

## **BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

### **CABINET**

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

Wednesday, 11th April, 2018

#### **Present:**

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 Transformation and Customer Services
Councillor Paul May	Cabinet member for Children and Young People
Councillor Bob Goodman	Cabinet Member for Development and Neighbourhoods
Councillor Mark Shelford	Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment

#### **183 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair was taken by Councillor Charles Gerrish in the absence of Councillor Tim Warren who had sent his apologies for this meeting.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

The Chair also thanked Strategic Directors Andrew Pate and Louise Fradd for their services to the Council and wished them all the best in future.

#### **184 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

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

#### **185 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor Tim Warren had sent his apologies for this meeting.

#### **186 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

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

There was none. The Chair used this opportunity to inform the meeting that item 15 on the agenda (Devolution of the Adult Education Budget - Legislative Process) had been withdrawn and it would be considered under the Single Member Decision process. The advice from the Monitoring Officer was that the decision should be considered under Single Member powers to allow time for technical issues raised by

other WECA members, and Legal and S151 officers, to be resolved and included in the final report.

## **188 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS**

There were 18 questions from Councillors and 4 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.]*

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

David Redgewell read out a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website]* on the subject of bus strategies.

Rosemary Naish (on behalf of B&NES ALCA group) read out a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website]* where she endorsed the new Parish Charter.

Dianne Alecock read out a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website]* where she expressed her concerns with the leaves collection at Pennyquick Park.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson read out a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website]* where she asked the Cabinet to request termination of the Norton Radstock Regeneration Company.

## **190 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> February 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

There were none.

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

There were none.

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

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

## **194 PARISH CHARTER REVIEW**

The Monitoring Officer informed the meeting that those Councillors present who were also Parish and Town Councillors did not need to declare an interest in this item as this was a matter of public record.

Councillor Neil Butters made an ad hoc statement by welcoming the report and asked the Cabinet to recognise importance of informing and training of all Council staff that would be in working closely with Town and Parish Councils. Councillor Butters also stressed the importance of cross-boundary work with neighbouring authorities.

Councillor Paul Myers introduced the report by thanking the Working Group of Parish representatives who had overseen the process of revising the Charter and the associated consultation. The Group had met regularly since November 2016 and invited Cabinet Members and senior officers to their meetings to discuss views and experiences. The adoption of the revised Parish Charter represents a significant milestone in the evolving relationship between Bath & North East Somerset Council and local Parish Councils. The Charter contained a series of core principles and commitments on both sides. The Charter set out additional useful information such as updated terms of reference for Parish Liaison and Parish Council functions and responsibilities. Alongside the Charter there was a 'Toolkit' designed to be a working document offering practical information on structures, protocols and standards. The Toolkit could be readily updated and changed and made available to other organisations including in non-parished areas. Councillor Myers also said that the Charter had been subject to extensive consultation, with 43 parishes out of 51 responding. The draft Charter was considered by the Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel who recognised the importance of training and development to ensure that Council staff would have a good understanding of the Charter and the opportunities for partnership working with Parish Councils.

Councillor Paul Myers moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul May seconded the motion by saying that since the Parish Charter was adopted in 1999, the context had changed significantly as a result of financial pressures but also due to new opportunities such as advances in digital technology and enhanced partnership arrangements. As a result, the Parish Charter had been revised and a new, draft Charter was now ready for adoption.

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

2.1 Adopt the revised Parish Charter attached as Appendix 1 to the report, with the exception of the revised Terms of Reference for Parish Liaison which are for Council to determine.

2.2 Recommend that the Council's AGM in May endorse the Parish Charter and that it reviews and adopts the revised Terms of Reference for Parish Liaison set out in Appendix 1 of the Charter document.

2.3 Agree that the implementation of the Charter be reviewed and evaluated in the first year of its operation in order to make any further refinements required as part of the Council's Changing Together programme.

2.4 Acknowledge and thank the members of the Working Group for their contributions and the parish councils who responded to the consultation.

## **195 DETERMINATION OF THE STATUTORY NOTICE PROPOSING THE CLOSURE OF CAMERTON CHURCH SCHOOL**

Councillor Paul May introduced this item by thanking the officers for the report. Councillor May also said that the Council had tried to keep the school open but pupil numbers had been falling for several years and for September 2017 only seven pupils in total were on roll. Despite the efforts of the Governing Body over the years to increase pupil numbers through publicity, open days, providing a pre-school nursery on site, working closely with other small schools and eventually becoming part of a federation of three schools, pupil numbers had gradually reduced. At this size, the Governing Body believed it would be extremely difficult to provide a rounded education that would meet the academic, social and emotional needs of the pupils at the school. As schools were funded on a per pupil basis, with such small numbers year on year, the budget to operate the school had continued to diminish. This made it very difficult to provide a rich and engaging curriculum and opportunities for pupils to achieve high standards in their learning and to develop social friendship groups. The Governing Body had therefore concluded that the school was no longer viable either educationally or financially and had taken the difficult decision to propose closing the school.

Councillor Paul May moved the recommendations.

Councillor Charles Gerrish seconded the motion by saying that the school could not operate economically and educationally and that the transport for the remaining seven children would be provided between home and allocated school at Shoscombe in line with the current Home to School Transport Policy.

**RESOLVED** (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed with the closure of Camerton Church School on 31 August 2018.

## **196 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL ORGANISATION PLAN 2017 - 2021**

Councillor Dine Romero made an ad-hoc statement where she expressed her concerns with the report; in particular that some longstanding issues in the South West of Bath were still not considered. Councillor Romero also said that only St Martins School would have an increase in places for children from the Foxhill regeneration development. Councillor Romero concluded her statement by expressing concern on the lack of secondary school places for children from South West of Bath due to the closure of BCA School and that some children would have to travel over 3 miles to get to allocated schools.

Councillor Paul Crossley made an ad-hoc statement and also expressed his concern with the report as he felt that the paper did not reference an increase of population in Bath and North East Somerset. Councillor Crossley felt that parents of children living in South West Bath were discriminated in relation to their choice of schools, especially those parents who were on lower income scale. Councillor Crossley

concluded his statement by asking the Cabinet to send this report back to officers for further work on these matters.

Councillor Tim Ball made an ad-hoc statement by expressing his concern that children from South West Bath, who were with special educational needs, would have to travel long distances to the school with SEN provision. Councillor Ball also asked the Cabinet to send this report back to officers for further work on these issues.

