recently created West of England Combined Authority to address the transport issues facing Bath and North East Somerset to ensure that we sustain economic growth and support the provision of new homes.

1.3 To continue to investigate and implement approved schemes as identified in paragraph 4.13 of this report.

Annie Kilvington

Christine Boyd

Andrew Mercer

Nicolette Boater

Patrick Rotheram

109 MODERN LIBRARIES OPTIONS FOR BATH

Councillor Dine Romero started her statement by asking the Cabinet why had already dismissed three options out of five before local residents had their say on their preferences. Councillor Dine Romero also said that the Cabinet had not explored other options to deliver £800k in savings and urged the Cabinet to pause the consultation and consider other options for the Podium library.

Councillor Richard Samuel said that two of the least desirable options had been highlighted. Councillor Richard Samuel expressed his concerns about the consultation and felt that the Council would have to borrow the money in order to achieve some savings, and urged the Cabinet to end this scheme.

Councillor Joe Rayment said that political circumstances had changed nationally and urged the Leader of the Council to ask central government for a financial support for libraries.

Councillor Tim Warren said that the Council had made provision for a capital budget of £5.953m plus £0.773m identified balances (a total of £6.726m overall) in order to deliver the modern libraries programme with focus on the delivery of integrated Library and One Stop Shop services in Bath. The proposed scope of works for each of the two options was described within the business case. The capital costs used in the analysis were derived using standard rates and calculations were only on the assumption that all integrated services would be delivered from each site. No design had been developed at this stage. This had been done in order to assess and confirm assumptions on indicative costs and timescale. The design work would commence on the chosen option once the budget is approved later this year.

On a request from Councillor Tim Warren, Andrew Pate (Strategic Director Resources) explained that the Council was well protected under the lease, as explained in the Appendix 2 of the report.

Councillor Tim Warren moved the recommendations as printed.

Councillor Paul Myers seconded the motion by welcoming the consultation scheme which would be of the community benefit.

Councillor Charles Gerrish highlighted a success of the Keynsham Library which has integrated with One Stop Shop. Councillor Charles Gerrish also said that savings set by Library Services were integral part of the budget.

Councillor Karen Warrington said that this Cabinet had been proactive in keeping libraries open whilst other Council had had to close their libraries, and also highlighted a success of Keynsham Libraries integration with One Stop Shop.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to:

- 2.1 Note and be cognisant of the Business Case and the appendices, in particular the consultation proposals at appendix F (1, 2 & 3).
- 2.2 Approve the proposed consultation approach as set out in Appendix F (1, 2 & 3) in order to determine the preferred option.
- 2.3 Receive a further report in October which will include consultation findings, a further Equalities Impact Assessment of the selected option to implement and a request to approve capital funding.

110 REVENUE & CAPITAL OUTTURN 2016/17

Councillor Andrew Furse expressed his concerns that the revenue budget outturn overspend for 2016/17 was £2.221m and felt that the present performance was damaging the credibility of the Council.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that this report had provided information about the Council's financial performance against its revenue and capital budgets in 2016/17. The report had identified that after allowing for carry forwards, the Council overspent by £2.221m, which to give some context, represents less than 1% of gross budgeted spend excluding schools. It was proposed that the overspend is funded by drawdowns from both the Revenue Budget Contingency (£1.155m) and the Adult Social Care Reserve (£1.066m). The 2016/17 revenue budget had included a requirement for the delivery of £12.644m of savings and additional income generation of which over 90% were achieved during the year.

The ongoing implications arising from the year end position would be considered as part of the 2017/18 budget monitoring process, including appropriate mitigating actions.

The capital spend in 2016/17 was £53.910m against a budget of £78.591m giving a variance of £24.681m, primarily reflecting the delivery time to complete projects moving into future financial periods. Of this variance, £23.932m was requested for carry forward to 2017/18 to cover re-phased costs of capital projects.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations as printed.

Councillor Paul May seconded the motion by thanking Councillor Charles Gerrish and the officers on the report. Councillor Paul May also said that the Council was in difficult situation, with even more difficult task to achieve savings.

The rest of the Cabinet Members highlighted financial pressures within their portfolios.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to:

- 2.1 The revenue budget outturn overspend of £2.221m for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix 2 is noted.
- 2.2 The revenue carry forward proposals and write-off requests listed in the tables in Appendix 4 are approved.
- 2.3 Transfers from Earmarked Reserves to fund the revenue overspend are agreed as set out in Appendix 1 paragraph 1.8.
- 2.4 The revenue virements for 2016/17 reported for information in Appendix 6(i) are noted.

2.5 The resulting reserves position shown in Appendix 1 paragraph 1.10 is noted and that unearmarked reserves remain at the target level of £13.5m (excluding Invest to Save drawdowns).

2.6 The provisional outturn of the 2016/17 capital programme in Appendix 7, and the funding as laid out in the table in Appendix 1 Paragraph 1.20, is noted.

2.7 The capital rephasing and write-off of net underspends as listed in Appendix 8 are approved. This reflects the outturn spend position on projects against final budgets as detailed in Appendix 9.

2.8 The adjustments to the 2016/17 to 2021/22 capital programme as recorded in Appendix 10, and the final capital programme for 2016/17 in Appendix 9 are noted.

The meeting ended at 5.50 pm

Chair _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEETING 19th July 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. David Redgewell re: Transport matters
2. Dionne Pemberton re: Libraries
3. Caroline Ambrose re: Libraries
4. Kiki Ambrose (9yr old daughter) re: Libraries
5. Gillian Kirk re: Libraries
6. Fiona Carnie re: Proposed changes to rubbish collection
7. Annie Kilvington re: Park and Ride
8. Christine Boyd re: Transport and engagement with the Council (Park and Ride)
9. Andrew Mercer re: Transport and engagement with the Council (Park and Ride)
10. Nicolette Boater re: Park and Ride
11. Ben Palmer re: HMO Policy
12. Patrick Rotheram (Federation of Bath Residents' Associations) re: Park and Ride

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Dine Romero
<p>Could the Leader give us a summary of B&NES staff who are/will be seconded to WECA?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Warren
<p><i>There are currently 4 staff seconded to the WECA from B&NES. There are no current plans to second any further staff.</i></p>		
M 02	Question from:	Councillor Dine Romero
<p>Would the Leader apologise to B&NES residents for the two years of uncertainty and stress and the waste of time and public resources caused by the Cabinet's mishandling of the East of Bath park and ride scheme?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Warren
<p><i>The need to address the traffic and transport issues within Bath, and particularly on the east of the city, are well established, and identifying a site for an East of Bath Park & Ride has been a long-established policy of this Council under successive administrations.</i></p> <p><i>Much of the work which formed part of site options analysis was undertaken under the previous administration, and fed into the process which has taken place since August 2015. I believe it was right for the Council to undertake a thorough process in narrowing-down the site options, which included detailed analysis undertaken by the cross-party LDF Steering Group as well as a large public consultation exercise and a Scrutiny Inquiry Day.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst the Cabinet report recommends that neither site B nor site F are progressed for the reasons set out, we remain committed to working on alternative options as set out in the Cabinet report, and much of the work undertaken up to now – including detailed traffic studies and modelling – can be used to support the further development of these alternatives.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
<p>When did the Cabinet know about access safety issue?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Warren
<p><i>A response will be provided within 5 clear working days.</i></p>		

