

Cabinet Supplementary Information



Date: Thursday, 25 February 2021

Time: 4.00 pm

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

2. Public Forum
Statements and Questions

(Pages 3 - 42)

Issued by: Corrina Haskins, Democratic Services
City Hall, Bristol, BS1 9NE
E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk
Date: Thursday, 25 February 2021



CABINET – 25 February 2021

PUBLIC FORUM ITEMS

Statements and questions have been received as follows (full details are attached):

Agenda item 8 – Carbon Reduction Projects

Questions:

CQ08.01 Councillor Martin Fodor

Agenda item 9 – Bristol Bus Shelter Advertising Concession Agreement

Statements:

PS09.01 David Redgewell

Questions:

PQ09.01 Nicola Round, Adblock Bristol

Agenda item 10 - Reorganisation of Church of England Primary School Provision in Bristol City Centre

Statements:

PS01.01 Jen Smith
PS10.02 Kayleigh Mossop
CS10.01 Councillor Mark Wright (agenda item 11 also refers)

Questions:

PQ10.01&02 John Mossop
PQ10.03 Jen Smith
PQ10.04&05 Christine Townsend (agenda item 11 also refers)

Agenda item 11 - Proposal to close St Pius X Primary School

Questions:

PQ10.01 Jen Smith

Agenda item 12- Development of Hawkfield Business Park

None

Agenda item 13 - Southmead Regeneration

Statements:

CS13.01 Councillor Brenda Massey

Agenda item 14 - Lawrence Weston Community Hub

Statements

CS14.01	Councillor Don Alexander
CS14.02	Councillor Jo Sergeant
PS14.01	Mark Pepper

Agenda item 15 – Commissioning of Rough Sleeping Services

None

Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Statements

PS16.01	Gordon Richardson
PS16.02	Christina Biggs
PS16.03	Caroline Grazebrook
PS16.04	Melanie Watson, One City Transport Board
PS16.05	Andrew Lynch
PS16.06	Bristol West Chamber and Initiative
CS16.01	Councillor Jerome Thomas

Questions

PQ16.01&02	Tom Phipps
PQ16.03&04	Jennifer and Andrew Gibson
PQ16.05&06	Ed Plowden
PQ16.07	Susanna Day
PQ16.08	Lisa Stone
PQ16.09	Aileen McLoughlin
PQ16.10	Ani Stafford-Townsend, Chair of Christmas Steps Art Quarter Residents & Traders Association
PQ16.11&12	Stephen Wickham
CQ16.01	Councillor Don Alexander

Agenda item 17 – Budget Monitoring Outturn report P9

None

Agenda item 18 – Delivery of Cleaning and Security Services

Item withdrawn from the agenda

Agenda item 19 – Re-procurement of mobile voice and data contracts

None

Agenda item 20 - Reboot West Phase 2 – care leaver project extension

None

Agenda item 21 - Bristol Impact Fund 2

None

Agenda item 22- Covid 19 Rapid Testing Centre

None

Agenda item 23 - Substance Misuse Services Contact Extension

None

Agenda item 24 - Changing Futures Bid

None

Question: PQ08.01

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 8 - Carbon Reduction Projects


Question submitted by: Councillor Martin Fodor

I welcome the continued council commitment to renewable energy. The decades of work on this have paid off with the wind farm, PV projects and battery storage. I look forward to this continuing and the ambition increasing.

But I have concerns about the risks of the Heat Network related to price rises and outsourcing. The Winter Update from Fuel Poverty Action in London * reports the scandal over tariffs being charged, eg in Peabody flats and elsewhere in Tower Hamlets and the Eon scheme in Lambeth, plus Southwark.

As these examples in London show, the provision of heat supplies has to be very carefully managed and regulated.

Question: What steps will be taken to ensure any City Leap partner and the City Leap Board act in the best interests of tenants and other users, not just its own interests or to earn a return for the council?

*see Winter Update 2020-2021 
from : fuelpoverty-london-announce@lists.riseup.net

Statement: PS09.01

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 9 – Bristol Bus Shelter Advertising Concession Agreement

Statement submitted by: David Redgewell

We would like to raise the following issues; the extension to the contractor is welcomed and the restrictions on unhealthy food advertising, similar to the contract with Transport for London and the mayor on the city public transport network.

On the shelter we are concerned about cleaning and Covid 19 security standards, the repairing of Class maintenance of lighting for community safety issues; and working realtime information.

The design of shelters are very important with good seats and turning circle for wheelchairs with castle kerbs and drop kerbs. The metro bus shelter are passenger friendly and easy to use for wheelchair users, mother and father with buggies.

It we are to attract people back to bus and coach service across the city and county of Bristol and the Bristol and Bath city region, bus shelters must be of high quality design standards with dry rain proof shelters, good waiting areas, seating, lighting, passengers timetable information interchange, maps for other bus services, railway stations and ferry stops and Taxis stands; high cleanliness standards and maintenance and proper seating, not seating designed to prevent people sleeping on the bench.

We must update safe information and passengers timetables at Bus stops across the WECA mayoral transport authority and North Somerset council areas.

Bus stops and interchanges shelters which must be of good design and also have CCTV and litter bins.

Good quality bus shelter are part of WECA mayoral transport authority and North Somerset council's bus strategy and important in the recovery of good quality public bus services.

I also note that these shelters are at the main Taxi stands in Bristol city centre; and in future could be added to Ferry stops and Terminals.

The metro bus stops are of good quality design. We welcome the contract extension, on the new contract we would like to see public consultation with public transport users and the with Bristol Transport board and the WECA mayoral transport authority.

We believe in the future that bus shelters and infrastructure should be like Greater Manchester, West Yorkshire, West Midlands combined authority, be under the control of the WECA mayoral transport authority in the city and county of Bristol, South Gloucestershire, Banes and North Somerset council which must join WECA mayoral transport authority.

We note public bus services are now under the control of the WECA mayoral transport authority and metro mayor.

We also note the lack of equalities input by equalities officers into the equalities impact assessment.

Bus shelters have issues for disabled people and community safety issues of passengers and especially for single people, women BAME community and LGBTQ communities.

Please bring our statement to overview and scrutiny commission meeting 24th February 2021, 25th February cabinet meetings of Bristol city council.

Lucy Travis Somerset catch the bus campaign; David Redgewell, South West Transport Network; and Gordon Richardson, Chair, Bristol Disability Equalities Forum.

