

## **BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

### **CABINET**

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

Wednesday, 19th October, 2016

#### **Present:**

Councillor Tim Warren	Leader of the Council and Conservative Group Leader
Councillor Liz Richardson	Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning
Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones	Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Conservative Deputy Group Leader Bath
Councillor Charles Gerrish	Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency, Conservative Deputy Group Leader North East Somerset
Councillor Vic Pritchard	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health
Councillor Anthony Clarke	Cabinet Member for Transport
Councillor Martin Veal	Cabinet Member for Community Services
Councillor Michael Evans	Cabinet Member for Children's Services
Councillor Paul Myers	Cabinet Member for Policy, Localism & Partnerships

#### **38 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

#### **39 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

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

#### **40 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

#### **41 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

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

There was none.

#### **43 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 7th September 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

Christine Boyd in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 1 and on the Council's website*] urged the Cabinet to approve the documents for consultation subject to officers making a minor amendment, as outlined in her statement.

Andrew Mercer in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website*] urged the Cabinet not to rush in making the decision on Park and Ride.

Vicky Drew in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to consider all aspects, and the potential impacts before finalising contract with Virgin Healthcare.

Note: Councillor Paul May left the room before Vicky Drew read out her statement and returned when the statement was finished.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website*] said that Westfield Parish Council had supported strategic planning, though they had had concerns that important employment sites have been designated for housing. Councillor Jackson also said that the improvement of strategic transport corridors for the benefit of employment in the area must be adhered to; no development should take place in Westfield until there were substantial improvements of A367; and the railway line Radstock-Westbury-Frome should be restored.

Councillor Dine Romero welcomed that the West of England Partnership would carry out consultation, and asked for an assurance that statements read at this meeting would be considered as early responses to the consultation. Councillor Romero said that Liberal Democrats had expressed their concerns about any plans for Green Belt within the heritage site; that plans for Bathampton Meadows Park and Ride would not make any difference to the amount of traffic and levels of pollution in the city; that the Council would need to work closely with neighbouring authorities, especially with Wiltshire, to address existing problems in Bath; focus on integrated transport scheme which would not depend solemnly on car usage; concerns over proposed bypass and support for train station in Saltford; and concerns that report had had little about Somer Valley.

Councillor Tim Ball said that the failure to manage the Bristol housing situation had had an impact on Whitchurch. Councillor Ball urged the Cabinet to hold on to our Core Strategy and added that too much additional housing was likely to make people leave the area.

Councillor Will Sandry in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website*] said that there was everything to welcome about a public consultation, and the residents of Bath and North East Somerset should be encouraged to respond.

Councillor Andrew Furse expressed his concerns that the Spatial Plan focuses on the existing economic areas and the A4 corridor. Councillor Furse felt that there was a significant risk that leave Radstock/Westfield/MSN would be left behind. The area already had had 2500 houses planned in the Core Strategy, and this spatial plan which was looking forward over 20 years, should be the mechanism used to improve jobs and economics of this area by building infrastructure to enable growth and opportunity. The infrastructure should include improved road links as well as reopening the Radstock to Frome rail link.

Councillor Cherry Beath said that the Council must make sure to have balanced communities and to continue to develop employment sites across the area. Councillor Beath also said that the Council should protect Green Belt and resist providing a solution to the housing problems from Bristol.

Councillor Paul May in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website]* said that the Cabinet would probably have to approve the JSP moving to full consultation. However, the Cabinet should record their own reservation on the gap between the JSP and the Transport Vision in relation to the proposals in Whitchurch village (identified as suitable for an additional 3500 houses and a park and ride). Councillor May felt that this was unrealistic proposal and that he would be campaigning strongly against these proposals during the consultation period and beyond.

David Redgewell in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to the Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website]* expressed concerns from South West Transport Network.

#### **45 WEST OF ENGLAND JOINT SPATIAL PLAN AND TRANSPORT STUDY - EMERGING SPATIAL STRATEGY AND BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET CORE STRATEGY REVIEW**

Councillor Liz Richardson said that this report would trigger three key policy elements:

- Consultation on an important high-level cross-authority spatial document “towards the emerging Spatial strategy”;
- Consultation on Council’s Core Strategy review commencement document;
- Adjustments to the Council’s local development scheme, to ensure timetables were adjusted to reflect the timescales attached and modifications required as a result of work on these documents.

