

CABINET MEETING 2nd Dec 2015

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

Where the intention is to speak about an item on the Agenda, the speaker will be offered the option to speak near the beginning of the meeting or just before the Agenda item.

Statements about issues NOT on the Agenda

- Cllrs Lisa Brett and Joe Rayment
Re: Disparity between the composition of the Council and the composition of the general public in B&NES
- Chris Beezley, FoBRA member and Chairman of Beech Avenue Residents' Association
Re: Student Numbers and Accommodation Requirements
- Rosemarie Naish (Chair of Clutton Parish Council)
Re: Traffic calming measures in Clutton
- Annie Kilvington
Re: East of Bath Park and Ride
- Sian James
Re: East of Bath Park and Ride
- Christine Boyd
Re: East of Bath Park and Ride

Statements about issues on the Agenda

- Mr Robin Kerr (Chairman, Federation of Bath Residents' Associations)
Re: Placemaking Plan
- Cllr Karen Warrington
Re: Placemaking Plan
- Caroline Kay (Chief Executive of Bath Preservation Trust)
Re: Placemaking Plan
- Caroline Kay (Chief Executive of Bath Preservation Trust)
Re: Establishment of a Local Property and Development Company

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

M	01	Question from:	Councillor Sarah Bevan				
<p>How can we and residents be reassured that the Curo and other social housing enterprises owned/managed shared open spaces will not be built on without specific protection measures for these much valued community play and environmentally precious green spaces?</p>							
Answer from:			Councillor Liz Richardson				
<p><i>The policy framework that is being established through the Placemaking Plan will protect community play and other open spaces and ensure new spaces are provided to meet the needs arising from new development.</i></p> <p><i>Protection of open spaces is achieved in two main ways - through proposed Policy LCR5 and additionally, through the designation of Local Green Spaces.</i></p> <p><i>Policy LCR5</i></p> <p><i>Policy LCR5 will protect open spaces (including play space) by preventing development unless clear criteria will be met. This means that open spaces could only be lost to development if there is a surplus of facilities in the local area or suitable replacement facilities of at least equivalent quality, quantity and community value are provided. Consideration of whether there is a surplus of different types of open/green space in an area is based on evidence set out in the Green Spaces Strategy (GSS) (also being considered by Cabinet on 2nd December). The GSS establishes a standard for the provision of different types of green spaces and has also assessed existing provision, thereby concluding whether there is a surplus or deficiency in a local area of these types of green space. In Cllr Bevan's Ward the main conclusions show that there is currently a deficiency in most of the types of green space assessed (see table below).</i></p>							
Ha	Amenity Green Space	Park and Recreation Ground combined	Park and Recreation Ground	Outdoor Sport (Private)	Play Space: Children	Play Space (Youth)	Accessible Natural Green Space
Current supply for Peasedown St John parish	-1.41	-4.48	-4.48	4.61	-0.07	-0.14	116.6

As such any proposals for redevelopment of Curo or other social housing enterprises housing would need to ensure re-provision of at least equivalent quality and quantity of these types of green space in this area.

Local Green Space

In addition to protection through Policy LCR5, specific open/green spaces are also designated and protected as Local Green Spaces. In order to be designated as Local Green Space it needs to meet the criteria set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This requires that the space is demonstrated to of special importance/significance to the local community. In relation to Cllr Bevan's Ward Peasedown Parish Council nominated a number of spaces for designation as Local Green Space. The spaces listed below are recommended for designation in the draft Placemaking Plan:

- Bath Road Green Space*
- Bath Road recreation Ground*
- Beacon Hall Playground*
- Ecewiche Green*
- Eckweek Lane Play Area*
- Frederick Close*
- Land between Pippin Close and Russett Way*

For these spaces, in addition to the overarching protection through Policy LCR5, development that conflicts with the reasons for its designation or prejudices its role as a Local Green Space is prevented other than in very special circumstances.

Supplementary Question:

Thank you for your response. If Green Spaces within housing estates are already protected authority wide by Placemaking Plan policy LCR5, then why there was a call for nominations for additional protection and which Curo, for example, had opted out of?

Answer from:

Councillor Liz Richardson

The primary difference between the two allocations is that the LCR5 allocation is the requirement for the space. The secondary allocation, Local Green Space, would always stay at the exact space so it would inhibit the development.

M 02

Question from:

Councillor Karen Walker

Who would be accountable to the residents of Frederick and Albert Avenue, Peasedown St. John if they lost their green space to development? Would that be Banes for allowing Curo to have it protected under policy LCR5 ?