Question: PQ09.01

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 9 - Bristol Bus Shelter Advertising Concession Agreement

Question submitted by: Nicola Round, Adblock Bristol

Q1. I am pleased to see that the Council is planning to introduce a ban on advertising for High Fat, Sugar and Salt products in the forthcoming Advertising Policy, even though it won't be in place in time for this contract. Will the council consider adopting the other proposals presented by Adblock Bristol members at the November 2020 meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board?

These are:

- A planning policy on advertising, either as part of the Local Plan or as a standalone document, to assist the council in responding to new billboard applications anywhere in the city. (This was requested by members of Development Control A after a recent planning application.)
- An Advertising Policy to include not just junk food advertising but also - in line with the council's declaration of climate emergency - the advertising of 'high carbon' products such as airline flights, polluting cars and fossil fuel companies.
- The Council's public health team to lodge complaints with the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) where adverts breach existing ASA rules against junk food adverts being placed in settings with a high footfall of children and young people (e.g. on billboards near schools). Despite this rule having been in existence for some time, it is frequently breached by advertisers.

Q2. I am aware that parts of the Advertising Concession Agreement may be commercially sensitive, but within the bounds of what you can legally publish, please can you tell me what benefit the Council gains from the contract? I.e. whether ClearChannel covers 100% of the costs of constructing and maintaining bus stops; how much this amounts to per year approximately; and whether they cover any other costs, or whether there is any other income or saving to the Council.

Statement: PS10.01

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 - Reorganisation of Church of England Primary School Provision in Bristol City Centre

Statement submitted by: Jen Smith

Bristol does not have enough special school places. It does not have enough secondary places in Central East.

Finzels Reach, Castle Park, Frome Gateway, Broadmead, St Phillips, the City Centre and Hotwells are all places in and around Central Bristol seeing the current and future development of homes which will include families.

But here we are with Bristol City Council asking for approval to close two schools – St Michael's on the Mount C of E (VC) Primary School and St George C of E Primary School and all under the euphemism of 'reorganisation'.

We even have the closure St Pius X Roman Catholic Primary School in the very same meeting.

The purpose with the city centre schools is to close both and open one new one, but once schools no longer exist, it is incredibly hard to open new ones again.

The St George site though small, has a capacity for 105 pupils, not to be sniffed at during a school place crisis.

Papers to Cabinet state that 'The proposals will help to secure primary school provision in the city centre for the short to medium term.

They also state: 'The new school to be opened will also be under significant financial pressure if pupil numbers do not increase from the current combined total.'

It doesn't sound like a convincing plan for the future and the additional wishy-washy nature of the future of the St George building paints a worrying picture.

There is a significant lack of information in the Cabinet papers relating to the future of the St George building.

Papers state: 'It is hoped that the St George building can continue to provide education provision in some form in future.'

And: 'If the proposal is approved, the St George building would initially be considered for other education uses.'

Initially and hoped are smoke and mirrors and it's insulting to glaze over this fundamentally important aspect of the school closure.

It is not possible to properly scrutinise plans put forward due to a lack of information and those plans appear to have already decided that the new school will fail. Setting aside the upset that the closure of the St George site surely has on its pupils and the impact this will have on their education, that this site potentially could be lost when we have so many children and young people with Send desperately needing small schools with small classes, is shameful.

Statement: PS10.02

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 - Reorganisation of Church of England Primary School Provision in Bristol City Centre

Statement submitted by: Kayleigh Mossop

I am the current Chair of St George's PTA so have taken a big role in this process, making sure that all parents are aware of what is happening and trying to help them navigate through the process we have found ourselves in.

From the start we as parents have been excluded, the governors have made decisions that are in their best interest and ignored our parent governor representative. They dismissed her proposals and ideas for advertising and actively discouraged it.

From start to finish the whole process has been mismanaged, with the initial announcement and meeting causing a lot of parents to be so concerned about the fact that a decision had already been made and we were not going to be listened to, they left the school and added to the declining numbers. It appeared that this was done in a way to aid the outcome that the governors wanted from the start.

It then took several attempts by the parents to make sure that all of the meeting notes were being taken and that all letters sent out were being translated into the appropriate languages for our diverse community of parents at St George.

The way that the process has been managed has made it an impossible situation, we as parents have been on our own, with the governors making the decision and then the teaching staff having their hands tied as they are not wanting to jeopardise their jobs, they are unable to be a part of the campaign to help to save the school and their jobs. As parents we have no prior knowledge of how this process works and with the Governors themselves getting the process wrong is evidence at how impossible it has been for us. It all adds to the completely underhandedness of the whole process.

The Appendix A (ii) documents it states 8. As most pupils will be able to continue to walk to school there is no anticipated increase in car use caused by the proposals, but as we have said right from the start, it will take parents and children more than 20 minutes to navigate the busy streets of Bristol from the St George site, this is not from our homes, with some parents living only just in walking distance to St George currently. This will mean that those who do have access to a car will use them and add to the already congested city roads. With new charges for using cars being proposed this will also be a financial implication for parents too.

We are also very disappointed that the information seen recently in the local news about the current baby boom has not been included and considered within the decision making process. We know that Mr Ian Bell is aware of this as he was quoted in several of the articles. Surely it would be better to take a small deficit now and plan for the long term future of the children of Bristol city centre. This yet again is showing a shortsightedness and not thinking of the education and future of our children.

Question: CS10.01

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 - Reorganisation of Church of England Primary School Provision in Bristol City Centre (Agenda item 11 - Proposal to close St Pius X Primary School also refers)

Statement submitted by: Councillor Mark Wright

I write to give cautious support to the proposed merger of St George's and St Michael's schools. To be honest it is a shame that we've ended up here, because I feel that if things had been played differently over the last 20 years then both schools could have thrived. But mistakes over that time have led to the situation where this proposed option is almost certainly the best – possible the only – solution to the low pupil numbers that both have persistently faced. It is because this move has been proposed by the governing bodies, and because the schools have been operating successfully as a federation for a few years now, that I support the proposal. I was a governor at the school for 6 years from 2005-11 and remember well the shock and horror of the governing body of St George's when the Council announced out of the blue that it was going to forcibly close the school back in 2008. We fought a spirited campaign and defeated the Council. There were high hopes for the future and plans for expansion. Unfortunately, St Georges never really recovered after the aborted closure attempt. For several years after that, when the school could have been recovering and growing, instead pupil numbers declined – driven down first by continuing uncertainty over closure, second by a lack of necessary urgent building maintenance, and third by the unfortunate appointment of an extremely disruptive headteacher, who drove out most of the existing staff and alienated parents. The proposed new start for both schools on the St Michaels site requires the Council commitment and capital investment that the Council was never willing to provide to St George's. I hope that the administration will deliver for the future this time.

