

## **BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET**

### **CABINET**

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

Wednesday, 12th June, 2013

#### **Present:**

Councillor Paul Crossley	Leader of the Council
Councillor David Dixon	Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods
Councillor Simon Allen	Cabinet Member for Wellbeing
Councillor Tim Ball	Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning
Councillor David Bellotti	Cabinet Member for Community Resources
Councillor Caroline Roberts	Cabinet Member for Transport
Councillor Dine Romero	Cabinet Member for Early Years, Children and Youth
Councillor Ben Stevens	Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development

#### **10 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chair was taken by Councillor Paul Crossley, Leader of the Council.  
The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

#### **11 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

The Chair drew attention to the evacuation procedure as set out in the Agenda.

#### **12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

#### **13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Dine Romero had declared that under item 17, she had a disclosable but non pecuniary interest (an "other interest") by virtue of being a Governor of Morelands Schools Federation and that she had a child who attended the school.

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

There was none.

#### **15 QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC AND COUNCILLORS**

There were 15 questions from the following Councillors: Malcolm Lees (2), Brian Webber, Michael Evans, Anthony Clarke (5), Dave Laming (2), Patrick Anketell-Jones (2), Charles Gerrish, Tim Warren.

There were no questions from members of the public.

*[Copies of the questions and response, including supplementary questions and responses if any, have been placed on the Minute book as Appendix 1 and are available on the Council's website.]*

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

Lin Patterson (Campaign to Save Larkhall Toilets) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 2 and on the Council's website]* told Cabinet that the public toilets in Larkhall were needed by its ageing population and in order to attract visitors and shoppers. She appealed to Cabinet to rethink the proposals to close the toilets.

The Chair referred the statement to Councillor David Dixon for reply in due course

Clare Crowther (Head of Nursery) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 3 and on the Council's website]* referred to the decision by the owners to cease operating the childcare facility in Dover Place after 31<sup>st</sup> August. She highlighted the impact this would have on the 109 children and 19 staff. She appealed to Cabinet to support the proposed management buyout in order to retain high quality child care in the city.

Councillor Dine Romero asked Clare Crowther whether she was aware that the ownership of the premises was not shared between the authority and the church; and whether she knew that the authority's responsibilities were highly prescribed.

Clare Crowther agreed but repeated that she felt there were not enough available places to meet demand.

Amy Lunt (Concerned Parents of Norlands Nursery) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 4 and on the Council's website]* asked for Cabinet support to facilitate the proposed purchase of Dover Place nursery by its current nursery manager. She highlighted the benefits which the existing provision was bringing to many families. She presented a petition of 233 signatures asking for the nursery to be saved.

The Chair referred the petition to Councillor Dine Romero and promised a response to the petition in due course.

Susan Charles (Chair, Access Bath Group) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 5 and on the Council's website]* alerted the Cabinet to the difficulties faced by disabled people who wished to use the facilities at Keynsham Leisure Centre. She asked the Cabinet for their support to resolve the problems.

David Batho (Resident of Claverton Parish) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 6 and on the Council's website]* brought to the Cabinet's attention a possible conflict between the benefits of solar panel installations and the harm to visual amenity suffered by those nearby. He made some proposals to Cabinet which he said would help to ensure a proper balance between environmental gains and conservation of the historic and natural environment.

Steve Mansergh (Jack and Jill Hill Preservation Society) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 7 and on the Council's website]* spoke about a proposed 35 acre solar farm on agricultural land near Haydon. He believed the development would have a major visual impact on the landscape. He

asked the Council to work with Mendip Council on this cross boundary issue, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. He presented a petition of 197 signatures to this effect.

## **17 MINUTES OF TWO PREVIOUS CABINET MEETINGS**

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was **RESOLVED**

(1) That the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 8th May 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair; and

(2) That the minutes of the Special meeting held on Monday 20th May 2013 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **18 CONSIDERATION OF SINGLE MEMBER ITEMS REQUISITIONED TO CABINET**

There were none.

## **19 MATTERS REFERRED BY POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY BODIES**

There were none.

## **20 SINGLE MEMBER CABINET DECISIONS TAKEN SINCE PREVIOUS CABINET MEETING**

The Cabinet agreed to note the report.

