

Cabinet

Supplementary Information



Date: Tuesday, 13 July 2021

Time: 4.00 pm

Venue: The Council Chamber - City Hall, College Green, Bristol, BS1 5TR

2. Public Forum

(Pages 3 - 33)

Issued by: Corrina Haskins, Democratic Services

City Hall, Bristol, BS1 9NE

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

Date: Monday, 12 July 2021



Cabinet Public Forum

Date: Tuesday, 13 July 2021



Agenda

1. Public Forum Statements and Questions

(Pages 2 - 31)

Issued by: , Democratic Services
City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol, BS1 9NE
E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

www.bristol.gov.uk

CABINET – 13 July 2021

PUBLIC FORUM ITEMS

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

Agenda item 8 - Additional Highways Maintenance Funding Allocation

Statements:

PS08.01 David Redgewell

Questions:

CQ08.01&02 Cllr Ellie King
CQ08.03 Cllr David Wilcox

Agenda item 9 - Children's Social Care and Special Education Spot Purchase Placements

Questions:

CQ09.01 Cllr Christine Townsend

Agenda item 10 – Education Capital Programme: SEND Sufficiency – Elmfield School for Deaf Children & Trinity Academy

Statements:

PS10.01 Dr April Gallwey
CS10.01 Cllr Brenda Massey
CS10.02 Cllr Philippa Hulme

Questions:

PQ10.01 Sally Kent
CQ12.01 Cllr Steve Pearce
CQ12.02 Cllr Christine Townsend

Agenda item 11 – Amendments to the Keeping Bristol Safe Partnership Constitution

None

Agenda item 12 – City Centre and High Streets Recovery

Statements:

CS12.01 Cllr Tony Dyer

Questions:

PQ12.01&02 Jen Smith
CQ12.01&02 Cllr Marley Bennett

CQ12.03

Cllr Steve Pearce

Agenda item 13 - St Philips Reuse and Recycling Centre – Lease renewal

CS13.01

Cllr Martin Fodor

Agenda item 14 - Re-tender of the Network and Telephony contract

None

Agenda item 15 - Changing Futures MHCLG Bid Submission

None

Agenda item 16 - National Heritage Lottery Project Prioritisation - Stoke Park and Temple Church and gardens

Statements:

PS16.01

Hedley Bashforth and Ian Wright

Agenda item 17 – P2 Finance Outturn Report 2021/22

None

Agenda item 18 - Bristol's Drug and Alcohol Strategy 2021-25 and funding

Questions

CQ18.01&02

Councillor Barry Parsons

CQ18.03&04

Councillor Ani Stafford Townsend

Agenda item 19 - Quarterly Performance Progress Report (Q4 - 2020/21)

Statements

PS19.01

Suzanne Audrey

CS19.01

Cllr Paula O'Rourke

Questions

PQ19.01

Suzanne Audrey

CQ19.01

Cllr Heather Mack

Statement: PS08.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 8 - Additional Highways Maintenance Funding Allocation

Statement submitted by: David Redgewell

Highway maintenance allocation

Whilst we welcome the money for Highway improvements and maintenance money especially the £8000 for pavement footway works, from an equalities point of view we are hoping that these schemes will include the maintenance of drop kerbs and castle kerbs at bus stops.

We also hope that the issue of continue pavement widening is being looked into.

We welcome the allocation by the West of England combined authority Mayor.

We welcome the fund allocation to St Peter Rise, footway repairs of park street but as a wheelchair user, it's very important the maintenance work also looks at drop kerb within the schemes if their bus stop again castle kerbs should be included within the scheme

Pothole maintenance fund again needs to look at road used by cyclist and public transport.

Traffic signal upgrades should take account of pedestrians movement not just traffic flows and cycling movements but with bus service upgrade as part of “bus back better” the National bus strategy and the West of England mayoral combined authority and North Somerset Council bus service improvement plan should look at upgrading the signal to green waves to allow bus to be speeded up at traffic signals on main bus corridors across Greater Bristol including bus lane and priority.

Again we welcome the allocation of money to the St Philip causeway but we need a footway from St Phillips and Old market to Brislington.

