

Cabinet

Supplementary Information



Date: Tuesday, 1 September 2020

Time: 4.00 pm

Venue: Virtual Meeting - Zoom Committee Meeting
with Public Access via YouTube

2. Public Forum

(Pages 3 - 29)

Issued by: Corrina Haskins, Democratic Services

City Hall, Bristol, BS1 5TR

Tel: 0117 35 76519

E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

Date: Friday, 11 September 2020



Cabinet - Public Forum



Date: Tuesday, 1 September 2020

Issued by: , Democratic Services
City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol, BS3 9FS
E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk



Agenda

1. Public Forum Questions and Answers

(Pages 3 - 27)



Question: PQ08.01

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 8 – Clean Air Zone Update

Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

I understand additional monitors are to be installed during the new 'test and learn' phase. Please can you confirm if these monitors will be installed on any key roads in the Totterdown area likely to be affected (positively or negatively) by changes in traffic movements? I am thinking particularly of Bath Road, Wells Road, St Lukes Road and St Johns Lane.

Answer:

No additional monitors are planned for those locations because we already have data from the monitors on Wells Road, St. John's Lane and Bath Road, which we'll continue to review. These are available to view online.

Link to air monitors: <https://bit.ly/3gvliAS>

Question: CQ08.1

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 8 – Clean Air Zone Update

Question submitted by: Cllr Jerome Thomas

Background:

I welcome city centre changes that prioritise active travel and use of public transport but am concerned that reducing road space for cars will create more pollution and congestion on adjacent roads as drivers work out their new routes. As a result of the combination of similar numbers of polluting cars on fewer roads I believe it is unlikely that air quality will reach an acceptable legal standard without putting in place a class D clean air zone. With new live air quality units in an increased number of locations interested folk will hopefully be able to quickly find out the impact on air quality of the council's new proposed approach.

Question:

Can the council state which new locations will have live air quality units as part of the Council's proposed 'Test and Learn' approach?

- 1. We have an extensive air quality monitoring network with more than 100 monitored locations. It offers good coverage of the central locations in Bristol and key arterial routes where the highest levels of air pollution are expected and we will continue to operate this network.**
- 2. New monitors have been set up on Baldwin Street and High Street for the Bristol Bridge project. Marlborough Street \ Upper Maudlin Street already has suitable monitoring for the scheme there. A new continuous analyser will be installed on Marlborough Street for monitoring the effect of the changes on this road. As details of all the Test and Learn interventions are confirmed we will identify whether our existing monitoring network is sufficient or whether additional monitors are required and their locations.**
- 3. We're working with our consultants, Jacobs, to develop an evaluation for the Test and Learn approach that will use air quality and traffic data as inputs to analysis to assess the impact of interventions in a short timescale.**
- 4. Data from the Test and Learn programme will be published.**

Question: PQ10.01&02

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 10 – Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Sufficiency and Capital Proposals

Question submitted by: Sally Kent

- 1) 190 of Bristol's children and young people with Special Educational Needs are currently deprived of their right to an education and have no suitable school place this September or in the foreseeable future.

Is the mayor in direct communication with the Dept for Education and central government about this council failing in its statutory duty under section 27 of The Children's and Families Act to ensure sufficiency in SEND school places?

Answer:

- Yes, Bristol City Council is in communication with DfE.
 - Following the outcome of the Local Area SEND inspection last year Bristol was required to produce a Written Statement of Action (WSOA) to improve the provision and system for supporting SEND across the city.
 - The WSOA was approved by Ofsted and the Quality Care Commission in April 2020. Progress is formally monitored by the Department of Education (DfE) and NHS England (NHSE) by monthly data returns for key outputs and formal monitoring visits every 4 months.
- 2) Also is the Mayor aware that this is now a critical Human Rights issue? Protocol 1, Article 2 of the Human Rights Act, Article 28 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and Article 24 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities all specify the right of disabled people to receive an education.

What security can he provide for all the families of children with SEND who have no school place and are uncertain about when they ever will have one, at a time when everyone else is being encouraged to get their children back to school?

Answer:

- To clarify, because there has been misreporting of this matter, the majority of pupils requiring specialist provision continue to attend their current setting and are supported through the resources outlined in their EHCP.
- A detailed project has commenced to address concerns about the sufficiency of specialist placements new placements are due to begin to

open in autumn 2020. The Council is working closely with the Regional Schools Commissioner, DFE, educational settings across Bristol and beyond to secure additional specialist educational placements for our children and young people.

