

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

CABINET

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

Wednesday, 7th February, 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

165 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

166 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the evacuation procedure as set out in the Agenda.

167 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

168 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

169 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

170 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS

There were 12 questions from Councillors.

[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.]

171 STATEMENTS, DEPUTATIONS OR PETITIONS FROM PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS

Councillor Dine Romero read out a statement on behalf of David Redgewell who expressed his concern on bus services cuts and asked where and when public consultation on this matter would be held. David Redgewell also said that WECA Mayor should have his say on this matter and asked if bus subsidies could be found via parking charges.

Nigel Sherwen (Camden Residents' Association) read out a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website*] where he asked the Cabinet to consider their report on Traffic Congestion and Poor Air Quality in Bath. Nigel Sherwen gave a copy of the report to Councillor Mark Shelford.

Councillor Richard Samuel (Walcot Ward Councillor) praised the work of the Camden Residents' Association and invited the Cabinet to examine this report and engage with residents.

Councillor Karen Walker gave a statement where she asked the Cabinet to consider the following 'wish list' for Peasedown St John Ward as part of the Budget:

- £30k for play-park improvements
- £10k for 20mph speed limit implementation in Carlingcott
- £40k for Lower Peasedown Rd resurface
- £100k for A367 Peasedown bypass resurface
- £75k for Braysdown Lane resurface

Councillor John Bull gave a statement where he said that Parking Strategy was more like Car Park Charging Strategy. Councillor Bull felt that the CTE PDS Panel had not had an opportunity to look at final proposals in the Strategy and that comments from one of the previous Panel meetings, during early stages of consultation on the Strategy, had not been investigated or taken on board.

172 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETINGS - 23RD NOVEMBER AND 6TH DECEMBER 2017

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 23rd November 2017 be confirmed as a correct record, subject to the correction of a few typos, and signed by the Chair.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 6th December 2017 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

173 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET

There were none.

174 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES

Councillor Sarah Bevan, Chair of the Resources PDS Panel, read out the following statement:

'At Resources PDS panel on Monday 5th February we discussed the Cabinet's proposed budget after receiving an overview from Donna Parham and Andrew Pate.

As you will all be aware the panel aims to scrutinise objectively as far as possible and leave political comments for political groups to raise separately.

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

The clarity of the report was welcomed. There was a significant level of questioning and key themes were:

- This year's spending above budget and future implications
- Levels of risk in the various budget proposals
- The potential impact on equalities issues
- The impact on the Council's workforce
- Definitions of 'critical services', 'front line' etc
- The use of delegated powers

More specifically it was requested that the use of delegation to officers? was reviewed and the Cabinet member undertook to report back on this and consider alternatives prior to Cabinet?.

Specific issues raised included:

- Why the Council Tax increase was below the referendum level
- The rationale for the profit share renegotiation for the Spa
- Why delegated powers were planned to be used to:
 - Extend the TDC lease
 - Use the invest to save reserve
 - Fund the Leading Together change programme.

The relevant portfolio holders had explained the issues including:

- The benefits from a thorough review and rebasing of budgets to remove legacy issues which gave rise to some previous budget inaccuracies
- That budgets were now much tighter with minimal scope to offset any sending above budget elsewhere
- The need for adequate reserves and a budget contingency provision
- That equalities work was an ongoing part of the process and issues could continue to be highlighted
- That workforce reductions were significant for the CEO to manage and phased to help minimise their impact on services
- That definitions of what was critical would be kept under review and considered as part of the workforce change process. There will be an update on this at March PDS Resources
- That an update from the portfolio holder would be forthcoming at Cabinet on use of delegated powers

I'd like to thank the panel for their hard work scrutinising the budget. It was a constructive meeting and looked at a lot of detail. The minutes are available for anyone who wishes to study this in advance of Council.

I'd also like to thank officers for their support and explanations.'

The Leader of the Council thanked Cllr Bevan on her statement.

175 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

176 ADOPTION OF A PARKING STRATEGY AND ASSOCIATED CHARGES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ODD DOWN COACH PARK

Sian James read out her statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website*] where she expressed her concerns about the Strategy, in particular an impact that short stay car parking would have on air pollution.

Sian James read out a statement on behalf of Fiona Powell [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website*] where she expressed her concerns about the Strategy, in particular on lack of detail on car volumes and movements.

Christine Boyd read out her statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website*] where she highlighted outcomes of the Charlotte Street Car Park survey conducted by her and another resident.

Andrew Lea addressed the Cabinet by saying that the Cabinet should not make the decision based on inaccurate information. Andrew Lea also said that Park and Rides were at its maximum capacities only during peak times at Christmas period.

Annie Kilvington read out her statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website*] where she said that residents should not be rewarded by driving to Bath and parking on a short stay basis, and why the Council did not asked DEFRA for comment.

Patrick Rotheram (FOBRA) read out his statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website*] where he said that the Council had been mandated to bring air pollution below the legal limit as soon as possible. Although FOBRA had supported increased long-term car park charges to encourage commuters to use the Park and Ride, they felt that reducing car park charges for B&NES residents would encourage more local traffic and could well cancel out any reduced commuter use.

Councillor Richard Samuel made an ad-hoc statement where he said that residents would want to see an improvement in air quality, and this Strategy would take the Council backwards in terms of achieving its goals. Councillor Samuel expressed his concerns that key recommendations from the CTE PDS Panel had not been taken into account.

Councillor Dine Romero made an ad-hoc statement where she said that short term car park pricing would not benefit the residents and it would increase air pollution.

Councillor Paul Crossley made an ad-hoc statement where he said that the Strategy would not put the residents first. The Council should encourage reduction in car usage, reduction in air pollution, repair the potholes and encourage bus use. Councillor Crossley urged the Cabinet to reject proposals.

Councillor Alison Millar made an ad-hoc statement where she said that the Council should stop encouraging car use as residents' health was at risk. Councillor Millar asked the Cabinet to promote bus use and consider funding bus subsidy.

Councillor Mark Shelford thanked all officers for their hard work on this issue. Councillor Shelford also thanked Camden Residents' Association for their report on Air Quality and to all speakers and contributors who spoke on this matter.

Councillor Mark Shelford introduced the report by saying that Parking Strategy had been seen as good practice due to the impacts that public parking could have on the Authority as a whole, and it would put residents first.

The Parking Strategy would also provide links to the emerging work on air quality and would recognise that parking charges, restrictions and other policy changes were important tools to help to contribute to reductions in air quality issues. The need for the strategy had been reflected in the significant demand on the network from the numbers of commuter, business and resident vehicles coming into the Authority on a daily basis. The Parking Strategy would support the use of Park & Ride to reduce long stay parking in the city as well as other more sustainable modes of transport such as car clubs, electric vehicles, motorcycles and cycling. These changes would then help to address air quality issues. The Parking Strategy also recommends reviews of the use of parking permits within the City and residents parking zones, both of which were raised during the public consultation process.

Adoption of the Parking Strategy would allow further work to be undertaken to resolve the issues highlighted by residents within these areas.

Councillor Shelford also said that there was a need to relocate the Riverside Coach Park to Odd Down Park & Ride to enable redevelopment of the site and a formal decision was required to enable the works to proceed. This decision would also allow officers to start marketing the Odd Down site with coach operators. Members on the CTE Scrutiny Panel were united on the need for long stay coaches to park out of the city centre and for their customers to come into the centre via the Park & Ride service at Odd Down.

Councillor Shelford concluded his statement by saying that this Strategy was just a start of the journey and the Council would be looking at differential car park charges, and any additional money raised would be put towards safer school journey and bus subsidies.