M 03	Question from:	Councillor Andrew Furse
<p>Could the Cabinet member confirm the basis of the urgent decision published on 23 June to extend Cabinet delegation to enable property disposal of Riverside and Loan to ACL?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>Aequus Developments Ltd (ADL) is a wholly owned company created by the Council with the intention to provide income generation by the provision of high quality housing for rent to private tenants. The Council delegated to officers in consultation with members the power to make loans to ADL to facilitate developments to provide housing stock for rent. The Directors of ADL were advised, by their accountants, that in order to be tax efficient and ring-fence risks inherent in development, ADL should create a wholly owned subsidiary company, Aequus Construction Limited. The projected savings to ACL in being able to fully reclaim VAT were in the hundreds of thousands of pounds. In order to achieve these savings the Council was required to make loans to ACL rather than ADL. The delegation to officers only related to ADL. Consequently the original delegation required to be extended to cover loans to ACL. The development at Riverside in Keynsham would be subject to costly delay unless the power to make loans & transfer property to ADL was extended to ACL.</i></p>		
M 04	Question from:	Councillor Tim Ball
<p>To ask the Cabinet member if he will investigate as a matter of urgency reports that former Sirona staff, who have been transferred to Virgin Care, have experienced delays in their pay of up to three months (for BANK casual staff) and who have not been able to access online pay slips? What actions are being taken to prevent staff losses and service disruption?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p><i>Following the transfer of 1,300 staff to Virgin Care on 1 April 2017, Virgin Care report that the first pay run was successful with only a normal number of queries raised, as would be expected following any pay run. During the May 2017 pay run however, a small proportion (around 10%) of colleagues in B&NES – mainly those paid on an hourly rate – raised queries about their pay; Virgin Care immediately took action to resolve individual queries as soon as possible, within a number of days, and launched a full investigation led by a member of their executive team. Commissioners can confirm that Virgin Care do not believe, and has not been made aware of, any colleague who has waited the length of time described for a correction to be made. The June 2017 pay run was successful and again only a small number of queries were raised. Virgin Care has taken action both to re-communicate deadlines for the submission of time sheets, resolved queries raised – with additional payments where necessary made within days – on an individual basis with colleague, and implemented suggestions made by colleagues in B&NES to simplify processes. Virgin Care moved B&NES colleagues from a paper-based to an online payslip system and we have supported colleagues to access and print these, providing support as part of our business as usual processes.</i></p> <p><i>Commissioners have submitted a full 100 Day Report to Health and Wellbeing Select</i></p>		

Committee containing information in relation to this question.

M 05 **Question from:** Councillor Tim Ball

Could the Cabinet member confirm whether Virgin Care have been unable to implement their IT system, meaning that staff are using the old 'Huddle' system and that some new staff have no IT access at all?

Answer from: Councillor Vic Pritchard

In order to support the safe transfer of services, Virgin Care made arrangements for colleagues who transferred on 1 April 2017 to continue to use their existing computer network for the first 100 days of the contract and this included continuing to use the Huddle system as teams had previously done. However, this arrangement could not be extended beyond 1 July and so the timescales of the replacement of the computer network and all devices was driven by necessity. Virgin Care completed the roll out of their new network to the B&NES community services on 1 July 2017 as planned and all colleagues are now working on the Virgin Care's VDI (Virtual Desktop Infrastructure) network. This rollout project included deploying hundreds of desktop computers, laptops, tablets and more than 200 smart phones as well as the replacement of 300 desk phones and the complete replacement of all network infrastructure and connectivity across 32 sites.

As would be expected with any project of this scale (and as noted in Section 7.4 of the Full Business Case), users reported some disruption and issues were logged and resolved in line with the project plan. The issues reported related to accessing files, access to systems by visiting clinicians and difficulties using newly-installed printers and scanners.

On 3 July 2017, Virgin implemented a formal incident reporting framework allowing additional resource to be diverted to support the operation of frontline services. Virgin Care also liaised with commissioners, the CQC and other affected local providers to ensure both regulators and partners were aware that services were operating business continuity plans and were informed of the actions being taken.

There are still some minor IT issues outstanding. However, as a result of the appropriate planning of the project through the Safe Transfer Group (which consists of senior managers from Council, CCG and Virgin Care) and the actions taken to mitigate and resolve issues as they arose, we are in a position at the time of writing this statement to report a return to business as usual at Virgin Care.

Commissioners have submitted a full 100 Day Report to July Health and Wellbeing Select Committee containing information in relation to this question.

M 06 **Question from:** Councillor Alison Millar

What options, other than externalisation, were considered to achieve cuts in the youth service budget?

Answer from:	Councillor Paul May
<p><i>The budget agreed in February includes a savings target relating to the youth connect service that seeks to maintain the Council's commitment to delivering its statutory requirements, whilst also encouraging and enabling local community groups to develop the additional capacity in key areas that will offer supplementary services for young people. The aim is to explore options that would enable alternative delivery arrangements for services creating potential partnerships with local communities/parishes thus enabling local community groups to develop the additional capacity in key areas that will offer supplementary services for young people. We are working carefully with staff to look for community based options, this is not about simple externalisation of services. The full savings target is for delivery in 2019/20, giving time to explore the various options for service delivery before final decisions are taken.</i></p>	
M 07	Question from: Councillor Dine Romero
<p>Could the Cabinet Member give us an update on whether all children at Bath Community Academy now have a place at an alternative school for September 2018?</p>	
Answer from:	Councillor Paul May
<p><i>56 of the 58 students from BCA have confirmed places for September. Two children do not have agreed place for September and discussions with both families continue to seek to resolve this as soon as possible.</i></p>	
M 08	Question from: Councillor Dine Romero
<p>Could the Cabinet Member give us details about any approaches that the Council has received for use of the Bath Community Academy site for secondary education?</p>	
Answer from:	Councillor Paul May
<p><i>BCA will close in July 2018 and ownership of the site will revert back to the Council from 1 September 2018. The Council has not received any proposals for the use of the site for any form of secondary education. The Council has previously stated that it would like to see that site continue to be used for educational purposes and this remains our view. The form this should take is a matter that will need to be considered carefully, taking account of the types of educational provision required in Bath and the wider area. As part of this, we must also recognise that the preceding two general admission secondary schools on this site have not been able to attract the pupil numbers required to become sustainable.</i></p>	
M 09	Question from: Councillor Richard Samuel
<p>Can the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning state the total number of social housing units in B&NES available for rent each year from 2006/7 to 2016/17 together with the total numbers on the housing waiting list for the corresponding years?</p>	

Answer from:

Councillor Paul Myers

The table below details total number of social housing units in B&NES available for rent each year from 2006/7 to 2016/17 together with the total numbers on the housing waiting list for the corresponding years.

Year	Applicants registered	Social housing vacancies
2008/09	n/a	549
2009/10	n/a	545
2010/11	10344	689
2011/12	11775	768
2012/13	12860	568
2013/14	4747*	622
2014/15	5148	812
2015/16	5877	788
2016/17	4357 **	674

Notes

The figures reported for properties available to rent relate to the number of social housing vacancies being advertised each year. This figure can vary from year to year for a number of reasons, though the biggest factor is simply residents moving or passing away. In addition, yearly figures can show spikes in numbers of homes available when large-scale developments come on-line, as has been the case in recent years with developments such as Bath Western Riverside, Norton Radstock Regeneration, and Somerdale and K2 in Keynsham . Other factors which can affect figures include vacancies being held by the Registered Provider for refurbishment/regeneration.

n/a *Data not available*

* *Policy revision and data cleanse*

** *Data cleanse. Team are now operating a continuous data cleanse model.*

Supplementary Question:

I have asked about total number of social housing units. Could I have an answer on that?

My supplementary is – can the Cabinet Member inform us about the level of sums received through planning process for affordable housing for each year and are all of those sums committed to social housing?

Answer from:

Councillor

The total number of units is on increase from year 2011. For year 2016 there are 8,821 units.

For supplementary - A response will be provided within 5 clear working days.

