Corporate Strategy Appendix D:

Responses from individuals

1. Staff feedback from Sandy Park - I feel very strongly that the Lollipop lady at my children's school may be done away with due to cost cuts. Can you explain why you can spend considerable money at this time installing some 4 - 5 hundred trackers on council vehicles at the cost of somewhere in the regions of £200,000 and then spend a yearly fee of between £30-40k to run the system when trackers are already fitted to the phones we have and new phones that are going to be given out shortly. I feel that my child's safety is far more important than money spent on something that is already in place, i.e. the phone.

2. We have already replied on the Corporate Strategy. But we have seen something on the news this morning that prompts us to add another suggestion to aid Bristol's finances. Some years ago, a `workplace parking levy' was looked into. Nottingham actually imposed this, and today's news reports that they are raising £9,000,000 (nine million pounds) a year (which they spend on public transport). Surely it's time Bristol imposed this, as it also helps to cut congestion. (Apparently, Oxford and Cambridge are also looking into this possibility.)

3. As Bristol now has a Mayor, is there really a need for 70+ Councillors? I don't have much understanding as to what these Councillors do behind the scenes but I have been wondering for quite some time if some significant savings could be made there. I don't wish to talk anyone out of a job – that's the last thing I'd want to do - but I think the elephant in the room is that the service the Council provides is already at breaking point (without even considering the spending restrictions). I'm certain another waves of cuts will be heading our way sometime next year and I believe that if we cut more frontline staff, this organisation has a real chance of being crippled.

4. I did not choose to have a mayor of Bristol to have it become a political position. The mayor of Bristol is for all citizens and organisations and his/her job is to run the city and provide direction and services for all. It is not to indulge their particular political philosophy. Marvin Rees should stop playing politics and get on and run the city and make it punch its weight. Focusing and prioritizing on the needs of one small and vulnerable group will not accomplish that. The taxpayers expect and deserve their taxes to be spent on key issues that impact all of them and not used disproportionately for a small minority. Running down key city amenties and assets such as parks that improve the quality of life of all citizens is not appropriate.

5. I don't have time to complete the whole survey (I started but it's way too long), but the one point I really have to emphasise is please, please, please no more council tax rises! Council tax in Bristol is already higher than some places in central London! My salary certainly doesn't increase by 4% then 2% every year after that. Unfortunately the harsh reality is that if you don't have the money to provide something, then you can't provide it...
   Also, I'm not sure if you should really be using emails collected for the purpose of providing council tax bills online for collecting responses to a survey, but I'll forgive you as you have alerted me to such a serious thing going on :-)

6. The consultation tool does not appear to allow me space to provide my viewpoint on the proposed increase in Council Tax, only offering simplistic 'yes'/'no' options, and so I thought I would respond to you by email. Will the additional increases in Council Tax be applied across all tax bands? If so, I feel obligated to ask why deprived areas are once again shouldering the majority of the burden of social care issues? Deprived areas already have a far higher instances of these problems, whilst the majority of solutions to those problems - such as probationary housing, homeless shelters, and harm reduction services - are placed within those same areas. This exacerbates trends of anti-social behaviour and crime associated with these problems, creating ghettos across the city. Yet now these same deprived areas are intended to pay for the privilege of keeping more salubrious areas safe and clean? It would make far more sense to add this additional cost to properties in wealthier areas, making sure that the cost of social care is spread more fairly across the city - keeping in mind that the cost is far more that financial in deprived areas. Also, it would avoid pushing additional costs to the very families who are

most likely to be affected directly by these social care issues - I don't see much point in charging families with substance abuse issues the costs of resolving those issues!

7. First my disclaimer of interest: I own and have run a small recycling, reclamation, second hand tool business in the centre of Bristol for over 30 years after scientific research and a PhD at the University of Bristol. I think environmental issues are important, but also economics and a rational analysis of problems. These comments are not organized in the best possible way, but hopefully will not be too difficult to follow.

Possible Ways to Save Money (not in any particular order) along with income generation:
A. Stop expenditure on “Traffic Calming” measures. Generally designed as “Pinch Points” to slow already slow traffic. Really seem to be designed to make driving in Bristol more difficult, probably causes more pollution with the stop-start it forces, and put up business costs due to slower movement. These seem an expensive use of resources which have bad secondary repercussions on costs and business efficiency.

B. Cut down on translation services. Much of this should be offered by the respective communities as volunteer service. Have heard (second hand) that in some council offices little or no assistance is given to white, middle aged native born but all hands instantly turn to newly arrived immigrants to find translation services and other assistance. Causing some real backlash feelings (driving the most unlikely people to UKIP). Provide only limited print items in anything other than English. As recent report also highlights makes it less likely that women will integrate and be able to leave the house as no need to learn English.

C. Data Collection and Analysis. Stop collecting, hence also stop spending on analysing, the questions on gender, sexual preferences, race, religion, etc. that occur on nearly every council questionnaire. Often these questions have no relevance to the main body of the questionnaire, often cost extra paper, take staff time to analyse. Money could be better spent elsewhere. Yes, keep if they are questions particularly relevant to the remainder of the questionnaire but only then.

D. Cut the number of highly paid council jobs. Some / many posts (administrative, managerial, directors) could be filled very adequately with lower pay. Seems to be a status symbol to offer high pay. Jobs offering pay over, say, twice the national average should be advertised at lower pay first and only allowed at higher pay in very desperate situations when No candidates at lower levels exist.

