



**Note of the meeting of the Bath City Forum
held on Tuesday, 26th April, 2016
in Concourse Room - Southdown Church Centre, Bath BA2 1NJ**

In Attendance

Councillor Patrick Anketell-Jones
Councillor Rob Appleyard
Jeremy Boss
Councillor Fiona Darey
Van DuBose
Jo Farrar
Councillor Andrew Furse
Councillor Bob Goodman
Michael Hill
Caroline Kay
Robin Kerr
Councillor Michael Norton
Councillor Lin Patterson
Councillor Christopher Pearce
Rosie Phillips
Councillor Joe Rayment
Councillor Liz Richardson
Councillor Dine Romero
George Samios
Councillor Shaun Stephenson-McGall
Councillor Peter Turner
John Wilkinson

In Attendance/presenting

Simon De Beer
Carrie-Ann Evans
Sgt. Anthony O'Brien
Mark Hayward
Andy Thomas

Apologies Received from

Councillor Paul Crossley
Patricia Griffin
Sally Harris

Matt Humberstone
Penny McKissock
Paul Pennycook
Councillor June Player
Dr Christopher Roche
Nigel Sherwen
Kevin Thatcher

1. Public Open Session

The Chair of the Forum, Cllr Goodman, welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited Sergeant O'Brien, Avon and Somerset Neighborhood Policing Team to update the Forum on local policing matters.

Sergeant O'Brien updated as follows:

- There has been a spate of theft from cars parked on the roadside at night. The reports have been citywide but there are several hotspots, particularly in Snow Hill, Whiteway and Charlotte Street Car Park. Neighbourhood Policing initiatives are in place to address this and several arrests have been made as a result of this work.
- The Police are acting to deal with drug dealing in the Snow Hill area, with perpetrators coming into the city from outside areas
- Street drinking in the city centre is being tackled through Community Protection Warnings and Orders
- Recent indecent exposure incidents have led to a number of arrests

Sergeant O'Brien then responded to questions as follows:

Question 1 - Cllr Turner – Have the car thefts been aimed at older vehicles and has CCTV helped with investigating the incidents?

Response – There have been certain makes/models targeted but all types of vehicle are potential targets as doors are being bent back and thieves steal the valuables from inside very quickly. CCTV does help and the advice is not to leave any valuables on display inside vehicles.

Question 2 – Robin Kerr – What is being done to deal with people defecating in parks such as Sydney Gardens and Henrietta Gardens?

Response – This particular issue is not one that has been brought to the attention of the Police; if reports are made then patrols can be stepped up to cover these parks.

Question 3 - Cllr Romero – There have also been a number of incidents outside of schools and on school routes. Could any progress that is being on tackling this made be fed back to the schools?

Response – The Police take these incidents very seriously. As highlighted previously, indecent exposure incidents have led to an arrest. Feedback to schools can be provided.

Question 4 - Cllr Rayment – What is being done to help people who are homeless, begging or street drinking?

Response – The Police role is to enforce the law where a crime is being committed. Warnings and advice are also given as appropriate and links made to support services. The Council, Police and other partners worked together on the ‘Your Kindness Can Kill’ campaign

Question 5 - Cllr Furse – As the summer approaches, what can be done to tackle rough sleepers, dogs and fighting that is occurring in Royal Victoria Park?

Response – The Police will deal with offences as they are reported and patrol areas and move people on in the known to be trouble hotspots. Consideration is being given to a new “Streetwise” initiative.

Additional Comment – Rosie Phillips – A Homelessness Partnership is well-established and DHI chairs this. There is a distinction to be made between homelessness and begging issues. Rosie will report back to the partnership and suggested that the Forum may wish to look at the wider topic of social inequality in the City at a future meeting.

Additional Comment - Cllr Romero – If issues are dealt with in the city centre there needs to be consideration given to where the issues may be displaced to.

Additional Comment - Cllr Rayment – Is there a process for determining who will be “moved on” from public places?

Additional Comment - Cllr Furse – The DPPO had been in place for a number of years now: a degree of tolerance is needed when managing city centre issues as displacing people can lead to more serious issues occurring.

Question 6 – Cllr Turner – The public perception of community safety is a real issue- does this affect how the Police deploy resources?

Response – The Police will patrol areas of the City and a visible presence is needed. There are also Street Pastors and Bath BID staff that support safety in the city centre. Neighbourhood patrols are still in place but resource has to be deployed where the need arises.

Question 7 – Cllr Patterson – Is there any Police liaison with Julian House?

Response – Yes, the Police do work with Julian House.

Question 8 – Cllr McGall – How are the Police adapting to their move to Redbridge House and the one stop shop presence in Manver’s Street? How have the public responded and has there been any effect on the beat teams?

