MINUTES OF FULL COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 9 JANUARY 2018 FROM 7.15PM–8.45PM AT POOLE COURT, YATE

PRESENT

Councillor John Ford

Councillors Ben Campbell, Ian Blair, Tony Davis, Mike Drew (part meeting), John Gawn, Cheryl Kirby, Margaret Marshall (part meeting), Alan Monaghan (part meeting), Ben Nutland, Wully Perks (part meeting), Penny Thoyts (part meeting), Karl Tomasin, John Serle, Sue Walker and Chris Willmore (part meeting).
Town Clerk, Deputy Town Clerk & RFO (part meeting) and Service Support Manager.
1 x member of the public.

61 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

RESOLVED Apologies for absence were received from Councillor John Davis (currently taking leave of absence as approved at Full Council, Minute 60, 24th October 2017).

62 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCALISM ACT 2011

Councillor Mike Drew YOSC (SGC and BGS Governor) Item 65
Councillor John Ford YOSC (YOSC Ltd Director) Item 65
Councillor Cheryl Kirby YOSC (YOSC Ltd Director) Item 65
Councillor John Serle Yate and District Bowling Club Item 72/4 (f)

63 REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATION

No requests for dispensation were received.

64 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SESSIONS WITH RESPECT TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

No members of the public wished to speak.

65 YOSC TRACK AND ATHLETICS PROJECT, FUTURE GOVERNANCE OF THE SITE AND LEGAL AGREEMENTS BETWEEN BRIMSHAM GREEN SCHOOL, SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNCIL AND YATE TOWN COUNCIL

Following a request to the Chair, this item was taken at the beginning of the meeting and also referred to under Minute 78/3 - Confidential Items.

RESOLVED That 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 be instructed to withdraw.

(The member of the public left the meeting)
(Councillors Cheryl Kirby and Mike Drew left the meeting)
Councillor John Ford remained in the meeting but took no part. Councillor Karl Tomasin (Vice Chair) took the Chair for item 65 only.

A summary (Confidential Appendix 1) was received in respect of;

a) Update on negotiations between Brimsham Green School, South Gloucestershire Council and Yate Town Council;

(Councillor Mike Drew returned to the meeting)

b) Recommendations from the YOSC Athletics and Track Project Steering Group;

c) Update on proposed governance model between Yate Town Council and YOSC Ltd.

RESOLVED;

○ The meeting return to open session.

(Councillors Margaret Marshall, Alan Monaghan, Wully Perks and Penny Thoyts entered the meeting. Councillor Cheryl Kirby and the member of the public returned to the meeting).

RESOLVED;

○ The contents of the summary be noted and all recommendations contained therein at Confidential Appendix 1 be approved including the following:

The following tenders were received in relation to the athletics and track refurbishment project (including provisional items and contingency) as follows:

1. Blakedown Sports & Play Ltd;
2. Bernhard’s Sports Surfaces Ltd;
3. Cleveland Land Services Ltd;
4. McArdle Sport-Tec Ltd;
5. S&C Slatter Ltd;
6. South Wales Sports Grounds Ltd;
7. Sportsfield Ltd.

In the sums of:

a) £ 797,426.00;
b) £ 811,939.83;
c) £ 817,267.67;
d) £ 866,454.31;
e) £ 916,990.16;
f) £1,007,514.50;
g) £1,059,004.10.
It was **RESOLVED** that the contract for the refurbishment of the athletics and track facilities at YOSC be awarded to Cleveland Land Services Ltd in the sum of £817,267.67 (including provisionals and contingency), subject to:

- satisfactory financial credit check;
- extension of the bond to match the guarantee period spanning a couple of years;
- satisfactory due diligence process check;
- satisfactory references;
- subject to security of s106 and asset transfer funding before finalisation and award of the contract;
- a significant handover and training package to YTC/YOSC Ltd be included within the final contract;
- project works to run from 9th July (site possession date) – 30th September 2018 (contract completion date).

It was **NOTED** that Cleveland Land Services Ltd was not the lowest tenderer but had been selected due to the consultant advising that they had provided the most professional and precise bid along with additional relative information submitted and that he would feel confident in working with them.

It was further **RESOLVED** that:

- A camera and associated equipment be purchased for a timelapse recording of the project build (estimated to be around £200) and funding for its installation agreed;
- Delegated powers be granted to the YOSC Athletics and Track Project Steering Group to take decisions on this project in the best interest of the council within the financial remits of that available (e.g., removal of provisional items to be identified should not all funding be available);
- Further to Minute No. 17c of the Finance and General Purposes Committee meeting of 28th November 2017, the Business Plan be formally adopted (Confidential Appendix A), including approval of a governance model between Yate Town Council and YOSC Ltd of a lease and service level agreement, together with a grant payment to YOSC Ltd in exchange for agreed provision of services. It was **NOTED** that the Business Plan would need to be modified as more up to date information is known such as final amount payable for school use;
- Investigations take place into developing proposals on potential future options for an alternative base for the boxing club.

Thanks were extended to everyone involved in negotiations and YOSC project for their hard work.

*(Councillors Chris Willmore and Mike Drew left the meeting).*

**MINUTES OF THE TOWN COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 24 OCTOBER 2017**
RESOLVED The minutes of the Full Council Meeting held on 24 October 2017 be approved and signed as a true and accurate record.

67 MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 14 NOVEMBER 2017

RESOLVED The minutes of the Environment and Planning meeting held on 26 September 2017 be approved and signed as a true and accurate record and recommendations approved therein.

68 MINUTES OF THE FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 28 NOVEMBER 2017

RESOLVED The minutes of the Finance and General Purposes Committee meeting held on 28 November 2017 be approved and signed as a true and accurate record and recommendations approved therein.

69 FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE MATTERS FROM MEETING HELD ON 28 NOVEMBER 2017

69/1 Minute No. 9/4 Staffing and Governance Sub-Committee: Policy Adoption

Further to Minute No. 3/1a of the Staffing and Governance Sub-Committee minutes of 20th November 2017 appertaining to Governance, the following revised policies were circulated;

- Appraisal and Supervision Policy;
- Code of Conduct (including Member-Officer protocol);
- Employee Health & Safety;
- Fraud and Corruption;
- Training & Development.

RESOLVED The above policies be adopted subject to staff consultation.

69/2 Minute No 12 Town and Parish Council Forum

The Town and Parish Council Charter was received.

RESOLVED Yate Town Council to sign up to the Parish and Town Council Charter (Appendix 2).

69/3 Minute No 12 Shopmobility

Information was received that South Gloucestershire Council will be ending funding to Shopmobility on 31 March 2018.

RESOLVED Contact be made with Shopmobility requesting details of the shortfall in their funding and further details of operation (ie accounts) to enable the Town Council to consider any application for grant funding. Shopmobility to be reminded
to advise Dodington Parish Council and Sodbury Town Council of the withdrawal of South Gloucestershire Council funding.

*(Councillor Mike Drew entered the meeting).*

69/4 Minute Number 15 Town Council Meeting Dates 2018/2019

**RESOLVED** The Yate Town Council meeting dates for 2018/19 be approved. (Appendix 3).

70 FINANCIAL REPORTS

70/1 Accounts for Payment

Accounts for payment made in November 2017, were received and **NOTED.** (Appendix 4)

70/2 2018/19 Budget

**RESOLVED** The budget for 2018/2019 be approved (Appendix 5). The Town Council to precept for £1,175,049. Thanks be extended to the RFO for her work.

70/3 Mid-Year 2017 Internal Audit

A letter of assurance and completed action plan from the Town Council mid-year audit was received and **NOTED.** (Appendix 6) It was **RESOLVED** that the action plan be approved.

It was further **NOTED** that transparency requirements under the Local Government Transparency Code will be audited in future.

70/4 External Audit of Accounts Year Ending 31 March 2017

It was **NOTED** that in line with attached appendix 7, PKF Littlejohn LLP has been appointed as Yate Town Council’s external auditors for the financial years 2017/18 to 2021/22.

71 SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

71/1 Planning Sub-Committee

(a) Minutes

The minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee meetings held on 28 November and 21 December were received and **NOTED.** (Appendix 8a & 8b).

Thanks were given to Councillor Chris Willmore for her hard work in preparing comments.

(b) Meeting with Representatives of Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes
Minutes of the meeting with representatives of Barratt Homes and David Wilson Homes held on 7th December 2017 were received and NOTED. (Appendix 9)

(c) Emerging Vision for Yate Town Centre

Minutes of the meeting to discuss the Emerging Vision for Yate Town Centre held on 6 December 2017 were received and NOTED. (Appendix 10)

71/2 Staffing and Governance Sub-Committee Meeting Date

It was NOTED that the next meeting of the Staffing and Governance Sub-Committee will be arranged to take place in February/March 2018.

72 TOWN COUNCIL PROJECT STEERING GROUP REPORTS (TASK LIMITED)

72/1 Abbotswood Leases

It was NOTED that as this item is confidential, an update would be given at the end of the meeting, under Item 76 Confidential Matters.

72/2 Cambrian Drive Project

Further to Minute No. 59/4 of the Full Council meeting of 24th October 2017, it was NOTED that the purchase of the land at Cambrian Drive was completed on 20th December 2017 and:

- work is in hand to remove fencing, erect signage, cut the grass and arrange a community workday in the new year;
- the Town Council solicitor has been instructed to ensure the overage arrangements are recorded with the Land Registry.

72/3 Howard Lewis Land Project

It was NOTED that as this item is confidential, an update would be given at the end of the meeting, under Item 76 Confidential Matters.

72/4 Play Areas and Properties Project Steering Group

(a) Brinsham Play Area Project (Phase 1)

Further to the delegation of powers granted to the clerk in conjunction with members of the Play Areas and Properties Project Steering Group (Minute No. 55/3 of the Full Council meeting of 24th October 2017), it was NOTED that quotations for the enhancement of the play area facility were assessed and an order placed with Hags in the sum of £23,500, with a deadline for completion set as 31st March 2018 to meet s106 clawback deadline of 2nd May 2018.

(b) Howard Lewis Play Area
It was NOTED that following consultation with members, an amended s106 bid was made in the sum of £49,628.74 to South Gloucestershire Council. The outcome is expected by the end of January 2018.

(c) Kingsgate Park Exercise Equipment

It was NOTED that a s106 bid in the sum of £72,380 was submitted to South Gloucestershire Council for Exercise Equipment in Kingsgate Park. The outcome is expected by the end of January 2018.

(d) Abbotswood Phase 2

It was NOTED that a s106 bid in the sum of £89,535 was submitted to South Gloucestershire Council to increase the amount of equipment available. The outcome is expected by the end of January 2018.

(e) Eggshell Lane Play Area

It was NOTED that a s106 bid in the sum of £3,461.89 was submitted to South Gloucestershire Council to improve the play area but was declined.

(f) Sunnyside Changing Room Extension

It was NOTED that:

- a management plan has been submitted to South Gloucestershire Council to enable s106 funds to be released;
- when the funding is released, the architect will be appointed;
- construction works are likely to impact on part of the 2018/2019 football season and work is underway to mitigate effects by exploring the following options:
  - pursuing an option to use facilities at the bowling club during the construction phase;
  - prolonging access to the disabled toilet in the current changing rooms;
  - exploring costs of hiring portacabin toilets.
- The outcome of the public consultation will be reported to Full Council on 27th February 2018.

It was RESOLVED that:

- project timeline be as contained in Appendix 11;
- delegated powers be granted to the Clerk in consultation with the Play Areas and Properties Project Steering Group to work with the architect to progress the project including approval of tender brief, specification and designs for planning purposes, arrangements for the public consultation and to negotiate with the Bowling Club regarding use of the building for changing facilities for the duration of the build;
- local residents be fully consulted and briefed on any works at the bowling club, especially those living closest to the club.
72/5 Land at the Rear of Ridgewood Community Centre

It was NOTED that South Gloucestershire Council have been instructed as follows:

- To draw up the lease subject to the existing license;
- The expectation is that all fencing which surrounds the site will be in place and in good order prior to any transfer;
- Any encroachment issues are dealt with prior to transfer.

72/6 YOSC

(a) Track and Athletics Project, Future Governance of the Site and Legal Agreements Between Brimsham Green School, South Gloucestershire Council and Yate Town Council

It was NOTED that this item was covered at the beginning of the meeting (Minute No.65), following a request to the chair.

(b) YOSC Liaison Group Meeting with Representatives of YOSC Ltd

The minutes of the meeting between the YOSC Liaison Group and Representatives of YOSC Ltd held on 1 December 2017 were received and NOTED. (Appendix 12)

(c) Outstanding Information

It was NOTED that YOSC Ltd has been asked to advise when they will be in a position to forward the following documents as previously requested:

- A budget;
- Business Plan to evidence sustainability and viability.

It was NOTED that a list of works carried out onsite to date and estimation of works that are required in the short, medium and long term has been received and will be plotted onto an appropriate timeframe so that they can be planned for.

(d) Maintenance Works

It was NOTED that the hot water pump to the clubhouse stopped working (as it did in September 2017). Work was undertaken on the grounds of health and safety at a cost of £815 and RESOLVED it be met from the transfer of funding awaited from South Gloucestershire Council.

73 SUB COMMITTEE REPORTS

73/1 Yate Ageing Better Working Sub Committee

The minutes of the Yate Ageing Better Sub-Committee meeting held on 22nd November 2017 (Appendix 13) were received and RESOLVED that the Terms of Reference for the Sub Committee contained therein be approved.
It was further NOTED that:

- The Men in Sheds group drafted a constitution which includes suggested financial processes between the group and Yate Town Council. The constitution will be considered and proposed to the next Finance and General Purposes meeting for approval;
- The Lunch Club continues to take place on a Monday at St Nicholas Church. Recent feedback has seen around 20 individuals engaging;
- Further to the Full Council meeting of 5th September 2017 (Minute No.41/1), Yate Town Council was not eligible to submit an application to South Gloucestershire Council’s Three Year Equality Support Grant Programme for the Yate Ageing Better consultant / consultation / strategy. However, funding opportunities are being explored. So far, unfortunately the application made to Quartet’s Fund for Older People for the Yate Ageing Better consultation was declined on 5th December.

74 WORKING GROUP REPORTS

74/1 Priorities Working Group

It was NOTED that the meeting of the Priorities Working Group will be convened in due course.

75 CONSULTATIONS

75/1 Current consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Name</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Date Circulated</th>
<th>Closing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This consultation was NOTED.

75/2 Consultation responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Name</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disqualification of Councillors and Mayor Criteria (Appendix 14)</td>
<td>30.11.17</td>
<td>Thanks were extended to Councillor Chris Willmore for completing the response on behalf of the Town Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
76 TRAFFIC THROUGH BRIMSHAM PARK

The following comments were received from a member of the public in respect of a rat run in Brimsham Park:

The traffic at certain times of the day using Randolph Avenue in both directions has increased immensely. Most prominently between 8.00 am and 9.30 am and from around 4.00 pm until 6.00 pm. I assumed to start with that it was probably an increase in people using the road from Brimsham Park housing, but I think it is something else. The traffic is going in both directions both morning and evening.

Although I haven't spent time monitoring the mornings, I have spent time on a few evenings in the summer at both the roundabout at the bottom of Peg Hill and the roundabout at the end of Randolph Avenue where it joins Goose Green Way. I have noticed that when there are queues of traffic tailing back on Peg Hill down to the traffic lights on Goose Green way, a lot of cars coming down Peg Hill opt to use the roads on Brimsham Park to bypass the light changes. Similarly when there is heavy traffic coming from the Bristol direction on Goose Green Way, that there are a lot of cars opting to use the roads on Brimsham Park to miss the traffic lights further along the road.

This problem is likely to increase with additional housing which is being proposed in the wider area around Yate. Let alone the massive increase in traffic on Randolph Avenue when they start building the new town north of Brimsham Park.

I know my observations are far from scientific. However the increase in traffic is coming from somewhere and I don't believe it's just residents of Brimsham Park.
I am not sure what can be done to alleviate this problem, but hope that this can be brought to the attention of the right people who can plan for the discouragement of this practice.’

It was NOTED that the comments have been forwarded to South Gloucestershire Council and a response is awaited.

77 PROTOCOL FOLLOWING THE DEATH OF A SENIOR FIGURE

The South Gloucestershire Council Protocol following the Death of a Senior National Figure was received. (Appendix 18)

It was RESOLVED that the South Gloucestershire Council Protocol following the Death of a Senior National Figure be adopted by Yate Town Council.

78 CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

RESOLVED That 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 be instructed to withdraw.

(The member of the public left the meeting).

78/1 Abbotswood Leases

A confidential update was received and decision taken as shown in Confidential Appendix 19.

78/2 Howard Lewis Land Sale

A confidential update was received and NOTED. (Confidential Appendix 20)

78/3 YOSC Track and Athletics Project, Future Governance of the Site and Legal Agreements Between Brimsham Green School, South Gloucestershire Council and Yate Town Council

This item was received at the beginning of the meeting in confidential session and recorded under minute number 65.

Signed……………………………

Dated……………………………
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Town and Parish Councils Charter

Introduction

South Gloucestershire was established, following the reorganisation of local government, in 1995. From the outset there was an appreciation of the roles of Parish and Town Councils, and how they and the Unitary Authority should work together to best serve the people. The first version of this Charter was agreed, and adopted by the majority of local councils in 2002.

The Charter is a framework for South Gloucestershire Council and the Town & Parish Councils (or Local Councils) to work in partnership in order to improve the well-being of the varied communities that make up South Gloucestershire. Through this Charter the respective councils agree to work in partnership whilst respecting each-other’s rights as separate democratic bodies.

Town and Parish Councils are locally elected bodies which play an important role in the lives of communities. They are funded principally by an annual precept collected through the Council Tax on their behalf by South Gloucestershire. They have a wide range of powers, and many of their activities are interlinked with those of South Gloucestershire, and so by working in partnership more can be achieved than by each working alone.

The South Gloucestershire Compact is an associated document which focuses on partnership working with the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector, and shares the same fundamental principles as the Charter. Indeed the Parish and Town Councils are all covered by the public sector commitments of the Compact.

All Town and Parish Councils are invited to formally adopt the Charter as recognition of the relationship with South Gloucestershire, and also that this relationship is managed in accord with the Compact.

This Charter was formally agreed by a meeting of the Cabinet of South Gloucestershire Council on 4 September 2017 and signed on their behalf by the Leader of the Council.

Signed ........................................................................
GETTING IT RIGHT TOGETHER

Who needs to be involved

There are 44 Town & Parish Councils in South Gloucestershire and 2 communities that hold an Annual Parish Meeting.


In addition there are two unparished areas of Kingswood and Staple Hill.

Town and Parish Councils come together in the Town and Parish Council Forum, which speaks on their behalf about matters of mutual interest. This function of the Forum is formally recognised by South Gloucestershire Council.

In addition, South Gloucestershire Council and Town & Parish Councils recognise the role of Avon Local Councils Association in supporting and promoting the work of Town & Parish Councils.
What’s in it for us?

**Better outcomes** - Successful co-operation between South Gloucestershire Council and Town & Parish Councils and the Voluntary and Community Sector lead to improved services and an enhanced quality of life for residents and communities.

**Guidance** - This Charter can be used as a guide to help understand when and how to work with each other which will lead to the design and development of better quality services.

**Checklist** – Town & Parish Councils have signed up to The Code of Conduct and adherence to this Code of Conduct will ensure compliance with both the law and best practice guidelines for Town & Parish Councils.

**Public engagement** - In order to ensure continued support from local residents and communities, it is important that we continue to demonstrate effective cross sector collaboration. This can be achieved through successful implementation of The Parish Charter.

**What does The Parish Charter cover**

**Shared Principles and Commitments** – Town & Parish Councils and South Gloucestershire Council share the same vision to create a thriving, sustainable and diverse environment for residents in South Gloucestershire. As the first tier in local government, Town & Parish Councils are well placed to represent the interests of their parish.

**Working in partnership** - South Gloucestershire Council recognises the different capacity of each of the Town & Parish Councils and acknowledges that by working together in partnership, it can help the effective delivery of services to local communities. They agree that all proposals under the Localism Act will be subject to consultation with Town & Parish Councils.

**Mutual respect** - South Gloucestershire Council recognises and understands that the work of Town & Parish Councils is heavily reliant on volunteering and good will and will respect the different capabilities of smaller and larger Town & Parish Councils in terms of ability to handle information and resources. They agree that all proposals under the Localism Act will consider and respect these differences.

**Localism** – Localism can mean different things to different people and can be delivered in different ways. It is not a set of rules, but a way of working.

To support a joined-up approach to the delivery of localism in South Gloucestershire a common definition is considered to be

“The devolution and the fundamental shift of power to councils, communities, neighbourhoods and individuals. Empowering local people to come together to take more responsibility for their community”

Localism or as it is more commonly known, the ‘localism agenda’, is made up of a number of key elements which can be summarised as follows:
• Local needs and opportunities – places are different and need local solutions to solve their problems
• Local voice and influence – opportunities for all sections of the community to be consulted and involved in improving their area
• Locally responsive services – not a one size fits all approach, but services tailored to meet local needs and priorities
• Local accountability – the performance of all service providers held to account by local communities

The Area’s shared vision as set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy is that South Gloucestershire is ‘a great place to live and work’. This is supported by a specific commitment to “engage people of all ages so they feel they belong and can help provide local solutions ...” A strong sense of community spirit lies at the heart of this. The Council, along with its partners wants to encourage and support local communities to get involved and work with it to strengthen their ability to deal with local challenges. The Council also wants to work closely with town and parish councils, voluntary groups, local people and other public sector organisations to establish community needs and to help meet those needs in the most effective way.

**South Gloucestershire’s localism principles**

Delivery of the vision is underpinned by seven key principles which set out how localism is to be delivered. Through localism South Gloucestershire will:

• Utilise the **strategic community leadership** role of democratically elected representatives

• Create an ethos of building greater resilience within communities – **communities that are strong and self-reliant**

• Ensure clarity in the arrangements for **community engagement**

• Aspire for **innovative partnerships** and a flexible approach to partnership models

• Promote **flexibility in the delivery of services**, moving away from the one size fits all approach to one which reflects local needs

• Strive for a **balance** between local delivery and economies of scale

• Ensure robust **accountability and scrutiny** mechanisms are in place where services are devolved

At a very local level, more powers and responsibilities will be devolved to those town and parish councils who wish to take over some assets and services - where this makes sense and delivers better value for money.

**Leadership roles**
Town and Parish Councils – Town and Parish Councils are the first tier of democracy in local government. They bring knowledge and experience that in some instances could be more fully utilised. Localism provides the opportunity to enhance further relationships by building on the commitments outlined in South Gloucestershire’s Charter for Parish and Town Councils and by providing support to build capacity so that local councils can take on new roles.

South Gloucestershire Council – The Council as a corporate body must drive, enable and support engagement with and implementation of localism, working with councillors, partners and local people to help them realise expectations and opportunities. Whilst localism means that services could be delivered differently, accountability for specific services will still rest with the Council.

Voluntary and Community Sector – The Voluntary and Community Sector is a vital resource in delivering services to local communities. It can reach parts of the community that some public agencies cannot reach and can deliver more tailored services. Localism presents the opportunity to build on South Gloucestershire’s Compact and identify and support ways to build the capacity of the Sector to take on new challenges and opportunities.

Values – One of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 was that South Gloucestershire Council and Town & Parish Councils had to adopt a Code of Conduct. This Code commits members to behave in a manner that is consistent with the following principles – selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership.

Independence – South Gloucestershire Council will support the independence of Town & Parish Councils as the first tier of local government and respect that many parish councils are small and located in sparsely populated rural areas and that they generally have modest and constrained resources.

Sustainability – South Gloucestershire Council and Town & Parish Councils recognise the importance of building sustainability for the future.

Town & Parish Councils should actively promote their work and achievements to local residents and South Gloucestershire Council through all appropriate media.
COMMITMENTS

It is mutually acknowledged that many of the topics on which South Gloucestershire Council consults the public and Town and Parish Councils are operational in nature, and relate to local implementation of wider policies. In many cases the process, audience, and timetables for such consultation are laid out in statute, and must take precedence over the Town and Parish Council Charter.

Involvement in Policy Development

(a) Commitments for South Gloucestershire Council

1. Include Town & Parish Councils in the public consultation on all issues which are likely to affect their areas, and where appropriate highlight the responses from Town & Parish Councils in reporting the results.

2. Have regard to the views of Town & Parish Councils when making decisions and offer feedback on the outcomes once the consultation has taken place.

3. Keep under review the level and quality of consultation.

4. Prepare a brief synopsis for all council consultations that are more than four pages long and allow 6 weeks for Town & Parish Councils to respond to consultations. For consultation involving major changes to services or key council strategies the council will endeavour to consult for a period of 12 weeks. If this is not possible, the Council will seek approval in advance from the Chair / Vice Chair of the Town and Parish Council Forum for a shorter consultation period. (NB – there are specific arrangements for consultation on Planning Applications and Planning Policy Documents – see appendix 6).

5. Make it explicit if information or material provided to Town and Parish Councils is to be kept confidential; and any dates after which it may be provided to others or discussed in public.

6. Respond to requests for information from Town and Parish Councils in a helpful, efficient manner within 10 working days.

7. Provide information/briefings to raise awareness among staff to ensure they have a good understanding of the role, function and size of Town & Parish Councils.

8. Provide briefing sessions/workshops to groups of Town & Parish Councils on complex central and local government policies and initiatives which are relevant to and will have an impact on Town & Parish Councils. In addition they will assist partnership working and local delivery.

9. Produce a regularly updated contact list of South Gloucestershire Council Officers and Members and compile a directory of Town & Parish Council Clerks’ email addresses and make this available on the South Gloucestershire Council website.

10. Give as much notice as possible to Town and Parish Councils about opportunities to fund extra levels of service, and take account of Parish budget-setting timetables when establishing services on this basis.
(b) Commitments for Town & Parish Councils

1. Endeavour to take part in consultation exercises and respond electronically within the given period.
2. Work with South Gloucestershire Council to seek the views of residents on issues of common interest.
3. Identify local needs and consult with local communities and South Gloucestershire Council.
4. Notify South Gloucestershire Council if they cannot respond to a consultation within the given period. Town & Parish Councils should recognise that it may not always be possible for their views to be taken into consideration if they are unable to respond within the given period.
5. Maintain the confidentiality of information or material shared in confidence, and not provide this to others or discuss in public in advance of dates notified by South Gloucestershire Council,
6. Respond to requests for information from South Gloucestershire Council in a helpful, efficient manner with 10 working days and notify South Gloucestershire Council when any changes of personnel, councillors or community assets occur in order that the Directory is kept up to date.
7. Make every effort to attend meetings/events run by South Gloucestershire Council in which they have an interest and co-operate with South Gloucestershire Council in making their meeting places available for public, community or partnership meetings in which they have an interest.
8. Provide email address information to South Gloucestershire Council to allow the compilation of the directory of Town & Parish Council Clerks’ email addresses and enable general correspondence to be sent electronically.

Resources

(a) Commitments for South Gloucestershire Council

1. Make every effort to attend Town & Parish Council meetings when invited.
2. Provide Town & Parish Councils with information and access to relevant training courses at the same cost as they are offered to South Gloucestershire Council officers and members.
3. Assist in enabling a Town & Parish Council to develop services within their own community where the Council holds specialist expertise
4. To ensure that officers and councillors attending meetings will be treated with respect in line with the council’s code of conduct.
(b) Commitments for Town & Parish Councils

1. Allow officers and councillors of South Gloucestershire Council to speak at local council or parish meetings on matters of mutual interest if they request to do so.

2. With a view to providing a good quality service to local residents, encourage members and staff to attend relevant training courses and briefings.

3. Consider whether they wish to take on any functions/services from South Gloucestershire Council having regard to local considerations, needs and their capacity to deliver such functions/services, bearing in mind any implications for raising their precept this may have.

4. To ensure that officers and councillors attending meetings will be treated with respect in line with the council’s code of conduct.

Both South Gloucestershire Council and Town & Parish Councils should take account of three successful strands to “meaningful engagement” that underpin the more tangible aspects of engagement between the two partners. They are trust, partnership working and clarity of roles.

Town and Parish Councils come together in the Town and Parish Council Forum, which speaks on their behalf about matters of mutual interest and this role of the Forum is recognised by South Gloucestershire Council.

Both South Gloucestershire Council and Town & Parish Councils recognise the role of Avon Local Councils Association in supporting and promoting the work of local town and parish councils.

Achieving Equity

(a) Commitments for South Gloucestershire Council

1. Keep Town & Parish Councils fully appraised of all strategic partnerships entered into by the authority, how they may effect services in their area and invite town and parish councils to have representation on appropriate partnerships.

2. South Gloucestershire Council undertakes to work on an impartial basis with Town & Parish Councils to the best of its ability whilst recognising the wide variation in size, financial status and ability to deliver additional services of town and parish councils.

(b) Commitments for Town & Parish Councils

1. Seek to fill places offered on strategic partnerships to provide a local perspective.

2. Town & Parish Councils should acknowledge the fact that South Gloucestershire Council may not always be able to offer support to allow Town & Parish Councils to take on additional services.

(c) Commitments for both parties

1. To promote the continuous improvement of the working relationship between South Gloucestershire Council and the 44 Town & Parish Councils and 2 Parish meetings in South Gloucestershire through the Parish Charter.
2. To ensure that all Town & Parish Councils in South Gloucestershire can participate in the dialogue and raise issues through the Town and Parish Council Forum.
CONSTITUTION OF THE TOWN AND PARISH COUNCIL FORUM

NAME:
The name of the group shall be :- The South Gloucestershire Town & Parish Councils’ Forum (T&PCF).

MEMBERSHIP:
The membership of the group shall comprise the following:-
- The Clerk to every Local Council (Town and Parish Councils and Parish Meetings) in South Gloucestershire
- The Chairman, or the Chairman’s nominated representative, of every Local Council in South Gloucestershire
- An appropriate Senior Officer of South Gloucestershire Council (SGC)
- The Chairman of the Communities Committee of SGC
- Political representation from other parties for Communities Committee SGC
- Compact

Administrative support is provided by SGC
Meeting facilities provided by Local Town and Parish Council’s (rotate)

PURPOSE:-
The purpose of the T&PCF shall be to act as a forum for the Local Councils to interact with SGC to an agenda set by the local councils. Principal among such matters will be the constant monitoring and periodic review of the Charter between SGC and the Local Councils known as the Parish Charter. Additionally the T&PCF will provide the input in parallel with SGC to the South Gloucestershire Compact between SGC and the Voluntary & Community Sector.

OFFICERS:-
The T&PCF is to elect a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman. These honorary posts are to be elected on an annual basis (normally in January). There is no limit to the term of office for either post, but it is recommended that they serve for no more than 3 years continuously, with no bar to future re-election.
The posts are open to any of the Clerks or Chairmen who are members of the Forum.

MEETINGS:
Initially the meetings will be held 4 times per year, but extra meetings may be called if though necessary; similarly a meeting may be postponed or deleted in the absence of appropriate business.
AGENDA:
The agenda for each meeting will be set by the Chairman in consultation with the Vice Chairman and SGC Officers. Matters for the agenda may arise from:

- Suggestions made at a previous meeting
- Matters of significance that have come to the notice of the Chairman or Vice Chairman
- Matters that SGC wish to bring to the meeting
- Any matters that may be raised from any of the local council members of T&PCF

Members and / or officers of SGC may be invited to meetings to facilitate the understanding of members on specific matters. It is expected that Members and Officers will respond positively to any such requests from T&PCF.

MINUTES:
Draft minutes will be circulated as soon as is reasonably practical to all members for checking for accuracy and omissions. Once checked, the minutes will be confirmed at the following meeting and, once confirmed, shall be placed in the public domain.
Contact email addresses

ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

General - ECSFeedback@southglos.gov.uk

- Anti-Social Behaviour
  asbreporting@southglos.gov.uk
- Cycling and cycleways
  streetcare@southglos.gov.uk
  Phone 01454-868004
- Dangerous buildings
  streetcare@southglos.gov.uk
- Highway Maintenance (Assess and Decide)
  environmental.protection@southglos.gov.uk
- Noise, fly tipping, pollution or other environmental problems
  libraries@southglos.gov.uk
- Libraries
  parklegally@southglos.gov.uk
- Parking Enforcement
  pestcontrol@southglos.gov.uk
- Vermin or pests
  planningapplications@southglos.gov.uk
- Planning applications
  planningenforcement@southglos.gov.uk
- Breaches of Planning Permission
  rightofway@southglos.gov.uk
- Public Rights of Way
  streetcare@southglos.gov.uk
- Roadworks
  sag@southglos.gov.uk
- Safety Advisory Group for public events
  streetcare@southglos.gov.uk
- Street Care
  trading.standards@southglos.gov.uk
- Trading Standards
  waste.management@southglos.gov.uk
- Waste Management

CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND CORPORATE RESOURCES

General - cecrdirectorate@southglos.gov.uk

Topic
- Council meetings
democraticservices@southglos.gov.uk
- Property owned or operated by South Gloucestershire Council
property.services@southglos.gov.uk
- Traded Services
tradedservices@southglos.gov.uk
- Traveller Unit
travellerunit@southglos.gov.uk

CHILDREN, ADULTS AND HEALTH

General - cahfeedback@southglos.gov.uk

Topic
- Early years services for children
eyears@southglos.gov.uk
- Emergency Planning and major emergencies
emergencyplanning@southglos.gov.uk
- Housing waiting list
homechoiceteam@southglos.gov.uk
- Homeless people and those at risk of homelessness
homelessness@southglos.gov.uk
- To report safeguarding concerns about a child:
Monday to Thursday 9am-5pm; Friday 9am-4.30pm phone 01454-866000
Out of these hours and at weekends phone 01454-86615165
- To report safeguarding concerns about an adult:
- Young people services
ypsERVICE@southglos.gov.uk
STRATEGIC / POLICY PARTNERSHIPS

West of England Partnership

The West of England Partnership comprises Councillor representatives from the four local unitary authorities, South Gloucestershire Council, Bath & North East Somerset, North Somerset and Bristol City Council. The Partnership seeks to achieve mutually agreed objectives across a wider range of cross border issues. The Partnership has its own administrative organisation and website (www.westofengland.org).