E. Over £50 million has been spent on cycling projects in the past 2 years, yet we still have potholes, uneven road surfaces which can throw a cyclist. The cycling budget would be better spent on repairing roads than some of the cycle lanes which have minimal use, i.e. need better realistic analyses of most cost effective spend. Use some of the money to provide the old fashioned “defensive cycling” techniques which taught how to avoid being a road casualty.

F. For both safety and income generation, cyclists breaking the law such as cycling without lights, running red lights, locking bikes so they cause obstructions, cycling on pavements, should have fines imposed or bikes confiscated. This would quickly improve cycle safety and could raise revenue if treated with the same zest as car drivers are treated.

G. Cut down on the use of consultants, cut down on their fees. I have had local experience of city funded consultants doing survey, offering advice on local area and payments seemed way excessive for doing nearly a non-job. They explained that being highly paid gave them the kudos to seem more believable. Seems to be rather a lot of this.

H. Reduce the “poles in the ground” along roads. Each sign, traffic light, bollard, etc. all cost

money; costs to install, costs to maintain, costs for work on pavements, etc.. Some junctions have literally hundreds of this type of street furniture. Stop highways department from allowing this proliferation. I gather research on reducing traffic lights shows traffic moves smoother (cuts pollution doing that) when lights are removed but many other posts are not really necessary. Some signage, such as pedestrian direction information ones, are non standard and very expensive to produce. Don't commission any more, use less expensive (and with larger lettering) ones when needed. Told by the young designer that these signs were done deliberately small so people in cars couldn't read them, but even as a pedestrian often can't read form other side of junction – not a good signage system.

I. Reduce expenditure on “fact finding missions”, but opening it up to the general population to gather information and report back from their time on holidays. Could be done at a fraction of the cost of current “fact finding missions” and would bring a lot of real interest and community spirit.

J. Graffiti and tagging are a real eye sore in Bristol, makes everything look very run down. Council funding to support graffiti is very two edged, it legitimises it to an extent but may also provide a creative outlet. Any found outside of authorized locations, try and find perpetrator and charge and fine heavily. Tagging costs money to clean up both for the council but more for individuals and businesses. It really needs to have prosecutions to discourage it.

Accommodation

Housing, Really much more of a crisis than seems to be acknowledged. The proposals are too little, too slow, too late, needlessly expensive and not diverse enough. Yes, what is proposed is generally good as one aspect of solving the housing problem, but the proposals are much too limited. In addition to brownfield sites some greenfield sites should be made available. Generally useable houses should not be demolished to build new (sometimes happens as a way of producing a brownfield site to build on). The build requirements are too restrictive to allow the rapid and quantity building actually needed. Housing or more correctly population density is too high – gone are the escapes like craft rooms, garden sheds, storage space, even spare bedrooms which allow families to get away from each other. The old idea that the garden shed, allowing husband to have his own space, kept married couples together might well have something in it. OK, some of the housing problem is due to government regulation, but ways around some of the restrictions such as use of static mobile homes for filling short term (5-10 years) housing needs should be found along with other “PreFab”, “Manufactured” houses.

a. Council land we hear has been released/sold for development, but not built on (speculators waiting as land prices to go up). Don't sell land but lease it with a variety of tenure lengths and covenants that its to be used for affordable housing. Some of this could have relatively short leases, even 5 to 15 years or less (see below) when it is in a location that might want longer term more major development. Other plots could be leased for longer periods (10-20 years) for more substantial housing but still with concepts of the housing being temporary. Then of course still longer leases for long term permanent homes.

b. Allow manufactured, prefab, type constructions. Some could almost be at the PortaCabin, Shipping Container, level rather like that used in the migrant camp at Calais, set up on the short term leased plots with rents that could be down to £100/week or less. Rent high enough to cover the rental of the land plus give a payback of say 10 percent on the costs of the container. If no more than 1 to 3 of these were allowed on a single plot of land and scattered around the city they wouldn't cause a ghetto effect. Could find hundreds of people trying to rent as could be much better housing than some of the damp, mouldy private rental property now in use. Funding for this could be by crowed sourcing as a payback better than current savings as well as socially useful. Yes, this would be fought against by private landlords, the planning department and even some demanding housing groups but it could solve some immediate problems. It would be financially neutral to profitable for the city. Time frame could be almost weeks if council really wanted (sidestep, overrule planning department).

c. Allow manufactured housing, more substantial but still of a semi temporary nature on city land let on 20 plus year lease. Again on smaller plots, but could have numbers high enough to form tight communities. Construction methods can be diverse like some of the fixed caravans or some of the American “manufactured” housing. These could be in the affordable rental range of £150 - £250/week price, so catering for some families, working individuals. Time frame for building could be in months.

If Bristol worked with adjacent local authorities could hopefully find land which could be leased for manufacturing site(s) for offsite building of homes, ideally multiple companies each with their own ideas / designs. This could be a major employing sector, produce for the region. Pre-manufacturing can and should be to a variety of budgets from inexpensive up, not just the current upmarket variety.

d. More provisions of land for self-build and small builders are a good idea. The proposal put forward at open discussion of the council budget meeting of renting/selling out council housing land in an affordable way was great.

The current proposals seem to perpetuate the exclusivity of housing, not providing enough to meet demand. I understand building regulations and control are one of the slow processes, it should be within the councils ability to speed this up, do it. The other problem is affordable land which could be met with council land where houses could be built on leased, not sold, land.
Opening housing up to really affordable homes could help to spur some private landlords to improve their offerings and would allow many more people some security. If houses could be leased for say £100/month, even if they were insulated shipping containers, hundreds to thousands would probably be let as fast as they could be installed.

