**Working group on options to strengthen community representation and civic governance in Bath- Evidence Base**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NAME OF DOCUMENT** | **DATE** | **TYPE OF EVIDENCE** | **HEADLINE DATA** |
| [Minutes of working group, 29 May 2014](http://api.ning.com/files/QsQ1m7RyND32Zny0IoAyX291jKrwYEZBqnsWOxeQCIPB6Lw*bsdeiE0PEwlybTEXJqAdSsxSNpkuzCVJ8ze2vHkQm7333ZJR/NoteofthemeetingoftheWorkingGroupoptionstostrengthencommunityrepresentationandcivicgovernancewithinBath.doc) | 19 May 2014 | Record of member discussion | Discussion of draft Terms of Reference, initial consideration of options and work plan. The meeting agreed **7** initial options and **5** questions for each option. |
| [“Pros” and “Cons” of options put forward](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/appendix_10_pros_cons_2.docx) | May 2014 | Background | Information on pros and cons of options |
| [Minutes of working group, 5 June 2014](http://api.ning.com/files/0U8UQjwDEm*JGMkh9j5s*-C32PyCk-Na5LHPPbuadGR41VAAjXrqRSacF5gpRf8EJdJYD9PuEbJl47qozkEq1dkh0sJs*HfN/NoteofthemeetingoftheWorkingGroup050614.doc) | 5 June 2014 | Record of member discussion | Options Analysis- Area Committee. An indicative vote **showed preference for a single Area Committee for Bath that has both elected and co-opted members (with co-opted members not having voting rights**) |
| [Minutes of working group, 12 June 2014](http://api.ning.com/files/Y-6c8O6EPx8IRX8YhieeFnWXPG*FScWG5fJJgiH6UETN6rhi3ucGzyBcGtUmUEzcve5IJ3VhiiQUd6L4t4UYVMA3mjDvNeNx/DraftNoteofthemeetingoftheWorkingGroup120614v2.doc) | 12 June 2014 | Record of member discussion | Options Analysis: Parishing. An indicative vote showed **equal preference between options as follows: “multiple Bath Parishes” ; “a single Bath Parish” ; and “not in favour of either Bath Parish options”** |
| [Minutes of working group, 19 June 2014](http://api.ning.com/files/Y-6c8O6EPx-SX9Tmr*-Y4*pvBE3*zu1GLb8hCqjqGs0zsLYFml0iuLKei0o1qofcl9gu195dW9ibGMUzM7NPQCop*RHE0MfZ/DraftMinutesWorkingGroup190614MH.docx) | 19 June 2014 | Record of member discussion | Options analysis: No change. An indicative vote was as follows:   * No Change – Votes for:  **0** * Some Change, unspecified, proposed from within the working group to go to Council to decide – Votes for: 1 * Some Change, unspecified to be formulated with public consultation Votes for: **7** |
| [Under what circumstances can co-optees to the “Voice for Bath” committee vote?](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/appendix_1_cooptees_votes__2.docx) | June 2014 | Background paper | Summarises powers of **co-optees** on council committees |
| [Community Infrastructure Levy](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/appendix_6_cil_2.docx) | June 2014 | Background paper | Sets out details of Community Infrastructure Levy on Bath & North East Somerset and identifies that **communities without a Parish, Town or Community Council will still benefit from the 15% neighbourhood portion (or 25% portion, if a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order has been made). If there is no Parish, Town or Community Council, the charging authority will retain the levy receipts but should engage with the communities where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend the neighbourhood funding.** |
| [The Mayoralty of Bath](file:///C:\Users\Thomasa1\Desktop\The%20Mayoralty%20of%20Bath) | June 2014 | Background paper | Information on the mayoralty of Bath |
| [Community Governance Reviews](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/appendix_9_community_gov_review_2.docx) | June 2014 | Background paper | Briefing note on community governance reviews |