The Partnership was formed to focus on things that are better planned at the West of England level, rather than at the level of the individual council areas. One example is major transport schemes, which have an impact on the West of England as a whole and which may cross the council boundaries.

South Gloucestershire

The strategic and policy partnerships in South Gloucestershire are as follows:

| South Gloucestershire Partnership Board | The South Gloucestershire Partnership is made up of private, public, voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations who work with communities to identify and tackle key long, medium and short-term local issues to ensure South Gloucestershire remains a great place to live and work. |
| Safer and Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership | The Safer and Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership is made up of organisations who work together and with communities to tackle crime and disorder and improve community strength by:
  - establishing a strategic direction;
  - co-ordinating and helping deliver actions that support the development of safer and stronger communities;
  - exercising the functions of the statutory Community Safety Partnership for South Gloucestershire; In particular, to encourage, support and propose actions that will help achieve the agreed aims set out in the South Gloucestershire Sustainable Community Strategy. Further details are available at www.southglos.gov.uk/community-and-living/stronger-communities/community-strategy/safer-stronger-communities-strategic-partnership or by emailing sscsp@southglos.gov.uk |
| Health and Wellbeing Board | The Health and Wellbeing Board will provide leadership to achieve, for all ages, improvement to the health and wellbeing of the local population, including the safeguarding of children young people and vulnerable adults. It will report on progress to the Local Strategic Partnership. It will Monitor and support the configuration of services and the allocation of resources to meet priority outcomes, and drive |
| Evidence based and collaborative approaches to commissioning. The focus will be on areas where a multi-agency integrated approach is beneficial to the people of South Gloucestershire. Further details are available at [https://council.southglos.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=435](https://council.southglos.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=435) or by telephoning 01454-863009. | **Children, Young People and Families Partnership**

The Children, Young people and Families Partnership brings together agencies working to make South Gloucestershire a great place for children and young people to grow up in.

Key priorities for children, young people and families in South Gloucestershire include reducing child poverty, supporting children to have the best start, early help, improving outcomes for children and young people with special educational needs and/or disability, improving mental health and wellbeing for all and closing achievement gaps in education.

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY
South Gloucestershire 2036 “A great place to live and work”

South Gloucestershire Partnership Board
Cross-cutting, thematic issues including carbon reduction, infrastructure & place, economy & skills

Chief Officers’ Group

Safer and Stronger Communities Strategic Partnership

Health and Wellbeing Partnership Board (is also a committee of the council)

Senior officer group

Children, Young People and Families Partnership
Appendix 4

RIGHT TO BID / ASSETS OF COMMUNITY VALUE

The Localism Act gives local communities the chance to nominate, for inclusion on a formal register, assets that are of value to the local community (assets of community value). Communities also have the right to bid to purchase registered assets of community value if they come up for sale.

An asset is a physical building or land and can be privately owned – it does not have to belong to the council or a public sector organisation. Examples of assets that would be eligible are:

- community centres
- libraries
- leisure centres
- the last public house / shop in an area
- post offices
- theatres
- museums

For an asset to be eligible, either

a) its current main use must further the social interests or social wellbeing of the local community, and it must be realistic to think that such a use can continue,

or

b) a use in the recent past must have furthered the social interest or social wellbeing of the local community, and it must be realistic to think it could be brought back into such use within the next five years.

Town and Parish Councils are amongst the organisations eligible to submit applications for assets of community value.

Full details including application forms and the register of assets of community value can be found at

www.southglos.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/localism/community-right-to-bid/
PLANNING ISSUES

Applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (such as the proposal for a new nuclear power station at Oldbury on Severn) are made to the Planning Inspectorate, and the decision is made by the Secretary of State. The following agreement relates solely to those applications to be determines by South Gloucestershire Council as a Planning Authority.

Development Management

South Gloucestershire Council will:

- Consult Town and Parish Councils on all applications for planning permission.
- Allow 21 days for the submission of representations by Town and Parish Councils.
- Notify Town and Parish Councils of any significant amendment to a planning application and allow up to a further 14 day period for representations to be made before a decision is taken on the amended plan. This period will be dependent on the case officer’s assessment of nature of the changes proposed and the need to ensure timely decision making. (Significant amendments are those considered by the case officer to materially affect the planning application, but not to require a new application).
- Have regard to the views of Town & Parish Councils which will be summarised in all cases on either the circulated schedule (proposed decisions under delegated powers) or to the relevant Development Control Committee, in accordance with the Council’s scheme of delegation.
- Send to Town & Parish Councils, a list of proposed decisions appearing on the Circulated Schedule. Where the Town & Parish Council’s view on any planning application differs from action proposed under delegated authority, they may make representation to their Ward Councillor who will have the power to seek call in of the application for consideration at a Development Control Committee.
- Notify Town and Parish Councils of all planning decisions on which they have been consulted.
- Provide Town and Parish Councils with copies in electronic format of the Planning Committee agenda items on request.
- Allow a representative of Town & Parish Councils to attend and speak at meetings of South Gloucestershire’s Sites Inspection Panel in respect of any planning application and to address the Development Control Committee in accordance with the Council’s scheme of public participation.
- Endeavour to make officers available to attend meetings of Town and Parish Councils to clarify the details of significant or controversial applications where more than 200 dwellings/or 4 hectares or 10,000 square metres of commercial floor-space is proposed.
• Where resources permit, provide periodic training sessions for local councillors and/or parish clerks to aid an understanding of the planning process and the matters which have a material bearing upon the determination of a planning application.

• Provide a substantive response to enforcement complaints within 20 working days and provide progress updates at not less than 6 weekly intervals on longer cases.

Town & Parish Councils will:

• Acknowledge that South Gloucestershire Council will not always be able to accede to requests of Town & Parish Councils.

• Respond promptly in writing to all planning applications received from South Gloucestershire Council and respond using electronic forms of communication unless otherwise agreed with South Gloucestershire Council.

• Comment on planning applications on planning grounds, and specify as fully as possible the reasons for an objection to, or support for, a particular application.

• Create a mechanism whereby the Town and Parish Councils can respond to any amended plans received from South Gloucestershire Council.

• Attend meetings, briefings and training to gain a better understanding of the planning process.

Planning Policy

South Gloucestershire Council will:

• Produce a “Local Plan” setting out the planning policies for the area. The Local Plan for South Gloucestershire will consist of the Core Strategy, the Policies, Sites & Places DPD and the Joint Waste Core Strategy with some supporting Supplementary Planning Documents on detailed matters. Planning Applications in South Gloucestershire are judged against policies in these documents as well as guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and “other material considerations” where relevant.

• Consult Town & Parish Councils when drawing up planning documents in line with national guidance and the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement.

• Help Town and Parish Councils to understand Neighbourhood Planning processes through holding training events and a dedicated Neighbourhood Planning web page.

• Within the resources available, endeavour to support any Town or Parish Councils who want to undertake Neighbourhood Planning with technical advice and advice on sources of information and support.

Town & Parish Councils will:

• Respond to consultations by the Council on statutory planning documents including a wider consultation with their communities where appropriate.
• Review and consider the issues that affect their communities and set objectives which can be expressed as policies/actions for achieving identified outcomes through the planning system.

• Recognise that Neighbourhood Planning will be led and managed by Parish & Town Councils.

• At their own discretion, consider whether any of their aims, objectives and priorities could be furthered through the preparation of Parish or Community Led Plans, Village Design Statements or Neighbourhood Plans.

(Under the Localism Act, parish & town councils now have the right to undertake Neighbourhood Planning by producing Neighbourhood Development Plans, Neighbourhood Development Orders and/or Community Right to Build Orders if they wish to. Where such documents are produced under the statutory process set out in the Localism Act and Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, they will become part of the statutory Local Plan and any planning applications will be judged against the policies within them, alongside the other national and local planning policies.

Parish or Community Led Plans and Village Design Statements would be non-statutory plans. Such plans produced by Parish or Town Councils can assist local communities in producing a common vision of how their community should look or develop in the future. Each has a role in helping communities identify and articulate what is of value in their area and to guide planning decisions. Where relevant they may be considered as material considerations in making planning decisions but they will not have the same weight as documents in the statutory Local Plan.)
LICENSING ISSUES

South Gloucestershire Council will:

- For new Licences and review of Premises/Club Licence consultations, South Gloucestershire Council’s Licensing Team will consult with the relevant Town and Parish Council.

- For new Street Trading consent consultations, South Gloucestershire Council’s Licensing Team will consult with the relevant Town and Parish Council.

- Representations by Town and Parish Councils must be according to the statutory or policy timescales.

- Written observations and objections, made in line with the statutory or policy frameworks, received from Town and Parish Councils will be taken into consideration when determining an application.

- If valid objections are received against the granting of a Street Trading Consent or Premises/Club Licence, from a Town or Parish council the application will normally be referred to the Council’s Licensing Panel for determination.

- Where objections or comments have been received, notification will be given to the Town and Parish Councils of the licensing decision.

- Provide the relevant advice and information to any Town or Parish Council wishing to complain or call a review of a licence.

- Provide periodic training courses for local councillors and/or parish clerks to aid an understanding of the licensing process and the matters, which have a material bearing upon the determination of a licensing application.

Town and Parish Councils will:

- Acknowledge that South Gloucestershire Council will not always be able to accede to the requests of Town and Parish Councils.

- Make representations in accordance with the Statutory or Policy guidelines and endeavour to respond using electronic forms of communication.

- Recognise that if representations are made outside of the consultation time period they have to be deemed invalid.

- Ensure that every representation regarding a Licensing Act 2003 application, is linked to one of the four objectives:
  - The protection of children from harm
  - Public safety
  - Prevention of public nuisance
  - Prevention of crime and disorder
If representations are not related to at least one of these objectives, South Gloucestershire Council’s Licensing Team, are not legally allowed to consider your views and they will be disregarded.

- Ensure that every representation regarding a Street Trading Consent application is linked to one of the following objectives:
  - Public Safety
  - Public Order
  - Avoidance of Nuisance

If representations are not related to at least one of these objectives South Gloucestershire Council’s Licensing Team will deem the objection invalid.

- Create a mechanism whereby the Town and Parish Councils can respond to any amended applications received from South Gloucestershire Council.

- Ensure that representations are evidenced based and just not anecdotal.

- Attend meetings, briefings and training to gain a better understanding of the licensing process.
TOWN COUNCIL MEETING DATES 2018/2019

2018

9 January     Full Council
23 January    Environment and Planning
6 February    Finance and General Purposes
27 February   Full Council
13 March      Environment and Planning
10 April      Finance and General Purposes
24 April      Annual Parish Meeting
15 May        Annual Town Council Meeting
               Planning & Transportation
22 May        Environment and Community
5 June        Planning & Transportation
12 June       Finance and Governance
19 June       Planning & Transportation
26 June       Full Council
3 July        Planning & Transportation
10 July       Environment and Community
24 July       Finance and Governance
31 July       Planning & Transportation
21 August     Planning & Transportation
4 September   Full Council
11 September  Planning & Transportation
25 September  Environment and Community
2 October     Planning & Transportation
9 October     Finance and Governance
23 October    Planning & Transportation
30 October    Full Council
6 November    Planning & Transportation
13 November   Environment and Community
27 November   Planning & Transportation
4 December    Finance and Governance
18 December   Planning & Transportation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 January</td>
<td>Full Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 January</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 January</td>
<td>Environment and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 January</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 February</td>
<td>Finance and Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 February</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 February</td>
<td>Full Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 March</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 March</td>
<td>Environment and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 March</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 April</td>
<td>Finance and Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 April</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 April</td>
<td>Annual Parish Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 May</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 May</td>
<td>Annual Town Council Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yate Town Council, Poole Court Drive, Yate, South Gloucestershire BS37 5PP  
Phone 01454 866506  
www.yatetowncouncil.gov.uk  info yatetowncouncil.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Paid</th>
<th>Beneficiary Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Purpose of expenditure/Merchant Category</th>
<th>Net Payment</th>
<th>Vat that cannot be recovered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/11/2017</td>
<td>South Glos Council</td>
<td>Town Council Properties</td>
<td>Rates.Armadillo</td>
<td>£ 1,236.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/2017</td>
<td>South Gloucestershire Council</td>
<td>Town Council Properties</td>
<td>Rates - Poole Court</td>
<td>£ 1,390.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>Bristol Gas &amp; Heating Ltd</td>
<td>Yate Outdoor Sports Complex</td>
<td>Installation of new boiler</td>
<td>£ 4,400.00</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>BWS Security</td>
<td>Sunnyside Bowling Pavilion</td>
<td>Security alarm maint 17/18</td>
<td>£ 421.00</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>Catering Tech Services Ltd</td>
<td>Pop Inn Café</td>
<td>Kitchen Equipment Repair/Maintenance</td>
<td>£ 739.00</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>Chapple &amp; Jenkins Wholesale De</td>
<td>Pop Inn Cafe/Armadillo</td>
<td>Kitchen stock for resale</td>
<td>£ 744.84</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>Murray Hire Ltd</td>
<td>Town Council Properties</td>
<td>Estates equipment</td>
<td>£ 1,424.90</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>Off The Record</td>
<td>Grants/Community Support</td>
<td>Off The Record grant 17/18</td>
<td>£ 1,535.74</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>Paul’s Place</td>
<td>Grants/Community Support</td>
<td>Paul’s Place grant award 17/18</td>
<td>£ 500.00</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>PC World Business</td>
<td>Armadillo</td>
<td>Computer Equipment Armadillo funded from grant</td>
<td>£ 1,190.43</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>Phoenix Software Ltd</td>
<td>Service Support</td>
<td>IT software</td>
<td>£ 900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>VALUATION OFFICE AGENCY</td>
<td>Town Council Properties</td>
<td>Land valuation</td>
<td>£ 4,320.80</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/11/2017</td>
<td>Siemens Financial Services Ltd</td>
<td>Service Support</td>
<td>Quarterly copier charge</td>
<td>£ 520.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/11/2017</td>
<td>Avon Sports Ground Maint Co.</td>
<td>Sunnyside Bowling Green</td>
<td>Bowling Green maintenance October 17</td>
<td>£ 475.31</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/11/2017</td>
<td>Beacon Cleaning Services</td>
<td>Town Council Properties</td>
<td>Cleaning Town Council Properties</td>
<td>£ 1,033.05</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/11/2017</td>
<td>GLDM</td>
<td>Yate Outdoor Sports Complex</td>
<td>Refurb consultancy support</td>
<td>£ 4,400.00</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/11/2017</td>
<td>Grant Thornton UK LLP</td>
<td>Service Support</td>
<td>Annual return 2017</td>
<td>£ 2,000.00</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/11/2017</td>
<td>Greendays Lighting Ltd</td>
<td>Yate Outdoor Sports Complex</td>
<td>Water softener overhaul</td>
<td>£ 2,993.73</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/11/2017</td>
<td>South Gloucestershire Council</td>
<td>Town Council Properties</td>
<td>Cleaning Town Council Properties</td>
<td>£ 1,269.00</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/11/2017</td>
<td>South Gloucestershire Council</td>
<td>Service Support</td>
<td>Provision of internal audit services</td>
<td>£ 920.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/11/2017</td>
<td>West Mercia Energy</td>
<td>Town Council Properties</td>
<td>Electric September 2017</td>
<td>£ 7,189.97</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11/2017</td>
<td>Avon Pension Fund</td>
<td>Yate Town Council Staffing</td>
<td>Pension Contributions</td>
<td>£ 8,798.75</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11/2017</td>
<td>DD to payflow</td>
<td>Yate Town Council Staffing</td>
<td>Staff Salaries</td>
<td>£ 39,647.64</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11/2017</td>
<td>HR/RC</td>
<td>Yate Town Council Staffing</td>
<td>NI and Tax Contributions</td>
<td>£ 10,457.55</td>
<td>£ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
YATE TOWN COUNCIL

2018/2019

Full Council

Budget
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NB: The 2018/2019 budget has been prepared using the current committee structure however it is acknowledged that in the 2018/2019 financial year, the committee structure will change and future budgets will reflect this.
BASIS FOR SETTING 2018/2019 BUDGET

Budget Increase
The RPI for September 2017 is 3.99%. The figure of 3.99% has been used as a general guide for increasing the budget. The precept has been increased by 4.99% to accommodate extra works planned by the council in the next year.

Gas and Electricity
Gas and electricity budgets are based on historical consumption and supplier forecasts of non-commodity charges (subject to change) as advised by the energy contractor.

Loans
The following loans are outstanding and payable by Yate Town Council as at November 2017:
- Armadillo: 12 years 3 months 29 days to run - last payment due 2.3.30 - balance o/s as at 31.3.17 £371,601.85
- Heritage: 7 years 4 months 22 days to run - last payment due 25.3.25 - balance o/s as at 31.3.17 £116,597.05

Local Council Tax Support Grant (LCTSG)
Due to the changes in calculating the council tax some five years ago, leading to a reduction in precept that local councils could raise, government introduced a Local Council Tax Support Grant to offset the difference. This grant has been passed down to town and parish councils by South Gloucestershire Council in its area.
However the LCTSG has been reduced since it was first put in place with funding being received as follows:
2014/2015 - £85,430
2015/2016 - £83,488
2016/2017 - £44,498
2017/2018 - £29,553

Pay Awards & National Insurance Contributions
Further to the draft budget received by the Finance & General Purposes Committee meeting on 28 November 2017, a final pay offer has been made by the National Employers for Local Government Services. The final pay offer has been incorporated into this final Full Council budget and has increased the salary bill. The effect of the offer has been to bottom load pay scales SCP 6 - 19 (resulting in pay awards of 9.191% for SCP 6 i.e. 3.734% for SCP 19) and an increase in pay scales of SCP 20 and above by 2%. Further funding has also been allocated to the Estates Salary budget to accommodate the call out payments as previously agreed.

Employer’s National Insurance contributions for 2018/2019 have been retained at the current rate of 13.8%. Actuals are currently unknown.

Pensions
In line with the 2016 Actuarial Valuation, Avon Pension Fund corrections have resulted in recovery payments and future service contributions; rates until 31 March 2020 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018/2019</th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Service Rate (% of payroll)</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Pension Fund Corrections (£)</td>
<td>£13,100</td>
<td>£13,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next actuarial valuation takes place in 2019 for application to 2020 for a further three years.
ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEE BUDGET NOTES

1) (1) Sports Facilities

**Sunnyside Bowling Facility**
Yate & District Bowls Club has asked for a reduction in its licence fee for the next three years due to a fall in membership and income. If Members wish to consider this request they could think about one of the following options:

1) reducing the rent;
2) offering a grant;
3) consider a SLA.

The income budget has not been reduced to reflect the request from the Yate & District Bowling Club but instead the sum of £1,210 has been placed in grants for consideration.

Further to the above to note, options are also currently being explored for the provision of changing rooms/toilet facilities (as an alternative to the football changing rooms) to accommodate the football clubs for the first part of the 2018, whilst the football pavilion project is completed; Timescales currently unknown. This is also an option to reduce the rent by offsetting to cost for the use of the facilities, again for consideration.

The decision in relation to the application of the above grant will be taken at the Finance & General Purposes Committee meeting to be held on 6 February 2018.

**Sunnyside Football Facility**
This facility is due to have extra changing rooms added next year and solar panels added to the roof. A small decrease in electricity has been applied to reflect the solar panel installation. The income has been increased slightly to reflect the anticipated extra use, however due to possible revised time scales for the project worked planned; this income target may not be met.

2) (2) Parks

**Kingsgate Park**
Funding was set aside in the 2017/2018 budget in the sum of £15,000 for a one year loan repayment for works planned to be undertaken to the toilets in Kingsgate Park. It has been decided the toilets will be funded via a loan from town council reserves and repaid via annual repayments. Taking into account the £15,000 set aside this year it is anticipated a further 4 years with a £15,000 repayment will be allocated, therefore a further £15,000 has been put into the 2018/2019 budget.

Less income was received via the Ice Cream licence for 2017/2018 than anticipated; however this has now increased in the 2018/2019 financial year.
Yate Common
It was expected that Yate Common would be transferred from South Gloucestershire Council to Yate Town Council in the 2017/2018 financial year, however, as yet this has not transpired and it is not expected now to be transferred to Yate Town Council until 2018/2019 at the earliest. Given this the £7,000 allocated in the 2017/2018 budget has been earmarked towards the cost of bollards required as identified by the council to prevent unauthorised access to open spaces.

3) (3) Play Area Maintenance
It is expected that the play area maintenance budget for 2017/2018 will not be fully spent, therefore spare funding has been earmarked, again to put towards the cost of bollards required as identified by the council.

4) (4) Open Spaces
The proposed Open Spaces budget for 2018/2019 is showing an increase of approx. £7,561. Funding has been allocated to this budget head to pay for the buyback of extra Streetscene and Highway Maintenance services from South Gloucestershire Council in 2018/2019 (or alternative provider as decided); this was a service previously provided and funded by South Gloucestershire Council. Whereas £7,000 was previously transferred from earmarked reserves to fund the 2017/2018 expenditure, no earmarked reserve funding has been allocated to offset the cost of this service in 2018/2019 and beyond.

This budget has also been overspent due to the allocation of funding to accommodate the action undertaken following the unauthorised encampment on Lye Field.

As recommended by the Finance & General Purposes Committee on 28 November 2017, £4,000 has been allocated to be spent from the open space budget in 2017/2018, should external funding not be raised to cover the cost of the tree carving being commissioned as a result of the felling of a long-standing tree in Yate.

5) (6) Woods at the rear of Ridgewood
The woodland at the rear of the Ridgewood Centre is due to be transferred from South Gloucestershire Council to Yate Town Council and it is expected this will take place between now and the end of the 2018/2019 financial year. £5000 has been incorporated into the 2018/2019 budget to cover the cost of the following:

- £500 2 litter bins
- £300 1 seat
- £1,500 nature reserve 5yr. management plan by ecologist
- £1,000 tree works
- £700 misc., possible walkway improvements etc.
6) (9) Estates Equipment, Vehicles and Machinery

The first table below shows the vehicles and equipment currently in use by Yate Town Council with anticipated running costs. There has been an increase of one extra leased vehicle in 2017/2018, to accommodate extra staff required following the transfer of assets by South Gloucestershire Council to Yate Town Council. The second table shows the larger equipment currently used by Yate Town Council with anticipated lifespan and renewal cost and future equipment wish list to improve working practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicles</th>
<th>Anticipated spend</th>
<th>2018/2019 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crewcab Tipper Peugeot Boxer</td>
<td>6,787</td>
<td>7,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall Combo Van</td>
<td>3,614</td>
<td>3,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride on Kubota Mower</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batwing Mower</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>4,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranger pickup truck (shortly due to be replaced, replacement vehicle type yet to be decided)</td>
<td>5,910</td>
<td>5,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etesia Rotary Mower</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENAULT Kangoo ZE Electric</td>
<td>4,316</td>
<td>4,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates Equipment</td>
<td>5,258</td>
<td>5,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,119</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,441</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Anticipated life span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisis Tractor Mounted Spiker</td>
<td>Aeration and drainage to grass sports pitches</td>
<td>+ 10 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 m Roller (Tractor mounted)</td>
<td>Levelling to grass sport pitches after use and also end of season grass pitch maintenance</td>
<td>+ 10 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubota Rotovator (Tractor Mounted)</td>
<td>End of season grass pitch maintenance ready for seeding</td>
<td>+ 10 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Accupro 2000 Fertiliser spreader</td>
<td>Seasonal fertilising to grass pitches</td>
<td>+ 5 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor</td>
<td>Multi use</td>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride on Kubota Mower</td>
<td>Grass maintenance</td>
<td>+ 5 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batwing Mower</td>
<td>Grass maintenance</td>
<td>3 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etesia Rotary Mower</td>
<td>Grass maintenance (box mowing, collects grass arising).</td>
<td>4 yrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future equipment wish list**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Anticipated life span</th>
<th>Anticipated purchase cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Towable power washer</td>
<td>Removing moss/algae from play area surfaces &amp; pathways etc.</td>
<td>10 yrs.</td>
<td>£4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus shelter cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PVC cladding etc. cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleaning play equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towable Chipper Timberwolf 190</td>
<td>Chipping up of pruning$\text{'}s$, arising$\text{'}s$, branches etc.</td>
<td>10 yrs.</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Tractor and flail</td>
<td>Hedge flailing, current YTC tractor not fit for use with a flail, so new tractor required.</td>
<td>+ 10 yrs.</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) **Transport Initiatives**

£1,000 has been allocated to the transport Initiatives budget to allow for the replacement of panes in some of the bus shelters.
## ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---

#### EXPENDITURE

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17,572</td>
<td>17,504</td>
<td>Bowling Green &amp; Pavilion</td>
<td>17,928</td>
<td>8,076</td>
<td>17,681</td>
<td>18,710</td>
<td>19,271</td>
<td>19,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,907</td>
<td>11,616</td>
<td>Football Pavilion and Pitches</td>
<td>9,911</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>8,790</td>
<td>9,044</td>
<td>9,315</td>
<td>9,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,319</td>
<td>Yate Outdoor Sports Complex</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>(3,010)</td>
<td>3,434</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>3,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30,287</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,784</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,667</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,674</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,252</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,213</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,201</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCOME

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19,710</td>
<td>19,710</td>
<td>Bowling Green &amp; Pavilion</td>
<td>19,710</td>
<td>9,855</td>
<td>20,006</td>
<td>20,006</td>
<td>20,301</td>
<td>20,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,878</td>
<td>10,635</td>
<td>Football Pavilion and Pitches</td>
<td>6,878</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>7,692</td>
<td>8,192</td>
<td>7,725</td>
<td>7,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>1,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,180</td>
<td>Yate Outdoor Sports Complex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,148)</td>
<td>(1,148)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>To Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27,988</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,919</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,016</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,577</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,978</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,682</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,555</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,441</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SPORTS FACILITIES NET COSTS

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,651</td>
<td>(1,903)</td>
<td><strong>SPORNS FACILITIES NET COSTS</strong></td>
<td>2,797</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>2,658</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (2) PARKS

#### EXPENDITURE

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24,967</td>
<td>14,262</td>
<td>Kingsgate Park</td>
<td>32,273</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>30,707</td>
<td>32,636</td>
<td>48,160</td>
<td>48,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,104</td>
<td>7,595</td>
<td>Brinsham Fields Park</td>
<td>8,132</td>
<td>8,948</td>
<td>15,348</td>
<td>9,192</td>
<td>9,166</td>
<td>9,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,857</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,172</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,055</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,827</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,326</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,398</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCOME

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>6,872</td>
<td>Kingsgate Park</td>
<td>5,575</td>
<td>2,874</td>
<td>2,874</td>
<td>7,379</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>Brinsham Fields Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3,076</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,168</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,575</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,878</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,878</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,379</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,828</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PARKS NET COSTS

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34,830</td>
<td>8,689</td>
<td><strong>PARKS NET COSTS</strong></td>
<td>34,830</td>
<td>8,689</td>
<td>34,448</td>
<td>40,726</td>
<td>50,570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (3) PLAY AREA MAINTENANCE

#### EXPENDITURE

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,162</td>
<td>16,418</td>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>22,744</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>19,954</td>
<td>24,629</td>
<td>24,676</td>
<td>25,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCOME

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PLAY AREAS NET COSTS

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,162</td>
<td>16,418</td>
<td><strong>PLAY AREAS NET COSTS</strong></td>
<td>22,744</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>19,954</td>
<td>24,629</td>
<td>24,676</td>
<td>25,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### (4) OPEN SPACES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>38,160</td>
<td>19,483</td>
<td>48,952</td>
<td>49,847</td>
<td>51,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>38,160</td>
<td>19,483</td>
<td>48,952</td>
<td>49,847</td>
<td>51,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LAST YEAR BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>38,160</td>
<td>19,483</td>
<td>48,952</td>
<td>49,847</td>
<td>51,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>38,160</td>
<td>19,483</td>
<td>48,952</td>
<td>49,847</td>
<td>51,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (5) ABBOTSWOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3,232</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>5,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>3,232</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>5,408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (6) WOODS AT THE REAR OF THE RIDGEWOOD CENTRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (7) PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Environment and Planning Committee

### Last Year Budget 2016/2017

|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|

### Estates Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>171,400</th>
<th>71,177</th>
<th>154,242</th>
<th>177,825</th>
<th>183,160</th>
<th>188,655</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers NIC</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>5,592</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>17,911</td>
<td>18,448</td>
<td>19,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training</td>
<td>12,650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>11,075</td>
<td>11,407</td>
<td>11,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditure:** 234,205

**Income:**

| Misc | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Total Income:**

### Estates Equipment Vehicles and Machinery

| Insurance Claims | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Total Expenditure:** 38,460

**Income:**

| Insurance Claims | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Total Income:**

### Transport Initiatives

| Bus Shelter Lease | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bus Shelter Repair | 0 | 0 | 500 | 1,000 | 1,030 | 1,061 |
| Insurance | 213 | 217 | 217 | 225 | 232 | 239 |

**Total Expenditure:** 1,213

**Income:**

| Grants | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Total Income:**

### Estates Staff Net Costs

**Total Expenditure:** 234,205

**Income:**

### Estates Equipment Vehicles and Machinery Net Costs

**Total Expenditure:** 38,460

**Income:**

### Transport Initiatives Net Costs

**Total Expenditure:** 1,213

**Income:**

---
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## Environment and Planning Committee

### Last Year Budget 2016/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30,287</td>
<td>SPORTS FACILITIES</td>
<td>32,667</td>
<td>9,674</td>
<td>30,775</td>
<td>32,252</td>
<td>33,213</td>
<td>34,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33,071</td>
<td>PARKS &amp; COMMONS</td>
<td>40,405</td>
<td>13,172</td>
<td>46,055</td>
<td>41,827</td>
<td>57,326</td>
<td>58,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,162</td>
<td>PLAY AREAS</td>
<td>22,744</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>19,954</td>
<td>24,629</td>
<td>24,676</td>
<td>25,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29,260</td>
<td>OPEN SPACES</td>
<td>38,160</td>
<td>19,483</td>
<td>48,952</td>
<td>49,847</td>
<td>51,343</td>
<td>52,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>ABBOTSWOOD</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,232</td>
<td>5,630</td>
<td>5,408</td>
<td>5,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249,160</td>
<td>ESTATES STAFF</td>
<td>234,205</td>
<td>97,387</td>
<td>210,110</td>
<td>243,971</td>
<td>251,290</td>
<td>258,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,694</td>
<td>ESTATES EQUIPMENT VEHICLES AND MACHINERY</td>
<td>38,460</td>
<td>16,301</td>
<td>33,119</td>
<td>33,143</td>
<td>34,137</td>
<td>35,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828</td>
<td>TRANSPORT INITIATIVES</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>415,754</td>
<td>152,230</td>
<td>393,914</td>
<td>438,025</td>
<td>462,169</td>
<td>475,047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Last Year Budget 2016/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30,287</td>
<td>SPORTS FACILITIES</td>
<td>28,016</td>
<td>11,577</td>
<td>27,978</td>
<td>29,682</td>
<td>29,555</td>
<td>30,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3076</td>
<td>PARKS</td>
<td>5,575</td>
<td>6,878</td>
<td>6,878</td>
<td>7,379</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>7,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>PLAY AREAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>OPEN SPACES</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>ESTATES STAFF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>ESTATES EQUIPMENT VEHICLES AND MACHINERY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>TRANSPORT INITIATIVES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>33,651</td>
<td>18,515</td>
<td>34,916</td>
<td>37,121</td>
<td>37,217</td>
<td>38,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>380,298</td>
<td>274,566</td>
<td>382,103</td>
<td>358,998</td>
<td>400,905</td>
<td>424,952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) (11) Democratic Representation

An additional £3,850 has been placed in this budget to build up the funds towards the cost of the next election along with a further £918 to meet the cost of IT licences to enable Councillors to access a councillor/staff area on the Town Council server.

9) (12) Civic

A small amount of extra funding has been allocated to the Civic budget to allow for any extra costs that may be involved in allowing for the Armistice Day to be included in the Remembrance Service in 2018.

10) (13) Service Support

Salaries

At the time of writing, we are anticipating a future part time position to undertake extra works depending on how the council’s work evolves (e.g. YOSC, PAS outcome, possible youth hub, fund raiser etc.) therefore an extra 26 hours at Community Project Manager rate to continue after the returning of a member of staff currently on maternity leave has been allowed for within the 2018/2019 staffing budget.

11) (14) Youth and Community Support

Despite the night bus funding not being used due to the demise of the night bus service this year, the Youth and Community Support budget is showing as overspent in 2017/2018 due to:

- a grant being awarded to Age UK to offset the cost of the lease room at Poole Court after the budget was set. However, this overspend has been compensated by the extra income received from Age UK not budgeted for under Poole Court;
- a grant of £1,536 being awarded to Off The Record (not budgeted for) however following the resolution of the council to use returned funding from the closure of the Joint Parishes Youth Forum Steering group to support a youth organisation, this income was used to offset the grant awarded.

