

## **Christine Boyd: statement to CTEPS Panel 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2017**

I am speaking to call in number 9a about how the Cabinet report misled Cabinet about the Placemaking Plan (PMP) and why that was a fatal error.

The PMP is listed (at section 4) as an adopted policy. In fact it is a draft policy.

Indeed the Council itself has recently proposed modifications to this draft, including to the section on P&R and policy ST6, which sets out the rules by which any planning application for P&R would be determined.

Consultation on these modifications finished just 9 days ago.

Because of these modification it was wrong for the report to say at 4.15 that;

*'The Council's draft **Placemaking Plan** refers to the Council's long established policy to develop a new P&R facility to the east of Bath'.*

This statement has been deleted from the new draft, probably because it is inaccurate.

There is no council policy that approves P&R to the east. The Transport Policy required the council to;

*'Identify need for increased P&R capacity.... through the placemaking plan as part of a wider parking strategy'*

This it has not been done.

It was incorrect, and highly improper for the report to say at 4.15 that

*'The Council has received informal comment from the Planning Inspector regarding the main modifications to the Placemaking Plan.'*

The Planning Inspector is not at liberty to have informal discussion with anyone, all information must be in the public domain. We have received assurances from the Planning Inspector's Programme Officer that this did not occur.

The council's conclusion at 4.15 that

*Policy ST6 (see paragraph 4.16 below) can be afforded significant weight.*

Is absurd. The version of ST6 offered to members in the Cabinet report is the old version that the council itself wishes to change, no possible weight can be attributed to something that will be deleted.

Cabinet was not shown the revised version, but this can't be given weight either, since its soundness has been challenged and the Planning Inspector has yet to decide whether it should be approved, deleted or amended.

Now the worst bit...at 8.1 Cabinet is told that;

*The technical work that has been undertaken identifies a need for an east of Bath P&R and this was accepted by the Inspector at the recent Placemaking Plan Examination.*

This is completely untrue; we are reliably informed that the Inspector has not accepted that need for an east of Bath Park & Ride has been established.

Indeed at the public examination hearing on 22 September 2016, the Council's Planning Policy team manager Richard Daone conceded, (in response to a direct question from the Planning Inspector) that need for park and ride would have to be tested; and

In her closing remarks, the Planning Inspector confirmed she would proceed to give further consideration to whether the submitted PMP is sound. This has not yet occurred; absolutely no assumptions can be made until the Planning Inspector has made her determination.

So why is all of this important? Because Cabinet relied upon a report, that was factually flawed and which assured which them that local planning policy was in place to support an east P&R. This is very far from the truth.

The fact is that the Council should never have selected a site before the Placemaking Plan was approved.