- Work is also commencing in early autumn to develop a long term specialist provision strategy for the city, which will be co-produced with key stakeholders. This strategy will focus on the longer term vision for SEND provision in Bristol over the next 5 to 10 years.

Question: CQ10.1

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 10 – Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Sufficiency and Capital Proposals

Question submitted by: Councillor Tim Kent

Q1. Could you clarify the figures for children and young people who have EHCPs and require special provision and also the modelled need for at least the next 5 years? Can you provide those figures with current requirement and current capacity as well as future projected need? Can you also include the breakdown of need and places by Primary, Secondary and post 16 placements as well as by SEND category?

Answer:

- Given the level of information being requested and because we are very responsive to a changing picture, which has been distorted over the last 6 months due to Covid, the detailed breakdown will be issued by way of follow up.
- There has been a rise in demand for specialist provision with a large increase in the number of Education and Health Care Plans now being processed. The rise is significantly above that which would be expected from the rise in the general school population.
- Existing specialist provision across the city is at or very close to capacity. A project commenced in March 2020 to increase the number of specialist placements in both mainstream and special schools, available across the city matched and to needs. Although this project was adversely impacted in the early months by Covid-19, it is now resumed. 31 individual school programmes are being explored through three waves of feasibility studies. If all 31 were able to be delivered, which is highly ambitious, then this would result in 629 additional places (79% for SEMH/ASC provision).
- The current projection is focused on the next 2 years, due to the current urgency for places. A longer term strategy will be developed, through co-production, which will focus on the next 5 to 10 years.

Q2. For the past several years you have been warned that your plans for special placements were inadequate, what assurances can you give parents that this time your statistical planning and resource allocation is correct?

Answer

- This is an important matter that has been neglected in the council for years, we've been up front about that and are putting it right.

- Work has been undertaken with comprehensive planning to address the current urgent need. The analysis and forecasting is based on data, which is now accurate and quality assured.
- In line with the WSoA an Early Identification register is being developed to enable data to be gathered at the earliest point for planning for our children and young people. We are now able to identify the primary need categories in different areas of the city and to match these on to current provision to identify what types of provision are needed and where.
- The SEND Scrutiny enquiry day was on the 3rd February and looked at these matters in some detail to satisfy themselves how we our reporting processes work.

Further information was requested by Cllr Kent and the service will provide it directly under separate cover.

Question: CQ11.1

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – Securing Outline Planning Consents for Housing Delivery

Question submitted by: Cllr Martin Fodor

More housing is welcome, but by selling land we lose the control we have as owner to ensure the highest energy standards and build quality and space standards, plus other amenities that might be needed. And outline permission means most issues are then foreclosed for debate when the substantive application comes to DC for a final decision.

Question:

How will we ensure these issues, like higher energy standards are achieved?

- **The Housing Delivery Team will procure a multi-disciplinary team whose brief will be to prepare all of the sites in line with Local Planning Policy, including energy efficiency.**
- **It is acknowledged that whilst the Council continue to be the land owner of these sites we can deliver the outline planning consent secured. The Housing Delivery Team is exploring delivery routes were the Council is still in control of the delivery of the outline planning permission and its planning obligations. This gives us a far greater amount of control over the type of housing we build and ensures we can maintain a high level of quality, energy and space standards.**
- **On previous council-owned sites the approach proposed in this Cabinet Report, to secure outline planning consent on council-owned land in order to overcome site constraints, accelerate delivering new homes, and increase the value the council receives for the land, has enabled us to put in place agreements with housing associations and developers that successfully deliver the quality homes, space standards, public outdoor space and low carbon, sustainable development that we all want to achieve.**
- **Examples include Hartcliffe Campus in South Bristol, Crome and Constable Roads in Lockleaze, and the approach we're taking on Hengrove Park, which is why the approach outlined in the report is the Housing Delivery Team's favoured approach on further council-owned sites.**

Question: CQ13.01

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 13 – Fleet Services Electric Vehicle Centre of Excellence

Question submitted by: Councillor Don Alexander

This bid sounds very exciting and I hope it's successful. Could the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Commercialisation please explain the practical benefits this could potentially bring to residents?