M 10	Question from:	Councillor Dine Romero
Please could the Cabinet member provide an update on buildings fire safety checks?		
	Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>The Council has a firm understanding of its roles and responsibilities in relation to fire risk management as it relates to new building design, premises management, statutory planning and building control.</i></p> <p><i>The primary function of building control is to maintain the health and safety of people in and around buildings, and clearly fire safety is a key part of this. The Council's building control section continues to carry out detailed checks on all applications submitted to us for building regulation approval, throughout both the design and construction phases of a project. However, as the approval process operates within a competitive marketplace, it may be the building control function is administered by a private company and the Council has no control over those.</i></p> <p><i>We will continue to work with Architects, Engineers, building contractors and developers to ensure, as far as can be ascertained, building regulation requirements are met and compliant buildings are handed over at the end of construction. For buildings other than dwellings, the responsibility for managing fire safety risk post construction then lies with the 'responsible person' (often the building owner or building user) as defined within the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005.</i></p> <p><i>With regards to the main Council offices, fire risk assessments are commissioned and reviewed, annual fire alarm servicing is undertaken, fire alarms are tested weekly and evacuation drills carried out on a regular basis.</i></p> <p><i>However, the issue of building compliance remains a key priority for this Council and a high level review looking specifically at fire risk management is currently being undertaken by officers across this Authority. Updates will be provided as this review progresses.</i></p>		
M 11	Question from:	Councillor Paul Crossley
What work is the Council doing with the private sector in Bath and the large number of empty outlets in their control?		
	Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>Of the 223 retail units the Council holds within its commercial portfolio, there are currently 14 presently empty of which 5 are under offer to prospective tenants. The number of voids not under offer therefore represents approximately 4% of the overall retail stock, which compares very favourably with market performance indicators.</i></p> <p><i>The Council works closely with its tenants and wherever possible seeks to market and re-let any properties where it has received advance notice that an existing tenant is intending to vacate their unit.</i></p> <p><i>In an effort to mitigate the effects any empty units may have on a particular street the Council regularly grants window licences and pursues short term lets, such as 'pop ups'</i></p>		

which provide an opportunity for smaller start-up companies to test their products and experience trading opportunities before entering into any longer term commitments. The Council and its partners including the BID are working proactively with the Department of International Trade (DIT) to increase the inward investment potential of the area and have recently hosted a visit from the DIT's national retail lead. The Council is also working closely with the Bath Independent Businesses group to ensure that their concerns about the vitality of local retail and their suggestions to support the sector are heard and put in place.

M 12	Question from:	Councillor Richard Samuel
-------------	-----------------------	---------------------------

Can the Cabinet Member explain the rationale that has been used to only offer residents on fortnightly collections from November a 140 litre gull proof sack and not a smaller 70 litre sack where residents would prefer this?

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

The 140 litre bags are being blanket delivered to those properties on every other week collections to ensure that residents have enough capacity as these are the same volume as the wheeled bins. If after receiving the 140 litre bag a resident feels that they will be able to manage with the reduced capacity of a 70 litre bag then they can contact the Council to arrange for it to be changed.

M 13	Question from:	Councillor Richard Samuel
-------------	-----------------------	---------------------------

Can the Cabinet state what the residual waste collection arrangements for the Christmas and New Year period will be, and provide assurance that, as with neighbouring authorities, residents will be permitted to present additional waste to that contained within bins or sacks and that this will be collected by the Council's collectors and no residual waste will be left uncollected?

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

The collection schedule for Christmas is planned to mirror neighbouring authorities already on every other week refuse collections. Collections after the Christmas bank holidays will take place up to 2 days later, with collections catching up and back to normal after 3 weeks. The Council understands that Christmas is a busy period for residents and so additional waste will be collected during this period.

Supplementary Question:

Have you started negotiations with contractors about Christmas collection arrangements?

Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
---------------------	----------------------------

All will be set for Christmas period.

M 14	Question from:	Councillor Andrew Furse
<p>Could the Cabinet Member update us on the running total of requests from residents for a different waste container (wheelie bin or sack) or a different size than allocated? How many of these requests have been refused and how many complaints has the Council received about the scheme in general?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Martin Veal
<p><i>Total number received – 2137 Completed so far – 2096 Accepted – 1207 (58%) Not accepted – 889 (42%) 2 complaints logged through the corporate complaints procedure 13 requests for a review by a senior manager.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
<p>Will the Council reconsider its approach by giving those residents who did not accept real choice between wheelie bin and sacks?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Warren
<p><i>889 residents who did not accept is a low number in comparison to total number of properties in BANES. Nevertheless, the Council will be as flexible as possible.</i></p>		
M 15	Question from:	Councillor Paul Crossley
<p>How much did the council spend on clearing up fly tipping in the financial year ending 2017, 2016 and 2015 and how many incidents made up this total?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Martin Veal
<p><i>A response will be provided within 5 clear working days as the data needs to be collated because it covers a number of financial years.</i></p>		
M 16	Question from:	Councillor Paul Crossley
<p>How many fly tipping incidents were reported to the Council that were not cleared up by the Council as they were on private land – again for the financial years ending 2017, 2016, 2015?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Martin Veal
<p><i>The Council does not hold information about the incidents of fly tipping reported to us that are on private land, we direct the complainant to the land owner directly usually without the need for it to be logged.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		

We must have an idea on how many fly tipping we pass on to other people, so is that number not achievable?	
Answer from:	Councillor
<i>A response will be provided within 5 clear working days.</i>	
M 17	Question from: Councillor Paul Crossley
How many of the fly tipping incidents in question 16 were on Curo land?	
Answer from:	Councillor Martin Veal
<i>The Council does not hold information about the incidents of fly tipping reported to us that are on private land, we direct the complainant to contact Curo or the land owner directly usually without the need for it to be logged.</i>	
M 18	Question from: Councillor Paul Crossley
The Council achieved a recycling rate of 80% in the year ending May 2015. What were the rates achieved for the recording year ending in 2016 and 2017?	
Answer from:	Councillor Martin Veal
<i>The 80% figure for the 14/15 financial year is the Recycling and Recovery rate. The year-end figures for 15/16 show we Reused, Recycled & Composted 53% of our waste and recovered value from 81%. The year-end waste figures for 16/17 haven't been audited yet but the draft figures show that we Reused, Recycled & Composted 53% of our waste, and recovered value from 87% of our waste.</i>	
M 19	Question from: Councillor Dine Romero
<p>With regard to the recently announced consultation on the future location of Bath Central Library and the Bath One Stop Shop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposal of combining the two services at the Podium envisage any loss of floor space for the library compared to the current layout? • Will the Cabinet publish an example floor layout for the combined services at the Podium (example floor layouts for Lewis House having already been published in the February/March consultation)? • Why were the other three options mentioned in the draft consultation document rejected? • Now the archives have been moved, when will the exhibition room at Bath Central Library be reopened? 	
Answer from:	Councillor Martin Veal
With regard to the recently announced consultation on the future location of Bath Central Library and the Bath One Stop Shop:	

Does the proposal of combining the two services at the Podium envisage any loss of floor space for the library compared to the current layout?

The report is recommending consultation on two options for an integrated Library & one stop shop with the space available for public use highlighted in the consultation documentation. Consultation on the location will run from the 20th July to the 15th September 2017 (a period of 8 weeks). Once the preferred location has been decided we will work with a cross section of community to design the new layout which includes the integration of both services.

It is important to recognise that:

- Our experience in Keynsham and the experience of other authorities that have brought together services has shown they can successfully share facilities with relatively little dedicated space*
- The space vacated by moving the archives to the specialist centre in the Guildhall does provide more opportunities to make better use of the available floor plate.*
- A revamp of the furnishings and the introduction of new technology will also create new opportunities to meet the changing needs of users and make better use of available space*

Taking all of these together, we don't anticipate that the combining of these two services will result in any diminution of the services provided by either one. The final layout and use of the space will be developed together with a cross section of the community once the final location is determined so the public will have a real say in how the space is allocated and used.

Will the Cabinet publish an example floor layout for the combined services at the Podium (example floor layouts for Lewis House having already been published in the February/March consultation)?

