

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

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

Tuesday, 18th December, 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

57 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

58 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

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

59 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

60 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Paul May declared an other interest as non-executive director on Sirona's Board and said that he would leave the room during the statement from the Unison Officer about Sirona dispute.

61 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

The Chair invited the meeting to pay their respects by standing for a minute's silence for Sandra Flowers (ex PA to Chief Executive) and Andy Coles (Traffic Regulation Orders Technical Officer) who recently passed away.

62 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 24 questions from Councillors and no 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.]

Questions and Answers sheet

63 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

Sarah Moore made a statement where she highlighted concerns about road safety in Twerton and presented a petition for a pedestrian crossing outside/near Twerton Infants School. Sarah Moore also invited Councillor Mark Shelford, as the relevant Cabinet Member, to attend a meeting with the residents to discuss traffic safety measures.

Councillor Mark Shelford thanked Sarah Moore for the petition and said that in principle he would support this issue though any new projects that were not set in the budget would take time to be achieved. Councillor Shelford also welcomed a suggestion to meet with the residents on this matter.

Note: Councillor Paul May left the room at this point.

John Drake (UNISON) addressed the Cabinet about the long running dispute between the UNISON and Sirona Health and Care. John Drake said that workers were asked to work additional hours for exactly same pay, or take a significant pay cut. John Drake said that the UNISON believed that this has happened because the Council has offered flat rates contracts with Sirona. John Drake also said that the reputation of Sirona was damaged and long term viability of Sirona was in jeopardy. John Drake urged the Council to bring these services back in house as the Council could provide much better services than Sirona.

Note: Councillor Paul May returned to the meeting at this point.

Councillor Richard Samuel said that questions he had asked on certain details related to Bath Podium Library project were not fully answered. The project was now paused as there was no popular support for it. Councillor Samuel also said that he has made requests for background information which were refused. Councillor Samuel felt that he had right to see this information as a Member of the Council and that he was being obstructed from getting the information that he was entitled to.

The Chair said that he would speak to the Monitoring Officer and get back to Councillor Samuel with answers on this matter, outside the meeting.

64 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETINGS

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings held on 31st October and 8th November 2018 be confirmed as correct records and signed by the Chair.

65 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

66 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

There were none.

67 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

68 BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE - CLEAN AIR ZONE

Councillor Tim Ball made an ad-hoc statement by saying that the Cabinet was legally obliged to make the decision this year, and it should not wait for March or any other month next year.

Councillor Richard Samuel made an ad-hoc statement by saying that the Cabinet Member responsible for the Clean Air Zone suggested that further direction on this matter would be considered by the Cabinet in 6 to 8 weeks from now. Councillor Samuel expressed his doubt that this Cabinet would make any decision during the purdah period, and suggested that the decision would be made after Local Elections in May 2019. Councillor Samuel was concerned that Council would be exposed to financial risk by delaying the decision on the Clean Air Zone. Councillor Samuel recognised that there was excellent response from the public, and that the officers would need some time to get the feedback, though this would not stop the Cabinet making the decision before purdah period.

Councillor Dine Romero commented that she would be interested in mitigation measures for those who would not be able to afford newer and compatible cars, those who were providing essential services to the community and what alternatives in transport could be provided.

Councillor Bob Goodman introduced the report.

Councillor Goodman said that residents and businesses had taken the time to engage with the Council and as such, they have deserved a proper response. This was important given the unique nature of Bath which was one of only two entire cities designated by UNESCO as World Heritage Sites (the other being Venice). The area surrounding the city was also designated. Bath was a major tourist destination whilst it was also a key transit point between the south coast and the motorway network. Therefore, the Council had to balance addressing air quality, that had the potential to be a highly complex and controversial issue, with measures that may be perceived to unfairly "penalise" residents and businesses, when the causes of the poor air quality also relate to transiting traffic, tourism and the topography of the city and surrounding area.

As a responsible public body, the Council has taken its duties and responsibilities seriously and has demonstrated best endeavours to comply with the Government Directive and legal requirements. It should also be noted that the Council was

significantly further ahead in this process than a number of other local authorities provided with an air quality direction.

