



COUNCIL MEETING
Wednesday, 19 October 2011

PRESENT

Ian Adams, Brian Allinson, Jane Allinson, Pat Apps, John Ashe, June Bamford, Nick Barrett, Michael Bell, Janet Biggin, Ian Blair, Linda Boon, Ian Boulton, Tim Bowles, Bill Bowrey, John Calway, Sheila Cook, Keith Cranney, Ruth Davis, Mike Drew, Clare Fardell, Howard Gawler, Heather Goddard, John Goddard, John Godwin, Robert Griffin, Neil Halsall, Dave Hockey, Pat Hockey, Dafydd Holbrook, Sue Hope, Brian Hopkinson, Justin Howells, Colin Hunt, James Hunt, Jon Hunt, Roger Hutchinson, Robert Jones, Trevor Jones, Dave Kearns, Alan Lawrance, Carol McCarthy, Gareth Manson, Adam Monk, Katherine Morris, John O'Neill, Eve Orpen, Andy Perkins, Sarah Pomfret, Shirley Potts, Christine Price, Bob Pullin, Steve Reade, Matthew Riddle, Mike Robbins, Pat Rooney, Adrian Rush, Marc Scawen, Ian Scott, Sam Scott, Ben Stokes, Maggie Tyrrell, Ben Walker, Keith Walker, Sue Walker, Terry Walker, Erica Williams and Claire Young

34 EVACUATION PROCEDURE (Agenda Item 1)

The Chair of Council drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure as set out in the Agenda.

35 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 2)

Apologies for absence were received from

Councillors: Shirley Holloway, Tony Olpin, Kevin Seager and Alderman Ken Dando

36 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 (Agenda Item 3)

The Following interests were declared:

Councillor	Item number and nature	Personal or Personal and Prejudicial
Roger Hutchinson	Item 13 - Motion 5 – Lives in a postcode are which is the subject of the debate	Personal and Prejudicial
Bill Bowrey	Item 13 – Motion 3 – In receipt of BAE pension and holds BAE shares, Member of Bristol Aero Collection and Chair of South West Defence Industries Alliance	Personal

37 MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING OF THE 20 JULY 2011 (Agenda Item 4)

The minutes of the meeting were signed as a correct record subject to being corrected to show Councillor Sheila Cook as in attendance.

38 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (Agenda Item 5)

The Chair announced that the Corporate Contact Centre had won the award for Best Public Sector Contact Centre. The award recognised the Contact Centre as the best public sector Contact Centre in the south west, comparing performance not only against other local councils but a wide range of Government organisations.

The judges recognised the significant performance improvements and excellent customer service that the contact centre delivered.

39 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC (Agenda Item 6)

Dave Regwell from the South West Transport Network spoke to Council. He expressed concern at the potential loss of engineering skills should the Filton airfield close. Council heard that his major concern was if the airfield became housing. Mr Regwell called for broad consultation and involvement of surrounding Councils in any decisions. Finally, Mr Regwell stressed that the wrong decision would not protect the engineering skills base of the area.

Bert Hindle of the Save Filton Airfield Campaign spoke to Council expressing his concern of the potential for the airfield to close. Council heard a brief history of the airfield and its strong links to the area. Mr Hindle expressed concern regarding BAE's approach to the airfield and the report produced by BAE which he believed to be inaccurate. Council heard of concerns relating to the risk of jobs and for the congestion resulting from possible development for housing. Mr Hindle spoke of the possible opportunities that the airfield could be used for while still operating as an airfield. In closing Mr Hindle called on Councillors to consider the impact of the impending decision

on future generations and to protect the prosperity of the area which he believed would not be best served through housing at the site.