This report asks the Cabinet to endorse the proposal to agree that these documents are released into a consultation process. This would enable people across the West of England (WoE) to have a further say on the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) and Joint Transport Study (JTS), when the next phase of the consultation opens on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016. Those responses would be welcome information to

help shape this into a draft document next year. The four West of England Councils - North Somerset, Bristol City, South Gloucestershire and Bath and North East Somerset – had signed a commitment to work together in March 2014, as a result of a need to demonstrate A Duty to Co-operate – based on legislation introduced in the 2011 Localism Act.

Councillor Liz Richardson concluded her statement by saying that no decisions had been made at this stage, and she urged all the communities and stakeholders across the West of England to engage in the consultation which would start on 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016.

Councillor Liz Richardson moved the recommendations.

Councillor Anthony Clarke seconded the motion by saying that the Council, and the whole region, would need to think on transport issues now, and no housing or economic development should go ahead before an adequate infrastructure is in place. Councillor Clarke stressed the importance of planning and transport departments working together and also said that this Council would work with neighbouring authorities (Wiltshire and Somerset) and not only with the WoE region. This was a high-level document which should give an overall approach on what the Council, and the region, aspire to achieve. Councillor Clarke concluded his statement by saying that this was not the final document and urged everyone to respond to the consultation.

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones said that this document had represented 20 years of progress and this would be transformative period for WoE. This document would be an important part in developing the economy across the region. Councillor Anketell-Jones highlighted growing importance of Keynsham, links to Bath and importance of consultation responses on Green Belt issues.

Councillor Charles Gerrish said that this document had reflected all of the hard work that Council's planning team had undertaken over years. This document also recognises the importance of the definition of Green Belt. Councillor Gerrish also said that the infrastructure should be put in place first before any development takes place. Councillor Gerrish expressed his concerns about the vision for transport and urged the public to respond to the consultation. Councillor Gerrish concluded by expressing his concern that the document did not address aging population considering that the document mainly highlighted the need for walking and cycling.

Councillor Martin Veal said that he had fully endorsed and supported public consultation on this Study as a must to invest in infrastructure and observe and protect the Green Belt, and he supported comments from Cllr Gerrish and asked all officers to make a concerted effort to engage the majority of residents throughout the West of England, rather than be over-influenced by the easy access of lobby groups. Councillor Veal supported this document in principle, but challenged some of its assumptions, and asked for even-handed consultation and an in-depth look at proposals through the scrutiny process. Councillor Veal concluded his statement by saying that he supported promotion of walking and cycling, but he would want to see evidence that reflects the views of the many car drivers, many of whom must use their vehicles to access services, such as medical care, and to traverse the Towns and Cities and the wider area out of necessity.

Councillor Michael Evans also supported the need for a full consultation and highlighted more emphasis on highways.

Councillor Vic Pritchard said that this was not a complete document and that the transport report was in its infancy. Councillor Pritchard also expressed his concern on Saltford bypass and urged the residents to fully engage in the consultation.

Councillor Tim Warren said that the Council would be responding to the needs of our growing population and on increasing demands for homes and jobs. Councillor Warren also agreed that no development should take place before an adequate infrastructure is put in place. This next phase in the consultation would give local residents a further say on the West of England Joint Spatial Plan and Joint Transport Study. Councillor Warren concluded his statement by encouraging people to get involved and make their views known from 7<sup>th</sup> November 2016.

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

- (1) The “Towards the Emerging Spatial Strategy” and the “West of England Transport Vision” document for the public consultation on the Joint Spatial Plan and Joint Transport Study commencing on 7 November 2016;
- (2) The Core Strategy Review commencement document for public consultation commencing on 7 November 2016;
- (3) The amendments proposed to the B&NES Local Development Scheme which will need to be agreed by Full Council in due course.

The meeting ended at 7.15 pm

Chair \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Prepared by Democratic Services**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Christine Boyd, Statement to Cabinet 19.10.2016**

Today you are considering strategic plans for the wider region that have been many months in development - you must of course approve them for consultation

There is after all a lot to commend in these documents with the promotion of cycling, walking and bus franchising in particular

But in doing so, you must not fall into the trap of thinking that these are finished plans that will be implemented in full – they are ‘draft’ plans subject to consultation and to change

So the fact that they talk about an east of Bath P&R being part of the solution to traffic, does not bind you to having an east of Bath P&R

Indeed, I must draw attention to a statement at the top of page 60 which really does need to be amended in the light of new evidence that the council has.

*‘Further park and ride sites, with a wider network of services, are expected to reduce congestion on main roads and in urban centres, particularly where there are problems with air quality’*

This is a general statement about P&R, but Bath is not Bristol

You now know that in Bath, there is no longer any expectation that P&R will reduce congestion on main roads or urban centres where there are problems with air quality.

