

CABINET MEETING 3rd Nov 2010

The following Statements and Questions had been registered by the time of publication.

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

There were 5 statements at the meeting.

- Pamela Galloway, Save Our 6-7 Buses
Re: 6-7 Buses
- Cllr Dr Eleanor Jackson
Re: Radstock Youth Club (and to submit a petition)
- Stefan Difinitzio (Youth Parliament)
Re: Youth Services
- Agnes Melling
Re: Pulteney Bridge
- Manda Rigby
Re: Pulteney Bridge

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

01

Question from: Councillor Nigel Roberts

A number of bins have gone missing in Odd Down and other parts of Bath, we have repeatedly asked for them to be replaced, some requests stretch over 6 months. Who is making the decision not to replace these bins? A bench has gone missing from Rush Hill, who has made the decision not to replace this?

Answer from: Councillor Charles Gerrish

I am aware that a number of litter bins have gone missing over recent months; it is believed that these are being stolen for their scrap metal value. The Council is liaising with the Police over this matter and is taking steps to ensure that bins are installed in a manner so as to avoid such thefts in the future.

An officer manages the day to day installation of litter bins and reviews any requests for new ones. A judgement is made on whether the installation of a bin will help to reduce litter levels in the immediate area, having consideration of the number of bins that are already in the area. With respect to Odd Down, the Council has recently replaced a bin in Old Frome Road and assessed a request for a bin in Odins Road (where there is a play area nearby that already has a bin

in it). Officers were not hitherto aware of a missing bench on Rush Hill but will investigate this matter.

I would ask that Cllr Roberts liaises with Joanna Brain, (Street Scene Officer) to discuss any bins that are missing from Odd Down so that any necessary replacements can be installed.

Officers will in the near future be reviewing our policy for the installation of litter bins to ensure that the most appropriate bins are located in the right places. This will also involve consideration of installing bins for recyclable materials in appropriate locations.

02

Question from: Councillor Cherry Beath

The Public Realm and Movement Strategy refers to a “feasibility and design study leading to the closure of Pulteney Bridge to buses and taxis” (page 57). Has such a study been made, and if not, could the Cabinet member explain why draft proposals to close the bridge were published before the study was begun?

Answer from: Councillor Terry Gazzard

A traffic modelling study was carried out on a proposal to close Pulteney Bridge at the time the Public Realm and Movement Strategy was being developed.

03

Question from: Councillor Cherry Beath

Why is the closure of Pulteney Bridge currently under consideration, when it is listed under “second generation” projects in the Public Realm and Movement Strategy?

Answer from: Councillor Terry Gazzard

Pulteney Estates Residents’ Association sought to progress the closure of Pulteney Bridge at the earliest opportunity

04

Question from: Councillor Ian Gilchrist

Can the Cabinet Member for Customer Services please find out and report what is happening with the proposed re-location of the pedestrian crossing on Wells Road? This was the subject of a petition approximately two years ago, following a fatality, and agreement from officers following a pedestrian survey, that the current crossing should be moved about 80m down the hill.

Answer from: Councillor Charles Gerrish

<p><i>The investigation following the petition requesting relocation of the existing crossing on A367 Wells Road, recommended that a scheme be identified, and then subject to prioritisation for possible inclusion within a future Traffic and Safety works programme.</i></p> <p><i>Accordingly, a nominal scheme to remove the existing Pelican crossing, and install a new Puffin crossing at a site further east, has been placed on the Task Register, and will need to be considered alongside other schemes for inclusion in a future Capital Works Programme.</i></p>	
Supplementary Question:	
<p>Is the Cabinet member aware that data from the Widcombe Speed Watch scheme shows that Wells Rd has the worst speed record of the roads being monitored, and whether this would cause him to ask officers to raise the priority for this scheme?</p>	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>Officers would be happy to view the Speed Watch figures, and liaise with the Police to consider whether any remedial measures are appropriate. Unfortunately the priority of the scheme is unlikely to be affected by this information.</i></p>	

05

Question from:	Councillor Eleanor Jackson
<p>Why is Radstock Youth Club taking a cut of 60% not 40% as elsewhere?</p>	
Answer from:	Councillor Chris Watt
<p><i>The changes to the youth service are being implemented after a thorough review of the service and extensive consultation with staff and also with wider stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>There are no set percentage cuts such as 60% or 40%; changes are being made on the needs and demand in each area. The changes will however ensure that the Youth Service is able to do much more than provide services direct to young people and include a clear focus on building local capacity to provide a range of opportunities for young people.</i></p> <p><i>Given this combined activity in the future there may well be more activities in the Radstock area than currently not less.</i></p>	
Supplementary Question:	
<p>Thank you for the interesting reply. The Cabinet member said in his reply that the focus was to "build local capacity" – could he clarify this and also could he agree to give a year's grace so that local communities can prepare themselves and get things in place to provide these opportunities to young people?</p>	

