

Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel

Date: Monday, 11th March, 2019

Time: 4.30 pm

Venue: Council Chamber - Guildhall, Bath

Councillors: John Bull (Chair), Brian Simmons (Vice-Chair), Neil Butters, Alan Hale, Richard Samuel, Peter Turner, Ian Gilchrist, Michael Evans and Patrick Anketell-Jones

Councillor Mark Shelford (Cabinet Member for Transport and Highways), Councillor Bob Goodman (Bath and North East Somerset Council) and Councillor Karen Warrington (Bath and North East Somerset Council)

Chief Executive and other appropriate officers
Press and Public

Panel members please note that there will be a pre-meeting in the Chamber at 4pm.

Michaela Gay

Democratic Services

Lewis House, Manvers Street, Bath, BA1 1JG

Telephone: 01225 394411

Web-site - <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk>

E-mail: Democratic_Services@bathnes.gov.uk

NOTES:

1. **Inspection of Papers:** Papers are available for inspection as follows:

Council's website: <https://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?bcr=1>

Paper copies are available for inspection at the **Public Access points:-** Reception: Civic Centre - Keynsham, Guildhall - Bath, The Hollies - Midsomer Norton. Bath Central and Midsomer Norton public libraries.

2. **Details of decisions taken at this meeting** can be found in the minutes which will be circulated with the agenda for the next meeting. In the meantime, details can be obtained by contacting as above.

3. **Recording at Meetings:-**

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 now allows filming and recording by anyone attending a meeting. This is not within the Council's control. Some of our meetings are webcast. At the start of the meeting, the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be filmed. If you would prefer not to be filmed for the webcast, please make yourself known to the camera operators. We request that those filming/recording meetings avoid filming public seating areas, children, vulnerable people etc; however, the Council cannot guarantee this will happen.

The Council will broadcast the images and sounds live via the internet www.bathnes.gov.uk/webcast. The Council may also use the images/sound recordings on its social media site or share with other organisations, such as broadcasters.

4. **Public Speaking at Meetings**

The Council has a scheme to encourage the public to make their views known at meetings. They may make a statement relevant to what the meeting has power to do. They may also present a petition or a deputation on behalf of a group. They may also ask a question to which a written answer will be given. **Advance notice is required not less than two full working days before the meeting. This means that for meetings held on Thursdays notice must be received in Democratic Services by 5.00pm the previous Monday.** Further details of the scheme:

<https://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=12942>

5. **Emergency Evacuation Procedure**

When the continuous alarm sounds, you must evacuate the building by one of the designated exits and proceed to the named assembly point. The designated exits are signposted. Arrangements are in place for the safe evacuation of disabled people.

6. **Supplementary information for meetings**

Additional information and Protocols and procedures relating to meetings
<https://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13505>

**Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel -
Monday, 11th March, 2019**

at 4.30 pm in the Council Chamber - Guildhall, Bath

A G E N D A

1. EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair will draw attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out under Note 6.

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point in the meeting declarations of interest are received from Members in any of the agenda items under consideration at the meeting. Members are asked to indicate:

(a) The agenda item number in which they have an interest to declare.

(b) The nature of their interest.

(c) Whether their interest is **a disclosable pecuniary interest** *or* **an other interest**,
(as defined in Part 2, A and B of the Code of Conduct and Rules for Registration of Interests)

Any Member who needs to clarify any matters relating to the declaration of interests is recommended to seek advice from the Council's Monitoring Officer or a member of his staff before the meeting to expedite dealing with the item during the meeting.

5. TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

6. ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THIS MEETING

7. MINUTES (Pages 5 - 12)

8. CABINET MEMBER UPDATE

The Cabinet Member will update the Panel on any relevant issues. Panel members may ask questions on the update provided.

9. CONSULTATION, COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (Pages 13 - 28)

A report is attached on Consultation, Community Engagement and Communications.

10. TRANSPORT STRATEGY (Pages 29 - 34)

An update report on Transport Strategy is attached.

11. UPDATE ON 20MPH ZONES (Pages 35 - 42)

A report on Review of the Department for Transport's Research into 20mph Speed Limits is attached.

The Committee Administrator for this meeting is Michaela Gay who can be contacted on 01225 394411.

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

**MINUTES OF COMMUNITIES, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY
DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL MEETING**

Monday, 21st January, 2019

Present:- **Councillors** John Bull, Brian Simmons, Neil Butters, Alan Hale, Richard Samuel, Ian Gilchrist, Michael Evans and Patrick Anketell-Jones

Apologies for absence: Councillors: Peter Turner

53 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

54 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chairman drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

55 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillor Peter Turner gave his apologies.

56 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

57 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There was none.

**58 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS,
STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF
THIS MEETING**

David Redgewell made a statement regarding transport issues. He stated that the 178 and 179 bus routes were important and should be maintained. He also mentioned that the Somerset Tourist Guide does not have adequate local transport information as it did last year. David Redgewell also mentioned that the Tourist Information Centre in Bath is not accessible. Councillor Bull stated that the relevant officers would be informed on the above two points.

Clive Turner made a statement regarding cuts in the 179 bus service. He explained the service has gradually eroded since January 2017 which has had a huge impact on the community and caused enormous discontent. He asked that the Council help to get the assessment criteria amended so that the impact on the environment and communities is measured.

Councillor Richard Samuel made a statement regarding Bath Library and the decision to delay the integration. He stated that the predicted savings are shown in the budget papers and asked how the savings are to be made if the project is uncertain. He asked for clarity on exactly when the decision would be made on whether to go ahead with the plans.

Councillor Richard Samuel made a statement regarding the Clean Air Zone and the delay in the Cabinet decision. He asked if the decision would be made in March or after the May elections. He stated that the Council had missed the deadline of 31st December and was now exposed to financial risk. He added that residents want to know what is happening and the lack of clarity is unsatisfactory.

59 MINUTES

The Panel confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting as a true record and they were duly signed by the Chairman.

60 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE

The Cabinet Member for Transformation and Customer Services – Councillor Karen Warrington gave the following updates:

- Bath Library – the savings shown are to be made over the whole Modern Libraries Programme (Bath and community libraries). £450k had been saved to date.
- Mobile Library – this will be replaced as it had been difficult to maintain the vehicle, this was on target for April/May 2019.
- Community Libraries – there are 4 community libraries which are doing well in Weston, Timsbury, Saltford and Bishop Sutton. There are also a number of other community libraries developing – Peasedown, Larkhall, Paulton and Radstock.

Questions from the Panel

Councillor Samuel asked if plans would be in the Capital Programme at the Cabinet meeting in February. The Cabinet Member confirmed this.

Councillor Bull stated that residents of Paulton have to pay an extra £20 per year on their Council Tax for their community library – he asked if the Cabinet Member felt it was fair that they would have to pay but Bath residents do not and their library will be unaffected. The Cabinet Member explained that the Council's statutory duty is to provide library facilities in Bath, Keynsham and Midsomer Norton. David Trethewey, Director of Partnerships and Corporate Services explained that each business case was different and there were a range of funding mechanisms.

The Cabinet Member for Development and Neighbourhoods – Councillor Bob Goodman gave the following updates:

- Bath Leisure Centre – opens on Wednesday following a successful refit.

- Keynsham Leisure Centre – this is progressing, no change in facilities.
- Waste – Christmas collections went well and the number of missed collections had gone down. There are ongoing talks with Curo and residents of flats with a view to bringing improvements.
- Litter enforcement – 3GS will prioritise education as well as enforcement in line with the Panel comments.
- Clean Air Zone – there had been a huge response to the consultation, technical modelling is ongoing and a report will be available soon.
- There is a clean air roadshow in 6th March.
- AQMP – there is funding for a feasibility study for Farrington Gurney in 2019.

