

Full Council Supplementary Information



Date: Tuesday, 8 September 2020

Time: 6.00 pm

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

6. Public Forum (Public Petitions, Statements and Questions)

(Pages 3 - 36)

Issued by: Sam Wilcock, Democratic Services

City Hall, Bristol, BS1 5TR

Tel: 0117 92 23846

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

Date: Wednesday, 23 September 2020



FULL COUNCIL – 8th September 2020

QUESTION PQ01

Question submitted by: Eileen Means

Subject: School holiday and school uniform initiatives

Given the uncertainty of employment/regular and adequate income prospects at this difficult time for many families in Bristol, the initiatives taken by this Council and its Officers and Partner organisations over the long school holidays to ensure that no child in our city went to bed hungry plus the school uniform initiative deserve recognition. They should be highly supported and commended by all.

Please would the Mayor or Lead Councillor inform us:

How many meals/food deliveries/food vouchers were delivered to our city's deprived children over the school holidays?

REPLY:

- **Thanks to schools, FairShare South West, Feeding Bristol, the Play Sector (under Playful Bristol). The Youth Sector also ran further sessions through the existing Bristol Youth Community Action funds and others.**
- **Around 8,400 primary and 4,800 secondary pupils will have received vouchers over the summer holiday period.**

The summer Healthy Holidays programme delivered:

- **Nearly 50 Family Food sessions with partner organisations, providing up to 20 families at a time the chance to prepare food along with a trained chef**
- **750 resource packs have been distributed per week to families in most need. These packs had a weekly theme: growing, cookery, sports, creativity, reading and books**
- **Over 200 additional Play sessions, across 14 different organisations in Bristol, supporting kids aged 2-8 years**
- **Additional Youth sector activity sessions in the most disadvantaged areas of Bristol, across 11 different organisations, supporting kids aged 8-12**

Question submitted by: Eileen Means

Please would the Mayor or Lead Councillor inform us:

How many Bristol children benefitted from the school uniform recycling scheme?

REPLY:

- **We have been delighted by the public's response to our Summer Uniform Drive. We have received well over 1000 items donated by the public.**
- **Families were asked to get in touch with the Mayor's Office or with their local ward councillor to request items. In addition, many of our children's centres proactively reached out to families and took orders for items they needed.**
- **In all, so far we estimate that 142 children have received uniform directly from the campaign in this way.**
- **Community partners from across the city (such as Lockleaze Neighbourhood Trust, Eastside Community Trust, Empire Fighting Chance, Young Bristol and more) also distributed uniform we provided through uniform swaps and giveaways, directly helping families in their local area.**

Question submitted by: Jon Eccles

Residents of Lawrence Hill ward will generally be pleased to hear that planning permission has been granted for the Oasis Academy on Silverthorne Lane. They would like to know what arrangements are now proposed for sports facilities for the new school.

REPLY

- **Although the site has been granted planning permission by Bristol City Council, that decision has been called in by the Secretary of State due to objection by the Environment Agency.**
- **Should planning permission ultimately be granted, the Department for Education will procure the design and construction of the proposed new school on the Silverthorne Lane site.**
- **Oasis Community Learning Trust will operate the school. They are working with the DfE to define and deliver the facilities required to deliver their curriculum.**
- **As this is a Free School the council is not involved in the provision of sports facilities.**

Question submitted by: Lee Elliott

Subject: The future of Hartcliffe Community Farm

Regarding hartcliffe community farm can we the local people seek a written guarantee that regardless of future tenants, the farm will continue in some form as part of the local community!

I ask that this be made available as the argument of the current tenants which includes councillor Tim Kent have cost the city and its taxpayers thousands of pounds in cost through the courts, is that once they vacate the land this community asset will be lost despite numerous public reassurances that it won't!. I also ask that local people be given clear transparency going forward through consultation and engagement into what will be available to the community.

Finally I ask that the council look to support many local businesses that are being impacted by the poor management of the current tenants on the site.

REPLY:

- **We fully intend for the Farm to remain a community asset; we absolutely have no plans to end this use, or to sell the property**
- **on 20 August we published a 15-page prospectus to encourage expressions of interest from organisation that are interested in taking over and managing the property**
- **we are working closely with Hartcliffe & Withywood Community Partnership and the prospectus sets out the community's vision as well as our vision for the future of the Farm**
- **our aim is to develop a community-managed 'countryside' resource centre and to give the local community a voice in the way in which the Farm is operated and developed in the future**
- **we believe that the Farm has a lot of untapped potential and should be used much more intensively to support the ambitions of the local community**
- **the new leaseholder will be expected to attract major investment and bring new uses and activities to the Farm**

Question submitted by: Nicholas Coombes

Subject: Renewal reminders to Residents Parking Permit Holders

Questions to the Cabinet Member for Transport

Can the cabinet member confirm that renewal reminders are no longer sent to residents' parking permit holders owing to a failure to transfer the necessary data when letting the outsourcing contract?

