

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, 11th July, 2019

Present:- **Councillors** Rob Appleyard, Tim Ball, Colin Blackburn, Alison Born, Shelley Bromley, Neil Butters, Vic Clarke, Sue Craig, Paul Crossley, Chris Dando, Jess David, Tom Davies, Sally Davis, Douglas Deacon, Winston Duguid, Mark Elliott, Michael Evans, Andrew Furse, Kevin Guy, Liz Hardman, Steve Hedges, Joel Hirst, Lucy Hodge, Duncan Hounsell, Shaun Hughes, Eleanor Jackson, Grant Johnson, Matt McCabe, Hal MacFie, Ruth Malloy, Paul May, Sarah Moore, Robin Moss, Paul Myers, Lisa O'Brien, Michelle O'Doherty, Bharat Pankhania, June Player, Manda Rigby, Dine Romero, Mark Roper, Richard Samuel, Bruce Shearn, Brian Simmons, Alastair Singleton, Shaun Stephenson-McGall, Karen Walker, Sarah Warren, Karen Warrington, Andy Wait, Chris Watt, Ryan Wills, David Wood and Joanna Wright

Apologies for absence: **Councillors** Sarah Bevan, Gerry Curran, Alan Hale, Dr Kumar and Vic Pritchard

19 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out on the agenda.

20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Monitoring Officer issued a general dispensation for all Councillors with regards to housing and buses in relation to agenda items 12 (Social Housing Update report) and 15 (The Future of First Bus), so they could take part in the debate and vote.

The Monitoring Officer issued a specific dispensation for all Members and Reserve Members on the Planning Committee in relation to agenda item 11 (Amendments to the Constitution), so they could take part in the debate and vote. [This dispensation was issued when the item was reached.]

The Monitoring Officer issued a further specific dispensation for all Councillors who had registered their name with her as having an interest in rental property in relation to agenda item 13 (Ending Unfair Evictions), so they could take part in the debate and vote.

The Monitoring Officer issued a further specific dispensation for Councillor Paul Myers in relation to agenda item 18 (Maintaining our Heritage), so he could take part in debate and vote.

Councillor Joel Hirst declared an 'other' interest in agenda item 9 (Youth Justice Plan) as an employee of AWP. [Following advice from the Monitoring Officer, this was amended to a 'pecuniary' interest and Councillor Hirst exited the Chamber for the duration of this item.]

Councillor Joel Hirst declared an 'other' interest in agenda item 14 (Food Poverty) as an occasional volunteer for St Alphege's soup run.

Councillor Eleanor Jackson declared an 'other' interest in agenda item 14 (Food Poverty) as her sister runs a food bank in Leeds. [This declaration was made at the item.]

Councillor Brian Simmons declared an 'other' interest in agenda item 17 (B&NES Transport Options between Bristol and Bath) as Chair of the Keynsham & District Dial-a-Ride service.

21 MINUTES - 13TH JUNE 2019

On a motion from Councillor Dine Romero, seconded by Councillor Shaun Stephenson McGall, it was

RESOLVED

That the minutes of 13th June 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

[Notes;

- 1. Following an objection raised by Councillor Chris Watt, and some debate about the accuracy of the minutes of 21st May 2019, it was agreed they would be further amended and brought back for approval at a future meeting. During the discussion Councillor Appleyard retracted his comments about the role of the Chair and acknowledged that these were incorrect.]*

22 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR OF THE COUNCIL OR FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Chair made the customary housekeeping announcements regarding mobile phones, webcasting and using the microphones.

The Chair informed Council that she wished to be addressed as Madame Chair, she reminded Councillors that all comments should be directed through the Chair and requested that surnames and titles should be used. She also asked Councillors to introduce themselves and their ward before speaking.

The Chair reminded Councillors of the forthcoming Civic Service on 21st July at Trinity Methodist church in Radstock.

The Chair had had the privilege of being in attendance when Princess Anne visited the Save the Children charity shop to present certificates to long serving volunteers. She was struck by the fact that the Council and the community owe an enormous debt to all the volunteers in the many different forms that their service takes.

23 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There were no items of urgent business.

24 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Statements were made by the following members of the public;

Bob Hollingdale, Chair of Bath Taxis Association, made a statement about Uber. He explained that they had not kept promises from a few years ago about mainly using locally licensed cars and were not abiding by other regulations and insurance requirements, thereby making little contribution to the city. Restrictions resulting from the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) could have a major positive impact. Councillor Paul Crossley asked Mr Hollingdale if he was aware of any other cities having introduced restrictions being subject to legal challenge. Mr Hollingdale responded that he was not aware of that, and had information where this had been introduced in Southampton, Cardiff, and Swindon. He would be able to supply a list, which was welcomed.

