

Full Council – 10 November 2015

RESPONSES TO PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Responses are attached to the following questions from members of the public received for the 10 November 2015 Full Council meeting:

- PQ 01 - Question to the Mayor – Cycle routes to serve Temple Quarter and Arena
Question from Pete Goodwin
- PQ 02 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Elizabeth Eddy
- PQ 03 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Michael Goose
- PQ 04 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Ellie Plaster
- PQ 05 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Robert Stinchcombe
- PQ 06 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Kate & Simon Ferguson
- PQ 07 - Question to the Mayor – European Green Capital
Question from Robert Massey
- PQ 08 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Nigel Currie
- PQ 09 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking
Question from Edward Bowditch
- PQ 10 - Question to the Mayor – Disposal of docks estate
Question from Alderman Royston Griffey
- PQ 11 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Brian Wiltshire
- PQ 12 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Penelope Maynard
- PQ 13 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Roy Lucking
- PQ 14 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Julian Baker
- PQ 15 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Tim Maynard

- PQ 16 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Vicky Calvert
- PQ 17 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Wendy Wiltshire
- PQ 18 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Debbie Baker
- PQ 19 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Sarah Seaman
- PQ 20 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Mark Jones
- PQ 21 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Bradley Seaman
- PQ 22 - Question to the Mayor – Trade union bill
Question from Steve Crawshaw
- PQ 23 - Question to the Mayor – Trade union bill
Question from Kathleen Pittman
- PQ 24 - Question to the Mayor – Trade union bill
Question from Samantha Jewell
- PQ 25 - Question to the Mayor – Trade union bill
Question from David Ashby Styles
- PQ 26 - Question to the Mayor – Trade union bill
Question from Mike Hines
- PQ 27 - Question to the Mayor – Trade union bill
Question from Pete Barrett
- PQ 28 - Question to the Mayor – Trade union bill
Question from Fred Jerrome
- PQ 29 - Question to the Mayor – Trade union bill
Question from Charlotte Bagshaw
- PQ 30 - Question to the Mayor – Trade union bill
Question from Jayne Empringham
- PQ 31 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Janet & Eileen Berry

Subject: Cycle routes to serve Temple Quarter and Arena

Question submitted by: Pete Goodwin

On 4th March last year, the Cabinet approved a package of spending to improve transport links in and around the Temple Quarter "to support and facilitate jobs growth"

1. Can you confirm that the full project is still on track as proposed, or list any significant changes that have been made?

2. In particular, can you confirm when, and whether, the promised cycleways on the Conham riverbank and along the Whitchurch railway trackbed (passing beneath the A4 Bath Road) are expected to materialise?

Reply from the Mayor:

- The reconfiguration of Temple Circus junction is in the detailed design stage and is on track for the main construction to be completed by March 2017. The other schemes within the programme are also on track for completion by March 2017.

- In early September the Local Enterprise Partnership approved the Council's application to revise the spend profiles and key milestones of the programme to accommodate changes to the delivery of schemes required by:
 - the need to integrate with the Arena Project;
 - design changes to the Temple Circus scheme in response to the successful consultation;
 - and, the need to coordinate delivery of Temple Circus alongside the MetroBus projects.

- Feasibility and design work undertaken since the Cabinet decision has required reassessment of the proposed schemes in terms of priority as further detail regarding the costs of schemes revealed that not all could be delivered with the funding available. Having taken into account delivery risks, and seeking to maximise the benefits to the TQEZ realised from use of the funding, the decision was taken to not progress with the Conham Road, Conham Towpath and Whitchurch Railway Path schemes as part of the TQEZ RIF Infrastructure Programme.

- There is still an ambition to undertake these schemes in the future, as and when funding becomes available.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Elizabeth Eddy

1. Why have the Council failed to understand the nightmare suffered by residents around the hospital?
2. Section 106 monies from the hospital should be directed to paying for resident prioritised parking. Residents should not be asked to finance any parking permits because they have suffered enough for the benefit of the city and region. Please would you respond to these points?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Supplementary question from Elizabeth Eddy:

Thank you Lord Mayor for your response, sadly I didn't hear anything new in any of what has been said, I knew all of that before I turned up today. I really don't think that you and your leadership team understand the far reaching consequences of what is happening to our lives, it is a nightmare. The survey you have referred to does not include my road, and my road is a very short distance from the hospital and there are very many roads near me that are outside the very tiny boundary of the survey. So my question is, will I be able to park near my house or is a nightmare that I have to live with?

Reply from the Mayor:

I am determined that we do end up with a solution so that you can park near your house. I have to rely on the expertise of the transport team and there no quick fix. I think you must recognise that this is something that started many years ago before my time in office, and in terms of the planning of this hospital that has been going on for the past decade.

