



**Note of the meeting of the Neighbourhood CIL Panel for Bath  
held on Monday, 28th October, 2019  
in Dome Room - Guildhall, Bath**

**Meeting Attendance**

<b>In Attendance</b>
Councillor Rob Appleyard
Councillor Colin Blackburn
Councillor Sue Craig
Dave Dixon
Roger Driver
Mark Hayward
Robin Kerr

<b>Apologies Received from</b>

**1. Neighbourhood CIL for Bath Project Summary**

- 1.1 The panel heard that the current developer receipts available for supporting Neighbourhood CIL for Bath Projects is £558K as at September 2019.
- 1.2 Any further receipts when they become available are provided twice a year, this normally falls in April and September.
- 1.3 The panel were reminded that any recommendations that require support from B&NES Council Services must have an agreement in place with the service area before final sign off can be requested.

**2. Bath Gateway Out and About**

- 2.1 The panel felt the application for providing support for Bath Gateway Out and About set out a good case in the need to expand the services being offered.
- 2.2 The panel felt the application did not provide a strong argument that showed how the funding would make the additional events sustainable in the longer term.
- 2.3 The financial plans that were set did not satisfy the panel because: -

- The publicity materials costed at £5,000 was felt to be excessive. The panel members have experience of organisations that have been able to deliver at a lower cost.
- The panel felt that a number of people who wish to use their services are already known to the organisation, additional publicity could be achieved using more simple options with lower costs.
- It was felt the costings for the introduction of adding onto existing activities were too high.
- The panel felt the application had looked at the costs for one year's activities but did not provide enough detail on how an additional night would be able to continue once the funding runs out.
- The application did not reference any partnership organisations such as the third sector group and the volunteer centre that offer support and advise when developing activities through volunteers.

2.4 The panel concluded that the application was not successful.

### **3. Julian House Bike Workshop and DVA Therapy Shed**

3.1 The panel were very supportive of the applications and I am pleased to confirm that they will be making recommendations to ask the Council to agree the funding of: -  
£27,941 - Project Gear Change – Julian House  
£5,000 – Therapy Shed – Julian House

3.2 The panel felt that both projects supported the demand for the services that comes with the growth in the number of additional dwellings being delivered in Bath.

3.3 The panel asked that recognition of the funding from Bath CIL is included when these are delivered by Julian House

3.4 The sum agreed for the therapy shed is up to £5,000. This is £1,000 higher than your request in the application. The panel felt that if needed, the additional sum should be available to ensure the furnishing is of a good standard that allows caseworkers and clients to be comfortable when meeting in this space. Please let me know how the extra funds would be used if you feel this is required.

3.5 The applications will be cleared by the Councils Legal Advisor and will then set out a request to the Council to make a decision to fund the projects.

### **4. Access at Glasshouse Pavilion**

4.1 The panel spoke at great length about the application for The Glasshouse Playing Field Site improvements and the concept for the suggested improvements for The Glasshouse Playing Field Site were welcomed.

4.2 The question was raised about the move to make the site exclusive to the use for cricket. It was suggested that the community was not fully supportive of this move and were not happy about the relocations of football that had taken place.

- 4.3 The panel felt that further information is required around the charging proposals that will be made for ground rent to the cricket clubs who use the site.
- 4.4 The panel was keen to know if there will be any other provision other than cricket at the playing fields or provided within the new pavilion?
- 4.5 The panel asked if the schools using the site will be charged for using the facilities.
- 4.6 The panel asked how much inclusivity will be delivered to the community through the planned usage.
- 4.7 The panel would like to see additional details on how the £150,000 breaks down for the delivery of the safe access and disabled drop off point.
- 4.8 The panel would be keen to know what discussions have taken place with highways about the work that would be required on the access to the site.
- 4.9 The panel were not able to make a recommendation for funding at this stage. The panel were in agreement that a revised application that covers the points raised come back to the next meeting on 13 January 2020.

## **5. Enleigh Development Crossing**

- 5.1 The panel felt the application for a pelican crossing on Lansdown Road demonstrated the issue with traffic in an area that has undergone development.
- 5.2 The panel questioned why there has not been funding for the road infrastructure through the B&NES main CIL fund. Prior to CIL this would have been Section 106 territory?
- 5.3 The panel asked why B&NES Council had not recognised this project as a priority under their responsibilities.
- 5.4 The panel questioned if this would fit under the remit of local neighbourhood CIL.
- 5.5 It was felt that the response from Highways did not provide any urgency as the delivery date is shown could be as late as 2022.
- 5.6 The panel were not able to make a recommendation for funding at this time. It was felt that there will need to be a clearer understanding around why the need has not been picked up by the planners or developer.
- 5.7 It is suggested that the next step would be for the applicant to approach to B&NES Planning Policy to find out if there are any options that may have been missed.

## **6. CCTV for Norfolk Crescent**

- 6.1 The panel felt the application was clear in the request that it was making, there were a number of reservations on the introduction of new CCTV.

- 6.2 It was felt that although it was stated in the application that the local police and PCSO are supportive of CCTV, there was not any detail provided on how they felt the introduction of CCTV would reduce the level of crime. The panel have asked for the police to make a statement that shows how they feel this project would deliver improvements to community safety.
- 6.3 It was felt that if this request was approved it could potentially open up a number of similar requests from other locations across the City.
- 6.4 It was felt that criminals with knowledge could identify cameras that do not connect into a live monitoring solution.
- 6.5 It was felt that details are needed to explain how we would monitor if the introduction of a camera had been successful.
- 6.6 It was felt that there needs to be supportive information provided from B&NES Councils CCTV representative.
- 6.7 This item received the greatest level of debate out of all of the applications discussed and the panel decided that they would not be making a recommendation to fund this application.
- 6.8 The panel did feel they would be happy for the application to be return to the next meeting if the points above can be addressed and the supporting evidence provided