Paul Roles made a statement presenting photographic and press evidence of problems caused by Uber drivers and the impact this had on the city's licensed taxi trade. Councillor Manda Rigby, Chair of the Licensing Committee, asked if Mr Roles and Mr Hollingdale would like to meet with her and officers to discuss these issues; to which they replied that they would.

Andrew Pattie made a statement regarding the Clean Air Zone, a full copy of which is available on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Richard Samuel asked if Mr Pattie agreed that the CAZ as approved would result in traffic displacement into Landsdown ward which was undesirable, to which Mr Pattie agreed. Councillor Paul Myers asked if vague statements from the Liberal Democrat administration about the CAZ had caused undue anxiety, to which Mr Pattie agreed that they had. Councillor Karen Walker asked if Mr Pattie was aware that the Climate Emergency & Sustainability Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel would be looking at this at their meeting on 22nd July 2019, to which he replied that he had not been aware, but now was.

Martin Grixoni made a statement calling for clarity from the new Administration on their direction for the CAZ and traffic management issues. Councillor Dine Romero asked if Mr Grixoni was aware that they had never planned to charge private cars in Bath. Mr Grixoni responded that he was aware but was concerned by the Administration's comments that the proposals 'do not go far enough' and wondered what else was proposed. Councillor Paul Myers asked if Mr Grixoni agreed that this had been an important lesson in the merit of providing information sooner rather than later, to which Mr Grixoni agreed that it was, and they were just seeking clarity. Councillor Robin Moss asked Mr Grixoni if he welcomed that there was now clarity over the issue of charging private cars in Bath, to which he confirmed that he did.

Mark MacDonnell made a statement regarding the Clean Air Zone, a full copy of which is available on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Dine Romero asked Mr MacDonnell if he was aware that the independent review that the Administration are requesting is not intended to introduce a charge for private cars, to which he replied that he had not been aware. Councillor Paul Myers asked whether Mr MacDonnell considered spending £100K on the independent review was an effective use of public money, to which he responded that he did not.

Gemma Killick made a statement regarding the Clean Air Zone on behalf of Moorland & Oldfield Clean Air group and specifically the effect on Junction Road (B3111) which is a narrow road and unsuitable for the volume and heavy traffic currently using it, now further exacerbated by the effect of nearby residents' parking zones. She set out a range of requests which would help address the situation. Councillor Shaun Stephenson McGall referred to a recent meeting Ms Killick had had with the Cabinet Member and asked if she was reassured that this issue would be investigated, with a report back in September 2019. Ms Gillick replied that she was. Councillor Paul Myers asked if any Traffic Highways Engineers had been to visit and offer any solutions. Ms Killick replied that she wasn't aware that they had.

Jane Middleton made a statement regarding food poverty, a full copy of which is available on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Richard Samuel asked Ms Middleton if she agreed that the most appropriate route for formulating a food poverty action plan was to take this to the Children, Health & Wellbeing Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel prior to coming to Cabinet and Council for adoption. Ms Middleton agreed and added that it needed to be in co-operation with local organisations and experts. Councillor Liz Hardman asked Ms Middleton if she had seen a copy of the Labour amendment proposed for the later item on the agenda, and if so, whether she considered this would achieve the aspirations contained within this and her last statement to Council. Ms Middleton agreed that it would, and added that the Council had a responsibility to accept this if they were serious about addressing this issue.

Celia McCarthy made a statement regarding the roll out of 5G, a full copy of which is available on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Dine Romero asked that, as this was an issue covered by national planning, was Ms McCarthy aware of any campaigns or actions challenging this at government level. Ms McCarthy replied that she was not, although she was aware of various petitions on this subject. Councillor Grant Johnson asked if there was any concrete evidence about physical harm, to which Ms McCarthy responded that was part of the problem as the research was being conducted by mobile networks and therefore not independent.

Emma Shaw made a statement regarding 5G, a full copy of which is available on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Dine Romero asked Emma if she agreed that, when proposals do come to the Council, advice should be sought from the relevant regulatory and advisory services to ensure the safety of residents and visitors. Ms Shaw agreed.

Jamie Hughes made a statement regarding pollution levels in Bath and proposing car free Sundays, a full copy of which is available on the Council's Minute book and attached to the online minutes. Councillor Sarah Warren asked whether Mr Hughes was aware that the new Cabinet was hoping to put in place additional more forward looking and practical alternatives to the car. Mr Hughes replied that he wasn't sure extra traffic lights would be sufficient. Councillor Paul Myers asked whether charging cars would have a disproportionate effect on the less well off. Mr Hughes replied that his point was not that all cars should be charged but that it was for the Council to decide how to tackle this issue. Councillor Colin Blackburn asked Mr Hughes if he was aware of an apparent change of position of Councillor Richard Samuel from

October 2018 to now, regarding the inclusion of high polluting cars in CAZ proposals. Mr Hughes replied that, going forward, the public would be monitoring progress.