## **21 HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION IN BATH: ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION & SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

Gavin Dick (National Landlords Association) in a statement [*a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 22 and on the Council's website*] asked the Cabinet to explain the Council's response to the recently announcement by DWP about welfare support. He was concerned that the proposals would reduce house prices as had already happened in Newcastle. The impact would be on the most vulnerable in society.

Johnny Kidney in an *ad hoc* statement said that although he supported the Licensing proposals, but not the Article 4 proposals now before Cabinet. He lived in a road with 88% HMO density and was concerned that the proposals would have a devastating effect on his ability to sell the house. He asked Cabinet to make exemptions to high density roads, as other councils had done.

Councillor Geoff Ward in an *ad hoc* statement recognised the challenges of student life and also of local residents. He felt that Cabinet was about to use Article 4 rather than tackling the rogue landlords. The proposals would reduce property values for owner-occupiers but would not choke off the demand for multiple occupation, in a city with 2 universities.

Councillor Dave Laming in an *ad hoc* statement observed that more students could be accommodated on the river, as in Oxford.

Anthony Masters in an *ad hoc* statement [*a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 23 and on the Council's website*] said that the critical question would be how to measure whether Article 4 was successful. He said that the problem would simply move to another part of the city. He reminded Cabinet that problem tenants and problem landlords could be dealt with under existing powers. He urged Cabinet to reject the proposals, which he predicted would not improve housing or behaviour.

Councillor Will Sandry in an *ad hoc* statement said the proposals were about community. He assured Cabinet that in Oldfield Ward, his constituents were calling for the proposals to be adopted. He said that the speakers from the National Landlords Association did not speak for his constituents. He responded to Anthony Master's question by saying that the success of the proposals would be evident on the first day - investors would be prevented from buying residential homes and converting them into multiple occupancy.

Stella Wainwright, a resident of Oldfield Park, in an *ad hoc* statement said that the proposals were 18 years too late. If implemented now they would prevent local people from selling their homes and would leave them marooned. She asked for Cabinet to make an exception for high density roads.

Councillor Tim Ball introduced the item by emphasising that Cabinet wanted to see balanced communities. The proposed threshold would be reached when an area reached 25% density. He responded to the points made by Gavin Dick by saying that he had seen no evidence of any detrimental effect on vulnerable people. He was ready to look at examples from other councils. In response to the appeals for exemptions in certain high density streets, he pointed out that a year after making an exception in high density areas, Exeter had seen an increase in the density in those streets. In response to those who had been concerned about their house prices, he replied that house values were not a matter for planning policy. The danger of exempting certain streets was that the Council might be subject to challenge. It would also give an indication that the Council expected those streets to become 100% density.

Councillor Ball explained that the Article 4 Directive could be reviewed after a period. However, if Cabinet did not adopt the proposals now, there would be a further year's delay. He moved the proposals.

*[A copy of Councillor Ball's notes is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 8 and on the Council's website].*

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal. He said that Cabinet must address the long term needs of housing. Landlords had caused a huge increase in house prices by buying up houses to convert into multiple occupancy. He felt that, even if this took 10 or 15 years to redress, it would be worth it for the city and its communities.

Councillor Paul Crossley said that Article 4 would clarify the situation for home owners and landlords. He thanked local residents for their massive support during the consultation period. He acknowledged the benefits to Bath brought by its 2 universities, and said that the Council was encouraging purpose built student accommodation.

Councillor Ben Stevens expressed some sympathy with Johnny Kidney's concerns about the value of his home; however, the Council received one complaint every 2 days about refuse, which was not acceptable. The speakers from the NLA had a

vested interest and he was hopeful that their doomsday predictions would not come true.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To CONFIRM the Article 4 Direction relating to small HMOs made on 31 May 2012 and advertised in the Council's Notice of Making an Article 4 Direction;

(2) To ADOPT the Supplementary Planning Document on Houses in Multiple Occupation in Bath, to supplement the Local Plan, specifically saved Policy HG.12 which will be given significant weight in the determination of planning applications; and

(3) To DELEGATE responsibility to the Divisional Director of Planning & Transport to make graphic and minor textual amendments to the SPD prior to adoption.

