

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING

Tuesday 21st February 2023

Present:- **Councillors** Rob Appleyard, Colin Blackburn, Alison Born, Shelley Bromley, Neil Butters, Sue Craig, Paul Crossley, Chris Dando, Jess David, Tom Davies, Sally Davis, Winston Duguid, Mark Elliott, Michael Evans, Andrew Furse, Kevin Guy, Alan Hale, Liz Hardman, Joel Hirst, Lucy Hodge, Duncan Hounsell, Shaun Hughes, Dr Eleanor Jackson, Grant Johnson, Dr Kumar, Hal MacFie, Ruth Malloy, Paul May, Sarah Moore, Robin Moss, Michelle O'Doherty, Lisa O'Brien, Bharat Pankhania, June Player, Vic Pritchard, 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** Tim Ball, Sarah Bevan, Vic Clarke, Gerry Curran, Douglas Deacon, Steve Hedges, Matt McCabe and Paul Myers.

72 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair asked the Democratic Services Manager to read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

73 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Monitoring Officer issued a general dispensation for all Councillors who pay Council Tax or were School Governors and therefore had an interest in these items, to enable them to take part in the debate and vote on agenda item 8 - Budget & Council Tax 2023/24.

In addition, specific dispensations were granted for the following Councillors;

- Councillor O'Brien – a family member in receipt of adult social care services.
- Councillor Craig – a family member in receipt of a social care package from B&NES.
- Councillor Warren – a family member in receipt of an EHCP.

The following declarations of interest were also made;

- Councillor Simmons – Chairman of Keynsham & District Dial a Ride – non-pecuniary.
- Councillor Davies – spouse is Treasurer/a Trustee of Cleveland Pools Trust – non-pecuniary.

- Councillor Jackson – member of Church Council of Trinity Methodist church, Radstock & Westfield – non-pecuniary.
- Councillor Hodge – Chair of the charity The Friends of B&NES Society of Young Musicians – non-pecuniary.

74 MINUTES - 17TH NOVEMBER 2022 & 19TH JANUARY 2023

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

RESOLVED that the minutes of 17th November 2022 and 19th January 2023 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

The Chair made various housekeeping announcements, followed by the following statement;

I am delighted to inform council that B&NES Building Control Team was announced 'team of the year' at the national local authority building control building excellence awards. The awards celebrate best practice and quality in construction and are attended by more than 850 leading construction industry figures.

The awarding panel stated that our building control customer service is exemplary with a full programme of engagement including regular email communications, technical seminars, and focused updates. The team works with over 40 partner companies, one of whom said, "B&NES Building Control are generous in providing clear, sensible and pragmatic advice and support during the design process and are keen to help find solutions when problems arise."

Many congratulations to Phil Mansfield and the team; it is fantastic to see their proactive approach to working with local businesses and the quality of their work validated by national private and public sector partners. Well done to all!

The Chair further informed Council that it had been a great honour to welcome the Queen Consort for a visit to the Royal Osteoporosis Society to launch their new buildings in Bath: a charity for which she has been a great ambassador and patron for a number of years.

76 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There were no items of urgent business.

77 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Statements were made by the following members of the public;

Martin Thomas made a statement about Residents' parking zones (RPZs). He commented that the views from the consultation had not been taken properly into

consideration, and partial support had been taken to mean full support. He expressed the view that the RPZs appeared to be a means of increasing revenue regardless of them being very unpopular in the community and suggested there were other ways to limit traffic that would have less of a negative effect on local families and businesses. Councillor Vic Pritchard referred to Mr Thomas having proposed 3 hour parking zones as an alternative and enquired if this had the support of other residents. Mr Thomas replied that quite a few comments he had received had expressed a wish for something along those lines.

David Redgewell made a statement about bus services, in particular those serving the rural communities, acknowledging they are the responsibility of WECA but noting that WECA do not have precepting powers. He called for longer term planning to be in place so passengers could rely upon these services and investment could be made. He concluded by saying that the transport infrastructure needed to be handed to WECA. Councillor Guy asked if Mr Redgewell was aware of WECA's proposal for the 522 service through Paulton and other villages, to which he replied that he was. Councillor Pritchard referred to the mention of the 672 service from Blagdon through Chew Valley to Bristol and that subsidy would be required from the 3 unitary authorities and asked if Mr Redgewell was aware if there had been any negotiation yet on this. He replied that he understood the Mayor had been trying to achieve this, but as Bristol City Council were cutting their bus budget, this was a serious problem. Councillor Moss asked if Mr Redgewell was aware if an equalities impact assessment had been carried out by B&NES regarding the cuts in rural buses, and Mr Redgewell replied that he was concerned as this had not taken place by any of the councils, despite him trying to push for this and it needed to be revisited. A full copy of the statement has been added to the Minute book.

Rosemary Naish made a statement expressing her concern about the future of rural bus services. Councillor Guy asked Ms Naish if she agreed that the £50 million Dan Norris has to spend should be used to supply bus routes in North East Somerset, to which Ms Naish replied that she did not know about that. Councillor Pritchard asked Ms Naish to clarify her comment that all rural transport had been removed, to which she replied that it was all rural subsidised transport. Councillor Hardman asked if Ms Naish agreed that Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) was not a substitute for a regular service; to which she responded that she did agree. A full copy of the statement has been added to the Minute book.

Bob Goodman made a statement touching on a number of aspects about Bath, including remembrance events funding, gull prevention measures, the commercial estate, city centre security measures, Residents' Parking Zones and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. Councillor Guy asked Mr Goodman if he was aware that the Royal British Legion and the military will get exactly the service they asked for with no difference in cost, to which Mr Goodman replied that it was only from Bath paying for it. Councillor Pritchard asked if Mr Goodman would agree that Bath residents feel they're living in a completely different city than they did 4 years ago, to which Mr Goodman replied that he wholeheartedly agreed. Councillor Blackburn asked if all the positive gains against the plight of the gulls will be undone by the cutting of the prevention measures, to which Mr Goodman replied that he had no doubt that was the case. Councillor Moss asked if Mr Goodman was aware that residents in North East Somerset pay for remembrance events through the additional parish precepts and would be unhappy to subsidise Bath as well as their own, Mr Goodman replied

that they were already subsiding Bath. A full copy of the statement has been added to the Minute book.

