

CABINET - 5 DECEMBER 2013
Public forum questions & replies

A. WRITTEN QUESTIONS RELATING TO AGENDA ITEMS:

Re: agenda item 6 – Cathedral primary school lease

A.6.1 Michael Flanagan

A.6.2 Christine Townsend

A.6.3 Dawn Dyer / Steve Mills, Bristol UNISON

Re: agenda item 7 – Education policy directions

A.7.1 Alderman Brian Price

B. WRITTEN QUESTIONS NOT RELATING TO AGENDA ITEMS:

B.1 Cllr Mark Wright - subject: low emission zone

B.2 Paul Wheeler - subject: minimum alcohol pricing

B.3 Cllr Christian Martin - subject: waste services issues

B.4 Cllr Christian Martin - subject: corporate videos

B.5 Alderman Jon Rogers - subject: exploring alternative resident parking options in Ashley ward and elsewhere

B.6 Roy Norris - subject: Bristol, Guangzhou and human rights

B.7 Simon James Lewis - subject: residents parking / role of the Bristol councillor

B.8 Ben Wood - subject: residents parking - Our Streets Our Scheme campaign

B.9 Cllr Christian Martin - subject: Mayor's travel costs

B.10 Cllr Sean Emmett - subject: Ashley Hill & Horfield rail stations

B.11 Cllr David Willingham - subject: Memorial ground & related issues

B.12 Cllr Claire Hiscott - subject: re-opening of rail stations serving Horfield and Lockleaze

B.13 Even Clarke - subject: academies / free schools

Question from Michael Flanagan

Question re: Cathedral Primary School Lease for Cabinet meeting 5 December 2013

My greatest concern regarding a Primary School within the library is that of encouraging yet more traffic into the city centre during rush hour. This seems to be a somewhat backward step in town planning. I have read that parents are to be encouraged to use public transport. Anyone that lives in the real world will know that will simply not happen. All the infants and many of the other older children (those that have fearful parents, and this is the city centre we are talking about) will have parents wanting to park (probably 4x4s and Estates) and then walk their children right to the doors of the school. I cannot see many of these parents abandoning the family car and taking the bus into town to get the children to school, especially if they themselves have to get somewhere else for 9am in order to start work.

So the question is - where will all these cars be parked? Is the lovely tree filled area in College Square to be paved over and turned into a car park?

REPLY:

I understand your concern but the Council is not the body which determines academy or Free School proposals. These are determined by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has already decided to approve the Cathedral Primary School. The school therefore already exists and started taking pupils in September 2013. As a consequence, the issue before the Council at the present time is whether or not to lease part of its property to Bristol Cathedral School as the school wants to increase its accommodation. The matter before Cabinet is, therefore, whether the proposition should be supported from the Council's perspective as landlord. If the recommendation before Cabinet is accepted, this will open the way for detailed consideration of the implementation. There is no intention, from either the school or the Council of allowing College Square to be adversely affected. The school will develop the travel plan with our assistance, as part of the planning process, which will include a reduction in parking on College Square.

QUESTION A.6.2

Questions for Cabinet Meeting December 5th

From Christine Townsend re: Cathedral primary school lease report

- 1) How does this educational proposal fulfil the following objectives from the Children and Young People's Plan 2011-14:-
'narrow the gap to reduce inequality of outcomes and to improve outcomes for children and young people who are socially and economically disadvantaged'
'maintain the role of the local authority as champion and advocate and particularly promote shared responsibility for most vulnerable children' ?

REPLY:

The Council is not the body which determines academy or Free School proposals. These are determined by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has already decided to approve the Cathedral Primary School. In law, the school is an academy. What the Council asks of all education providers within the City, including academies, is that they collectively and individually support the principles within the Children and Young People's Plan. Bristol Cathedral School supports the principles through:

Working with other schools and the Local Authority. The primary school has a specialism in music and is supported by the secondary school which has specialisms in music and mathematics. The trust is already in discussion with a number of other schools about how it can support and work in partnership in relation to both subjects. A number of projects are already taking place within the secondary school, courses run in partnership with City Academy and Merchants Academy in supporting middle leaders and newly qualified teachers. Music and Mathematics support hubs are well established and we are working with a number of local schools to support attainment in mathematics. The aim is to ensure that both primary and secondary school play a significant role, working in partnership, disseminating best practice, raising attainment and providing culturally enriching opportunities for Bristol children.

The secondary school BCCS has a well developed music outreach programme which takes music into primary and secondary schools, ensuring that students who may be socially and economically disadvantaged have opportunities to hear and take part in musical activities. The school Gospel Choir support the Primary School prom and the Cathedral Choir, boy's choir and girl's choir visit other schools

regularly to perform and provide workshops for students and teachers. Cathedral Primary School is committed to ensuring that parents from all areas of the city are aware of the admissions policy. As a city centre school, the trust is committed to out of hour community use and access. The aim is to ensure that the school provides opportunities for evening and holiday education for residents, well served by public transport.

- 2) How will this educational provision contribute to the following outcome measure from the Children and Young People's Plan 2011-14? - 'closing the attainment gap between pupils eligible for free school meals, BME pupils, children in care and their peers?'

REPLY:

CPS has a high proportion of students eligible for FSM, children in care and from BME backgrounds. The high quality provision within the school is supported by a number of outside agencies. The secondary school already provide specialist subject teachers in Music, Science, Languages and PE. Students have reading and play time support from sixth form mentors. Further mentoring is being provided by the local business community and the educational outcomes are likely to be outstanding. Disseminating the provision will be in the interest of the wider educational community.

The admissions policy has a statutory obligation to provide priority places for children who are looked after and who may have a statement of special educational need. The school is already making effective use of pupil premium monies to ensure that appropriate interventions are in place to support children who may falling behind.

- 3) How does this educational proposal fulfil the public sector duty requirements where LA must have due regard for the following in carrying out their functions:-
- 'eliminate discrimination'
 - 'advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant characteristic and persons who do not share it' using the 'positive duty' model
 - 'foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it' ?

REPLY:

The school is an academy, not a Local Authority maintained school. As such, the LA is not carrying out public sector duties in relation to education provision. In such cases (and the majority of secondary schools and 30% of primary schools are academies) the Local Authority identifies its objectives and priorities (as expressed through the Children and Young People's Plan) and seeks to work with and influence providers to identify how they contribute to these objectives.

- 4) For what reasons is council confident that this educational proposal avoids indirect discrimination based on socio-economic background by enabling children from low-income families (living outside of walking distance) to access the provision in the same way as those from better off backgrounds?

REPLY:

The provision already exists. The school opened in September 2013 following a decision by the Secretary of State. The Academy Trust is the admission authority for an academy (including a free school) and is responsible for setting the admission arrangements. Under the terms of their funding agreement they must ensure compliance with the law relating to school admissions. When setting the admission arrangements all admission authorities must ensure that the arrangements comply with the School Admissions Code and associated Regulations. It is, therefore, reasonable for the Council to work on the basis that the Secretary of State has satisfied himself that the admissions arrangements do not result in indirect discrimination.

The matter before the Council is whether or not it should look to lease property to the school. If it does not agree to do this, then this will not change the fact that the school will continue to exist as a legal entity and continue to accept pupils based upon approved admission arrangements.

QUESTION A.6.3

Steve Mills / Dawn Dyer - UNISON Questions to Cabinet 5/12/13 - Central Library Proposal.

Following on from the Scrutiny meeting of 20/11/13 and the questions raised at that meeting - we now find we have supplementary questions.

1. Cardiff is not a core comparator city. Our original question asked about our comparators which are;
The English Core Cities – Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, Nottingham and Sheffield.

Manchester - according to the Manchester website - it is intended to bring Archives, rare books etc under "one roof" when the Manchester Central Library is refurbished April 2014. Was this taken into account when the answer was delivered to Scrutiny? Also the material at B Bond will (we believe) be general reference material and not archives/rare books/special collections. These items you might expect to wait for while security checks are being made.

REPLY: CIPFA provides two comparator groups – near neighbours and core cities. We provided answers to take this into account. The reply from Manchester came directly from their Head of Service. We are in discussion with Archives about the exact collections that might be housed as B Bond to see if there is any joint use of collections and to make it easier for customers to know where that material is. The exact location of materials is not yet decided except for a commitment to retain the Art Reference and loan material and Central Lending Store in the Central Library.

2. Breakdown of £500,000/600,000 costs - the reply stated there is no allowance for extra staffing to review collections, and all the preparation work needed. Why wasn't this factored in? SEE ALSO NO.3.

REPLY: The staffing team already undertake “stock edits” as part of core duties around all libraries. These would be suspended and work concentrated on stock edits in the basement collections. The library management team would also be involved.

3. Staffing - as staffing levels in the Library service have been whittled down in the last 2 Library Reviews - we are struggling to maintain our frontline service at present. It is not clear from the reply exactly how this retrieval system will work, especially in light of the Current Budget proposals of £1.1 million cut from the Library budget, £285,000 cut/change from other Library services and the reduction in the Record Office - £50,000. Joint working was mentioned in the reply however, the EQ said "closure of BRO". We now understand this was a mistake and it is a "reduction" of public engagement staff - does this mean frontline staff? Transport costs are an unknown quantity at this time. How do we know the £35,000 will cover staffing and transport as stated? What happens if it doesn't?

REPLY: We will work within the budget we have. There are many unknowns as is common in a proposal not yet decided and with many variables. The impact of the library service budget proposal cannot be determined at this point. We are discussing joint working with Archives and also joint transport. The Archive budget reduction is not concerned with Reading Room opening hours.

4. Breaking the lease - BCC will not have the right to do so. And if this arrangement is detrimental to the Library service and its users - BCC will have no recourse to make a reversal. How widespread is the practice of a 125 year lease that only the tenant can break?

