

**MINUTES OF FULL COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 5
JANUARY 2016 2015 FROM 7.15PM – 9.50PM AT POOLE COURT, YATE**

P R E S E N T

Councillor Tony Davis – Chair

Councillors Ian Blair (part meeting), John Davis, Mike Drew, John Ford, John Gawn, Cheryl Kirby, Margaret Marshall (part meeting), Alan Monaghan, Wully Perks, Karl Tomasin, Sue Walker and Chris Willmore.

Councillor Gloria Stephen (part-meeting) South Gloucestershire Council Town Clerk, Deputy Town Clerk/RFO (part meeting), Parks Supervisor (part meeting) and Senior Administrative Assistant.

65 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

RESOLVED Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ben Campbell Chris Edmonds and Penny Thoyts. Councillor Aziz Chowdhry was absent.

66 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCALISM ACT 2011

Councillor John Ford	Director of YOSC Ltd	Item	74/7
Councillor Cheryl Kirby	Director of YOSC Ltd	Item	74/7
Councillor Mike Drew	Brinsham School Governor	Item	74/7

67 REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATION

No requests for dispensation were received

**68 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSION WITH RESPECT TO ITEMS ON
THE AGENDA**

No members of the public wished to speak.

**69 MINUTES OF THE FULL COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 27
OCTOBER 2015**

RESOLVED The minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 27 October 2015 approved and signed as a true and accurate record.

Minute Number 59/6 Land at Rear of Ridgewood

RESOLVED Councillor Tony Davis to be added to attend any meetings in respect of the land at the rear of Ridgewood.

**70 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON 10 NOVEMBER 2015**

RESOLVED The minutes of the Environment and Planning meeting held on 10 November 2015 be approved and signed as a true and accurate record and the recommendations therein be approved.

71 MINUTES OF THE FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 1 DECEMBER 2015

RESOLVED The minutes of the Finance and General Purposes Committee meeting held on 1 December 2015 be approved and signed as a true and accurate record and the recommendations therein be approved.

Minute Number 8/1

a) Poole Court Security

RESOLVED In view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is advisable in the public interest that the public be temporarily excluded and they are instructed to withdraw.

A confidential report in respect of Poole Court Security was received. (Confidential Appendix 1)

RESOLVED;

- The meeting return to open session,
- The actions contained within confidential appendix 2 be actioned.

(Councillors Margaret Marshall and Gloria Stephen entered the meeting).

b) Poole Court Heating

An update was received in respect of heating at Poole Court (Appendix 3).

RESOLVED;

- Instruct heating engineers to make further investigations at a cost of £160 and provide a full specification of necessary works;
- Delegated powers be granted to the Clerk in consultation with the Chair and Chair of Finance and General Purposes Committee to proceed with necessary works to the Poole Court heating system (eg, replacement of boilers, power flush of system, adoption of eco-efficient system)

Thanks were relayed to the Parks Supervisor for the clear reports presented to the meeting.

(The Parks Supervisor left the meeting).

Minute Number 9/2 c)ii

SLA South Gloucestershire Youth Service

RESOLVED A three year Service Level Agreement to be entered into with South Gloucestershire Council for the delivery of youth work in Yate.

Minute Number 10/2 b) Yate and District Heritage Centre Trust Minutes

RESOVLED Delegated powers granted to the Clerk in consultation with Councillors Tony Davis and Mike Drew to identify and appoint a Town Council appointed Trustee to the Yate and District Heritage Centre Trust.

13/1 South Gloucestershire Council Consultation – Draft Waste Strategy

It was **NOTED** that the response shown in appendix 4 has been submitted to South Gloucestershire Council.

13/2 South Gloucestershire Council Consultation – Transport Study

It was **NOTED** that the response shown in appendix 5 has been submitted to South Gloucestershire Council

13/3 South Gloucestershire Council Consultation – Joint Spatial Plan

It was **NOTED** that the response shown in appendix 6 has been submitted to South Gloucestershire Council.

13/4 South Gloucestershire Council Consultation – Universal Youth Budget – Future of the Positive Activities Subsidy

It was **NOTED** that the following response shown has been submitted to South Gloucestershire Council.

We write on behalf of Yate Town Council in response to your letter dated 6th October 2015 on the above topic. Although we note the formal review process into the future of the Positive Activities Subsidy (PAS) has yet to be undertaken, such is our level of concern that we felt the need to express our views at this early stage.

As you are no doubt aware, Yate has been identified as an area of priority need. Objective data has clearly demonstrated that Yate has many young people living in the town who are considered vulnerable (specifically in relation to attainment and domestic and health context data) and thus rely on vital additional support provision, funded by the PAS, which encourages them to take ownership of their own lives and develop the skills and enterprise to build positive personal futures.

Furthermore, uncertainty around the future funding of LDD and Priority Neighbourhoods into the future will be devastating. The cessation of funding from South Gloucestershire Council just a few years ago to many valuable projects had a huge impact on vulnerable people, but this would have been much worse if it were not for the hard work of countless voluntary organisations, stepping up to provide some of these services. The removal of this funding will only serve to drastically reduce the willingness of voluntary organisations to undertake these types of vital projects in the future.

Yate Town Council would therefore strongly urge South Gloucestershire Council to makes its savings elsewhere, not at the expense of funding which provides support for young vulnerable people at this critical stage of their life, to help them achieve their

potential and develop a positive personal future, for themselves, and also for the benefit of the wider community!

72 FINANCIAL REPORTS

72/1 Accounts for Payment

RESOLVED Accounts for payment as shown in Appendix 7 be approved and paid.

72/2 2016/17 Budget

RESOLVED The budget for 2016/2017 be approved. The Town Council to precept for £1,072,656.

Thanks were relayed to the Deputy Town Clerk/RFO for her work in relation to the budget.

(The Deputy Town Clerk/RFO left the meeting).