| [Minutes of working group, 3 July 2014](http://api.ning.com/files/*whl3J3XpWSuhNKwTRAoWIUn68RM2BKojvWxY*qaXPfz5c3HaR7C4TZLkaajPwHihNjPfZRXuOzl0N2WvmC0cdNEis9qozOG/DraftMinutesWorkingGroup03Jul14.docx) | 3 July 2014 | Record of member discussion | Discussion of preferred option and reporting to Council. It was agreed that officers prepare a paper **summarising the debate over options** and highlighting questions. |
| [Minutes of working group, 17 July](http://api.ning.com/files/jPrLLXuRuu4hQCbvSQegNZrD7LIvDRrfM1*xwUG3*aozBLeEg616gI9woR*riJtpcgfpcqqc-46roMxezXRviWDc5Hc3d0Oa/WorkingGroupMinutes17.07.14.dot) 2014 | 17 July 2014 | Record of member discussion | Following discussion it was agreed that a proposal to **request public views and comments** on the work of the working group would be brought forward. |
| [Minutes of working group, 24 July](http://api.ning.com/files/jPrLLXuRuu5nfpQCewCnOncV1dVcOAGv2QG**MqNdxYwELxNdeAhRzl1n9mqgYaSxyZbE36iFNimG69RVChn46Y16X6iAlpb/24JulyMinutes.dot) 2014 | 24 July 2014 | Record of member discussion | The draft e-consult page was demonstrated and the group made amendments to the **Interim Report**. |
| [List of powers of town and parish councils](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/appendix_3_parish_powers_5.docx) | July 2014 | Background paper | Information on the powers of these councils supplied by **Avon Local Councils Association** |
| [All options considered](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/appendix_5_all_options_2.docx) | July 2014 | Background paper | This lists all **9 options** the working group has considered |
| [Cross-Party working group to consider options to strengthen community representation and civic governance within Bath](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/interim_report_july_2014_2.docx)  [Interim Report for Comment - July 201](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/interim_report_july_2014_2.docx)4 | July 2014 | Interim Report of working group | This interim report was produced by the working group to elicit views. It sets out the background information, the current situation in Bath, and offers **three options** for consideration. Appendices give a wide range of background material and there is a **“Frequently Asked Questions”** section. |
| [The differences between a parish council and a “Voice for Bath” committee](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/appendix_10_pros_cons_2.docx) | July 2014 | Background paper | This sets out the differences between the two approaches |
| [Minutes of working group, 28 August 2014](http://api.ning.com/files/BIHCTCFFxEWY-CuFOPXkMQPvreRXkQ6sUs0WyFq*atIHTTvGj-uN7A8SlpQys2PZ-fGC0YTEbo-*szEMx3HhQTQ2Wpr1xmAV/WorkingGroupMinutes280814final.docx) | 28 August 2015 | Record of member discussion | Discussion took place on the **56** public comments received on the Interim Report |
| [Comments received on ‘Options to strengthen community](http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s32291/Community%20representation%20etc%20-%20Appendix%202.pdf)  [representation and civic governance in Bath’](http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s32291/Community%20representation%20etc%20-%20Appendix%202.pdf) | August 2014 | Consultation results | A summary of the “headline” results of this are as follows  Of the three options set out above, which is your preferred option?  No Change- **9**  A “Voice for Bath” committee (to include co-opted stakeholders as well as B&NES elected members)- **11**  The parishing of Bath - either as a single parish for the City or multiple parishes for different parts of the City- **30**  No Response- **6**  Should consideration be given to multiple parishes for Bath or a single parish (for Bath as a whole?)   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Multiple | **19** | | Single | **21** | | No Response | **16** | |