REPLY: It is very widespread to grant a 125 year lease which the landlord cannot break where the tenant is investing substantial capital. The agreement to allow the tenant an option to break does not impact on that principle.

Appendix QUESTIONS FROM STEVE MILLS, UNISON

As per scrutiny meeting on 20/11/13

Q1. How many of the public libraries in our comparator cities have off-site storage?

A1 Manchester is using Deepstore for archives, rare books and special collections. Deepstore do retrieval every fortnight and deliver it to Manchester. Customers are required to give 1-2 weeks' notice.
Cardiff Central Library also have off site storage with retrieval in 48 hours.
We are looking at a Bristol model of between 48-72 hours for retrieval from B Bond.

Q2. Could we have a breakdown of the £500,000 - 600,000 estimated costs for the movement, cataloguing and storage of books (s.12). In particular how much is allowed for the cost of extra staffing to allow us to review the collections prior to the move?

A2 All are estimates -
Packing and specialist removal to B Bond = £71,000
Purpose built storage for Reference collections = £250,000
Retrospective cataloguing = £215,000
Building changes to Central Library to accommodate staff changes = £10,000
Estimated total of £546,000

There is no current allowance for extra staffing to review the collections prior to the move, but all planned stock work in other libraries will be temporarily halted to allow for a focus on work within the Central Library. This will involve all the Stock Librarians and Management Team.

Q3. Could we have details of the anticipated staffing at the new book store and the transport details, to explain the estimated revenue cost of £35,000?

A3 There will not be permanent staffing at B Bond for the new store but staff will be rota – ed, possibly daily, depending on need and demand. We anticipate an increase in hours for staffing rather than posts. The transport costs depend on current and future capacity in our delivery vans and will be subject to review if the proposal goes ahead. We will work within the budget allocated. Equally we will explore joint working with the Archive Reading Room service.

Q4. Under the terms of the proposal (s 19) will the Council have the right to break the lease after 25yrs if the arrangement proves highly detrimental to the Library Service?

A4 The Break option operates in favour of the tenant therefore as currently drafted and agreed the Heads of Terms would not permit the landlord to break

the lease but the tenant can do so at each 25th anniversary of the term on provision of at least 12 months written notice.

Q5. What public consultation do you intend to undertake?

A5 The library service will consult with our customers, if the proposal goes ahead, on the impact during the build. We will consider how best to manage the Central Library and whether we need to change our service delivery depending on noise, disruption or the physical changes required to utility and ICT supply.

Q6. Why is the authority considering this, when there are not shortages of school places in central Bristol?

A6 There is a shortage of primary school places in central Bristol. To the period 2017, there is an estimated shortfall equivalent to a new 3 form of entry primary school.

Furthermore, for the record, and the minutes of scrutiny, Unison is opposed to this move to relocate Bristol's collective assets to B-Bond, for the benefit of a single school. We feel that the Central library is an essential collective resource, assessable to all of Bristol's citizens. The service provided by the Librarians is excellent, and extreme caution should be exercised here.

QUESTION A.7.1

Questions from Alderman Brian Price

Children Looked After

Children Act 1989 as amended by section 52 of the Children Act 2004 Section 22(3)a. Secondary - Section 22(3)a of the Children Act 1989 placed a duty on local authorities to safeguard and promote the welfare of a child looked after by them. Section 52 of the Children Act 2004 amended that to include a particular duty on local authorities to promote their educational achievement.

2004 /

002

Promoting the educational achievement of looked after children.

Regarding

4.3 Recommendation: that the Council determines the future form of delivery for traded services to schools in the context of the wider changes to its organisational structure

Q1 When will the reorganisation affecting the traded services with schools services be completed?

REPLY: Any reorganisation will be completed in line with the timescales for the rest of the Council.

The fact that you are approving this recommendation leads to the question.

Q2 Why have you further delayed the implementation of the 'improvements' required to be implemented as a result of the review of the Education of Children Looked After Service?

REPLY: Any improvements as a result of the review will be also be implemented as part of the overall restructure of the Council.

Whereas the ECLAS service used to be able to call on the services of the Department now in TWS; They can't do so now until the organisation structure is completed and ECLAS and the Headteacher of the Virtual School has a budget.

Q3 Will you please note that the Ofsted Inspector giving evidence to the Select Committee said that if nothing else, the follow up of the children in the care of the LA gave access to the various types of schools in Bristol?

REPLY: The Council's role is as the community leader and champion of all children and parents, including the most vulnerable. It has a particular role as well as the Corporate Parent for Looked After Children. These responsibilities facilitate access to all types of schools in Bristol (including the independent sector) in different ways and at different levels.

Q3 Why is the Organisation driving the Service as opposed to the Service Needs driving the Organisation?

REPLY: I don't accept that this is the case.

6. Young people, skills and employment.

Recommendation: to be derived from the work of the Skills Commission

Post 16 Education and Training. Employment

Q4 Have we to wait for your Commission to report before getting a policy?

REPLY: There is already much activity in the city to support the skills and employment of young people. This include actions related to the Raising Participation Age Strategy about retaining young people in learning and the draft Employment and Enterprise Strategy which includes young people as a priority group and has implementation proposals around apprenticeships, Work Experience, careers guidance and transport. The role of the Commission is to review all this and make recommendations for any potential improvements.

Q5 Has it got a finish date?

REPLY: The Commission is due to report in Spring 2014.

Q6 Has it been told to concentrate on the Enterprise Zone and ignore other area?

REPLY: No, it is considering the city-wide picture as well as having a particular focus on the Enterprise Zone. Any jobs created there will of course be available to people from all over the city.

Equality and Diversity

Q7 Where is the Policy with regard to the LA's application of E&D to the Schools of Bristol as is expected of the Schools towards their pupils?

REPLY: The Council has an overarching corporate Equalities and Diversity policy which is available through its website. As schools have become more autonomous and received higher levels of delegated funding, as entities in their own right they are expected to fulfil their obligations under the Equalities Act and develop and implement their own policies. In complex circumstances, they can seek the advice of the relevant Equalities and Community Cohesion Manager.

Q8 Without a plan of actions: How can the people of Bristol keep track of the progress being made towards achieving/fulfilling the pledges made by the elected Mayor?

REPLY: Actions relating to the issues raised by OfSTED in their review of school improvement in the city are included in the Post-OfSTED Action Plan. The final version of this, following consultation, is about to be published. The development of a wider plan to include other issues will be done in partnership with schools and others through the multi-agency Attainment and Progression Group and the Education Strategy Group.

QUESTION B.1

Question to the Mayor from Cllr Mark Wright

Low Emission Zone

Residents of central Bristol are strongly in favour of a Low Emission Zone (LEZ) targeting large diesel vehicles, and the Mayor has indicated in the past that he wants to explore the idea. In March, the Sustainable Development and Transport Scrutiny Commission supported investigating an LEZ as part of the city's emerging Air Quality strategy.

Can the Mayor outline what steps have been taken since then in evaluating the feasibility of an LEZ for Bristol ?

REPLY:

I asked officers to commission a study in August 2013 to examine a range of transport interventions for consideration as part of the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy. The options included two versions of Low Emission Zones. These were:

- 1. A "London" style zone with Euro IV minimum emissions standards for particulate matter for bus, coach and HGV, with a Euro 3 standard for large vans and minibuses.**
- 2. LEZ "plus" which is Euro V for all vehicles excluding motorcycles.**

The study examined the impact of the interventions at locations in the city where traffic counts are available and there are variations in the impact of these interventions due to differing traffic composition and speeds.

Both of the LEZ options showed an encouraging reduction in emissions, although this unfortunately was not predicted to lead to a significant reduction in ambient concentrations of NO₂ due to relatively high background concentrations and the non – linear relationship between NO_x and NO₂. An LEZ is likely to be a relatively costly option to tackle poor air quality due to the infrastructure and enforcement system costs.

Other interventions offered comparable, and sometimes more favourable reductions, such as a minimum standard for all buses of Euro VI. Active travel also showed clear benefits for air quality and there are other health and sociological benefits arising from investment in active travel that do not necessarily accrue directly from LEZ.

Unfortunately an LEZ is likely to be a relatively costly option to tackle poor air quality due to the infrastructure and enforcement system costs unless introduced together with a congestion charge. Arup have been commissioned to provide a report which will examine the business case for LEZ and enable an informed decision to be taken about pursuing this option. This study will

report in March 2014 and be available to the March 2014 SD&T Scrutiny Commission as part of the presentation on the Air Quality Strategy.

The summary of the TTR study report is appended to provide more detail on the study's findings.

BRISTOL LEZ - STUDY SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

This report summarises the outcomes of a scoping study commissioned by Bristol City Council (BCC) to understand the potential impact of implementing traffic focussed policy measures to reduce traffic emissions and air quality concentrations.

Over a quarter of Bristol is failing to meet the government's health-based air quality targets originally set for 2005. These areas have been declared Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). Over 100,000 people live in these areas (including 13,000 children) and tens of thousands more work or go to school in the central AQMA. The majority of pollution in Bristol comes from road traffic¹.

The aims of the scoping study are to:

- Define the possible traffic impacts from an available range of transport policy options
- Test the theoretical traffic changes by modelling the impact on emissions and road-pollutant concentrations.
- Provide high level advice on the methods of implementation and outline costs of potential options.

1.2 What is the problem?

BCC has declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) for central Bristol and key road corridors on the basis of exceedences of the annual NO₂ objective limit and for PM₁₀, as a precautionary measure, as monitoring of PM10 within the city does not take place at 'worst case' locations. The levels of pollutant concentration in central areas of Bristol exceed the UK (and EC) health-based objective and limit values and this gives cause for concern over the damage to human health.