Answer from:	Councillor Chris Watt
<p><i>There has already been a year of grace, because these changes were flagged up a year ago to local communities. The intention is that local voluntary groups will come forward with proposals to run local youth clubs which could be supported by the Council with pump-priming funds.</i></p>	

06

Question from:	Councillor Nigel Roberts
<p>Please could the Executive member report on what the Council is doing to ensure that the Wansdyke through Odd Down is safeguarded and that the footpath that runs along the Wansdyke is passable for walkers.</p>	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>The section of the Wansdyke earthwork that runs through Odd Down and South Stoke is a Scheduled Ancient Monument. This is a national designation placing legal restrictions and obligations on the relevant land owner, which are enforced by English Heritage (on behalf of DCMS). Due to ongoing management problems and anti-social behaviour affecting this section of the Wansdyke, the council's Archaeological Officer has hosted meetings of the local ward councillors (including Cllr Roberts), South Stoke parish councillors, English Heritage, interested local residents, the Police, PROW Officers and Parks Officers. As a result of these meetings English Heritage are keen to establish a monument management strategy/plan for this stretch of the monument, and with the agreement of the above working group have produced a brief for the management plan.</i></p> <p><i>Further progress was made this year when ownership of the Odd Down section of the monument and adjacent public open space was transferred from Crest to the Council's Parks Department, while the South Stoke section remains in private ownership. As part of the adoption of Sulis Meadows, including The Wansdyke, a commuted sum was provided to fund the maintenance of the grass, trees shrubs and vegetation. The Archaeological Officer and Arboricultural Officer will meet on site over the winter period with English Heritage to agree the management regime that provides the best protection for the monument. The condition of the footpath associated with the monument is also being looked at as part of ongoing discussions between English Heritage and the Council's PROW Officers. However, as a result of the Government's spending review English Heritage are about to lose 32% of their budget and we are now uncertain whether they will still be able to support this project. The Archaeological Officer has contacted English Heritage on this issue and will coordinate another working group meeting once the situation becomes clearer. In the meantime the Council's Parks Officers and PROW Officers will continue working with those concerned to resolve the ongoing problems affecting the monument and footpath.</i></p>	

07

Question from:	Councillor Nicholas Coombes
Is there any evidence to support the reported suggestion that Pulteney Bridge is suffering structural damage from carrying traffic?	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>On 28th October a limited visual inspection of the basements below No. 17 Argyle St. (The Bridge Café) was carried out by a Senior Structural Engineer in conjunction with Property Services. There was evidence of previous structural repairs at, and close to, the support of the end gable wall of the building above. This long standing repair had failed again which resulted in further movement and opening of the cracks previously filled with mortar.</i></p> <p><i>A temporary scaffolding system will be erected in the basement to support the reinforced concrete floor slab and external façade to facilitate permanent works at a later date.</i></p>	

08

Question from:	Councillor Nicholas Coombes
The closure of Pulteney Bridge will lead to bus and taxi traffic being displaced to other routes around Bath. Could the Cabinet member confirm what work was done on traffic modelling before the publication of the closure TRO? Is it not correct that the traffic modelling which has been carried out only envisages the closure of the bridge as part of a package including changes to the layout of the bus gate?	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<p><i>The traffic modelling work carried out as part of Public Realm and Movement Strategy investigated a variety of traffic management measures including the closure of Pulteney Bridge. The overall effect on the wider transport network of extending the bus gate and closing Pulteney Bridge was not found to be significant, because of the relatively low number of vehicles crossing the bridge. More detailed traffic modelling of the junction of North Parade and Pulteney Road subsequently carried out on the impact of closing Pulteney Bridge on alternative routes confirmed this.</i></p>	
Supplementary Question:	
My question asked for confirmation that the traffic modelling carried out only envisaged the closure of the bridge as part of a package in conjunction with other proposals (eg to the operation of the bus gate). Could the Cabinet member now confirm to us that the closure of Pulteney Bridge was always considered in conjunction with other proposals, not as a stand-alone proposal?	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish

The closure of Pulteney Bridge and proposals in the High Street are entirely separate traffic management proposals and are not dependent on each other. Public realm improvements for the High Street are being taken forward as part of the Bath Transportation Package and linking the two projects has never been considered.

Proposals for High Street and Pulteney Bridge are identified as separate schemes in the Public Realm and Movement Strategy (P74).

