

## **BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

### **CABINET**

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

Wednesday, 5th September, 2018

#### **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 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, Conservative Deputy Group Leader Bath

#### **14 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

#### **15 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

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

#### **16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

The Chair informed the meeting that Councillor Mark Shelford would have to leave the meeting after the agenda item 'Sub-National Transport Bodies'.

#### **17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Paul May declared a disclosable pecuniary interest on any matters related to Sirona as a non-executive director on the Sirona Board.

Councillor Bob Goodman declared that in the past he had dealt with licensed properties. The Monitoring Officer, Maria Lucas reported that a dispensation had been granted to Councillor Goodman so that he could speak on this issue.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

The Chair stated that he would take item 14 'Sub National Transport Bodies' after item 11.

## **19 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS**

There were 14 questions from Councillors and 1 question from a member 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.]*

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

David Redgewell made a statement on public transport, litter and graffiti issues.

Councillor Jackson made a statement regarding Westfield ward *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes and available on the Council's website]*.

## **21 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> June 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

There were none.

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

There were none.

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

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

## **25 SUB-NATIONAL TRANSPORT BODIES**

Councillor Dine Romero made an ad-hoc statement, stating that this was yet another body for strategic oversight and asked how a combined scrutiny response will be co-ordinated.

Councillor Tim Ball made an ad-hoc statement where he stated that this seemed to be another body along with the Cabinet and WECA (West of England Combined Authority) and asked if more research was needed.

Councillor Mark Shelford moved the recommendations and stated that this was an opportunity for the authority to work collaboratively with others in the South West and that work was being done so that this authority would have the correct influence in this body. Councillor Shelford reported that Dorset was now part of the Gateway project.

Councillor Tim Warren seconded the motion and stated that authorities cannot work in silos and this would help to blur the lines and that there was a significant funding from the Government for this project.

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

- 1) Approved Bath and North East Somerset Council's participation in a Shadow Sub-National Transport Body.
- 2) Agreed the Shadow Sub-National Transport Body prospectus and note the emerging transport priorities (Appendix A).
- 3) Agreed to enter into a Heads of Terms and Constitution agreement with other Transport Authorities (Appendix B).
- 4) Agreed to appoint the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment to represent the Council on the Shadow Sub-National Transport Body's Partnership Board and for a fellow Cabinet Member to act as a nominated deputy in the absence of the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment.
- 5) Agreed to delegate authority to the Corporate Director, in consultation with Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment, to represent the Council on the Shadow Sub-National Transport Senior Officer Group.

## **26 ADDITIONAL HMO LICENSING SCHEME**

NOTE: Councillor Mark Shelford left the meeting at the close of the last item.

Councillor Will Sandry made an ad hoc statement where he explained that this issue had been well debated by the Planning, Housing and Economic Development Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel and that he was pleased that this scheme was being introduced. He commented that the scheme could be extended to North East Somerset.

Councillor Paul Crossley made an ad hoc statement where he explained that HMO's (along with AirB&B and others) have resulted in the loss of family housing across the authority and that a swift Government response was needed on this.

Councillor Tim Ball made an ad hoc statement where he spoke in support of the proposals and of the need to push up standards. He added that the scheme could be expanded to other areas.

Councillor Paul Myers introduced the item, he explained that this report will expand the licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation - HMOs - to cover Bath City. Councillor Myers further explained that there are around 3 and a half thousand HMOs in the City providing valuable accommodation for almost 20,000 residents and most are an asset for the city but that evidence indicates that a significant number are of substandard condition. Councillor Myers explained that he was supporting the proposal which would mean that the Council, and more importantly tenants, would have reassurance that minimum legal standards, particularly fire safety standards, would be met; that the Council would have the contact details of the landlord or person managing the property and finally that the Council know where the HMOs were located.

Councillor Myers explained that at this stage the evidence did not support a wider scheme but this would be kept under consideration. Councillor Myers further explained that the cost of licensing would be met by charging landlords a licence fee and this impact on landlords must be weighed against the benefits to tenants - and the broader community. Councillor Myers concluded that he considered that on balance the benefits of the scheme outweigh the burdens and risks identified by the impact assessment

Councillor Paul Myers moved the recommendations.