The Chair thanked all the speakers and referred their statements to the relevant Cabinet Members.

25 UPDATE REPORT ON ESTABLISHING JOINT VENTURE PARTNERSHIPS

The Council considered an update report on the establishment of joint venture (JV) LLP partnerships with other local authorities for the purpose of delivering local housing developments and maintaining a pipeline of sites for development by the Council's housing development company (ADL).

On a motion from Councillor Richard Samuel, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, it was

RESOLVED

1. To note the latest legal advice; and
2. To approve the proposed change to the original JV partnership arrangements to clarify both the legal power being used and its purpose for entering into JV LLP arrangements with neighbouring councils.

[Notes;

1. *The above resolution was carried with 45 Councillors voting in favour and 9 Councillors abstaining.]*

26 YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN 2019-20

The Council considered a report presenting the Youth Justice Plan 2019 – 20 setting out how services are organised and funded to prevent youth offending and re-offending across Bath and North East Somerset.

On a motion from Councillor Kevin Guy, seconded by Councillor Karen Walker, it was unanimously

RESOLVED

1. To agree that the Youth Justice Plan fulfils the requirements of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and can be submitted to the Youth Justice Board for England and Wales;
2. To adopt the Youth Justice Plan as part of the Council's Policy and Budget framework that can be accommodated within the Council budget; and
3. Note that the Youth Offending Service Management Board is responsible for ensuring delivery and ask the relevant Development and Scrutiny Panel to oversee performance.

27 TREASURY MANAGEMENT OUTTURN REPORT 2018/19

The Council considered this report which gives details of performance against the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Plan for 2018/19.

On a motion from Councillor Richard Samuel, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, it was unanimously

RESOLVED

1. To note the Treasury Management report to 31st March 2019, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice; and
2. To note the Treasury Management Indicators to 31st March 2019.

28 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Council considered a report setting out various proposed amendments to the Constitution arising from the size of the Council dropping from 65 to 59 Members, and changes needed to the Planning delegation scheme.

On a motion from Councillor Richard Samuel, seconded by Councillor Matt McCabe, it was unanimously

RESOLVED

1. To agree the amendments to various constitution sections as a result of the reduced Council size as set out in Appendix 1, with the number for the required 20% of Council seats (part 4A, rules 32, 33 and 34) being rounded down to 11;
2. To agree the revised Planning Delegation scheme for adoption.

29 THE DELIVERY OF SOCIAL HOUSING - UPDATE TO MARCH RESOLUTION

The Council considered a report updating the position following the Council resolution of 14th March 2019 to bring a report to this meeting on options and implications covering policy, budget and Council operations regarding social housing, recovery of empty properties and further regulation of the private rented sector.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor Sarah Warren, it was

RESOLVED to note that, given the importance of the topic, Cabinet have requested;

1. Further investigative work on the options relating to the building of Council housing, with a report being presented to Cabinet later in the year;
2. Furthermore, that this topic is taken forward for discussion and development at the Climate Emergency and Sustainability Panel for cross party discussion before coming back to Council; and

3. That this work (at resolutions 1 and 2 above) is undertaken in the context of an agreement by this Council that, in principle, it wishes to start building Council housing again.

[Notes;

- 1. The above resolution 3 was proposed by Councillor Robin Moss, seconded by Councillor Liz Hardman, and accepted into the substantive motion by the mover and seconder.*
- 2. The successful resolution was carried, with 43 Councillors voting in favour and 9 Councillors voting against.*
- 3. During debate, the Monitoring Officer was asked to advise whether bringing the report back in this form breached any constitutional rules. She responded that the March resolution requested a report to this meeting, and that had happened.]*

30 MOTION FROM THE LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP - ENDING UNFAIR EVICTIONS

On a motion from Councillor Michelle O'Doherty, seconded by Councillor Alison Born, it was

RESOLVED unanimously that Council

1. Welcomes the campaign by the "End Unfair Evictions Coalition", calling for Section 21 of the Housing Act 1988 to be scrapped;
 2. Notes that Section 21 brought in "no fault evictions", allowing private landlords to evict tenants with just two months' notice, once the initial term of a tenancy has expired;
 3. Notes that fear of "revenge eviction" may discourage renters from complaining about maintenance issues;
 4. Notes that housing insecurity can contribute to anxiety and mental health issues, lead to problems with debt, and make it harder for private renters to access services and establish community ties;
 5. Acknowledges research published by "Generation Rent" showing the link between Section 21 evictions and rising homelessness in England; and research showing that as many as 80% of private-sector evictions fall under Section 21;
 6. Notes that in 2017 the Scottish Government adopted the Private Housing (Tenancies) (Scotland) Act, effectively creating open ended tenancies and banning no-fault evictions, whilst still providing safeguards for landlords;
- and therefore:
7. Supports the "End Unfair Evictions" campaign;
 8. Welcomes the recent announcement that government intends to scrap "no fault" evictions;

9. Requests that the Leader write to relevant Ministers and local MPs expressing this Council's support for abolishing Section 21, noting the need for fair safeguards for landlords, and calling for the consultation and legislation to be brought forward without delay;
10. Requests that officers work with the relevant cabinet member to prepare a response to the consultation; and
11. Asks the Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning, and Economic Development to consider options for actions the Council could take to improve standards of rental accommodation in B&NES.

