Minutes of the Consultation Response Group meeting held on Thursday 29th October 2026 in the Town Council Office, 15 – 17 Temple Street Keynsham at 2.00 p.m.

PRESENT: Cllrs D Biddleston, M Burton and D Cooper

IN ATTENDANCE: Dawn Drury – Town Clerk, Cllr A Wait and Cllr A Halliday

24. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

RESOLVED:
To receive and accept apologies from Cllrs Alex Beaumont and C Fricker.

25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

26. DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

27. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

RESOLVED
That the minutes of the Consultation Response Group held on 6th October 2026 be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

28. DRAFT INFRASTRUCUTRE DELIVERY PLAN SEPT 2026 SUPPORTING THE B&NES DRAFT LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION 2025 -2043

RESOLVED:

(i) To receive and note the documents.

(ii) That the response to the B&NES Infrastructure Delivery Plan on pages 2 - 17 below submitted to B&NES Council.

(iii) That the Clerk write to the Integrated Care Board (ICB) of the NHS and request that they provide data on what the needs of Keynsham are, what the town is lacking and how provision should be increased to keep in line with the proposed population increase due to the forecast housing numbers increase.

(iv) That the Town Clerk researches the National Planning Policy Framework 2026 to see if there is guidance or methods of calculating the green space requirement per person/property within a development/town.

Note: Cllr A Wait left the meeting at 3.50 p.m.

Keynsham Town Council's response to B&NES Infrastructure Delivery Plan

General Statements

The Keynsham Town Council is aware that Infrastructure Delivery Plans produced by other neighbouring authorities are considerably more detailed, with some extending to approximately 270 pages. These documents provide substantial background information, including population projections, anticipated housing growth and the infrastructure requirements necessary to meet the needs of an increasing population.

B&NES document is much less detailed being only 50 pages long excluding appendix documents and there is a high risk in respect of the weak language used, for example the use of conditional, advisory and non-mandatory language. Terms should be defined to prevent ambiguity, misinterpretation, and legal or operational risk.

The central concern is that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies some infrastructure associated with growth in and around Keynsham, but it does not yet provide a sufficiently convincing, joined up account of how the town's existing problems will be resolved, how new demands will be accommodated, and how essential services will be funded and delivered at the right time.

The IDP includes no mention of infrastructure development for Youth Services for young people aged 11 – 19 years (up to 25 years for those with special needs). The document lacks information on how many young people should be able to access such infrastructure provision or where funding to do the same will come from. B&NES Council should provide clear data detailing the formulation of Youth Service provision requirements.

Keynsham Town Council is concerned about the potential for double taxation in relation to youth service provision. The Town Council fully funds its Youth Service Provision through its Precept, whilst residents also contribute towards Youth Service Provision across the wider Bath and North East Somerset authority through their Council Tax.

We recognise that Youth Services across the authority are struggling to meet the needs of the increasing population of young people in Bath and North East Somerset Council. Youth Service facilities are not only a place to give our young people a safe space to meet, participate in activities, socialise with peers but also provides a service for young people that would not normally engage with such provision, but instead are part of groups causing anti-social behaviour putting pressure on the Police and Youth Support Services across the authority.

Recommendation – B&NES Council include Youth Service facilities, that are fit for purpose, and are included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Planned growth and infrastructure implications

Infrastructure requirements category

4.1 Education and Children's Services

Schools and SEND: provision is identified, but delivery needs to be secured.

The IDP identifies new primary school provision in North Keynsham and South West Keynsham, expansion of Broadlands Academy and additional inclusion provision (pages 6 – 9).

These proposals recognise the pressure that housing growth will place on education. The remaining question is whether the places will be available when children need them.

The plan should explain:

- When each school or expansion is expected to be delivered.
- How school capacity will keep pace with each phase of housing development.
- Whether sufficient land, capital funding and staffing are realistically available.
- How SEND and inclusion provision will be delivered, rather than left dependent on further work.
- What arrangements will prevent existing schools from being overwhelmed while new facilities are being built.

Recommendation: link housing occupation to the timely delivery of necessary school places and inclusion provision, with clear responsibilities, funding and milestones.

4.2 Health infrastructure

Healthcare: a recognised capacity problem without a sufficiently clear solution. Educational requirements are assessed against projected housing growth to establish the number of school places required. However, the IDP does not appear to provide equivalent population-based evidence or projections for healthcare provision. Where is the corresponding assessment of the additional healthcare capacity required to accommodate the proposed population growth?