The Bristol Air Quality Action Plan (2003) summarised the situation for air pollution in the city by describing the situation by pollutant type, source of pollution, location and impact on air quality.

"Citywide, around 70% of **NO_x emissions** in Bristol come from road traffic. The other main sources of pollution are industry (25%) and domestic (home heating and cooking – 5%). Once pollutant emissions enter the air they are mixed, complex chemistries occur, and they are measured in terms of concentrations and how much of the population is directly exposed. For example, virtually none of the 25% of NO_x emitted by industry is experienced by the population because of the way the pollution is dispersed (mainly from tall chimneys). In contrast, those living next to or near roads tend to suffer the worst affects of pollution due to their proximity. So, within the central area AQMA a far higher proportion (97%) of the **NO₂ pollution** to which people are exposed originates from road traffic."

The annual mean objective necessary to reach to revoke the AQMA for NO₂ pollutant concentrations is 40 µg/m³. It was noted at the time of the 2003 AQAP that levels of pollution within the AQMA. will have to be reduced by up to 40% (15 µg/m³) if the government target for NO₂ is to be achieved. Particle emissions (PM) would have to be halved to **meet the indicative particles target for 2010**.

Currently, in 2013, there continue to be a number of places where current automatic monitoring stations show air pollution at higher levels than the objective, such as Parson Street School (47.9 µg/m³), Wells Road (41.2 µg/m³) and

¹ Bristol Air Quality Action Plan (2003), Bristol City Council

Newfoundland Road Police Station ($52.7 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). This suggests reductions in concentrations in a range between 2 and $12 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (i.e. between 5% and 30% of total NO_2) are required at various points across the city to meet the objectives.

It should be noted that the national air quality objectives are health based targets. Increasing amounts of evidence is showing that air pollution at a variety of concentration levels causes a range of people health problems. The target levels for the main pollutants of concern – NO_2 and PM – are important for benchmarking success, but as important is the direction of travel, and benefits that arise from lowering pollution levels to which the population are exposed. There are no ‘safe’ levels for PM, beyond which there are no further benefits, until PM is completely removed.

1.3 How can air pollution be reduced?

1.3.1 Rationale

Because the majority of air pollution in the central areas of Bristol are traffic related, and action is already being taken to tackle industrial and domestic sources of pollution (through regulation and energy efficiency programmes), the focus of the AQAP for Bristol was on transport measures. This study continues the examination of transport options to tackle vehicle emissions from Trucks (HGV), Bus/Coach, Van (LGV) and passenger cars (petrol and diesel).

1.3.2 What are the options?

The study team and client manager used experience from previous projects and background knowledge of the City to determine a number of transport measures to test. Following in-depth discussions with BCC, the following measures were chosen, variations agreed, and suitable tests devised.

Test 1 - Low Emission Zone – same as in London with Euro IV minimum for PM for bus, coach, HGV and Euro 3 for large vans and minibus.

Test 2 - Low Emission Zone “Plus” - Euro V for all vehicles (including car, but not motorcycles).

Test 3 - Freight consolidation centre (FCC) – 2, 4 and 6 times current size (i.e. number consolidated loads)

Test 4 - Bus fleet A (All bus are Euro VI)

Test 5 - Bus fleet B (All bus are Euro V)

Test 6 - Bus fleet C (All Euro IV bus to become Euro V)

Test 7 - Traffic Cells - reduces *city centre / suburban* short trips (0-5km) by car/van by up to 50% (to the degree that general car/van traffic falls (with variations of 4%, 12% and 22% reduction)

Test 8 - Major active travel schemes - increase cycling to 20% or 30% of mode share as a Bristol target or a European-city comparator (and a resulting reduction in general car/van traffic by 12% or 22%).

Test 9 - Road user charging (RUC) – reduces car trips in AM peak by 15% and PM peak by 5%

Test 10 - A reduction in all traffic flow of 25% and then 50% (including buses).

The intention was to make the traffic measures (and therefore tests) ambitious in scale and intensity because past experience has shown that small to medium changes in traffic has negligible impact on pollution concentrations. One reason for this is that as exhaust emissions transform into pollutant concentrations the relationship is not linear due to atmospheric chemistry, and because there is a large ‘store’ of background pollution in most urban areas.

It should be noted that Test 2 (LEZ 'London Plus') was included as a 'theoretical' test of this measures potential, rather than a well-founded policy option. Also, Test 10 (a reduction in all traffic flow) was a theoretical comparator to enable an understanding of impact from very significant traffic reductions of 25% and 50%. The larger reduction does not have a policy basis, the former might be considered as very ambitious.

A more detailed description of each measure including the geographical area affected, vehicles changed and chosen test sites are provided in the full study reporting. All tests were assumed to be implemented in the same test year of 2013.

Initially, the direct change in vehicle emissions was estimated. Then the affect this might have on measured pollution concentrations (at the road) was modelled. Finally, the impact the reduction in road pollution has on the wider area (known as the 'background' levels) was estimated in a limited manner.

1.4 What are the predicted changes to vehicle emissions?

1.4.1 Baseline emissions from traffic (as a pollution source)

Traffic and vehicle fleet information was collated and the most appropriate test sites with robust baseline data were chosen to describe the current situation for traffic flows, speed, mode shares and Euro (emission) standards. The four test sites were:

1. Bristol Bridge (A4053 Victoria Street)
2. A38 Gloucester Road (around St Andrews)
3. A4 Bath Road (Arnos Vale to A37 junction)
4. A4032 Newfoundland Way to M32 Junction 2

The contribution of different types of vehicles to four key emissions were estimated, as shown in Table 1. For reference, the traffic flows (in number of vehicles) are shown in Table 2.

Table 1: 2013 Baseline emission source apportionment

	Petrol Cars	Diesel Cars	LGV	HGV	Buses/ Coaches	M/cyles
CO₂ (%)						
Bristol Bridge	35%	25%	10%	6%	24%	1%
Gloucester Road	35%	25%	14%	6%	19%	1%
Bath Road	35%	26%	15%	11%	12%	1%
Newfoundland Road	42%	29%	13%	12%	3%	1%
NOx (%)						
Bristol Bridge	6%	24%	10%	10%	50%	0%
Gloucester Road	7%	27%	14%	9%	42%	0%
Bath Road	8%	29%	17%	19%	28%	0%
Newfoundland Road	12%	43%	18%	20%	7%	1%
PM10 (%)						
Bristol Bridge	23%	32%	14%	6%	25%	1%
Gloucester Road	23%	32%	19%	5%	19%	1%
Bath Road	25%	33%	19%	10%	12%	1%
Newfoundland Road	31%	40%	15%	10%	3%	1%
PM2.5 (%)						
Bristol Bridge	19%	34%	14%	6%	26%	1%
Gloucester Road	21%	35%	20%	8%	15%	1%
Bath Road	21%	35%	19%	10%	13%	1%
Newfoundland Road	27%	43%	16%	10%	3%	1%

Table 2: Summarised traffic information

	Total flow	Cars	LGV	HGV	Buses/ Coaches	M/cyles	Average speed
	AADT	%					km/h
Bristol Bridge	7991	79	11	2	6	2	21
Gloucester Road	6739	77	14	2	5	3	23
Bath Road	10786	77	15	3	3	2	37
Newfoundland Road	29690	84	11	3	1	1	73

The baseline source apportionment showed that light duty vehicles (cars and LGV [van]) contributed between circa 70 and 85% of CO₂ and PM 10/2.5 emissions, with higher figures at Newfoundland Road compared to the other three sites. The remaining 15 to 30% of pollutant emissions were attributable to Heavy Duty Vehicles (Heavy Good Vehicles [HGV], Bus, Coach). This is broadly in line with the %'s of total traffic flow made up by these vehicle types.

However, for NO_x emissions, then the split for three test sites between Light Duty and Heavy Duty Vehicles was around to 50:50. This is largely due to a disproportionate amount of emissions from buses, given their relatively small numbers compared to other traffic.

Within the car fleet, diesel cars are estimated to contribute a higher proportion of NO_x and PM than petrol cars, despite being fewer in number. This is the reason for concern over of the recent shift to more diesels (as 44% of cars on urban roads are now diesel vehicles and this is predicted to grow further).

The subsequent tasks focussed exclusively on pollutants to air, so that benefits from carbon reduction are not quantified further. Measures that reduce traffic levels very directly translate into carbon reductions.

1.4.2 Change in road traffic emissions for each test measure by location

The estimation of emission impacts of the tests (for each measure and any variations) involved changing the traffic flow, fleet mix and/or Euro emission standards to model the impact of each of the ten test options and individual scenarios on emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO_x), particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and carbon dioxide (CO₂). The Emission Factor Toolkit (EFT), version 5.2c was used to generate emission rates for the baseline year (2013) and all test options/scenarios (for the same year) for all road links at the four test sites.