To NOTE funding has also been allocated for the following in 2018/2019:

- Yate & District Bowling Club £1,210
- Age Concern £7,320
- Off the Record £4,500
- Running costs for the Urbie £2,900
- Volunteer training £2,000

(At the Finance & General Purposes Committee meeting held on 10 October 2017 it was agreed consideration be given to providing Off the Record with an SLA to offset against the cost of the lease)
12) (15) Facilities Development

This budget has been established to allow for revenue costs associated with development of facilities by Yate Town Council as necessary.

13) (17) Properties

Heritage Centre

In previous year funding has been allocated under the salaries heading within the Heritage Centre budget to fund two interns. This funding has not been used in the past couple of years and has therefore been removed from the 2018/2019 budget to assist with offsetting the new pay awards.

Armadillo

Following the transfer of the Armadillo to Yate Town Council, the Armadillo budget has been increased by 3.99% in line with the remaining buildings. The cost of this venue is accounted for by offsetting the Armadillo income against expenditure and the difference being met from the Yate Town Council budget for the premises and the funds previously transferred from South Gloucestershire Council.

The transfer funds from South Gloucestershire Council will have all but run out following 2018/2019 financial year leaving an estimated fund of £29,877. There is funding available in the Youth Provision earmarked reserve, however if it advised that the cost met by Yate Town Council be increased over a period of time to fully absorb the cost of this venue into the council’s revenue budget expenditure.

Therefore if the funding previously allocated for 2018/2019 under YOSC is not required it is recommended it be used to increase the level of funding allocated to the Armadillo running costs.

£3,000 extra has been included in the Armadillo maintenance budget for 2018/2019 to enable the outside of the building to be re-painted.
## FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

### LAST YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Conference Fees</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Members Training</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>IT - Members licensing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Members ICO Registration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>4,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transferred to Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>DEMOCRATIC REPRESENTATION NET COST</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>6,663</td>
<td>7,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>Chairman's Allowance</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,672</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>Civic Events (EG Remembrance Service etc.)</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>4,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,492</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>4,037</td>
<td>4,653</td>
<td>4,793</td>
<td>4,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,492</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>CIVIC NET COST</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>4,037</td>
<td>4,653</td>
<td>4,793</td>
<td>4,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62,832</td>
<td>36,917</td>
<td>Service Support</td>
<td>60,837</td>
<td>30,114</td>
<td>62,424</td>
<td>74,149</td>
<td>76,374</td>
<td>78,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195,350</td>
<td>197,811</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>235,200</td>
<td>120,238</td>
<td>238,620</td>
<td>266,094</td>
<td>276,137</td>
<td>284,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,650</td>
<td>17,125</td>
<td>Employers NIC</td>
<td>23,145</td>
<td>7,534</td>
<td>24,600</td>
<td>30,893</td>
<td>31,820</td>
<td>32,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33,350</td>
<td>32,865</td>
<td>Employers Superannuation</td>
<td>36,420</td>
<td>15,030</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>42,241</td>
<td>43,508</td>
<td>44,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Service Support Apprentice</td>
<td>10,240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td>8,980</td>
<td>9,249</td>
<td>9,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307,182</td>
<td>284,718</td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>365,842</td>
<td>172,916</td>
<td>367,524</td>
<td>424,357</td>
<td>437,088</td>
<td>455,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>Bank Interest/Service Support/Misc</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,446</td>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305,182</td>
<td>274,272</td>
<td>SERVICE SUPPORT NET COST</td>
<td>363,842</td>
<td>171,785</td>
<td>365,504</td>
<td>422,357</td>
<td>435,028</td>
<td>448,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE**

### LAST YEAR BUDGET 2016/2017

#### (14) YOUTH AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,500,000 Grants</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>11,345</td>
<td>9,375</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Communities Emergency Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000,000 Citizens Advice Bureau</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Age UK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SLA Provision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123,460,000 Youth Provision</td>
<td>91,975</td>
<td>29,427</td>
<td>75,975</td>
<td>93,815</td>
<td>80,149</td>
<td>82,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200,000 CPRE</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500,000 Provisional SLA</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,300,000 N50 Night Bus</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,232,000 Events in the Parks</td>
<td>16,267</td>
<td>15,031</td>
<td>15,031</td>
<td>16,267</td>
<td>16,755</td>
<td>17,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261,000 Christmas Carol &amp; Grants Event</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Volunteer Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Yate Community Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,900,000 Community Project Support</td>
<td>16,058</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transfer to Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transferred from Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,607)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180,353,000 Total Expenditure</td>
<td>132,707</td>
<td>63,893</td>
<td>132,095</td>
<td>144,087</td>
<td>129,814</td>
<td>132,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,000,000 CPRE</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,514</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178,353,000 YOUTH AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT NET COSTS</td>
<td>130,797</td>
<td>58,289</td>
<td>125,045</td>
<td>144,087</td>
<td>129,814</td>
<td>132,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LAST YEAR BUDGET 2016/2017

#### (15) FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Facilities Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,192</td>
<td>28,043</td>
<td>28,884</td>
<td>28,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Total Expenditure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,192</td>
<td>28,043</td>
<td>28,884</td>
<td>28,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
19,823 | 15,280 | Heritage Centre | 19,306 | 8,284 | 19,256 | 20,521 | 21,137 | 21,771
48,241 | 42,650 | Heritage Centre Salary Costs (Incl. NIC & Pension) | 50,000 | 20,986 | 48,109 | 43,940 | 45,258 | 46,616
18,125 | 18,125 | Heritage Centre Loan Repayment | 18,124 | 9,063 | 18,124 | 18,124 | 18,124 | 18,124
13,891 | 10,516 | Parish Hall | 13,743 | 4,510 | 12,523 | 13,347 | 13,747 | 14,159
28,115 | 25,784 | Pop Inn Café (PIC) | 30,302 | 11,689 | 12,523 | 13,347 | 13,747 | 14,159
9,494 | 8,500 | PIC Salary Costs (Incl. NIC & Pension) | 8,210 | 4,082 | 8,174 | 8,340 | 8,595 | 8,848
58,602 | 49,053 | Poole Court (P/Crt) | 61,587 | 29,110 | 55,936 | 56,979 | 58,688 | 60,449
21,655 | 20,256 | PIC Salary Costs (Incl. NIC & Pension) | 20,400 | 7,899 | 18,255 | 21,370 | 22,011 | 22,671
58,000 | 63,445 | Armadillo | 69,805 | 31,661 | 86,664 | 79,268 | 81,646 | 84,096
140,000 | 119,935 | Armadillo Salary Costs (Incl. NIC & Pension) | 155,000 | 59,499 | 139,194 | 155,224 | 159,881 | 164,677
37,820 | 37,817 | Armadillo Loan Repayment | 37,820 | 18,909 | 37,820 | 37,820 | 37,820 | 37,820
(99,000) | (70,123) | From Earmarked Reserves to fund Armadillo | (86,218) | 0 | (101,125) | (102,331) | (94,266) | (86,260)

| **Total Expenditure** | **354,766** | **341,243** | **354,766** | **341,243** |
| **INCOME** | **371,087** | **382,661** | **403,598** | **424,862** |

| 3,100 | 3,100 | Heritage Centre | 3,200 | 3,200 | 3,450 | 3,450 | 3,554 | 3,600 |
| 14,000 | 13,493 | Parish Hall | 12,611 | 7,873 | 13,737 | 13,641 | 14,050 | 14,472 |
| 24,000 | 23,650 | Pop Inn Café | 30,800 | 12,117 | 23,800 | 30,830 | 31,755 | 32,708 |
| 53,805 | 43,845 | Poole Court | 46,967 | 28,081 | 52,178 | 53,270 | 54,868 | 56,514 |
| 0 | 52,084 | Armadillo | 36,616 | 32,023 | 58,553 | 61,981 | 63,841 | 65,756 |
| 0 | 0 | Transferred to Earmarked Reserves | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| **Total Income** | **94,905** | **136,273** | **130,194** | **83,364** | **151,718** | **163,172** | **168,087** | **173,109** |

| **PROPERTIES NET COSTS** | **259,861** | **204,970** | **267,885** | **122,328** | **219,369** | **219,490** | **235,531** | **251,753** |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1,300                     | 809                       | 1,300                         | 107                            | 925                       | 6,663         | 6,863                       | 7,069                       |
| 4,492                     | 2,550                     | 4,390                         | 344                            | 4,037                     | 4,653         | 4,793                       | 4,937                       |
| 307,182                   | 284,718                   | 365,842                       | 172,916                        | 367,524                   | 424,357       | 437,088                     | 450,201                     |
| 180,353                   | 142,406                   | 132,707                       | 63,803                         | 132,095                   | 144,087       | 129,814                     | 132,829                     |
| 0                         | 0                         | 0                             | 0                              | 11,192                    | 28,043        | 28,884                      |                             |
| 354,766                   | 341,243                   | 398,078                       | 205,692                        | 371,097                   | 382,661       | 403,598                     | 424,862                     |
| 548,093                   | 771,726                   | 902,318                       | 442,862                        | 875,668                   | 973,616       | 1,010,196                   | 1,048,781                   |
| FINANCE & GENERAL PURPOSES INCOME TOTALS | | | | | | |
| 2,000                     | 10,446                    | 2,000                         | 1,131                          | 2,020                     | 2,000         | 2,060                       | 2,122                       |
| 2,000                     | 45,211                    | 2,000                         | 5,514                          | 7,050                     | 0             | 0                           | 0                           |
| 94,905                    | 136,273                   | 130,194                       | 83,364                         | 151,718                   | 163,172       | 168,067                     | 173,109                     |
| 98,905                    | 192,340                   | 134,194                       | 90,009                         | 160,788                   | 165,172       | 170,127                     | 175,231                     |
| FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES NET COSTS | | | | | | |
| 749,188                   | 579,385                   | 768,124                       | 352,853                        | 714,860                   | 808,443       | 840,072                     | 873,550                     |
14) (18) Play Areas and Sports Facilities

Trim Trail
It is not expected the £20,000 allocated to the trim trail will be used as s106 capital funding is likely to become available to fund this project. Therefore the £20,000 has been allocated to the cost of placing bollards on South Gloucestershire Council land.

Funding has been allocated in the 2018/2019 budget as follows:

- Priority - surface overlay at Millside Playzone £5,500 (suggested this cost be met from Play Area Projects ER);
- To improve the approach road to YOSC estimated at £10,000.

YOSC
It is anticipated £108,108 will be spent at this site which will be met from asset transfer money.

15) (19) Buildings

Building Fund
It is anticipated the current budget will be fully spent this financial year financial year represented as follow:

Various Building Lighting works £ 2,980
Caretaker& flat refurbishment £ 4,867
CCTV installation at Poole Court £ 4,175
Replacement windows at Poole Court £ 1,000
Further security works at Poole Court £ 400
Estimated remaining Fund to earmarked reserves for emergencies £ 5,210

£45,050 has been placed in the building fund budget for 2018/2019 to fund as follows:

Water softener at Sunnyside Lane Football Pavilion £ 4,000
Replacement chairs in Council Chamber at Poole Court £ 2,500
Replacement key pad alarm fob at Heritage Centre £ 550
Boiler works at Poole Court £ 23,000
Building Fund contingency £ 15,000

Of the above it has previously been agreed that £23,000 be transferred from earmarked reserves to fund the boiler works.
16) (20) Bus Shelters

Members requested that £8,000 be placed in the budget to replace two bus shelters in Yate in 2017/2018. However the site that was identified also required a hard standing pad so the funding only accommodated one shelter.

A further sum of £5,000 has been placed in the budget for 2018/2019 to fund one replacement shelter (with pad if necessary).

17) (21) Parks and Greens

Kingsgate Park

Toilets - Funding has been allocated to undertake the toilet works at Kingsgate Park; £15,000 was raised in the 2017/2018 budget with a further £15,000 being raised in 2018/2019. A loan for the remaining £45,000 has been made from earmarked reserves with the funding borrowed from the youth provision earmarked reserve to be repaid over the following 3 years, 2019/2020 – 2021/2022, at £15,000 per annum.

Estates Yard

Further to the Business Plan presented to the Finance & General Purposes Committee meeting on 28 November 2017, see listed below estimated costs for the revision of the Yard in Kingsgate Park:

Shed & yard costings

- Shed including planning (max size 270 m²,) £40,000
- Internal fittings i.e. power, emergency lighting, H&S signage & security £5,000
- To install a new hard surface (max size 780 m²) for the rear compound £30,000
  TOTAL £75,000

Future equipment

- Towable power washer £4,500
- Towable Chipper Timberwolf 190 £20,000
- New replacement Tractor & Flail £40,000
  TOTAL £64,500

RESOLVED:

- The £75,000 required for works as listed above for the shed and yard be carried out in one go and be funded by way of a loan from the youth provision earmarked reserve to be paid back over a period of five years at £15,000 per annum commencing 2019/2020.
- That the capital building fund contingency be reduced from £15,000 to £10,000 and the towable power washer be purchased in 2018/2019 and the towable chipper Timberwolf also be purchased in the same year, should not all the Environment & Planning
Committee revenue be spent. However, should it not be the case that funding is available then the towable chipper Timberwolf be budgeted for in 2019/2020.

Rodford Playing Fields
£15,000 allocated in the 2016/2017 budget to fund fencing and gates at Rodford playing fields; met from Earmarked reserves is now to be used for hedge laying, gate and signage.

Signs & Noticeboards
£24,000 has been allocated in the 2018/2019 budget to update banners, small and large info signage following the recent review undertaken.

18) (22) Other Project Expenditure

Youth Vehicle
The youth vehicle has been purchased this year at a cost of £38,555. Funded as follows:
Grant funding raised £10,950
Income from Sale of old Urbie £ 2,675
Earmarked reserve fund £ 8,500
Balance of funding allocated 2017/2018 £ 4,900
Loan from Youth Provision ER £11,530

The above loan to be repaid over the next two years 2018/2019 & 2019/2020 at £5,765 per annum.

Business and Staffing Review

£39,670 will be spent from this fund in the 2017/2018 financial year in updating and networking the Town Council’s IT.

Further funding in the sum of £18,345 has been set aside in 2018/2019 to undertake a review of the telephone system, upgrade of websites.
Future Project Aspirations/for Consideration

- £15,000 - replacement kitchen at Poole Court;
- £15,000 - to start building a fund for emergency building expenditure.
- £40,000 - new tractor and flail;
- £12,000 - Poole Court foyer refurbishment;
- £ 7,000 - upgrade to sprinkler system at Sunnyside bowling green (proposed future S106 under courts and greens);
- Money for refurbishment of Eggshell Lane Play area (proposed future S106);
- £1,000 - Brinsham Fields - installation of path on corner of field to Coopers Drive (walkers cut through & desire line forming) (proposed future S106);
- Eggshell Play Area Refurbishment;
- Brinsham Park Play Area Phase 2;
- Bowling Club Extension;
- Lunch Club (at another venue) phase 2;
- YOSC second set of long jump pits/repositioning of fencing;
- Provision of 4G pitch at YOSC;
- YOSC car park works (this suggestion was bought up at the YOSC liaison meeting held on 3 November 2017, however please note this car park does not belong to Yate Town Council) currently held in abeyance and possible extension of the car park between the all-weather pitch and the houses.
## Capital and Project Expenditure

### Play Areas and Sports Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>66,039</td>
<td>CE - St Mary’s Play Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>CE - Millside Playzone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>CE - Brinsham Park Play Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>25,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>CE - Witches Hat Play Area Project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>CE - Play Area Refurbishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>CE - Howard Lewis Play Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>CE - Older Persons Trim Trail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>CE - Sunny Side Tennis Courts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>CE - YOISC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38,660</td>
<td>108,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANS TO EARMARKED RESERVES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>68,919</td>
<td>Expenditure - Play Area &amp; Sports Facilities</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>41,815</td>
<td>135,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANS FROM EARMARKED RESERVES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(108,108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>68,919</td>
<td>Net Expenditure - Play Areas &amp; Sports Facilities (After reserve transfers)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>41,815</td>
<td>27,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,992</td>
<td>CE - Poole Court Refurbishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>CE - Youth Café</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>36,695</td>
<td>CE - Building Fund</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>8,990</td>
<td>10,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANS TO EARMARKED RESERVES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>41,687</td>
<td>Expenditure - Buildings</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>8,990</td>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>LESS TRANS FROM EARMARKED RESERVES</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>41,687</td>
<td>Net Expenditure - Buildings (After reserve transfers)</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>8,990</td>
<td>15,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### CAPITAL AND PROJECT EXPENDITURE continued……

#### (20) BUS SHELTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure - Bus Shelters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Expenditure - Bus Shelters (After reserve transfers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (21) PARKS AND GREENS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>38,545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,061</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>32,009</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>32,009</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure - Parks &amp; Greens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>35,770</td>
<td>207,259</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>38,545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(110,009)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Expenditure - Parks &amp; Greens (After reserve transfers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>35,770</td>
<td>97,250</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CAPITAL AND PROJECT EXPENDITURE continued……

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE - ESTATES VEHICLES EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE - YOUTH VEHICLE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38,555</td>
<td>38,555</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>OP - BUSINESS AND STAFFING REVIEW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,478</td>
<td>39,670</td>
<td>18,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OP - SERVICE &amp; PROJECT DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OP - YOSC SUPPORT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OP - YATE AGEING BETTER</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OP - BRINSHAM PARK NESTING ISLANDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,216</td>
<td>7,216</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OP - FRIENDS OF YATE STATION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSFER TO EARMARKED RESERVES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenditure - Other Projects (After Reserve transfers)</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>53,249</td>
<td>90,441</td>
<td>63,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANS FROM EARMARKED RESERVES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(48,170)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenditure - Other Projects (After Reserve transfers)</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>53,249</td>
<td>42,271</td>
<td>63,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Capital Expenditure</td>
<td>196,600</td>
<td>139,824</td>
<td>453,733</td>
<td>138,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capital and Project Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>68,919</td>
<td>CE - Income Grants Receivable (Gov)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(60,588)</td>
<td>25,370</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CE - Income Grants Received (Other)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>10,950</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CE - Income YOSC Transfer Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>479,608</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CE - Income Sale of Assets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>CE - Income Loan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Transferred to Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(479,608)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>68,919</td>
<td>Total Net Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(49,638)</td>
<td>47,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

168,000 86,295 196,600 189,462 406,413 138,122

(7,000) 0 Transferred from Earmarked Funds (2,000) 0 (266,287) (28,500)

161,000 86,295 194,600 189,462 140,126 109,622
EARMARKED RESERVES

It is anticipated that the following earmarked reserves will be held at the end of the 2017/2018 financial year after provisions have been made for projects as identified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Play Areas Projects</td>
<td>23,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Held towards the cost of new or the refurbishment of kickabout/play areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Youth Vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This funding was originally set aside to fund the cost of the Urbie which has now been purchased.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Building Fund</td>
<td>5,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This fund to be increased annually to enable the Town Council to meet the cost of urgent building repairs etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Armadillo Sinking Fund</td>
<td>157,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinking fund held to fund large building repairs to the Armadillo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kingsgate Park Toilets</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocated to replace toilets in Kingsgate Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Abbotswood Capital Enhancement</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A fund set aside to undertake capital enhancement works at Abbotswood following the open space at the front of the shops now owned now by Yate Town Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allotments - £12,000 was earmarked in 2012/2013 to develop land for use as allotments should land become available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Service &amp; Project Development</td>
<td>8,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding held to support Capital and Project expenditure as identified by the council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Armadillo Settlement Funds</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armadillo settlement monies held to assist with the running costs of the Armadillo. It is anticipated that £92,185 will be transferred to the Armadillo budget to meet the balance of the 2017/2018 operational costs with the balance making up a total of £99,000 transferred to the Armadillo sinking fund.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>YOSC Transfer Funds</td>
<td>371,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is anticipated that the final part of the settlement from South Gloucestershire Council following YOSC being leased to Yate Town Council will be transferred this year. The balance of monies left are to fund the track and other capital spends at the site should not all the earmarked £371,500 be required for the track project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Noticeboard Refurbishment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding originally set aside to undertake the first phase of the noticeboard review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Armadillo Project Funds</td>
<td>18,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The balance of project monies held on behalf of the Armadillo to fund project expenditure as and when identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Armadillo Apprentice Funds</td>
<td>8,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance of funding raised and held to fund the employment of apprentices at the Armadillo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Business Review ï IT</td>
<td>14,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance of funding left from the IT review retained to replace equipment as necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>17,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earmarked funding to meet the cost of the elections in 2019/2020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yate Community Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A small amount awarded to Yate Community Plan towards the cost of planning in Station Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Public Rights of Way</td>
<td>6,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Rights of Way monies for the public footpath order.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Grant Funding</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Youth Provision</td>
<td>212,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding allocated to meet future Youth Provision in Yate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EARMARKED RESERVES

### PLAY AREA REFURBISHMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,724</td>
<td>23,411</td>
<td>23,411</td>
<td>23,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ER - YOUTH VEHICLE</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,424</td>
<td>5,210</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,634</td>
<td>5,634</td>
<td>5,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ER - ARMADILLO SINKING FUND</td>
<td>128,398</td>
<td>28,877</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157,275</td>
<td>157,275</td>
<td>157,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ER - KINGSGATE PARK TOILETS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ER - ABBOTSWOOD CAPITAL ENHANCEMENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>ER - ALLOTMENTS</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Transfer In</th>
<th>Transfer out</th>
<th>Anticipated Balance as at 31 March 2018</th>
<th>ESTIMATE 2018/2019</th>
<th>ESTIMATE 2019/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ER - SERVICE &amp; PROJECT DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>71,997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63,627</td>
<td>8,370</td>
<td>8,370</td>
<td>8,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ER - ARMADILLO SETTLEMENT FUNDS</td>
<td>128,877</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127,877</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ER - YOSC TRANSFER FUNDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>479,608</td>
<td>108,108</td>
<td>371,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ER - NOTICEBOARD REFURBISHMENT</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ER - ARMADILLO PROJECT FUND</td>
<td>18,658</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,658</td>
<td>18,658</td>
<td>18,658</td>
<td>18,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ER - ARMADILLO APPRENTICE FUNDS</td>
<td>16,948</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,760</td>
<td>8,188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ER - BUSINESS REVIEW - IT</td>
<td>53,937</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39,670</td>
<td>14,267</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMITTED REVENUE EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>ER - ELECTIONS</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Transfer In</th>
<th>Transfer out</th>
<th>Anticipated Balance as at 31 March 2018</th>
<th>ESTIMATE 2018/2019</th>
<th>ESTIMATE 2019/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,099</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,099</td>
<td>22,099</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ER - YATE COMMUNITY PLAN</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ER - PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY</td>
<td>6,081</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,081</td>
<td>6,081</td>
<td>6,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ER - GRANT FUNDING</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ER - YOUTH PROVISION</td>
<td>328,370</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>131,500</td>
<td>212,870</td>
<td>212,870</td>
<td>212,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 856,621 | 618,695 | 528,773 | 946,543 | 480,398 | 458,299 |
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PRECEPT CALCULATIONS

South Gloucestershire Council Tax Base figure, as agreed by Cabinet on 4 December 2017, for 2018/2019 is 7067 band D properties. This figure has been used to calculate the 2018/2019 draft budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Base</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cost per band D House</th>
<th>precept raised</th>
<th>precept raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>6,995</td>
<td>158.37</td>
<td>1,107,798</td>
<td>1,107,798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table shows how much precept can be raised based upon the advised indicative tax base x a percentage increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Base</th>
<th>% increase</th>
<th>cost per band D House</th>
<th>precept raised</th>
<th>Increase per band D household per annum</th>
<th>Increase per band D household per week</th>
<th>Balance required to meet the proposed % increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>158.37</td>
<td>1,119,201</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>55,848.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,067</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>159.95</td>
<td>1,130,393</td>
<td>159.95</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>44,656.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,067</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>161.54</td>
<td>1,141,585</td>
<td>161.54</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>33,464.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,067</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>163.12</td>
<td>1,152,777</td>
<td>163.12</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>22,272.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,067</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>164.70</td>
<td>1,163,969</td>
<td>164.70</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>11,080.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,067</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>166.27</td>
<td>1,175,049</td>
<td>166.27</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESERVES SUMMARY

### Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017-2018</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Planning</td>
<td>393,914</td>
<td>415,754</td>
<td>438,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and General Purposes</td>
<td>875,668</td>
<td>902,318</td>
<td>973,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,269,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,318,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,411,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Planning</td>
<td>34,916</td>
<td>33,651</td>
<td>37,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and General Purposes</td>
<td>160,788</td>
<td>134,194</td>
<td>165,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Council Tax Support Grant</td>
<td>29,553</td>
<td>29,553</td>
<td>18,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Activities Support Grant</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>236,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET REVENUE EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,028,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,104,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,175,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL AND PROJECT EXPENDITURE (NET)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>406,413</td>
<td>196,600</td>
<td>138,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>406,413</td>
<td>196,600</td>
<td>138,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Funded from Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>(266,287)</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>(28,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NET EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>1,168,451</td>
<td>1,299,274</td>
<td>1,284,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financed as Follows:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Reserves as at 1 April 2017</td>
<td>494,025</td>
<td></td>
<td>433,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated General Reserve as at 31 March 2018</td>
<td>433,384</td>
<td></td>
<td>323,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used/(Available) to Fund Expenditure</td>
<td>60,641</td>
<td>191,464</td>
<td>109,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PRECEPT</strong></td>
<td>1,107,810</td>
<td>1,107,810</td>
<td>1,175,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,168,451</td>
<td>1,299,274</td>
<td>1,284,671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note** Recommended reserve equal to

- 3 months net expenditure: 282,081
- 306,169
- 323,762

**Recommended reserve equal to 3 months net expenditure:** 306,169

**Recommended reserve equal to 3 months net expenditure:** 323,762
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earmarked Reserves</th>
<th>Actual 31.03.16</th>
<th>Actual 31.03.17</th>
<th>Anticipated 31.03.18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>309,860</td>
<td>185,456</td>
<td>646,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>559,678</td>
<td>671,164</td>
<td>299,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>869,538</strong></td>
<td><strong>856,621</strong></td>
<td><strong>946,543</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NB: Due to early indication, future years budgets have been projected with a possible shortfall of approx. £7,700 in 2019/2020, this will need to be addressed at budget setting in 2018 for 2019/2020'

INDICATIVE PRECEPT CALCULATIONS 2019/2020

South Gloucestershire Council has advised the provisional indicative Council Tax Base figure for 2019/2020 is 7311 band D properties (this represents an increase of 244 band D properties based on the previous year) The provisional indicative figure has been used to calculate the 2019/2020 draft budget using an estimated 3% increase in the RPI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Base</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cost per band D House</th>
<th>precept raised</th>
<th>precept raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,067</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>166.27</td>
<td>1,175,030</td>
<td>1,175,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table shows how much precept can be raised based upon the advised indicative tax base x a percentage increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Base</th>
<th>% increase</th>
<th>cost per band D House</th>
<th>precept raised</th>
<th>Increase per band D household per annum</th>
<th>Increase per band D household per week</th>
<th>Balance required to meet the proposed % increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,311</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>166.27</td>
<td>1,215,600</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44,185.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>167.93</td>
<td>1,227,756</td>
<td>167.93</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>32,029.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,311</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>169.60</td>
<td>1,239,912</td>
<td>169.60</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>19,873.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,311</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>171.26</td>
<td>1,252,068</td>
<td>171.26</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>7,717.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,311</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>172.90</td>
<td>1,264,102</td>
<td>172.90</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4,317.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,311</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>172.92</td>
<td>1,264,224</td>
<td>172.92</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>15,711.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ESTIMATED RESERVES SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Summary</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2019 - 2020</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Planning</td>
<td>438,025</td>
<td>438,025</td>
<td>462,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and General Purposes</td>
<td>973,614</td>
<td>973,614</td>
<td>1,010,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,411,640</td>
<td>1,411,640</td>
<td>1,472,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Planning</td>
<td>37,121</td>
<td>37,121</td>
<td>37,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and General Purposes</td>
<td>165,172</td>
<td>165,172</td>
<td>168,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Council Tax Support Grant</td>
<td>18,298</td>
<td>18,298</td>
<td>7,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Activities Support Grant</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>236,591</td>
<td>236,591</td>
<td>212,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET REVENUE EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>1,175,049</td>
<td>1,175,049</td>
<td>1,259,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL AND PROJECT EXPENDITURE (NET)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Funded from Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>(28,500)</td>
<td>(28,500)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NET EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>1,284,671</td>
<td>1,284,671</td>
<td>1,279,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financed as Follows:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Reserves as at 1 April 2017</td>
<td>302,050</td>
<td>302,050</td>
<td>344,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PRECEPT</strong></td>
<td>1,175,049</td>
<td>1,175,049</td>
<td>1,322,831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**

Recommended reserve equal to
- 3 months net expenditure: 296,262 + 318,762 + 344,946 = 960,970

V5 Full Council Budget - Ratified at Full Council 09 January 2018
South Gloucestershire Council has advised the provisional indicative Council Tax Base figure for 2020/2021 is 7412 band D properties (this represents an increase of 101 band D properties based on the previous year). The provisional indicative figure has been used to calculate the 2020/2021 draft budget using an estimated 3% increase in the RPI.

### Indicative Precept Calculations 2020/2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Base</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cost per band D House</th>
<th>precept raised</th>
<th>precept raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>171.26</td>
<td>1,252,082</td>
<td>1,252,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table shows how much precept can be raised based upon the advised indicative tax base x a percentage increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Base</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>cost per band D House</th>
<th>precept raised</th>
<th>Increase per band D household per annum</th>
<th>Increase per band D household per week</th>
<th>Balance required to meet the proposed % increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>171.26</td>
<td>1,269,379</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40,885.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>172.97</td>
<td>1,282,073</td>
<td>172.97</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>28,191.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>174.69</td>
<td>1,294,767</td>
<td>174.69</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>15,497.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>176.40</td>
<td>1,307,460</td>
<td>176.40</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2,803.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>178.09</td>
<td>1,320,027</td>
<td>178.09</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>9,763.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,412</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>178.11</td>
<td>1,320,154</td>
<td>178.11</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>10,414.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ESTIMATED RESERVES SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Summary</th>
<th>2019 - 2020</th>
<th>2020 - 2021</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Planning</td>
<td>462,169</td>
<td>462,169</td>
<td>475,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and General Purposes</td>
<td>1,010,199</td>
<td>1,010,199</td>
<td>1,048,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>1,472,368</td>
<td>1,472,368</td>
<td>1,523,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Planning</td>
<td>37,217</td>
<td>37,217</td>
<td>38,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and General Purposes</td>
<td>168,067</td>
<td>168,067</td>
<td>175,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Council Tax Support Grant</td>
<td>7,299</td>
<td>7,299</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Activities Support Grant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INCOME</strong></td>
<td>212,583</td>
<td>212,583</td>
<td>213,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET REVENUE EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>1,259,785</td>
<td>1,259,785</td>
<td>1,310,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL AND PROJECT EXPENDITURE (NET)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Funded from Earmarked Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NET EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>1,279,935</td>
<td>1,279,935</td>
<td>1,330,569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financed as Follows:**

- **General Reserves as at 1 April 2018**
  - 344,946
  - 306,453

- **General Reserve as at 31 March 2019**
  - 306,453
  - 357,566

- **Used(Available) to Fund Expenditure**
  - (42,896)
  - (42,896)
  - 0

**TOTAL PRECEPT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019 - 2020</th>
<th>2020 - 2021</th>
<th>2020 - 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,322,831</td>
<td>1,322,831</td>
<td>1,381,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Recommended reserve equal to**
  - 3 months net expenditure
    - 317,446
    - 339,946
    - 357,566
  - Plus £30,000 contingency

**Note**
Dear Steph and Catherine

Internal Audit Review – September 2017

I can confirm that the annual audit of Yate Town Council’s accounts by Maria Bowes has now been completed.

The objective of the audit was to provide an independent opinion on the appropriateness of the financial control procedures operated in the Council. Maria examined these procedures and was pleased to form the opinion that they are of a High standard.

The auditor was pleased to report that there were just 2 matters arising from the current audit and these have been included in the accompanying action plan.

Please find enclosed various Appendices. Appendix 1 describes our standard audit opinions. Appendix 2 describes our key control objectives, illustrating the areas examined during the course of the audit for your information. Appendix 3 is a Quality Control Questionnaire and I would be grateful if you would complete this and return it to myself, Justine Poulton, Audit Manager. Your answers to this questionnaire, which shall of course be treated as confidential, will help to ensure that the service provided to you meets the highest standards and is relevant to your needs.
Our daily rate for 2017/18 is £230 a day and our agreement with Yate Town Council is 4 days’ work per year. Therefore, I have arranged for an invoice to be issued for the fee of £920 plus VAT for the work we have undertaken this year to date, and to include year end work.

In conclusion, I would like to thank you for the help and courtesy during the course of the audit. Should you require any further advice or assistance on any aspect of the report, please do not hesitate to contact Maria on the above telephone number.

