

Full Council – 15 December 2015

This document sets out details of the questions submitted and the replies from the Mayor.

The following questions were submitted:

- PQ 01 - Question to the Mayor – Freedom of information requests
Question from Christian Martin
- PQ 02 - Question to the Mayor – Green Capital accounts
Question from Christian Martin
- PQ 03 - Question to the Mayor – Parking issues – Southmead hospital area
Question from Brian Wiltshire
- PQ 04 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking permits
Question from Miles Taylor
- PQ 05 - Question to the Mayor – Commuter rail access
Question from Michael Owen
- PQ 06 - Question to the Mayor – Single yellow lines
Question from Michael Owen
- PQ 07 - Question to the Mayor – Disposal of port land freehold
Question from Alderman Royston Griffey
- PQ 08 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues /residents parking
Question from Emma Cree
- PQ 09 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues – M32 speed limit/traffic congestion
Question from Dawn Nielsen
- PQ 10 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking
Question from Keith Morgan
- PQ 11 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking
Question from Sarah Parr
- PQ 12 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/Prince Street bridge/M32
Question from Paul Collis
- PQ 13 - Question to the Mayor – Mayor's plans
Question from Steve Nutland
- PQ 14 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking
Question from Rachel Roberts

- PQ 15 - Question to the Mayor – Single yellow lines
Question from Andrew Pink
- PQ 16 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues / residents parking
Question from John Bishop
- PQ 17 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues / residents parking
Question from Christine Muddiman
- PQ 18 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues / residents parking
Question from Ben McGinn
- PQ 19 - Question to the Mayor – 20 mph speed limits
Question from JJ Phillips
- PQ 20 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from John Welch
- PQ 21 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Marcelle Stevens
- PQ 22 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking
Question from Catherine Downer
- PQ 23 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/20 mph speed limit/residents parking
Question from Alistair Wardle
- PQ 24 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Colin Waite
- PQ 25 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Martyn Miller
- PQ 26 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Sam Hobday
- PQ 27 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Colin Julian
- PQ 28 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/20 mph speed limit/residents parking
Question from Lynda Sanders
- PQ 29 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Sandra Jones
- PQ 30 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking figures
Question from James Lancashire
- PQ 31 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking
Question from Andrew Thomas

- PQ 32 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking
Question from Martin Hunt
- PQ 33 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking
Question from Des Baker
- PQ 34 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/Prince Street bridge
Question from Troy Finch
- PQ 35 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Renate Mader
- PQ 36 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking
Question from Caroline Clarke
- PQ 37 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking/Prince Street bridge
Question from Jon Green
- PQ 38 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Josh Beard
- PQ 39 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues – Windmill Hill
Question from Rich Harryman
- PQ 40 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking – Southville/ 20 mph
speed limits
Question from Linda Steadman
- PQ 41 - Question to the Mayor – Wessex bus 505 service
Question from Sarah Spilsbury
- PQ 42 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking
Question from Paul Leonard
- PQ 43 - Question to the Mayor – Whitehall area of Bristol
Question from Richard Bond
- PQ 44 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking/the Downs
Question from Anthony Davis
- PQ 45 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking - accounts
Question from Andrew Carton-Kelly
- PQ 46 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues – 8 December
Question from Viv James
- PQ 47 - Question to the Mayor – Bush centre
Question from Caroline Stevenson

- PQ 48 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking/20 mph speed limits
Question from Tony Cross
- PQ 49 - Question to the Mayor – Swimming pool facilities
Question from Ian Townsend
- PQ 50 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Andy Martin
- PQ 51 - Question to the Mayor – The Bush centre
Question from Ornella Saibene
- PQ 52 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Darren Worlock
- PQ 53 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues – 8 December
Question from Caroline Finch
- PQ 54 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking - Bedminster
Question from Roger Turner
- PQ 55 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Edward Bowditch
- PQ 56 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from John Henn
- PQ 57 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking/20 mph speed limits
Question from Bob Lewis
- PQ 58 - Question to the Mayor – Bus services
Question from Martyn Hillier
- PQ 59 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking
Question from Alan Graham
- PQ 60 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking - Southville
Question from Ryan Livingstone
- PQ 61 - Question to the Mayor – Montpelier RPS displacement
Question from Lynne Roberts
- PQ 62 - Question to the Mayor – School Coach Parking Bay - Fairlawn School
Question from Lynne Roberts
- PQ 63 - Question to the Mayor – Feeder Road bridge
Question from Michael Dubin
- PQ 64 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking
Question from Sara Haydon

- PQ 65 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking – Gloucester Road
Question from Sergio Romagnoli
- PQ 66 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking/dropped kerb issue
Question from John Morton
- PQ 67 - Question to the Mayor – Montpelier RPZ
Question from Kate Hodges
- PQ 68 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues - Cattle Market Road/Whitby Road
Question from Jessica Calvey
- PQ 69 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking
Question from Alice Gadsby
- PQ 70 - Question to the Mayor – Carriageworks/Westmoreland House site
Question from Jenny Grigg
- PQ 71 - Question to the Mayor – 20 mph speed limit, Gloucester Road
Question from Jenny Grigg
- PQ 72 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues/residents parking
Question from Lynn Ingleton
- PQ 73 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking zones
Question from Annette Jones
- PQ 74 - Question to the Mayor – Traffic issues
Question from Amanda Williams
- PQ 75 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking
Question from Stephen Greaves
- PQ 76 - Question to the Mayor – Residents parking
Question from Nicole Kruysse
- PQ 77 - Question to the Mayor – Malcolm X centre funding
Question from Amirah Cole
- PQ 78 - Question to the Mayor – Gentrification of St Paul's
Question from Amirah Cole
- PQ 79 - Question to the Mayor – Funding for Malcolm X centre/St Paul's Carnival/race
equality issues
Question from Steve Stephenson
- PQ 80 - Question to the Mayor – Green Capital
Question from Barry Cash

QUESTION PQ 01

Subject: Freedom of information requests

Question submitted by: Christian Martin

The Mayor in answering a question at Full Council in September 2015 stated that the FOI process was “being mis-used by some” at a cost of six figures to the Bristol Taxpayer. It is noted that the Mayor couldn’t give the detail of the actual cost and indeed a subsequent FOI request resulted in the Council refusing to answer the question about cost.

An article published in the Post six months ago clearly states that “many of the requests come from organisations interested in business rates and rental values rather than individual members of the public.”

<http://www.bristolpost.co.uk/Bristol-City-Council-answered-half-FOI-requests/story-26408761-detail/story.html><http://www.bristolpost.co.uk/Bristol-City-Council-answered-half-FOI-requests/story-26408761-detail/story.html>

Can you please provide the detailed evidence for the “mis-use by some” that you mentioned?

Reply from the Mayor:

I see the Freedom of Information as a vital tool to guarantee the transparency of local authorities’ work. However, sometimes I do feel certain people misuse the FOI option. For example, when a single person makes the same request over and over again, I consider this wasteful of the public resource that has to go into answering these requests.

Sometimes people would be wise to simply search for information on the internet or on the Bristol City Council newly launched website where we store much of the information that is requested. We are also currently looking into publishing more information on our website.

QUESTION PQ 02

Subject: Green Capital accounts

Question submitted by: Christian Martin

The Audit Committee at their meeting of the 27th November was presented with some accounts for Green Capital. The figures shown were for headline cost headings rather than an actual breakdown line by line of expenditure for the £8.3m of public money. For example, no salaries were shown, no hotel, travel or subsistence breakdowns for delegates, no office rent was included, no cost breakdown per summit to account for the £1.1m of cost (summits to which Bristolians were not invited), £76,000 was identified for a solar balloon but no details of what this represented – was it for hire, R&D, purchased. In order for members of the public to fully evaluate the true value to Bristol of the Green Capital year and to understand whether taxpayers money was well spent will the Mayor now instruct officers to provide full and transparent accounts line by line accounting for every last penny and for these to be published in a timely manner before the end of the financial year April 5th 2016 in order for the electorate to be able to consider them before next May's local and mayoral elections?

Reply from the Mayor:

As the former councillor knows from asking remarkably similar questions before, Bristol 2015 Ltd is a separate company to Bristol City Council and is responsible for publishing its own Financial Statements.

However, the following end of year reporting arrangements are planned, as outlined in the report to the Audit Committee in November:

- January 2016: Interim end-of-year report to the Department of Energy & Climate Change
- March 2016: An end of year review which will be presented to the EU Commission and DECC, as well as local stakeholders
- June 2020: Five year impact review, for local stakeholders and the EU Commission

An Overview & Scrutiny Management Board Enquiry Day is to be scheduled for March 2016, which will provide an opportunity to review the year and look at how the Council can build on activity to ensure long term benefits. The Council will prepare its annual Statement of Accounts for publication by 31st May 2016, in accordance with the Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom 2015/16 published by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA).

QUESTION PQ 03

Subject: Parking issues – Southmead hospital area

Question submitted by: Brian Wiltshire

First of all, I notice that you have failed to answer the question I submitted for the meeting held on 10th November. I asked if the council can confirm that the consultation document for parking in Horfield/Southmead 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? Your response went into detail about the RPZ, which I had not asked about, so please confirm the details I asked for.

Secondly, the Parking Consultation was finished on 13th November and I am not aware if the results have been published – if so, where are they and, if not, please can you confirm the results of the Consultation Survey? This is important, as I note that in the Southmead Hospital Travel Working Group Travel and Parking Update October 2015 it states the following in FAQs:

“What is the timescale for delivery of works? Consultation will take place throughout Autumn 2015 (I assume this refers to the survey) with construction early 2016.”

This clearly states that work will be carried out early in 2016, whilst you seem to still be of the opinion that we should wait for all the on-site parking to be completed before any action is taken. There is a clear divergence between your opinion and that of the Southmead Hospital Travel Working Group, so it would be useful to know (a) the results of the Consultation and (b) when the work will commence.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The whole consultation area was visited before the proposals were drawn up. Initial assessments suggested that whilst there was some evidence of parking by hospital staff, this was limited, as was overspill parking from the nearby South Gloucestershire parking scheme. That is what has been reported to me.
2. The initial proposals were therefore put forward as a ‘light touch’ solution to reduce nuisance parking whilst ensuring adequate access for residents and emergency vehicles.
3. We are working through the results and amending our proposals as appropriate, as the evidence grows. This commonly takes several weeks and the process has not yet finished. More information about the delivery timescale will be provided once we have finalised the proposal.

In response to your supplementary question, it is my understanding that on-site, physical surveys / assessments were carried out before the proposals were brought forward.

QUESTION PQ 04

Subject: Residents parking permits

Question submitted by: Miles Taylor

Can the Mayor confirm if the council plans to reduce the cost of residents parking permits once schemes have paid for their set up cost as was originally promised when the schemes were set up?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. This was never promised. We made it clear at the start of the programme that permit prices were a policy matter and were set according to the benefits that the permit holder gains from that permit, which is generally judged to be good value.
2. No commitments were made to change the price of residents' permits and there are no plans to do so.

In response to your supplementary question about whether money raised via permits will be ring-fenced for transport purposes, I can assure you that all the money raised will be spent on transport schemes that improve manoeuvrability – that is the whole point.

QUESTION PQ 05

Subject: Commuter rail access

Question submitted by: Michael Owen

Given the proximity of the Portway Park and Ride to the Severn Beach branch railway line, has any further consideration been undertaken to allow the development of access to help commuters reach Bristol Temple Meads by rail rather than bus. If not, why not?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Yes, there is a long-standing aspiration to add a rail platform to the Portway Park & Ride site to connect it to the Severn Beach line. It is a key priority for the Council for widening travel choices and improving access to areas such as the Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone and key destinations along the Severn Beach line.

In response to your supplementary question about changing the way the park and ride system works in 2016 (you referred in particular to extending the opening hours to accommodate the needs of some workers, such as shift and hospital workers, and to enable the public to access evening events), we have already extended the hours to a certain extent. I would personally like to see the opening hours extended to 11.00 or 11.30 pm in the evening and that is an option that has been included within the tenders that we are currently considering.

2. The City Council is currently working with Network Rail on developing the project and officers will be meeting with them in January to discuss the next steps and agree a delivery programme.

QUESTION PQ 06

Subject: Single yellow lines

Question submitted by: Michael Owen

The Evening Post has reported that single yellow lines might be used instead of double yellow line markings near Southmead Hospital. The Council have offered to suspend double yellow lines near The Fiddlers' Club, which may be replaced with single yellow markings. Why was this option not offered in Clifton, Redland, Montpelier, St Pauls et al?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. No decisions have been made about the detail of the restrictions to be proposed around Southmead Hospital.
2. The situation on Willway Street, where Fiddlers are located, is unusual because we need to provide sufficient space for lorries to access business premises but only during the daytime. The businesses needing that access are closed in the evening so it is acceptable for cars to park there at that time.
3. There is no 'one size fits all' template for residents' parking schemes – we adjust to circumstances and will continue to adjust to circumstances subject to experience, especially taking into account the 6 month reviews.
4. Ideally, I would never have double yellow lines where you can't park – I would prefer to have lines where you can park. That happens in some European countries and is so much more civilised I think. But we have to work with the law - double yellow lines are horribly visible all over the place – but they are necessary in order to help make Bristol a safe city.

QUESTION PQ 07

Subject: Disposal of port land freehold

Question submitted by: Alderman Royston Griffey

1. It is understood that the detailed procedures set out in the right of pre-emption (or 'right of first refusal') clauses in favour of First Corporate Shipping Limited (FCS), and contained in the leases to FCS, were not followed or complied with, and that consequently no other potential purchasers were given the opportunity either to match or exceed the offer of £10m made by FCS. Why were the formal procedures not complied with?

2. Why was the proposed disposal of the Docks Estate not advertised in the European Journal as is required under European law?

Reply from the Mayor:

The question is based on a total misunderstanding of the relevance of the right of pre-emption. Officers have already provided you with a copy of the actual lease for you to study.