## 22 HOUSING IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION: ADDITIONAL LICENSING

Martin Thomas in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 9 and on the Council's website]* said that the consultation on the proposals had failed to demonstrate that the council had considered other approaches, for example the use of its extensive existing powers to tackle problems. He felt that so far as housing standards were concerned, there was no case for introducing additional licensing.

Rob Crawford (Chair, National Landlords Association Wessex Branch) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 10 and on the Council's website]* said that the council was in danger of being in breach of the Housing Act 2004 because it had not satisfied the criteria laid out in the Act. He felt that the published evidence documents showed a bias. The papers did not demonstrate that a significant proportion of HMOs were being managed ineffectively. He regretted that if the Council pressed on with the measures, it would be subject to legal remedy.

Jacqui Darbyshire (National Landlords Association) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 11 and on the Council's website]* said she believed that the proposals would make the situation worse. The loss of the existing voluntary, city-wide accreditation scheme will have a detrimental effect. She also cited the experience of Thanet District Council, where the license scheme had cost more than £500K.

Gavin Dick (National Landlords Association) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 22 and on the Council's website]* gave a number of reasons why the proposals would not tackle the problem. He called for the Council to use its existing powers to resolve the problems of bad landlords and tenants.

Rosemary Simcox in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 12 and on the Council's website]* said that as a landlord she had found good will on all sides to maintain safety and high standards. She felt that the proposals would alienate all landlords. She appealed to Cabinet to encourage the existing successful Accreditation scheme.

Alexander von Tutschek in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 13 and on the Council's website]* said that landlords had a vested interest in working with the community and with the Council. He suggested some ways in which landlords could be encouraged to make sure that tenants left houses

and gardens tidy at the end of their leases. He felt that these co-operative approaches would be more effective than the proposals now before Cabinet.

Councillor Will Sandry in an *ad hoc* statement reminded the Cabinet that the local community must be considered. He had seen the conditions in which some rogue landlords allowed students to live. The Accreditation scheme was voluntary so the bad landlords had ignored it. He believed that the proposals were the right approach and would improve standards for all.

The Chair observed that Appendix 5 had been replaced in the public documents with a Public Interest Test explaining why it was exempt from publication. He asked the Cabinet to agree that the document was in fact exempt.

On a motion from Councillor Paul Crossley, seconded by Councillor Tim Ball, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that Appendix 5 (Legal Advice) constitutes exempt information according to the categories set out in the Local government Act 1972 (amended Schedule 12A) because it contains information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings, and therefore that the public interest is best served by exemption of the information.

Councillor Tim Ball introduced the item. He was working towards sustainable communities and good housing conditions for students. In response to a number of speakers, he emphasised that the Council has prosecuted a number of landlords recently under its existing powers. He imagined the National Landlords Association would want all housing to be of an acceptable standard and agreed with Alexander von Tutschek that the Council would work with landlords to encourage a multi-agency approach to raise standards. He referred to the comments made by some, that rubbish was the responsibility of student tenants. He emphasised the responsibility of landlords to facilitate and encourage good practice amongst their tenants by providing the space and facilities they needed to dispose of rubbish considerately. He reminded Cabinet that it was often possible to tell the good and bad landlords apart by the state of their properties. He thought that landlords would be challenged by the results of a recent survey conducted by students, seen by the NLA, in which the majority said they would not recommend their existing landlord.

He moved the proposals.

Councillor David Dixon seconded the proposal. He acknowledged that there were a great deal of good landlords but he had heard of reports from students of unrepaired furniture, damp and mould in their homes. He had seen the standards in which some students had to live – in some cases there had been no bin provision, and no space into which a bin could fit. Environmental Health Officers were already active in some wards, issuing fines. It was the responsibility of the landlord to look after their property. He looked forward to the implementation of a proper database which would mean that the Council knew who owned a property.

Councillor Paul Crossley emphasised that the proposals were not about victimising landlords but were about driving out bad landlords. Not only students lived in multiple occupancy; many young professionals did, too. In the areas in question there were lots of disputes and lack of action by landlords. He felt strongly that good landlords would in fact benefit from the proposals.

