

Tim Williams statement to call in 23rd January 2017

Thank you for the opportunity to speak, I will be speaking to item 6 and item 9b of the reasons for call-in to explain how the cabinet report was incomplete and as such was not adequate to support such an important decision and one that had attached to it such huge cost.

The report should have begun with a statement of project issues to be addressed and objectives and the way in which it was anticipated the solution would meet these.

In order for the decision to be sound it should have been supported by a host of other reports, indeed we were led to believe that these would be provided. (This is a reference to my letter to Tim Warren and the response from Peter Dawson provided with our report.)

These are the reports that are required to support a decision of this kind.

- A business case; Cabinet agreed that options ranging from 14m to 17.5m were all acceptable solutions. They voted to proceed with an option that would lose £115k/annum, despite the cuts being seen elsewhere in the Council budget. They had virtually no financial information to support this
- A Heritage Impact assessment – Heritage England have been asking for this for over a year. In November 2016 Louise Fradd told Historic England that ‘the planning agent has commenced work on the HIA in order to support a forthcoming Cabinet report’. Later she told the Finance Scrutiny call-in on the P&R spend that it had been completed and Historic England were happy – so where is it and why are HE so annoyed?
- A patronage study to identify need for additional P&R capacity as recommended by the Halcrow report in 2013 and required by the Transport Strategy(2014). It was also promised to Batheaston parish Council and last September Richard Daone confirmed to the Planning Inspector that need would have to be tested.
- A post implementation review of the last 4.5million that was spent on P&R to investigate why p&r use has not increased since 2009 when permission was granted for the Bath Package expansions.
- A parking review showing how many spaces the council wants to remove from the centre of Bath and how many people say they would use P&R. In July 2015 the Cabinet was told this had been done, but that was incorrect, in fact this is not expected till the end of march 2017
- An adopted Placemaking Plan. The Bath Preservation Trust and Historic England as well as BMA have stressed that no site decision

should be made until the council adopts this. There can be no certainty that planning permission will be given without this,

- An Equalities Impact Assessment. Every Cabinet report reminds members that they must ensure that it bears in mind equalities considerations but this was not mentioned in the report. 30% of people in Banes don't have access to a car and so cannot use P&R they could be adversely affected if P&R draws people off service buses and these in turn are cut. How has this been considered?

If you have any doubt whether a sound decision has been made you should recommend this decision be referred to full council and only determined when all of these things are in place.