Councillor Bob Goodman seconded the motion and stated he felt this scheme would receive support from most landlords.

Councillor May stated that Bath was a small city and this was a major issue in the community and pressure must be kept on standards.

Councillor Pritchard asked if officers could cope with the extra workload caused by the increased licensing. Councillor Myers stated that he was confident that resources were there to cover the work.

Councillor Warren supported the proposal and thanked the speakers for their support.

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

- 1) Having studied the evidence base it is satisfied that there is a sufficiency of evidence to justify the new scheme which accords with the Services Regulations 2009 and that any detriment to landlords is outweighed by the benefits to tenants and the wider community, sufficient safeguards are in place to mitigate the impact on affected landlords and the proposed scheme is the least intrusive means of achieving the Council's legitimate aims.
- 2) An HMO Additional Licensing scheme, as detailed within the designation report attached in appendix 1, is introduced for a period of 5 years commencing on the 1st January 2019.
- 3) The Head of Housing undertakes the appropriate and statutory steps to enable the introduction of the proposed licensing scheme.

**27 PILOT SCHEME TO INCREASE ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CRIME**

Councillor Richard Samuel made an ad-hoc statement where he stated that he supported action against littering but that this scheme had had mixed results in other authorities and there was no business plan or details of costings. He queried if there would be a competitive tendering process and if consultation had been carried out. He expressed his concern that vulnerable people may be targeted and asked the Cabinet to defer the item for consideration by the Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel.

Councillor Tim Ball made an ad-hoc statement where he stated that he was concerned that enforcers may target the poorest communities to raise funds.

Councillor Will Sandry made an ad-hoc statement where he urged the Cabinet to put this issue to the Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel and to carry out an Equalities Impact Assessment. He shared the concerns made above that the vulnerable communities could be penalised.

Councillor Rob Appleyard made an ad-hoc statement where he supported the intention to deal with littering but was concerned that there could be a danger of alienating communities. He queried if the enforcers would have targets. He urged that education be the priority and that the issue to put to a Scrutiny Panel.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones made an ad-hoc statement where he stated that feedback from his residents was supportive of the Council enforcing littering rules. He added that outsourcing a service does involve some risk and hoped enforcement would help the issue in Balance Street where fly tipping is cleared by Curo who then charge the tenants.

Councillor Robin Moss made an ad-hoc statement where he agreed that there was a need to reduce litter but that the issue should be considered by a Scrutiny Panel. He raised concerns that enforcement may be used for income generation though there may be disputes and intimidation.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson made an ad-hoc statement where she stated that there should be very close scrutiny of the contract. She commended the Cabinet Member for dealing with the fly tipping in Radstock and that the budget used for gulls should be used for an effective littering policy.

Councillor Bob Goodman introduced the item, he stated that it was a depressing motion to bring as littering should not happen and a shift in mind-set was needed so that littering is not tolerated. He explained that he would prefer that the Council could enforce this but there were financial constraints, he further explained that these proposals were cost neutral and have been through the procurement process.

Councillor Bob Goodman moved the recommendations.

Councillor Karen Warrington seconded the motion and stated that she agreed that littering, dog fouling and fly tipping were a scourge on society and have to be addressed. She also agreed that there was a need to make sure vulnerable people were not targeted and that education was important. She explained that this was a pilot scheme which would be closely monitored and which has been successful in other authorities.

Councillor Paul May stated that he supported the concept and suggested a report back in 6 months.

Councillor Charles Gerrish stated that litter on roadside verges was also an issue and that he supported the proposal with a review after 6 months.

Councillor Paul Myers stated that dog fouling can affect people's health. He added that a private business could do the job as long as the contract was well managed. He also stated that the aspiration for a clean environment was a key and that savings on litter clearing could be put towards statutory services.

Councillor Vic Pritchard stated that people could still help with litter clearance and this pilot would be ancillary to that.

Councillor Tim Warren stated that the community would be more likely to be alienated if the Council did not deal with litter issues and that if people do not litter, they would not be targeted.

Councillor Goodman stated that there would be a progress report in 6 months.