The equalities impact assessment did not take into account disabled access to footway and crossing within this highway maintenance budget allocation especially with 700 footways in need of repairs again a lot of these pavements have no drop kerbs or continues pavements or castle kerbs at bus stops.

Again with the Redcliffe Bridge there needs to be an audit of accessible pavements. With regard to the heritage assets of cobbled stone pavements in part of the old city and west Bristol, Clifton, Redland, Cotham it important to take account of the need of wheelchair users and disabled access.

We hope the Director of Highway and the cabinet member for transport on west of England Transport Board would welcome consultation with disabled people and users groups about these schemes and the Bristol one city transport board.

Finally we welcome the rainbow crossing on wine street but the vandalism of the crossing is unacceptable and the maintenance cost. We hope that the homophobic hate crime has been reported to the Avon and Somerset police.

David Redgewell south west transport network.

Railfuture Severnside.

Bristol disabled equalities forum trustee

Question: CQ08.01&02

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item

Question submitted by: Cllr Ellie King

The report states: “In March 2021 the Department for Transport announced a £1,303,394 reduction in funding and therefore the reduction will significantly affect the authority ability to deliver its statutory duty and ability to deliver its preventative programme of work.”

Q1:

Can the Cabinet Member for Transport confirm that local government is having to bear the brunt of continued Government austerity, and that the Government has little interest in improving transport in Bristol, aside from piecemeal gestures?

Q2:

I welcome the additional £9m funding to fill in potholes. Could I ask Cabinet how much has been spent on filling in potholes since 2016?

Question: CQ08.03

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item

Question submitted by: Cllr David Wilcox

Bristol Green Party welcomes the investment by Bristol City Council in maintaining highway assets and bridges.

However, I want to note one of the recent Citizens Assembly's conclusions: that the council should spend an equal amount on active travel as it does on roads by 2030. One of the items detailed in the report is that the Park Street pavements are to be repaired to reduce insurance claims against the council.

This is an excellent opportunity to add a separate uphill cycle lane and widen the pavements to make them more covid friendly and provide a useable seating area for the hospitality trade. Can this be incorporated into the schedule, please?

Question: CQ09.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 9 - Children's Social Care and Special Education Spot Purchase Placements

Question submitted by: Cllr Christine Townsend

What is the 20/21 baseline data in relation to child placement decisions that exceed the £500k threshold funded in total or in part from the HNB?

Statement: PS10.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 - Education Capital Programme: SEND Sufficiency – Elmfield School for Deaf Children & Trinity Academy

Statement submitted by: Dr April Gallwey

Statement of Support for the Planned Co-location of Elmfield School for Deaf Children with Upper Horfield Community School and Early Years

Upper Horfield Community School (UHCS) have met with Elmfield's SLT and governors for a number of meetings since autumn/winter 2020 about the Elmfield move to the BEC site and out of those meetings there is a clear commitment between all involved to collaborate and work together for the mutual benefit of both schools. To this end, meetings have been focused on 'co-location', the sharing of key resources, pedagogical collaboration and the strengthening of both schools' visions and the communities which they serve. The following key areas have been highlighted as important opportunities for co-production and future conversation:

The benefit of having a Special Needs school alongside a Mainstream School presents huge potential for both schools. UHCS is a school which has a long history of inclusivity and support for children with special needs and vulnerable families. UHCS and Elmfield can join together to strengthen their core values in terms of *diversity, tolerance and inclusivity*. **In future, the co-location of the two schools will offer a model vision of how a mainstream and special needs school can co-locate to provide a unique education, as well as having broader value to the wider community of Bristol.**

- UHCS is a school which supports families within the local community from the point of birth through to the end of primary. Due to its longstanding relationship with the Children's Centres in Bristol, the school offers an invaluable service to families through 'Stay and Play' for babies/early years, as well as family services. The school's nursery has a long-standing reputation for excellence in the local community and children/parents can therefore benefit from a relationship with their school from their early years, through to starting secondary. **This is the caring foundation of a 'community' school and the co-location with Elmfield could provide a way of sustaining and developing this 'from birth' form of education, which is particularly essential for children who have special needs and live in areas of socio-economic deprivation.**
- The proposed sharing of space between the two school communities in terms of a Reception area, dining hall, outside play areas and family support services will strengthen both schools and the relationships between the children, staff and families they serve. **This will also provide opportunity for pedagogical collaboration, the bolstering of family and welfare services, and opportunity for children (and staff) to learn in new and innovative ways.**