Financing really really cheap housing- with council land lease, then crowed funding of individual or small groups of container / prefab homes I suspect would or could happen quickly with no council cost and generated a feeling of community good for getting something done. Rents could be set to give a payback to investors of 10% with a 10 year life on the building. Insulated large containers with windows and doors could probably delivered in 2-4 months or quicker allowing rental at that £100/month (or sale).

Some land is being considered for building on which is in flood plain or prone to flooding. These area should have uses that would have minimal impact of being flooded like open space, parks. If building are to go they should have stipulations of being on stilts so not affected by high water. This can be very effective, prevent spending large sums on money on flood prevention.

Other housing groups

A. **Homeless:** Current proposals for the homeless are old fashioned or at least not overly imaginative. Some chose to live outside, others would happily rent one of the above inexpensive container homes. To really help some of the homeless individuals addition facilities where homeless (or anyone else) could have a safe secure storage space for a few belongings are needed. Theft is a constant problem for anyone living on the street, so set up a scattered network of lockers which could be in the new concept of library/community centres. Charge a small rent on the lockers so could self fund though wouldn't generate great income. Other things needed for the homeless are places for showering, washing – currently problems are that hostels often require residency to use showers. Non-alcoholics, non-drug user homeless find hostels threatening as many residents are addicted and can be violent so these individuals not abusing substances won't stay.

B. **Student housing**, stop further expansion in central Bristol as this is already distorting the environment for anyone else trying to live here along with distorting the business possibilities. The centre of Bristol is effectively becoming or has become a student ghetto. To much is already built, more has permission so stop it at that. As for other aspects of student housing:

a. Enforce waste disposal regulations – I know the city can't charge students any rates or landlords for anything to do with students but they disproportionately produce rubbish and seemingly not interested in recycling. Locally we find students are happy to just dump rubbish near bins instead of opening the tops to put it in. They aren't bothered to use the provided recycling bins as easier just to leave on the street.

b. Not just students causing the problem and expense of cleaning off advertising posters, but at least some cities are fining gigs, bars, festivals that are fly posting advertisements on public and private property. The cleaning up of the mess this causes should not fall on the council.

c. The building and letting of student accommodation is incredibly profitable, make sure that planning gains are substantial for any approval (but please no more in central area). It seems most other uses of land or buildings can't compete with profits from student lets so preventing other uses.

A resilient city

In the “Reaching the future – setting our strategic direction” mention is made of making Bristol a resilient city, which seems a good concept. Resiliency does include aspects of redundancy so everything doesn't grind to a halt with any small glitch. This needs to include roads and provision for cars not just public transport. We have virtually no redundancy in transport infrastructure and a single accident easily brings road traffic to a standstill often for hours. Resilience should include ring roads and other ways that cars can bypass the main area of Bristol. With the new government proposals for money toward transport infrastructure Bristol should be prepared to bid for road improvements and new roads. Transport in Bristol is poor, not just public but also private, the promise when RPZ were brought in was that any revenue in excess of running was only going to be used for transport improvement. This promise seems to have been broken, it needs to be reinstated. Car transport is often essential for some, but the concept of “emphasis on people being able to help themselves as much as possible before the council’s services need to be engaged” is undermined by the council making car use more costly and difficult. Of course housing and ability to move house is also part of resilience. Cities, such as the much hated / maligned Los Angeles, California, have policies of a minimum of 10 percent empty usable housing. When it dips below this it is time to start building. This is to allow for people moving house, for expansion, for building works, etc. We have an impossible chance to do that, but policy should be having enough housing always free that people can find accommodation at all levels.

Telecoms and broadband provision is a bit poor in parts of Bristol. The emphasis has been on fibre, but some of the copper needs improvements or at least fibre to all cabinets. Broadband speeds in the centre of Bristol can drop to 3 or 4 kbps or less, almost using these low speeds as blackmail to force customers onto more expensive fibre. This needs to change, not everyone can afford fibre prices however much one would like it so copper cable needs work. Some more adventuresome cities have or are putting in public high speed WiFi, maybe it could come to Bristol (talk to Google). Jobs / work: much is made of “creativity and innovation” which is good, but workshop space is in very short supply. Larger creative institutions such as the BBC need encouragement to remain and expand in Bristol. This fosters many smaller start-up entrepreneurial businesses. Housing that has room for home workshops would help, rental workshops are also needed. Creative industries cover
a wide field and currently many policies limit them.

Health and fitness:

The cycling city does (or has) receive large amounts of funding, but totally misses on some aspects. In many other countries buses (as well as trains and trams) transport cyclists with their bikes with cycle

racks on the front so extending the range that a cyclist can travel. Why not here? Some of the millions of pounds spent on cycling could be supporting this type of initiative.

Bristol long ago privatized access to community leisure centres, sold off school playing fields and tries to sell off open spaces used by many for recreation. What it could do a little (or even no cost by opening to sponsors) is have simple exercise stations scattered along footpaths, in parks. Many cities abroad have this in a variety of forms and with a bit of thought it can be done cheaply. Would improve health and fitness.

Install drinking fountains and water bottle refilling stations in schools, public building and ultimately in parks. Cuts down on pollution caused by all the disposable water bottles, saves cost of providing cups or bottled water. Don't provide bottled water at meetings or events. The proliferation of wood burning stoves is now causing a significant increase in pollution. Their environmentally friendly persona has serious issues both due to the sources of wood but the fine particles and toxic chemicals produced. No public buildings should be burning wood and maybe his should be discouraged in the residential sector. In the USA this has been recognized as a problem for some time and fires are categorized for pollution levels with burning restrictions applied with increasing pollution levels. It is beginning to be seen as a problem in the UK competing with cars for polluting. Leaving dead leaves on the road and pavements also causes pollution as broken down into dust to become airborne (along with clogging drains). Just some ideas from a citizen concerned about council spending and sometimes the directions that policies take the city.

