

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

MINUTES OF COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, 8th November, 2018

Present:- **Councillors** Cherry Beath, Patrick Anketell-Jones, Rob Appleyard, Tim Ball, Colin Barrett, Jasper Becker, Sarah Bevan, Colin Blackburn, Neil Butters, Anthony Clarke, Matt Cochrane, Sue Craig, Chris Dando, Matthew Davies, Sally Davis, Douglas Deacon, Emma Dixon, Michael Evans, Charles Gerrish, Ian Gilchrist, Bob Goodman, Francine Haerberling, Alan Hale, Liz Hardman, Steve Hedges, Deirdre Horstmann, Eleanor Jackson, Les Kew, Marie Longstaff, Barry Macrae, Paul May, Robin Moss, Paul Myers, Michael Norton, Lisa O'Brien, Bryan Organ, Lin Patterson, June Player, Vic Pritchard, Joe Rayment, Liz Richardson, Nigel Roberts, Dine Romero, Richard Samuel, Will Sandry, Mark Shelford, Brian Simmons, Peter Turner, David Veale, Martin Veal, Karen Walker, Geoff Ward, Tim Warren, Karen Warrington and Chris Watt

Apologies for absence: **Councillors** John Bull, Paul Crossley, Andrew Furse, Lizzie Gladwyn, Steve Jeffries, Shaun Stephenson-McGall, Alison Millar, Michelle O'Doherty and Caroline Roberts

46 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out on the agenda.

47 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations were made by the following Councillors;

Item 7 – Statements from the public

- Councillor Paul May declared a disclosable pecuniary interest with regard to the statement from UNISON about Sirona, as a non-executive Director of Sirona. He left the Chamber while this statement was considered.

Item 8 – Joint Community Safety Plan

- Councillor Joe Rayment declared an 'other' interest as an employee of DHI which is mentioned in the document.

Item 12 – Protocol on Council Company Governance

- Councillor Charles Gerrish declared an 'other' interest as Chairman of ADL.

Item 15 – Labour motion – School Places and the Threatened Closure of Bath Studio School

- Councillor Emma Dixon declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as she works as a Teaching Assistant at Saltford School, which is part of the Wellsway MAT. She left the Chamber for this item.

- Councillor Tim Ball declared an ‘other’ interest due to having children at the Studio School.
- Councillor Liz Hardman declared an ‘other’ interest as a Governor at Aspire School run by the Wellsway MAT.

Item 17 – Liberal Democrat motion – SEND funding for Children

- Councillor Tim Ball declared an ‘other’ interest as having children with special educational needs.
- Councillor Robin Moss declared an ‘other’ interest as the Chair of the SEND partnership.
- Councillor Charles Gerrish declared an ‘other’ interest as a school governor at Threeways school.

Item 18 – Liberal Democrat motion – People’s Vote

- Councillor Robin Moss declared an ‘other’ interest, having signed the People’s Vote petition.
- Councillor Eleanor Jackson declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as being in receipt of a German state pension.

During consideration of item 9 on the agenda ‘Influencing the central government policy agenda’, the Monitoring Officer re-issued a dispensation for all Councillors with interests in Airbnb, short term lets, hotels, guest houses etc to enable them to take part in the debate and vote.

48 MINUTES - 13TH SEPTEMBER 2018

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Karen Warrington, it was

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of 13th September 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

49 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OR FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

In addition to the customary announcements regarding meeting arrangements, the Chair made the following announcements;

- She asked Councillors to note that the Monitoring Officer had agreed a minor amendment to the job title for the officer delegation for the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) (granted at the 9th November 2017 Council meeting) to change from Strategic Director for Place to ‘Corporate Director’.
- She asked Councillors to stand for a minute’s silence in recognition of the WW1 centenary, and also to remember former B&NES and Avon Councillor Jim Lingard who has passed away.

- She reminded Councillors of the programme of ceremonies and services for remembrance being offered in November 2018. [Details available in a leaflet on Reception and online.]
- She invited Councillors to the Holocaust Memorial Day event – 24th January (5.30 for 5.45 start) in the Alkmaar room.
- She reminded Councillors and the public to nominate to the Young Stars Award recognising young people's achievement;
www.bathnes.gov.uk/ouryoungstars
- She reminded Councillors of the Chairs awards ceremony on February 27th 2018, closing date for nominations 21st December 2018.

50 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There were no items of urgent business.

51 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

The Chair made reference to the Q&A document which had been circulated at the meeting and is attached to the online minutes.

Statements to the meeting were made by the following members of the public;

Andrew Dickens from the Lower Common East Allotment Association (LCEAA) addressed the Council and made reference to his requests at the September Council meeting which he explained had not been addressed. He raised the same concerns about the rights of their allotment association regarding the access gates and noticeboards and called again for these rights to be properly respected. Councillor Rob Appleyard asked Andrew if he was aware of any reason why the Council took the position that it did. Andrew responded that he had been told that the access to gates and noticeboards was given to one association per site. A copy of Andrew's statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book. The Chair thanked Andrew for his statement which was referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

Paul Roles made a statement in which he updated the Council on progress with the issues he had raised at the July meeting regarding Curo accommodation in Kingsmead. He reported that, with the Cabinet Member's help, there had been some progress on improving those issues. He had also been reporting drug dealing and Curo had taken action in this regard the previous day. Paul also raised the issue of mopeds in the city centre and problems with how they were sometimes parked across a full car space. He suggested a consultation and then measures to enforce action (a sticker with a first warning and then fines). Councillor Dine Romero asked Paul if he thought some of the issues he had raised were worse as a result of not having a local police station in Bath. Paul replied that he definitely thought so. The Chair thanked Paul for his statement which was referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

David Redgewell made a statement on behalf of Bus Users UK. He explained he had been pushing hard for the U1 and U2 services and thanked Councillor Mark Shelford for his help with that. He expressed concern about the 179 service and wondered if CIL money could go towards supporting that service at the weekend. Councillor Neil Butters asked if David considered that the transfer of powers to the Metro Mayor was proceeding according to the original timetable, to which David responded that pressure needed to be kept up for that. A copy of David's statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book. The Chair thanked David for his statement which was referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

Andrew Jones made a statement about the Council's planning website and requested it be modified to make the charges more evident. Councillor Sarah Bevan asked Andrew to confirm if he had already achieved some minor amendments to the planning portal, to which he replied that the website had been significantly changed to help inform individuals, but that further changes were needed about the charges. A copy of Andrew's statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book. The Chair thanked Andrew for his statement which was referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