I urge the Cabinet to reject the closure of St Pius X school. With the other cabinet item closing St George's school it feels very much like Groundhog Day from 2008 here. St Pius X school was my own infant school, so naturally helped defend it from closure back then when the Council last proposed closure, when the two Labour councillors of the time had abandoned it. Again we were successful, which turned out to be just as well because an unexpected bulge of children appeared in the demographics a couple of years later and there was a shortage of places across much of the city. But much like St Georges, St Pius never really recovered from the aborted closure, because the necessary commitment was never provided by the Council. Being in special measures has been a heavy blow that has piled on the tragedy and should have been better handled, and low number continue to be a problem – although I'll point out that when I was at the school there was only about 100 pupils as well and we did just fine. With the proposed big wave of new homes coming in across south Bristol it seems inevitable that within a decade a new school will be being built within walking distance of this site, and we'll all wonder why the school was ever closed. So instead of closure, how about the Council properly commits to provide the support the school needs to succeed?

Question: PQ10.01&02

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 - Reorganisation of C of E Primary School Provision in Bristol City Centre

Question submitted by: John Mossop

1. There is a statement within the Decision pathway report that relates the 'short to medium term pupil numbers outlook' This seems contradictory to the longer term view as published by local media outlets which is expecting a baby boom. Can the council explain the balance of short vs long term and how this has not been considered as a part of the consultation and how the complete lack of support and publicity of both schools has led us to be at this juncture?

2. The report does not take into account any views of parent choice and/or travel situations relating to which school current pupils will attend. It appears to be expected that all current pupils will attend the new school on the St Michael's site and whilst it is acknowledged that the new school will not be full can the council comment on the break even point needed to make this viable along with the data analysed to conclude that most people will still be able to walk to school and there will be limited impact environmentally?

Question: PQ10.03

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 - Reorganisation of Church of England Primary School Provision in Bristol City Centre

Question submitted by: Jen Smith

What are the exact plans for St George CE Primary School building, land and playground when it closes? – without using ‘initially’ and ‘hoped’ type answers.

Question: PQ10.04&05

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 - Reorganisation of Church of England Primary School Provision in Bristol City Centre (agenda item 11 - Proposal to close St Pius X Primary School also refers)

Question submitted by: Christine Townsend

- 1) How is this administration planning to use the released resource of the St George and St Pius X primary school sites to meet the needs of children living in the city with SEND in September 2021?
- 2) What are the land/building ownership relationships for VC and VA schools?

Question: PQ11.03

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Proposal to close St Pius X Primary School

Question submitted by: Jen Smith

What are the exact plans for St Pius X Primary School building, land and playground when it closes?

Statement: CS13.01

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 13 - Southmead Regeneration

Statement submitted by: Cllr Brenda Massey

I am submitting this statement to show my full support for the proposed regeneration of the Arnside Road/Glencoyne Square area in Southmead. As one of the ward Councillors and a member of the Southmead Development Trust, I have been fully involved in the proposals for a number of years. I am proud to say that the amount of public consultation on the proposals has been extraordinary, and very illuminating.

We realised a few years ago that Southmead (as one of the early Council estates) is lucky to have many council houses with larger spaces and gardens. This is a great bonus for families, but can be more of a burden as people age. Some of our tenants have lived in the area for most of their lives, but are now finding that the upkeep is becoming a problem and whilst they really want to remain in the area, they would like a smaller, easier to maintain home.

The majority of Meaders are proud of their area and want to stay in the locality near to their friends and families. Building new smaller housing units could provide that opportunity, and release the larger properties for young families to enjoy.

Over the last few years we have spent a lot of time working with Council officers discussing designs and what local people would like to see on the site. The priorities include improving the local shops with a wider range of choices, having good transport links including cycle lanes, and a key priority is to have a new library which will allow access to all residents, as the current one is very difficult for disabled people to use, and has restricted opening hours. Having extended opening hours will allow children to work there after school, and provide computer access for local people who need to apply for jobs, etc.

Building a new Health Centre has also been added to the plan, as the current one has outgrown it's present site, and is no longer fit for purpose.

Another consequence of the new build is the installation of SUDS to provide better drainage and prevent the flooding that is a threat in the area. Work on an improved children's play area is also anticipated. Work is already underway on improving the road layout and better parking by the shops.

Involving and listening to the community has been a major factor in the proposals before you today, and I hope that you will fully support the plans which have had so much input and support from local people.

Statement: PS14.01

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 14 – Lawrence Weston Community Hub

Statement submitted by: Mark Pepper, Ambition Lawrence Weston

Following our inception in 2012, the residents that make up Ambition Lawrence Weston Development Trust, have been delivering a massive amount of work to ensure we develop a sustainable, cohesive, and well-balanced community.

This work has included delivering a 10-year resident written Community Plan, and a Neighbourhood Development Plan.

We have influenced, welcomed, and improved many proposed housing developments, applied for and attracted millions of pounds of investment, facilitated 3 new play parks, highways and public realm improvements, ensured the future of the local youth centre, facilitated a new supermarket to come to the area, as well as distributing thousands of pounds of funding to smaller organisations and individual residents in need.

We have supported and mobilised many other local residents to form several different groups of interest to deliver benefits locally and city wide, including a crafts and men in sheds workshop, a community shop, litter picking group, gardening group, community library, climate action group, planning forum, ALW Network group, to mention just a few, and are now about to embark on delivering a climate action plan for the area.

We have supported BCC depts with free and low cost venue hire and support, became a BCC Covid Hub delivering support to local area, helped with many BCC agendas and projects, secured planning approval for a community owned wind turbine, we are also developing a 38 affordable homes project, facilitated and financed a successful £1.2 million coastal communities fund application, and provided match funding to enable the successful highways departments Challenge Fund application, that brought £14million of highways improvements to the Avonmouth and wider area.

The above is just a small sample of the benefits that communities can deliver when well supported by the local authority and other stakeholders.