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

- 1) That the Group Manager for Neighbourhood Environmental Services, in consultation with the Cabinet member for Development and Neighbourhoods to enter in to a 12 month pilot scheme to increase the enforcement of environmental crime throughout the district with the following provision:
  - a) the contract is at zero cost to the council
  - b) the contract is flexible to include additional enforcement activity as deemed appropriate
  - c) the providers take a proportionate approach in accordance with the legislation
  - d) that education and awareness raising of the consequences of environmental crime are prioritised
  - e) that if successful, proposals for a more permanent arrangement are developed towards the end of the trial.

## **28 REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING, CASH LIMITS AND VIREMENTS – APRIL TO JULY 2018**

Councillor Dine Romero made an ad-hoc statement where she stated that targets were being missed and that there were unintended consequences of the actions that had been taken to make the savings and a national solution is needed.

Councillor Robin Moss made an ad-hoc statement that staff should be congratulated on the underspend in Adult Social Care.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations. He explained that the report was in a new format which was very clear and open. He explained that the bulk of the overspend would be met from Revenue Budget Contingency. He added that Property Services are considering two potential commercial properties which would be income generating. He further commented that a national solution to Local

Government funding is needed and that Cabinet Members will continue to work with officers to find savings.

Councillor Paul May seconded the motion, he stated that this is the most difficult financial criteria for a Council that he had ever had to work with. He thanked the officers for the clear report.

Councillor Tim Warren stated that these are financially tough times but that on the whole the authority is doing well. He thanked the officers for the hard work and clear reporting.

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

- 1) To note the 2018/19 forecast over budget of £2.6m (as at the end of July 2018) and the recovery plan actions outlined in Appendix 1;
- 2) To note the mitigations that will be required shown in paragraph 5.6, if the over budget position cannot be reduced by the end of the financial year
- 3) To note the capital year end forecast detailed in paragraph 5.16 of this report;
- 4) To note the revenue virements listed for information in Appendix 3(i);
- 5) To note the changes in the capital programme including capital schemes that have been agreed for full approval under delegation listed in Appendix 4(i)

## **29 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT TO 30TH JUNE 2018**

Councillor Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul May seconded the motion.

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

- 1) The Treasury Management Report to 30th June 2018, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice, is noted.
- 2) The Treasury Management Indicators to 30th June 2018 are noted.

The meeting ended at 5.45 pm

Chair \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Prepared by Democratic Services**

This page is intentionally left blank



## **CABINET MEETING 5<sup>th</sup> Sep 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 - Public transport issues and in regards to litter and graffiti at train stations and trains

#### Councillors:

1. Councillor Eleanor Jackson – The view from Westfield

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

<b>M 01</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor June Player
<p>Gull issues at Bath Western Riverside</p> <p>Over the last couple of years I have been approached by more and more residents at Bath Western Riverside about the nuisance that gulls especially are causing them. I have previously referred them to the Council's Gull Strategy Service. Having now looked into the matter further I find the below.</p> <p>As part of the approval decision for Bath Western Riverside Development Area, Midland Road, (ref no. 06/04013/EFUL) Section 34 states that:</p> <p>'prior to the occupation of any building within the development a Pigeon/Gull Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA and thereafter the management plan shall be adhered to'.</p> <p>Reason: to ensure the implementation of measures to discourage pigeons and seagulls.</p> <p>In Crest Nicholson's Gull and Pigeon Strategy, Bath Western Riverside, March 2011 Section 4.2 recommends control strategies around dustbin use and signage.</p> <p>However, 4.2.4 it states that:</p> <p>'..if these measures do not reduce the nuisance caused by gulls and pigeons then methods of population control such as egg and nest removal, sterilisation or the use of fake eggs will need to be incorporated into the management of the site'.</p> <p>This year I have been informed that 13 nests and 30 eggs were removed from the Western Riverside and currently Falconry is taking place every week to help with the gull problems.</p> <p>How exactly do the Council and Crest Nicholson work together on this matter and, what financial contribution have Crest made to the overall service?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Bob Goodman
<p><i>The Council's contractor for the gull treatment programme liaises with the local management of Crest Nicholson so that egg and nest removals can take place on the site. Crest Nicholson do not make any financial contribution to the Council's gull treatment programme. Officers will continue to liaise with Crest Nicholson in relation to managing this issue.</i></p>		
<b>M 02</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Richard Samuel
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Will the Cabinet Member (Goodman) confirm that the Council is intending to establish a Parks Foundation to support B&amp;NES parks and opens spaces with Bristol City Council?</li> <li>2) If so, can the Cabinet Member provide details of where the decision to establish</li> </ol>		

such a Foundation was made and by whom, who was consulted on it, what the financial, legal and human resources implications are, and whether there is proposed to be any transfer of assets to the proposed Foundation?