QUESTION PQ 08

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking

Question submitted by: Emma Cree

1. RPZ appears to have worsened congestion to record levels in the central areas, contrary to what the £10m scheme was supposed to achieve. In particular I have noticed cars driving around and around certain areas and not being able to park which is having a huge detrimental effect on many businesses. How will this divergence be resolved?
2. Central area traffic lights have now failed twice in as many months. What remedial action is being taken to prevent a recurrence?

Reply from the Mayor:

- The programme of Residents' Parking Schemes is one of a series of measures aimed at reducing traffic pressure and congestion over the long term, by managing the availability of destination parking. The impacts of RPS have been modelled and are being monitored although it is too early to tell what the scale of the impact has been. It is certainly the case though that more people are using buses and bikes to commute into the city on a daily basis. Businesses, like everyone else, need to adjust to the new arrangements and the Council has offered advice and support to companies affected. To date, hundreds of employers in the RPS areas have taken up this offer.

Recent congestion levels are not representative of overall congestion trends and we are working hard to monitor impacts of transport measures over the longer term.

- Traffic signals across Bristol are controlled by a central computer system that links different sets of lights together. This system generates approximately 15% additional capacity. Any failure of this system at a time of heavy traffic flow can immediately cause severe congestion to build up that can take several hours to dissipate.

The system failed last month for approximately 1 hour in the afternoon due to a physical hardware issue. The system was returned to working order in time for the evening peak and the impact on congestion was limited.

The more recent system failure, on 8th December, was caused by an information communications issue that overloaded the system and caused it to fail. This lasted throughout the evening peak before being cleared at 9pm and therefore had a significant impact on congestion across the city due to the loss of capacity with traffic subsequently gridlocking. This particular event was not representative of levels of congestion in Bristol, but did demonstrate the vulnerability of the network and the importance of having a proper system to control traffic signals to manage this.

Changes to the communications network are being carried out now that will prevent this particular issue occurring again. These alterations will be completed by Christmas.

The Council is also moving forward with plans for a new operations centre. This centre will replace and upgrade all of our existing traffic systems, increasing resilience and further reducing the likelihood of any future system failures.

QUESTION PQ 09

Subject: Traffic issues – M32 speed limit / traffic congestion

Question submitted by: Dawn Nielsen

1. Regarding the 40mph speed limit as one exits Bristol on M32. The reason for this speed limit has been that there is a faulty barrier. This speed restriction has been in force, to my knowledge, for more than one year already. Is it not time to fix the barrier so that traffic can leave the city at motorway speeds (presumably will reduce congestion in the city at rush hours)... or is the reason for the restriction another?

2. During the awful congestion last night, I believe that I was photographed crossing a red light... but I did not cross the light on red...I just got stuck on the crossing because vehicles in front pulled up suddenly. Will any fines received for incidents such as this which were caused by the congestion on 8/12/15 be quashed?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Highways England, formerly the Highways Agency, is responsible for the operation of the national motorway and trunk road network, including the M32. The Council therefore has no jurisdiction over speed limits or maintenance programmes, although officers are in regular discussion with HE officials about these issues.

2. The police are responsible for the enforcement of the crossing of red lights, not Bristol City Council. Any appeals against fines issued should be directed to them.

QUESTION PQ 10

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking

Question submitted by: Keith Morgan

1. RPZ appears to have worsened congestion to record levels in the central areas, contrary to what the £10m scheme was supposed to achieve. How will this divergence be resolved?
2. Central area traffic lights have now failed twice in as many months. What remedial action is being taken to prevent a recurrence?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The programme of Residents' Parking Schemes is one of a series of measures aimed at reducing traffic pressure and congestion over the long term, by managing the availability of destination parking. The impacts of RPS have been modelled and are being monitored although it is too early to tell what the scale of the impact has been. It is certainly the case though that more people are using buses and bikes to commute into the city on a daily basis. Businesses, like everyone else, need to adjust to the new arrangements and the Council has offered advice and support to companies affected. To date, hundreds of employers in the RPS areas have taken up this offer.

Recent congestion levels are not representative of overall congestion trends and we are working hard to monitor impacts of transport measures over the longer term.

2. Traffic signals across Bristol are controlled by a central computer system that links different sets of lights together. This system generates approximately 15% additional capacity. Any failure of this system at a time of heavy traffic flow can immediately cause severe congestion to build up that can take several hours to dissipate.

The system failed last month for approximately 1 hour in the afternoon due to a physical hardware issue. The system was returned to working order in time for the evening peak and the impact on congestion was limited.

The more recent system failure, on 8th December, was caused by an information communications issue that overloaded the system and caused it to fail. This lasted throughout the evening peak before being cleared at 9pm and therefore had a significant impact on congestion across the city due to the loss of capacity with traffic subsequently gridlocking. This particular event was not representative of levels of congestion in Bristol, but did demonstrate the vulnerability of the network and the importance of having a proper system to control traffic signals to manage this.

Changes to the communications network are being carried out now that will prevent this particular issue occurring again. These alterations will be completed by Christmas.

The Council is also moving forward with plans for a new operations centre. This centre will replace and upgrade all of our existing traffic systems increasing resilience and further reducing the likelihood of any future system failures.

QUESTION PQ 11

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking

Question submitted by: Sarah Parr

1. At the Full Council Meeting on 15th December, can I please ask what is going to happen to all the cars that park on the Downs (to get to work etc!) now that double yellow lines have been painted along one side of Stoke Road?

I agree that some action has to be taken as it is virtually impossible to drive across the Downs in the rush hour. However, it is impossible for people to get to work in the city. I work in Clifton Village and need to take 2 buses to get there from Westbury on Trym and home again (taking nearly 2 hours in each direction). BCC cannot pretend that people won't bring cars in to the city centre - for many, it is the only way to get to work. Although, at the rate businesses are leaving Clifton Village, there soon won't be any people working here!

2. Also can I ask, under the Freedom of Information Act, how much money has been received by BCC from the Pay and Display machines in each RPZ and where this money goes?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The parking review around the Downs was carried out with the input of local residents, councillors and the Downs Committee in order to protect and enhance this iconic green space. The 5hr limited waiting bays will make it easier for people to park and shop at local businesses in Clifton Village and on Whiteladies Rd and use the open space on the Downs for leisure purposes. The restrictions will also improve traffic flows and ease congestion in the area during the week, particularly those on Stoke Road which will assist the no. 4 bus service.

2: Response below:-

RPS Zone	Income generated by P&D 15/16 (as of 30 Nov 15)
Kingsdown	£174,915
Redcliffe	£28,355
Cotham	£87,538
Easton St Phillips	£60,707
Cliftonwood	£51,910
Cotham North	£70,628
Redland	£19,564
Bower Ashton	£4,239
St Pauls	£42,530
Clifton Village	£517,265
Clifton East	£173,819
Montpelier	£18,743

Bedminster East	£5,228
Southville	£0
Spike Island	£0

The money raised from RPS P&D income is ring-fenced by Section 55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act and, in the first instance, must be spent on covering the costs of implementing the schemes. After this, the income is required to be put towards other transport improvements in the city.

QUESTION PQ 12

Subject: Traffic issues/Prince Street bridge/M32

Question submitted by: Paul Collis

1. Why are Prince Street bridge repairs taking so long - there is no sign of any work being done. Will it reopen or is the agenda to keep it closed?
2. If the barriers are unsafe on the M32, why have they not been repaired rather than dropping the speed limit?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. We have completed the majority of the investigatory works needed to establish the condition of the bridge. This was a lengthy process because we needed to expose its hidden internal structure to establish the full extent of the problems. The historic nature of the bridge meant that this work had to be done by hand and it was only possible to work on one section at a time.

We fully intend to reopen the bridge as soon as possible.

2. These barriers are the responsibility of Highways England and not Bristol City Council.

QUESTION PQ 13

Subject: Mayor's plans

Question submitted by: Steve Nutland

1. Obviously George your plan isn't working, when are you going to change your mind and do something constructive instead of destructive?
2. Most of your green measures had little or no effect, your speech about Bristol being an example of how a city should be run made you a laughing stock, Bristol is now far worse than when you started your 5 year plan ,so what makes you think people like you so much and that your plans are working?

Reply from the Mayor:

I pick up a slight note of hostility in your question so assume that whatever I answer it won't change your mind. That said, please rest assured that my plans are already seeing huge positive changes across the city. To give just one example the 25% increase in bus use in the last 18 months combined with an even bigger increase in cycling rates shows the transport plan is starting to work.

QUESTION PQ 14

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking

Question submitted by: Rachel Roberts

Why is there no communication or integration between the Parking Services team, the RPZ team and the traffic control team? Why are complaints of profiteering being ignored?

EXAMPLE: the parking services team are issuing tickets to residents in areas where schemes have been implemented on one side of the road (CV/Pembroke Rd) four months before the other side (CE/Pembroke Rd) causing a migration of cars seeking free parking to the other side. The RPZ team decided to do this during term time when there was a high number of students and commuters seeking free parking.

The result was no parking for tax-paying residents who live on Pembroke Rd and surrounding streets - parking a few metres away in CV resulted in a inflated PCN (£35 instead of the usual £25) as CE permits were not issued until May.

Parking services team are profiteering.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Officers in these teams have worked together to deliver the RPS programme.
2. There is no profiteering taking place. Revenue from the schemes is needed to pay for its implementation and ongoing costs. If we reach a point where surplus revenue is generated, this can only be spent on transport improvements.
3. Signage is installed adjacent to each bay in the area and it is the responsibility of the driver to check this signage before leaving their vehicle in the bay.
4. However, for the first two weeks of each scheme, vehicles without a permit or pay & display ticket were issued with a notice to let drivers know about the scheme. They were not issued with a fine. After two weeks we enforce all parking restrictions because we need to make sure that the scheme achieves its aims.

QUESTION PQ 15

Subject: Single yellow lines

Question submitted by: Andrew Pink

Why are there now no single yellow lines in Bristol? What is the purpose of replacing single yellow lines, which allow temporary stopping and then parking in the evening, with double yellow lines, which do not, and thereby increase stress and punish drivers unnecessarily?

Please consider removing double yellow lines except where they are needed, and not as a way of alienating the motorist.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Double yellow lines also permit stopping, boarding and alighting and loading; they only restrict waiting, i.e. parking.

2. Whilst there is nothing preventing single yellow lines from being installed, our current approach is that we should allow parking without restriction unless the presence of a parked vehicle would cause an access or safety problem. We need to ensure that larger sized emergency services and waste collection vehicles have the access that they need and we also need to ensure that parked vehicles do not prevent safe access and egress to/from driveways. In locations where a parked vehicle would cause an obstruction, access is just as important during the evening as it is during the day.

QUESTION PQ 16

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking

Question submitted by: John Bishop

1. I have been cycling through the city centre every day for the past eight years and I have only seen congestion getting worse, and additionally seen no reduction in congestion since the introduction of the RPZ. The RPZ seems to address the wrong problem - namely parking. The real problem is moving traffic, not parking and cars parked on the street at home.

My first question is: Is it time to scrap the failed RPZ in favour of a congestion scheme that tackles the real problem of moving vehicles - not parked vehicles?

2. The RPZ includes intentions to charge residents more for parking vehicles that have larger engines. As a very keen cyclist but one that has a car with a large engine that hardly ever gets used, then under the planned scheme I would be charged more for leaving my car parked (and not polluting). If I have to pay more to keep my car then I am going to make sure I use it more often, to make it worthwhile. If other residents are in the same situation then this is going to increase congestion in the city, not reduce it. I find the clause in the planned RPZ to charge more for larger vehicles both counterproductive to congestion and unfair.

My second question is: have the council considered the effect that RPZ might increase congestion in the city? If Tuesday 8 December was anything to go by then we are looking at a future of worse and worse congestion.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The programme of Residents' Parking Schemes is one of a series of measures aimed at reducing traffic pressure and congestion over the long term, by managing the availability of destination parking. The impacts of RPS have been modelled and are being monitored although it is too early to tell what the scale of the impact has been. It is certainly the case though that more people are using buses and bikes to commute into the city on a daily basis. If you are suggesting that Bristol should introduce a congestion charge scheme then this is something that has been considered before and may be again at some time in the future, once the full traffic effects of the RPS programme have been understood.

2. I do not believe RPS is causing additional congestion as it is designed primarily to manage the demand for car-borne commuting, not increase it. The congestion event on 8th December was caused by an information communications issue that overloaded the system and caused it to fail. This lasted throughout the evening peak before being cleared at 9pm and therefore had a significant impact on congestion across the city due to the loss of capacity with traffic subsequently gridlocking. This particular event was not representative of levels of congestion in Bristol, but did demonstrate the vulnerability of the network and the importance of having a proper system to control traffic signals to manage this.

QUESTION PQ 17

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking

Question submitted by: Christine Muddiman

1. I would like to know what will be done about the outward movement of informal 'Park & Ride' areas as the RPZs are being extended?

Every available roadside space is filled with cars now, making Bristol residents' lives a misery. Just continuing to move the RPZs further out just makes it worse for everyone & blocks roads.

What was once a lovely city to live in is now a miserable traffic clogged ghetto.

2. In view of the massive increase in congestion, why are the planners allowing more & more trees to be cut down, only to be replaced by small 'supermarket car park' style trees, the City council should be prioritising the preservation & planting of trees to help reduce the foul air pollution, which is increasing as people have to drive around in low gear due to new speed limits along with the hideous congestion?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. With an ambitious programme such as the introduction of residents' parking schemes in a city which previously had unrestricted parking available in its central areas, there will always be a degree of settling-in as people get used to the new arrangements. If areas of the city become problematic in terms of new parking patterns then we will take appropriate action to rectify the situation. We welcome feedback from local people regarding specific areas of concern.

2. Trees will only be permitted to be felled where there is strong justification and often where replacements are introduced. My ambition is to see a tree planted for every child in Bristol and we are well on the way to completing this project.