Therefore, we implore you to agree to providing the funding needed to allow us to carry on delivering this work, through the realisation of a new Community Hub Building, as this will then enable us to carry on creating a well-balanced, sustainable and cohesive community for Lawrence Weston residents and others.

Statement: CS14.01

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 14 – Lawrence Weston Community Hub

Statement submitted by: Cllr Don Alexander

This decision is extremely welcome and will enable the community of Lawrence Weston (which suffers from high levels of deprivation) to have a modern, centrally-located hub for all kinds of activities. Sadly, the large plot next to this, also central to the community, was sold by the previous Mayor to Persimmon Homes and we've now lost that apart from the usual planning controls. Nevertheless, the new hub and the new surgery building at the other end of Ridingleaze will contribute greatly to regenerating the heart of Lawrence Weston - further evidence of this administration's commitment to all parts of the city. Thank you.

Statement: CS14.02

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 14 – Lawrence Weston Community Hub

Statement submitted by: Cllr Jo Sergeant

I am delighted that approval of support for the Lawrence Weston Community Hub has finally been brought to cabinet, resulting in a 35 year lease and a £1million grant. I would like to thank the Mayor and relevant cabinet members (both past and present) for getting us to this point after five years.

However it does raise the question of why it has taken so long and what we can learn from this experience to help similar projects progress more efficiently.

My residents would also appreciate a similarly positive resolution to the issue of the Kings Weston footbridge, which has been out of commission for over five years.

Statement: PS16.01

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Statement submitted by: Gordon Richardson

Whilst we welcome the clean air Zone in Bristol city centre. It is very important to Clean up the city air with 135 deaths a year for respiratory illness in the from poor air quality caused by motor vehicles.

In Bristol we have major south west regional Hospitals in the city at the Bristol Royal infirmary, Bristol children's hospital, Bristol heart institute and Bristol Dental hospital. It is very important to have good air quality around the hospital complex and a Green travel plan.

We welcome the charging of dirty vehicles entering the city centre.

We need of course to Improve sustainable transport and public transport in the city region the showcase bus service will help between Cribbs Causeway bus station 2 2a service to Stockwood via Southmead Henleaze Clifton down station City centre Broadmead Bristol Temple meads railway station Knowle Hengrove and Stockwood. We would like to the 2a operated from Southmead hospital bus station.

Others showcase bus routes are planned across the city region in the future with first group west of England buses are 1 Cribbs causeway, bus station to Brentry, Henbury, Westbury on Trym, Clifton Down station, City centre Broadmead Bristol Temple meads station Arnos Vale, Broomhill, Brislington, 75 cribbs causeway bus station to Patchway, Filton, Horfield, Bishopston Cheltenham Road, for Montpelier station, Stokes Croft, city centre , Bedminster station , parson street station Bishopworth Highridge ,withywood, Hartcliffe, Hengrove, Hospital.

76 Cribbs causeway bus station southmead, southmead hospital bus station. Henleaze Clifton down station park street, Broadmead Bedminster railway station Bedminster, parson street Bishopworth, Highridge, Hartcliffe Hengrove hospital bus interchange

Other routes will follow in the bus deal between WECA mayoral transport authority and Bristol city council and south Gloucestershire council.

Other public transport improvements measures include improved Train services between Severn Beach st Andrew's road ,Avonmouth Dock Portway parkway Park and Ride new station and transport interchange shirehampton ,sea mills ,Clifton down station Redland ,montpellier , Stapleton road Lawrence hill station Bristol Temple meads proposed new station ,Anne's Park station,keynsham Salford Proposed new station ,Oidfield park Bath spa Freshford, Avoncliffe ,Bradford on Avon,Trowbridge ,Westbury with some train s to Dillton marsh and warminster or Frome.

New train service is due to start this December 2021 along with Portway parkway Station.

A new Park and ride service is due to open in 2021 2022 at Yate with a Express bus service by first group lynx buses to the city centre Y1. Via A420 Ring Road and Bristol city centre.

And a railway service from Yate Railway station to Bristol Stapleton road Lawrence hill and Bristol Temple meads

Other important areas to clean up the city's area include Removing of Traffic from the old city. Bristol Bridge bus gate walking and cycling route .Baldwin street and Victoria street restrictions and Cumberland road with local access.

We would like to see Park street as a Public transport walking and cycling corridor with access by car only to the shops ,museum ,Music centre, business and homes . Other important issues to is access for Coaches to on schedule services to Bristol Bond street coach terminal and Bristol bus and coach station.

Megabus and falcon part of stagecoach Group operate Express and Region Coaches services from Bristol as does National Express Coaches from Bristol bus and coach station.

Eurolines operate from Bond street to Poland and Hungary.

All the service Coaches are Euro 6 but duplication service are not and we do not want region coach service charge as these provide vital links across south west England .especially Towns and cities without Railway stations.

Has the Western gateway Transport board and south west Transport board been consulted on the Coaches issue

With the confederation of passengers transport and Road Haulage association Coach operators group.

On railway replacement service these are run for the Department for transport and Network rail By First group west of England for First group,Great western railway and South western railway and others service for Cross country trains German state railway.

Theses are for schedule Engineering work like re building Bristol Temple meads station and east entrance.

Works on East junction. Metro west works to Bristol Temple meads station to pill and portishead line or the Henbury Ashey Down station ,Filton North and Henbury station line and loop..

All these projects will require line closures and first group to run rail replacement service s most will be euro 6 engine s with full disability access.

But in an emergency railway will be closed due to bad weather train breakdown s incident s where track are closed and Coaches are brought in and first group can not use it own euro 6 bus and coach fleet no euro 6 Coaches maybe used with wheelchair access.

We would request a full exemption for Railway replacement service.

Which the Department regulation need to be fully accessible by September 2021although at present good reason need to be given to the Department for transport for not operating none complaint vehicle now .

We were shock at the Department Government owned Road company Highway England who were given exemption where the the motorway network closes for a

emergency or motorway maintenance was given a exemption to charging for vehicles through Bristol to pollute the city centre and the hospital air by dirty diesel lorries and cars through the city centre

But the the Departments of Transport Network Rail western routes will be charged at £100 per coach for Emergency Railway replacement service's.
We believe that Public transport users on railway replacement service Coaches should be exempted.