Yours sincerely

Justine Poulton
Audit Manager

Encs
The following table describes our standard audit opinions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Standard</th>
<th>Reliable Standard</th>
<th>Improvements Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full reliance can be placed on the arrangements operating.</td>
<td>There are very few significant matters arising from the audit.</td>
<td>Existing procedures need to be improved in order to ensure that they are fully reliable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only minor recommendations have been made.</td>
<td>Recommendations made serve to strengthen what are reasonably reliable procedures.</td>
<td>Extensive recommendations have been made but the issues are not of such a significance to represent a major risk to the Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Yate Town Council

### Key Control Objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Achieved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Appropriate accounting records have been kept properly throughout the year.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The council’s financial regulations have been met, payments were supported by invoices, all expenditure was approved and VAT appropriately accounted for.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The council assessed the significant risks to achieving objectives and reviewed the adequacy of arrangements to manage these.</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The annual precept requirement resulted from an adequate budgetary process; progress against budget was regularly monitored; and reserves were appropriate.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Expected income was fully received, based on correct prices, properly recorded and promptly banked; and VAT appropriately accounted for.</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Petty cash payments were properly supported by receipts, all petty cash expenditure was approved and VAT appropriately accounted for.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Salaries to employees and allowances to members were paid in accordance with council approvals, and PAYE and NI requirements were properly applied.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Asset and investment registers were complete and accurate and properly maintained.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Periodic and year-end bank account reconciliations are properly carried out.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Accounting statements prepared during the year were prepared on the correct accounting basis (receipts and payments or income and expenditure), agreed to the cash book, were supported by an adequate audit trail from underlying records, and where appropriate debtors and creditors were properly recorded.</td>
<td>To be tested at year end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Trust funds (including charitable). The council met its responsibilities as a trustee.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Matters Arising from Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **1** | The insurance limit to monies held overnight at The Armadillo is £500 for each of the 2 safes, therefore £1,000 in total across the two safes. On one occasion, for the night of 14/09/17 – 15/09/17 £1,146.10 was retained across the two safes. | Insurance limits have been breached and the site would not have been covered in the event of a claim. | The on site staff should work with Yate Town Council staff to review the regularity of banking, to ensure that insurance limits are not breached in future. (The Auditor would not recommend insurance limits being increased as this would increase the risk of more cash being held on site.) | Responsible Finance Officer, Deputy Responsible Finance Officer and Armadillo staff  
Completed – November 2017  
Emailed Armadillo manager to advise to cash held overnight to be kept within the limits set in the cash handling policy and a proviso put in place should the issue arise again in the future 09.11.17  
Insurance limits not breached currently set at £5,000 (min Zurich cover) for money held overnight in safes and strongholds. Armadillo Insurance amalgamated with YTC in 2017 so fully covered. SGC Auditors advised. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Matters Arising from Review</th>
<th>Potential Consequence</th>
<th>Recommendations &amp; Management Comment (Where Applicable)</th>
<th>Responsible Officer, Proposed Timescale and Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The EU Procurement Thresholds stated in the Standing Orders are the 2015 levels.</td>
<td>Confusion could arise in the event of a high value procurement exercise.</td>
<td>The Standing Orders should be updated to the most recent threshold figures. The most recent levels should continue to be worked to until the UK leaves the EU. While we are still a member state EU legislation still applies in the UK.</td>
<td>Clerk, Responsible Finance Officer and Deputy Responsible Finance Officer As soon as possible Updated Standing Orders with correct information on 8 November 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notification of external auditor appointments for the 2017/18 financial year
Yate Town Council

Dear Chair/Clerk/RFO,

Under powers set out in Regulation 3 of the Local Audit (Smaller Authorities) Regulations 2015, Smaller Authorities Audit Appointments Ltd (SAAA) was appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government as "a person specified to appoint local auditors" and as the Sector Led Body (SLB) for smaller authorities. Smaller authorities are those whose gross annual income or expenditure is less than £6.5 million.

Under the Regulations, SAAA is responsible for appointing external auditors to all applicable opted-in smaller authorities, for setting the terms of appointment for limited assurance reviews and for managing the contracts with the appointed audit firms.

During 2016 various communications outlined that smaller authorities would be 'opted-in' to the new central procurement regime managed by SAAA unless they expressly decided to 'opt-out' and correctly followed the various procedures required under statute to appoint their own external auditors.

Your authority is opted-in to the central procurement process and therefore an external auditor has been appointed for your authority for the 5 year period commencing with the financial year 2017/18. The contact details of your appointed external auditor and fee scales are shown in the attached appendix, and can also be found on our website.

The approach applied to making these appointments was described last year on the SAAA website at http://www.localaudits.co.uk/appts.html. The approach follows the established practice of grouping auditor appointments for Town and Parish Councils by county area. Drainage Authorities and other bodies all have the same audit firm appointed. The audit firms all have previous experience of conducting limited assurance reviews for smaller bodies and have dedicated personnel to support communications. SAAA will monitor the performance of the appointed firms in providing limited assurance audit services in terms of quality and compliance with their statutory terms of appointment.

If your authority has any potential conflict of interest relating to the auditor appointment, for instance if a Councillor, or close relation is
employed by the appointed auditor, you should advise SAAA immediately.

**Exempt authorities**

There are various changes to the legislation taking effect from 2017/18, most notably the potential for authorities where the higher of income or expenditure for the year was £25,000 or less, to declare themselves as 'exempt' from a limited assurance review by an external auditor if they meet certain qualifying criteria.

However, all authorities, even if they declare themselves 'exempt', will still need to fully complete and publish an annual return and must still have a named appointed auditor to deal with questions or objections from local electors about the accounts. Opted in authorities have already had an auditor appointed for them by SAAA.

**The Annual Return**

The Annual Return will now be known as the "Annual Governance and Accountability Return" and will need to be completed in accordance "proper practices" as set out in 'Governance and Accountability for Smaller Authorities in England, a Practitioners’ Guide', and then be published in accordance with the applicable Transparency Codes.

The new, Annual Governance and Accountability Return forms will be sent out by your appointed auditor electronically at the end of the financial year. It is assumed that your authority is willing and able to accept documents electronically by e-mail unless you specifically advise SAAA to the contrary no later than 31 December 2017. The return can either be completed electronically or printed off and completed manually.

Advice and assistance is available from the various sector membership organisations, namely:

- National Association of Local Councils and County Associations - [www.nalc.gov.uk](http://www.nalc.gov.uk)
- Society of Local Council Clerks [www.slcc.co.uk](http://www.slcc.co.uk)
- Association of Drainage Authorities [www.ada.org.uk](http://www.ada.org.uk)

Yours faithfully,
Appendix

Auditor appointments for smaller authorities for the five financial years from 2017/18 to 2021/22

On 30 November 2016 SAAA announced the conclusion of its procurement process and the award of limited assurance review contracts for five years to the successful external audit firms. Responsibilities under the new contracts will relate to accounts for the financial year beginning on 1 April 2017. Further details of the specific appointments by County area for opted-in authorities are detailed below.

Audit appointments by area for 2017-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MA ARS LLP</th>
<th>MOORE STEPHENS</th>
<th>PKF LITTLEJOHN LLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>Avon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland and Co. Durham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herefordshire</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland and Tyne and Wear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>Internal Drainage Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>Northumberland and Tyne and Wear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>Lancashire, Greater Manchester and Merseyside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberside and East Riding of Yorkshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>Lancashire, Greater Manchester and Merseyside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Drainage Boards</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>Warwickshire and West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>Warwickshire and West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>Warwickshire and West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>Warwickshire and West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>Warwickshire and West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>Warwickshire and West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire, Greater Manchester and Merseyside</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warwickshire and West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>Warwickshire and West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>Warwickshire and West Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>East Sussex</td>
<td>Warwickshire and West Midlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All auditor appointments are listed by contract (County) area above. Their contact details are shown below.

### APPOINTED AUDITORS CONTACT DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essex</th>
<th>Norfolk</th>
<th>Worcestershire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>Other Scheduled Authorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following fees have been determined by SAAA following consultation for the Audit Years 2017/18 to 2021/22.

#### Scales of Fees 2017/18 to 2021/22

The following fees have been determined by SAAA following consultation for the Audit Years 2017/18 to 2021/22.

#### Scales of audit fees

Scales of fees for smaller authorities, are based on bands of annual income or expenditure, whichever is the higher. This means that the fees are broadly proportionate to the public funds involved and the ability of each authority to pay.

Table 1 sets out the scales of audit fees for smaller authorities that complete their Annual Returns fully and accurately within the required timescales, and provide the necessary supporting information and any explanations sought.
Authorities with neither income nor expenditure exceeding £200,000 will be subject to basic limited assurance audit review. Authorities with either income or expenditure exceeding £200,000 will be subject to intermediate limited assurance audit review.

Table 1 Scale of fees for bodies subject to limited assurance review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME/EXPENDITURE BAND (£)</th>
<th>FEE FOR LIMITED ASSURANCE REVIEW (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0  25,000</td>
<td>200 (see note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001  50,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001  100,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001  200,000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,001  300,000</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,001  400,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,001  500,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,001  750,000</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750,001  1,000,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,001  2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000,001  3,000,000</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000,001  4,000,000</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000,001  5,000,000</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000,001  6,500,000</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: An authority with neither income nor expenditure exceeding £25,000 will have the right to certify that it is an exempt authority and in normal circumstances no fee will be payable.

Reminder letters

Where a supplier is required to send a reminder to any authority, the supplier will charge the authority £40 for each reminder.

Additional work and variations to the scale fees

If an active authority fails either to submit its Annual Return to the supplier for review by 30 September or (if it is an exempt authority) to provide a certificate of exemption, the supplier will consider issuing a public interest report, the cost of which will be payable by the
authority pertaining to the fee income band of that authority as in Table 1 (above).

Extra fees may also be charged, subject to SAAA’s approval, in other circumstances, for example where auditors have to:

- consider objections to the accounts from local electors, from the point at which the auditor accepts the objection as valid;
- exercise special powers in relation to the review, such as issuing a report in the public interest; or
- undertake any special investigations, such as those arising from disclosures under the Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998.

Extra fees will be calculated and charged according to the work required, subject to the maximum hourly rates set out in Table 2 below.

**Table 2  Maximum hourly rates for additional work at smaller authorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF GRADE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM £ PER HOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement lead</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior manager/manager</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior auditor</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value Added Tax**

The fee scales exclude Value Added Tax, which will be charged at the prevailing rate on all work undertaken.

**SAAA** - Smaller Authorities' Audit Appointments Limited
77 Mansell Street, London E1 8AN  [www.saaa.co.uk](http://www.saaa.co.uk)

*This email is for the sole use of the intended recipient and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender immediately and do not use, rely upon, copy, forward or disclose its content to any other party.*
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 29th NOVEMBER 2017 FROM 7.00PM – 7.30PM (ADJOURNED) AND 8.30PM TO 9.00PM AT POOLE COURT, YATE

PRESENT: Councillors Chris Willmore, John Serle, John Gawn, Cheryl Kirby, Ben Nutland Karl Tomasin, Deputy RFO (YTC)
Part Meeting – Andy Lowrey (Yate Shopping Centre) Matthew Williams and Heather Gallagher (Williams Gallagher)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

RESOLVED Apologies for absence were received from Councillors, Ian Blair, Ben Campbell, John Davis, Tony Davis, Mike Drew, John Ford, Margaret Marshall, Alan Monaghan, Wully Perks and Sue Walker.

2. MEMBERS’ DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No declarations of interest were received.

3. PLANNING APPLICATION PK/17/5064/F

Yate Shopping Centre and Williams Gallagher provided representation on the above application.

Following their representation, they left the meeting and the meeting was adjourned at 7.30pm.

3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The meeting reconvened at 8.30pm and considered all other planning applications receive from South Gloucestershire Council in Appendix 1.

RESOLVED To submit the comments as shown in Appendix 1

4. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next Planning Sub-Committee meeting will be held before the Full Council meeting on 9th January 2018 at 7.00pm.
### YATE TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING APPLICATIONS

**Tuesday 28th November 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>PK17/4987/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Erection of a two storey side and a single storey rear extension to form additional living accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>35 The Glen Yate Bristol South Gloucestershire BS37 5PJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>YTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received</strong></td>
<td>10.11.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **YTC Comments** | Objection  
- Impact on sightline;  
- Possible loss of light;  
- Possible increase in parking;  
- If the application is given approval by SGC, sensible conditions be imposed in order to minimise impact on the neighbours such as construction between sociable hours of 9-5pm weekdays, or similar. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>PK17/5068/PNOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>Prior Notification under Part 3 Class O for a change of use from an office use (Class B1(a)) to Residential (Class C3) as defined in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>First Floor Building 2 Riverside Court Bowling Hill Chipping Sodbury South Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>YTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received</strong></td>
<td>10.11.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **YTC Comments** | Object  
YTC object to the change of usage from office to residential because of the loss of vital office employment land when there is a chronic a shortage in the town. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>PK17/5016/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Demolition of existing garage and erection of 1no detached dwelling with access and associated works. (re-submission of PK17/3629/F).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>75 Highworth Crescent Yate Bristol South Gloucestershire BS37 4HL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>YTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>15.11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td>Object - Whilst we note adjustments have been made we repeat the previous concern regarding the inadequacy of off street parking other than a garage which may not remain as a garage. - Still does not demonstrate proper off-street parking in an area where off street parking is a problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>PK17/5216/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Erection of a first floor side extension to form additional living accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1 School Walk Yate Bristol South Gloucestershire BS37 5PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>YTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>15.11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>PK17/5064/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Change of use of ground (A2 Use Class) and first floor (B1 Use Class) to 8 no. self-contained flats (Class C3) as defined in Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and associated works including alterations to the external appearance of the elevations and minor reconfiguration of footway to rear service yard elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>39 South Parade Yate Bristol South Gloucestershire BS37 4BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>21.11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td>Object&lt;br&gt;Whilst we do not object to the change of usage for the upper floor if can deliver parking for both floors, we do object to the change of usage to the bottom floor. &lt;br&gt;The conversion could lead to loss of job centre which is an important service. &lt;br&gt;If the job centre was to relocate within the shopping centre it would result in loss of office activity from the unit it currently occupies and loss of retail frontage to the new location. &lt;br&gt;The Shopping Centre Manager confirms that there is no decline in the demand for retail within the shopping centre therefore we do not support the loss of retail frontage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>PK17/5008/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Erection of two storey semidetached building to form ground floor office accommodation with 1 no. residential flat above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Unit 3 Wellington Road Yate South Gloucestershire BS37 5UY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>21.11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td>Object&lt;br&gt;Loss of retail&lt;br&gt;Whilst we would normally support, this applicaton is too small for a residential flat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>PK17/5164/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front and rear extensions to provide additional living accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>36 Longford Yate Bristol South Gloucestershire BS37 4JN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>13.11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>PK17/4478/LB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Installation of exterior signage to include 8no fascia signs, 13no floodlights and 1no lantern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>White Lion Public House, Church Road, Yate, South Gloucestershire, BS37 5BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>28.11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td>Object We repeat previous objection. Inappropriate signage for a listed building. In particular the signage on the North Facade is not in keeping with the rest of the building and should be removed. We support the Conservation Officer’s comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>PK17/4453/ADV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Display of 3no externally illuminated static fascia signs, 1no externally illuminated static hanging sign and 5no non-illuminated hoarding signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>White Lion Public House, Church Road, Yate, South Gloucestershire, BS37 5BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>28.11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td>Previous plan comments from Yate Town Council – Object. Inappropriate for a listed building. We support the Conservation Officer’s comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 21st DECEMBER 2017 FROM 10.00AM – 11.00AM AT POOLE COURT, YATE

PRESENT: Councillors Mike Drew, Chris Willmore, John Serle and John Gawn. Service Support Manager

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

RESOLVED Apologies for absence were received from Councillors, Ian Blair, Ben Campbell, John Davis, Tony Davis, John Ford, Cheryl Kirby, Margaret Marshall, Alan Monaghan, Karl Tomasin, Wully Perks and Sue Walker.

2. MEMBERS’ DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No declarations of interest were received.

3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Planning Applications received from South Gloucestershire Council in Appendix 1 were received.

RESOLVED To submit the comments as shown in Appendix 1

4. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next Planning Sub-Committee meeting will be held before the Full Council meeting on 9th January 2018 at 6.45pm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>PK17/5388/RM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Erection of 77 dwellings, associated roads, drainage, landscaping, garages and parking to include reserved matters of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping (Reserved Matters application to be read in conjunction with Outline Planning PK12/1913/O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Parcels PL23A And PL23C North Yate New Neighbourhood Yate Bristol South Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td>See attached comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>PK17/5389/RM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Erection of 86 dwellings, associated roads, drainage, landscaping, garages and parking to include reserved matters of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping (Reserved Matters application to be read in conjunction with Outline Planning PK12/1913/O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Land North Of Brimsham Park PL14D And PL22 North Yate New Neighbourhood Bristol South Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td>See attached comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>PK17/5570/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Erection of first floor side extension to form additional living accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>82 Clayfield Yate Bristol South Gloucestershire BS37 7HU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td>No Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>PK17/5407/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Demolition of existing garage and erection of 1 no detached dwelling with parking and associated works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>15 Ridgeway Yate, BS37 7AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>12th December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>PK17/4449/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Demolition of existing garage and erection of 1 no detached garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>29 Lyndale Road, BS37 4DB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
<td>14 December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTC Comments</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Applications

Land North of Brinsham Park, Yate, BS27 7JT

We object to Applications PK17/5388/RM and PK17/5389/RM

Yate Town Council has consistently objected to the plan to build these thousands of houses, but now turn to dealing with the detail.

This set of objections cover the details of both sites, as whilst there are some areas in which the sites are very different, most of our objections relate to the design of both application sites, and their interface.

Our first concern is not a planning one – that the developers are calling this Ladden Garden Village. This will confuse people as it sounds as though it is not part of Yate and is miles north on the Ladden Brook. The stream that runs through this area is the Brimsham Brook, the Ladden Brook starts miles to the north and does not run through this site. So this is completely misleading. There will be no vehicular access out of the site to the north, access will be solely through Yate so this marketing label is confusing at best.

We have met the developers and put some of our initial concerns to them. They agreed with us about some eg render, and the question of the location of play areas and the idea of keeping those as informal spaces, and putting the equipment in the existing area in the park to make it into a super play area like Kingsgate Park. But they say they are tied by the s.106 agreement to provide the equipment on site, and tied into render by the s.106. We really oppose this, and want to work to get the best solution for the residents of the existing and new houses. The larger take play areas for example are much preferred and would mean the new equipment being a matter of yards from where the s.106 says……

1. Construction Traffic
   a. We note the proposal for wheelwashing facilities adjoining the compound. However, we want a condition making it mandatory for construction related traffic to go through wheelwashing whichever route they take away from the site, as the clay is particularly claggy.
   b. Vehicle routing for compound and construction traffic must come in from the Goose Green Way Roundabout up Randolph Ave and must not come in along Eastfield Drive
   c. Traffic calming is needed on Eastfield Drive to stop rat running of traffic
   d. Compound needs to be moved further from housing - currently too close to Pear Tree Hey in particular, it should be further into the new development, and not on the allotment site adjoining existing dwellings. This will be the main compound for all 2000+ dwellings and industrial estate and this is far to big and long term to be located that close to existing dwellings
   e. The site for the compound will have a long term adverse effect on the ability to deliver the allotments at the north of Randolph Avenue because of compound materials and use compacting the ground. A condition for restoration of the compound ready for organic allotment use is required.
f. We object to the plan to bring all construction traffic for the whole site in via Randolph Avenue and not to complete the third access road at the start of the development – this will put unacceptable pressure on the existing two roads throughout the construction.

g. We are deeply concerned about the impact of site traffic on access to Brimsham Green School for pupils crossing Randolph Avenue and require that pedestrian controlled lights are put in now, as traffic increases rather than coming later, and that construction traffic movements be banned during school entry and exit times. We note currently they are planning to have site traffic from 8am to 6pm for six days a week, which would include heavy lorries during school access times, and Randolph Ave has a huge number of unaccompanied children crossing it to school each day from Brimsham Park and from the Counties area. The developer needs to fund a solution from day 1.

2. Design in relation to existing dwellings
   a. Housing on 5389 which adjoins existing dwellings is poorly laid out and in particular has no regard to the amenity of existing residents. Many will have terraces of houses way too close to their garden, and we object unless the housing is set much further back so there is an equal distance either side of the fence. And Plot 71 beside 30 Dryleaze is very poorly located. It will block all light to the north for the garden and result in a 2 story gable end within 3 feet of the garden, with overlooking and a dominating effect. The housing should be set back far more from existing dwellings - that small cul de sac of plots 68 – 71 needs rethinking.
   b. But across the whole of 5389, which is the most sensitive site as it backs onto established existing housing we consider there should be a thick hedge row/landscaping bund, so that the existing houses have some screening from the new ones, at least until the householders can develop additional planting in their gardens to screen themselves. We note the new housing on both applications is being well screened from the new roads, and we consider it essential that the same courtesy is extended to existing residents to give them screening.

3. Pedestrian access
   a. Need to retain footpath walk from end of Randolph across to end of Leechpol and along to park so redesign cul de sac behind Pear Tree Hey.
   b. We are extremely concerned about the complete lack of pavements except on the two main roads. All adoptable roads need a pavement, so people walking through them can walk safely. Otherwise they have to walk in the road in conflict with cars. This is not safe for children walking through to get to school or for older residents. So we need pavements along the edge between gardens and the roadway.
   c. We are unable to see any pedestrian crossings on the main roads. We need these planned in, with provision for adjusting their location should desire lines turn out to be different from expected. Where green corridors cross main roads we need barriers and in the case of spine roads then we need pedestrian controlled traffic lights; we need a safe routes to school plan, with safe pedestrian crossing points ie lights of zebras where children will need to cross the main roads shown on the current plan to
get to school – both primary schools and Brimsham Green as the secondary school. These need to be planned and shown from the very start.

d. We are very concerned about the lack of pedestrian crossing facilities. There are dropped kerbs along the roads, where they cross side roads. But there is only ONE junction that has dropped kerbs to enable people to cross Leechpool or the road to the District Centre. We must have dropped kerbs at every junction and at desire lines along the road, so that people can CROSS Leechpool and cross to the District Centre when built.

e. We are deeply concerned at the lack of any facilities for the public to cross Leechpool or to the District Centre. These will be very busy roads, being one of the main spine entrances to the entire estate. Yet we cannot even see a traffic island - and we consider these roads need a safe pedestrian crossing point. Leechpool will be busy, one of three entrances to the entire development yet children will need to cross it every day to get to Brimsham Green school in one direction and the Park in the other. So it desperately needs traffic light pedestrian controlled and / or a zebra crossing – and these need to be installed by the developer. Yet they are not shown on the plans.

4. Main roads

a. Crossing points

b. Drives exiting onto main road - We are extremely concerned at the drive ways that exit onto what will be main roads through the estate. If we compare the existing Brimsham Park estate where drives do not exit onto the main roads, we are very surprised to see drives exiting onto main roads, particularly where they are narrow and done the side of houses with no room to turn, so vehicles will have to manoeuvre on the main road to reverse in or out. This is fine in the roads within a small street but not on the main roads. We are particularly concerned at….

c. Lighting – we can see there is lighting on side roads and on the main road, with the exception of the eastern side of Leechpool – this is a crucial main spine adjoining the district centre. It is likely to be extremely well used, on both sides of the road, so needs lighting on both sides, following the footpath along the eastern side. A good example of this is along Greenways Road.

d. Footpath along the eastern side of Leechpool. We are opposed the footpath on the eastern side running along the kerb. It needs to be set back into the deep area of open space, so as to form a pleasant green walkway, with the lighting alongside it. Greenways Road, a similar sort of deep green space along the road shows how this can be planted so as to feel like an off road walking route, which is extremely well used by the public (whereas nobody walks on the other side in front of the houses)

e. Cycling – we can see no provision for cycling routes along the main roads or off road. This is essential to ensure Yate continues to be a cycling friendly town.

f. Path through the open space area along the east of Leechpool Road

g. We are unable to see any pedestrian crossings on the main roads. We need these planned in, with provision for adjusting their location should desire lines turn out to be different from expected. Where green corridors cross main roads we need barriers and in the case of spine roads then we need pedestrian controlled traffic lights; we need a safe routes to school plan, with safe pedestrian crossing points ie lights of zebras where children will need to cross the main roads shown on the current plan to get to school – both primary schools and Brimsham Green as the secondary school. These need to be planned and shown from the very start, and to ensure children
walking along the existing routes through Brimsham Park will be able to cross the current Leechpool. It is currently a quiet road and safe to cross, but this will cease to be the case once the development is under way and new houses come down it, so it needs a safe crossing now, not after the traffic is there.

h. We are opposed to the thin areas of grass verge on the main roads between pavement and road. These serve no amenity purpose but are a considerable maintenance cost to tax payers. We welcome the trees, but consider the pavement should extend to the kerb without these little grass bits which are tiny and will not enhance amenity (they will get wheels on them from cars and become a mess).

5. Parking/estate roads

a. Reversing – we are strongly opposed to the provision of narrow drives on main road frontages with no off road turning spaces which will result in reversing onto or off of the main road. This is particularly acute on the corners, and worst of all where the housing fronts directly onto the pavement with no front gardens which will result in shocking sightlines (see plots 60/61 in 5389). The cases where there coincide with corners on 5389 are particularly awful.

b. Badly located parking spaces We are deeply concerned at the arrangements for parking for the corner houses on the main road frontage of 5389. In each case, these are large four bed houses, but the single garage and single off street parking space is located at the rear, accessed not from the front of the house but from the back. We know from experience that in such situations people park directly outside their doors (particularly given they will only have one off street parking space!) These need to be redesigned to locate the parking spaces closer to the door and to ensure they have the correct number of parking spaces for a four bedroom house. This mess applies to all the corner plots on 5389 eg plots 1, 56, 76, 6, 16, 36. We are particularly concerned about turning on 5388 in relation to pots 20/21 and 6-15 where there is no room, even as shown on their plan. Where will visitors pto 20, 23, 22 park?

c. Number of spaces Some of the properties have the correct number of off street parking spaces, but overall we consider 10 visitor spaces on 5389 way too low. 16 on 5388 is slightly better but still not enough. This is particularly the case as there are many properties in 5389 which do not have the correct number of parking spaces for the number of bedrooms, which will result in vehicles parking on street routinely. Some eg plot 11 on 5389 have only 1 off street parking space and one single garage for a detached house. We must at the very least have all dwellings meeting the council’s parking standards. At present we have a number of four bed houses with only a single garage and one off street parking space on 5389. This is completely unacceptable. We assume the Council will check the parking spaces and garages meet the Council’s minimum dimensions. The properties have the correct number of parking space for the dwellings, excluding the visitor allowance, if the garages are big enough and count, although we have grave reservations about garages being included as so very few people park in garages, making on street parking crucial – feeding into our concerns about ensuring the roads are wide enough for on street parking. Otherwise the council is creating the sort of parking chaos we have in Normandy Drive.

d. Visitor parking. Whilst the properties do deliver the Table A parking spaces, they do not then provide the additional 0.2 spaces per dwelling for use by visitors, so for example on 5389, with 80 dwellings there is only provision for 10 visitor spaces,
rather than the 16 the SPD requires. Additionally some of these are located in places that will cause congestion – and some houses are so far from ANY visitor parking that they are not realistically of any use. We are particularly concerned that the houses fronting the main road have no visitor parking easily accessible, and have four bed houses with only one off street parking space and one garage, so they are going to inevitably find visitors park on the main roads, which are already too narrow for that purpose.

c. Parking for the flats. PLOTS 41 – 48 are flats, mainly one bed. There is only one visitor space for all 8 flats, and only 1 parking space per flat. This is inadequate, and there is no room for eg work vehicles. The Council’s parking standards in their 2013 (SPD) would require 1.6 visitor spaces and as this is a corner frontage on a main road there is no scope for on street parking so an additional bay needs to be provided.

f. Plots 85/86 on 5389. We realise these are the show homes, but the garages should be normal size, as these excessively long garages unduly impact upon existing dwellings which adjoin the plots.

g. Road widths turning and parking. We are extremely troubled by the layouts within each development in terms of turning, refuse and fire brigade access. We are aware of the disaster in Normandy Drive, which is too narrow for vehicles to get through when anyone parks along the roads. We note the turning area plans attached to both applications show how a car can get in and turn, but this is a car, not a larger vehicle, and they only show vehicles parked on side of the road. Given the lack of off street and visitor parking it is very likely there will be a lot of on street parking and vehicles will not be able to get through. It is essential the roads are all wide enough for a car each side and the refuse cart to get through or they will be building another Normandy Drive. On 5389 the vehicle track plots show that cars could not get in if there is parking eg at 28/49/50/51 let alone a refuse vehicle if people park on both sides. And the entry road between 16 and 31 will be a problem if there is on street parking. Roads must be wide enough, and double yellow lines must be put in on tight corners from the start, not retrofitted years later at public expense as with Normandy Drive.

h. We are concerned at the inconsistency of what is adoptable and what is not. The bottom spur of plots 22 – 26 is a small area on 5839 and shout not be adoptable, on the other hand, plots 69 – 74 on 5388 should not be adoptable. We need consistency on whether private spurs are to be publicity maintainable.

6. Play areas

a. These two phases show no play space. The only green spaces are along road margins, which are not play space. Accordingly, for children to run around or kick a ball around they will need access to Brimsham Fields the park to the south east of the application sites. This means there must be safe access across the roads, and, crucially the entrance to the park needs to be formed right at the start (and in the right place) The eastern play areas are in the wrong place, these should be informal open space and the equipped area should be merged into the one in the park, less than 100 yards away to form a bigger integrated all age facility which is what residents want, and we as occupiers of the park want. These small equipped areas opposite houses always end in problems and get removed. Not a single one like this has survived in yate. We are fundamentally opposed to the Leap / Neap concept, and to the particular locations chosen. Overall, we have found the leaps and neaps do not work. Parents no longer
let their children go and play unsupervised, and both parents and children have told us they much prefer to have a smaller number of larger play areas, where there is a bigger variety of equipment, which can meet the needs of all ages (and therefore families whose children are of diverse ages) and which are a destination. Our parks in Kingsgate, Witches Hat etc are hugely successful examples of this. We have found Leaps and Neaps, which do not offer this variety are little used, neglected, and face opposition from residents. They are eventually removed. We would therefore much prefer to do what was done on the original Brimsham Park, where the sites which would have been leaps and neaps were left as informal open space, and the money that would have purchased the equipment was pooled to provide the big play area at Millside, within the development.

b. We are particularly concerned about the location of the LEAPS and NEAPS. Two are located at entrances to Brimsham Fields, (Neap 3 ad NEAP 5) the local park, yet there is a large area in that park set aside for play, and the friends of the park want to improve that by adding more equipment. It would be better to have one big play area, rather than three within yards of each other. And this would be better located in relation to distance from dwellings. – need one large play area as evidence says parent take children to play and prefer larger play areas. Our proposal would keep the locations as informal play spaces, but put the equipment into the Park, into an area already fenced for play. This area is WITHIN SIGHT of the proposed equipped play area, and we can think of nowhere that such small pockets within sight of an established bigger area have worked. Far better to merge into one super area. This is preferable to parents, children and the town council who would then take maintenance and replacement responsibility.

c. We are keen to take responsibility for the play area provision, subject to it being suitably located in a good cluster

7. Relationship to the Park
   a. The Northern main entrance to the Park needs to be further to the east, as at present it comes in onto the narrowest part of the park where there will be only a footpath between the entrance and the lake, creating a dangerous pinch point, particularly for children running into the park. We have pointed this out at every stage and as the authority that runs the park we are keen to stress again that the access cannot be made at this point because of the dangers of doing so and needs to be further east.

8. Design of new buildings
   a. We strongly oppose the use of weatherboarding or render in construction. Neither play any part in the local vernacular (which is stone and brick) and from experience where they have been used elsewhere locally they deteriorate very quickly, and are difficult to maintain. Particularly on road frontages this very quickly has a serious adverse impact on the character of the neighbourhood. Brick and stone do not deteriorate in this way. We have spoken with the developer and we know they do not like render either, but the design brief forces it upon them. We strongly urge this be varied to delete weatherboarding and render.
   b. All boundary partitions that form a frontage to a public area whether main road or side road must be brick with pillars, not single skin runs (which fall over) or wood (which deteriorates). Again, we say this from experience of what deteriorates and undermines the character of an area.
c. We are concerned that only one social housing unit on 5389 and none on 5388 are shown as designed for life, ie wheelchair friendly. All of the properties should be designed for life and therefore suitable for people with wheelchairs. And the parking spaces for the unit designated as wheelchair friendly only has a normal parking space outside, whereas of course it needs a disabled width parking bay to make it wheelchair friendly, otherwise wheelchair users will not be able to access their vehicles.

9. Trees and hedges
   a. The whole development needs at TPO so nothing is removed without consent. Also need hedgerow protection orders as all main hedgerows are over 400 years old dating from an earlier enclosure and are examples of Midland Fields system. Hedgerows to be in public ownership (YTC) and not in gardens to be consistent;
   b. Verges - the narrow bits of grass between pavement and roadway on the main roads will become muddy messes, cost money to maintain and will not add to the street scene. We welcome the idea of trees, but not of the verges and suggest the pavement extends to kerb, with trees set in.
   c. We have considered the tree method statement and worry that for many of the trees the fencing matches the canopy. The tree and hedge protection barriers must extend for the full root width as well as canopy width in line with the best professional standards to avoid the problems we encountered at Barnwood Road, and the tree barriers must be retained in place at all times.
   d. We object to the notion of water basins being treated as public open space. We have experience of this happening on the corner of Greenways Rd and Goose Green Way and the land is utterly unusable as public open space because it is waterlogged for so much of the year. So whilst we welcome water features these must be as well as not instead of public open space.
   e. We are very concerned about the treatment of the area along the retained hedge on 5389. Firstly, the ends of the ditches, where they are going to be steep ends to the ditch much have fences / barriers to protect from small children falling down the sheer slope (we have had an experience of this at Rectory Close and had to get the council to put in a proper barrier to stop accidents). These should be developer funded (the sides of course are different as these are less steep and therefore okay. Secondly, the footpath from between Dryleaze and Pear Tree Hey comes into 5389 opposite the open space / hedge. There is a pedestrian crossing point shown as a raised area, but then the public footpath completely stops. There are no pavements, and there is no footpath through the land to the north. Currently the footpath runs along the hedge line northwards. This must be retained, and the hedge and adjoining houses laid out to ensure this happens ie with a surfaced path through the gap alongside the hedge area, and with some of the houses located so that the hedge does not just become a neglected area behind back fences on both sides, which will become a dumping ground. We want the hedge and land around it to continue to be a feature with the footpath alongside it. Otherwise we have a very major north south footpath coming to a dead end, which is crazy. This path must be laid out in the planning consent along the line of the current public footpath – and explicitly so as a surfaced path particularly given the hedge is to be maintained by a private management company who may seek to exclude the public if this is not explicit.
PRESENT: Councillors Chris Willmore (Chair), Ian Blair, John Ford and Karl Tomasin.
Chris Dolling and Will Morgan (Barratt Homes representatives).
Cecelia Hughes (David Wilson Homes representative).
Town Clerk.