Keith Russell made a statement about the gull problem in Bath, as a resident of Bath Western Riverside, where he said it is a significant problem. He called for a number of measures to address this, including responsibilities placed on developers, and various gull-proofing initiatives. In response to a question from Councillor Tim Warren about whether residents would be prepared to pay a small contribution for anti-gull measures in their own buildings, Keith responded that he would but couldn't speak for others, and that developers needed to consider this issue with flat roofs generally. Councillor Ian Gilchrist asked if Keith was aware that the gull removal programme relied on residents asking for help, to which Keith responded that he was aware and acknowledged that residents who rented may have less interest in pursuing the issue. Councillor June Player asked if Keith thought spikes and netting were helpful as the current measures weren't working, to which Keith responded that a mixture of such measures was helpful, but reiterated that genuine engagement from developers was key. A copy of Keith's statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book. The Chair thanked Keith for his statement which was referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

Fiona Edwards addressed the Council and presented a petition of 1137 signatures from Keynsham Plastic Reaction with the following wording;

"Single use, disposable plastics such as polystyrene takeaway containers and plastic cups are a cause of litter, a waste of resources, and a problem for future generations. They waste fossil fuels and create unsightly streets, and their persistence causes untold harm for wildlife on land and at sea.

We all need to play our part in resolving this situation, but local government in Keynsham should play a leading role as champion, active supporter, regulator, and service provider in ending the prevalence of single use, disposable plastics."

Councillor Bob Goodman asked if Fiona was aware that the Council was already committed to removing single use plastic and supported the ambitious targets within the petition, to which she responded that she was. Councillor Cherry Beath asked what further practical support the Council could give, to which Fiona responded that they were working towards national accreditation, but being able to consult Councillors and the Cabinet Member was helpful. Councillor Joe Rayment asked if

there was a similar group in Bath, to which Fiona responded that there was. A copy of Fiona's statement has been placed on the Council's Minute book. The Chair thanked Fiona for her statement and petition which were referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

Sarah Moore made a statement about the proposed closure of Bath Studio School closure following Bath Community Academy closing, which had affected her son. She mentioned accommodation problems resulting from Academies increasing numbers for funding but not increasing the space available for learning. She acknowledged that the Council did not have control over Academies but called on the Council to put pressure on Government to put in guidelines for limiting pupil numbers to ensure an optimum learning environment. In response to a question from Councillor Tim Ball about whether Sarah considered enough information had been given to parents before the closure was announced, she responded that she definitely did not think so. The Chair thanked Sarah for her statement which was referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

Angie Sowton made a statement to Council in support of a petition of 130 signatures which she presented on behalf of the parents of children at St Andrew's Church school opposing planned cuts to education. It called upon the Council to write to the Secretary of State for Education and the Chancellor of the Exchequer calling for them to reverse cuts to school budgets and amend arrangements for per pupil funding so that no school loses out. Councillor Paul May asked if Angie was aware that the Council, traditionally in receipt of quite low funding, had this year received the highest settlement through the national funding formula representing 7.8% for the next two years, plus extra funding for special educational needs: Angie responded that she was aware of the extra SEN funding but that, in most schools, they were facing cuts. Councillor Tim Ball asked Angie if she considered that funding was sufficient to meet the needs of the ever growing number of SEND pupils, to which she replied that it wasn't and teachers and volunteers were being expected to deal with children with more and more complex needs. Councillor Chris Dando asked if Angie considered this would be sorted out by the funding promised in the budget from Philip Hammond, to which Angie responded that she didn't consider that would be the case. The Chair thanked Angie for the statement and petition, which would be placed on the Council's Minute book and referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

Jane Riekemann made a statement calling on the Council to publicly support a people's vote on the final terms of any Brexit deal and outlined a number of ways in which the South West would be adversely affected by leaving the European Union. Councillor Tim Warren asked whether Jane didn't consider that this issue was up to individuals rather than the Council to express a view, to which she responded that it was effective if the Council as a public body gave a view, as well as individuals giving their views. Councillor Sue Craig asked if Jane was aware that the Local Government Association had asked Government for a strategy to address the £8.4 billion funding shortfall which would open up when we leave the European Union, to which Jane responded that she was not. The Chair thanked Jane for her statement, which would be placed on the Council's Minute book and referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

Pam Richards made a statement to Council highlighting lack of progress in two key performance areas of the Virgin Care Transformation programme. Full details can be read in Pam's statement which has been added to the Minute book and attached to the online record. Councillor Vic Pritchard asked if Pam was aware that he intended to bring a comprehensive update to the next Health & Wellbeing Select Committee. Pam responded that she was aware, it was about time and more information was needed. Councillor Tim Ball asked Pam what more she considered the Council should be doing, to which she responded that Virgin Care needed to be held more closely to account and there needed to be a more transparent and accountable atmosphere in Virgin Care. Councillor Robin Moss asked if it was still the case that staff were having to complete multiple referral forms leading to poor information sharing and potentially putting clients at risk, to which Pam responded that that was her understanding, despite IT integration being one of Virgin Care's promises. The Chair thanked Pam for her statement, which would be placed on the Council's Minute book and referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

Dave Dixon made a statement highlighting various aspects of the public realm which he considered would benefit from a portion of the £10million of public funding that the Leader would be discussing with WECA later this month. Councillor Tim Warren asked Dave if he was aware that 80% of the Council's budget went on Adult and Children's Social care. Dave replied that he was aware of that, but wanted the Leader to access some of the WECA funding to support the high street. Councillor Dine Romero sought clarity on when the photos that Dave showed were taken, to which he replied that it had been earlier that day. Councillor Robin Moss asked Dave if he knew who was responsible for some of the unsightly aspects of the city centre that he had displayed, to which Dave responded that when the Liberal Democrats had put them in, they had been in good condition. The Chair thanked Dave for his statement, which would be placed on the Council's Minute book and referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

John Drake from UNISON made a statement regarding the current dispute with Sirona and stated the Council had a moral responsibility to sort it out. He asked the Council to think about the care workers who would lose out if this change to their contracts was implemented, and further called on the Council to not enter into any flat rate contracts in future. Councillor Tim Ball asked John if he was aware that, were the Council to step in with funding, it would mean that 5 existing staff would need to be made redundant. John responded that would be one way of doing it, but there were other ways and explained that Bristol City Council had raised the pay of care workers so it must be possible. Councillor Tim Ball asked if John believed the Council could have done better to avoid the situation, to which John responded that it would have been better to not force flat cash contracts onto care providers, which take no account of inflation or pay awards. Councillor Robin Moss asked if John could confirm what he had heard that, due to problems with recruitment and retention, staffing rotas were lower in some shifts than health and safety requirements permitted. John responded that as Sirona's reputation as an employer was not very good, he had heard that there were shifts which did not have the correct staff levels. The Chair thanked John for his statement which would be referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

52 JOINT COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN

The Council considered a report presenting the Joint Community Safety Plan which sets out the joint community safety work which will be done by the Community Safety Partnership and the Police and Crime Commissioner over the next three years.