We wish to see time given to stagecoach west buses to be given a years exemption to fit euro 6 engine conversion to its fleet based in its Bristol Depot in patchway.
A number of route operators for the weca mayoral transport authority.
Route 13 city centre Bristol Royal infirmary, Bishopton ,Henleaze southmead hospital bus station southmead west of Trym to sea mills and shirehampton.
Service from south Bristol via the city centre, some service via Clifton Henleaze, Filton,Patchway to Aztec west
Or via Cheltenham Road and Bishoston
Gloucester Road to Filton Patchway and Aztec west.
Public transport transport users should not have to paid higher fares for this clean air zone.
Exemption should be made for hospital visits. and weca mayoral transport authority should urgently improve bus service to the Bristol Royal infirmary hospital complex with first group stagecoach west and university hospital trust Bristol and Weston super mare.
and a green travel plan.

Exemption should be for One year only on low income s to replace their car with euro 6 engines .
Especially working Class people on low incomes should have grant aid for replacement vehicles or Public transport credits for tickets.
The disabled exemption for Blue badge holders cause us mayor concern with a Region hospital complex and key region service for the west country .
Main public service are provided from Bristol .
We have a weca mayoral transport authority area with North Somerset council. and a North Somerset Bristol and south Gloucestershire clinical commission group area.
Disabled people are referred to Hospital from Bath, Swindon Wiltshire clinical commission group areas and from the rest of the south west region.
Why should disabled people from Devon Cornwall Somerset Dorset Gloucestershire,and Wiltshire be charged for visiting Bristol hospitals and city centre.
have to pay
The city and county of Bristol is a small part of the Bristol, Bath city region.
Blue badge holder should not be charged .we welcome exemption for community transport vehicles.

Breaking down freight loads is very important to prevent HGV entering the city centre.
On Tourist Coaches this is a major concern as we are a west country city and Tourism is worth £1.4 Billion Pounds a year and 6000 job pre covid 19 .

We must discuss coach access to Bristol city centre with no coach park or station in the city centre.

Bath has coach parking at odd Down park and ride and First group Weston island depot.

No coach parking is allowed at Bristol park and ride sites or the long Ashton park and ride in North Somerset council area .

This issue need addressing as does the school coach service which needs exemption to upgrade Coaches because wheelchair access to schools Coaches become law in July 2021.

One year exemption are required for Coaches on school service s.

Exemption and Grant's need to be worked out with the Taxi trade.

The council should work with NHS south west Ambulance service to clean up the ambulance fleet and NHS staff vehicles.

A large numbers of NHS Doctors and nurses are pushing for the clean air zone and is to be welcomed but the NHS trusts in Bristol for the south west region need to clean up their vehicles fleet.

We welcome the clean air zone in Bristol we need to reduce dirty vehicles entering the city centre work with the city region WECA and North Somerset council which must join WECA mayoral transport authority.

To improve Public transport network. Of this involves park and Ride sites being built in south Gloucestershire county council area .at cribbs causeway top of the m32 in Yate station car parking at Severn Beach station and Patchway station.

Coach based park and ride at Fairfield.

and new station on the Henbury line and Charfield stations. on the Gloucester line.

South Gloucestershire local plan consultation finish on 4th march 2021 .

In Banes new park and ride sites are required at whitchurch and Hickgate to Replace Brislington park and ride.

With bus priority lanes on the A4 and A37.

Push the Department for transport for Electrification of the chippenham to Bristol Temple and Taunton main line through Bristol and up to Bristol parkway and patchway.

To electrify the Henbury loop Severn Beach line and Portishead line .

To remove dirty Diesel trains from the city region and Bristol city centre.

Consultation on the Bath transport plan finish on the 1st march 2021.

We are pleased that Bristol city council is working closely with Banes in the clean air zone and learning from Bath scheme which goes live on the 15th March 2021.

It is very very important that we charge dirty vehicles entering the city centre with pollution and dirty air cost lives and respiratory illnesses.

We urge the council to move forward with this plan for charging from Oct 2021 as there is legal Action by client Earth against the uk Government and the city council.

To make one year exemption to the scheme with grants and address the Coaches and railway replacement service issue.

To be careful on polls that are carried out which have not been carried out by city council officers on the public Transport network due to covid 19 .

On the clean air zone it is very important to day that Bristol put in a clean area zone in the City centre and charges like Bath in the city centre from October 2021.

A lot more still has to be done to clean up the city air quality and this is a start.

We must remove dirty vehicles from Bristol city centre.

Statement: PS16.02

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Statement submitted by: Christina Biggs, BCAA steering group member

Summary

Bristol Clean Air Alliance (BCAA) supports the current proposal for a Small Area Clean Air Zone Class D (all vehicles) on the basis that the purpose is for:

- reducing the illegal levels of air pollution in the centre of Bristol to legal levels under lockdown;
- reducing traffic congestion and carbon emissions;
- improving access for pedestrians and safer cycling through the centre;
- reducing bus journey delays and therefore incentivising the use of public transport
- contributing to better safety, security and health for residents and visitors to the city centre;
- improving quality of life and creating a healthier environment.

Background

BCAA have supported the Bristol City Council's previous proposal in November 2019 of a Small area Diesel Ban as arguably (and demonstrated as such by the computer traffic modelling) more effective than a charging clean air zone, and lament that the central government Joint Air Quality Unit (JAQU) did not see fit to grant the necessary change in legislation. However, we have also been sympathetic to the needs of small businesses and understand the dilemma facing Bristol City Council as they seek to balance the needs of all Bristol's citizens.

Other measures for attaining clean air

BCAA views the general strategy of roadspace removal as a positive step for Bristol, as this is economically fairer than a clean air zone and arguably could deliver better air quality due to the inherent danger of vehicle drivers having the freedom to pay to pollute. It also has the benefit of allowing buses to run more punctually as they will not be caught as much in the road congestion, and this will encourage more people to take the bus to work. However we recognise that a charging Clean Air Zone, given the opportunity for government funding, will be more effective in the short term.

BCAA recognises that the Bristol Bridge bus gate is only the first step in achieving enough roadspace removal to deliver legal air quality, but that the location of Bristol Bridge is sufficiently strategic to deliver a significant long-term change from introducing just this intervention, after allowing motorists to experience delays in the short term and hopefully changing their journeys for less polluting ones. We recognise the exasperation felt by business delivery drivers in particular when the measures were first brought in, but urge Bristol City Council to continue the Bristol

Bridge trial past the end of the current lockdown – and in conjunction with the new Clean Air Zone – to ensure a continuing improvement in Bristol’s air quality.