Answer from:

Councillor Liz Richardson

The Placemaking Plan will protect open spaces in two main ways through proposed Policy LCR5 and additionally, through the designation of Local Green Spaces (LGS).

Policy LCR5 prevents development of open space (including that serving Frederick Avenue/Albert Avenue in Peasedown) unless if it is demonstrated there is a surplus of such spaces serving the community or replacement provision of at least equivalent quantity, quality and value to the local community is made. The Green Spaces Strategy that underpins LCR5 shows there is a deficit of this type of space in Peasedown St John. Therefore, alternative replacement provision would need to be made by Curo as part of any potential redevelopment scheme in order to ensure the proposal complies with planning policy.

In addition, the LGS at Frederick Avenue has been nominated for and recommended to be designated as a LGS in the Draft Placemaking Plan. This means that development that conflicts with the reason for its designation or prejudices its role as LGS will be prevented, except in very special circumstances. This offers a high level of protection to this space.

M 03	Question from:	Councillor Neil Butters
-------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

A local resident has informed me that her children were refused entry to the main swimming pool at the Bath Sports and Leisure Centre. She was told that children under 16 are not allowed in the main pool before 4 p.m. Is the Cabinet member aware of this apparently blanket restriction and is this consistent with the Council's Fit for Life strategy? Could he seek a more flexible approach which allows for the possibility of school inset days, parental supervision and children who wish to swim for sports training?

Answer from:	Councillor Martin Veal
---------------------	------------------------

GLL (more commonly known as BETTER) took over the leisure facilities in July and have instigated numerous changes to policy, procedures and staffing. One of these changes has seen a lot of the main pool daytime sessions being reprogrammed as fitness swimming sessions suitable for adults only.

The programme changes during school holidays to ensure children can access the main pool as well as the leisure pool. GLL try to keep track of all inset days to ensure the correct programme can be put in place. On this occasion they were unaware and hence were working to their normal programme. This should have been corrected when a family arrived at the centre and they should have allowed access and the pool programme should have reverted to a holiday programme and additional staff brought in to cover this. On the day of this particular visit it would appear that an over enthusiastic member of staff was ensuring full adherence with new operating procedures NOPS and failed to speak to the General Manager who would have ensured common sense prevailed and would have made the required changes to allow access.

I can assure you GLL would never want to turn away any family wanting to access any of our facilities. The family have been offered free family swim session as way of an apology for the inconvenience caused.

M 04	Question from:	Councillor Neil Butters
-------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

With regard to the independent transport projects review: at the Cabinet meeting of 8 July the Leader committed to published in the consultants' names, costs and the results of the review in a timely fashion; at the Cabinet meeting of 9 September the Leader said he would share the terms of reference 'before the end of September' and would report later in the Autumn. Can the Leader please provide an update on why none of this information appears to have been shared?

Answer from: Councillor Tim Warren

The independent review report is still awaited. The reviewer has confirmed the review has been completed and should be issuing it to the Council in the near future. The findings will be shared once the document has been received and reviewed by the Cabinet. The only cost to the Council was in travel expenses, and the hope is that by conducting this review it will save the Council money in the long-term. As previously stated, the review has been conducted by representatives from TfL.

M 05 **Question from:** Councillor Lisa Brett

What has happened to the £60K in compensation from the developers of the Southbourne Gardens site which was allocated by the Planning Inspector to pay for replacement allotment space for local residents?

Answer from: Councillor Liz Richardson

The £60k was paid to the Council in the week commencing 2nd November 2015. The money is now with the Council and will be passed to the allotments department for allocation and spending in accordance with the terms of the legal agreement.

M 06 **Question from:** Councillor Lisa Brett

What has happened to the funding transferred by Major Projects to the Highways Department to pay for the pavements outside Anglo Terrace, London Road, to be replaced?

Answer from: Councillor Anthony Clarke

There is a contingency sum available from the project which will be made available to undertake further work at Anglo Terrace. Work at this location was suspended during the period of Rail Replacement Service and due to the city centre's road works embargo further works on the London Road will not be delivered until the new calendar year.

M 07 **Question from:** Councillor Lisa Brett

How many children in B&NES will be homeless this Christmas?