The traffic modelling study considered a number of ideas emerging from the Public Realm and Movement Strategy and, for efficiency and cost effectiveness, the idea of extending the bus gate in the High Street and idea of closing Pulteney Bridge were modelled together. The overall impact of both these measures on the highway network were not considered to be significant. The conclusion drawn was that the impact of the closure of Pulteney Bridge on its own would not have a significant impact.

This conclusion was confirmed by detailed junction analysis of the Pulteney Road/North Parade junction, which modelled the closure of Pulteney Bridge on its own.

The idea to extend the bus gate in the High St is not being taken forward and is not necessary in order to implement the closure of Pulteney Bridge.

09

Question from:	Councillor Nicholas Coombes
Will B&NES request an emergency order to return full bus service to Great Pulteney Street while the Pulteney Bridge closure TRO is considered?	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<i>The Council has already secured an agreement from First Bus to re-route the No. 4 service via Great Pulteney Street and will continue discussions regarding other affected services.</i>	
Supplementary Question:	
Can the Cabinet member say whether in his view the mitigation measures are enough to support the needs of local people?	
Answer from:	Councillor Charles Gerrish
<i>As I said, further conversations are still ongoing.</i>	

10

Question from:	Councillor Marian McNeir
Could the cabinet member comment on the value of the arts to the local economy	

and the growth prospects for this sector, especially given that the West of England Local Enterprise Partnership submission refers to the creative and media sector as a key sector?

Answer from: Councillor Terry Gazzard

The value of the cultural and creative industries to the district

Recent research shows that Bath and North East Somerset has strengths in what are called the "Creative Industries" – including publishing, television and radio, animation, and film and video.

The South West Regional Development Agency (SWRDA) estimates that the Creative Industries generate some £220m (2008) in GVA in Bath and North East Somerset. (Value added is the difference between the value of goods and services produced and cost of raw materials and other inputs that are used in production. Gross Value added therefore is the sum of all the value added by activities that produce goods and services). The GVA for Creative Industries compares locally with the Financial sector's contribution of £158m and £349m from the Distribution and Retail sector.

The research suggests Bath and North East Somerset has the highest proportion of Creative Industries among all Upper Tier Local Authorities in the South West – higher even than Bristol.

Under the South West Regional Development Agency's definition of the Creative Industries (which includes arts, crafts, media, and architectural and engineering activities), Bath and North East Somerset contains:

- A total of 6,700 people reliant upon the Creative Industries for their livelihood employed in 700 business units with 4,200 employees*
- 2,500 further individuals in self employment*
- 3,200 separate 'enterprises'*
- Media market leaders such as Future Publishing and Touch Productions are based in Bath*
- Creative Bath, a business network for those involved in the creative industries, which now has 935 individual members.*

The creative industries in B&NES achieve an annual turnover in excess of £800 million (GWE Business West Research, Feb 2010).

According to a recent report by GWE Business South West, commissioned by Creative Bath:

- The proportion of employment in B&NES in the Creative Industries at 5.4% is more than twice the South West regional proportion at 2.5% and significantly higher than the national average of 3.0%.*
- The Creative Industries in B&NES already account for 8.3% of all employing units, well above the regional average of 5.2% and the national average of 5.8%.*
- There are more businesses and employees in B&NES in the Creative Industries than in Tourism.*

Research into the economic impact of cultural businesses, commissioned by Bath Area Cultural Forum from Dr Peter Dawson of the University of Bath (2010), shows that:

- The economic value of cultural activities in B&NES is estimated to be at the very least £157 million every year.*
- Cultural activities generate at a minimum over 6,000 jobs for the local*

economy.

The Council specifically aims to grow the proportion of jobs in those activities falling within the Creative Industries which are the most productive. These activities (including publishing, and architectural and engineering activities) are generally contained within the broad Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) industries of "Information and Communication" and "Professional and Scientific". Our aim, articulated in the Economic Strategy, is to grow the proportion of jobs in B&NES within these two industries from a current 13% of the economy to 20% of the economy by 2026.

Bath Area Cultural Forum has 70 + members (organisational memberships) and the Council provided support to set up (officer time and modest financial support of £3,500 p/a over past two years)

The Council's investment in culture and the arts

Future Bath Plus has been set up as public / private partnership between the Council and local businesses. FBP has strong interest in the support & development of cultural activity, especially through the FBP Public Events Panel which has an overview of major festivals and events.

Council funding for Arts Development 2009-10 was £646,000, which levered a further £1,384,000 coming into the district from other external sources (ratio: 1:2.14).

Arts organisations in receipt of contracts or grant funding achieved this leverage from commercial sponsorship, box office earnings, donations & charitable giving, and bids to trusts & foundations.

It should be noted that this figure is based solely on the information which the Council can collect from funded arts organisations. If organisations which are not Council-funded were to declare their leverage figures as well, the total would be greatly in excess of £1.384m.