31 MOTION FROM THE LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP - FOOD POVERTY

On a motion from Councillor Ruth Malloy, seconded by Councillor Andy Wait, it was

RESOLVED that

Council notes:

1. The Department of Health and Social Care definition of food poverty as "the inability to access or afford food to make up a healthy diet";
2. That food poverty is a complex issue with many causes; that it can affect anyone, including many people who work and many families, even in an apparently well off area such as ours;
3. There is a growing problem of food insecurity in the UK, affecting as many as 8.4 million people, of which increasing reliance on food banks is one symptom;
4. That food banks in Bath and North East Somerset supply thousands of food parcels each year to local people;
5. Efforts by the Council to raise awareness of families' eligibility for free school meals, and by extension the pupil premium, locally;
6. The importance of local food systems and education in ensuring access to affordable, sustainable and healthy food options;
7. The Council has previously adopted a Local Food Strategy for Bath and North East Somerset;
8. Addressing food poverty may contribute to improving the health, wellbeing, education and independence of local residents; supporting the local food economy; and reducing environmental impacts.

Council therefore:

9. Commends the invaluable work done by local charities, churches and food banks in Bath and North East Somerset to support people facing food poverty and crisis;
10. Requests the Children, Health & Wellbeing Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel to work with local organisations and develop recommendations for a Food Poverty Action Plan for Bath and North East Somerset; and
11. Requests that the Cabinet investigate refreshing the Local Food Strategy for Bath and North East Somerset.

[Notes;

1. *During debate, an unsuccessful amendment was moved by Councillor Liz Hardman, and seconded by Councillor Robin Moss, to take the recommendations a stage further with specific areas for the Action plan to include. This was lost, on a vote of 8 Councillors voting in favour, 40 Councillors voting against and 2 Councillors abstaining.*
2. *The substantive motion was then carried unanimously.]*

32 MOTION FROM THE LABOUR GROUP - THE FUTURE OF FIRST BUS

On a motion from Councillor Jo Wright, seconded by Councillor Joel Hirst, it was

RESOLVED

Council notes that:

1. FirstGroup, which operates First Bus along with GWR Franchise, is considering a sale of its UK businesses;
2. FirstGroup has confirmed that it intends to divest itself of First Bus;
3. The completion of the Bus Strategy by the West of England Combined Authority (WECA) Mayor is progressing slowly and the options available through WECA are to pursue 'Advanced Quality Partnerships', 'Enhanced Partnerships' or franchising, with the greatest opportunities for control, as well as the greatest financial challenges, being through franchising.

This Council believes that:

4. Bus services are a vital component of our transport system. Excellent bus services help to encourage bus usage, create sustainable growth, reduce social isolation and support people to get out of their cars. This in turn has a positive impact on pollution, congestion and climate change;
5. It is in the interests of all residents that Councils and WECA have more influence over the routes, timetables, fares and vehicle emissions related to bus services;
6. First operates 90% of the bus services in Bath and North East Somerset, and any change to the management of First Bus must not be at the expense of local bus services;

7. First Bus is a significant local employer and uncertainty about the future of the company must be resolved in the interests of its employees.

Council resolves to:

8. Call upon the WECA Mayor to complete the Bus Strategy without delay and ask the Leader to use her position on the West of England Combined Authority Committee to press for improved bus services across B&NES and the swift completion of the Bus Strategy, these improvements should include considering:
 - a. using the new powers in the Bus Services Act 2017 to bring about change;
 - b. Moving from a de-regulated bus system to a system where Council and users have more control, which works better for users and Local Authorities;
 - c. Devoting sufficient resources to the Bus Strategy to ensure that it covers rural bus services, school bus services and other services with social value;
 - d. Improving public transport so that it becomes an attractive alternative to driving in both urban and rural settings;
 - e. Ensuring that all buses run on ultra-low-emission or zero-emission fuels by January 2021;
 - f. Creating a new dynamic partnership with bus operators to increase bus usage;
 - g. the opportunities of working with non-profit providers.
9. Ask the Leader to communicate this position to the WECA Mayor and local MPs.