Graham Pristo made a statement stating that low traffic neighbourhoods were pitting neighbourhoods and businesses against each other at a time when the city needed a chance to recover. He also commented on the commitment from Councillor Guy to build 100 new affordable homes, in the context of 6000 households on the waiting list for such accommodation, but having looked for where these were, had not yet been able to identify this, as those he was aware of were earmarked for specific groups. Councillor Guy referred to Mr Pristo's comment that he had never seen the city so diverse and asked if he considered this a problem, to which Mr Pristo replied that was not his intention and he had probably used the wrong term. Councillor Pritchard asked, with reference to the Councillor Guy interview that Mr Pristo had mentioned, whether he now found the interview to be misleading and giving a false sense of security, to which Mr Pristo replied that he did. Councillor Blackburn asked if a BBC listener should expect to hear factual information from broadcast interviews and, if that had not taken place, whether an apology should be issued by the Leader. Mr Pristo agreed that it should.

A statement from Ann Perry who was unable to attend the meeting at short notice was read out by Graham Pristo. Ms Perry's statement set out her concerns regarding the RPZ programme. A full copy of the statement has been added to the Minute book.

Louisa McFarland addressed the Council about the former land site at Entry Hill, raising concerns about its safety. Councillor Pritchard asked what sort of assurances Ms McFarland would expect from the Council, to which she replied that she would like the Council to test the water in Lyn Brook for certain pesticides plus an assurance that all mitigating measures would be carried out before any development on the site. A full copy of the statement has been added to the Minute book.

David Pye, a business owner in Moorland road and Chair of the Moorland Road Association, explained his view that the RPZ proposal for the Oldfield Park area was a disaster for the High Street and asked for it to be reconsidered. He reported survey results that demonstrated local residents and businesses were opposed. A Monday – Friday enforcement would be better. He stressed there was still time to make changes before July and hoped that local businesses could expect the support of their local Council. Councillor Rigby asked if Mr Pye would be prepared to meet him to which he replied that he would. Councillor Pritchard referred to Mr Pye's comment in his statement that their requests to meet Councillors had not been successful and asked if he knew why that might be the case, to which Mr Pye responded that he assumed it was because decision makers did not want to discuss it. Councillor Blackburn asked Mr Pye if he agreed that the community engagement had been a waste of time if the outcomes appeared predetermined, to which he replied that he did.

The statements were referred to the relevant Cabinet Members.

78 BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2023/24 & FINANCIAL OUTLOOK

The Council considered a report which presented the revenue and capital budgets together with proposals for increases in Council Tax and the Adult Social Care Precept for 2023/24.

On a motion from Councillor Richard Samuel, seconded by Councillor Kevin Guy, it was

RESOLVED

1. To approve

- a) The General Fund net revenue budget for 2023/24 of £131.03m and the individual service cash limits for 2023/24 as outlined in Annex 1;
- b) The savings and income plans outlined in Annex 2(i), funding requirements 2(ii), in conjunction with the Equalities Impact Assessment Report in Annex 3.
- c) An increase in Council Tax of 2.99% in 2023/24 (an increase of £47.10 per Band D property or 91p per week).
- d) An increase of 2% to Council Tax for the Adult Social Care Precept in recognition of the current demands and financial pressures on this service. This is equivalent to an increase of £31.50 on a Band D property (61p per week).
- e) The movement in reserves outlined in section 5.6 and the adequacy of Un-earmarked Reserves at £12.58m within a risk assessed range requirement of £11.6m - £12.8m.
- f) To note the Children's Services management plan set out in section 5.2.7 of the report.
- g) The Efficiency Strategy attached at Annex 4.
- h) The Capital Programme for 2023/24 of £87.89m including new and emerging capital bids outlined in Annex 5(i), planned sources of funding in 5.8.2, and notes the programme for 2024/25 to 2027/28 and that any wholly funded projects coming forward during the year will be added to the Capital Programme in line with the Budget Management Scheme.
- i) The delegation of implementation, subject to consultation where appropriate, of the capital programmes set out in Annex 5(i) to Annex 5(iv) to the relevant Director in consultation with the appropriate Portfolio Holder.
- j) The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) allocations and amendments outlined in Annex 5(v).
- k) The Capital & Investment Strategy attached at Annex 6.
- l) The MRP Policy attached at Annex 7.

- m) The Capital Prudential Indicators outlined in 5.8.6.
 - n) The Annual Pay Policy Statement at Annex 8.
 - o) The Community Contribution Fund pilot 12-month extension outlined section 5.5.
 - p) The Council Tax Support Scheme for 2023/24 shown in the following link and referred to in 5.3.5:
<https://beta.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-01/Proposed%20Council%20Tax%20reduction%20scheme%20April%201%202023%20-%20March%2031%202024.pdf>
 - q) To approve the Fees and Charges schedule for 2023/24 at Annex 11 and support its publication following approval of the budget.
2. That the Council approves the technical resolutions that are derived from the budget report, and all the figures in that report, including the precepts for towns, parishes and other precepting bodies as set out in Annex 12.
 3. That the Council note the S151 Officer's report on the robustness of the proposed budget and the adequacy of the Council's reserves outlined in 5.7.
 4. That Council note the budget consultation responses in Annex 10.