On a motion from Councillor Bob Goodman, seconded by Councillor Mark Shelford, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to adopt the Joint Community Safety Plan.

53 INFLUENCING THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT POLICY AGENDA

The Council considered a report setting out progress made in developing a single document containing the Council's key requests of central government in order to create a more sustainable Council.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Lisa O'Brien, it was

RESOLVED

1. To support the outlined proposals in the attached document *Thriving in uncertain times*, but note that the total estimated additional income to the Council if all of these proposals were agreed to by government would only be an estimated £2.3m p.a.
2. To adopt the document attached as the Appendix as its core position statement in order to influence the central government policy agenda, with the following amendment:

Delete, on page 3, from 'This document is not about...' to '...future funding of local authorities'. Replace with:

'This document sets out our thinking about how local authorities such as B&NES can be granted new powers to raise revenues in order to alleviate some of the pressure that has resulted from demographic changes and significant reductions in our Revenue Support Grant. These proposals reflect the changes that have taken place in recent years such as the growth of Universities and changes to the retail sector, including the growth of e-commerce. We want to be a constructive voice in the debate around the future funding of local authorities, and this document outlines some ways that we could raise revenues through new powers and technical changes, rather than increased grant funding. However, we will also press central Government to restore money directly to us through the Revenue Support Grant, as this is the only way that we will be able to continue to deliver for our residents.'

3. And with the following further amendment to update the section on page 7 ii) b) **Technical Changes that can be achieved in the shorter term** so that this paragraph now contains the replacement underlined words, and now reads;

'Fees for listed building applications: B&NES receives around 800-900 such applications per year, which rightly require time and resources from the council to deal with. We strongly support the need to maintain and safeguard listed buildings for the future, and indeed are very proud of our approach to listed buildings in our area. However, we believe it is unreasonable to expect a small authority to pick up the disproportionate cost of having such a high concentration of listed buildings and we will be engaging further on how best to compensate Bath & North East Somerset for these costs.'

4. Ensure that relevant Secretaries of State, local Members of Parliament, key officials and other relevant stakeholders receive a copy of the adopted document;
5. Use the document in order to continue to seek influence on central government; and
6. Encourage local stakeholders to use the document to also influence central government to benefit Bath & North East Somerset residents and businesses.

[Notes;

1. *During debate, an unsuccessful amendment was moved by Councillor Richard Samuel, and seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, to refer the document to the Resources Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel for further work. This was lost with 12 Councillors voting in favour and 43 Councillors voting against;*
2. *Resolutions 1 and 2 in the successful resolution were proposed by Councillor Joe Rayment and accepted into the substantive motion by the mover and seconder;*
3. *The above resolution was carried with 44 Councillors voting in favour and 11 Councillors abstaining.]*

54 REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS AND POLLING STATIONS 2018 - APPROVAL OF FINAL POLLING DISTRICT SCHEME

The Council considered a report presenting a plan of polling stations for the local elections in May 2019, following the Local Government Boundary Commission for England publishing its final recommendations on the electoral review of B&NES ward boundaries.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, it was unanimously

RESOLVED

1. To approve the new polling district scheme; and
2. To note the proposed polling station plan, acknowledging that work is still in progress, and that the Returning Officer will continue to liaise with Ward Councillors and Parish Councils in order to identify the most suitable venues.

55 REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES UNDER THE GAMBLING ACT 2005

The Council considered a report seeking adoption of the Statement of Principles with regard to gambling which, under the Gambling Act 2005, is required to be reviewed every three years. This follows consultation and a recommendation of the Licensing Committee.

On a motion from Councillor Bob Goodman, seconded by Councillor Les Kew, it was

RESOLVED to adopt the Statement of Principles provided in Appendix B to the report, having had regard to the responses received following the public consultation exercise, as recommended by the Licensing Committee.

[Notes:

- 1. The above resolution was carried with 50 Councillors voting in favour, 2 Councillors voting against and 3 Councillors abstaining.]*

56 PROTOCOL ON COMPANY GOVERNANCE

The Council considered a report setting out the progress made on implementing the decisions of Council on 14th September 2017 relating to the governance arrangements for local authority trading companies.

Councillor Sarah Bevan, as Chair of the Resources Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel, informed Councillors of her Panel's recommendations when they considered this item earlier in the week. Those recommendations were incorporated into the resolution below.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Charles Gerrish, it was

RESOLVED to approve the proposed amendments to the Protocol for governance arrangements of local authority trading companies and the consequent Constitution changes, as set out in the report and summarised in paragraph 5.2, with the addition of the following further recommendations from Resources Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel;

1. With regard to the Group Leaders Briefing (Appendix E, page 215 of the agenda pack),
 - i. the Group Leaders may hold a separate briefing to discuss such matters if they wish (separate from their standard meetings which can be time pressured) and may send an appropriate substitute from their group;
 - ii. Minutes should be taken at the above briefings;
 - iii. Group Leaders (or their substitutes) can ask that their concerns (or dissent) are noted in the minutes; and
2. The proposals for Scrutiny should be reviewed early in the new administration (after May 2019, but before November 2019).

[Notes:

1. *The above resolution was carried with 52 Councillors voting in favour and 2 Councillors abstaining.]*

57 TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2018/19 QUARTER 2 PERFORMANCE REPORT (MID YEAR UPDATE)

The Council considered the Treasury Management quarter 2 performance report.

On a motion from Councillor Charles Gerrish, seconded by Councillor Paul May, it was unanimously

RESOLVED to note;

1. The Treasury Management Report to 30th September 2018, prepared in accordance with the CIPFA Treasury Code of Practice; and
2. The Treasury Management Indicators to 30th September 2018.

58 ANNUAL REPORT ON USE OF REGULATORY INVESTIGATIONS POWERS ACT (RIPA)

The Council considered a report providing an update on the use of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers policies and procedures.

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Dine Romero, it was unanimously

RESOLVED

1. To note that no Inspector's report for 2018 has been received; and
2. To note the Council's use of RIPA.

59 MOTION FROM THE LABOUR GROUP - SCHOOL PLACES & THREATENED CLOSURE OF BATH STUDIO SCHOOL

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Paul May, it was

RESOLVED that

This Council notes that;

1. Ministers from the Department for Education (DfE) have given their in-principle agreement to the termination of the Bath Studio School's funding agreement following a request by the Wellsway Multi Academy Trust to seek this by mutual agreement. This decision was not made by the Council but instead by the Regional Schools Commissioner.
2. It is proposed that following the termination of the funding agreement, the Bath Studio School will close in August 2020.