I do think there was a lack of forethought in dealing with this issue at the time, and it should have been included in the planning conditions at the time. It is much more difficult to pick up the problems later on; I accept that I have got that challenge and we will do everything we can do to meet that challenge to enable you to park near your house. At the moment, I am sorry you haven't heard anything new; I have given you what I am able to give. I think I have shown a general willingness to be broadminded about what solution we end do up with, I just don't want to let you feel there is a magic free solution to that will give you everything that you want.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Michael Goose

For many years, we residents have suffered extreme vehicle parking difficulties in the area around Southmead Hospital. Since the new hospital opened over a year ago, our roads have been choked with parked cars each weekday, mainly the cars of staff working in the hospital but backed up by patients and visitors cramming into every available space. Neither group seem particularly concerned with what obstruction they cause by parking across drive-ways or on bends. It is common to see vehicles parked partially or even totally on pavements. There is an obvious lack of effort from the council in monitoring and controlling dangerous or illegal parking. In my own vicinity I have never seen a traffic warden more than once a day (which is a bit of a joke when you consider that some of the parking spaces are limited time!) and it is common that no warden will be seen all day, leaving illegally parked vehicles not penalised. Additionally, why do the council take no action against parking on pavements. As a result pedestrian progress is impeded and pavements are dangerously damaged in many places.

The result is that many of us are virtual prisoners within our own homes, we cannot go out by car because we will probably be unable to get back to park during the day. Arranging for callers, eg. relatives, friends, health visitors, hairdressers, repair engineers, etc. is a nightmare because there is nowhere for them to park their vehicles!

This has not only been a problem since the new hospital has opened, for years before we had similar problems with the building contractors parking around the area.

It is not evident that the completion of additional parking facilities inside the hospital will result in any alleviation of these problems. It is assumed that this additional parking will attract the same (exorbitant) parking fees as those currently existing. How are you going to persuade the staff, patients and visitors to pay to park inside the hospital when they have become accustomed to parking for free outside. The adjacent South Gloucestershire area has residents only parking, why not similar arrangements for us?

What do you intend to do to resolve these problems?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area (Dorian Road)

Question submitted by: Ellie Plaster

A system of 'limited waiting' during the day six days a week is proposed as part of the consultations on parking in Horfield and Southmead. This would apply to the whole of my road, Dorian Road and would leave many in an impossible situation. This system would mean that, according to the literature, residents would need to move their cars once during this period which is impossible for many who work.

How is a system that punishes residents of this area for leaving their cars at home under threat of a fixed penalty notice for parking outside their own houses compatible with an approach which is trying to encourage people to walk, cycle or take public transport to work as per the city's status as a green city?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as "quickly as possible" because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principal issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have

been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Robert Stinchcombe

The area of Horfield around Southmead Hospital has been turned into a car park by the Mayor's lack of action. This has not only caused great distress to local residents but it has also cost money (people so frustrated by being unable to park on the street that they live in that they have paid to have a drive put in) and great danger. Each day as I and my neighbours navigate the streets around the hospital we have to risk being hit by a car moving towards us but looking in a different direction for a parking space. Current measures have proved to be completely useless. The root cause of this problem is charging staff to park at their place of work. Will the Mayor please make some effort (before he is unsuccessful at re-election) to do some good for the residents of Horfield and rid of this problem once and for all?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as "quickly as possible" because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have

been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Kate & Simon Ferguson

Why has the Council not implemented a solution to protect resident parking spaces in the area surrounding the new hospital and ensure hospital workers have adequate and economic parking?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: European Green Capital

Question submitted by: Robert Massey

1. Cities awarded with the title of European Green Capital are assessed on the basis of twelve environmental indicators:

- Climate change: mitigation and adaptation
- Local transport
- Green urban areas incorporating sustainable land use
- Nature and biodiversity
- Ambient air quality
- Quality of the acoustic environment
- Waste production and management
- Water management
- Waste water treatment
- Eco innovation and sustainable employment
- Energy performance
- Integrated environmental management

Can the Mayor tell me what quantifiable progress is being made in improving Bristol's performance in relation to each of these indicators since we were granted Green Capital status?

2. The council has a target to reduce energy use by 35% by 2025 and carbon dioxide emissions by 50% by 2035. Will the mayor provide an update regarding progress he has made in reaching these targets and as part of his answer will give an assessment of how likely it is that Bristol will achieve these targets by 2025 and 2035 respectively?

Reply from the Mayor:

- The Award of European Green Capital was made in June 2013.
- Within the 12 topics there are a larger number of specific indicators.

It is important to look at these indicators over several years, as many of these indicators need several years to change significantly, are subject to annual fluctuations and for some there is a lag in obtaining the data of a year or more, so for example we have recently received the 2013 energy use and carbon dioxide emission data from central government.

We are therefore planning to report on progress against these indicators in March 2016, showing trends over the past 5-10 years, and we will continue to report over the next 5 years so that we can see the longer term impacts. We are currently

collating the data for this report and will share that with you when we publish it in March.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Nigel Currie

1. On Radio Bristol recently you agreed that the parking problems faced by residents around the new Southmead Hospital complex could be seen as a 'special case' when it came to the action required by Bristol City Council and the North Bristol NHS Trust. After 18 months of delay in effecting meaningful improvements, do you now agree that the proposals offered in the current consultation exercise are inadequate, and that the only solution for many residents will be some form of Residents Parking Scheme?