Whilst the volume and complexity of responses to the consultation was unprecedented, certain themes were emerging, these include:

- Suggestions to either extend or reduce the boundary of the zone
 - Other alternative measures to address the air quality levels
 - Diversion routes to avoid 'rat runs'
 - Identification of impacts of the proposals on specific groups of people, specific localities and businesses
 - Suggestions on mitigation measures such as; charging variations, public transport measures, access restrictions, infrastructure improvements, parking and transport management measures and development of low emission transport modes.
- The Joint Air Quality Unit, commonly known as JAQU, was established by UK government Departments for transport and the environment to deliver national plans to improve air quality and ensure compliance EU air quality objectives. Air quality modelling was central to developing these plans. In accordance with JAQU guidance, modelling for the local CAZ has been undertaken using the most frequently used UK model for assessing emission concentration from road traffic sources (Ref: Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System for Roads). The model inputs included; emission sources, meteorological data, background pollution levels and the likely impacts of structures/urban environments.

Councillor Goodman concluded his statement by saying that that despite the challenging timeline set by the Government, the Council has achieved the deadline for submitting the initial plan to the Joint Air Quality Unit and immediately proceeded with the technical work necessary to develop a final plan and preferred option. Extensive public and partner engagement on the initial plan was also undertaken in parallel with a view to enabling the shortest possible consultation on the final plan and preferred option. However, the extent of the response would require additional time to complete this piece of work effectively and fairly.

Councillor Bob Goodman moved the recommendations.

Councillor Mark Shelford seconded the motion by saying that taking additional time to complete this piece of work was the right thing to do. The volume and complexity of responses to the consultation was unprecedented and the officers would need to take some time to assess these correctly. The Council would work on improving the health of local people with as small as possible detrimental effect on businesses in the city.

Councillor Karen Warrington also supported the motion by saying that she would not want to make final decision on this matter until all feedback from the consultation is processed.

Councillor Paul May said that Bath was a heritage city and its residents deserve clean air. The unprecedented number of responses to the consultation deserves proper consideration so the Cabinet can get clarity on what the residents had said.

Councillor Vic Prichard said that the Cabinet did not have enough time to consider feedback from the consultation so this was the right thing to do. It would be unfair to residents if the Cabinet rushed to make the decision and ignored overwhelming feedback. The Cabinet would also need to take into account people who own non-compliant vehicles and how they would travel to the hospital; what sort of public

transport provision would be in the city; impact on businesses; and how to reduce the pollution.

Councillor Paul Myers welcomed the consultation responses from the public and said that the Cabinet would listen to the residents. Councillor Myers also suggested that the Council should consider car sharing options signage, similar to Bristol.

The Chair commented that it was important for the residents of Bath, and also North East Somerset, to be able to breathe the clean air. The Chair also said that all of us were to blame for the pollution, and all of us would have to work together to reduce the pollution in Bath. The Council has received over 8,400 responses to the consultation and it would have to look at all of them before taking next steps. It would also have to consider risks to the residents, visitors and businesses including mitigation measures.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to:

- 1) Note the unprecedented high number of consultation responses, as highlighted in section 8 of this report.
- 2) Receive a further report with fully costed and modelled options, including a range of mitigation measures as soon as is reasonably possible. In any event receive an update report in March 2019.
- 3) Request a full analysis of the consultation responses and any consequential statistical and financial modelling work deemed necessary to ensure comprehensive consideration of the wide range of comments received.
- 4) Request Officers to continue to liaise with the Joint Air Quality Unit (JAQU) regarding the timeline and the on-going funding for the remaining Outline and Full Business cases (OBC and FBC), subject to understanding the implications of further modelling.

69 REVIEW OF TAXI LICENSING POLICY AND ASSOCIATED CONDITIONS

Councillor Will Sandry made a comment that he was happy with the report though he was concerned about the language used at some Licensing Committee meetings.

Councillor Dine Romero expressed her concerns that conditions would not apply to vehicles which were licensed in other authorities.

Councillor Bob Goodman introduced the report by saying that the previous policy and conditions adopted by the Council have been updated to align with the proposals on air quality, the need to ensure that all drivers have an awareness of how to respond to concerns about Child Sexual Exploitation and the need to ensure that new applicants are able to effectively communicate with passengers in the interests of public safety. Following the Equality Act 2010 (Commencement No. 12) Order 2017, it was also recommended that the Council adopts these provisions in the interests of transparency and fairness to both licence holders and wheelchair users.

Councillor Bob Goodman moved the recommendations.

Councillor Tim Warren seconded the motion.