- 3) Can the Cabinet member also provide full details of the grant award from NESTA, its terms and conditions, duration of the grant and project proposal, plan with timescales?
- 4) Finally can the Cabinet member confirm what the future governance arrangements will be for any Foundation?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Bob Goodman

- 1) Yes.
- 2) *The decision was made on 8th May 2018 by an officer delegated decision and endorsed by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods. The financial and human resources associated with the project are shown in the relevant documents (available on request), and, at this stage, it's difficult to say what the legal implications might be as its unclear what the legal structure will be (see point 3 below). However it is worth noting that the project carries a significant budget (funded by NESTA) to cover the legal costs associated with the Foundation. B&NES is offering staff time and hotdesking office space as in-kind funding towards the project, but there are no funds being transferred from B&NES to the foundation. There are no proposals to transfer assets to the proposed Foundation, the desired models for the Foundation would not allow for land ownership and any efforts to pursue land ownership by the Trust would be well outside of the aims and spirit of the NESTA funding.*
- 3) *The grant application and project milestones are attached. In summary, Bristol City Council has been awarded £193,617 to develop an independent foundation to raise funds for, and attract more people to volunteer in, parks in Bristol and Bath. The funding is largely to cover staff costs – all of whom will be employed by Bristol City Council and the Natural History Consortium until the Foundation is launched. The project will also work with voluntary organisations in the two cities to promote the foundation, and will work in partnership with Bournemouth Council to learn from their experience of setting up a parks foundation and to identify the scope for a foundation to generate income through trading. The NESTA funded project will run until July 2020 and it is hoped that the Trust will be launched in June 2019. The Trust will be financially independent and will need to cover its costs from the funds it generates. From its launch, the Trust will need to cover all of its own costs from the funds it generates and will not be subsidised by either council.*
- 4) *Determining the governance arrangements for the Foundation will be one of the main tasks in the first year of the NESTA funded project (August 2018 – July 2019). It is anticipated that the Foundation will be an independent charity with separate advisory groups for Bath and Bristol, but this will be confirmed through development work undertaken in 2018/19.*

**M 03**

**Question from:**

Councillor Richard Samuel

What safety inspections were carried out at Bath Leisure Centre before the swimming

pool was re-opened to the public?

Who was responsible for carrying out safety inspections at Bath Leisure Centre before the swimming pool was re-opened to the public and what was the Council's role?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Bob Goodman

*Under the terms of their contract GLL are responsible for the safe management, operation and maintenance of the buildings and for the design, management and operation and maintenance of the refurbishment works to the facilities.*

*The Council received a Building Control application for the centre and provided that service as follows:*

*1. Safety Inspections through 2016, 2017 and into 2018. It is important to note that the Building Control regime exists to ensure compliance with the building regulation requirements.*

*The person undertaking the building work is responsible for ensuring compliance with building regulation requirements and guidance from the government is clear on this. Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government advice makes it clear that the inspections which Building Control undertake should not be confused with full site supervision and completion certificates or final certificates, which local authorities or Approved Inspectors respectively issue, are therefore not a guarantee of warranty for the building work that has been carried out.*

*2. Inspections before the Leisure centre reopened.*

*The swimming pool refurbishment works were in phase 3 of the overall scheme and it was re-opened in July 2018.*

*The building regulations allow for a local authority to consent to a building being occupied before building works are fully completed providing that fire safety requirements are satisfied. This is normal with larger schemes as they near completion and was the case with the various phases of the leisure centre. This means that the building refurbishment works on the leisure centre have not yet been fully completed in terms of building regulations.*

*When an existing building is refurbished building regulations will generally apply only to new building work. They cannot be retrospectively applied to existing parts of the building which might not conform to current standards.*