3. A high proportion of current pupils at Bath Studio School transferred there from Bath Community Academy (BCA) which closed its doors for the last time in July. Without these additional pupils, the lack of parental demand for the school would have been much starker, resulting in a recommendation for closure even earlier.
4. Bath Studio School has one of the highest proportions of students eligible for free school meals in Bath.
5. Bath Studio School only opened in 2014 and has only had one full Ofsted inspection.
6. Bath Studio School has state of the art facilities, specialising in digital media, which is a growing and vital industry in the West of England.
7. That current students at BSS will be able to complete their existing course of study, either to 16, when many pupils naturally transition to a new establishment for Sixth Form or college course, or to 18 when they would have finished school anyway.
8. That there is a range of 'good' or 'outstanding' educational options available locally including multiple Sixth Form or college options and two other more successful studio schools within B&NES.

This Council believes that:

9. That the Secretary of State and Regional Schools Commissioner, working with the Wellsway MAT have a duty to consider all possible options to make the school viable, but if they are satisfied that these options have been exhausted, they still have a duty to local pupils to ensure they have better educational opportunities available.
10. The quality of educational experience and outcomes for pupils should be the paramount factor in determining a school's viability.

Council resolves therefore:

11. To ask the cabinet member to write to the Wellsway MAT and RSC to ask them to ensure that if, following due process, they agree to the closure of the school, that: -
 - a. BSS pupils are given as much support as possible to successfully complete their current course of study without disruption, and to then successfully move on from BSS to their next preferred destination;
 - b. They will work with other local education providers to make the best use of the specialist resources owned by BSS and to consider if other providers can adapt their Sixth Form curriculum offer to address needs formerly met by BSS;

- c. That the future opportunities for children and parental choice shall be explored by all parties to provide long term sustainable educational uses in the area.
12. To ask the Cabinet member for Children and Young People to raise the issue of which schools will be offering T-levels at the Schools Standards Board; and
13. To request that our local MPs lobby government to reinstate the role of local authorities in agreeing planned admission numbers.

[Notes;

1. *The above resolution was carried as an amendment to the Labour motion which appeared in the agenda pack, on a vote of 33 Councillors in favour, and 20 Councillors against.*
2. *The words 'Driven by parental choice' were removed from the start of resolution 10 at the suggestion of Councillor Joe Rayment, and accepted by the mover and seconder of the substantive motion.*
3. *The resolutions 12 and 13 were proposed by Councillor Tim Ball, and accepted into the substantive motion by the mover and seconder.*
4. *The substantive motion was carried unanimously.]*

60 MOTION FROM THE LABOUR GROUP - COUNCIL TAX COLLECTION

On a motion from Councillor Charles Gerrish, seconded by Councillor Chris Watt, it was

RESOLVED

Council notes that:

1. The 2018 House of Commons Treasury Committee report Household Finances: Income Saving and Debt, found that government and local authorities are often found to be the most zealous and unsympathetic of creditors in collecting arrears, with routine recourse to bailiffs.
2. It concluded that the public sector should be leading by example in their treatment of the most financially vulnerable, but that the current approach risks driving them into further difficulties.
3. Citizens Advice, in its evidence to the Treasury Committee, said that Government and local authority debt collection practices have a lot to learn from consumer creditors who have been brought into line both by regulation and by the realisation that aggressive collection methods are not effective at getting money out of people.
4. Bath and North East Somerset has a significant number of payment plans with residents either directly or through advice agencies and seeks to use alternative methods of debt recovery. However, as in many other local authorities, once an individual falls behind with their Council Tax the right to

pay by instalments can be withdrawn, formal action to recover the money owed can move very rapidly and costs to the Council Tax payer can rise sharply.

5. During 2017/18, 2852 liability orders for Council Tax were sent to bailiffs in B&NES. Once a Council Tax debt has been referred to bailiffs it incurs additional bailiff fees thereby exacerbating an already difficult situation.
6. Officers in B&NES are about to enter into discussions about early referrals to Citizens Advice to support people experiencing difficulties paying their Council Tax.
7. The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham has said it will stop using bailiffs for unpaid Council Tax. Bristol City Council is also piloting an approach to a more ethical form of Council Tax collection.

This Council believes that:

8. It is important that residents pay their Council Tax. Any money not collected is money that can't be spent on delivering the services that residents depend upon.
9. In cases where people are able to pay but choose not to, the Council must act to recover the money owed.
10. However, where people are struggling with arrears, they should be offered help to produce affordable payment plans. Alongside this, early intervention and money management services should be used to support people before they fall behind with their payments.

Council resolves therefore:

11. To agree in principle that, as the Council is currently reviewing its total Debt Management Policy, that officers should provide their conclusions to the Corporate Audit Committee in February to which the Resources Policy Development & Scrutiny Panel members should be invited, which in turn should consider the Council's proposed approach to debt collection before any final decision is made.

[Notes:

1. *The above resolution replaced the Labour motion which had been included with the agenda pack, and was carried on a vote of 42 Councillors voting in favour, 7 Councillors voting against and 4 Councillors abstaining.*
2. *The substantive motion was carried unanimously.]*

61 MOTION FROM THE LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP - SEND FUNDING FOR CHILDREN

On a motion from Councillor Dine Romero, seconded by Councillor Tim Ball, it was

RESOLVED unanimously that

Council notes:

1. The serious concerns raised by parents and teachers in Bath and North East Somerset regarding school funding.
2. The particular concerns around funding for young people with a special educational need or disability. There are over 4,200 children and young people locally either receiving SEND Support in mainstream schools or having an Education Health and Care Plan, with the number of EHC Plans or Statements having risen by 58% between January 2015 and January 2018. SEND services are under particular pressure due to a combination of growing demand and complexity of need; rising costs for specialist provision; the pressure on places in the outstanding special schools in B&NES due to the number of children being placed here by other Local Authorities; and the under-funding of the positive SEND Reforms introduced by government. Sufficient funding is vital to ensure that children are able to access the specialist education and support that they need in order to thrive.
3. The recent meeting for parents and carers, which was organised by the National Association of Head Teachers and the National Education Union, and at which the massive pressure on school budgets locally were highlighted.
4. That whilst B&NES schools remain under pressure, they have received the best funding settlement in the country over the last two years at 7.8%, this reflects that our schools are funded above the regional average and just below the national average.