73 SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

73/1 Planning Sub-Committee

(a) The minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee meeting held on 2 December 2015 were received and **NOTED**.

(b) It was **NOTED** that the next meeting of the Planning Sub Committee will be held immediately after the Full Council meeting on 5 January 2016. **RESOLVED** Councillors John Ford, Cheryl Kirby, Alan Monaghan and Karl Tomasin to attend.

c) Information in respect of planning applications Barnwood Quarry PK11/0612 & PK0613 was received.

RESOLVED Correspondence to be sent to South Gloucestershire Council advising that Yate Town Council reiterates previous comments in respect of this application and reports the comments made by the member of the public.

d) Correspondence from South Gloucestershire Council in respect of planning application PK15/2330/F Cambrian Drive was received.

RESOLVED Correspondence to be sent to the Planning Inspectorate reiterating Yate Town Councils previous objections to the proposed development.

e) Former Rodford School Tree Planting Scheme

Information in respect of the tree planting scheme at the former Rodford Road School was received. (Appendix 8)

RESOLVED Correspondence to be sent to South Gloucestershire Council to advise that Yate Town Council specifically oppose the planting of the trees along the central reservation at Rodford Way.

73/2 Staffing and Governance Sub Committee

RESOLVED In view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is advisable in the public interest that the public be temporarily excluded and they are instructed to withdraw.

The minutes of the Staffing Sub-Committee meeting held on 2 December 2015 & 31 December 2015 were received.

(The Town Clerk and the Senior Admin Officer left the meeting whilst the resolution was reached).

RESOLVED:

- The meeting return to open session;
- Decisions contained in Confidential Appendix be actioned.
- Decisions contained in Confidential Appendix be actioned.

74 TOWN COUNCIL PROJECT STEERING GROUP REPORTS (TASK LIMITED)

74/1 Abbotswood

RESOLVED In view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is advisable in the public interest that the public be temporarily excluded and they are instructed to withdraw.

A confidential update was received and **NOTED**.

RESOLVED;

- The meeting return to open session;

74/2 Elswick Park Development Project Steering Group Committee

RESOLVED In view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is advisable in the public interest that the public be temporarily excluded and they are instructed to withdraw.

The confidential minute of the meeting held on Monday 30 November 2015 were received.

RESOLVED;

- The meeting return to open session;
- Taylor Wimpey to be chased for a response following the meeting held on 30 November 2015.

74/3 New North Yate Project Steering Group Committee

No information was received.

74/4 Parish Hall Redevelopment Project Steering Group Committee

a) Project

It was **NOTED** that this project is held in abeyance. *(NB: Further to minute number 42/5 of the Full Council meeting held on 2 September 2014, the redevelopment plans for the Parish Hall are to be reconsidered if the Town Council is unable to secure the Community Arts Development building at Elswick Park).*

(b) Hanson Sports and Social Club Proposal

It was **NOTED** that Hanson Sports and Social Club are no longer active and therefore will not be pursuing the use of the Parish Hall.

Thanks were relayed to all those involved in negotiations with Hanson Sports and Social Club in giving them the opportunity to pursue the use of the Parish Hall, with special thanks to the Deputy Town Clerk/RFO for her work in relation to this issue.

74/5 Play Areas Project Steering Group Committee

The minutes of the Play Areas Project Steering Group held on 14 December 2015 were received and **NOTED**.

74/6 Land at Rear Of Ridgewood

No further information was received.

74/7 YOSC

RESOLVED In view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is advisable in the public interest that the public be temporarily excluded and they are instructed to withdraw.

- a) Confidential minutes in respect of meeting to discuss the handover of YOSC meetings held on 14th, 21st and 28th September 2015 were received and **NOTED**.
- b) A confidential update in respect of negotiations was received.

RESOLVED;

- The meeting return to open session;
- The YOSC Limited Board members to agree how capital expenditure is made but be reminded of the financial limitations;
- Clarification to be sought from South Gloucestershire Council in respect of who is responsible for the connection fee for the Street lights leading to YOSC;
- Delegated powers be granted to the Clerk in consultation with Councillor Chris Willmore to continue to negotiate the final Heads of Terms with South Gloucestershire Council.

Councillors Cheryl Kirby and Chris Willmore and the Senior Admin Officer were thanked for their hard work in respect of YOSC negotiations. Thanks were relayed to the Parks Supervisor and Jeremy Dale of YOSC Ltd for their work in relation to practical issues on the ground.

75 WORKING GROUPS

75/1 Kingsgate Park Café/Kiosk Working Group Meeting

It was **NOTED** that submission of tenders for the Kingsgate Park Café/Kiosk are to be advertised for 6 weeks from Monday 4th January 2016 until Friday 12th February 2016. The results of the tenders to be considered by Full Council on 23rd February 2016.

76 YATE TOWN CENTRE

76/1 Yate Town Centre Strategy Group

The minutes of the Yate Town Centre Strategy Group meeting held on 2 September 2015 were received and **NOTED**.

77 CONSULTATIONS

77/1 South Gloucestershire Council – Child Poverty Needs Assessment

Details of the above consultation were received, available from;

<https://consultations.southglos.gov.uk/consult.ti/childpovertyneedsassessment/consultationHome>

Consultation open from 2nd December 2015 – 13th January 2016.

Circulated 3.12.15

Closing date 13..01.16

RESOLVED Delegated powers be granted to the Clerk to submit comments shown in appendix 15 by 13th January 2016.

77/2 South Gloucestershire Council – Draft Cycling Strategy

Details of the above consultation were received, available from;

<https://consultations.southglos.gov.uk/consult.ti/cyclingstrategy/consultationHome>

Circulated on 03.12.15

Closing date 15.01.16

RESOLVED Delegated powers be granted to the Clerk to submit comments shown in appendix 16 by 15th January 2016.