Councillor Will Sandry made an ad-hoc statement where he also expressed concern on the report. Councillor Sandry felt that it was not appropriate to put all of the children from South West of Bath in Bath schools since the BCA closure. Councillor Sandry also said that such move would affect children's travel and education.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson made an ad-hoc statement where she questioned estimated figures of new children arriving in Radstock and Westfield area as a result of new housing provision on previous railway land. Councillor Jackson also expressed her concern that academies would not take as many children as expected.

Councillor Paul May introduced the report by saying that this report had been seen by the Children and Young People PDS Panel before coming to the Cabinet, with the reflection on a need to sufficient school places in Bath and North East Somerset. Councillor May responded to concerns raised at the meeting in terms of placement of children from South West Bath into St Marks School by saying that the school was a good school with a provision of good and quality education. Councillor May also said that should future proposed new housing development identified in the Local Plan in a particular area be projected to result in a shortfall of primary school places, the Authority would apply CIL funding or seek S106 Developer Contributions to provide additional school places. These places would likely to be delivered via the expansion of existing schools, with the exception of proposed new housing in Keynsham and Whitchurch, where whole new schools would be required. In those areas where options for delivery of additional places via the expansion of existing schools were limited because the schools cannot be expanded as the sites they occupy were not large enough, any future housing allocation in these areas would require whole new schools to be provided.

Councillor Paul May moved the recommendations.

Councillor Charles Gerrish seconded the motion by saying that he had understood concerns raised at this meeting, however the design and specification of schools was responsibility of the Department of Education and not the Council. Nevertheless, Councillor Gerrish welcomed the report and added that officers would continue to work closely with colleagues in Planning Policy to ensure that any land requirements for school expansions or the provision of new schools were reflected in the emerging Local Plan.

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

2.1 Approve the proposed strategy for the provision of school places within the 2017 – 2021 plan period.

2.2 Approve the proposed strategy for the provision of school places over the longer term within the Core Strategy period and agree the emerging approach for the Local Plan period.

The meeting ended at 5.15 pm

Chair \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Prepared by Democratic Services**

## **CABINET MEETING 11<sup>th</sup> April 2018**

### **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 – Bus Strategies
2. Rosemary Naish (on behalf of B&NES ALCA group) – Parish Charter

#### Councillors:

1. Councillor Eleanor Jackson - economic regeneration in Radstock-Westfield

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

<b>M 01</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
<p>It has been reported to me that council operatives are clearing away the tents and bedding of homeless people sleeping rough, even of military veterans. Is this true? There seems to be a considerable increase in the number of beggars in the centre of Bath. What is being done about this?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Paul Myers
<p><i>Notices have been put on belongings (including tents and bedding) that have been left in public places (for example in vacant shop entrances) where Bath BID are aiming to let to new occupiers and dress the shop to make them more attractive to new business. The notices ask people to clear up their belongings within a certain time and their personal belongings are stored for a period of time so people can collect them.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding military veterans, officers are aware of 2 individuals with military connections. One person has no local connection and is being linked back into housing in his local area and is being assisted by support services including veterans support.</i></p> <p><i>The other person has categorically stated that they are not willing to move into a hostel and does not wish to access permanent housing that has been offered. However, they are encouraged to take up support services when unwell or during severe weather.</i></p> <p><i>Services carry out active outreach with the Outreach team (eg nurse; drug &amp; alcohol support; mental health team, etc) and encourage rough sleepers to access services in a more appropriate setting than on the pavement. If people are begging and have their own housing they are encouraged to return home and not to beg on the streets. Homeless people are offered a range of support services and are actively assisted into appropriate housing and to resolve the issues that cause them to beg – such as getting linked into benefits, debt support and reducing drug and alcohol issues.</i></p> <p><i>Close links with Big Issue means that people who are begging are offered the positive step of working for the Big Issue as a way of earning money and moving away from a street based lifestyle.</i></p>		
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>		
What sort of practical measures the Council might contemplate to combat this increase?		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Paul Myers
<p><i>I think that I have answered this already but I can meet with Councillor Jackson afterwards and go through my answer in case I missed on something.</i></p>		

<b>M 02</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Tim Ball
<p>Parking on Pavements: Can the Cabinet Member comment on whether it is now Council policy to allow parking on pavements? If this is Council policy what element of public safety has been taken into account and how will this be implemented?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Mark Shelford
<p><i>We recognise that vehicles parked on pavements can cause difficulties for pedestrians and it's not something we usually condone.</i></p> <p><i>However, in Caledonian Road, Westmoreland, we have responded to concerns raised by the public about inconsiderate and unsafe parking on the pavement by marking a parking bay that is partially on the pavement and partly on the road. The local ward member, Cllr June Player, had received complaints that vehicles were parking fully on the pavement and pedestrians had to squeeze past or walk in the road. Vehicles are now parking within the marked bay and leaving a clear path for pedestrians, pushchairs and wheelchairs on the pavement.</i></p> <p><i>It's an exceptional solution for this specific street and the safety of pedestrians was the main reason for marking a parking bay in this manner. The only other alternative would have been to ban parking along the entire side of the road, which would not have been acceptable to residents. It's the first time we've used a parking bay like this, but it's commonly used in London and some other cities. Officers will monitor how it's working.</i></p>		
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>		
<p>Can the Cabinet Member comment on the issue of the proposed Government legislation to outlaw parking on pavements? If that is not the case would the Cabinet Member agree to roll out this idea to other areas of Bath?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Mark Shelford
<p><i>I am not familiar with the Government legislation view on this particular policy and I am waiting for a brief which I will send it to you in 5 working days. As far as the options are concerned – this is not something that we are rolling out across Bath. This was just a one-off particular for this area which we will monitor how it progress.</i></p>		
<b>M 03</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Andrew Furse
<p>Bath Sports &amp; Leisure Centre: Can the Cabinet member please confirm the status of Bath sports centre refurbishment and delays against the original programme? I have been informed that the swimming pool will not open until the end of May, significantly beyond the expected opening dates. Can the Cabinet member please clarify opening dates and costs against budget with overspend incurred by the council?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Bob Goodman
<p><i>The Council's last Press Release (marking the opening of the new trampoline park)</i></p>		

*dated 16/01/18 stated “The trampoline park is the latest completion in an £8 million refurbishment project – including a soft play area, bowling alley and diner, with the redevelopment of the centre’s main pool and leisure pool due for completion in the Spring”. GLL (the Council’s leisure provider) have advised “We are currently expecting the pools to reopen May 2018”. This has been forecast as the prospective opening date for some time.*

*Should any further unforeseen delays occur in completion of the works to the pool areas, additional costs will be borne by the leisure provider and not by the Council.*

**M 04**

**Question from:**

Councillor Andrew Furse

Since the introduction of the new refuse collections there is considerable concern and confusion from residents around refuse collections from significant Curo properties in the city centre. This has resulted in bin rooms being locked by the Curo, waste not being stored or separated and flytipping resulting.