Answer from: Councillor Michael Evans

We are only able to provide information on the families that present to the Council's Housing Options team as homeless. Whilst we are satisfied that no families with children are sleeping out, we cannot be certain that there are no 'hidden homeless' families who have chosen not to come to the Housing Options team for assistance. It should also be noted that these figures are correct as of the 1st December and could be subject to change over the Christmas period. In terms of children still dependent on their parents (usually under 18 and living in the same household), there are:

- *A total of 17 children living in temporary accommodation, of which:*
 - *3 of these are in Dartmouth Avenue, which is a supported hostel for homeless families.*
 - *14 are living in self-contained dispersed flats.*
- *We anticipate that 4 of the families in dispersed flats will have moved into permanent accommodation by Christmas.*

The Council works corporately and with a range partners to prevent homelessness for all residents, though particularly for young people under 18. This is done by providing a range of services including: the Young People's Mediation Service; high quality tenancy and housing options advice; drop-in surgeries; housing life-skill talks to schools and youth groups; bespoke support plans; and a range of supported accommodation options including the Supported Lodgings Scheme and supported housing such as Pathways and The Foyer. All of these services are commissioned by the Council to prevent or alleviate homelessness for young people. As a result I am pleased to confirm that our use of temporary accommodation is extremely low when compared to the national rate.

M 08	Question from:	Councillor Lisa Brett
<p>The previous administration allocated a budget of £1M to improve youth & community facilities to the East of Bath. On becoming Cabinet Member for C&YP Cllr. Evans agreed to undertake a review of options for this budgeted allocation of funds. Can Cllr. Evans confirm that this review has now been completed and provide a copy of the Officers report?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Michael Evans
<p><i>In the February 2014 Budget, the Council granted Provisional Approval for up to £1m for this project, subject to the development of a specific business case which was not ultimately forthcoming. I therefore undertook to review if an alternative scheme would be appropriate and work is underway to look at enhancements and refurbishment of the Riverside Youth Hub, this is still in progress with the aim of producing a Project initiation Document within the next few weeks, I would be happy to share information with Councillor Brett and other colleagues in due course as the project takes shape.</i></p>		

M 09	Question from:	Councillor Lisa Brett
<p>Could Cllr. Anketell-Jones kindly explain what this administration are proposing to do to</p>		

support the Cleveland Pools Trust and ensure that the £4.1M secured for Bath from Heritage Lottery subject to £650k in matched funding is in fact granted?

Answer from:

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones

Cllr Brett will be aware of the background to this project, in that this is a Council owned property and in 2004 the Council agreed to allow the Cleveland Pools Trust to take forward a project to re-open the pools in preference to commercial sale of the land and buildings. The Council's Property Services Team worked closely with the Trust to put in place the necessary contractual arrangements concerning a lease and other documentation.

The 2014/15 budget included provisional approval of the sum of £200k to contribute to match funding as part of a bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund. This bid was successful with a grant of £366,200 awarded in July 2014 as stage 1 (development phase) funding.

Council liaison into the project is provided via an officer who sits on the monthly project board. We understand that the application for the second round of Heritage Lottery funding will be submitted in August 2016. This submission will require fundraising and we understand that this is underway in accordance with a fundraising strategy which in turn sits under the business plan.

The financial management for this project resides with the Cleveland Pools Trust. Aside from the £200k allocation outlined previously, the Council has not been approached to provide further financial assistance at this stage. Any request would be duly considered through the normal budgetary processes.

This administration remains very supportive of this project. The Leader of the Council, the Chief Executive and I visited the Pools in November and were happy to follow this with a message of support which is to be posted on the project web-site to give confidence to other potential supporters. We are also currently discussing the possibility of providing office accommodation for the Trust's project manager and we continue to devote officer time in order to stay fully engaged with progress.

M 10

Question from:

Councillor Dine Romero

With reference to the East of Bath Transport Solution would the Cabinet Member confirm the point(s) of contact and interaction between the LDF steering group and CTE PDS with regard to the forthcoming review?

Answer from:

Councillor Anthony Clarke

Louise Fradd, as the Director of Place and Peter Dawson, Group Manager for Transport, will provide the primary officer support to both the LDF and C,T&E PD&S and provide the necessary linkages.