77/3 Timing of Community Infrastructure Levy Payments Consultation

Further to minute number 62/5 of the Full Council meeting on 27th October 2015, it was **NOTED** the following response has been submitted to South Gloucestershire Council;

'Yate Town Council opposes annual payments in arrears. Payments should be made quarterly or at worst, twice a year.'

77/4 Review of Modern Records – Consultation

Further to minute number 62/3 of the Full Council meeting on 27th October 2015, it was **NOTED** that the following response has been submitted to South Gloucestershire Council;

'The Town Council oppose the proposals, which amount to cultural vandalism of the highest order. The review suggests permanent irreparable damage to the narrative of who we are culturally. Documents that show the history of people, origins and cultures matter. Archives matter, because they tell the tale of who we are, and where we have come from, which is an important narrative. The Town Council opposes the suggestions because of the irreversible nature of them which will lead to the permanent loss of records which are crucial to the narrative of who we are and our journey.'

77/5 Housing Related Support Review – Consultation

Further to minute number 62/1 of the Full Council meeting on 27th October 2015, it was **NOTED** that the following response has been submitted to South Gloucestershire Council;

'Yate Town Council responds to the above consultation as follows:

Whilst rationalising all the services to cut waste and make it simpler is supported, Yate Town Council object to cutting the direct support.

Group support and drop in sessions have their place but many requiring housing related support are those that require adaptations to enable them to remain in their own homes are unable to attend. Focus needs to be upon ensuring that when someone needs support they get quick, effective on site delivery of support.

Cuts should not start with hitting support to the vulnerable.'

77/6 2016/17 Council Tax Base and Provisional 2016/17 Local Council Tax Reduction Support Grant Allocations

The outcome of the above consultation was received and **NOTED**.

77/7 South Gloucestershire Council Local Plan - PSP Regulation 18

RESOLVED Delegated powers be granted to the Clerk to submit comments by 8th January 2016.

Councillor Chris Willmore was thanked for her hard work in responding to consultations.

(Councillor Ian Blair left the meeting).

78 90th BIRTHDAY OF QUEEN ELIZABETH II

Information was received that St Mary's Church are in the early stages of planning an event to commemorate the 90th Birthday of Queen Elizabeth II (21st April 2016) within the Parish of Yate.

Information from Her Majesty's Pageant Master was received in respect of lighting beacons across the United Kingdom.

RESOLVED;

- Yate Town Council to support the church in promotion of any event they organise
- Details of the beacon lighting event to be sent to Shireway Community Centre who already have a purpose built beacon.

79 ST MARY'S GREEN WAYLEAVE

A wayleave agreement from Western Power Distribution was received.

RESOLVED Delegated powers be granted to the Clerk in consultation with Councillor John Ford to action.

80 YATE TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT STUDY

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 November 2015 to discuss the Yate Traffic and Transport Study were received and **NOTED**.

A further draft issues paper was received and comments were requested to be forwarded to Councillor Chris Willmore.

81 LOCAL COUNCIL AWARD SCHEME

It was **NOTED** that further consideration will be given to the Local Council Award Scheme after the staff review which is due in the first quarter of 2016.

Signed.....

Dated.....

Poole court heating upgrade

We have been advised that the heating system at Poole Court requires upgrading. The parts for the two boilers are no longer supplied due to their age. If one of the boilers was to break down it is possible to run the building on one boiler but this will most likely cause this one to break down. To replace two boilers an estimate of £2000 per boiler has been advised. To replace the boilers the existing pipework would need to be renewed in the plant room.

Three port valves are not working sufficiently; to replace these an estimate of £600 per valve has been advised.

For an accurate quotation we have been advised that this would require further investigation at a cost of £160, this would include a full specification of requirements and if the works could be split over two years.

J:\Full Council\Poole court heating upgrade.docx

3. Draft Waste Strategy 2015-2020

Closing Date 15th Feb

<https://consultations.southglos.gov.uk/consult/ti/wastestrategy2015/consultationHome>

This covers waste collection not disposal. The main aim is to reduce waste, then recycle, and promote the circulate economy (reduce, recycle, reuse, repair).

It says S Glos performance is below European Target of 50% by 2020 (currently 47.5%) although the Government's figures say SGC is recycling above 50%. Either way it is below the performance of the best authorities who manage 66%.

The new proposed changes to the service intends "to simplify the kerbside offering to residents. It will encourage reuse and recycling through; increasing recycling collections to weekly and reducing the size of the black bin. These two proposals come as a package and would be delivered together." It will mean:

- a single green box (possibly with lid) for ALL recycling weekly (unsorted)
- a fortnightly black bin but changed to a smaller one
- ending of kerbside collection of batteries
- food waste – no change
- green bin – no change.

Looking at the best authorities, they

- have a green bin as the main bin (recycling) the same size as the smaller black usually alternate weeks to the black bin.
- a smaller black bin for the residual waste that cannot be recycling
- a brown bin for garden waste (some charge some don't)
- a weekly food waste collection

Draft YTC response

Looking at best practice in terms of the authorities who have the highest levels of recycling in the UK the proposed strategy fails to adopt a number of the key strategies essential to their success. A better system copying the best would be

1. A green bin as the main bin (for all recyclables) – this needs to be the same size as a small black bin – even very average households will more than fill a green box with mixed recyclables in a week.
2. A small black bin, as proposed, but with this marked for 'residuals' i.e. things that cannot go in the green bin. This change of presumption is vital.
3. The most successful authorities continue to recycle batteries at kerb, by saying they should be put on top of the green bin
4. The most successful authorities collect the green (recycling) bin and black bin alternative weeks and do not find that impacts upon collection rates – you only need weekly green box collection if using a small box/ multiple boxes. This saves money compared to the proposed solution.
5. If the Council insists on a green box solution, then it needs to have SECURE lids, and operatives need to put the lids on securely – if the boxes do not have secure lids then we will have plastic bottles all over the roads each week.
6. What measures will be taken if households find they have more recyclables per week

than their green box holds, and they put it in their black bin? (or will it be possible to get more than one green box or put out supplementary boxes?)