Table 3: Average change in road traffic emissions for each test scenario by location

Test	Description	Bristol Bridge		Gloucester Road		Bath Road		Newfoundland Way	
		Road NOx	Road PM	Road NOx	Road PM	Road NOx	Road PM	Road NOx	Road PM
1	LEZ (as London)	-11%	-9%	-9%	-7%	-8%	-6%	-4%	-3%
2	LEZ Plus (all to Euro V)	-17%	-30%	-20%	-30%	-27%	-26%	-42%	-25%
3a	FCC 2x current size	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
3b	FCC 4x current size	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	-1%	0%	0%	0%
3c	FCC 6x current size	-1%	-1%	-2%	-1%	-1%	-1%	0%	0%
4	Bus A (all fleet Euro VI)	-29%	-8%	-25%	-6%	-17%	-3%	-5%	-1%
5	Bus B (all fleet Euro V)	-3%	-4%	-3%	-3%	-5%	-2%	-2%	0%
6	Bus C (all Euro IV to V)	2%	0%	1%	0%	-1%	0%	-1%	0%
7a/8a	Traffic Cell/Active travel 4%	-1%	-2%	-1%	-2%	-2%	-2%	-2%	-3%
7b/8b	Traffic Cell/Active travel 12%	-4%	-7%	-4%	-7%	-4%	-7%	-7%	-9%
7c/8c	Traffic Cell/Active travel 22%	-7%	-12%	-8%	-12%	-8%	-13%	-12%	-16%
9	Road User Charging (peak)	-1%	-2%	-1%	-2%	-1%	-2%	-2%	-2%
10b	All traffic reduced (25%)	-25%	-25%	-25%	-25%	-25%	-25%	-25%	-25%
10c	All traffic reduced (50%)	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%	-50%

The key findings from the emissions assessment are as follows.

Firstly, it is prudent to note the two theoretical, comparator tests (Test 2 LEZ Plus and Test 10c All traffic reduce 50%) in order to appreciate the lower impact from the remaining transport measures that are more likely to be implemented.

For the standard LEZ (London equivalent), Bus Fleet renewal (to latest standard) and Active Travel (largest mode shift) were the measures with the largest impact on emissions across the various sites and pollutants (of NO_x and PM).

There are variations in impact depending on test location, which is due to existing traffic composition and the manner in which a given measure then changes that traffic and vehicle mix.

For the LEZ (London equivalent) test, the highest reduction in NO_x emissions was estimated for the Gloucester Road and Bristol Bridge locations at ~10 percent and 11 percent respectively. The London LEZ standards are Euro IV (PM) levels for heavy duty vehicles, Euro III (PM) standards for larger vans, and does not include vans or cars.

LEZ Plus is a theoretical test with all vehicles (including cars and vans) at Euro V, so manufactured since 2008 (HDV) or 2009 (LDV). These reductions in emissions are impressive but implementation in the short-term would be very challenging. It can be noted that Transport for London are examining an Ultra Low Emission Zone for central London, pencilled in for 2020.

Bus options had most impact on the Bristol Bridge test site, followed by Gloucester Road site. This is somewhat expected given the source apportionment results show bus emissions prominent in the overall share at this sites. Three tests were carried out to represent potential changes to the bus fleet:

- Test 4 (all bus are Euro VI) – this had a strong impact compared to the other measures, and much greater than the other two bus tests. It can be considered extremely ambitious as all buses would be the very latest standard and at this time less than 1 years old;
- Test 5 (all buses are Euro V) – achievable by replacing the engines in all older buses, but provides a much lower benefit than Euro VI, due to poor NO_x reduction performance at low vehicle speeds;
- Test 6 (Bus Fleet C) – achievable through Engine Management System reprogramming to raise all existing Euro IV buses to Euro V while also relatively low impact could be almost half as effective as Test 5 but at a much lower cost.

The scope for reducing traffic emissions by focussing on buses is demonstrated by the potential impact of Euro VI buses, which the latest emission standard designed to bring emission benefits in real-world operations. Other bus fleet options, not tested, but anticipated to give similar emission reductions would be via Natural Gas/Biomethane fuelled vehicles or Battery Electric buses.

Active travel and Traffic cells were interchangeable in terms of the mode shift away from car/van and onto bike (or walking), therefore all modelled under Test 7/8 (a, b and c) for different intensities of application. The most ambitious (50% of current short trips by car/van shifted to walk/cycle) results in a 22% reduction in general car traffic and reduces emissions by up to 15% (on Newfoundland Way where LDV dominate emissions) and up to 12% at other test sites.

For FCC, the results indicate only marginal reductions in all emissions for the most extensive option modelled (i.e. ~2 percent in terms of NO_x). Previous studies indicate that HGV emissions can be reduced more significantly by combining FCC with more comprehensive route and delivery management, that will impact on significant numbers of HGV that may still not use the FCC. The impact is likely to then be local to the roads affected (both where vehicle numbers are reduced, and on those where they may be displaced towards).

1.5 What are the likely affects on air quality?

1.5.1 Air quality on road corridors

The emission estimates were used as inputs to an air quality (dispersion) model to calculate annual mean concentrations of NO_x, NO₂ and PM₁₀ from road sources for the baseline and various test scenarios. Results were estimated at one of the four test areas (and a % change against baseline estimated) for each measure, and results then extrapolated to the other three test sites (shown in red text). This section provides a summary of the main results for road NO₂ (the pollutant of current interest) showing the average and percentage change concentrations across all receptors compared to the baseline concentration of annual mean road NO₂ levels (see Table 4). The study deliberately focussed on the measures (and their variations) with the greatest impact, acknowledging these may be challenging to consider for implementation, to understand the scale of change to air quality from theoretical changes to traffic.

Table 5: Average change in annual mean road component NO₂ concentration

Test#	Description	Baseline - Annual mean road NO ₂ concentration (µg/m ³)	Average change in concentration (µg/m ³) & where modelled as % of baseline road NO ₂			
			Gloucester Road	Bristol Bridge	Bath Road	Newfoundland Way
1	LEZ	6.6	-0.2 to -0.4	-0.7 (11.2%) to -0.3	-0.3 to -0.6	-0.2 (4.9%) to -0.5
2	LEZ Plus	6.6	-0.6 to -1.6	-1.1 (17.0%) to -2.8	-0.9 to -2.3	-1.8 (42.7%) to -0.7
3	FCC (x 4)	3.8	-0.1 (2.4%)	-0.2	-0.1	-0.1
4	Bus Fleet A (All Euro VI)	6.6	-1.1	-1.8 (28.0%)	-1.5	-1.1
7c & 8c	Traffic Cells / Active Travel (22% reduction in car trips)	5.3	-0.3	-0.6	-0.44 (8.4%)	-0.3
9	RUC	4.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.1	-0.07 (1.7%)
10a	Traffic change (25% increase)	3.8	-1.9 (49.7%)	-3.3	-2.6	-2.0
10b	Traffic change (25% reduction)	3.8	-1.0 (25.5%)	-1.7	-1.4	-1.0
10c	Traffic change (50% reduction)	3.8	0.9 (22.7%)	-1.5	-1.2	-0.9

Results in red are predicted (scenario not modelled at test site)

These results indicate the potential change in air pollution concentration. This method is being used primarily as a method of comparing measures effectiveness rather than defining absolute changes. Note that the baseline annual mean NO₂ concentration being reduced is a much lower value than the background base load of pollution.

The greatest impact is seen from a 50 % reduction in traffic flows (i.e. -1.9 µg/m³ or ~50% of baseline road NO₂ at Glos. Road, and up to -3.3 µg/m³ at Bristol Bridge), but this was a simple comparator test without a specific policy measure to support it. In comparison, a similar reduction in road NO₂ was estimated in the vicinity Bristol Bridge from converting all buses to Euro VI. The result here reflects the high number of buses present in the fleet at this location.

A similar result was estimated at Newfoundland Way for the very stringent LEZ Plus scenario (i.e. -1.8 µg/m³). Again, this might also be considered a comparator with little policy basis. However, the incremental reduction in NO₂ to here is not influenced by buses but more so by the higher light duty component. The impact of the LEZ Plus scenario is reduced at Bristol Bridge (i.e. -1.1 µg/m³). Note, LEZ and LEZ Plus was modelled and then extrapolated from two different test locations, each which produces its own range of results that are presented here to indicate the potential upper and lower range of impact. This finding illustrates that caution is required when extrapolating findings across a wider road network.

The modelling of the standard LEZ indicates the level of variance that may be expected according to location. Encouragingly, the standard LEZ is estimated to reduce NO₂ by 0.7 µg/m³ at Bristol Bridge.

The impact on NO₂ concentrations as a result of an expanded freight consolidation centre (a fourfold increase on the existing scheme) was tested on the Gloucester Road. The reduction was negligible but there is uncertainty as to whether the impact has been fully realised and incorporated into an appropriate methodology.

The benefits of traffic cells / active travel appear to be encouraging. The test undertaken on the Bath Road suggests reductions in the region of 0.5 a microgram of NO₂ may be achievable (equalling some 8.4% of road NO₂). Clearly a shift to active travel does not just reduce air pollution and carbon emissions, but also brings numerous health benefits.

Road user charging in the format modelled in this study produced very little reduction in NO₂.

In general, very large reductions in pollutant concentrations were not expected from all the measures, even though the tests were set up to reflect very intensive application of a given transport policy. The results are fairly consistent with what might be expected in most other urban conurbations. The key message is that even with ambitious measures it is probably necessary to combine them to work towards achieving the air quality objective and limit values. For example, A combined strategy of city centre LEZ combined with reducing car/van short trips by 50% (resulting in 22% reduction in car traffic) could result in 1 to 2 µg/m³ reductions in annual mean pollutant concentrations at the road-side.

1.5.2 Air quality at background sites

It has already been noted that this study focussed on the road component of NO₂ with respect to the baseline road component and not the total levels of pollution in the city, which includes background sites away from the road side. The purpose of this study was to understand comparative impacts from key measures and some insight of the scale of impact. To model total concentrations requires more complex modelling feasible in a more extensive study.

The net effect on population exposure however is the key determinant of measure effectiveness, and of obvious interest. In practice, reductions at roadside for measures focussed on a small area generally exceed those reported at background, which are by definition further away from the changes to the pollution source. However, the study remit included transport measures that could be applied over a wide area (of the city).