Can the Cabinet member confirm whether detailed discussions have taken place with Curo, whether a solution to help residents is being planned and, whether revised collection points and bin facilities need to be implemented?

Furthermore problems seems sporadic, therefore have collection solutions been agreed with other RSLs or large blocks of flats and not implemented uniformly across the city.

**Answer from:**

Councillor Bob Goodman

*The waste team is working with Curo at an operational level to troubleshoot collection problems and providing input into their bin store improvement project. Curo’s asset team has set aside £200k for 2018/19 to rebuild bin stores at approx. 6 sites and make significant improvements at others. The waste team will continue to be involved in this programme.*

*In terms of closures of bin rooms, this has been required at a handful of locations in the centre such as one block at Rosewell Court. Prior to the service change, Curo cleaners were pulling black bag waste out of the bin rooms at this block and presenting them in piles on the pavements on collection day, a practise that could no longer continue under the new system aimed at keeping the streets cleaner.*

*Residents in these flats have all been issued with individual small re-usable rubbish bags and instead requested to manage their waste in a similar manner to other flats within the centre. This site is being monitored and we will continue to explore other options for communal containers with Curo and increased recycling facilities.*

*To confirm, the waste team are also in contact with other such management companies resolving any collection issues. We were always clear that a ‘one size fits all approach’ would not be feasible so site visits and discussions are generally required to agree an approach which best suits the larger blocks of flats as they vary considerably.*

**M 05**

**Question from:**

Councillors Alison Millar and Richard Samuel

Riverside Youth Centre

The Council has owned the property at Riverside for almost 80 years. Can the Cabinet member please confirm what he understands the administration's intentions to be for the Riverside property (which is currently utilised by organisations such as the Toy Library, Mentoring Plus and Autism UK)? Are there any plans for a sale of that property as has been stated in the press?

What are the current plans for the next 2-3 years for the excellent music studio contained within the Riverside property?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Paul May

*The Children's PDS Panel received an update report in March which shared our latest thinking and gave panel members the opportunity to question the cabinet member and relevant officers on the plans. As outlined in that report, with the reduction in size of the Youth Connect Service, we need to review the best use of the remaining three buildings which are currently used in the delivery of this service. Council will be aware that the budget reduction set last year will require the service budget to reduce to half its current size. The report presented to the Scrutiny Panel on 20th March 2018 outlined some of the possible options for the service and each of the buildings. The report also made clear that no firm decisions have yet been taken with regard to any final position with regard to the Riverside building, or indeed the other two buildings.*

*The current options would be to explore a possible Community asset transfer which could allow the current organisations to continue to remain in the building, although there will also be a need to explore how the running costs of the building could be covered through an overall management arrangement. Given the location of the building, initial explorations would also indicate that a number of local community groups might be interested in developing the building as a rentable space for various functions and activities. We have also been advised that the site may also have considerable commercial value. We are currently exploring the likely value of the site, and whether or not any potential commercial re-development value would so great as to provide greater eventual opportunities for the local community and the Council.*

*Any eventual decision with regard to the future use of the building has not yet been made. We will continue to explore all options, and we remain very mindful of the community value of the services that are currently situated in the building. These groups provide a valuable service to young people and families and any future decision must ensure that their services are not jeopardised or compromised. We continue to liaise with these groups to keep them updated on the process and the possible options for the future.*

*The Recording Studio facility is much valued by young people, and any plans for how the Youth Connect Service develops in the future will need to take account of the fact that the studio facility is very valued. The operation of the studio will be part of any discussions we have with partners about the use of the Riverside building.*

*My commitment to the needs of the local community means that no decision to dispose of the site would be taken lightly.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Will the Cabinet Member join me at the public meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> April at Riverside Youth Centre to address the public and explain what he intends for that service?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Paul May
<i>I would like further notice for that request as we are going through due process to the three hubs. I will need to take an advice on whether I could go to that meeting as no decisions were made yet. I will respond to you in 5 clear working days.</i>	
<b>M 06</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Alison Millar and Richard Samuel
<p>Changes to Youth Service</p> <p>Can the Cabinet member confirm whether Council delivery of youth work will definitely stop at the various youth centres on 30th September 2018?</p> <p>Have young people and local communities been consulted on the proposed changes If so when and to what result?</p> <p>Has an equalities impact assessment been conducted in relation to the changes to the service and if so will he publish it?</p>	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Paul May
<p><i>Whilst we have signalled that last year's budget reduction will mean a fundamentally different service offer, the delivery of more targeted and structured work with young people will continue to be offered. Because of the reductions in staff that will come into effect on 1st October for the Youth Connect Service, we will not have capacity to offer "Open Access" sessions. We are continuing to discuss with local community groups how they might expand some of their more universal, activity based programmes so that young people can be sign-posted to these activities.</i></p> <p><i>I can confirm that young people using the Youth Hubs have been kept up to date with the progress of how services will be re-structured and staff from the Youth Connect service have been actively involved in exploring alternative delivery models and structures for the service post October 1st.</i></p> <p><i>A full Equalities Impact Assessment will be undertaken to support decisions on the final service model.</i></p>	
<b>M 07</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Richard Samuel
<p>Mobile library service</p> <p>At the last Cabinet meeting the Cabinet member provided figures on availability that showed the library had been unavailable due to staff absences and breakdowns during 207/18 for 23% of the time. In January and February 2018 the comparable figures approached 50% downtime.</p> <p>Can the Cabinet member state what precise action she has taken to ensure that rural communities receive a reliable and consistent service from the mobile library, when it is clear from her figures that this cannot have been the case in the past year?</p>	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Karen Warrington

*As part of the Modern Libraries review the Council has committed to retaining a mobile service and is in the process of evaluating a number of options for improving this provision in a more sustainable manner*

*Councillor Samuel is probably aware that in 2012 the Council's then administration proposed axing the mobile library service. Following public demand, the mobile service was ultimately reduced from 2 vehicles to 1 vehicle in 2013.*