Dave Goodwin spoke to Council as a resident of Filton. Mr Goodwin advised council that BAE had acquired the airfield site around 1990. Mr Goodwin expressed the view that BAE had neglected the airfield which had included the sale of the Northfield area. Council heard that the Communities and local Government Planning Policy Guidance recommended the retention and promotion of the airport. Mr Goodwin also spoke of the possible future uses of the airfield site as an airfield. Mr Goodwin spoke of his concerns regarding the loss of jobs and also the figures reported in the press of the losses being incurred by BAE when the companies accounts show a profit in relation to the site of £1.29M in 2010. Mr Goodwin called on councillors to support the vision of Filton airfield continuing to support the local aerospace cluster.

Steve Bissell who works in the aerospace industry addressed Council next on the subject of Filton airfield. Mr Bissell advised that he felt the council had a financial duty to consider the compulsory purchase of the airfield to return the site to public ownership. Council heard that the site was uniquely placed and heard concerns relating to a possible engineering skills crisis.

Doug Daniels spoke to Council on the airfield issue. Mr Daniels said that he was saddened to hear the possibility of the airfield closing. Mr Daniels advised that he felt the airfield should be kept as a maintenance facility for the A380. Mr Daniels stressed his concerns of the possibility of developers benefiting from the site and the loss of engineering base that would be suffered. Mr Daniels said that he felt Housing would be a wrong decision and explained his concerns relating to congestion. In closing Mr Daniels called on the Council to stop any change of use of the airfield site.

Pete Cowles addressed Council. He estimated that the airfield future would be the most important decision that would come before the Council. Council heard how estimations are that an additional 4 linked jobs are created for every job on the airfield. Mr Cowles advised that he felt without the airfield the future of the site would be as housing or trading. Mr Cowles explained he felt BAE had made little effort in regard to the site. In closing Mr Cowles asked if the literature given out at the public meeting carried an inference that a decision de facto had been made to allow development on the site.

The Chair advised that the issue was still at a consultation stage.

Dave Tiley spoke as Chair of the Bristol Aerospace Unite Union and as a Patchway Town Councillor. Council heard that Mr Tiley worked on the airfield site as had several generations of his family before him. Mr Tiley explained his concerns for manufacturing in the area if the site was closed and the airfield sold. Mr Tiley called for Council to seek independent advice and for a long term vision for the site.

Andy Allsop, a Patchway Town Councillor for the Stoke Lodge parish ward presented a petition to council calling for a community governance review. The purpose of the petition was to call for a separate Parish Council for the current Stoke Lodge ward.

It was **agreed** that the petition would be referred to the Council's Electoral Registration Officer

William Moore who was a Councillor on Filton Town Council spoke next on the airfield issue. Mr Moore appealed to all Councillors to set aside party politics. He explained that he felt the Council had a moral duty to protect Filton including local business and stressed the national importance of Filton to the Aerospace industry. In closing Mr Moore asked if core samples had been taken from the site to assess if development could be unviable.

It was **agreed** that the Council would take account of all of the submissions on the airfield when considering the item later in the agenda.

40 Motions (Agenda Item 13)

Motion 3 of 2011/12 - Supporting Filton Airfield

Councillor Ian Scott **proposed** and Councillor Adam Monk **seconded** that:

“This Council notes BAE Systems’ proposal to close Filton Airfield in 2012, the ‘Position Statement’ consultation subsequently conducted by planning officers, and the August 15 letter from the Independent Inspector in regard to the council’s Core Strategy.

Council also notes the groundswell of public opinion that the Airfield is an integral unique asset to the economic wellbeing of South Gloucestershire’s own world centre of excellence in aerospace, supporting high-value skilled engineering jobs.

Council believes that the airfield site should play an important role supporting the aerospace industry and jobs into the future. This authority should not act in a way that would have far-reaching consequences for the long-term vibrancy of the local aerospace economy.

Council therefore resolves to throw its support behind the efforts to retain the Airfield and defend engineering jobs into the future. Council commits not to proceed with policies or actions that would facilitate development on the Airfield.”