Councillor Mark Shelford supported the report though he felt that taxi drivers should wear some sort of uniform in near future which would, in his view, add value to the service.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed to:

- 1) Note the responses to the public consultation and the officer recommendations;
- 2) Adopt the revised hackney carriage and private hire policy following endorsement by the Licensing Committee;
- 3) Adopt Section 165-167 of the Equality Act 2010 following endorsement by the Licensing Committee;
- 4) Note the amended private hire driver conditions and hackney carriage driver byelaws following amendments proposed by the Licensing Committee;
- 5) Note the remaining conditions adopted by the Licensing Committee at the meeting on 17 October 2018.

70 REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING, CASH LIMITS AND VIREMENTS – APRIL TO OCTOBER 2018

Councillor Richard Samuel made an ad-hoc statement saying that there was £50k of underspend in July 2015 and today the figure was £4.1m of overspend. Councillor Samuel also said that Council's reserves have been depleted.

The Chair explained that during the last 4 years the Council had to find £50m in savings, whilst also protecting the most vulnerable.

Councillor Charles Gerrish introduced the report by highlighting the following:

a) Revenue budget

The Revenue budget outturn was currently forecast to be £4.1m over budget. This is £1.5m higher than the £2.6m reported previously and this was mainly due to unmitigated delays in savings delivery of net £1.8m, additional demand in Children's Services £2.2m, and a £1.2m shortfall in income from Commercial Estate. This has been partially offset by a forecast under budget position of (£0.86m) resulting from Council funded growth allocations now being funded from additional grant in Adult Social Care. Urgent actions have been put in place through Recovery Plans to mitigate this position. The report highlighted which savings were delayed and which were considered high risk and may not be delivered. Those that were delayed can be supported through the smoothing reserve but this would utilise all of the reserve allocation for 2018/19.

b) Capital budget

The capital budget was currently showing an expected under budget position of £11.4m mainly due to slippage and re-phasing.

This report would also seek approval to make adjustments to the current capital programme following the review that has been carried out to support 2019/20 budget planning.

c) Council tax and Business rates

The current forecast Council's share of the year end Collection Fund position was:

- Council Tax – Surplus of £0.760m (2017/18 Deficit £0.154m)
- Business Rates – Deficit of £0.259m (2017/18 Deficit £1.473m)

Business rates collection remained slightly lower than target and would continue to be monitored closely over the next few months

d) Council Reserves

Council reserves would be required to mitigate the current position if the actions being put in place were not successful. The Budget Contingency Reserve which has been set up to mitigate budget risk would be completely depleted with a further £0.53m requirement from Un-earmarked Reserves. This would reduce General Fund Un-Earmarked Reserves to below the range required to meet the Council's financial risks and therefore required a review of all reserves and a requirement for further savings to replenish them in 2019/20.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul May seconded the motion by saying that the Cabinet has been open and transparent to the public in terms of the budgetary position. Councillor May added that the demand in children services was higher due to increased costs from new residential placements as a result of children being at risk of harm, as well as a number of children having to move from foster care into more expensive residential care due to the complexity of their needs.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet agreed:

- 1) To note the 2018/19 forecast over budget of £4.1m (as at the end of October 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 5.17 of this report;
- 4) To approve the revenue virements listed for approval and note the 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)
- 6) The capital schemes listed in Annex 4(iii) for removal / deferment from the current 5 year capital programme.

The meeting ended at 11.45 am

Chair _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEETING 18th Dec 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 – Clean Air Zone
2. Sarah Moore – A petition for a pedestrian crossing outside/near Twerton Infants School
3. Adam Reynolds (Bath Cycle Network) – Budget allocation for cycling and walking
4. John Drake (UNISON) – Sirona dispute

Councillors:

1. Councillor Karen Walker – Budget statement
2. Councillor Richard Samuel – Libraries

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M	01	Question from:	Councillor June Player
<p>In January 2012 I asked the following question regarding To-Let Signs.</p> <p>“What action is the Council prepared to take to restrict the To-Let signs in areas such as Westmoreland and Oldfield Park?</p> <p>Prior to 2009 I understand that there was a Gentlemen's Agreement amongst Estate Agents whereby To Let signs were not put up outside vacant properties. I would ask that this Council follow in the steps of other cities where To Let signs are being banned/restricted in problem areas. The signs increased and relentless annual appearance blights many streets. Due to the internet and its use by the students, there is no longer the necessity to display these signs. They are only of benefit to the Estate Agents for free advertising.</p> <p>Due to the failure of this Gentlemen's Agreement and the apparent disregard for the state and concerns of communities I ask that the Council seeks approval from the Sec. of State under the Town & Country Planning Act to direct that in future Estate Agents have to 'seek express' consent before they put up a sign in Bath and/or Wards that are heavily populated with HMO's.”</p> <p>The issue has raised its head again and is blighting our streets. This is sheer unpaid-for advertising by Estate Agents at the cost however to the area and its residents as these signs are totally unnecessary. Would-be tenants do not walk around the streets as they now go online/Estate Agent Offices or in the case of students seek accommodation via the Universities Accommodation Lists or by word of mouth. What is the Council going to do to prevent this situation?</p>			
Answer from:			Councillor Bob Goodman
<p><i>The Regulation 7 Direction which was most recently extended in November 2016 for a further period of ten years prevents the display of estate agent boards on properties only within the City of Bath Conservation Area. This has been in place since 1989.</i></p> <p><i>The majority of Oldfield Ward and the entire Ward of Westmoreland are outside of the City of Bath Conservation Area and are therefore outside of the additional controls provided by the Regulation 7 Direction.</i></p> <p><i>If a ‘gentleman’s agreement’ has been in place then it was only that and the Council has never sought to control the display of estate agent boards in areas outside of the conservation area.</i></p> <p><i>In order to justify the extension to the Regulation 7 Direction there would have to be a significant identifiable harm to the visual appearance and character of the area and significant concern that existing controls available to the Council do not offer sufficient safeguards.</i></p>			

M 02	Question from:	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
<p>Can you explain how it is that residents in Westfield and Radstock, whether at the RUH or not, are being asked to provide their own walking aids, Zimmer frames etc. post-surgery?</p> <p>When was a decision made that residents should provide their own equipment?</p> <p>Do you agree that the impression given by a recent press release and survey is that B&NES and local NHS CCG are still providing community equipment?</p> <p>What are the criteria for determining whether an individual gets community equipment or whether they are expected to provide it for themselves?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p><i>The provision of Community Equipment is a statutory duty for Councils, as outlined in the Care Act (2014). Such duties note that where the Council issues equipment, this must be free of charge to those who have an assessed and eligible need. Similarly, Clinical Commissioning Groups also fund the provision of Community Equipment.</i></p> <p><i>To enable the Council and the CCG to deliver such requirements, the Council and CCG jointly commission the provision of Community Equipment within B&NES and have a number of contracts in place with several organisations. The largest of these contracts is with Sirona Health and Care, who support the ordering and delivery of Adults Community Equipment to individuals who have been assessed as requiring such equipment to support their care and support needs. Equipment prescribers, primarily occupational therapists, physiotherapists and registered nurses, are able to order equipment from a catalogue of equipment. Sirona will then order and deliver this equipment free of charge to the individual.</i></p> <p><i>For people recovering from surgery, individuals would generally be expected to receive any minor aids that they need, such as crutches or Zimmer frames, from the provider of the surgery, free of charge, at the point of discharge.</i></p> <p><i>Where individuals or prescribers are requesting equipment that is over and above their assessed needs, this may not be provided by the Council or CCG through the Sirona contract and thus may liable to a charge.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Council and CCG do hold a contract with the British Red Cross to support the provision of short term loan wheelchairs to residents of B&NES. Individuals should be able to access a wheelchair from the Red Cross for a short period (up to 12 weeks) enabling people who are either waiting for a bespoke wheelchair, or those who have a short term need for a wheelchair to benefit. Such provision is free of charge, although it is noted that the British Red Cross may request a deposit for such wheelchairs or may accept donations to support this provision.</i></p> <p><i>If individual residents have concerns in regards to the issuing of equipment post-surgery at the point of discharge we would be keen to explore them further. Please encourage individuals to raise such concerns via the Clinical Commissioning Group PALS team on Freephone: 0300 013 4762 or via email: BSCCG.Feedback@nhs.net.</i></p>		

