

DISCLAIMER

The attached minutes are DRAFT minutes. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information, statements and decisions recorded in them, their status will remain that of a draft until such time as they are confirmed as a correct record at the subsequent meeting.



Agenda Item 4

Bristol City Council

Minutes of Place Scrutiny Commission

Monday 15th September at 6.00pm

Members Present:

Councillors Martin (Chair), Bolton, Hiscott, Khan, Jackson, Negus, Pearce, Threlfall, Windows

Officers in Attendance: Strategic Director Place, Barra Mac Ruairi, Deputy Monitoring Officer, Shahzia Daya, Service Director Transport, Peter Mann, Service Manager, Strategic City Transport, Alistair Cox, Scrutiny Co-ordinator, Lucy Fleming, Democratic Services Manager, Shana Johnson

16. Apologies for Absence, Substitution and Introductions

None

17. Declarations of Interest

None

18. Public Forum (Agenda Items 4 and 11)

The Chair requested the Mayor to answer supplemental questions from the public in relation to residents parking. The Deputy Monitoring Officer explained that public forum is a separate part of the agenda to item 4 (Mayors response to the Residents Parking Working Group) and it would be for the Panel to decide if they wished to put supplemental questions raised during public forum to the Mayor at that point. The Panel is the appropriate body to question the Mayor on decisions/actions taken. Public Forum Questions should be addressed to the Chair of the Scrutiny Commission. At the request of a member of the public the Deputy Monitoring Officer agreed to supply the relevant legislation referred to. Set out below is a summary of the supplemental questions asked. The supplemental questions were put to the Mayor from the Chair as part of Agenda Item 4.

Questions from Members of the Public to the Chair of Place Scrutiny Commission in relation to Agenda Item 4 Residents Parking Zones – Mayors response to the recommendations of the Cross Party Working Group:

1. Paul and Freda Straker
2. Daphne Muir
Supplemental Question: *Are you prepared to accept healthcare cuts as a consequence of introducing RPZ and will the Mayor reduce the permit charge?*
3. Maita Robinson
Supplemental Question : *Can we have a park and ride scheme for North Bristol before RPZ is rolled out to the rest of the City ?*
4. Damian McBraida
5. Michael Owen
Supplemental Question: *Why are there no notices on The Downs about extending the RPZ to that area?*
6. Robert Duxbury
Supplemental Question: *Why will the Mayor not consider such an innovative RPZ scheme such as 'Our Scheme'?*
7. Dave Massey
Supplemental Question: *Will the Mayor consider using public transport for all journeys for 4 weeks?*
8. Teri Brammah
Supplemental Question: *What clear lines of communication have been established with local communities on RPZ?*
9. Steve Smith
Supplemental Question: *Is the Mayor going to consider collecting parking charges by phone instead of meters?*
10. Simon Chapman – Late Question
Supplemental Question: *Will the Council consider including the media in the list of approved trades for a traders permit?*
11. Mark Moran – Late Question
Supplemental Question: *What is the income from parking meters versus projection?*

Public Forum Statements in relation to Residents Parking Zones

- 1 Mark Moran
- 2 Councillor Brenda Massey
- 3 Cllrs Clare Campion Smith and Glenise Morgan
- 4 Maita Robinson – Late Statement

Public Forum Statements Non- Residents Parking Issues

1. David Redgewell – Bus Service Review
2. David Redgewell – New Deal for South West Rail Network
3. Dan Bramwell – Agenda Item 12 – Metro West
4. Tony Dyer – Rail Issues
5. David Redgewell – Bus-Rail Interchange – Late Statement
6. Christine Biggs - WEP Preliminary Business Case for Metro West Phase 1 – Late Statement

19. **Residents Parking Zones – Attendance of Mayor under Standing Order OSR15 (2) to respond to issues raised by the scrutiny commission.** (Agenda Item 4)

The Chair and Commission agreed to put supplemental questions raised during Public Forum to the Mayor as part of the Scrutiny Commission discussion. The questions and a summary of key points in the reply from the Mayor/Assistant Mayor or officers as appropriate are set out below:

Are you prepared to accept healthcare cuts as a consequence of introducing RPZ and will the Mayor reduce the permit charge?