[Notes;

1. *The original motion included with the agenda, moved by Councillor Robin Moss, and seconded by Councillor Chris Dando, was subsequently replaced by the successful amendment above with 36 Councillors voting in favour, and 13 Councillors voting against.*
2. *The vote on the substantive motion was then carried with 44 Councillors voting in favour and 5 Councillors abstaining.]*

33 MOTION FROM THE LABOUR GROUP - CLEAN UP BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET

On a motion from Councillor Grant Johnson, seconded by Councillor Robin Moss, it was

RESOLVED unanimously that

Council notes that:

1. Bath Live and the Bath Chronicle have launched a campaign to Clean Up Bath;

2. The actions of the Council's contractors, 3GS, in fining a resident £150 for feeding pigeons have resulted in national interest in the way in which this Council addresses the problem of litter;
3. There is widespread concern about litter among communities not only in Bath but also in North East Somerset and that residents would like to see action taken.

This Council believes that:

4. The Clean Up Bath campaign is to be welcomed. Responsibility for keeping our streets, playgrounds and parks clean rests with us all. However, this Council must accept that it has a lead role in addressing littering;
5. Any action taken to tackle littering must be proportionate.

Council resolves therefore:

6. To ask the Climate Change and Sustainability Policy Development and Scrutiny to undertake a full review into littering in Bath and North East Somerset This review should assess the scale of the problem and identify a range of measures that could help to eliminate litter from our area including:
 - a. Working with businesses to ensure that they are not encouraging the feeding of gulls;
 - b. Investigating ways of reducing littering in parks, whether by providing more recycling and waste facilities or encouraging visitors to our parks to be more responsible with their litter;
 - c. Promoting the Green Flag award which sets the benchmark standard for the management of recreational outdoor spaces;
 - d. Promoting the formation of Friends of Parks to help improve public opens spaces in the context of diminishing Council resources;
 - e. Investigating what more the Council can do to support and encourage existing and new community anti-litter groups;
 - f. Investigating the potential for a competition to identify the cleanest street, park and playground in Bath and North East Somerset; and
 - g. Continuing to review the working of 3GS to ensure that it is meeting the requirements of its contract with Bath and North East Somerset Council and that its enforcement action is proportionate and is focused on the issues of greatest concern to the public.

[Notes:

1. *The successful resolution above contains wording changes proposed as an amendment by Councillor David Wood, seconded by Councillor Sue Craig, which was accepted into the substantive by the mover and seconder.]*

34 MOTION FROM THE CONSERVATIVE GROUP - B&NES TRANSPORT OPTIONS BETWEEN BRISTOL AND BATH

This item was carried over to the next regular meeting of Council.

35 MOTION FROM THE CONSERVATIVE GROUP - MAINTAINING OUR HERITAGE

This item was carried over to the next regular meeting of Council.

36 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

There were none.

The meeting ended at 9.55 pm

Chairman

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

COUNCIL MEETING 11th JULY 2019

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

- Bob Hollingdale
Re: Uber
- Paul Roles
Re: Uber
- Andrew Pattie
Re: Clean Air Zone
- Martin Grixoni
Re: Clean Air Zone
- Mark MacDonnell
Re: Clean Air Zone
- Gemma Killick
Re: Residents' parking/traffic control on Junction Road and environs
- Jane Middleton
Re: Food Poverty
- Celia McCarthy
Re: 5G in Bath
- Emma Shaw
Re: 5G in Bath
- Jamie Hughes
Re: Air quality/pollution in Bath

This page is intentionally left blank

Andrew Pattie statement

Chairman, Councillors. Thank you for granting me this opportunity to speak. I want to talk about probably the most important matter that will affect the city over the next five years the Clean Air Zone CAZ. The question that comes to mind is why has everything gone so quiet? The previous administration involved us in an extensive consultation, received a clear answer that the people of Bath favoured the option C, the Government agreed with this option and praised the authority for the way it had handled the process. And as far as everyone was concerned, we're off. It's exciting, it's a new plan, lots of mitigation, it'll reduce Nox emissions, it'll probably reduce traffic too, what's not to like? Then we have an election, we have a new administration and then.... complete silence, the whole issue of CAZ disappears like a puff of smoke. I think, what the people of Bath would like to know is, what on earth is going on? Why the silence. Are the liberal democrats completely flummoxed by the whole thing or is there some secret agenda. Not good options those for the people of Bath are they: no idea what your doing, or scary secret agenda to tax polluting vehicles £3,000 a year. My advice to you is to stop fiddling around in your usual way, make a decision and get on with it. By the way, if you do decide that your national Liberal Democrat agenda to big up your eco-credentials ends up with you deciding upon Clear Air Zone D for Bath, destroying the City's economy and impoverishing the young, the old and the poor, well beware for the people of this city will not forgive you. Nor should they.

This page is intentionally left blank

11.7.19.

