

# The West of England Partnership

---

## Board Meeting

**11 September 2009**  
**Council House, Bristol**

**Present:**

**Bath and North-East Somerset**

Cllr Francine Haeberling

Cllr Paul Crossley

Cllr John Bull

**North Somerset Council**

Cllr Nigel Ashton

Cllr Elfan Ap Rees

**Bristol City Council**

Cllr Barbara Janke

Cllr Helen Holland

Cllr Richard Eddy

**South Gloucestershire Council**

Cllr John Calway

Cllr Ruth Davis

Cllr Roger Hutchinson

**Social, Economic & Environmental Partners**

John Savage, GWE Business West

Rachel Robinson, ChangeUp Consortia

Stephen Harrison, Employment & Skills Board

Sonia Mills, North Bristol NHS Trust

**Observers**

David Crook, Government Office for the South West (GOSW)

Ian Knight, South West Regional Development Agency (SWRDA)

**In attendance**

John Everitt, Bath and North East Somerset Council

David Lawrence, Bath and North East Somerset Council

Jon House, Bristol City Council

Graham Turner, North Somerset Council

Peter Jackson, South Gloucestershire Council

Terry Wagstaff, West of England Partnership

Sally Gregory, West of England Partnership

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr Nan Kirsan, North Somerset Council

David Clarke, Bristol University

Steve Grainger, Avon Bio-Diversity Partnership

Ian Ducat, SWTUC

Hilary Neal, Government Office for the South West (GOSW)

Peter Brown/Stuart Todd, SW Councils

Jan Ormondroyd, Bristol City Council

Amanda Deeks, South Gloucestershire Council

## **2. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR FOR 2009/10**

**Resolved:**

**That Stephen Harrison be elected.**

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

## **4. PUBLIC FORUM**

There were no items.

## **5. BRISTOL'S BID TO BE A HOST CITY: FA BID TO STAGE THE FIFA WORLD CUP**

Stephen Wray and Guy Price gave a presentation (available at <http://www.westofengland.org/media/162309/worldcupbid%20presentation.pdf>), saying that they had had very positive feedback on Bristol's bid. The FA decision would be made on 14 December. If successful there would be 7 years of marketing, with potentially huge numbers of additional visitors to Bristol, the sub-region and the region. The Fanfests would involve locations outside Bristol.

In discussion there was clarification that the proposed new stadium could be extended to the required capacity; however, Jon House (Deputy Chief Executive, Bristol) reminded the meeting that the development of a stadium suitable for a host city by Bristol City Football Club was dependent on planning permission. It was hard to tell whether the bid would help to draw in funding for transport infrastructure. Stephen Wray agreed to send copies of the bid to the four councils.

The approach from the bidding team was welcomed and it was suggested that they came back to the Partnership once planning permission was granted.

## **6. MINUTES OF MEETING ON 25 JUNE**

**Resolved that:**

**The minutes be noted.**

## **7. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

### **i) Principles of Partnership Working**

This was welcomed and it was agreed that the principles should be adopted and the necessary practical arrangements made.

It was noted that councillors may also have different views to matters determined by the Partnership (paragraph 8).

**ii) Culture, Leisure and Tourism Group**

David Lawrence, Assistant Director - Culture, Leisure and Tourism at Bath & North East Somerset Council presented the paper on behalf of the Group. He acknowledged that the Group needed to improve its feedback to the Board and outlined the recent issues it had focused on and achievements. He said that, apart from libraries, the services covered were discretionary, but they made an important contribution to building communities. He outlined the priorities for 2009/10.

The following views were expressed:

- North Somerset works with Somerset as well as with this sub-region.
- North Somerset would value the group examining ways of saving money whilst maintaining services.
- Bristol said there are too many meetings (quarterly), priorities need to be clear, and asked whether bilateral meetings would be more useful.

The conclusion of the discussion was that the continuation of their meetings was a matter for the authorities.

**iii) Waste Management Budget**

Terry Wagstaff explained that the basis of revised Waste Management Budgets for 2009/10 and 2010/11 had been agreed, as well as the budget for the Joint Waste Core Strategy Draft Submission Document. The Interim Accountant for the Partnership was preparing revised estimates in the usual format and these would be circulated to the Board as soon as possible. In the case of waste, the revisions substantially reduced sub-regional provision, given the authorities were not at this stage proceeding jointly with Phase 3 of the Strategy.

**iv) Partnership Board Forward Plan**

This was welcomed and it was suggested that an equivalent be produced for all parts of the Partnership, which would help to show where Joint Scrutiny fitted in. Further information on objectives and outcomes was requested.