It is unfortunate that one effect of the lockdown has been to deter citizens from using public transport and this has led to significantly higher vehicle traffic levels than expected. We believe it is important, therefore, that these experimental roadspace removal changes are continued for a further period of at least six months to enable proper evaluation of their effect when city-centre movements have returned to more typical levels. We are aware that there has been opposition to both the Bristol Bus Gate and the charging Clean Air Zone, so we recommend that BCC should message the big picture, especially the potential gains to air quality and the possibility of the charging clean air zone becoming unnecessary in the longer term as travel habits shift towards active and public transport, and promote the use of cargo electric bicycles and electric delivery vans.

As a vital “carrot” to the “stick” of road traffic restrictions we would like BCC to ensure that the West of England Combined Authority (WECA) delivers the long-awaited MetroWest Phase 1A half-hour service from Avonmouth to Westbury in the December 2021 timetable. In the longer term we would like to see BCC support WECA with MetroWest Phase 2 to Henbury and Gloucester, and to fast-forward the WECA mass transit plans as an overground light rail network that displaces car traffic and leads to further improvements in air and noise quality in the whole of Bristol and the travel to work area. With this as the goal, we would further urge BCC and WECA to implement workplace charging levies and further roadspace removal plans.

Technical note

One metric of air quality that has been little talked about is the total NO_x (and particulate) air pollution over the whole of Greater Bristol. We would continue to urge BCC to monitor air pollution and continue to track this crucial metric as this will translate directly into the number of excess deaths per year, currently the much better known figure of 300.

Extending the Clean Air Zone concept to particulate pollution

Although the current government directive for a clean air zone is solely focused on nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), we would also commend that the concept of Clean Air Zone be extended to include particulates, particularly from domestic and restaurant woodburning stoves, now reported as the highest contributor to particulate air pollution in the UK and responsible for 168 of the 300 premature deaths are due to PM_{2.5}. Traffic is only responsible for 13% of PM_{2.5}, whereas domestic solid fuel is responsible for 38% of PM_{2.5} and the remaining 49% is from industrial combustion.

An immediate enforcement of the existing regulations on burning wood in domestic wood burners and in the hospitality trade would be welcomed, as well as immediate steps towards a total ban. The place of wood-burners is in the countryside and the citizens of Bristol should be made aware that to receive the benefits of a modern and culturally thriving city they should accept the responsibility for those other citizens downwind of their chimneys.

Statement: PS16.03

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Statement submitted by: Caroline Grazebrook

I am writing to confirm my support for the proposed Clean Air Zone CAZ which is being considered at the committee meeting on 25 Feb but would like to make a couple of comments regarding the details of the proposed draft boundary plan for CAZ D zone

I am writing about Granby Hill BS8 where I am a long suffering resident with the traffic and fumes.

Looking at the details of the proposed signs for the notices on the City Engineers map E19015 - C-DZ038 I can see that the CAZ starts half way up Granby Hill, at the junction with Hope Chapel Hill and Victoria Terrace. This means that HGVs will continue to use this narrow hill and potentially get stuck or try to turn around half way down the hill to avoid entering the CAZ thus exasperating an existing problem.

There is an existing weight restriction to Granby Hill with 5 ton signs located at the top and bottom of the hill. We have an ongoing problem of large HGV's ignoring the 5 Ton weight restrictions at the top of the hill and coming down Granby Hill as they are unable to negotiate the chicanes of Hope Chapel Hill so continue down to the bottom trying to pass by my house where the road is particularly tight between the buildings and parked cars. Cars have been damaged and also sides of a house.

The proposal is to remove the 5 ton sign at the junction of Victoria Terrace with Granby Hill which suggests that lorries might be encouraged to avoid entering the CAZ by turning left up Victoria Terrace which itself is narrow and then navigating a hair pin bend around Windsor Terrace to Windsor Place. This appears to be impossible and lorries will just get stuck!

I would like to suggest two points:

1. The CAZ boundary starts at the top of the hill to discourage lorries coming down in the first place. Here the road is wide enough for a lorry to tun around at end of York Gardens.
2. The 5 ton weight sign is retained at the bottom of Victoria Terrace.

I am not sure about the future of the 5 ton sign at the bottom of Granby Hill but it needs to be visually reinforced so can not be easily ignored. Similarly, the sign at the top of the hill needs to be retained and possibly an additional sign erected to give drivers advance notice of the limit before they get too close to the top of the hill.

I hope that you will consider and support these proposals.

Statement: PS16.04

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Statement submitted by: Melanie Watson, Co- Chair Bristol Transport Board,

At our Board Meeting on 18th February, the One City Transport Board considered the proposed Clean Air Zone.

As a Board we recognise the need to improve Air Quality in Bristol which will benefit the residents of Bristol, improve their health outcomes and meet the legal requirements and comply with the government's direction.

We broadly support the implementation of a Clean Air Zone 'D' for the central area as proposed subject to further detailed work and the funding of the proposed mitigation measures. Reducing traffic in the inner zone will bring benefits to air quality and people's health and can enable greater use of sustainable travel options such as walking, cycling and public transport.

We recognise that any restrictions and charges will affect different groups in different ways and welcome the proposed mitigations. There is a balance to achieve between incentivising changes to behaviours and not penalising certain communities or groups. Providing grants, loans, mobility credits and / or additional time to adapt are welcome. We would like to see further work on the detail of the mitigation plans and recognise that such measures are dependent on funding being secured.

We would be happy to work with the Council to help develop and support bids for funding mitigation measures. In particular we feel the following measures are important and welcome further detailed work before the planned implementation:

- A broad communication programme to the general public explaining the need and benefits of the Clean Air Zone and wider measures and proactive engagement of local and business communities;
- Enabling behavioural change which leads to less travel overall, and greater use of walking, cycling and public transport to get around;
- Exemptions or funding support (mobility credits) for lower income and deprived groups who have older vehicles and are often key workers
- Grants for retro-fitting older non-compliant buses and coaches used on socially important subsidised, school and rail replacement services;
- Targeted exemptions / targeted funding support for those least able to afford to change their more polluting vehicles or travel patterns into or through the proposed Clean Air Zone;
- Linking up the Clean Air Zone to the wider Bristol Transport Plan, Climate Emergency Action Plan and Covid-19 Economic Recovery Plan so the measures are joined up, connected, comprehensive and complimentary.