8. I tried to complete the survey but it is just way too lengthy and the questions are biased. Asking someone to choose two options out of a list presupposes that there are options in the list which they agree with. For example if you give a vegetarian the option to kill one chicken or two chickens for lunch which are they supposed to choose. There should be the 'none of the above' option

9. I am open minded to empowering communities and devolution in general. I am not a supporter of urban parish council as I believe fundamentally that act against so many of our Labour values and these are the reasons:-

   1. They engrain social and economic differences. Why? Because rich areas are able to raise more in precept than poor areas thus ensuring better public infrastructure, services and furthering the gulf which rich and poorer areas of the city.
   2. It’s an unfair tax. Now I am not against tax however they tax and we (Labour controlled Council and Mayor) will get the blame for that. The other obvious fact is poorer areas are struggling to make ends meet now. If we tax more, and the precept is a regressive tax, it is likely to push more people to the breadline.

3. Undermine & confuse city councillors role. At the moment we are developing a real civic duty amongst councillors and people have taken that challenge forward by advocating for their areas. Parish councillors will confuse that space and give a hiding place for poor city councillors not do to the right thing for their areas.
4. Allow a political platform for fringe parties. A real worry is that BNP and other nasty fringe political groups often find refuge in parish councillor seats. In some locations some parish council seats are not even contested. I think it's a real worry and we would not want to give a platform to those people.
5. They fragment services with the result that services are often more expensive and the quality poorer that with well managed council services. The unions have been dead set against devolution as you would imagine that if you give more control locally you end up with costs going up and potentially terms of conditions of workers being forced down.

It's a concern and I think further consideration should be given to allowing services to be responsive to local people without losing economies of scale and synergies that you retain from a city wide service.

10. Comment redacted

11. I am unsure whether you are proposing to close more public toilets? I really hope that you are not. I consider them essential to health and wellbeing for myself and many, many others. I am 65 years old, fit and able at the moment despite a having had cancer a few years ago. I hope to keep fit for a long time to come. I regularly run, walk and cycle. I therefore rely on public toilets a lot. Without them I would be travelling by car and giving up these sports. The idea of using cafes and pubs is not feasible, especially when part way through a run or in a large group. I have been turned away when I have tried, even though I was on my own at the time. Some cafes only have one toilet which is in heavy use from their customers. Cafe Retreat on the Downs is one such example.
Please do not close any further public toilets. Obesity and Type 2 Diabetes are already crippling the health service. Running, walking and cycling are gaining in popularity, particularly amongst mature people. Please do not hamper or stop people doing these activities by closing public toilets or shortening the opening hours.

12. I ask that Bristol City Council consider the following items in response to the proposals within the Corporate Strategy 2017-2022 document. Whilst the proposals refer to the Revenue budget, the Capital budget also needs examination.
    - Use some of the reserves to progressively introduce change.
    - Officers' salaries should be capped at the salary of a Minister of State.
    - University student's exemption from Council Rates should be removed in part or whole, or in the alternative, paid by the University where they are the landlord.
    - Sell the Council's Energy Company.
    - T117 Sell the Bristol Arena.
    - CF6 It is not possible for volunteer groups to take over the maintenance and running of parks and green spaces.
    - Community festivals, sporting events and, road closures should be funded entirely by sponsors; we are regularly told that the events "bring in millions to Bristol". BCC should provide management expertise at commercial rates.
    - T122 It was understood that the £1m from the sale of the Docks freehold had been assigned to the Neighbourhood Partnerships by the previous elected mayor.
    - T304 BCC should not provide £7m for further cycling enhancements whilst abolishing bus passes for carer companions.
    - T308 The proposal for a rail platform was examined in the NW Fringe Park and Ride Sites report (March 1996). It was found that a second Severn Beach track would have to be provided with additional rolling stock to provide a nominal number of additional trips from the Park & Ride.

13. I do not have a particular view on other issues and I am aware that cost savings need to be made across the board!

Firstly, I am concerned that withdrawing Concessionary Bus Pass re-imbursement from Community Transport Operators may result in these operations being shut down due to their financial viability – this would directly impact the most vulnerable people who use public transport (perhaps only once a week) and for whom there is likely to be no alternative bus service available.

Reducing the amount spent on supporting non-commercially viable (supported) bus services would also need to be considered carefully to avoid the same outcome.

Thirdly, I am concerned that changing the start time of the Concessionary Fares Scheme from 09.00 to 09.30 will not actually achieve any real savings, as the majority of pensioners will simply leave home ½ hour later, since for most their journey is not time-critical. There is also a greater likelihood of overcrowding on some bus services as everyone leaves home to catch the first available bus after 09.30. Also, those booking doctors' appointments, etc., will be more restricted in the times they can be available, as they will be reluctant to pay bus fares to the surgery…

I hope these comments will be seriously considered - they are born out of 16 years' experience in public transport operations!

These comments relate mainly to the need for "bold ideas" to meet our "five year challenge".
I would suggest the following way forward:

1. Particularly when money is short, I understand that the Council needs to have very clear priorities for its spending

So in order to have enough money for badly needed housing and social facilitiies, expenditure on non-essential facilities should be delayed or avoided completely at least for the time being. Therefore I suggest that:

(a) Expenditure on the 'Arena' is delayed.
(b) Expenditure by the Council on Music and Art facilities (such as the Colston Hall facilities) is avoided. They should pay for themselves.
(c) The 'Metrobus' project is carefully studied to find possible savings.