2. Do you agree that in the event of some form of Residents Parking Scheme being introduced into the area around Southmead Hospital that this should be free to the residents, at least for one year, in recognition of the inconvenience and disruption they have had to endure during the last 18 months?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are

implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Residents parking

Question submitted by: Edward Bowditch

1. The inner ring residents parking zones have cost approximately £10 million. Despite the expense single line provision has been ignored, even though they represent a valuable traffic management tool and are standard practice in all other cities along with the existing Bristol CPZ. Single lines allow parking & waiting provision to increase at evenings and weekends, both for benefit of residents and providing support to the valuable night time economy - in accordance with the scheme objectives of a reduction in circulating traffic. As seen with Fiddlers Club the impact of disregarding such provision imposes a high burden. All representations requesting single lines have been dismissed, with an example of objection# 33 to Cotham North scheme being responded to in the statutory consultation with "*Single yellow lines are not used in the scheme as we want to make it clear to people where they can and cannot park.*" Is it to be inferred that the council believes people in its area have less ability to distinguish between single and double lines compared to those elsewhere. Given BCC officers did not bother including single line provision, is it not the case Bristol is now marooned with substandard design quality schemes relative to other authorities, hence putting the city at a competitive disadvantage?
2. Would the Mayor wish to join other Bristol residents (currently over one thousand) and complete a voluntary citizen participation survey: "Bristol 20mph and RPZ Survey, autumn 2015"? <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/K2VWGBY>.

Reply from the Mayor:

RPS areas are designed to be fit for purpose at all times. Double yellow lines are installed where it is particularly important to prevent unsafe or obstructive parking. This facility is needed at all times. The hours of operation of the various types of parking bay in the scheme areas are a different matter; they are very carefully chosen to balance the benefits of the schemes against the unnecessary restriction of activity at times when there is less demand for commuter parking.

Subject: Disposal of docks estate

Question submitted by: Alderman Royston Griffey

1. As is now well known, the controversial amount of £10m was paid to the City for the disposal in August 2015 of the freehold interests in the former publicly owned Docks Estate at Portbury, Avonmouth and Chittening to First Corporate Shipping Limited. The Mayor's decision to sell those interests took place in defiance of the majority wishes of members of the City Council as expressed at an Extraordinary Full Council Meeting. The sale proceeded at a consideration that has been challenged (and will continue to be challenged) on the basis that such a valuable and unique public asset was disposed of at a serious undervalue, and without the approval of the Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government.

In the meantime, what actual use has the money received been put to? It is requested that precise and accurate financial information in some detail should be supplied, and not vague generalisations or a future 'wish list'.

2. In view of the booming and active property market in the Bristol area, and the huge pressure on the development of land of all types in an attempt to address the severe and growing housing shortage, does the Mayor now accept that his decision in disposing of the freehold interests in the Docks Estate was premature and should, at the very least, have been delayed if not reversed? It should be noted that a simple 'No' to the question will not be sufficient to address public concerns.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The valuation of the reversionary freehold of land held long leasehold by the Port Company was reviewed by Place Scrutiny Commission held on 5 February 2015. Following the Scrutiny hearing the Commission recording in its resolution to the Mayor and Cabinet that was aware that the current proposal to sell the freehold for £10m represented good value / a favourable deal for the Council at the present time.

2. It has been clearly evidenced and reported that the sale price was at or above best consideration in accordance with s123 of the Local Government Act 1972. Accordingly, there was no question of any need for approval by the Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government.

3. The capital sum received is fully retained by the Council. None of the amount has yet been allocated. It was recorded at the Cabinet meeting on 3rd March 2015 that in consultation with Cabinet members and the local councillors for Avonmouth and Kingsweston wards (the two wards most affected by operations at Avonmouth), a £1m local investment fund would be set up out of the proceeds of the sale to stimulate local regeneration projects. This is being progressed.

4. The reversionary freehold of land held long leasehold by the Port Company was a land interest in an area that was already fully within the control of the Port Company until 2141. There was no realistic prospect that any of that land could contribute to resolving the housing shortage in the current booming and active property market now or in the foreseeable future.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Brian Wiltshire

Can the council confirm that the consultation document for parking in Horfield/ South mead was based on a physical assessment by visiting and surveying the area rather than a desk based assessment? In Pitlochry Close, what was their reasoning behind the Cul –de- Sac's no parking areas, and the impact of only addressing part of the development?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the

restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Penelope Maynard

The NHS has been told by the Government to change to seven day working, however the current proposals only consider that parking is required Monday to Friday. Has the council taken into consideration the changes to NHS working days, and how that will impact on the parking around us?

These changes will actually make matters worse for the local residents.

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the

restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Roy Lucking

1. Why has the BCC failed to act on the interests of the residents by **not** working with South Gloucs. Whilst at the same time reassuring us they were? This was responsible for a complete failure on an integrated parking scheme

2. Why has the Council failed to spend the Section 106 money which is specifically earmarked for dealing with parking and transport issues connected with the hospital redevelopment?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Supplementary question from Roy Lucking:

When you were on the Radio, you mentioned that Southmead was a special project that you were interested in, I would like to see some reflection on that please.

On Inkerman Close, it is BCC Logo on the signs, does that mean it is supported by BCC or not?

Reply from the Mayor:

Inkerman is an unadopted road that is a private road that belongs to the Estate Developers rather than to us. They may have the BCC signs on by some

arrangement, in legal terms that is a unadpoted road that we cannot implement the scheme.