Mr. Grixoni

re. CAZ,

Why have I taken the trouble to come here today?

The main reason is I believe the people and businesses of Bath and North East Somerset deserve clarity over the CAZ and traffic management direction of the new Council.

They need to be held to account for the decisions they have or have not taken, might or maybe should take in the future. On behalf of those concerned locals, we would like some answers!

It is proposed to spend a £100,000 of Council tax payers money on a new study, and yet we have virtually nothing to work with or discuss. You asked that we appreciate you need time - as I might put it: to 'put your mark on it', and whilst we're appreciating that, the council coffers are surely depreciating for a little needed study.

You claimed that the previous administrations' plans were only a half-hearted attempt to solve the problem, and that you would introduce a wide range of measures, yet give little clue as to what they might be. Are you deriding the previous models that indicated compliance was possible by 2021 with a cat C CAZ? What are the terms of reference for the new study? How are the public going to be involved in it?

Your spokesman for 'Clean Air' Richard Samuel also stated that you will publish your proposals for Cabinet approval by late summer, and that you overall will definitely not be charging cars, despite previously saying the sensible proposals already agreed 'do not go far enough'. There has been a lot of people wondering what you meant by that, and they surely have a right to know. Might it be greater charges for all the other vehicles? This could adversely affect business – some large, but also many small. What on earth else could 'not going far enough' mean?

Surely it should be incumbent to include the people of Bath that have concerns and indeed fears over what you might propose. You claimed that you will 'work with local residents', and yet there has been nothing concrete to work with, and little interaction. This can hardly instil confidence, and I have met many folk that are wary of your intentions and are wanting greater transparency, plus a clear way forward that they can discuss and input to. What they do not want is a bunch of Liberal elites from the Meadows deciding what's best for them, not providing information in good time, then foisting something ill thought through and under-discussed on to the hard working people of BANES.

There are enough difficulties in the world that need clarity; surely with openness and discussion, followed by sensible and workable solutions such as that which we already had, we can stand a far better chance of getting what is best for the people of BANES. We should surely work together on this, as it should be above party politics and not risking the livelihoods and businesses that make Bath such a prosperous and sought after place for both business and living. There was a lot of hard work put in to get Bath to this point, so let's not damage it by over-extending ourselves. Let's have an open and constructive debate.

Can you take the trouble to be careful of ALL those you represent?

This page is intentionally left blank

Mark Mac Donnell issues raised changing from CAZ Class C to Class D:

What do you say to the parent that needs to drive their children through Bath every day to drop off their children at school and cannot afford to upgrade their car?

Some people are driven into Bath by relatives or friends for church, medical appointments and social events on a regular basis. These are often vulnerable people that rely on others to get around- will they hesitate to ask friends/neighbours/family to help them if they cannot afford to pay the charge?

Some people are worried about using the internet for payment of the charge, and the severe penalty for not paying on time; will they avoid coming into Bath?

The High Street is in a crisis, Bath is losing out to other towns nearby. This will be a reason for not coming to Bath. We don't want Bath to be a theme park for tourists, we need Bath to be a sustainable place to live, shop and work.

The streets outside the Zone will become more congested and polluted with people parking there to avoid the charge.

Rat runs will be created to avoid the Zone. In addition to residential areas, most schools are outside the Zone and will be adversely affected from the increase in polluting traffic from those trying to avoid the zone.

One rat run will be the toll bridge at Batheaston which is ill equipped structurally to cope with a large increase in traffic.

The people of Bath have been consulted in 2015 and requested that we go for the Class C CAZ with improvements to infrastructure, please listen to the people – a solution has been found and the natural cycle of changing to newer less polluting cars will decrease the amount of NO2 in time. Let us encourage this change without excluding the vulnerable and low/medium income households from Bath.

Let us create an infrastructure of charging points that will encourage people to switch to electric. Then, in 3-5 years' time there will be a sizeable supply of affordable second hand hybrids/electric cars that are low polluting and energy efficient.

This page is intentionally left blank

STATEMENT TO COUNCIL MEETING 11 JULY 2019: Jane Middleton

When I came to speak at the last meeting here, I asked you to be the council that put an end to food poverty in Bath and North East Somerset. So I'd like to thank the Lib Dem group for taking the first step towards that by putting forward a motion on food poverty. I am hugely grateful that you have given this issue priority, and especially grateful to Ruth Malloy, proposer of the motion, for reassuring me of her commitment to it.