- **Pedagogically there are some key areas where we see exciting possibilities for the staff and children to work together and develop innovative education practice:** the promotion and celebration of signing across both schools as a life skill, the promotion of multi-sensory learning to enhance the wellbeing and resilience of children in a challenging world (through dance and other performative skills, sensory outdoor space and planting, visual/art based learning).

We're grateful for the continued dialogue with the project team and representatives of Elmfield and look forward to exploring the details of co-locating in our future meetings. We have begun discussions on bringing our respective governing bodies closer by identifying link governors to enhance communication and understanding going forward into the next academic year.

Dr April Gallwey,
Parent Governor, Upper Horfield Primary School and Early Years

Statement: CS10.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 - Education Capital Programme: SEND Sufficiency – Elmfield School for Deaf Children & Trinity Academy

Statement submitted by: Cllr Brenda Massey

I apologise that due to conflicting appointments I cannot be at the Cabinet meeting to give my support in person, but I heartily support the proposed increase to the budget for the transfer of Elmfield School from its present site in Southmead to be co-located with Upper Horfield School. I know both sites well, having been a governor of Upper Horfield until very recently, and having visited Elmfield over several years to look at the condition of the school and the impact on the pupils.

The Elmfield buildings are in an extremely poor condition, with leaking roofs etc., and the pupils who attend the school definitely deserve better accommodation. There are also huge advantages for both Upper Horfield and Elmfield with the proposed move to co-locate on the Horfield site.

The reputation of Elmfield as a school for children with hearing issues is well known, and there will be many advantages for both schools when they are co-located. The proposed family centre was discussed by the governors of Upper Horfield, and agreed that together with the changes to the entrance, and the provision of a MUGA, this would be extremely beneficial for both schools.

Please support the additional cost, which will be such an advantage to both schools.

Statement: CS10.02

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 - Education Capital Programme: SEND Sufficiency – Elmfield School for Deaf Children & Trinity Academy

Statement submitted by: Cllr Philippa Hulme

I would like to put on record my support for allocating additional funding to Elmfield School for Deaf Children to cover costs for its co-location with Upper Horfield School. Elmfield's current property has been in need of investment for some time, so I would be very pleased to see the Cabinet find the money to support it when city budgets are so tight.

I strongly believe that the co-location will be of mutual benefit to children at both Elmfield and Upper Horfield School, and would like to share some anecdotal evidence to support this view.

Several years ago, my daughters attended a mainstream primary school near Elmfield's current site. One daughter's class decamped to Elmfield for a term, to avoid building work at their school. She loved singing and signing at joint assemblies, and playing together at playtimes. My other daughter made friends with an Elmfield student and subsequently joined an after-school group to learn sign language. For my daughters, the impacts of these opportunities have been long-lasting.

As one of the councillors for Horfield Ward, I would love the children at Upper Horfield School to have similar opportunities to get to know – and learn from – the children and staff at Elmfield School for the Deaf.

I strongly support allocating additional funding for the relocation of Elmfield School for Deaf Children.

Question: PQ10.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 Education Capital Programme: SEND Sufficiency – Elmfield School for Deaf Children & Trinity Academy

Question submitted by: Sally Kent

The SEND capital plan requires approx £28m in funding. The plan currently stands around £13m short on funding with hopes of the shortfall being covered by the Department for Education or loans against the DSG. If these methods of funding prove unsuccessful will the Mayor guarantee the needed funds will be in place in order to complete the SEND capital plan?

Question: CQ10.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 Education Capital Programme: SEND Sufficiency – Elmfield School for Deaf Children & Trinity Academy

Question submitted by: Cllr Steve Pearce

As someone with a hearing impairment, I'm pleased to see Bristol City Council investing in Elmfield School and supporting children with hearing difficulties. I would like to ask what other work the Council has done to support children with hearing impairments?

