



**Note of the meeting of the Bath City Forum  
held on Thursday, 1st December, 2016  
in Banqueting Room - Guildhall, Bath**

**Meeting Attendance**

<b>In Attendance</b>		
Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones		
Lisa Bartlett		
Councillor Jasper Martin Becker		
Jake Bishop-Ponte		
Jeremy Boss		
Councillor Fiona Darey		
Dave Dixon		
Councillor Charles Gerrish		
Councillor Bob Goodman		
Sally Harris		
Penny Hay		
Mark Hayward		
Michael Hill		
Matt Humberstone		
Caroline Kay		
Jon Lovatt		
Penny McKissock		
Andrew Pate		
Councillor Lin Patterson		
Councillor Christopher Pearce		
Rosie Phillips		
Councillor June Player		
Councillor Joe Rayment		
Les Redwood		
Dr Christopher Roche		
Councillor Dine Romero		
George Samios		
Councillor Will Sandry		
Councillor Shaun Stephenson-McGall	Andrew	
Councillor Peter Turner		

<b>Apologies Received from</b>		
Ashley Ayre		

Van DuBose
Councillor Andrew Furse
Robin Kerr
Gareth Lloyd
Councillor Michael Norton
Andy Thomas

## 1. West of England Consultation Joint Spatial Plan and Joint Transport Study

A presentation was given by Lisa Bartlett and Jon Lovatt on the West of England (WOE) Consultation Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) and Joint Transport Study. This presentation can be found on the Forum Website:

[http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/jsp\\_forum\\_presentations\\_bath\\_city\\_forum\\_without\\_notes.pptx](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/jsp_forum_presentations_bath_city_forum_without_notes.pptx)

Forum members were invited to take part in the consultation which can be found at:

<https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti>

Comment following the presentation:

- Councillor Joe Rayment felt that there are limitations on affordable housing and a gap seems to exist.  
Response: The current policy is to achieve an average of 30% Affordable Housing across the WOE. Evidence shows that Affordable Housing is being delivered at a rate of 22% across the WOE. The JSP consultation acknowledges that additional routes need to be explored as the planning system alone cannot deliver sufficient Affordable Housing to meet the identified need. .
- Councillor Bob Goodman commented that this is an area of major concern.
- Councillor Shaun felt that there needs to be more structure to support the emerging communities, this includes the large increases of students in the City.  
Response: The JSP will not allocate development sites. These will be allocated in line with the JSP, once adopted, through Local Plan reviews.

## 2. Bath and North East Somerset Council, Our Budget Challenge - Presentation and Workshop

A presentation was given by Andrew Pate and Councillor Charles Gerrish. A copy can be found on the Bath City Forum webpage:

[http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/budget\\_presentation\\_-\\_18.11.16\\_without\\_notes.pptx](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/budget_presentation_-_18.11.16_without_notes.pptx)

Points that arose during the presentation

- B&NES Council will be part of the pilot for the retention of business rates, this starts next year.

- This year's presentation appears to have skipped over feeding back on what cuts were made last year. These cuts should be brought into the public awareness.
- Approximately £900,000 CIL money is expected to be received this year. This will be separate to the budget and used for capital projects.
- The savings being discussed are for this coming year and the next three years.

#### Feedback following on from the presentation

1. Become more accountable for where the Council spends its money.  
Response – The Council are carefully monitoring how investments and borrowing is conducted, we stay aware of the impacts of interest rates, bond rates and the effects that these can have on the Pension Fund we are involved with.
2. Find ways to make accommodation for students pay, with 24 percent of Baths accommodation used for students something needs to be done as they are not paying their way.  
Response – Work is taking place to look at HMO's and accommodation for Students.
3. Congestion charging that looks at the vehicles coming through the City.  
Response – As a stand-alone City, Bath is too small to make a congestion zone a viable scheme. There have been discussions with neighbouring authorities but the willingness to participate was not there.
4. Other means for the Council to make money by setting up additional separate businesses, like the property company.  
Response – Where opportunities arise we would be willing to look at new approaches, we need to remain mindful not to damage existing smaller businesses in the process.
5. Create a tourist levy for visitors to the City as they have in Europe. Avoid making this a burden to hotels and B&B's.  
Response – This is something that the Council would like to trial but presently central government restricts us from doing so.
6. Consider the statutory and non-statutory services that are being provided. Carefully monitoring of where private companies take on delivery of services.  
Response – Bath Adult Services will maximise the service provision, the Council will monitor carefully.
7. Increase second home taxes as has been done in other areas.  
Response – This is an idea that the Council would be happy to look at.
8. Consider an approach to introduce precepts to Bath through creating new Parishes.  
Response – Any new Parish requests will need to come from a bottom up approach, 7.5% of a given population would need to be in favour before a motion could be taken forward. If an unparished area of Bath (example: Weston Village) wanted to do this they could do so by themselves.
9. Ask the question around increasing Council Tax instead of cutting services.

Response - Yes, public opinion can be used to determine increasing Council Tax, we do however need to be mindful of those less well-off that are unable to afford rises.  
A separate precept is included on Council Tax which goes directly into Social Care; this is separate and can be increased by 2% each year.

10. Can the students be asked to make a contribution? Introduce off campus University levy?

Response - It is not possible to charge Council tax to students.

11. Key worker homes and affordable housing requires a greater effort as there is not enough being achieved in the City. Could supplementary planning rules be put in place to make more homes available?

Response – Yes, the Council is keen to help key workers and young professionals find ways into affordable housing.

