Bath & North East Somerset Council / Cleveland Pools Trust.

Third meeting of the Cleveland Pools Liaison Group (CPLG), at St Mary’s Bathwick Wednesday 29th August 2018, 6.30-8.30pm

Present: Simon Chippendale (CPIN)(SC), Tony Crouch (TC), Charles Draper (BERA) (CD), Sally Lewis (Resident)(SL), Ming Mungai (CPIN)(MM), Cllr Paul Myers (PM), Etain O’Shea (CPT Administrator) (EOS), Cllr Richard Samuel (RS), Paul Simons (CPT Trustee) (PS), Collette (CPIN) (C), Mary Stacey (CPT Trustee) (MS) and Ali Turnbull (Resident)(AT).

Apologies: Apologies were received from Mark Hubbard from Voscur who was to chair the meeting.

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

RS welcomed the meeting and agreed to act as chair as Mark Hubbard was unable to attend due to illness. All present gave a brief introduction to themselves.

1. **Minutes from previous meeting (11/7/18)**

CD explained his request to clarify item 12 of the previous minutes of the meeting. RS agreed with him and therefore the first sentence of the first paragraph on page 6 was removed and the following words added… “*RS had requested that the narrative accompanying the questionnaire be separated from the individual questions. This had been done in the version of the questionnaire circulated to the residents of the Bathwick Estate*.”

PM raised his disappointment concerning the circulation of the CV’s of the a potential new chairperson and that these had not been circulated to the whole group. MS explained the process that the sub-group had been through when coming to the conclusion that MH was the best person for the job, this had been agreed by MS, CD and PS.

CD agreed that this wasn’t what the meeting had agreed but he felt it reflected the spirit of wishing to identify an independent chair. PM expressed deep concern around this issue as it reflects a lack of communication between the subcommittee and the group. MS said that the group should invite Mark to the next meeting to introduce himself and to chair the meeting. The CPLG would then discuss Mark’s role and decide if they wished him to continue in the role of chair. This was agreed by all present.

CD suggested that the Council members should continue to chair the meetings but PM was most resistant to this suggestion and would not support it.

SC raised the issue of voting, and he was reminded by CD that the meeting had agreed to no voting and to decide matters by consensus.

1. **Matters arising.**

Nothing further.

1. **Declarations of interests.**

None.

1. **Update from Cleveland Pools Trust.**

PS explained that CPT had recently focused on the Stage II submission to HLF. The HLF has approved the Business Plan and the project has planning permission. The three key issues remaining that came out of last years unsuccessful HLF bid were: i) the lease, ii) heads of terms with Bath Recreation Ltd. and iii) an access logistics report. The Trust had also submitted a new Project Execution Plan (PEP). PS clarified that the PEP and Construction Management Plan (CMP) are one and the same thing. PEP is HLF terminology whilst CMP is used in the planning permission by the local authority. He understood there to be no further site visit from HLF. The decision date is the 11th December and the Trust is likely to receive verbal confirmation the following day but with the decision embargoed until the HLF agree to release all results. This may take up to 2 weeks and will be followed by a press release announcing the HLF decision.

RS explained that it was good to be aware of this timescale so that the group could think further ahead and as to when it should book in the next meetings.

CD asked a question about the heads of terms and financial support from Bath Recreation Ltd. PS said that Bath Rec have accepted the approved business case, the design that has planning permission and have agreed in principle that they are happy to run the pools under these circumstances on behalf of Trust.

CD asked what will they do if they will run into a loss? PS explained that that would be a matter for Bath Rec. CD mentioned an alternative business plan that was the cold-water scheme which had been dismissed by the HLF, B&NES and the Trust. He asked if Bath Rec had been made of this proposal. PS said that this had not ben discussed with Bath Rec as it was clearly not a viable option and would receive no further consideration. He reminded the group of the terms of reference of the CPLG and the fact that alternative schemes were not up for discussion.

SC asked has Bath Rec ever done anything, he asked do they support rec in bath? PS explained that SC should look on the website [www.bathrec.co.uk](http://www.bathrec.co.uk) for information concerning Bath Rec’s activities and charitable purpose.