2. Achieve a major increase in the provision of housing by:

(a) Expansion of the City where possible for mainly housing use (local shops and common facilities would also be needed).
(b) Development of Castle Park as shown on the attached sketch layout.
(c) Compulsory purchase of unused office/workshop buildings and sites for conversion to housing.
(d) Exploring the possibility of using currently unused or very little used public buildings such as churches for other public uses such as schools, health centres and community rooms so releasing buildings and sites for housing.

3. Make new development as economic and sustainable as possible by:

(a) Planning development as compactly as possible so that walking distances are minimised so reducing the need for travel by car. Schools (particularly primaries), shops, community facilities and health centres should be within walking distance wherever possible.
(b) Planning development with low external wall and roof areas and good thermal insulation to minimise construction costs and heat loss (and therefore energy use).
(c) Using the buildings to shelter the streets, so they should be about three to five storeys high. (Single-storey, detached and semi-detached buildings which are more expensive to build and insulate should be avoided.) Streets should be kept fairly narrow - ideally about ten to twelve metres wide - again this will be economic in the cost of land.

However tall buildings (more than seven or eight storeys high) should be avoided because:

- They are considerably more expensive to build.
- They can cause very high winds at street level.
- There is no longer any visual contact between the street and the highest floors.
- They dwarf the lower buildings and human activitiy in the streets.

4. Make the City - particularly the streets, squares and public buildings - beautiful again by:

(a) Ensuring top quality and frequent street cleaning (with fines for leaving rubbish in them). To encourage good sustainable rubbish disposal, waive the charge for green bins and bulk collection by the Council, because the current charge just leads to fly-tipping.

(b) Insisting on high quality street elevations using natural materials such as stone, clay and painted wood.

5. To tackle congestion, make public transport free (at least for local people)

This would probably mean increasing the local rates to some extent, but most people would make a saving overall and the benefit would be enormous:

(a) Car use would probably be very substantially reduced.

(b) Public transport would be faster and cheaper because ticketing could be minimised or eliminated.

(c) Congestion would no longer be a problem, making the City's economy much more efficient.

(d) Transport would suddenly become very sustainable.

(e) The streets would become much safer.

6. With Central Government agreement if needed modify the current town planning system in the City to be able to plan well and efficiently in the future and to ensure a sufficient supply of housing (and other uses)

The reformed system would work as follows:

(a) The City Planning Department to plan all development in outline (i.e. the pattern of all streets, squares and public open spaces, the locations of all public buildings) and design all elevations onto these public spaces (often called 'The Public Realm').

(b) Key rules to be introduced for private property to cover matters affecting neighbours such as:

- The emission of noise/effluent.
- Overlooking of other property.
- The requirement for licences for special uses such as drinking establishments, shops, substantial workshops, major offices, etc.

(c) The City (rather than Central Government departments) to decide on the locations of public facilities such as schools, colleges, health centres, hospitals, etc. so that these facilities can fit properly into the City Plan (at present such facilities are often very poorly located, making access and travel to them long and difficult).

(d) The above would allow the requirement for Planning Approval to be abolished saving much time and money.

14. In light of this year proposed savings of 27 million and 92 million in five years. I warmly invite Bristol City Council to continue on their transparent journey for the collective mobilization of new ideas, insights and innovation to co-create, impactful change to deal with the array of complex and interwoven social and financial concerns to re-shape Bristol City Council to enable the draft proposal the new changes be with in the financial reach of everyone benefits from the city's success which ensures no-one is left behind'.

I reading previous reading of Empowering communities: making the most of local assets - Locality and 'Saving money by doing the right thing - Locality. The draft Bristol City Council 2017 -2022 Corporate Strategy will be adopting the Social Care framework.

I am seeking clarity by adopting this framework has there been a clear evidenced statistical data. Supported by Neighbouring wards listening record and data, which accurately reflects the wider social adoption in the hearts and minds for many community wards in Bristol.

I also have grave concerns regarding Bristol youth Links and Early Help. This draft document is in contradiction of the some of it vision namely 'Bristol to be a city In which everyone benefits from the city's success and no-one is left behind Where life chances and health are not determined by wealth and background "' p.5 . The apparent short sightedness which goes against the predictive analytic data which confirms many children, young people and families living in difficult circumstances of which some notably still on the facing multiple deprivation factors as well as some remaining on the edge of care. Early help and Bristol Youth Links are deeply enmeshed with social health and wellbeing policies and cannot be treated as a single entity. The disparaging cuts to take place at the heart of the most vulnerable citizens, of young people with no voice '18,900 children under 16 (23%) live in low income families in Bristol, more than national average of 20%' There is evidence to suggest in Ashley ward every other child /young person I pass is living with social and economic disadvantage and deprivation factors. This document is not clear on the steps that will be taken to support and maintain their resilience to deal with situations beyond their control is bellies Bristol City strategic direction.

Issues with the document

- This document is too big. Too many hyperlinks in the full document and acronyms in this report to make it readable. Not all residents will have the time or a PHD to interject the level of research skills needed to traverses this document fairly and objectively. Some context is missing for a lot of the points – information is so minimal or allusive deeper reading is a must to understand
- Throughout the whole document there appears to be No deadline- , who is responsible to follow up implement KPIs.
- Lack of budgets by some headings. How can we gain a full understanding if the 2017- 2018 budget has not been approved yet
- Not clear what theory good practice underpins Bristol City Council change or internal heart changing to making this happen not just spoken about?

Questions

I had great attention to respond point by point. I have filled in your questionnaire and see the below questions and highlighted notations on the attached document.