M	03	Question from:	Councillor Richard Samuel
Can the Cabinet member state the total expenditure on the now abandoned Bath Library/OSS project?			
Answer from:			Councillor Karen Warrington
<p><i>To correct your misinterpretation of the issue, the project is on pause not abandoned. In October 2017 we reported to cabinet that £322,000 had been spent more than half of which was invested in the new Local History and Archives research and information centre in the Guildhall. A further maximum budget of £330,000 was approved to take the Bath project into the design stage. As a result of the decision to pause the investment plans at the podium site, a detailed review by the Council finance team of all project expenditure to date is underway. The capital investment in the Podium sat within an overall programme of modernising libraries and customer services across the district, much of which has been and continues to be delivered, and separating out individual items to establish the specific expenditure of the work to the Podium only is part of the review by finance. When the review is concluded the information will be shared.</i></p>			
M	04	Question from:	Councillor Richard Samuel
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How much has the Cabinet saved by cutting the Christmas tree collection? 2. How much does the Cabinet expect to spend in picking up uncollected Christmas trees on the streets as a result of the cut? 			
Answer from:			Councillor Bob Goodman
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>£35K is anticipated to be saved by standing down the garden waste collection for 2 months. The Service will resume on 28th January.</i> 2. <i>There is no additional budget allocation. We do not expect residents to leave Xmas trees on the public highway. We expect residents to take responsibility for their own waste and not dump trees on pavements. Xmas trees can be recycled at any of our 3 recycling centres or stored on the residents own property for the garden waste collection service which resumes on 28th January. Charities will carry out Xmas tree collections in parts of the district also and we urge residents to look out for the publicity if they would prefer to make a charitable donation.</i> 			
M	05	Question from:	Councillor Richard Samuel
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many road gullies exist in B&NES? 2. How many have been routinely cleared in the past 12 months? 3. How many reports have been made of blocked road gullies in the past 12 months? 4. What the normal programme of gulley clearance is and what budget was provided from 2015-2019? 			
Answer from:			Councillor Mark Shelford
1. 31260			

2. 22487
 3. 447 reports recorded
 4.

Description	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Drainage Reactive – Gully Jetting & Emptying	£ 111,425.00	£ 113,654.00	£ 114,791.00	£ 117,087.00	£119,429.00
Drainage Planned – Gully Emptying	£ 327,589.00	£ 334,141.00	£ 337,482.00	£ 294,232.00	£300,117.00
Total	£ 439,014.00	£ 447,795.00	£ 452,273.00	£ 411,319.00	£419,546.00

M 06 Question from: Councillor Richard Samuel

Can the Cabinet member provide the exact date when the Clean Air Zone decision will be made?
 If this date is after the 31st December 2018 - has the Council received advice from DEFRA that the legal deadline can be deferred and is this in writing?

Answer from: Councillor Bob Goodman

*The date for a decision on the Clean Air Zone will be confirmed following the completion of the consultation analysis and any further modelling which is required to be done as a result of these consultation outcomes.
 The Council has written to the Secretary of State for DEFRA advising them of the situation.*

Supplementary Questions:

1. How long does the Cabinet Member expect the analysis he referred to take?
2. Has the Cabinet Member received legal advice from Council's legal officer about the failure to comply with the direction?
3. Can the Cabinet Member confirm that the Council is not exposed to any legal and financial risk?

Answer from: Councillor Bob Goodman

1. *I fully expect us to have a line of direction in the next 6-8 weeks.*
2. *Yes, we had sought a legal advice from our legal officers.*
3. *We could be in the risk.*

Answer from: Councillor Tim Warren

As there were so many responses it would be unwise not to look at all responses properly.

M	07	Question from:	Councillor Tim Ball
Can the Cabinet member confirm that Christmas trees outside residents' houses, awaiting collection at the end of January/beginning of February, will not be treated as fly tipping? Will additional side waste be collected after Christmas this year?			
Answer from:		Councillor Bob Goodman	
<i>We expect residents to be responsible for their own waste, and to not to leave Xmas trees on the public highway. They can be recycled at any of the 3 recycling centres or through the garden waste collection service which resumes on 28th January. The tree should be kept on the resident's property, not on the street. Additional side waste will be collected after Xmas, but we encourage everyone to make sure they recycle as much as they can so there is not much waste left for disposal.</i>			
Supplementary Question:			
Can you confirm that you have encouraged people by default not to use real Christmas trees this year? Real trees are more environmentally friendly. Would you be looking to bring green waste collection forward in future years?			
Answer from:		Councillor Bob Goodman	
<i>There is no evidence at all that anyone is going to plastic trees. Like you, I do oppose the use of plastic trees. We will be looking at all provisions for bringing forward green waste collection. I would remind everyone that they can bring Christmas trees to any of the three recycling centres, which is very much on the same principle what other Local Authorities do.</i>			
M	08	Question from:	Councillor Tim Ball
Can the Cabinet member confirm that the new compounds in allotments for fallen leaves and compost will be in place during the next financial year?			
Answer from:		Councillor Bob Goodman	
Yes. Officers are working on proposals now.			
M	09	Question from:	Councillor Tim Ball
Can the Cabinet member give a progress report on the use of anaerobic digestion for fallen leaves?			
Answer from:		Councillor Bob Goodman	
<i>Leaves collected from the highway are deemed to be contaminated (by law) and go through a variety of processes to treat them. We recover as much value from the leaves as possible through different treatment processes via our contractor. The separated silt fraction from our leaves is processed through anaerobic digestion.</i>			

Leaves from parks are not contaminated and are recycled through open windrow composting to produce a valuable compost product.