This consultation is only about location (not design) and we have given an equally balanced assessment of both options in the supporting materials. There are pros and cons for each location and these are also highlighted in the report so we would encourage people to think about the type of services and space they wish to use and make an informed choice. The council is completely open minded as to its preferred location and wants the local community to be able to work with the Council, on a new layout without feeling constrained by pre-existing designs. For this reason we have not set out designs at this stage, but have set out in the consultation documentation the public floor space that is available for both options so that residents can make their own judgements on the suitability of each location.

We will only get in to design stage once the preferred location has been chosen. It is at that point we will work closely with the community to develop designs that meet the needs of all users of the Library and One Stop Shop

Why were the other three options mentioned in the draft consultation document rejected?

The reasons for rejecting the other three options are detailed in the Business case which accompanies this report.

Now the archives have been moved, when will the exhibition room at Bath Central

Library be reopened?

As outlined by the Leader Tim Warren at the BDB meeting on the 11th July, we are making plans to bring the exhibition room back in to use.

We are planning on removing the rolling stack which is broken, once this has been done we will then engage contractors to make good the space and we will be able to empty the exhibition space and relocate overflow stock to the rolling stack area. At present we are working with the Landlord to ensure lift facilities are capable to take the removal loads. We anticipate this to be complete during the Autumn at which point we will re-open the Exhibition for a temporary period until the options for the new Modern library are finalised.

It should also be noted that since we have moved the Local History Section to the Guildhall, we will be reorganising shelving in the Central library to extend the children's section to enable a wide range of activities to take place in this area including our annual Summer reading challenge which attracts a considerable footfall.

Supplementary Question:

Will the Cabinet now consider resident led options?

Answer from:

Councillor Tim Warren

We will be looking at Modern Libraries consultation tonight and after that we will consider full report in October. We will study responses from residents. We want to protect our libraries.

M 20**Question from:**

Councillor Neil Butters

Is the Cabinet member satisfied that the Council's emergency contact number system is fit for purpose? Is this service provided in-house and who responds to the emergency number? Residents have reported to me that they were unable to make contact for over an hour when trying to report the blockage of the B3110 by a fallen tree last month.

Answer from:

Councillor Martin Veal

The Officer on call at the time of the enquiry responded to the caller in the very early hours of the morning. This incident was dealt with after an hour and given the time of night constitutes a reasonable response to the enquiry and reaction to the incident. A similar incident occurred shortly afterwards and the response mechanism worked effectively, in short I believe that the system is effective.

Supplementary Question:

Can you please look further at this issue?

Answer from:

Councillor Tim Warren

Yes.

M 21

Question from:

Councillor Andrew Furse

With regard to the children's play area in Royal Victoria Park:

- Why is the 'picnic area' being given over to a pay-to-play, commercial ride? Residents are angry at the loss of this gentle slope, from which parents can easily monitor their children.
- Is the ride a permanent installation?
- Why were ward Councillors not informed of changes to the play area?
- Why has there been no user engagement over play equipment being moved around the play area?
- Can the Cabinet member assure us that there are no further plans to commercialise children's play areas in parks?

Answer from:

Councillor Martin Veal

1. *The play area has many areas for picnicking, we have fixed picnic tables around the perimeter of site and these offer good views of the site for surveillance purposes, the cafe concession has added some wooden picnic tables that move around the site. The slope adjacent the café will remain. The lease agreement permits 2 rides as has been the case for many years (a carousel on the tarmac area and an inflatable near the cafe). The concession holder is able to locate both rides within the central area under the terms of the lease, as the tarmac area is less viable due to it being harder to monitor and manage, being further away from the cafe - consequently the carousel therefore only operates at weekends and school holidays at the moment. This is clearly not in the Council, the park users nor the concession holders best interests. The concession undoubtedly adds value to the site as it adds vibrancy and inwardly invests making the site a more attractive experience for the customer.*

2. *The carousel is a permanent feature and the inflatable is a summer season item only.*

3. *Ward Cllrs were not involved with the re-tendering of the concession as the terms of the lease were as had been for many years. The Council experienced no issues with the temporary inflatable use last year. There is no net increase in 'rides', it is only the location of the carousel which will likely change.*

4. *As point 3*

There is no net increase in rides at this site and no net increase in commercialization therefore, however the Council does need to maximise the income it makes from the concession. The Council is exploring all income streams to offset budget pressures and where there are opportunities to increase revenue streams from play areas, then these will be assessed also. There are no plans on the table currently though.

Supplementary Question:

Will the Cabinet agree that for city centre residents this children play area is their key play area and share my concern that relocation will lead to undue pressure on all parents?

Answer from:	Councillor Tim Warren
<i>I will, together with you, visit the play area and make my decision afterwards.</i>	
M 22	Question from: Councillor Alison Millar
Why is the Cabinet Member for Community Services unable get the newly-opened public toilets in Batheaston repaired when he has been aware of the problem since April this year? The situation is made worse by the fact that Ward Councillor Initiative money (public funds) were made available to the Parish Council in order to get them re-opened earlier this year.	
Answer from:	Councillor Martin Veal
<i>See question 28.</i>	
M 23	Question from: Councillor Richard Samuel
Can the Cabinet Member for Transport confirm that all the outstanding works identified in the 2015 safety audit for the London Road improvements will be completed in the current financial year?	
Answer from:	Councillor Mark Shelford
<i>The Council has allocated funding in the 2017/18 capital programme for London Road. The safety audit identified a number of issues that will be addressed this financial year.</i>	
M 24	Question from: Councillor Ian Gilchrist
When will ward members and the Widcombe Association receive any kind of meaningful reply to repeated questions about progress on the Widcombe Parade rectifications? As a reminder, the new scheme was opened in June 2015. Snags were identified and discussed in detail on a walkabout with officers in June 2016. Money (£55k in total) was approved in the budget (Feb 2017) to tackle these snags, but despite repeated requests to meet and an indication of what is being considered nothing of any use has been returned. Numerous promised dates have been offered and then missed, the latest being for June 2017.	
Answer from:	Councillor Mark Shelford
<i>The council allocated funds in the 2017/18 capital programme for Prior Park Road - Rossiter Road. These works are programmed for Quarter 2 , the Design & Projects team will begin work on this in the coming weeks and will keep stakeholders updated as the project progresses.</i>	
M 25	Question from: Councillor Neil Butters
With regard to the recently announced preliminary study into the feasibility of a light rail tram system in Bath, to be completed within this financial year:	

- How was the decision to allocate funding taken?
- How much money is the Council allocating to the study and from which budget line?
- Are any other organisations making financial contributions towards the study?
- What are the terms of reference of the study?
- Who will undertake the study?

Answer from:

Councillor Mark Shelford

How was the decision to allocate funding taken?

The Trams feasibility study was undertaken as part of the Getting Around Bath work stream which forms part of the Transport Improvement Programme. This was agreed in consultation with the Cabinet Member and falls within the budget framework agreed by Full Council.

How much money is the Council allocating to the study and from which budget line?

The budget for the study has been set at £10k.

Are any other organisations making financial contributions towards the study?

No

What are the terms of reference of the study?

*Review previous studies
 Review JTS and identify opportunities for a linked or a standalone system.
 Identify similar schemes that could be used for comparison and the key issues with delivery, costs, and operation.
 Provide summary of the:
 capital costs
 operating costs
 commercial case
 impacts on the highway network in terms of congestion and road space
 delivery
 *benefits / disbenefits**

Who will undertake the study?

WS Atkins will undertake the study

M 26

Question from:

Councillor Neil Butters

It is commonplace for buses not to show up as being tracked on the supposedly Real Time Information system. This is often worse than having no RTI system at all as intending passengers may simply walk away believing no bus is due - especially where

timetables have been removed - often to find their bus overtaking them shortly after they have set off.