Questions from the Panel

Councillor Hale asked for clarification on whether Keynsham Leisure Centre would have changing villages rather than male and female changing facilities. The Cabinet Member stated that there was no indication of a change from the original plan.

Councillor Gilchrist asked about timings for street sweeping. The Cabinet Member explained that streets were swept on demand.

Councillor Samuel if there had been any view expressed from DEFRA since the Council missed their deadline on the CAZ decision. The Cabinet Member explained that he had had a positive meeting and they were supportive of plans to move forwards.

In response to a question from Councillor Samuel regarding litter enforcement, the Cabinet Member explained that 3GS prioritised education along with enforcement.

Councillor Michael Evans asked that the Panel receive an update report on 'Fix My Street' (this will be emailed to Panel members).

The Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment – Councillor Mark Shelford gave the following updates:

- Winter preparation – thanks to the officers for their preparations (salt, gritters, drivers and flood preparation) over Christmas.
- Underpass (Widcombe) – there have been some delays but this is going ahead, when the designs are signed off, there will be another 4 weeks work.
- Buses – he explained that he was supportive of public and rural transport and urged the WECA mayor to engage with this. He added that a rural bus committee had been formed.

Questions from the Panel

Councillor Hale asked what influence the Council can have on keeping bus services running. He stated that it does not make sense to encourage people to use public transport while services are being cut. He mentioned the 349 service. The Cabinet Member replied that there is a small amount available to keep vital lines going but in

the long term the subsidy is declining across the UK. He commented that the 349 is a commercialised service.

Councillor Butters asked about the 179 service. The Cabinet Member replied that this was also a commercial service and that he had not spoken to First Bus about this route yet.

Councillor Gilchrist asked if the delay on the subway is adding to the cost. The Cabinet Member said he would report back.

Councillor Gilchrist asked if there was any enforcement when people park on pavements. The Cabinet Member explained that a number of London Boroughs have designated pavement parking and that this was being trialled in Westmoreland ward. He further explained that enforcement officers do pick this up where it is correct to do so but not where it is unclear. Councillor Samuel stated that it was not illegal to park on a pavement but it was illegal to drive on the pavements. He added that there can be damage caused by vehicles parking on pavements. He asked if the policy was going to be examined. The Cabinet Member explained that there would not be a policy review at this stage and that there must be a safe and balanced approach.

The Cabinet Member mentioned a new rural transport group was being set up – Councillors Bull and Butters volunteered to be part of this.

61 COMMUNITY ASSET TRANSFER POLICY

Andy Thomas, Head of Strategy, Engagement and Marketing and Sara Dixon, Locality Manager, Communities Team introduced the report.

Panel members asked the following questions and made the following points:

Councillor Hale asked how fast CATs (Community Asset Transfers) take. The officer explained that each one is different, some are more complex than others.

Councillor Gilchrist asked if people might be put off by how cumbersome the process is. The officer explained that organisations wanted to get it right and welcomed the detailed information.

Councillor Anketell Jones asked if any community groups would be disadvantaged by not having the resources to put a business plan together. The officer reassured the Panel that an equalities analysis had been carried out.

Councillor Butters asked if organisations would be allowed to develop on any land gained as a result of a CAT. The officer explained the Council can only grant a lease if it is receiving benefits so that if there were potential profits made by an acquirer, they would be shared. It was acknowledged that in the past CATS may have had different arrangements. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources explained that CATS can take longer than they should which has often been the result of legal delays.

Councillor Symonds summarised the consultation response given by Keynsham Town Council. The officer stated that this feedback would be taken into account in the consultation process.

The Panel made the following comments on the draft policy:

- This progress is encouraging and the Policy will streamline the process.
- Encouraged by the determination to learn from best practice.
- Support from the Panel for the draft policy.

62 CORPORATE & BUDGET PLANNING 2019-20

David Trethewey, Director of Partnerships and Corporate Services introduced the report.

Councillor Charles Gerrish, Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency, Martin Shields, Corporate Director, and Mandy Bishop, Director of Environmental Services, were also present to answer questions.

Panel members asked the following questions and made the following points:

Councillor Anketell Jones asked, regarding the Organisational Plan, what the critical point was if the amount in the pound spent on adult and children services kept on rising. The Director of Partnerships and Corporate Services explained that there is no categorical answer but that a Fair Funding Review was in place.

Regarding the Core Offer (page 61), Councillor Evans referred to the middle section and stated that he was concerned that safety was becoming the only criteria regarding roads rather than travel. The Director of Partnerships and Corporate Services explained that the Council has resources for core delivery but it can still influence others to affect results.

Councillor Anketell Jones asked about the PREVENT agenda and the Director of Partnerships and Corporate Services explained that the Council would continue to work with partners and the community.

Councillor Samuel stated that the Council had a long way to go to make it's online services more transactional which would lead to huge savings. He added that the One Stop Shop is not a comprehensive service and the current website is not fit for purpose. The Director of Partnerships and Corporate Services responded by explaining that there is a proposal in the digital transformation plan a move to a transactional service around parking and a new website is being worked on. Councillor Bull raised an equalities issue with transactional services by stating that not all people have access to or can use online services. Councillor Hale sought assurance that we never move away from the human voice on the phone system. The Director of Partnerships and Corporate Services stated that this would be considered in the roll out of services and residents access needs would be assessed but could not give an ongoing assurance regarding the phone system. Councillor Hale stated that an automated phone system would be a backwards step. Councillor Symonds gave an example that there were 650 members of Dial a Ride in his area

and only 50 have access to email so many would have problems accessing the Council if any services were online only.

Councillor Samuel asked why the parking strategy (page 63) was marked as high risk. Mandy Bishop, Director of Environmental Services explained that this will now be reassessed as medium risk.

In response to a query from Councillor Neil Butters regarding parking income, Martin Shields, Corporate Director explained that the income can be used to support the highway (for example safe routes to schools).

Councillor Bull noted the large savings that were predicted from 'Getting from A to B', the officer confirmed this and added that the savings will be mainly in 2020/21.

Regarding a query about pothole repairs, the Director of Environmental Services explained some permanent pothole repairs would become part of the Capital programme. She explained that the CIPFA guidelines had changed recently. The Panel supported this.

There was some discussion on Green Waste collections. Councillor Gilchrist stated that there was a proposed increase in charges but reduction in this service and asked if some residents could pay more to get a full 12 month service. The Corporate Director explained that there had been a review of the service which found that it would not be cost effective to pick up small amounts of waste. Councillor Samuel pointed out that if the service operates on a cost recovery basis, it would not matter if there was a gap in the service. He added that when services are intermittent, they are not used. Councillor Charles Gerrish, Cabinet Member for Finance and Efficiency, stated that he had heard the points made.

Councillor Samuel stated that the 'Fix my street' App is a great innovation but still did not provide adequate feedback on what had been reported. The Corporate Director explained that it was a mechanism to make clear what was in the system but in the future it could be refined to link with back office systems to give more information. The Director of Environmental Services said she would check out Councillor Samuel's suggestion of sending a picture of a repair to the complainant.

In response to a question from Councillor Butters, the Cabinet Member explained that strategic work is funded by WECA and local work by BANES.

The Cabinet Member confirmed that the gulls nest removal programme will continue in response to a query from Councillor Gilchrist.

Regarding Air Quality monitoring, Councillor Samuel explained that he had asked if the Council had considered bidding to DEFRA for real time monitoring in the city. He explained that diffusion tubes were in place currently and they only looked backwards. The Corporate Director explained that the Council was in detailed discussion with DEFRA regarding what they would fund.