A review of permit price for healthcare workers is taking place. Probably completed by next Place Scrutiny Commission meeting in October. Officers will confirm the timescale.

Can we have a park and ride scheme for North Bristol before RPZ is rolled out to the rest of the City?

The Mayor responded that the introduction of Park and Ride requires co-operation of South Gloucestershire. There is not a satisfactory solution within the City boundaries. Cllr Bradshaw is speaking to South Gloucestershire counterparts and looking at a range of solutions.

Why are there no notices on The Downs about extending the RPZ to that area ?

There are no proposals to extend the RPZ to that area. The Downs is tending to become an unofficial park and ride and this is inappropriate. The Downs should be for recreation and leisure. Discussion will take place with the Downs Committee to see how to manage the Downs and ensure they do not become a West Bristol Park and Ride.

Why will the Mayor not consider such an innovative RPZ scheme such as ‘Our Scheme’?

Alternatives have been considered and questions asked about the reasons why the ‘Our Scheme’ cannot be done. Schemes can be ingenious but schemes also have to pay their way.

Will the Mayor consider using public transport for all journeys for 4 weeks?

Probably not all journeys but I am encouraging people to take active transport. I will use buses more where I can but don't want to make a commitment to use only buses for 4

weeks.

What clear lines of communication have been established with local communities on RPZ?

Voices have been listened to and the Clifton scheme adapted accordingly. As part of consultation all residents received consultation forms and details of meetings.

Is the Mayor going to consider collecting parking charges by phone instead of meters?

Yes should be considering using latest technology but not at the expense of citizens who use system. Consideration will be given to smarter ways of doing things. Cllr Bradshaw added that it is necessary to consider the balance between using smart phones/cash. There are travel apps coming on to market and need to consider and weigh up pros and cons

Will the Council consider including the media in the list of approved trades for a traders permit?

This will be looked into.

What is the income from parking meters versus projection?

There is constant tracking of the economic viability of the RPZ scheme. Peter Mann – Service Director Transport added that a number of assumptions were made about take up of permits - assumptions made to present a sound financial case so the programme could be agreed. There is no information to suggest that the income from pay and display and permits is different to projections. The revenue from every machine cannot be tracked.

Scrutiny Commission Member Questions

Cllr Christian Martin: Why has there been a delay to RPZ in Clifton Village – why has Clifton East been delayed and if Clifton Village is delayed why can't Clifton East be implemented sooner?

The scheme has been delayed to consider responses and concerns raised during the consultation. There were concerns that implementation would be too close to the Xmas period and potentially damaging to Xmas trade. The scheme will now be completed in March 2015. Consultation resulted in over 100 changes to the scheme. Clifton East will be delayed until April to follow on from Clifton Village and out of consideration for residents of Clifton East.

Councillor Anthony Negus – *Where does the fine money go? If it doesn't go in to the overall model where does it go?*

The Mayor responded that the general principle is that all money raised goes into transport in general and RPZ in particular. Cllr Bradshaw pointed out that fines are a quasi-judicial matter and not within his jurisdiction. He also pointed out that it is hard to hypothecate the fines income. The Service Director Transport added that penalty charge income comes under S55 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act and can only be used for specified services e.g. parking costs, other transport improvements. Fine income is not part of the RPZ financial model as it is not secure income as it is reliant on enforcement. Assumptions have been made about pay and display and permit income but the financial model cannot be based on penalty charge income.

Councillor Mhairi Threlfall

What are we going to do to improve consultation and communication. What can we do to make sure public listened to?

The Mayor responded that it is important to listen to people and apologies to Terr Brammah that communication on RPZ was not received. There is always an opportunity to learn from the roll out of the programme. Yes we pledge to move on with smarter systems when practical. Very keen to reduce pavement machines as quickly as responsibly able to.

Councillor Christopher Jackson

What will happen if we don't meet the income target – will the loan just be extended?

The Mayor responded that that is not the intention but if the target is not reached this would be the normal commercial way of dealing with this. If there are other ideas about how to deal with any shortfall then these could be considered.