7. The authorities at the top of the table offer Garden Waste collection (some charge some do not). We are surprised that there is no mention of the Garden Waste service in this Strategy given that this was a key election commitment of the majority of the Council and evidence shows that garden waste strategy is a vital part of any waste and recycling strategy. Its exclusion is not acceptable and the consultation should be reissued to include the proposals on green waste to provide a full waste strategy – at present it is only a partial waste strategy. Assuming the previous strategy will be superseded the omission of reference to garden waste will leave the Council without a strategy.
8. We oppose the termination of battery collection at kerb – it is done by the authorities with the best recycling rates, and will otherwise lead to metals and other materials ending up in the black bin waste stream (it is not environmentally efficient to drive domestic batteries to the Sort it Centre!). If SGC is insistent on ending kerbside collection, despite evidence from better authorities, we strongly urge that it works with local battery retailers to publicise the legal obligation to offer free take back of used batteries if the supplier sells more than 32kg on batteries a year.
<https://www.gov.uk/battery-waste-supplier-reponsibilities>
9. We suggest that instead of recycling engine oil at kerb it is recycled at Sort It centres or via local garages under a local authority marketed scheme, as otherwise, without a well publicized outlet there is a risk it will be be disposed of into drains.

1. West of England Joint Transport Study

Consultation open until 29 Jan

This will cover the period to 2036, Draft Response from YTC:

1. We are very concerned about the timing of this and its relationship to the Spatial Plan process, as there is a danger it will need to be finalised before Spatial allocations are sufficiently progressed, so that it is unable to respond.
2. As far as Yate is concerned, we are already in the position of the transport Plan implementation lagging behind the housing. NONE of the projects in the current strategy implemented to date have had any effect upon Yate / Sodbury, despite massive growth in the town in the past 10 years in terms of retail, leisure and residential development. The position started with considerable congestion and has only deteriorated because of inaction.
3. We have already experienced growth of over 10% and there are consents in place for a further 2,600 dwellings prior to 2026, but the current Joint Transport Study makes almost no provision for moving the people affected to and from work and other destinations. At the same time, the development of the town centre is making the town an increasingly significant draw bringing in people to shop and for leisure (although employment land is not keeping pace). This is having a massive impact on traffic to and from and within the town, even prior to the 2600 addition dwellings.
4. The current plan makes provision for a more frequent rail service – although no date has yet been put on its implementation. Even so rail at present only takes 1.8% of movements, and even if it doubled would remain a modest player. The key travel journeys are by road to the employment areas to the south and south west of the town. At present these are poorly served by buses, if at all. We are aware of the proposals in a future Phase of Metrobus, but these are too vague, and too far into the future.
5. We need the Transport Study
 - to recognise the scale of development taking place in Yate
 - its massive impact on in and out flows of traffic
 - the reliance on road for that
 - the lack of any proposals in the current Joint Transport Study for any new roads, or significant public transport infrastructure
 - to include provision and funding for
 - a park and ride at the edge of Yate on Badminton Road before 2020 (all of our work indicates the Park and Ride / Kiss and Ride must be on the edge of town, not in the middle of nowhere (eg Wick Wick) if it is to achieve modal shift),
 - Metrobus enhancements from Yate hub to ALL major employment centres (Emersons, Filton, Patchway) before 2020, linked to the phasing of the current planning consents
 - Metrowest rail enhancements before 2020 to double the frequency of trains to Filton Abbeywood and Bristol – this is more important and more affordable as a first step than new routes, although as a second stage the

Henbury loop would add to rail choices: – and provide a proper station facility and some stopping through trains.

- Buses to key service locations that are direct and swift – most importantly Southmead Hospital
- A thorough travel and transport study leading to a town wide Travel and Transport Strategy within the town to ensure traffic congestion in the town minimised, to address both current problems and the problems resulting from growth.
- Expansion of the Yate transport hub to ensure it provides appropriate facilities for a major hub (rather than just a slightly souped up bus stop).
- Action to reduce the bottlenecks – in and out of Yate at peak periods on both the Badminton Road and Goose Green Way, and at the A432/A4174 junction.
- Recognition of and funding for Strategic Corridor Packages for the routes from Yate to A4174 and M4

2. Joint Spatial Plan: Issues and Options

Consultation open until 29 Jan

<https://www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk/consult.ti/JSPiO2015/>

This will cover the period to 2036, and is set to allocate land for 85,000 new homes across the West of England Area. The Issues and Options paper starts from a vision for the WoE area that is fundamentally different from previous ones, which have been based upon sustainable growth. The word 'sustainable' is noticeably restricted in this vision:

"By 2036 the WoE will be one of Europe's fastest growing and most prosperous sub regions with the gap between disadvantaged and other communities closed and a rising quality of life for all. The rich and diverse environmental character will be integral to health and economic prosperity. Patterns of development and transport will facilitate healthy and sustainable lifestyles. Existing and new communities will be well integrated, attractive and desirable places and supported by the necessary infrastructure. New development will be designed to be resilient to, and reduce the impacts of climate change."

Draft Response from YTC:

Question 1 and 2

- We oppose the wording of the Vision for 2036, with its failure to put sustainability and innovation at the heart of the vision. The WoE area has established an international reputation for being a city region committed to sustainability and innovative (e.g. Green Capital 2015) – a sustainable, inclusive, innovative region. The vision should reflect this and work to support the implementation of that vision. As such the vision should not talk about the speed of growth, but the quality and vitality of the community e.g. ' By 2036 the WoE will be one of the world's most innovative and vibrant regions, with a sustainable and inclusive community in which..... '
- We also oppose the wording of the vision because of the limited extent to which it recognises climate change as a key feature for all spatial planning - seeing it as being about designing development to mitigate the impacts of climate change – whereas spatial planning has a crucial role in seeking to reduce the human contributors to causing climate change. As our long term strategy it should be explicit about ensuring spatial planning is designed to reduce causes (eg putting development where there will not be reliance on cars, and zero carbon housing as a norm) as well as looking at resilience in terms of risks of consequences.