Answer:

- **Increasing the number of Electric Vehicles on the roads around the city, replacing polluting vehicles, will result in improved air quality. The health benefits of which, to citizens are widely recognised.**
- **This collaborative project, developed in partnership with Highways England, will enable a dedicated team to work with local taxi drivers, businesses and organisations that operate fleets, to help them to trial (for free) the EVs and understand and evidence the financial and environmental benefits* of switching to electric.**
- **This grant award includes funding for 5 electric charge point hubs to be strategically located around the City, four commercial and one taxi, expanding the city's electric charge point infrastructure available public use. This will give people confidence that when they buy an electric vehicle that there will be access to a sufficient spread of charge points around the City.**

Question: CQ15.1

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 15 – Bristol Future Parks Programme

Question submitted by: Cllr Martin Fodor

Parks in Bristol are currently subject to a number of different pressures:

- Budget pressures from the cuts to the services (£2m down from £6m)
- Increased usage from the public during coronavirus

Also the potential impact of commercialisation measures being introduced to raise funding – but while this summer has seen new concessions let it has not resolved the investment that allows traders to thrive, such as electricity and water supplies on Redland Green.

Our approach to Parks and open spaces also needs to take into account the impact of climate change and increased demand for local food. The existing strategy arguably now needs to be reviewed to take account of these priorities.

On the positive side, better stewardship of our parks in partnership with Friends of Parks groups could help Bristol tackle the ecological and climate emergencies we have declared.

But the ways all these pressures and factors interplay needs to be clearer; more fundraising can help and better coordinated volunteering has a part to play, but the ground rules must be set out.

Question:

So how will the many issues above be factored in to the Future Parks initiative?

- **The austerity measures introduced by the coalition government in 2009/10 saw significant pressures placed upon local authorities budgets. As a result Bristol's Parks and Green Spaces were required to introduce series of savings targets. Currently our funding is focussed on maintaining the existing infrastructure and maintenance of assets. Investment required to provide new infrastructure such as the installation of utilities will need to form part of a capital investment plan or through opportunities which are presented through the Future Parks Programme Expression of Interest and procurement process.**
- **Running in parallel with the Bristol Future Parks project is the development of a new Parks and Green Spaces Strategy, currently in planning stages. The strategy will provide the council with a 25 year plan for Bristol City.**
- **Bristol Parks are also developing an innovative approach to volunteering, working up site management plans to enable better**

volunteering impacts year round and the introduction of a volunteer database.

- **In addition to this we are working very closely with our project partners, Bristol and Bath Park Foundation to develop additional approaches, such as a small grant fund to support citizen action and volunteering within our parks.**

Question: CQ19.01

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 19 – Covid-19 Emergency Decision Making Update

Question submitted by: Councillor Don Alexander

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the officers who have worked so courageously and so diligently throughout this crisis. The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government has promised to 'make good' all local authorities' extra financial costs. Would Cllr Cheney please remind us of how much we remain out of pocket?

- **The whole cabinet would like to echo your sentiment which recognises the work the staff have been doing.**
- **The current indicative General Fund in year shortfall is estimated at £13.9m due to COVID 19, however the medium term financial impact over the MTFP period will be more significant in 21/22 and future years, including the impacted of collection fund deficit.**
- **In regards to in-year funding, whilst there is an appetite from the government to support income losses on fees and charges, the published detailed guidance last week adds greater complexity and indicates a material deterioration from the income grant originally estimated (£20.6m) for the Council. If this materialises it would add to the residual General Fund in year shortfall of £13.9m.**
- **We continue to ask the government to cover the full costs of COVID to local authorities, this year and beyond as originally promised and provide us with the basic government funding information to enable us to plan for the future.**

Question: CQ20.01

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 20 - Housing Benefit and Council Tax Reduction Process

Question submitted by: Cllr Clive Stevens

I welcome your decision to move away from the old risk based system which banded claimants into three different groups to define the level of evidence they needed to provide to get their entitlements. A system like that rings alarm bells, your paper describes: "Categorisation of risk is by algorithms that are confidential to the supplier so local authorities do not know why cases are categorised as they are".

We have just seen with A Levels how prejudice can creep into algorithms. Thank goodness you are moving away from that approach.

I am wondering how widespread algorithms are within BCC's systems to help define priorities, for example are they used in Homechoice, Highways maintenance or school appeals; just three quick thoughts.