1 ELECTION OF CHAIR

Councillor Chris Willmore was agreed as chair for the meeting.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mike Drew.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCALISM ACT 2011

Declarations of interest under the Localism Act 2011 were received from:

Councillor Ian Blair South Gloucestershire Council Development Control East
Committee member
Councillor John Ford Director of YOSC Ltd

4 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The representatives of Barratt and David Wilson Homes were welcomed to the meeting and introductions took place.

5 LIAISON

It was explained that the meeting would explore plans by Barratt and David Wilson Homes to develop north Yate and to explore how they will liaise with Yate Town Council during the development to enable dialogue for early problem resolution.

It was NOTED that Barratt / David Wilson would be willing to meet with representatives of Yate Town Council throughout the development phases and that the frequency of meetings will depend on the timescales connected to the development and the detail involved at each stage.

6 NORTH YATE DEVELOPMENT

It was NOTED that:

- in July 2013, South Gloucestershire Council granted outline permission for a new neighbourhood north of Brimsham Park for 2450 dwellings, with 12 acres of employment land set around a new local centre with shops, a pub, 2 primary
schools, mixed use community centre, police post, sports facilities, allotments and play areas;

- Barratt / David Wilson has inherited the masterplan;

- All reserved matters will be linked to: PK17/4826/RVC;

- Freehold land, owned by Barratt / David Wilson, will be built first with the building of the promotional land coming second;

- Barratt / David Wilson intend to locate the compound, in situ for the life of the estimated 15-year development timespan, on land allocated for allotment use, accessible from Randolph Avenue;

- Phase 1 will see 86 Barratt Homes built (PL14D and PL22), along with 76 David Wilson Homes (PL23A and PL23C), totalling 162 homes, 35% of which are to be affordable homes;

- After phase 1, the rate of build will be 250 dwellings per year;

- The first infrastructure application is with South Gloucestershire Council, with the second infrastructure application being submitted in the New Year;

- Pylons (including existing pylons) will be grounded from June 2019 – June 2020;

- Heights are to feature on main streets (not on the development edges);

- Housing design is based around brick (buff and red colours) and rendering, with no reconstituted stone. Barratt / DWH acknowledged that the addition of some constituted stone would be of benefit to the scheme and there was agreement from Yate Town Council on this point;

- Grey windows would feature on the main frontage, as opposed to white UPVC;

- Garages will be 6m by 3m internally;

- Barratts / David Wilson was asked:
  
  - how they plan to positively create character in the area and design it so that when residents are travelling or walking through it, they will know where they are. Barratts / David Wilson confirmed that they aim to tie the development together via subtle cues and contemporary nature of the housing design. It was explained that one development parcel might feature formal and classic housing, with another parcel appearing more rural and cottage-like.

  - how the development will be integrated into the Yate community so that it is part of the existing coherent parish of Yate. It was explained that there will
be lots of little neighbourhoods within the development, each constituting a part of Yate.

- Yate Town Council commented as follows:
  - existing residents have not been consulted on the proposed location of the compound and it would be far better if it is placed as far away as possible from existing residents to minimise any impacts of the development on them;
  - Yate Town Council has submitted comments on PK17/4260. These comments were shared with representatives present and it was highlighted that the comments have implications on the current parcels of development;
  - Yate Town Council representatives confirmed they would be happy to see reconstituted stone feature in the housing design as opposed to materials such as rendering which would need more frequent maintenance. Barratt / David Wilson representatives confirmed they would talk to South Gloucestershire Council about the use of reconstituted stone;
  - Yate Town Council representatives commented that flats above garages have worked well in the local area;
  - The protection of the Jubilee Way is welcomed. However, there is a dog walking route at the top of the Randolph Avenue field which Yate Town Council wish to see retained. Residents wish to maintain the ability to travel though the development in a green-ish corridor without needing to weave through the houses and a discussion was held regarding the potential options available;
  - Clusters of high density housing on the borders of existing housing is not wanted and Barratts / David Wilson were asked to consider alternative ways of designing the development to alleviate this;
  - The developers were asked to:
    - avoid creating narrow little corridors which are unlit and unattractive;
    - retain easy access to Brimsham Park for existing residents;
    - not build or locate small play areas throughout the development,
    - ensure connectivity through the development (e.g., the school site is currently a barrier and a through-route needs to be designed in);
    - to accommodate desire lines where possible.
  - It was explained that Yate Town Council run Brimsham Park and play area, (along with all other play areas in the parish) and that;
    - In the experience of Yate Town Council, pocket play areas, near to houses, are not successful as they often lead to complaints from
residents and from parents who feel that the play areas are too small and not varied enough to meet the needs of different aged children;

- Equipped, multi-functional play areas for a wide spread of ages offer the opportunity for a family outing and engage the children, as primary users, for longer;
- Play money from a previous Brimsham development went into the popular Millside Playzone, which includes a multi-use games area for young people;
- There is a Friends of Brimsham Park group in operation which supports the Town Council’s aim to expand the existing play area in Brimsham Park;
- It would make most sense for Brimsham Park to be the place of play for the new community, as opposed to having smaller play areas dotted amongst the houses and to risk complaints from residents and underuse;
- Barratt / David Wilson was asked to:
  - put money which they would have spent on equipping small play areas throughout the development, into the expansion of the Brimsham Park Play Area and the provision of new and exciting play opportunities there;
  - change use of smaller play areas to informal open space;
  - speak to South Gloucestershire Council to lift any constraints on location of play area spending so that the needs to the community can be met;
  - revisit the masterplan so that a parcel of housing can be moved to where a small play area has been plotted, and instead, the land be given over to the expansion of Brimsham Park which adjoins it;
  - accompany Yate Town Councillors and Friends Groups in a tour of Town Council play areas such as Kingsgate Park, Millside Playzone and the Witches Hat Play Area, for an understanding of the Town Council’s provisioning for the community in terms of play;
  - consider locating the community building adjacent or near to Brimsham Park to create a community hub.

- Yate Town Council:
  - Has a key interest in the strategic placement of open spaces and in ensuring there is a comprehensive maintenance regime across the whole area;
  - is interested in the management of the open space areas, particularly the open space adjoining Brimsham Park (but is not interested in assuming the management of the incidental verge areas);
  - is interested in the management of the allotment site.

- If the area of land in the northern part of the development will be used as a retention pond, it should not count as public open space.
It was explained that:

- YOSC is a Yate Town Council facility;
- a tender process for the refurbishment of the athletics and track facility is underway, estimated to be around £850,000, and sponsorship is being sought. Barratts / David Wilson to consider this;
- the site is used by Bristol Rovers Academy, Brimsham Green School and Yate and District Athletics Club amongst others, is the best national facility for target sprint, has a well-used community clubhouse onsite as well as football pitches and an all-weather pitch – all of which are served by an access road owned by Yate Town Council located to the south of the scheme;
- The development should provision easy access from the north for the new residents who will want to access the site for use as a sports and social venue;
- It was suggested that the current pedestrian / cycle access from the north should be upgraded to a (potentially limited) vehicular access to integrate the two areas. It would not therefore be the right place to locate a play area in the vicinity of the proposed access point. It was suggested that alternatively, a play area could be provisioned within YOSC and the area on the plan earmarked for a play area be instead used for car parking for the YOSC site;
- The upgrade of the existing 3G all weather pitch is a future aspiration, along with the addition of a 4G all weather pitch (which could be located adjacent to the track, on the pitch on the other side of the fence).

7 NEXT STEPS

Barratt / David Wilson confirmed that:

- their next steps will be to submit an application and notify neighbours by letter;
- Information and plans are available at: barrattbristolcommunity.com;
- Detailed consents will be submitted in small phases.

It was agreed that a further meeting take place in Spring 2018 (around March time) after the planning application has been submitted to South Gloucestershire Council, but before it’s been determined.

All those present were thanked for attending the meeting.
Additional Comments Received from Barratts after the Meeting:

- Barratts has inherited the MasterPlan and the ‘Design Code’, which are approved as part of the planning permission. Officers at South Gloucestershire Council are expecting reserved matters submissions to accord with these documents and any deviations from the proposals contained would require justification and have limited prospects for success;

- Barratt / David Wilson advised that the public open space and the play area strategy has already been fixed by the outline planning permission. The opportunities for relating play spaces on site to the existing facilities at Brimsham Park would be discussed with Officers at South Gloucestershire Council.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING WITH SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNCIL PLANNING OFFICERS, TO DISCUSS AN EMERGING VISION FOR YATE TOWN CENTRE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE LOCAL PLAN, HELD ON WEDNESDAY 6 DECEMBER 2017 FROM 9.30AM-11.30AM AT POOLE COURT.

PRESENT: Councillor Chris Willmore (Chair) and Service Support Manager – Yate Town Council.
Councillor Ruth Davis – South Gloucestershire Council.
Donna Ford – Clerk to Iron Acton Parish Council.
Andrew Lane (Principal Planning Officer) and Kayleigh Dando – South Gloucestershire Council.

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR FOR THE MEETING

It was agreed that Councillor Chris Willmore would chair the meeting.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ian Blair (Yate Town Council), Councillor David Lane (Dodington Parish Council), Patrick Conroy and Carl McClure (South Gloucestershire Council Planning Officers).

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCALISM ACT 2011

None received.

4. RECAP ON DISCUSSIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING ON 12 JULY 2017

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2017 were received. It was agreed that copies of the “Futures” papers tabled at the last meeting be forwarded to Iron Acton and Westerleigh Parish Councils.

5. UPDATE FROM SOUTH GLOUCESTERSHIRE COUNCIL

The Principal Planning Officer updated the meeting (Appendix 1) and the following was NOTED:

- The JSP links into the Local Plan consultation document which will launch in January/February 2018;
- The Local Plan covers the whole of South Gloucestershire and includes transport and minerals but not waste;
- It is recognised that Yate offers something different to North Fringe;
- It is necessary to deliver 2,900 ‘urban’ homes throughout the region;
- The draft report which is going to South Gloucestershire Committee includes the ‘Nash’ report which will be circulated by the Principal Planning Officer –
comments are needed by 15 December 2017 if any factual errors are noted. However, the consultation will be the time for comment on contents.

General discussion took place about planning in the town centre and it was NOTED that:

- The use of the phrase ‘urban living/housing’ may alarm people without a thorough explanation of what this may look like and where it may be;
- It is difficult to be positive about the consultation as the JSP is still ongoing and difficult to shape a response pending its outcome. It is likely that Parish Councils will object as they need to fight for the best outcome;
- There is general concern that Coalpit Heath will eventually join Yate and the only distinct gap will be filled by a link road which will eventually be surrounded by development;
- It is desirable for Yate town centre to serve the expanding population, and be complimented by a retail park (larger stores, white goods, hotel, office spaces for high density employment etc.) at the western gateway, close to the railway station, and for the 1960s industrial estate areas to develop into modern industrial enterprise areas – the opportunity to consult on this appears to have been missed;
- It is important to offer public engagement in the areas that are affected. The vision will shape the local community for the next 50-100 years and therefore the current community need to understand the need for more housing and buy-in to the impact of new housing;
- The new development that will affect Iron Acton and Westerleigh was referred to as “North East Yate” and as such was not immediately obvious that it was a new development outside the Parish of Yate.

6. THE WAY FORWARD

- Westerleigh Parish Council has prepared an objection to the North East Yate Development (from the Westerleigh Ward) and will forward to the clerk for circulation. The Coalpit Heath Ward objection is to follow;
- Iron Acton Parish Council will share its objection to the ‘North East Yate’ development to all surrounding parishes to enable a joined-up approach by the Parishes;
- Councillor Willmore to take maps away and identify junctions with pedestrian issues;
- The Principal Planning Officer to circulate a timeline in respect of the Transport Plan – specifically with reference to proposed new link road from Emersons/J18a route through to Badminton Road and beyond.
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Full Council 9.1.18
What we will be covering today

• JSP and New Local Plan Update

• New Local Plan - Consultation Document

• Urban Localities: Review of Potential (Nash Partnership)

• Timetable and Public Engagement
JSP Preparation

- **November 2017**
  - Consultation on the Publication version JSP

- **January 2018**
  - Close of Consultation on the Draft JSP

- **Spring 2018**
  - Submit to SoS

- **Mid 2018 tbc**
  - Examination hearings date provided from PINS

- **Late 2018**
  - JSP Adoption

South Glos Local Plan Critical path

- **December 2017**
  - South Glos Local Plan – Consultation Document (Reg 18) considered by Cabinet

- **Early 2018**
  - Local Plan Consultation Document (Reg 18) public consultation

- **Spring/ early summer 2018**
  - Consider comments made to Local Plan Consultation

- **Summer/ Autumn 2018**
  - Keep LP timetable under review pending JSP EiP outcome /Additional consultations

- **Winter 2018**
  - Daft LP prepared reflecting outcome of JSP
South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Consultation Document

Part 1
Preamble & Introduction

Content:
• Introduces the Plan’s new focus
• Confirms the basis for the new LP
• Relationship to JSP
• Spatial portrait
• Feedback from January 2017 Prospectus consultation
• Critical issues and priorities which the Plan needs to address
Part 2 New Spatial Narrative

**Content:** 5 sub-sections
- Strategy for development – 4 elements
- Core Strategy Sites/existing permissions
- New approach to Urban Living – opportunities and challenges
- Strategic Development Locations (SDLs)
- Introduction of initial options for how we could deliver the JSP non-strategic growth
Part 3: Policy Discussion Points

Content: 3 sub-sections
- Explains the intended overall structure of the new Local Plan
- Sets out titles of strategic development policies intend to include
- 15 policy areas as discussion points, providing a potential direction of travel
South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Consultation Document

Content: Urban Living

- A change from ‘business as usual’ – details new approach
- Requirement to 2,900 homes
- Practical implications, advantages, challenges, focus going forward.

- Yate – Background, opportunities, challenges, opportunities for change

(supported by the Review of Potential Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Stage</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept Design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Startup, measure up, consultation, sketch proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Design</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Develop design and submit for planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Design</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Detailed drawings and specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contractor tender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tender Review and Contractor Mobilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Handover and user briefing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Stage</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dec 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Jan 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Jan 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jan 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jan 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Jan 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Feb 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Feb 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Feb 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Feb 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Mar 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mar 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mar 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mar 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Apr 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>Apr 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Apr 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Apr 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Apr 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07</td>
<td>May 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>May 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>May 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>May 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Jun 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jun 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jun 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jun 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Jul 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>Aug 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Aug 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Aug 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Aug 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sep 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Oct 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>Oct 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Oct 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Oct 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Oct 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Nov 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 11

FC 9.1.18
MEETING OF THE YOSC LIAISON GROUP & REPRESENTATIVES OF YOSC LIMITED HELD ON FRIDAY 1 DECEMBER 2017 FROM 1.30PM – 4PM AT POOLE COURT, YATE.

PRESENT: Councillors Chris Willmore (Chair), Karl Tomasin and John Serle. Jeremy Dale, Ellen Morley and Stuart Nunn – YOSC Limited. Town Clerk, Estates Manager, Community Project Manager and Service Support Manager.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tony Davis, Mike Drew, John Ford (Director of YOSC Ltd) and Cheryl Kirby (Director of YOSC Ltd). Geoff Robson (Director of YOSC Ltd) was absent.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCALISM ACT 2011

No declarations of interest were received.

3. LEGAL AGREEMENTS

- An update in respect of legal negotiations between South Gloucestershire Council, Brimsham Green School and Yate Town Council was received and it was NOTED that a second offer has been received and rejected by Yate Town Council. A meeting with the school has been requested urgently.

- It was NOTED that Yate Town Council is preparing a Business Plan for the YOSC site to cover long-term management of it as a Town Council asset;

- It was NOTED that YOSC Limited has been asked to prepare and share with Yate Town Council its budgeted business plan, containing the vision of YOSC Ltd, and projecting figures for YOSC covering site operations, including YOSC FM income;

- Following the informal meeting held on 14th November 2017 to discuss the possible options for governance between Yate Town Council and YOSC Ltd, the following was NOTED:

  o YOSC Ltd would prefer to run the site under a licence/lease with day-to-day responsibility, with capital costs met by Yate Town Council. YOSC Ltd would like to employ a Site Operations Manager to pick up routine maintenance inspections and actions as well as managing the site;
  
  o Yate Town Council has reservations about the level of risk involved if YOSC Ltd and its staff actioned safety checks, effectively as a third party, as the liability resulting from any inaccurate or incomplete checks would rest with Yate Town Council. The cleanest model would be for health and safety checks and maintenance to be controlled by Yate Town Council;
  
  o There is a need to be very clear who is responsible for what in the final legal agreement to provide each party with certainty and clarity and to ensure obligations are met;
o Some routine activities could be delegated to YOSC Ltd to complete under and
SLA with a grant to YOSC Ltd;
o Providing YOSC Ltd remain a tenant then rate relief will apply.

RESOLVED;

o YOSC Ltd to work up a budgeted business plan, which includes an indication
of income, to ascertain the level of rent it could afford for the lease/licence;
o A list of works to be created by YOSC Ltd detailing what works have been
completed to date and those needed in the short, medium and long term so that
maintenance works can be planned for insofar as possible.

4. FINANCIAL OVERVIEW

Estimated income and expenditure report for 2016–7 prepared by Yate Town Council’s
Responsible Finance Officer, based upon information together with estimated receipts and
payments for YOSC FM for 2016-17, was received. (Confidential Appendix 1)

Estimated running costs and projected income for YOSC Ltd 2018/19 was received
(Confidential appendix 2)

RESOLVED;

o YOSC Ltd to review the figures and to give better estimates on the assumption
that YOSC Ltd employs a Manager and health and safety duties are under the
control of Yate Town Council, as well as costings for Yate Town Council only
involved in 1 or 5 year (depending on requirements) statutory Health and Safety
inspections (YOSC Ltd preference);
o Yate Town Council to check if some figures have been double counted or over
estimated, and to factor in reduced income whilst track refurbishment is
undertaken (Jeremy Dale and Steph Davis to meet on Tuesday 5th December
2017 to review figures);
o Yate Town Council to ascertain the exact statutory requirements of the landlord
in respect of timing of statutory Health and Safety Inspections;
o YOSC Ltd to confirm that based on the financial information produced, that they
can afford to employ a Site Manager.

5. ITEMS FROM YOSC LTD

The following updates were received from YOSC Ltd:

- **Quarterly Report** – work is underway to input all of 2016/17 onto a new accounting
  system to compare with 2017/18. Information will be ready by the New Year and then
  as regular as required thereafter;
- **Governance Documents** – It was confirmed that the following policies have been
  prepared to satisfy the requirements of the Charity Commission and have been
  approved by the YOSC Ltd (Board Meeting Minute 4.2, 20th October 2017);
  - Conflict of Interests;
  - Data Protection;
  - Financial Controls;
  - Investment;
• Risk Management;
• Safeguarding;
• Volunteering.

It was NOTED that the Complaints Handling Policy is in the process of being prepared.

• Structure & Roles of Directors

It was NOTED that at the YOSC Ltd Board Meeting (Minute No. 5/1, of 20th October 2017) it was stated that:

- In accordance with Minute item 3.1 ‘Structure’, CK issued an email dated 25 September 2017, to all YOSC Directors explaining the expected roles and some of their duties that are usually associated with UK Charities. After some general discussion by the Directors, it was agreed that the following roles would be allocated as follows:-
  - Chair – Jeremy Dale;
  - Secretary – Cheryl Kirby;
  - Treasurer – Ellen Morley.

All Directors acknowledged that they remain jointly responsible for YOSC Ltd and all emphasised that they are working, as a team, to carry out the goals of the charity to the best of their abilities.

• Building Control Certificate for the Shed – documents and payment has been sent to South Gloucestershire Council, certificate awaited;
• Bank Signatories – forms have been sent to the bank, awaiting confirmation from bank.
• Health & Safety File and Operation Manuals – A quote for £6,000 has been received to prepare a Health and Safety Operations Manual for the YOSC site. RESOLVED To proceed with quotation to prepare Health and Safety Operation Manual. Jeremy Dale to also forward concerns to Councillor Mike Drew for the attention of South Gloucestershire Council.

6. YOSC ATHLETICS AND TRACK PROJECT

It was NOTED that:

- The tender period is live with a return date of 18th December 2017;
- Concern was raised that by handing the site over to the contractors would mean some large events would need to be cancelled/postponed;
- A meeting of the YOSC Athletics and Track Project Steering Group will recommend the way forward for decision at Full Council on 9th January 2018.
7. **YOSC SITE MANAGER**

It was **NOTED** that YOSC Ltd has drafted a job description for a Site Manager post and that YTC has fed back with comments about:

- Itemising all key duties of the post (in terms of site management, managing clubhouse, bar and catering offer, escalating issues to YTC as landowner, financial operations, site policies and data/document management, contract administration, communications, marketing, call out, recruitment, training and supervision of site staff and volunteers, H&S (accidents and incidents), safeguarding, sponsorship and fundraising, meeting targets, ensuring cover etc);

- Including all key duties within the job description (with skills and qualifications such as COSHH and Legionella featuring in the person specification);

- Necessity for governance arrangements between Yate Town Council and YOSC Ltd to be in place before an appointment is made in order for YOSC Ltd to know exactly what the post holder will be expected to do to reflect requirements of Yate Town Council on YOSC Ltd.

It was further **NOTED** that YOSC Ltd has confirmed that:

- a HR consultant is assisting YOSC Ltd to ensure an effective recruitment process is in place to attract the right candidate;

- YOSC Ltd will set targets for the post holder once baseline has been established;

- YOSC Ltd consider the role to be affordable and even without all the H&S responsibilities and to be benchmarked correctly in the market place;

- YOSC Ltd are keen to advertise and commence recruitment process but will not appoint until governance matters in respect of the licence/lease are confirmed.

It was **NOTED** that Yate Town Council did not recommend that YOSC Ltd appoints a Site Manager until:

- they are certain they can afford it;
- the governance arrangements are confirmed so that they are sure what they will expect the post holder to do.

8. **GENERAL UPDATES**

It was **NOTED** that:

- The works and servicing to the water softener unit have been completed;

- Works to moving the switches for the tennis court floodlights from the Boxing Club have been completed although it was further **NOTED** that YOSC Ltd is not sure
what has changed and Brinsham Green School now owe money for the Tennis Court floodlight usage. **RESOLVED**  The Estates Manager to follow this up with South Gloucestershire Council.

- The container for Men in Shed’s has been moved from YOSC;
- Investigation into works and enhancements to the car park to be held in abeyance until negotiations with Brimsham Green School are complete. However quotes have been requested in the meantime;
- Drainage – South Gloucestershire Council has supplied a feasibility study and investigations are continuing;
- An update was received from the Estates Manager in respect of the hockey dug out; The following is recommended;
  - To paint the metal base frame to avoid future corrosion;
  - Add a strip of angle trim to roof edges;
  - The 25mm ground level bar to the entrance to be painted a bright colour such as yellow;
  - Regular treatment of timber to preserve the timber from the elements;
  - The dugout to be secured to the ground.
- South Gloucestershire Council completed a survey of the boxing club on 14th November 2017;
- Sample result regarding the fire on the trading estate and materials found at YOSC in relation to the fire confirmed ‘asbestos not detected’.
- Correspondence is awaited from South Gloucestershire Council to complete repairs to the roof;
- A request was made by YOSC Ltd in respect of whether there is sufficient funds to complete the railings work (66 railings). YOSC Ltd was advised that until the tender for the track project is complete and final costs know versus monies raised for the project, it is unknown if there will be sufficient funds available. **RESOLVED**  The 66 railings be added to the “wishlist” for future;
- Contact has been made with Brimsham Green School and YOSC Ltd to talk about progressing the idea of an all-weather pitch at YOSC. A meeting will be scheduled in the new year with interested parties to discuss how to take this forward, considering FA, RFU and other viable funding sources.

**8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was **RESOLVED**  that the next meeting will take place on Friday 5th January 2018, at 1.30pm at Poole Court.
MINUTES OF THE YATE AGEING BETTER SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 22ND NOVEMBER 2017 FROM 2PM – 3.30PM AT POOLE COURT, YATE.

PRESENT: Yate Town Councillors John Gawn, Karl Tomasin and Sue Walker.
Community Projects Manager and Venues Operations Officer - Yate Town Council

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND OF VICE-CHAIR OF THE YATE AGEING BETTER SUB-COMMITTEE

It was RESOLVED that:

- the Yate Ageing Better Sub-Committee would be chaired by Councillor Karl Tomasin;
- Councillor Sue Walker would take on the role of Vice Chair of the Yate Ageing Better Sub-Committee.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors John Ford and Chris Willmore.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCALISM ACT 2011

No declarations of interest were received.

4. TERMS OF REFERENCE

It was RECOMMENDED that the Terms of reference to be agreed at Full Council meeting 9th January. (Appendix 1)

5. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 22nd AUGUST 2017

RESOLVED Minutes from the Older People’s Provision Review meeting held on 22nd August 2017 were received and agreed.

6. TO RECEIVE PROJECT UPDATES

6/1 Men in Shed’s

- A newsletter has been circulated to around 70 of those who had expressed an interest in the project to provide an overall update. RESOLVED Officers to circulate the newsletter to Councillors on this Sub-Committee;
- Development works have begun to set up the Men in Shed’s project including a visit to Ridgewood Community Centre to consider whether it could be a venue for the project;
• The container has been moved from YOSC and is now at Kingsgate Park. It will be used as storage for the Men in Shed’s project. Works or sessions will not be undertaken here as originally considered;

• The Men in Shed’s group is in the running to receive funding from the Tesco Bags of Help Scheme. In store customer voting will run until January 2018;

• Prospective members of Men in Shed’s have gathered to begin forming an association;

• The Community Projects Manager has met with the lead member of the Men in Shed’s group to begin the handover of the project setup to the volunteers;

• A regular informal Men in Shed’s meeting will take place every Thursday at the Armadillo Café at 10:30am, welcoming both committee members and prospective members. The session will allow committee members to explore formal topics and for prospective ‘shedders’ to gather to find out updates and to offer an opportunity to socialise with others interested in the project.

• Further details on how Men in Shed’s will obtain funding from Yate Town Council to be explored and agreed at a later date.

It was RESOLVED that:

• Yate Town Council support the group of volunteers to lead on taking forward the project setup actions;
• The Community Projects Manager to continue liaising with the lead volunteer, regarding the setup of the Men in Shed’s project, and report updates back to the Sub-Committee;
• An indication be made to the group of volunteers that:
  o Yate Town Councillors would like to be involved in the recruitment of the committee members;
  o There is interest from some Yate Town Councillors to become involved in the Association.

6/2 Lunch Club

• Lunch Club continues to take place at St Nix Church every Monday.

RESOLVED St Nix to be advised of the cut-off date of April 2018 for spending / claiming the £500.00 allocated by Yate Town Council to support the setup of the Lunch Club.

6/3 Yate Ageing Better

(a) Consultation (review consultation timeline Appendix 2)
It was **NOTED** that Officers are attending a South Gloucestershire Council Ageing Better Consultation event on 29\textsuperscript{th} November 2017 held at the Batch, to find out more about the wider strategy and what is happening locally.

It was discussed and the following was **RESOLVED**:

- Officers to begin the design of the consultation to include creating a wish list of participants and defining the consultation brief;
- The consultation to ask participants for feedback about existing Yate Town Council projects aimed at those over the age of 50.

(b) **Funding (Including the consultation)**

It was reported that Quartet has been in touch to obtain further information to support the application for funds that was submitted to cover the cost of the consultation.

It was **NOTED** that discussions have begun around funding of Yate Ageing Better projects for the 2018 financial year but have not yet been confirmed.

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- Members Award Funding to be explored to cover the consultation before the next meeting;
- Officers to continue to seek external funding for the consultation and Men in Shed’s project;
- A recommendation regarding the source of funding for the consultation be made by the Sub-Committee no later than 24\textsuperscript{th} January 2018 to be received at the Finance and General Purposes Committee on 6\textsuperscript{th} February 2018.

(c) **Facebook Page**

There is now a live ‘Yate Ageing Better’ Facebook page coordinated by Yate Town Council staff, promoting Yate Town Council opportunities aimed at the over 50s locally;

The Facebook page is regularly updated with information about the Pop Inn Café, Senior coffee morning at the Armadillo, Men in Shed’s, Lunch Club and provides updates in regards to the Yate Ageing Better Consultation.

**RESOLVED** Information available online be condensed into a quarterly Yate Ageing Better newsletter and be made available at Yate Town Council properties to reach those who do not use social media.

(d) **Vision Statement**
RESOLVED The vision statement for Yate Ageing Better to read:

“Yate Town Council is committed to working with local people to provide a wide range of opportunities to support individuals and groups, to age in a way that is:

- Positive;
- Inclusive and;
- Empowering.

Working together with the community, we are ‘Yate Ageing Better’.”

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

To NOTE that the next meeting will be set in January 2018 via a Doodle poll.
Terms of Reference

Yate Ageing Better Sub-Committee
(Responsible to the Finance and General Purposes Committee / Full Council)

1. Membership
   1. Members as appointed by YTC.

2. Delegated Business
   2.1 The Yate Ageing Better Working Group to take identified projects forward within budget without recourse to either the Finance and General Purposes Committee or Full Council for decision (agreed at FC 24.10.17)

3. Referred Business
   3.1 To identify projects / new provision for older residents in Yate and to make recommendations to the Finance and General Purposes Committee/Full Council for decision.
   3.2 Any other matter referred to the Yate Ageing Better Yate Working Group for decision by the Finance and General Purposes Committee or Full Council.
YATE AGEING BETTER DRAFT CONSULTATION PLAN

STAGE 1
27th Oct

ESTABLISHING MISSION STATEMENT/TAGLINE YATE AGEING BETTER

STAGE 2
30th Nov-22nd Dec

PLAN: Who/What/Where/When/How
- Incorporate ‘5 ways to wellbeing’?
- Support the mission statement of Yate Ageing Better
- Create organisation input ‘wish list’

STAGE 3
2nd Jan – 2nd Feb

SPECIFICATION: Alongside the spec, YTC to provide an overview of existing activities locally

STAGE 4
5th Feb- 2nd March

TENDER CONSULTATION: CVS could act as broker to find an independent consultant

STAGE 5
5th March- 16th March

APPROVE AND APPOINT CONSULTANT:
Panel to include Councillor(s)

STAGE 6
19th March-1st June

CONSULTATION TO TAKE PLACE

STAGE 7
22nd June

CONSULTANT TO COMPILE AND PRESENT REPORT TO YTC

STAGE 8
W/C 9th July

YTC COMMUNITY EVENT TO CELEBRATE/ PROMOTE FINDINGS
Yate Town Council Response to Consultation – Disqualification Criteria for Councillors and Mayors

This response is on behalf of Yate Town Council, a large local council north of Bristol;

Q1 - Yes, however we do not understand why police authorities are not included - we see an overwhelming case for consistency in the rules for all public roles, if anything the police requirements should be stronger.

Q2 - Yes, because there is not a conviction in place and the person has not had the opportunity to test the evidence.

Q3. See question 6

Q4 See question 6

Q5 No

Q6 We are deeply concerned that there is no rationale for picking out these two matters (a civil injunction and CBO) when more serious offences do not lead to disqualification. This creates an deeply inconsistent picture in which persons convicted of fraud, or of repeated offences of violence would not be disqualified, but someone subject to a CBO or civil injunction would). Given the threshold currently is that the offence has to be subject to a sentence of three months in prison (whether or not suspended), someone can have a pretty major record of dishonesty or violence, and not be disqualified. As such, whilst we welcome further protection for the public, given the position of authority that vests in the council role, we consider it should be consistent and either apply from everything from a CBO / civil injunction upwards or not be changed, rather than picking off two new issues and leaving a gap.

Whilst responding we would also like to suggest consideration is given to adding to the disqualifications that if a person is struck off their professional register for misconduct - eg solicitor, barrister, accountant, financial services, medical registers - that should disqualify them from holding elected office for a period, as they have shown they do not have appropriate regard for proper rules and procedures. This is about protecting public assets. We have been surprised to see a person who was struck off a statutory financial regulatory register being able to be elected as a councillor and take up a leadership role in a principal authority. We would ask the review to consider this issue.
Yate Town Council

Responses to Consultation on South Gloucestershire Local Plan 2018 - 2036

Introduction

The Prospectus obviously only considers the approach to compiling the Local Plan at a very high level, but generally we consider that the approach is adequate.