Question 3

Spatial Objectives – following from the above, we consider these should be reworded to reflect the sustainability and innovation imperative – 'economic growth' needs to be the right sort of economic growth that fosters solutions to global problems, and is innovative, and the environment section repeats the comment about climate change consequences but not causes. In the phrase 'fostering community' we would also wish to add 'and integration into existing communities within the carrying capacity of those communities' – fostering community is not just about how you design new development, it is equally about how the new houses can be integrated into the existing communities, and the ability of the existing community to handle the pace and

scale of change. Community vitality is a fragile thing, and change at too fast a pace can undermine the ability of a community to support the new development.

Question 4

We consider the plan is providing for too many new dwellings, and is hooking itself into the cycle of going for massive growth, which brings more people into the area, which fosters more growth. Economic vitality and an innovative sustainable community are the keys.

Question 5

Developers need to develop the land for which they have consent, not landbank it, as appears to be happening. And facilities and infrastructure need to come at the start of development not at the end, to encourage landowners to develop quickly to recover costs.

Question 6

It also has an inappropriate balance between 'affordable' and other housing, and should be planning for a higher percentage of affordable housing, which can then be reflected in DC decisions.

Question 7

The key employment issue for our area is the need to commute to work, with only very limited public transport to key employment centres, meaning most people travel by car on already heavily congested roads. Intensification of the use of existing allocated industrial land has a major contribution to make, and employment allocations should be made in locations which have a short fall of employment to housing ratios as a result of development in the current Spatial Strategy – e.g. in Yate there is a shortfall in ratio in the current Strategy, and our industrial estate acreage is low intensity and therefore does not produce sufficient employment. This contributes to a massive outmigration commute each day. However it also needs to be recognised that some forms of employment need to be in the main urban areas where there is a strong and diverse set of public transport options.

Question 8

In Yate we need an intensification of the use of current employment land, and commitment not to release employment land for housing rather than additional land – in the current plan period we have seen employment land released for housing, with no compensatory provision and inadequate additional provision to service the new residential developments. We believe that in communities with an employment imbalance like Yate, employment land should not be released for residential use, or if it is, it should be replaced with equivalent acreages of new employment land readily accessible by public transport from Yate.

Question 9

- The priority of building more homes in Bristol is absolutely essential, but this should not be extended to include towns such as Yate, i.e. the smaller towns, because they do not offer the same environmental and service benefits. We support brownfield

development subject to our comments on Question 8 – the importance of maintaining an employment: residential balance.

- Land assembly / landowner disputes have delayed development in the Bristol North Fringe area of South Gloucestershire, requiring the release of additional sites to achieve the 5 year supply. When these sites come on line they will contribute to the development in this new plan. However the problem illustrates the extent to which landowner disputes are central to the delivery of urban development strategies. A more proactive public sector role in land assembly would overcome that – equivalent to the Enterprise Zone approach re employment.

Questions 10 and 11

- In terms of Bristol's role as a global leader in innovation in delivering sustainable cities, and in terms of climate change prevention it is essential that the Urban Intensification option is pursued and given huge weight over other options. The second choice is urban extension, although without green belt loss. We fundamentally oppose options 3 and 4, in terms of the types of development which place weight on trans green belt development. Given the location of the primary employment centres are within the green belt in the main urban areas, any development beyond the green belt builds in excessive and unnecessary additional travel – which creates climate change, and adds hugely to cost by necessitating either new road building or massive public transport investment.
- WoE would expect Yate Town Council be opposing models which might add more development to yate – and we do so, because we know the town will not be able to handle more development in terms of travel and transport within the town and to centres of work, and because we know the community is going to be stretched to the limits to ensure the development already consented is implemented in a way that integrates communities – after that we will need a period of stability to settle as a new community before new development. In 1988 after a sustained period of growth, this need to stabilise and take a deep breathe was recognised, and Yate Sodbury was given a 'breathing space'. We desperately need another one.
- However, our objection to development strategies that could risk significant development in Yate is not just based on our knowledge of the capacity of our community and local housing market, but also upon the fundamental concept of sustainable cities needing to build within the urban area, not cross the green belt and build in costly and unnecessary additional travel. We refer back to our comments on Questions 1 and 2.
- It follows that in terms of the Scenarios, we strongly support Scenario 2, if it is limited to the Table 5.1 list of urban intensification and extension sites, with the addition of Bath. We also support Scenario 3, providing Yate is deleted from it – in a transport focussed scenario, the only strategic public transport recognised in the document is the station, which currently only carries 1.8% of our out of town work force – and even with the best will in the world and maximum investment cannot be classified as a major transport option. We fundamentally oppose Scenarios 4 and 5, as they are unprincipled response, and does not address the fundamental issues of sustainability, which requires intensification in the major urban areas.