The IDP acknowledges that Keynsham's primary care services face space and capacity pressures and that growth will require additional provision. However, the document identifies no specific key healthcare project at this stage (pages 12 – 17).

This is a significant gap. The plan should not rely on a general expectation that developer contributions will eventually help. It should identify what additional primary care capacity is required, where it will be provided, who will deliver it and when.

Questions that need answering include:

- What additional GP, consultation and treatment capacity will the projected population require?
- Has the NHS or relevant integrated care body confirmed the necessary scale and location of provision?
- Is there sufficient land and funding for the required facilities?
- How will provision be phased so that existing residents and people moving into new homes are not left with inadequate access?
- What happens if the expected contributions do not meet the full cost?
- The ten-year Health Plan is very unlikely to be correct as housing numbers and populations increases are uncertain. Should the plan reviews be shorter (5 years).

It is estimated that there are 28,000 patients registered across the surgeries at the Chocolate Quarter, Temple House and West View. These surgeries not only serve the residents of Keynsham but the wider community of the surrounding villages.

Keynsham Town Council is aware that there is lack of capacity and available space, residents of our community have difficulty getting GP appointments, there are long waiting times for appointments and treatment. The largest sectors of our population are those over 65 and young people and children, those that would be most at need of health care.

Keynsham Town Council have concerns that there is no mention in the plan of affordable extra care housing that could be funded through Sec.106 agreements.

In respect of new health care provision, it does not state anywhere what type of health care infrastructure, where it will be built and by who it will be built.

Recommendation:

That the Local Plan should set out a deliverable healthcare infrastructure plan for Keynsham, with a clear commitment from the relevant health bodies and a realistic funding and delivery timetable.

That there be a review of existing facilities and calculation of the net loss of facilities.

That with the provision of any new Health Care facilities, before commencement of development that accurate data is gathered to ensure that there are enough Doctors, Nurses and Health Care Specialists allocated that such services will be of a good standard.

That B&NES consider the inclusion of a state-of-the-art walk in Health and Minor Emergency Centre that will cut down the need for car journeys to places such as the RUH.

4.3 Emergency Services

Keynsham Town Council are concerned that there is no mention of the Police Service or reference to crime statistics. There is also not consideration as to how future development will have an impact on the crime statistics.

4.4 Green Infrastructure

Green Infrastructure there are good aspirations, but delivery and access need to be clearer. There are numerous references to the word 'should,' this needs to be strengthened to read 'must' to ensure that developers adhere to agreements that include green infrastructure. Keynsham has suffered repeatedly with developers reneging on conditions within Section 106 agreements.

The IDP identifies substantial green infrastructure around Keynsham, including country park and woodland provision and links between green spaces (pages 19 – 22).

The gap is that identifying green space does not necessarily guarantee that it will be delivered at the right time, remain accessible to the public or be properly maintained.

The plan should clarify:

- When each park, woodland and walking route will be provided?
- Whether the links will form a connected network, rather than isolated parcels of green space?
- Who will pay for long term maintenance and management?
- How access will be provided from established Keynsham neighbourhoods as well as new developments?
- How green infrastructure will contribute to biodiversity, recreation, drainage and climate resilience?
- There are new country parks mentioned that are to be developed within Keynsham, one in the south west near Abbotts Wood and one north of the River Avon. The proposed South West Keynsham allocation includes approximately 950 houses and would result in the existing green buffer being eroded and relocated to accommodate development extending towards Parkhouse Lane, adjoining Compton Dando Parish. This raises an important question about whether sufficient land will remain available to provide the proposed country park whilst retaining the intended green buffer and separation between the settlements. In respect of the Keynsham north country park allocation Keynsham Town Council is aware that this within a flood plain and marshland which is

frequently waterlogged. It is assumed that any country park in this location will be properly landscaped to include boardwalks to allow access to the country park throughout the year?

- Additional country parks are mentioned as being formed within the Manor Road Woodlands. How will these work with the space? What is the evidence that these are going to happen? How are they to be funded and maintained? Once again, the descriptive language used is poor e.g. "it is expected that ……" and not that it will happen!

Recommendation: B&NES must set out a phased, connected green infrastructure network with clear delivery and maintenance arrangements.