- What is the current level of reliability for RTI?
- How has the figure changed over the past 3, 6 and 12 months?
- What measures are in place to improve matters, and when can we expect 95% reliability?

Answer from:

Councillor Mark Shelford

Operation of the real-time information (RTI) system for buses relies on several processes happening in the background and a problem in any one of these can affect the output.

Bus operators are responsible for ensuring their vehicles are equipped with the necessary equipment and that it is working. The target level for vehicle "tracking" for all bus operators is 90% of scheduled journeys and we receive monthly reports on operators' performance. In 2016/17, most of them ranged from 87% to 96% - these operators use a GPRS link from the bus ticket machines to the system. However, the two main bus operators in B&NES did not hit the target in any month in 2016/17. They both use a radio link to the system and experience has proved that this form of communication is not as reliable as GPRS. Also, every time these operators transfer vehicles into or out of the local fleet, the RTI equipment has to be removed or refitted.

The monthly average figures fluctuate but there has been an improvement over the past year. The figures for the periods requested are: April 2016 to March 2017 – 77%, October 2016 to March 2017 – 81%, January to March 2017 – 82%. Since April 2017 it has been 80% overall.

The contract with the system provider requires that 99% of RTI-fitted vehicles be displayed on information units. Faults in the display units are passed on to our contractor to follow up and there is a financial penalty if the contractor fails to rectify faults promptly. Faults in the electrical supply require the attendance of a specialist electrical contractor. Officers check the system remotely for faults every working day - subject to staff availability - and report them straight away. We don't hold statistics on the number of units that are functioning fully at any one time.

Occasionally, faults occur as a result of errors in the timetable data supplied to the system. These tend to happen when bus operators change their timetables and reconfigured data has to be uploaded.

Procurement of a new RTI contract to succeed the current one in October 2017 is being carried out by Bristol City Council on behalf of WECA and the four West of England councils. Performance targets will be the same as in the current contract but all bus operators are expected to move to the GPRS system. That should improve RTI performance by reducing the need for maintenance and eliminating the need for on-bus equipment to be removed and re-fitted.

Successful operation of the RTI system is vital to give bus passengers accurate information on how services are running and to give bus operators data to help manage their operations. Officers will maintain pressure on the contractor and bus operators to play their part in improving the performance of the system. The priority is to get all operators to achieve the 90% tracking target but I regret that, at the moment, I cannot give a date by which that or any higher figure will be achieved consistently.

M 27

Question from:

Councillor Neil Butters

What is Council policy with regard to attempting to remove through-route, but nonetheless unsuitable and narrow streets, particularly in villages, from Satnav systems? Ditto high vehicles from routes with low bridges such as the Midford Viaduct on the B3110. How many primary organisations are involved with Satnav mapping and how successful has the Council been in influencing them?

Answer from:

Councillor Mark Shelford

The Council updates the National Street Gazetteer and Ordnance survey via their Highways Layer. Satnav companies are able to contact these organisations direct to obtain updated information the Council has not received request for information direct from Satnav companies and has made no direct contact.

M 28

Question from:

Councillor Alison Millar

What is now holding up the Community Asset Transfer of the Batheaston public toilets to the Parish Council?

Answer from:

Councillor Charles Gerrish

The proposed Community Asset transfer of a parcel of land at Batheaston including the public toilets has unfortunately suffered a temporary delay owing to the discovery of significant damage to the drainage system servicing the toilets.

The works have been specified and are currently with contractors to provide cost estimates. The contractors will be instructed as soon as the estimates have received and approved.

In the meantime, discussions will continue with the Parish Council in relation to completing the transfer of the land.

Supplementary Question:

That drain has been blocked for some time and public money has been spent and we need to know when the work will happen so the public toilets can be open?

Answer from:

Councillor Charles Gerrish

This issue came recently to my attention. I have had conversation with Property Services this week to move this matter forward.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P 01	Question from:	Christine Boyd
Does the transport strategy have an implementation plan yet?		
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford
<p><i>The Transport document, 'Our Plan to Get Bath Moving' summarises a wide range of transport and movement opportunities that the Council are looking to develop further. The report to Cabinet on the Park and Ride to the east of Bath summarises some of these initiatives. If the recommendations in the report are approved officers will be asked to investigate the options further and provide a further report to Cabinet, this will include a delivery plan which will be used to set priorities and summarise progress on individual projects. This delivery plan will sit alongside the Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy Action Plan which is due to be published in the near future.</i></p>		
P 02	Question from:	Christine Boyd
Please list all of the targets and performance indicators in the Transport Strategy and show what progress has been made against these since the Strategy was adopted in 2014?		
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford
<p><i>In addition to the recently published document 'Our Plan to Get Bath Moving' The Getting Around Bath Transport Strategy contains a number of indicators relating to air quality, congestion and parking. The current programme for transport includes various schemes aimed at delivering the strategy.</i></p> <p><i>A summary of the delivery on the transport strategy targets along with the emerging wider transport objectives from the West of England Combined Authority and the Joint Transport Study will be reported to a future Cabinet meeting.</i></p>		
P 03	Question from:	David Martin
Could the Cabinet Member advise if and when the Council is planning any pedestrian crossing improvements on the A36 Warminster Road , Bath, in the location of the Holburne Park development/Minster Way junction and at the junction of Warminster Road with North Road.		

Answer from:	Councillor Mark Shelford
<i>Pedestrian improvements will be provided in the vicinity of Minster Way junction and A36 Warminster Road as part the planning agreement for the new development. The improvements will be constructed by the developer and the necessary technical approvals and agreements are in the process of being finalised. It is anticipated that the works will be undertaken by the developer before the end of this year.</i>	
P 04	Question from: Nicolette Boater
<p>Paragraph 4.13 of the report under item 12 of this agenda pledges to “undertake the scoping study for a light rail system (tram) in Bath and whether this could open up future opportunities to remove vehicles from the city.” Please can you clarify</p> <p>(i) Who will be undertaking this study? i.e. Will it be done externally by transport or engineering consultants or internally by officers, and if the latter, which functions and expertise will be involved?</p> <p>(ii) Will a terms of reference specifying the purpose, objectives, scope, methodological approach and evidence base for the study be made publically available, and if so when?</p>	
Answer from:	Councillor Mark Shelford
<p><i>The study will be undertaken by WS Atkins who are an external multifunctional Consultant.</i></p> <p><i>The terms of reference are listed in the response to question 25.</i></p>	
P 05	Question from: Matthew McCabe
<p>What plans do the council have for this site (confirmed by the questionnaire as the Bath Community Academy), if they cannot fulfil the conditions of ownership, that it be used in perpetuity for the education of the boys (and girls) of the City of Bath?</p> <p>Are there any circumstances where the property would be returned to the original owners at Barrow Castle?</p>	
Answer from:	Councillor Paul May
<i>A response will be provided within 5 clear working days.</i>	

This page is intentionally left blank

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Integration should be at the heart of what WECA does.

The project has the support of Chris Grayling and Jeremy Corbyn nationally.

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

Tim Warren, at the Bath Deserves Better meeting last week, you asked me ‘what do you have against integration?’ and I’d like to be very clear and state for the record that neither myself, nor Save Bath Library, has *anything* against integrating council services.

In fact, as Council Officer Ian Savigar, who is heading up the library move knows full well, it was Save Bath Library’s Caroline Ambrose who first had the idea to investigate integrating the One Stop Shop into the Podium. On March 9th it was our campaign who mapped this out for Savigar in a coffee shop.