*As an added layer of protection the Council and GLL employed an Independent Certifier to verify that the works had been carried out to the required standards. The Independent Certifier performed an occupation inspection before the building was opened to the public and while noting a number of issues that needed to be dealt with, the railings located within the viewing gallery, of which there has been significant media coverage, were not picked up as an issue by this inspection.*

*Once this matter was raised the Council advised GLL and the viewing gallery remains closed while the railing design is altered to resolve the issue.*

<b>M 04</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Will Sandry
Is the council sufficiently resourced to check (and fill if necessary) its network of grit bins before winter?		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Mark Shelford
<i>There is over 400 grit bins on the highway network and the Council will, as in previous years, replace any damaged Council bins and restock them prior to winter.</i>		
<b>M 05</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Will Sandry
Does the Council have a policy regarding engine idling for its own vehicles? Has the Council provided any instruction or training on idling for drivers of its own vehicles or for officers using their own vehicles on Council business?		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Mark Shelford
<i>There is no formal policy regarding engine idling, however fleet vehicle drivers are trained to drive in an efficient and safe manner.</i>		
<i>Research has shown that vehicles, certainly diesels, emit higher levels of exhaust fumes if they are constantly started and restarted. The driving requirements upon Council staff vary depending on the nature of the role and type of vehicle driven.</i>		
<i>Some vehicles such as those employed in refuse &amp; recycling require the engine to be idling to operate ancillary equipment such as compactors and roll-on/roll-off equipment.</i>		
<i>Many grey-fleet vehicles now have stop-start mechanisms fitted as standard. It is also a requirement of the Highway Code not to leave an unattended vehicle idling.</i>		
<i>The Council already has a number of electric vehicles in the fleet and will continue to invest in electric vehicles in the fleet which avoids the pollution from idling vehicles</i>		
<b>M 06</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	Councillor Ian Gilchrist
Is the Cabinet member aware that there appear to be a number of failings in the running of the 'Buy With Confidence' scheme which is supposed to protect members of the public from incompetent traders, and from which the Council derives some income by allowing traders to claim endorsement from the Council? (N.B. A second part of this question has been removed as it refers to a specific complaint that has been already raised with the Council, Constitution Part 4D Rule 30, though the details of that complaint have been acknowledged by the relevant Cabinet Member in their response).		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Bob Goodman
<i>This complaint related to an issue that was originally raised with the Council's Trading Standards team back in 2015. This complaint was thoroughly investigated and was subject to the Council's Stage 1 and Stage 2 Formal Complaint procedure before the</i>		

*complainant referred the matter to the Ombudsman. I refer to the Ombudsman's report, and would draw attention to pages 4 and 5 of the Ombudsman's final decision which states*

*" 26. I commend the action the Council has already taken to improve the mediation service it offers under the BWC scheme, set out at paragraph 19 above.*

*27. The Council has also confirmed that in 2016 it reviewed the administration of the BWC scheme and appointed a new officer with responsibility for delivery of the scheme, leading to procedural improvements.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Will Councillor Bob Goodman meet with the member of public on this matter and hear the evidence.

**Answer from:**

Councillor Bob Goodman

Yes.

**M 07**

**Question from:**

Councillor Rob Appleyard

How many B&NES residents have registered for the MiPermit residents' discount since it was launched and how many discounted parking sessions have taken place? What is the processing cost or administrative charge for using the app? Are there any additional costs to the Council?

**Answer from:**

Councillor Mark Shelford

*We are pleased to say that as of 30th August 429 Resident Parking Saver Accounts have been set up and 329 residents have received a discount on the advertised parking charge from accessing this benefit. An additional 498 users who auto qualify for a Resident Parking Saver account by way of having an existing Residents Permit have also received a discount on their parking. A total of 899 stays have been created saving residents approximately £400 against the standard advertised tariffs.*

*The costs for using the system to access the Residents Parking Saver are in line with the charges for the standard cashless parking system for all users. All customers pay a 10p convenience fee to offset the costs of running and maintaining the system as well as any standard network charges that apply from the customers' network provider. The total cost of making a payment using the Resident Parking Saver system is always less than the standard advertised tariffs for the general public.*