The Panel **RESOLVED** to pass on the following comments to the Cabinet:

- Regarding the digital transformation and core service redesign – consideration be given to those residents who cannot access or use online services.
- Consideration be given to the possibility of giving residents the option of paying more for a full 12 month green bin service.
- Consideration be given to refining the ‘Fix My Street’ App, which is a great innovation, so that it can provide adequate feedback to complainants.
- Consideration be given to getting real time monitoring (regarding Air Quality) across the city.

63 PANEL WORKPLAN

The Panel noted the workplan with the following amendments:

- 11th March 2019 meeting – add ‘20mph zones Update’

The meeting ended at 7.10 pm

Chair(person)

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council		
MEETING	Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel	
MEETING	11th March 2019	EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE:
TITLE:	Consultation, Community Engagement and Communications	
WARD:	All	
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM		
<p>List of attachments to this report: Appendix : Report to Cabinet, 5th March 2019</p>		

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 This report briefs the Panel on a report to Cabinet on work undertaken with members of our Connecting Communities Forums on ‘Consultation, Community Engagement and Communications’. Cabinet was due to consider the report at its meeting of 5th March, including a recommendation to invite the Panel to advise on the future development of this piece of work.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Panel is asked to

- 2.1 Note the update on the development and work of the Area Forums set out in the Cabinet report
- 2.2 Consider the outcomes so far from the working group established to consider consultation, community engagement and communications, summarised below in Paragraph 5.1
- 2.3 Advise on how best to develop further this work and incorporate it into the Council’s policy and practices.

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)

- 3.1 There is a well-established business case for delivering effective and efficient consultation. Identifying appropriate resources for high-quality communications and engagement on projects should be built into their planning phase from the outset.

4 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS AND BASIS FOR PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The council has a wide range of statutory duties relating to engaging and consulting with local residents, and considering responses appropriately through its decision making process.

5 THE REPORT

- 5.1 Cabinet on March 5th was due to consider a report on 'Consultation, Community Engagement and Communications' The report is attached but in summary it:

- 1) Sets out the background and context to the council's approach to local engagement, including the "Connecting Communities" programme, which aims to help local people, organisations and parish councils address the issues that matter to them in their communities
- 2) Describes the current work of the Connecting Communities Forums, involving parishes, local elected members and other residents and local groups. Three Connecting Communities Forums were established initially covering the Somer Valley, Chew Valley and Keynsham areas, building on long-established partnership arrangements in these areas. This was extended to the whole of the parished area with the creation of the Bathavon Forum (now the "Cam Valley" and "Bathavon North Forums"). The council also established the Bath City Forum in 2015, which draws together elected Bath & North East Somerset Councillors and co-opted members. All these Forums have continued to evolve and develop- for example, the Bath City Forum now advises the Cabinet on disbursing the local portion of the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 3) Sets out the work that a group, drawn from the Forums, Avon Local Councils Association (ALCA) and the Third Sector Group (3SG), have undertaken to improve and refine the engagement processes. The group have drawn from the experience of and learning from a wide range of consultation processes, including on Your Care Your Way, the East of Bath Park and Ride, Libraries and Air Quality.

- 5.2 An appendix to the Cabinet's reports sets out the detailed discussions of the working group. However, in summary, the proposal is that four key areas be explored further, as set out below

- develop a 'Charter' on consultation similar to the Parish Charter adopted by the Council to support our working relationship with town and parish Councils.
- agree a vocabulary of 'consultation language' which, whilst not affecting the Council's statutory obligations, would be better understood by residents
- explore opportunities to work more closely with the 3SG to engage harder to reach groups. •

- investigate the idea of setting up an 'Consultation Panel' to give officers feedback prior to the Council embarking on consultation.

5.3 There is a strong commitment on behalf of the Forum members and the council to work together to develop this work further. The outcomes and next steps have been reported back to the Forums and further work is planned. The outcomes of the Panel's discussions will be fed into this.

6 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

6.1 None

7 CONSULTATION

7.1 These proposals have been drawn up through joint working with representatives from the local forums, the Third Sector group and parish councils.

8 RISK MANAGEMENT

8.1 A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.

Contact person	<i>Dave Dixon Community Engagement Manager. 01225 396532</i>
Background papers	Report to Cabinet- Consultation, Community Engagement and Communications, March 2019 https://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s54795/E3133%20Consultation%20Community%20Engagement%20and%20Communications.pdf
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council

MEETING	Cabinet	
MEETING	5th March 2019	EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE:
		E 3133
TITLE:	Consultation, Community Engagement and Communications	
WARD:	All	
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM		
List of attachments to this report: Appendix 1: Notes of Consultation Workshop held on 26 th January 2019		

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 This report updates the Cabinet on work undertaken with members of our Connecting Communities Forums on Consultation, Community Engagement and Communications. The report sets out the learning from recent consultation processes, ideas for building on good practice and suggested new approaches. The report also sets out the outcome of a detailed engagement process on this work so far and proposes next steps.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet is asked to;

- 2.1 Note the work of the area's Local Area Forums in engaging with local residents, parish councils, town councils and the community and voluntary sector.
- 2.2 Thank the Bath City Forum and the Consultation Working Group, drawn from representatives of the Forums, ALCA and the 3SG, for their work to date on further developing our framework for Consultation, Community Engagement and Communications.
- 2.3 Requests the CTE PDS Panel to consider in more detail the outcomes of the groups findings, attached in Appendix 1 and detailed below in 5.12, and to advise the Council's Cabinet on how best to develop further this work and incorporate it into the Council's policy and practices.

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)

- 3.1 There is a well-established business case for delivering effective and efficient consultation. Identifying appropriate resources for high-quality communications and engagement on projects should be built into their planning phase from the outset.

4 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS AND BASIS FOR PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The Council has a wide range of statutory duties relating to engaging and consulting with local residents, and considering responses appropriately through its decision making process.

5 THE REPORT

- 5.1 Cabinet in May 2013 adopted a new Local Engagement Framework for Bath & North East Somerset. The central aim of this new “Connecting Communities” approach was to help local people, organisations and councils address the issues that mattered to them most in their communities, particularly in the light of ongoing financial challenges. The Framework was therefore built around establishing a number of local “Connecting Communities Forums”, involving parishes, local elected members and other residents and local groups. This approach also enabled a complex range of existing locally-based groups to be replaced, removing duplication and providing a single basis for engagement. In addition, it allowed for updates to be given to the Forums from key public services such as the Council, Police and Fire and Rescue Service.
- 5.2 Three Connecting Communities Forums were established initially covering the Somer Valley, Chew Valley and Keynsham areas, building on long-established partnership arrangements in these areas. These Forums brought together Parish Councils, local elected members and community groups as well as Director-level sponsors to highlight and champion their work. Action Plans for each Forum drew together partner activity to utilise the capacity and skills of the local communities themselves.
- 5.3 Following positive feedback on the first phase of the introduction of the Forum approach, it was extended to the whole of the parished area with the creation of the Bathavon Forum in July 2015. This was followed by the first meeting of the Bath City Forum in October 2015, established by Council in July 2015 following a review of governance arrangements for the City. Given that Bath is unparished the representation on the Forum was drawn from elected Bath & North East Somerset Councillors and from co-optees. This meant that for the first time a clear engagement framework had been embedded across the whole of Bath & North East Somerset.
- 5.4 The Forums have continued to evolve and develop. For example, the Bath City Forum now advises the Cabinet on disbursing the local portion of the Community Infrastructure levy for Bath through a Panel established for that purpose. Most recently the Bathavon Forum has been replaced by two separate Forums for Cam Valley and Bathavon North, which it was felt would better reflect the community needs and identities. The Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Forums come together regularly to assess progress, share best practice and make forward plans. However, even within this common framework, local issues are prioritised, identified and pursued. Recent examples of this include a

focus on Houses in Multiple Occupation at the Bath City Forum, whilst the Somer Valley and Chew Valley Forums have discussed rural transport issues. The Keynsham Forum has focussed on issues such as community safety and anti-social behaviour.