We do however have a number of serious concerns:

- A lack of confidence in the evidence base because Dodington parish is omitted entirely from the Sustainable Access Profiles. This needs to be rectified for us to have meaningful discussions grounded on the evidence base.
- A lack of transparency regarding the Call For Sites data – the documents supporting each site should be immediately accessible from the clickable map.
- It is not clear how the Local Plan process will bring together issues such as sustainability of sites, infrastructure, and the link between employment sites and housing, so that residents do not have to cross the Green Belt to get to work.
- In respect of this last point we would refer to the issues raised in our submissions to the Joint Spatial Plan and the Joint Transport Study (attached). We comment now that the methodology of the Local Plan needs to account for how each of the issues we raised regarding the JSP and JTS will be addressed when the Local Plan is being compiled/

Q1 We are keen to know what cross boundary strategic matters neighbouring authorities, government agencies etc. would like to engage with us on and which methods of engagement would best suit.

The pattern of developments in the Yate / Sodbury / Dodington / Westerleigh area affect all 4 parishes. There needs to be detailed workshops with representatives of the local councils, jointly where appropriate. The discussions should include housing, employment, retail and service locations, infrastructure, public transport, and environmental issues such as flooding and the effects of development on the local environment.

We also feel very concerned as we indicated in our Core Strategy submissions, that the proposal identifies strategic employment locations on one side of the green belt and strategic housing growth locations on the other side – with the resulting impact on access to employment, costs of travel to work, congestion and the environment in the green belt.

Q2 Are the key priorities identified in paragraph 3.8 and in Topic Paper 1 the right key priorities for the South Gloucestershire new Local Plan to tackle up to 2036?
S Glos will need to consult closely with representatives of local communities and with individual residents themselves. Involvement is the key. We have concerns about the key priorities in para 3.6 of the document as published.

- Section 3 overall is very geographically focussed, and has dropped the idea of spatial planning looking at people and communities as well as geography. We hope the SGLP as drafted will ensure a people focussed approach – using place in its sense of being communities constructed by people as opposed to simple geography. We note the mention of ‘successful communities’ in topic paper 1, but it is not mentioned in the Prospectus and requires a higher profile in that prospectus.

- There is a key admission from the key priorities – that of ‘reducing inequality’. There are currently massive inequalities in access to employment, and therefore prosperity – and to key facilities such as hospitals. The strategy talks of ‘maintaining economic prosperity’ which rings hollow for those who do not have public transport access to key employment centres and face expensive and congested journeys to work – the strategy needs to address explicitly the question of how we locate employment opportunities close enough to where people live to provide increase equality of access to opportunity. Whilst there is some mention of this eg in relation to health and wellbeing in Topic Paper 1 it needs to be a key objective not just in relation to health and wellbeing.

- We support the aim of ensuring there is sufficient affordable housing, but unfortunately this is not achieved by the release of large new neighbourhoods for private sector development, with houses prices as high as £600k. We hope the draft document will genuinely engage with the question of truly affordable housing in sufficient number.

- We are concerned about the 3.8 emphasis upon economic growth as opposed to sustainable growth or a sustainable economy. Growth which is not sustainable fuels the demand for more housing for people moving to the area and does nothing to address the local inequalities of wealth or open up local opportunities. Our aim should be to deliver a prosperous area where all have the opportunity to live a happy and healthy life. The current statement lacks that focus upon people and sees economic growth as a good independent of its impact upon quality of life, inequality and prosperity. We hope the fuller draft document will better reflect that the aim is prosperity and wellbeing for all.

- We have worries about Topic Paper 1, for example 3.i seems to assume that delivering the housing numbers will address access to affordable housing. It notes the affordability gap in 3.ii but does not suggest how this can be dealt with.

Q3 Have you any comments on what should be included in the visions for any of the following areas: 1. Overall vision for the whole of South Gloucestershire 2. Urban areas in the north and east of Bristol 3. Yate & Chipping Sodbury 4. Thornbury 5. Severnside 6. Rural areas
See our previous comments on the JSP and JTS, which we attach. We would stress protecting Green Belt and avoiding the damaging effects of placing employment and housing in locations that require people to commute through the Green Belt.

We welcome the emphasis upon development of a coherent sense of place and richer mix of opportunities. However the emphasis in Topic Paper 1 upon the town as a destination is at the expense of thinking about the town’s internal needs. This is reflected in the Evidence Base profiles. In relation to other communities for example the profile talks about where you can get to FROM the community by public transport. So it is focussed upon the people in that community and how they get places. But for the Yate profile the equivalent box talks about.

We are concerned that the comment on public transport in the Yate Vision needs to be explicit about public transport and road access to key centres of employment and services FROM Yate.

We are concerned that the Vision makes explicit that the 3000 dwellings to the north of the Town are explicitly linked to the ones currently consented, to avoid ambiguity.

We are also very concerned about the lack of reference to the need not merely to diversify local employment, but also to increase local employment opportunities beyond matching housing growth to address local losses of employment.

**Q4 Is the draft structure the most appropriate approach?**

It seems a logical approach but the process should allow for some flexibility in case of unforeseen issues or external influences e.g. changes in national policies that would affect the local economy.

**Q5 Do you consider the approach to combining policies and the range of policies identified is appropriate to address the land use issues facing South Gloucestershire?**

Yes, so far as we can tell based on the limited information we have received so far.

**Q6 Are there other policies that are needed to address the land use issues relevant to South Gloucestershire?**

We know that the Environment Agency is consulting on flood relief measures for the River Frome, and this may have a major effect on viability of some development locations. This needs to be factored in, together with the strategic issues associated with inequalities.

We are also concerned that the high level statements do not reflect the importance of community to the wellbeing of an area, so that strategic planning is about creating.
communities not just land use – and feel that sense of community infrastructure and identity needs to permeate the plan.

We have commented on omissions in the current deposit PSP and continue to have those concerns.

It is important to consult the local people and to get their views on any “gaps” in the policy and evidence bases.

**Q7 As part of this consultation additional sites and evidence supporting their deliverability can be made using the online response form available from [www.southglos.gov.uk/callforsites](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/callforsites)**

The map needs to be linked through to the documents behind each of the sites nominated now or in the past.

Pending this we request that we should be given access to the information submitted for each site referenced in and affecting our town. We are deeply concerned to see a number of employment locations listed, given our deep concern at the loss of local employment sites to development that we have seen in recent years. We are opposed to all of those redevelopment sites, and to sites which give rise to urban sprawl.

We are troubled by paras 5.8 – 5.11 which says work has been commissioned to review seven localities that ‘could offer further potential to boost urban living’. No criteria are given for this work that has been commissioned, so we have no way of knowing whether the appropriate questions have been asked, nor do we know who is doing the work and how local people will be consulted and engaged to ensure all appropriate evidence is gathered. We oppose such a secretive evaluation which will become in practice determinative of where further development goes.

**Q8 Do you have any comments on the methodology used to construct the Sustainable Access Profiles? For example comments on the approach to defining the range of key services and facilities, assessing walking and cycling and public transport access.**

The methodology seems appropriate and provides a useful baseline. However the omission of Dodington Parish in its entirety undermines the credibility of the methodology. It is a distinctive community and needs its own evidence statement. At present we cannot tell whether you have put it all in Yate, or some in Yate and some in Sodbury.

See our answers to question 5 – where we have grave concerns that the methodology and outcome profiles have not treated Yate consistently with other areas, and have profiled it as a destination not an origin / community with its own needs. That means there is a risk of the Plan not reflecting the needs of Yate residents. So we ask that the Yate evidence base be recalculated using exactly the same criteria as for other communities – and then with a separate evidence base element for destination communities.
We are concerned that the baseline provides static data and not trends. So for example in Yate we have seen a net loss of employment sites to residential use, at the same time as we have been experiencing substantial housing growth. That is creating major pressures on commuting and upon economic prosperity for local people. The evidence base needs to reflect trends as well as a static picture to see where issues need to be addressed. It also needs to understand better the character of jobs in a locality and whether they are about people commuting to them, or are local jobs.

Documents such as the town centre strategy for Yate are not listed in the Key Evidence Base. These extra statutory documents should be included in the key evidence base.

We are unable to comment upon the accuracy of the evidence base as for example it talks of major employers, but does not confirm what counts as such.

Q9 Do you have any comments on the findings and detail of individual Sustainable Access Profiles? E.g. are certain key services and facilities included which should not be, or are others missing?

We are very concerned that there is no Sustainable Access Profile for the Dodington Parish area, which has a substantial population. Our local community facilities are largely unlisted, and there is no basis for assessing the services our residents have access to.

We wish to lodge a fundamental objection to the process, as it is not clear what data for Dodington has been analysed, and if it has been considered, where that analysis can be found.

This calls into question whether the baseline for deciding development locations is appropriate, and we wish to know what other significant settlements within South Glos have similarly been ignored.

We are also deeply concerned about the failure to reflect adequately the crisis in traffic and transport congestion problems, or the access to hospital issues.
**Food Plan Consultation**

Whilst this is a good plan in what it says, we are very concerned about the resources available to implement it. We urge South Gloucestershire to rethink the balance of time spent on producing these sorts of plans and the resources available to implement them. If they are to be used by the voluntary and private sector to help focus their activities they need to be very short, focussed and easy to apply. If they are to guide S Glos action then they need to be really focussed on the change that is sought in various other areas of service - so each service knows what to do differently - and so it is clear how much additional resource is going to be made available to support the plan.

There are four omissions we would like to see addressed:

1. The plan as a whole would benefit from being located within the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Many authorities are now using them to frame strategic initiatives, and they offer a very good tool for identifying the benefits of the various suggestions within the document and the interrelationship with other objectives.

2. We are aware of and support other feedback arguing for a planning restriction upon the high concentration of takeaway facilities offering menus high in fat and salt, such as kebab and fish and chip shops. Not all fast food outlets are problematic, some do offer a more balanced diet, but it would be beneficial if more attention could be paid to the proliferation of unhealthy fast good outlets, as opposed to healthier ones.

3. Availability of cookery classes. Some of us remember when cookery classes were available as evening classes. We would welcome an initiative by South Gloucestershire to stimulate the provision of cookery classes within the adult education offer - not for NVQs/work (they already exist) but as basic cooking courses to encourage people to cook healthy meals from basic ingredients to make inroads on food poverty, obesity and healthy lifestyles.

4. Fairtrade and associated initiatives. We would have liked to see more about how the council intends to promote this

**What could your Council do?**

The Town Council is a Fairtrade organisation and promotes healthier foods in its own outlets. We would welcome stalls from the South Glos Food plan at the big public events we organise. We are working on delivery in additional allotments (individual and community)

**What is the biggest issue in your area?**

Food poverty. Families in our priority neighbourhoods say they do not need leaflets etc advising them about healthier eating, they know what that is. The problem is price. The single biggest thing they say would make a difference is if supermarkets agreed to always make their BOGOF offers healthy foods, rather than unhealthy ones. Could South Glos talk with the big retailers to try to achieve this.
West of England Joint Spatial Plan - Publication Representation Form

The West of England councils - Bath & North East Somerset, Bristol City, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire councils are inviting representations on the Publication Document of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan. These will be considered by the examining Inspector in the context of the soundness and legal compliance of the Plan.

**Please return this form by Wednesday 10th January 2018.**

**Email to:** comment@jointplanningwofe.org.uk  **or post to:** West of England Joint Spatial Plan, C/o South Gloucestershire Council, Planning, PO Box 1954, Bristol BS37 0DD

This form has two parts:

**Part A – Personal Details**

**Part B – Your representation.**

Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

To ensure your representation is restricted to issues of soundness and legal compliance, you are advised to refer to the accompanying **Guidance Document** and make your representation on this official form that has been specifically designed to assist you in making your representation.

**Please be aware that all comments made on the Joint Spatial Plan will be publicly available.** Anonymous forms cannot be accepted and so to submit your form you must include your details below.

You should refer to section 5 in the Guidance Document for advice on how to make a **joint representation.**

**Part A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details*</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title*</td>
<td>Prof Cllr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name*</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name*</td>
<td>Willmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title <em>(where relevant)</em></td>
<td>Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation* <em>(where relevant)</em></td>
<td>Yate Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Poole Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>Poole Court Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 3</td>
<td>Yate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Code</td>
<td>BS37 5PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td>01454 866506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chriswillmore@blueyonder.co.uk">chriswillmore@blueyonder.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If an agent is appointed, complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes in 1. below adding the agent’s details in 2 below.*

Signature

Date
Part B - Your Representation

Please use a separate form for each representation made and read the accompanying Guidance Note that accompanies this form before you complete it.

Name or Organisation:

Q1. On which part of the Joint Spatial Plan are you commenting? Please see the note above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.12 in particular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Diagram

Q2. Do you consider the Joint Spatial Plan to be:

- Legally compliant? Yes [ ] No [x]
- Sound? Yes [ ] No [x]
- Compliant with the Duty to co-operate? Yes [ ] No [x]

Please tick as appropriate

Q3. Please give details of why you consider the Joint Spatial Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Joint Spatial Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your representation.

Please see attached document

Please continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary
Q4. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Joint Spatial Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the matter you have identified at Q3 above where this relates to soundness. (Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at Examination.) You will need to say why this change will make the Joint Spatial Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible:

Please see ayyached

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Q5. If your representation is seeking modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the Examination?

[ ] No, I do not wish to participate at the examination hearings

[ ] Yes, I wish to participate at the examination hearings

Q6. If you wish to participate, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Yate would be affected in fundamental ways if the proposed North West Yate SDL proceeded and the entire future planning concept for the town was to move from market town to ‘urban living’. Given that YTC regards the proposal to be the result of a fundamentally flawed process, with substantial inconsistencies between the articulations of policy in the document and the choice of locations it should be allowed to participate to represent the interests of its parishioners who will suffer the consequences on our services, roads and community. We have shown our ability to argue at this strategic level through a long term involvement in all EIPs/ oral examinations into strategic development affecting Yate for 30 years and need to participate in what will for our residents and electors represent a shift in the nature of the town far more fundamental that previous allocations.
Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the Examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Chris willmore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>9/1/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All representations must be received no later than Wednesday 10\textsuperscript{th} January 2018

Please keep a copy of this form for future reference.
Yate Town Council Response to JSP Public Representation questionnaire:

Q1. On which part of the Joint Spatial Plan are you commenting?

Our primary concern is about:

Chapter: 4 – Policy Framework

Paragraph: 7.12 - Yate

Policy: 7 – Strategic Development Locations

Key Diagram: Appendix 1 Concept Diagram North West and West Yate

However we also express concerns about earlier sections of the document which create the policy context for that decision.

However we also object to the concept of ‘urban living’ as a uniform approach to ‘market towns’ and the concept of ‘affordability’ in the document.

We set out our concerns about the strategic development location first, and then our other concerns.

We attach three documents to which we refer,

1. that are reports produced by councillors in Yate” Lets Get Yate Moving, setting out the transport challenges and lack of evidence base for strategic decisions – we argue strongly that there is a need for actual evidence about how people could be got from where housing is proposed to where they work before any strategic allocations can be made.

2. Our ‘Real homes and Green Fields’ report which looks at the evidence showing none of the new housing being built in Yate is actually affordable to local people.

3. Our response to the 2016 draft which sets out our concerns about further residential allocations at Yate. None of our concerns have been reflected / addressed in this consultation draft - leading us to question the role the consultation replies have played. We would have expected to be able to see how responses had influenced thinking or at the very least prompted further evidential work in order to rebut the concerns.

Q2. Do you consider the Joint Spatial Plan to be:

Legally Compliant? No

Sound? No
Q3. Please give details of why you consider the Joint Spatial Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate.

Yate Town Council (YTC) considers the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) legally non-compliant because it has failed to have proper regard to the Secretary of State’s national policy and guidance on green belt land in making the proposals on North West Yate; it has failed properly to appraise and assess potential locations around Yate/Chipping Sodbury and to demonstrate that ‘North West Yate’ is more sustainable than alternative locations; has failed to undertake effective community consultation in line with its Statement of Community Involvement and has failed to have regard to the consents already granted in the immediate locality which have not been implemented yet, and has failed to ensure the Strategic Transport Plan aligns with the JSP proposals to ensure a parallel investment in transport or employment infrastructure.

The Council considers the JSP to be unsound by reason of its legal non-compliance; its failure to justify through robust and credible evidence and argument its proposals for development in North West Yate; and its failure to justify departures from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other national planning policies (see below).

a. Non-compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Green Belt policy

Paragraph 18 of the JSP quotes the NPPF as follows:

“Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan.”

Paragraph 84 of the NPPF says:

“When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channeling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset
within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.”

The Stage 1 assessment of the Bristol and Bath Green Belt in preparation for the spatial strategy looked at all Green Belt land in the four authorities of the West of England and

“confirmed that all of the cells performed 2 or more of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt”.

The Stage 2 assessment focused further work on the locations being examined as potential strategic development locations, including those around Yate/Chipping Sodbury. The aim of the stage 2 assessment was to determine an overall contribution rating for each cell against the five NPPF criteria. These were set out in paragraph 2.8 of “Assessment of Strategic Development Locations beyond settlement boundaries – Methodology Paper” (a 2016 annex to the document “West of England Joint Spatial Plan: Towards the Emerging Spatial Strategy”):

“2.8 Green Belt purposes 1, 2 and 4 are directly expressed:

• 1 - to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas;
• 2 - to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
• 4 - to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;

whereas purposes 3 and 5 are expressed as assistance roles:

• 3 - to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
• 5 - to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.”

Significantly, despite the decision to determine an overall rating for each cell, the methodology paper noted that the NPPF does not specify that land is of greater Green Belt value if it performs more of the five purposes. In other words, an area only needs to contribute to one of the purposes to have Green Belt value. The annex was explicit about the decision not to exclude Green Belt areas when identifying and assessing potential strategic development sites. Paragraph 4.4 said

“Land within the Green Belt was considered as part of the assessment, as the National
Planning Policy Framework allows Green Belt boundaries to be altered in exceptional circumstances through the preparation or review of the Local Plan.”

The decision to include Green Belt land in considering possible strategic development sites in the JSP raises a conundrum. The NPPF requires Green Belt changes to be made through the Local Plan process. But local plans must be in conformity with strategic plans which are ‘superior’ in the planning hierarchy. So if a ‘superior’ plan, such as the West of England JSP specifies a SDL in the Green Belt, the South Gloucestershire Local Plan must include that SDL. It cannot be used as a vehicle to reopen the JSP process. This in turn means that any consideration through the local plan process of whether exceptional circumstances existed which justified de-designation of Green Belt land would be nugatory, since the JSP would require such de-designation for the development to go ahead. If the local plan concluded that inclusion of the Green Belt land in the SDL in itself constituted exceptional circumstances, the argument would become circular. The SDL would in effect have extinguished the Green Belt designation in contravention of the NPPF by bypassing its requirements. The only way around this dilemma (without revising the NPPF) would be for the JSP process to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances and the local plan process formally to change the Green Belt boundaries. The draft JSP does not do this.

The West of England JSP is the first to reach the inquiry stage. It has, however, reached this stage without meeting the NPPF exceptional circumstances test and it is therefore defective.

The existing South Gloucestershire Local Plan retains the current green belt boundary west of Yate and makes no proposals for change. The draft JSP includes the proposal for the North West Yate SDL within that Green Belt. The process leading up to the draft JSP has failed to establish that there are exceptional circumstances which justify the major alterations proposed to the Iron Acton Green Belt. This is despite the commitments set out in JSP objective 4:

“To protect and enhance the sub-region’s diverse and high quality natural, built and historic environment and secure a net gain in biodiversity.

To prioritise development on brownfield sites, optimise densities and retain the overall function of the Bristol and Bath Green Belt.”
If the draft JSP were to be confirmed through the inquiry, it would determine the location of the Yate/Chipping Sodbury SDL on Green Belt land. The outcome of any post facto examination through the local plan of changes to the Green Belt would have been pre-empted.

In its strategic Green Belt Assessment in December 2011 for its Core Strategy, South Gloucestershire concluded that the Iron Acton Green Belt met the assessment criteria for retention, including the preservation of the setting and special characteristics of villages near Yate and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The annex “Towards the Emerging Spatial Strategy Green Belt Assessment Stage 2” document summarised the findings for Yate Green Belt areas as follows (paragraphs 3.20-3.21)

“Cells to the south and west of Yate are assessed as making a contribution to Green Belt purposes. Cells contribute to preventing the merger of neighbouring towns in the corridor between the north fringe of Bristol and Yate by assisting in preventing the coalescence of settlements. Most of the cells also contribute to assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.”

“Cell 22b, north of Engine Common and 21d, west of Yate are identified as making a limited contribution to Green Belt purposes.”

In paragraph 3.43 it summed up its findings

“Considering cells in combination, no substantial areas have been identified which make only a limited contribution to Green Belt purposes. There are no extensive tracts of land which, notwithstanding their current Green Belt status, have been shown to be unnecessary to keep permanently open by reason of their limited contribution to Green Belt purposes.”

In the attached detailed pro forma it concluded in relation to cells 22a and 21c (which together are largely coterminous with the area referred to in the Green Belt Assessment of 2011 and form the substance of the North West Yate SDL):
22a “It is therefore considered that Green Belt designation in this location assists in safeguarding wider open countryside from encroachment, particularly from potential development from Yate’s western and northern edge”; and

21c “Cell makes a contribution to limiting potential merger in the corridor from North Fringe and Yate, by preventing development along the A432 [Badminton Road] between Yate and Coalpit Heath. It also assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”.

Nowhere in the JSP is an argument put forward setting out the NPPF’s exceptional circumstances which would justify this proposed development in the Green Belt. Nowhere in the JSP is there reference to the impact of extinguishing 160 hectares of the Iron Acton Green Belt: major urban encroachment on the 16th, 17th and 18th century settlements of Engine Common, Iron Acton village and Nibley village; destruction of open countryside; damage to the natural environment including the Frome River, ancient hedgerows and the historic Coach Pond on Dyers Lane; degradation of sections of the Frome Valley Walkway and the Avon Cycleway; extinguishment of a network of historic footpaths criss-crossing the proposed location; and destruction of the rural feel and in some cases closure of Mission Road, Dyers Lane, Nibley Lane, Hope Road and Bridge Road. The population of Iron Acton Parish would be doubled, changing it from an overwhelmingly rural parish with small village and farm settlements into a parish dominated by a major urban encroachment from Yate.

This failure to comply with the Secretary of State’s green belt policy constitutes the first of the grounds on which YTC considers the proposals legally non-compliant.

b. Failure adequately to appraise potential development locations around Yate/Chipping Sodbury

Despite its apparent singularity, the Sustainability Appraisal for the JSP is actually a complex of documents prepared at different stages in support of different documents and leading on from each other, making it very difficult for anyone who was new to planning to follow and understand the appraisal process as a whole.
The sustainability appraisal of eight potential development locations around Yate/Chipping Sodbury was undertaken to inform the 2016 consultation on the emerging spatial strategy for the JSP and is contained in four annexes one of which – on locational assessments – stretches to 307 pages. The Sustainability Appraisal documents which support the 2017 JSP document form a further five appendices covering only the (new) North West Yate proposal. Additionally, the 2016 emerging spatial strategy was supported by a further five annexes on assessment of strategic locations. To find whatever analysis formed the basis for the decision to opt for the North West Yate option, therefore, it is necessary to work through 14 complex annexes produced over a period of years. It is clear that non-planners wishing to follow the trail of argument which seeks to justify the North West Yate proposal face a daunting task.

Secretary of State guidance published by the then Office of the Deputy Prime Minister sets out the purpose of a sustainability appraisal (SA) including:

“2  Develop the Local Plan options including reasonable alternatives

3  Evaluate the likely effects of the Local Plan and alternatives”.

It also sets out the five themes (all divided into sub-themes) which form the structure for sustainability appraisals:

“Theme 1: Improve the health, safety and wellbeing of all”

“Theme 2: Support communities that meet people’s needs”

“Theme 3: Develop a diverse and thriving economy that meets people’s needs”

“Theme 4: Maintain and improve environmental quality and assets”

“Theme 5: Minimise consumption of natural resources”.

The SA (in the annexes “Towards the Emerging Spatial Strategy: Sustainability Appraisal: Locational Assessments” and its sister document “Summary of Findings for
Strategic Locations”) assesses each of the eight Yate alternatives and finds little to distinguish amongst them. In these documents locations YC7 and YC6 together contain within their boundaries the development at North West Yate proposed in the JSP (rather confusingly, location YC7 is called West Yate and includes the area of Iron Acton Green Belt north of the railway line, and YC6 is called South West Yate and includes the area south of the railway line – while YC8 North West Yate has no overlap with the 2017 North West Yate and covers an area east of Dyers Lane). The summary document distinguishes locations YC7 and YC6 from the other six alternatives for only three of the 21 SA sub-themes: 4a (“Minimise impact and where appropriate enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings”) where development at YC7 is seen as more damaging than other locations; 4c (“Minimise impact on and where appropriate enhance valued landscapes”) where development at location YC6 is seen as marginally less damaging; and sub-theme 4f (“Minimise vulnerability to tidal/fluvial flooding (taking account of climate change), without increasing food risk elsewhere”) where development at YC7 is seen as lower risk. It is not at all clear that these add up to sufficient grounds to justify development in these rather than the alternative locations.

Additionally, the detailed Locational Assessments document (on which the summary is based) contains a number of factual errors in the appraisal of area YC7. Under sub-theme 2c (access to community facilities) it asserts that

“the nearest dedicated community centre and post office [is] located in Iron Acton just over 1km to the west and Engine Common a similar distance to the east”.

Under sub-theme 2e (town centre services and facilities) it suggests that

“There are local shops in area YC7.”

Iron Acton’s post office closed decades ago along with the village shop and it would take a stretch of imagination to describe its Parish Hall as a ‘community centre’. There have been no local shops in area YC7 for many years.
Under sub-theme 4b (impact on habitats and species) it states that

“There are no known ecological constraints within YC7. Notwithstanding this there is limited Phase 1 Habitat data for this area so additional work may be recommended.”

In fact, location YC7 includes part of the River Frome Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI), a status conferred on it by the local authority. There is no evidence in the documents that the additional work flagged was undertaken before the decision to opt for development in North West Yate.

The 2016 annex “Assessment of Strategic Development Locations beyond settlement boundaries – Methodology Paper” (not part of the Sustainability Appraisal) set out the approach taken to identify and assess the eight potential sites around Yate/Chipping Sodbury. Paragraph 4.4 said

“Land within the Green Belt was considered as part of the assessment, as the National Planning Policy Framework allows Green Belt boundaries to be altered in exceptional circumstances through the preparation or review of the Local Plan.”

In paragraph 5.4 is said, amongst other things

“As part of the assessment it was also considered that land was not generally considered suitable for strategic development where the following list of environmental assets and physical constraints applied: …

- High landscape value areas/views of high importance …
- Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs) … “

The outcome of the assessment was summarised in the further annex “WoE JSP Emerging Strategic HELAA – Assessment of Strategic Development Locations Beyond Settlement Boundaries – Location Dashboards”. The dashboard for Yate and Chipping
Sodbury had a sidebar headed “Potential Development Areas” which reads

“Northwest Yate has good proximity to the rail station, Badminton Road and existing development areas, hence there is considered potential in a broad band sweeping from fields north of Yate Town Football Club and south of Mission Road around to the B4059 and turning south to Nibley Lane and the river Frome and continuing south across the Badminton Road including fields west of the Business Park.”

YTC has not been able to find the reasoning and argument for this sweeping statement set out in any of the published documents. Not only is that a serious defect in the process, but the statement itself contains omissions and inaccuracies. While the accompanying map showed clearly that all of the location referred to was within the green belt area, that it included the Frome river Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI), and the Sustainability Appraisal assessed the landscape in YC7 to be of “medium high/high sensitivity” no reference was made to this despite the criteria (quoted above) set out in the methodology paper. The site does not have good proximity to the station - which is only accessible from the A432 and not from any other locations to the north / northwest and therefore not directly accessible from the new development, and is access along a main road which at peak times is already beyond capacity, with no scope for increasing that capacity. Placing additional traffic at the eye of a storm without major transport investment is not acceptable.

We have over the past 18 months submitted a set of FOI requests to South Gloucestershire Council so that we can understand the highway and transport data available to South Gloucestershire, to assess the impact of these proposals. We have been deeply concerned at the lack of data. They have supplied everything they have but openly admit they do not have any traffic and transport models to show the impact of this sort of development, or of any of the road proposals being discussed in the media. Without detailed data on current flows, capacity and modelling it is impossible to say this proposal is sound and has an evidential base. We have published a report, ‘Lets Get Yate Moving’ which uses all of the evidence South Gloucestershire has to make proposals for travel and transport. it shows that there is a complete lack of evidence to sustain this proposed growth.

Confusingly, the statement was made alongside a map which identified location YC8 as North West Yate, but was clearly referring exclusively to locations YC7 and YC6
identified as West Yate and South West Yate respectively. The reference to “good proximity” to Badminton Road was somewhat disingenuous since the bulk of the area described is separated from it by the railway line and the River Frome, while the main “existing development area” for housing is the North Yate New Neighbourhood which abuts location YC1 (North Yate) not YC7 or YC6.

The decision to propose the North West Yate development in the JSP must logically arise from the work described above. Notwithstanding that the proposed strategic development location (SDL) has a different geographical footprint to any of the locations assessed in the 2016 documents, YTC has not been able to find any further justification beyond the earlier inadequate assessment of these locations. The 2017 suite of JSP documents includes further Sustainability Appraisal annexes, and these are subject to consultation on the same timetable as the draft JSP. In “Appendix D: Appraisal Tables” the North West Yate strategic development location is appraised against all the SA sub-themes. The assessments include the following negative impacts:

4a (historical environment) “There are Listed Buildings and potential for archaeology associated with this historic landscape all around the periphery of Yate. There are a number of Listed Buildings within the SDL area. Some archaeological potential across the SDL area, particularly associated with Nibley village and former Mayshill colliery, and areas in proximity to Acton Court SAM and Iron Acton village.”

4b (habitats and species) “The River Frome forms part of the boundary of the SDL area, and is designated as an SNCI for its open flowing water and bankside vegetation. Fields at Mission Road/North Road – are also designated as an SNCI, again for their species-rich neutral [sic - natural?] grassland interest.”

4c (valued landscapes) “The SDL area is not located in the Cotswold AONB. The majority of Yate is within the Wickwar Ridge and Vale landscape character area, a diverse undulating landscape coverer [sic – covered?] with a mix of farmland, woodland and common. The landscape in this area is considered to be of medium to high/high sensitivity.”

4d (conservation of land) “Development would be greenfield. Development on
greenfield land does not contribute to promoting the conservation and wise use of land. Therefore all locations have a negative effect on this objective and there is no apparent scope for mitigation.”

4e (loss of productive land especially best and most versatile) “The area surrounding Yate and Chipping Sodbury contains areas of potential Grades 1, 2, 3 and 4 agricultural land. The majority of the SDL area is made up of potential Grade 3 agricultural land. There is however an area of potential Grade 2 land in West Yate, and a swathe of potential Grade 4 to the south. The area is outside of Flood Zone 3.” [Best and most versatile agricultural land is that graded as 1, 2 and 3a]

4g (surface water flooding and increasing flood risk) “The area is at risk of surface water flooding in 1 in 30, 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 year events. Surface water flow routes along river corridors, with areas of surface water pooling across the SDL area. Along river corridor there is potential for groundwater flooding to occur at surface. Parts of the area are within a zone where there is limited potential for groundwater to occur.”

5a (access to sustainable transportation) “There are regular bus services between Yate and Bristol, although the quality of local bus services is variable, with services to/from Bristol being caught in traffic congestion. Yate Station is at the western edge of Yate and is served by 1-train per hour (a local service running between Malvern/Gloucester, Bristol and the South Coast). MetroWest Phase 2 will double the frequency of services from 2021; this improvement would use up the remaining capacity on the network at Westerleigh Junction.”

Mitigation or enhancement

“Policy 7.12 requires the development to provide or contribute to a strategic transport package including: Metrobus extension to Yate and Chipping Sodbury, strategic cycle route A432 Park and Ride, Yate Rail Station enhancement, Winterbourne and Frampton Cotterell Bypass and local bus services.”

The “Joint Spatial Plan Strategic Development Location Templates” annex includes a section and map covering the North West Yate SDL. This is discussed in more detail under c. below but it, too, fails to justify the decision to opt for the proposed location
rather than any of the others canvassed around Yate/Chipping Sodbury. While it does include some proposals designed to mitigate the downsides identified in the SA, it fails even to attempt to demonstrate that these would be greater in other locations. While it mentions the Green Belt designation of the land it fails, once again, to even mention the exceptional circumstances which might justify green belt development.

The assessment process has also failed to consider properly the transport implications of the North West Yate location and its impact, sustainability and effectiveness. The bulk of the proposed SDL would sit north of the Yate to Thornbury railway line and the River Frome, effectively isolating it from the major arterial route along the A432 Badminton Road, and increasing the load on the already congested and smaller B4058/9 Yate/Bristol Road. Even building bridges across the railway line and river would not of itself prevent traffic adding to congestion on the Yate/Bristol Road. Not only this, but the plan fails completely to consider the significance and impact of the proposed M4 Junction 18A near Emersons Green which has been the subject of meetings between the local MP, Luke Hall, and the Secretary of State for Transport. Should that go ahead it would increase greatly the argument for development to be concentrated south of Yate rather than to the North West, changing fundamentally the relative advantages of the different location options.

The draft JSP is unclear as to whether the object of the Yate SDL is to accommodate population growth endogenous to Yate (the most sustainable option) with associated employment growth, or the far less sustainable objective of increasing dormitory accommodation for Bristol, stoking commuting and the already excessive car dependency in Yate/Chipping Sodbury. Any development to the west or south of the area will be more likely to attract people commuting to work in Bristol. By contrast, developments to the north or east of the area are more likely to support endogenous growth. It is not clear from the family of JSP documents that the West of England authorities had proper regard to these important considerations before opting for the North West Yate location.