Question: CQ10.02

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 Education Capital Programme: SEND Sufficiency – Elmfield School for Deaf Children & Trinity Academy

Question submitted by: Cllr Christine Townsend

BNGF is awarded to the city to ensure each child has a school place and calculated on child number and need - can the Cabinet lead for education explain why £900k of the BNGF for 22/23 is being allocated to pay for academy conversion costs and off-site highway construction?

Statement: CS12.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 12 – City Centre and High Streets Recovery

Statement submitted by: Cllr Tony Dyer

East Street in the Bedminster part of my ward of Southville was long seen as South Bristol's "High Street". In many ways it played the role that Gloucester Road does in North Bristol. However, some time ago it fell into severe decline and is in desperate need of repair and regeneration.

I, of course, welcome today's proposals for additional funding to be allocated to East Street and several other local high streets as representing another positive step forward. However this still represents a very small percentage of the funded needed to regenerate South Bristol's High Street.

The recently launched East Street Vision presented ambitious plans for how we can restore East Street to something approaching its former glory, an ambition which, if realised, will have considerable positive impacts far beyond East Street itself, positive impacts right across South Bristol.

With so many of the most deprived areas of our city being in the wider South Bristol area, and with this part of Bedminster itself also being one of the more deprived parts of our city, I am sure we all realise the benefits of investing in East Street.

There is a lot of expectation of additional investment being generated as a result of major residential development at Bedminster Green and elsewhere although there is no guarantee of CiL money, for example, being spent in the immediate area in and around East Street and Bedminster Green itself.

However, any investment that does come from this source, will take time to filter through, and there is considerable concern from myself and other members of the Bedminster BID team, as well as long standing community activists, that the need for investment in East Street is increasingly urgent.

My purpose here today is to once again raise the need for investment in East Street, and to ask that it is kept at the forefront of your minds when considering the recovery of our high streets.

Question: PQ12.01&02

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 12 City Centre and High Streets Recovery

Question submitted by: Jen Smith

Q1: The City Centre and High Streets Recovery Decision Pathway Report states:
'The focus is on ensuring the city centre is open to all residents of Bristol and visitors both day and night, with a particular emphasis on being family friendly and a range of activities throughout the year.'

What accessible public toilet provision will be in place? The Community Toilet Scheme only works during the hours that participating venues are open so this is focussing on the wrap around time.

Q2: If no additional public toilets will accompany this, how does the council plan to mitigate the barriers this creates for those disproportionately affected due to their protected characteristics?

Question: CQ12.01&02

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 12 - City Centre and High Streets Recovery

Question submitted by: Cllr Marley Bennett

I'm pleased to see that Stapleton Road has been identified for high streets funding, and I'm particularly pleased that this funding will be used to support the creative and hospitality sector, which have especially struggled this last year.

The report states the funding is to be used to support pop-ups and that businesses will be supported through a grants programme – Delivering on one of our key manifesto pledges.

Q 1: Do we have specific details on which businesses / areas of Stapleton Road will benefit from the funding?

Q2: I would like to ask how these grants will be allocated? It mentions bringing vacant properties into use – will this funding be used to support businesses to permanently fill vacant lots, or will it be used just to support temporary pop-ups, or a mix of both?

Question: CQ12.03

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 12 - City Centre and High Streets Recovery

Question submitted by: Cllr Steve Pearce

There is much concern in my ward regarding some intractable traffic and transport issues around 2 mile hill that not only make getting about the ward difficult and more hazardous than need be but also make walking to and from local shops less attractive than it should be.

Can we match fund these high street improvements with Transport, CIL and S106 budgets to get more bang for our buck?

Statement: CS13.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 13 - St Philips Reuse and Recycling Centre – Lease renewal

Statement submitted by: Cllr Martin Fodor

I'm pleased to see the 5 year lease renewal on a like for like basis at St Phillips Reuse and Recycling Centre [R&RC]. This has long been a worry for those scrutinising the service and I'm sure the same for Cllr Beech trying to ensure its future. I'm glad offices have secured it.