I know that you would not wish to send the West of England Joint Spatial Plan out to consultation with such a misleading statement

I would therefore urge you to approve the documents for consultation subject to officers making a minor amendment to reflect this new reality.

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Andrew Mercer, Statement to Cabinet 19.10.2016**

I am here today to congratulate you for not rushing a decision on P&R. If you had of taken a decision last November it would have been a grave mistake.

Not only would you not have had a proper process in place but, you would have done so believing;

- that P&R would improve traffic and air quality in the city
- that it would reduce traffic on the London Road
- that existing park and rides were well used and popular
- that there was an urgent need for 1600 more spaces

You now know, from your own consultant's reports that none of this is correct.

P&R wont do anything for the environment and you have more than 1000 spare P&R at the busiest time of day – so what's the hurry?

It's a very good thing not rush into a bad decision.... especially when you don't have the evidence to support it.

This is not just about getting the process right, or about fudging the emissions numbers, or spinning reports to pick out the best bits.

It's about reviewing the need for P&R in the light of this new evidence.

If you can't demonstrate a benefit that is capable of overcoming the substantial harm of loosing Bathampton Meadows, then you can never get planning approval for this site.

This is not 2009 and you can't just dust off the old plans and push this through like the council did before.

- The evidence has changed
- The planning framework has changed

So please, don't listen to those who say 'just make a decision'

It's not about making a quick decision; it's about making the right decision.

This page is intentionally left blank

There is clearly widespread concern regarding the decision to allow Virgin Healthcare to take over Community Care Services in Bath and North East Somerset.

With £500 million of public money set to be entrusted to a largely commercial organisation, we need to ensure that the best value for taxpayers' money is at the core of this decision. A substantial number of the public feel there are many unanswered questions and wonder if the Cabinet have thoroughly considered their objections and concerns regarding this contract?

The previous consultation appears to have been very limited, and with widespread opposition to our local health services being handed to a private company- it is crucial that the concerns of people across B&NES are heard and taken seriously.

It is unknown how Virgin would co-ordinate with other providers to provide a 'seamless' service. For example how will Sirona feature? Which services will Sirona retain and which will go to Virgin Healthcare?

How would Virgin coordinate with other providers, particularly in relation to elderly residents at risk of residential care if community support doesn't enable them to live independently? It is also unknown whether there has been any risk assessment of the impact on Council budgets regarding the possible increased need for residential care.

And how will Virgin manage increasing patient demand within the constraints of the contract's budget?

All these serious questions need answering before the Council gambles with Community Care Services.

I ask the Cabinet to please provide the public with answers, and consider the potential impacts before finalising this contract with Virgin Healthcare.

This page is intentionally left blank

Joint Spatial Plan/Joint Transport Plan

There is a good word in India English in use in the former Bengal presidency areas mofussil bet translated as 'out in the sticks' It has an onomatopoeic quality which describes very well the feelings of Westfield Parish Council and the residents it represents when confronted with the kind of planning policies enshrined in the documents on the table before you. It is not that we object to strategic planning, but we want to be consulted properly , and heard! Important industrial sites urgently need for employment are calmly designated for housing developments because they are 'brownfield' and the greenbelt must be protected at all costs. In fact protecting the greenbelt is the modern theological mantra, constantly repeated, yet the Waterside valley in west field, and the fields stretching down to Kilmersdon and the White Post have no protection at all. The housing development boundaries are not sacrosanct, as they should be, and it seems to us that dormitory suburbs for Bristol and Bath can be created even when there is a two hour commute for the new residents.

At one LDF meeting I was told 'Bath is full'. – well sorry, Westfield is, too! On page 22 we read 'improvements to the strategic transport corridors could make locations more attractive for employment.' Well, yes, but how?

Residents feel strongly that there should be no more developments until there are substantial improvements to the A367 , the Fosseway. It may have been functional for the Roman legions who built it in AD43, to march slaves to the mines, and to keep the natives in order, but now it is too narrow and dangerous, especially outside bath College (Somer Valley Campus) There are not even continuous pavements at this point.

Turning top50, pathetically little space is given to the potential for rail apart from the main GWR line. So I would urge you to work towards bringing back the Radstock-Westbury-Frome line which would give all those who commute to London once or twice a week a way to get there without motoring to Bath first.

We read also 'more walking, cycling and public transport within urban areas ' will be provided. With the cuts to bus services in rural areas, I wonder how. We need a better deal for rural areas like ours. You will be hearing more from the mofussil and I urge all residents in the Somer Valley to respond to the consultation.