Will the council make amends for this by sending the data to the new provider, issuing renewal reminders itself, or waiving fines for any residents caught out?

REPLY:

- **The administration of Parking Permits has not been outsourced, the Council simply procured a new system for the digital parking permits. The administration of those permits still rests within BCC (although the software supplier does operate a call centre to support any customers needing help with the system).**
- **The responsibility for having a valid permit has always rested with the permit holder. The transition to a new digital platform has not changed that responsibility.**
- **There is already a small grace period after a permit has expired in which our Civil Enforcement Officers will not enforce, in order to give citizens full opportunity to renew their permits.**

Question submitted by: Sean McGough

- How does the council account for the extra travel (usually by car) that people will end up taking to swim if the local pool is closed, given that air quality needs to improve?
- There are also waiting times in most swimming pools already. By reducing the number of pools, people will be put off going swimming despite it being a cheap, fun way of exercising. How does the council plan on managing demand across fewer pools?

REPLY

Question 1

- The method that people use to travel is a matter for them. We encourage people to use sustainable and active methods.
- A leisure centre and available pool of a superior size and capacity is available within 3 miles of Jubilee.
- Whilst we'd like to have swimming pools dotted around the city they have to be financially sustainable and both the operator and ourselves have come to the conclusion Jubilee is not.
- We have invested in physical activity and swimming and continue to do so. We have kept leisure centres and swimming pools and are planning to reopen Bristol South, Hengrove and Easton.

Question 2

- This is a very good question as of course we're investing in leisure centres and pools that can take large numbers of users so they are sustainable and financially viable.
- The restrictions around size and access around jubilee pool have been part of the problem with its viability.
- Sport England undertook supply and demand analysis using their Facilities Planning Model. Although there is a small predicted undersupply of pool water space across the city, the requirement is not likely to be in South Bristol.
- Demand across existing facilities will be managed through smart programming and better utilisation of existing pool water space.

Question submitted by: Sarah Pigott

May I ask where members of the public may obtain full details of ALL the data and evidence (contract clauses, pool usage, costs, minutes of meetings where the closure was discussed, profitability, equality impact reviews etc) that was used to form the decisions to reject all the options apart from closure. This evidence is worthy of public scrutiny and Friends of Jubilee Pool would like the opportunity to see and review the evidence and test this against the conclusions drawn

REPLY

- **All the information that is not commercially sensitive will be sent to you as part of your FOI already submitted**
- **The consultation itself sets out a summary of the reasons for the recommendations**
- **No decision has been made**
- **The consultation has been initiated because of the decision by the operator to give notice of termination.**

Question submitted by: Steve Trebaczyk

Pre Covid, over 50s swim sessions at Jubilee were very popular. What proportion of older (Over 50s) swimmers do you think will stop swimming permanently, and what proportion will travel all the way to Hengrove?

REPLY

- Whether Jubilee closes, or we find a way to keep it open, we will continue to promote sport and exercise.
- Naturally we hope people will not stop swimming if the pool closed. It is not possible to quantify the proportion of members who would travel to Hengrove, or how they would travel, but our data shows that there are many Hengrove Leisure Centre members who live in the vicinity of Jubilee Pool and indeed all over south Bristol, which suggest people do travel.

The challenge is:

- Over six times as many people use Hengrove as use Jubilee pool.
- The number of adult swims at Jubilee per week is as low as 358, which includes some people swimming a multiple number of times.
- Less than 10% of swims are concessions.
- Jubilee pool is within 3 miles of Hengrove by road.
- My offer remains to work with the community to keep the pool open and I'm prepared to transfer the pool and the building prepared to keep swimming going.

Question submitted by: Karen Sillence

I frequently observe people sitting in their cars on their mobile phones with the engines idling. What is Bristol doing to educate drivers and to reduce this antisocial and polluting behaviour?

In some states in America citizens can report idling when they see it happening, and fines are issued to offenders. Could Bristol consider such a scheme, please? Alternatively, could we have signs and a public campaign?

REPLY

In January of this year we ran an Idling Action Campaign based on the successful behaviour change model run in London and in different places around the UK.

We asked drivers to turn their engines off when stopped to help improve air quality citywide, but especially around air pollution and idling hotspots, such as schools and hospitals.

The first phase from Jan-March 2020 focused on activities in and around schools. Over 1400 pupils engaged in air quality activities across 3 schools including the Eco team from one school staging their own protest about the pollution from traffic outside their school.

We also ran citywide communications on temporary street signage during events, billboards, radio campaign, social media and a press release, with the campaign being featured throughout Emma Britton's Breakfast show on BBC Radio Bristol on the 4th March.