QUESTION PQ 18

Subject: Traffic issues / residents parking

Question submitted by: Ben McGinn

1. Since the implementation of RPZ, traffic congestion has worsened considerably in the outlying areas of the city as traffic now flows out from the city centre into residential areas looking for parking options. In addition, the areas that do not have RPZ are now littered with "live-in vans" parking on pavements and blocking visibility on many of the roads making it unsafe for pedestrians, most especially children to cross.

Question: How will these issues be resolved given that I understand £10m has been spent on RPZ already?

2. It is often said that there is no problem so bad that government interference can't make worse. The traffic lights in Bristol have now failed twice in as many months causing widescale delay and difficulties.

Question: What action will be taken to prevent the huge disruption to motorists caused by your inability to manage the extensive traffic light systems implemented in the city over the last 15 years?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The programme of Residents' Parking Schemes is one of a series of measures aimed at reducing traffic pressure and congestion over the long term, by managing the availability of destination parking. The impacts of RPS have been modelled and are being monitored although it is too early to tell what the scale of the impact has been. It is certainly the case though that more people are using buses and bikes to commute into the city on a daily basis. I do not believe RPS is causing additional congestion as it is designed primarily to manage the demand for car-borne commuting, not increase it.

The knock-on effects of the RPS areas beyond the current ring of schemes is also being monitored and I am aware that some people believe extending restrictions would be beneficial and this is something I think needs to be considered in the future.

2. Traffic signals across Bristol are controlled by a central computer system that links different sets of lights together. This system generates approximately 15% additional capacity. Any failure of this system at a time of heavy traffic flow can immediately cause severe congestion to build up that can take several hours to dissipate.

The system failed last month for approximately 1 hour in the afternoon due to a physical hardware issue. The system was returned to working order in time for the evening peak and the impact on congestion was limited.

The congestion event on 8th December was caused by an information communications issue that overloaded the system and caused it to fail. This lasted throughout the evening peak before being cleared at 9pm and therefore had a significant impact on congestion across the city due to the loss of capacity with traffic subsequently gridlocking. This particular event was not representative of levels of congestion in Bristol, but did demonstrate the vulnerability of the network and the importance of having a proper system to control traffic signals to manage this.

The council is also moving forward with plans for a new operations centre. This centre will replace and upgrade all of our existing traffic systems increasing resilience and further reducing the likelihood of any future system failures.

QUESTION PQ 19

Subject: 20 mph speed limits

Question submitted by: JJ Phillips

Will you roll back the 20mph speed limits on roads in Bristol Besides areas that are within 200m of schools and hospitals?

1. The police have said that won't enforce these limits
2. The vast majority of road users ignore them
3. They bring no real safety or economic benefit to the city

As such please remove them except for the areas indicated where they can provide a direct safety benefit to children and infirm citizens.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The police are enforcing the 20mph speed limit and are in fact piloting a 20mph speed awareness course to provide an education alternative to those caught speeding in a 20mph speed limit area (if within the correct thresholds).

2. The speed limit is not ignored in the city and speeds are reducing, but we have always said that it will take time to get speeds down as this requires a change in driving behaviour.

3. Reduced speeds bring a multitude of benefits to the city. By reducing speeds of motorised vehicles people become more physically active as more choose to walk and cycle and this can in turn improve their health and well-being and lessen the cost on the NHS in terms of treating conditions which can be caused through lack of mobility such as heart disease and diabetes. In addition, slower speeds can help reduce the severity and volume of road collisions and help reduce congestion by encouraging smoother flows of traffic and this alone will reduce the economic costs to the city. Reduced noise, negligible impacts on pollution and calmer communities are all conducive to a more productive city which is why Bristol is only one of many major cities in the UK to introduce 20mph limits on residential roads. The speed limit has not just been applied by schools and hospitals but on residential roads to allow the whole community to benefit from the slower speeds.

QUESTION PQ 20

Subject: Traffic issues

Question submitted by: John Welch

Why do so many traffic lights seem to be timed to impede rather than aid movement of traffic?

I came to Bristol nearly two years ago and have long since lost count of the number of times I have sat at lights whilst nothing else moves (this in various parts of the city and all times of the day or night - rush hours excepted). I have even been stopped at pedestrian crossings in the middle of the night when there is no-one in sight - the lights changed as I approached... (unless the lights are faulty this suggests a deliberate, and perverse, policy of making life difficult for drivers).

The duty of traffic managers is to facilitate progress, minimizing delays and inconvenience (this is also in-keeping with promoting an environmentally aware approach as there is nothing more counter-productive, from the point-of-view of emissions, than having cars standing still with their engines running). Apropos of which my fuel consumption has never been worse than in Bristol. In the last few years I have driven (the same car) regularly in Bristol, Shropshire and Tuscany (Florence, Siena, and twisting mountain roads). My fuel consumption here is consistently worse. (Incidentally, in Italy most traffic lights are switched to flashing-amber in the middle of the night and drivers are left to work things out for themselves. The authorities know that no self-respecting Italian driver is going to sit at a red light in the middle of the night when there is not a another vehicle in sight and have sensibly adapted to this reality. No such pragmatism here...)

Reply from the Mayor:

Traffic lights are controlled by a central computer system. This system links together different sets of lights and attempts to smooth the flow of traffic. The system also reacts to changes in traffic volumes and optimises timings based on fuel usage and therefore air pollution, seeking to minimise both.

Bristol's road network is limited and there is a significant and growing demand to travel whether by car, cycle, foot or bus. Whilst the system is effective at making the most of the available capacity there is a limit to what can be achieved when traffic volumes are very high.

Traffic lights are not set up to stop drivers late at night but some complicated junctions such as roundabouts will operate in a fixed mode rather than reacting to individual demands. This is to that safety standards are maintained between different sets of lights.

Unfortunately we do not have the powers to install flashing amber signals at night, this would need to be approved by the DfT and they currently have no plans to allow this.

QUESTION PQ 21

Subject: Traffic issues

Question submitted by: Marcelle Stevens

With the number of road improvement schemes now in progress, along with regular utility maintenance, what action is taking place to minimise the resulting traffic congestion in South Bristol whilst these are ongoing?

For example, the traffic signal improvements at the junction of Dean Lane and Coronation road cause significant delay leading up to Bedminster Bridge, which itself is subject to ongoing delays due to the increase in traffic caused by Prince Street Bridge closure and Metrobus work in St Mary Redcliffe. I would suggest that it would have been more sensible to conduct these works earlier in the year before the other major schemes commenced.

Reply from the Mayor:

The closure of Prince Street Bridge was unplanned but has to be carried out owing to the structural integrity of the bridge.

Works along the Redcliffe Hill and Redcliffe Roundabout started in Spring this year and has to be completed in a phased manner. Any lane restrictions are removed during the morning and evening peak times.

The works to modernise and improve the junction of Coronation Road and St Johns Rd were planned. They have been carried out at this time in order to ensure they are complete before further MetroBus and Revolving Infrastructure Fund works take place next year. The temporary signals installed at this site are the first of their kind and being trialled in Bristol. The signals have the ability to be linked to the city's traffic control system and therefore work in conjunction with neighbouring signal controlled junctions. Again, all lanes are returned to operation during the morning and evening peak.

QUESTION PQ 22

Subject: Residents parking

Question submitted by: Catherine Downer

How am I supposed to pick my daughter up from Southville Primary school?
We live in Totterdown and were unable to be offered a place at a school accessible via bus or walking.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. We have provided shared use parking immediately outside the school on Merrywood Road; there is also extensive shared use parking nearby on Bealey Road.
2. Shared use bays provide half an hour's free parking. In addition to this, vehicles can stop within all of our parking bays, which may be appropriate for children who are old enough to walk out of the school grounds to the car.
3. Therefore, it should not be any more difficult to collect children from school than it was previously.

QUESTION PQ 23

Subject: Traffic issues/20 mph speed limit/residents parking

Question submitted by: Alistair Wardle

1. Why is it that the introduction of the 20 mph speed limit in the city, which is really unenforceable as we don't have traffic police anymore, has increased traffic congestion in the city, which in turn has made pollution far worse? This is ironic as we are supposed to be the Green city !!!

2. Why is it that introducing RPZ's to the city, has just succeeded in infuriating the vast proportion of the population from the council? In the daytime when the parking restrictions are in force, most people are at work and the streets have plenty of spaces. When people come home from work when space is needed to park, anyone can park on your road !!!!

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The 20mph speed limit has been introduced to Bristol as in many other major cities on residential roads to help improve traffic congestion whilst having a negligible impact on pollution. With slower speeds many people choose non-polluting modes of transport such as walking and cycling for shorter journeys rather than drive which in itself helps reduce traffic pollution. However slower, smoother driving styles can also reduce pollution as there is less need to change gear and it reduces the stopping and starting. It can also ease congestion as there is less space required between vehicles allowing more to get through a junction. The police are enforcing the 20mph speed limit and are in fact piloting a 20mph speed awareness course to provide an education alternative to those caught speeding in a 20mph speed limit area (if within the correct thresholds).

2. I do not believe that people are infuriated - the majority of the feedback that we have had so far has been very positive, with many of the negative comments asking us to change a specific parking layout

Residents who do not keep their vehicle in the area during the day do not need to pay for a residents' permit. For those that do, most say that they find it much easier to come and go than it was previously.

Where local residents asked for longer hours when we were drawing up our proposals we have included this. There are some areas where there was no clear support for this at the time but we will review each area regularly and can propose changes to the operating hours if that is what local people want to see.

QUESTION PQ 24

Subject: Traffic issues

Question submitted by: Colin Waite

Do you think the emphasis should be taken away from cars and handed to cyclists? Possibly making certain roads one way to cars and making roads cycle lanes. Giving cyclists the priority at traffic lights. I think given the chaos which occurred during the recent traffic light incident, the amount of cars on the road would be significantly reduced with all the advantages that happen as a result.

Reply from the Mayor:

Bristol is proud to have been the UK's first Cycling City and to have seen a significant and sustained growth in cycle use for 15 years. We now have a Cycle Strategy and continue to secure Government funding for cycle infrastructure improvements. I therefore think that cycling has an extremely high degree of emphasis. It is important to recognise of course that not everyone is able to cycle regularly to and from work and other forms of transport need to be accommodated as we need to balance the needs of all of those travelling in and around the city. This we seek to do with a comprehensive transport strategy including investing in public transport and road improvements where necessary.

QUESTION PQ 25

Subject: Traffic issues/traffic light failure – 8 December

Question submitted by: Martyn Miller

1. When was the SCOOT system updated, and why it is so unreliable, and where were the traffic police?
2. The SCOOT system has been in Wilder House for many years. Has it been updated?

Reply from the Mayor:

- The SCOOT system is updated regularly and Bristol's system has all of the latest upgrades. The SCOOT system is actually very reliable and the incident on 8th December was the first major city wide failure of any sustained duration for over 8 years.
- The SCOOT system itself did not fail, the failure occurred in the information communications network that supports the SCOOT system. The system will be fully upgraded as part of plans for a new operations centre. This centre will replace and upgrade all of our existing traffic systems increasing resilience and further reducing the likelihood of any future system failures.
- A senior traffic officer attended site during the failure to manually control the traffic lights at Cabot Circus to release some of the queued traffic. Unfortunately police would not have been of much assistance due to the complicated nature of the problem junctions.

QUESTION PQ 26

Subject: Traffic issues

Question submitted by: Sam Hobday

What is being done to speed up the implementation of Bristol traffic improvement projects?

Whilst I am well aware of all of the "improvements" to Bristol traffic over the past few years, very little of it seems to have helped. One of the big things that always jumps out at me is the time it takes to implement new traffic schemes meaning they are

Prince Street Bridge is taking forever.

Bridge Valley Road a few years ago took a huge amount of time.

The whole Fountains / Metrobus area is likely to take years Feeder Road is/was closed for over a year The redevelopment of Redcliffe Roundabout / Hill is a multi-year project and so far appears to have made the roundabout a bit prettier.

I appreciate large projects can take time, but it is quite clear to me now that the improvement works are taking so long, that by the time they are finished, not only have they been superceded by other works, but that Bristol is now just one big building site with as many of the major roads being closed or slowed as those that are working.

I'm all for improving things, but they need to be done much much quicker or they're out of date by the time they're complete.

Reply from the Mayor:

We are committed to achieving these projects as quickly as is feasible and to avoid travel disruption. Complex projects will take longer to implement, but will have a positive long term impact on the city.

QUESTION PQ 27

Subject: Traffic issues

Question submitted by: Colin Julian

The traffic in Bristol, not just yesterday, but for months now is embarrassingly bad.

This is despite the money wasted on introducing rpz's and 20 mph zones. The situation has just got worse and worse.

Why are the buses as bad, if not worse, than they always have been. (I have lived in Bristol all my life, over 60 years, and buses have always been unreliable and expensive). They are completely unreliable and it is no wonder that people prefer to travel by car despite the obstacles put in their way by the Mayor.

Cycling for me is not an alternative due to a bad knee injury. Many people are in the same situation as I am. The pandering to cyclists has also slowed traffic.

Clearly action is needed to improve things.

What does the Mayor intend to do, without giving the excuse about the road works on the Centre?

Reply from the Mayor:

Our whole approach to transport strategy in Bristol is to reduce traffic pressure causing congestion, by improving alternatives such as public transport and cycling, managing demand through parking restrictions and optimising the use of the highway network through our traffic control system. The demands on the city are huge and complex and it will take time to see all the changes we want. However, we are already seeing significant increases in bus use which is up by 17% across the board in the last couple of years. This has prompted massive investment in the bus fleet by operators with scores of brand new double deckers being added to the city this year alone. Cycling is also steadily on the rise as we introduce more and better cycling facilities and more people are choosing to leave their cars at home and get on a bike. We are pressing on with MetroBus and MetroWest rail and will continue to secure Government funding to invest further in the future of the city's transport networks. There's plenty of action going on.

QUESTION PQ 28

Subject: Traffic issues/20 mph speed limit/residents parking

Question submitted by: Lynda Sanders

1. The 20 mph zones around the city are not achieving anything except frustration. From where I live going to the local shops I go from 40 mph, then 30 mph, then 20 mph, then 30 mph, then 20 mph. I spend more time looking at my speed dial than the road. Can you provide RECENT and INDEPENDENT evidence that this scheme is working without adverse effects?