Response – The one stop shop is still “bedding in” and the number of public visitors is down compared to the old police station. The Police need to undertake more work on public awareness of the changes that have taken place. Beat managers now undertake response roles but there will always be a local presence.

2. Minutes of the last meeting - 21st January 2016

Cllr Peter Turner moved the adoption of the minutes as a correct record of the meeting of 21st January 2016, and this was seconded by Caroline Kay and agreed by the meeting.

3. Update on actions from the previous meeting

Cllr Goodman reported that he had met with the Council Leader and agreed that Cllr Goodman would carry out a detailed review of University development planning, student accommodation and HMOs.

Cllr Goodman explained that he had continued to discuss the issues with a number of members of the Bath City Forum, B&NES ward councillors, both Universities and areas with similar issues (in particular Oxford).

Work will be ongoing for another 4-6 weeks and any additional views will be welcomed.

Cllr Romero asked if work is taking place alongside the appropriate PDS Panel. Cllr Goodman confirmed that he will work with the Panel as appropriate

Robin Kerr asked if Cllr Goodman was aware of the national conference looking at these issues. Cllr Goodman confirmed that he was aware of this.

Cllr McGall asked that Cllr Goodman be aware of the other educational organisations that are based in the city and have impacts.

4. Neighbourhood Planning in Bath

Cllr Liz Richardson, Cabinet Member for Homes and Planning, made a presentation on Neighbourhood Plans (attached) and responded to the questions that were asked, summarised below:

Question 1 – Cllr Darey – What access is available to funding and resources for producing a Neighbourhood Plan?

Response – Funding can be applied for in set “time windows”. When the Chew Valley produced their plan the funding amount was £5000 but this has recently changed. Chew Valley has so far spent just under £10000 and has received additional funding which included Ward Councillors Initiative funding.

Question 2 – Caroline Kay – What was the population included in the Chew Valley Plan?

Response – The total was around 4300 for the wards involved in the NP area

Question 3 – Cllr Goodman – Bath is a big area: would a single plan or a number of separate plans be the best approach?

Response – Bath is probably too large for a single plan. There needs to be an approach that looks towards local areas that have shared needs and identities. Every plan that is put forward has to be supported by a local group.

Question 4 – Robin Kerr – Where a neighbourhood plan is adopted, does the local element of CIL rise from 15% to 25%?

Response – This is correct: CIL money can also be pooled collectively.

Question 5 – Jill Brown (local resident) - felt that the existing ward areas could come together to set up planning areas.

Response – Plans can be as local as required.

Question 6 – Cllr Romero – What would be the optimum number of people that could be covered by one plan?

Response – What is important is to have areas who have things in common – eg in the Chew Valley, the focus was on the rural villages and did not include the villages adjacent to the A37.

Question 7 – Caroline Kay – The Neighbourhood Plan appears to start where the Placemaking Plan left off. Separate plans need to be reflecting the different parts of Bath.

Response – Cohesion is needed on the needs of the area, as a 51% “yes” vote is needed at the referendum.

Question 8 – Jeremy Boss – The area of Widcombe has looked at the idea of a neighbourhood plan and found that it needs a great deal of commitment and resource to take this forward. The question is what benefits would be achieved from this commitment.

Response – The specific issues that an area addresses through the plan are dependent on a consensus on local needs. The area could (for example) have a simple plan with only one item included so long as that was seen as important locally.

Additional Point – Cllr McGall – In previous years there was a group called ‘Oldfield Outlook’ that showed that urban communities can come together in agreement. However, a challenge in this process was that there needs to be certainty in advance about the “lines on the map”

Question 9 – Van DuBose – Bath should be thought of as a city as a whole. There are areas of Bath where high levels of development are planned and others that have very little. Without a plan for the whole of the city we could see tensions develop between communities. Proposing a plan for the whole city of Bath would ensure that more localised proposals would not be able to come forward.

Response – Any group can present a proposal to be a neighbourhood planning area to B&NES; once an area is accepted as a neighbourhood planning area it can’t be covered by another. It was not an appropriate rationale for putting forward a single neighbourhood plan proposal that it closed off the option of a larger number of plans.

Question 10 – Cllr Romero – Where there is development in the city does the local element of CIL remain in the area where the development takes place?

Response – CIL is provided to help meet the demands of new developments. There is more freedom of usage for the so-called “local” element of CIL.

Question 10 – Cllr Turner – Where growth is being promoted how do the dynamics differ between parished areas and Bath?

Response – There are clear differences between rural and urban needs. Conservation areas have to be considered and any plan needs to highlight what is good for the people in the included area, however large or small.