*The Councils costs are limited to, in line with all cashless payments, to the fees due for processing the credit/debit card payment at approximately 8p per transaction. This cost is approximately half of the fee due per transaction if a credit card payment is taken through the Pay and Display machines within the car parks.*

<b>Supplementary Question:</b>	
Can the system identify how many of our residents are parking for the minimum time?	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Mark Shelford
<i>An answer will be provided in 5 working days on how many of the 899 stays were short.</i>	
<b>M 08</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Paul Crossley
How many road repairs are currently outstanding on the Fix-My-Street scheme and how many of these have been reported more than once?	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Mark Shelford
<i>Due to annual leave it has not been possible to provide the information in time for the Cabinet meeting. A full answer will be provided to Cllr Crossley within 5 working days</i>	
<b>M 09</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Paul Crossley
What is the average length of time to resolve a problem reported on Fix-My-Street?	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Mark Shelford
<i>Due to annual leave it has not been possible to provide the information in time for the Cabinet meeting. A full answer will be provided to Cllr Crossley within 5 working days.</i>	
<b>M 10</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Richard Samuel
Can the Cabinet member give an update on the proposals to relocate the Bath Recycling Centre including progress on identifying a replacement site?	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Bob Goodman
<i>The current site at Midland Road will need to close as a household recycling centre sometime during the financial year 2021/22 as we need to construct a new waste transfer station at Pixash Lane before the site can close. Any new location needs to be easily accessible for residents bringing bulky waste items for reuse and recycling, and designed to maximise opportunities for reuse and recycling both now and in the future as the population grows, diverting waste from landfill and enhancing resident's satisfaction when using it. Therefore, we are currently reviewing suitable alternative sites and officers have been referring to the advice from WRAP as part of this process.</i>	
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>	
Can you confirm the timescales for the alternative provision, whatever decision is made, and confirm that the alternative provision will be accessible?	

<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Bob Goodman
<i>An answer will be provided in 5 working days with details but the alternative provision will be state of the art and accessible.</i>	
<b>M 11</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Paul Crossley
Can the Cabinet member please confirm whether the bid for Homes England grant support for Bath Quays North has been approved or not? If it is approved, how many social units will it enable on Bath Quays North? If it is not yet approved, when will the allocation be confirmed or not?	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Paul Myers
<p><i>The Council has been awarded the following Homes England Accelerated Construction funding for the delivery of housing at PACE, the Governments methodology for accelerating delivery of new homes above the rate the market would normally achieve. Delivery of the works being funded has to be complete by March 2021.</i></p> <p><i>The Grant is not directly for subsidising affordable homes but has the effect of supporting delivery by closing the viability gap and retaining the value of this in the scheme for affordable housing. Depending upon the tenure and unit mix the amount of affordable will vary.</i></p> <p><i>We have a grant offer for the following;</i></p> <p><i>BQS - £2.423m</i>  <i>BQN - £3.533m</i>  <i>BWR - £5.253m</i></p> <p><i>The expectation being that we achieve 30% affordable delivery with a blend of shared ownership and discounted market sale and rent.</i></p> <p><i>We have not yet entered the agreement, each of the above sites having pre-conditions to enable us to commit to the funding terms.</i></p>	
<b>Supplementary Question:</b>	
Is the answer that there are zero social rented units?	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Paul Myers
<i>An answer will be provided in 5 working days.</i>	
<b>M 12</b>	<b>Question from:</b> Councillor Paul Crossley
Are the Cabinet aware of any schemes to ensure education on the Bath Community Academy site and, if so, what are they?	
<b>Answer from:</b>	Councillor Paul May



*A report on developing future plans for the BCA site is on the agenda for the Children & Young People Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel meeting on 18th September. This report sets out both short term arrangements for continuing occupation of the site (including some educational provision) and the anticipated process for developing a longer term masterplan for the site. The Regional Schools Commissioner made clear that the DfE could not support the provision of a mainstream secondary school on this site and our data (also being reported to the PDS panel on 18th) bears out that there is insufficient demand to fill another school. The city of Bath has 6 mainstream secondary schools for 11-16 year olds and a seventh is unsustainable. Indeed an additional school could impact on the viability of existing schools. There may however be future requirements for a venue for more specialist educational facilities to serve the wider B&NES area and these can be considered as part of the masterplanning process described. Such a facility would be accessed on the basis of individual need criteria and not on the basis of geographic proximity.*

**Supplementary Question:**

Can you confirm that the masterplan contains awareness that the land has a covenant?