The challenge around fining people for this is that people must be warned first, at which point they usually turn off their engines. Quite different to America. Those that don't can only be fined £20, meaning it is a large expense for small return. This is why we are leading a more positive comms campaign.

Question submitted by: Afrikan ConneXions (Ms Jendayi Serwah)

Subject: Atonement and Reparations for Bristol's role in the Transatlantic Trafficking of Enslaved Afrikans (TTEA)

The motion concerning 'Atonement and Reparations for Bristol's role in the Transatlantic Trafficking of Enslaved Afrikans' (TTEA) is very timely as it allows for synergy of action between the incoming cohort for the Mayor's Commission on Race Equality and the steering group working alongside Bristol City Council on the community education and consultation process into how Bristol's legacy of involvement in the TTEA should be recognised and repaired.

How will the council ensure that the community most impacted by this history (Afrikan/Afrikan Caribbean people) have a primary role in shaping this synergy and that it also aligned with the key themes of the UN International Decade for People of Afrikan Descent (IDPAD) 2015-2024 which are 'Justice, Recognition and Development'?

REPLY

We are continuing to support people to come into positions of leadership as we have been doing since my administration began. Including Stepping Up, access to the magistracy, and our efforts over the years to support people to come into political leadership.

Recognising the importance of getting people into leadership and influence and working to do that is hugely significant. But also wider, it's about doing the real job of tackling ongoing inequalities. The work we're doing on race and inequality will help to bring the wealth and social capital into the community to make sure that the community is more powerful.

Reparations is a timely conversation which we've been having for decades. It's about understanding that racism isn't just about words or offence or debates over definitions. It's always been about power and inequality.

Question submitted by: Christine Townsend

QUESTION PQ14 & PQ15

Subject: Bristol's Growth Fund

Questions to Councillor Anna Keen:

- 1) School Forum papers for May 2020 states that 213 secondary school places for Sept 2020 were offered to families living outside of the Bristol city council boundary. How many of these places will attract funds from the Bristol Growth Fund as a result of the administration's policy to support financially schools that choose to allocate these newly created places to non-resident children within their admission arrangements

- 2) If the Temple Quarter secondary fails to open in Sept 2021 there will be further calls on Bristol's Growth Fund. How does this administration justify choosing to financially support, via its policy, secondary schools that will allocate some of these places to non-Bristol resident children as a result of the admission arrangements?

REPLY

Question 1

- **The answer to this question cannot be quantified until after the Autumn census is released, which is likely to be December 2020.**

- **What the Schools Forum sub-group received last month was an indication of which schools are likely to receive growth funding for the September 2020 intake.**

- **If we are to be precise about exactly how much growth funding that is paid, is due to pupils resident outside of Bristol, then we won't know that until we have the Autumn census details.**

Question 2

- **The Schools Block formula – and by extension the Growth fund - are Local Authority (LA) policies and recommendations, which are then approved (or not) by Schools Forum.**

- **Where there is a disagreement between the LA and Schools Forum, the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) will arbitrate or form a decision.**

- **The current policy has been debated a number of times, and ultimately gains majority support by Schools Forum.**

- **Cross-border movements are entirely normal and reciprocal and that general education provision would be in severe difficulty – both in terms of place planning, and more importantly for pupil travel time – if pupils could not attend a school near their home, even if in a neighbouring LA, rather than one in their home LA that could be many more miles away.**

Question submitted by: Dr Val Hennessy

Subject: Language Schools

BCC has refused to include language schools in its allocation of BRR and grants to the tourism and hospitality sector despite the fact that 44% of councils in England which have language schools in their constituencies have done the opposite and extended both rates relief and grants. In view of the fact that language schools in Bristol contribute more than £10 million directly into the local economy in part through students accommodation, tourism and leisure activities, what is the justification for this?

REPLY

- **The majority of councils have not included language schools in their extended rate relief and grant. BEIS advice does not include it in the criteria.**
- **We appreciate the financial difficulties faced by Bristol’s language schools in responding to the Covid-19 pandemic and the impact the restricted measures have had and will continue to have in the short to medium term for small businesses in the Bristol economy.**
- **However the Council is committed to supporting as many businesses as possible during these challenging times and have utilised local discretion in supporting language schools from the Local Authority Small Business Discretionary Fund.**
- **BCC’s entire allocation of £4.72m from the Local Authority Discretionary Grant Fund (LADGF) has now been paid out. BCC did use a degree of discretion with regards to assisting the city’s language schools, and some schools were successful.**

Question submitted by: Dr Val Hennessy

Subject: Language Schools

Why is it that Bath, Exeter, Cardiff, Cambridge, Oxford, Brighton, Bournemouth and many more areas which benefit hugely from the tourism and leisure generated by language schools have been able to interpret the government guidelines to allow them to offer relief to the schools in their areas whilst Bristol insists that this is impossible?