Statement: PS16.05

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Statement submitted by: Andrew Lynch

Proposed CAZ signs at Granby Hill/Hope Chapel Hill DZ38/39

As a longtime local resident, I would draw your attention to the proposed signage at the junction of Granby Hill and Victoria Terrace, which is listed in the background items under

E19015-C-DZ038 Granby Hill & DZ039 Hope Chapel Hill, item 16

This item suggests that the weight limit sign on the verge at Victoria Terrace will be removed.

It seems that this will push traffic (and in particular lorries) that don't wish to enter the CAZ back up through Victoria Terrace and then Windsor Place.

It would be simpler and safer to start the CAZ at the top of Granby Hill.

That would give vehicles plenty of space to turn around, as well as not introduce overweight lorries into an area which in the past has been spared these vehicles.

Statement: PS16.06

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Statement submitted by: Bristol West Chamber and Initiative

Bristol Clean Air Plan

Business West and Bristol Chamber of Commerce and Initiative is broadly supportive of the introduction of a Clean Air Zone. We absolutely recognise the harm that pollution causes to our residents and visitors, and the legal obligation the Council is under to address this issue. We take this issue very seriously and have been supportive of a smaller CAZ D since 2019, thinking it a better and more targeted option than a diesel ban, and with less negative economic harmful side effects than a larger CAZ zone would create. We believe it is important that all forms of polluting vehicles are targeted, including private cars in order to reduce pollution as effectively as possible.

However we have the following concerns around the details of design and its implementation:

- Firstly: the inclusion of key routes for city and city region movement, particularly North-South and East-West. This is particularly important for Bristol, given the lack of a complete orbital road system, and the high levels of ‘through traffic’ for city and city regional journeys. We are concerned inclusion of important through routes will lead to significant displacement of traffic and pollution into inappropriate residential roads. Our concerns focus on the inclusion of Temple Way through to the M32 and in particular the inclusion of the Portway, Cumberland Bridge and Brunel Way.
- Secondly, whether the mitigation package will be adequate, particularly for smaller biz and LGVs and HGVs. We continue to encourage Bristol to secure a significant and ambitious package of grants and loans, which are targeted on lower income small and local businesses who may struggle to adapt, given their LGV and HGV fleets and the strain many are under post Covid. This includes a ‘hardship fund’ for struggling businesses to use.
- Finally we are concerned by the very tight timescale for the overall schedule to implementation, including distribution of mitigation funds. There is very little time to establish the infrastructure, the funding mechanisms and the needed time for business awareness and adaptation for an end of Oct go live date. Many businesses will struggle with this timetable and there is a significant communication challenge to properly explain the new measures particularly given the measures are fixed around a very narrow compliance requirement. We are also worried that the market provision of say ‘retro fit’ isn’t strong enough to deal with the level of local demand this will create over a compressed six month period.

Our single largest concern is that the smaller CAZ D zone includes the lower part of the Portway, Plimsoll Bridge and the upper part of Brunel Way.

The inclusion of this vital North-South route will negatively impact significant levels of traffic that is not going into Bristol City Centre and just wants to go round and past it. This traffic has no direct pollution impact on the central parts of the city that are currently breaching legal thresholds. We are worried that its inclusion will lead to significant displacement of traffic. We are also concerned about its potential negative impact on south Bristol – both for workers moving to Avonmouth and to jobs on the 'north fringe' of the city, but also its impact on commercial and investment demand in areas of south Bristol which have historically struggled to attract commercial occupiers in competition with more accessible parts of the city region. These measures are also being proposed to be implemented at a time of unprecedented economic challenge as a consequence of the pandemic when many businesses and their workers are under severe financial pressures – and the measures will send out a negative message in business terms. We understand that the inclusion of the Portway is a function of a form of transport modelling which central government has instructed Bristol to use, not due to the direct pollution impact of these roads. We believe this inclusion is disproportionate and want to work with Bristol City Council to raise these concerns directly with central government.

We request these concerns are raised with government and welcome the opportunity for a continued dialogue.

Statement: PS16.05

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Statement submitted by: Councillor Jerome Thomas

The proposed Clean Air Zone is an essential step in reducing the 300 deaths per year in Bristol linked to illegal air quality. As the evidence has suggested since the beginning of this process, charging vehicles is required for the reduction in pollution that is needed.

People in Bristol could have been better prepared for the Clean Air Zone charges and other elements of the scheme. Bristol's mayor, Marvin Rees could have spent less time trying to avoid the scheme in the first place and more time preparing to do it well. Bristol Green Party have been arguing for a number of years that a charging zone was required*. We understand people need plenty of time to change vehicles or to plan adjustments in their travel routines, and businesses need certainty about the future. This kind of advance notice and planning is what has happened in other cities including Bath and Birmingham.

Now that we have the proposals for the scheme, discussions are taking place in the council, led by the scrutiny committee and in the cabinet to ensure that the scheme is as well designed as possible. The precise boundaries of the scheme may not yet be correct and need to be looked at carefully, including after implementation of the initial scheme. There will be an inevitable element of air quality 'whack a mole' as drivers with older non-compliant vehicles seek to avoid the charging zone. Minor changes to the area covered by the Clean Air Zone may be necessary, along with support for the neighbouring areas. This will help reduce damaging knock on impacts such as worsened air quality, speeding and dangerous parking while ensuring that legal air quality is achieved in the fastest possible time.

The final level of funding from the Government for mitigation and transition measures is yet to be agreed. This funding should be used to avoid unnecessary financial hardship, support necessary changes in public transport provision and invest in active travel infrastructure to give people genuine alternatives to polluting vehicle use. Our asks to Government for funding need to be clear and well argued, and we would hope that Government responds supportively given the severity of the crisis and the lack of local government money.

There may be specific tweaks and exemptions needed in other elements of the Clean Air Zone arrangements. I understand that drivers with disabilities or registered disabled vehicles will be exempt from the charges if they reside in Bristol, and not if they live in the Bristol conurbation but in a different local authority.

In summary the charging Clean Air Zone is essential to reduce avoidable deaths and improve the health of people in the city. We now need to finalise exemptions from the scheme, agree the length of any transition period, maximise the level of government funding and agree the best way to spend that government money.