Peter Mann Service Director Transport confirmed that income from RPZ is carefully tracked and money is borrowed as it is needed - assessments are made about the viability of income paying off loans and appropriate adjustments made – relative income to costs incurred.

Councillor Steve Pearce

Councillor Pearce responded to issues raised about consultation and the fitness for purpose of communications, engagement and involvement commend by referring to a piece of work that the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board will be

undertaking later in year on the development of a corporate standard for community involvement.

Councillor Clare Hiscott

Would it be possible to review the cost of permits before 3 years? For example if in a particular area a scheme was generating more income than expected?

The Mayor responded that 3 years gives some certainty. The cost of the Bristol scheme lies mid-range in relation to other authorities across the country at £48.00.- 3 years is probably the right time to review.

Cllr Charlie Bolton

Can we think more of the benefits of RPZ and do more to humanize the streets e.g. Green walkways project. Look at other things rather than having streets as car parks?

The Mayor thanked Cllr Bolton for his comments.

Cllr Anthony Negus

This is a residents parking scheme but should actually be a community parking scheme – how can we make things work for the community – including a potential rover ticket for people who need to use cars?

The Mayor agreed that it should probably be better described as a community or neighbourhood parking scheme. Everything can be reviewed and talking to residents there is a high level of acceptance and reversal of opinion in many cases.

Cllr Bradshaw responded that a traders permit and multi-zonal permit had been introduced to tackle issues raised by traders and businesses. Talks were ongoing with the business community, including looking at ways to make it simpler and easier to top up and apply for permits.

Cllr Mahmudur Khan

Will people be able to determine themselves if they want RPZ and will there be a cap on permit costs?

The Mayor responded that he did not have absolute power in terms of transport – the is a deregulated public transport system and that he would like to see an Integrated Transport Authority. Transport planning has to be done by agreement with surrounding authorities. The objective is to make Bristol more environmentally friendly . Air quality is improving as a result of the reduction of the number of people circulating round. The Permit cost is reasonable for the first car – and higher for the

second car to encourage people to consider reducing the number of cars and finding other modes of transport. Looked at comparator permit costs and Bristol is not high – in Easton the cost is the old permit cost. It would not be possible to give assurances or a cap beyond 3 years.

Councillor Christian Martin

If had to do something because of environmental issues why did you not put in manifesto? 90 differences in Clifton what are differences made and what would be disruption of rolling out RPZ in Clifton before Xmas – what's real reason for delay?

The Mayor responded that he was taking into consideration the concerns of traders and this was a reasonable thing to do. The delay was not the result of a lack of resources. In particular issues were raised about 3 hours and 1 hour stay and this has been extended to 3 hours in the heart of the village

The RPZ is part of a bigger strategy to make the city a better place to live. The programme has been reduced by taking out some of the outer areas and there is no intention to put these back in until there is demand to do so. When taking up office the Mayor asked what policies/ studies had been done to improve traffic flow in the city and requested a report on all measures possible e.g. congestion zone, low emission zone. .

Councillor Martin thanked the Mayor and residents for their participation. The Mayor also thanked the Commission for a positive session.

Action:

The Strategic Director Place undertook to provide a financial statement in relation to RPZ for the Scrutiny Commission meeting in October, including the issue of fines, payment of the loan and alternative solutions to dealing with any shortfall of income, income projections and actuals. He would not be able to include in the statement the cost of 'mistakes'

20. **Minutes** (Agenda Item 5)

The minutes of the meeting held on the 31st July were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

21. **Action Sheet** (Agenda Item 6)

- **Green Capital** - requests for information on organisational structure to be actioned by Strategic Director Place following Green Capital Briefing on the 16th September.
- **Public Forum statement from Dan Bramwell** – issues raised to be addressed as part of the October Scrutiny session on transport.

22. **Workprogramme** (Agenda Item 7)

Noted that the provisional date for the Waste Inquiry is the 24th October and a scope would be sent out to members shortly.

23. **Key Decisions – Forward Plan** (Agenda Item 10)

Noted.