Councillor Ben Stevens observed that the proposals covered his ward. It was true that rubbish disposal was the responsibility of the tenant – but often there were too many people crammed into a house to be able to use the bins provided. He was

pleased that some good landlords had come to Cabinet tonight – but the bad landlords had not come to answer for themselves. He noted that in the consultation, half of landlords had said they felt the proposals would improve safety. For him, that was a deciding factor in the debate.

Councillor Tim Ball summed up by saying that it was not fair to expect the Council Tax payer to pay for policing the properties owned by bad landlords. He observed that if all landlords maintained high standards, the Cabinet would not be discussing these proposals tonight.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor David Dixon, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(2) To INTRODUCE an additional licensing scheme, as detailed within the designation report, for a period of 5 years commencing on the 1st January 2014 with licence applications being accepted from 1st October 2013;

(3) To ADOPT the fee structure, as set out in the report, for both the additional licensing and the mandatory licensing schemes; and

(4) To ASK the Head of Housing to undertake the appropriate and statutory steps to enable the introduction of the proposed additional licensing scheme.

## **23 GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN (PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT)**

Judith Chubb (Chair, Stanton Drew Parish Council) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 14 and on the Council's website]* spoke of the dismay amongst her parishioners over the lack of progress on the DPD and the perceived mishandling of the two planning applications and urged the Cabinet to resolve the numerous issues.

Simon Whittle (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 15 and on the Council's website]* asked for all references to the Stanton Wick site to be removed from all documentation and that the Cabinet's decision taken in September 2012 to remove Stanton Wick from the list of sites would not be reversed under any circumstances.

Sue Osborne (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 16 and on the Council's website]* asked why no progress had been made in developing the Bristol Road site as agreed by Cabinet in September 2012 which she felt was leaving the Council vulnerable to inappropriate planning applications.

Karen Abolkheir (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 17 and on the Council's website]* said she believed that the pursuit of a site at Stanton Wick was highly inappropriate. She felt that the delays had caused stress and uncertainty to the local community.

Clarke Osborne (Chair, Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 18 and on the Council's website]* highlighted failings in the progress of the DPD and in the way planning applications had been handled. He regretted the resulting estrangement of settled and travelling communities.

Chris Ree (Stanton Wick Action Group) in a statement *[a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 19 and on the Council's website]* felt that the reviewed

site assessment criteria document was too brief. He regretted that the scoring matrix had been abandoned in favour of a new process. The progress made since September 2012 had been unsatisfactory.

Phil Townshend read a statement on behalf of Tony Heaford (Chair of Publow with Pensford Parish Council) [*a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 20 and on the Council's website*] in which he said that the process had been badly managed and had distressed the local community. He asked for care to be taken in dealing with the major planning application at Stanton Wick.

Councillor Geoff Ward said in an *ad hoc* statement that this had now become extremely urgent because of the need to agree the Core Strategy.

Peter Duppa-Miller (Secretary, Local Councils Association) in an *ad hoc* statement [*a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Appendix 21 and on the Council's website*] urged the Cabinet to finalise the assessment of the sites as soon as possible to remove the uncertainty being experienced by the settled communities. He asked whether Cabinet was uneasy that the Inspector might decide that the Core Strategy was rendered unsound by the delays to this issue. He offered the help and co-operation of the local councils in finalising the assessments, since they held much information which was of relevance.

Councillor Dave Laming observed that over 700 travellers on the river had no right to the services of doctors and other services.

Councillor Tim Ball introduced the item by thanking all the contributors. He promised to reply to all the new comments made. He thanked Peter Duppa-Miller for his offer of co-operation, and agreed to take up local councils on their offer. He referred to the comments made by Judith Chubb-Whittle and explained the process for handling planning applications which he understood could raise concerns in local communities; however, he believed the planning system was designed to be open and transparent and the views of third parties were always sought.

Councillor Ball assured the Cabinet that the Council actively continued to assess sites for suitability. He was pleased to report that a pre-planning enquiry for Lower Bristol Road had been completed in April and further work could now be done in preparation for a planning application, including detailed site surveys.

He moved the proposals.