REPLY:

- We acknowledge that language schools have fallen through the gap with government support.
- We asked the direct question of BEIS and they said no, they did not qualify for the business grant. Because they are education establishments
- Therefore there is a real risk that the authorities which did pay-out will see it clawed back.
- The smaller local discretionary scheme provided some limited discretion which has been exercised and applied consistently across business sectors. I'm pleased to say that some language schools applied and have received some financial support from this fund.
- In Bristol we have based our assessment of each of the Language Schools on the published guidance and taken a final opportunity to verify the position again with BEIS prior to closure of the scheme on the 28 August 2020.
- We are not in a position to provide an overview of the assessments undertaken by other local authorities or the justification for the outcomes they have arrived at.
- We believe that such an interpretation is open to challenge.

Subject: Stop the sale of the Rastafari Cultural Centre in St. Pauls.

Question submitted by: Afrikan Caribbean Assembly Bristol Youth Chapter

1 We understand that the interim moratorium period for the RCC (Rastafari Cultural Centre) expired on 10/10/2019 as detailed on the council's website. Given the importance of the RCC and the services it has provided to the community, **we would like to know why no one from the council came to notify Ras Bandele of these dates or informed him by letter, email or SMS text message.** It's very clear that Ras Bandele has been providing a valuable yet unfunded service to a disadvantaged and often excluded community filling the gaps which no other local authority, voluntary or charitable sector organisation has.

2. Through our campaign and subsequent meeting with you the Mayor and deputy mayor regarding the sale and displacement of the Rastafari Cultural Centre (the only Rastafari religious centre in Bristol and serves the wider community, as you now understand) it is clear that there have been a number of errors made including misinformation, false representations, lack of equality assessments and lack of due diligence. **Whilst we are deeply relieved to know that our elder and the centre is safe, what reassurances can be given to us as grass roots members of the African Caribbean community that such oversights and damaging errors will never happen again?**

REPLY:

We are in the process of negotiating an agreement for a lease of part of the property which we hope will ensure continued use by Ras Bandele.

We'll continue to work with Voscur and representatives of the voluntary and community sector to make sure community organisations are supported.

We have established the Commission on Race Equality to look at the issues of race and ethnicity discrimination in Bristol which you are welcome to work positively with.

Question submitted by: Sally Kent

QUESTION PQ20

Subject: Special School Places

Question submitted by: Sally Kent

The sufficiency and planning report which went to Mayors cabinet on 1st September reports that 190 children and young people are currently without a special school place who require one.

Can you break the 190 figure down by;

- a) Mainstream/Alternative Provision
- b) Preschool/primary/secondary/post 16
- c) Constituency
- d) Council Ward

REPLY

- a) 183 of the 190 attend a mainstream school.
- b) Seven of the 190 children are currently on roll at an alternative learning provision
- c) Of the 190 children and young people:
 - 16 Pre-school,
 - 68 primary school,
 - 95 Secondary
 - and 5 Post 16
 - 6 children's ages unknown at the time of reporting as they are moving into the City and detailed information is pending.
- d) The data is supplied in areas determined by where they live rather than where their primary education is sited. We can supply the maps when you receive the written answer to your question after the meeting.

Question submitted by: Ian and Linda Jones

Subject: Anti Social Behaviour in a HMO

Why won't BCC engage with local residents on the issues we are experiencing in our road?

As BCC have the ultimate responsibility for placing these young people at this accommodation why have they ignored the fact that neighbouring children have been frightened to play in they own garden and sleep undisturbed at night, neighbouring young ladies having to endure sexual comments and disgusting innuendos, that we have to listen to lewd and racist language, witness fights in their front and rear gardens and accept rubbish being thrown onto our property etc?

REPLY:

- I am limited in what I can say here because it might identify the individuals concerned.
- We work with providers of care and support to ensure that they are working appropriately. The provider reports to us that they are communicating with local residents, but maybe this hasn't been good enough here and we are continuing to try to resolve this.
- We have asked for your ward councillor, who I know you're in contact with, to meet with officers.
- We are reviewing with the provider appropriate needs to be supported in this setting, as existing tenants move on.
- Officers have tried to address the issues raised by residents and their councillor, but have to act within a legal framework - The young people living there have full tenancy rights and possession proceedings were suspended during the pandemic. Appropriate monitoring and action is being taken. I am not able comment in detail.
- We will look at appropriate future placements in this specific setting, but of course existing tenants already have tenancy rights.

Question submitted by: Kim Hicks

Subject: Plans and Policies of the Council

With so many changes happening at the moment please could the council provide information showing how the following all fit together?