4.5 Sport and Recreation

A survey was undertaken by B&NES in respect of Sports Pitch usage; there has been no feedback from this survey. B&NES needs to look at Sports England guidance in respect of provision requirements, quality of pitches provided (taking into account factors that many are in Keynsham flood areas and are unusable at various times of the year. Evidence should be provided in a Playing Pitch Strategy, looking at future needs. Once again descriptive language used in the section of the plan is weak.

Page 24. B&NES references the Built Facilities Strategy. Keynsham Town Council asks whether B&NES Council actually used the Sport England Play Pitch calculator?

4.6 Community and Cultural Facilities

Community facilities: location and existing assets need more careful consideration

IMPORTANT - The Community Hall should be more central to Keynsham

The IDP identifies a Community Hall for South West Keynsham as part of a new local centre. It also identifies a Community Hub in North Keynsham (pages 25–26). There is no definition of a Community Hall and a Community Hub – What do they look like (size and purpose) this needs to be made clear.

The issue is whether locating a new community hall within a development on the edge of the town is the best way to serve Keynsham as a whole.

A Community Hall should be accessible to residents across the town, including people who do not drive. Its location should support walking, cycling and public transport connections, and should

make it easy to combine attendance at community activities with visits to the town centre and other services.

There is a strong case for examining a more central location, where the facility could serve both established neighbourhoods and new development. This should be considered before the location is treated as settled.

Work has already been undertaken by consultant architect Bob Allies and Keynsham Regeneration lead officer Shelley Dewhurst. That work should be brought into the assessment, rather than overlooking previous thinking and potentially duplicating effort. It is vital to the work that we have done on regeneration projects to be clearly and precisely included into this document. If it isn't, what was the point of us meeting?

B&NES Council should explain how that work has informed the current proposals, what options were considered, and why the proposed location offers the best overall accessibility and value for money.

St John's Church should be recognised as a potential community asset

The IDP identifies new community facilities but does not appear to give specific consideration to the potential contribution of St John's Church in Keynsham.

The Church is currently undertaking a project to raise funds to make the building more open to the community and to create more usable space in addition to its continuing use for worship.

This presents an opportunity to build on an existing community asset. With suitable investment and adaptations, St John's could potentially support a wider range of community activities, meetings, events and local services.

The Local Plan should consider this alongside proposals for new facilities, asking:

- What additional community space could St John's provide?
- Community activities that take place at Saint John's Church are fundamentally different to the needs of a community hall as has been addressed by our continued discussions with the regeneration project team.
- What adaptations, accessibility improvements and facilities would be needed?
- Could developer contributions or other appropriate funding support the community use of the building, where the relevant planning and funding tests are met?
- A Rural Facilities Audit has been undertaken but not for larger communities like Keynsham, why not?

B&NES Council should assess the capacity of an existing building that is actively seeking to broaden its community role.

There must be sufficient funding for faith community facilities, and such should be considered as part of Sec.106 agreements.

Recommendation: include St John's in the community infrastructure assessment and examine how it could form part of a wider network of community facilities for Keynsham.

4.7 Transport and Movement

Road infrastructure

This is the most significant omission. The current proposals appear inadequate to address the road pressures that further development will place on Keynsham.

The IDP identifies a limited number of highway measures Including (IDP pages 28–29).

- A St Ladoc Road and Charlton Road junction upgrade.
- A new access road for North Keynsham.
- Some local road and active travel improvements around North and South Keynsham.

The proposed highway measures do not, in themselves, demonstrate that Keynsham's wider road network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the cumulative impact of the proposed housing allocations. A comprehensive assessment is required, taking account of existing congestion, junction capacity, road safety and the additional traffic generated by developments across the town and neighbouring areas.

In particular, the plan needs to address:

- Stockwood Lane: existing blockages and congestion, and the increased traffic likely to result from further development.
- Scotland Road: the necessary development and improvement of the route, including how it will function within the wider road network.
- Cumulative traffic impacts: the combined effect of development at North Keynsham, South West Keynsham, South East Keynsham, Hicks Gate and other sites, rather than assessing individual developments in isolation.
- Junction capacity and network resilience: whether key junctions and approach roads can cope at peak times, and what improvements are required before new homes are occupied.

- Road safety and access: the effect of additional traffic on residential roads, pedestrians, cyclists, bus services and access to schools and health facilities.