Second supplementary question from Roy Lucking:

The fact is that South Gloucester Council did not work with Bristol Council; Bristol Council gave South Gloucester Council £500,000 to improve the highways, but not the parking. Within the system you have mentioned with the two traffic light signals and the cycling path, etc.; each the traffic light signals cost £50,000, the cycle track cost £300,000, the money for the parking was as whatever it could be, the day of the project was dependant on other projects. That is not a very positive on what is going to be done about the parking around Southmead. That is from an Oliver Cortman Documentation, which you just referred to in your answer.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Julian Baker

Now that it is clear that the redevelopment is having a negative impact upon local communities, can the Council demonstrate that it is prepared to put the interests of these communities surrounding the hospital first, and that any solution will be implemented in line with the wishes of the residents?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the

restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Tim Maynard

The new Southmead Hospital development has a city-wide and regional benefit. Does the council not care about the effects on local communities when allowing a regional development?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Vicky Calvert

BCC provided Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent (also near Southmead Hospital) with Resident Parking schemes. Why will they not do the same for Pitlochry Close and other roads surrounding the hospital?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area (residents parking zone for the area)

Question submitted by: Wendy Wiltshire

Once agreeing RPZ will be implemented, can you guarantee it will always be free, as residents will be bearing the impact of the development for years to come?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area (parking restrictions, when in place)

Question submitted by: Debbie Baker

What will the Council do to monitor and enforce parking restrictions once they are in place?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Sarah Seaman

Can the council confirm that a full impact assessment has been conducted across the community affected and that monitoring of the situation has been actively undertaken in order for an evidence based solution to be reached?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Mark Jones

What is the likelihood of the hospital parking permits being taken up? – given they will cost hundreds of pounds. Following on from the current lack of enthusiasm amongst the staff, why pay when you can park free?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Bradley Seaman

Can you explain fully why should residents be further inconvenienced by the ill-conceived plans in the consultation?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.

Subject: Trade union bill

Question submitted by: Steve Crawshaw

Bristol's improving public services and good industrial relations have been achieved thanks to open minds and strong partnership working from unions and employers. Some examples of this in Bristol City Council are:

- Introduction of a new "Bristol Contract" for all employees through a collective agreement
- A council – wide restructure in 2014 saving £21m with only 4 compulsory redundancies
- A successful Job Evaluation scheme "owned" by employer and employees
- Robust structures for corporate and departmental negotiations
- Numerous service reviews supported by the trade unions

By introducing excessive legalistic barriers and limiting the freedom of workers to organise among themselves, the government's Trade Union Bill undermines partnership working and paves the way for bad, autocratic firms to undercut good, fair ones. Does the Mayor therefore agree that the Trade Union Bill is a threat to public services and to prosperity, and pledge to lobby relevant ministers to drop the bill or amend its contents in partnership with the trade unions and business?

Reply from the Mayor:

I am a supporter of the principle and benefits of trade union membership as is the council as an organisation. The positive role of trade unions was recognised in the report of my Fairness Commission that I set up in 2013. I am sorry that I have been unable to implement everything that has come out of it as partly of some of it was removed from my budget last year.

This Council has a long history of achieving agreement with trade unions on a range of complex and difficult issues, which would not have been achieved without compromise. For example, Bristol was one of the first local authorities in the UK to reach agreement with the trade unions on equal pay.

It is organisations and trade unions working productively together that build good industrial relations. It is the job of government to provide a fit and proper legal framework that incentivises the right behaviours and outlaws poor practice.

I see the current Trade Union Bill as an unnecessary intervention, which will add nothing either to the quality of industrial relations or to the productivity of Bristol businesses.

I cannot see any benefit of the proposal to end the practice of trade union members paying their union membership fees via the payroll. That is something that is done automatically at zero costs to us effectively.

In particular, I would be concerned that the use of agency workers to cover for those on strike could damage relations between the Council and trade unions. However there will sometimes be cases, in terms of safety and health, and other emergencies, where I can see that happen. But as a general reaction, I don't think it will be a good one.

This could impact on the Council's ability to agree with the trade unions that employees carrying out certain essential services will not be called out on strike, which has become practice over recent years and I appreciate that.

I will express my views in a very calm way to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills. In any event, I will do all I can to ensure that the Council's long-standing healthy relationship with trade unions and professional associations is not adversely affected by whatever change is brought about through the Bill.

Subject: Trade union bill

Question submitted by: Kathleen Pittman

The Mayor is a keen advocate of devolution and on this we agree – more power in the hands of people doing jobs on the ground is a key ingredient of better and more innovative jobs and services

However, the Trade Union Bill is the direct opposite of localism. It gives widespread new powers to the government to ban strikes and impose vaguely-worded but harshly applied regulations onto trade unions – this country's biggest local voluntary bodies.

Will the Mayor raise the anti-localist nature of the Bill with relevant ministers, and if they do not relent, ensure that any further devolution that involves Bristol includes the freedom to determine our own industrial relations, in a similar way to the flexible business regulations that exist in some areas of the city?

Reply from the Mayor:

I am a supporter of the principle and benefits of trade union membership as is the council as an organisation. The positive role of trade unions was recognised in the report of my Fairness Commission that I set up in 2013. I am sorry that I have been unable to implement everything that has come out of it as partly of some of it was removed from my budget last year.

This Council has a long history of achieving agreement with trade unions on a range of complex and difficult issues, which would not have been achieved without compromise. For example, Bristol was one of the first local authorities in the UK to reach agreement with the trade unions on equal pay.

It is organisations and trade unions working productively together that build good industrial relations. It is the job of government to provide a fit and proper legal framework that incentivises the right behaviours and outlaws poor practice.