2) RPZ appears to have worsened congestion to record levels in the central areas, contrary to what the £10m scheme was supposed to achieve. How will this divergence be resolved?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The 20mph speed limits are achieving slower speeds which in turn and over time will help achieve more active travel of non-polluting modes, ease traffic congestion, improve road safety and encourage vulnerable people such as children and older people to increase their mobility and use their local communities. A recent and independent survey for the central area has shown that people supports these lower limits on residential roads. Initial data speeds are also showing a reduction in speed particularly in the central area and on main roads where many of the shops, schools and hospitals are located.
2. The programme of Residents' Parking Schemes is one of a series of measures aimed at reducing traffic pressure and congestion over the long term, by managing the availability of destination parking. The impacts of RPS have been modelled and are being monitored although it is too early to tell what the scale of the impact has been. It is certainly the case though that more people are using buses and bikes to commute into the city on a daily basis.

Recent congestion levels are not representative of overall congestion trends and we are working hard to monitor impacts of transport measures over the longer term.

QUESTION PQ 29

Subject: Traffic issues – 8 December

Question submitted by: Sandra Jones

Yesterday evening was a disgrace directly as a result of council actions. Why is it not possible for traffic lights to be repaired same day? - Why is bridge still closed?

- reverse 20 mph limits and RPZ to as they were before and you might - just might be able to put things right - green city - what a joke - cycle lanes in Baldwin Street a complete disgraceful waste of public funds - cyclists completely disregard rules of the road why are they not prosecuted - solution get rid of an expensive unnecessary extra mayor that Bristol did not want anyway - this was imposed on Bristol.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Traffic signals across Bristol are controlled by a central computer system that links different sets of lights together. This system generates approximately 15% additional capacity. Any failure of this system at a time of heavy traffic flow can immediately cause severe congestion to build up that can take several hours to dissipate. The system failure, on 8th December, was caused by an information communications issue that overloaded the system and caused it to fail. This lasted throughout the evening peak before being cleared at 9pm and therefore had a significant impact on congestion across the city due to the loss of capacity with traffic subsequently gridlocking. This particular event was not representative of levels of congestion in Bristol, but did demonstrate the vulnerability of the network and the importance of having a proper system to control traffic signals to manage this.
2. If you are referring to Prince Street bridge, the assessment of the severe erosion is indicating that it is more extensive than first hoped so it will need to remain closed until the works are complete. Every effort is made to minimise the duration of roadworks that require the highway to be closed and to manage the traffic effects as efficiently as possible.

QUESTION PQ 30

Subject: Residents parking figures

Question submitted by: James Lancashire

I would like to know figures for number of and income from RPZ permits issued, revenue from RPZ parking meters and level of money from RPZ fines?

I am asking for an aggregate figure at this stage not per area so the work required is not onerous. I would like a written reply within 10 days.

Reply from the Mayor:

Financial Year	15/16 (up to 30/11/15)
Permit numbers	18128
Permit Income	£1,025,424
P&D Income	£1,255,441
Total Income	£2,280,865

It is not possible to provide the number of PCN fines by RPS location as we do not hold this information in this format.

QUESTION PQ 31

Subject: Residents parking

Question submitted by: Andrew Thomas

How do streets with no residential element on an industrial estate qualify to be in the RPZ unless it's to force business owners to pay for parking for their employees as another tax levied on top of business rates?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Many of our RPS areas include some streets that are more commercial or industrial than others.
2. If we were to exclude individual streets from an area-wide scheme, these streets would become the focus for commuter and other parking displaced from the RPS area. This would significantly reduce parking provision for local businesses and their customers.

QUESTION PQ 32

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking

Question submitted by: Martin Hunt

1. Central area traffic lights have now failed twice in as many months. What remedial action is being taken to prevent a recurrence?
2. RPZ appears to have worsened congestion to record levels in the central areas, contrary to what the £10m scheme was supposed to achieve. How will this divergence be resolved?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Traffic signals across Bristol are controlled by a central computer system that links different sets of lights together. This system generates approximately 15% additional capacity. Any failure of this system at a time of heavy traffic flow can immediately cause severe congestion to build up that can take several hours to dissipate.

The system failed last month for approximately 1 hour in the afternoon due to a physical hardware issue. The system was returned to working order in time for the evening peak and the impact on congestion was limited.

The more recent system failure, on 8th December, was caused by an information communications issue that overloaded the system and caused it to fail. This lasted throughout the evening peak before being cleared at 9pm and therefore had a significant impact on congestion across the city due to the loss of capacity with traffic subsequently gridlocking. This particular event was not representative of levels of congestion in Bristol, but did demonstrate the vulnerability of the network and the importance of having a proper system to control traffic signals to manage this.

Changes to the communications network are being carried out now that will prevent this particular issue occurring again. These alterations will be completed by Christmas.

The council is also moving forward with plans for a new operations centre. This centre will replace and upgrade all of our existing traffic systems increasing resilience and further reducing the likelihood of any future system failures.

2. The programme of Residents' Parking Schemes is one of a series of measures aimed at reducing traffic pressure and congestion over the long term, by managing the availability of destination parking. The impacts of RPS have been modelled and are being monitored although it is too early to tell what the scale of the impact has been. It is certainly the case though that more people are using buses and bikes to commute into the city on a daily basis. Businesses, like everyone else, need to adjust to the new arrangements and the Council has offered advice and support to companies affected. To date, hundreds of employers in the RPS areas have taken up this offer. Recent congestion levels are not representative of overall congestion trends and we are working hard to monitor impacts of transport measures over the longer term.

QUESTION PQ 33

Subject: Residents parking

Question submitted by: Des Baker

For some years, I have regularly parked on Cheltenham Road, near the Polish Church, whilst keeping an appointment nearby. Between 10.00 and 16.00 there has been no charge.

This morning, without knowledge of any consultation, or forewarning, I found this stretch of road turned into an RPZ and parking subjected to a charge.

Is this what you would understand to be one of the 'democratic services' referred to in this email address?

Reply from the Mayor:

The Montpelier Residents' Parking Scheme came into force on the 6th July 2015. Prior to its introduction, extensive non-statutory and statutory consultation was carried out. The location in question is now a shared-use parking bay between 10am and 4pm where permit holders or pay & display parkers can park. The pay & display charges are free for stays of 30 minutes or less and one pound per hour for longer periods. The statutory process included site notices stating the proposals and advertisements in the Bristol Post.

QUESTION PQ 34

Subject: Traffic issues/Prince Street bridge

Question submitted by: Troy Finch

1. Why are Prince Street Bridge repairs taking so long? Will it reopen or is the agenda to keep it closed?
2. Central area traffic lights have now failed twice in as many months. What remedial action is being taken to prevent a recurrence?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. We have completed the majority of the investigatory works needed to establish the condition of the bridge. This was a lengthy process because we needed to expose its hidden internal structure to establish the full extent of the problems. The historic nature of the bridge meant that this work had to be done by hand and it was only possible to work on one section at a time.

We fully intend to reopen the bridge as soon as possible.

2. Traffic signals across Bristol are controlled by a central computer system that links different sets of lights together. This system generates approximately 15% additional capacity. Any failure of this system at a time of heavy traffic flow can immediately cause severe congestion to build up that can take several hours to dissipate.

The system failed last month for approximately 1 hour in the afternoon due to a physical hardware issue. The system was returned to working order in time for the evening peak and the impact on congestion was limited.

The more recent system failure, on 8th December, was caused by an information communications issue that overloaded the system and caused it to fail. This lasted throughout the evening peak before being cleared at 9pm and therefore had a significant impact on congestion across the city due to the loss of capacity with traffic subsequently gridlocking. This particular event was not representative of levels of congestion in Bristol, but did demonstrate the vulnerability of the network and the importance of having a proper system to control traffic signals to manage this.

Changes to the communications network are being carried out now that will prevent this particular issue occurring again. These alterations will be completed by Christmas.

The council is also moving forward with plans for a new operations centre. This centre will replace and upgrade all of our existing traffic systems increasing resilience and further reducing the likelihood of any future system failures.

QUESTION PQ 35

Subject: Traffic issues

Question submitted by: Renate Mader

1. I live in Hadrian Close, and am scared to drive away from my home and back to it again due to the fact that there is no yellow line anywhere to stop the cars parking all along this road making it a one track way. It is a hill into the bargain. When someone comes off the Portway, that person has to literally pray that there is not a 'four by four' for example coming up Hadrian Close - they will never back for anyone as they seem to have the right of way. The reverse is the case for drivers want g to join the Shirehampton part of the Portway.

Why is nothing being done about this - several people have been killed already but this council doesn't seem to care or do you?

2. The town's congestion must be second to none since the rpz of 20 limit has been implemented. It isn't working. Bristol is supposed to be the Green City. Is Bristol going to be the laughing stock of Europe due to this new self-made congestion. Are you going to reconsider this decision. The money this congestion has cost could well have been spent on much better things for this town. There are people living on Bristol's streets for example.

What, if anything are you going to do about this self-made chaos?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Highway Officers are already aware of the local concerns being caused by parking along Hadrian Close and have already discussed these with the Local Members. The accident records indicate that there has only been 1 slight injury as a result of a road traffic collision on Hadrian Close in recent years. The concerns have already been added to the list of local traffic issues for the Henleaze, Stoke Bishop and Westbury-on-Trym Neighbourhood Partnership to consider next time they meet to determine their traffic priorities.
2. The RPS and 20mph projects are part of the City Council's transport strategy that seeks to encourage sustainable travel by making cycling and walking safer and more attractive options than travelling by car, both initiatives seek to reduce congestion rather than increase it.

QUESTION PQ 36

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking

Question submitted by: Caroline Clarke

- How will workers and residences travel into the central area given the Downs limited waiting RPZ is about to come into force - where does the Council expect all the cars to go next?
- Why has the Council removed the two hour free waiting periods dotted around different areas of Clifton / central areas which helped residents attend GP appointments / do shopping without having to pay to park. I thought the idea of the RPZ's was to deter commuters driving into Bristol and parking all day rather than become an income generating source for the Council.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The parking restrictions on the Downs are intended to enable the Downs to be used for recreational purposes rather than as a commuter car park.
2. There are many more sustainable ways of travelling to the residential areas close to the Downs. Two new bus services, the 505 and the 901, travel to Clifton from the Park & Ride sites and the area is also close to the A4018 high-frequency bus route, which has recently doubled in frequency, and to Clifton Down rail station. There is also a car park at Clifton Down shopping centre for those who need to drive.
3. RPS provides half an hour's free parking to support local amenities, with longer stays costing £1 an hour. This is intended to support local businesses by ensuring regular turnover of space throughout the day. It is also more efficient to enforce than the traditional limited waiting approach, which means that it is more effective.

QUESTION PQ 37

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking/Prince Street bridge

Question submitted by: Jon Green

1. The roll-out of RPZ was carried out on the understanding that it would reduce congestion in the city, however it appears to have worsened congestion to record levels in the central areas. How will this divergence from predicted results be resolved?
2. In view of the slow progress of repairs to the Prince Street Bridge; is there a hidden agenda to keep the Prince Street bridge closed?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The programme of Residents' Parking Schemes is one of a series of measures aimed at reducing traffic pressure and congestion over the long term, by managing the availability of destination parking. The impacts of RPS have been modelled and are being monitored although it is too early to tell what the scale of the impact has been. It is certainly the case though that more people are using buses and bikes to commute into the city on a daily basis. Recent congestion levels are not representative of overall congestion trends and we are working hard to monitor impacts of transport measures over the longer term.
2. We have completed the majority of the investigatory works needed to establish the condition of the bridge. This was a lengthy process because we needed to expose its hidden internal structure to establish the full extent of the problems. The historic nature of the bridge meant that this work had to be done by hand and it was only possible to work on one section at a time. We fully intend to reopen the bridge as soon as possible.

QUESTION PQ 38

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking

Question submitted by: Josh Beard

1. Why do you feel the need to put RPZ in place but then allow non residents to buy permits, surely that defeats the point of residence Parking zones?
2. Why did you put in place a cycle path with bollards that cause more damage than just having a dividing Kurb stone? Why didn't you talk to cyclists who regularly use the roads - having come from a background as a cycle courier for three years in Bristol I can tell you that would not have been the way I would have done it.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The other types of permit available are provided to support local businesses, schools, churches and other valued public amenities. There is sufficient room for these permit holders to park alongside residents and their visitors once commuters and other parking unrelated to the local area has been removed.
2. The bollards on Clarence Rd are being replaced by kerbs, this was an experimental approach which we accept has not worked in this location. We host a regular cycle Forum where we listen to cyclists; the next is in Brunel House on Thursday 21st Jan; more details here <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/streets-travel/cycle-forum>

QUESTION PQ 39

Subject: Traffic issues – Windmill Hill

Question submitted by: Rich Harryman

1. My first question is in reference to the proposed plan to make it 'more difficult for motorists' to use the Windmill Hill railway bridge...In an area of limited routes due to the nature of the city and the tendency of Bristol to suffer 'gridlock' I would seriously question the wisdom of blocking an alternative route for motorists around the several unmovable features of the city due to its geographic properties...

Preventing the ability for a motorist to use this route through Windmill Hill should have a weighty justification and I hope and presume this is not just to make Windmill Hill a little quieter. Surely that makes the whole rest of Bristol a lot noisier and much more congested? Please explain the reason.

2. When will the no entry sign stopping cars turning the wrong way (which I see everyday) down the side of Victoria Park Primary School onto Raymend Road be made clear? I have been chasing the council on this for over a year and am yet to have this rectified - check your records. Does a child need to be terribly injured before anything is done.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The Neighbourhood Partnership prioritised a scheme to encourage through traffic to use more suitable main roads rather than using smaller residential roads. Residential roads should be used to allow people to reach local destinations; through traffic should not be using these roads.
2. A small amount of additional traffic on more appropriate roads should not have a significant impact on congestion in the city as a whole. Removing this traffic from residential roads can improve road safety and quality of life for local people.
3. Child safety is extremely important and we are aware of concerns at this location relating to cars violating the signs on site. We need to conclude our investigation and take appropriate action.