Councillor Paul Crossley, in seconding the proposal, explained that the Core Strategy needed to understand the range of housing needs across the entire district. He assured the Cabinet that the slow pace would not threaten the Core Strategy, because so long as consultation was under way the Inspector would not intervene. There was no hidden agenda. He was very hopeful that sufficient progress was being made on Lower Bristol Road that it would be included in the Core Strategy document.

Councillor Crossley observed that the Council had no control over who made planning applications, nor how many applications they submitted. In response to the criticisms of the Council's Planning Department, he praised Planning officers for their professionalism in getting the Council to this point.

Councillor Tim Ball summed up thanking the Planning officers for their hard work on an issue which he felt should have been tackled a number of years earlier.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Ball, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)



- (1) To NOTE the progress on the preparation of the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Plan; and
- (2) To AGREE the revised programme for the preparation of the Plan, and the consequential amendment to the Local Development Scheme.

## **24 PERSONAL BUDGETS: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMON RESOURCE ALLOCATION SYSTEM**

Councillor Simon Allen introduced the item. He explained that the issue would affect many members of the community because it involved the introduction of the national resource allocation system and the refocus of the social care pathway. Personalising care services had been a long process but would be beneficial to clients. The Resource Allocation System had been well received by local professionals.

Councillor Allen said that the personal budgets would be rolled out as people came up for their reviews. Alongside this would be an increase in preventive and early intervention work. As a result, services would become more responsive to individual needs.

He moved the proposals.

Councillor Dine Romero seconded the proposal. She felt that the previous system had not been so fair or sustainable and had placed too great a burden on practitioners.

Councillor Paul Crossley thanked Councillor Allen for his update. There was a wide range of new challenges and only personalisation could meet those challenges. He supported the proposals.

On a motion from Councillor Simon Allen, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

- (1) To NOTE progress in implementing the National Resource Allocation System and work that is underway to adjust the focus of the current social care pathway; and
- (2) To ASK for an update after the first year of implementation of the new RAS.

## **25 APPRENTICESHIPS, INTERNS, PLACEMENTS, WORK EXPERIENCE AND VOLUNTEERING POLICY**

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones in an *ad hoc* statement observed that over 600, or about 11% of the Council's full time workforce, acted as volunteers. He noted that in return they received "the opportunity to contribute to the delivery of local services". He felt that this statement should include the fact that volunteering developed people's skills. He regretted that recently the free public gallery in the Victoria Art Gallery had to remain closed for lack of volunteers to man it. It would be a start to provide greater public recognition and privileges.

Councillor Ben Stevens introduced the item. There were currently 26 apprentices in the Council and the aim was to improve on that. He hoped that other businesses would follow the Council's example. He himself had struggled to find work after graduating so he understood the need for increased opportunities for young people.

He moved the proposals.

Councillor David Bellotti seconded the proposal which he said was excellent. It was good news, set against the fact that there were now 29.7M people in work in the UK, the highest number ever. In this authority, the number of jobless had reduced by 230. He paid tribute to the Council's Youth Service, the Youth Offending Team and the Connections Service for the contribution they all made to meeting the needs of young people. The proposals were not just about jobs, but were about life opportunities. He referred to paragraph 2.5 of the report in which it was recognised that the Procurement Strategy, adopted by the Cabinet recently, obliged the Council to take account of local economic, environmental and social factors in its procurement decisions; and these values applied to decisions about new jobs and apprenticeships. The biggest problems were experienced by the 18-24 year old young people – a relatively small number but a huge impact on their lives.

Councillor David Dixon reminded the Cabinet that the Council used large numbers of volunteers especially as litter pickers, in community libraries and in the new hub in Paulton. The Council had a very good relationship with the Volunteer Centre in Bath Central Library. He was delighted that the MOT Centre and the Parks Service both ran apprenticeship schemes.

Councillor Paul Crossley referred to Patrick Anketell-Jones' appeal for more recognition and observed that the Chairman's Diary often showed that he entertained volunteers, throughout the year. He had been very impressed with "Project Search", which arranged placements for young people with significant disabilities in placements across the Council and most of whom gained meaningful work after their placements.

Councillor Ben Stevens in summing up said he hoped to see the number of volunteers increasing.