Councillor Mark Shelford moved the recommendations.

Councillor Tim Warren seconded the motion by saying that the Strategy would put residents first and it would demonstrate continued support for local traders and independent businesses. The Strategy was aimed at improving air quality and reducing congestion by encouraging commuters and visitors to use the city's Park and Rides or other public transport. In addition, the Riverside Coach Park would now be relocated to Odd Down Park and Ride in support of the Council's Economic Strategy, Placemaking Plan and it would be a part of the regeneration of Bath Quays North.

RESOLVED (unanimously) that the Cabinet:

2.1 Agreed with the proposed changes to parking charges set out in the Report which will be taken forward through the necessary statutory process, alongside the adoption of the Parking Strategy;

2.2 Approved the use of Odd Down Park & Ride for long stay coach parking.

177 COUNCIL TAX DISCOUNT FOR CARE LEAVERS & FOSTER CARERS

Councillor Liz Hardman made an ad-hoc statement by welcoming this report which came as a result of Labour Group motion agreed at Full Council in September 2017 and an amendment put by Conservative Group at the same meeting. Councillor Hardman also said that she was under impression that it would be full Council Tax Discount for this category and asked for a clarification on that matter.

Councillor Alison Millar made an ad-hoc statement by welcoming comments from Councillor Hardman and asked for a cost comparison on what impact 100% discount would have on the Council. Councillor Millar also said that the Council had constantly advertised for foster carers and this would be a massive incentive for them. Councillor Millar concluded her statement by endorsing the paper and said that she was proud that BANES Council would join other Councils who had already started similar Council Tax Discount schemes.

Councillor Charles Gerrish introduced the report by saying that at September 2017 Full Council meeting the Cabinet was asked to consider a discount for care leavers and foster carers. The work on this matter had been completed and the Budget

report would give more details on exact figures. Councillor Gerrish also said that his recollection was that the motion had asked for a discount, and not a full discount, hence why Council Tax discount for care leavers and foster carers is 25%.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul May seconded the motion by thanking Labour group for putting this motion forward at September 2017 Full Council. Councillor May also said that this was an important issue which would show that the Council would be supporting those who were most vulnerable.

Councillor Vic Pritchard commented that this was fine example showing that Members of the Council could work together, no matter what political party they were from. Councillor Pritchard also said that if this was agreed then the Council may be able to raise the level of discount for care leavers and foster carers.

RESOLVED (unanimously) the Cabinet agreed:

2.1 That a class of reduction will be applied in accordance with the Bath & North East Somerset Care Leaver Relief Scheme detailed in the report.

2.2 That a class of reduction will be applied in accordance with the Bath & North East Somerset Foster Carers Relief Scheme detailed in the report.

178 TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT TO 31ST DECEMBER 2017

Councillor Gerrish introduced the report by saying that the average rate of investment return for the first nine months of 2017/18 was 0.27%, which was 0.06% above the benchmark rate. The Council's Prudential Indicators for 2017/18 were agreed by Council in February 2017 and performance against the key indicators had been shown in Appendix 1 of the report. All indicators were within target levels.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul Myers seconded the motion by saying that the Council's lending and borrowing list had been regularly reviewed during the financial year and credit ratings were monitored throughout the year

RESOLVED (unanimously) the Cabinet agreed that:

2.1 The Treasury Management Report to 31st December 2017, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice, is noted;

2.2 The Treasury Management Indicators to 31st December 2017 are noted.

179 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT AND ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY 2018/19

Councillor Paul Crossley made an ad-hoc statement where he had praised team of financial officers for their outstanding work in terms of managing Council's investments and for giving priority to the security and liquidity of those investments. Councillor Crossley expressed his concern down to increasingly uncertain times, such as Brexit, 'Trump trade' effect and to a high risk of conflict between some

countries which would may have an impact on future investments, and asked the Cabinet to consider working with wider range of international banks.

Councillor Charles Gerrish replied that Council's lending and borrowing list was regularly reviewed during the financial year and that credit ratings were monitored throughout the year.

Councillor Charles Gerrish introduced the report by saying that the Local Government Act 2003 requires the Council to 'have regard to' the Prudential Code and to set Treasury Indicators for the next three years to ensure that the Council's capital investment plans are affordable, prudent and sustainable. The Act therefore requires the Council to set out its treasury strategy for borrowing and to prepare an Investment Strategy; this sets out the Council's policies for managing its investments and for giving priority to the security and liquidity of those investments. The suggested strategy for 2018/19 in respect of the following aspects of the treasury management function was based on the Treasury Officers' views on interest rates, supplemented with leading market forecasts provided by the Council's treasury advisor, Arlingclose.

The Strategy Statement for 2017/18 set Treasury Indicators for 2017/18 – 2019/20, which included a total borrowing requirement at the end of 2017/18 of £308 million. At the end of December 2017, external borrowing was at £176.9 million, which may increase before the end of the 2017/18 financial year should a review of the Council's cashflow and capital investment decisions highlight additional borrowing was required. The level of borrowing was in line with the policy of utilising internal cash to reduce net borrowing costs and investment counterparty risk.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Paul May seconded the motion by saying that he was pleased that all lending and borrowing transactions were within approved limits and with approved institutions.

RESOLVED (unanimously) the Cabinet agreed to:

2.1 Recommend the actions proposed within the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (Appendix 1) to February Council.

2.2 Recommend the Investment Strategy as detailed in Appendix 2 to February Council.

2.3 Note the Treasury Management Indicators detailed in Appendix 1 and delegate authority for updating the indicators prior to approval at Full Council on 13th February 2018 to the Chief Finance Officer and Cabinet Member for Finance & Efficiency, in light of any changes to the recommended budget as set out in the Budget Report elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting.

2.4 Note that any comments made by the Corporate Audit Committee at their meeting on the 8th February 2018 will be reported to Full Council on 13th February 2018.

**180 REVENUE & CAPITAL BUDGET MONITORING, CASH LIMITS AND VIREMENTS
– APRIL TO DECEMBER 2017**

Councillor Paul Crossley made an ad-hoc statement where he said that Transport and Environment portfolio forecast was £97k overspend although the Cabinet made a decision earlier to cut revenue in this area.

Councillor Richard Samuel made an ad-hoc statement by saying that the overspend was £3.4m with £350k savings made, which still makes the total overspend of over £3m. Councillor Samuel felt that this was a poor financial report with likelihood for tax increases, mass redundancies and cuts in services for residents.

Councillor Robin Moss asked why there was no link between supply and demand in Adult Social Care.

Councillor Charles Gerrish responded that the revenue in Transport and Environment portfolio would increase and that the Council had had issues with supply in Adult Social Care.

Councillor Charles Gerrish introduced the report by saying that the Budget Management Scheme had required that the Cabinet consider the revenue and capital monitoring position four times per year. Divisional Directors had been asked to outline the actual expected outturn for the year and the reasons to date for over / under budget forecasts. For revenue budgets which were forecast to be over budget, the Divisional Directors were expected to seek compensating savings to try and bring budgets back to balance. The current year-end forecast was an over budget position of £3,396,000 which equates to 0.94% of gross budgeted spend (excluding Schools). Appendix 1 sets out the detail for each Portfolio of the current position on Council spending, and the forecast outturn for 2017/18. This was an improvement of £355,000 compared to the position previously reported based on the period to the end of October 2017. The financial strategy, presented in October 2017 outlines how these pressures would be addressed over the short to medium term. Strategic Directors had agreed measures to reduce and mitigate this position, as set out in the report.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations.