An additional task was completed to start to understand the impact of selected measures on background concentrations (without complex and therefore time-consuming modelling). In summary, the method used was:

- Reduce the road transport contributions (as components of background) by the proportion derived for the road NO₂ concentrations in section 1.5.1 above.
- Assume these reductions also took place in adjacent 1km² grids (i.e. an extensive area-wide measure)
- Estimate the change in average background concentrations across the 1km² grid of interest.

The results were derived for two example measures with results as follows. These were the LEZ Plus and Active Travel.

Table 6: Estimated change in NO₂ concentration at two background sites

Location	Bath Road	Newfoundland Way
Measure	Active Travel (-22% car/van)	LEZ Plus (all Euro V)
Road NO ₂ change	- 0.4 (µg/m ³)	- 1.8 (µg/m ³)
Background NO ₂ change	- 0.6 (µg/m ³)	- 5.3 (µg/m ³)
% additional impact (road NO ₂ value to background value)	+50%	+194%

This is a comparatively simple method to estimate an impact on background pollutant concentrations, applied to a limited number of options and sites. The results indicate the scale of impact a given road NO₂ change might have on background

concentrations if the measures is widely applied. The most relevant area wide measures are: LEZ and Active Travel (supported by traffic cells). In both case the change in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ value for the background pollution is greater than the modelled road NO_2 value, and in the case of an LEZ a considerable higher at almost twice the reduction value (+194%). This provides an indication of the relative scale of impact these type of measures might achieve under less ambitious variants, such as LEZ London and Active Travel with lower levels of mode shift. For example, the standard LEZ applied at Bristol Bridge is estimated to reduce road NO_2 by $0.7 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and this analysis indicated that if the LEZ also influenced all roads in the wider area the background NO_2 levels could be anticipated to reduce by a greater amount (perhaps by as much as twice the value of road NO_2 reduction).

The issue remains that background levels of pollution in urban areas make up the bulk of the annual mean values, so that relatively high levels of pollution are the starting point for any resulting efforts to improve air quality.

This analysis provides strong evidence that applying measures that affect all or the vast majority of roads in a widespread area is key to achieving largest air quality improvements, due to the higher reduction values achieved when background air quality is considered.

1.6 Conclusions

As noted in section 1.2 current automatic monitoring stations show air pollution at higher levels than the objective, such as Parson Street School ($47.9 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), Wells Road ($41.2 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) and Newfoundland Road Police Station ($52.7 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$). This suggests reductions in concentrations in a range between 2 and $12 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (i.e. between 5% and 30% of total NO_2) are required at various points across the city to meet the objectives. The relatively simple analysis possible in this study indicates that its unlikely for most transport measures *on their own* to achieve these levels of reduction. However, in combination, applied over a widespread area and over a sustained time period some areas could be brought down towards or even past the objective levels at some parts of the current AQMA.

There is a degree of uncertainly over any modelling, however, and the method used in this study is better suited to comparing measures (for further investigation) rather than predicting absolute changes. More complex and comprehensive modelling approaches could be applied to the same measures/locations in any follow-on study.

Notwithstanding the interest in achieving the air quality objective targets (of $40 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ annual mean for NO_2) it should be acknowledged that any reduction in the general (i.e. background) levels of pollutants – of NO_2 and especially PM - will produce benefits for very much greater numbers of the population. From a health perspective this is more valuable than focussing on small areas/populations near the road-side alone. Ideally, strategies that lead to reductions in background *and* road-side pollution are incorporated into a comprehensive and long term commitment to reduce transports contribution to air pollution.

Report Contact Details

Tom Parker
Transport & Travel Research Ltd
Divisional Manager (Energy & Environment)

Tel: 0117 907 0088
Email: Tom.Parker@ttr-ltd.com
Web: www.ttr-ltd.com



QUESTION B.2

Question to the Mayor from Paul Wheeler

I wish the following written question to be answered by the Mayor:

What action has been taken by the Council to investigate the introduction of a minimum unit price for alcohol sold in Bristol and when does the Mayor plan to decide whether such a price will be introduced?

REPLY:

- **I have no specific power as Mayor that would enable me to introduce minimum unit pricing for alcohol. However I am responsible, through the Director of Public Health, for the Council's role as the responsible authority for public health under The Licensing Act 2003. The Full Council is currently consulting on its statutory Licensing Policy, (consultation end on 9th December - full details on our website) and the following contribution has been made on behalf of the Director of Public Health:**

"We would like the Bristol Licensing Policy to be amended so that new conditions can be introduced. These will support the four objectives of the Licensing Act.

Condition 1 on Premises Licenses

Alcohol will not be sold at less than 50 pence per unit of alcohol.

Comment: Very cheap alcohol is mainly bought by underage people and problem drinkers. So the condition would address:

- objective 4 (protection of children from harm) as alcohol would not be sold for pocket money prices and young people would be less able to procure alcohol as it would be expensive. Many underage drinkers get their alcohol from proxy sales so a reduction in the amount of alcohol brought in this way would reduce the crime of proxy sales.
- objective 1 (reduce alcohol related crime and disorder) if problem drinkers can afford less alcohol then they will not get so intoxicated and levels of anti-social behaviour will be reduced.
- very inexpensive alcohol encourages alcohol dependency and thus leads to more ill health in the population.

Condition 2 on Premises Licenses

Strong beer, lager, or cider of more than 5.5ABV will not be sold unless it is a premium product.

Comment: Licensing already has this condition on licenses in Stokes Croft. It should be rolled out to the whole city. The condition means that the off trade do not sell strong cheap beers, lagers and cider. So the condition would address:

- objective 1 (prevention of crime and disorder) as cheap strong alcohol is linked to street drinking, and the resulting anti-social behaviour.
- Strong alcohol is favoured by problem drinkers and can lead them deeper into dependency.

Condition 3 on Premises Licenses and Personal Licenses

The organisers of all large organised events will ensure that a drug and alcohol advice service is in attendance to provide advice to participants.

Comment : This would cover all festivals and carnivals, for young and old. This condition would address:

- Objective 1, as the presence of the drug and alcohol advice service should modify people's behaviour, and they can seek help and information if they are tempted to misuse alcohol or drugs.
- Objective 2 (public safety), there has in recent years been drug deaths associated with large gathering (carnivals and festivals), for instance the death of a young man in the street next to a licensed musical event in Bristol. By having drug and alcohol advice services present at these events the customers can be influenced not to experiment with unknown substances .
- Objective 4 (protection of children from harm), many young people attend these events especially the big community events, and will be vulnerable to experimenting with substances. Having the alcohol and drug services in attendance will help counter the culture that promotes experimentation and ignores risks.

We would also recommend that the council investigates the possibility of developing a local by-law to bring in a minimum unit price for alcohol of 50p (initially), an integral part of this would be a risk assessment.

Public Health Bristol supports the introduction of EMROs as this would contribute to a reduction in the amount of alcohol consumed. This would assist with the prevention of crime and disorder, which is influenced by higher levels of drunkenness. It would also contribute greatly to public safety as evidence shows that increased levels of alcohol are linked to road traffic accidents, for both drivers and pedestrians, particularly during the darker hours when the EMROs would be in place. It would also be linked to a reduction in violent assaults, especially on young men. There would be a reduction in the levels of public nuisance, particularly in terms of noise and antisocial behaviour during the hours of the EMRO. This can have a negative impact on health in communities caused by sleep deprivation.

We would prefer a three year review of the licensing policy, not a five year review as proposed, this is because there can be a lot of legislative changes in any five years period, and the policy could end up very out of line with national policy and strategy'

The Full Council must consider all consultation responses before finalising its statement of licensing policy, which it must adopt having regard to guidance given by the secretary of state and with a view to promoting the four licensing objectives. The ability of licensing authorities to respond to the minimum pricing issue is constrained in the absence of relevant powers directed to the protection of public health in this context. Protection of public health is not one of the specific licensing objectives. The UK healthy city network work together to advocate for improved public health legislation; this includes support for national legislation on the minimum unit price. They are about to start campaigning anew for national legislation and our public health team is part of this action.

QUESTION B.3

Question from Cllr Christian Martin

Waste services issues

1. In the two and a bit years that I have been a councillor the issue of waste/rubbish and all aspects associated (collection, street cleaning, stray wheelie bins, recycling boxes, to name a few) have been the matters most often raised with me. In turn I have had to raise them ad nauseam with officers.

Can you please provide details of the number of complaints the council has received on this issue annually for the last couple of years?

REPLY: Since the start of the contract in Nov 2011 up to Nov 2013 there have been 1718 complaints. In year 1 there were 1065 complaints and in year 2, my first year in office, there were 653.

The 1718 complaints can be broken down into the following areas;

	Year 1	Year2
• Policy	50	41
• Process	63	19
• Service Expectation	189	336
• Service Failure	675	208
• Service Withdrawn	9	0
• Staff attitude	48	26
• Staff misinformation	5	0
• Vehicle and or Driver Issue	26	23

Could you also provide the details of the number of complaints by ward?

REPLY: Unfortunately, the fair comment complaints are not available by wards.

2. Bristol has won the Green Capital City bid and our streets being awash with detritus is not only appalling in itself, it makes a mockery of this accolade.

Can you please detail what action is going to be taken and what plans are being devised to resolve this problem for now and the long-term future?

REPLY: The contract requires the street cleansing service to be undertaken in line with the Environmental Protection Act 1990; code of practice on litter and refuse. The act requires roads to be cleaned only when they fall below the acceptable standard. There is then a requirement to bring the road up to a clean state in line with the table below.