- 5.5 A key benefit of the relationships created across all our communities provided by the Forums has been the ability for public services to consult at local level, and to use the Forums to receive a local “take” on B&NES-wide consultations. This was found particularly useful, for example on the “Your Care Your way” community services proposal and also on a wide range of other consultations.
- 5.6 The Bath City Forum in 2018 raised, what they felt were, a number of key learning points from some of the complex consultations that have taken place in recent years, including the East of Bath Park and Ride, Libraries and Air Quality. It was considered that there were some useful lessons to be learnt from these which were considered when developing the Air Quality consultation process. For example, a period of broad engagement and communications prior to the consultation period itself was built into the planning. Overall, this consultation received what is believed to be a record number of responses.
- 5.7 Following this issue being raised at the Bath City Forum, all the other Forums, Somer Valley, Chew Valley, Keynsham, Cam Valley and BathAvon North were asked for their views on how best to work together to improve the process of engagement and consultation in our area. As a result a working group was established consisting of four Members of the Bath City Forum and two from each of the others. Also included were representatives from Avon Local Council’s Association (ALCA) and the 3SG (Third Sector Group). A working group of seventeen in total.
- 5.8 The initial proposal was to undertake a joint workshop with the working group and Council Officers. This was subsequently revised following discussions with the Cabinet Member for Economic & Community Regeneration. It was agreed to hold the workshop just with the representatives from the Forums.
- 5.9 The workshop took place on Saturday the 26th of January 2019 with ten of the seventeen members of the working group present. The workshop was run by the Cabinet Member for Economic and Community Regeneration supported by Officers from Partnerships and Corporate Services.
- 5.10 The workshop was very well received by the members of the Forums who participated, particularly as the format allowed members to engage in role play in order to appreciate the complexity and different perspectives. The outcomes and next steps have been reported back to all the area Forums and further work is planned. There is a genuine desire on behalf of the Forum members and the Council to work together to develop this work further.
- 5.11 The Council has already learnt a lot of lessons from the refresh of the Parish Charter and it is proposed that the resulting principles of partnership working are also fed into our future consultation arrangements.
- 5.12 The workshop proposed four key areas to explore further. These were to:
 - develop a ‘Charter’ on consultation similar to the Parish Charter adopted by the Council to support our working relationship with Town and Parish

Councils. This could provide the guidance on the rules including responding to issues as they arise as well as training and promotion of the Charter.

- agree a vocabulary of ‘consultation language’, whilst not affecting the Council’s statutory obligation, that is understandable by residents across the district.
- explore opportunities of working more closely with the 3SG to engage harder to reach groups.
- investigate the idea of setting up an ‘Consultation Panel’ to give officers feedback prior to the Council embarking on consultation. The Panel will need to be managed within existing resources.

6 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

6.1 None

7 CONSULTATION

7.1 There has been widespread discussion of the proposals within the Bath City Forum and at other Forum meetings across the district. The Bath City Form members have been instrumental in driving the issue forward.

7.2 The whole issue of Consultation, Community Engagement and Communications will be presented to CTE PDS Panel on 11th March for further comment and discussion. These discussions will be reported back to Cabinet at a future date.

8 RISK MANAGEMENT

8.1 A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.

Contact person	<i>Dave Dixon Community Engagement Manager. 01225 396532</i>
Background papers	<p>Cabinet Meeting paper – Connecting Communities: Update December 2014 http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/siteimages/cc_report_december_2014.pdf</p> <p>New Conversations: LGA guide to engagement https://www.local.gov.uk/new-conversations-lga-guide-engagement</p>

Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format

**Notes of Consultation Workshop
Mulberry Park Hub
Saturday 26th January 2019, 10am – 2pm**

Attendees

Name	Representing
Cllr Paul Myers	Cabinet Member for Economic and Community Regeneration
Cllr John Adler	Chair of Freshford Parish Council and Cam Valley Forum
Cllr Hugh Baker	Chair of Bathford Parish Council and Bathavon North Forum
Richard Clist	Clerk to Swainswick Parish Council, Bathavon North Forum
Cllr Dave Collett	Timsbury Parish Council, Somer Valley Forum
Dave Dixon	Community Engagement Manager, B&NES
Sara Dixon	Locality Manager, B&NES
Roger Driver	St Michael's Church, Bath City Forum
Mark Hayward	Community Engagement Officer, B&NES
Adrian Inker	Volunteer and Vice Chair of Keynsham Area Forum
Kathryn Manchee	Clerk to 3 Parish Councils, Cam Valley Forum
Kate Morton	Chief Executive - Bath Mind; B&NES Third Sector Group (3SG)
Cllr Rosemary Naish	Chair of ALCA and Clutton Parish Council. Chew Valley Forum
Paul Roles	Bath City Forum
Alison Wells	Community Engagement Officer, B&NES

Apologies

Name	Representing
Enya-Jayne Battersby	Vice President Bath Spa Students Union, Bath City Forum
Nicolette Boater	Resident. Bath City Forum
Stephen Dale	Head of Community Partnerships – Dorothy House, B&NES 3SG
Chris Head	Chief Executive of West of England Rural Network and Chair of Chew Valley Forum
Mike Hammond	Resident. Keynsham Area Forum
Cllr Alastair Slade	Midsomer Norton Town Council, Somer Valley Forum
Roanne Wootten	Operations Director - Julian House, Bath City Forum

1. Welcome, Housekeeping, Introductions and Ice-Breaker

PM welcomed those present and gave a safety announcement. The aim of the session was to look at the issue of consultation – he referred to his own experience being a resident, Town Councillor, Ward Councillor and Cabinet Member. Roundtable introductions were made.

PM explained that the Council had received a proposal from representatives of the Bath City Forum which highlighted:-

- an inconsistent approach to consultation,
- lack of expertise in the process,
- poor methodology and design of consultation materials and
- apparent lack of application of results ('a black hole').

Part of the aim of the workshop is to take forward the proposal and explore the experiences from other areas. The Council does have processes it needs to follow including statutory.

The group will do an exercise later to feel what it's like to live through a consultation from different perspectives.

2. Truth and Reconciliation

PM asked the group to share their views about what was good and what was bad with consultation exercises in the past. In order to achieve the best consultation going forward, we need to be really frank today, no comments will be attributed to individuals.

Roundtable discussions were held and the following comments were made:-

- As part of the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) consultation, a well-attended public meeting was organised by the Council. It quickly became apparent that there were no options - a decision had been made on the solution. Also, no-one from the Council was taking any notes – this gave the impression that they did not care about the views being given.
- Up until recently, I thought consultation meant that the Council was getting consultants in – people have no interest in how the Council works so don't understand the processes.
- People have lost trust in consultation as they think it is a done deal – the CAZ is a good and recent example of this as is the Keynsham One Way. This entrenches people's views. It should be a two stage process the first being 'Why are we doing it' then, when the community are on board with that, look at 'how to get there'. Keynsham has grown enormously in size with the community having little say on the matter. It seems at times that common sense has gone out of the window with decisions.
- Whilst officer reports suggested that there was support within the community for a One Way System in Keynsham, the Council they didn't consult on the best way to reach the objective.
- Some of it is about the language used – this needs to be right early on and avoid Council jargon.
- Could there be a central place on-line where notes from consultation events are posted?
- The on-line consultation form for the CAZ only included one section where you could give a view.
- The Hollies Library move was a 'done deal' – you are often consulting on a solution that has been decided, not getting ideas in advance.
- Don't assume that everyone can access information or take part in consultations on-line. For example, a consultation affecting homeless people was put on on-line.
- The planning consultation process is very open and there can be lots of comments to wade through – I do feel for the officers having to do this because there never is one solution to please everyone.
- It strikes me that the Council is often in a position of power – it's a bit like planning a family holiday – I ask the kids where they want to go but I will have the final say

because I am paying. There was also a view that it would be better if the Council could admit this at the start.