**Answer from:** Councillor Paul May

*I will check on this before the item goes to the Children and Young People Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> September.*

**M 13** **Question from:** Councillor Dine Romero

What preparatory work or risk assessments has the Council carried out with regard to Brexit?

**Answer from:** Councillor Tim Warren

*The Council is monitoring the position with regard to Brexit and is considering the possible implications for local government, and Bath and North East Somerset Council in particular. The Council is receiving briefings from the Government as the negotiations progresses. Also, the Local Government Association is part of the national planning process and will provide advice and guidance to the sector. As the outcome of this process is not yet clear, the Council does not have a definitive assessment it could make public.*

**M 14** **Question from:** Councillor Shaun Stephenson-McGall

What steps has the Leader taken to implement the resolution of Council of 12 July 2018, with regard to transparency around his discussions with other Council Leaders in Somerset?

**Answer from:** Councillor Tim Warren

*There has been one further informal meeting involving the Council Leaders and Chief Executives of the six Somerset Councils which I attended and which discussed the proposals for the six Councils to commission work to review options for local government re-organisation within the boundary of Somerset. No formal processes have yet started and my intention would be to brief Group Leaders about developments and before any formal participation by Bath and North East Somerset Council.*

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

<b>P 01</b>	<b>Question from:</b>	David Martin
<p>Has the Council undertaken a strategic economic and social assessment of the potential impact of Brexit on B&amp;NES, and if so can the findings be made public?</p>		
<b>Answer from:</b>		Councillor Tim Warren
<p><i>The Council is monitoring the position with regard to Brexit and is considering the possible implications for local government, and Bath and North East Somerset Council in particular. The Council is receiving briefings from the Government as the negotiations progresses. Also, the Local Government Association is part of the national planning process and will provide advice and guidance to the sector. As the outcome of this process is not yet clear, the Council does not have a definitive assessment it could make public.</i></p>		

Address to cabinet: The view from Westfield. 5 September 2018

Sometimes I think the Council deliberately sets out to provoke me, this time by having the single member decision on the new Hope House Surgery in the papers. I have supported residents in their opposition to having the last publicly owned green space in Radstock town centre developed, at a time when we are urged to adopt healthy living and combat obesity. However, I am more concerned about the lack of safe pedestrian access from the town centre and available car parking. How many pedestrians will be injured on the roads before a proper crossing is put across the A362. Particularly parents with pushchairs and the disabled will find it difficult to get to the new library – if it is not closed.

Secondly there was the situation on Saturday morning when I could not get to my Westfield surgery because there were no buses up there at all, and no warning notices on bus stops. Even the diversion sign had disappeared. It is a simple thing not to take the diversion signs down until the road is cleared.

The main issue however, which Westfield Parish Council wishes to have communicated to you, is that they object strongly to having services outsourced. Residents are telling them that they object to paying more council precept to cover services such as the youth service and the library service and those living in the Holly Court are horrified that BANES has stopped cutting the grass and contractors will have to be found to do it. The parish council also protest about all the pit paths which are swamped in brambles and nettles. How can children walk to school if access is blocked?

Westfield Parish Council strongly support the youth services, with over 75 young people attending the 'club' at the Westfield chapel, as do Christians Together in Radstock and Westfield, who started the Friday night 'café sessions in Radstock. We appreciate very much all the support officers have given us over the last four years to create a Neighbourhood Plan (referendum tomorrow! 55% of postal voters already voted..) but though we will claim the enhanced CIL/S106 money to realise community aspirations, it will not be possible to provide everything Westfield residents deserve, neither can charities and churches make up the gap. And we take a particularly dim view of littering contracts being privatised and limited to Bath. More on that from Cllr Moss Eleanor Jackson.

(Lab. Westfield, Westfield Parish Council, Chair: Christians Together in Radstock & Westfield

This page is intentionally left blank