Question: PQ16.01

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Question submitted by: Tom Phipps

I understand that the proposed Clean Air Zone in the city will mean that parts of Southville and Bedminster including Coronation Road will be included in the charging zone.

I welcome the overarching ambition to tackle air pollution in the city, but could the relevant Cabinet Member:

- i) Outline what assessments have been undertaken to ensure that the inclusion of Coronation Road in the charging zone will not have an adverse impact on air pollution in the residential streets to the south of Coronation Road where residents have been working to create Liveable Neighbourhoods and reduce rat-running in the area?
- ii) Outline what provisions and exemptions will be made to ensure that residents can continue to access local businesses and services e.g. shops, doctors, nurseries on (and around) Coronation Road without being charged?

Question: PQ16.03&04

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Questions submitted by: Jennifer and Andrew Gibson

1) The Southville area is on the very edge of the clean air zone, with an obvious 'avoidance' routes running along North St, West St and Winterstoke Road. What is being considered to minimise the impact on Southville and other bordering areas, particularly bearing in mind the number of primary schools in the area that would benefit from a clean air zone, but now instead seem likely to bear the brunt of an increased number of polluting vehicles using alternative routes to avoid the clean air zone?

2) Has any consideration been given to the prohibitive effect that these charges would have for central schools and nurseries when it comes to the operation of, for example, minibuses? Redcliffe Nursery School, for example, operates a minibus taking small groups of city centre children out to the forest on a daily basis. It seems highly unlikely that the nursery would be able to afford to update its current minibus given the funding difficulties that it already has, and charging them for use of its minibus would make these trips prohibitively expensive, reducing children's ability to get out into the clean air outside the city - rather ironically!

Question: PQ16.05&06

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Questions submitted by: Ed Plowden

The report identifies that many areas on the edge of the proposed Clean Air Zone will suffer from increased traffic, and whilst the percentages are small, these often residential areas already suffer from significant congestion and poor air quality, so this is of considerable concern to many people. It is inevitable that some problems will emerge, whether identified by the modelling or not, and holistic local responses will be needed.

Q1. There is no proposal in the report for mitigating the effect on local areas especially those adjacent to the CAZ. Presuming that surplus income will be ringfenced and made available for investment in transport, will funding for residential areas and the roads around schools on the edge of the CAZ that are adversely affected be a top priority for the use of surplus funds?

Q2. It is not clear from the modelling whether the impact of additional motorists seeking to park on the edge of the CAZ has been taken into effect, including the circulation involved in finding a place. In any case, if re-elected will the Mayor be allowing parking controls, such as residents parking, to be installed in areas close to the CAZ where they are needed and relaxing the currently impossibly high bar which acts as an obstacle to making local progress in controlling parking?

Question: PQ16.07

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Questions submitted by: Susanna Day

How will the council avoid the increased air pollution and associated illnesses and deaths when all motorway traffic from the West and North of the city is diverted away from non-residential roads designed to take it (A38, A4044, A4032) to the residential areas along the B4051 Ashely Road - residential areas with a high proportion of deprived and BAME population, and several new large residential developments?

Question: PQ16.08

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Question submitted by: Lisa Stone

I very much support the council with the introduction of a Clean Air Zone, and I feel that the air quality in Bristol is a absolute scandal, that the council have been exposing the citizens of Bristol to this pollution, which they have known about and been taken to task over for many years now. However, I am concerned about the Windmill Hill area, would say that the air quality in this ward needs to be seriously considered.

I have looked at the CAZ proposal, and on the bases that the Cumberland road will fall into this Zone I feel that this would push many polluting vehicle to travel along St John's Lane, the closest direct parallel road, between the A4/A36 and the A38. St John's Lane is already a busy, polluted road and the additional commercial vehicles will exasperate the situations and make it unbearable for the local residents. I would like to ask if the council has a traffic management plan for this area to help relieve the situation and if not a citizens compensations proposal in place for the residents of St John's Lane and the adjoining areas?

Question: PQ16.09

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Question submitted by: Aileen McLoughlin

I live in Knowle and will be standing as a candidate for Windmill Hill in May. I know that residents in both these wards want reassurances that roads neighbouring the CAZ D will not suffer from worsening Air Quality due to displaced traffic.

I know that modelling is reassuring that expected vehicle upgrades and changes in travel behaviour will compensate for any displaced traffic and there is no evidence to suggest worsening Air Quality in areas adjoining the CAZ. We need to be set up to verify that when the scheme is introduced.

With several Primary schools like Victoria Park Primary, Parson Street Primary, Hillcrest Primary and St Mary Redcliffe Primary in our area it is a priority to closely monitor air quality near schools and on major routes such as St Johns Lane, Bedminster Road, Wells Road and Bath Road.

I am sure the same will apply in all wards across the City - can this be put in place and what measures are planned to offer reassurance to residents?

Question: PQ16.10

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Question submitted by: Ani Stafford-Townsend, Chair of Christmas Steps Art Quarter Residents & Traders Association

Regarding the implementation of the CAZ, what real and tangible support will be given to the already struggling independent businesses in and immediately next to the zone?

Exemptions are available for blue badge holders and residents for the first year, what will happen to these groups after the first year?

Question: PQ16.11&12

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Question submitted by: Stephen Wickham

Whilst welcoming the CAZD in principle the emphasis has changed from a diesel ban, in first round consultation to hitting Euro 3 petrol , which MAY emit less NOX than real-world use of many Euro 6 diesels. (Slide in consultation 2)

Question:

1. What status will petrol cars registered to the disabled tax class have ? (re CAZ D charges)
2. Will arrangements for those cars registered inside the CAZD differ from those outside? (as I've yet to find guidance in published papers pre deadline)

Question: PQ16.01

Cabinet – 25th February 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Improving Public Health - Bristol Clean Air Zone Update

Question submitted by: Councillor Don Alexander

A resident of Sea Mills is concerned that the signs for the CAZ on the Portway (southbound) will advise vehicles heading towards Bristol that the junction with Sylvan Way and into Sea Mills is their last chance to leave the A4 and avoid payment. Whilst Sea Mills welcomes visitors to its many attractions, could the Cabinet Member offer me clear assurance that the signage on the Portway will not encourage speculative attempts to use Sylvan Way as a rat run to avoid the CAZ?
Thanks.