*The vehicle that was released was a 10 ton mobile Library which entered service in 2001. The current vehicle (a 54 plate) is a 7.5 ton bespoke vehicle; coming up to 14 years old and as such starting to encounter mechanical issues which have had some effect on the service.*

*Demand for the service has continued to remain static over recent years, however regular users report that the service is important to them. The routes are regularly reviewed with the driver and operational team and revised taking into account usage and demand.*

*Over recent month's service delivery has been affected due to staff sickness, mechanical issues with the vehicle and difficulties in recruiting a temporary driver with the appropriate driving qualifications.*

*In order to mitigate these issues the service has been doing a number of things:-*

- 1. On days when the mobile is unavailable key contacts/regular customers within the area (where the mobile is due to stop that day.) are contacted by telephone or e-mail and advised of the situation and informed of alternative provision.*
- 2. Regular updates are made to the Bathnes.gov.uk website and through social media, advising customers if and/or when the mobile will not be on the road/delivering a service.*
- 3. The Project Team working on the Modern Libraries programme is busy networking in a number of rural areas with community groups who want to set up their own Community Run Library. There will be an opportunity then to review the existing mobile timetable and consider replacing stops with the new provision which could offer longer hours and a wider community offer.*
- 4. The Project Team is reviewing the current van delivery service which transports resources around the local authority to and from Consortium stores and other local authority libraries. The review is considering designating the Haydon storage depot as the main store for books and resources for Bath and NES libraries and those moving within the wider Consortium and the potential for a 'Click and Collect' service for Community Run Libraries which will be more sustainable.*
- 5. The Development Team continues to provide a service to house-bound readers in the community (Home Library Service) and over 40 volunteers deliver books across Bath and NES to readers. There are robust links with other adult care services and the RNIB, Age UK etc. Potential Community Run Libraries have also been interested in providing something similar for the housebound in their local areas.*

6. *We maintain contact and network through events with vulnerable groups of children, young people and parents/carers. These groups include those attending social care contact centres, those based at children's centres and youth services, groups of foster carers, home educated children, refugees, travellers etc. The service continues to deliver the national Book start programme with Health Visitors and Early Year's providers – nurseries, pre-schools and childminders - and is designing, with Public Health, a School's literacy award alongside the Summer Reading Challenge. Thinking digitally we are now delivering a Code Club in Bath Library and embarking on a project to set up a similar club in Keynsham with Centre 67. There has been recent investment in additional Sensory Story Sacks for children, young people and young adults with additional needs, as well as producing additional Memory Boxes which are being distributed to dementia cafes, Care Homes and to local adult groups. There is current work to target Fathers/Dads groups' especially in disadvantaged areas and to link with known targeted parenting groups.*

7. *Transport services are supporting the project team in evaluating alternative vehicle options and it is hoped that an options appraisal will be completed in the coming months, whilst in the meantime the mitigating actions set out above are in place.*

<b>M 08</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Richard Samuel
-------------	-----------------------	---------------------------

Will the Cabinet members confirm the precise timetable for the approval by the Council of the final strategic business case for Air Quality compliance in Bath due to be submitted to DEFRA by 31st December including the proposed dates for scrutiny review?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillors Mark Shelford and Bob Goodman
---------------------	---

*The full business case to achieve compliance with the National Air Quality Plan will be brought to the relevant Scrutiny Panels, as well as Cabinet, for review before 31 December 2018. Dates will be confirmed in due course following discussion with the Chairs of the relevant Panels as extra meetings maybe required to fit in with the tight timescales demanded by the delivery of this project.*

<b>M 09</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Richard Samuel
-------------	-----------------------	---------------------------

Can the Cabinet member confirm what options, other than removal of the planters on London Road, have been considered?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Mark Shelford
---------------------	--------------------------

*The option of building out the southern footway of the London Road over a 140 metre length to provide the requisite visibility in front of the planters at Bedford Street, Weymouth Street and two unnamed side roads was considered. The build outs could have been replaced by hatched road markings as a less costly alternative, however, these are judged to be less effective at preventing inappropriate parking.*

*However, the building out of the footway would have limited available road space for future maintenance to the central reserve or trees, with the likelihood that the cycle lane*

*would require closure when maintenance works were being carried out.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Can the Cabinet Member exactly say what he is intending to do with the planters as there is considerable public concern and uncertainty about the decision he intends to make?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Mark Shelford

*I will be looking at all options about re-use of those planters and as soon we find a suitable re-use I will let you know.*

**M 10**

**Question from:**

Councillor Neil Butters

In the light of yet another serious accident on the B3110 past Midford Castle, when a car flipped on its roof, would the Cabinet Member please think again about reducing the speed limit on that stretch of road in addition to the forthcoming welcome alterations to the camber?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Mark Shelford

*The design of the resurfacing scheme is yet to be concluded, however there are no current proposals to change the camber at this location. Is part of our 2018/19 Accident Investigation and Prevention programme officers are drawing up a safety scheme at this location. Reducing the speed limit will be one of the options they are considering if it is assessed as being an effective means of reducing accidents.*

**Supplementary Question:**

I was surprised that there are no proposals to consider camera at this location. Was there any change of heart on this matter? What would be the timescale for this work?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Mark Shelford

*I cannot answer about the camera now so I will provide an answer in 5 working days. This is part of the safety audit which looked at all aspects and once I have the information I will share it with you.*

**M 11**

**Question from:**

Councillor Neil Butters

What is the total extent of subsidy to public bus routes at present, and how might that be expected to change over the next financial year?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Mark Shelford

*Subject to verification of the end-of-year figures, the Council paid £1,145,703 in subsidy to bus operators for non-commercial bus services in 2017-18. Of that amount, £618,277*

*was made up of contributions from third parties (e.g. developers) so the net amount spent by the Council on non-commercial bus services was £527,426.*

*In terms of predicting into the future, I can advise that the budget for bus revenue support in 2018-19 is for a net spend of £507,063. This figure takes account of known changes in third-party contributions (such as the completion of certain developer contributions) but does not take account of any additional third-party contributions that may be obtained nor any changes to contract prices that may arise from competitive tender. I have asked officers to strive to meet these targets by making more efficient use of resources and ensuring value for money. You may also be aware that WECA is currently in the process of producing its West of England-wide bus services strategy, which the Council will have input into.*

<b>M 12</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Neil Butters
-------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