Cllr Goodman asked the Forum members for feedback on what they felt Bath needed to be thinking about regarding neighbourhood planning. A Task and Finish group was suggested to follow on from this discussion. The following points were made in response:

- Cllr Furse felt that a single plan for the City was what was needed. Wards are distinctive in themselves but people do move around the City as a whole.
- Cllr Patterson felt there was a need to explore further the requirements in Bath as it has a diverse range of people and communities. If the city wishes to go ahead with a plan/plans it will need to focus on helping Bath’s identity.
- Michael Hill felt that Bath is not a “neighbourhood” but a city; it will be difficult to deal with all its requirements in one plan.

- Robin Kerr felt that the Forum has a duty to investigate this matter further.
- Cllr Appleyard felt that certain wards will be taking on a great deal regarding the planned development for the City; the wards across the City will all have their own community challenges which they will want to respond to. If there were to be more than one Neighbourhood Plan then specific areas could move forward at their own speed.
- Caroline Kay was not against neighbourhood plans and would like to see more work carried out to investigate the best way forward. Careful thought will be needed to ensure that parts of the City do not “fall through the cracks.”
- Cllr Anketell-Jones was concerned that neighbourhood plans will not enhance the effective planning arrangements we already have in Bath. The city should work as one to make any improvements needed; to keep local people engaged there will be a need to lay out what difference a plan would make.

Cllr Goodman recommended that a Task and Finish group be established to look at the options for Neighbourhood Planning for Bath, and this was agreed by the meeting.

5.1 Report from Constitution Task and Finish Group

Cllr Rayment reported back on the work of the this group. Recommendations, including draft Terms of Reference, Standing Orders, Code of Practice and Declarations of Interest, had been circulated. He made the following points:

- The initial Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Bath City Forum had been agreed by Council last year.
- The group had set out to review the TOR, with the intent of avoiding amendments being required too often, and with many details now in the Standing Orders
- The group had agreed that the arrangement for electing a Chair and Vice Chair of the Forum be changed so that an elected Bath councillor should hold the position of Chair and a co-opted Member that of Vice Chair.
- It was felt that co-opted members should be given a period of office of two years, with a possible extension of a further two years
- The group was proposing a selection panel to agree on co-opted members, to comprise the Chair; the Vice Chair, one additional co-opted member and two additional Councillors.

Robin Kerr asked for clarification on Rule 4 which stated that the Chair and Vice Chair act independently. It was confirmed that this meant that these were distinct roles, not linked to any political or other grouping. Robin also queried why an Area Committee model (based on the model that Winchester had adopted) had not been selected for Bath. It was confirmed that the Task and Finish Group had discussed this matter in some detail and, amongst other considerations; the issue identified was that co-opted members could not have voting rights on Area Committees.

Cllr Appleyard felt that two year terms for co-options will create better continuity for these roles. However, he was concerned that this might lead to the potential of a significant loss of experience at one time. He suggested therefore that adopting this approach for half of the

membership each year would avoid this. Additionally, Cllr Appleyard suggested that the community could be involved in the selection process.

Nicolette Boater (Bath resident) felt that the existing selection panel works well as there is representation for all political parties involved in the process. As a resident she felt that political balance matters when looking for the expertise and ability that the Forum requires and she was concerned by the idea of the Chair being a co-opted member as this would not allow for adequate party representation.

Cllr Rayment felt that having a co-opted member as the Vice Chair would bring this voice to the agenda setting process for the Forum.

Cllr Goodman moved the following recommendations

- That the Terms of Reference and Standing Orders for the Bath City Forum be recommended to Bath & North East Somerset Council to replace the Terms of Reference document agreed by Council in July 2015
- That the Code of Conduct and Declarations of Interest documents be adopted by the Forum

This was seconded by Cllr Rayment and on being put to the vote was carried

11 votes in favour with 1 vote against and 1 abstention

With the agreement of the Chair, Cllr Rayment then circulated "The Bath City Forum Short Term Plan Proposal" (attached) for consideration. In discussion of this proposal, the following points were made:

- Caroline Kay felt that the timings for selection of new panel members needed to be staggered to avoid the election cycle. Robin Kerr agreed with this point.
- Cllr Appleyard suggested that all of the short term proposal should be referred back to the Constitution Task and Finish Group as the proposals required further consideration.
- In response to a query, Cllr Rayment clarified that the AGM was required to take place within thirteen months of the first Forum meeting.

Cllr Goodman then moved that the AGM be held on 1st July 2016 in The Guildhall at 5pm, to coincide with the date of the 2016 Bath City Conference.

Cllr Patterson asked for clarification of the business for the AGM and Cllr Goodman explained that the Chair and Vice Chair would be elected, in line with the arrangements adopted earlier in the meeting.

Jeremy Boss asked for clarity on the process for this. Cllr Goodman explained that Forum members would nominate and a vote would follow, with nominees being invited to say a few words in support of their nominations in line with the first AGM of the Forum.