I see the current Trade Union Bill as an unnecessary intervention, which will add nothing either to the quality of industrial relations or to the productivity of Bristol businesses.

I cannot see any benefit of the proposal to end the practice of trade union members paying their union membership fees via the payroll. That is something that is done automatically at zero costs to us effectively.

In particular, I would be concerned that the use of agency workers to cover for those on strike could damage relations between the Council and trade unions. However there will sometimes be cases, in terms of safety and health, and other emergencies,

where I can see that happen. But as a general reaction, I don't think it will be a good one.

This could impact on the Council's ability to agree with the trade unions that employees carrying out certain essential services will not be called out on strike, which has become practice over recent years and I appreciate that.

I will express my views in a very calm way to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills. In any event, I will do all I can to ensure that the Council's long-standing healthy relationship with trade unions and professional associations is not adversely affected by whatever change is brought about through the Bill.

Subject: Trade union bill

Question submitted by: Samantha Jewell

Civic volunteering is a great British tradition and something that visitors to Bristol often mark as a good quality of our city – the high levels of community engagement bring increased welfare and better neighbourhoods for so many of our residents.

Trade unions are the way that ordinary Bristolians organise at work – over 100,000 of us are members of a trade union. We volunteer our time – I am a rep / officer / etc – to ensure fairness and decency in the world of work.

Does the Mayor think that it is trade unions that need cracking down on as the government is attempting to do in its Trade Union Bill, or should the government in fact be celebrating the British people at work? If he does think the latter, will he organise a celebration of trade unionism in Bristol before next spring and commission a report into the contribution of trade unionists to Bristol's economy and society, to be presented to the government at the first possible opportunity?

Reply from the Mayor:

I am a supporter of the principle and benefits of trade union membership as is the council as an organisation. The positive role of trade unions was recognised in the report of my Fairness Commission that I set up in 2013. I am sorry that I have been unable to implement everything that has come out of it as partly of some of it was removed from my budget last year.

This Council has a long history of achieving agreement with trade unions on a range of complex and difficult issues, which would not have been achieved without compromise. For example, Bristol was one of the first local authorities in the UK to reach agreement with the trade unions on equal pay.

It is organisations and trade unions working productively together that build good industrial relations. It is the job of government to provide a fit and proper legal framework that incentivises the right behaviours and outlaws poor practice.

I see the current Trade Union Bill as an unnecessary intervention, which will add nothing either to the quality of industrial relations or to the productivity of Bristol businesses.

I cannot see any benefit of the proposal to end the practice of trade union members paying their union membership fees via the payroll. That is something that is done automatically at zero costs to us effectively.

In particular, I would be concerned that the use of agency workers to cover for those on strike could damage relations between the Council and trade unions. However there will sometimes be cases, in terms of safety and health, and other emergencies,

where I can see that happen. But as a general reaction, I don't think it will be a good one.

This could impact on the Council's ability to agree with the trade unions that employees carrying out certain essential services will not be called out on strike, which has become practice over recent years and I appreciate that.

I will express my views in a very calm way to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills. In any event, I will do all I can to ensure that the Council's long-standing healthy relationship with trade unions and professional associations is not adversely affected by whatever change is brought about through the Bill.

Subject: Trade union bill

Question submitted by: David Ashby Styles

Agency workers perform an important job filling in gaps and are often multi-skilled and adaptable individuals. However, many of them are disturbed by the Government's idea in the trade union bill that they will be put to work breaking strikes and thereby undermining their neighbours, colleagues and friends.

Does the Mayor agree with the Recruitment and Employment Federation that the Trade Union Bill should not allow agency workers to be used to break strikes, and therefore the Bill should be opposed if it still contains this provision?

Reply from the Mayor:

I am a supporter of the principle and benefits of trade union membership as is the council as an organisation. The positive role of trade unions was recognised in the report of my Fairness Commission that I set up in 2013. I am sorry that I have been unable to implement everything that has come out of it as partly of some of it was removed from my budget last year.

This Council has a long history of achieving agreement with trade unions on a range of complex and difficult issues, which would not have been achieved without compromise. For example, Bristol was one of the first local authorities in the UK to reach agreement with the trade unions on equal pay.

It is organisations and trade unions working productively together that build good industrial relations. It is the job of government to provide a fit and proper legal framework that incentivises the right behaviours and outlaws poor practice.

I see the current Trade Union Bill as an unnecessary intervention, which will add nothing either to the quality of industrial relations or to the productivity of Bristol businesses.

I cannot see any benefit of the proposal to end the practice of trade union members paying their union membership fees via the payroll. That is something that is done automatically at zero costs to us effectively.

In particular, I would be concerned that the use of agency workers to cover for those on strike could damage relations between the Council and trade unions. However there will sometimes be cases, in terms of safety and health, and other emergencies, where I can see that happen. But as a general reaction, I don't think it will be a good one.

This could impact on the Council's ability to agree with the trade unions that employees carrying out certain essential services will not be called out on strike, which has become practice over recent years and I appreciate that.

I will express my views in a very calm way to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills. In any event, I will do all I can to ensure that the Council's long-standing healthy relationship with trade unions and professional associations is not adversely affected by whatever change is brought about through the Bill.

Subject: Trade union bill

Question submitted by: Mike Hines

Industrial relations is about employers and workers coming together to reach a fair and decent outcome for all. It is about negotiation, balancing interests, and above all solutions to problems.