High intensity of use	½ a day. This means by 6pm if reported before 1pm or by 1pm the next day if reported between 1pm and 6pm on the previous day.
Medium intensity of use	1 day. This means by 6pm the following day
Low intensity of use	14 days
Areas with special circumstances	28 days or as soon as reasonably practicable

The Highway areas are as follows;

- **High intensity of use (busy public areas) examples; major shopping areas, town centre**
- **Medium intensity of use ('everyday' areas, including housing areas occupied by people most of the time)**
- **Low intensity of use (residential lightly trafficked areas)**
- **Areas with special circumstances (where issues of health and safety and reasonableness and practicability are dominant considerations when undertaking cleansing operations).**

Kier May Gurneys cleansing regimes in the main are designed to comply with this act by cleaning; high intensity areas several times a day, medium intensity areas between daily and weekly and low intensity areas weekly / fortnightly. They also have teams to react to cleaning needs should any area become unacceptable between cleaning frequencies.

Kier May Gurney performance is also monitored by independent assessors from the Keep Britain tidy group and their performance has shown considerable improvement since the commencement of the contract following recent changes in cleaning rounds.

Could you please provide details of the total number of fines (and their value) that have been imposed on May Gurney/Kier Group for failure to comply with the terms of their contract?

REPLY: Financial deductions are calculated in a number of ways either for not meeting annual targets or not correcting errors within required time scales and for the number of service failures. In the 1st year of the contract financial deductions have been made however at this time we cannot disclose further information relating this as the Council is currently in discussions with Kier regarding contractual issues. Any public disclosure at this time would prejudice or would be likely to otherwise prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs.

QUESTION B.4

Question from Cllr Christian Martin

Corporate videos

Bristol City Council has had a variety of corporate videos made in recent months - including videos on Make Sunday Special, RPZ Businesses in Cotham, Mayor's Ideas Lab etc.

Can you please provide the cost per video and details of which budget they have been paid from?

REPLY:

Videos are proving an excellent way of increasing public participation and interest in working and for the city council. The council's in-house design team have the facility to create and edit video. The cost to the council of producing these videos is the staff time to plan, film and edit the videos. There are no external costs to the council.

The officer hours used for these videos are:

RPZ: 20 hours officer time. £440 inc. on-costs. Paid by RPZ team.

Mayors Budget Video: 4 hours officer time. £88 inc. on-costs. Paid by Mayor's Office

The **Mayor's Ideas Lab** video was produced and edited by @Bristol one of the council's partners in this crowd sourcing ideas initiative. The only cost to the council was £200 on the hire of lighting. Paid by Communications and Marketing.

The **Make Sundays Special** film was produced by a local filmmaker for a cost of £500 which was met by the Mayor's Making Sunday Special budget.

Mayor's Vision: £1,765 spend on camera crew. The company used was specified by Bristol University as the event was hosted by them and other equipment had already been booked by them. Paid by Mayor's Office.

Could you please give details on any corporate videos planned for the future, their cost and the budget that funds them?

REPLY:

Current bookings with the in-house team are for:

Introduction to adoption: estimated 12 hours officer time. £264 inc. on-costs. Paid by CYPS.

Litter Campaign: 2 hours officer time. £44 inc. on-costs. Paid by Waste Services.

I intend to use the medium more for such campaigns, being considerably more effective and better value than paper based material.

Could you please provide details of how these videos were commissioned/tendered?

REPLY:

There was no requirement for tendering as the films are made by the in-house team. In the rare event that the team cannot fulfil the brief, then they would follow the council's procurements regulations and seek three quotes.

A request for a video can be made by any department using its own budget, subject to approval by Corporate Non-Pay Panel.

QUESTION B.5

Questions to the Mayor from Alderman Jon Rogers

Exploring alternative resident parking options in Ashley ward and elsewhere

The Mayor is aware that the residents and businesses in Ashley ward and elsewhere in the city are divided about the necessity for introduction of a "Kingsdown style" Resident Parking Scheme RPS.

Many of the residents of Kingsdown were pressing for an RPS for over a decade as they were badly affected by the adjacent central controlled parking area. Cotham residents were against RPS while the problem was mainly in Kingsdown.

That changed when RPS was introduced in Kingsdown. Then Cotham residents were themselves affected and then started pressing for RPS in their area. This "knock on" or "domino" effect for RPS is well recognised, and the Lib Dem policy on RPS was to introduce RPS when it was "needed and wanted". The Mayor initially sought to pre-empt that process by extending the scheme much more widely on the basis that residents would want a scheme when the adjacent scheme was installed, but then reversed to areas where the scheme was "needed and wanted".

Even this is causing controversy, as there is debate about whether a scheme is "needed and wanted". In St Pauls and St Agnes for example, most people responded saying that there is a problem with parking on their street, including commuter parking. However, there were major concerns about the cost of RPS and the inflexibility.

"Our Streets Our Scheme" is a resident led campaign seeking to work with the Council to understand the issues on a street by street basis, exploring low cost innovative approaches to street use. I have written to the Council on a number of occasions since 3rd September, (emails 3rd September, 26th September, 11th October x2, and most recently 21st November) asking questions and seeking informal exploratory meetings with Cllr Bradshaw and officers.

We had a successful press launch on Saturday 24th November with newspaper, TV and radio coverage.

We would like to explore innovative, intermediate options for street parking. We believe that such schemes might address the "domino" issue, and be attractive to residents of a much wider area. Certainly residents of St Pauls, St Agnes, Montpelier, St Werburghs and St Andrews residents have expressed a strong interest.

Such schemes could deliver significant environmental, social and quality of life benefits in addition to strengthening community cohesion. They would be designed to engage residents and businesses and other users of our streets. They would require low officer input and be funded by the residents themselves. They would provide important information about how our streets are currently used. They would encourage community discussions on parking and car use. They could encourage

use of car club schemes. They would not preclude a full "Kingsdown style" RPS subsequently if needed.

More information and discussion on moderated Facebook group at <http://bit.ly/BRStocalstreets>

Q1. Does the Mayor support exploring innovative ideas for our Bristol streets?

REPLY:

Of course. I have already developed many innovative ideas for Bristol's streets over the last year, such as Making Sundays Special and my plans to enhance the Old City area. We will be as flexible as we can be within the context of the Residents' Parking scheme proposals approved on 27th June 2013 and will work with ward members and local residents to develop the best solutions that we can for each local area.

Q2. Please would the Mayor and/or Cllr Bradshaw meet with residents in December 2013 to discuss the way forward?

REPLY:

I am always happy to discuss proposals for better management of on street commuter parking within the framework agreed by my Cabinet on 27th June 2013

Q3. Please could the formal Traffic Regulation Consultation TRO consultation scheduled for St Pauls and St Agnes be deferred, at least until the outcome of the above meeting?

REPLY:

The informal consultation on the proposals for St Pauls that was undertaken demonstrated that there are significant parking problems in the area. The introduction of a Residents' Parking Scheme will tackle many of these so a scheme that both meets the needs of the local community and is fully workable needs to be formally consulted on as soon as possible to overcome the problems being encountered. I perhaps do not need to remind you that parking pressures in St Pauls were highlighted in your then Cabinet's reports of 21st July 2011 and 4th July 2012 when you personally advocated very similar proposals to the ones I am now implementing.

Q4. Is the Mayor or his officers aware of any schemes elsewhere that seek to address the "domino" effect with RPS?

REPLY:

The approach set out in the Cabinet report of 27th June 2013 includes action to address the migration of on street commuter parking by offering local ward councillors a 'fast track' towards implementation. There are also six monthly

and annual reviews for each RPS so we can make adjustments if there are changed local circumstances.

QUESTION B.6

Question to the Mayor from Roy Norris

Bristol, Guangzhou and human rights

I have also attached a short document from Amnesty International that is mentioned in the questions. I'd be grateful if this was supplied to the mayor too.

I understand the mayor and some of his senior managers have recently visited Guangzhou, Bristol's twin city in China, to promote trade links between our cities. The mayor has also recently signed an EU partnership agreement with the mayor of Guangzhou.

Guo Feixiong is a human rights lawyer, writer and activist based in Guangzhou. Guo, who has been campaigning against the corruption of officials within the Chinese Communist Party for some years and is a supporter of the New Citizen pro-democracy movement in China, was detained by Chinese authorities on 8 August this year.

With no arrest warrant issued and no charges laid, Guo was effectively kidnapped by the Chinese authorities until 20 November when his family finally received notification from the Guangzhou Public Security Bureau of his formal arrest on the charge of "gathering a crowd to disrupt order in a public place".

At the time of writing, Guo has not been allowed access to lawyers or his family for the entire 120 days of his detention. His family and lawyer believe this is because Guo may have been tortured. This is a genuine threat that has been acknowledged by a number of international human rights organisations.

Guo has been tortured by the Chinese government before - including being shocked with electric batons - when he spent five years in prison between 2006 – 11. He was jailed over the publication of a book which exposed official corruption in the city of Shenyang.

Guo has been designated a prisoner of conscience by Amnesty International.

In view of this and the fact that all forms of international pressure, no matter how large or small, need to be brought to bear on China in regards to their disgraceful attitude to human rights, could the mayor answer the following questions please:

1. Will the mayor unconditionally and publicly condemn the conduct of the Chinese government in relation to their treatment of Guo Feixiong? And will the mayor publicly call for Guo's immediate and unconditional release from custody?
2. In the Amnesty International document enclosed, they list three contacts and addresses for some of the Chinese authorities responsible for Guo's detention. Will the Mayor undertake to write to all three on behalf of the people of Bristol and condemn Guo's treatment at the hands of the

Chinese authorities and request his immediate and unconditional release from custody?

3. The mayor recently met with his counterpart from Guangzhou and signed a partnership agreement with him. In the spirit of openness and dialogue with our twin city, will the mayor write to Mayor Chen Jianhua to condemn Guo's treatment at the hands of the Chinese authorities in Guangzho and request his immediate and unconditional release from custody?