The North West Yate JSP proposal is in marked contrast to previous assessments of potential locations for the expansion of Yate for the then Regional Spatial Strategy and subsequent South Gloucestershire Core Strategy. Both focussed on land to the north and east of the Yate/Chipping Sodbury settlement, ruling out development in the green belt to the west and south. No clear explanation is given in the JSP for the dramatic departure from South Gloucestershire’s previous commitment to retaining the Iron Acton Green Belt and the role it plays in preserving the open land between Yate and
the settlements of Iron Acton village and Engine Common, and maintaining the separation of settlements along the B4059/B4058 Yate/Bristol road.

The JSP says in Policy 7.12 on Yate that a

“Green Infrastructure network will reinforce the new Green Belt boundary, protect the river valley, linear settlement of Engine Common and Nibley Village, provide an attractive segregated route along the Frome Valley Walkway”; and

“The historic parliamentary enclosures, which comprise small to medium sized fields, reinforced by a strong mature hedgerow network and large number of trees, north of Mission Road and east and west of North Road will also be protected by a new landscape and or Green Belt designation”.

This is disingenuous. The proposal would in fact damage all of these and the ‘green infrastructure network’ would simply be an attempt to mitigate that damage. It appears to be little more than an aspiration for planting to screen the proposed development from the rump of green belt land. In practice what is proposed would result in the degradation of the current open aspect along the B4059 Yate Road, significant visual intrusion into the Iron Acton Conservation Area, and further development on the historic Engine Common. Reference to protection for ‘historic parliamentary enclosures’ and a ‘strong mature hedgerow network’ north of Mission Road and east of North Road fails to make clear that the proposal for development in the Green Belt would lead to the destruction of exactly the same historic and natural resources south of Mission Road and west of North Road.

This failure properly to set out the basis for the decision to propose North West Yate as the SDL and to demonstrate that it is more sustainable than alternative locations around Yate/Chipping Sodbury constitutes the second of the grounds on which YTC considers the proposals legally non-compliant.

c. Failure to undertake effective community consultation
By failing to provide a fair and even-handed description of the impact of the North West Yate proposal on the face of the JSP the Combined Authority/South Gloucestershire has failed properly to consult. The NPPF requires the planning authority to undertake community consultation in line with its Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). For the purposes of the JSP that means consultation in each authority’s area should be undertaken according to that authority’s SCI. YTC accepts that in South Gloucestershire the consultation followed the process set out in the SCI. However, the Parish Council considers that it departed fatally from the spirit and purpose – to such an extent that it was defective and failed to comply with NPPF requirements. For a consultation to be reasonable and hence compliant the authority should set out for consultees, especially those most likely to be interested (in the case of the North West Yate proposal the parishioners of Iron Acton), clear details of the proposal and its alternatives, and the implications of each, positive and negative. It should do so in an accessible and understandable form; and it must give consultees a reasonable period in which to consider and respond to proposals.

Identifying the proposal in Policy 7.12 as one for development in North West Yate was misleading for consultees since the whole of the proposed location is in Iron Acton Parish, something mentioned nowhere in the text on page 46 setting out the details. Instead, it refers to

“Land at Yate comprising two broad locations to the northwest and west of Yate”

and throughout refers to Yate as the location without a single mention of Iron Acton, village or parish. Only by delving into the “Strategic Development Location Templates” annex to the JSP and uncovering the section entitled ‘Northwest and West Yate’ does it become apparent that Iron Acton parish might be affected. Extraordinarily, even in the seven page document here there is not a single reference to Iron Acton in the text or on either of the two maps. Only a close scrutiny of the “Appendix 1 Concept Diagram” reveals that what is involved would be a major intrusion into Iron Acton Parish and its Green Belt. An uncharitable reading might conclude that it was a deliberate attempt to misdirect consultees.

Despite an undertaking in the SCI to avoid, where possible, consultations which clashed with the Christmas period the consultation on the draft JSP runs over the
Christmas break. Despite an undertaking in the SCI to consult for a minimum of 6 weeks, the consultation period was not extended beyond that minimum despite the impact of the Christmas break. Most Parish Councils meet only monthly (YTC) meets every 2 months as a full council). Consideration of, and response to such a significant proposal would normally require at least two meetings. It has also made it more difficult for parishioners and others to respond individually. That was not helped by the fact that the consultation event arranged by South Gloucestershire was held in Chipping Sodbury, rather than in the affected areas.

The North West Yate SDL was not identified as an option in the November 2016 consultation “Joint Spatial Plan: Towards an Emerging Spatial Strategy”. In the 2016 consultation it was difficult to find in the technical documents exactly which locations were under consideration.

Table 1 of the document “Strategic Development Locations and the rationale for inclusion in the emerging spatial strategy” included, under the section “Locations within or partially within the Green Belt” a strategic location termed the “Yate strategic corridor (Yate/Chipping Sodbury)” for up to 2,600 homes. Under the heading “Rationale for inclusion in the emerging spatial strategy” it said:

“Long-term phased greenfield development would also support investment in regeneration and the town centres and improving the range and type of jobs and help to unlock potential brownfield development at the western gateway.”

Again, there was no clue here to the subsequent proposal to overturn South Gloucestershire’s long held policies on the Iron Acton Green Belt and the policies of its “Development in the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document”. The failure to flag clearly in the primary documentation the emerging preference for development in the Green Belt (normally considered sacrosanct) effectively deprived local people of their opportunity to make their views known to their elected councillors at both unitary council and parish council levels earlier in the process and has left, as the only option, representations to the inspector at the planning inquiry. This is a technical and daunting stage of the process where the opportunity to influence the outcomes is limited to questions of legality, soundness and duty to co-operate.

There are, furthermore major internal inconsistencies in the document, which contribute to this unsoundness eg
We strongly support para 15, and its emphasis upon sustainability and proximity - however we cannot see how applying those good concepts of proximity to reduce car journeys leads to the spatial plan which locates thousands of houses in Yate and Coalpit Heath, whilst locating the major new employment centres the other side of the Green Belt, building in massive commuting journeys, requiring new roads and new public transport infrastructure.

We strongly support para 16 and its concern to avoid the unsustainable expansion of the north and east fringes, but again, we cannot see how building out from Coalpit Heath, and back towards Coalpit Heath from Yate, so that they nearly coalesce can be seen as consistent with this policy commitment. This plan effectively makes Yate the outer fringes of Bristol, completely contrary to the reason people chose to live here (and the vast majority of people in yate chose to come here from other places in the Bristol area or beyond, or their parents did). They know what it was that attracted them, we are extremely concerned that this plan will destroy that.

**Lack of JSP / Transport planning integration**

The basis of our concerns, whilst particularly focussed on the specific allocation would apply to ANY location in the Yate Sodbury Area in the next plan period. We already have had over 1000 houses constructed in the last 5 years and have consent for 2600 more to be built. There has been not a single penny spent on highway or public transport infrastructure in the past 20 years to increase capacity for people in Yate/Sodbury to reach the centres of employment. Over 30% of the town population have to commute to work elsewhere, and the granting of strategic consents where developers have been permitted to build more houses than land for jobs have worsened the balance (eg Brimsham North)) and of course most of the other consents have been on what was active employment land, replacing jobs with housing and therefore increasing commuting. Yet not one project has been implemented to increase highway or public transport capacity. South Glocuestershire does not even know how many people commute to work from Yate each day, or their destinations. So, it is not even aware of what it should be planning for. This is a complete failure to deliver the statutory requirements of a strategic plan. We have attached our report Let Gets Yate Moving which illustrates the strategic (and more operational) gaps in provision. We consider any plan to be compliant must demonstrate the highway and transport proposals to catch up and address new need – and must ensure that any development is conditional up and required to fund the necessary works.

It is the view of YTC that these shortcomings, taken together, constitute grounds for legal non-compliance.
d. Grounds for considering the draft JSP unsound

If upheld, the legal non-compliance of the draft JSP on the grounds set out in a.-c. above would render the plan unsound. Were the inquiry to conclude, notwithstanding our arguments, that the proposals are legally compliant, the YTC contends that its arguments would nevertheless demonstrate that the plan is unsound. The plan is:

- **Not justified** – the evidence base is flawed, with gaps and inaccuracies as described
- **Not effective** – the Yate/Chipping Sodbury development would fail to deliver the sustainability objectives set out in national guidance and in the JSP itself (see above); it relies on major infrastructure works (including the extension of MetroWest, MetroBus, the Frampton Cotterell/Winterbourne bypass, new bridges over the railway and the Frome river within the SDL) which are highly ambitious, not currently funded and unlikely be funded through section 16 agreements or Community Infrastructure Levy payments; additionally even if all were delivered they would increase rather than resolve the current chronic congestion around the Great Western Business Park Roundabout on the western boundary of Yate as increased volumes of traffic sought to enter or leave Yate via the roundabout and B roads serving it; it would surround the employment land between Iron Acton Way and Station Road (Yate), which includes many distribution enterprises, with dense housing so that all lorry movements were forced through residential areas increasing nuisance and subjecting residents to raised noise and air pollution levels;
- **Not consistent with national policy** – see above on inconsistency with NPPF and Green Belt policy.

e) Our concerns about ‘affordability’ as used in the plan

Further comments
This refers to t ‘affordability ratios’ - viz average earning to average house prices. The JSP needs to also look at affordability in terms of whether the new houses they are building are actually going on the market at affordable prices, if not, they they worsen the affordability ratio. We know that no new build property on the market in yate Since May 2015 has been sold at a price a first time buyer on average wages in Yate could afford. We have carried out an assessment which demonstrates that all new development since May 2015 in Yate has not been affordable to purchase by local families.

Page 11 - critical issues
‘Affordability’ needs to be real affordability in terms of average incomes not the notional ‘Affordability’ of government guidance. The plan is misleading, as it talks of ‘affordability’ but does not define it, so people are misled. We need truly affordable housing, not more housing that is too expensive for average families.

f) Market towns and urban living

The strategic priority on page 12 is to focus upon the three primary centres of Bristol, Bath and Weston. YTC strongly support that. Our concern is about how the JSP then interprets the concept of ‘the complementary role of market towns’.

We are deeply concerned about the application of the concept of ‘urban living’ to the market towns. We see it is a strong image and worth developing in relation to the primary centres, whose residents believe they are living an urban lifestyle. We see it has application in urban Kingswood. However, we are strongly opposed to its use in relation to market towns like Yate and Chipping Sodbury. The entire reason people live here is because it is a market town ie a rural town, not urban living. Indeed, developers are at pains to market it as a market town in the countryside, not urban living. The first marketing package for the new North Yate development is at pains to call itself ‘Ladden Garden Village’. Developers, who understand the market in this respect, consider the non-urban context crucial to seeing their houses. People will buy houses here because they see it as not being urban. it does not have the characteristics of urban communities and people want to keep it that way. So we are completely opposed to the application of urban living to areas such as Yate. There are opportunities for a change in approach in relation to the town centre, and the business estates, to intensify their use, but this is fundamentally different from adopting an urban living approach. This will destroy the very character of the town which is the reason people chose to live here, not in Bristol. We note that new development sites in the North Fringe eg at Charlton Hayes are adopting an urban living approach, and we consider it fundamentally important that development in places like Yate continues to have a more market town rather than urban approach so as to provide choice in the market.
Q4. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Joint Spatial Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the matter you have identified at Q3 above.

We have identified three areas where revision is particularly needed:

1. YTC regards the Joint Spatial Plan to be fatally flawed in the ways set out above. It considers that the only way to remedy this would be to reopen consideration of the Yate/Chipping Sodbury SDL; reappraise and reassess the options for this SDL; publish the revised considerations and re-consult on the new set of options. Failing this the Yate SDL should be struck from the JSP. Any compliant plan would need to dovetail the transport plan and JSP elements and demonstrate the capacity to provide employment and other infrastructure to underpin growth to date and any future growth.

2. Affordability We consider in addition that pages 10-11 needs revision to reflect the realities of what is affordable in the real sense not the notional sense of government guidance.

3. Market towns and urban living The plan needs to be revised in relation to ‘market towns’ to understand and reflect the fact that the concept of urban living is not appropriate to market towns around the cities, and is only appropriate for cities the size of Bristol, Bath or Weston, which are indisputably urban. The public need the choice of being about to purchase housing in urban areas such as Charlton Hayes, rural areas, or in market towns. These are three very different types of communities and should not all be ‘urbanised.’

Q5. If your representation is seeking modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the Examination?

Yes

Q6. If you wish to participate, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Yate would be affected in fundamental ways if the proposed North West Yate SDL proceeded and the entire future planning concept for the town was to move from market town to ‘urban living’. Given that YTC regards the proposal to be the result of a fundamentally flawed process, with substantial inconsistencies between the articulations of policy in the document and the choice of locations it should be allowed to participate to represent the interests of its parishioners who will suffer the
consequences on our services, roads and community..

Name

Cllr Chris Willmore

on behalf of Yate Town Council

Date

9 January 2018

Annexes follow
Let's Get Yate Moving
Yate Travel and Transport Recommendations.

A working group of Yate and Dodington Councillors, concerned at the lack of any strategic approach to the transport issues affecting our town has interrogated local authority data, and spoken with residents to identify key strategic issues facing Yate. This Paper identifies the issues facing the town and calls upon South Gloucestershire Council as transport authority to respond to these issues and identify specific funding, action plans and associated timelines.

The paper addresses the current problems identified as arising from current residential development, for which catch up funding is required. It calls upon South Gloucestershire Council as highways authority to set out a strategy for addressing the traffic and transport problems our residents face on a daily basis.

All new development gives rise to additional demands. Our responses to the Draft Joint Strategy Transport Plan (December 2016) identify our concerns about the proposed land use strategy and highway implications, but this document is focussed upon the very real problems we currently face as a community and calls for action on those.

The recommendations are based on the data we have gathered from statutory agencies, and from the views and experiences of the residents of our town through residents’ surveys delivered door to door by us as their councillors.

1. Commuters

As long ago as the 2010 Joint Transport Plan the problems for commuters in and out of Yate were recognised. We are surprised that despite that South Gloucestershire Council has no origin and destination data from the town, only basic traffic monitor figures show the daily movement in and out of the three key western exits from the town.

This data shows movements are about equal\(^1\) from each main exit, but does not show origin or destination data, so it is impossible to use the limited data to map demand patterns or model changes in transport opportunities. It does show the total movements in and out of the town per day is over 63,000, spread across 5 possible routes. The key westbound routes are trying to cope with over 500 vehicles an hour in the peak periods. There is no data on congestion delay duration, but queues on the A432 regularly reach back to Nibley and on the Iron Acton bypass as far as Iron Acton. There is evidence from the accident data about the impact of these queues on cycle/motor cycle accidents.

Recommendation 1. That origin and destination data be obtained as a matter of urgency to facilitate traffic modelling and prioritise action.

The 2010 Joint Transport Plan included a ‘Yate Package’ but no detail was specified in the Plan, and the ‘Package’ was included within Policy CS4 and Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy. South Gloucestershire Council has been unable to give any indication as to the implementation of the Package. We have commented on the draft 2016 Plan and call for more detail together with an implementation timeline to ensure action in this next plan period.

\(^1\) Two way AADT data 2015 on Goose Green Way/ North Road junction 16185 – 11938 of which continue along towards Winterbourne, the turning off e.g. at Latteridge; two way AADT on A432 by the station 15088; two way AADT data 2015 on the Westerleigh Road between Rodford Elm and Westerleigh village 13029. Additional smaller flows of 8194 head north to Wickwar and 10852 head east through Old Sodbury.
The Package is described in the Atkins 2012 report as comprising:

- Improved bus services between Chipping Sodbury and Yate and Bristol and North Fringe;
- Extension of future Rapid Transit services using the Temple Meads – Emersons Green route to Yate via Westerleigh;
- A new ‘Yate town’ bus service;
- A Yate / Chipping Sodbury walking and cycling network;
- New cycling routes from Chipping Sodbury and Yate to Bradley Stoke and Downend;
- Nibley Park & Ride;
- Improvements to Yate railway station, car park and passenger interchange, together with provision of a half-hourly train service to and from Bristol;
- Contributions towards the Ring Road Package, Greater Bristol Metro and extension of the A38 Showcase Bus Corridor to Thornbury; and
- Extension of smart ticketing opportunities.

None of this in the vicinity of Yate has been implemented in whole or part, (despite being part of the 2010-2016 strategy). We require it all to be implemented.

This was the Package in the 2010 Joint Transport Plan, and consultation is currently under way towards implementing the next plan. The only element which has had any money spent on it has been the Ring Road work, but that does not address the immediate congestion and transport problems faced in and adjoining the town. We consider this complete failure to invest in implementing this aspect of the plan to be inexplicable and unacceptable and we ask that this is rectified.

We are concerned at the continuing delays in implementation of even the rail frequency – with it being delayed technically, and then delayed for discussion with Gloucestershire about through running to Gloucestershire, then subject to possible delays because of the changes between Temple Mead and Parkway and then track doubling at Filton, and major works at Temple Meads East. The physical capacity of the trains is actually preventing growth in use, as trains are sometimes so full people are not allowed on.

**Recommendation 2: That the Yate related elements of the Package be delivered within three years to a costed timeline. And that the improvements to rail services be introduced this spring (2017).**

However, since then the problem has worsened. The loss of employment sites in the town to residential development, coupled with the growth in population from the additional 671 dwellings completed in the past three years - a growth of 10% in dwellings- means more people need to commute to work., with all but a handful of those dwellings being on former employment land.

Commuting imposes a disproportionate burden on those in low wage jobs, as the cost of commuting represents a proportionate percentage of their gross earnings. We are disappointed that South Gloucestershire’s Core Strategy allocated less land for employment that the new housing represents, therefore producing a net increase in the need for people to travel out of town to work. This is exacerbated the lack of any progress by South Gloucestershire Council in relation to the intensification of the current employment areas to the west of the town.

South Gloucestershire Council has been unable to supply any data on the loss of jobs within
the town, and its impact on commuting, but even with the 10% growth in housing the growth in commuting must be more than that as there has not been additional employment provided in the town for these new dwellings and they are all built on former employment land. Data on jobs trends as well as housing trends needs to be gathered and analysed by the highways authority to understand the growth in commuter problems. Does this need to be a standalone recommendation?

Young people are particularly reliant upon public transport to access employment, and so we are not surprised that in the latest data published by South Gloucestershire Council on youth employment (June 2015 Labour Market Briefing) Yate Central has the highest percentage of 18 – 24 year olds claiming JSA of any ward in South Gloucestershire. Lack of transport has a real impact on accessing the work place. Across all age groups Yate has above national average out of work benefit rates, as of May 2016, matched only by the other priority neighbourhoods. With over 11% of the 16-64 age group population in the area adjoining Station Road being in receipt of out of work benefits and 20% of children living in poverty. Yate is showing the same resistance to home working as is seen across Europe – with negligible growth in it.

The 2010 JTP was based upon the 2001 census, but we have drawn upon the 2011 census (itself predating the more recent housing growth). Over 73% of people living in Yate and Chipping Sodbury travel to work by car according to the 2011 census, 9% walk,- a figure that has not changed since 2001. Slightly fewer now cycle (3.6% against 4% in 2001) and dramatically fewer travel by bus (2.7% compared to 4% in 2001) and 1.6% travel by train. These figures run counter to more general trends, with the reduction of cycling and dramatic reduction in reliance upon buses for commuting. This correlates with the feedback from residents who complain that buses do not go to centres of employment, and services change so frequently that they cannot rely upon buses for employment decisions. Just under 13,000 commuters travel by car every day from Yate/Sodbury.

We are not the first to identify this crucial and growing problem, for example the Atkins Report in 2012 identified traffic congestion in peak periods including the town centre junctions, A432 and, B4069 and to this we would add the Westerleigh /Rodford Elm/ Nibley lane area. We have identified the following current rush hour issues:

- rush hour queues in and out of town on Station Road and Goose Green Way
- rat running through Rodford Elm and Nibley Lane to avoid Station Road congestion
- congestion on Scott Way and Goose Green Way approaching the town centre at school times, rush hours and weekend peaks
- congestion at the A432 Lozenge roundabout
- congestion on ring road and A432 junction onto the ring road from the Yate direction and the Hambrook junction from the Yate direction.
- lack of access to main employment centres in under 30 minutes (JLTP fig 7.4)
- inadequacy of modal shift opportunities
  - lack of bus routes to key employment centres e.g. Ememsons Green or Filton distorting where people can work
  - inadequacy of train services in terms of frequency, capacity, hours of operation and destinations
  - cost of public transport
  - lack of access to transport hub in town centre / parking for bus hub
  - public transport cost to centres of employment and the unreliability of those public transport routes discourage public transport reliant employment (for example the changes this year to bus routes to Ememsons, Southmead, UWE and Bristol undermine public transport reliant commuting)
South Gloucestershire Council needs to compile data on key employment locations within 30 / 60 minutes’ drive, map appropriate commuter routes and seem to ensure there is adequate capacity for residents to access those sites, by chosen mode, whether cycle, car or public transport. Does this need to be a standalone recommendation?

We are extremely concerned that in response to our inquiries, South Gloucestershire Council has been unable to identify any current funded proposals to address any of these issues (or even to carry out basic data gathering). Whilst some might be addressed in a future phase of the Metrobus scheme, nothing is currently allocated and funded.

**Recommendation 3** We call for an integrated town commuter strategy to ensure access at low cost of key centres of employment, and a reduction in congestion. This will need to include modeling to demonstrate the impact on in town commuter flows (including rat running) and flows on routes from the town to employment centres. We believe this will need works that enable vehicles to leave town by the nearest key route, rather than cutting across residential rat runs to key routes – but we consider modeling followed by public consultation on detailed options is required to seek to address even current congestion needs.

The considerable increase in commuting since the 2010 plan means there is a need for more radical solutions. We consider there is an urgent need to

- Build the Stover Link Road, to connect the Iron Action bypass/Goose Green Way roundabout to the A432, to enable people to enter and leave the town centre by the nearest route and reduce pressure on Station Road.
- Improve Nibley Lane to reduce the accident dangers from vehicles using it to avoid Station Road congestion.

These are essential without waiting for any major new roads which may or may not be funded in the longer term.

**Recommendation 4** We call upon South Gloucestershire Council to draw up a fully funded implementation plan to address all of these issues within 3 years. These are current problems and need to be addressed before additional vehicles from new development add to the problems. This will need to include the Stover Link Road and Nibley Lane improvements set out above.

The position in relation to access to hospitals and other key services has worsened dramatically since the Package was identified in 2010. At that point none of Yate was within access of a hospital within 30 mins in JLTP fig 73 and that was BEFORE Frenchay closed. Now, with Southmead as the nearest hospital and only limited public transport access, there is a crisis in access to health facilities. We are encountering massive pressures on community transport facilities to try to address this problem. The Package needs to be revised to include specific provision for access to hospital facilities for patients and visitors.

**Recommendation 5** That the Package be revised to make specific provision for reliable and suitable public transport access to Southmead as the nearest hospital for patients and visitors.

2. Moving about within Yate

Our second package of concerns relate to the impact of the growth in the size of town of 10% already upon town centre issues. The town centre is increasingly used as a sub regional
destination, with a growth in traffic movements into the town centre far higher than the
growth in housing numbers to date.

The Town Centre owners funded South Gloucestershire Council to carry out a Town Centre
study as part of their consent to build Tesco. This has now been open five years, but the study
has not been published, and no remedial action taken. We have sought to obtain the
information via a FOI request, but have been refused access on the basis it remains a draft
report. We consider this unacceptable after five years.

We are particularly concerned about the congestion in the town centre at school rush hour,
particularly at each end of Link Road.

Cotswold Way / Heron Way junction – this has historically been an accident black spot, with
the current turning bans doing nothing to prevent fatal accidents, but greatly inconveniencing
local people. People from Heron Way wanting to head into Chipping Sodbury have to turn
left, go onto the Scott Way roundabout and execute a U turn. This adds to congestion on what
is currently a dangerous roundabout. Work is needed to redesign the Cotswold Way /
Kennedy Way /Heron Way junction to make it safer and enable a full set of turning
movements.

Recommendation 6 That the Town Centre Traffic Study be published immediately for
consultation and that urgent action be taken to resolve the Heron Way / Cotswold Road
Junction, and to ease school rush hour congestion in the town centre.

The JTP 2010 Package included a proposal for bus routes within the town to enable people to
get about within the town easily. The 2012 Atkins report included recommendations for this,
for improved pedestrian and cycling routing, and for enhanced car access to the town centre.
No action has been taken to implement these recommendations.

Congestion in the town centre (and difficulty of accessing buses to other locations that only
go through the town centre) makes it vital to put in place quickly a public transport network
within the town, low cost, one day £1 ticket to enable travel anywhere in the town for a £1 for
the day to encourage movements by public transport; a round town bus route to enable
movements within the town. Since the 2010 plan the new town centre bus area has been
installed. Despite overwhelming local protests this continues to provide inadequate shelter
and needs extension.

Recommendation 7 That a round town bus and £1 all day bus fare be implemented
immediately together with improved bus shelters in the town centre.

Atkins in 2012 identified a problem with poor links to the train Station and industrial areas
from most of the town, and particularly by bike and cycle from the north of the town. They
also identified that the signage of pedestrian and cycle links is poor and does not give
directions to destinations such as the town centre and station, in Atkins words (2012) ‘it is
therefore difficult for someone new to walking or cycling to negotiate the network
comfortably’. We have witnessed a deterioration of facilities for pedestrians and cyclists -
most particularly despite our objection consent has been given for more housing on Broad
Lane, which is a primary cycle and pedestrian route to Brimsham Green School and the site
of two serious accidents in the five year period for which figures have been supplied.

Recommendation 8 That development control protects existing cycling routes and
extends them wherever opportunities arise, and that an integrated signage strategy for
within the town is implemented.
The Atkins report in 2012 identified limited passenger facilities at Yate Station, the hourly service, and poor access to the station, poor bus interchange facilities and lack of measures for cyclists using Station Road as key issues requiring action. Accident figures confirm the issue for cyclists on Station Road. We have sought funding to address these issues as a community project, unsuccessfully from GWR and now require it to be done from SGC funding.

We are told that the draft LTCP for 2016/17 included a provision scheme for the A432 at the station junction. Nothing has been done to implement it. This is an important and urgent scheme with high levels of pedestrian movements and vehicle turning movements at peak times. We were also informed that traffic signal coordination enhancements would be carried out on Station Road to improve peak period traffic flows. We have not seen any noticeable improvement.

Recommendation 9 That the facilities at Yate Station be improved to provide shelter, covered ticketing area, better access, better bus interchange, self-service bike hire stands and better measures for cyclists on Station Road. And that the improvements to Station Road in the draft LTCP for 2016/17 be implemented this year.

3. Accident blackspots in town

We have analysed the accident figures for the town for the period 1 January 2010 – 30 November 2015. Apart from the Rodford Way junction, the following issues need to be addressed:

- Scott Way / Link Road roundabout
The problem here is a lack of lane marking, with vehicles going from Link Road into Scott Way i.e. straight ahead, behind hit by vehicles coming down the A432 from the east and not recognising the vehicles are going straight on. This is the source of the most near miss complaints as well as producing a number of reported accidents
- 2 cyclist injury accidents, on Broad Lane, one serious. This is the main approach to Brimsham green School, is a cycleway as well as having extensive pedestrian access movements to School but with only a narrow pavement. There are further residential development applications there
- Goose Green Way / Peg Hill traffic light junction – rear end chunts, possibly caused by the different phasing of sections of the lights misleading drivers
- The A432 and Goose Green Way are the source of most serious accidents (7/12) and both fatal accidents. An analysis of the accidents is needed to establish common features (vehicle turning movements?)
- We are also concerned at the puzzling distribution of serious accidents by time. There are only two serious injuries between midnight and 1pm, with the serious accidents spread through the afternoon and evening, with both fatal accidents in the evening. The peak period for accidents of all kinds is 5 – 7pm, with more accidents then than between 7pm and 8 am. This suggests the evening rush hour congestion is not merely about congestion and frustration but also produces a disproportionately high number of accidents (20 in each hour).
- Width of pavement outside Firgrove House leading to pedestrian risk
- Vehicles turning, reversing and pedestrian movements outside Westerleigh Road stores
- Turning movements from Station Road into Andrew Millman Court / the rear of Ridgewood
- Station Road past the Cow Mills - the layout makes the width for cyclists limited, and vehicles go past them too tight.
- White Lion Station Road/ Church Rd junction and puffin crossing produces a range of issues.
- Issues for pedestrians and cyclists at the Lozenge roundabout at the junction of Westerleigh Road / Station Road
- North Road / Goose Green Way junction causing rear end chunts
- Church Road – bridge lights and speed humps causing rear end chunts
- A number of cyclist turning movement related issues on Station Road – along the length from the Station to the Lozenge where there are multiple turning movements of cars and cycles. Some of this is the result of congestion leading to cyclists moving past stationery cars.
- We note the number of cycle accidents involving roundabouts where drivers are not paying attention to cyclists.

Recommendation 10: That urgent action be taken on the Scott Way roundabout, Heron Way junction Station access junction and Broad Lane, and to investigated and include the other items in the work plan as quickly as possible.

4. Governance and Vision

We are concerned that whilst we have a joint cycleways group, that brings together the highway authority local user groups and parish councils, there is no equivalent forum for other transportation issues.

Recommendation 11: That an effective forum be established for local residents, users, providers and senior council figures with decision making responsibility be convened regularly to look across the full spread of travel and transport needs for the Yate area, to establish a travel and transport strategy and monitor its implementation.

Our future vision for travel and transport for Yate is:
- Improved connectivity and accessibility by sustainable modes throughout the town linking to the town centre and across the town
- High quality well signposted links for pedestrian and cycling links throughout the town
- A step change in bus services to transform accessibility to key centres of employment and key services such as hospitals
- Park and Ride at Nibley
- Improved quality and frequency of rail services
- Mitigation of traffic congestion in the town, key commuter routes, and rat running through junction improvements and new road links
- Improved travel choices

Recommendation 12: That a vision for travel and transport for Yate be adopted by the Highways Authority following consultation with residents, and steps taken to implement the required actions.

Appendix: Yate Town Council Submission to Joint Strategic Transport Plan Consultation 2016

Q8 Are there any other schemes you would like to see in the package?

We would like to see more conversion of the current and future Metrobus routes to light rail and the introduction of tram trains, for example to get to the Mall at Cribbs Causeway. It is important that services from north of the M4 are express services,
not ones that stop frequently within the urban Bristol area, otherwise journey times will be too long to be attractive. We would like an expansion of the MetroWest project, with more station openings.

The proposals for the Yate area are woefully inadequate.

- Station improvements – we have been promised these improvements for many years, in successive plans, but they have not been delivered. Our current services often leave people on platforms with trains too full to squeeze people on, so there is a risk these proposals will just deliver a catching up not a radical improvement. We welcome the proposals, as a contribution to sorting out the problems but are concerned to ensure this is not seen as a solution to commuter issues as it only serves about 2% of commuters.

- MetroBus – It is noted that this would be “ordinary buses”, and we have very recent local history of bus services being reduced and eliminated by First Bus at their sole discretion. The Metrobus services must have a firm contractual basis to make sure that this does not happen again. However it is unclear how space will be found for it in the urban area, given the 40% growth of population and therefore the corresponding town centre pressure.

- Park and Ride – This has been promised for so long that the land originally zoned for it is now not large enough. The original concept was that it would only be served by the buses that were passing anyway on the main road. The Park and Ride needs to be much better integrated into the Metrobus system – and needs to be provided immediately not in the distant future. Pinchpoint schemes and junction improvements – Not enough information about what you see as pinchpoints has been provided to enable us to comment.

- We are extremely concerned that there is no mention of any work to address traffic and transport problems with the Yate/Sodbury conurbation. You may consider that a ‘detail’ but it is not more of a ‘detail’ than addressing ‘pinchpoints’. We consider the document should recognise the need to invest in a traffic and transport project within the town as well as between the town and other locations. The two are inextricably linked, not least given the plan appears to show the Metrobus running right through the town centre, reducing highway capacity.

- Winterbourne / Frampton Cotterell bypass – A proper link needs to be established all the way from North Yate to the Avon Ring Road, without gaps in the middle of this strategic B4058 route, which already has traffic backing up in both rush hours.

- New road to M4. If this is to be built, it is essential that it serves all parts of Yate/Sodbury and careful modelling is carried out to ensure it will not worsen rat running through the town or villages e.g. it must extend from Nibley across to the Iron Acton bypass to take traffic from the north of Yate as well as the south.

We also wish to propose additional traffic mitigation measures:
- Yate also needs a proper link from the Station Road A432 corridor to the B4058, possibly on the lines of the Stover Road Link that was proposed some time ago. This should include walking and cycling facilities – and to ensure traffic from the northern part of the town can access the A432 and proposed M4 link, rather than rat running through the town.

- Most of the proposed Yate / Sodbury strategic development locations are isolated from the existing settlements, and close attention needs to be paid to integrating them with the present towns. Not everyone will be able to travel by car, nor is this desirable. Public transport, walking and cycling routes will be very important.

- Therefore walking and cycling packages need to be added to the mitigation measures.

- Walking and cycling also need to be integrated into any major road developments.

Re-prioritising the A432 corridor for public transport and cycling will reduce the effective capacity for other users. This supports the need to improve the B4058 corridor and links, and possibly other routes from Yate / Sodbury to employment areas.

It is very disappointing that the Yate Spur and North Yate to Winterbourne cycle routes are not mentioned at all, even though they have already been identified as strategic links in the South Glos Cycling Strategy. Both these routes have a potential to increase the number of people able to cycle from residential areas of Yate/Chipping Sodbury to work places and educational establishments in the East Fringe and development and enterprise areas, and also to reduce cyclist accidents. In fact we were disappointed by the lack of detail regarding strategic routes and cycle routes in general despite the emphasis placed on them in the text.