M	10	Question from:	Councillor Rob Appleyard
----------	-----------	-----------------------	--------------------------

How many issues have been reported through Fix My Street since the new system launched and how many issues have been resolved? Does each individual who reports an issue receive feedback on progress and resolution of the issue?

Answer from:	Councillor Bob Goodman
---------------------	------------------------

A written response will be provided within 5 working days

M	11	Question from:	Councillor Will Sandry
----------	-----------	-----------------------	------------------------

Please provide data on all events in Bath and North East Somerset over the last 12 calendar months which have been applied for via the Apply4 website.

Please detail:

- Name of organisation
- Description of event
- Fee charged

Please highlight any events for which the fee has been:

- waived
- paid for by an internal transfer from a Bath and North East Somerset Council cost code.

Have any event applications been processed without the Apply4 website being used as part of the application process? If so, please detail give the details outlined above for these events too.

Answer from:	Councillor Bob Goodman
---------------------	------------------------

A written response will be provided within 5 working days.

M	12	Question from:	Councillor Dine Romero
----------	-----------	-----------------------	------------------------

Was any monitoring carried out of the effect on air quality in different areas of Bath (e.g. the Southern end of Gay Street) whilst Milsom Street was closed during the Christmas Market? If so, are any figures available regarding the impact?

Answer from:	Councillor Bob Goodman
---------------------	------------------------

Monitoring of nitrogen dioxide has been carried out in a number of locations near Milsom

Street during 2018 using diffusion tubes. These are small analysers which are exposed for one month and then analysed in a laboratory. The period of the Milsom Street closure was mainly covered by a diffusion tube exposed in November (exposed 31/10-4/12), these tubes were sent to the laboratory recently and the results take approximately one month to be processed. Results for November can be made available in early 2019.

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

Has the Cabinet member considered assigning more dedicated motorcycle parking spaces as part of the on-street parking offer in Bath?

Answer from:	Councillor Mark Shelford
---------------------	--------------------------

The use of motorcycles is increasingly popular due to their ability to bypass congestion, fuel efficiency and ease of parking. They also produce significantly lower emissions than cars and so have positive impact on air quality as well as congestion levels. In line with the Parking Strategy Objective PSO26: Improve the provision of high quality dedicated motorcycle parking spaces on street and in Council operated off-street car parks designated spaces should provide motorcycles with anchor points for locking the motorcycle. Currently, there are secure points at the following on-street locations, Portland Place; Sydenham Buildings; and Westgate Buildings. Further locations for improved provision will be identified as part of the parking strategy action plan as and when funding streams can be secured.

M	14	Question from:	Councillor Dine Romero
----------	-----------	-----------------------	------------------------

At the recent conference organised by the Bath Alliance for Transport and the Public Realm, the Cabinet member referred to “a technical study” on the feasibility of using one carriageway of the A4 Batheaston bypass as a park and ride site.

1. Does the technical study find this proposal to be technically feasible?
2. How many parking spaces are possible?
3. What is the likelihood of the A4 being released to B&NES or WECA for this purpose?
4. What is the likely cost?
5. What was the cost of the technical study work carried out by consultants?

Answer from:	Councillor Mark Shelford
---------------------	--------------------------

A draft technical study is being reviewed by Officers who will issue the report with a summary before the end of December 2018. Whilst this is still work in progress the Technical Study work is anticipated to cost £2,300.00.

Supplementary Question:

Will technical study be definitely available by the end of 2018?		
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford
<i>We are working hard with timetables so I have no other information than it will be delivered by that time.</i>		
M	15	Question from: Councillor Neil Butters
Can the Cabinet Member give an update on Terrace Walk following the withdrawal of the dedicated coach marshals? Is he aware that the situation with regard to coach traffic has deteriorated since the removal of the marshals? Accidents are apparently occurring on a regular basis and air quality has deteriorated, with drivers keeping their engines idling for prolonged periods of time.		
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford
<p><i>Due to the seasonal nature of coach traffic the dedicated marshals have been removed during the periods of the year when coach traffic is lower but will be in place during the busier peak periods to ensure best use of the resources available. The Traffic and Safety team have reviewed the reported accidents statistics for the period up to the end of October 2018 and can confirm that there has been one reported injury accident in Terrace Walk in the last 5 years (up until the end of Oct 2018 – the latest data we have). It occurred in March 2015 when a pedestrian stepped out in front of a bus or coach, which then hit them, resulting in slight injuries.</i></p> <p><i>There is currently no evidence that air quality has been impacted by the removal of coach marshals during the off peak period. Analysis of the results from the diffusion tube analyser which has been in Terrace Walk since Oct 2017 (monthly averages) and the AQMesh type monitor which was in Terrace Walk from April to Oct 2018 confirm that whilst there is variation in nitrogen dioxide concentrations due to weather and emissions no step change in results is seen. However, this will be monitored as part of the regular monitoring processes and if issues are identified consideration will be given to taking appropriate action.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
How well the new Odd Down Coach park is working?		
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford
<i>I have visited the site the other day and it was full. I will get back to you how full it is by days with figures from officers.</i>		
M	16	Question from: Councillor Neil Butters
Can we please have an update on what transport-related powers have been transferred to		

WECA so far, what are still to be transferred, and their likely timescale?			
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford	
<i>A written response will be provided within 5 working days.</i>			
M	17	Question from:	Councillor Neil Butters
What is the envisaged timetable for implementation of MetroWest through Bath, and to and from which destinations? How likely is it that these services will be run by GWR? Is any rebranding of rolling stock, to proclaim 'MetroWest', likely?			
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford	
<p><i>MetroWest Phase 1 will see half hourly services on the Severn Beach Line and local stations to Bath Spa with a possible extension to Westbury. The additional works required to facilitate the Westbury link are currently being assessed by Network Rail.</i></p> <p><i>Network Rail's programme of renewals and enhancements up to late 2021 includes the renewal of Bristol East Junction (east of Temple Meads station) which is programmed to be completed by September 2021, subject to confirmation of funding by the DfT. The quantum of changes to train services planned for January 2019 is such that Network Rail are not currently able to confirm whether MetroWest Phase 1 services could operate without the renewal of the Bristol East junction. WECA continue to work with Network Rail to map out infrastructure improvements to facilitate short, medium and long-term rail aspirations such as Bristol East. The current programme for MetroWest Phase 1 identifies delivery in late 2021 following the completion of the Bristol East junction.</i></p> <p><i>There is a potential that the Department for Transport will extend GWR rail franchise until 2022, in which case GWR will run the MetroWest service and we would expect rebranding of the rolling stock to proclaim "MetroWest"</i></p>			
M	18	Question from:	Councillor Neil Butters
What representations have been made to GWR to provide additional rolling stock between Bristol and Westbury - now it is becoming available from other areas - to tackle overcrowding? What answers have been received?			
Answer from:		Councillor Mark Shelford	
<i>A written response will be provided within 5 working days</i>			
M	19	Question from:	Councillor Neil Butters
A tram or tram-train system has been mooted between Bristol and Bath, broadly along the			

route of the A4. What assurances have been received, and from whom, that a sufficiently broad corridor has been identified to facilitate such a system? What would the key elements of that corridor comprise?

Answer from:

Councillor Mark Shelford

A written response will be provided within 5 working days.

M 20

Question from:

Councillor Will Sandry

Please could the Cabinet member detail the progress of and achievements to date of the Council's mental health review.

When will the review be completed?

Answer from:

Councillor Vic Pritchard

I provided a written briefing to Health and Wellbeing Select Committee in November, confirming that the review remains on track. A number of specific deliverables have been identified as a result of the review, further details of which are published on the CCG website at www.bathandnortheast Somersetccg.nhs.uk/get-involved/project/mental-health-services-review. Some key areas of development include:-

- Improved Crisis Provision: Strongly identified as a local need, Commissioners and Virgin Care are working with Bath Mind who will lead the service operation to develop the specification for a new safe haven facility in Bath and North East Somerset. An NHS Grant has been identified to support start-up of the project and the safe haven space is expected to be open in Spring 2019.*
- Wellbeing House: The need for pre-crisis support was clearly identified in the review and whilst Commissioners have received positive feedback from this service the review showed that people wanted it to be open for longer, and to deliver an increased level of support. Discussions are in progress with the existing provider about enhancing the offer including extended opening and the option of an additional bed for longer stays.*
- Service Specifications: The review showed a need for more joined up work and stronger collaboration across a coherent and clear pathway. Workshops are in progress with providers and review deliverables are being integrated into transformation plans. Any new specifications will have a focus on joined up working, holistic support, putting the person at the centre and making best use of community resources.*
- Collaborative Framework: All providers involved in the mental health review support the development of a collaborative framework. The framework that is currently in draft sets out the spirit of collaboration as well as the actions that will need to be taken to achieve a unique and high quality pathway for individuals with mental health needs. We expect this framework will incentivise people and services to work together to build a unique package of support which promotes recovery and*