QUESTION PQ 40

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking – Southville/20 mph speed limits

Question submitted by: Linda Steadman

1. I work full time in Southville, and have mobility problems, I therefore drive to work. I see virtually empty streets due to the RPZ introduced in Southville. Yet I cannot park for the duration of time I am at my workplace. When I leave work the streets are rammed with cars as its after 5pm. Surely, the RPZ would be better enforced between 5pm and 9am.

I may lose my job as a result of the difficulties I have with walking any distance. So my question is why is the RPZ not enforced overnight and not during the day?

2. When are you going to reverse the 20mph throughout the city? I understand the need for it in places like shopping streets and outside schools. Teaching the Green Cross Code would be useful!

Reply from the Mayor:

1. All employers within the RPS area are eligible for permits to support them in the running of their business. However, it is the employer that decides how those permits are used.

Blue Badge holders can park in the pay & display and shared use bays for an unlimited time period. This applies to Blue Badge holders across the country, not just Bristol City Council residents. Parking Services can provide advice on Blue Badge eligibility if that is appropriate.

2. Pavement Professors is the new version of the Green Cross Code and is offered to local primary schools in Bristol along with Bikeability which is the same as the old Cycling Proficiency courses. The 20mph speed limit has been introduced on residential streets in Bristol and where there are schools, shops and hospitals, play areas and old peoples' homes to help bring about the wider benefits of calmer communities. Slower speeds mean that more people may choose to travel by foot or on bike, whilst allowing people who have mobility issues to continue to use the car but both road users will benefit from safer and calmer streets.

QUESTION PQ 41

Subject: Wessex bus 505 service

Question submitted by: Sarah Spilsbury

Has the council yet come to a decision on the application from Wessex Bus for a small diversion in the 505 bus route near Horfield Church which would provide a bus stop for the north-bound service; bearing in mind that:

1) As a regular user of the service, I originally raised the matter of the absence of a north-bound bus stop with the councillors for Bishopston and Henleaze and was given to understand that the council had been informed about it in August 2014, and again in August 2015 and

2) I understand that Wessex Bus had been hoping to start the new route on 1 January 2016.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Following a number of requests regarding stopping arrangements for the 505, we are currently considering the options. As the requests are in conflict, it is proposed to consult further with local residents through the neighbourhood groups.

2. Service amendments are required to take place on fixed timetable change dates and the next available date would be 24th April 2016.

You asked a supplementary question in which you stated that your understanding was that Wessex Bus had advised that they had given the statutory 56 days notice to enable the new route to start on 1st January and that therefore you didn't understand what the difficulties were in making this decision. As I indicated at the meeting, I did not have the information available to be able to respond immediately to this question, but I will ask officers to contact you to answer this point.

QUESTION PQ 42

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking

Question submitted by: Paul Leonard

- RPZ appears to have worsened congestion to record levels in the central areas, contrary to what the £10m scheme was supposed to achieve. How will this divergence be resolved?
- Downs limited waiting RPZ - where do BCC expect all the cars to go next?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The programme of Residents' Parking Schemes is one of a series of measures aimed at reducing traffic pressure and congestion over the long term, by managing the availability of destination parking. The impacts of RPS have been modelled and are being monitored although it is too early to tell what the scale of the impact has been. It is certainly the case though that more people are using buses and bikes to commute into the city on a daily basis. Recent congestion levels are not representative of overall congestion trends and we are working hard to monitor impacts of transport measures over the longer term.

2. The parking restrictions on the Downs are intended to enable the Downs to be used for recreational purposes rather than a commuter car park.

There are many more sustainable ways of travelling to the residential areas close to the Downs. Two new bus services, the 505 and the 901, travel to Clifton from the Park & Ride sites and the area is also close to the A4018 high-frequency bus route and to Clifton Down rail station. There is also a car park at Clifton Down for those who need to drive.

RPS provides half an hour's free parking to support local amenities, with longer stays costing £1 an hour. This is intended to support local businesses by ensuring regular turnover of space throughout the day. It is also more efficient to enforce than the traditional limited waiting approach, which means that it is more effective.

QUESTION PQ 43

Subject: Whitehall area of Bristol

Question submitted by: Richard Bond

Why does the Whitehall area, specifically the area around the Gordon Estate (Embassy Walk, Embassy Road & Gordon Avenue) seem to be continually neglected?

The pavements are in a terrible state and the gutters have weeds in them. Following the recycling collections, any dropped items are never cleared up and the vehicles are riding on the pavements doing further damage. Why?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. We have spoken with our contractors Bristol Waste Company regarding the street sweeping service and the recycling collections. They visited the area mentioned, on Friday last week both for the recycling issues and the street cleansing you mention.
2. The Street Cleansing Manager identified some weeds requiring removal and those will be dealt with. They will review this to ensure that it is maintained to the standards. The Recycling Manager has discussed the collections with the crews and the supervisor and they are not aware of any issues regarding the dropping of items not cleared up. However, the Supervisor will be going out on Monday 14th (when the collection is due) with the crew to ensure that the service is delivered to the right standard and maintained in this manner.
3. Liaison will also take place separately with our Highways team regarding the reference to weeds in the gutters.

After hearing of your experiences a crew visited the area on Friday last week to inspect it for the issues you highlighted. On that occasion everything seemed in order with the exception of some weeds that needed removing which I understand will be followed up.

However, if you do ever see any waste issues then please do get in contact with us by calling 0117 922 2100 or email waste.services@bristol.gov.uk

QUESTION PQ 44

Subject: Residents parking/the Downs

Question submitted by: Anthony Davis

1. The basic principle of RPZs is flawed. Most residents need to park near their homes during the evening and night, and near their place of work during the day. RPZs actively prevent working people parking near their place of work, while leaving unused spaces near their homes during the day, and make no difference at night when RPZ restrictions are lifted. How can the Mayor continue to believe blindly that RPZs encourage walking or cycling or using public transport - without considering those with limited or unreliable public transport links, those who need to carry heavy or bulky items to work (teachers with children's work, laptop, teaching resources and packed lunch) or those who find cycling around Bristol's hilly streets too physically demanding and prefer not to arrive at work hot, sweaty and exhausted?

2. The Downs has become a parking lot because of the parking restrictions in nearby Clifton and Redland. The solution, however, is not to commit millions of pounds to knee-jerk yellow-line schemes to manage such knock-on effects, but simply to roll back the RPZs. How can the Mayor continue to ignore the fact that RPZs do not work and the knock-on effects of each new zone will continue to damage the viability of Bristol as an effective business and residential city?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Most people who have provided us with feedback about how the RPS areas are working have been very positive, with the remainder mostly seeking minor changes to parking layouts.
2. There is no 'one size fits all' scheme. Some do operate in the evenings where local people have requested this. If residents in other areas would like the hours to be extended this is something that we can propose to do, as we are committed to regularly reviewing each scheme.
3. The Downs scheme provides free parking with a maximum stay of five hours. This is intended to ensure that the Downs can be used for recreation and leisure purposes rather than as a commuter car park.

QUESTION PQ 45

Subject: Residents parking - accounts

Question submitted by: Andrew Carton-Kelly

1. Will we be allowed to see the accounts for the RPZs e.g. how much has been spent on putting in the zones, yellow lines, machines, paying traffic wardens etc and how much the council is making back by selling permits, parking fees and fines etc?
2. It is now harder to find a space later in the evening, due to extra, unnecessary double yellow lines (they could all be single!) and so I find myself deciding not to do things because of this. Was the intention of RPZs, to trap people in their homes? (As I get older parking several streets away is becoming less and less attractive.)

Reply from the Mayor:

1. RPS accounts have already been published through Place Scrutiny in February 2015 and an update version will be published in February 2016.
2. Total income for 2015/16 (not including PCNs) £2,280,865

It is not possible to provide the number of PCN fines by RPS location as we do not hold this information in this format.

3. Our approach to RPS areas is to allow parking unless the presence of a parked vehicle would cause an access or safety problem. In locations where a parked vehicle would cause an obstruction, access is just as important during the evening as it is during the day. The intention of double yellow lines is to enable people to come and go and certainly not to keep people in their homes.

QUESTION PQ 46

Subject: Traffic issues – 8 December

Question submitted by: Viv James

Why can traffic lights not be switched off and drivers left to negotiate the city centre by themselves?

Reply from the Mayor:

Traffic lights serve an important function controlling and managing conflicting traffic flows across the city. This is important for road safety and also for pedestrian accessibility. More vulnerable pedestrians, particularly the visually impaired, rely on traffic lights to navigate the city safely.

If traffic lights were turned off, pedestrians would have great difficulty crossing the road and certain vehicle movements would dominate others. Those that were not getting priority would quickly block back and block other movements causing additional congestion.

The effects of traffic flows blocking other movements was clearly demonstrated when the SCOOT system, which seeks to prevent this, failed last week.

QUESTION PQ 47

Subject: Bush centre

Question submitted by: Caroline Stevenson

1. The council has been presented with our petition against the cut to the Bush service which has 4018 number of signatures. Exactly when will the council respond to our concerns and the concerns of the 4018 number of Bristol residents about the worrying disregard for the well-being of disabled children and their families?

2. We understand that budgets are being stretched thinly, but would the council not agree that a cut to respite and short breaks services makes the likelihood of children and families requiring far costlier crisis support much greater and that, therefore, this cut represents a false-economy. Does the council agree that a cut here will inevitably put extra strains on mental health services and, if so, what steps are being taken to ensure a robust Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The reduction in beds at The Bush does not reflect a cut in funding but is part of a wider programme of re-distribution of funds to provide a greater range and number of short breaks for disabled children and their families.

The plan has been to reduce funding from residential short breaks (15 to 10 beds) and to re-invest all of the funding in other short breaks including direct payments, residential holidays and targeted services such as play activities and befrienders. These plans would mean we are able to fund short breaks for about 50-60 additional children and families. Short breaks will continue to be offered to those families who need them. We do have to look to the greater good and undoubtedly this approach will enable us to reach many more people than we could otherwise reach.

2. Short breaks are offered to families of disabled children in order to give parents and carers a break from their caring role. They also give children the opportunity to have a break from home and gain new experiences. It is unlikely that changes to the range of short breaks offered will lead to an increased need for child and adolescent mental health services. We continue to work closely with our NHS health partners, to plan for our future joint provision in the context of providing the best possible care for our children and families.

To emphasise, this re-commissioned service will provide an additional 50-60 families with short breaks provision, increasing the flexibility and range of service provision for a wider range of families and was at the core of the Cabinet decision in 2014.

QUESTION PQ 48

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking/20 mph speed limits

Question submitted by: Tony Cross

1. Whilst I agree with having 20MPH speed limits on minor and side roads, why are there so many 20mph speed limits on main roads and bus routes. For many motorists it is not possible to drive at less than 30mph in top gear, so to keep to the speed limit we have to drive around in 3rd gear, which is not fuel efficient and adds to pollution. Also to keep to 20mph one is constantly checking the speedo instead of keeping eyes on the road. There are also a lot of inconsistencies when (for example) a 20mph limit suddenly becomes 30mph for no apparent reason.

(eg top of Parrys Lane, Stoke Bishop)

2 - The spread of RPZ schemes outwards is making life miserable for residents in outer areas. The Downs is now fast becoming a commuter carpark and in my local area of Henleaze and Westbury-on-Trym, it's becoming impossible to park during the day, so the problem of parking has just moved to a different area. Discuss.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The 20mph speed limit has been introduced on to residential streets in Bristol and some of the main roads in the central area are included as these have the highest levels of mix of road users. Driving at slower speeds means that there is less stop/starting with fewer gear changes which can in fact improve fuel efficiency. People often choose to walk and cycle more in calmer areas, which in turn, means using non-polluting modes helping to reduce pollution.
2. The recently introduced Downs parking scheme provides free parking with a maximum stay of five hours. This is intended to ensure that the Downs can be used for recreation and leisure purposes rather than as a commuter car park.
3. The intention of the RPS programme was to encourage commuters to use more sustainable forms of transport rather than continuing to park in residential areas. We are logging any comments we receive about local residents finding it difficult to park in their street and will continue to monitor the parking situation in these areas.

QUESTION PQ 49

Subject: Swimming pool facilities

Question submitted by: Ian Townsend

Q1. The revenue subsidies for existing pool sites are set to continue in 2016/17, and for some sites into 2017/18. In all but one case, these figures are greater than the £100,000 annual subsidy suggested for the East Bristol Pool. This latter estimate appears overly pessimistic, and could likely be much reduced through a strong negotiation with any proposed facility provider, as suggested in the October 2013 Resources Scrutiny Commission report (para 6b). What assessment has been made of the scope to reduce or eliminate the ongoing subsidy requirement for the East Bristol Pool, for example by installing additional revenue-raising gym equipment at the existing Brunel site, as proved successful at the Jubilee site?

Q2. There is much support for a new swimming facility in East Bristol to replace the Speedwell pool, which was closed in 2005 on a temporary basis pending the building of a new facility. What are the results of the recent demand assessment, and what further assessment has been made of the potential health benefits, such as addressing long-standing health inequalities, for this part of Bristol?

Reply from the Mayor:

Q1 Response:

1. Work has been undertaken to demonstrate how a proposed East Bristol Pool could be provided for a revenue subsidy of less than £100k per year. The approach taken was to show how it might be possible to increase income from the whole of the leisure site (including wet and dry side) to achieve a reduction in net revenue cost.

The subsidy figure suggested for an East Bristol Pool is already based on the potential to increase fitness membership. Financial plans have been based on the fitness suite being extended and extra pieces of fitness equipment being introduced, which could potentially increase overall income.

Q2. Response

2. Despite the previous work undertaken, most recent work through the FPM shows that the evidence is not compelling for a new East Bristol pool when looking at the level of unmet demand now or in 2026.