[Notes;

1. *An amendment was moved by Councillor Joanna Wright, and seconded by Councillor Robin Moss, to request a budget spend of £200,000 for a one-off school street in B&NES. This was lost on a named vote;*

Councillors in favour (10); - Councillors Colin Blackburn, Chris Dando, Liz Hardman, Shaun Hughes, Eleanor Jackson, Grant Johnson, Robin Moss, June Player, Karen Walker and Joanna Wright.

Councillors against (32) - Councillors Rob Appleyard, Alison Born, Shelley Bromley, Neil Butters, Sue Craig, Paul Crossley, Jess David, Tom Davies, Winston Duguid, Mark Elliott, Andy Furse, Kevin Guy, Joel Hirst, Lucy Hodge, Duncan Hounsell, Hal McFie, Ruth Malloy, Paul May, Sarah Moore, Michelle O'Doherty, Bharat Pankhania, Manda Rigby, Dine Romero, Mark Roper, Richard Samuel, Bruce Shearn, Alastair Singleton, Shaun Stephenson-McGall, Andy Wait, Sarah Warren, Ryan Wills and David Wood.

Councillors abstaining (9) – Councillors Sally Davis, Michael Evans, Alan Hale, Yuktेशwar Kumar, Lisa O'Brien, Vic Pritchard, Brian Simmons, Karen Warrington and Chris Watt.
2. *The above successful resolution was carried on a named vote;*

Councillors in favour (32); - Councillors Rob Appleyard, Alison Born, Shelley Bromley, Neil Butters, Sue Craig, Paul Crossley, Jess David, Tom Davies, Winston Duguid, Mark Elliott, Andy Furse, Kevin Guy, Joel Hirst, Lucy Hodge, Duncan Hounsell, Hal McFie, Ruth Malloy, Paul May, Sarah Moore, Michelle O'Doherty, Bharat Pankhania, Manda Rigby, Dine Romero, Mark Roper, Richard Samuel, Bruce Shearn, Alastair Singleton, Shaun Stephenson-McGall, Andy Wait, Sarah Warren, Ryan Wills and David Wood.

Councillors against (19); - Councillors Colin Blackburn, Chris Dando, Sally Davis, Michael Evans, Alan Hale, Liz Hardman, Shaun Hughes, Eleanor Jackson, Grant Johnson, Yuktेशwar Kumar, Robin Moss, Lisa O'Brien, June Player, Vic Pritchard, Brian Simmons, Karen Walker, Karen Warrington, Chris Watt and Joanna Wright.]

79 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT 2023/24

The Council considered a report which fulfilled the Authority's legal obligation under the Local Government Act 2003 to have regard to the CIPFA Code to approve a treasury management strategy before the start of each financial year. This report was scrutinised by the Corporate Audit Committee at the 7th February 2023 meeting, and reported to Cabinet on 9th February 2023.

On a motion from Councillor Richard Samuel, seconded by Councillor Mark Elliott, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to agree to;

1. Approve the actions proposed within the Treasury Management Strategy Statement (Appendix 1);
2. Note the Treasury Management Indicators detailed in Appendix 1, and
3. Approve the adoption of the Treasury Management Clauses (Appendix 3).

80 AGREEMENT OF COUNCIL AGM DATE

The Council was asked to formally confirm it's annual meeting date.

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

RESOLVED to agree that the Council's Annual General meeting take place on 25th May 2023.

81 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

Councillor Kumar made a statement entitled 'Honesty is the best policy', in which he picked up on various aspects of the Administration's policies and highlighted his concerns about these.

Councillor Guy took this opportunity to apologise for an earlier remark made by him following the statements from the public, and also stated that he would apologise personally to the individual concerned.

82 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

On a motion from Councillor Karen Walker, seconded by Councillor Grant Johnson, it was

RESOLVED

that having been satisfied that the public interest would be better served by not disclosing relevant information, in accordance with the provisions of Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item(s) of business and the reporting of the meeting be prevented under Section 100A(5A) because of the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, as amended.

83 WAIVER OF 6 MONTH COUNCILLOR ATTENDANCE RULE

Section 85 (1) of the Local Government Act 1972 requires a member of a Local Authority to attend at least one meeting of that Authority within a period of six consecutive months, in order to avoid being disqualified as a Councillor. This requirement can be waived and the time limit extended, if any failure to attend was due to a reason approved by the Authority, in advance of the six month period expiring. The Council considered such a request.

On a motion from Councillor Karen Walker, seconded by Councillor Alan Hale, it was unanimously

RESOLVED

1. To note and approve the reason for the failure of Councillor Doug Deacon to attend meetings of the Council since 4th May 2021;
2. To approve a further period from this meeting until Monday 8th May (being the fourth day after the day of election on 4th May 2023, when a Councillor not elected ceases to be a Councillor), for the non-attendance at meetings of Council and its Committees by Councillor Doug Deacon, due to ill-health.

The meeting ended at 9.23 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

MEMBERS' CODE OF CONDUCT

Grant of a Dispensation

Name of Members	All Councillors
Meeting and item of business for which the dispensation has been sought	Full Council – 16 th February 2022 (Agenda item 8– Budget and Council Tax 2022/23 and Financial Outlook).
Reason for dispensation	The Monitoring Officer issued a general dispensation for all Councillors who pay Council Tax or were School Governors and therefore had an interest in these items, to enable them to take part in the debate and vote.

Having received a request at the meeting from the councillors requesting this dispensation, it was granted.

Signed**Michael hewitt**.....

M Hewitt
Monitoring Officer – Bath & North East Somerset Council

Dated 16th February 2022

This page is intentionally left blank

BATH & NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

MEMBERS' CODE OF CONDUCT

Grant of a Dispensation

Name of Member/s	Councillor Lisa O'Brien Councillor Sue Craig Councillor Sarah Warren
Meeting and item of business for which the dispensation has been sought	Full Council on 21.02.23 - Agenda item 8 Budget and Council Tax 2023/24 The councillors named above have requested dispensations as they or a member of their family are in receipt of Council Services mentioned in the Budget
Reason for dispensation	The Monitoring Officer issued a general dispensation to the above Councillors

Having received a request from the above Councillors requesting this dispensation, it was granted.