- It has been shown that citizens in diverse communities need culturally reflective breathing space where by intrinsic bi- cultural competence and social capital prevail and Combining resources has its dual benefits namely to help vital organisations to thrive.
- Have all the internal and interdepartmental BCC budgetary been correctly accounted for in this document. Some BCC departments are still working l work in silos to their own tune. Bristol Community Hubs are mentioned with no budget or departmental changes references. Is this a new service with a neighbourhood objective if so this information is not being shared in the right settings and how does it interlink **with**
- Urban Parish what is this, what will it cost, look like. Is this an effective model used to enable residents positive engagement at grass roots levels to deepen civic responsibility to impact fully empower improvement on system drivers within the BCC and government
- P. 10 can you be clearer in giving specific details of other costs with in the £ 149 m (13%)
- No budget set aside for re training and reframing for staff. Cost of implementation and distention of this change model process to ensure sustainability
- Suggestion of Urban Parishes what is this. Neighbourhood Partnership in Ashley hasn't even mentioned this. No councillor can explain without a different interpretation what it is or this model may not be used.
- What is meant by a regional body- who will govern this and ensure the aims of BBC draft document is achieved?
- What is the Capital programme? The BBC draft document alludes that is up for revision especially as the document says it can be up for revision
- Unclear how just refinancing Hen grove leisure centre alone will enable the saving suggested in the document

Education

- Nothing said about the powerful role of Community citizenship in education and how this can be used as an influential driver to to maintain and aspire engagement in school and further learning.
- Education does not seem to benefit from the inclusion of external community resources.
- On p . 2 Develop Recruitment & Retention action plan diverse workforce should refer to the original aim.
- Develop a campaign to promote the uptake of Pupil Premium and breakfast clubs/out of schools clubs to disadvantaged families in how you are going to achieve this no mention of the community improved engagement and a clear understanding that several deprived communities remain digitally excluded and
- What is the Bristol WORKS Hub? How does this have an outcome on education outcomes? This is not clear
- Implement the Bristol Learning City Partnership Employment and Skills Strategy what is this? Will it have an effect on Neighbourhood partnership or Urban Parish supporting a local awareness and approach?

15. Ideas to raise/save money:
    - It is so difficult to find a reliable trade person – painter, decorator, plumber, carpenter etc in Bristol, Why don't we use our BCC trade persons to do work for private people as well – the profit comes to the council and the citizens get a reliable craft worker.
    - Ask citizens to kill the weeds on the pavements outside their houses themselves
    - When you change the libraries into multi-function hubs ensure that this includes income generation projects, for instance converting part of a library into a gym (Lambeth have been doing this I think)
    - Take back the management/running of leisure centres into the council to benefit from the profit. This can be used to fund other parts of the council. Why did we handed over profit making businesses to the private sector in the first place?

16. I would like to express my concern at the proposed charging for Vassals Park car parking on p56 of the Corporate Strategy. I live on St Matthias Road, a nearby road off Oldbury Court Road and I believe implementing charges would cause parking problems where I live. Two years ago when the car park was closed for resurfacing there were parking issues as people parked on surrounding roads (as they no doubt would to avoid charges should fees be introduced).
    I look forward to hearing from you and hope that you will reconsider proposed charges for the sake of the nearby residents. I have a toddler and need to be able to park near my house.

17. I wish to submit my response to the above proposal as a resident of Oldbury Court Drive. I have only consulted my own family about the issues detailed by residents of the near by Perrymans Close, all of which I would echo, especially point no.1. This road is often inconvenienced due to people parking when the current car park is either full,(hence your plans to extend???) and on Bank Holidays when closed.

    1. **Significant Inconvenience to local residents caused by obstruction of local roads and footpaths.**

       Many visitors to the estate will simply park in the many residential streets surrounding the estate, rather than pay for parking. This will greatly increase the likelihood of obstruction of roads and footpaths. This will obstruct access for deliveries, service and emergency vehicles, and support services including nursing and home care staff, and seriously inconvenience local residents.
       Notes: Unlike Ashton Court and Blaise Castle Estates, Oldbury Court Estate has no convenient public transport, and the car park is effectively located at the end of a long cul-de-sac, and is surrounded by residential streets, many of which are narrow and easily obstructed.
       Lack of sufficient parking at the Estate has been recognised by the council (see recent planning approval for an overflow car park at Oldbury Court Estate). Charging for parking will simply exacerbate existing problems for local residents.
       The car park is heavily used from dawn to dusk, throughout the year (even on cold wet winter days). Many visitors are regular users.
       If parking charges are introduced, visitors will seek to park in adjacent residential streets.

    2. **The Economic Case for Revenue Generation at Oldbury Court Estate has not been demonstrated**

       The reason for charging is to raise revenue for the council. There is extensive on street parking in adjacent residential streets. Many visitors will avoid the charges by parking in local streets. This will significantly reduce any revenue generated for the council and call into question the economic viability of charging.

Note: The corporate plan indicates charging would raise £100,000 annually but no detailed business case has been provided to show how this would be achieved.
There is no breakdown of what sums would be raised at each of the three parks mentioned, and no indication of how charges would be enforced or how the council would mitigate the adverse effects (as above) caused by parking charges.
Consequently, there is currently no demonstrated case that charging at Oldbury Court Estate would be economically viable.