Q. My question is therefore, how many other systems do BCC use that are based on algorithms and profiling that help define priorities?

Answer:

- **Your question is not specifically about the cabinet report, and is widely defined, which makes it difficult to answer definitively.**
- **You mention examples, and Bristol City Council uses data analytics in the prediction of the condition of road surface and examples from Children's Services – Child at Risk of Sexual Exploitation, Child at Risk of Criminal Exploitation, Risk of NEET.**
- **Children Services highlight that all of their models have an element of human decision making – none have automated decision making attached. Our models identify risk, which is then presented back to frontline professionals to better understand the vulnerabilities that the individual is facing**
- **These can be really useful tool to help us maximise resources and enhance services, and will be an important part of the future. As with the example you note, we have to make sure they're fit for purpose.**
- **This is why we are working with Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation, an independent expert committee with a remit to help the UK navigate the ethical challenges presented by data-driven technology.**

- We've announced a 12-week partnership to develop an ethical data governance framework to ensure that our approach is ethical, inclusive, transparent, and driven by responsible innovation.
- We're expecting the results and recommendations to be shared in late October, and you'd of course be welcome to comment then.

Question: CQ21.01

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 21 - Imperial Apartments (Parkview development)

Question submitted by: Cllr Clive Stevens

I welcome your attempts to “seize the moment” and put in a solution to manage the potential increase in homelessness. It is a shame this is a permitted development as I think it would have benefitted from going through the planning process. But Boris knows best presumably!

I'm more interested in how much control the Council will have over the behaviour of Caridon as BCC's nominated landlord. According to Caridon this is a fairly new model for managing property. Effectively they will be the Council's tenant and then sublet to the public. Caridon have recently had some bad press (according to the Risk Register and the BBC article on Templefields House in Harlow) but if they learn from that and improve it could be positive for the future sub-tenants of Imperial Apartments and for BCC as the landlord.

Q. My question therefore, is about the procurement and contract terms you will have with Caridon, the nominated landlord; whether there are any specific requirements for problems or complaints from their sub-tenants to be open to scrutiny and any fines or incentives (or even termination) if they don't perform. **I appreciate some of the contract will be exempt and so limit my question to finding out if you have terms that ensure the open scrutiny of sub-tenant complaints, whether there are penalty clauses and an option to terminate the contract for such reasons?**

Answer:

- **I would just like to clarify that, if plans are approved, the Council will not be the landlord of Imperial Apartments and therefore Caridon will not be the Council's tenant. Caridon will be the landlord and the Council would be acquiring nomination rights to a number of apartments within the block.**
- **In response to the question, an agreement in principle has been reached with Caridon, but the contract has not yet been finalised. It has though been agreed in principle that Caridon will report to the Council on complaints from tenants, as well as service failures, on a regular basis and the Council will of course actively manage the contract. Further information can be provided on how the contract will operate once it has been finalised and executed.**

Question: PQ22.01

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 22 – Watershed Phase 1 Redevelopment

Question submitted by: Stephen Layland

QUOTE: While Watershed has two distinct phases of work, this report only relates to Phase 1 for which a conditional approval has been granted by WECA. Watershed has confirmed that Phase 1 is a standalone project, and that it is critical to their financial resiliency plan, regardless of Phase 2 going ahead or not. For the avoidance of doubt, it should be noted that the Councils support and underwriting the Phase 1 Grant does not constitute approval or support for the Phase 2 proposition.

PREAMBLE: to rehearse the point I made at one of the public consultations - held within the Watershed's Pervasive Media Studios - that while presented as two distinct phases of work, the external expression or intrusion of the saw-like upper-profile of the proposed tower of Phase-2 into the surrounding city-scape would be over-determined - be fixed - by any decision to approve the terms of Phase-1 - vis: by effectively foreclosing the adaption of more of the roof of Phase-1 shed [say to provide a alternative platform on which to establish a more extensive array of photovoltaic-cells, as if hidden behind [totally obscured by] a front-facing (or elevation) raised- upstand/facade, on which a scrolling or rolling digital-display of forthcoming attractions would add to the media-like atmosphere of the local district] in keeping with the place-enhancing commitments listed below.