REPLY to all questions:

As a lifelong supporter of Amnesty I have considerable personal sympathy with the issues you raise. Britain is beginning to rebuild its diplomatic relations with China following a period of tension between the two countries. Bristol is replicating this at a city level with the recent signing of the MOU between Bristol and Guangzhou, which seeks to strengthen the long-standing sister city link¹. In recent visits to both Sri Lanka and China the UK Government has highlighted the importance of raising the global awareness of the human rights agenda by actively developing an ongoing dialogue with the countries in question.

In order for me to exert any degree of influence over the human rights agenda in China, it will first be necessary to establish a relationship of mutual trust and understanding with the Mayor of Guangzhou, Mayor Chen.

You will appreciate I am not in a position to address individual human rights issues and will therefore not be able to respond directly, and I am not in favour of making gestures at the expense of building a constructive relationship.

¹ Bristol signed a formal sister city agreement with Guangzhou in 2001

QUESTION B.7

Questions to the Mayor from Simon James Lewis

Residents parking / role of the Bristol councillor

1. Recently residents in Montpelier witnessed and spoke to people from the Nationwide Data Collection company who were taking car registration details of cars on streets in Montpelier at different times throughout the day. They confirmed that they were collecting data for BCC in connection with RPZ.

When will the results of this data collection be shared with residents?

How much did this cost?

Why is this data being collected now and not before the report was presented to cabinet back in June?

REPLY:

The data is being collected as part of our preparation of initial proposals for a Montpelier RPS. The results will be shared with residents during the informal consultation on these proposals which is scheduled to take place in spring 2014. The final cost of the data collection and analysis is not available at this stage.

2. Residents in Ashley ward have held several events to discuss and share alternative low cost no cost Resident Parking Schemes in St Pauls and Montpelier. The Mayor has been invited to attend the first one (video link here <http://youtu.be/Xiaa9lwBPKY>) but didn't attend and was unfortunately in China on the day of the Our Streets Our Scheme event. Residents have identified the problems and are progressing ideas to solve them we would like to again invite the mayor to meet with us, we are happy to come to City Hall.

Will you meet with us and listen to our ideas and consider their implementation following consultation?

REPLY: As you state I was on an official visit to China so could not attend. My Cabinet, in June 2013, agreed a framework for taking action to tackle commuter parking. As a city, we need a consistent, enforceable approach to managing on street parking in areas of greatest pressure. This has been recognised by previous administrations and is not my invention, but simply falls to me to take the necessary action that has previously been avoided.

3. With a Mayor now in place for over a year the role of councillors has change dramatically. Can the Mayor please give a detailed definition of what he considers to be the role of a Bristol Councillor?

REPLY: Councillors are actively involved in helping to shape local RPS implementation and in providing advice on policy development. I welcome their ongoing input in representing their constituents and on strategic issues.

QUESTION B.8

Question to the Mayor from Ben Wood

Our streets, our scheme campaign

1. Is George aware of the Our Streets Our Scheme campaign that was launched on Saturday 23rd November ?

REPLY:

I am.

2. Can George visit St Pauls (after invitation) in order to speak with the locals and find out what alternative ideas they have?

REPLY:

If my diary permits this.

3. OSOS ask for the TRO's in St Pauls to be deferred until a people's scheme has been presented, can this be done?

REPLY:

St Pauls has long been identified as an area facing on street parking pressures. Informal consultation was carried out in St Pauls in 2012 following two earlier Cabinet reports under the previous administration which identified parking pressures in the area (the then local councillor was a senior member of that Cabinet) This work clearly demonstrated that there is a significant parking problem in the area so a scheme that will address these needs to be introduced as soon as possible. The scheme to be consulted on will need to both meet, as far as possible, the desires of the local community and to be fully workable. My Cabinet agreed a revised framework for implementing action to tackle commuter parking in June 2013.

QUESTION B.9

Question from Cllr Christian Martin

Mayor's travel costs

On 28th November I discovered that someone had published an FOI request that they had submitted to the council on the mayor's travel costs to date. It has been stated by the BBC that these were less than Boris at approximately £1900, the mayor has stated several times publicly that they are about £2500, he also pointed out that host countries were contributing to some of the costs of his travel. The FOI request reveals that his travel costs totalled £9,283. Given that this is a considerably larger figure than circulated by BCC and the mayor can you explain the discrepancy and confirm if this figure is correct?

REPLY:

As anyone who takes the time to read these FOI and media questions would appreciate, the answers vary because different questions are being asked.

The £1950 reported by the BBC was in answer to a specific question related to the actual cost to the taxpayer for my attendance at various events abroad during my first year as Mayor. I have challenged that answer as it seems so low but am assured it is correct.

The £2,500 I have referred to is because I was being cautious in an off-the-cuff reply to a question in a public meeting. I am sure you prefer that I err on the side of caution.

With regards to the figure of around £9,300, this is simply the danger of raw data being used without context. The request was for all travel including domestic visits and meetings, rather than just international visits. It also took in a longer timeframe as it was not answered until the end of November 2013. The person answering this included all expenses **before** relevant costs had been reclaimed by other parties. I have made it clear that I have often been paid for or reimbursed by organisers of foreign events, and the same often applies for domestic travel. I have asked for this to be made clear in all future requests and for an amended version to be provided to the requestor, showing the actual cost to the Bristol taxpayer, which is considerably less..

For the avoidance of doubt - the lowest quoted figure of £1950 is correct for my foreign travel from 19 November 2012 – 19 November 2013. I will be happy to provide a similar figure for domestic travel as soon as it has been calculated and provided that supplying that information does not take more than 18 hours of staff time. I am proud of the amount I have been able to achieve for the city with so little. Ten times these costs would have represented good value.

Questions to the Mayor from Cllr Sean Emmett

Ashley Hill and Horfield Stations

1. At the cabinet meeting held on 3 October 2013 when I requested to meet with the consultants who are carrying out the feasibility studies into Ashley Hill and Horfield stations you had no objection. Yet when I requested the Council's rail officer to arrange a meeting he refused, stating

"I have received your request to meet with the consultants carrying out the feasibility study for potential stations at Constable Road, Ashley Down and Ashton Gate. The work to deliver these studies is at an advanced stage and it would not be appropriate to interrupt the project at this time. To arrange a meeting with the consultants would also add additional cost to the studies and potentially delay the final versions which are due in late January 2014. The consultants were given a very clear brief on identifying all engineering interventions that would be required to deliver these stations, estimated engineering and build costs as well as user demand forecast models. We will, of course, be happy to share the findings of their work on completion of the study.

Can you confirm that the consultants are acting for the Council as a whole?

Reply: Yes, I can confirm that the consultants contracted to study the feasibility of potential new stations on the Filton Bank are indeed acting for the Council as a whole. Officers instructing the consultants have met with you to ensure they understood your concerns (see response to question 2).

2. Why are you preventing local Councillors who have a keen interest in this work from engaging with the consultants?

Reply: This is simply not the case. Indeed, Alistair Cox and Todd Graham from the Regeneration Department attended an extensive site visit and walked around with you and Councillor Kent to look at all potential options for station locations. This information was fed in to the consultants carrying out the work on behalf of Bristol City Council. Assistant Mayor for Transport, Mark Bradshaw has also spoken with you and Councilor Tincknell, and answered Cabinet questions.

3. What is the detailed brief that has been given to the consultants?

Reply: Officers will supply a copy of the brief

4. Why has this not been shared with the local ward Councillors?

Reply: We do not normally send out internal project documentation to ward councillors but as stated in A3 we are happy to share the brief now requested.

5. In a statement in the Bristol Post on 8 November 2013, assistant Mayor Bradshaw stated that he had "been given technical advice that Ashley Hill is not possible because of regulations over gradient and curvature of the track". What technical advice has he been given?

Reply: The location of the former rail station at Ashley Hill is not compliant with legislation on track curvature. New station designs must be on a stretch of track that is 1:1000 or better. The former station site at Ashley Hill is 1:1025. This would require a slewing of the tracks to bring them into compliance. New stations must have safety designed into them and any station on the Filton Bank would require engineering interventions to make them between 1:260 and 1:500 gradient compliant. The study to identify feasibility will contain the correct gradient profile that would be accepted by Network Rail.

6. Why has that not been shared with the relevant ward members?

See A5

7. What has changed since the announcement made in the Bristol Post on 5 September 2013 which indicated Ashley Hill was set to re-open?

Reply: The MetroWest package includes a station in the Ashley Hill area but the technical work will give us a better understanding of the exact location, challenges and costs.

8. Are the Mayor, Assistant Mayor and Council officers aware that the mandatory requirement for vertical track alignment or gradient through station platforms has been withdrawn in issue four of GI/RT7016?

Reply: There is still advice contained in the Network Rail and the Office of Rail Regulation documentation that indicates that all gradients that are not between 1:260 and 1:500 must be engineered out if possible. Are you suggesting either the Council and or the consultants ignore this advice?

9. So why are the Mayor, his assistant and Council officers continuing to use the gradient issue as a reason preventing re-opened or replacement stations on Filton Bank?

Reply: See A5 and A8

10. What are the curvature issues preventing the reopening of Ashley Hill station on its original site?

Reply: See A5.

11. What alternatives are being looked at, for both Ashley Hill and Horfield?

Reply:

The rail consultants are looking at a range of sites as part of their preliminary study

12. What work has been done regarding the business case for both Ashley Hill and Horfield stations?

Reply: We are part way through the work looking at construction issues and demand modelling due to finish end of January 2014.

13. Have local businesses and other organisations (including Southmead Hospital) been contacted by the consultants?

Reply: No. It is premature at this pre-feasibility stage.