What is the anticipated effect of the lane switch on the south western approach to Odd Down Roundabout? To what extent is it likely to reduce queuing lengths? How is this being monitored?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Mark Shelford
---------------------	--------------------------

*Under the current weekday AM peak scenario (2014 traffic flows) the predicted time saving is 3-4 minutes. Queue length analyses show that the scheme has the potential to reduce the maximum queue length (2014 traffic flows) from circa 1,300m to around 900m*

*Journey time monitoring was undertaken in 2014 and again in March 2018 (albeit unfortunately affected by the extreme weather). After approximately 6 months, traffic monitoring will be again undertaken to review the impact of the experimental order.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Highways report suggests that, with the implementation of even phase 1 of the proposed Sulis development, queue length back from Odd Down roundabout in the morning rush hour would be up to 2 km (by 2022). Is it anticipated that there would be a similar percentage reduction (30%) that would apply if phase 1 goes ahead?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Mark Shelford
---------------------	--------------------------

*I will provide an answer in 5 working days.*

<b>M 13</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Neil Butters
-------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

If it is the settled will of a parish council either to adopt an advisory 20 mph scheme, or move from an advisory scheme to a mandatory scheme, will that be supported - irrespective of the forthcoming DfT report?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Mark Shelford
---------------------	--------------------------

*Our current position is that we want to see more information and evidence to help us understand the effectiveness of 20mph limits before we put in any more of these advisory or mandatory speed limits. The exception we will make to this is outside of schools, where we will consider requests for advisory 20mph limits accompanied by flashing amber lights. The forthcoming publication from the Department for Transport should include research on 20mph speed limits from all over the country, in both rural and urban areas, so this will be very informative in helping us to decide our future approach. The DfT recently advised us they expect to publish the findings later this year.*

**M 14**

**Question from:**

Councillor Dine Romero

What reassurances can the Cabinet Member give me that the nearest appropriate school has been allocated for children in the South West of Bath?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Paul May

*Every effort has been made to offer the nearest appropriate school for every child in Bath and North East Somerset in line with the Admissions Code of Practice and published Admissions criteria of each local school. Despite the competition for places, 92.7% of applicants to Bath and North East Somerset schools were offered a place at one of their top 3 preference schools on National Offer Day.*

*There was an error within the original processing of applications for secondary places this year, where an incorrect postcode was used in measuring distances from Beechen Cliff and Hayesfield Schools – however that error was identified and the offers have been rectified so that no pupil has been disadvantaged by it.*

*The admissions process is a complex one but works on the principle of looking at every preference for a Bath and North East Somerset school named on every application we receive and, where a school is oversubscribed, judging each of those applications against the published admissions criteria of the relevant school (these judgements are made 'blind' of the order of preference stated). Based on those criteria, offers are made up to the Planned Admission Number for each school, with every pupil being offered the highest stated preference for which they have been successful. Once all preferences have been exhausted in this way, any pupils without a school place offer will be offered their nearest school with an available place. This is why it is so important that parents make full use of their 5 preferences to name 5 schools. We don't want a situation where for example Bath pupils have to be given places in schools outside Bath because local parents haven't named sufficient local preferences. We know that very few parents made full use of that facility this year and the service has worked hard with local schools to create additional places in order to avoid exactly that scenario. We cannot guarantee this being possible in future and so we appeal to all parents to state 5 preferences in future – and encourage all ward members to actively promote this to parents in their wards.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Would the Cabinet Member comment on how the 5 choice option works in practice when the nature of the schools in Bath does not give parents a real choice of 5? Two schools are denominational (at least one has admissions criteria that make a successful application from someone of no religion unlikely). Two schools are single sex, so thus automatically removes one choice for parents; one is only for children in years 10 and above. Only two are both mixed and non-denominational.

The criteria of the Bath schools mean that for most parents they really only have a choice of 3 schools.

**Answer from:**

Councillor Paul May

*I will provide an answer in 5 working days.*

**M 15****Question from:**

Councillor Dine Romero

What partnerships or other financial arrangements were explored before decisions were taken regarding youth hubs and services across Bath and North East Somerset?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Paul May

*Please see the update paper presented to Children & Young People's PDS panel on 20th March 2018.*

*The decision was taken to reduce the youth service budget in February 2017 and officers have regularly and routinely reported progress to the PDS including briefings about a possible Staff Mutual as a community interest company plus work with Parishes and other bodies to mitigate the impacts.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Is there a list of the other potential partners other than the parishes, churches and charities who attended the stakeholders groups? I am aware that there are number of organisations that use the hubs who may be in a better financial position to deliver the services that are at risk of being cut.

**Answer from:**

Councillor Paul May

*The budget decision was taken last year and there were regular consultations with the relevant PDS Panel. We are trying to get more targeted approach to youth services in future and we are having discussions with stakeholders. Meeting are open and advertised to all and everyone have an opportunity to come along and comment. We are getting to the point where we will bring forward some proper proposals which will then be presented to the relevant PDS.*

<b>M 16</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Will Sandry
<p>What could the Council do to improve transparency around viability assessments, with regard to affordable housing contributions, both as an initial application is determined and at any subsequent reassessment of the affordable housing contribution?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Bob Goodman
<p><i>When applicants submit viability assessments in support of their claim to reduce the level of affordable housing within their housing scheme, or to reduce their financial contribution towards affordable housing elsewhere or other S106 contributions, it is current Council policy to pass this assessment to an independent chartered surveyor (or suitably qualified and independent financial professional chosen by the Council) to interrogate the economic viability assessment provided. The assessments are kept confidential by the Council as they usually contain commercially sensitive information.</i></p> <p><i>However, I am pleased that the Government is already looking into this issue as part of its drive to speed-up the delivery of affordable housing across the country.</i></p> <p><i>The Government is currently consulting on proposed revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which, if accepted, will mean that where applications accord with all relevant policies in an up-to-date development plan, no viability assessment should be required to accompany the application. In cases where a viability assessment is needed, it should reflect a standardised approach to be outlined in national planning guidance (NPPG), including standardised inputs. The guidance is also proposing that viability assessments be made public unless there are exceptional reasons to not do so. At the least an Executive Summary should be made publicly available.</i></p> <p><i>It is anticipated that the final revisions to the NPPF and NPPG will be published later this year at which point the Council's planning officers will update the current policies and procedure as necessary to ensure that they reflect the guidance within the NPPF.</i></p>		
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>		
<p>Without waiting for changes to the NPPF and NPPG to be finalised Bristol City Council decided to start publishing viability assessments from November 2018. Why can't Bath and North East Somerset Council start publishing viability assessments right away?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Bob Goodman
<p><i>I will provide an answer in 5 working days.</i></p>		
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>		
<p>Would the Cabinet Member agree with me that the Council should require developers to use the Existing Use Value Plus (EUV+) approach rather than Market Value when determining viability?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Bob Goodman

*My personal is yes. There are ways that developers may go out of commitment for social housing by selling on. That will be looked at new consultation and it will form appropriate action.*

**M 17**

**Question from:**

Councillor Robin Moss

Youth Connect Service

A recent report to the Children and Young People PDS Panel stated that there were three expressions of interest in managing each of the three Youth Hubs. Please could you provide me with the following information:

Which organisations expressed an interest in the Youth Hubs?