Question 12

Yate maps badly onto chapter 2 criteria

- its only strategic transport link is the Station, which has very limited capacity to deliver commuter travel, so is heavily reliant on roads through the green belt. It therefore significantly adversely affects Green Belt environmental assets (or if people go via the Ma it affects the AONB)
- Inclusion of Yate as a possible town expansion in the Protection of Green Belt Scenario misunderstands the nature of the Green Belt. The Green belt is at its thinnest between Yate and Emersons Green, where it is under 4 miles in depth. That area is under huge pressure. Any additional development at Yate undermines that Green Belt because of the massive impact of commuting through the Green Belt, with its pressure for advertising and urban sprawl activities along the roads, and the impact on villages of very high levels of commuter traffic through their heart. So protection of the Green Belt means protection from both development AND from commuting through the green belt. Some trans green belt communities might have easy motorway access as an alternative to commuting through the green belt, and those south of Bristol have access to Weston Super Mare as a major urban area. Yate and Thornbury however cannot be expanded without significant adverse impacts on the Green Belt – particularly at its fragile thin point at Yate. Tabel 5.3 recognises the impact of trans green belt community, but seems to only limit it to some locations (it is not clear which). We strongly urge that Yate and its fragile green belt is seen as one such location.
- Inclusion of Yate on the Transport focused one misunderstands the level of current public transport access (one station handling 1.8% of commuter journeys) – even doubling that would not have a significant impact. Major upfront investment in public transport would be needed before Yate would meet transport focussed criteria – and we have seen that in all the Joint Transport Study scenarios Yate is not a priority and there is as yet no date for and no detailed proposals for significant transport investment.
- Figure 6 is inaccurate in its depiction of the Yate station location, making it look as though it extends to the north of the town, whereas it stops further down, and is therefore not well located in relation to any green field sites.
- In terms of housing, the massive current allocation will meet the need for housing in the area for the foreseeable future. It is noted that the rise in second hand housing prices in Bristol has been massively higher than house price rises in Yate, which provides strong evidence for the extent to which there is not a high demand for additional housing.
- Yate has worked hard to absorb the development it received in the pre-1990 period, and was given a breathing space to do so. We are now working hard to absorb and integrate the massive development allocated in the current Core Strategy, which will have led to a 50% growth in the population of Yate Parish in the Core Strategy period. This is a massive growth. In terms of integration it is not just about design of the new development, it is also about adjusting the existing community to absorb and change to incorporate the new. We need a breathing space to tackle the growth the parish is facing.
- It is difficult to identify any possible locations for new development in Yate which could be integrated into the community – because of the railway lines to south and west and green belt; the design of the new north yate development which effectively

closes off the top of the town; the existence of flood areas and common land to the east. New development would therefore be in locations that cannot be integrated, however well designed – and if effectively a new location is being designed, it would be better for it to be an entirely new settlement close to e.g. Weston.

- Yate has no public transport links to existing Enterprise Zones. We would welcome a specific policy about employment locally, as we are increasingly dependent upon community, with previous brownfield employment sites being redeveloped for housing, with no additional employment sites replacing them, with an underprovision of employment land for the new housing. This decline in employment access for those reliant on public transport is marked – for example Central Yate has the highest level of underemployment amongst 18 – 24 year olds in South Glos – because of limited access to the job locations and loss of employment locations in Yate. Opportunities exist to intensify the use of the existing employment zones, and an Enterprise Zone status would assist it – not to justify more housing, but to address an existing economic issue.
- Transport – as we have outlined elsewhere in our response, Yate is very poorly served by public transport both to and within the town. No significant improvements are planned, despite the 50% growth in the parish population – the doubling of the rail service will only increase its capacity from 1.8 to 3.6% of commuters.
- Access to both employment and essential services e.g. hospital is vital. Yate does not have effective access to a hospital, as both Southmead and BRI are the other side of the major rush hour congestion points, so it can take an hour and a half in the rush hour to reach EITHER hospital by car, and longer by public transport.
- Significant areas around Yate are in flood risk zones, but also, because of the need to rely on the private car for journeys to work, any development in Yate is a high climate change generator. It would be much better to locate development close to the major centres of employment, or to places with lots of public transport opportunities.
- Any development in Yate would be on greenfield sites, and therefore violate that criteria. It would move out into the countryside, and would no longer be focussed on the town centre, but would become urban sprawl, heading towards Wickwar. Brownfield sites have all now been developed, and any further development would simply undermine the jobs: housing relationship (which is bad enough).

Question 13

Scenario 2 by far the least worst option, for the reasons given above.

If other options are picked, then the development should focus to the south of Bristol green belt, where development can then focus upon Weston Super Mare as its major centre. Weston > See Question 14 for reasons.

Question 14

If a wholly new settlement were adopted, it should be well located in relation to a major centre, and should NOT generate massive additional trans green belt A road travel – i.e. motorway travel or proximity to major employment centres without trans green belt travel.

That means it should be in the Weston Super Mare area. That is for other reasons the area of the region which is economically weakest. The north of the WoE area is the

economically hottest, and any new development there will simply make the problem massively worse. We need to spread the economic opportunity and focus upon Weston as a key centre for economic development, well connected to Bristol, with a coastal aspect. With the right marketing, it should be possible to regenerate Weston. Development focussed upon Weston could be designed to contribute to that regeneration, without affecting the Green Belt.

Question 15

We have already commented that Yate has had no major transport investment since the station was reopened over 25 years ago. The only proposal which currently has funding is to double the train service frequency. This will increase its capacity from 1.8% to about 4% of the commuting public. Most people currently commute by car, along congested A and B roads through the Green Belt.

Yate needs the Metrobus now, a park and ride on the edge of town (A432), a Metrorail expansion with trains every 15 minutes and strong feeder buses from stations to destinations; a public transport system within the town.