Councillor Tim Warren seconded the motion by saying that the officer would develop an action plan to continue to work towards managing the budget in each service area.

Councillor Paul May highlighted high demand of services within Children and Young People portfolio.

RESOLVED (unanimously) the Cabinet agreed that:

2.1 Strategic Directors should continue to work towards managing within budget in the current year for their respective service areas and develop an action plan of how this will be achieved, including not committing any unnecessary expenditure and stringent budgetary control.

2.2 This year's revenue budget position as shown in paragraph 5.3 is noted.

2.3 The mitigations that will be required shown in paragraph 5.8, if the over budget position cannot be reduced by the end of the financial year, are noted.

2.4 The capital year end forecast detailed in paragraph 5.18 of this report, is noted.

2.5 The revenue virements listed for approval in Appendix 2(i) are agreed, and those listed for information are noted.

2.6 The changes in the capital programme listed in Appendix 3(i) are noted.

2.7 That £75,000 of provisionally approved capital budget for Cleveland Pools in 2017/18 is fully approved.

181 BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2018/19 AND FINANCIAL OUTLOOK

Councillor Dine Romero made an ad-hoc statement where she expressed concerns from the Liberal Democrat group that the Cabinet did not recognise what was important when setting the Budget proposals. Councillor Romero felt that services around improving chances for children and young people, helping vulnerable and keeping people healthy and safe would be lost because the Cabinet had spent money on other projects such as Park and Ride, Bath Library and the Metro Mayor. Councillor Romero concluded that the Council should not cut from children and library services.

Councillor Paul Crossley made an ad-hoc statement where he suggested that decision to cut from Grand Parade and Undercroft funding was a bad decision and also that £4.273m allocated funding for West of England Combined Authority should be scrapped.

Councillor Joe Rayment made an ad-hoc statement where he welcomed proposed amendment in wording for recommendation 2.1.c. However, Councillor Rayment felt that Members of the Council could not see the complex formulae used to calculate the lease and felt that the Council would get better return in short term but not in the long term. Councillor Rayment also felt that it was not democratic that some of the recommendations were delegated to the Chief Executive and not to the Cabinet or Single Members.

Councillor Robin Moss made a statement where he said that Labour group would give their comments and ask questions at the Full Council meeting on 13th February 2018. Nevertheless, Councillor Moss said that he was concerned with only 4.95% increase in Council Tax when the Council could set an increase to 6%. Councillor Moss asked if the discussion between the Council and Government would be available for inspection, why the Council would not consider in-house provision of Adult Social care and how cuts in essential services to most vulnerable would have detrimental impact on services users in long term.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson made an ad-hoc statement by expressing her concerns on youth programme provision. Councillor Jackson also said that according to a survey from few years ago 75% of young people wanted to stay in the area, though the latest survey had suggested that the same percentage now want to leave the area down to a lack of affordable housing. Councillor Jackson asked the Cabinet if they could use their powers to increase affordable housing in the area.

Councillor Charles Gerrish responded to Budget issues raised by Councillors. Councillor Gerrish said that Grand Parade matter went to Scrutiny before the Cabinet made its final decision and unfortunately the business case for this project did not stack up. The Council had to balance an increase in Council Tax rates and 4.95% increase had been seen as the most appropriate. In terms of the social care – the voluntary sector had shown readiness to work with the Council to provide services for those in greatest need. The Council would be working with the YMCA in terms of provision of affordable housing for young people. Some issues that had been raised at the Resources PDS Panel meeting would be looked at and considered by the Group Leaders.

Councillor Charles Gerrish introduced the report by thanking officers, Cabinet Members and Scrutiny for their hard work and by saying that the paper was in a new format which should be more understandable and approachable. The next year would be a very difficult year due to significant pressures and savings required. The Budget would seek to respond to these challenges.

The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) that had been approved in October 2017 outlined how the budget would be delivered over the medium to long-term. The MTFS for B&NES spans two years with a further three added to show the likely longer-term picture.

The Council would need to deliver a balanced budget over the term of the plan. A balanced budget means that balances or reserves were not used to meet on-going expenditure commitments. The MTFS had shown a projected budget gap for 2019/20 and beyond. The figures included all estimates for pay awards, pension costs, Council Tax, business rates, Government grant, and inflation.

The Budget would focus on protecting frontline services at a time when the authority was facing cuts in funding whilst facing unprecedented increases in demand in Adults and Children's Services. An increase of 3% in the Adult Social Care Precept had been included in this budget to help meet the pressures in Adult Social Care.

Significant savings and income generation plans totalling £26.83m were included within budget proposals. Of these savings 61% were considered high risk and reflects the same position as many local authorities in that savings plans were becoming more complex and difficult to deliver. The plans included a reduction of approximately 15% in staffing over the next two years that would need to be delivered while protecting front line services to our residents and businesses together with other business critical activities.

To help protect front line services and meet additional pressures in Children's Services the budget includes a recommendation that Council Tax would be increased by 1.95% in 2018/19 (an increase of £25.04 per Band D). The proposed Band D Council Tax for Bath and North East Somerset Council next year including the Adult Social Care Precept was £1,347.89 (£1,284.33 in 2017/18) an increase of £63.56 per Band D (£5.30 per month).

At the end of 2016/17 the Council had reported a £2m over budget position – this occurred too late in the financial year to rebase within the 2017/18 budget process. The expected 2017/18 year end position at the end of December 2017 was an over budget position of £3.4m mainly due to additional demand in Adult Social Care, Children's Services, and Special Educational Needs and Disability (including the

impact of the previous year). The year-end estimate was after the use of £1.3m in Adult Social Care Reserves.

There had been a number of measures put in place to mitigate some of the pressures including:-

- Reviewing all vacancies to hold or remove;
- Introducing a three month turnover saving before a vacancy can be filled;
- Buying leave option for staff;
- Bringing forward planned savings;
- Regular monthly updates to the Transformation Group;
- Reviewing all income streams;
- Reviewing all spend above £10k.
-

In addition specific measures have been agreed within Adult Social Care:-

- Additional capacity for project management, transformation, and contract management;
- Improvements to the IT system in processing and reporting;
- Approval panels set up for care packages;
- Support planning and brokerage of placements.

In terms of the savings and income generation - revised estimates for savings and income generation show that £28.7m would be required over the next two years. This was based on the assumption that the savings already approved and proposed savings of £26.8m could be delivered. This would leave remaining savings gap of £1.9m in 2019/20 for which savings plans would need to be developed by February 2019. The proposals for savings and income generation, which were outlined in the report, had been included in the Operational Plan for 2018/19 and were reviewed by each of the PDS Panels before Council on 13th February 2018. The report had been updated to reflect any amendments to savings plans and income generation.

A review of the capital programme was carried out as part of preparing next year's budget with the following objectives:-

- To ease staffing capacity issues;
- Ease financial pressures;
- Review financial and delivery risks.

The Capital Programme reflected the amendments as per the report. The review outlined further recommendations for the current and future capital programme with the following principles requiring consideration:-

- All existing schemes to be reviewed and simplified, reduced, paused or stopped as necessary;
- Minimise new schemes except those that meet corporate priorities; and;
- Create additional income or savings;
- Address a statutory or health and safety imperative;
- Replace obsolete or inefficient assets/equipment;
- Part of a high priority government funded programme or WoE programme.

Councillor Charles Gerrish moved the recommendations subject to amended recommendation 2.1.c [*attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's*

website] and an additional recommendation 2.1.q [*attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website]* with updated Annex 1 2018/19 Revenue Budget Cash Limits [*attached to the Minutes as Appendix and on the Council's website]*.