Finding answers to workplace questions is not always easy or fast. It is essential therefore that each side respects the other and has a fair opportunity to put their case.

So the government's trade union bill is a threat to good workplace relations, because it enables bad employers to obstruct the negotiation process by jumping on minor technicalities that the union may have missed due to human or administrative error. Such legalistic nitpicking adds nothing to the productivity of services and instead draws out conflict.

Does the Mayor agree that the point of industrial relations debates is solutions to real problems, not obstruction from one side? Will the Mayor take action on this by writing to the minister to remove the enhanced regulation from the Trade Union Bill, and establish and champion a Bristol charter of good employers that sets out a fair framework for workplace relations?

Reply from the Mayor:

I am a supporter of the principle and benefits of trade union membership as is the council as an organisation. The positive role of trade unions was recognised in the report of my Fairness Commission that I set up in 2013. I am sorry that I have been unable to implement everything that has come out of it as partly of some of it was removed from my budget last year.

This Council has a long history of achieving agreement with trade unions on a range of complex and difficult issues, which would not have been achieved without compromise. For example, Bristol was one of the first local authorities in the UK to reach agreement with the trade unions on equal pay.

It is organisations and trade unions working productively together that build good industrial relations. It is the job of government to provide a fit and proper legal framework that incentivises the right behaviours and outlaws poor practice.

I see the current Trade Union Bill as an unnecessary intervention, which will add nothing either to the quality of industrial relations or to the productivity of Bristol businesses.

I cannot see any benefit of the proposal to end the practice of trade union members paying their union membership fees via the payroll. That is something that is done automatically at zero costs to us effectively.

In particular, I would be concerned that the use of agency workers to cover for those on strike could damage relations between the Council and trade unions. However there will sometimes be cases, in terms of safety and health, and other emergencies, where I can see that happen. But as a general reaction, I don't think it will be a good one.

This could impact on the Council's ability to agree with the trade unions that employees carrying out certain essential services will not be called out on strike, which has become practice over recent years and I appreciate that.

I will express my views in a very calm way to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills. In any event, I will do all I can to ensure that the Council's long-standing healthy relationship with trade unions and professional associations is not adversely affected by whatever change is brought about through the Bill.

Subject: Trade union bill

Question submitted by: Pete Barrett

The Westminster government seems to be Janus-faced on the status of public service workers. On the one hand it wants to cut our terms and conditions, yet on the other it is trying to gain the power to designate us “essential” and thus unable to strike.

Will the Mayor fight this discrepancy by pressuring the government to establish a fully funded and supported Royal College for any group of workers designated essential under the Trade Union Bill’s provisions, and where a Royal College already exists, ensure that appropriate representatives of that profession are consulted before such decisions are made?

Reply from the Mayor:

I am a supporter of the principle and benefits of trade union membership as is the council is as an organisation. The positive role of trade unions was recognised in the report of my Fairness Commission that I set up in 2013. I am sorry that I have been unable to implement everything that has come out of it as partly of some of it was removed from my budget last year.

This Council has a long history of achieving agreement with trade unions on a range of complex and difficult issues, which would not have been achieved without compromise. For example, Bristol was one of the first local authorities in the UK to reach agreement with the trade unions on equal pay.

It is organisations and trade unions working productively together that build good industrial relations. It is the job of government to provide a fit and proper legal framework that incentivises the right behaviours and outlaws poor practice.

I see the current Trade Union Bill as an unnecessary intervention, which will add nothing either to the quality of industrial relations or to the productivity of Bristol businesses.

I cannot see any benefit of the proposal to end the practice of trade union members paying their union membership fees via the payroll. That is something that is done automatically at zero costs to us effectively.

In particular, I would be concerned that the use of agency workers to cover for those on strike could damage relations between the Council and trade unions. However there will sometimes be cases, in terms of safety and health, and other emergencies, where I can see that happen. But as a general reaction, I don’t think it will be a good one.

This could impact on the Council's ability to agree with the trade unions that employees carrying out certain essential services will not be called out on strike, which has become practice over recent years and I appreciate that.

I will express my views in a very calm way to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills. In any event, I will do all I can to ensure that the Council's long-standing healthy relationship with trade unions and professional associations is not adversely affected by whatever change is brought about through the Bill.

Subject: Trade union bill

Question submitted by: Fred Jerrome

Inequality is far too high in Bristol. People from one part of the authority get vastly different chances in life to those in another. For a man born in my ward of Southville, life expectancy is 74 – yet for someone growing up on the other side of the city in Henleaze it is 84. What's the cost of inequality in Bristol? 10 years off of someone's life. This is unfair and unjust and we must take steps to reduce this gulf.

A prime weapon against inequality is the trade union movement. The New Economics Foundation published a report showing that if Britain had stronger unions there would be better wages for workers and a more prosperous economy as that money is spent in British businesses supporting British jobs.

Does the mayor agree that as a key part of the fight against inequality, the government should be promoting trade unions, rather than demonising them as they are in the Trade Union Bill? Will he take steps accordingly to promote the facts about trade unions in Bristol and to pressure the government to reflect this in their legislation – to start with by dropping the incompetent trade union Bill?

Reply from the Mayor:

I am a supporter of the principle and benefits of trade union membership as is the council as an organisation. The positive role of trade unions was recognised in the report of my Fairness Commission that I set up in 2013. I am sorry that I have been unable to implement everything that has come out of it as partly of some of it was removed from my budget last year.