Which Youth Hubs were they interested in managing?

What did each of the organisations plan to do with the buildings?

Which of the organisations submitted a business plan?

Who was responsible for assessing the viability of the business plans?

On what criteria were each of the expressions of interest assessed?

The CYP report stated that the main issue with any asset transfer of Riverside is that it would be hard to argue that the likely value of the site would be outstripped by the community benefit. Do you not agree that this is a matter of judgement and not fact? Please could I have access to the information given to officers so that I can make my own judgement as to whether or not the value of the Riverside asset is outstripped by the community benefit? By making this judgement, would you not agree that any expression of interest in managing the Riverside building was destined to be unsuccessful?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Paul May

*The discussion of this item at CYP PDS Panel, confirmed that it would not be appropriate or productive to disclose the names of the groups that had expressed interest in each of the current Youth Hub buildings. We do not have the express agreement of these organisations to do so, and therefore it would not be appropriate. As stated in the report (section 3, bullet point 5), there was no one organisation that expressed an interest in running or co-ordinating all three buildings. The interest was largely from organisations that were based within the communities or areas close to each of the Youth Hubs. This was in line with the discussions that took place at two engagement events held in the spring and summer of 2017, which made clear that we wished to explore expressions of interest from groups that were interested in developing activities for young people alongside any more broadly community based or commercial activity.*

*The focus of interest from the majority of groups that we spoke to was on community activity, but all also understood the importance of incorporating some form of youth activity into the use of the building, either provided by themselves, or through an arrangement with the re-structured Youth Connect service.*

*No group submitted a business plan, as this had not been expressly requested of them*

*at that stage. The PDS paper sets out the details of the group of officers who looked at the expressions of interest.*

*With regard to the issue of the value of the Riverside site, the paper is clear that no firm decision has yet been taken on Riverside (or indeed Southside and PSJ). The paper sets out the current position and some of the emerging options. One of these options would be to explore the commercial value of the site. It is absolutely appropriate and prudent that the Council considers what this option might or might not provide for residents. Local Authorities have a duty to consider the best value available for any disposal of land and buildings that they own. Under the General Disposal Content (England) 2003, local authorities can dispose at less than best price where certain criteria are met and the transfer furthers local social, economic or environmental wellbeing. This leaves the future options for the location open.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Considering that BANES Youth Officers are currently looking at forming staff mutual, how it would be possible for them to take part in expression of interest for potential management of youth clubs?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Paul May

*The process of staff mutual has moved from 1<sup>st</sup> phase into 2<sup>nd</sup> phase. A proper business plan will be brought forward. If there are expressions of interest in one hub then we have to consider what impact that would have on other two hubs. All of the staff was involved and engaged in every stage of the process*

**Supplementary Question:**

At what point in the process will the details of expression of interest, business planning, risk assessment, financial investment, etc. be public so those could be scrutinised internally and externally?

**Answer from:**

Councillor

*We are in the process of looking at all options on the table and as soon as possible I will make sure to present the findings to the relevant PDS Panel.*

**M 18**

**Question from:**

Councillor Robin Moss

SEND

At our recent CYP Panel, we were told that up to 107 SEND places would be available in mainstream schools and Bath college. Are these schools ready and skilled to cope with additional SEND pupils? Do we have enough places in our Special Schools for children with additional needs?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Paul May

*We have acknowledged that currently we do not have enough specialist SEND spaces locally to meet demand. The additional places referred to will expand existing provision in special schools, schools and colleges to partly address this pressure. This has resulted from an 'invest to save' capital commitment of £1.077m to improve these local services and reduce the stress of travelling for vulnerable young people.*

*We are confident that these establishments are skilled and ready to meet these needs. Bath College was recently rated Good by Ofsted, who particularly praised its work with young people with SEND. Our local special schools are very skilled at working with children with special educational needs and are rated Outstanding or Good by Ofsted. The mainstream school involved is also Good and has a reputation within the local authority as having an excellent SEND department.*

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

<b>P 01</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Sarah Moore
<p>The deteriorating Road surface at North Way and Poolemead Road is causing concern.</p> <p>1) I am sure the cabinet member is confident that the advice of his officers to only monitoring and patch repairs as required will keep this road in a safe condition for heavy buses to run both ways on, but will he agree to meet me on site to see for himself the problems that I am talking about.</p> <p>2) Will he listen to local residents who are concerned for the safety of the road and its users and conduct a safety audit on this road and agree to carry out urgent works if they are identified as a result of the road safety audit.</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Mark Shelford
<p><i>Thank you for your question. I am aware that you have been in correspondence with the Director of Environmental Services regarding this issue and that he has informed you that these roads were inspected by our highways inspectors less than 3 weeks ago and they will continue to be inspected as part of a regular inspection regime to keep the roads in a safe condition.</i></p> <p><i>I am always happy to discuss issues of concern with residents, however I am aware that both the Director and Strategic Director have already visited these roads and seen their</i></p>		

*condition, so in addition to the technically qualified highway inspector there have already been site visits to these roads to see their condition.*

*Clearly there are always demands for roads to be prioritised for resurfacing across the area which is why we have put significant additional sums into the highway maintenance in the Council's most recent budget. However, the Council still needs to assess the highway conditions and prioritise roads for resurfacing/repair against a set of criteria that has to be based on functionality and safety rather than appearance.*

*The inspector will be undertaking regular inspections to address any safety issues until such time that these roads are included in a future programme, therefore a safety audit is not required. Please be assured that the sites will continue to be inspected through our inspections regime so we will address any defects when they require attention to keep the roads in a safe condition.*

<b>P 02</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Jane Samson
-------------	-----------------------	-------------

This question concerns the possible closure of the youth facility at Riverside.  
The selling off of this building is being considered at a time when the Youth Service is being drastically cut and facilities like those being offered at Riverside are even more important than ever.  
Why has there not been more consultation with local residents about this?