M 11	Question from:	Councillor Dine Romero
<p>Given the importance of 'getting this right' would the Cabinet Member confirm that no decision on a site will be taken before CTE PDS has properly examined all the evidence on the process so far, and all potential solutions?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>The Cabinet does not intend on taking a decision on a preferred site for an East of Bath Park & Ride until both the LDF Steering Group and the CT&E PD&S Panel have had a chance to undertake the work set out in the motion agreed at the November Full Council meeting, a process which should enable Cabinet to select a preferred site early next year as stated within the Council motion.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
<p>Do you agree that order of process should be the most logical order and not the one written in the motion at the last Council? In particular, the Communities, Transport and Environment PDS Panel ought to come before the re-affirmation of the commitment to the Park and Ride?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>The two processes are different and addressing different issues so I don't agree with your question.</i></p>		
Supplementary Question:		
<p>Could you explain why they are different?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p><i>The Local Development Framework Steering Group review is to look at all the options for the location of an East of Bath Park & Ride prior to Cabinet selecting a preferred site early next. The Communities, Transport and Environment Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel is to undertake an open and transparent public scrutiny, examining a wide range of integrated transport solutions.</i></p>		

M 12	Question from:	Councillor Dine Romero
<p>Would the Cabinet Member ensure that no professional bodies or consultants will be commissioned before the conclusion of the CTE PDS work on the East of Bath Transport Solution?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Anthony Clarke
<p></p>		

We will continue the work commissioned to develop solutions to the transport problems of Bath and I would be reluctant to give this assurance as it is quite possible the officers might require such assistance including, for instance, in support of the LDF Steering Group.

M 13

Question from:

Councillor Cherry Beath

With reference to the Placemaking Plan, what can the Council do to ensure the growth of the Universities, with regard to accommodation needs for students, is balanced with delivering housing targets in B&NES?

Answer from:

Councillor Liz Richardson

Balancing competing demands for space does not mean that these demands are treated equally, where there is potential conflict between them. The Plan favours the delivery of new 'conventional' housing and the retention of the existing 'conventional' housing stock over meeting the combined aspirations of the Universities. Due to the effect of Policy B5 this has been the case in the Enterprise Area, City Centre and on the MoD sites since the adoption of the Core Strategy. This does not block student accommodation absolutely but it requires an assessment of its effect on delivering 7,000 conventional houses and office space. Given the number of blocks permitted to date and the residual supply of land available for conventional housing and office space, the scope for more blocks is very limited, but not exhausted.

The Placemaking Plan is a key part of the Council's policy framework which now supplements the Core Strategy by allocating future development sites within the Policy B5 areas for a mixture of other uses (e.g. housing and office space), thereby implicitly making them unavailable for student accommodation. Sites that are not allocated or sites outside the specified areas could be available for student blocks. In addition, in July 2003 the Council made an Article 4 Direction which has slowed down the rate of increase in HMOs. The SPD accompanying the Direction can be changed to further manage HMOs if the net 7,000 dwellings for the city is at risk.

The Universities will need to manage their aspirations within this context. The University of Bath will have to rely on its own (non-Green Belt) estate for follow-on accommodation, more so than currently, if it is to grow at high levels. Bath Spa University has less flexibility as a landowner and may therefore have to manage expectations or endeavour to find hitherto unknown (and deliverable) sites. None have been identified during the preparation of the Plan.

A detailed assessment of this issue is presented in Section 2F of the Draft Placemaking Plan and the related policies for the university campuses.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P 01	Question from:	38 Degrees Bath
<p>Has the Council considered how the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), which is currently being negotiated in secret between the European Union and the United States, will curtail its ability to take democratic decisions to promote the wellbeing and prosperity of local residents and local businesses and may also impact its finances?</p> <p>This is a hugely controversial deal which could have enormous consequences for all of us. In October, a petition against it of over 3.25 million signatories (including over half a million from Britain) was delivered to the European Commission. Three days later, more than 250,000 people demonstrated in Berlin against TTIP and Ceta (the parallel treaty between the EU and Canada).</p> <p>To date, over 1,400 residents have signed a petition asking BANES Council to debate TTIP thoroughly. We are afraid that it will open up previously protected public contracts, e.g. in health, social care and education, to multinational corporations whose overriding concern is profit, not wellbeing.</p> <p>Moreover, both the EU and the US want TTIP to include an Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) system, enabling corporations to sue public authorities over any change of policy or regulation that could reduce their projected future profits, not through British courts but through a separate system of unaccountable international tribunals.</p> <p>This could encourage a corporate compensation culture, with very negative effects on the Council's finances and its ability to promote local wellbeing and prosperity. For example, under ISDS the US oil and gas company Lone Pine Resources is now suing Canada for \$250 million for lost future profits after the province of Quebec placed a moratorium on fracking beneath the St Lawrence River.</p> <p>The Local Government Association is taking a very cautious approach to TTIP.* (LGA representatives in London and Brussels are following the negotiations closely and would be a good source of further information.)</p> <p>Will the Cabinet investigate these concerns and report to full Council how BANES should:</p> <p>a) react to these aspects of TTIP and</p> <p>b) communicate its views to local MPs, MEPs, central government and the LGA?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Warren
<p><i>Thank you for your question, I am aware of the debate around the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and broadly support the position taken on our behalf by the Local Government Association in as follows:</i></p> <p><i>“Whilst recognising the significant free trade benefits of the deal, the LGA is pressing for:</i></p> <p><i>1. Clear and specific safeguards for services delivered by councils, including education and social services. The approach is currently unsatisfactory in a deal which could have</i></p>		

public sector consequences if the drafting is not watertight.