Council resolves to:

5. Back local children, parents, carers, teachers, other schools staff and the LGA who are campaigning for better funding for our schools and education system.
6. Instruct the Leader of Council to write to the Secretary of State for Education and to the MPs for Bath and North East Somerset highlighting the impact of funding pressures locally and calling for additional funding to be made available for schools and particularly for SEND services.

[Notes:

1. *The above resolution contains suggested wording from Councillor Paul May, comprising resolution 4, and the words 'and the LGA' in resolution 5, which were accepted into the substantive motion by the mover and seconder.]*

62 MOTION FROM THE LIBERAL DEMOCRAT GROUP - PEOPLE'S VOTE

On a motion from Councillor Tim Warren, seconded by Councillor Colin Blackburn, it was

RESOLVED

To note that:

1. The outcome of the United Kingdom European Union membership referendum of 23rd June 2016;
2. The question posed in the referendum presented a binary choice;
3. On Saturday 20th October 2018, over 700,000 people marched in London to support a People's Vote on the final outcome of the government's exit negotiations with the European Union. This represented the second largest protest march ever hosted by our capital city.

To recommend that:

4. Those who express support for either side of the argument should write to the Member of Parliament in order to register their interest on the issue with them.

[Notes;

1. *The above resolution was moved as an amendment to the motion published with the agenda and was carried with 33 Councillors voting in favour, 15 Councillors voting against and 6 abstentions.*
2. *The substantive motion was carried with 33 Councillors voting in favour, 4 Councillors voting against and 17 abstentions.]*

63 QUESTIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

The Chair made reference to the question from Councillor Richard Samuel which had been circulated.

Councillor Richard Samuel then made a statement to the meeting calling for more clarity on the proposals for Bath Central Library. The statement was referred to the relevant Cabinet Member.

The meeting ended at 9.58 pm

Chairman

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

COUNCIL MEETING 8th NOVEMBER 2018

REGISTERED SPEAKERS

- Andrew Dickens
Re: Lower Common East Allotment Association
- Paul Roles
Re: Mopeds
- David Redgewell, South West Transport Network
Re: Public transport service delivery
- Andrew Jones
Re: Council's Planning website
- Keith Russell
Re: Gulls
- Fiona Edwards
Re: Keynsham Plastic Reaction
- Sarah Moore
Re: Bath Studio School
- Angie Sowton
Re: School Funding in B&NES
- Jane Riekemann
Re: Brexit/People's Vote
- Pam Richards
Re: Virgin Care Contract
- Dave Dixon
Re: Love our High Street
- John Drake
Re: Care Services in B&NES

[Statements supplied in advance are attached]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - PUBLIC

P 01	Question from:	Andrew Jones
<p>When should fines (surcharges) be applied for the Infrastructure Levy?</p> <p>I would like to ask the Council if as a matter of process to consider the circumstances when the surcharge (fine) is applied. The levy should be paid within 3 months of the commencement of the works. Provided payment is received within 3 months, the Council has suffered no loss. Could the Council consider instructing its offices as a matter of process not to apply the surcharge unless payment is received late, in the interest of fairness?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Bob Goodman
<p><i>The ability to impose surcharges is set by central government, rather than the Council and is enshrined in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, 2010 (as amended) and the Council is not able to amend, modify or deviate from primary legislation. The level of surcharges is also set by the Government and is designed to ensure developers/builders adhere to the regulations.</i></p> <p><u><i>[Following a query from Mr Jones about the content of the response, some notes of clarification were added;</i></u></p> <p><i>Surcharges may be levied in circumstances where there is a failure to notify of the commencement date before work commenced (regulation 83).</i></p> <p><i>Regulation 85 stipulates the criteria for late payment surcharges and the regulations are clear that this applies after 30 days from the date on which payment was due. The Council is not able to extend the period for payment to 3 months, as this would require a change in legislation.</i></p> <p><i>The request being made at P01 is not at the Council's discretion to make or change as the dates for payments and levels of surcharges are set by the Regulations.</i></p> <p><i>The Regulations do state that the council "may" impose a surcharge. The ability to impose surcharges is at the Council's discretion and B&NES consistently exercises this discretion as it is entitled to do.]</i></p>		

P 02	Question from:	Andrew Jones
P02 - Should fees charged to discharge planning conditions that are successfully		

appealed be refunded? Where an individual successfully appeals planning conditions should the Council, as a matter of process, not refund any fees paid by the applicant to discharge the conditions?

Answer from:

Councillor Bob Goodman

The Town and Country Planning Fees Regulations set out the process for charging fees for discharge of condition applications. The Regulations do set out some limited circumstances whereby a refund may be issued however that does not include where an appeal in relation to either an application or a condition has been made and succeeded. To make refunds on the basis suggested would not only be contrary to the relevant Regulations but would add an additional cost burden upon the Council that would adversely affect the Service delivery.

It is worth noting that many planning conditions require discharge before the building is occupied and the time lag in receiving a decision on an appeal is such that it is not practical or desirable to delay the development and so application for discharge until the decision is known.

The Planning Inspectorate are responsible for timescales associated with appeal decisions.

With regard to conditions, the responsibility rests with the developer to ensure they have satisfied all conditions before undertaking any work on site. To act in breach of condition is an offence and at the developers own risk. If a case is at appeal and the developer chooses to commence development that is a significant risk that only they can bear. In the event of an unsuccessful appeal this could result in formal enforcement action being taken so the Council could not advocate any form of premature commencement.

[Following a query from Mr Jones about the content of the response, some notes of clarification were added;

An application for discharge of a condition must be accompanied by the statutory fee. As explained, there is no mechanism for the council to refund the fee even if an appeal inspector later finds that the condition should not have been included on a permission.

There is a totally separate process whereby an appellant can submit a claim for costs at a planning appeal if someone involved in the appeal behaves unreasonably and incurs unnecessary costs. This includes if they:

- fail to co-operate with you or others*
- miss deadlines*
- fail to turn up to a site visit, hearing or inquiry*
- gave information that was wrong or declared after the deadline]*

P 03	Question from:	Pam Richards
<p>In the interests of transparency and the huge investment of public money in the delivery of the community services contract, does the Council agree that the quarterly reports on Quality and Performance should be published on the Council and CCG websites? Are councillors satisfied that sufficient progress is being made in all key areas of the transformation plan?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p><i>Detailed performance and quality information is reviewed monthly as part of formal Contract Quality and Performance Management meetings and a specific quality sub-group of CQPM as the case for other key providers of health and social care services. Actions to address areas of poor performance are undertaken in line with contractual provisions, this can include the issue of a Contract Performance Notice. A report on performance and quality and progress against the transformation plan will be provided and published in the Cabinet Member update to Health and Wellbeing Select Committee regularly with the next update to be provided to the November meeting of Select Committee.</i></p>		