The Council has also given significant support to (for example) Theatre Royal Bath (£100k) and Holburne Museum (£200k) for building re-development projects.

11

Question from:	Councillor Marian McNeir
What match funding, deriving from grants by the Council, is given to arts organisations locally?	
Answer from:	Councillor Terry Gazzard
Council funding for Arts Development 2009-10 was £646,000, which levered a further £1,384,000 coming into the district from other external sources. The Council's Arts Development team does not currently require arts organisations to report on the sources of their additional income, ie. whether from local businesses or from elsewhere. We ask arts organisations to report two figures: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Total income p/a (turnover)• Total leverage funding 'Leverage' has the following definition:	

This is the total amount of funding your organisation obtained in grants and donations from sources other than the Council - such as Arts Council England, other public funding bodies, charitable trusts and foundations, individual and corporate sponsorship, donations or bequests. This should be expressed as a total sum in pounds. Note: this figure excludes earned/box office income.

We do not ask organisations to break-down the total leverage into separate amounts for the different sources or types of income.

However, Officers can make the following observations based on their knowledge of local arts organisations:

- Four local arts organisations currently receive core funding from Arts Council England, totalling £455,132 in 2010-11
- Other arts organisations received one-off project funding from Arts Council England £159,451 in 2009-10
- (note this also includes awards to individual artists)
- Smaller organisations will tend to attract corporate donations or sponsorship primarily from local businesses, and from private/individual donors. Businesses include for example, solicitors, accountancy firms, retailers of all types.
- Larger organisations will tend to additionally attract corporate donations or sponsorship from national businesses
 - this reflects the fact that larger organisations have the staffing capacity to devote to fundraising, whereas smaller organisations are usually reliant on one or two part-time members of staff (and sometimes are run solely by volunteers)
 Businesses include for example, national press/media publications, retailers of all types, financial services/products businesses.
- Organisations of all sizes/scales have had successes with applications to the Lottery and to charitable trusts and foundations.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

12

Question from: Manda Rigby

(a) I understand that there is now going to be a six month period before a final decision on the closure of Pulteney Bridge to traffic is made. I'd like to know what will be done during this time, to be assured that the full public consultation Cllr Haerberling promised will be carried out, to know what was therefore done prior to this initial TRO if it now appears a further 6 months work needs to be done and, most importantly, will the council use emergency powers to restore the bus service to its status quo before First moved their routes during this time?

(b) Can you let me know the results of the partial consultations done previously and, given the fact that PERA has now distanced itself from fully supporting the

closure, and the Juice bar has both changed hands and the previous owners said their petition showing in favour of the closure was based on 2 bits of misinformation, that the bridge was being destroyed by the traffic and that there would be full pedestrianisation allowing them to put tables and chairs across the bridge, can you let me know who actually now supports the proposal in its current form?

Answer from: Councillor Charles Gerrish

(a) Cllr Haeberling is awaiting requested names of individuals for her to meet. The Traffic Regulation Order was published in draft form for consultation allowing the Council to consider the issues raised and where possible find ways of resolving any objections before deciding whether to proceed with the Traffic Regulation Order or modify it.

The Council is currently addressing two of the main issues raised out of the consultation process which are the loss of bus services and delays on alternative routes as a result of diverting buses and taxis onto alternative routes.

Service 4 will be diverted via Great Pulteney Street and Edward St from 14th November 2010 to improve bus access. Minor work is also being undertaken on Pulteney Road to improve the flow of traffic at peak times. The Council will evaluate the impact of these improvements over the next 6 months.

The routing of commercial services is a decision for First. The Council does not have any emergency powers to direct First to route commercial services over Pulteney Bridge.

Prior to carrying out a comprehensive consultation, the draft Traffic Regulation Order the Council carried out detailed informal consultations with a wide range of stakeholders.

(b) In November 2009 prior to advertising the draft Traffic Regulation Order, informal consultations were carried out with a wide range of stakeholders to consider the following issues:

- Impact on city centre access for emergency vehicles;*
- Longer route via North Parade and higher cost for taxi/public hire operators*
- Longer route via North Parade and higher cost for bus operators;*
- Loading and unloading restrictions for business affected by the proposals;*
- Delays in North Parade/Manvers St affecting buses and taxis following the opening of the first phase of Southgate.*

In general, resident groups and businesses in the pedestrianised area were supportive of the proposed closure, including the Pulteney Estates Residents' Association (PERA).

PERA's update position as stated in their email of 22nd October 2010 is that the bridge should be closed to buses and taxis, but additional bus services should be provided along Great Pulteney Street to Laura Place and back again.