In moving and seconding the motion, Councillors Scott and Monk expressed the following views:

- that they felt this was the most important issue that South Glos Councillors of this term of office are likely to make

- that Filton was a world leading site
- BAE shareholders are profit driven and the public will not understand if the Council allows a decision to be made that is focussed on private profit
- A decision that allows development can only be made by the Council
- The SGC core strategy said that the airfield was essential for the successful economic prospects of the area
- Spoke of the strategic importance of the site
- Explained fears of housing development which would exaggerate current congestion problems
- Drew attention to the profit of £1.29M made by BAE on the site which contradicted reports that the site was making a loss
- Daily flight movements had increased and overall flight number have reduced only because the airfield had been closed at the weekend
- Spoke of the national significance of the site.

Councillors Keith Cranney and Trevor Jones spoke and explained that residents who lived under the flight path suffered from noise pollution issues and that they did not feel it was the Council's role to support unviable business sites.

Councillor Pat Hockey **proposed an amendment** that:

“This Council notes BAE Systems’ proposal to close Filton Airfield in 2012, the ‘Position Statement’ consultation subsequently conducted by planning officers, and the August 15 letter from the Independent Inspector in regard to the council’s Core Strategy.

Council also notes the groundswell of public opinion that the Airfield is an integral unique asset to the economic wellbeing of South Gloucestershire’s own world centre of excellence in aerospace, supporting high-value skilled engineering jobs.

Council believes that the airfield site should play an important role supporting the aerospace industry and jobs into the future. This authority should not act in a way that would have far-reaching consequences for the long-term vibrancy of the local aerospace economy.

Council believes that people who live and work in South Gloucestershire should contribute their opinions on the site and its importance before any decision is made as to the future of the airfield, and strongly encourages all local people to submit their views both to the ongoing consultation, and the further consultations planned.

In moving amendment Councillor Hockey explained:

- the strong community links to the airfield
- the need to take the right action in considering the matter.
- The Council was being told by the owner that the future of the airfield depended on investment and the way to obtain this was to sell the site. The Council could not stop this from happening

- Planning relied on a development plan for the area and that was decided by an inspector who had said they wanted to know what the Council considered appropriate for the airfield site. The Secretary of State would be likely to make the final decision based upon recommendations from the inspector.
- It was essential to consult widely otherwise the Council would not meet the requirements of the process. Furthermore that the consultation process was still underway and any decision at tonight's Council meeting would be premature

Councillor Scott indicated that he **would not** accept the amendment.

The amendment was then **seconded** by Councillor Blair who stressed the importance of the site to the whole authority area and also the importance of the Council allowing a comprehensive consultation process to be completed before coming to a decision on the matter.

In the extensive debate that followed Council heard:

- It would be wrong to take a decision at this stage which would be premature prior to the close of the consultation process – Councillor Brian Allinson
- The issue was one of the most important SGC Councillors would face. That the current consultation process was flawed because of the issues that have been raised relating to the questioned information in the BAE report. The impact of approximately 3,500 cars would have a significant detrimental affect on surrounding communities. It would signify the end of a world renowned industry and would send negative messages to other large employers considering moving to the area – Councillor Bowrey.
- Save Filton Airfield Group should be congratulated. The figures quoted as losses by BAE in relation to the site are not supported by the financial records which show a £1.29M profit. That the “no way to 33K” campaign made reference to congestions problems, poor air quality and a lack of access to good health services. That residents were overwhelmingly in support of retaining the airfield and the Council should support them – Councillor Boulton
- All Councillors were aware of the importance of the Core Strategy. As part of the Core Strategy the Council had been asked to explore future options for the airfield. Council is urged to support the consultation process and not to consider its position until the consultation has concluded and a report had been produced – Councillor Dave Hockey
- Every response to consultation would go to the Planning Inspector. Some Town Councils had made a decision on the matter and SGC should do so as well. Housing development would create congestion. Councillor Ian Scott

In summing up Councillor Pat Hockey stressed that the Council was not in a position to make a decision on the future of the airfield and to do so would endanger the consultation process.