Signed**Michael Hewitt**.....

M Hewitt
Monitoring Officer – Bath & North East Somerset Council

Dated 21th February 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL MEETING 21ST FEBRUARY 2023

STATEMENTS FROM PUBLIC & COUNCILLORS

Public

1. Martin Thomas - Residents parking zones
2. David Redgewell - Transport issues
3. Rosemary Naish - Rural transport
4. Bob Goodman - Where is Bath going?
5. Graham Pristo - Bath in general
6. Ann Perry - Chelsea Road RPZ
7. Louisa McFarland - Entry Hill Golf course
8. David Pye - Proposed RPZs in the Moorland Road & Oldfield Park area

Councillors

1. Cllr Kumar - Honesty is the best policy

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M	01	Question from:	Cllr Karen Walker
<p>The combined authority are working to improve public transport, thanks to £540 million secured from Government through a successful city Region Sustainable transport settlement.</p> <p>Supported bus services, why has this Council chosen not to supported funding after June for:</p> <p>82 Paulton-Midsomer Norton-Paulton 172 Bath-Paulton 179 Midsomer Norton-Bath 672 Blagdon-Bristol 768 Midsomer Norton- Bath.</p> <p>What will happen to evening and night time workers, especially those that work in hospitality? Demand Responsive Transport stops at 7pm</p>			
Answer from:			Cllr Sarah Warren
<p><i>As the local Transport Authority, the West of England Combined Authority is responsible for bus services within the West of England B&NES has provided funding to continue the following bus services until the end of May 2023: 672, 82, 179, 172 and 768, to support communities in the transition to Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) services. B&NES is currently lobbying the combined authority to commit additional resources needed to support communities during the transition to DRT and to engage with all affected B&NES communities on the final design of the DRT, which should include hours of operation. The Metro Mayor also has approximately £50million of government funding available to provide new transport services through the Bus Service Improvement Plan. Therefore, we are also pressing the Mayor to confirm investment in five new spinal routes, which will complement the introduction of DRT and ensure bus provision for Chew Valley, Keynsham, Midsomer Norton, Radstock and Timsbury.</i></p>			

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P	01	Question from:	Lee O'Bryan
<p>It is evident that BANES faces significant short term financial challenges, for instance a BANES press release in November 2022 said that BANES is 'facing an unprecedented financial challenge '. It is my understanding that some services have already, and will in the very near future, need to be reduced / cut to meet budgets. Given this challenge, I do not understand why BANES undertook an asset transfer of land at Bathampton to the National Trust 'for a peppercorn rent'. Government guidance for some years has encouraged a flexible use of capital receipts, and this guidance states any such money can be used for revenue costs associated with transformation activities, including for instance, the revenue costs of activities to reduce costs, income generation, and also activities in support of more efficient provision of services. <i>I would like to know why BANES council decided to gift the land at Bathampton to the National Trust, and thereby forego the opportunity of securing hundreds of thousands of pounds of income, which could be used to help protect and improve current services to the residents of BANES, at a time of 'unprecedented financial challenge'.</i></p>			
		Answer from:	Cllr Richard Samuel
<p>The Council received an application from the National Trust in accordance with its Community Asset Transfer Policy and determined that a disposal at nil consideration was warranted in order to secure the promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of its area.</p>			
P	02	Question from:	Jackie Head
<p>I am a member of Chew Valley Area Forum Climate & Nature Emergency, Sustainable Transport working group, who have been working with officers in B&NES and WECA since 2021 to try to secure improved public transport services in the Chew Valley.</p> <p>Thank you for lobbying the WECA Mayor about the 5 new BSIP routes proposed to WECA, designed by them, tendered and bid for, before being dropped. 3 of them have a direct impact on the Chew Valley area (517, 526, 527) . We hope you are successful in this, as we believe they would give DRT a fighting chance of working and thus help to achieve the modal shift towards buses and decarbonisation that we so desperately need.</p>			

1. However, if you are unsuccessful, will you act to ensure spinal routes, needed for DRT, are in place. i.e

- **will you fight to re-instate the 672**, run by Eurostar, a greatly valued service and essential travel for many people who are vulnerable to loss of jobs, already living with social isolation and in poverty? This includes Ukrainian refugees, young people and working families as well as the elderly for whom it is a lifeline? As I write a new petition to save the 672 has over 500 signatures. If you calculate its carbon benefit by applying a carbon calculator to passenger uptake now (passengers x miles travelled) it may compare favourably with inner city routes with shorter average journeys per passenger
- **will also lobby for improvements to the 376 service on the A37/9 bus corridor**, given that this service is insufficiently frequent and too unreliable currently, to allow DRT to work effectively for the Chew Valley. It is run by First Bus, whose reputation is at an all time low in our area.

Answer from:

Cllr Sarah Warren

As the local Transport Authority, the West of England Combined Authority is responsible for bus services within the West of England

B&NES is pressing the Mayor to confirm investment in the five new spinal routes, funded via BSIP, which will complement the introduction of DRT and ensure bus provision for Chew Valley, Keynsham, Midsomer Norton, Radstock and Timsbury. I am also writing to the Mayor to support to the exceptional work undertaken by the Chew Valley Area Forum Climate & Nature Emergency working group which clearly sets out the case for the continued support for the 672 and improvements to the 376.

P 03

Question from:

Jackie Head

We understand that WECA only plans to move to begin community engagement about Demand Responsive Transport in March, and we fear this will be too late to prevent people, who are currently angry and anxious about bus cuts, from future-planning car use options (in some cases buying a car when they do not currently have one in others increasing car use) which would be a retrograde step in B&NES journey to net Zero plans . As a group we would like to set up community meetings to allay fears and assist the transition to using DRT at an earlier stage.