I have read that the residents of Perrymans Close would want to see additional parking restrictions/residents only parking arrangements in place if the proposal to charge for parking goes ahead. I would support this extending to all local roads potentially affected by those who may choose to avoid paying to park at this beautiful park facility. Quite how BCC will ensure restrictions are adhered to concerns

18. I was surprised to read recently that our government have given around 4 million pounds to an African girl band, in Africa. I am a dancer and musician and have been involved with Brazilian community arts for over 20 years. I am shocked at the general lack of concern or interest, investment in celebrating our own roots here in the UK both in the urban environment and as a cohesive intact practice regarding the integrity of our ecosystems, which can be very bountyful and beautful. I am very keen to raise consciousness of our indigenous ways and practices.
As a dancer myself I feel our own cultural heritage and knowledge in artistic practices is massively underfunded and unseen and of course much has been lost, but there is a groundswell and surge of public interest and I believe the people are ready for, need and desire identity nourishment, soul purpose and human care. I propose there is much to gain with cultural investment and especially as we may be running for capital of culture - let it be a celebration of our own culture for the running at least!!
I would be happy to raise some more specific ideas. For example a carnival style procession celebrating our heritage and natural elements. This could involve year round preparation and education, and giving to creating more community cohesion. These could be celebratory points or centres honouring the respect of life giving properties of elements such as water for example or building resources.

19. It is quite clear that the task given to Bristol City Council – of balancing its budgets given the reduction in funding from Central Government, is impossible. The savings put forward in the Strategy do not achieve the balanced budget, and many of the proposals put forward are unachievable. I am presuming the Council will increase council tax by the 3% rather than 2% for Social Care, as recently allowed by the Government, as well as the 1.9% general increase. I would suggest representations are made to Central Government to review central taxation to allow especially Health and Social Care to be funded appropriately. My feeling on this is that what amounts to £1 a week increases won't be noticed by most people, and they would be happy to pay more to have Health & Social care services operate properly.
Looking at the specific proposals, there are several I have particular concern over, as a carer and as a Charity based volunteer provider of services for people with disabilities.
    - RS1. Saving £552K – 1.1 M from Drug and Alcohol services. A saving of this magnitude can only be achieved by reducing quality and quantity of services provided. This is going to give bigger problems in many other areas - domestic abuse, homelessness, policing etc, all areas where other attempts to make cuts are being aspired to. If central Government had implemented minimum pricing for Alcohol, that might have been a start! *Tackling the issue through a "Health and Wellbeing strategy" while cutting services, is hypocrisy*!
    - The system is all inter related, and squeezing one area like a balloon, results in a bulge in problems somewhere else. The amount of squeezing proposed can only make the balloon burst!

- CF2 & CF3: £250K – 500K savings envisaged in homeless support services – and then £150K in preventing homelessness. This cannot be achieved simply by efficiency ! More will be homeless as a result especially given the housing problems in Bristol and the reduction in drug & alcohol services.
- Several of the proposals look really quite discriminatory – specifically impacting people with Disabilities:
- IN2: £200 charge for a Disabled parking bay. If you need a disabled parking bay you really do need it! If you are well enough off, you will have a driveway to park on! This is another tax on disability!
- RS4: £400K saving by removing the travel companion concession for carers of people who "Cannot travel alone". This adds cost to carers – most of whom are making sacrifices to care, or paid the minimum wage to do so. This I would suggest would contravene the Disability Discrimination Act. Where is the Equality Impact Assessment for this?
- RS6: £195K saving by cutting the subsidy for concessionary bus passes, putting it back to the Bus service providers – who will withdraw it and blame the council! Again impacting the elderly & disabled who cannot drive! Again not DDA Compliant.
- CF10. Save £413K by closing one or more of the Bristol Community Links Centres. There are only 3 of these, and they replaced 12 Day centres only a couple of years ago. These take the most severely disabled service users, who will not be able to find easily alternative services to go to. This I believe would contravene the obligations the Council has under the Care act, as well as the Disability Discrimination Act. They have also just had a major capital injection in refurbishment!
- CF16. Save £50K means testing Carers and charging them for services they receive. This really adds insult to injury! Carers invariably provide round the clock care and support for their family members at great personal cost, please do not add to their difficulties by this measure.
- RS11: Save £572K by reducing Police Community Support Officers. These Officers with all due respect, are already police on the cheap! This is yet another squeeze of the balloon which will make problems pop up elsewhere, especially with the reduction in drug funding etc as above!!

As with most savings proposals, these are unlikely to succeed completely, will not be able to be implemented in the timely manner envisaged, or are just totally unrealistic and are unachievable, and may result in legal challenges suggesting the Care Act or Disability Discrimination law is being broken. Many of the proposals if implemented will interact with other cuts and result in a significant deterioration in civil society in Bristol. Whilst I understand the need for balancing the budget, it should not be at the cost of undermining society, and as a result of some of these proposals, probably the cost of individual lives. We need to solve the problem by funding services properly.

I have commented on proposals that deal with Health & Social care particularly, many others will comment on other aspects, as everyone else did at the Henbury School meeting. I will not tread on their grounds of expertise.
One simple idea however to reduce traffic congestion - remove or limit Bus Lanes! These reduce road carrying capacity significantly. The best example of this is the portway. The bus lane causes huge congestion in car traffic, for at the best 6 buses an hour. If cars could use both lanes and merge after the traffic lights at Bridge Valley Rd, there would be no congestion, along with its associated extra pollution and cost!

20. I have reviewed your proposed corporate strategy, and while I agree that the Council should consider a re-structure and review its operations and ways
of working, I believe that funding does not need to be raised by an increase in council tax as there are alternative options available to the Council.
Please find below my own input regarding how to improve operations, structure and funding for Bristol City Council.
I have sent this prior to the deadline of completing your survey by 4th January, as again the questions posed by the questionnaire capture intangible
ideas and quantitative data rather than actual solutions and implementation approaches to drive the results you require.