This Council has a long history of achieving agreement with trade unions on a range of complex and difficult issues, which would not have been achieved without compromise. For example, Bristol was one of the first local authorities in the UK to reach agreement with the trade unions on equal pay.

It is organisations and trade unions working productively together that build good industrial relations. It is the job of government to provide a fit and proper legal framework that incentivises the right behaviours and outlaws poor practice.

I see the current Trade Union Bill as an unnecessary intervention, which will add nothing either to the quality of industrial relations or to the productivity of Bristol businesses.

I cannot see any benefit of the proposal to end the practice of trade union members paying their union membership fees via the payroll. That is something that is done automatically at zero costs to us effectively.

In particular, I would be concerned that the use of agency workers to cover for those on strike could damage relations between the Council and trade unions. However there will sometimes be cases, in terms of safety and health, and other emergencies, where I can see that happen. But as a general reaction, I don't think it will be a good one.

This could impact on the Council's ability to agree with the trade unions that employees carrying out certain essential services will not be called out on strike, which has become practice over recent years and I appreciate that.

I will express my views in a very calm way to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills. In any event, I will do all I can to ensure that the Council's long-standing healthy relationship with trade unions and professional associations is not adversely affected by whatever change is brought about through the Bill.

Supplementary question from Fred Jerrome:

Thank you Mayor for your support for our campaign opposition to the Trade Union Bill. I would like to ask you translate your warm words into action for the Trade Unions for us to defeat this.

Will you meet with Trade Union colleges to discuss the exact nature of the opposition that you will raise with the Secretary of State for Business and provide us with the meetings and content of the discussions you have with him in written record. And ensure in future if you are committed to good industrial relations and a positive working relationship with the trade unions, that future devolutions deals have the potential to include devolved levels of industrial relations in Bristol so we can avoid situations like this where a government in Westminster is adversely affecting our city.

Reply from the Mayor:

I think those are two perfectly reasonable requests; my time is unbelievably carved up and while I would be very happy in principle, I will see whether we can find some time to meet. I think it is very important that we do conduct friendly industrial relations with the staff in increasingly difficult times. When one hears of cuts that are imposed from central government, we know that is going to put pressure and stress on our establishment. If time can be found, I will via Human Resources and Richard Billingham, and lead by Steve Crawshaw, will see if we can have a conversation.

On the question of Devolution, one of the issues we are aiming to have devolved, a very big issue, is that of skills, and I think alongside that we should be looking at the issue of staff relations. I cannot say much more than that at the moment, we need to get over the first hurdle of Devolution in principle and that we are aiming to do currently and look at the ways we can make ourselves more independent of central government edicts of that sort.

Subject: Trade union bill

Question submitted by: Charlotte Bagshaw

In my role as a UNISON worker I have seen first-hand the effects of workplace stress: mental health issues, family troubles, and workers unable to do their jobs properly.

The 2014 Labour Force Survey showed that 11.3 million days per year are lost to stress and depression – 20 times as many as are lost to strikes.

It is trade union reps who are on the front line fighting bad workplace practice and ensuring that people have the support they need to prosper at work. Often reps themselves are so over-worked as to suffer from stress and anxiety issues.

Does the Mayor join me in commending the work of trade unions in preventing workplace stress, and will he therefore call for the secretary of state to halt his attempt to reduce facilities time allowances, and instead convene a review of workplace mental health that develops the role of trade unions in protecting Britain's workers?

Reply from the Mayor:

I am a supporter of the principle and benefits of trade union membership as is the council as an organisation. The positive role of trade unions was recognised in the report of my Fairness Commission that I set up in 2013. I am sorry that I have been unable to implement everything that has come out of it as partly of some of it was removed from my budget last year.

This Council has a long history of achieving agreement with trade unions on a range of complex and difficult issues, which would not have been achieved without compromise. For example, Bristol was one of the first local authorities in the UK to reach agreement with the trade unions on equal pay.

It is organisations and trade unions working productively together that build good industrial relations. It is the job of government to provide a fit and proper legal framework that incentivises the right behaviours and outlaws poor practice.

I see the current Trade Union Bill as an unnecessary intervention, which will add nothing either to the quality of industrial relations or to the productivity of Bristol businesses.

I cannot see any benefit of the proposal to end the practice of trade union members paying their union membership fees via the payroll. That is something that is done automatically at zero costs to us effectively.

In particular, I would be concerned that the use of agency workers to cover for those on strike could damage relations between the Council and trade unions. However there will sometimes be cases, in terms of safety and health, and other emergencies, where I can see that happen. But as a general reaction, I don't think it will be a good one.

This could impact on the Council's ability to agree with the trade unions that employees carrying out certain essential services will not be called out on strike, which has become practice over recent years and I appreciate that.

I will express my views in a very calm way to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills. In any event, I will do all I can to ensure that the Council's long-standing healthy relationship with trade unions and professional associations is not adversely affected by whatever change is brought about through the Bill.

Subject: Trade union bill

Question submitted by: Jayne Empringham

I am an admin worker at UWE and member of UNISON. In day to day working many minor and less minor issues arise that are worked out between our elected representatives in the unions on the one hand, and management and HR on the other.