Cllr Goodman's recommendation was seconded by Cllr Rayment and, on being put to the vote, was agreed **12 votes in favour, 1 vote against and 1 abstention**

5.2 Reports from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Task and Finish Group

Cllr Darey reported back on the work of this task and finish group.

Cllr Furse asked if the levy regulations contained a definition of “infrastructure”.

Carrie-Ann Evans (B&NES Senior Legal Advisor) confirmed that she would be happy to circulate the wording contained in the regulations

Cllr Romero asked if there is a “radius” for the “local portion” of CIL from the development itself.

Carrie-Ann Evans explained that the regulations are not so specific as this; the local portion of CIL can be pooled across areas but there are set timescales for spending and it is clear that the funding must be used to meet the demands caused by the development itself.

Cllr Appleyard explained that there is a document available on the Council website that explains the CIL issues and the last meeting of the Planning PDS Panel included this.

Following discussion, Cllr Goodman moved the following recommendations:

- That the Forum recommend to the Council that the process set out be adopted for allocation of the neighbourhood portion of CIL in the unparished area, and that the Council’s scheme of delegation be updated to reflect this.
- That a Forum Standing Panel be established with a membership comprising Forum members (to be determined) and also those local elected members appropriate to the neighbourhood portion of CIL under discussion at any one time.
- That regular updates be made to the Forum on the progress of disbursement of all CIL moneys in Bath.

This was seconded by Cllr Darey

On being put to the vote, this was carried with 10 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 1 abstention

6. Establishment of new Task and Finish Groups

Cllr Goodman updated the Panel on the current position regarding Task and Finish Groups. Following discussion, the following was agreed:

- 1) That a CIL Standing Panel be established, following the agreement of the recommendations contained in agenda item 6.
- 2) That a Task and Finish Group be established for independent shops and businesses. This will include the involvement of people from outside the Forum and the inclusion of areas across the city not just the city centre.
- 3) That a Task and Finish Group be established to consider how best the Forum can contribute to major developments in the city. This followed discussion on the best approach, in which the following points were made:

- It might be possible to involve Forum members either as individuals or through a sub-group, as statutory consultees on planning applications, similar to parish councils' roles. Practical issues and potential conflicts of interest would need to be addressed
- There was the need to build on and learn from the Design Review Panel approach
- That there was a need for involvement at an early stage in major development such as the Enterprise Area. Jon Wilkinson identified that the Forum could prove useful in this way so that a view is given at the start of the process.

Forum members are asked to express their interest in any of the above groups by e-mailing Mark Hayward- mark_hayward@bathnes.gov.uk . It was agreed that this information would be circulated in a consolidated email.

7. Consultations

It was noted that The World Heritage Site Management Plan will be subject of a consultation from 23rd May 2016 which will run for eight weeks. Cllr Goodman suggested that Forum members may wish to respond with their views.

<http://www.bathworldheritage.org.uk/>

8. Bath City Conference

Cllr Goodman explained that this year's Bath City Conference will take place on Friday 1st July. Active involvement from Forum members throughout the day of this year's event is encouraged. The Conference will be hosting a number of debates during the daytime along with a showcase of exhibitor's that represent a range of interests from across the City. A "question and answer session" will be held in the evening where a panel will take a range of questions from the public.

Cllr McGall suggested that in future the Conference would benefit from being held at a time when the students are present in Bath.

9. Meeting Summary, Future Agenda Planning and Date of the next Forum meeting

Devolution

Jo Farrar asked the Forum if they would like to receive a presentation on the West of England Devolution deal. Council will be taking a decision on 29 June 2016. The options would be to either use the Forum meeting on 28 June or find an earlier date to hold the session. It was agreed that the forum would like a session but at an earlier date than 28 June.

Future Agenda

An Agenda Plan showing future items was included in the agenda pack. All Forum members are invited to put forward their suggestions for future agendas

Public Sessions

Cllr Goodman explained that the open public session that is scheduled at the beginning of Forum meetings is available to other organisations to come along and be part of this discussion. Suggestions could include, the MP for Bath, Health Services, Fire and Rescue and RSLs.

Robin Kerr explained that the Police now use the Forum to deliver the work that the PACT meetings used to cover. Andy Thomas added that the Police also have web-based information that allows the public to access crime statistics across the City. The Police also hold beat surgeries that allow local communities to feed back to them.

The Forum members are asked to promote the public sessions.

Custody Visits

Cllr Goodman agreed that he would provide new dates for the visit to the Keynsham Custody Facility.

Overview of the Meeting

It was agreed that the information on Task and Finish groups would be circulated in a consolidated email to members of the Forum.

Meeting Dates

Bath City Conference – **01 July 2016 (from 12 noon until 7.30pm)**

Bath City Forum Meeting – **13 September 2016 (5.15-8pm) – The Guildhall**

*Note: Bath City Forum Meeting – **28 June 2016** will not now take place.*