Councillor Vic Prichard seconded the motion by saying that Budget proposals and Council Tax changes had been set in order to protect front-line services, increase investment in social care and support local economy. This Budget was in line with our Putting Residents First manifesto and its three core aims of the Council:

- Efficient and well run
- Investment in the future of the area
- Putting residents first

The Budget would focus on the Council's key priorities and the Council had made good progress towards achieving its vision by being guided by these priorities. The Budget would enable the Council to invest in the things that matter the most to local people.

RESOLVED (unanimously) the Cabinet agreed to:

- a) The General Fund net revenue budget for 2018/19 of £113.271m and the individual service cash limits for 2018/19 as outlined in Annex 1.
- b) The savings and income generation plans outlined in Annex 2 in conjunction with the Equalities Impact Assessment Report in Annex 3 and thereby agrees to implement the Council's draft Operational Plan which has been presented to each of the relevant PDS Panels.
- c) That the agreement of a revised TDC Profit share arrangement is delegated to the CEO in consultation with the S151 officer and Leader, with appropriate independent legal advice obtained, and on the basis this will generate a simpler approach and better return for the Council, but that any associated extension of the lease is subject to a separate executive decision.
- d) To help protect front line services and meet additional pressures in Children's Services the budget includes a recommendation that Council Tax is increased by 1.95% in 2018/19 (an increase of £25.04 per Band D).
- e) An increase of 3% to Council Tax for the Adult Social Care Precept is approved in recognition of the current demands and financial pressures on this service. This is equivalent to an increase of £38.52 on a Band D property.
- f) That the release of reserves, including the Invest to Save Reserve is delegated to the Council's S151 Officer in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Efficiency and the Chief Executive.
- g) The transfers between reserves outlined in 5.5.1 and the adequacy of Un-earmarked Reserves at £12.2m within a risk assessed range requirement of £11.9m-£13.1m.

- h) The Efficiency Strategy attached at Annex 4 and delegation of the Leading Together Change Programme funding of £2.0m to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council.
- i) The Capital Programme for 2018/19 of £83.111m including the capital review outlined in 5.7.2, new and emerging capital bids outlined in Annex 5, planned sources of funding in 5.7.3, and notes the programme for 2019/20 to 2022/23 and that any wholly funded projects coming forward during the year will be added to the Capital Programme in line with the Budget Management Scheme.
- j) The delegation of implementation, subject to consultation where appropriate, of the capital programmes set out in Annex 5(ii) to Annex 5(iv) to the relevant Strategic Director or Divisional Director in Consultation with the appropriate Portfolio Holder.
- k) Approve the amended process for Provisional Capital Schemes to become Fully Approved Schemes as outlined in 5.7.3 and all other delegations as set out in the report.
- l) The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) allocations outlined in Annex 5(v).
- m) The MRP Policy attached at Annex 6.
- n) The Capital Prudential Indicators outlined in 5.7.5
- o) The Annual Pay Policy Statement at Annex 8.
- p) The Council Tax Support Scheme for 2018/19 shown in the following link <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/CouncilTaxSupportScheme2017-18> and referred to in 5.3.4.
- q) The additional one-off Adult Social Care Support Grant of £456k for 2018/19 announced in the final local government settlement is held within the Adult Social Care budget as contingency for any Social Care local provider market pressures that emerge during the year. Specific allocations of this funding are to be delegated to the Strategic Director – People & Communities in consultation with the S151 Officer and Cabinet Members for Finance & Efficiency & Adult Care, Health & Wellbeing.

2.2 That the Council include in its Council Tax setting, the precepts set and approved by other bodies including the local precepts of Town Councils, Parish Councils, and Charter Trustees of the City of Bath, and those of the Fire and Police Authorities.

2.3 That Cabinet note the S151 Officer's report on the robustness of the proposed budget and the adequacy of the Council's reserves outlined in 5.6.

2.4 Authorise the Council's S151 Officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Efficiency, to make any necessary changes to the draft budget proposal for submission to Council.

Councillor Paul Crossley, in an ad-hoc statement, welcomed the report and asked if it would be possible to explore where visitors from coached based tourism and family based tourism mostly go and which sites they mostly visit.

Councillor Paul Myers replied that he would be discussing that matter with officers.

Councillor Paul Myers introduced the report by saying that this was the third update of the Heritage Services five-year Business Plan 2015-2020 that was approved by Cabinet in February 2015. The update covered the five financial years from 2018/19 to 2022/23 and had been prepared following the annual in-depth review of business activity. The revised Plan included an analysis of the risk involved. In September 2004 the then Council Executive had decided that Heritage Services should be retained as an in-house service and should operate as a business unit with substantially improved operating arrangements focused upon:

- Sustaining and improving the annual profit generated for the Council;
- Improving the visitor experience; and
- Conserving the historic assets for present and future generations to enjoy.

Following this approach, annual profit to the Council had grown by 214% in the years from 2005/06 to 2017/18.

The approved operating arrangements included the introduction of rolling 5-year profit targets for the Service, to be set by Council and included in the Corporate Financial Plan, with financial performance presented in fully inclusive accounts outside normal local authority conventions. This operating model ensured that a holistic approach had been taken to decision-making and that all resources required to sustain and generate income flows were fully aligned. As a business unit working to business principles already approved by the Council, Heritage Services had absorbed all costs, including those cost increases that were funded corporately for all other Council services.

Councillor Paul Myers moved the recommendations.

Councillor Mark Shelford seconded the motion by welcoming the report and congratulated to the whole team on their hard work.

RESOLVED (unanimously) the Cabinet agreed to:

2.1 Approve the Heritage Services Business Plan 2018-2023 (“The Plan”);

2.2 Confirm that it wishes Heritage Services to continue to work to the business principles agreed by the Council Executive in 2004, as amended.

The meeting ended at 6.40 pm

Chair _____

Date Confirmed and Signed _____

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET MEETING 7th February 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 re: Transport matters
2. Nigel Sherwen (on behalf of The Camden Residents' Association) re: The Camden Residents' Association's Report on Traffic and Poor Air Quality
3. Sian James re: Parking Strategy
4. Fiona Powell re: Parking Strategy
5. Christine Boyd re: Parking Strategy
6. Andrew Lea re: Parking Strategy
7. Annie Kilvington re: Parking Strategy
8. Patrick Rotheram (FOBRA) re: Parking Strategy

Councillors:

1. Councillor Sarah Bevan (as Chair of Resources PDS)
2. Councillor Karen Walker (Ward Councillor Budget requests)
3. Councillor Sarah Bevan (Ward Councillor Budget requests)
4. Councillor Richard Samuel (The Camden Residents' Association's Report on Traffic and Poor Air Quality)
5. Councillor Eleanor Jackson (in support of a letter to the Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment about the proposed reduction of bus services in Westfield)
6. Councillor John Bull (Parking Strategy)
7. Councillor Robin Moss (Budget)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M 01	Question from:	Councillor Karen Walker
<p>What measures/ policies does Banes have in place to make sure that any recycling that has been unexpectedly blown out of recycling containers because of a storm is cleaned up?</p> <p>The recycling ends up in hedges, fields and gutters. If retrieved does the recycling/waste end up in landfills or at an extra cost to residents the waste is sorted into correct containers?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Bob Goodman
<p><i>Windblown litter in hedges and verges is cleared up by our cleansing crews. The cleansing waste goes to a mechanical biological treatment plant where as much value as possible is recovered from it – but recycling is by far the best option both for cost and for the environment.</i></p> <p><i>We urge residents to make sure their waste is contained so that it cannot blow away, in boxes with lids preferably. Boxes with lids are available to everyone by contacting Council Connect.</i></p>		
M 02	Question from:	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
<p>Why , when the Council is faced with making such drastic cuts (to give 'growth avoidance' its Yorkshire name) are Community Equipment Services throwing out mobility aids such as zimmer frames even when they have been returned unused? A commercially supplied chair lift can be re-sold when no longer needed, so why not a BANES one, thus recouping some of the cost. As it is, they are dumped in a skip and sent to landfill, at a cost to the council, and to the environment. Does this not set a very bad example to the public, who are being encouraged to re-cycle more and waste council tax payer's money?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p><i>I understand that this relates to walking frames and walking aids owned by the Royal United Hospital, which have been returned to the Radstock Community Equipment Store, prior to being delivered back to the RUH. This equipment is not kept inside the Community Equipment Store due to lack of space and at the moment is stacked outside the store. Although it is not being thrown away, it does not look tidy and this is being addressed with the Community Equipment Store and the RUH who are working together to agree a different solution for equipment returned on behalf of the RUH.</i></p> <p><i>All aspects of the Community Equipment Service are currently being reviewed and this issue has been flagged as part of the review. Councillor Jackson's point about recycling equipment is well made and whilst there are some items of equipment that cannot be</i></p>		

recycled because they are either custom-made, for infection control reasons, or because they have worn away, but there are also very many items which can be recycled.

A stocktake of equipment was carried out in all community equipment stores in January 2018, which will now allow a full review of all items to take place and the equipment catalogue to be updated. Some items are no longer appropriate to use and will be disposed of. This will then allow more space for items to be returned during the planned equipment amnesty which will take place at the end of February/March 2018. This amnesty will allow people to return items of equipment that they, or members of their family are no longer using so that they can be cleaned and re-used to support others where possible.

Supplementary Question:

Would you consider donating 20 of these zimmer frames to Radstock in Bloom?

Answer from:

Councillor Vic Pritchard

I will have a conversation with Councillor Jackson on what intentions might be behind this request and then action on it.

M 03

Question from:

Councillor Eleanor Jackson

Several Radstock-Westfield residents want to know, why, when we are making cuts, is so much money being lavished on a new Hope House Surgery in an expensive location, to subsidise a private business?

Answer from:

Councillor Charles Gerrish

*The Hope House surgery will **not** be subsidised by the Council. The question seems to be based on a misunderstanding. The surgery is to purchase the land at an independently agreed value and is being funded by NHS England. The achievement of national funding for a £5M new facility of this nature is a major benefit for the local community. The existing provision has poor access and the surgery have indicated that they will find it difficult, if not impossible, to offer the range of services now demanded from the existing site with no potential for extending the existing site. The surgery will incur its own costs of development and will manage the construction. Once complete running costs will be attributed to each party in an equitable manner.*

There is a strong business case for this facility which has been accepted by NHS England and the CCG, with about 80% of the net capital costs being met by the NHS, and the remainder (relating to B&NES services) funded mainly from receipts in the B&NES capital programme. The business case reflects local needs, an expanding population, new ways of working arising for the Your Care Your Way initiative with new models of care and the opportunity for a more integrated service that includes children's centre and health visitor provision. The planned shared facility will also help put the local Council services that will be a part of this, including the library, on a more financially sustainable basis with shared overheads. This approach also reflects the

thinking in the national One Public Estate programme.

The Council is only to pay for its share of the facilities and there will be a single member decision detailing this, scheduled for February. The decision will be timed to coincide with the completion of due diligence work and will indicate that the project is ready to move into delivery phase. This decision will take forward the provisional approval contained in the draft capital programme.

Supplementary Question:

I am most concerned about future of Radstock Library. What will happen with it – will it be moved over to a community group?

Answer from:

Councillor Karen Warrington on behalf of Councillor Charles Gerrish

We are looking at the number of different options and we didn't take anything of the table at the moment.

M 04

Question from:

Councillor Richard Samuel

In the light of the recent decision by the Heritage Lottery Fund to refuse grant funding to the Cleveland Pools Trust, and given the fact that the premises are owned by the Council and is on the national buildings at risk register, can the Cabinet member say what action he now intends to take to restore this important local heritage asset?

Answer from:

Councillor Charles Gerrish

Thank you for your interest in this project and the work you've done at a local level. I believe you are now aware that the HLF are encouraging the Trust to resubmit and we have met with them to offer our support. We have also been directly in contact with HLF. You may have seen in the budget monitor report that £75K is being moved in the capital programme to fully approved to enable progress on a new bid.

As you know the Trust had put a large amount of work into their original submission and I believe that they are now looking in more detail at site access for construction, future operating arrangements together with the draft lease so that the bid can be updated and hopefully become successful.

A lot had been achieved over the last year including planning permission, agreement of boundary works, detailed project planning, local engagement and agreement of funding mechanisms. The lease is also substantially complete albeit HLF may now require further changes so it can align with their proposed funding agreement which we will need to see.

The Cabinet remains supportive of the Trust and is hoping their bid will be successful this time.

Supplementary Question:

Will the Cabinet member answer the questions put to him in an email of 25th January 2018 which for clarity are as follows:-

Will he:

1. Release the funding already sitting in the Council's budget for this project.
2. Appoint a Project Manager to lead for the Council in pulling together this project
3. Make a public statement on the Council's position following the bid's refusal indicating full support for the project
4. Ensure that legals in respect of leases and wayleaves are now dealt with more expeditiously than has previously been the case
5. Establish a high level steering group to oversee this project?

Having said that I do welcome an answer from Councillor Gerrish.

Answer from:

Councillor Charles Gerrish

The answers to lot of questions Councillor Samuel raised were dealt with the Cleveland Pools Trust. We are releasing money as per Budget report and recommendations. The HLF sign off was required to release that money though the Council moved £75k to enable progress on a new bid.

In terms of the lease – we are still awaiting response from the HLF lawyers. The Council has consistently supported the project and I am personally totally in support of the scheme.

M 05**Question from:**

Councillor Dine Romero

What is the Cabinet's plan for providing housing that is affordable for the average wage earner in Bath and North East Somerset?

Answer from:

Councillor Paul Myers

The Council is committed to securing affordable housing across Bath and North East Somerset by using its own capital funds and applying for external grants. We have allocated £7.2m of funding between 2015 and 2018, and have also just successfully bid for £12.5m of funding under the Housing Infrastructure 'Marginal Viability' fund to improve deliverability and viability of future phases at Bath Western Riverside. This will have a positive impact on the ability of the scheme to deliver affordable housing. WECA is also spearheading a push for housing funding for the West of England, some of which will be targeted at improving future affordable housing delivery in the EZ.

In addition to using our own funding and accessing external grants, the Council also uses the existing Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to

determine the type of affordable housing secured through Core Strategy affordable housing policy. The SPD prioritises the delivery of social rented homes. However around 25% of affordable housing is required to be delivered as intermediate housing, usually homes for low cost market sale such as shared ownership. Out of the 547 affordable homes forecast to deliver between April 2015 and March 2018, 145 are intermediate homes. There is a further pipeline of 288 intermediate homes secured through planning permissions yet to be delivered.