P 04	Question from:	Pam Richards
<p>Are councillors aware of the dissatisfaction of staff with the Virgin Care organisation and the impact this is likely to have on service delivery?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Vic Pritchard
<p><i>The Council and CCG are concerned about the results of the Virgin staff survey. Virgin Care has also expressed concern about these results.</i></p> <p><i>Issues such as staff turnover, vacancy and sickness levels are monitored as part of formal Contract Quality and Performance Management meetings and in light of the staff survey there has been a particular focus in these formal meetings on actions being taken by Virgin Care.</i></p> <p><i>In response to concerns raised by commissioners with Virgin Care about the staff survey Virgin has provided the following comments:</i></p> <p><i>In looking at the score for recommending Virgin Care as an employer it is important to note that 65% would recommend Virgin Care as a place for care.</i></p> <p><i>As leaders of Virgin Care Community services in B&NES we were also concerned to receive the Have Your Say results and improving them going forward is a priority for all of us. We have implemented an action plan to improve the scores across all the findings but in particular for recommending Virgin Care as an employer on the Have Your Say</i></p>		

Survey. Some of the steps in the action plan include:

- *Using focus groups and workshops across all our staff groups to explore what were the key issues for colleagues*
- *Developing key actions to improve staff perception, specifically including work around health and wellbeing and career progression*
- *Improve communications on areas of positive progress including regular 'you said, we did' updates*

Our senior leaders and each individual team will use the feedback to continuously improve colleagues' and service users' experiences and to ensure that they are being supported.

In addition, staff turnover in B&NES is relatively low at 1.58 per cent in August

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement from David Redgewell

Bus Users UK believe there is a need to improve and deliver as part of the Metro Mayor's bus review a viable bus network in North and South Bristol and North East Somerset.

Service 10 Southmead hospital - Patchway - Bristol Parkway station - UWE - Lyde Green must be reinstated along with service 16 Bristol Parkway - UWE - Fishponds (Lodge Causeway including the Hillfields estate) - Hanham - Longwell Green.

With recent Council cuts on service 17 Southmead hospital - Fishponds - Staple Hill - Kingswood - Keynsham with subsidy withdrawn on evening and Sunday services and proposed cuts on service 36 City Centre - St Annes - Brislington Wick Road only with a new service 96 Brislington - Hengrove hourly and revised services in North East Somerset eg service 179 Bath - Marksbury - Radstock with a potential reduction in Saturday/Sunday evening services and service 178 Bath - Radstock evening and Sunday service reductions it is important to protect the bus network and not reduce journey opportunities for the general public who depend on them.

At the moment there is an urgent need to train more drivers, maintenance engineers and cleaners at First depots in Bristol, Bath, Wells and the Westbury area and gateline staff are required by GWR as well as platform staff and customer hosts.

While services have improved during the week with new drivers on City & Country routes by bringing in drivers from other depots in the South West of England eg Bridgwater, Taunton, Yeovil, Weymouth and Camborne/Penzance, Sunday and evening service cancellations are a cause for concern and need to be addressed by the Mayor and Metro Mayor.

There is also the issue about Bath University bus routes U1, U2 & U5 and route 70 UWE - Bristol Temple Meads station which are not operating in the daytime due to ongoing roadworks.

DAVID REDGEWELL (Bus Users UK)

This page is intentionally left blank

To the Councillors of Bath and North Eastern Somerset

From Andrew Jones

I have a comment on the Planning web site and 2 questions regarding process for the Council

BANES planning website – a trap for the unwary – please change it.

The current BANES website, despite significant recent changes to make the Council Infrastructure Levy more prominent, still does not prominently inform ratepayers that they must submit a notice of commencement in advance of starting works or they will be fined 20% of the infrastructure levy as a surcharge. For a small 2 bedroom property of 80 square meters this represents a fine of over £1,100.

Could I suggest on the CIL home page (one click from the Planning homepage) that you have an illustrative table of the fine payable if the forms are not submitted on time, say for 40, 80, 100, 120 sqm developments?

When should fines (surcharges) be applied for the Infrastructure Levy?

I would like to ask the Council if as a matter of process to consider the circumstances when the surcharge (fine) is applied. The levy should be paid within 3 months of the commencement of the works. Provided payment is received within 3 months, the Council has suffered no loss. Could the Council consider instructing its offices as a matter of process not to apply the surcharge unless payment is received late, in the interest of fairness?

Should fees charged to discharge planning conditions that are successfully appealed be refunded?

Where an individual successfully appeals planning conditions should the Council, as a matter of process not refund any fees paid by the applicant to discharge the conditions?

It is worth noting that many planning conditions require discharge before the building is occupied and the time lag in receiving a decision on an appeal is such that it is not practical or desirable to delay the development and so application for discharge until the decision is known.

This page is intentionally left blank

Stress to Bath Residents Caused by Colonies of Nesting Gulls – Constructive and Cheap Proposals to Enhance Current Anti-Gull Measures.

Gulls in Bath are the source of unbearable noise during the nesting season, which lasts 6 months of the year. In summer this noise starts at 4:30 in the morning. Sleep deprivation, attacks, mobbing and gull excrement seriously degrade living conditions for residents and visitors. Businesses are adversely affected.

I live in the Crest Nicholson Bath Riverside development. This is in a zone including Homebase and other buildings constructed with flat-topped roofs – perfect nesting sites for lesser black-backed gulls. Last year I saw dozens of healthy chicks fledge from their nests in the area.

Gulls are smart and tenacious. They return to their nest sites year after year. RSPB data shows that the population of urban gulls is rising in the UK.

Some older buildings are hot-spots with mature breeding colonies.

More and more buildings with flat-topped roofs are being constructed in the riverside area - we are constructing superb nest sites. Why? What are developers doing to help?

At Bath Riverside the only contribution I am aware of is a hawk, which is flown once a week. This has the effect of making the noise even more unbearable for an hour until the hawk is removed.

Councillor Bob Goodman kindly met me to discuss current anti-gull measures. The egg removal programme helps but overall these measures are not working in the riverside area. The gull problem there is serious and getting worse.

I propose:

Developers to implement measures for genuinely dealing with nesting gulls on their sites. Hold them accountable. Current measures at Bath Riverside are weak and don't work.

New buildings to be designed so that nesting is not possible. Architects are talented; I have no doubt that this can be done with no material impact on cost or aesthetics (despite what developers may say). Future-proof the build.

Hot-spots. Where older existing buildings have a serious gull problem, council to advise and work with the owners to ensure effective anti-gull measures are taken.