- Will B&NES offer support (potentially including financial support) to our group in booking community spaces, creating fliers/posters, exploring options for shared transport to get people to such events, and sending personnel to attend?

Answer from :		Cllr Sarah Warren
<p><i>As the local Transport Authority, the West of England Combined Authority is responsible for bus services within the West of England</i></p> <p><i>B&NES has pressed the Mayor to allocate resources to help local people make the switch to DRT, by engaging fully with local communities to raise awareness and support the transition to using the unfamiliar new system, and to publish a comprehensive funding and transition plan so that local authorities can effectively support all the activities identified. B&NES has provided funding to continue the following bus services until the end of May 2023: 672, 82, 179, 172 and 768, to support communities in the transition to Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) services. All B&NES funding that we have been able to secure has been devoted to continuing the above services until the end of May and unfortunately we are unable to support personalised travel planning.</i></p>		
P	04	Question from:
		Jackie Head
<p>Given that certain communities could be unduly disadvantaged financially or socially by any failure in DRT to deliver straight away, will B&NES commit to supporting those who are currently reliant on supported bus services to get support in journey planning, on an individual basis, and will you lobby WECA to put resource into this? I am in particularly thinking of the elderly, of those on low incomes, of Ukrainian Refugees, and of those who do not have access (and have no prospect of access) to the internet and smart phones.</p>		
Answer from:		Cllr Sarah Warren
<p><i>As the local Transport Authority, the West of England Combined Authority is responsible for bus services within the West of England</i></p> <p><i>B&NES has pressed the Mayor to allocate resources to help local people make the switch to DRT, by engaging fully with local communities to raise awareness and support the transition to using the unfamiliar new system, and to publish a comprehensive funding and transition plan so that local authorities can effectively support all the activities identified. B&NES has provided funding to continue the following bus services until the end of May 2023: 672, 82, 179, 172 and 768, to support communities in the transition to Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) services. All B&NES funding that we have been able to secure has been devoted to continuing the above services until the end of May and unfortunately we are unable to support personalised travel planning.</i></p>		
P	05	Question from:
		Jane Chapman

How much are Council Tax Arrears 2022?

Answer from:

Cllr Richard Samuel

As at 9 February 2023, the amount of Council Tax outstanding for 2022/23 is £5,755,017.08.

P 06

Question from:

Jane Chapman

What is the lost revenue to date from the closure of the Fashion Museum?

Answer from:

Cllr Richard Samuel

The Fashion Museum closed to the public at the end of October 2022. From November 2022 to January 2023; the lost revenue income has been £52,514. This is due to the National Trust exercising the lease termination clause which has required museum operations to cease at the Assembly rooms, until a new facility is opened there will be corresponding reductions in the operating costs to minimise the impact on the Council's revenue budget.

P 07

Question from:

Jane Chapman

How much is the cost for removal of modern white paint from the pillars in Bath Street?

Answer from:

Cllr Tim Ball

The work to remove and reinstate an appropriate finish to the columns in the colonnade in Bath Street will be carried out by the leaseholders in accordance with listed building consent 22/02699/LBA.

David Redgewell - Public statement.

Somerset catch the bus service campaign Bristol disability equalities forum Railfuture Severnside South west transport Network.

We are very concerned about the bus service cuts in the Greater Bristol and Bath city region.

Despite the government giving a further £ 80 million pounds of revenue support to bus services in England and £75 million pounds for fare capping till june of the £2 and £4 fare .

The Department for transport recent data reports that the city and county of Bristol, B&NES and North Somerset.

In Bristol city region South Gloucestershire county council less service cuts.

That bus service have been cut very badly in the city region through driver shortages and funding cuts .

Plus the clasp on HCT buses services.

By the council not setting a levy for bus service that allows for bus inflation.

At 47 % .

Many bus Bristol communities will be left without bus services or reduced services very different to the Bus service improvement plan the council signed up to as Highway Authority with B&NES council South Gloucestershire council and North Somerset council and Dan Norris the metro mayor of the West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority jointly with North Somerset council.

The plan is to protect orbital bus services to link with main line bus services and Demand responsive buses services for Deep rural areas.

And places like Brislington and Keynsham on the edge of rural North east Somerset.

But the bus service improvement plan is now very different to the submission to the secretary of state for transport and the Department for transport.

Bristol has one pilot area in Totterdown.

The council budget will cut off communities in South Bristol, East Bristol and North Bristol.

In the south of Bristol and North east Somerset.

The following services are withdrawn.

Leaving communities without bus services.

Services In Bath and North Somerset have been left with an extension only to june 2023

Are service 172 Bath spa bus and coach station Peasedown St John Radstock Westfield Midsomer Norton paulton and Wells bus and coach station.

Evening service.

Leaving the community with bus link back from college university work hospital and nighttime economy.

Operator First group plc.

Service 179 Bath spa bus and coach station to Timsbury Paulton and Midsomer Norton.

Operator CTC coaches.

With no replacement service.

Service 82 Midsomer Norton , Radstock

Paulton town service.

Operator libra Travel.

768 Bath spa bus and coach station to Radstock Midsomer Norton and Writhington .

CT Coaches of Radstock.

672 Bristol city centre Bedminster Bishopsworth Highridge Dundry Chew Magna Bishop sutton west Hartree and Blagdon.

Euro coaches .

D2 Bath spa bus and coach station to Midford Norton st Phillips Rode Beckington and Frome.

Keynsham town service 663 664 665

Is replace by a Demand response bus service.

But has no link to Whitchurch and South Bristol hospital.

And what happened to the 106 money

From the Cadbury quarter.

For the Town service.

Will the Demand responsive buses

Extend to Whitchurch and the Hospital

With the Chew valley if the bus service improvement plan route 527 is not let

From Bristol Anchor road to the Chew valley.