- People think the Council is responsible for everything – there was a huge protest outside the Guildhall about Culverhay/Bath Community Academy closing but surely the ultimate decision was not the Council's? People were angry but didn't know where to direct their frustration about this issue.
- I think the Council should make more use of existing groups of people (eg interest groups, WI, rugby clubs etc) to consult. People can discuss the issue with others they know and trust, then feedback be given. This may encourage individuals to give a view when they might not otherwise.
- I often see letters in the local press from residents complaining and it is obvious that they do not understand the issue or the facts. Maybe the Council needs to explain things better.
- I have an issue with how the Council uses the media. It was recently announced that they are considering using the A46 as a Park and Ride – that is not the way to introduce a scheme or policy to the public.
- When I worked for a private company in marketing, we planned communications and launches. It is different at the Council where everyone has a right to Freedom of Information; differing views; information put out can be distorted or not read. Politicians set policy, officers implement.
- There are often time constraints that influence when engagement takes place and officers can have one hand tied behind their back – this goes over people's heads sometimes.
- It is difficult to know what the truth is when you read newspapers, Twitter etc. People are engaging with angry social media posts, not facts. Sometimes it almost seems that the media want to engage in conflict to create headlines and drive sales.
- Consultation means different things to different people in different situations. We get consultation from the Council, consult the public ourselves as an organisation, individuals want to discuss things with us. My biggest disappointment with the Council is that consultation is often *'this is what we have decided, what do you think?'* It would be preferable to talk through options with groups, although it's appreciated that this is a longer process. However, having a longer process would allow for feedback at different stages.
- Maybe consultation is the wrong word unless it's statutory – maybe it should be resident/community involvement.
- I would hold out for the word consultation – it is consultation when it goes your way and not when it doesn't!
- Officers are not always clear on the difference between the 3 C's (Consultation, Community Engagement, and Communication). The three words are really an iterative process where the starting point is the stage most appropriate to the specific subject. Internally the Council needs to be clearer so that officers know which method is appropriate and what is meant by the terms eg consultation, engagement or communication.

- I would endorse starting the process earlier where possible, although it is appreciated that sometimes there is a push to reach a deadline. If so, this needs to be communicated too.
- I see it a bit like planning a meal out. First of all you make a suggestion 'Shall we go to a restaurant on Friday', then you need to decide which one, then when you get there, you decide what you want to eat.
- 80% of the feedback probably comes from 20% of the people - most probably don't care.
- The Council cut the parish sweeper scheme and told the affected parishes just two months before. When this was deemed to be outside the terms of the Parish Charter, the Council found a way of mitigating the impact. It is possible to negotiate.
- A lot is a lack of understanding about why things have to happen – sometimes people probably regret getting caught up in misleading information and taking a polarised position.
- It is easier to put out fires when they are small. Also, people respect honesty.
- There can be 'organisational ego' perhaps due to individuals concerned about their legacy.
- Some departments of the Council are particularly prone to being the experts taking a 'we know best' approach – this disengages people.
- Consultation can be affected by cost and deadlines. If there was a Terms of Reference, the clear outcomes could be known at the outset.
- Consultation can be seen a vote but it is not. It is not always possible to get people to agree but there is a need to address the needs of those who are not going to get what they want and mitigate the impact of decisions.
- There is also consultation v expectation. We have an issue that will impact on our community and one group of people feels we should engage and consult but another feels there are elected representatives with a mandate should take these decisions.

PM thanked everyone for their contributions. There was a short break.

3. How Can We Make Consultation Better?

Roundtable discussions continued and the following comments were made:-

- The Council undertook a similar process when refreshing the Parish Charter – there were workshops with officers and parish representatives and everyone had a chance to say how it felt for them. We do have a Parish Charter but still need to make sure that people know how to behave as both officers and protesters. We also want to engage the media in this process.
- Is it built into Council staff objectives/performance?
- I am sometimes horrified at the way in which people behave towards the Council.

- Be up front – we are consulting but say if there are constraints.
- Don't call it consultation if it's not.
- The example in the budget about the cost of adult and children's social care really helped people to understand the costs and difficulties the Council faces.
- What outcomes are you looking for – it might not be a yes/no but a how do we get there.
- The three C's are different things but all are being presented as consultation – the Council needs to say which it is and why you are doing it as well.
- Is it a consultation you have to do or are choosing to do?
- There should be a check list for officers eg., have you made your decision already, if so, it is not consultation.
- Whichever one of the 3 C's it is, there needs to be a clear definition of the purpose and the objectives and what the problem.
- Define where you can and can't go and what the project is.
- If there was a joint process for the Council and public to follow, what should it be called – a 'contract'; 'memorandum' or 'deal'? It doesn't need to be a lengthy document – we just need some rules that everyone involved in the process whether they are in opposition; Cabinet; press; officers or public, can agree.
- I struggle with contract as this suggests something different like Charter or Memorandum of Understanding.
- I've seen it work with the Parish Charter and Parish Sweeper.
- An example where the Council has made improvements is Fix My Street which is working well. It is very transparent. It addresses criticism around lack of feedback from the Council.
- Be up front.
- The Council's budget presentation is clear – 82p in the £1 is spent on essential services.
- If we have arrived at conflict, we have failed.
- There are Government guidelines on consultation which the Council can use and apply in simple language.
- In marketing, there are panels to use as 'critical friends'. They represent a range of people and views with members regularly changed so they do not become 'experts' and views remain fresh. Do you think something like this would be helpful?
- People thought the bus service was being cut by the Council – they did not realise the decision was made by First.

- Would statutory consultation cause issues with this approach?
- Both can be combined as long as it is made clear what the Council has to do and what it has chosen to do.
- The NHS has to consult on major changes with a particular time frame – it may only be 12 weeks.
- Officers would need to be trained in whatever the process is. The Forums could have a session on it.
- When the Forums were set up, it was considered whether they might play a role in testing ideas, so it may be possible to use them.
- The Forums are not diverse enough.
- One of the newer Forums has been asking what it is for, where it is going. There was little community involvement until the presentation on the CAZ – this was vocal and vociferous because the issue interests people – individuals came and personal views were given.
- It is because the CAZ affects everyone.
- Often there is consultation on a small point – the Forums could be used to engage with communities before it goes to individuals.
- There are two universities in Bath – they have sophisticated knowledge of sampling and research. The Council could make use of this.
- How would the Council ensure that all people have access to the process? Some people do go to meetings but others are harder to reach. Does the Council commit to at least try to reach them? The Council cannot force people to engage.
- Community organisations can help share information.
- In Foxhill, residents were trained to undertake engagement.
- I still think there is benefit from engaging with groups, not individuals – people are comfortable talking in their groups, not to the Council.
- People talk on buses – there could be an opportunity for them to pick up leaflets on the bus.

The group agreed the following key actions for consideration:

- develop a 'Charter' on consultation similar to the Parish Charter, providing guidance on the rules including responding to issues as they arise as well as training and promotion of the Charter.
- agree a vocabulary of 'consultation language' that is understandable by residents across the district.
- explore opportunities of working more closely with the 3SG to engage harder to reach groups.