- SDS (replacement for the JSP)
- LTP (replacement for the JLTP4)
- Local Plans (i.e. the plans for the 4 councils BCC, BaNES, SCG and NSC)
- Neighbourhood plans
- Planning reforms – recently announced by the Government
- New housing targets for BCC. (it is unclear what the new numbers are)
- The NPPF
- Climate Emergency
- Environment emergency
- Covid-19 Emergency

Ideally, please could the reply be in plain language so that ordinary members of the public will understand. If it could also be in diagram form as well that could be really useful.

Please could you provide timeframes for all the above that is listed in question 1

REPLY:

- This is complex and demonstrated the challenges we face in interpreting these national plans to work at our city level.
- I've spoken with officers and considering the amount of information you're requesting and the amount of officer time that is necessary to answer this you will receive a written response following the meeting.

Question submitted by: Barry Cash

I wrote to you on the 5th July asking for reforms to be made to the way Bristol City Council deals with Council tax arrears. I do not seem to have had a reply. Do you intend to reform the system and if so when?

REPLY:

You have now received a response to your letter.

Our focus is on the most vulnerable people as demonstrated by the fact we're the only major city to have maintained a fully funded Council Tax Reduction Scheme.

We are continually reviewing council tax recovery practices with a particular emphasis on identifying vulnerability and supporting citizens:

- **additional staff being recruited with the intention of reducing the number of summons notices issued and reducing referrals to enforcement agents;**
- **establishing service level agreements with enforcement agents where they identify vulnerability;**
- **re-wording recovery documentation;**
- **using multiple methods and channels of communication;**
- **referring those struggling to pay to internal departments as appropriate as well as third party organisations offering free,**
- **independent advice (for example the current pilot with the Money & Pensions Service);**
- **putting in place longer term repayment arrangements where circumstances merit.**

Our summons costs are genuine and are reviewed on an annual basis through being calculated against the cost of actual officer time spent in relation to summons cases.

The details of these calculations are made available to the Magistrates at every hearing and the Magistrates must be satisfied that these are reasonable.

While the costs charged by Bristol City Council were £89.00 in 2019/20, the most recent review of the level of costs has seen these reduce by 5.6% for the 2020/21 year to £84.00.

Subject: RPS St Andrew/ Bishopston

Question submitted by: Rebecca Marlow

Please could the Mayor quantify what would have constituted 'overwhelming support' for a Residents' Parking Scheme in the St Andrews and Bishopston area?

Specifically what percentage response rate, and what percentage of votes in favour, and how these compare to figures from previous RPS consultations in other areas of the city.

REPLY:

- Each result should be taken on its merits.
- However for overwhelming support I would expect a majority of residents to respond and an overall majority to be in favour.
- In each area there are mixed results in groups of streets and apart from one small collection of streets that border the Redland parking zone, there was no clear outcome for a small geographical area.
- Imposing a parking zone on residents who have either not expressed a view or voted against is a big act that needs to be considered carefully.
- In most of our consultations, junction protection was the biggest outcome in favour and we are looking at this. it is worth saying that junction protection reduces the overall number of parking available.
- As Cllr Dudd's letter says we will look to engage in a bit more detail and this will include looking at the rules of residents parking as our direction of travel is towards liveable neighbourhoods.
- RPZs do nothing to change people's travel patterns and behaviours and we need to look for fairer system for all citizens.

Subject: Resident Parking Schemes (RPS) in BS3

Question submitted by: Matthew Gibbs, BS3 Traffic and Parking Group Chair

1. On the topic of parking and traffic reviews in our BS3 area, Cllr Dudd stated he did not want our City Hall to impose regulations on local people*, and needed communities and their local ward members to support new [RPS] areas and to be satisfied that they have led on the decision”*. After two recent locally-led surveys both showed significant support for RPS Cllr Dudd stated, “we decide what is substantial support”*. Does the Mayor see any inconsistency in these statements, and would he be willing to share an anonymised dataset of the most recent BS3 survey so local people can lead on commissioning an independent review?

*Email to Mr Matthew Gibbs 24th August 2020

REPLY

These exercises were consultation not a form of democratic decision-making.

The consultation were not overwhelming except where there was large support for match day parking and we are engaging with the sports club on this matter.

There was some support for junction protection and we are looking at this although worth noting that junction protection results in an overall reduction in availability.

Our direction of travel is towards liveable neighbourhoods. RPZs do nothing to change people’s travel patterns and are unfair on others travelling around the city. As we move towards more city centre living, higher density living and car free, liveable neighbourhoods RPZ are an out of date mechanism.

Subject: Resident Parking Schemes (RPS) in BS3

Question submitted by: Matthew Gibbs, BS3 Traffic and Parking Group Chair

2. In light of two recent locally-led surveys both showing significant support for new Resident Parking Schemes in BS3, and that net support in Ashton is 74% in favour, and that all results have been rejected by Cllr Dudd on account of them not showing “overwhelming support”, can the Mayor please clarify precisely what he and his administration would define as overwhelming?