3. Most recent work undertaken to assess the strategic need for a new East Bristol Pool has not involved looking specifically, at the potential health benefits. The work has however, identified that the majority of demand from East Bristol residents is satisfied from other neighbouring facilities within a twenty minute catchment area.

QUESTION PQ 50

Subject: Traffic issues

Question submitted by: Andy Martin

1. Yesterday morning it took over 1 hour to get from Longwell to Ashton Court, this was despite leaving at 07:00. Please can you explain why this is. (Longwell Grn to Hicks Gate, traffic solid, up through Stockwood lane, through Whitchurch lane, Hartcliffe way, Winterstoke Rd.) ?
2. Please can you tell me how long the road from Feeder Rd past Temple Meads will remain closed?

Reply from the Mayor:

- As you may be aware there were significant issues with congestion on Tuesday evening due to a failure of the comms network that supports the SCOOT/UTC system.

This was largely resolved on Tuesday evening but there were some residual issues during the Wednesday morning peak.

I cannot comment on the exact reasons for a particular journey, especially when some of that journey and the delay took place outside of Bristol's boundary.

Whilst the issues with the network have now been resolved, we will still experience congestion due to high traffic volumes and limited road capacity.

- Cattlemarket Rd will remain closed permanently westbound heading towards Bath Bridges.

This was consulted on as part of the proposed revisions to the network around Temple Meads to facilitate the development of the Enterprise Zone.

The eastbound movement heading towards Feeder Rd is closed currently to enable construction works relating to the bridge to the arena site.

It is likely to reopen in August 2016

QUESTION PQ 51

Subject: The Bush centre

Question submitted by: Ornella Saibene

The cut to the Bush service was supposed to go ahead only when alternatives are in place. As the cut has gone ahead, we can assume that the alternatives are already in place. Would the council please clarify exactly what the alternative provision is and whether it's in place or not? If not, does the council accept its responsibility in leaving disabled children and their families in the lurch. If it is in place, what steps has the council taken to advise parents of disabled children of the support they can access?

Reply from the Mayor:

Commissioners have successfully retendered short breaks to meet a wider range of needs including complex needs which can be assessed directed by the family. Amongst this is the residential holiday provision, out of school activities and school based holiday activities, the Bristol autism project has also been retained, 156 additional personal budgets have been provided and a third of this take up is for children with very complex needs. These plans would mean we are able to fund short breaks for about 50-60 additional children and families. Short breaks will continue to be offered to those families who need them.

In addition recruitment has been ongoing around recruiting more family based carers who are able to provide short breaks and these are approved specialised carers trained to manage a range of complex needs. There continues to be 10 beds available; 5 at Belbrook and 5 at The Bush which will offer 29 individual opportunities at these short break homes.

Parents have been consulted through direct consultation meetings with officers, letters and information sharing. Families who were directly affected by the reduction in the beds at the Bush were given an opportunity through the young person's review process to discuss the proposed changes and the options available. The letters sent to all parents and carers also explained the alternative provision and the reason for its development.

To emphasise, this re-commissioned service will provide an additional 50-60 families with short breaks provision, increasing the flexibility and range of service provision for a wider range of families and was at the core of the Cabinet decision in 2014.

In a supplementary question, you asked whether the Full Council at the budget meeting had voted not to cut the beds at The Bush unless there was a proper alternative in place. You are absolutely right, but my view and the general judgment (and this will not be agreed by everybody, and I understand the strength of feeling from some and the individual situations which some people are in) is that 156 additional personal budgets are being provided and a third of this take-up is for children with extremely complex needs. These plans do mean we are able to fund short breaks for about 50-60 additional families, and they will continue to be offered

to those families that need them. I absolutely believe that I will not be able to satisfy everybody with whatever answer I give, and I understand that, but I do have a responsibility to make sure that we deliver for the greater good and I believe that is what we are doing.

QUESTION PQ 52

Subject: Residents parking/traffic issues

Question submitted by: Darren Worlock

Now that the RPZ is being used in central Bristol and there is nowhere to park without a permit, does the rest of the Bristol Residents follow YOUR EXAMPLE as pictured daily on Facebooks Bristol Post Page and just park like you do on Double Yellow lines or blind corners of streets where ever there is a space for a car? If this is not ok, why do you not get booked but normal residents would. Why is it ok for you but not for us. Why would you roll out an RPZ knowing not even you can park without breaking the law? But you do.

Reply from the Mayor:

I can assure you that I receive absolutely no special treatment in relation to the Council's parking enforcement so if I did park where I shouldn't, then I would be likely to get a fine like anybody else.

QUESTION PQ 53

Subject: Traffic issues – 8 December

Question submitted by: Caroline Finch

1. What was the cause of the horrendous gridlock in Bristol last night (8th Dec) and how can future problems be avoided?
2. Why are there so many set of roadworks/improvements going on in the City at once. How are these co-ordinated so that one does not have a knock on effect on other areas already impacted? Traffic is worse than I have ever known it in nearly 20 years of living here in Bristol.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Traffic signals across Bristol are controlled by a central computer system that links different sets of lights together. This system generates approximately 15% additional capacity. Any failure of this system at a time of heavy traffic flow can immediately cause severe congestion to build up that can take several hours to dissipate.

The system failed last month for approximately 1 hour in the afternoon due to a physical hardware issue. The system was returned to working order in time for the evening peak and the impact on congestion was limited.

The more recent system failure, on 8th December, was caused by an information communications issue that overloaded the system and caused it to fail. This lasted throughout the evening peak before being cleared at 9pm and therefore had a significant impact on congestion across the city due to the loss of capacity with traffic subsequently gridlocking. This particular event was not representative of levels of congestion in Bristol, but did demonstrate the vulnerability of the network and the importance of having a proper system to control traffic signals to manage this.

Changes to the communications network are being carried out now that will prevent this particular issue occurring again. These alterations will be completed by Christmas.

The council is also moving forward with plans for a new operations centre. This centre will replace and upgrade all of our existing traffic systems increasing resilience and further reducing the likelihood of any future system failures.

2. Bristol has received major investment funding from the Government to implement major transport improvements across Bristol and its neighbours. The funding has strict deadlines, which does mean that the central area is now encountering several projects taking place at the same time.

The works are being coordinated where possible to ensure works on the

same or adjacent routes are avoided but there will be times when this will occur.

The public are being advised to consider their transport choices and times that they travel where possible.

Bristol's highway network is at capacity and will not be able to cater for continued high rates of growth of private vehicle usage.

QUESTION PQ 54

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking, Bedminster

Question submitted by: Roger Turner

I live in Hebron Road off North St, Bedminster, I have lived here for over 30 years, my street is a one way street and has never been good for parking. So most of the time I park on North St. Now it has this parking scheme and my road isn't in the zone I cannot park there anymore? I've asked about a permit and was told I can't have one as I don't live in North St, all the other streets on the other side are being done so where am I supposed to park?

I rang the parking number on the machine and was told to just drive around till I find a place!! I pay my road tax and my council tax and this is not acceptable the council is taking away my civil rights.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. We do not have any current proposals to introduce additional RPS areas but we are recording any requests that we receive.
2. I will ensure that my officers include your comments as they continue to review requests for parking improvements in your area. This will help in deciding whether future residents' parking schemes might be appropriate.

QUESTION PQ 55

Subject: Traffic issues

Question submitted by: Edward Bowditch

- The traffic light failure on evening of Tuesday 8th December draws attention to worsening congestion in the central Bristol area. The RPZ cabinet enabling report of 27th June 2013, written by Peter Mann, claimed the £9.8m schemes would “*help to reduce and better manage traffic entering the central area, especially during the peak periods when traffic congestion is at its worst*”, along with a variety of claims that air quality would improve. However the outcome has diverged from these aspirations, with record congestion throughout the CPZ area experienced by persons located in or travelling through, which has created significant environmental and economic costs that did not previously exist. It appears the RPZ has merely forced traffic to enter the CPZ in search of suitable parking provision, as opposed to the previously dispersed arrangements. Given the high concentration of employment activity in the central areas, can urgent action be taken to redesign RPZ areas, for example including single yellow line provision given BCC did not bother properly considering them at time of consultation despite numerous representations received?
- *The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996* requires that an order making authority, BCC in this instance, consults with a neighbouring authority in circumstances “*where the order relates to, or appears to the order making authority to be likely to affect traffic on, a road for which another authority is the highway authority or the traffic authority*”. The RPZ schemes have affected traffic on other authority's highways, in particular Leigh Woods, and the further dramatic extension of RPZ areas planned from summer 2016 will impact further on both North Somerset and South Gloucestershire. BCC did not bother to consult with neighbouring authorities as part of the statutory consultation process for the RPZ schemes. Is it not unassailable that, leaving aside regulation requirements being ignored, such lack of consultation demonstrates an inappropriate lack of cooperation and desire to shift problems onto someone else as opposed to constructively solving them at a regional level?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Recent congestion levels are not representative of overall congestion trends and we are working hard to monitor impacts of transport measures over the longer term.
2. Each RPS area is reviewed regularly; there is nothing to suggest that we need to take any specific urgent action due to congestion. There are some instances where we can and do make temporary adjustments to individual streets and we will continue to do this where appropriate, especially in light of the 6 month reviews.

3. Whilst there is nothing preventing single yellow lines from being installed, our current approach is that we should allow parking without restriction unless the presence of a parked vehicle would cause an access or safety problem. In locations where a parked vehicle would cause an obstruction, access is just as important during the evening as it is during the day.
4. Working with neighbouring authorities is a priority for me and we will always do this in appropriate circumstances.

QUESTION PQ 56

Subject: Traffic issues

Question submitted by: John Henn

Let's have some joined up thinking.

- 1) Is there any possibility of creating underground car parking under the Downs and then having a park and ride system?
- 2) Can some of the old railway lines now cycle tracks be used for a tram system?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The Downs is a protected and iconic green space and any development would need the express support of the Down's committee. A large car park is likely to exacerbate traffic problems in the area, as well as being prohibitively expensive to build.
2. We have previously investigated using former railway lines for Rapid Transit and this is being actively considered as part of the Joint Transport Study on which we are currently inviting public comment on www.jointplanningwofe.org.uk

QUESTION PQ 57

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking/20 mph speed limits

Question submitted by: Bob Lewis

1. I would be grateful if Mayor Ferguson could advise why, when he is so very often overly proud of the implementation of Residential Parking Zones and the blanket introduction of 20mph zones (without it should be noted having undertaken any specific pre-implementation monitoring to provide accurate baseline figures enabling the effectiveness of these measures to be accurately evaluated), his published propaganda sheet issued to bolster he re-election prospects makes no mention of these divisive and unpopular schemes?

2. Please can the Mayor guarantee that he will never use the phrase “silent majority” to back up any of his claims or beliefs (as unfortunately some councillors have) as it is impossible to know what the “silent anything” want if they are truly silent?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The 20mph speed limits and RPS programme were initiated before the Mayoral election in November 2012. The council did undertake two 20 mph pilot schemes in 2010 and consulted with other local councils both in the UK and in Europe to provide evidence for the citywide rollout. Pre-implementation monitoring of speeds has been undertaken and before and after data will be made available once sufficient time has elapsed to be statistically useful. The first RPS area was introduced in January 2011.

2. Our survey work shows that 70-80% of Bristol residents support 20mph where they live, and this figure typically increases in each local phase when the schemes are implemented. There is also a considerable amount of local support within RPS areas such that removing them is not being considered.

As you quite rightly point out, I am very proud of delivering both the RPS and the 20mph zones – two schemes which are part of my wider response to tackling congestion, poor air quality and creating a healthier and happier city for us all to live in.

As for the use of the phrase “silent majority” I am afraid I will continue to use that phrase as and when it is appropriate.

QUESTION PQ 58

Subject: Bus services

Question submitted by: Martyn Hillier

1. Why is First bus continually getting away with not running a service? Try living in Broomhill and getting a no 1 that runs on time and turns up when stated. It is a disgrace that I only have to use infrequently but my poor wife has to use daily.
2. First bus again - How is it London has had an oyster card for many many years and they simply cannot implement a similar service? Also sticky out bus stops add to congestion as do one door buses....ain't rocket science to have an in door and an out door.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Congestion is an issue for all bus operators in the city and we are working to improve this, especially during current construction works. The Council has agreed a new partnership with First and works closely with other bus operators to identify measures that will improve bus services reliability and service 1, as well as numerous other services, will benefit from enhanced bus priority in the central area when these works are completed.

Bus services are regulated by the Traffic Commissioner who can use a range of sanctions against bus operators that are failing to deliver services.

2. Operation of public transport in London is controlled by Transport for London and this gives them the ability to specify the ticketing arrangements across the network. This facilitates a system like the Oyster card. Outside London, the bus operation is largely commercial and often a multi operator scenario. In these cases, operators will provide their own smart ticketing arrangements, and most operators in Bristol have some form of smartcard and/or mobile phone ticketing. The West of England Authorities have worked with bus operators to provide multi operator products, that are being developed to operate on a smartcard platform.

In general, when a raised kerb is installed (and associated bus cage & clearway), no changes are made to the existing kerb-line i.e. the pavement is not widened to create a 'build-out' or narrowed to create a 'lay-by. Lay-bys are used in a few specific circumstances where there could be serious traffic flow problems and a risk of increased congestion or highway safety issues, such as a near pedestrian crossing. However, a lay-by takes up more space to allow the bus to pull in and align with the raised kerb with the consequential loss in parking/waiting & loading.

Pavement build-outs have the advantages of allowing parking to continue closer to a stop while the bus is able to maintain its place in the main traffic lane. The length of a bus stop cage & clearway can be reduced to just 12 metres in some cases where a pavement build out is made. However, they cost more to install, need to be designed carefully to avoid potential problems with highway drainage and can cause some inconvenience to other road users. They are generally only

used in locations where parking demand is heavy and infringements often prevent buses from pulling in to serve kerbside stops.

First Group's vehicle strategy is a commercial decision for them and there are reasons why current preference is for single door entrance/exit. First are aware and keen to reduce boarding times and have made progress through wider ticketing options.