Housing supply is an integral part of the delivery of the Council's aspirations for a vibrant and economically sustainable Enterprise Zone, and this includes delivery of affordable homes targeted to meet the needs of lower wage earners in the city. Through the planning system recent permissions in the City for innovative affordable housing delivery supports this aim:

- 51 Discounted market rent homes as part of the L&G purpose built private rent scheme at Roseberry Place
- 5 Discounted market sale 'Micro Homes' at Banglo, Lower Bristol Road
- 13 Discounted market sale flats at Midland Road

These homes are available to people earning less than £60,000, who have a local connection to B&NES, who are not property owners and who cannot meet their housing need in the local area because house prices are too high compared to their income.

Supplementary Question:

How many houses across BANES will be marketed to the rate that is affordable to those earning the average local wage which is far less than £60k per annum?

Answer from:

Councillor Paul Myers

I will provide an answer to you in 5 clear working days.

M 06

Question from:

Councillor Will Sandry

With regard to the preparation of the Local Plan, are projections are being made around the growth in numbers of employees of Bath's two Universities, as well as the growth in student numbers? What consideration is being given to the future housing needs of these employees?

Answer from:

Councillor Bob Goodman

The Local Plan will set out a strategy and identify sites to meet requirements for additional housing and economic & job growth. The Local Plan will to deliver the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP). Evidence underpinning the JSP has considered and establishes a strategic housing requirement for B&NES and job growth across the West of England. This includes considering the relationship between housing and jobs (homes/workers to support economic growth). At a local level and within the context of economic projections underpinning the JSP work is being undertaken to inform preparation of the Local Plan to assess economic and job growth in B&NES across the

range of economic sectors represented in the District, including the education sector. The role of the Universities in this growth is also being researched. This work is being undertaken alongside consideration of information on the growth of student numbers (based on both the Universities 5 year growth plans and in the longer term). The scope of the new Local Plan, and the evidence needed for its preparation, will be considered by the LDF Steering Group and a programme of meetings is in the process of being arranged.

M 07 **Question from:** Councillor Richard Samuel

Could the Cabinet member please state the weekly tonnages for recyclable and non-recyclable waste deposited by residents at the recycling centres from 1st Sept 2017 to 31st January 2018?

Answer from: Councillor Bob Goodman

The table below shows monthly tonnages for the period in question. Weekly information is not readily available. September to December are actual tonnages, whereas January data is an estimate only and will not be verified for at least a month as we record materials going out of the sites, not materials coming in and there is obviously a time lag in various receptacles filling up.

The figures reduce over the winter period as less garden waste, soil and rubble is brought to us.

Recycling Centre	Sep-17	Oct-17	Nov-17	Dec-17	Jan-18
Total Reuse & Recycling	1462	1399	1204	701	860
Total Disposed (landfill)	443	448	482	468	429
Total Energy from Waste (wood only)	140	139	123	92	124
Total Recycling Centre Waste (all of the above)	2045	1986	1809	1261	1413

Supplementary Question:

Could I expand my question and now ask for total waste figures which covers street cleaning, domestic waste, fly tip rubbish and recycling centre for the same period?

Answer from: Councillor Bob Goodman

I will provide an answer to you in 5 clear working days.

M 08 **Question from:** Councillor Richard Samuel

Could the Cabinet member please outline the current contractual arrangements for the

reprocessing of plastic recyclable material collected by the Council and the annual income accruing?

Answer from:

Councillor Bob Goodman

Mixed plastics and cans are currently taken to Jayplas in Derbyshire for processing and recycling. The income achieved is based on a variable £ per tonne market rate as published in LetsRecycle – an independent industry provider website. We forecast an income of £46k p.a. for both materials combined for the coming year, based on market rates. These rates are based on the quality of the recyclables collected and kerb side collection is recognised as the best way of improving the quality of the recyclable materials and as a consequence they command a greater price.

We annually publish details of the reprocessing and recycling destinations of waste that is sent for reuse, recycling or recovery in our end-user register document available on our website

M 09

Question from:

Councillor Dine Romero

What resources or assistance does the Council provide to Curo to maintain shared open spaces?

Answer from:

Councillor Bob Goodman

Curo, like any other registered housing provider is responsible for maintenance of open spaces within their ownership. We do not have shared open spaces. Curo very quickly let the Council know if there are issues on land near their properties which is not their responsibility. Our teams talk to each other to resolve problems. Curo have their own contracts with service providers to maintain their land. They do not contract this work to the Council.

Supplementary Question:

I am surprised that there was no money to help Curo with shared open spaces. Could Councillor Goodman reconsider, or perhaps consider, whether there should be some assistance to deal with problems which may not necessarily arise from Curo owned properties?

Answer from:

Councillor Bob Goodman

Curo knew what they had to deal with so it is their responsibility.

M 10

Question from:

Councillor Dine Romero

How far does the government's £272,000 pothole grant go towards addressing the current list of repairs needed? What will be the shortfall?

Answer from:

Councillor Mark Shelford

The total capital budget for the Highway Maintenance Programme in 2018/19 is

£6.746m, of which the government's additional pothole grant is only one element. In addition, the Council has regularly invested additional capital into the resurfacing programme as preventative maintenance stops potholes forming in the first place. For 2018/19, an additional £808k of the Council's own capital has been included in the draft budget. Furthermore, in addition to the Department for Transport's annual maintenance block grant the Council has successfully secured £632k from the Government's Incentive fund and £2m to resurface the Keynsham bypass. Officers inspect our highways on a programmed basis and prioritise works on a risk assessment basis and work is undertaken when required.

M 11	Question from:	Councillor Paul Crossley
-------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

In light of the Council's support for action on single use disposable packaging (November 2017), can the Leader of Council take steps to ensure that single use disposable packaging is not used in Council-owned outlets and that biodegradable alternatives are used in Council buildings (e.g. water cooler cups)?

Answer from:	Councillor Tim Warren
---------------------	-----------------------

Yes. There is now a cross-departmental team working on identifying opportunities to work with Council-owned outlets to avoid single use plastic packaging and single use plastics in general, where practical alternatives are available that are truly either compostable or recyclable. This work includes finding alternatives to single use plastic cups in Council buildings as quickly as possible, whilst plastic straws have already been withdrawn from the staff cafes in Keynsham Civic Centre and Lewis House. GLL will be replacing plastic drinking straws with paper ones and switching to compostable cups and lids. Heritage Services already have plumbed in filtered water dispensers at their venues, rather than bottled water. In addition, I wrote to the Secretary of State for the Environment last November following the Council Motion on this subject and the Council continues to lobby government to take more rapid action that will enable us to do more at the local level, such as on deposit return schemes and charges for non-recyclable, disposal cups and bottles. Officers are also developing support both for local businesses and local voluntary organisations to enable them to take more action in the community.

M 12	Question from:	Councillor Paul Crossley
-------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

Will the Cabinet consider, in its budget this year, reaching agreement with a number of Bath based sports clubs who have been in discussion with Parks on the Asset Transfer, on a long term lease at a peppercorn rent, of the playing pitches at Lansdown North?

The pitches concerned are opposite the poultry farm and between the rugby pitch and the houses next to the P&R. This transfer would increase community resilience in allowing a number of clubs to increase their sporting activity and training capacity. This would help in meeting well-being targets. It would enable them to manage the asset on a long term agreement. It would save the Council the cost of maintaining these pitches (approx. £5kpa).

Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>The Council is currently assessing a number of options for the future use and operation of all 3 sites at Lansdown Playing Fields. The aim is to improve the facilities and ensure they are delivering the objectives of the Councils Fit for Life Strategy to get more people, more active, more often while also ensuring their financial sustainability into the future. Asset transfer and long leases are being considered as well as partnership working models and 3rd party investment to ensure the Council and local residents get the maximum benefit from the site.</i></p>	
Supplementary Question:	
<p>Will Councillor Gerrish agree to meet with me and members from various residents' groups in couple of weeks' time (date to be confirmed) to discuss how they would view an asset transfer and the benefits for Council's Budget?</p>	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>I am always happy to meet with residents' groups.</i></p>	

Camden Residents' Association

Report on Traffic Congestion and Poor Air Quality

ABSTRACT

Camden Residents' Association has been discussing and consulting with residents in our area on measures to ameliorate congestion, speeding and poor air quality on our streets. Our 53 page report sets out proposals for actions that will limit dangers for our residents and those using our streets but it won't eradicate them.

We urge B&NES council to develop a comprehensive traffic reduction plan for Bath which also recognises the special difficulties in Camden and much of NE Bath.

Most of what has been achieved on Camden Road over recent years has been neutral in ultimate effect, soon eclipsed by adaptive behaviours from drivers or has simply made things worse. Long term problems **persist** and are now known to be a cause of poor air quality on what are essentially residential streets.

Camden Road is used by 7,000 cars a day. At peak time it is a **rat run** which offers an alternative to slow progress along the A4, ie London Road and the Paragon. The ultimate end-to-end rat run involves Lower Swainswick, Larkhall's back streets, Eastbourne Avenue, and culminates in Camden's streets and affects many people.

To put some scale on this, 7000 is 33% of that on the arterial London Road and yet Camden Road is single track in places with slow, stop-start traffic generating high emissions. Off peak the road can be very quiet, unlike London Road, which strongly suggests that at peak times the **comparative flows are much closer**. It is at these times that we see many **pedestrians also** using the road and being threatened by bad driving and forced to breathe in dirty air.

Congestion and poor quality air are probably a Bath-wide issue requiring a Bath wide solution, such as implementing Low Emissions Zones along the arterial roads. This might make an eye-catching headline but is at risk of **pushing yet more traffic** along constricted residential streets such as ours.

We are putting the case for **NE Bath to be considered particularly carefully** as it draws in traffic from the East and North, but also from the South of the city. The streets making up the principal rat-runs are narrow and appear **to hold on to vehicle emissions** (for various reasons we discuss in the report), so not only do those living on these streets endure congested traffic but they are also breathing illegally dirty air.

Our report lists 70 recommendations of which **30 address this bigger NE Bath picture**.

We commend our proposals to the decision-makers as they offer **fresh and viable solutions to long standing issues** and get back to root causes using hard evidence wherever possible.

In short, present conditions are condemning some of the population of NE Bath, as well as many visitors to one of UNESCO's finest world heritage sites, to heavy traffic with pollution levels already at dangerous levels **well beyond current legal standards**, and **85% higher than Bristol**, for example. **We don't believe this is a tolerable situation for NE Bath.**

Jeremy Labram, Chair, Camden Residents' Association

BathNES Cabinet meeting 7th Feb 2018: Parking Strategy

Statement by Sian James (resident)

We have been eagerly waiting for the new Parking Strategy for what 18 months now, the original consultation was over 12 months ago, but now we have a Strategy that is openly being 'rushed through' as an 'URGENT item' for budget reasons.

We understand that you have budget issues and need to increase revenue ASAP, but as the work with DEFRA on the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) is obviously incomplete, you must recognise that parking is part of the AQAP solution and therefore any changes you make now are by definition temporary - so you should not be spending money on anything that cannot be easily unraveled/amended.

Talking of budgets - what are the assumptions behind the numbers? They are not stated in any of the cabinet papers that I can see, which is surprising...

How many cars are assumed to

- a) switch to P&R
- b) switch to public transport
- c) switch to walk/bike
- d) switch to parking in residential streets
- e) stop visiting bath
- f) switch to or from season tickets... (and how on earth are season-tickets only going up by 10%???)
- g) or is there zero modal shift taking place and the additional income is simply the increase in parking charges?

And what is the risk to the budget of these numbers not being delivered?

What is the cost of having to amend the proposal in say 3/6 months when you complete the AQAP work with DEFRA?

I note that the cost of implementation is estimated as £150k, and the additional income is £662.7k in 2018/9.

Does that mean it will cost another £150k to amend once the DEFRA work is complete?

What is the forecast cost of the 10% reduction given to BANES residents, and how much will this residents programme cost to set up and maintain?

All of these assumptions should be clearly stated, so that you, and residents, understand the forecasted impact of this parking proposal.

In summary - yes you need to increase revenue, but you also need to manage the cost of implementation and you MUST reduce air pollution ASAP..... and if you are converting long stay into short stay, thereby increasing the traffic churn, this may well not be helping air pollution at all. As always, the devil is in the detail – which is why I suspect that your strategy will change once you have worked through the ANPR detail with DEFRA.

Finally - just which residents are you putting first? The ones that live in Bath itself, in the bowl, where air pollution is greatest – or the ones that live on the outskirts that want to get in their cars to ‘pop into town’?

Please think about the answers to these questions – before you make a decision on parking charges & discounts.

Fiona Powell 3 minute speech to B&NES Cabinet of Wednesday 7th February

Subject: Item 12. ADOPTION OF A PARKING STRATEGY AND ASSOCIATED CHARGES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ODD DOWN COACH PARK

Good evening. I haven't felt the need to register to speak for over 6 months. My speeches usually focus on the lack of a transport evidence base when decisions are taken on this topic – both volumes and reasons for travel. But the 'urgent item' here before you today has me back in utter frustration.

Transport policy had seemed to be moving towards having an evidence base that has been sorely lacking to date. Defra's intervention and funding for an ANPR camera study would at least give a genuine, recent, snapshot insight into the volumes of car movements, the times of day at which these happen and the cordons crossed in the process. No it wouldn't be a study over time, no it wouldn't properly cover the change brought about by the school run and holidays and no it wouldn't give people's reasons for travel or motivations for being in their car, but at least it would be a good starting point.

But here today you are being asked to take a decision about how much parking charges should go up to in the absence of having this evidence base back. These events must be days apart but they should be so fundamentally linked that should be impossible to decouple them. This data will triangulate information you have from car parks about usage, it will give you an up to date universe of car movements that parking usage sits within and most importantly, it will help you understand how much you might need to decrease parking trips to be replaced with other modes by in order to support the air quality improvement mandate from Defra.

Incredibly, car volumes and movements get not a single mention in your paper today. As a result there is no quantification in the public domain that would give the public any confidence about what these proposals might deliver. There is no quantification of the context in which parking and especially long-term parking sits within car movements, nor the forecast impact these proposed increases will have on car movements. There is no discussion about the role that season tickets play in volumes of users, which would make it transparent as to whether these charges would likely impact long-term parking in the city as is the policy intent. For all the Cabinet knows, given the current publicity surrounding this topic, there might be a further switch to season tickets (and city-centre parking) that only bring in less than half of the pay-by-the-day rate.

Along with other Bathampton Meadows Alliance members, I have documented concerns that the parking strategy will increase car movements, not decrease them. Indeed the official consultation response document acknowledges that this may happen unless other alternatives are put in place. Yet there is no sense in the paper today that you are seeing these parking charges as a temporary measure until ANPR data is available and a proper, broader, plan is agreed with Defra support. To do this would certainly reduce my frustration. It just seems to be about revenue generation in isolation including a sop to the loud-shouting sections of the community who show scant regard for the health and wellbeing of local residents impacted by high volumes of car trips and who aren't even having a sensible debate about what improving the vitality of the city of Bath should really be about. Surely we are agreed that clogging our streets with cars isn't optimal vitality.