Prior to a vote being taken Councillor Shirley Potts called for a **named vote** to be taken which was supported by Labour Councillors.

The Monitoring officer then proceeded to call the named vote with each Councillor responding with For, Against or Abstain. The result of the named vote was:

For:

Ian Adams, Brian Allinson, Jane Allinson, John Ashe, June Bamford, Nick Barrett, Janet Biggin, Ian Blair, Linda Boon, Tim Bowles, John Calway, Sheila Cook, Keith Cranney, Ruth Davis, Mike Drew, Clare Fardell, Howard Gawler, Heather Goddard, John Goddard, John Godwin, Robert Griffin, Neil Halsall, Dave Hockey, Pat Hockey, Dafydd Holbrook, Sue Hope, Brian Hopkinson, Justin Howells, Colin Hunt, James Hunt, Jon Hunt, Robert Jones, Trevor Jones, Dave Kearns, Alan Lawrance, Carol McCarthy, Katherine Morris, John O'Neill, Sarah Pomfret, Christine Price, Bob Pullin, Steve Reade, Matthew Riddle, Mike Robbins, Adrian Rush, Marc Scawen, Ben Stokes, Maggie Tyrrell, Ben Walker, Sue Walker, Erica Williams and Claire Young

Against:

Pat Apps, Ian Boulton, Bill Bowrey, Michael Bell, Roger Hutchinson, Gareth Manson, Adam Monk, Eve Orpen, Andy Perkins, Shirley Potts, Pat Rooney, Ian Scott, Sam Scott, Keith Walker, Terry Walker

Abstentions:

None

The amendment was **carried** and the debate returned to the substantive motions as amended.

Councillor Monk spoke of his concern that if the report by BAE was flawed then the consultation process based on the report must also be flawed.

Councillor John Calway asked for the Chief Executive to clarify the situation with the BAE report.

The Chief Executive advised that the report commissioned by BAE was on the Council's website as it was appropriate for it to be placed there. However, the Council was in the process of validating the report and had not confirmed or validated the report as correct or complete.

The substantive motion as amended was then put to the **vote** and with 52 voting in favour was **carried**

Motion 4 of 2011/12 - Nursing care at the new community hospital at Frenchay

Councillor Andy Perkins **proposed** and Councillor Pat Apps **seconded** the motion:

“This Council notes with concern the North Bristol NHS Trust’s recent announcement that an external provider will provide the nursing care at the new community hospital at Frenchay. This was never part of the Bristol Health Services Plan proposals for Frenchay as understood by this council, and is a completely unexpected and unwelcome development that will result in the removal of NHS staff from Frenchay and the part-privatisation of patient care there.

Council further notes the recent open letter from about 400 senior doctors and public health experts warning that increased commercialisation and marketisation of current NHS services will:

“aggravate risks to individual patient safety; erode medical ethics and trust within the healthcare system; widen health inequalities; waste much money on attempts to regulate and manage competition; and undermine the ability of the health system to respond effectively and efficiently to communicate disease outbreaks”.

Council therefore resolves to lobby the Trust to rethink and overturn this decision. Council also resolves to contact South Gloucestershire’s three MPs to ask them to add their pressure to retain an all-NHS facility at Frenchay.”

Following the debate, the motion was put to the **vote** and with 31 voting in favour, 33 voting against and 3 abstentions the motion was **lost**.

Councillor Roger Hutchinson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item and left the meeting.

Motion 5 of 2011/12 - Filton Postcodes

Councillor Adam monk **proposed** and Councillor Ian Scott **seconded** the motion:

“This Council notes that a small number of homes and residents in Filton fall within the Bristol BS7 postcode, unlike the vast majority of the town which is in BS34. Many residents within this area consider this to be an anomaly and are campaigning for it to be remedied.