Or the 517 Chew Magna to Wells link not let

Will the Demand responsive bus services link in pensford or Farrington Guerny

With service 376 Street, Glastonbury Wells bus station, Chewton mendip Farrington Gurney, Clutton, pensford Whitchurch , Hengrove , Knowle Bristol Temple meads station Bristol bus and coach station.

And West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority support bus service

,379 bus service

Bath spa bus and coach station Peasedown St John Radstock Westfield Midsomer Norton paulton Clutton pensford Whitchurch Hengrove Knowle Bristol Temple meads station Bristol bus and coach station.

Where will the Transport interchanges be situated.

Or At Bristol Airport with stagecoach group Dml Deutsche bank/ Scottish city link bus service. Comfort delgro.

Plymouth coach station, Newton Abbott Exeter cullompton, Wellington Taunton Bridgwater East Brent churchill Bristol Airport and Bristol Bond street.

Will Chew valley Demand responsive buses link to this Network.

Or to 126 at Axbridge for cheddar Draycott, Westbury sub mendip and Wells bus and coach station or wincombe Banwell locking Weston bus and coach station.

Will the buses be big enough for commuter journeys or school or college movements.

Service 82 should be relet as Bus service improvement plan service.

518 or or 30 seat Demand responsive bus with fixed timming points.

All other B&NES rural bus services with those in North Somerset council area

With need Demand responsive buses run by vol or we DRT and we Transport solutions,

We are very concerned about the Ambulance company E-zec medical service merger with ERS medical services and funded by cairngorm capital. a hedge fund.

Will public money be protected.

Will we have enough bus drivers to run the services 70 buses and drivers .

The question of the bus service improvement plan grant bus service need addressing.

517 Chew valley to Wells bus station

518 Midsomer Norton to Radstock.

519 Keynsham town service.

526 Chew valley link.

527 Bristol to the Chew valley.

520 Longwell Green to Southmead hospital bus station.

521 to Hengrove.

523 Brislington circle.

525 Long Ashton to Hengrove hospital.

We should be following Devon Cornwall and Somerset county council s and

Rerouting support service and commercial bus services to add Bus service improvement plan grant.

Like the service 1 in Taunton which in the evening operators via silk mills park and ride Taunton,
musgrove park Hospital priorwoods

301 Combe Martin Ilfracombe Barnstaple bus and coach station now extended to Barnstaple Railway
station..

The Bath city bus services are only expended in Contract for 1 year .

Meaning investment in new buses will be very difficult.

For service 11 Bathampton to Bath bus and coach station.

12 Bath spa bus and coach to Haycombe cemetery.

No Faresaver buses

Service 20 circle bus via the RUH

Only route left with big lemon buses.

Exept Stockwood, Whitchurch,Hengrove imperial park in Bristol

22 Twerton to the university.

And First group Evening services an

2 Bath spa bus and coach station to mulberry park.

6 A Bath city centre to larkhall.

Service 4 4a Weston RuH hospital Bath bus and coach station and Oid Down park and ride.

779 Bath city centre East of Bath.

The following Bristol services are also withdrawn.

96 st Anne's park Brislington Knowle Hengrove, Whitchurch, Hartcliffe Hengrove hospital south
Bristol.

A bus of Brislington

No replacement service

636 Whitchurch ,Stockwood,Keynsham.

CTC coaches

513 , 514 Brislington town service.

Run by stagecoach west part DML Deutsche bank.

Part replacement Demand bus service's.

No to Knowle.

Service 516 .

Whitchurch estate ,Hengrove,Knowle.

506 Bristol city centre st Philip Lawrence hill Easton Eastville Horfield Southmead hospital bus station.

No replacement service.

Operated by big lemon bus company of Brighton Sussex.

52 Bishopsworth, South Bristol hospital Bristol city centre.

Transpora bus and coach services of North west England.

No replacement service.

672 Chew valley Bridgwater road Bishopsworth, Bedminster Bristol city centre.

Service extended until june 2023

By B&NES council.

512 Hengrove to Bedminster.

Euro coaches of yate Gloucestershire

511.Totterdown local service. To Bristol city centre

Euro coaches.

Part replacement Demand response buses.

Service 17 Keynsham Town centre Keynsham Railway station ,willsbridge longwell green,Hanham,kingswood cosham hospital, Hilfields staple hill,Fishponds Eastville park, Horfield Southmead hospital bus station.

Evening service withdrawn.

Service 47 Yate bus station Westerleight puckchurch Emerson green Downend oidbury court, Fishponds road,st werburgess and st Paul's Bristol.

Due to be withdrawn on 1st April 2023 .

No bus service was tendered by the West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority.

Operated by first group plc

Owned by pension funds staff union and local share holders.

It is not owned by an American family as Report on BBC radio Bristol breakfast programme and we own it .

Who gave alot of misleading information on Franchising of the west of England and North Somerset bus Network.

Service 10 Avonmouth Dock to Lawrence Weston Westbury on Trym Southmead hospital bus station, UWE bus station Bristol parkway station, Via Filton college Bradley stoke Aztec west Hortham Alverston Thornbury.

Is withdrawn from Southmead hospital bus station to Thornbury leaving no links to UWE bus station and Bristol parkway station or the Filton college.

Service 11 Shirehampton Westbury on Trym Southmead hospital bus station is withdrawn to UWE bus station Bristol parkway station and Filton college.

Theses service are operated by stagecoach west DML group Deutsche bank.

Stagecoach west are to run the Bristol park and ride service s

Portway parkway station Shirehampton station, sea mills HotWells, Bristol city centre Bristol Temple meads station and Broadmead.

Brislington park and ride Bristol Temple meads station Bristol city centre.

First group plc had offered to run the 349 Keynsham Brislington Arnos vale Bristol Temple meads station Bristol Broadmead and bus station via Brislington park and ride.

But the West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority decline the offer.