- investigate the idea of setting up an 'Consultation Panel' to give officers feedback prior to the Council embarking on consultation.

PM thanked everyone for their input and said he would be feeding back to Informal Cabinet on Monday.

4. Putting principles into Practice

A participatory workshop was held. The aim of which was to understand the varying issues, draw conclusions. Roundtable feedback was given.

5. Conclusions and next steps

PM thanked everyone for really getting into the spirit of the session. All agreed that it had been a very interesting session particularly to see the different perspectives and impact of a consultation process.

PM confirmed that he would report back the consultations and suggested actions to the Cabinet. The group proposed that they would be interested in continuing to develop a new consultation approach for the Council. This was agreed with a unanimous show of hands.

There was a vote of thanks to PM and the officers and a request for feedback to be given at Bath City Forum on Monday and to the B&NES Third Sector Group.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 10

Bath & North East Somerset Council

MEETING/ DECISION MAKER:	Community, Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny	
MEETING/ DECISION DATE:	11th March 2019	EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE:
		E
TITLE:	Getting from A to B Strategic Review	
WARD:	All	
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM		
List of attachments to this report:		
None		

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 The presentation updates panel members of the progress within the Getting from A to B Strategic Review.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Panel members are asked to;

- 2.1 Note the update as set out within the report.

3 BACKGROUND

- 3.1 The Getting from A to B Strategic Review Programme looks at options for moving people differently by reassessing the mode of travel used and what additional capacity is available within other elements of the overall fleet movements.
- 3.2 The focus of the programme is on people rather than modes of transport to coordinate and cross support all transport modes.
- 3.3 The overarching aim is to remove dependence on Council or subsidised transport – leading to empowerment for communities with sustainable transport for all users and all needs whilst removing duplication.

4 SUCCESSES INCLUDING FINANCIAL SAVINGS

- 4.1 To date the project has realised cashable savings of £1.1m against the 4 year stretch target of £1.938m.
- 4.2 We have also saved in excess of £300k in growth avoidance – for example where we have changed the way we transport children from the point of transport allocation. Rather than under the historic processes which would have been costly the new processes have significantly reduced the cost of the transport from first allocation.

- 4.3 A number of supported services have been moved from support to a fully commercial offer or alternative funding streams such as section 106 funding with no drop in service/
- 4.4 We have also accessed funding from WECA to help support the remaining subsidised bus routes showing cross regional working is improving. It is also recognised that the public see bus routes as critical and that any further removal is challenging as services that will be affected are those in rural areas.
- 4.5 We have moved a number of children onto scheduled bus services rather than dedicated home to school services. This provides greater flexibility, increased independence and helps to secure the scheduled service for the wider community.
- 4.6 We have embedded a process of offering Personal Travel Budgets to parents and carers to help them provide the correct travel options for their children. This in turn reduces the overall costs to the council.
- 4.7 We have reduced the non-core services delivered by the internal fleet that were not cost effective such as the internal courier route. This allows them to focus on the main role and reduces the number of vehicles and drivers needed within the council.

5 BARRIERS

- 5.1 The project has been successful in delivery of a number of the key outcomes as set out within the critical success measures. However changes to the responsibilities of certain areas of transport provision with the formation of West of England Combined Authority removed and delayed some of the opportunities first identified. This includes community transport and concessionary fares.
- 5.2 Communication of the project aims to both internal staff and stakeholders is difficult (unpacking everything is complex) and trying to get this understood was hard. We had 37 separate pieces of work being undertaken, many that had interdependencies with other streams of work and this was challenging to explain.
- 5.3 Timing changes on the financial and school year timelines causes both delay and further communication challenges. Cross cutting workflows require cooperation as the message needs to be the same in all teams with different contexts in which people work. Lastly, the change in approach needs to be embedded with internal teams to make it stick and this is ongoing.
- 5.4 We still have issues with expectations of users, be that parents who want services to continue as they have previously, to challenges around what we are allowed to consider when assessing safe routes to school, for example wanting us to consider if a route is pushchair friendly when assessing the route for siblings. This does show that we still have much work to do around selling the changes better to ensure that service delivery is in line with expectations.
- 5.5 Capacity is difficult, giving it the priority needed. We have a number of high profile projects being delivered at the same time and project management resource has been redirected.

6 HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT

- 6.1 Due to procurement regulations we have to retender all routes for changes to occur in April 2019. We have added in requirements to increase the use of pass scanning to try and better understand users, trip usage and flows for time of year. This will help to develop the data on occupancy of the vehicles - allocating spaces for people who never use the vehicle is wasting resource – despite their right of access through the statutory criteria.
- 6.2 We also continue to work on the software trial to move more children onto scheduled buses to support the rural bus network and make sure that the limited resources is

reinvested for the benefit of the whole community. However, this does bring challenges for pupils and parents who may have to get used to different transport provision.

7 PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND RURAL TRANSPORT PROVISION

7.1 The provision of public transport (bus and rail) for rural communities has declined steadily since its zenith in the 1950s and it has reflected wider social and demographic changes. There has been a “vicious circle” of higher car ownership and use, decline in local facilities, demand for travel to a wider variety of destinations and falling demand for established public transport services.

7.2 Characteristics of rural areas are diverse but usually include some if not all of the factors below.

- Dispersed settlements
- Ageing population
- High levels of car ownership and dependency on car
- Pockets of deprivation masked by apparent prosperity
- Social exclusion more difficult to identify and tackle than in urban areas
- Decline in local facilities (shops, Post Offices etc)
- Centralisation of essential facilities (education, health etc)
- Spread of travel demand to a variety of destinations
- High average trip length
- Tourist areas suffer from the environmental impacts of car-borne visitors
- Rural economy dependent to some degree on visitors
- Greater impact of severe weather conditions
- Many narrow roads with lengthy diversionary routes if closed for road works etc

7.3 In 2001, 16% of the population of the West of England lived in the 177 rural parishes in the area and 72% of those living in the West of England’s rural areas used their car to travel to work, compared with 60% in urban areas.

7.4 In 2015, 10% of households in rural areas had no access to a car or van compared with 28% in urban areas. People living in the most rural areas travelled almost 50% further per year than those in the most urban areas and in the most rural areas, 88% of travel was made using a car (as a driver or passenger) compared with 69% in the most urban areas.

7.5 Bus operations in rural areas have a number of challenges. This includes low levels of commercial provision – except on inter-urban corridors and a general lack of stability of commercial network (characteristic of all bus services). This has historically left services heavily reliant on revenue support from local authorities – which are under great pressure in the challenging financial climate. A limited supply of operators further compounds any market forces with small operators reluctant to participate in multi-operator ticket schemes. Operators are unwilling to cross-subsidise rural operations from viable urban operations for fear of breaching competition law. This has left a majority of the supply focussed on statutory home-to-school transport.

7.6 Patronage levels are further affected by longer journey times to urban centres than by car as each service has to cover a larger area. Operating costs are also generally higher with vehicles generally older and meeting lower emission standards. The lack of interchange facilities to/from commercial route network prevents a joined up approach to more commercially robust services.

7.7 Rural services also have a high proportion of concessionary travel pass holders which reduces the income available to bus operators. Lack of accessible bus stops and limited space on highway for bus stops and interchange points further reduce the overall service offer for customers which in turn leads to fewer opportunities to get income from advertising or sponsorship to fund maintenance of infrastructure. Lack of promotion of wider network and the lack of real-time information units – in many cases because of

lack of power supply prevents customers from having a wider understanding on how to use services in the most efficient way.