1. GET THE BASICS RIGHT
a) From a city council perspective:
• List the 'must haves' – what MUST you do to meet
o the strategic plan
o legal obligations
o governmental obligations
b) From a city perspective:
• List the 'must haves' to meet basic city operations
c) Any other activities are a 'nice to have' – terminate them.

2. DRIVE EFFICIENCY
Analyse council business processes and workforce operations – a basic 'labour standards' exercise to achieve process improvement.
• What people in each department are required to complete an end to end task?
• How long does it currently take to complete each task and how many colleagues are involved? Is this an acceptable time-frame? Can the number
of colleagues involved be reduced?
• Where are the interfaces between other departments to complete a task? What are the time-frames for these interfaces to respond?
• Where are gaps in the process, time delays, overly manned decisions? Where can the process and time-frames be improved and unnecessary
activity stripped out.
The above is a very high-level summary of an activity which will give you a template across the council to improve basic operations and reduce cost
through improved performance. It also starts the process of identifying where roles can be merged or removed to greatest effect.
End flexible working hours. It is not cost-effective and creates over-resourcing across the organisation. Anyone who disagrees can leave, which when
part of a redundancy programme creates efficiencies through voluntary redundancies.

3. THINK 'END TO END' SOLUTION, NOT INDIVIDUAL TASK – PLAN AND DELIVERY SERVICES TO MEET THE NEEDS OF BOTH THE COUNCIL
AND RESIDENTS
Stop thinking in terms of department tasks and deliverables and start thinking in terms of 'organisation' tasks and deliverables. Ask yourself 'what is the
job to be done' not, what is the job title, or department, or who has a pre-defined role.
Great examples of where money, time and resource is wasted on council deliverables are;
• The parking team re-mark the parking bays
• The road team then re-surface the road, removing all the paint for the nice new bays
• Bristol water lay new pipes, digging up the new surfaces.
Seriously?!

My personal favourite are the gentlemen employed to blow leaves off the pavement and into the gutter. It then rains. We have blocked drains, which
the council then has to clear. What happened to the team who collect leaves and bag them at the same time? End to end thinking saves time, money,
resource and avoids additional problems.
These situations can be avoided with visual working techniques found throughout businesses, especially manufacturing – get some calendars up on
your walls and plan all works and activities together. Not difficult, hugely cost-effective.

4. SPEND MONEY TO MAKE MONEY – CREATE A COMMERCIALISATION PROGRAMME
Simply raising the cost council tax is short-sighted, not a well thought through solution, and is a short-term solution as the cost of living gradually
increases. The council and mayoral office already have initiatives in place that you are not capitalising on.
a) Traffic regulations
Bristol is the only city I have ever lived in either in the UK or abroad that allows people to completely ignore traffic and parking regulations. Install road
cameras and fine people who block yellow boxes, ignore red lights, double yellows, zig zags, roundabouts (the clue is in the name!) and no left/right turn
signs. I have never met another city where these basic safety and traffic flow regulations are so blatantly ignored. The fines raised would pay for the
equipment installed and fund council activities and initiatives. Talk to any London council and they can advise on this! America also stops and fines
cyclists who ignore traffic regulations and put drivers and pedestrians at risk. You will also find you reduce congestion and traffic jams by forcing
residents to drive and park more responsibly. With this potential at your finger-tips, why do you need to raise council tax?
a) Parking regulations
Why install a parking scheme across the majority of the city then reduce its success by not putting in place initiatives to uphold its regulations? Hire
more parking attendants. They will generate increased revenue, which will both cover their salary and fund council initiatives – either through fines or
through payment for permits. In my road alone this year I have seen 3 builders park their vans Monday – Friday every week from July 2015 to
December 2016. They have perhaps received 3 parking fines each during this period. By my calculation this totals a lost revenue in parking fines of 19
months x 20 days per month = 1,140 parking ticket fees. If a ticket = a £40 fine, that’s £45,600 raised simply by patrolling outside one house in one
street in the city.
And if you really want to make some easy money, work with the Downs parking team and have parking attendants patrolling the Downs every Bank
Holiday. Tow cars that park on the grass and fine those without tickets.
In London you know if you don’t buy a ticket you’ll receive a fine within 15 minutes of parking. Funds raised may be considered an additional tax by
Londoners, but these fines raise millions, reduce parking and congestion issues, raise funds and pay for council initiatives.
C) Act like a business and move away from old school public sector thinking
You have documents on your site which list the costs of installing CCTV cameras. Look beyond the numbers. With Bristol Council’s buying power you
can enter into commercial deals with suppliers and together agree innovative procurement solutions to get these initiatives started and start raising
funds.

5. LEARN FROM OTHERS

There are many councils in the UK who are already operating in a significantly more commercial way and are hiring externals to drive improved working
and operational understanding. Contact them, listen and learn.

Ask for help, not just opinions – Bristol is full of experienced consultants and professionals like me who resolve problems like this for organisations
every day, working to fixed deliverables, fees and timeframes. Long-term, having those with experience to advise and work alongside you is much
cheaper than trying to do it yourself in addition to your day job.

Ask if qualified and experienced residents would donate some of their time to help and advise. I myself would be happy to offer some of my time.

Bristol is a great city, but it acts like it's a small country town. It needs to step up and start acting like a professional City Council, and it needs to move
fast as it is falling behind many other major UK cities. If this continues we will lose businesses, investors, and employers. It's time create an achievable
and realistic direction for the Council and move away from outdated behaviours and principles that stem from the last century.