This page is intentionally left blank

Councillor Will Sandry statement 19<sup>th</sup> October 2016 Cabinet

There is everything to welcome about a public consultation, and we should encourage residents of Bath and North East Somerset to respond.

To the people of bath, ask yourself why the whole bath travel to work which included Frome and Trowbridge aren't included. Why doesn't the conservative administration appear to be talking to Wiltshire and Somerset councils? I do need to see a sustainable business plan, but why are there no innovative transport ideas such as a cable car in these plans?

To the people of Saltford, Are you sure you want a by-pass? Liberal Democrats in Saltford are telling me it will bring more homes just like it did in Peasdown.

To the people of Midsomer Norton, Radstock, Paulton and Westfield, please ask yourself why the conservatives have left you out of these plans.

To the people, of Whitchurch, you might be Bristol's urban extension with an extra 1100 homes, make sure you look carefully at these plans.

We should all question whether £7.5bn price tag is achievable when the devolution deal will only bring in £1bn over 30 years.

Finally to the landowners and their agents and planning consultants who will pour over these plans. The days of massive profits need to stop. By all means turn a profit and create employment but seek to maximise the value to the community of a development rather than yourselves

This page is intentionally left blank



**Banes councillor Paul May statement**

**Cabinet meeting re the proposed JSP. 19<sup>th</sup> October 2016**

**Leader, thank you for allowing me to speak about this item.**

**I represent the village of Whitchurch which is identified within the draft JSP/Traffic vision as suitable for an additional 3500 houses and a park and ride.**

**Whilst it is clear there is a government duty and agreement for the four Unitary authorities to work together to meet the housing need of the sub region this proposal will take a small village and increase its population by some tenfold and destroy its character.**

**This is not a NIMBY approach. The previous council approved a 50% increase in the size of the village and we have been working so hard with developers to minimise the impact on the environment and to welcome a significant number of new people into our village.**

**Our community survey shows that 70% of our working residents work in Bristol, 97% have cars and only 19% can use buses to reach their work.**

**The village is on the highest plateau adjoining the city so proposal to walk or cycle the eight miles are not reasonable for large numbers of commuters.**

**The vast majority of the population already rely upon their cars to reach their work so congestion, pollution and pedestrian safety has made the A37 road into Bristol already a nightmare for our residents.**

*So point 1... the area has taken significant strategic growth and there is no further scope without major transport improvement works before the village to be capable of taking further expansion.*

*So point 2...The JSP correctly refers to the joint need to provide infrastructure in the right place and at the right time. The fundamental flaw at the heart of the JSP argument is the impossibility of delivering the infrastructure to support the concepts of this dispersed development aim.*

**The transport paper is a "vision" not a plan. It predicts a need for £7.5 Bn of capital investment which they say is much higher than that made available to date and presents no practical idea how to resolve this.**

**There are no details, design nor even consistency with the JSP document in relation to infrastructure to allow significant development in whitchurch village.**

**The practical business case for a new route from Hicks gate to south Bristol via Whitchurch village will require detailed design and costing to prove the viability and sustainability test for 3500 houses there.**

*Point 3... the reasons for removing 250 approx acres of green belt does not meet the requirements of development sustainability in comparison with other areas outside of Banes.*

**The arguments used to exclude clearly more reasonably sustainable areas for Bristol city housing expansion fail miserably in comparison with the constraints of Whitchurch village. This will be vigorously challenged.**

**This is not a criticism of our planners who have gone out of their way to talk to our community but of the overall fairness of how the NPPF rules have been applied elsewhere.**

**I accept the cabinet will probably have to approve the JSP moving to full consultation but I do think it could record its own reservation on the gap between the JSP and the Transport Vision in relation to the proposals in Whitchurch village.**

**I will work tirelessly within the community to fight this unrealistic proposal during the consultation period and beyond.**

David Redgewell Statement from SWTN to BANES Special Cabinet 19th October 2016 and Bristol City Council Place Making Committee - Draft Spatial Plan meeting 17th October 2016

SWTN are pleased to see the initial preliminary outcome of the draft spatial plan and would like to support the proposed public transport solutions, urban extensions and regeneration strategy.

With proposed urban extensions at Yanley Lane, Long Ashton and Withywood linked to a light rail and Metrobus extension to Bristol Airport this will allow for housing, employment, school and community uses in these settlements with a new station at Flax Bourton and an upgrade of Nailsea and Backwell station to serve the airport.