2. The continued right for councils to determine their own service delivery models now and in the future.

3. The continued right for national governments and councils to set public policy and standards in all fields: health, safety, environmental protection, labour law, data protection, consumer protection etc.

4. A levelling up rather than a levelling down of common EU-US goods and services standards.

5. Reform or removal of the special tribunal (ISDS) mechanism in order to limit private litigation against public authorities. Talks have currently been suspended on this issue.

6. The fullest transparency in the negotiating process itself and local government representation in the negotiations via the EU's Committee of the Regions.

The LGA also note that both the European Commission and the UK government emphasise that the deal will have no negative impacts upon services delivered by Councils."

I will ask officers to keep an eye on the debates and if the Council has concerns we will feed these through the LGA who are our representative body.

P 02	Question from:	Annie Kilvington
-------------	-----------------------	------------------

Item 17 of the Agenda for the Cabinet Meeting is the adoption of the Bath and North East Somerset Council Green Space Strategy. For the purposes of the strategy, natural and semi-natural green space is defined as covering a variety of spaces, including meadows, woodland, copses, river valleys and lakes, all of which share a trait of having natural characteristics and biodiversity value, and are also partly or wholly accessible for informal recreation [see page 49 of the Strategy]

In this context:

1. Does the Council agree that Sites B & F for a proposed Park & Ride to the East of Bath, both of which have clear and well used public access, and defined and legal public rights of way, fall within the definition of natural or semi-natural space?
2. If it does so agree, could the Council please confirm that Sites B & F should therefore formally be identified as natural or semi-natural space within the Green Space Strategy?
3. If it does not so agree, could it please state its reasons for disagreeing?
4. Could the Council please confirm whether Sites B & F are currently identified as natural or semi-natural space within the Green Space Strategy, as they appear not to have been included in the Bathavon North portion of the study on which the Strategy is based?
5. If Sites B & F are not currently identified as natural or semi-natural space within the Green Space Strategy, would the Council please agree that any approval of

the Green Space Strategy should be made subject to the addition of these two sites as identified natural or semi-natural space?

Answer from:

Councillor Liz Richardson

1. *No, they are land used as grazing by farmers and have not been identified in the Bathavon North section of the Green Space Strategy.*
2. *No, because the primary purpose of the sites currently is for agriculture.*
3. *The analysis carried out through the Green Space Strategy does not identify the sites.*
4. *As the sites have not been identified in the Bathavon North section, they have not been included within the Green Space Strategy.*
5. *No as set out in the above answers the sites do not fall within the scope of the Strategy.*

P 03

Question from:

Sian James

1. When will all of the 242 questions raised on P&R for the full council meeting on Nov 12th be answered?
2. Tim Warren, on Radio Bristol yesterday (Thursday) talked about additional housing in Wiltshire causing additional cars into Bath. The Hill paper focuses on additional traffic caused by the Enterprise Area inside Bath drawing workers in from outside Bath. Ben Howlett talks of the 'Death Corridor' caused by HGV's and through traffic focussing on the pollution aspects on the London Road.

There is obviously a conflict between reducing pollution for residents and creating new jobs for non residents that will cause more traffic. Your 'strap line' is 'Putting Residents First'. Which is the priority for the cabinet? Is it putting residents first - or is it jobs for non residents?

Answer from:

Councillor Tim Warren

1. *These have now been placed on the Council's web site.*
2. *One of the Cabinet's top six priorities, as set out at our Cabinet meeting in July, is 'improving transport'. This includes action to tackle the high levels of congestion and resulting pollution experienced in central and eastern Bath, including measures such as an East of Bath Park & Ride and link-road, as set out in our 'Putting Residents First' manifesto published before the election. Another of our top six priorities is 'creating new homes and jobs', which includes action to support and enable the thousands of new jobs that are to be created at the Bath City Riverside Enterprise Area over the coming years. The Bath Transport Strategy underpins both the Council's Core Strategy and Economic Strategy, enabling these new jobs to be created. Whilst we hope and expect that the majority of new jobs to be created in Bath over the coming years will be taken by local residents, this is not always within the Council's control and we must be realistic about the fact that many people do commute to work, and if no action is taken to provide alternative ways of getting into and out of the city then traffic will only continue to worsen in the years ahead. I do not see a conflict between creating new jobs and improving transport, indeed I believe these issues to be*

integral to one another.