The North Yate to Winterbourne cycle route would needs to be integrated if the proposed Winterbourne / Frampton Cotterell ‘bypass’ proceeds and our suggested B4058 improvements between the bypass and the Yate fringe.

The proposed “new road and cycle link north from this (new) motorway junction to Yate” needs to be discussed with local cycling groups so that it can be integrated into the existing facilities at both ends – for example, where is it going to link into south of the M4?

The Badminton Road/Station Road corridor is already heavily congested, with the Nibley/Stover Road area an existing pinch point. The new houses allocated in the North Yate New Neighbourhood in the Core Strategy will significantly worsen the congestion there. Adding in traffic from another 2,600 homes around Yate/Sodbury and 1,500 at Coalpit Heath and a motorway link funneling yet more traffic into this pinch point will bring the area to a standstill. There is no mention in the JTS of how this problem might be addressed.

Pinchpoint schemes and junction improvements”. Re-designing junctions is not
enough, there needs to be a comprehensive analysis of the current and predicted traffic flows around Yate and major measures, such as a new by-pass, are likely to be required to maintain satisfactory circulation. Otherwise people will not be able to access the Park and Ride and the station. Local shuttle buses also need to be considered to help people access the core public transport routes and reduce congestion caused by local journeys.

We would like to see a self-service, bike sharing scheme at public transport nodes and other locations, like the one in London, with good signing including distances for walking and cycling.

We also believe that the next 20 years will see an increase in people wishing to work from home as an alternative to commuting. Therefore the provision of high speed broadband everywhere is an important element of reducing congestion on our roads and making more locations sustainable places to live.

Q9 Do you have any other comments about the proposed transport vision?

We believe the ambition in this study is much too low for an area growing as rapidly as the West of England. There is far too much reliance on non-segregated bus routes, which we do not believe will provide the swift, reliable journeys that will make public transport an attractive alternative to car use. The timing of the delivery of the infrastructure in relation to the delivery of the new housing is critical.

The current plans for a Park and Ride at Nibley are insufficient to mitigate even the existing development allocated in the Core Strategy, let alone further development in the area. The package proposed includes prioritising Badminton Road for buses and cyclists but even with a new motorway link road, it would be difficult to provide a segregated lane through Coalpit Heath due to the constraints of the built environment and the need for people living there to be able to drive to and from their properties. In Q3, we agreed with the principle of diverting non-local traffic but the top priority should be to divert people on to public transport rather than simply diverting their vehicles on to new roads. The new road connections mentioned in Q7 should be primarily to facilitate the public transport and cycling routes, by providing somewhere to which you can divert non-local traffic and enabling people to access public transport nodes like Park and Rides and railway stations.

In addition we are disappointed in the lack of detail regarding freight movements outside the major urban areas. Heavy goods vehicles already cause serious congestion and danger/damage on many minor roads, and also existing congestion on the Yate / Sodbury links to the Ring Road and Bristol deters employment in this sector locally – transport firms need to minimise travel times, and they will not relocate to congested areas without the appropriate supported infrastructure being available.
Real Homes & Green Fields

May 2017
Introduction

For a long time, residents have been opposing new residential development on green field sites, and at the same time continuing to express concern about the inability of first time buyers to join the property ladder, the pressure to rent rooms in houses rather than establishing their own home and the pressures on elderly people unable to find bungalows to downsize to and unable to afford retirement home schemes.

Government approaches to housing need have long assumed that building more houses of the kind developers want to build will address these issues. It assumes that houses are like tins of baked beans, if you increase supply price drops. Critics of this approach point to inelasticities in the pricing of properties, not least the influence of new development upon property prices, and the control over new development prices exerted by developers. Work carried out for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in 2007 offers a complex model for assessing this.

This report looks at the evidence for whether the massive amount of house-building that has taken place and continues apace in Thornbury and Yate has had an impact upon the ability of two groups – the young and the ageing - to meet their housing needs.

This report connects up data on income, housing supply and actual property prices to suggest there is a real problem that is not being addressed by current supply side approaches. It concludes that releasing green fields for housing development is destroying our countryside, without having an impact on housing affordability and that a different approach is needed that protects green fields from development and delivers truly affordable housing.

We recognise there is complexity to the question, but consider the headline figures in bold in this report require further urgent work to ensure local people can afford housing whilst also protecting our open spaces which are crucial to the quality of life of all residents.

1. Income and borrowing capacity.

The median income in Thornbury & Yate constituency is £21,497, and the median for full time employees £27,628 (as compared to the South Gloucestershire wide 2016 figure of £29.752). This conceals some very significant differences in income.

---

4 Ibid
5 ASHE Survey (ONS 2015)
Mortgage lenders vary in their approach. Some will lend up to 95% of value, but using online comparison data to source mortgages suggests lenders will lend a maximum of £118,000 on the local average full-time income. Where more than one income can be used to underpin borrowing this figure can be increased, although the increase for the second income varies.

Shelter advises that families should not spend more than 35% of their income on housing after tax and benefits. This means that even if a sufficiently large deposit can be mustered for someone to purchase their first home, they are unlikely to be able to afford the mortgage repayments within that figure. A BBC website enables people to check what sort of deposit / monthly rent / mortgage repayments they need to secure a property at the bottom of the market in each local authority area. It suggests that even at the cheaper end of the market local people need to be able to pay £675 to rent a one bed flat and would need a deposit of over £7,000 with monthly repayments over £600 to be able to purchase, even if they could find a property to purchase.

ONS data indicates the impact of age upon average income, suggesting the median wage is only obtained on average when people enter their 30s. So the borrowing capacity of under 30s is lower.

The mean income for pensioners on the last published ONS Parliamentary interactive map (2012) was £13,800 (median £11,100). This impacts upon the capacity of pensioners to meet the service charges associated with retirement home developments, irrespective of their ability to meet capital costs from property sales.

Whilst South Gloucestershire as a whole is one of the 20% least deprived areas of the UK, it has 17 LSOAs within the most deprived 20% of areas nationally, indicating a significant inequality across the area.

---

6 http://www.knowyourmoney.co.uk/mortgage-calculators/how-much-could-i-borrow-calculator/?gclid=CKkngyB8ptQCFcWVGwodyzoAfQ
7 http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-23234033
8 http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/1acb0de0-07fa-11e2-a2d8-00144feabd0.html?ft_site=falcon#axzz4j8FlWnA2
2. Housing supply
In 2015/16 a total of 1107 net additional dwellings were constructed across the whole of South Gloucestershire. Within Yate and Chipping Sodbury, the focus of this report, 222 completions of new properties took place in 2015-16, with 69 in Thornbury and 68 in the rural areas.

New build is not addressing the needs of older residents either.
- None of the new dwellings constructed in Yate/Sodbury were bungalows in the two year period 2015 – 2017.
- Retirement flats in Yate/Sodbury were all above the price of an average house in the area:
  - Coopers 44 flats (2012 consent) with prices for resale in the past two years all over £199,95.
  - Barnhill Court 60 flats (Built 2015) with prices from £235,000 - £349,000.

New development is required to include a proportion of ‘Affordable Housing’. The precise basis for the South Gloucestershire approach can be seen in the 2015 SHMA and subsequent discussion during the PSP process.

However underpinning that complexity is the stark reality that the government definition of ‘affordable’ to purchase as a starter home is up to £250,000 – set out in the Housing and Planning Act 2016 (s.2) as being the price cap for starter homes outside of London. A price well beyond the means of local first time buyers (indeed Shelter estimates nationally it is beyond the reach of 97% of first time buyers). So even the ‘affordable’ housing element is not truly affordable.

3. House prices
Using Land Registry data:

In the past two years (May 2015 – 2017)
- In Yate and Chipping Sodbury 22 flats and 2 houses have sold for £118k or less.
- In Frampton Cotterell / Coalpit Heath – one property was sold for £118k or less in the two year period
- In the Thornbury area – 4 properties were sold for £118k or less.

Not one of them was a new build. This suggests that new build is not relevant to the question of housing supply for average income first time buyers in the area. It is not helping address the problem of affordability and is needlessly destroying green fields.

---

11 Ibid.
13 Land Registry
The average house price in the constituency in 2015 -16 was £245,500. The median house prices to median earnings ratio on the most recently published DLCG data is 7 times average earnings. Data from the SHMA work in 2015 indicates that whilst house prices rose in the period 2001 – 2008 within South Gloucestershire the rise since then, particularly for lower quartile prices, has been very limited. There is no correlation we can find between the availability of new build and house prices i.e. there is no evidence of supply affecting prices in this economic area. More housing does not mean cheaper housing.

The cheapest new build property coming to market was a flat in Yate for £148,000. The cheapest new build retirement property was in Yate and sold for £205,000.

It is these headline figures, which we consider gives rise to the need for South Gloucestershire Council and the Metro Mayor to take action to ensure our young people have the capacity to settle and creates homes of their own here and to stop thinking that building ever more houses on green fields will do anything to address this issue.

The 2016 SHMA report suggests 45.7% of new households cannot afford to buy or rent in the market, amounting to 1000 households a year in South Gloucestershire unable to even enter the rental market. Our data on actual property prices indicates the severity of this gap.

4. Conclusions

We see five key problems in the Thornbury and Yate that are specifically to do with housing affordability. We do not see that current planning policies, which are focussed upon releasing endless green field sites at the benest of developers will do anything to address any of them and urge that addressing them becomes the focal point of planning strategy. We call upon the strategic planning authorities, South Gloucestershire Council, the office of the Metro Mayor and the DCLG to address these challenges so our families can afford to live here and so that the planning authorities do not release more open space for housing development.

1. No new builds for sale are at a price that average wage earners can afford. So the notion of building to meet housing need is a myth.
2. Rented properties cost more than mortgages, but high prices on new properties are driving expectations and therefore restricting the ability to buy existing houses.
3. No new builds are bungalows, this is creating a block on property movement.
4. There is insufficient affordable extra care provision to provide the genuine 'move through' communities with mixed levels of support needs, and the facilities that are promised do not exist or are short lived.

---

14 Median house prices ONS House price statistics for small areas.
15 Land Registry
16 Land Registry
5. The word 'affordable' in the context of government housing strategy is a complete misnomer and should always be in quotation marks, as no family on average wages locally could afford them.

There are, of course, related issues eg to do with social care to enable people to remain in their own homes, however the focus of the report is upon the myth that if more and more green field sites are built on, housing will become affordable.

1. No new builds for sale are at a price that average wage earners can afford. So the notion of building to meet housing need and make housing more affordable is a myth.

Over the last two years, when new builds have been coming on line at a high rate in the Yate/Sodbury area, not one has been at a price a first time buyer on even average local wage could afford. The new build market is therefore doing nothing to address the needs of people wanting to buy their first home. The maximum mortgage a person on an average local wage can afford is £118k. (Data on sale prices - Land Registry)

2. Rented properties cost more than mortgages, but high prices on new properties are driving expectations and therefore restricting the ability to buy existing houses.

Only 24 existing dwellings, almost all flats have come on the market in Yate/Sodbury at a price that an average income earner locally could afford. There is no evidence of market forces meaning new house supply is controlling price inflation. Many of our residents are caught unable to get a foot on the ladder and being forced to pay high rents and often only able to afford a rented room.

3. Not one of the new builds are bungalows, this is creating a block on property movement. It is twenty years since there was any addition to the bungalow stock in Yate/Sodbury

We understand the SGC density issues. However in design terms this means we are producing a distorted housing supply. Six bedroomed houses are being built, but no bungalows. As a result bungalows are in such short supply locally that estate agents have queues. Hardly any come onto the market. Recently a resident wrote to the local papers explaining the effect of this lack of bungalows upon them and their friends. It is preventing them moving to a smaller more manageable home - with impacts upon their ability to remain independent and an impact on the housing market.

4. There is insufficient affordable extra care provision to provide genuine 'move through' communities with mixed levels of support needs, and the facilities that are promised do not exist or are short lived.

The extra care provision that has been built locally is too little to address the need. As a result people who are relatively able but need small levels of support and would benefit the scheme initially but then gradually be able to
move through support are not able to get a place. The original proposed mix is not being realised. The overwhelming bulk of new build housing for older people has been flats for sale, with prices which are prohibitive for local people.

5. The word 'affordable' in the context of government housing strategy is a complete misnomer and should always be in quotation marks, as no family on average wages locally could afford them (£250,000).

   This creates a false understanding in the community and leads to feelings that decision makers do not understand what is affordable to people on the average local income.
Yate Sodbury Dodington Liberal Democrat Response to

Joint Spatial Plan: Issues and Options

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 ration 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 see 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 tyoepes 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 an 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
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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 mines 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.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
Yate maps badly onto the criteria so should not be selected:

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 transport links.

Contact
C Willmore, on behalf of Yate Sodbury Dodington Liberal Democrats - councillors and members.
3 church farm close yate BS37 5BZ
chriswillmore@blueyonder.co.uk
Protocol for Marking the Death of a Senior National Figure or Local Holder of High Office

This protocol (based on the guidance provided by the National Association of Civic Offices to LAs) provides a procedure to follow for marking the death of the reigning Sovereign, other senior members of the Royal Family and certain national figures or local holders of high office, listed below, to ensure the appropriate response is made by the district in such circumstances and will be implemented by the Chief Executive, or Head of Governance, Legal and Democratic Services, in her absence.

It may also be appropriate to use elements of the procedure when responding to an incident which has led to a large number of deaths, for example, a terrorist attack or major incident. (Refer also to the Council’s Strategic Emergency Plan and Recovery Plan.) This would apply if a National Day of Mourning was announced by 10 Downing Street.

This protocol sets out the action to be taken by South Gloucestershire Council in the event of the death of:

- HRH The Queen (State Funeral)
- HRH The Duke of Edinburgh (Ceremonial Royal Funeral)
- HRH The Prince of Wales (Ceremonial Royal Funeral)
- HRH The Duchess of Cornwall
- HRH The Duke of Cambridge
- HRH The Duchess of Cambridge
- HRH Prince George of Cambridge
- HRH Princess Charlotte of Cambridge
- HRH Prince Henry (Harry) of Wales
It will be appropriately adjusted in relation to:

- The Prime Minister
- Any former Prime Minister
- The Members of Parliament for the constituencies of which the District of South Gloucestershire forms a part
- A serving Chair or Leader of the Council
- A serving member of the Council

Contact details for all those with responsibilities under this protocol are set out in Appendix 5 (exempt) to this protocol.

This protocol was approved by:

Cllr Matthew Riddle, Leader of Council
Date: July 2017

Amanda Deeks, Chief Executive
Date: July 2017

This Protocol is to be reviewed annually with the first review to take place no later than July 2018.
PART 1      Implementation of the Protocol on hearing of the death

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Authorised by</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Gloucestershire Council’s Protocol will be implemented on the formal announcement of the death of any one of those persons named on pages 1-2 of this document.</td>
<td>Chief Executive, Leader of Council or by the Head of Governance, Legal and Democratic Services.</td>
<td>Flags to be lowered immediately and books of condolence to be opened on the next working day.  (<a href="http://www.royal.gov.uk">www.royal.gov.uk</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be liaison with the Lord Lieutenant of Gloucestershire’s office throughout the process.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of Strategic Communications to be advised. Communications to issue press release with relevant details to ensure public are informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the event of the death of the Sovereign, Appendix 4 gives the summary of key actions for the council and timeline.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Executive to notify all Councillors and staff by email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item to be placed on Council’s website and intranet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PART 2 Flag flying**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Implemented by</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Immediately** at the request of the Leader of Council or Chief Executive, Union flag to be flown and lowered to half-mast. | The Head of Property & Business Services  
At Badminton Road council offices by the duty caretaker  
At the Civic Centre, Kingswood by the duty caretaker | All flagpoles at Council buildings to fly Union flag at half-mast to adopt practice to be followed for Government buildings.  
(Guidance given in Appendix 1.)  
If the death falls on St. George’s Day or the period of mourning includes St. George’s Day, the flag of the Patron Saint should be replaced by the Union Flag at half-mast. |
| **Applicable only following the death of the Sovereign:**                        |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                              |
| **On Proclamation Day** (D+1) (day following the death of the Sovereign, when the new Sovereign is proclaimed) flags to be raised to full mast at 11.00am and flown throughout the day at full mast. **On the day following Proclamation Day** (D+2) they will be returned to half-mast at 1.00pm. | The Head of Property & Business Services  
At Badminton Road council offices by the duty caretaker  
At the Civic Centre, Kingswood by the duty caretaker |                                                                                                                                              |
| **On Subsequent Days:** Following the death of the Sovereign or other member of the Royal Family identified in the list on pages 1-2, flags will continue to be flown at half-mast until 08.00am on the day following the funeral (D+11). For all others identified in the list on pages 1-2, flags in South Gloucestershire will fly at half-mast on the day of the announcement of the death. On subsequent days the usual local arrangements will resume (see note opposite) until the day of the funeral when they will again fly at half-mast. | The Head of Property & Business Services  
At Badminton Road council offices by the duty caretaker  
At the Civic Centre, Kingswood by the duty caretaker | The funeral of the Sovereign will take place 10 days after the day of death. For other senior members of the Royal Family the number of days will be fewer.  
The phrase “Usual local arrangements” should be read as meaning that where a flag is usually flown it can, on the day following the funeral, again be flown at full mast. If no flag is usually flown, the flag can be taken down. |
### PART 3 Books of Condolence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Implemented by</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the day following the announcement of the death of the Sovereign, The Duke of Edinburgh, The Prince of Wales or The Duchess of Cornwall, a Book of Condolence will be opened at the Badminton Road Offices, Yate and the Civic Centre, Kingswood. Consideration will be given at the time of each death on whether Books of Condolence should be opened for other members of the Royal Family. Table and chair to be positioned in each venue. Table to be covered with a tablecloth and a framed photograph of the relevant person. Pens and desk lamp (where necessary) to be provided. Books of Condolence will be open from 09.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday and will remain open until 18.00 on the day following the funeral (11 days).</td>
<td>Head of Property Services via facilities team in liaison with the Chief Executive’s office. Caretakers under the guidance of the Head of Property Services.</td>
<td>Books of Condolence (loose-leaf black folders) and a supply of paper will be supplied by the Chief Executive’s office. Black table cloths and framed photographs of the relevant person will also be supplied. Caretakers to ensure there is adequate paper available in the book. Pages that have been defaced or include offensive or other questionable comments should be quietly removed until such time as a decision can be taken at senior level (Chief Executive or Director of Corporate Resources) on whether or not they should be permanently excluded. There is a painting of The Queen (+ easel) held at Kingswood Civic Centre for citizenship ceremonies. Books may only be open during office hours. Judgement to be taken on this at the time subject to demand for use after office hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leader of Council will issue a statement via the Press Office, expressing the sadness of the Council and people of South Gloucestershire at the news of the death of ....... The statement will also appear on the home page of South Gloucestershire Council’s Website.</td>
<td>Head of Strategic Communications to have lead responsibility for ensuring the press statement is issued and posted on South Gloucestershire Council’s website homepage.</td>
<td>When a decision has been taken on the Chair of Council’s programme of events and engagements it might be stated that events are being cancelled as a mark of respect or that they will begin with a period of silence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action required</td>
<td>Implemented by</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The statement will confirm that flags are to be flown at half-mast and will give details of Books of Condolence. In the case of the death of the Sovereign or a member of the Royal Family it will also mention any arrangements for an e-Book of Condolence on the Royal website and provide the link.</td>
<td>Also to liaise with the bigger Town /Parish Councils and sign-post to any books of condolence or events they may organise in their area.</td>
<td>It is not possible for every book of condolence from all such sad occasions to form part of the Royal Archives. However, in a letter of condolence from Leader of the Council reference should be made to the Book of Condolence and its existence in the local archives which then ensures that when that letter goes in to the Royal Archives its acts as an effective cross reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the Book of Condolence has been closed the Chief Executive will discuss with the Leader of Council arrangements for binding and where the final bound version is to be lodged.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Books of Condolence are essentially a local record of sentiments by local people of the death of a national figure. They should form part of the Authority's archive for future reference on the way in which national events were marked in the area. Loose leaf pages with messages of condolence to be sent for binding at conclusion of period of mourning then placed with Gloucestershire Archives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART 4  
**Events during the period of Mourning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Action required</strong></th>
<th><strong>Implemented by</strong></th>
<th><strong>Other Notes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To review the programme of engagements undertaken by the Chair of Council to ensure it is appropriate in a time of national mourning and that it sits comfortably with the national mood.</td>
<td>The Chair of Council with the Democratic &amp; Member Services Manager, and discussion with the Chief Executive and others.</td>
<td>Careful thought should be given to all types of events and activities which are held or hosted by the Chair / Deputy Chair. Lunches, dinners and receptions may need to be cancelled or postponed. Visits to Schools by Councillors might be helpful, talking about the events that are unfolding. Decisions to be taken locally with great sensitivity. The National period of mourning is 2 weeks, the Royal Mourning period is 1 month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration should also be given to working with local faith groups to arrange some sort of Service if appropriate on the eve of the funeral, enabling local people to join together in an act of remembrance.</td>
<td>Potentially identify suitable areas where flowers can be laid – possibly areas where the proclamation is being read. (Liaise with StreetCare.) Strategic Communications team to publicise events to the public as appropriate.</td>
<td>Prayers in local churches, memorial services – likely to be arranged locally. Civic attendance will add to sense of community coming together. Useful to know which Churches are doing what and when and local councillor attendance. Coordination with the Gloucester Diocese may help with this as they have a comprehensive website and would probably issue their own guidelines. Thornbury have a ‘Churches together’ initiative where they do things ecumenically across the denominations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nationally
Proclamation Day is set to be the day following the death of the Sovereign (D+1). Proclamation to be read out at 11.00 a.m. at St. James' Palace, London (or 2.00 p.m. if on a Sunday - tbc). At 12.00 noon the Proclamation will be read out at the Royal Exchange in the City of London.

The next day (D+2), the Proclamation will be read out at 12.00 noon in Edinburgh, Cardiff and in Belfast, and a second reading at 12.30pm in Edinburgh.

### Locally
The Proclamation to be read at 12.30pm on the steps of Gloucestershire Shire Hall by High Sheriff in presence of Lord-Lieutenant.

The Leader / Chair of South Gloucestershire Council to read the Proclamation at 1.30pm at Kingswood Civic Centre. Deputy Lord Lieutenant to give an introduction.

The Mayors/Chairs of Town/Parish Councils for Bradley Stoke, Thornbury, Yate and Chipping Sodbury are invited to read the Proclamation at 1.30pm (or after) at an appropriate local venue.

All those listed in Appendix 2 to be invited to be present and advised where the proclamation will be read. Councillors to be advised to wear suitable dark attire.

### Implemented by
- Notification of the reading of the Proclamation to be given by the Chief Executive to those identified in Appendix 2.
- Strategic Communications Team to ensure that the public are informed by way of a press release and item on the Council’s website
- Strategic Communications team in liaison with facilities team to arrange access (as appropriate) and setting up of any public address system

### Other Notes
- Deputy Lieutenants from South Gloucestershire to be invited to attend.
- Wording of Proclamation to be read out will be available from the Buckingham Palace website (www.royal.gov.uk) and the Privy Council website (www.privy-council.org.uk)
- Flags to be at full mast when the Proclamation is read at 12 noon and 12.30pm.
- Flags to go to half mast at 1pm and will remain so until the day after the funeral (D 11)
- Provision should be made for the Deputy Lieutenant to offer words of introduction before the proclamation is read.
- NB: timings may have to be adjusted, depending on the time of year, etc.
- NB: Check if any Citizenship Ceremonies are taking place at this time. On the death of the Monarch the oath will need to be amended.
Reading of the Proclamation to be publicised.
Arrangements to be made for crowd control, media access and liaison with local police, town centre manager and other agencies for the managing of the occasion as necessary.

Facilities Team to manage arrangements and liaise with Strategic Communications team regarding media access

The Safety Advisor Group (SAG) may be able to assist in this process.

### PART 6 Dress Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Implemented by</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A small stock of black ties, mourning ribbons and black arm bands will be available from the Chief Executive’s office for use by the Leader of Council, Chair and Vice-Chair of Council and Chief Executive following the death of a senior figure. Councillors may wish to wear black ties/black ribbons/dark colours when conducting public business.</td>
<td>The stock to be issued and maintained in good order by the Chief Executive’s office. Chief Executive to send e-mail to Councillors inviting them to adopt this practice if they would like to do so.</td>
<td>At the time of the annual review of this protocol consideration will be given to the number of items in stock, their condition and the need for cleaning, repair or replacement. A list of suppliers for these items is set out in Appendix 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the death of the Sovereign, South Gloucestershire’s Chains of office will not be worn by the Chair or Vice Chair of Council. Consideration should be given to badges of office being worn on black neck ribbons/black tie from the day of death until and including the day of the funeral of the Sovereign

Chief Executive to consider with Chair / Vice Chair and Leader of Council.

Black ties / armbands /ribbons will be available for use by the Chair, Vice Chair and Leader during the mourning period.

NB: the period of mourning starts on proclamation day. There will be a Royal Mourning Period of 1 month.
PART 7  Marking a Silence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Implemented by</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The death of a senior national figure/or other member of the Royal Family may be marked by a National Two Minute Silence. Details will be announced by Buckingham Palace.</td>
<td>Head of Property and Business Services</td>
<td>Consideration will be given at the time of each death on whether a Silence will be kept for other members of the Royal Family. (D+8 for other senior royals.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In South Gloucestershire, where Silence is to be kept for a senior member of the Royal Family, the Leader of Council will lead a Public Silence at the council's Badminton Road offices in Yate.</td>
<td>The start and finish of the period of silence to be marked at Badminton Road by the blow of a whistle, and at Kingswood Civic Centre by a ring on the fire alarm.</td>
<td>The day of the funeral of the Sovereign is likely to be a National day of mourning where most businesses/contractors will close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The silence will also be observed at the Kingswood Civic Centre.</td>
<td>Strategic Communications team to ensure that the public are informed by way of a press release and item on the Council’s website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All those listed in Appendix 2 to be invited to be present. Recommendation that Councillors wear black ties/black ribbons /dark colours. Arm bands/ribbons to be available for Chair/ Vice Chair of Council, Leader of Council and Chief Executive.</td>
<td>Facilities Team/ Strategic Communications team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Public Observing of the Silence to be publicised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the death of the Sovereign there will be a Two Minute Silence at 11.00 a.m. on the day of the funeral (D+10 for the Sovereign).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements to be made for crowd control, media access and liaison with local police and other agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action required</td>
<td>Implemented by</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As soon as practical, a letter of condolence will be drafted and circulated to</td>
<td>Head of Strategic Communications in liaison with the Chief Executive to draft</td>
<td>In case of death of a member of the Royal family, letter to be sent to the Private Secretary of the deceased, asking that condolences be passed to the next of kin and other members of the family (except in the Sovereign’s death, which case the letter should be sent to the new Sovereign’s Private Secretary asking that condolences be passed to the new Sovereign.) In each case, other than exceptional local circumstances, one letter of condolence only should be sent on behalf of the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Leader of the Council / Chair of Council before dispatch.</td>
<td>letter of condolence ready for signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities have been advised that Books of Condolence need to be retained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locally so future generations are able to gain easy access to them. It is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not feasible for every Book from all such sad occasions to form part of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Archives, hence the request for the letter to act as an effective cross-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Flying flags at half mast

Authoritative information on flag flying can be found on the website of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

Information is also carried on the website of the Flag Institute (www.flaginstitute.org), but bear in mind that the Institute is not an official body and whilst its guidance can assist it does not carry the same weight as information from the Government.

On the formal announcement of Death, all flags are to be lowered to half-mast until 0800hrs. on the morning following the Funeral.

Half-mast means the flag is flown two-thirds of the way up the flagpole, with at least the height of the flag between the top of the flag and the top of the flagpole. Flags cannot be flown at half-mast on poles that are more than 45° from the vertical, but a mourning cravat can be used instead (see the Flag Institute's website for further details).

When a flag is to be flown at half-mast, it should first be raised all the way to the top of the mast, allowed to remain there for a second and then be lowered to the half-mast position. When it is being lowered from half-mast, it should again be raised to the top of the mast for a second before being fully lowered.

When a British national flag is at half-mast, other flags on the same stand of poles should also be at half-mast or should not be flown at all. Flags of foreign nations should not be flown, unless their country is also observing mourning.

In the case of the death of the Sovereign, the day following the death will be Proclamation Day (the day when the new Sovereign is proclaimed). On Proclamation Day flags will, at the start of the day, be flying at half mast.

All Flags will then be flown at the Mast-head from 1100hrs. on D+1 (Proclamation Day) to coincide with the Reading of the Principal Proclamation and until 1300hrs. the following day, i.e., D+2. This is because the Proclamation, having been read in London on Proclamation Day, will then be read in Belfast, Edinburgh and Cardiff on the day following Proclamation Day.
APPENDIX 2

Those who might be invited to be present
at the Reading of the Proclamation on the accession of a new Sovereign
and at the Public Observance of a Two Minute Silence

All Members of the Council
Freemen of South Gloucestershire and Honorary Aldermen
Senior Council officers
A representative Deputy Lieutenant
Past Chairs of Council
District Police Commander – Avon & Somerset Constabulary
District Fire Commander – Avon Fire & Rescue
Deputy Lieutenants from South Gloucestershire

The High Sheriff will have read the proclamation at County level but that does not prevent a Borough, District or Town Council from also inviting the High Sheriff to be present at a subsequent reading and that may be especially appropriate if the High Sheriff is a resident of the Borough, District or Town.

The Reading of the Proclamation to be held in up to 6 areas of South Gloucestershire, Councillors will be advised to attend at their local venue.
APPENDIX 3

List of possible suppliers

**Binding:** Barnard and Westwood, 23 Pakenham Street, London, WC1X 0LB (www.barnardandwestwood.com). The company can bind the loose leaf pages when the book is closed.

**Photographs:** Free downloadable Press Association images of the Royal Family will be available at www.royal.gov.uk for use by charities and non-profit making organisations (viz Councils). Site also gives details of companies from which a wider range of photographs can be purchased. Framed photographs if required can be purchased from Mike O’Keefe (mike@royalimages.co.uk), Custodian of the Official Royal Image Library of HM The Queen and HRH The Duke of Edinburgh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Held</th>
<th>Where stored</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Last Checked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black loose leaf folders (x2)</td>
<td>Chief Executive’s Office Ground floor, car park side</td>
<td>PA to the Chief Executive</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional loose leaves (quality paper &amp; plastic sleeves)</td>
<td>Badminton Road office, Yate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black ties (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black armbands (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black ribbon (1 roll of wide ribbon suitable for use as neck ribbon for Chair/Vice Chair to wear badge on)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black ribbon mourning pins (for Chief officer/Cllr use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal pictures (painting of The Queen held at Kingswood Civic Centre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Key Actions and Time Line

The following table outlines the key required actions to be undertaken following the announcement of the death of the Sovereign, which are set against a nationally recognised timeline. Further detail for each element can be found in the associated section in the full protocol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D-Day</th>
<th>Formal Announcement of the Death of HM The Queen</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Chief Executive receives formal notification from the Lord Lieutenant of Gloucestershire’s office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Notify all Councillors and staff by email</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Flags to be lowered to half-mast</td>
<td>Property Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Formal statement of condolence released + relevant details to inform the public regarding books of condolence and reading of the proclamation (website and intranet)</td>
<td>Strategic Comms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Review Chair of Council’s programme for next two weeks</td>
<td>Chair’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proclamation Day</strong> – proclamation of the new Monarch at St James’s Palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Books of condolence opened at Badminton Road, Yate and Civic Centre, Kingswood</td>
<td>CEO office / Property Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Flags raised to full mast at <strong>11am</strong></td>
<td>Property Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Day following Proclamation Day</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>High Sheriff to read the Proclamation at 12.30pm at Shire Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Flags to be lowered to half-mast at <strong>13.00pm</strong></td>
<td>Property Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>Leader / Chair of Council to read the Proclamation at <strong>1.30pm</strong> at Kingswood Civic Centre</td>
<td>Strategic Comms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td>Mayors/Chairs of Town Councils invited to read the Proclamation at 1.30pm or after</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eve of the State Funeral</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m)</td>
<td>Memorial service at Gloucester Cathedral – check local arrangements</td>
<td>CEO office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>Day of the State Funeral at Westminster Abbey</strong> (if on Sunday = D+11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n)</td>
<td>2 Minute public silence observed at <strong>11am</strong> (this may be declared a day of national mourning)</td>
<td>Property Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D 11</strong></td>
<td><strong>Day following State Funeral</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o)</td>
<td>Flags to be raised to full mast at 08.00am</td>
<td>Property Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p)</td>
<td>Books of Condolence to close at 18.00pm</td>
<td>CEO office / Property Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Order of Events and Timings

Formal Announcement of the death of The Sovereign

- Flags to be lowered to half mast
- Notify all staff and Members by email
- Statement of Condolence, info for the public about arrangements

Proclamation Day D+1

- Books of condolence opened
- Flags raised to mast-head at 11:00 a.m.
- National Proclamation is made at 11:00 a.m at St James Palace

Day Following Proclamation Day D+2

- Flags to be lowered to half – mast at 1:00 p.m
- Proclamation to be read locally at 1:30 p.m.

The eve of the State Funeral D+9

- Local Faith Group Services (TBC)

Day of the State Funeral D+10

- Two minute silence to be observed at 11:00 a.m.
- Memorial Service at Gloucester Cathedral

Day Following the State Funeral D+11

- Flags to be raised to the mast-head at 8:00 a.m.
- Books of Condolence closed at 6:00 p.m.