So we ask that Mayor Rees, Kevin Guy Leader of B&NES and Toby Savage Leader of South Gloucestershire council to work the west of England with North Somerset council to increase the transport levy to metro mayor Dan Norris to maintain the city and county of Bristol B&NES south Gloucestershire and North Somerset bus Network.

The only bus service improvement plan

Bus service in Bristol is Brislington park and ride to Keynsham and Paulton to Odd Down park and ride site.

No Brislington to Hengrove hospital.

Or Long Ashton park and ride site service to Hartcliffe and Hengrove hospital have been let by west of England mayoral combined transport Authority.

Bus Franchising will take 5 years to buy buses and Depots from First group and stagecoach group. In Bath ,Bristol weston super mare and Wells Somerset from First group and Patchway Depot Bristol from stagecoach group.

And require 600 buses to be purchased.

So is not the answer to the bus funding crisis in Bristol.

Regarding the city region Transport plan

And the A37 Bristol bus and coach station to Bristol Temple meads station Knowle Hengrove
Whitchurch pensford Clutton Farrington Gurney Chewton Mendip Wells bus and coach station
Glastonbury and street.

A367 Bath spa bus and coach station to Peasedown St John Radstock Westfield Midsomer, Norton
Farrington Gurney.

Chilcompton, Shepton Mallet and Wells bus and coach.

A4 Bath spa bus and coach station to Weston, Newbridge, Salford, Keynsham, Brislington, Arncliffe
vale, Bristol Temple meads and Bristol bus and coach station

The bus infrastructure along with staff and maintenance needs transferring to West of England
Mayoral Combined Transport Authority as is happening at Bristol city council.

Peter Travis Somerset catch the bus service campaign.

Somerset bus partnership.

David Redgewell Bristol Disability Equalities forum.

This page is intentionally left blank

Good evening.

Over the last few weeks many people have told me how worried they are about the future of buses in the rural areas – I share their concerns.

Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) has been around since 1980's, so there are a lot of data available on their success or failure rates. They can be very successful if they are in support of a regular bus service, especially in urban areas. But as a substitute for a regular bus, particularly in rural areas they don't work, and if they are introduced without accepting concessionary fares the outlook is very bleak.

Residents who don't drive, either for medical or financial reasons will find their lives blighted. The remaining residents will just start using their cars more – all the hard work to combat climate emergency will be undone.

Residents can not understand why all the council support for rural bus services has been removed, while retaining 100% in Bath, especially as Bath has only 43% of the total electorate!

If this change causes hardship then I can promise that in May the voters of North East Somerset will remember who is responsible.

This page is intentionally left blank

Bob Goodman statement

It was barely 2 weeks ago that I spoke at Cabinet exposing the deception that this council was cutting the entire budget for Remembrance Sunday and making yes making the residents of Bath pay for it instead of BANES. The Chronicle needs to expose this to its readers and not just regurgitate the press releases from the Leaders office saying everything will stay the same.

How amazing it was when the Leader of the Council in replying to my question to him said he would still want an invitation to the Remembrance Sunday if he was still the leader of the Council, let's hope for the City he won't be.. but if this not hypocrisy of the highest order I don't know what is.

He tried to defend the decision to cut the money from BANES budget because all the other Parishes pay for it themselves... how little does he know.

He failed to acknowledge that Bath produces the majority of the income for BANES. BUT worse that that he clearly does not appreciate that BANES pays for one Area Forum for Bath and yet including the Parish liaison meeting there are Six meetings that are funded by BANES which accounts to well beyond the budget for Remembrance Sunday for Bath. HOW FAIR IS THAT.

Residents of Bath this is the thin end of the wedge and a defining moment in the history of the City. What next.. well the cutting of the Gull budget is not getting the traction that it deserves. Perhaps if this Council dealt with waste better then the growth of the Gull population would have been reduced, where will the Gull population be in a few years if action is not taken?

Lib Dem propaganda leaflets suggest that millions have been spent on Parks- can we have a commitment not to reduce the Parks budget for Bath in the years to come.. but will anyone believe the Empty promises we have had from this Administration especially in the last 2 years.

I was particularly disappointed to listen to a speech by a Lib Dem Cllr immediately following my speech to Cabinet. He had been fed information about how wonderful the Commercial Estate was doing, to say it was economic with the truth was an understatement.

It doesn't take much to see for oneself the destruction of the City Centre and yes some shops are filling empty spaces but more are closing and as long as the Commercial Estate is being run as it is with NO direction then it has little chance of recovery. I say that not for any Political reason but from a desire to see a thriving City which we can once again be proud of.

OPEN your eyes , stop the ridiculous Ring of Steel where due to incompetence the budget increase in costs are breathtaking, interest alone would pay for Remembrance Sunday.

We in the city don't need poorly thought out RPZ's and LTN's, we need to show love and attention to our streets to attract back shops and offices to boost the local economy.

It is sad beyond belief that I have to once again come to the council to express my concerns with the demise of the City. Before finishing, I do urge all Bath Cllrs to vote against this budget and reinstate the Money for Remembrance Day.

This page is intentionally left blank

Ann Perry statement

My views and opinions are non-partisan. They are from the perspective of a Bathonian, who has lived and worked in the city their entire life.

I have decided to speak at today's meeting because I am passionate about the city, its local people and local business. I have a sustainable and environmentally focused retail business based on Chelsea Road, so I am also very aware of environmental issues.

The United Nations define sustainability as "meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs".

There is no doubt in my mind that we must all change our habits to protect the environment and the planet for future generations, however the definition also highlights the necessity to meet the needs of the present.

Who can be better placed to decide on matters that are important for the present, than the present themselves.

And it is essential that these views are allowed to be heard in equal measure in a fair and democratic process.

In the matter relating to the Residents' Parking Zones (RPZ) [Chelsea Road] it is my belief that this process was ignored and it was decided that the the opinions of the local residents did not matter, that their views were insignificant and that this policy was to be implemented regardless.