P 04 **Question from:** Christine Boyd

Can Cllr Warren give a clear undertaking that the communities, transport and environment scrutiny panel will be given the time and resources that it deems necessary to undertake an open, transparent public scrutiny, examining a wide range of integrated transport solution for the east of Bath?

Can Cllr Warren also give assurances that no attempt will be made to tie the hands of scrutiny or direct its work programme?

Answer from: Councillor Tim Warren

Yes, in accordance with the motion passed at the November Council meeting and the process and timescale set out in the motion.

P 05 **Question from:** Terry Wagstaff

Would the Leader of Council provide and publish the dates of the programme of meetings of Cabinet, the Local Development Framework Steering Group and the Communities and the Transport & Environment Scrutiny Panel which are to undertake further work on Park & Ride East of Bath & an Integrated Transport Strategy, as listed in the draft minutes of the decision of Council on 12 November, 2015?

This will enable the Parish Councils and communities East of Bath, and the many other interested parties, to plan their preparations for the engagement and public consultation on these matters by the council.

Answer from: Councillor Tim Warren

The dates of these meetings are set by the Chairs and Vice-Chairs (where relevant) of the committees, in consultation with the committee members, not by myself. I believe that an initial meeting of the LDF Steering Group is due to take place in December, with further meetings planned in the new year. The currently scheduled dates of meetings of the C,T&E PD&S Panel are published on the Council website.

P 06 **Question from:** Leslie Skipper

I have been looking at the council's draft budget and am interested in a paragraph which features in the People and Communities Directorate plan. The council believes a lot of money can be saved from Service Redesign with regards to People and Community. However I would like to know more about how the 'Healthy Lives, Healthy People' community grants scheme (£22k) is affected. Can you give me some examples of organisations that have previously benefited from this grant please?

Answer from: Councillor Vic Pritchard

This grant is administered by Quartet, a voluntary sector agency, on behalf of the Council. This question cannot be answered fully in time for the Cabinet meeting as the

commissioners responsible for it, who sit in the public health team, are not available in the short time between receiving the question and the deadline for approving a reply. This interim response therefore just acknowledges the question and commits to providing a full written answer within one week of the Cabinet meeting.

P 07	Question from:	Fiona Meldrum
-------------	-----------------------	---------------

Tim Warren on Radio Bristol on 26th November spoke about a park and ride in the east of the city being set up to serve commuters. Which usage survey has he or the team conducted that has led him to the conclusion that commuters would use one?

Answer from:	Councillor Tim Warren
---------------------	-----------------------

Surveys of our existing Park & Rides show that around half of those who use these Park & Rides are commuters, with most of the remaining users being visitors. At least 4,000 people commute into Bath from the east each day, and in addition to this thousands of new jobs are due to be created at Bath's Riverside Enterprise Area in the coming years. In order to cater for both this existing and future demand, the Ch2mHill report of November 2014 concluded that: 'it is clear that enhanced park and ride around the city will be an absolutely essential requirement which the Transport Strategy will need to deliver.' And that 'Whilst modest expansions assumed to the existing capacities at the Odd Down and Lansdown sites will clearly contribute, the largest potential for car trip abstraction will be a site to the 'East of Bath'.'

P 08	Question from:	Whitelands and Tynning Green Space Group
-------------	-----------------------	--

Having been informed by B&NES that the site that we named as the Green Batch is being recommended by officers for designation as Local Green Space, and noting that only the woodland top of the batch (previously mapped as woodland on B&NES Green Infrastructure mapping) is marked as proposed Local Green Space in the Somer Valley Pre-submission draft plan without the remainder of the batch included, and noting that the plan states that the maps will be updated prior to the consultation, we ask:

- a) is this is a mapping problem?
- b) can we be assured that this detail will be looked at by officers prior to publication of the consultation draft plan?

Answer from:	Councillor Martin Veal
---------------------	------------------------

If there has been a mapping error then we will look into this. Thank you for drawing this to our attention and if there is an error we will ensure that the draft area profile maps are considered by planning policy officers and amended as appropriate.