Now that this motion is before you, you have a chance to change the lives of the thousands of people in Bath and North East Somerset who cannot afford to put food on the table. Because food poverty is so devastating in its impact – and especially because it disproportionately affects children, the disabled and the long-term sick – it's vital that the motion you vote on tonight clearly defines the council's priorities and the most effective agenda for the food poverty action plan. To achieve this, I believe the motion needs to be strengthened in two ways:

- First, it must make an unequivocal statement about Council responsibility and accountability, by saying that it will put food poverty at the heart of all its policy making. This is a point I stressed in my last statement, and it will send out a powerful message that hunger is unacceptable here in our community and that the Council is serious about addressing it. But responsibility is also about recognising that the Council is the biggest referrer to food banks locally. And that it must therefore use every lever at its disposal to intervene on food poverty *before* people have to resort to food banks. It should, for example ensure that the Welfare Support Scheme hands out food bank referrals as a last resort, not a first, as I believe happens too often now.

- Secondly, the motion must formally recognise that hunger – the most extreme manifestation of food poverty – needs urgent priority attention. It should do this by including concrete proposals, such as:

- Measuring the extent of food poverty and setting targets for its reduction
- And pledging to prioritise feeding hungry children – through holiday projects, through school breakfast clubs, and through improving uptake of free school meals. There are examples available of councils tackling children's food poverty – Hampton & Fulham council offers one model, for example, and Bristol another.

Everything I have just suggested is currently under consideration by Guildford Council – like Banes, a new Lib Dem council – following a Lib Dem-led report into food poverty there. It's a brilliant report, and if in Guildford they can make a strong mission statement on food poverty, backed up by powerful action, we can do it here too. So please, use tonight to make this motion as powerful and effective as possible. Because there are so many local people whose well-being depends on it.

Celia Mccarthy statement

I'm here to talk to you about why I think Bath should join Brussels in delaying the roll out of 5G until we have more robust evidence that it is safe.

I'm not a scientist or an expert in electromagnetic radiation, but I have read enough evidence to be sure that we need to slow down and ask questions.

For those who are new to this subject let me give you a brief overview. 5G is the fifth generation of mobile phone networks. But it's not just one step up from 4G in the way previous upgrades were. According to the BBC: 5G is a "brand new radio technology" and will be between "10 and 20 times faster" than 4G [1].

To achieve this, 5G will utilize high frequency, 'millimeter' radio waves. Its delivery will also be different, because these higher frequency band widths are only effective over short distances many more antennas are required - resulting in antennas on lampposts, rooftops and bus stops, spaced every 10 to 12 houses in urban areas [2].

Think of a city blanketed in a network of coverage. This is an extra layer of new and higher frequency electromagnetic pollution on top what we already have. The long-term effects of this, in particularly relating to children and pregnant women have simply not been tested.

Recognizing this, in April of this year Brussels halted work on preparing for 5G networks citing health concerns. I want to quote Environment minister Céline Fremault directly, she said.

"I cannot welcome such technology if the radiation standards, which must protect the citizen, are not respected, 5G or not. The people of Brussels are not guinea pigs whose health I can sell at a profit. We cannot leave anything to doubt." [3]

In addition more than 230 independent scientists and physicians from 35 countries have also signed a letter recommending a moratorium on 5G roll-out until radiation levels are proven safe. [4]

And for those who make money out of assessing risk 5G is ringing alarm bells. In 2015 CFC Underwriting, a Lloyds-backed insurance company excluded compensation claims for injury and illness caused by electromagnetic radiation. This type of exclusion is fast becoming the norm as insurance companies weigh up the evidence [5].

Swiss Re one of the world's largest insurers says of 5G. "To allow for a functional network coverage and increased capacity overall, more antennas will be needed, including acceptance of higher levels of electromagnetic radiation...Existing concerns regarding potential negative health effects from electromagnetic fields are only likely to increase. An uptick in liability claims could be a potential long-term consequence. [6].

I think we should join cities such as Florence, Geneva and closer to home Glastonbury in putting a hold on 5G until more independent research is conducted. [7 &8]

REFERENCES

- 1) <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-44871448>
- 2) <https://www.bcs.org/content-hub/is-5g-dangerous/>
- 3) <https://www.brusselstimes.com/brussels/55052/radiation-concerns-halt-brussels-5g-for-now/>
- 4) <https://www.5gappeal.eu/>
- 5) <https://www.computerweekly.com/feature/Mobile-phones-and-health-is-5G-being-rolled-out-too-fast#Insurance>
- 6) <https://www.swissre.com/institute/research/sonar/sonar2019/SONAR2019-off-the-leash.html>
- 7) <https://www.bristolpost.co.uk/news/bristol-news/5g-bad-you-protesters-storm-3059551>
- 8) <https://www.somersetlive.co.uk/news/somerset-news/glastonbury-residents-resist-5g-rollout-2667704>

Emma Shaw statement

I've been living in Bath for 20 years, and am a mother of two. I'm concerned about 5G increasing the level of electromagnetic radiation in my city.