The council's desire to generate income in the next budget year without annoying the electorate too much is not a good enough reason for this paper given the public health issues at stake. You already know from Census analysis that it is we residents who do most to block up our streets in our cars. For example, the last census told us that 8,297 Bath residents drive within the City limits to work, of which 1,978 into the City centre itself. As Adam Reynolds aptly puts in 'we are the problem'. It is your duty as Cabinet members to adhere to the Nolan Principles of public life including Objectivity, *Holders of public office must act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias.* It is my opinion that you are now knowingly taking a decision in the knowledge that better, objective data exists. Should you pass this item and move to consultation, it should only be as a clearly-stated temporary measure until an evidence-based plan is agreed with Defra.

Christine Boyd; Statement to Cabinet 7th February 2018

BANES is mandated by Defra to improve air quality – **‘in the shortest possible time’** The directive came as you were poised to consult on this long awaited Parking Strategy.

The council knows that parking is one of the most effective levers it has to influence driver behaviour and improve air quality, but strangely the Defra intervention did not cause you to pause.

Instead you stuck to a plan made earlier, by those now departed, and included in the Transport Strategy and key planning policy.

- To close city centre car parks to enable development,
- To relocate long-stay commuter parking into P&R, and,
- To use the vacated space for more short-term parking to preserve the ‘vitality’ of the city.

This plan that was derived before;

- The BMA pointed out that commuters don’t use P&R
- Before it was known that expanded P&R spaces would result in no automatic take up, and most significantly,
- Before the Defra directive.

The only apparent departure from the original plan is the resident’s discount. A political sweetener, ahead of an election, that risks further damage to the environment and to public health.

And the attitude to evidence has not shifted either. Once again the council has sought evidence to support policy rather than test it.

The Council admits that more short-term parking in the city has the potential to INCREASE traffic movement. But there is no air quality impact assessment as recommended by Scrutiny

We see no analysis of how the strategy might change travel behaviour for good or ill, or even how it impacts parking income.

You ask residents if they would like more short –term parking, but you don’t ask commuters if they would move to P&R to enable this.

You didn’t ask, but we did.

Early last Thursday morning Andrew Lea and I surveyed 53 people using Charlotte Street car park, 52 were commuters. Andrew will speak more to this but here are the headlines;

- 58% used a permit - they can continue parking in Charlotte street for £6 per day, not £15
- 37% came from within the BANES area – they wont see any increase at all, so why change behaviour?
- 63% would continue to park in Charlotte street no matter how much the cost went up - 17% had their parking paid by an employer
- Of the 37% who said they would move if the cost of parking went up, over 50% said the this would need to increase by £10 a day or more.
- Only 12% (6 people) would consider moving to P&R

Results from this small test sample suggest no great stampede towards P&R and few spaces freed up for short-term parking.

Meanwhile you have created an expectation amongst residents that they can 'pop into town' more often and at 2010 prices – creating more traffic churn at the very time you should be encouraging people out of the car and offering real alternatives.

It could be argued that driving to hell in a handcart at least less damaging than arriving in a 4 x 4. But really Councillors, don't you think its time for change?

B&NES Cabinet Meeting 7.2.18

The draft parking strategy has a “commitment to put residents first”. That includes me. I don’t live in the city centre, but just that bit further out. If I drive in, I will sit sandwiched between lorries on Cleveland Bridge, both the perpetrator and the victim of noxious emissions and my journey will take longer than by bike. Occasionally I *do* drive in. But I should be penalised for my choice, for creating traffic churn in inner city streets, not rewarded by a 10% discount. Increased local traffic is the inevitable result of a Strategy dedicated to increasing in availability and decreasing in price short term on-street parking.

This strategy has chosen *which* of its residents to put first; prioritising those who want to pop to the shops over those who want to breathe clean air. It’s a strategy completely schizophrenic about its duty to contribute to reducing air pollution. According to the CH2M Hill summary of consultation responses the most common concern was that the Strategy did not sufficiently address air quality. Yet respondents’ suggestions around car free centres, congestion charging, work place parking levies, school traffic, and public transport pricing were all deemed outside the remit of the Strategy. Finessing car park revenue it can do; contribute to a conversation around congestion it apparently cannot.

What would DEFRA make of this Strategy, and why haven’t you asked them? I have learned that you’ll include the Parking Strategy in the package of measures you hope will convince DEFRA you’re on course to eliminate illegal levels of pollution in the shortest possible timeframe. I also know the results of the ANPR survey conducted in the Autumn are imminent; you may already have the headlines. This dataset will give us a robust, objective, upto-date, insight into car volumes and movements /within the city. Census data tells us we, the *residents* of Bath, are the source of our traffic problem; the ANPR results should corroborate or deny this for us. If we are, then how can offering inexpensive short term parking to residents be part of the solution? If we are not, what else will the ANPR tell us which might inform the Strategy?

You don’t intend to revisit this Strategy for 5 years once implemented. It is reckless and irresponsible to finalise it without analysing the ANPR Data and ensuring that DEFRA agrees it will make a meaningful contribution to reducing air pollution.

Annie Kilvington

This page is intentionally left blank

B&NES Cabinet 7 February 2018 – Parking Strategy

Notes by Patrick Rotheram, Federation of Bath Residents' Associations (FoBRA)

Parking creates traffic. This isn't rocket science. Cars aren't beamed down to parking spaces, they are driven there. That is traffic. The more parking in the city, the more traffic, and the more pollution. Short-term parking generates more journeys. So reducing parking is a direct way of reducing air pollution. The parking strategy recognises that parking control can help reduce traffic and pollution, and we welcome that.

B&NES has been mandated to bring air pollution below the legal limit as soon as possible. Traffic volumes must be reduced to achieve this. We support increased long-term car park charges to encourage commuters to use the Park and Ride. However, reducing car park charges for B&NES residents will encourage more local traffic and could well cancel out any reduced commuter use.

We welcome the Hierarchy of Kerb Space, which places residents above short-stay and long-stay parking. It should be applied as soon as possible in the central zone, where residents have almost no priority despite this being the most densely residential part of the city. Reducing meter parking would dramatically reduce the traffic caused by people driving round and round looking for a space. Instead they would go straight to an off-street car park or use the park-and-ride. Air pollution, which harms the health of thousands of residents, would be reduced. Put Residents First!

Reducing traffic and pollution will add to the vitality and viability of Bath, not detract from it. These are not in conflict, as the many historic cities that have removed traffic from their centres have shown, to the benefit of residents, businesses and visitors.

FOBRA supports parking control on Sundays. Sunday is a major shopping day and is now as busy as any other, certainly Saturday. Cars create just as much congestion and pollution on Sundays. Sunday is a difficult day for city centre residents find parking (which *they* do pay for). You are also foregoing the chance to raise parking meter revenue by one-sixth. But none of that is mentioned in this paper. You have heard from people who like to park for free, but there is no logic in treating Sundays differently. We hope you will reconsider this when you consider how to meet your air pollution target.

The one good thing in the coach strategy was the choice of Odd Down as the long-term coach park. The coach strategy as a whole was totally flawed, as it proposed to allow coaches to drop off in the heart of the city, taking no account of the wider aims of reducing traffic and air pollution set out in Council policies [the Core Strategy, Placemaking Plan, Public Realm and Movement Strategy, Transport Strategy and Air Quality Action Plan]. Coach operators and visitors were consulted, but not residents. You should follow the example of York, which allows no coaches in its historic core (except disabled, by arrangement). We hope that you will revisit the strategy to provide for drop-off on the edge of the centre in places such as Lower Bristol Road and Pulteney Road, from where it is just a short walk in to the heart of the city.

This page is intentionally left blank