On a motion from Councillor Ben Stevens, seconded by Councillor David Bellotti, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To SEEK to maximise its social return on investment in the local community by creating, where possible, apprenticeships, paid and unpaid work placements, work experience, internships and volunteering thus enabling more people to gain access to potential employment opportunities in the private sector and wider labour market;

(2) To ASK the Divisional Director (Policy and Partnerships) develop and launch a consistent programme of opportunities across service units and will ensure more effective co-ordination of the Council's recruitment, induction, training and support for apprenticeships, paid and unpaid work placements, work experience internships and volunteering;

(3) To ENDORSE the policy approach set out in the report including:

- the provision of support, advice and help to managers;
- increasing the number of participants in such schemes;
- sharing of good practice;
- the provision of consistent, high quality recruitment, induction, training and support processes;
- minimum standards which can be applied to ensure that all services know what is expected of them when recruiting and managing participants

(4) To ASK Council services to make a commitment to:

- identify opportunities for apprenticeships, paid and unpaid work placements, work experience, internships and volunteering as part of the annual work force planning process;
- undertake an annual survey of activity, to collect data on opportunities offered;
- re-imburse travel expenses for people undertaking unpaid work placements and work experience through accessing internal support packages; and
- report regularly to DDG on any issues, successes, concerns.

(5) To NOTE that the Council's Procurement Strategy 2013-17 'Think Local' approved by Cabinet in April 2013 committed the Council to prioritise Social Value. The Council now follows this policy which must recognise the local economic, environmental and social improvements that can come from each procurement, such as new jobs and apprenticeships; and

(6) To AGREE that the Council will prioritise the marketing of opportunities, encourage applications from and provide advice on applying for such schemes to:

- Care leavers
- Groups who are most at risk of long term unemployment
- Those who live in disadvantaged wards
- Those living in rural areas

## **26 CHILDREN'S SERVICES CAPITAL PROGRAMME PRIORITIES 2013 -14**

Councillor Dine Romero introduced the two items being proposed for capital funding. She was delighted to be able to support the development of the two schools. She moved the proposals.

Councillor David Bellotti seconded the proposal.

Councillor Paul Crossley warmly welcomed the fantastic news which was part of preparing for the growth in primary school numbers. He congratulated Ashley Ayre, Strategic Director, People and Communities, and his team.

On a motion from Councillor Dine Romero, seconded by Councillor David Bellotti, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To NOTE that the projects put forward for approval are in line with Children's Services capital programme priorities; and

(2) To APPROVE the proposed Capital allocations for inclusion in the Capital Programme 2013/14 for projects at the following schools:

(a) St Saviours Junior School, Bath - £1.85m for extra pupil places and replacement of poor condition temporary buildings;

(b) Moorlands Federated Schools - £70k for conversion of IT space to provide extra pupil places.

## **27 WEST OF ENGLAND PARTNERSHIP BID FOR DESIGNATION AS A BETTER BUS AREA**

Councillor Caroline Roberts introduced the item by explaining that the government wanted to change the way it allocated grants to bus operators by devolving the decisions to councils, in return for a 20% increase in the funds. It was anticipated that the fund would be administered by a partnership board of operators and councils. She referred to the appendix, which listed the outline proposals which

would form part of the bid. She assured Cabinet that, even if the bid was unsuccessful, she would still aspire to the list.

She moved the proposals.

Councillor Paul Crossley seconded the proposals, which he felt strongly were part of the Council's planning to avoid jams as experienced in Bristol and elsewhere.

Councillor Tim Ball felt that this report had been long-awaited and would improve the bus users' experience.

Councillor Simon Allen felt that the proposals were an ideal opportunity to improve the Council's working with bus operators.

On a motion from Councillor Caroline Roberts, seconded by Councillor Paul Crossley, it was

**RESOLVED** (unanimously)

(1) To AGREE that a bid should be submitted to the Department for Transport for designation of a network of key bus service corridors in Bath & North East Somerset as part of a Better Bus Area in conjunction with other West of England Partnership authorities and local bus operators; and

(2) To DELEGATE authority to the Divisional Director for Planning & Transport Development, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Transport, to approve the final details of the bid.

The meeting ended at 9.50 pm

Chair \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Prepared by Democratic Services**