| [Options to strengthen community representation and civic governance within Bath](http://democracy.bathnes.gov.uk/documents/s32216/Community%20representation%20Civic%20governance%20in%20Bath.pdf) | 11 September 2014 | Report to Council | Council agreed  “1. To note the interim report of the working group to strengthen community representation and civic governance within Bath and thank its members for their work so far;  2. To agree that the working group continue its work, based on the next steps set out in paragraph 5.8 of the report, to provide an evidence base for the newly-elected Council in May 2015 to determine this issue; and  3. To agree to extend the life of the working group, as currently comprised, to deliver the remit set out in 2 above.” |
| [Minutes of working group, 9 October 2014](http://api.ning.com/files/PhpRQMoFW8ZZfvKHlPLLv90TjvQd8NSzTIWPjE-tpFfd-IZNN6l7E2jUKAoml2ci**YVSLfdhr0Uv4V3RsBWq53N1rozNKho/NoteofthemeetingoftheWorkingGroup9October2014.docx) | 9 October 14 | Record of member discussion | Plans were agreed for further developing the evidence base including a Voicebox survey and invitations to other areas to present on their models of local governance |
| [Minutes of working group, 20 November 2014](http://api.ning.com/files/li0jpfi0h9lnrkss850uKlyGtUpQqgNBbEyVt87hD29lQj8rQ8Hhb*AOIWJFe9eTa7AG0jF-5E2nCy7p0f19rWYZMokLd6LC/NoteofthemeetingoftheWorkingGroupfinal.docx) | 20 November 2014 | Record of member discussion | A Presentation was received from Weston Super-Mare Town Council. This highlighted the rationale for establishing the council, its key functions, services and funding arrangements. The presentation identified that the Weston Town Council Council Tax Band D precept is **£57**  The full presentation may be found here  <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/siteimages/weston-super-mare_-_why_a_town_council.ppt>  A Presentation was received on the Winchester Town Forum which</AI3> set out the history and background to the Forum, its membership, working arrangements and priorities. The Town Forum oversees a “Town Account” (c **£900,000**) but does not have final say on precept  The full presentation may be found here  <http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/siteimages/introducing_winchester_town_forum.pptx> |
| [Minutes of working group, 22nd January 2015](http://api.ning.com/files/ddTCHyz3Hmz5omybUpUSzjYuurA-xruGix87Pv*hFy3w3ITWKwINKDf-lZFyqy4roKD61HriX*2bR-EWsJWawi-2GbTeVEVV/220115BathGovernanceMinutesFinal.dot) | 22 January 2015 | Minutes | An Overview of the evidence base took place, along with an update on Voicebox  A Presentation was received from Van du Bose, which set out potential criteria for assessing the issue of Bath governance. |
| [City of Bath Governance-](http://api.ning.com/files/gDF3S0THO9xycStLrjYSqTmVXWvy2fOjgxyS1y4hQvHWy*00WXx9VcId9tzOka7lQbb12rnLvnDYfQ*3RZCePuWMTQP8jtQQ/CityofBathGovernance22January2015.pdf)  [Note for the Working Group](http://api.ning.com/files/gDF3S0THO9xycStLrjYSqTmVXWvy2fOjgxyS1y4hQvHWy*00WXx9VcId9tzOka7lQbb12rnLvnDYfQ*3RZCePuWMTQP8jtQQ/CityofBathGovernance22January2015.pdf) | 22 January 2015 | Presentation | Presentation from Van du Bose proposing design of governance should follow some criteria. The purpose should be to address collective City of Bath matters. He suggested seven city “portfolios” that might form the basis for this, namely: Transport, Public Realm, Spatial Planning, Worker Prosperity, Cultural Vibrancy, Civic Cohesion and Heritage Care. |
| [The Charter Trustees of the City Of Bath](http://www.mayorofbath.co.uk/the-charter-trustees-of-the-city-of-bath) | Information accessed June 32015 | Background paper | Source: [The Mayor of Bath website](http://www.mayorofbath.co.uk/the-charter-trustees-of-the-city-of-bath) |
| [Results of Voicebox Survey](http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/siteimages/bath_city_governance_presentation.pdf) | June 2015 | Survey Results | Source: Voicebox 23 |