We welcome new developments at Churchill and a new bus link from Bristol Airport and regeneration in Weston-Super-Mare with an electrification upgrade on the rail corridor from Bristol.

Bristol - Yate

We support the new light rail and bus corridors with the reactivation of the closed Midland Railway route through Lawrence Hill, Fishponds, Staple Hill, Mangotsfield, Westerleigh and Yate and high density housing and urban regeneration developments especially at Lawrence Hill, Old Market, Staple Hill, Warmley and Kingswood. This would benefit Kingswood, Staple Hill and Warmley in particular. We also support the light rail corridor from Mangotsfield to Bath via Warmley and Bitton and new housing in the East Bristol area and Bath Riverside alongside Saltford and St Annes stations reopening.

North of Bristol we support housing on the rail corridor to Gloucester with Metrobus extensions from Bristol to Yate via the M32 and the Ring Road, M5 and Thornbury and support the upgrade of the railway line to Gloucester and Cheltenham using light rail on the Thornbury line. There should be new housing and employment in Thornbury, a new town and housing in Charfield with new housing in Wotton-Under-Edge, Berkeley and Sharpness especially with the opening of a new power station at Berkeley (the railway line to Sharpness being reopened using light rail). We welcome growth around Pilning, Hallen, Severn Beach and Cribbs Causeway using light rail and tram-train to connect to employment and shopping developments.

In South Bristol we support a light rail corridor from the City Centre, Temple Meads, St Philips Marsh, Brislington, Callington Road and Whitchurch on the former North Somerset Railway corridor. This would allow housing development in Hengrove and Whitchurch with education and employment

included. We would also like to see urban regeneration around Temple Meads, Old Market, Newfoundland Road and Castle Park.

With any extra housing there is a requirement for high quality bus services in the evenings and Sunday's with 15 minute frequencies on all routes in the daytime. The recent cuts have caused severe hardship in the Greater Bristol/Bath travel to work area and need to be reversed.

### Historic Buildings

We think that the plans need to include regeneration of our historic buildings as we are very concerned about the continued loss of them in Bristol City Centre and Kingswood where there needs to be a stronger planning policy for protecting pubs in particular which in some cases could be used as small hotels and B& B's similar to the Wellington (Horfield Common). This applies to some pubs around Temple Meads like the George and Railway, Bell (Prewett Street) and the Grosvenor Hotel. The Cattle Market Tavern and Printers Devil should also be reopened to serve the new Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone.

Currently, it appears that many buildings are under threat at a time we should be investing in the surviving heritage around Temple Meads and the arena as a tourism quarter. We seem to be overwhelmed with student housing at the expense of family housing and LGBT and single people both in Temple Meads and Old Market. In the Kingswood area the Wesley chapels, the Chequers, Tennis Court Inn, Anchor Made for Ever and Cherry Tree public houses are at risk while in Fishponds the Farriers Arms is in poor condition and still occupied by squatters. In Bath the Mineral Water Hospital site is at risk.

There needs to be an urgent review of planning policies covering these buildings to prevent historic structures being lost or converted for inappropriate uses.

### Devolution

Whilst we welcome the Devolution deal the issues about transport powers are a concern as to how it will be possible to operate and franchise a bus network that does not cover the four unitary authorities in terms of a franchise or a quality partnership where buses operate between UWE - Portishead and Clevedon would be outside the agreement. Similarly bus services through Hotwells, Clevedon and Weston would have to operate under the permit system under the Buses Bill or would require a separate quality partnership covering North Somerset by the new combined authority to cover North Somerset either as an advanced quality partnership or an enhanced quality partnership. It would also require a different agreement for a multi-journey, multi-operator and multi-modal ticketing scheme and North Somerset would still require referral to the Traffic Commissioner for

services whereas the Metro-Mayor would have full control over the bus services through contracts or partnerships. Of course this would also apply to a Planning or Transport Commissioner.

On rail it would be very difficult to arrange improvements to services without the full Portishead line being in the deal as well as the line from Gloucester to Weston-Super-Mare. This would make station improvements very difficult or to seek rail powers for Metro-West within the franchise and Network Rail. Access for All programmes could be carried out at Lawrence Hill, Stapleton Road, Patchway, Pilning, Filton and Parson Street but this would leave the situation of station improvements in North Somerset outside the power of the combined authority. This would affect bus/rail interchange improvements at Weston-Super-Mare and Nailsea and Backwell and also electrification of the line between Bristol to Taunton.

This page is intentionally left blank