If we can bring groups into the library that didn’t visit previously, **great**, though I question whether a buildings mash-up costing millions of pounds is the best way to achieve this. However, integration should certainly be ONE of the alternatives under consultation *provided that*:

- a) Proper research has been conducted that this will benefit both library users and One Stop Shop visitors;
- b) Integration will not result in a diminished library service;
- c) The disabled or vulnerable will not be excluded from either the library or the One Stop Shop;

We now know that Lewis House should have been ruled out as a site for integrated services on March 29th when Council’s own contracted independent surveyor raised significant concerns about the site’s accessibility for disabled visitors. Quick reminder: *Almost half a million* people visit Bath Central Library each year. 41,000 + visitors a month.

Well over one thousand people daily.

For Council to consider raising footfall by that amount to a building that has been deemed confusing and exclusive to the vulnerable and disabled, to a multi-story building with limited entrances and exits, at a time when councils across the UK are facing scrutiny over safety decisions, is not best practice.

Which begs the question: Why haven’t you removed Lewis House from the table of options?

Councils across the UK are facing cuts.

Some councils choose to diminish libraries.

We, your residents, challenge you to think bigger and bolder about integration. If we’re going to do it why don’t we really go for it? What greater statement of “residents first” ambition than to have the great civic Guildhall Buildings become the mother of all One Stop Shops, from births to marriages to deaths.

The Guildhall was home to Bath library for 70 years.

You *claim* to have investigated it as a site for integrated library and council services, so where is the analysis and costing in the library report pack? And why didn’t Ernst & Young provide details on the financial summaries page for the Guildhall?

Don’t pay lip service to integration. Your residents deserve better.

This page is intentionally left blank

My name is Kiki Ambrose and I love Bath Central Library. I read lots of books. My favourite authors are JK Rowling, Jaqueline Wilson and Robin Stevens.

I love novels which let me imagine what it's like to be in someone else's head. When I read Heidi I felt what it was like to have to use a wheelchair. It made me think how lucky I am to be able to run around and do cartwheels whenever I like. But people in wheelchairs can do amazing things too, just look at the Paralympics - they're superhumans!

The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night Time is about a boy with a mental disability. He's called Christopher and he finds it hard to be in places full of signs and noise and cramped spaces make him claustrophobic.

There is a girl in my infants with learning and walking problems. Our school made changes so she could get around and feel welcome and cared for. She even has her own special room with a shower in it. Some of the problems with Lewis House can be fixed too, but you can't make three floors of an old office into a big one floor library specially designed to make everyone happy.

I think libraries should be welcoming places. Heidi's friend should be able to get around without having to struggle with lifts just to get from one bit of the library to the next. And their families definitely shouldn't have to worry about how they would escape if there was ever a fire in there.

Christopher wouldn't be able to use a library which feels small, confusing and has lots of busy desks with council stuff going on. He has big panics in places like that and gets so upset he never wants to go back.

My friend in infants would find it difficult to get around too. In the Podium, she can run to the big safe children's space right

from the escalator. Inside the Podium library there are no stairs inside to fall down and it's a lovely calm place.

I'd like my granny - she's called Granny Sparkle - to be able to come to the library with me too, but she walks with a stick and would probably make excuses if it moves to Lewis House.

I love librarians too. Did you know they study for years to qualify? Roald Dahl's Matilda goes to the library when her dad is at work and her mum is at the bingo. Matilda has lovely happy times sitting in the cosy corner. Her librarian, Mrs Phelps, knows exactly which author is right for Matilda, even though it's Charles Dickens and he's a writer for grown-ups!

Librarians are fun too. They put on lots of events and clubs. My friends and I feel really sad our event room closed when Lynne the librarian was told librarians aren't needed any more. When she was there kids could do all kinds of stuff like computer clubs and I saw an amazing storyteller once for the haunted house summer reading challenge. She got us all to rattle our chains and gnash our teeth!

They still give out summer reading challenge cards but there's no Lynne and this year there was just a man handing out free balloons. Balloons are nice, but they soon pop and that doesn't make the same memory as a good event.

I'm Caroline Ambrose. I work with a team of 20 kids including those whose life chances are directly linked to library services.

I'm here to raise some questions about the options for Bath Central Library.

Given the concern about the council's handling of this matter, my aim is to help cabinet steer away from a judicial review that will prove costly both financially and reputationally for B&NES.

Firstly, cabinet are you in a position to vote today? A mountain of info was published only last week which raises fundamental questions about viability of both options.

Cabinet have you had time to read and consider all documents? Has Cllr Veal briefed you on the serious issues and omissions? Option 1 is not viable on Bevans' report alone with unacceptable accessibility for those with mobility, learning, sight, hearing and mental health issues.

Alongside this, Option 1 has vastly increased costs of £6.4m which seem to fail the key criteria of "Delivery Within Capital Provision". Also vastly reduced savings and no info about external income.

A huge question mark also hangs over Option 2. The cabinet documents seem to have nothing on what integration would look like. Not even indicative layouts or operational models. According to the data, library footfall is 495k per year, the One Stop Shop 130k. How will a compressed library cope with over 25% more visits? How will a (presumably) smaller OSS cope with the huge uplift of being in a busier site on hugely reduced staffing? These are big operational questions.

There is also no detail about the impact on accessibility of what Bevans identify as a "plethora" of facilities added into the mix. Ergo, in all those documents, cabinet does not have enough facts, unless perhaps Councillor Veal can explain how it will all work?

Councillor Veal, you have also as yet not found time to receive the many other options collated since January by Save Bath Libraries. A valid petition was presented on February 14th but we've still not had the council debate at which we wish to present these options as you will not meet.

How is cabinet is being asked to vote in your full knowledge you have yet to represent options residents expect to be considered equally alongside those favoured by officers and/or yourself.

Lastly, as B&NES "2020 Vision" is to be "known as a beautifully inventive C21st place, where everyone is invited to think big" surely cabinet you would want to look at a ready-made list of beautifully inventive big ideas?

In view of all of this, I urge cabinet to postpone the vote. Option 1 is based on financial nonsense for a site some residents won't be able to access while Option 2 has a high chance of operational chaos. I trust you will agree this matter needs further time and thought?

Thank you.

19 July 2017: Bathnes Cabinet - Library Consultation (item 13)

Credentials

- Thank you for hearing me, ahead of library consultation opening tomorrow (20th)
- I'm a leading consultation adviser, hired by Chief Executives and Chairs of several globally-respected UK organisations to lead major consultations:
 - **BAA Heathrow, Transport for London, Royal Shakespeare Company, Bristol Old Vic, Colston Hall, PwC/Dept for Int. Development**
- I work with local & national government, from Numbers 10 and 11 downwards.
- This is my bread and butter and I am well respected for it.

My Professional Concerns

- I've been extremely concerned at what I have witnessed over our library this year.
- I have dedicated my career to advising people like yourselves who end up - often by accident - causing distress and offence to their local population...
- And of course, as you may know by know, experiencing misery in their own day to day lives from the stress this brings.
- You are our elected representatives - paid from our taxes.
- While I may protest about your decisions, I am honour-bound as a professional to say loudly & publicly that you can still turn this horrible situation around.
- **Leadership means exercising your right to pause and rethink.**

Tonight

- Tonight, you will consider the future of Bath Central Library - its co-location with the one stop shop.
- **But I strongly advise you to postpone because as things stand, it looks very much as through you are offering a false choice:**
 - The substantive question of whether to co-locate the library with another service is not going before the public
 - Your papers show that 1 of the 2 options is at very least challengeable under Disability Discrimination legislation - and it is by far the more expensive
 - You have even queered the pitch by sending a letter to parents through schools to put your case, before the consultation is even opened
- **Tonight, you can do something meaningful with your repeated statement that, "No final decision has yet been made":**

- Tonight, you can mandate every Committee and Department to assess the *holistic*, best value impact of co-locating the One Stop Shop & library

- Tonight, you - this new Cabinet - can show genuine leadership:
 - postpone this consultation,
 - and stop a headlong rush into an obsolete plan that will only harm our city.

- Tonight, you can stop this rush to folly.