It's common knowledge that more than 230 independent scientists and physicians from 35 countries have signed a letter recommending a halt on 5G roll-out until it is proven to be safe and also that Brussels have recently halted 5G over radiation concerns. [1 &2]

Those facts aside I want to ask you all to think about what 5G will mean for our city visually and culturally.

We all know that Bath is a UNESCO world heritage city. It's unique setting, history and architecturally important buildings making it both a pleasure to live in but also a huge draw for the millions of tourist who come every year.

But this status is put at risk when substantial changes happen, as was the case in 2009 with the developments of Southgate and Western Riverside as well as in 2017 with the proposed Bathampton Park and Ride. So it's worth us all being mindful of things that might put our UNESCO heritage status at risk.

5G necessitates the use of small-cell antennas normally spaced approximately 500 feet apart [3]. They range in size "from about 4 feet tall, with some as large as a refrigerator"[4]. Post changes to the National Planning Policy Framework in 2019 no planning permission is required for their erection [5].

This means that if a mobile phone company wants to instal a mast on a lamppost directly outside your home, or on the bus stop outside your children's school - they don't need planning permission to do so you just have to accept it.

In a historically important city like Bath, full to the brim with listed Georgian buildings and with very strict planning and conservation criteria, this lack of accountably seems totally inconsistent.

But there is much we can do. According to Historic England, Article 4 can be used to "control works that could threaten the character of an area of acknowledged importance, such as a conservation area". [6]

According to the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework: Local planning authorities can use article 4 to impose a ban on "new electronic communications development in certain areas" and "insist on minimum distances between new electronic communications development". It recommends that local planning authorities do not do either of these - whilst at the same time admitting that legally we can. [5]

I think we need a public consultation on this to allow the people of Bath to make a fully informed choice.

- 1) <https://www.brusselstimes.com/brussels/55052/radiation-concerns-halt-brussels-5g-for-now/>
- 2) <https://www.5gappeal.eu/>
- 3) <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/5g-devices-are-about-to-change-your-life/>
- 4) <https://interestingengineering.com/the-danger-of-5g-5th-generation-cellular-technology-might-be-a-threat-to-public-health>

- 5) [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF Feb 2019 revised.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf)
- 6) <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/hpg/historic-environment/article4directions/>

Jamie Hughes statement

Air pollution is now causing more deaths than smoking. Except unlike smoking, we have no choice in the air we breathe and it affects everyone, especially children and babies (4.). Leading experts are calling this a public health emergency (5.) and calling for urgent drastic action. Pollution causes a vast number of serious health issues, both physical and mental, with an estimated cost to the UK economy of £20bn a year (10.).

Bath is infamous for its pollution levels. Legislation states Nitrogen Dioxide levels must not exceed national limits more than 18 times a year, yet on London Road the levels are being exceeded twice every weekday (12.). In short, the air we breathe is literally illegal - and for some reason all pollution monitoring stations in Bath have recently been closed. Also; fine particulate matter, produced by all vehicles, is so harmful there is no safe level. The council have recently declared a climate emergency, so I'm wondering how you consider the clean air zone, which doesn't include cars, to be anywhere near significant enough to combat what you yourselves have called an emergency? Councillors have said "Bath will only comply with national standards if a dramatic reduction in car use along London Road takes place" and that "...everything from cars to coaches had to be included to hit the target". So by leaving out cars, you've acknowledged your plan will fail before it's even begun. Surely, having since declared a climate emergency, your plans now need re-evaluating?

I respect the potential concerns of local businesses, but we're talking about the health and future of our children. I'm sure many companies suffered as a result of the abolishment of slavery or child labour. Do we regret these changes now? The smoking ban wasn't popular with everyone at the time, but if a cafe was full of smoke now, we would probably chose not to take our children there. Yet our children are exposed to toxic air every time they go outside.

It's horrible feeling so powerless, knowing what is happening to my family - we can literally taste the pollution when we go outside. The only power I have is to campaign, protest and to talk until that light goes red. But you have real power. If the drinking water in Bath was found to be poisonous I'm sure you would act. Action is needed that is proportionate to the problem. With the current clean air strategies, it feels like you're tackling a wild fire with a water pistol.

One scheme I'd like to propose, which wouldn't penalise drivers financially, is 'Car-Free Sundays' in central Bath. This wouldn't be the only answer, but it would be a step forward. This is already happening elsewhere (11.) and it would show us what this amazing city could be like without traffic. Even if just for one day a week, it would get us out of our cars. It would set an example for the rest of the UK. Why not embrace the challenge to be a leader in tackling this crisis? Imagine Bath with more space for cycling, walking and for children and nature to thrive. We must be forward-thinking and radical in our approach to making Bath a healthier place to live, work and visit. Not in a few years time but now. Clean air is a basic human right. The climate emergency has been declared, now serious action must be taken. Our health is in your hands.

This page is intentionally left blank