QUESTION PQ 59

Subject: Residents parking

Question submitted by: Alan Graham

With regard to the RPZ introduction.

Would the elected mayor please respond to the question below:

Within the Risk Assessment for this major project, what criteria was established which at the point it was reached would the project be deemed:

A, success?

B, partial success requiring some review C, partial failure, requiring major review D, failure, requiring the possible dismantling of the project to date?

I am sure these procedures are in place, as it is impossible to judge the level of achievement of a new policy if there is not a previously agreed criteria to which the ongoing project can be periodically reviewed.

Reply from the Mayor:

The best way of assessing whether these schemes are working is to ask the people who live in the area. We do this for every scheme and so far there has been a clear majority who are pleased with the benefits that the scheme has brought.

QUESTION PQ 60

Subject: Residents parking - Southville

Question submitted by: Ryan Livingstone

1. I have lived on Dartmoor Street in Southville for the past 3 years. We are a 2 car house hold and most days my partner and I will walk to work in the centre of Bristol to avoid to congestions, so the main time that we use our cars is in the evenings. Prior to the implementation of the RPZ the parking on our street was never an issue, very rarely would I could home and not be able to park near our house. Since the scheme has been implemented, and many parking places have been replaced by double yellow lines, nearly every night we are now forced to park on adjoining streets.

How can you justify now charging residents to park in the area when in many cases (not just ours) the parking is worse than ever?

2. Further, the placement of signage on our street was excessive an unnecessary. We live on a cul-de-sac with now only resident parking allowed. Multiple signs were placed down the street advising of the parking restrictions in place. However, the RPZ guidance says that it is possible in some cases that there only needs to be signage at the start of the street, and that this can be requested by residents.

How can the residents of Dartmoor Street formally request that the current signage is removed from the street, to be replaced with signage only at the entrance to the street?

Reply from the Mayor:

- The Southville scheme has only been operational for a few weeks and is still settling down. Initial feedback suggests that it is working well overall but we are receiving concerns that it remains difficult to park in the evening. We are collating this feedback and if this remains the case, we may bring forward the scheme's initial review by consulting people early next year on the most appropriate hours of operation.
- The double yellow lines were introduced to protect the junction with North Street, the two accesses on the street and a turning head at the north end of the street. These locations are not viable parking spaces. There will be an opportunity to request amendments to the parking and signing layout when we review the scheme.

QUESTION PQ 61

Subject: Montpelier RPS displacement

Question submitted by: Lynne Roberts

What, if any, contingency plans were made by the Council when considering the impact newly implemented RPZs would have on neighbouring streets/areas. The following examples relate to personal experience, within St Andrews, as a result of the Montpelier RPZ?

For example:

1. vehicles partially/fully parked across people's driveways
2. vehicles parked on corners causing an obstruction
3. vehicles parked on double yellow lines, obstructing cycle paths and emergency access vehicles without tax/mot parked for days/months

Reply from the Mayor:

1. We are monitoring the performance of the scheme, including its impact on nearby residential areas. We are enforcing restrictions wherever they are in place. If people have concerns about vehicles parking in specific locations we will investigate this and take whatever action we can.
2. It may be possible to progress a review of parking arrangements through your local Neighbourhood Partnership or, if we continue to receive representations from people with similar concerns, we may investigate progressing a new scheme for St Andrews.

QUESTION PQ 62

Subject: School coach parking bay for Fairlawn School

Question submitted by: Lynne Roberts

It came to St Andrews residents' notice, sometime before the school opened, that Skanska were proposing the coach bay be put in Wolferton Road, despite the school being in Montpelier. This scheme would result in a loss of up to 10 parking spaces in Wolferton, Balmoral and Sommerville Road South. Can you update us as to the current state of application regarding the whereabouts of the parking bay for the new Fairlawn School coach. Also, can you tell us whether contingency was made within the Montpelier RPZ to accommodate the parking bay there. If not, why not?

Reply from the Mayor:

Providing a coach bay for Fairlawn Primary School will result in a loss of parking wherever it goes, because as well as the coach bay itself, narrow sections and junctions need to be kept clear to enable access. Wolferton Road was put forward as an option as this would remove less parking than other options to place the coach bay on roads adjacent to the school. The local concerns are understood and officers are currently reviewing other options for a bay on Falkland Road, Ashley Hill or Hurlingham Road.

The proposed parking restriction changes associated with the expansion of this school could not be taken into account in the Montpelier RPS because planning permission was not granted at the time for the school development.

QUESTION PQ 63

Subject: Feeder Road bridge

Question submitted by: Michael Dubin

Why has the weak bridge on the feeder still not been repaired?

Why has the dangerous surface on the last bridge, end of the feeder, still not been dressed?

One cannot fail to note that, whilst the above safety items have been ignored, a lot of cosmetics, road markings, etc., have received a lot of attention and money.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. If this relates to the old blocked up dock entrance just before Netham Lock, there are no plans to fill this area up. We will, however, be programming in some concrete repairs to the columns at the old dock entrance within the next five years.
2. The southbound bridge from Netham Road onto Feeder Road was inspected last year. No defects requiring urgent attention were identified. However, we will arrange to have this bridge inspected again to ensure that the surface is safe and that it meets the required standards.
3. Both of the above structures are safe as a result of our ongoing bridges and structures maintenance programme, which is separate from other highways maintenance matters such as road markings.

QUESTION PQ 64

Subject: Residents parking

Question submitted by: Sara Haydon

1. Why have RPZ's been introduced before there is even a halfway decent bus service in Bristol - eg: I live near the Zoo and cannot get to the BRI on a bus so I have to take a taxi and no, I cannot walk or cycle. I am 67, have arthritis and a replaced shoulder and knee. No provision is made for people like me, London with some 9 MILLION can do it, why can't Bristol?
2. Why no single yellow lines available for dropping off or picking up? eg: my three young grandsons; collecting my medication from the local chemist or buying a paper or a pint of milk

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Bus services in Bristol are de-regulated and are operated on a commercial basis by private bus operators, which is unlike London where they operate in a regulated market where Transport for London decide all the routes, timetables and fares of bus services.

It is not possible to provide direct services from all areas to all destinations, but most are achievable with interchange. Bus service 9 will take you directly from the Zoo to the Central area where you can change at The Horsefair onto the Hospital Shuttle Bus which departs from Bond Street outside Debenhams. Returning from the BRI you can take the Hospital Shuttle Bus from the BRI to The Haymarket, where you can change onto the service 8 which departs from Bond Street outside Debenhams to return to the Zoo.

2. Single yellow lines do not allow waiting during their hours of operation. RPS areas do provide pay & display bays close to local amenities which are free for up to half an hour and should be adequate for these purposes.

QUESTION PQ 65

Subject: Residents parking – Gloucester Road

Question submitted by: Sergio Romagnoli

We operate from Gloucester Road and have numerous client meetings on a daily basis. This area has always been ideal for its free parking. It was always YOUR plan (and your plan alone) to extend the RPZ to this area of Gloucester road. It would not be feasible to have clients and prospective clients start to have to pay for a 2 hour ticket. How would you begin to handle this?

Note – public transport is still very expensive.

Reply from the Mayor:

We have no plans to introduce a Residents' Parking Scheme on Gloucester Road. These proposals were abandoned when the programme was drawn up in 2013 because of these concerns.

QUESTION PQ 66

Subject: Residents parking/dropped kerb issue

Question submitted by: John Morton

1. Now that RPSs have been rolled out, there are fewer parking spaces than before. And these are far fewer than the number of Residents' Permits issued. So it is clear that residents have been duped into paying for a service which may not actually exist at the time they need to make use of it. This is fraud, isn't it?

2. BCC has failed to fully explain the law regarding dropped kerb parking.

BCC then went on to deprive many residents of the opportunity to exercise their right to park on the road adjacent to their own dropped kerbs, subjecting them to a process whereby BCC has taken away their right *unless* residents—in BCC's words, "opt out".

In other words, unless on an individual basis they specifically claimed a right which is established for all in law, then BCC has taken this right away from them as a matter of course.

Why has BCC failed to fully inform residents of their rights under Part 6, Section 86, Para 3 of the Traffic Management Act 2004?

Reply from the Mayor:

1. RPS provide parking spaces wherever it is possible for a vehicle to park without causing an obstruction. Places where parked vehicles would be an obstruction are not parking spaces we have not removed any viable spaces.
2. Residents are consulted on whether they would like their dropped kerb protected or not. Where it is possible to omit restrictions we accommodate this request.
3. The schemes fully comply with all relevant legislation.

QUESTION PQ 67

Subject: Montpelier RPZ

Question submitted by: Kate Hodges

Is there funding within the current RPZ schemes to deal with the impact of displacement? As a resident I raised issues about the Montpelier RPZ before it opened which were not addressed. Now the scheme is up and running St Andrews has been adversely affected by the RPZ scheme. Commuter Parking has increased massively in our streets, just over the bridge from Montpelier. We have had to pay for a sign to say No Parking across the drive entrance. Issues include:

1. vehicles partially/fully parked across people's driveways
2. vehicles parked on corners causing an obstruction
3. vehicles parked on double yellow lines, obstructing cycle paths and emergency access
4. vehicles without tax/mot parked for days/months

None of these were significant issues prior to Montpelier RPZ but now the whole character of street parking in St Andrews has changed. This has caused residents a lot of problems and despite emails to the central RPZ address there seems to be one automated response which answers no ones queries. If RPZ is not to be rolled out further funding must be applied to alleviate the parking issues caused by displacement.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. We are monitoring the performance of the scheme, including its impact on nearby residential areas. We are enforcing restrictions wherever they are in place. If people have concerns about vehicles parking in specific locations we will investigate this and take whatever action we can.

2. It may be possible to progress a review of parking arrangements through your local Neighbourhood Partnership or, if we continue to receive representations from people with similar concerns, we may investigate progressing a new scheme for St Andrews.

Subject: Traffic issues - Cattle Market Road/Whitby Road

Question submitted by: Jessica Calvey

- 1) Why has the closure of Cattle Market Road been extended for a further 8 months when the signs suggest the road will have reopened today (9 December)?
- 2) Is there anything that can be done in order Whitby Road is at least opened one way? Its closure is massively increasing journey times and causing misery for hundreds if not thousands of commuters.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. Cattle Market Road has been closed to allow for the construction of the new bridge that leads to Arena Island. However, as that work comes to an end additional works are planned to create a new cycle path and widen the walkway along Cattle Market Road. This will improve access to the arena and continue the delivery of cycle network improvements across the city. The road will reopen one way eastbound in summer 2016. While there may be some inconvenience while works take place, the environment for pedestrians and cyclists will be significantly improved once the works are complete.
2. Owing to the work taking place on both bridges at this location it is not possible to open the road one way. The works have also now been extended by one month owing to additional work that needs to be carried out.

QUESTION PQ 69

Subject: Residents parking

Question submitted by: Alice Gadsby

I am a "every weather" motorcyclist and I would like to ask the following questions:

1) Why is the council largely ignoring the use of motorcycles, scooters & two Powered-Two-Wheelers compared to the huge support being given to cycling - especially as this isn't even what our cyclists want?

- Studies have shown the huge potential for them to reduce congestion (and to improve air quality especially at 20mph) and the parking space required is dramatically less than cars. For people commuting more than a few miles it can be a much more accessible and practical mode of transport than cycling. The council are facing calls to do anything and everything to reduce congestion and parking problems so why are they overlooking such an obvious solution?

2) The enforcement of the RPZ scheme is largely useless. The problems people face when trying to park are during the evenings when residents cannot find a spot because neighbours are not parking considerately rather than during the daytimes. Why has the use of public amenities such as access to Bristol South Swimming Pool for example not been considered?

Parking close to the pool forces you to have a permit or to pay £1 for every hour you wish to partake in exercise. For someone who used to swim 5 times a week during my lunch break causes me to pay out in excess of £20 a month, or £240 a year! I am aware that the pool is now suffering on income due to the fact that a lot of it's users use it in their lunch breaks...

Unfortunately I am currently back on 4 wheels. I live in Yate and commute the total time of 2.5hrs to work everyday in Upton Road, Southville, BS3 1LW. You'd think that for those who work in the centre could be accommodated better for seeing as there are plenty of parking spaces available in the streets surrounding my work - the RPS is obviously not needed here!! If nothing can be sorted I will be forced to work elsewhere out of the city centre in South Gloucestershire where I live.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The Council recognises the contribution motorcycling can make and provides free parking in the city centre and in residents parking areas. We are also promoting motorcycling through the Local Sustainable Transport Fund project. Through this project our engagement team provides free motorcycle confidence lessons to encourage uptake.

Moreover our Wheels to Work scheme provides those who are unemployed access to a scooter to find skills, training or employment.

Motorcycles can park for an unlimited time period in any of the permit holders', shared use or pay & display bays in RPS areas as we recognise the importance of the efficient use of roadspace that they represent.

2. Residents' Parking Schemes seek to reduce dependence on the private car in order to deliver improvements in quality of life for local people and reduce congestion due to commuters driving into the city every day. All our schemes are designed to helpfully reflect the needs and demands within their local area, for example, the pay and display parking mentioned in the question has been specifically provided to allow people to easily visit the swimming baths. We welcome feedback on how schemes are operating and if we can make improvements then we will always do so; our commitment to regular reviews of all schemes allows us to do just that.

QUESTION PQ 70

Subject: Carriageworks/Westmoreland House site

Question submitted by: Jenny Grigg

Why not develop the Carriageworks/Westmoreland House site, or indeed another central site, to provide multi-storey carparking specifically for NHS staff, given the number of hospitals in the area and also that many staff work antisocial hours which makes use of public transport difficult if not impossible?

Reply from the Mayor:

The Carriageworks site is in private ownership and not within the Council's control. Use as a car park would not conform to planning policy for the site nor have the support of the local communities. After many years work the current owner and the community have agreed a development approach that has recently secured planning approval for a residential led regeneration scheme. The owner is working towards a start on site in July 2016.