REPLY

Overwhelming support needs to demonstrate that most residents are in favour.

At the very least I would expect to see a majority of residents replying and an overall majority of clear support for one option.

As Cllr Dudd has said we’ll continue to engage on solutions and will look at options to improve liveability in these communities. The consultations themselves are blunt instruments and unless there is overwhelming support for an option the consultations themselves don’t supply solutions.

Subject: Langton Court Bridge Closure

Question submitted by: Andrew Varney

On 15/01/19, I presented a petition at Full Council calling for a pedestrian crossing for Langton Court Road, near St. Anne's Infants School. The Council responded on 28/01/19 stating that, 'two new permanent pedestrian crossings will be designed and installed in the coming financial year 2019/20' and following the development of proposals, the normal statutory consultation was undertaken from 31/10/19 to 01/12/19.

However, the council is now proposing to close Langton Court Bridge to motor vehicles in order to aid social distancing and promote active travel. If the closure is permanent, this may negate the need for a pedestrian crossing, but if the bridge closure is temporary, we will still need a pedestrian crossing. Can you please give me clarification on the timings and nature of the new proposals? I'm sure you will appreciate the urgency as the children of St. Anne's Infants are now back at school but still have no safe crossing.

REPLY

- **To address concerns about the removal of the footbridge, we held an initial, non-statutory consultation with the school and community.**
- **This raised some other issues, and additional funding has been identified to expand the project to tackle these.**
- **The support from the Government to introduce measures such as point closures to aid social distancing and promote active travel, has provided opportunities to make interventions where concerns about the impact of through traffic have been raised over recent years.**
- **A closure of Langton Court Bridge was therefore included in the funding bid submitted to the Government because it had been suggested locally.**
- **The proposal is dependent on this bid being approved.**
- **Officers are therefore working on plans for both options – with or without the closure proposal, so that a coherent safer routes to school scheme can be delivered in either scenario.**
- **There will be further local engagement on this in the coming months to see if there is support for each element of this proposal.**

Question submitted by: Andrew Varney

In 2016, you promised to ban the harmful weed killer, glyphosate, and carry out a trial of alternatives. Almost 5 years later this product is still being used routinely across the city, although it is due to be phased out by next year. Could you tell me how those plans are coming along, what alternatives have been trialled, when the end date will be and whether in the meantime concerned local residents can choose not to have their street sprayed with Glyphosate?

REPLY

The Council has reduced the use and reliance of herbicides such as Glyphosate significantly over the past ten years in favour of the introduction of different maintenance regimes across the city.

The council does have a requirement to manage vegetation and invasive weeds such as Japanese Knotweed and is working to explore alternatives to the use of Glyphosate, that could be effective in these areas. The process does require us to consider the environmental impacts which each alternative solution may bring (some require the use of diesel generators and others are mild acid based applications), along with the financial implications when introducing an alternative. The process is not yet concluded and the current licence in place for the use of Glyphosate will cease in December 2022.

The Council has a commitment to introduce alternatives in line with the ecological emergency it has declared, but we need to ensure that any alternatives we introduce are not going to have a negative impact to the environment or be detrimental to wildlife and humans.

We do have a legal requirement as The Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 and The Environmental Protection Act 1990 requires land owners to managed a range of invasive weeds and land owners should not allow invasive weeds to impact upon neighbouring land.

Question submitted by: Zoe Goodman

Can the Deputy Mayor for Finance/ the Mayor provide a summary of what has happened to central government funding to Bristol City Council in the last 10 years: the 5 years under the Conservative and Liberal Democrat coalition government and the 5 years since of Conservative government?

REPLY:

- The nature of Local Government funding has significantly changed since 2010, moving from a largely grant based model to one mainly driven by local tax income. There have been significant cuts over the last decade to local Government funding which has meant since 2010 we have identified over £200million savings to ensure we set a balanced budget.
- However due to sound financial planning by the Council we had plans for a balanced financial position for the next five years. We are still trying to understand the impact of Covid on our long term financial position which is hugely uncertain until we know more about Government's intentions for public spending and their support for local Government.
- Conservative and their Lib Dem buddies launched their austerity measures. Local government has lost 60p in every £1 of central government funding since 2010, while demand for services such as Adult Social Care continue to grow.

Question submitted by: Zoe Goodman

Can the Deputy Mayor for Finance/ the Mayor state how much Bristol City Council has spent on its Covid response so far and the likely cost this financial year and compare this with what has been promised by central government and what has actually been provided?