The concern is not only that more roads should be built. It is that the Local Plan needs a credible, funded transport strategy that considers the whole network and provides the necessary improvements in step with development.

The IDP itself acknowledges that transport costs are significant and that funding will need to come from a mixture of sources, including developer contributions and regional or national funding.

Pages 31–32 do not, however, establish that every necessary improvement for Keynsham is funded or guaranteed.

The plan is not clear in its reference to Active Travel Hub and Travel Hub – what is the difference. What does a Travel Hub on an estate road look like? It is just a posh bus stop with digitalised bus information!

Recommendation: require a comprehensive Keynsham transport and highway assessment, covering the cumulative impacts of all proposed growth, with a clear schedule of necessary works, costs, funding sources and delivery dates. The plan should make clear which improvements must be completed before particular phases of housing can be occupied.

Bus services

The proposed network does not adequately connect Keynsham to the places people need to reach.

The IDP pages 28 – 31 references travel hubs at several locations around Keynsham and a proposed new Hengrove–Whitchurch–Keynsham bus service running at two buses per hour.

The IDP's proposed Hengrove–Whitchurch–Keynsham service does not, by itself, meet any need or suggestion ever made by our residents. A direct RUH connection should be explicitly considered and included in the transport strategy.

A direct bus connection to the Royal United Hospital

The plan should include a reliable bus service between Keynsham and the Royal United Hospital in Bath, via Saltford and Newbridge Park and Ride.

This would provide an important public transport link for patients, visitors, hospital staff and people who cannot easily drive. It would also help older and disabled residents and those who do not have access to a car.

A service that simply takes passengers towards Bath, requiring additional changes to reach the hospital, is not an adequate substitute for a practical hospital connection.

Recommendation: The proposal should therefore address:

- *A direct and convenient route from Keynsham through Saltford to Newbridge Park and Ride and the RUH.*
- *A frequency and timetable suitable for hospital appointments, visiting times and staff shifts.*
- *Convenient connections with local Keynsham bus services.*
- *Long term funding and protection against the service disappearing once initial development contributions have been spent.*
- *Parking near onward travel – improvements to the overflow car park near Keynsham Station including lighting, security and car park surfacing.*
- *Buses should be a size that can negotiate the width of the roads with the older parts of town and the newer developments that are being constructed with very narrow highways.*

The continued development of a network of small local buses serving the proposed larger town.

Keynsham needs more than a collection of bus stops and travel hubs. It needs a connected local bus network that enables people to travel between their homes, the town centre, shops, health services, community facilities and onward transport.
The plan should provide for a series of smaller, frequent buses serving Keynsham North, Keynsham South and Keynsham East, with routes designed to connect these areas to one another and to the proposed transport hub at Hicks Gate.

This would help residents in existing neighbourhoods as well as those moving into new developments. It could also provide a practical feeder service for larger buses, rather than expecting everyone to walk long distances to a main route.

The proposal should establish:

- Routes that link the north, south, west and east of Keynsham with the town centre and Hicks Gate.
- Regular, memorable frequencies, with reliable connections to onward buses.
- Services that operate throughout the day, rather than being concentrated only on commuting periods.
- A funding and operating model that makes the network viable in the longer term.

Bus services must be part of the development from the outset.

- Keynsham has a very large elderly population that simply will not access the town and other services via bicycle.
- The IDP acknowledges that early financial support may be required to operate new bus services, with Section 106 contributions potentially helping to meet initial costs (funding and early operating support are discussed on pages 31–32).
- The gap is that the document does not establish a fully specified, long term network for Keynsham, with all necessary routes, frequencies, connections and funding secured.

Recommendation: develop a Keynsham-wide public transport plan that includes the RUH route, local feeder buses and the Hicks Gate hub, and ensure services are available when people move into new homes.

4.8 Electricity Supply

Pages 33 - 36

Keynsham Town Council request that electric supplies are future proofed as the town is already subjected to regular electric outages especially in areas where there has been recent housing development.

There must be improved and working street lighting in place especially in darker areas such as alleyways where residents feel unsafe to walk after dark.

4.9 Water Supply

Pages 37–39.

The document indicates that further assessment and, in some cases, network improvements may be needed. This is not the same as demonstrating that the infrastructure is already adequate or that the necessary improvements are funded.