Enforce and extend the gull-proof bag initiative. Make it a clear offence to feed gulls. Extend signage beyond the city centre.

The noise and impact of gulls is unbearable in the Bath riverside area. Strong additional action is needed, including holding developers and large businesses to account for their part in causing this distressing problem.

This page is intentionally left blank

Statement from Fiona Edwards

Single use, disposable plastics such as polystyrene takeaway containers and plastic cups are a cause of litter, a waste of resources, and a problem for future generations. They waste fossil fuels and create unsightly streets, and their persistence causes untold harm for wildlife on land and at sea. Over the last 6 years the Wombles have picked up plastic litter from Keynsham's streets, and for 8 months Keynsham Plastic Re-Action has protested at supermarket's overuse of unnecessary plastic. But unnecessary plastic is everywhere, in such places as our stationary, takeaway packaging, cups, plates and eating utensils.

The need to act locally is especially important following the recent budget which had promised further action on single use plastic, but in fact didn't deliver any significant lead from central Government.

We all need to play our part in resolving this situation, but we believe Bath and NE Somerset Council should play a leading role as champion, active supporter, and regulator within its area of jurisdiction, in ending the prevalence of single use, disposable plastics. We would also welcome your support in our working towards the national Plastic Free Community status, as devised and promoted by Surfers Against Sewage.

We are aware that you are currently reviewing the single use plastic that you are directly responsible for, and are aiming to reduce your single use plastic consumption. We would urge you to complete this thoroughly and as soon as possible.

We welcome moves in the area of changing events and hire rules, specifying how the council's own facilities are run, and improved anti-littering enforcement.

But we would also like to highlight the following opportunities for improvements - procurement choices that specify alternatives to plastics, better promotion of recycling and composting in Curo housing, looking at changing the leases of council owned shops especially takeaways, and working with schools to reduce their kitchen plastic waste. Would the council be able to support businesses in changing to plastic free by the bulk buying of packaging to reduce costs, maybe through the Bath Improvement District organisation? We also call on you to promote your plastic free stance through the communications team and lobby the government for better powers to control waste.

There has been overwhelming public support for this call, as shown in the 1137 signature petition that we have collected on paper only, over a very few hours this summer. It represents a snapshot of the will of many who live, work or visit Keynsham.

I am now presenting the petition to you.

This page is intentionally left blank

God evening My name is Angie Sowton

I stand in front of you today as a mother of two girls at BANES primary schools and also as a child counsellor who has worked in several BANES schools over the last four years. I have seen for myself the drastic effects which school cuts have had on our children.

But this is not just anecdotal evidence. 54 out of 70 schools in BANES are still facing cuts despite some additional funding being made available in the recent budget. These cuts are hitting the most vulnerable children, and their families, the hardest. This leading to the loss of one-to-one support, of teaching assistants and pastoral support staff losing their jobs, and already overburdened teachers and headteachers being asked to do more with less.

Just today I was speaking to a Bath headteacher who has to supply teach in his own school in order to cut costs, thereby taking him away from the job he should be doing. Yesterday I spoke to teachers and parents who are paying out of their own pockets not just for educational supplies, but for food and sanitary towels for children in their classes.

If we continue to make staff do the impossible with the invisible, schools will be forced into denying admission to the children in most need, as they will not have the money to support them.

This short-term approach to school funding is setting our children up for more exclusions, more mental health problems and an education system unable to cope, all of which will be much more expensive for the taxpayer in the long-run.

It is clear that a two-tier system of education is forming in BANES state schools because of these cuts. Schools that already have the highest level of needs are facing the most severe cuts; schools in more affluent areas are better able to absorb these cuts through contributions by parents. This is unequal, unjust and not becoming of a city with such wealth.

Right now, there is a consultation taking place regarding funding for Financial Year 2019/20. BANES are asking some schools to consider giving a further 0.5% of their main funding to move over to the Local Authority's High Needs Block, which is not sufficient to meet current needs. We believe the Local Authority should be asking, no, demanding more funding for SEN/High Needs from Central Government, rather than taking that money from our already stretched schools' budgets.

In this council chamber you have the power to give opportunity and hope to the most vulnerable in our society. We are asking that you put the children of BANES, the future of BANES, at the forefront of your minds when making the extraordinarily difficult decisions you face. We all understand that everyone is doing more with less in these times of austerity but to hit the most vulnerable children and families in our communities so hard, with worse to come, is short-sighted and reprehensible.

I have emailed you all with the letter and petition from St Andrews parents but I am certain the same could be replicated across at least the 80% of BANES schools which are facing stringent cuts.

Thank you for your time.

This page is intentionally left blank

Dear

We are writing to you as a group of extremely concerned parents of children at St Andrew’s Church School. Our children are facing a real-terms cut of **£239 per pupil per year** if the planned spending cuts go ahead in the budget on **October 29th, 2018**.

This however is not just an issue that affects St Andrew’s. Across BANES **53 out of 70** schools are facing drastic cuts. Between 2015 & 2020 BANES Schools budgets will be down **£1.6 Million**.

Already class sizes have increased, and teachers, TAs and key support staff have lost their jobs. One-to-one support in schools is under threat, as is SEND support, and access to CAMHS is impossible except for the most extreme circumstances.

Many BANES schools are already asking parents to contribute financially for basic equipment and to provide the varied curriculum our children need.

These cuts are putting our children’s future at risk and as our local councillors we are urging you to do what you can locally and urge your political parties nationally to take action and call for an end to cuts in our schools that will leave a generation in jeopardy.

We ask you as our local councillors to write to the Secretary of State for Education and the Chancellor of the Exchequer calling for the government to:

- Immediately reverse cuts to school budgets that have taken place since 2015;
- Protect per pupil funding in real terms over the lifetime of this parliament;
- Provide the additional funding needed to implement a school funding formula that increases funding for schools in comparatively poorly funded areas of England without cutting funding per pupil for schools in any other part of the country, so that no school loses out.

Our schools can no longer do the impossible with the invisible. Please take action before it is too late. We look forward to hearing your response to our concerns and urge you to investigate the issues in more detail at www.schoolcuts.org.uk and www.fairfundingforallschools.org.

Yours Sincerely,

The Parents of Children at St Andrew’s Church School
PTO for names and signatures”

This page is intentionally left blank

Jane Riekemann: 3-minute speech

I'm here as a Bath resident to ask the council to publicly support a People's Vote on the final terms of any Brexit deal and to include the option to remain. This should then be put into writing and sent to the PM, the MPS for Bath and N.E Somerset and the Sec of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government.