REPLY:

- At the start of the pandemic, the government pledged to cover the costs we incurred. This has not happened.
- Our latest monitoring as presented to Cabinet in July indicates an impact this financial year to the Council of £70million as a result of Covid.
- This is made up of approximately
 - £36 million expenditure on responding to the incident,
 - £34 million lost fees and charges income such as parking, museums, and parks and
- We anticipate grant funding from Government to offset these pressures of £56million, leaving approximately £14million shortfall this year.
- We also set to see an impact of an additional £5million in lost rent and expenditure on our Council housing stock, which has no support from Government.
- In addition to this on behalf of the Council, Avon Fire, Police Crime Commissioner and WECA we are also set to have a shortfall in our Council tax and Business rates income of £33 million this year.
- Government have not yet given clear indication of the level of support which might be available to mitigate these losses.

Subject: Residents Parking Schemes (RPS) Changes

Question submitted by: Michael Broussine

It appears from recent reviews of existing and long established Residents Parking Schemes [RPSs] across our City that they are generally popular with a majority of residents and other users, and that our Council currently has no plans to decommission any RPSs.

In this context, can the Mayor please clarify why he and his administration are unable to accept that the results of the recent parking surveys in St. Andrews and part of Bishopston, [as well as in part of BS3]. These surveys show that a substantial majority of residents [60% in the case of St. Andrews and Bishopston] responding to the survey are in support of radical improvements to the management of parking in their neighbourhoods including the introduction of an RPS?"

REPLY:

I don't think RPZs are popular or even fit for purpose in many cases.

The parking survey shows 60% of the 39% who responded are supportive, this is now the overwhelming support needs to demonstrate that most residents are in favour.

More respondents are supportive of junction protection - As Cllr Dudd has said previously we'll continue to engage on solutions and will look at options to improve liveability in these communities. The consultations themselves are blunt instruments and unless there is overwhelming support for an option the consultations themselves don't supply solutions.

Our direction of travel is towards liveable neighbourhoods. RPZs do nothing to change people's travel patterns and are unfair on others travelling around the city. As we move towards more city centre living, higher density living and car free, liveable neighbourhoods RPZ are an out of date mechanism.

Subject: Jubilee Swimming Pool

Question submitted by: Adrian Scrimshaw

1. Why do you think it is appropriate for more vehicles to be on the roads transporting people to Hengrove or other leisure facilities.
2. Can the individuals/council team members who came up with this please come forward and explain the logic behind all this?

REPLY

We do recognise the benefits of the pool, and it is not correct to suggest otherwise. The situation has developed because the current operator does not think it can reopen and intend to serve notice.

We don't want to be encouraging unnecessary car journeys but equally we need to find a balance between this and delivering affordable leisure facilities.

It's not for us to decide how people travel.

REPLY

The current operator has told us they can no longer operate jubilee pool in a viable manner and this equally presents financial challenges for the Council.

Not only this but our current financial modelling related to Hengrove Leisure Centre highlights the impact of COVID-19 and the significant financial adjustments the Council is required to make over the foreseeable future.

Our modelling shows that regardless of who operates Jubilee Pool there will be a financial impact on the Council through the annual Unitary Charge it pays at Hengrove as a result of COVID-19, including where Jubilee closes and a portion of the Jubilee income transfer to Hengrove. A transfer of a portion of the income from Jubilee to Hengrove would help to mitigate any increases in the Unitary Charge arising due to Covid-19.

Combined with the financial context and on the basis Hengrove Leisure centre serves the catchment area for Jubilee Pool this is the reason we are having this conversation.

Subject: Resident parking permits St Andrews

Question submitted by: Sally-Anne Hayward

As a resident of St Andrews, I would like to know why, when the majority are in favour of RPZ's, the mayor and council seem reluctant to introduce them? The introduction of them to Montpelier has made the street I live on impossible to park on due to dumped vans, commuters and staff from the school in Montpelier using it as a free car park. If the reluctance to introduce RPZ's is due to council staff shortage in being able to issue parking tickets, then they only need to be introduced for an hour a day. Overnight this would make a difference and aid the mental health of the residents. It would also limit the amount of vehicles people choose to have per household, and the roads would no longer be used as car parks. A 40% response rate to the survey held is more than most surveys get yet still we are left frustrated. Can you answer this?

REPLY:

We have been clear that overwhelming support needs to demonstrate that most residents are in favour – the survey has not done that, but nothing has been ruled out.

Staffing is not an issue in the enforcement of them. They were originally designed to be self-funding through permits.

Our direction of travel is towards liveable neighbourhoods. RPZs do nothing to change people's travel patterns and are unfair on others travelling around the city. As we move towards more city centre living, higher density living and car free, liveable neighbourhoods RPZ are an out of date mechanism.

As Cllr Dudd has said we'll continue to engage on solutions and will look at options to improve liveability in these communities. The consultations themselves are blunt instruments and unless there is overwhelming support for an option the consultations themselves don't supply solutions.