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Paul May
---------------------	---------------------

*The report presented to CYP PDS on 20th made it clear that no firm decision on the future of Riverside has yet been taken. The report set out the likely options for the building (section 3). One is for its usage to be developed in conjunction with a number of potentially interested community groups whilst retaining a focus on youth activity. The other option has to be to explore the commercial value of the site. However the report makes clear that should the options of re-development be the preferred choice, it would be desirable for any development to ensure that facilities for young people are incorporated into any potential development.*

*The report also makes clear (section 3) that the Youth Connect Service had consulted with all users of Riverside, local community groups, faith groups and Schools in regard to the possible future usage of the building.*

*The site is an important location for the local community. Although the buildings are not of a high standard we value the services of Mentoring Plus and Bath Toy Library provided there and would want to enable them to remain there.*

<b>P 03</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Clare Crestani
<p>As a local resident of Bath I would like to ask why the future of the youth hubs 'open meetings' were not better publicised?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Paul May
<p><i>The purpose of the meetings was to engage key stakeholders to explore their interest in running services in future using these buildings</i></p> <p><i>Invitations to the engagement meetings went out to all users of each of the three Youth Hub buildings, the voluntary sector network and local churches in the areas local to each of the Youth Hub buildings. In addition invitations also went out to elected members in the areas near to each of the Youth Hubs as well as local schools</i></p>		
<b>P 04</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Lesley Bees
<p>The proposed selling off of the Riverside building for £3 million pounds represents short term gain as opposed to long term gain which is far greater i.e. £3 million pounds as against many young people's future prospects.</p> <p>Riverside is an excellent central location. It would be difficult to find another as good. If Riverside is sold off, what happens to Youth provision in the area, ensuring that future provision matches the quality of current provision at?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Paul May
<p><i>As outlined in the report on Youth Connect services presented at Scrutiny Panel on 20th March, it is important that I underline that no final decision has yet been taken in relation to the future of Riverside. The paper makes clear that we are currently exploring options for the site which includes how the building can be best utilised following the reduction in service in October, as well as an option in regard to the potential financial value that it has, and whether this value might allow the Council to use the money in ways that are equally productive. Given the importance of the decision it is important that all options are considered carefully and the paper presented to PDS panel on 20th March makes very clear that it sought to update Councillors on the current position and the options currently being considered, it did not propose any definitive course of action.</i></p> <p><i>The paper presented at Scrutiny Panel on 20th March also highlights the possibility that if a decision is taken to re-develop the current Riverside site, one option would be to ensure that any re-development incorporates a provision/facility for young people, in order to safeguard the potential benefits of its location which I agree is important to the community.</i></p>		

### ***Light Rail around Bristol and Bath***

*We want to see the budget for the light rail consultation studies in the Greater Bristol area to be fully protected and support the principles of a light rail route to Bristol Airport as a top priority and later to Bath especially from Lambridge across the City to Newbridge which could then make use of the light rail corridor to Bristol through Bitton, Saltford, Kelston, Warmley to Yate and East Bristol via Mangotsfield, Staple Hill and Fishponds as well as linking into the RUH at Weston, the new Bath Spa Art & Design College at Weston Lock and Park & Ride sites which need to be co-ordinated with the Bristol Mayor's rapid transit project. The two schemes must link to Warmley and Emersons Green. Retention of Avon Valley Railway steam services at weekends. Provision should be made for a continuous cycle/walkway between Bristol and Bath where possible. The implementation of light rail will help bring the City region into line with EU emission and clean air targets together with clean fuel buses and taxi's.*

*The corridor to Odd Down is welcomed however the majority of the traffic is to the Somer Valley at Peasedown, Radstock and Mid Somer Norton and therefore an extension of a rapid transit system to this area would be beneficial. What evaluation of the Somerset and Dorset railway corridor has been carried out as Norton Radstock is an enterprise zone and needs public transport improvement.*

*The route to Bath University seems to have gradient constraints and requires considerable engineering works and it should also be noted that all LRT schemes approved in the UK have been conurbation wide eg Midland Metro (Birmingham - Wolverhampton), Greater Manchester, Nottingham and Croydon and will require DFT funding and approvals in the long term and in the short term to be in the Metro Mayors joint transport plan.*

### ***Bus/Rail integration***

*This is required at Bath Spa station and other locations where light rail might possibly connect with buses. Across Europe and Greater Manchester/London rapid transit is fully integrated into the bus network. We need to make progress on bus/rail integration at Temple Meads as the proposed Temple Gate stops do not work for passengers.*

*On rail we welcome the work on disabled access at Stapleton Road and Patchway but the Stapleton Road temporary ramps do not provide good access without grab rails.*

*There should be investment in MetroWest between Westbury, Bath and Bristol currently out for consultation with the DFT as part of the GWR franchise with First Group as the operator until 2022. This could include a business unit for Bristol and Bath, Somerset, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire & Greater Bristol.*

*SWTN also want to see the GWR franchise kept as one complete business unit and not split up as proposed by the DFT. The GWR IEP electrification programme should also be completed in the shortest possible time to assist with high technology rail job creation opportunities in the region together with the Henbury loop rail project serving the proposed Arena.*

*There should also be a Greater Bristol business unit within the GWR franchise with devolved powers similar to the West Midlands and Greater Manchester PTE's.*

*Bus proposals can be included as should future schemes eg light rail integration and the Overground rail project in Bristol.*

### ***Arena issues***

*A full transport plan would need to be drawn up with First Group on whichever site the Mayor and Metro Mayor decide.*

*Temple Meads Arena would require coach parking, MetroBus stops, coach stops in Avon Street, bus stops at this location and on Bath Road Park & Ride services from Brislington, Parkway, Portway, Ashton Vale, extra trains from*

*Bath and West Wilts, Taunton, W-S-M, Cardiff, Newport, Patchway, Filton, Yate, Gloucester/Cheltenham, Severn Beach via Clifton Down, Henbury loop, Portishead and Swindon.*

*Regarding a shuttle train from Bristol Parkway to Temple Meads, taxi ranks, ferry terminal, service coaches and car parking including disabled.*

*Construction of Station Street and bus interchange at the Friary is required as part of the new University campus development at Temple Meads.*