In the absence of a South Glos transport strategy for Yate, the local Town and Parish Councils have produced an issues paper, and will want to see those issues addressed as a precondition of any further development at Yate. This involves a massive and fundamental rethink of the public and private

Cheques/Direct Debits/Visa/Electronic Payments List

Appendix 7

METHOD	ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	Member 1 Initial	Member 2 Initial	Clerk or RFO Initial
EP	ASMC	Bowling Green Materials - November 2015	£ 384.00	MS	MS	SS
EP	Bristol Wessex Water	Water and Sewerage - Heritage Centre	£ 88.41	MS	MS	SS
EP	Beacon Cleaning Services	Cleaning - Parish Hall November 2015	£ 299.66			
		Cleaning - Kingsgate Park Toilets November 2015	£ 149.34			
		Cleaning - Town Council Properties November 2015	£ 777.60			
		Cleaning - Pop Inn Café November 2015	£ 51.60	MS	MS	SS
EP	Blazen Web Marketing	12 months web hosting - Yate Town Council	£ 172.08	MS	MS	SS
EP	Bristol Gas and Heating Ltd	Heating System Works - Poole Court	£ 470.00	MS	MS	SS
		Boiler Replacement - Poole Court	£ 3,980.00	MS	MS	SS
EP	The Bristol Pest Controller	Pest control - Brinsham Fields	£ 180.00	MS	MS	SS
EP	Bristol Sound Systems Ltd	Speaker System - Remembrance Service	£ 298.80	MS	MS	SS
EP	Churchills	Kitchen Stock for Resale - Pop Inn Café	£ 87.60	MS	MS	SS
EP	Friends of Kingsgate Park	Grant Award - 2015/2016	£ 70.00	MS	MS	SS
EP	Worldline IT Services (Fuelgenie)	Estates Vehicle Fuel - November 2015	£ 361.24	MS	MS	SS
EP	J Hollister	Estates Equipment/Materials	£ 193.09			
		Estates Equipment/Materials	£ 125.77	MS	MS	SS
EP	The Parish of Yate	Grant Award - 2015/2016	£ 471.54	MS	MS	SS
EP	Quality Solicitors Burroughs Day	Legal services in respect of YOSC	£ 8,300.00	MS	MS	SS
EP	Quality Solicitors Burroughs Day	Legal Services in respect of Abbotswood	£ 19,800.00	MS	MS	SS
EP	Ross Office Supplies	Stationery	£ 15.14			
		Stationery	£ 16.58			
		Stationery	£ 95.51			
		Stationery	£ 38.85	MS	MS	SS
EP	Rubicon Play Ltd	Play Equipment Repairs	£ 637.56	MS	MS	SS
		Play Equipment Repairs	£ 60.00	MS	MS	SS
EP	SWALEC	Electricity - Peg Hill Lighting	£ 70.85	MS	MS	SS
EP	Sprint Print & Design	Printing - Christmas Cards	£ 334.80	MS	MS	SS
EP	Touchwood Enterprises Ltd	Witches Hat Play Area Refurbishment	£ 1,694.88	MS	MS	SS
EP	Virgin Media Business	Heritage Centre Broadband	£ 49.20	MS	MS	SS
EP	T H White	Estates Mower Repairs/Maintenance	£ 428.13	MS	MS	SS
		Estates Mower Repairs/Maintenance	£ 158.68	MS	MS	SS
EP	The Tortworth Estate Company	Christmas Trees - Parish Hall	£ 40.00	MS	MS	SS
EP	Zurich Municipal (Zurich Insurance plc)	Insurance Cover for estates hire vehicle	£ 68.69	MS	MS	SS
			£ 37,969.50			

Member 1 - Print Name: Mike Drin MS Date: 21/12/2015

Member 2 - Print Name: Tony Davis Date: 21/12/2015

Blowing Rock

Cheques/Direct Debits/Visa/Electronic Payments List Full Council - 5th January 2016

METHOD	ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	Member 1 Initial	Member 2 Initial	Clerk or RFO Initial
DD	Lex Autolease	Estates Vehicle Lease Payments - Nov 15	£ 262.74			
DD	Lex Autolease	Estates Vehicle Lease Payments - Nov 15	£ 225.28			
DD	Paperchase	Guest book for Poole Court 25th Anniversary Event	£ 18.49			
Visa	Friends Life	Staff Pension Contributions	£ 3,000.00			
Visa	Friends Life	Staff Pension Contributions	£ 150.00			
Visa	Waitrose	Refreshments - Poole Court 25th Anniversary Event	£ 191.80			
100886	Cash	Petty Cash Top Up	£ 163.96			
Transfer	Staff Salaries	Staff Salaries - December 2015	£ 33,632.95			
EP	BANES	Superannuation Contributions - December 2015	£ 7,567.92			
EP	BWBSL	Water/Sewerage - Sunnyside Bowling Pavilion	£ 771.19			
EP	BWBSL	Water/Sewerage - Kingsgate Park	£ 339.32			
EP	BWBSL	Water/Sewerage - Sunnyside Football Pavilion	£ 127.05			
EP	Bidvest Foodservice	Kitchen Stock for Resale - Pop Inn Café	£ 124.40			
		Kitchen Stock for Resale - Pop Inn Café	£ 103.20			
EP	Beacon Cleaning Services Ltd	Cleaning materials - Poole Court	£ 40.57			
		Cleaning materials - Parish Hall	£ 24.97			
EP	Blazen Web Marketing	Website Support - Heritage Centre	£ 82.80			
		Website Support - Yate Town Council	£ 82.80			
EP	Bristol City Council	Bedding Plants	£ 42.00			
EP	Chapple & Jenkins	Kitchen Stock for Resale - Pop Inn Café	£ 68.24			
		Kitchen Stock for Resale - Pop Inn Café	£ 65.43			
		Kitchen Stock for Resale - Pop Inn Café	£ 43.19			
		Kitchen Stock for Resale - Pop Inn Café	£ 76.23			
EP	Consortium	Stationery	£ 27.48			
EP	GB Sport & Leisure Ltd	Play Area Parts	£ 101.15			
EP	Horders	Electrical Works - Armadillo Youth Café	£ 320.98			
		Electrical Works - Town Council Properties	£ 90.00			
EP	HMRC	Tax/NI Contributions - December 2015	£ 8,749.39			
EP	Initial Washroom Hygiene	Hygiene Bins - Town Council Properties	£ 69.00			
		Hygiene Bins - Town Council Properties	£ 13.75			
EP	Lawrence Tree Services	Tree Works - Kingsgate Park	£ 96.00			
EP	NSG	Security Patrols - Town Council Parks	£ 873.48			
EP	Office Beverages	Water Cooler Sanitisation - Poole Court	£ 19.08			
		Water Cooler Sanitisation - Heritage Centre	£ 19.08			