RS asked at what point the CPT would appoint Bath Rec as operator of the pools? He added that the terms between CPT and Bath Rec would not be a concern to this group. PS explained that Bath Rec are the Trust’s preferred operator and that they have met with the HLF. CPT would be assigning the operation of the pools under contract to Bath Rec for an anticipated start of operation at Easter 2021. Furthermore CPT will continue to have a fall- back position of the previously approved Community Benefit Scheme.

RS presumed that the operator could suggest improvements and changes in ways of operating the pools. PS said that new, constructive ideas would always be welcome providing that they do not compromise the terms of the lease.

MS said that at an appropriate time in the future Bath Rec will be invited to attend the Liaison Group to discuss matters of operation. MS added that they are experts in running sports facilities.

RS highlighted that an early opportunity to meet with Bath Rec would be useful. He added that construction issues are currently of pressing concern and come before operational matters at the present.

1. **Cleveland Pools Consultation for Bathwick Estate – feedback and discussion.**

CD explained that doing the survey was discussed at the BERA AGM which agreed that it was necessary. He had asked RS for help on the survey. BERA had decided not to just allow yes/no questions in order to encourage discussion. It was sent out at the beginning of July and results were returned by the end of that month. CD was pleased with the 33% response rate and noted that this was a high turn out for something of this nature. 79% supported the restoration of the pools and he presented a table analysing the results in greater detail.

MM said that not all comments were about disruption as some mentioned that they don’t think money should be given to restore old buildings and housing the homeless considering the current economic climate.

RS said that there is a lot of information that has come out of this survey. He asked CD what he would like to see happen with it. CD said that everyone that is interested in the pools is welcome to analyse it. In his opinion he felt that the main point that was coming across in the survey was that people were concerned about the 36,000 visitors. RS replied saying that he is more interested trying to decide what can be done with the information. It should be analysed properly to point out the issues that require further consideration.

CD summarised by saying that whilst the Bathwick Estate wants the pools restored it doesn’t want the Trust’s scheme to happen. He added that there is a wealth of material here for all parties to use as appropriate.

RS asked PS his thoughts on the survey on behalf of the Trust. PS agreed with the sentiments expressed at the last CPLG meeting that the survey was clearly biased against the pools. CPT had met and reviewed all comments received from BERA. He wished to correct inaccurate information contained in the covering letter and agreed to write to BERA and to note these points. AT agreed with what PS was saying and wished for the discussion to continue in an unbiased manner. PS added that the CPIN scheme had been presented by BERA alongside the CPT scheme as if it were a viable and realistic alternative which it clearly is not. CD pointed out that the CPIN scheme is only in outline, both CPIN and CPT are concepts but they are not at an equivalent stage of development to each other. He agreed that the survey could not be analysed as a typical market survey.

PS summarised by saying that the Trust had identified six recurring points within the survey comments that it would be giving further consideration to, being: i) construction access; ii) traffic and car parking; iii) private functions and events; iv) noise; v) sustainability and financial viability and vi) opening hours.

AT said that the 222 people who have responded to the survey should perhaps deserve feedback and to highlight that there is a disagreement between CPT and BERA. CD explained that there is difficulty with communications, but all parties had agreed to put the minutes of these meetings on their websites. AT said that there are clearly differences which need greater clarity. RS questioned the value of more mail-shots/leaflet drops and felt it counter-productive as the Bathwick Estate had probably had its fill of questionnaires and more data would add to, not resolve confusion.

SL asked how will CPT respond to the issues raised and RS asked that the CPT should respond to the issues raised in a constructive way. PS added that this was the forum created to hold such discussions and to share information when anticipating the restoration and operation of the pools. He felt that the Trust should issue a note concerning its response to the BERA survey and that this would best be placed on the CPT website. MS added that many good points had come out of the responses and that in future the CPLG can work together on these.

CD noted that the issues before this group would change significantly after December if the CPT got a favourable response from the HLF and that for the meantime the survey had served its purpose to highlight concerns on the estate. The meeting therefore agreed that there was no need to re-visit the survey at a future meeting.

1. **Construction Access Options – feedback and discussion.**

RS asked PS to introduce the access report. He explained that one of the reasons that CPT didn’t get the funding last year was that they had not ‘de-risked’ the project enough and that HLF wanted more certainty. CPT commissioned a company from Bristol called, Build Collective to generate an options appraisal of all practical ways of accessing the CP site during restoration. At the same time it was a condition of the planning permission that the Council agree the method of accessing the site for inclusion in the Construction Management Plan.