Council believes that the local identity of communities within South Gloucestershire is important and consequently that it would be logical for all Filton residents to have a South Gloucestershire postcode. Council therefore resolves to give full support to the campaign to get the BS7 area within South Gloucestershire reclassified. To this end we agree to lobby Royal Mail urging them to make this change without delay.”

Councillor Trevor Jones **proposed** an amendment which Councillor Monk indicated he **was** prepared to accept. Upon being put to the **vote** it was unanimously **RESOLVED**:

This Council notes that a small number of homes and residents in Filton fall within the Bristol BS7 postcode, unlike the vast majority of the town which is in BS34. Many residents within this area consider this to be an anomaly and are campaigning for it to be remedied.

Council believes that the local identity of communities within South Gloucestershire is important and whilst it may seem logical for all Filton residents to have a South Gloucestershire postcode it's important to understand what impact postcode changes may have on neighbouring postcode areas. Council therefore resolves to set up a member working group to explore with Royal Mail the full implications of the campaign to get the BS7 area within South Gloucestershire reclassified. To this end we agree to meet Royal Mail without delay."

Councillor Roger Hutchinson returned to the meeting.

41 PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS (Agenda Item 7)

Councillor Ian Adams presented a petition signed by 65 residents from the Siston ward calling for speed restrictions on the A4174 Staplehill Link Road.

It was **agreed** that the petition would be referred to the Executive Councillor for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment.

Councillor Adam Monk presented a petition subscribed by 527 residents calling for the protection of Filton airfield as a unique asset supporting the local aerospace economy calling upon South Gloucestershire Council to protect and promote Filton and Patchway as an aerospace world centre of excellence providing high value skilled jobs.

It was **agreed** that the petition would be referred to the Executive Councillor for Planning, Transportation and Strategic Environment.

42 QUESTIONS TO EXECUTIVE MEMBERS AND CHIEF OFFICERS UNDER S.O. A31 (Agenda Item 8)

To the Leader of the Council

Question 2011/21 from Councillor Ian Scott

Does the Leader of the Council accept the Chief Executive's advice at the last Filton Airfield public meeting that South Gloucestershire Council does not have the internal expertise to evaluate BAE Systems' 'Filton Airfield Aviation Options Report' on the viability of the airfield? Given the huge importance of the airfield site, what action will his Administration be taking to ensure that the report is independently assessed so that the process can command the confidence of local people?

Answer

I agree with the view expressed by the Chief Executive that the Council does not have the internal expertise to evaluate all elements of the BAE Systems Aviation Report – a report that this Administration asked BAE to commission.

Given the importance of the report in supporting BAE's decision on the future of the Airfield, it is essential that the council takes all reasonable steps to ensure we consider the report is balanced and factually correct. Officers will undertake the following actions as a matter of priority:

Review the planning, transportation, engineering and financial elements of the report using the professional expertise available with the Environment and Community Directorate and Financial Services.

Review the technical competencies, track record and expertise in this field of Mott McDonald, the company who have prepared the technical elements of the Aviation report.

Seek confirmation from Airbus, Rolls Royce and GKN on whether they consider that the statements made in the Aviation Report are correct and accurately reflect the position of these companies.

Work closely with the LEP and wider business community to gauge the opinion and thoughts of the local businesses. For information the Council is facilitating the Filton business workshop on 26th October at 4-6pm at the Cribbs Causeway Business Centre

Review and consider the feedback and comments that our local communities and other key interested parties and stakeholders, including Bristol have made to the Filton Airfield consultation which closes on 24th October.

I consider that through these actions we will be much better informed about the contents of the report and I hope these steps will command the confidence of local people.

Supplementary Question

Will you assure us that you will use external expertise where we do not have the expertise internally to deal with the issue

Answer

Yes

Question 2011/22 from Councillor Shirley Potts

What will the process, timetable and member involvement be for spending the £1.6m agreed by Cabinet to develop a 'Big Society Fund'?