14. Is the Mayor concerned that the Temple Meads Enterprise Zone, which is set to create around 17,000 new jobs in the next 25 years, is more accessible from many places outside Bristol than from within the city itself?

Reply: This is not the case. The Enterprise Zone is accessible by all modes and there is a significant programme of works, including MetroWest and the £20m Temple Quarter Transport Programme to further enhance this. We have recently signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Network Rail and other key partners to help enable the redevelopment of Temple Meads into a transport hub for Bristol and the City Region. Do you not welcome this work?

15. Does the Mayor now agree that when opportunities such as the four-tracking of Filton Bank come along they need to be grasped with both hands, and so will the Mayor now personally commit to delivering the re-opening of Ashley Hill and Horfield stations on their original sites, or nearby alternatives?

Reply: This is why I asked officers to progress with the studies on both stations so we can all better understand the technical and cost implications. You will also understand the need to comply with the GRIP regime and preparation of business cases. Do you suggest we ignore these requirements? On four tracking at Filton Bank, both I and Mark Bradshaw, my Assistant Mayor for Transport, are using every opportunity to press the need for signing off four tracking and other local capacity enhancements

QUESTION B.11

Questions to the Mayor from Cllr David Willingham

Memorial ground and related issues

Q1 Could the Mayor please confirm when Bristol City Council first became aware of the restrictive covenant which prevents the construction of a supermarket on the Memorial Ground?

REPLY: Any restrictive covenant that relates to the land is a private matter for the land owners involved and not Bristol City Council. It is not a planning matter.

Q2 Could the Mayor please confirm when he was personally advised of the existence of this restrictive covenant on the Memorial Ground?

REPLY: Bristol City Council have not been advised of the existence of a restrictive covenant as this is a private matter between the landowners involved.

NOTE:

Since the Cabinet meeting on 5 December, the reply (to Q2 above) has subsequently been amended. Please note the following:

An email was in fact received by the Council regarding the restrictive covenant but the Mayor made it clear at the meeting of the Cabinet on 5 December that he was not aware of the email referred to by Cllr Willingham, and, if he was aware of it (i.e. having acknowledged its receipt) he did not recall it, but in any event the matter of a restrictive covenant in relation to the Memorial Ground was not a planning issue.

Q3 In light of this restrictive covenant on the Memorial Ground, does the Mayor agree with me that proceeding with a planning application in full knowledge of said restrictive covenant gives the appearance that the applicants acted in bad faith and with reckless disregard for said restrictive covenant?

REPLY: A restrictive covenant is matter of land law and has no bearing on the planning process which is covered by planning legislation.

Q4 In light of the applicant's knowledge of said restrictive covenant, is it not the case that the Council should not be held liable for any of the self-inflicted losses suffered by the applicant if the Council decided to settle the Judicial Review and revoke said planning application?

REPLY: Any restrictive covenant has no bearing on the planning process or the judicial review proceedings.

Q5 Given the Mayor's proposed budget cuts and the aforementioned covenant, how can the Mayor continue to justify the Council squandering public funds defending a Judicial Review, when it should cut its losses, admit to its failures in the planning process, settle with those bringing the Judicial Review and revoke planning permission?

REPLY: As stated earlier any restrictive covenant has no bearing on the planning process. The Council considers that the decision of the Development Control (North) Committee on 16th January 2013 to grant planning permission was lawful and that the Council will defend its decision at the forthcoming judicial review hearing. The current budget proposals do not affect either the Council's responsibility or ability to defend its lawful decisions from third party legal challenge.

Q6 How does the Mayor square his comments on congestion and air pollution made to Channel 4's documentary "The CCTV Traffic Wardens: Caught on Camera" with his support for the redevelopment of the Memorial Ground as the largest supermarket in North Bristol?

REPLY: In my Vision for Bristol I propose to "Keep Bristol Moving" through reducing emissions across the city to help protect people from the harm caused by poor air quality, removing the blight of commuter congestion and improving the flows for public transport and those who need to drive. The issues related to congestion and air pollution relevant to the approved application were considered in detail by the Development Control Committee as part of its consideration and determination.

Q7 Does the Mayor agree with me, with local traders and with Channel 4 that Gloucester Road is the "Jewel in Bristol's crown"?

REPLY: I agree that Gloucester Road is a unique environment with a strong focus on independent traders that is an asset to Bristol. The impacts of the proposed development on Gloucester Road were fully considered by the Development Control Committee and the s106 agreement secures mitigation for those impacts. I am keen to work with the traders to ensure that Gloucester Road's resilience as an independent retail area is re-inforced.

Q8 If, as the Mayor has said, road safety is not just about not being knocked over on the road but is also about the air our children breathe, why is the Mayor supporting a supermarket development that is likely to see Bristol's AQMA extended from Gloucester Road onto Filton Avenue?

REPLY: Please see the answer to Q6.

Q9 How is supporting the biggest supermarket in North Bristol along with the 133 to 197 net job losses, the traffic congestion and the air pollution that it will bring to the local community fulfilling your vision of "making Bristol a better place to live and work"?

REPLY: The Development Control Committee made their decision to grant planning permission in accordance with the Council's adopted planning policies and with regard to the relevant material planning considerations, as required by planning legislation.

Q10 Does the Mayor believe that it is inappropriate for any officer to have investigated or to give the appearance that they have investigated a complaint about themselves?

REPLY: The corporate complaints process is set up so that a more senior officer or an independent officer is involved in investigating any complaints. I consider that this provides suitable safeguards against the possibility of an officer investigating or appearing to investigate a complaint against themselves.

Q11 The post-implementation review of the A38 Gloucester Road Showcase Bus Route is long overdue; can the Mayor provide a date in the current municipal year by which this review will have started, or is he going to procrastinate and inflict further pain and suffering on the wonderful independent traders of Gloucester Road?

REPLY: Officers will write to you.

Q12 Could the Mayor please confirm what dialogue he, his Cabinet and his Officers have had with Cllr John Calway, the Leader of South Gloucestershire Council, about the creation of an Integrated Transport Authority?

REPLY: We have regular discussions with all of the neighbouring unitary authorities. Assistant Mayor for Transport, Mark Bradshaw, represents the Council on the Joint Transport Executive and on the Local Transport Body. Through this combined working over £400 million has been won for transport improvements in the City Region.

QUESTION B.12

Questions from Councillor Claire Hiscott to the Mayor, for the meeting of Cabinet, to be held on Thursday, 5th December 2013

REOPENING OF RAILWAY STATIONS SERVING HORFIELD & LOCKLEAZE

1. Can you confirm the external consultants engaged in this review and the remit given to them by the Mayor and Bristol City Council?

REPLY: Consultants were appointed by BCC following a request by Assistant Mayor for Transport, Mark Bradshaw.

Halcrow consultants are carrying out the work on behalf of Bristol City Council. Halcrow are transport consultant who have been providing advice and information to local authorities for over 10 years.

I have asked officers to provide you with the brief they are working to.

2. Do you agree with me that it is extremely important to include ward councillors in this project and keep them informed as they have 'on the ground' knowledge of the areas being considered, and represent the residents the project is trying to benefit?

REPLY: Yes, but it is also important for the rail experts to get this initial study done so we can discuss the findings with ward members and others. Without this work, we will know very few of the answers about precise locations and other factors, such as costs.

3. To date, there has been an abject failure to share information about this feasibility study. How does this square with your promise to “change the fortress culture of the ‘Council House’and encourage meaningful citizen participation?

REPLY: I cannot agree with this. My Assistant Mayor for Transport, Mark Bradshaw has met you to discuss various issues, including local rail options and he has advised scrutiny and others of his decision to ask for this further technical study.

4. Can you give me a clear explanation as to why local councillors have NOT been included in this work?

REPLY:

It is certainly my intention that local councilors are involved with all such issues involving their wards. As a Council we have learnt some hard lessons about not having correct research in place when seeking rail investment and the need to comply with Network Rail's GRIP process. Once the rail technical study is complete, we will share the report with ward councillors and others before any decisions are made. The work we have commissioned is essential to help deliver an enhanced local rail network - but we need to give the consultants space to get the work done and then we will share and discuss the outcome.

5. What opportunities will there be to publicly challenge any of the assumptions made - or contained within the final document - prior to a decision being taken on whether or not to reopen additional stations on this rail route?

REPLY: see A4

QUESTION B.13

Question from Even Clarke

Now that many schools in Bristol are academies or ' free ' schools outside the council could the cabinet answer the following please: Should the public report evidence to the council that such a school is allegedly failing to comply with legal Government guidelines regarding school governance, what powers do the council have to investigate and should the school be found to be in breach of such legal guidelines what powers do the council have to enforce the school to change its practice? For clarity as a former officer that aided democratic services in school admissions may I ask how the following would be handled. Should a free school or academy be found failing to adhere fairly with the school admissions process what powers do the council have to enforce the school to change in order to protect all parents of city to ensure their child is indeed treated fairly and equally to all others?'

REPLY:

The Academy Trust is the admission authority for an academy (including a free school) and is responsible for setting the admission arrangements. Under the terms of their funding agreement they must ensure compliance with the law relating to school admissions.

When setting the admission arrangements all admission authorities must ensure that the arrangements comply with the School Admissions Code and associated Regulations. This should ensure that arrangements are fair, clear and objective. Objections to the admission arrangements of any school, including academies, should be made to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator. Objections can come from the Local Authority, other admissions authorities, parents or others and the Schools Adjudicator has the power to make binding decisions.

In most cases, issues relating to individual school admissions would be handled at a local level in order to minimise any delay in admission and reduce disruption to a child's education. Where necessary the Fair Access protocols, agreed with all schools, can be used to ensure appropriate placement of the most vulnerable children.