In my experience this is a largely successful process and where it is not, ACAS exists to help. The low number of days lost to strikes – roughly 600,000 a year since 2010, as opposed to 7 million or more in the 1980s – suggests our current model works.

It seems to me that more government powers over unions are totally unnecessary. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

So who does the Mayor trust more to build good industrial relations: businesses and unions working together, or Westminster acting unilaterally? And if he does trust Bristol residents to manage their own affairs, will he write publically to the Secretary of State asking him to drop the dangerous Trade Union Bill and instead work with relevant groups to improve industrial relations in a reasonable and evidence based manner?

Reply from the Mayor:

I am a supporter of the principle and benefits of trade union membership as is the council as an organisation. The positive role of trade unions was recognised in the report of my Fairness Commission that I set up in 2013. I am sorry that I have been unable to implement everything that has come out of it as partly of some of it was removed from my budget last year.

This Council has a long history of achieving agreement with trade unions on a range of complex and difficult issues, which would not have been achieved without compromise. For example, Bristol was one of the first local authorities in the UK to reach agreement with the trade unions on equal pay.

It is organisations and trade unions working productively together that build good industrial relations. It is the job of government to provide a fit and proper legal framework that incentivises the right behaviours and outlaws poor practice.

I see the current Trade Union Bill as an unnecessary intervention, which will add nothing either to the quality of industrial relations or to the productivity of Bristol businesses.

I cannot see any benefit of the proposal to end the practice of trade union members paying their union membership fees via the payroll. That is something that is done automatically at zero costs to us effectively.

In particular, I would be concerned that the use of agency workers to cover for those on strike could damage relations between the Council and trade unions. However there will sometimes be cases, in terms of safety and health, and other emergencies, where I can see that happen. But as a general reaction, I don't think it will be a good one.

This could impact on the Council's ability to agree with the trade unions that employees carrying out certain essential services will not be called out on strike, which has become practice over recent years and I appreciate that.

I will express my views in a very calm way to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills. In any event, I will do all I can to ensure that the Council's long-standing healthy relationship with trade unions and professional associations is not adversely affected by whatever change is brought about through the Bill.

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Janet & Eileen Berry

Can you please tell us and the residents of Horfield two things.

1. What do you plan to do to alleviate the residents' continuing nightmare of Southmead hospital staff clogging up the streets surrounding the hospital?
2. When will measures be put in place to accomplish this plan and end the two years of misery that the Council's inertia on this issue has caused?

Reply from the Mayor:

I understand your frustrations with the parking problems in the residential area. A consultation has been carried out which to address the most serious problems of unsafe and obstructing parking as quickly as possible. I say as “quickly as possible” because a full Resident Parking Scheme would take at least 12 months to implement by a cabinet decision. I am afraid it is not possible to implement a Resident Parking Scheme that is free to the user as that would not be affordable to the city.

The principle issue is the amount of traffic that the hospital has generated. A Section 106 agreement generated an equivalent of over half a million pounds worth of mitigation for the development, much of that has been used in various ways.

In some streets, specific proposals have been suggested following feedback already received and officers are assessing these. I want to empathise that no decisions have been made at this stage about which proposals will be taken forward for any specific street and further feedback is welcome. When, and if, specific measures are implemented, we will always welcome further feedback.

The fact is Residential Parking Schemes do bring significant environmental and safety benefits to the areas they have been implemented.

The first Resident Parking Scheme was actually adjacent to the BRI so has some similarities in terms of that relationship. North Bristol NHS Trust is increasing parking capacity on the hospital site there – this will produce 2700 car park spaces from Spring 2016 onwards. This will include a 450 space public multi-story car park early in the New Year and a 500 space outdoor car park for staff. An assessment of the impact of this provision and our restrictions will be made shortly after the spaces are implemented. Whilst parking provision for hospital workers is the responsibility of the NHS Trust, I must empathise that the cost will be responsibility of the NHS, we have been working with the hospital trust on a range of measures to mitigate the impact of the hospital expansion.

We do enforce existing restrictions and carry out targeted enforcement where residents have specific concerns. I have also asked officers to ensure that the restrictions that are delivered through this review are enforced so that the scheme works as well as it can.

The residential parking restrictions on Inkerman Close and St Lucia Crescent were not installed by and are not managed by the City Council as these roads remain unadopted.

Officers have worked very closely with South Gloucestershire Council. I have been on site and received a briefing on the hospital travel plan. Officers have agreed an extension to the deadline for the delivery of Section 106 works of February 2016 and are actively working to meet this deadline.

£526,000 worth of S106 highway works were negotiated as part of the hospital planning application and include:

- Two signal-controlled pedestrian crossings at Southmead Road and Monks Park Avenue
- A38 road junction improvements
- Walking and cycling route improvements (Bristol and South Glos)
- Bus real-time information
- Off-site parking mitigation measures which are currently under consultation

I do not have a clear answer that is going to please everybody at this stage. I think you should give serious consideration as a community as to whether you would like have a Resident Parking Scheme as a similar nature as that such as Cotham, Kingsdown, Southville.

Feedback from residents living in resident parking schemes suggests the fear of implementation is greater than the generally positive aspects resident's experience. It would be inequitable for us to introduce and impossible in the current financial situation for the Council to implement a free resident parking scheme. Any Resident Parking Scheme has to apply to the car; they cannot apply to the house because it would be open too much abuse.