<i>maintains wellbeing.</i>		
<i>A consultation on the identified deliverables will be commencing in January with the expectation that the full business case will be presented to Governing Bodies in March and contracts in place by 1st April 2019.</i>		
Supplementary Question:		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wellbeing House – is your desire that it will move to 7 days in a week operation? 2. Do you believe that an additional bed for longer stay would be sufficient? 		
Answer from:	Councillor Vic Pritchard	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Wellbeing House – I recommend to any Member of the Council to visit the Wellbeing House and see how they work. The reason why it is not yet 7 days in a week operation is purely down to finance. If we can identify sufficient finances then it would be open as 7 days a week provision as early as possible,</i> 2. <i>This is a starting point and we will measure as we progress.</i> 		
M	21	Question from:
		Councillor Neil Butters
<p>What instances are there of doctors' surgeries which are based outside B&NES having outposts within B&NES? What support can be given to Freshford surgery, recently closed by its parent at Beckington due to building problems, to re-establish itself? Is this a unique situation?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p><i>The provision of GP surgeries is not directly within the remit of the Council, but I have shared your question with officers at the CCG who have confirmed that apart from Beckington Surgery, which is in Somerset, there are no other practices outside of the B&NES boundary who have a branch surgery in B&NES.</i></p>		
M	22	Question from:
		Councillor Dine Romero
<p>What could the Council do to encourage or incentivise other city centre landlords to bring accommodation, such as empty spaces above shops, back into residential use?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Paul Myers
<p><i>Through the Council's housing development company we are demonstrating to other landlords the value of bringing these spaces back into use and encouraging others to do the same. There are 30 properties fully let by Aequus where they were previously empty premises. The Council also recently ran a campaign on empty properties and there are the council tax incentives to bring them back into use (e.g. Council Tax penalties where properties lie empty). The Council has also previously used its CPO powers in extreme</i></p>		

cases.																											
M	23	Question from:	Councillor Dine Romero																								
Has the Council considered possible investments in Avon Mutual?																											
Answer from:			Councillor Charles Gerrish																								
<i>Members and Officers met with representatives of Avon Mutual a few months ago to consider their proposals. We decided that we were not in a position to make a long term commitment at that time. However, we remain in contact with Avon Mutual and receive regular updates from them on their progress.</i>																											
M	24	Question from:	Councillor Will Sandry																								
With regard to Lorne Road car park (at the junction of Lorne Road, Brougham Hayes and Lower Bristol Road):																											
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What was the capital receipt from the sale of this land? 2. What were the terms of the sale (e.g. freehold, leasehold)? 3. What was the income generated from this land in each of the last three financial years? 																											
Answer from:			Councillor Charles Gerrish																								
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The capital receipt from the sale of the subject site was £100,000.</i> 2. <i>In regard to the terms of the sale of Lorne Road Car Park, the property was sold on a long leasehold basis.</i> 3. <i>From a review of the records, the income generated over the past three years was £1,000, the expenditure from the DDA grant is the sum of £3,035 which equates to the maintenance works undertaken at the site since 2015.</i> <p><i>Below is the full breakdown of the income and expenditure generated from residential car parks including Lorne Road, London Street and James Street West which is where the figures were determined from:</i></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Income:</td> <td>2014</td> <td>2015</td> <td>2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Car Parks, Residents & Former £29,610</td> <td>£11,836</td> <td>£9,056</td> <td>£8,717</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LBA30</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Expenditure:</td> <td>2014</td> <td>2015</td> <td>2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>				Income:	2014	2015	2016	Grand Total				Car Parks, Residents & Former £29,610	£11,836	£9,056	£8,717	LBA30				Expenditure:	2014	2015	2016	Grand Total			
Income:	2014	2015	2016																								
Grand Total																											
Car Parks, Residents & Former £29,610	£11,836	£9,056	£8,717																								
LBA30																											
Expenditure:	2014	2015	2016																								
Grand Total																											

Car Parks, Residents & Former
£49,840.34

£16,130.17

£15,728.99

£17,981.18