QUESTION PQ 71

Subject: 20 mph speed limit, Gloucester Road

Question submitted by: Jenny Grigg

Can you remove the 20mph speed limit from the Gloucester Road? It is now more dangerous for pedestrians to cross the road as there is a continuous stream of slow moving traffic. Previously the traffic would move faster but in distinct bursts giving pedestrians the opportunity to cross safely in between.

Reply from the Mayor:

The 20mph speed limit was introduced on a limited number of main roads such as Gloucester Road due to the large number of people using shops and high numbers of pedestrians and cyclists using the road as well as motorised vehicles. There are several crossing points on this road which can be used by more vulnerable pedestrians who require more time to cross. However, for a mobile pedestrian who is looking to cross the road between traffic, slower speeds are still better than faster bursts of speed. Vehicles can react quicker to changes in road conditions such as people crossing the road and are often more likely to slow to let people cross between traffic flows. The nature of the traffic on Gloucester Road is very stop and start and there are a lot of parked vehicles, bus stops and obstructions that slow or stop traffic allowing people to cross.

QUESTION PQ 72

Subject: Traffic issues/residents parking

Question submitted by: Lynn Ingleton

1. Firstly, I would like you to tell me why the RPZ scheme appears to have worsened congestion to record levels in the central areas, contrary to what the £10m scheme was supposed to achieve. How will this divergence be resolved?
2. Secondly, I am concerned about newly designated RPZs just removing the parking of cars to another area. The Downs is operating a limited waiting RPZ and I'm interested as to where Bristol City Council expect the cars to go next?

Reply from the Mayor:

- 1) The programme of Residents' Parking Schemes is one of a series of measures aimed at reducing traffic pressure and congestion over the long term, by managing the availability of destination parking. The impacts of RPS have been modelled and are being monitored although it is too early to tell what the scale of the impact has been. It is certainly the case though that more people are using buses and bikes to commute into the city on a daily basis. Businesses, like everyone else, need to adjust to the new arrangements and the Council has offered advice and support to companies affected. To date, hundreds of employers in the RPS areas have taken up this offer.
Recent congestion levels are not representative of overall congestion trends and we are working hard to monitor impacts of transport measures over the longer term.
- 2) The Downs scheme is not an RPS but provides free parking to anybody, with a maximum stay of five hours. This is intended to ensure that the Downs can be used for recreation and leisure purposes rather than as a commuter car park. We are logging any comments we receive about local residents finding it difficult to park in their street and will continue to monitor the parking situation in these areas.

QUESTION PQ 73

Subject: Residents parking zones

Question submitted by: Annette Jones

Mayor Ferguson, when are you going to scrap the RPZ?

Reply from the Mayor:

I have no plans to scrap the schemes as I continually receive positive feedback about the benefits they bring to their local area.

QUESTION PQ 74

Subject: Traffic issues

Question submitted by: Amanda Williams

1. When the changes to the centre have finished is there going to be far more priority to buses than at present?
2. Why the hell was Baldwin Street narrowed to the extreme just to put in cycle lanes and increase congestion even more! I am concerned that once the central works have been completed they will just add to what is already absolute hell to get to and from work each day!!

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The current works in the City Centre are part of the MetroBus scheme which will see the introduction of new faster services into Bristol. As part of this scheme the Central area will see the introduction of additional bus priority measures including new and extended bus lanes and bus only sections.

There will indeed be more bus priority through the city centre, aimed not just at providing benefits for the MetroBus route but also improving reliability for the background services. Congestion in Bristol can't remain at its current levels which causes a range of implications, so we need people to consider alternative modes when possible. We are making sure those alternative modes are supported and offer a realistic alternative.

The key movement through the city by car is using the centre as a through route, specifically travelling from Park St to Baldwin St. We are further seeking to reduce congestion by preventing unnecessary journeys through the centre i.e. travelling across the centre to the M32.

2. The Baldwin St cycle route did not remove traffic running lanes, but cleverly reallocated road space to benefit pedestrians and cyclists. Baldwin Street is part of a strategic approach to encouraging cycling and walking in the city, to decrease congestion. This has had the effect of doubling cycling to work between 2001 and 2011 and walking and cycling combined now account for 20% of all commuting trips. Baldwin St was built to provide safety for people cycling but it benefits all road users.

There was a serious road safety problem on Baldwin St and preliminary data shows that this has been successfully addressed – there have been no recorded accidents since the first stage of the scheme was completed February this year.

In addition the number of people cycling on Baldwin St has increased significantly (30%) and there is expected to be an even greater increase when the scheme reaches the Centre, which can only help to reduce congestion on the road.

QUESTION PQ 75

Subject: Residents parking

Question submitted by: Stephen Greaves

1. Given the amount of money spent on parking schemes, why isn't any money spent ensuring road layouts are safe. There are many areas in the part of Bristol which I live in where aspects of road safety could be improved. Does it take fatalities at some of these potential blackspots before anybody pays any attention to them?

It seems that parking schemes could be called a cash cow for the council whereas spending money on road safety does not make a financial return. I could take transport officials on a tour of the Bishopston area to show them problems in road layout, etc, some caused even by the new parking places within the parking zones and some by housing development where even during planning permission stages the transport department say there is no problem with road usage. However on completion of the development the whole parking situation alters dramatically in a dangerous way.

2. Why are there still parking restrictions during rush hour periods on the Gloucester Road between Zetland Road junction and Somerville Road junction when a 20mph speed limit has now been imposed on that stretch of road?

The lack of parked cars during rush hour means that many road users (including buses) can be seen to be moving at about 40mph through this area cleared of all parked vehicles. During the daytime the parking on one side of the road makes a 20mph limit easily attainable due to constricting the road. It is unnecessary to remove that constriction as the traffic is not supposed to travel faster than 20mph in this area, it becomes a racetrack when parking restrictions are in force.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The City Council is committed to road safety and this year we launched our new ten year plan for "Developing a Safe Systems Approach to Road Safety in Bristol".

Road safety is a key consideration in everything we do, with a particular focus through our highway maintenance programme and schemes like 20mph, parking schemes and local traffic schemes delivered through the Neighbourhood Partnerships all directly addressing road safety matters.

The specific Casualty Reduction budget also aims to target those locations with the highest number and most severe injuries as a result of road traffic collisions.

Officers provide road safety advice through the planning process and this advice is considered when planning decisions are made.

-
2. The parking restrictions on Gloucester Road support the running of buses to timetable, whilst they also help to provide safer conditions for cycling along this very popular cycling route.

QUESTION PQ 76

Subject: Residents parking

Question submitted by: Nicole Kruysse

1. Has there been a study to determine the extra revenue taken by the owners of car parks in RPZ areas? The Sainsburys Clifton Down car park, for example, is now incredibly busy Mon - Fri, much busier than before the RPZ came into effect. Commuters haven't stopped driving but are now spending more money to park while at work. This leaves them less money to spend at local businesses.

2. Where will all the cars who currently park on the Downs going to park when parking is restricted there? As it is the cars park there as commuters who can't afford to park at Clifton Down can park there and walk to work. The area has become an easy target for car crime, as this week alone several cars there were burgled.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. The Downs scheme provides free parking with a maximum stay of five hours. This is intended to ensure that the Downs can be used for recreation and leisure purposes rather than as a commuter car park.
2. The intention of the RPS programme was to encourage commuters to use more sustainable forms of transport rather than continuing to park in residential areas. We are logging any comments we receive about local residents finding it difficult to park in their street and will continue to monitor the parking situation in these areas.

QUESTION PQ 77

Subject: Funding for Malcolm X centre

Question submitted by: Amirah Cole

The United Nations have declared 2014 – 2015 the International Decade of People of African Descent to try and address the injustice against People of African Descent. In Europe, e.g. in the UK, disproportionate numbers are incarcerated in prisons and mental health institutions and people of African Descent remain socio-economically marginalised with poor housing, access to health and other human rights in many instances.

Knowing this; why has Bristol City Council chosen to withdraw funding from St. Paul's African Caribbean Carnival and serve notice on Malcolm X Community Centre adding to the psychological trauma that many People of African Descent in Bristol face?

Reply from the Mayor:

I've had long discussions with the committee and the community leaders regarding the funding for St Pauls Carnival. The Council and Arts Council England are aligned on this and we have ring-fenced funding for St Pauls Carnival - there has been no withdrawal of funding from the carnival or community. We are determined that there is a proper celebration of our Afrikan and Caribbean community in Bristol. The carnival has the potential to be one of our leading cultural events. We have however, withdrawn funding from the organisers of St Paul's Festival because the organisers have been unable to deliver a carnival for the community which goes against their funding agreement with Bristol City Council. A review of their plans for 2016 does not provide any clarity on how they will achieve this next year either. Celebrating Afrikan and Caribbean culture and heritage is a major priority and positive discussions have already started to ensure a Carnival continues in St Pauls for years to come. We are looking at how a carnival could be delivered in 2017 and 2018, which will be the 50th anniversary and could be a brilliant opportunity for a very special event.

In relation to the Malcolm X centre, the Council has served notice on the management of the Malcolm X community centre and again, this is incredibly important, not to the community centre itself. The community centre will continue to stay open with all of the facilities and services being provided for the community, exactly the same as the current arrangement. The Council is committed to ensuring that the services and facilities in the centre remain available to the community and that the centre is managed in the best way possible to achieve this.

With regard to the Malcolm X community centre, in a supplementary question, you asked if I would look into the lease arrangements, as you felt that the action being proposed by the Council would "waste tax payers' money". As I said at the meeting, I will ask for a briefing on the situation regarding the lease.

QUESTION PQ 78

Subject: Gentrification of St Paul's

Question submitted by: Amirah Cole

What measures as been put in place by Bristol City Council to measure the adverse impact of gentrification on the existing residents of Bristol many of whom are on low incomes and disadvantaged?

The gentrification of St. Paul's and surrounding areas, when we talk about gentrification, we don't just mean an area getting nicer; it's about established working class residents and culture being priced or pushed out.

As a result of gentrification in St. Paul's we have seen:

1. Wealthier people move into poor neighbourhoods and landlords raise their rents to cash in from the wealth of the new influx of residents.
2. The criminalized of our young people, with a particular focus on BME teenagers because new people feel 'in danger.'
3. The systematic destruction of community driven organisation that provided quality social value replaced by profit-driven development from the private sector. I.e. Learning Centre Malcolm X Community Centre, St. Paul's African Caribbean Carnival and Kuumba (African Caribbean Resource).
4. Culture shifts as residents and communities lose their footing in their neighbourhoods as vibrant communities that rely on social networking are torn apart as Neighbours that people once relied on move out, and services that were beneficial to the community are not replaced.

Reply from the Mayor:

1. No specific measures have been put in place to assess the impact of 'gentrification' in St Pauls. However, deprivation data is available from the 2001 and 2011 census which does indicate change over time.

2. Planning policies for the area (Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies and SPD 10 Planning for a sustainable community for St Pauls) are designed to ensure appropriate development, renewal and regeneration to the benefit of the community. Any planning decision is potentially subject to an appeal and therefore careful consideration has to be given to that in order not to waste Council resources on defending failed "call-ins".

3. Investment in the physical fabric of an area to improve the quality of place and liveability of an area is likely to increase the attractiveness of the area to both market and affordable housing tenants. What is important is that there is a balance maintained and I am absolutely with you that it would be a crying shame to lose the character that has defined St Paul's over my lifetime in Bristol.

You asked a supplementary question about the issue of investing in local grass roots organisations to help make the area safe and build St Pauls in economic terms. It is important to recognise that a huge amount of money has been invested in community organisations in St Pauls, probably more than in any other community in the city over the years. I think it is not a matter of when or whether money is invested in St Pauls; it is more a matter of how money is invested in St Pauls to the greatest effect for the benefit of the community.

Subject: Funding for Malcolm X centre/St Paul's Carnival/race equality issues

Question submitted by: Steve Stephenson

1. Why has Bristol City Council not undertaken a Race Equality Impact Assessment before taking the decision to serve notice on the Malcolm X Community Centre and withdraw funding from St. Paul's Carnival?
2. This month we mark the 50th anniversary of the **1965 Race Relations Act (RRA)**. Bristol City Council has a Legal Duty to Promote Race Equality under 2000 Act.

Why is Bristol City Council chosen to 'deprioritise' race equality hiding behind the 2010 Equality Act, pushing Race off the agenda, supporting institutional and or structural discrimination through the implementation of their policies and practices which has led to the direct destabilisation and demise of grass roots organisation that have a long history of promoting positive race relations in the city. Organisations such as Kuumba African and Caribbean Resource, St. Paul's African and Caribbean Carnival, Malcolm X Community Centre and Black Carers?

Reply from the Mayor:

Bristol City Council and Arts Council England have withdrawn funding from the organisers of St Pauls Carnival, not from the carnival or community. Funding has been withdrawn because the organisers have been unable to deliver a carnival which is against their funding agreement. A review of their plans for 2016 does not provide any clarity on how they will achieve this next year either. However the funding has been ring-fenced and celebrating Afrikan and Caribbean culture and heritage is a major priority. We have already held some very positive discussion with some members of the community to ensure Carnival continues in St Pauls for years to come and over the next few weeks more discussions will happen within the community in order for them to discuss what their vision for carnival will be.

Bristol City Council has served notice on the management of the Malcolm X community centre and not the community centre itself. The community centre will continue to stay open with all of the facilities and services being provided for the community exactly the same as the current arrangement. The council is committed to ensuring that the services and facilities in the centre remain available to the community and that the centre is managed in the best way possible to achieve this.

QUESTION PQ 80

Subject: Green Capital

Question submitted by: Barry Cash

Now that Bristol Green Capital is over will you:

1. Release full accounts for Bristol 2015 Ltd so that we can see where the £8.3 M of public money went?
2. Ensure the accounts show how much was the pay-off given to Kris Donaldson?

Reply from the Mayor:

Bristol 2015 Ltd is a separate company to Bristol City Council and is responsible for producing its own Financial Statements. These Financial Statements will be produced in accordance with the relevant Financial Reporting Standards.