Q: Please highlight a few of the substantive ways - if there are any - in which that decision on the Business Case for Phase 1 - the supposed subject of the report/recommendations to the Mayor and Cabinet - can be sensibly held NOT to have predetermined/overdetermined any subsequent decision on Phase-2, by having foreclosed any sensible architectural alternatives to the most obvious, prominent, or characteristic saw-tooth-profile features of the roof-line of the tower of Phase-2 and which, I might add, only seems symptomatic of one of the very worst aspects of planning in Bristol - vis: by allowing the "internal" determinants [architectural-form-follows-"internal"-functions] to uglify Bristol's city-scape [witness the "Concentration-Camp" architectonic of the array of "Control Towers" [a.k.a. Car Park Exhaust Vents] that emerge to loom over the nearby Millennium Square.

Answer:

- **Planning permission and listed building consent for Phase 1 (change of use and internal) were granted in July 2019.**
- **The decision to award a grant fund to support these works was made by the West of England Combined Authority (WECA) in line with the fund's objectives to drive economic growth.**

- The recommendations of the BCC Cabinet report relate to the Council acting solely in a support role to transfer funds from WECA to Watershed Arts Trust Ltd, not as Local Planning Authority considering the merits of a further phase of development.
- As and when Phase 2 proposals are submitted for planning and listed building consent they will be considered by the Council as Local Planning Authority on their own merits, and will be the subject of public consultation in the normal way.
- Support, by way of transferring funds for Phase 1, does not pre-determine any future decisions by the Council as Local Planning Authority.

- To extend the new construction into and over part of Transit Shed W
- To construct new space in an area that will generate least disruption to the existing business
- To generate the opportunity to rearrange the circulation through the building
- To create a new entrance from Anchor Road
- To extend the street level frontage of Watershed
- To provide a livelier foyer area on the ground floor
- Use the new building to demonstrate and advertise the expanding work of Watershed
- To create additional workspace for talent development, incubation and early stage growth
- To ensure that the development is a demonstrator in sustainable principles
- Develop an architectural solution which is respectful to the listed building and appropriate to the location
- Take full advantage of this busy and lively location to encourage new and more diverse audiences to Watershed
- Generate improved public realm to Anchor / Canon's Road
- Explore the use of emerging sustainable technologies
- Optimise potential for PV energy generation
- Target low embodied carbon in the construction materials





Question: PQ23.03

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 23 – Hengrove PFI Leisure Centre

Question submitted by: Amanda Brett

Question:

Within the report on Hengrove Leisure Centre in relation to the Council's contractual obligation under the PFI contract, why does the Mayor and the Cabinet Member for Public Health consider opening Hengrove but closing Jubilee Pool will result with no negative impact for equalities groups 'as this proposal will allow for the service to resume and access to physical activity opportunities increase'?

Background:

The 'Corporate Strategy Alignment' indicates wellbeing, improvement to physical, mental health & wellbeing and to reduce health inequalities and supporting preventative interventions & opportunities, not re-opening Jubilee Pool will most definitely result in a negative impact for equalities groups as this proposal does not allow a large proportion of the elderly and those with physical/mental health problems unable to get to Hengrove to resume wellbeing services at Jubilee Pool. Clearly this will significantly impact and be to the detriment of the more vulnerable residents in the surrounding area who are already disadvantaged:-

Fact

- Jubilee Pool is used for hydrotherapy for enduring debilitating chronic pain. There are users who cannot bus or walk to Hengrove. Jubilee Pool is listed on the NHS Central Chronic Pain Clinic's list as one of the better pools to use for hydrotherapy exercises due to its warmer water (32 degrees). A family member uses Jubilee for hydrotherapy; prior to using Jubilee Pool this person was using the pool within the Central NHS Central Chronic Pain Clinic. They are therefore no longer burdening the NHS but using their own resources to better their health.
- Friends and users who have had knee/hip replacement use Jubilee for hydro exercises due to the warmer water; they are no longer a burden on the NHS.
- My daughter uses womens only swim. It is essential for her trauma recovery. Hengrove is too intimidating due to its noise and size and her high social anxiety.
- The elderly use Jubilee, not just for swimming but to promote wellness with physical problems (again the warmer water), as a regular group who walk to and meet at the pool it also alleviates their loneliness (which we know as a society we must address due to increasing figures for depression from loneliness in the elderly).
- Those with mental or physical ailments, the elderly are generally on a low income, do not drive and if they do, cannot afford parking at Hengrove.