EP	Postage by Phone	Franking Machine Top Up	£	500.00	MS	SD
EP	Murray Hire Centres Ltd	Service/repair estates equipment	£ 34.66			
		Estates Equipment	£ 72.54			
		Hire of estates equipment	£ 42.12			
		Estates Equipment	£ 25.32			
		Service/repair estates equipment	£ 32.26	206.90	MS	SD
EP	Pearce Bros	Estates Vehicle Repairs	£ 144.66			
		Estates Vehicle Hire	£ 493.92	638.58	MS	SD
EP	Quality first Premier Window Cleaners	Window Cleaning - Town Council Properties	£ 92.58			
		Window Cleaning - Poole Court	£ 80.34	172.92	MS	SD
EP	Quality Solicitors Burroughs Day	Legal Services	£ 3,645.00			
		Legal Services - YOSC	£ 4,184.00			
		Legal Services	£ 30.00	7,859.00	MS	SD
EP	P G Russell	Fencing - Witches Hat Play Area	£ 127.52			
EP	Scoffers	Kitchen Stock for Resale	£ 103.10	1,020.00	MS	SD
		Kitchen Stock for Resale	£ 128.60			
		Kitchen Stock for Resale	£ 149.29			
		Kitchen Stock for Resale	£ 127.57	636.08	MS	SD
EP	RK Sood & KN Sood	Newspapers - Pop Inn Café	£ 7,885.19			
EP	South Glos Council	Quarter 3 Localism Payment	£ 398.21	37.20	MS	SD
		Estates Vehicle Lease Payments	£ 1,044.06			
		Anti Vandal Guards - Peg Hill Lighting	£ 20.50			
		Bus Shelter Licences	£ 29.04	9,377.00	MS	SD
		Hire of Estates Vehicle				
EP	South Glos Council Recovery	Recovery Payment - January 16	£ 149.03			
EP	Sprint Print and Design	Display materials for Poole Court Anniversary Event	£ 105.60			
EP	SUEZ (Sita UK Ltd)	Refuse Collection - Kingsgate Park	£ 69.68			
		Refuse Collection - Sunnyside Lane	£ 83.52			
		Recycling Collection - Pop Inn Café	£ 22.70			
		Refuse Collection - Pop Inn Café	£ 69.68			
		Refuse and Recycling - Poole Court	£ 92.39	337.97	MS	SD
EP	Stannah Lift Services Ltd	Stair lift Maintenance - Heritage Centre	£ 109.90			
EP	Trade UK	Estates Equipment	£ 28.80			
		Estates Equipment	£ 24.72			
		Estates Equipment	£ 10.16			
		Estates Equipment	£ 4.48	72.18	MS	SD
		Estates Equipment	£ 4.02			
EP	Valuation Office Agency	Valuation fees - Abbotswood	£ 580.74			
EP	Virgin Media Business	Poole Court Wi-fi	£ 48.00			

To full cancel Jan 16

Cheques/Direct Debits/Visa/Electronic Payments List
F&GP - 1st December 2015 plus 1 interim payment

AMOUNT	Member 1 Initial	Member 2 Initial	Clerk or RFO Initial
£ 250.00	<i>AS</i>	<i>CE</i>	<i>WT</i>
£ 24.00			<i>WT</i>
<u>£ 274.00</u>			

DESCRIPTION

Fire Door Works to Parish Hall
Estates Equipment Repair

ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT

Bradley Stoke Windows
Murray Hire

METHOD

EP
EP

Member 1 - Print Name
TONY DAVIS Date *7/12/15*
Member 2 - Print Name
Cheryl Kirby Date *7/12/15*

Full cancel Jan 2016

Cheques/Direct Debits/Visa/Electronic Payments List
F&GP - 1st December 2015

METHOD	ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	Member 1 Initial	Member 2 Initial	Clerk or RFO Initial
EP	YOSC Ltd	Transf to YOSC Ltd from SGC Transferred Funds	£ 6,172.86	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>

£ 6,172.86

Member 1 - Print Name Tony Davis Date 8/12/15
Member 2 - Print Name IAN BARK Date 8/12/15

EP Worldline IT Services (Fuelgenie)
EP YOSC Ltd

Fuel - Estates Vehicles
Business Rates - Jan and Feb 2016

Member 1 - Print Name

M DREW

Date

19/01/2016

Member 2 - Print Name

T DAVIS

Date

19/1/2016

£ 323.00
£ 3,768.00

£ 83,526.02

1105
1105

23
23

Sally Johnston

From: Phil Dye <Phil.Dye@southglos.gov.uk>
Sent: 30 December 2015 13:16
To: Sue Walker; Ruth Davis; Yate Town Council
Subject: Proposed tree planting around former Rodford School
Attachments: Rodford School off-site planting plan.jpg

Dear Cllrs and Hayley,

I hope you had a good Christmas.

Please find attached a planting plan for trees around the former Rodford School site which is part of a planning condition for the site. These trees have been funded by Bellway Homes and the plan has been drawn up by us.

We intend to undertake the planting at the end of January. Letters have been sent to residents who overlook these planting areas to explain the proposals and invite comments.

Kind regards

Phil

Phil Dye

Arboricultural Officer

South Gloucestershire Council
Dept Environment and Community Services
Stakeholder Team
01454 865859

South Gloucestershire Council . Achieving excellence for our residents and their communities, ensuring South Gloucestershire continues to be a great place to live and work

This email and any files transmitted with it from South Gloucestershire Council are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. You should not forward it by any method to anyone else who does not have a justified 'need to know'.

If you have received this email in error please notify the South Gloucestershire Council postmaster at the address below

postmaster@southglos.gov.uk