Continuity of our services for households to reuse, recycle and get surplus materials managed well are essential to support the circular economy and the recycling targets. The facilities are also used by businesses too, but have yet to be made accessible to those who have long been asking to deliver materials by cycle / payload bikes which are increasingly popular.

My concerns are mainly to do with the continued uncertainties about the long term future of this site, and the worries that it might have to relocate or be part of a complex lease deal with Network Rail as described.

It's clear from the report that any changes and capital costs would be a burden we need to avoid. This could also affect scarce sites in the council estate. There is a real worry this must not be allowed to build up just because the temporary fix is in place. Also any interruption to services before or once the third R&R Centre finally opens could affect open hours and public accessibility. I understand that revenue for operating all three eventual R&RCs is yet to be confirmed so there remain worries about cuts to hours at existing sites which I hope can be assuaged when we scrutinise this service next. Not being able to access sites when they are needed could lead to flytipping which is already a substantial cost to the council. I'm sure we'd all like to see a commitment to adequate open hours and to services being available across the city to enhance the opportunities for reuse and recycling. This is notwithstanding outstanding issues about consistent pay and conditions for the open air workforce, which I believe still need to be resolved.

Cllr Martin Fodor

Green Party councillor Shadow spokesperson on Waste and Energy

Statement: PS16.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - National Heritage Lottery Project Prioritisation - Stoke Park and Temple Church and gardens

Statement submitted by: Hedley Bashforth and Ian Wright

This statement concerns the proposal that the Vench in Romney Avenue, Lockleaze be turned into a visitor centre for Stoke Park. Cabinet is being asked to support a bid for over £3 million from the National Lottery Heritage Fund to pay for works in Stoke Park. Nobody would criticise the proposal to restore features of the Park that would make it more attractive and remove it from the Historic England risk register. But the current proposals threaten the future of the Vench, and will lead to other unwanted and unintended consequences that would be detrimental to Lockleaze residents.

The report says that one of the 9 'restoration actions' that would be funded by the lottery grant is to 'provide a Stoke Park visitor focal point and associated facilities, including car park, food outlet, information point and access to the wider estate.'

In support of the proposal, the report refers to 'over 600 conversations (that) were had at public events in the park'. However, the report doesn't say who the conversations were with, and only two of the conversations were with children and young people under 18. Apart from the children who use the Vench, and their parents, there are many groups who use the facilities at the Vench and there is no evidence that any of these have been consulted.

We are concerned about this proposal for two reasons. Firstly, the Vench was opened in 1972 with the support of Bristol City Council to provide a playground for local children. Groundwork Trust took over the running of the Vench in 2016. Their website says their vision is that 'all children and young people in Lockleaze live happy and healthy lives' and that their mission is to 'amplify youth voice in the decisions that are made in Lockleaze and the surrounding area.' But Groundwork Trust now say that their adventure playground (they do call it their playground in the report) could provide an attraction to visitors of Stoke Park Estate. They do not say why they have changed their mind and now want the Vench to be a visitor centre. The Council's Heritage and Estates Officer supports the Groundwork Trust proposal.

On top of this potential loss of the Vench, the proposal will bring more traffic to an area that is already plagued by traffic problems. The report says that 'a small car park would be required', but there are no estimates of visitor numbers.

It is also extremely disappointing to read in the report to Cabinet that 'any development of catering facilities within the 'Vench site would not provide direct income to the Estate.' So there would be no public gain to compensate for the loss of the Vench.

This is no way to mark the 50th anniversary of the Vench. We call on the Council to reject this proposal which threatens the future of the Vench as a resource for local children, and to organise a meaningful consultation about the plans to turn it into a visitor centre.

Question: CQ18.01&02

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 18 - Bristol's Drug and Alcohol Strategy 2021-25 and funding

Question submitted by: Cllr Barry Parsons

Q1: I welcome this much needed Drug & Alcohol Strategy. Historically people accessing these types of services have worse outcomes when the service they are accessing is mixed drug and alcohol support. Does the strategy include specialised alcohol use provision?