Thank you.

FIONA CARNIE

I would like to talk to you about the Council's proposals for changing the arrangements for refuse collection. In Rockliffe Road in Bathwick we have been told that we will all be allocated wheeled bins and myself and many neighbours are unhappy about this. A number of residents have requested black gull proof bags and have been told that we cannot have them.

I have carried out a survey of those terraced houses in Rockliffe Road that do not have access to their back gardens and out of 28 such houses, 13 - **almost 50%** - have registered their strong opposition to the proposals. Opposition is based on the following reasons:

- There is little room in our front gardens for a wheeled bin
- It is not easy to wheel the bin through the house to store at the back (as has been advised by officers)
- The street will look ugly if there is a bin in every front garden
- We do not believe that the scheme will increase recycling.

I forwarded the results of the survey to Bath-based Councillors and 5 have responded to me that they also object to the scheme, and that a number of residents in their areas have also objected.

The Council says that they have consulted on their plans – but we do not recall any such consultation. In fact a number of households have not received letters about the change. At least one household received an incorrect letter from the Council telling them they had been allocated a re-useable bag. This mistake only came to light as a consequence of our joint activity on this issue. How many other Bath households have either not received letters at all or received incorrect letters and so have not registered their opposition to the scheme?

I should say that we fully support the Council's aim to encourage recycling, but it is unclear how the new arrangements will achieve this. Instead it will make it easy for people just to fill up their bins. I was informed yesterday by the Director of Environmental Services that two households in the road have requested larger bins and that this request has been agreed. If the Council is serious about increasing recycling rates surely such requests should be turned down.

We also feel that significant natural resources will go into the manufacture of such bins. At a time when there is so much in the media about the need to reduce plastics, Bath should be leading the way in finding alternatives to plastic.

So, as you can see, there is considerable opposition to the plans in Rockliffe Road with a number of residents remaining adamant that they will not use a wheeled bin. We have been told that there is similar opposition in other areas. If wheeled bins are delivered against our wishes there are plans to dump them at the Guildhall.

Nobody has explained why we cannot have a choice of bin or bag - and that is what we are asking for.

Below are some of the responses received from neighbours in Rockliffe Road:

I am not happy with this situation since I recycle a great proportion of my waste, live in a mid terrace house with no side access and do not want a larger than I need wheelie bin in my front garden.

I live in an inside terrace with no back entry, I have 5 steps up from the garden to my rear door, carpeted breakfast room & then 5 steps into the carpeted hall, then 2 steps to the front path, I shall be 84 when the changes take place, I will not drag a wheeled bin from my rear garden, nor will I leave a bin in my front garden. I require AND will get a refuse bag.

We oppose these plans and we did not know anything about it.

I and my husband disagree strongly with the proposals and would prefer to use a reusable rubbish bag

I suddenly have been allocated a wheelie bin when the letter of 9th March 2017 from the Council clearly stated that I was being given a 140 litre re-usable rubbish bag.

I have not received any letter informing me of these changes – but I am completely against them. I do not want a bin as we don't have very much rubbish

Surely the Council is not going to go ahead with this. It is madness and I do not want a bin. I don't have space for it.

It is such a waste of money and precious resources to be forcing bins on people who don't want them. Re-useable bags are much less resource-intensive.

In a city as beautiful as Bath I don't understand why the Council hasn't come up with a more imaginative solution.

I would like to thank the cabinet for allowing me to make a statement in response to the Planning, Housing and Economic Development Policy Scrutiny Panel's recent decision to endorse the emerging preferred approach to introduce a sandwich policy and lower the HMO threshold to 10%.

I am not only speaking on behalf of the students at the University of Bath but I am also speaking up for young people AND all who will be at detriment if this policy passes.

Firstly, it's important to point out that it is not just students that live in HMOs; young people, young professionals and other workers are also major demographics who live in these properties. Is it wise to prevent young professionals and workers from being able to live in Bath too? Considering that both locally and nationally, there is an aging population-limiting the amount of younger people in Bath means it will miss out on a range of benefits to both the economy and community.

Lowering the threshold to 10% is extreme and seems non-sensical when it is well over 10% of Bath's population who live in HMOs currently. HMOs are greatly needed in Bath with many jobs not providing enough money for workers to afford non-shared accommodation. The more affordable alternative of HMOs is the only way for many to live in such an expensive city.

Consequently, we fear that this policy is a knee-jerk reaction to some of the perceived negative impacts of students. Reading through reports, terms such as 'studentification' are hard to read. Not only is it hard to imagine such action and motive being applied towards other groups of people, but resolving complaints about students is not as easy as implementing a policy like this... student houses will still exist at current numbers; as such, these policies will not be solving the issue at hand.

Although limiting the development of more HMOs may seem like a method to cap student numbers, in reality, this holds no control over both universities' recruitment. The University is required to grow due to marketised Higher Education and they are now focussing on postgraduate recruitment. It is likely that both universities will continue to pour increasing numbers of students into Bath. Not only will that lead to students without accommodation, drop outs and other welfare concerns for students, such as isolation and increasing stress... But also, it will lead to more Purpose Built Student Accommodation; giving private developers a tighter grip over Bath, concentrating student numbers further and not to mention, being more expensive for students compared to HMOs. The council needs to exert greater control on the location, type and affordability of PBSAs. It is unfair to penalise students, *who are not just at university for personal development but to contribute more widely to society*, for the over-recruitment of universities. You cannot look towards our already crowded campus to house all new students because we are surrounded by; green belt and areas of outstanding natural beauty, restricting opportunities for development there.

Overall, it is particularly concerning to learn that the bulk of this consultation will take place over the summer months leading up to the next cabinet meeting in October, because a lot of students will not be in Bath. Considering that roughly 25% of Bath's population are students, it is only fair and right that we request you delay the consultation until the students are back and can truly be heard- especially as there was little to no acknowledgement of our previous consultation in the stakeholder engagement questions.

Students and young people are becoming increasingly engaged in politics, it is important that our view is heard, not to mention the many others who live in HMOs. So, I'm requesting you consider delaying the consultation and official voting on HMO policy until students return to Bath.

Thank you so much for your time.

Speech by Annie Kilvington to B&NES Cabinet 19.7.17

The Bathampton Meadows Alliance is delighted with the decision you are about to take not to proceed to develop the Meadows, and is keen to work with you on initiatives that can make a genuine reduction in congestion and pollution in the City.

Any anticipation we have of a future where transparent, evidence based decision making will prevail has however been seriously undermined by the rationale presented by the Council for the cancellation of the scheme. We are bewildered that there is no mention in the report to cabinet today of:

- the objections of the National Trust, and Bath Preservation Trust, the major stakeholders in the preservation of this City's World Heritage status; or
- the evidence of your consultants and the BMA that the scheme would make no positive contribution to the reduction of congestion or pollution in the City; or
- the absence of any realistic prospect of passing the high threshold tests in your new Placemaking Plan, and national planning legislation, to establish that any benefit would outweigh significant harm.

Instead you would have us believe that you have been broadsided by the safety concerns of the Highways Agency over access to Sites B and F and that reasons beyond your control are at the heart of today's decision. This is a pitiful, deeply misleading attempt to dignify the Council's withdrawal from the scheme.

HE approval has always been a major project risk – it is on the risk register. You've known since the 2013 Halcrow report that the access junction for Site B was likely to require a departure from Highways standards and would require HE approval. Your consultants Motts have been grappling with HE's "operational concerns" since 2016 and by the end of January this year were trying to convince HE to accept "economic benefits" as a trade off against public safety – a scandal in itself.

By 9 February 2017, before the call in of the January Cabinet decision was heard on 23 February, HE had told you they could not approve access to site B. You kept that information from the councillors on the scrutiny panel determining the call in, and you kept it from the public. You kept spending our money, you falsely used purdah to keep everyone in the dark and you waited until now to scrap the scheme.