12. Bus services such as the 6/7 service being cut leaves sections of communities in isolation. Cuts like these can be divisive.

Response – The West of England devolution deal will provide the Council with powers that allow bus routes to be franchised as packages that include the less profitable routes in with the more profitable.

13. Lobby Central Government against the cuts they are imposing on the Council.

Response – The devolution deal that the Council are part will provide us with greater access to central government along with the new funding.

14. The needs to special educational needs, there are higher numbers of places and assessments required.

Response – Yes, we will be monitoring the requirements for special school places

Due to time restraints the following points did not receive a response:

- Workplace parking schemes like those introduced in Nottingham.
- Consider the knock on effects of cuts and how they affect areas downstream.
- Build on the take up of digital services. Provide extra PC's in locations for those who need access.
- Create better methods of joining up services across the Council, information to be shared more effectively to avoid the need for duplication.
- Scale down the layers of management in the Councils organisation.
- Take better care of the workers that are being paid on the lowest graded roles in the Council.

### **3. Bath and North East Somerset as a Child Friendly City and Community**

Penny Hay and Jake Bishop-Ponte gave a presentation on Bath and North East Somerset as a Child Friendly City and Community. The presentation can be found on the Bath City Forum

website:

[http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/revised\\_cfc\\_story\\_so\\_far\\_ph\\_011216.pptx](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/revised_cfc_story_so_far_ph_011216.pptx)

The forum commended the work that has taken place and hoped that the presentation would be shared with other areas in B&NES.

There was a feeling that where additional work needs to be carried out there are numerous outlets that could help in joining up the dots. If there is a request for involvement the signposting can be helped by putting the information through outlets such as this forum.

#### **4. Minutes and Matters Arising from the last meeting 13.09.16**

The minutes of the last meeting of the forum on 13 September 2016 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

#### **5. Agenda Setting Group Update**

Rosie Phillips provided an update on the first meeting of the agenda setting group that took place with Ashley Ayre on 20 October 2016.

- It was agreed that the Bath City Forum needs to be more than a 'talking shop', there needs to be mechanisms that will allow for important areas of interest in Bath can be taken up by Forum members and brought back to advise the Council.
- There was discussion around the Forum seeking to bring in local residents views and to engage with the community to represent the city as a whole.
- It was agreed that the Forum will need to carry out some additional work to set out the themes and how the priorities need to be tackled for the different themes. The themed groups will need to consider if they have any projects that link into local CIL funding.

#### **6. Student Accommodation / HMO's**

Councillor Bob Goodman provided an update on Student Accommodation and HMO's in Bath.

- A workshop took place last week which looked at the issues higher student numbers bring as part of University Life as well as the topic of HMO's in general.
- Consultation is planned to take place early in 2017.
- The level of HMO's that are being allowed into our local developments is too high; there has been dialogue with central government regarding the split in the provision of HMO's for Professionals vs Students.
- This work is not intended to be 'University bashing' but there needs to be a chance for Bath's citizens to have their say on how affordability of homes is affected by HMO's in certain areas.

Councillor Dine Romero commented that there needs to be a Citywide approach that prevents certain wards being treated differently.

#### **7. CIL Update**

Councillor Fiona Darey provided an update on the local CIL

- As at 21 November 2016 Bath has a total of £126,493 in local funding which will rise as further developments contributions get added to this.
- There will be a mechanism for this local 15% element of the funding to be spent; Bath City Forum will have a part to play in putting ideas forward.
- Any members of the Forum who want to be involved in the CIL group should contact either Mark Hayward or Fiona.

The question was raised around the geographical area that the CIL money needs to be spent within. A request was made for a clear definition what local neighbourhood means for CIL.

It was pointed out that ward boundaries may possibly change in the coming years and the mechanism for allocation needs to be able to adapt should this happen.

It was suggested that clear governance arrangement be set out so that those who are part of the Forum and the other Wards in Bath have a clear understating of how allocation and spending of the funds will work.

## **8. Co-Opted Member Recruitment Update**

Councillor Joe Rayment provided an update on recruitment for co-opted members to the Bath City Forum.

- The documents for recruitment and selection of co-opted members have been reviewed by Joe Rayment and Mark Hayward. These were distributed in advance of the meeting.
- The approach that has been taken in updating the documents has been to make the application criteria more accessible to people from all sections of the communities in Bath.
- It was recognised that the importance of equalities was overlooked on a number of application in the last round of applications; this area has therefore been moved to become the first point on the criteria guidance.

Additional points made were;

- More residents should be included in the makeup of the Forum
- The selection panel need to make sure that consideration to all types of applications is given when shortlisting.
- The positions need to be affectively advertised so that we reach unrepresented groups.
- It was asked if previously unsuccessful candidates could be offered the vacant positions. This was previously considered but this was only if somebody in the first round of applications had not accepted their position.
- It was pointed out that all members of this Forum have a collective responsibility to promote diversity and opportunity to all.
- It was suggested that those who apply and are not selected should be encourage to take part in the Forum as observers.

The revised documents were proposed to the meeting by Joe Rayment and were seconded by Jeremy Boss. The Forum voted with 16 in favour and nobody against.

## **9. AOB**

It was agreed that the item on Westmoreland be carried forward to the next meeting.

It was agreed that Forum representation for FG Cook Charity Trust would be:

Councillor Paul Crossley (continuation)

Jeremy Boss

Barry Gilberton (A colleague of Caroline Kay from BPT)

Councillor Bob Goodman explained that he has been asked if he can collect the opinions of the Forum on redevelopment proposals for The Bath Mineral Hospital.