The items outlines in the Corporate Strategy Alignment show that these people will undoubtedly be EXCLUDED and will disallow them their current well-being regimes resulting in impacting their own mental/physical health thus resulting in them returning and burdening the local NHS Crisis Team, GPs etc.

Answer:

This report considers the Hengrove Leisure centre, and not Jubilee Pool. There has not yet been a decision reached on Jubilee Pool and an Equalities Impact Assessment will be undertaken before any permanent decision is made.

The investment we are making in Hengrove will mean that people are able to use the pool and facilities there, a positive for the community. The operator of Jubilee has indicated an intention to terminate their contract, as they do not believe they can make it financially viable due to Covid restrictions.

Question: PQ23.11&12

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 23 – Hengrove PFI Leisure Centre

Questions submitted by: Thea Kelly

The city benefits given on the decision pathway document state: "The Council will work with BAL to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 and continue to work in partnership to increase participation and realise maximum health and social benefits for local residents" How will the council ensure value for the city in the PFI contract and financial adjustment if Hengrove pool is limited to smaller numbers of users and Jubilee pool is not reopened by the same operator to support the larger numbers of local residents looking to maintain a healthy lifestyle? This question is raised within the context of Covid prevention and treatment as only today the newspapers report a 48% increased risk of death in those patients who are obese.

Do the council and mayor agree that value for money for the residents of the city is only reached with the operator incorporating the reopening of Jubilee pool into the revised conditions for the financial adjustment for Hengrove? Thus providing greater value and representing 'one of the Mayor's seven key commitments in the corporate plan... making culture and sport accessible to all.'

Answer:

- **Ongoing negotiations are taking place with the contractor at Hengrove Leisure Centre to provide the best value service for the people of Bristol while maintaining activities within the Covid guidelines.**
- **These are negotiations with a private company, and so what we might feel is best value might not be viable for them.**
- **Because of our contractual obligations with all our pools, and the lack of government support for the leisure sector, we are in a position of damage limitation, but we are determined to make culture and sport accessible to all in the city.**
- **The contracts for Jubilee and Hengrove are separate and not with the same contractor. Hengrove Leisure Centre is with the Councils PFI Contractor (Bristol Active Limited) and Jubilee is with Parkwood Leisure.**

Question: PQ23.07&08

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 23 – Hengrove PFI Leisure Centre

Questions submitted by: Julie Laming

Q1

Can the Mayor explain how the PFI deal allows for the provision of £900k in subsidy funding for BAL, a profitable private company, for Hengrove Leisure Centre only and not Jubilee Pool? This does not accord with the Council's Corporate Strategy Alignment objectives nor meet the five itemised city benefits as highlighted in the Committee Report. Excluding Jubilee Pool from BALs £900k financial subsidy means that:

- The Council is not working in partnership with BAL to secure Bristol's leisure services across both its leisure centres and swimming pools as they operate both Hengrove Leisure Centre and Jubilee Pool.
- The Council is not providing continued cost effective and efficient service provision that provides for the needs of the local community and contributes towards the city's strategic outcomes.
- The Council is not working for local residents to ensure that they and BAL mitigate the impact of COVID-19 and continue to work in partnership to increase participation and realise maximum health and social benefits for people, increase family and community connectedness, improve community networks and social capital, reduce the sense of isolation and loneliness and enhance peoples social skills and self-esteem.
- The Council is not supporting their local residents to be more physically active, which will impact on a range of public health and adult social care outcomes such as increasing obesity levels, social and health inequalities, reduced healthy life expectancy, an increase in the number of falls and injuries in the over 65s and early deaths from cardiovascular diseases, cancer and respiratory diseases.

Answer:

The PFI contract signed in April 2010 by Lib-Dem administration enabled the building of the Hengrove leisure centre, an Olympic sized facility.

User-ship trends, the PFI contract and the impact of covid are all conditions which drive circumstances toward the closure of the pool - but no decision has been made and we believe a community let approached could work.

The contract this paper relates to is not about Jubilee pool, which was built wholly with public money in the 1930s, not the approach which uses the private sector to share the risk.