There have been three burst water mains in Keynsham within the past three months. This is of grave concern.

The plan should establish:

- Who will pay for the works and when they will be completed.
- How cumulative effects across multiple developments will be assessed.

Recommendation: B&NES must require the relevant utility providers to confirm the infrastructure needed to accommodate growth, with clear plans for capacity, funding and delivery before development proceeds too far.

B&NES should ensure that current water supply services are up to standard before adding more housing that will put further strain on the system.

4.10 Waste Water

The IDP discusses waste water, but some of the assessments remain high level.

Wastewater and sewerage: pages 40–44

The document indicates that further assessment and, in some cases, network improvements may be needed. This is not the same as demonstrating that the infrastructure is already adequate or that the necessary improvements are funded.

The plan should establish:

- Whether sewerage networks and treatment capacity can accommodate the combined effect of the proposed sites?
- Where network upgrades or strategic drainage solutions will be required?
- Who will pay for the works and when they will be completed?

Recommendation: B&NES must require the relevant utility providers to confirm the infrastructure needed to accommodate growth, with clear plans for capacity, funding and delivery before development proceeds too far.

That B&NES must stipulate that every new dwelling should incorporate appropriate rainwater harvesting measures, including a rainwater storage tank for toilet flushing and at least one water butt connected to the property's rainwater downpipe system.

Keynsham Town Council are concerned in respect of the future needs remark on page 38 that 'Neither Bristol Water nor Wessex Water have raised strategic objections to the overall scale of the growth proposed in the Local Plan. Bristol Water had advised that it does not currently have sufficient internal resource to analyse all site allocations in detail but will consider the allocations though its next Periodic review. Wessex Water have not given a full response.

4.11 Drainage and Flood Risk

The IDP discusses drainage, but some of the assessments remain high level.

Flooding and drainage: pages 45–46.

The document indicates that further assessment and, in some cases, network improvements may be needed. This is not the same as demonstrating that the infrastructure is already adequate or that the necessary improvements are funded.

The plan should establish:

- Whether sewerage networks and treatment capacity can accommodate the combined effect of the proposed sites?
- Where network upgrades or strategic drainage solutions will be required?
- Who will pay for the works and when they will be completed?
- How surface water will be managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere?

Recommendation: B&NES must require the relevant utility providers to confirm the infrastructure needed to accommodate growth, with clear plans for capacity, funding and delivery before development proceeds too far.

B&NES must work closely with the EIA/landowners to ensure that smaller brooks and tributaries are regularly desilted and cleared of rubbish. Much of the flooding in Keynsham is a result of blockages within these minor water courses.

Keynsham Town Council requests that North Keynsham must have a strategic flood defence plan in place before any house development commences.

4.12 Waste

Page 47

Keynsham Town Council raises concerns in respect of whether B&NES will have the capacity to cope with the future waste in the authority. There are currently missed bin collection announcements and fly tipping incidents are on the increase. The proposed housing allocations and population increase for the town will put added pressure on waste collection staff, there will be a need for additional staff training, additional waste vehicles will need to be purchased and these will need to be sourced to work within the ever-narrower roadways of recent built and future planned housing estates.

Concerns are raised in respect of the Keynsham recycling centre that not only services Keynsham but the whole authority. Recent monthly recycling data has reportedly remained at no more than 75%. With the anticipated increase in population, it is difficult to understand how B&NES expects to improve this figure sufficiently to meet its future sustainability targets.

4.13 Digital Infrastructure

Page 48

Keynsham Town Council is concerned that digital infrastructure across the town remains inadequate. Some areas are still without access to broadband services, whilst other areas experience poor connection speeds, unreliable connectivity and regular service outages.

Recommendation: All new developments must have appropriate broadband infrastructure installed and operational before properties are occupied."

Infrastructure, Delivery and Funding

In respect of the funding and delivery documents these identify mechanisms but not always firm commitments.

The Council has recently learned, during a presentation by Matt McCabe, Cabinet Member for the Built Environment, Housing and Sustainable Development, of the importance of precise wording within planning documents to provide certainty and accountability.

Unfortunately, much of the language used within the current IDP does not provide firm commitments or assurances that the proposed infrastructure will actually be delivered. It is essential that these commitments are clearly and appropriately expressed within the document, providing residents with confidence that the necessary infrastructure will be delivered alongside development, rather than remaining aspirational proposals.