It's been 2 ½ years since the referendum and it's evident that all of us - Leavers and Remainers – now know more about what impact Brexit could have on our lives. In 2016 we were told by Dr Liam Fox that the Free Trade Agreement with the EU should be the easiest in human history. Nothing about Brexit has proved easy - clearly the current impasse over the Northern Irish border hadn't been considered – and with only 140 days to go we run a significant risk of crashing out of the EU without a deal – despite briefings that the govt might be nearing one. The government and NHS's impact assessments have shown Brexit in all its forms is just damage limitation with NO Deal being the most disastrous, resulting in instructions about stockpiling food and medicines - as if we were in a natural emergency as opposed to a man-made one.

And how would this impact our community? What assessments have been done for Bath and North East Somerset? For example, one of BANES's highest budget priorities is social care. Currently, there is a national shortage of care staff so to lose a potential 5.9% of EU workers would be catastrophic. According to CIFPA (the Chartered Institute of Public finance and Accountancy), the southwest could be hit harder economically than many other regions of the UK, not just because of the high number of EU workers in the aerospace and automotive sector, but because many of those industries have spoken publicly about leaving the UK in the event of a hard Brexit that would interrupt their supply chains. We're keen to attract tourists to the South West and traditionally 1.5 million come each year, but dealing with clogged ferry ports, additional visas and grounded planes will turn us into a country of chaos. And vital medicines such as insulin for diabetics or isotopes for radiotherapy and scans could be delayed or in short supply.

No wonder people are taking action. A You Gov Poll in August this year found an overwhelming majority in the South West supported a People's Vote, with 67% of under 25's favouring staying in the EU - which they see as their right and their future. On October 20th, 700,000 converged on the capital, in the 2nd biggest protest march this century. There is cross-party consensus among MPs for an amendment to the Brexit bill to include a public vote; business leaders and several councils have also called for one. So, please Bath and N.E.Somerset, do likewise for the future of the next generation.

Jane Riekemann

Bath, BA1 3RA

Sources:

NHS impact study: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(17\)31926-8/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(17)31926-8/fulltext)

Social care: <https://infacts.org/who-will-look-after-our-sick-and-elderly-after-brexit/>

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy:
<https://www.publicfinance.co.uk/news/2018/02/south-west-could-suffer-more-other-regions-after-brexit>

Open Skies Agreement and No Deal Brexit:

<https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-britain-eu-notices-flyingrights/british-eu-airlines-could-see-flights-grounded-in-no-deal-brexidUKKCN1M41SD>

YouGov Poll:

https://d25d2506sfb94s.cloudfront.net/cumulus_uploads/document/zl36ojndti/Brexit%20SW%20180807_w.pdf

<https://www.peoples-vote.uk/voters-in-the-south-west-demand-a-people-s-vote-on-brexit-exclusive-yougov-poll-reveals>

Pam Richards - Statement & questions to Council – November 8th 2018 from Protect Our NHS BANES

Progress with Virgin Care Transformation Programme

During 2017/18, Virgin Care was required to begin implementing their ambitious transformation programme in order to improve service delivery and achieve efficiencies to enable greater sustainability in future years. The report at the end of the financial year indicated lack of progress in two key performance areas which had a red rating. The commissioners report is quoted below

Implement the integrated care record (ICR)

Commissioners remain concerned that this work stream is behind schedule. Some clinical engagement efforts with RUH made, however critical conversations re scope of project and Information Governance are outstanding. Virgin has employed a new ICR Information Governance lead who comes from Connecting Care. Patient portal being developed with community champions, with v.1 available in April, and new version by December. 18/19 milestones set outline that Virgin must deliver two two-way data transfer projects per quarter in order to meet the clinical benefits realisation timelines.

Establish foundations for locality based provision and care coordination

Virgin have established a local group working on 4 agile projects for phase 1 care coordination; efficiency of Health Access Team HAT and ASIST, joining up the information, navigation and prevention, and estates. Advice Centre incorporating Direct Payment Hub will be in place in Q1 18/19. VCSL have linked up Health MyDoS with Wellbeing Options from the Council to start to build the first comprehensive Directory of Service. Review of Health Access Team ongoing in Q1 18/19 with an acknowledgement that issues persist, particularly for Primary Care. A recovery action plan has been implemented to bolster the capacity in HAT and to analyse the data in order to more accurately improve the service and ease pressures. Clinical systems process maps have been received, and key leads engaged from IT and clinical systems. In Q1 the focus will be on scoping the potential to co locate all advice functions into one hub. While progress has been made, the majority of the 17/18 milestones have not been met, hence the red rating. Phase 0.5 which will see the co-location of all access teams is due to go live in June.

'there are areas of transformation, particularly Integrated Care Record and Care Coordination, which features highly in their bid, where Virgin Care has not made satisfactory progress.'

Protect Our NHS BANES were concerned to learn in May of the lack of progress in these areas. Both areas of development depend significantly on the introduction of IT systems and we understand that there are still IT issues across Virgin Care health and community services. We believe that regular reports on these crucial projects should be published in the public domain.

We also note that in Sept 2018 nearly three in every four staff who responded to a staff survey said they would not recommend Virgin Care as a place to work. Staff were told in an internal newsletter that it was of “significant concern” that only 27 per cent of them would recommend Virgin Care as a place to work. In addition, we are aware that there are problems with staff turnover and retention.

1. In the interests of transparency and the huge investment of public money in the delivery of the community services contract, does the Council agree that the quarterly reports on Quality and Performance should be published on the Council and CCG websites? Are councillors satisfied that sufficient progress is being made in all key areas of the transformation plan ?

2. Are councillors aware of the dissatisfaction of staff with the Virgin Care organisation and the impact this is likely to have on service delivery ?

Pam Richards

Co-ordinator Protect Our NHS BANES

COUNCIL MEETING 8th NOVEMBER 2018

REGISTERED COUNCILLOR STATEMENTS

- Richard Samuel
Re: Libraries

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS - COUNCILLORS

P 01	Question from:	Cllr Richard Samuel
<p>The admission by the Cabinet on 31st October that £2500 of Council taxpayers money had been paid to planning consultants to advise the Cabinet how it could avoid making a full planning application in respect of the Bath Central Library/One stop shop project was shocking at a time of fiscal constraint for the Council.</p> <p>In view of the fact that the Cabinet actually sought and received planning consent for an essentially similar scheme at Midsomer Norton library as recently as 2017, does the Leader agree with me that the money would have been better spent on keeping Bath Central Library open instead of closing it regularly because of staff shortages or replenishing the book stock or both?</p>		
Answer from:		Councillor Tim Warren
<p><i>Officers have continued to follow due process and sought ongoing regular Planning advice synonymous with any public or private application in order to ensure the most appropriate approach.</i></p>		

This page is intentionally left blank