***Brabazon hanger option***

*Potential Arena will require coach parking, MetroBus stops, coach stops, bus stops at this location and on Park & Ride services to Brislington, Parkway, Portway, Ashton Vale, extra trains from Bath and West Wilts, Taunton, W-S-M, Cardiff, Newport, Patchway, Filton, Yate, Gloucester, Cheltenham, Severn Beach via Clifton Down, Henbury loop, Portishead and Swindon. There should be 15 minute frequency services on the Henbury loop serving the Arena and 10 minute shuttle bus service on main routes to it.*

*The IET trains will need to operate from London and South Wales via Parkway to Filton North station for the arena, services from the South West, West Midlands to the Henbury loop station, coach parking will need to be provided, taxis, bus links Greater Bristol wide, links to Cribbs Causeway and hotels will need to be addressed.*

*We urge the City Council, WECA and Bristol Mayor's to address a full integrated transport plan for the Arena similar to those at Manchester Victoria/Wembley.*

*The Arena rail services will need to be included in the new rail franchise.*

***Bus strategy***

*There should be no cuts in bus subsidies but more investment in the local bus network with the Metro Mayor and these issues must be addressed alongside any light rail proposals in Bristol and Bath especially where services like the 16 from Bristol Parkway to Longwell Green via Lodge Causeway have already been cut leaving residents with no buses. The 510/511 bus services should also be reinstated as part of an improved orbital bus network.*

*Passengers interchanging between bus/rail routes should have accessible toilet facilities on key routes with money for maintaining/cleaning bus shelters/bus bays. These should include facilities at Shirehampton Green, Eastville Park and Fishponds Park. One way to fund public transport would be to use money raised by parking fees instead of spending it on non transport infrastructure projects like pavement repairs. These toilets are also used by bus drivers and passengers on routes around Bristol. Has an Equalities Impact Assessment been carried out regarding the closures and any new facilities. Of course in South Gloucestershire, BANES and North Somerset have protected these facilities as part of the network.*

*We remind you that the tourism industry in Bristol is worth £1.3 billion and we do not want the reputation damage to Bristol so these facilities including community toilets and private sector transfers must work.*

***WECA Transport Forum issues***

*We are concerned about the lack of progress for a rail and transport forum and the need to merge the congestion task force with any WECA group. We also must address the proposed Regional Transport Board.*

*On integration we are concerned about the lack of integration between MetroBus and the background bus network especially around North Bristol along the Bradley Stoke corridor.*

*DAVID REDGEWELL South West Transport Network/TSSA/Railfuture*

Good afternoon.

I am speaking as Chair of the B&NES ALCA group.

Today you are considering the revised parish charter. At the first meeting of the working group we had some aspirations about what we wanted to do, one aspiration was to produce a Charter that would be a model for other authorities, and we have produced a very good document. We did that by working together well, and that is why I am here today because I would like to thank not only the working group but also the officers and cabinet members, past & present, who come to the various sessions and made valuable suggestions and contributions.

As you may be aware ALCA is not just B&NES but also includes North Somerset and South Gloucestershire, and my colleagues on the regional committee have been most impressed, and I think a little jealous, of how good a partnership has been forged by this piece of work.

This page is intentionally left blank

Can I thank Bob Goodman for coming to Twerton last week and meeting with me, Councillor Tim Ball and other residents at Pennyquick Park.

During our meeting we discussed the issues of the leaves that have been piled up in the park, some of what have been piled there for a number of years.

We suggested that the leaves needed to be raked flat into the woodland to let them rot away naturally, and this was a job that could probably be done using the probation service.

This would clearly need to be carried out in the next four weeks before the stinging nettles start growing.

We would ask that the council look at other ways of disposing of leaves that are collected from the streets perhaps using anaerobic digestion sites or even asking if Bath City Farm would take them, this would be far better than dumping in our parks.

It would also be helpful if the dog pooh bins that have been removed from a Pennyquick park could be replaced.

This page is intentionally left blank

This statement is an appeal to you to apply merciful euthanasia to this defunct organisation, the Norton Radstock Regeneration Company. It was created with altogether worthy aims c2005 but its only connection now with Midsomer Norton is the domicile of the majority of its directors, and it has singularly failed to deliver 'regeneration' in any shape or form. It was set up originally as a holding company for the former GWR railway lands, commissioned to obtain planning permission for their development and according to its 2005 Articles of Association, profits from the Radstock development should be ploughed into similar projects in Midsomer Norton. (No mention anywhere of Westfield!) Unfortunately owing in part to the withdrawal of the original developer when consent was obtained in 2007, work did not commence until 2015, by which time B&NES Council had not only seconded a senior officer, and made other facilities available in the Hollies, MSN under the 2007-11 administration, and relieved the developer of responsibility of paying for the new road system, but under the LibDem following administration, ploughed in about a million pounds in 'ecological mitigation' and decontamination costs. So far two offices have opened on the site, so employment gain is minimal, and NRR directors blocked the attempt by Radstock Town Council to take up the 2014 scheme to move its offices into the 'community space' next to the Victoria Hall. The NRR has not even come up with an appropriate scheme to save the Brunel Shed. But then it never consults residents on its plans.

I have opposed the railway lands development since 2005, but approach it like Brexit. It is happening. Therefore my responsibility to tax paying residents in the Somer Valley is to make sure we get the best possible deal, just as I am sure we all want the best EU divorce settlement. I consider the NRR has become a sink hole. The sooner it is abolished the better. The problem is that it is now a separate legal entity, and although it has as directors both a B&NES Cabinet member and a town council representative, it is a law unto itself. Its assets came from the SW Regional Assembly, abolished in 2007, and the South West Regional Development Association, to which it was answerable in 2011 (email to me from a director) disappeared in the Osborne 'bonfire of the quangos.' I am reliably informed it is also in debt to BANES.

We do not have an 'audit committee' like the parliamentary audit committee at unitary authority level, but I would request you to refer the case of the NRR stewardship of its mandate as found in its Articles of Association and Mission Statement to the Resources Scrutiny Panel. All the directors I know are volunteers, and committed amateurs, but they have failed, and BANES has a responsibility to investigate.

Secondly, I would request yourselves to use your influence to persuade the directors to vote to dissolve the company and resign. As it says in the Book of Ecclesiastes, there is a time to be born and a time to die, a time to plant and a time to pluck up what is planted, and it is most definitely a time to uproot this withered weed, the NRR.

Eleanor Jackson.