Answer

The 'Big Society Fund' will be created as an element of the work that is being undertaken to develop South Gloucestershire's approach to Localism. As the council continues its work around Localism, members and other stakeholders are being engaged in considering a way forward in relation to delivering Localism within the district, supporting the council's local vision of Localism. This work includes Big Society as a key component and as such members' views (as expressed at the Localism workshops) will be taken into account in considering how the 'Big Society Fund' might be used to best effect.

The criteria, timetable and process etc related to the 'Big Society Fund' will be determined pending the conclusions drawn from the current round of debate.

Supplementary Question

How will the Council monitor the CBS to ensure that funding is spent as it was intended and all groups receive support

Answer

I will ask the Chief Executive to develop proposals

To the Executive Councillor for Children & Young People**Question 2011/23 from Councillor Sam Scott**

After so many schools have been asked to take extra pupils to meet the unpredicted demand for local primary school places, how is the council now going to review the implementation and suitability of each school's travel plans?

Answer

The Council's Commissioning of School Places Strategy (COPS) 2010 - 2014, clearly identifies increasing pupil number projections, the demand for primary places across the

local authority area and the subsequent shortfall of places that need to be addressed over the next few years. To enable the Council to effectively deliver the number of places required, an Implementation Plan has been put in place, is updated annually and the Children & Young People Capital Programme has committed the resources necessary to meet the demand year on year.

Where a school is being required to expand to meet local demand for local places, all work including site adaptations, construction and school travel plan related development is covered in the overall cost of the project.

Supplementary Question

Will the Executive Member allow Scrutiny Committees to scrutinise travel plans so that concerns can be raised.

Answer

Select Committees manage their own workload and I have no authority over their work plans.

To the Executive Councillor for Communities

Question 2011/24 from Councillor Pat Rooney

How can the RFID (Radio Frequency Identification) Pilot evaluation and ongoing satisfaction survey be seriously viewed as informing future decisions when staffing reductions at the pilot libraries have already taken place by not renewing some fixed term contracts that expired in the summer? How can the Executive Councillor persuade many users that this survey is not a cosmetic exercise and that increased use of RFID is not a 'done deal'?

Answer

RFID enables customers to issue and discharge books themselves, thus freeing up staff for other duties. It has been trialed in several libraries with a limited number of them operating on reduced staff due to not renewing temporary contracts. This has enabled us to assess the impact of the combination of using RFID with reduced staff levels.

Without trialing the reduced staff number over the busiest period of the year, we would not be able to inform future decisions by knowing the impact of reducing staff numbers while using RFID without detrimentally affecting front line experience.

Supplementary Question

Will staffing levels be reduced further if the RFID is rolled out and will you act to replace the staff levels that have reduced already.

Answer

The intention of the trial was to operate with less staff in 3 of the 5 Libraries the RFIB trial has been very successful. The initiative has proved to be very popular with no detrimental affect to services.

Question 2011/25 from Councillor Pat Rooney

How can the Executive Councillor ensure that his directorate has enough capacity in staffing levels to ensure that all S106 projects can be completed within their scheduled timetable targets recently shared with councillors, particularly in regard to Open Spaces and Street Care?

Answer

The programme established and approved for 2011/12 is achievable with the current staffing levels. Should any slippage be identified this will be reported through the Executive Member and any approved re-programming will take into account constraints in respective agreements.

Supplementary Question

Can you assure me that all slippage will be notified to the relevant ward Councillors

Answer

I am unaware of any slippage at the moment but if there is any it will be reported to the relevant ward Councillors

Question 2011/26 from Councillor Dave Hockey

What problems have occurred in the distribution of the bags for cardboard and what steps will be taken if the 40,000 ordered for 108,000 homes in South Gloucestershire proves not to be enough?

Answer

The distribution of the free bags for cardboard has been successful, has been welcomed by residents, and uptake has been very good.

The team did experience a minor difficulty with the arrival of the second consignment, which was completely out of the control of the Council. Due to high demand in a few

outlets, primarily the leisure centres, officers were kept very busy keeping these outlets supplied during this period.