Question submitted by: Aileen McLoughlin

Q.37 What effect would the Hengrove PFI contract have on any alternative solutions for the Future of Jubilee Pool in Knowle such as a) a new private provider or community trust b) Community Asset Transfer c) in-house management d) a membership only operating model e) successful grant applications or funding sources e.g. Sports England? What potential penalties would there be for the council and taxpayers in scenarios which saw the pool continuing to operate?

Q.38 In 2015 a Sport England Facility Planning Model assessment predicted a shortfall in pool provision across Bristol by 2026? This was also found in a 2019 survey. What plans are in place to ensure the right level of swimming pool capacity in Bristol?

REPLY

- **The PFI contract signed in April 2010 which built Hengrove leisure centre set a context for pool provision in the south of the city, the consequences we're still grappling with.**
- **The standard income benchmarking provisions in the Hengrove project agreement allow either party to call for an income benchmarking every five years or more, with the potential to increase or decrease the Annual Unitary Charge paid by the council at the end of the exercise.**
- **There is also a Competing Facility mechanism that permits an income benchmarking exercise where a new council owned or sponsored competing facility opens within a 2.75 mile radius of Hengrove. Such income benchmarking would be conducted two years after the competing facility 'opened' and would typically be requested by the PFI contractor where such competition has undermined forecasted income levels at Hengrove.**
- **Any new operator at Jubilee Pool (including a community led trust) would provide the basis for the PFI contractor to call an income benchmarking exercise, although the risk would appear to be relatively low where the continued operation of Jubilee does not negatively impact current use of leisure services at Hengrove.**
- **However, any post COVID income benchmarking is likely to result in an increase in the Unitary Charge, as current leisure has been reduced for the foreseeable future. Any income at Jubilee Pool that transfers to Hengrove would help to mitigate the impact of a post COVID income**

benchmarking at Hengrove, by increasing revenues. For example, if all the current income from Jubilee transferred to Hengrove the additional payment the Council will likely need to make would decrease by approximately £300,000 per annum. This amount would, of course, vary with the percentage of income transferred.

REPLY

- Whilst there is a theoretical shortfall of pool water space projected in Bristol by 2026 this shortfall is not concentrated in any one specific area of the city. The greatest areas of unmet demand are concentrated around the central and central east area of the City.
- Some consideration has therefore been given to providing additional water space in and around Central / East Bristol however along with other challenges the costs in doing so have proved prohibitive.
- Work is frequently undertaken to ascertain appropriate levels of pool provision across the city and this will continue to be the case. In the meantime Hengrove leisure centre was built to serve a wide geographical area and has capacity to accommodate many more users from the Jubilee catchment area.

Question submitted by: Michele Tedder

The proposed closure of Jubilee Pool is inextricably linked with the Hengrove PFI contract. This is the root of the problems that Jubilee is facing - onerous clauses which prevent operation of a valuable and (pre- Covid) profitable community amenity. Residents would please like to know who originally made the important decisions about Hengrove PFI and when?

REPLY

- **An initial decision to progress with a PFI arrangement was taken at a 2008 cabinet meeting and the final project agreement was signed in April 2010 by the Lib-Dem administration.**

Subject: Roll out of Bike Hangars

Question submitted by: Julie Milton

Question to Councillor Dudd:

Can Councillor Kye Dudd please say how the council intends to roll out bike hangars fairly, and at the appropriate scale and speed in this multiple crisis?

Specifically, it would be helpful to know:

- how much funding from the Emergency Active Travel Fund and other sources the council has applied for
- how the council has estimated demand
- how many bike spaces the council hopes to deliver
- whether the council will proactively inform Bristol citizens about the bike hangars
- whether the council will provide hangars on high-density terraced streets as a matter of course
- how the council will ensure social justice in how hangars are rolled out
- what the timetable is for roll-out

REPLY:

- **At the time of writing we do not have confirmation of the funding we will receive from government (if at all) for cycle shelters**
- **Through WECA Bristol has submitted an ambitious bid to the DfT's Emergency Active Travel Fund to**
 - **improve existing temporary schemes in place,**
 - **fund improvements in neighbourhood areas to facilitate better walking and cycling links**
 - **Obtain funding for secure cycle storage.**
- **As with the previous rollout of bike shelters the council intends to gauge demand across the city via a comms campaign and fulfil as many requests as possible within the available funding**
- **If funding is secured the cycle shelters will be allocated on a 'needs basis' taking into account factors such as housing types, community support and access arrangements**

- **This prioritisation exercise will be subject to an Equality Impact Assessment to ensure that resources are allocated in a fair manner across the city**
- **The hangars will be subject to a procurement process but the council would hope to deliver between 12-20 hangars which will be installed in Spring/Summer next year.**
- **Further funding will be sought from WECA early 2021 for more cycle hangars**