The IDP expects infrastructure to be funded through a mixture of developer contributions, Section 106 agreements, the Community Infrastructure Levy, council funding, regional investment and utility-provider investment pages 31–32 and 49–50.

The problem is that a list of possible funding sources is not the same as a fully funded programme.

The plan also acknowledges that cost estimates are provisional and exclude items such as land acquisition, professional fees and abnormal costs.

This creates several risks:

- Costs may rise as projects are developed in more detail.
- Contributions from individual developments may not be enough to fund shared infrastructure.
- Different landowners and developers may not agree on the timing and allocation of costs.
- Infrastructure may be delayed while funding is negotiated.
- Essential services may arrive after residents have moved into new homes.

Recommendation: provide a Keynsham-specific infrastructure schedule identifying each project, its estimated full cost, committed and potential funding, responsible delivery body, target date and dependencies. The schedule should distinguish between identified, planned, funded and secured infrastructure.

The wider problem is that infrastructure is being considered in separate pieces.

The IDP covers schools, healthcare, transport, green space, community facilities and utilities in separate sections. That structure is understandable, but it does not necessarily demonstrate how the different elements will work together.

For example:

- A community hall may be provided in a location that is difficult to reach by bus.
- A new housing development may be occupied before school, or healthcare capacity is available.
- A bus hub may be proposed without a sufficiently frequent local service to connect residents to it.
- Green spaces may be provided without convenient walking and cycling connections.
- Road improvements may be identified without demonstrating that the wider network, including Stockwood Lane and Scotland Lane, can accommodate the cumulative traffic.
- A new community building may be proposed without fully assessing the potential of St John's Church or the previous work undertaken by Bob Allies.

The plan therefore needs to be more than a collection of infrastructure projects. It needs a coherent, town-wide strategy for Keynsham, coordinated with the development proposals and the infrastructure of neighbouring areas.

Summary of the principal gaps and recommended action:

Road infrastructure pages 28–29, 31–32 -Comprehensive assessment of cumulative traffic impacts, including Stockwood Lane and Scotland Lane, with funded and phased improvements

Direct hospital bus pages 28–32 - Explicitly consider a Keynsham–Saltford–Newbridge Park and Ride–RUH service

Local buses pages 28–32 Frequent smaller buses linking North, South and East Keynsham, the town centre and Hicks Gate

Community Hall pages 25–26 - Reconsider whether a more central location would serve the whole town better, using the work by Bob Allies

St John's Church pages 25–26 - Assess its potential to provide additional community space alongside its continuing religious use

Healthcare pages 12–17 - Identify the required capacity, location, funding and delivery timetable

Schools and SEND pages 6–9 - Secure provision in step with housing occupation

Green infrastructure pages 19–22 - Guarantee connected routes, public access, phased delivery and long-term maintenance

Water and wastewater pages 37–44 - Confirm capacity, required upgrades, funding and timing

Flooding and drainage pages 45–46 - Demonstrate that cumulative development will not increase flood risk

Funding and delivery pages 31–32, 49–50 - Separate committed funding from assumptions and provide a deliverable programme

Overall conclusion

The strongest argument is that the current Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not yet demonstrate that Keynsham's infrastructure will keep pace with the scale of proposed development.

Road infrastructure is a particularly serious concern. The limited highway measures listed do not appear to provide a convincing response to existing congestion and the additional traffic expected from growth, particularly around Stockwood Lane and Scotland Lane. The town also needs a better-connected public transport network, including a direct and convenient link to the Royal United Hospital via Saltford and Newbridge Road Park & Ride.

"B&NES must ensure that all infrastructure requirements, objectives and obligations placed upon developers are clearly defined and comply with the SMART principles: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound. This is essential to ensure that infrastructure commitments are meaningful, enforceable and delivered within agreed timescales."

29. HAVE YOUR SAY ON CHANGES TO PARKING CHARGES (BATH AREA)

RESOLVED:

(i) To receive and note the paperwork.

(ii) That Council do not respond to this survey but individual Councillors be encouraged to complete the survey circulated today on Park and Ride provision.

30. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED:
To note that a Doodle Poll will be sent out to ascertain the date and time of the Response Group's next meeting.

The meeting finished at 3.55 p.m.

Signed: (CHAIR) …… Date: ……

DRAFT