By taking such a dismissive and frankly authoritarian approach, you have demonstrated a total disregard for our long-standing democratic principles and acted as though you are above them.

The consultation reports are inaccurate and the data manipulated in order support a predetermined objective.

The LibDem group claims those that who partially supported the RPZ proposals did so as though they fully supported the proposals. This is delusional. I suggest that those that partially supported the proposals were saying "something needs to be done but we don't agree with what you want to do". It is equally valid to say that this group partially objected to the proposals.

If the aim of the proposals was to reduce the traffic flow caused by local residents driving around the neighbourhood in order to find a parking space near their homes, then other solutions could have been explored and trialed.

It is fact that the Chelsea Road area had previously asked for better enforcement of what were the existing parking restrictions, however this didn't happen. Had this action been taken, then local traffic flows would have been reduced.

Similarly, if the aim was just about stopping commuters, then why was a simple 3 hour restriction not implemented, without the need for introducing a mandatory parking permit?

The truth I fear is that the proposals are aimed less at reducing the environmental impact, but are more designed to increase local authority revenue. Yes, local authorities need revenue to provide valuable services, however these revenues shouldn't be generated in this manner.

In pursuing this agenda you failed to acknowledge the democratic wishes of the area and you have failed to consider the human cost of your decisions and actions.

So what has the human costs been. The process has been lengthy, which has meant months of uncertainty for small high street businesses and the mental impact on the owners of these businesses has been very real.

Business owners have spent months campaigning for dual use, attending meetings and consultations, and staff representing the council have rarely been able to answer the questions being asked of them due to a lack of knowledge or understanding, which has led to conflicting advice that has fuelled anxieties further.

This has all come on the back of the covid pandemic. While we should have been rebuilding our businesses following the pandemic, we have been hit with fighting another threat to our livelihoods and the struggle to have our voices heard. The timing of the consultations were ill-timed, perhaps it was strategic? They came at a time when business and the economy needed to rebuild, but you as a group failed to consider this. It questions your total lack of understanding of small business, small local business and the impact your actions on it.

This has been further demonstrated with the implementation of super fast broadband in the area. In an article from the Local Government Association; "The role of councils in driving the rollout of super fast broadband infrastructure is derived from their general duty to promote wellbeing as well as their role to lead local communities". I challenge you to demonstrate how you have fulfilled your responsibilities in either of the regards [wellbeing and leading local communities] from our perspective.

On top of the pandemic and the RPZ, we also had to endure Chelsea Road being closed for 3 weeks in order for City Fibre to install super fast broadband. I ask you to imagine yourself having no income while still having to pay all of your bills for 3 weeks, all because a group of people decided to dig your road up. And it's not as if we can be guaranteed all our customers would return or any token of compensation offered.

You have repeatedly demonstrated a fundamental lack of your responsibilities of a local authority. The same Local Authority Association (as mentioned above) states; "Councillors work with local people and partners, such as local businesses and other organisations, to agree and deliver on local priorities".

For our part, we small business owners, are prepared to embrace change. We understand change is a constant and it is essential if we are to meet the objectives to achieve a truly sustainable existence. As of the 20th the dual use RPZ which we worked so hard for came into force and time will tell if this compromise is the answer.

Sustainability requires an integrated approach that takes into consideration environmental concerns along with the economic. If you are to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs, you must understand these basic principles. You have to do better.

Statement to Council re Entry Hill golf course – 21 February 2023

Bath and North East Somerset Council announced on 1 December 2022 that it would not be submitting a planning application for the **former landfill site** at Entry Hill. Councillor Mark Roper, Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Regeneration and Growth cited rising costs and difficulties in obtaining external funding as the reason for the project not going ahead.

In a recent statement on Twitter, Councillor Alison Born, Ward Councillor for Widcombe and Lyncombe stated that:

I've always been clear that I thought the Pedal Progression bike park would have been great for local families. I'm really sad that it won't be going ahead

Councillor Born appears not to have read the Phase II Contamination Report published in December 2022 that was commissioned by the Council prior to submitting a planning application for the Entry Hill golf course site. This report states unequivocally that:

No evidence of an engineered or membrane capping system was observed over landfill soils in **any** of the 50-60 Number exploratory positions.

Integrale, the company employed to undertake the report, then goes on to observe:

...that it is likely there will be some increase in the risk to human health from the proposed end-use due to the increased potential for the disturbance of landfill soils compared with either the previous golfing end-use or the current limited recreational usage, e.g. dog walking.

It is clear from the report that Integrale believe that trail degradation should be kept to a minimum (highly unlikely for a mountain bike park) in order to prevent landfill soils from being exposed and thereby liberating airborne dust/soil particulates from those materials.

Finally, and perhaps even more importantly, given the absence of any formal capping system or widespread hardcore "the site has received rainfall for at least 40-50 years spanning the operational period and intervening period since the landfill closure, therefore significant infiltration into the waste material is likely to have taken place. It is unclear if there has been or continues to be any detrimental impact to the aquifer and/or surface water and springs." There has currently never been any testing of the Lyn Brook that runs under the site and out into Widcombe; the scope of the report was purely soil contamination.

The results of the soil testing prove that the following materials – **lead, PAHs, boron, copper and zinc** are all at concentrations that could pose a risk to human health. Also, the WRAS (Water Regulations Approval Scheme) Contaminant Threshold Concentrations are exceeded in most of the Topsoil and Made Ground.

In view of the above, does Councillor Born still think that a mountain bike park is the best use for this site? Especially bearing in mind, as stated in the report, the most likely potential receptors to contamination are:

Immediately adjacent residents – **critical receptor female child**.

For a local Ward Councillor she does seem to be particularly unconcerned about the health of those residents living closest to the site and indeed potential end-users who are also potentially at risk of being exposed to contamination. Does the Council intend to test the water in the Lyn Brook for contaminants?

This page is intentionally left blank