I can think of only three reasons why the Council can have continued to ignore the historical, empirical evidence of its consultants and major stakeholders. The first is political arrogance, the second is gross incompetence, and the third is corruption – by which I do not necessarily mean financial corruption, but a seam of moral corruption running deep within the council which has sought to steer money away from other public services in favour of a cause promoted for personal or political vanity. Which would you have the public believe it is?

This page is intentionally left blank

Christine Boyd statement to Cabinet 19th July 2017

After 2 years of fighting I should be happy with today's report, and of course I am pleased the EOB P&R is not going ahead. But as a concerned citizen the experience has left me angry that this could have happened and with a determination that it should never happen again.

The council knew in 2013 that there was an access problem to site B – the Halcrow report said it would require a departure from normal safety standards that would need to be agreed with Highways England (*Accommodating an access junction with the bypass to the west of Mill Lane is thus likely to require a 'Departure' from standard with respect to TD22/06; which would need to be agreed with the Highways Agency as the bypass form part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN)*). So why was site B ever in the frame and how did it ever become the preferred site?

This is just one example of the failure to consider evidence before coming up with a solution. We now also know that the existing P&R sites are only half full and that the east P&R would not have helped the London Road to any significant degree.

Under these circumstances how could the council have got a P&R on the meadows through planning when the benefits would have to be weighed against harm? The benefits were so few and the harm so great.

And so now the council drops park and ride and pulls some new tricks from the hat, a tram here and a link road there. A response to those who say, 'something must be done!'

We of course 'something must be done' – but it must be the right thing, and finding the right thing begins with gathering empirical evidence.

We all know Bath has a traffic problem particularly at certain times of day and certain times of the year. What we don't know is the detail of where the traffic is going and why:

- Are people going to work, shopping, visiting or on the school run?
- Are HGVs and LGV's 'through traffic' or delivering in the city too?
- How much traffic is due to very short local journeys and do sustainable alternatives exist that meet people's need?

Until we understand what contributes to this problem we can't possibly know if a bypass or a tram is the best and most cost effective solution.

Our council has failed to answer, or even to ask these questions.

The BMA therefore joins the Bath Preservation Trust and others in calling for an independent study and assessment of evidenced-based patronage data so as to understand people's travel behaviour and needs. We look forward to talking to the Council further about assembling this information.

This page is intentionally left blank

Andrew Mercer Statement to Cabinet 19th July 2017

There were plenty of warnings that the east of Bath Park and Ride project was the wrong solution in the wrong place and plenty of earlier opportunities to stop and think again.

Stakeholder engagement failed, had you consulted early, and genuinely engaged with;

- the community
- parish councils
- Bath Preservation Trust
- National Trust.
- Historic England, or
- Highways England,

this project would not have got off the ground.

Project planning has failed. The access issue was know from the start, it was on your risk register – yet the transport department ploughed ahead without bottoming out this fundamental and fatal risk.

Internal monitoring and challenge failed.

- Who was monitoring what the transport department and their consultants were doing?
- Why was scrutiny not given the time and resource to truly SCRUTINISE this project?
- Why was the call in panel that met on the 23rd February to examine the Cabinet decision not told about the email from Highways England 2 weeks earlier that said they would not approve access to site B?
- Why did officers, when challenged by the BMA, circle the wagons and cover one another's backs rather than investigate?

Finally this report fails to reflect on these shortcomings; there is no indication that the council intends to examine what went wrong or learn from this experience even with 2 years and £1m wasted.

Organisations that don't reflect on their failures and seek to improve are destined to make the same mistakes again.

If people are to have any confidence in the Council to get it right next time there must be an inquiry. The BMA urge you to investigate and are ready to cooperate.

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement to 19.7.17 Cabinet

At key points in the P&R East decision-making process, and as an economist and policy developer, I have expressed concerns about the way the decision was being made. So I am pleased to see that some of these have been addressed in your revised Transport Plan. In particular, I welcome

- It's awareness of the ever-changing policy-making context;
- It's emphasis on integrated rather than single project solutions;
- It's embrace of the opportunities WECA brings to progress high impact high investment schemes;
and
- It's emerging recognition that environmental and community, as well as economic development impacts, are critical to the evaluation of net benefits from infrastructure investment.

However, whilst I believe this P&R East decision to be the right one, I am less pleased with the enormous community stress, wasted public money and length of time associated with it, and am anxious that future infrastructure initiatives learn from its mistakes.

These are what I see as the three main P&R East lessons:

1. Stakeholder engagement needs to be earlier, better informed, more inclusive and open-minded:
In this regard I urge you to build, rather than assume, a shared purpose, and make sure initiatives such as city centre parking support it. And beware the dangers of, for example, "championing" the A39/A46 link road, without first understanding whether a wide range of stakeholders and expert opinion, all impacts considered, share your preference for it.
2. Ensure supporting evidence and analysis is transparent, impartial and "fit for purpose":
In these regards not only do I support those calling for independent, evidenced-based patronage data so as to understand the many reasons people travel, but also reiterate my concern around the circa £700k you have invested in P&R East related transport modeling, and question your claim that it is "transferable to other projects".
3. The final lesson is a subject in its own right, so I mention it here for completeness only: Align the Council's risk management and capital approval processes with those of delivering successful infrastructure projects, and make these processes more comprehensive, and implement them rigourously.

So, I implore all members, regardless of political persuasion, to learn from past mistakes, in order to better confront the enormity and complexity of the transport challenges our locality faces. And to do so, armed with both a coherent, evidence-founded and future-focused strategy, and the combined resolve of the many and diverse stakeholders in its successful delivery.

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



This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet 19 July 2017 - P&R East of Bath – speaking note by Patrick Rotheram, Federation of Bath Residents' Associations

1. I will not spend too long on the decision not to proceed with an Eastern P&R at Site B or F. Over the last 10 years FOBRA has consistently supported the case for an Eastern P&R, because we believe P&R can contribute to reducing city traffic, *as part of a comprehensive transport strategy* which includes reducing city centre traffic. Successive Councils followed a highly successful policy of expanding P&R, in conjunction with reducing visitor parking, to reduce the volume of traffic entering the city. We still think a P&R somewhere east of Bath is likely to be needed.
2. We are left seriously concerned about your intentions on transport. The need for action to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution remains as urgent as ever. As a World Heritage Site, the historic core of Bath is a joke: clogged with traffic, a shortcut for through traffic, its iconic spaces spoiled, its air foul with exhaust fumes.
3. The weird thing is, the Council's own policies recognise the need for change. The Core Strategy calls for a car-free city centre. The Placemaking Plan calls for a city centre free of all but essential traffic, while the excellent Public Realm and Movement Strategy sets out a compelling vision of beautiful public spaces free of traffic. The Transport Strategy set out a road map for achieving this.
4. The paper before you mentions the Transport Strategy, and we would like to ask you to confirm that this still stands as Council policy. It may need updating. 'Our plan to get Bath moving' is not a strategy. It contains no coherent vision for the city, no clear strategic objective, no costs and no timescales. On air quality, there is no mention of the need to reduce traffic volumes. There is nothing about reducing traffic in the historic core of the city through parking control and traffic management. It seems that off-street parking will not be reduced as was proposed in the Transport Strategy. Even worse, it talks of increasing short-term parking, quite contrary to the Strategy. Increasing parking will simply draw more traffic into the city, adding to the congestion and the already unlawful levels of air pollution.
5. On a positive note, we welcome Councillor Shelford's appointment as Cabinet Member for Transport. Our initial discussions with Mark have been encouraging, as he has stressed the need for a clear vision for the city on which to base transport policy. We look forward to engaging constructively with him on how to transform Bath from the current mess into a city worthy of its World Heritage Site status.

This page is intentionally left blank