Terry Wagstaff agreed to amplify the work programme by merging the content of the current forward plan with appropriate elements of the agreed Partnership Board Work Programme and it would then be circulated. This would be reported on at each meeting in future.

Forward Plans had been agreed by the Joint Transport Executive Committee and the Planning, Housing and Communities Board; one for the Joint Scrutiny Committee was imminent. At present no work programme is available for the Joint Waste Management Committee.

Sonia Mills asked about the absence of Science City from the 2009/10 Work Programme. Given their work connecting science and technology with business, it was agreed to invite Science City to give a presentation to a future Board meeting.

It was noted that the Conference would focus on Progress and Challenges.

## 8. JOINT WASTE CORE STRATEGY

Terry Wagstaff introduced the report, reminding members that this was a statutory process and that the documents would go to Cabinets and Councils for approval this autumn (presentation available at <http://www.westofengland.org/media/162312/jwcs%20presentaion.pdf>). The process had to result in plans which were deliverable. The 11 Strategic Residual Waste Sites and 2 Strategic Areas which had been identified took into account specialist technical work which had been carried out, eg in relation to habitats. Workshops had been held in each of the council areas. The Joint Scrutiny Committee had already looked at this and would reconsider it at the 'test of soundness' consultation stage. The purpose was to identify potential sites for residual waste treatment facilities to provide sufficient capacity to meet the West of England's requirements for all waste streams, commercial and industrial, as well as municipal.

Additional papers provided the views of the Planning, Housing and Communities Board and the Joint Scrutiny Committee. Substantial consultation had been undertaken including engagement with the waste development industry, Councillors and the public. The responses had been constructive and had informed the development of the draft JWCS submission document.

David Crook explained that the current document carried weight once it was published. Terry Wagstaff said that it could already be of material consideration for planning committees but that it would gain more weight as it progressed. It was important, therefore, to stick to the programme to avoid hijacking by particular organisations.

The capacities identified were indicative information, underpinned by the evidence base and apportioned taking account of the population, waste arisings and future areas of growth.

In response to the need to monitor future additional permissions for waste recovery sites, and those developed, Cllr Paul Crossley requested an appendix showing where the other existing sites were. Terry Wagstaff said it would be difficult to produce a list at this stage.

Laura Grady was thanked for her work.

### **Resolved that:**

**The report be noted and it be further noted that the documents would go next to the local authorities for consideration.**

## 9. SINGLE CONVERSATION

Terry Wagstaff said that the context for the Single Conversation was provided by the Multi-Area Agreement, which sought to ensure an integrated delivery

and investment plan for the provision of infrastructure. This would assist in maximising infrastructure support for development priorities, help give confidence to developers, discourage planning applications for inappropriate development and often provide flexibility through agreement to a sub-regional growth trajectory for housing in 5 year tranches.

The commitment to phasing was welcomed. The discussions were involving the Homes and Communities Agency, the Regional Development Agency, the Highways Agency and the Environment Agency.

Discussions were taking place on draft priorities and how co-funding and other methods could support the delivery of infrastructure and an increased provision of affordable and supported housing.

The aim was to produce a firm plan for the next three years, with 2 years 'soft' and a further 5 years indicative.

**Resolved that:  
The report be noted.**

## **10. CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S UPDATE**

### **Transport infrastructure**

Cllr Nigel Ashton asked about local contributions to Department for Transport investment in Major Transport Schemes. Peter Jackson said that the Department for Transport assumed 10 – 12% and that this was likely to be a matter for negotiation. Cllr Nigel Ashton asked that the Partnership write to the Minister Paul Clark (who he had raised that matter with) to seek any flexibility and assistance with the requests for local contributions to Major Transport Schemes because of the provision of essential infrastructure to accommodate growth. Terry Wagstaff said he could write, but it would be important to take account of the current peer review of 2016/17 schemes which was assessing deliverability and avoid suggesting that there were weaknesses in the West of England schemes. Peter Jackson said that the local contributions issue was a general one, so was unlikely to disadvantage the West of England. It was agreed that this would be followed up in correspondence with the Minister.

### **Weston Package**

Network Rail were no longer going to dual railtrack the line from Worle to Weston-super-Mare and it would be useful if the Partnership could take up this issue. Peter Jackson said that there were a number of issues like this, eg signals modernisation, and it was important to pick up all of them.

**Resolved that:  
The report be noted.**

## **11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Thursday 22 October, 2 – 4 pm at The Campus, Weston-super-Mare.