24. **Metro West Rail – Full Business Case** (Agenda Item 12)

The Commission reviewed progress on the West of England Metro West rail programme. The preliminary Business Cases sets out the first phase of MetroWest covering the Portishead, Bath and Severn Beach lines. Alistair Cox, Service Manager, Strategic City Transport highlighted key issues in the report, including Benefit Cost Ratios, financial issues, including revenue costs and operational costs.

Timelines for phase 1 and 2 were referred to in the Appendices to the report.

During discussions the following issues were highlighted:

Cllr Bolton raised the issue of an Ashton Gate Station and whether this was part of the Business Case. It was clarified that the case does not include Ashton Gate, however there is potential on the Portishead for an additional station and possibly 2 stations. A Business Case for Ashton Gate is also being considered and Network Rail has been sent this information. There is a need to understand the cost of an additional station and how it would perform. Documents relating to the study/Business Case will be available on the website once approved by Network Rail West has approved. There should be a response on the issue in the next 2 weeks but this is not part of 'core' work and Network West are under a lot of pressure.

Cllr Pearce raised an issue about potential capacity at an Ashton Gate station and in particular long cars for supporters. Cllr Jackson also iterated support for the development of an Ashton Gate station, not just for supporters but in respect of supporting other ambitions to get more people using public transport solutions.

It was noted that rail stations for events have potentially difficult operating environments and capacity issues need to be considered. The issues raised would be fed back to Network Rail. The current priority is for Network Rail not to do anything to line to adversely affect the line, or any future opening of a potential station. Cllr Bradshaw highlighted how important it is to follow Network Rail procedures.

Cllr Pearce asked for clarification on the large range between Benefit Cost Ratios.

It was clarified that this is due to fundamental differences in options – options which require more units impact on BCR and the main factors affecting the difference is around operational issues and also capital arrangements.

Priority is for Network Rail not to do anything to line to adversely affect the line, or any future opening of a potential station. Cllr Bradshaw highlighted how important it is to follow Network Rail procedures.

Cllr Negus highlighted mention of a shortfall in the report. This will change once the costs become clearer as the Business Case progresses. By next autumn there should be greater clarity on costs.

Cllr Negus raised concerns about further slippage to the Portway Park and Ride. It was confirmed that the opening date of summer 2016 has been the target opening date for the last 6 to 9 months. The budget put aside by the last administration is still there. Cllr Bradshaw clarified that Network Rail were asked to project manage this. Because the process had not been followed to the letter the bid failed. By giving the project to Network Rail it is more likely that mistakes from the past will not be repeated and requirements will be met. It is probably one of the best opportunities to achieve a more integrated transport system. Progressing through due process and will be in a position shortly to have worked up and costed scheme.

Cllr Hiscott pointed to Sunderland as a city which has been moving football supporter by rail for some time.

In response to a question from Cllr Hiscott, it was confirmed that Ashely Down, Horfield and Ashton Gate are all being considered as potential stations. It was also noted that there are there are different options in relation to the Henbury Loop, including operational, capital and revenue models. In relation to a potential level crossing at Portishead it was confirmed that this was still being worked through but costs are contained within the budget.

Cllr Khan raised issues about what happens if the MetroWest scheme does not become a value for money scheme. If this were the case the expectation would be for further funding from local authorities, although with the forecasting undertaken this is unlikely but could be a risk.

24. Local Sustainable Transport Fund (Agenda Item 13)

This item was deferred to the next meeting and agreed to ensure the full

appendices are attached.

25. Impact of the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood Development
(Agenda Item 15)

Information item deferred to the next meeting.

26. Events Security (Agenda Item 16)

Information item. Cllr Negus expressed concerns that clarity had not been provided at the last scrutiny commission meeting and concerns from a member of the public addressed sufficiently. The report for information was agreed following a commission Planning meeting and now clarifies the actions of officers in response to the incident on Park Street (discussed at the Commission on the 31st July). A further report will be brought to the January scrutiny meeting but as a result of investigation into the licensing of the event a number of processes have changed, as outlined in the report.

Date of Next Meeting

11am Tuesday 23rd October 2012

The meeting ended at 9.10 pm

CHAIR