7.8 The Getting from A to B transport strategic review is engaged with WECA to consider the future of bus services under the joint powers held between WECA and the constituent authorities. Possible ways forward that will be explored under the joint working arrangements (including the Joint Local Transport Plan 4, the Bus Strategy and development of a joint Integrated Transport Authority approach) include:

- Encourage local enterprise to reduce need to travel
- Encourage de-centralisation of public services to reduce need to travel
- Develop and encourage online access to services to reduce need to travel
- Promote Bus Checker apps to give real-time information (RTI)
- Incentivise all bus operators to participate in the WoE RTI system
- Challenge bus operators' unwillingness to cross-subsidise services
- Assist operators to offer m-ticketing and contactless payment to speed boarding times
- Assist communities to set up community bus schemes to operate bus services at lower costs under Section 22 permits
- Establish two-tier integrated bus network with self-sustaining services operating along core inter-urban corridors and complementary services feeding into them at key interchanges – either on a fixed-route or demand-responsive basis
- App-based demand-responsive taxis feeding onto core inter-urban routes
- More involvement by communities, e.g. in survey and research of demand, promotion, provision of information and cleaning shelters
- Local branding / identity to give sense of “ownership” by communities
- Provide good waiting facilities and accessible kerbs at bus stops, with good walking routes to them
- Local communities to take on cleaning of bus shelters and timetable displays
- Maximise use of developer contributions to improve or maintain bus services and infrastructure
- Seek contributions from visitor attractions to support sustainable modes of travel to such places and encourage cross-promotion
- Promote car sharing in rural areas
- Encourage and assist development of community car schemes – particularly for access to health facilities
- Investigate use of solar power for shelter lighting and RTI displays

8 NEXT STEPS

8.1 Further work will be undertaken within financial years 2019/20 and 2020/21 with WECA to ensure that bus services within the rural areas are developed in line with both WECA and BANES policies, including the development of an Integrated Transport Authority. This includes significant engagement with bus operators across the area to ensure that the outcomes can be delivered. Additional work will be undertaken with stakeholders to ensure that we engage with WECA to protect the vital services community transport groups provide and ensure they are fully integrated with the long term transport solutions and outcomes.

8.2 Continue working closely with services delivering the new integrated system for all health, social care and admissions (Eyes by a company called Liquid Logic). This has a number of benefits for all services but requires significant resource to ensure that they can be realised. In the short term staff resource has been tasked with managing the changeover rather than progressing the project.

8.3 Further reviewing the hazardous routes policy in light of feedback from appeals received. This will then allow future decisions to be taken under a new and revised policy.

8.4 A further review of the internal fleet will commence in financial year 2020/21 to ensure that we are still achieving best value. Recognising that the market has historically not been able to provide the specialist resource necessary to deliver the service.

8.5 A continuation of the new approach to move more parents onto personal transport budgets – but only where it is both agreed and in the best interests of the child/children being transported.

Contact person	<i>Chris Major – 01225 (39)4231</i>
Background papers	<i>None</i>
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

This page is intentionally left blank

Bath & North East Somerset Council	
MEETING:	Communities, Transport & Environment Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel
MEETING DATE:	11th March 2019
TITLE:	Review of the Department for Transport's Research into 20mph Speed Limits
WARD:	All
AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM	
<p>List of attachments to this report: 20mph Research Study, Atkins, AECOM & Prof M Maher for the Department for Transport (November 2018)</p>	

1 THE ISSUE

- 1.1 At its meeting on 17th July 2017, the Panel asked to be advised of the outcome of the Department for Transport's (DfT) review into 20mph speed limits. This report is a summary of the main findings of that research.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Panel is asked to:

- 2.1 Note the findings of the research.
- 2.2 Comment on the suggested future approach to 20mph speed limits detailed in section 13 below.

3 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS (FINANCE, PROPERTY, PEOPLE)

- 3.1 None. This report reviews and summarises the findings of the national research. Any future 20mph limits would require funding to be allocated for their implementation and maintenance.

4 STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS AND BASIS FOR PROPOSAL

- 4.1 The Council has powers under Sections 81 to 84 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement and amend speed limits. The DfT's guidance to local

authorities on setting speed limits is contained in the document Circular 01/2013 'Setting Local Speed Limits'.

5 BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

- 5.1 The objectives of the study for the DfT included looking at the effectiveness of signed only 20mph limits (ie those without traffic calming), to help inform future policy and to provide guidance for local authorities.
- 5.2 It looked at 12 case study areas in England. The evidence used in the research included questionnaire surveys with residents, interviews with non-resident drivers and user groups, speed data from surveys and GPS vehicle data, and analysis of road collision statistics.

6 HOW AND WHY 20MPH LIMITS WERE INTRODUCED

- 6.1 The researchers grouped reasons for introducing the speed limits as follows:

Transport-related: casualty reduction, reduce impact of vehicles

Community/politically driven: concerns about safety and environment

Health-related: to encourage walking and cycling, and improve health and well-being.

- 6.2 It was noted that the cost of introducing schemes varied widely because of the large variation in the size of schemes included in the case study areas. Most of the schemes were funded from local authority budgets although in one case a former primary care trust contributed and in another case developer contributions were used.
- 6.3 Factors identified as helping to enable 20mph schemes included early engagement with stakeholders and communities to achieve buy-in, and having supportive campaign groups. Common factors seen as barriers were funding and staff resources (especially in relation to being able to undertake effective engagement), opposition in some cases from anti-lobby groups, confusion by the media and others about police enforcement, and political change causing delay.
- 6.4 In terms of lessons learnt, the researchers highlight the need for objectives and outcomes from 20mph schemes to be stated clearly and delivered to ensure their effectiveness and to demonstrate value. They also point to the need to link schemes with wider policies on transport, health, environment and the local economy. They state that there is still an evidence gap in terms of the impact of 20mph limits on the local economy, health and environment/air quality.

7 SUPPORT FOR 20MPH LIMITS

- 7.1 Amongst user groups, post implementation levels of support were found to be as follows: cyclists 81%; residents 75%; non-resident drivers 66%; motorcyclists 29%.
- 7.2 Reasons for being supportive of 20mph speed limits included a perception that they create a safer environment, they reduce the severity of injuries and put cyclists under less pressure from drivers.

- 7.3 The main concern was related to compliance and a common view that the likelihood of being caught exceeding a 20mph speed limit was low.
- 7.4 It was found that there was higher support amongst residents living in larger residential area-wide schemes compared to smaller scale and city centre schemes. In the two city centre case study areas the schemes included some A and B-class roads as well as minor roads. Comments from the focus groups made reference to the unsuitability of 20mph limits on main roads, although some felt the benefits to be gained from doing so would be greater. There was very strong support for 20mph limits near schools.