A recent survey of the 53 distribution outlets has showed that 23 have some stock left in varying quantities, however demand is reducing. The 40,000 bags purchased appear to be sufficient at this stage.

Supplementary Question

After difficulty I located the cardboard recycling web pages. It states that there are 49 locations not 53 but it does not say which are out of stock. This may result in the public going to more than 1 location in order to get a bag. When will you update the web

Answer

The webpages will be updated as soon as possible. No more bags are being dispatched to distribution points and we will revert to the process where the public phone up.

To the Executive Councillor for Planning, Transportation & Strategic Environment

Question 2011/27 from Councillor Michael Bell

Does the Executive Councillor share the concern of many of my constituents that certain roads such as Burley Grove, Burley Crest and Hillhouse Road are being inundated throughout the day with traffic from driving schools conducting driving maneuvers? Does he agree that there needs to be a better balance so that learners have the opportunity to practice without certain roads being affected unreasonably, and what will he and his department do to persuade driving schools and instructors to take the wellbeing and safety of the residents and other road users in the affected streets into account?

Answer

Officers are contacting the test centres advising them of these problems asking that driving schools be encouraged to vary their routes. I also understand that driving tests are no longer conducted along predetermined routes and, therefore, there should be less of a desire for driving schools to follow the same route with the learner drivers. Officers will monitor this initial course of action and if driving schools persist in using these residential roads then the Council will make specific representations to the individual driving schools again encouraging them to vary their routes when conducting a driving lesson.

Supplementary Question

Will you accept the signatures I have collected from residents who have concerns

Answer

Yes

Question 2011/28 from Councillor Bill Bowrey

Is the Executive Councillor aware of the continuing high level of demand for dropped kerbs in the Kingswood area? What progress has the council made in delivering dropped kerbs since he last answered a question on this subject on 24 March 2010?

Answer

I am aware of the level of demand for dropped kerbs across South Gloucestershire. Funding is made available each year in the Local Transport Capital Programme to specifically implement new dropped kerbs for the mobility impaired and dropped kerbs are also installed as part of Streetcare's highway maintenance programme, where appropriate. Priority locations for dropped kerbs are usually governed by how they would serve the local community i.e. near shops, community buildings etc so that maximum benefits are achieved by their provision. In addition, specific routes for a series of dropped kerbs have been added to the task register and a number of dropped kerb routes have been included in this year's capital programme.

Supplementary Question

Can you please clarify if when you refer to "priority" it relates to priority wards or a priority in any area of the Council.

Answer

We will consider any area.

To the Executive Councillor for Community Care and Housing

Question 2011/29 from Councillor Claire Young

How many households in South Gloucestershire are in fuel poverty?

Answer

The most recent nationally published data on fuel poverty in South Gloucestershire dates from 2008. It showed a figure of 10.5 per cent for South Gloucestershire against an all England average of 15.6 per cent in fuel poverty.

The annual update from the Department of Energy and Climate Change published in July this year increased the national figure to 18.4 per cent. Assuming the same relative position this gives an estimated figure for South Gloucestershire of 12.4 per cent.

Supplementary Question

Can you confirm if any Housing Association in South Gloucestershire Council area submitted a bid for funds from the renewable heat premium scheme and what will you do to ensure houses in fuel poverty benefit from such schemes in the future.

Answer

I will provide you with a written answer once I have the detail.

To the Executive Councillor for Corporate Affairs

Question 2011/30 from Councillor Pat Hockey

According to DCLG figures, South Gloucestershire Council was awarded £883,361 for the financial year 2011/12 from the New Homes Bonus, which was intended to "ensure that those communities that go for growth reap the benefits of development, not just the costs". Which wards were the homes providing this bonus built in?