Q2

Can the Mayor please explain why the Council negotiated such an appalling PFI deal for the development of Hengrove Leisure Centre and is not attempting to renegotiate

this in light of current circumstances, which means that he is willing to sacrifice a much loved and well used community facility in Jubilee Pool and allow Bristolians taxes to subsidise a hugely profitable private organisation?

Answer:

I can't account for the deal signed by in April 2010, and I understand your criticism of it. However, it did enable the construction of a modern pool at Hengrove that was always designed to service swimmers in South and South east Bristol.

There is no mechanism to renegotiate the whole terms of the agreement. It is a contractual requirement to financially support the PFI contract at Hengrove. There is no contractual requirement to subsidise Jubilee Swimming Pool.

The company operating Jubilee, owned by the same company that operates Hengrove, has also received subsidy, but under that contract they are not responsible for the building.

Question: CQ23.01&02

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 23 – Hengrove PFI Leisure Centre

Questions submitted by: Councillor Graham Morris

1. Can the Mayor please confirm who signed the PFI agreement for Hengrove Leisure Centre on behalf of BCC (the “2008 Decision”), and can we see the formal advice of officers at this time, in particular regarding the financial compensatory mechanism?

Answer:

- **The PFI Contract was signed in April 2010 under the Lib-Dem administration at the time.**

2. Can the Mayor state who negotiated the terms of the “Qualifying Change in Law” (QCIL) clause which seems to place risks of financial or commercial losses back onto local taxpayers (something which the fundamental principle of risk transfer to the private sector was supposed to specifically guard against)?

Answer:

- **The Qualifying Change in Law clause is part of the standard PFI contract;**
- **It would have been accepted and signed off by the administration at the time;**
- **Both the Council and PFI Contractor had legal firms representing them throughout.**

Question: CQ23.03&04

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 23 – Hengrove PFI Leisure Centre

Question submitted by: Councillor Gary Hopkins

1 if his planned closure of jubilee proceeds can the mayor quantify the effect of 100,000 pounds revenue added to hengrove takings from customers forced to travel to hengrove under varying trading scenarios?

Answer:

- **The financial modelling suggests £100,000 revenue added to Hengrove could result in reducing the Annual Unitary Charge payment the council currently makes.**

2 Why has the mayor quoted the alignment with the corporate strategy in putting over £900,000 extra into hengrove but is completely ignoring it when it comes to his planned closure of Jubilee which would require a much smaller sum and was operating at a profit?

Answer:

- **It's not "extra" There is an obligation to the operator under the PFI contract to signed in April 2010.**
- **It's not just the pool, it's the whole £32m leisure centre - Gym, fitness classes, swimming, swimming lessons, café, rock climbing, four court sports hall, healthy living centre, back care**
- **£900k is an investment in our corporate strategy because it makes an important city asset that we clearly have to support the facility and provision operational.**

Question: PQ24.1

Cabinet – 1 September 2020

Re: Agenda item 24 – Revised Bristol City Council Business Plan 2020/21 (Covid-19 Recovery)

Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

Performance measures and targets. Appendix Aii states:

"Some indicators have been suspended entirely this year as they are not feasible to measure."

Key Commitment 4: Keep Bristol a leading cultural city; help make culture, sport and play accessible to all. This includes two targets

- Increase the number of visitors to Bristol Museums, Galleries and Archives
- Increase the number of attendances at BCC leisure centres and swimming pools

A target has been included for visitors to museums, galleries and archives, but not for attendances at leisure centres and swimming pools.

Given public health concerns about obesity, the need to encourage physical activity, and the fact that attendance can be measured:

Question. Why has no target been included for leisure centres and swimming pools?

Answer:

- **The target for this indicator (number of attendances at BCC leisure centres and swimming pools) has been suspended for the first two quarters of 2020/21. This is because all BCC leisure centres and swimming pools have been closed for the first 5 months of this reporting year, and so it has not been possible to measure attendance.**
- **Pools and leisure centres are run by an external provider, and so target-setting is a process of dialogue with the commercial company who provides the service. At the time of target-setting for this document we weren't able to complete this as the provider was not in a position to finalise an agreed target at the time.**
- **Now that there is more clarity for this sector, the conversation is being revisited and a target (covering the whole year) will be in place by the third quarter of the financial year. We will update our plans and performance monitoring reports with this detail in due course**
- **We could set targets for facilities such as museums because they are run in-house by the council and target setting was wholly within our control.**