8 IMPACT ON SPEEDS AND DRIVER BEHAVIOUR

- 8.1 The researchers had access to over 18 million vehicle kilometres of 'before' and 'after' GPS-derived journey speed data, as well as 410 spot speed site surveys.
- 8.2 Prior to the introduction of the 20mph limits, 44% of drivers in the residential areas and 59% in the city centre areas were already travelling below 20mph. After the introduction of the 20mph limits this increased to 47% in residential areas and 65% in city centre areas.
- 8.3 The DfT guidance on setting speed limits (Circular 01/2013) states that 20mph limits are most appropriate where speeds are already below 24mph. In the residential study areas, 70% of drivers travelled below 24mph and 86% in city centre areas, after 20mph limits were introduced.
- 8.4 The study identified that as well as there being better compliance in city centre 20mph schemes than those in residential areas, there was also greater compliance on minor local roads compared to 'important' local roads.
- 8.5 The researchers believe there is evidence that the character of a road has a bigger influence on driver speed than the speed limit itself, and that "changing the look and feel of the street ... may therefore result in higher levels of compliance."
- 8.6 The GPS-derived journey speed data showed that overall speeds (calculated as median speeds) fell by 0.7mph in residential areas and 0.9mph in city centre areas following the introduction of 20mph limits. In four of the study areas, spot speeds (calculated as mean speeds) fell by between 0.9mph and 2.3mph. In three other study areas there was no significant change in before/after spot speeds. The greater change in speeds was where 'before' speeds were higher.
- 8.7 Speeds were assessed on other 30mph roads over the same period where 20mph limits had not been introduced in order to strengthen the evidence. The researchers commented that existing DfT data had already shown that from 2011 to 2016 average speeds on local A-class roads had dropped by 1.9mph. When this was taken into account they concluded that the reductions in speed in the study areas was partly due to the introduction of the 20mph limits and partly due to this background trend of falling speeds.
- 8.8 Despite the measured speed reductions, when asked if they had noticed a change in speed as a result of the 20mph limits, around two-thirds of residents and just over half of non-resident drivers did not perceive there to be fewer vehicles driving at excessive speed. However, more than two-thirds of residents

and non-resident drivers said they agreed that 'the 20mph limit makes it more acceptable to drive at a lower speed.'

9 PERCEPTIONS ABOUT WALKING & CYCLING IN 20MPH LIMITS

- 9.1 The study refers to previous research which found that fear of collisions may suppress walking and cycling, and that improving the behaviour of drivers could have a positive impact on this.
- 9.2 From their own study, the researchers state that 20mph limits are perceived to be beneficial for cyclists and pedestrians, and that this is likely to be related to benefits from slower speeds rather than a belief that drivers are being more considerate.
- 9.3 Slightly more than half of residents taking part in the research agreed that 20mph limits provide a more pleasant environment for walking and cycling. But only 28% agreed that it is now a safer environment for children.
- 9.4 When asked about the importance of 20mph limits on the perceived quality of the walking and cycling environment, residents taking part in focus groups tended to state it was only one factor amongst others, with safe crossings, considerate driver behaviour and suitable cycle infrastructure being seen as other requirements.

10 IMPACT ON COLLISION AND CASUALTY RATES

- 10.1 The study looked at comparator 30mph areas so that background factors that may affect collisions, such as technology improvements, road type and weather, could be taken into account. The difference between the change in collisions in the study areas and the background trend was then assumed to represent the effect of the 20mph limits, using 'before' and 'after' collision data.
- 10.2 In the residential study areas, the researchers found there was not enough evidence to state there was a statistically significant change in collisions and casualties following the introduction of 20mph limits. It is important to note that the 'after' data availability ranged from 17 to 44 months, which is a relatively short period of time.
- 10.3 The number of collisions and casualties had fallen since the introduction of 20mph limits, but there had also been a reduction in the comparator 30mph areas.
- 10.4 One of the city centre study areas did record a statistically significant reduction in collisions (-18%) and casualties (-29% pedestrian casualties; -51% casualties aged 75 and over). The researchers comment on this particular scheme in some detail in their report, where they note that the area already had a downward trend in collisions prior to the 20mph limit. The area affected covered a number of more major, higher flow city centre A and B-class roads, where 20mph limits had been applied. Their conclusion was that based on the evidence available that there was a significant reduction in collisions and casualties following the introduction of the 20mph limits, even after taking account of the background trend.
- 10.5 Overall, the researchers stated that in most of the case studies there was no evidence of a statistically significant change in collisions or casualties, and

that due to the small size of the data sample and the fact that collision rates are known to fluctuate from year to year, further data would be needed once the schemes have been in for longer in order to assess the impact further.

11 IMPACT ON ROUTE CHOICE, JOURNEY TIMES & MODE USE

- 11.1 Although the researchers advised that journey times increased by 3% in residential areas and 5% in city centre areas, since the distance a driver travels on these roads would be relatively short, the real impact would only be a few seconds delay.
- 11.2 It appears that the 20mph limits have not affected the routes drivers use. Only 8% of non-resident drivers said they avoided driving in the study areas.
- 11.3 Nearly all residents in the study areas who took part in surveys said they are walking and cycling about the same amount as they did prior to the 20mph limits being introduced. But a small number with children did state that their children are cycling locally more often now. It is important to note that this information on mode use was based on asking residents rather than any data on levels of walking and cycling.
- 11.4 Residents and drivers were asked for their views about benefits from the 20mph limits on social interaction in the street, children playing outdoors and whether people are avoiding the area and consequently affecting local shops, but very few believed the speed limit had affected these. No data was collected as part of the research into impacts on health or the environment.

12 RESEARCHERS' CONCLUSIONS

- 12.1 20mph limits are generally supported despite residents and drivers perceiving that vehicle speeds have not changed.
- 12.2 In the study areas, the majority of drivers were already travelling under 20mph before the speed limits were implemented, but there has been a small increase in the proportion since.
- 12.3 Speeds have fallen by 0.7mph in residential areas and 0.9mph in city centre areas.
- 12.4 Larger speed reductions have been seen on faster roads carrying higher volumes of traffic, but the actual reduction was only about 1mph. Where average 'before' speeds are above 24mph signage alone is unlikely to lead to compliance.
- 12.5 The character of a road has more influence on the speed at which people drive than whether it is a 20mph or 30mph speed limit.
- 12.6 Changing how drivers behave and think about driving through residential areas or roads with high levels of cyclists and pedestrians needs to be taken place to help improve compliance.
- 12.7 20mph limits have the potential to deliver a range of transport and other benefits, particularly relating to health and community.
- 12.8 The most common concern from the public is about compliance.

- 12.9 There was no significant change in collisions or casualties other than in one city centre location. The data available was limited and this requires further research in the future.
- 12.10 Further evidence is needed to examine the relationship between 20mph limits and the impact on walking and cycling activity.
- 12.11 The DfT's guidance on setting speed limits could be strengthened to encourage local authorities to work with partners such as those in the police, environment, health and communities to deliver 20mph limits as part of an integrated approach, and also to address public concerns about enforcement.

13 FUTURE APPROACH TO 20MPH SPEED LIMITS IN BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET

- 13.1 Whilst the research for the DfT has identified modest impacts on reducing vehicle speeds and, based on data currently available, have little or no impact on collisions, it has identified that 20mph limits can have a positive influence on encouraging more journeys to be taken by walking and cycling. Even though other factors such as safe crossings and appropriate cycle infrastructure are cited as being important in encouraging such behaviour, 20mph limits are one element of this.
- 13.2 The majority of residential roads in the district, whose primary purpose is not as a through route for traffic, already have 20mph limits. There are some villages and other residential areas which do not have the limit in place.
- 13.3 It is suggested that future requests for 20mph speed limits are considered and prioritised in the same manner as requests for other speed limit changes and traffic management measures. This includes consideration of cost and ongoing maintenance of signs/lines, likely benefits, and with reference to other transport priorities. There is no additional funding available and 20mph speed limits would have to be addressed within current budgets and work programmes.
- 13.4 If funding is allocated to investigate the feasibility of a 20mph limit in a particular road as part of a future work programme, it would be assessed against current DfT speed limit guidance. It appears likely that as a result of the research the DfT will review that guidance.

14 CONSULTATION

- 14.1 None undertaken for this report. Any speed limit change requires the making of a Traffic Order, which includes local consultation.

15 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 15.1 A risk assessment related to the issue and recommendations has been undertaken, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.

Contact person	Paul Garrod (Traffic Management and Network Manager) paul_garrod@bathnes.gov.uk
Background papers	None
Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format	

This page is intentionally left blank