Answer

The NHB uses the annual movement in council tax base data available at a date in mid September to calculate the grant payable. This information is collected at an aggregate level and is therefore difficult to provide at Parish level. The information used by the council as a starting point for the local taxbase calculation is based on data as at 1st November and is held to parish level. Whilst not exactly the same (due to date and other more detailed adjustments) this data could be used as a proxy to the NHB calculation.

The net increase at November was 979 properties. The 6 areas with over a 50 property increase were:

Parish:

Kingswood Unparished area	+198
Almondsbury	+116
Siston	+113
Bradley Stoke	+ 77

Stoke Gifford	+ 68
Thornbury	+ 56
Total of these	+ 628 out of a net 979

Hence in proxy terms the 6 areas above probably contributed the major elements in the NHB Grant for 2011/12 and in total these 6 represent about 2/3rds of the total housing increase.

Supplementary Question

Whether we or they like it or not, as a Council we are making decisions that mean many of our communities are having to welcome new residents. The Government's intention is that these communities should have some benefit from this. Therefore can you inform us what steps are being taken to use the information available to us from the Council's own sources to direct the Homes Bonus funding to the relevant communities?

Answer

The resource have been distributed to cover the wider area which is all affected by development

Question 2011/31 from Councillor Claire Young

In view of reducing resources for community groups, could the member please explain the charging policy if community groups wish to use council premises?

Answer

The opening position is that any group that wishes to use Council premises will be charged. Charges are to cover building running costs - lighting, heating etc plus any additional security if the use is outside of normal office hours. Where groups have sole use of a space a rent is charged, however this is at a concessionary rate for non profit making organisations.

By supporting the council's financial position, this approach minimises costs being passed on to local taxpayers and it also supports local community groups and community based premises who offer similar facilities. If the Council let any space at less than current rates available in an area it would be taking away potential income from other community groups who let out their facilities. For example, if no charge was made for rooms in Kingwood Civic Centre, we would be encouraging users away from the Park Centre.

Groups are able to apply for additional funding through the small grants process to support such costs if that is required.

43 SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP (Agenda Item 9)

Councillor Howard Gawler **proposed**, Councillor Dave Hockey **seconded** and upon being put to the **vote** it was **resolved** to:

1. Approve the Council's participation in the LEP joint scrutiny arrangements, with the establishment by this Council of a LEP scrutiny committee of three members to meet jointly with the corresponding bodies created by the other councils, with terms of reference as set out in appendix 1 of the report.
2. Agree the political composition of the LEP Scrutiny Committee as 1:1:1 and waive proportionality as required under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

44 MID YEAR TREASURY MANAGEMENT MONITORING REPORT AND PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS (Agenda Item 10)

Councillor Howard Gawler **proposed**, Councillor John Godwin **seconded** and upon being put to the **vote** it was **resolved** to approve:

1. The Mid Year Treasury Management Monitoring Report, and Prudential Indicators contained in Appendix A, noting current treasury management activity and performance;
2. The amendment to the Investment Strategy with regard to CDS prices, discussed in paragraph 17 to the report, with the caveat that CDS prices are kept under continuing review and reported back to the Audit and Accounts Committee on a regular basis;
3. The amendment to the limit on exposure to variable interest rates, discussed in paragraph 24 to the report;
4. The proposed amendment to the liquidity benchmark – overdraft facility, discussed in paragraph 26 to the report;
5. To note the imminent review of UK bank and building society ratings by Moody's, discussed starting paragraph 27 to the report.

45 REPORT ON URGENT EXECUTIVE DECISIONS TAKEN (Agenda Item 11)

The Leader of Council introduced the report to Council for information.

It was **agreed** to note the information provided

46 UPDATE ON STRATEGIC WEST OF ENGLAND ISSUES (Agenda Item 12)

Councillor John Calway introduced the item to Council for information given the significance of this area of work.

It was **agreed** to note the information provided

47 URGENT ITEMS (Agenda item 14)

There were no urgent items.

The meeting closed at 10.30 PM

Approved as a correct record

..... Chair of Council

.....Date