Build Collective had limited the options to 5 due to the site being so restricted. CPT’s objective being to keep road traffic access to a minimum. PS presented these options and went on to express the trust’s preferred option and that of the Council, expressed in an appendix F to the report. This was to bring 85% of the required building materials and remove 100% of waste from site via the river. He confirmed that detailed negotiations had been concluded with Avon Rugby club for access to the river and that the consultants had spoken to the Environment Agency and specialist contractors who work on water ways.

One aspect of material delivery which cannot use the river is that of wet, mixed concrete, which requires managed road access, to be agreed with the Council. However the project design team is re-assessing if it can reduce the overall quantity of wet concrete required, current plans require some 500-600 cubic metres or approximately 80 truck loads. (The Curo retaining wall contract currently reaching completion has used around 100 metres of concrete).

CPT have submitted this options appraisal to HLF and B&NES. Highways and Planning have both agreed with the proposal and that CPT has no option other than to deliver concrete via road access.

MM asked is the barge just for materials, what about men and machinery and what about when the river is not navigable due to high flood waters. C added asked what is the plan for deliveries when the river is too high and AT noted that in his experience the average high water levels van be for 3 separate periods of 2 weeks each winter. SC wanted to know what is plan B for deliveries is if the river access is not available. PS confirmed that the workforce would be brought to site by mini-bus as all other vehicles would be left off-site. Small scale plant and equipment (dumper truck, mini-digger and spider crane etc.etc..) would be delivered by road as experienced in the current Curo contract. These deliveries would be very infrequent and the timing of deliveries would be agreed with the Council. MS added that project managers will be working to a strict schedule.

PS confirmed that the contract period would be 12 months and that some high water levels may be experienced during the construction phase. The CPT will be going to tender in late spring/summer next year and would expect the contractor to take this into consideration. The specialist contractor consulted works on the Avon and other navigations all the time. RS said that it is a fair point about river flooding and what the likely level of risk of this is over a 12-month project period. He asked that the group be informed of this and PS agreed to bring additional information concerning this matter once he has checked it out with the consultant, specialist contractor and Environment Agency.

CD also suggested that additional deliveries by road be forbidden in the contract documentation and that a contractor would therefore have to price for any impact or disruption that such delays may cause. MM asked who are contractors? PS stated that this was not known and would not be until the autumn of next year following the tendering procedure.

RS also asked PS to go back to Highways and ask them what they think. PS agreed.

RS asked how long will a cement lorry take to discharge a full load. PS replied that on average it will take 25 minutes. SC asked if the road would be blocked during this operation and PS confirmed that the Curo contractor had assured him that it had been possible to keep a passing place available during the recent operations. The size of permissible concrete lorries is currently under review by the Highways Agency.

Questions of detail were also raised about overhead power lines, access to Avon Rugby Club, the number of barge trips each day, the size of the barge, the nature of the temporary pontoon at the pools site, had the specialist contractors worked on a project of similar scale before on this stretch of the river and the potential impact on any wildlife. PS responded to these and agreed to supply the details concerning the size of the barge.

1. **Next steps and actions.**

The group felt that these issues had already been covered. MS mentioned the upcoming Heritage Open Days (15/16th September) and C expressed concern over the potential volume of cars that come on to the Bathwick Estate on Heritage Open Days. C said that on Heritage Open Day that people will still try to park on the estate. Current highway restrictions exist on Saturday but not on Sunday.

PS commented that on the heritage open days the national website, B&NES, World Heritage and CPT websites all make it perfectly clear that there is no parking; HoD’s “there is no parking at all, B&NES leaflet and website “no parking at site or nearby”, CPT “there is no parking as all neighbouring streets are in a residents parking zone”.

SC said that the Heritage Open Days is a perfect opportunity to trial traffic restrictions with temporary signage. RS stated that this should be possible and CPT will seek B&NES’s permission to erect temporary signs to forbid visitor traffic into Hampton Row.

1. **Date of next meetings**

6.30pm Wednesday, 10th October 2018, Bathwick St Marys.

6.30pm Thursday 15th November 2018, Bathwick St Marys.

Mark Hubbard is available to attend both of these dates.

Please confirm your availability to attend – thank you.

Etain O’Shea.

Administrator.