Q2: The strategy understandably involves working closely with the police, what will be the strategy for engaging with those who are reluctant to engage with authorities?

Question: CQ18.03&04

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 18 - Bristol's Drug and Alcohol Strategy 2021-25 and funding

Questions submitted by: Cllr Ani Stafford Townsend

Q1: I note that there is no Equalities report listed in the appendix. Has an equalities impact assessment been carried out, especially in relation to race?

Q2: Unfortunately, there are children younger than teenagers being groomed by drug gangs in our city, especially within the BME communities. What is the strategy for this group of vulnerable children?

Statement: PS19.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 19 - Q4 2020-21 Performance Report

Statement submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

Clean Air Zone

It is worrying to see in the Q4 2020-21 Performance Report that the target to 'Reduce the proportion of deaths attributed to particulate air pollution' is well below target; and it looks as if the trend is for a decrease (rather than an increase) in the % of monitoring sites that meet the annual air quality target for nitrogen dioxide.

I have been repeatedly disappointed to see that the information and modelling provided in relation to the case for Bristol's Clean Air Zone does not include public health information specific to Bristol. I fail to see how the need for, and benefits of, the Clean Air Zone can be properly assessed without this information. The history of Bristol's Clean Air Zone suggests reluctance on the part of the mayor and his team, couched in terms of concerns for members of low-income groups with non-compliant vehicles. But the health impacts of poor air quality on members of low-income groups are not mentioned.

Below I have listed information from 'Personalising the Health Impacts of Air Pollution – Summary for Decision Makers, Kings College London, November 2019'. This detailed academic work includes the negative impacts of air pollution in Bristol on: out of hospital cardiac arrests, stroke, asthma admissions in children and adults, reduced lung growth and lung function, lung cancer, asthma symptoms in children, term low birth rate, respiratory admissions all ages, cardiovascular admissions all ages, coronary heart disease incidence all ages, bronchitic symptoms (asthmatic children), acute bronchitis in children, COPD admissions all ages, and pneumonia admissions in children.

Is it possible to ensure that such public health information is provided with other documents relating to Bristol's air quality and the clean air zone?

These health issues are occurring now. Each delay in cleaning up our air adds to the number of people affected. And so, I hope members at least some members of Cabinet share my concerns that the recent Bristol City Council press release appeared to celebrate a further delay in implementing the Clean Air Zone, with no reference to the on-going health implications for citizens.

Bristol from Personalising the Health Impacts of Air Pollution – Summary for Decision Makers, Kings College London, November 2019.

<http://erg.ic.ac.uk/Research/docs/Personalised-health-impacts-Summary%20for%20Decision%20Makers.pdf>

Out-of-hospital cardiac arrests (pp79-80)

The risk of out of hospital cardiac arrest in Bristol is 2.2% higher on high air pollution days than lower air pollution days (short-term).

Each year on average, higher air pollution days in Bristol are responsible for 4 more cardiac arrests outside hospital than lower air pollution days (short-term).

Stroke (p83)

The risk of emergency hospitalisations for stroke in Bristol is 2.8% higher on high air pollution days than on lower air pollution days (short-term).

Living near a busy road in Bristol increases your risk of hospitalisation for stroke by 2.8% (short-term).

On high air pollution days in Bristol, there are on average 9 more hospital admissions for stroke each year than on lower air pollution days (short-term).

Lowering air pollution by 35.9% on high air pollution days in Bristol could save 9 hospital admissions for stroke each year (short-term/alternative).

Each year on average, higher air pollution days in Bristol can send up to 14 more people to hospital for stroke than lower air pollution days (short-term).

Asthma admissions in children (p88)

In Bristol, your child is 4.4% more likely to be hospitalised for asthma on days with high NO₂ pollution compared to days with lower air pollution (short-term).

In Bristol, an extra 5 children are hospitalised with asthma on days where air pollution is high compared to days where air pollution is low on average each year (short-term).

Asthma admissions in adults (p91)

In Bristol, adults are 1.5% more likely to be hospitalised for asthma on days with high NO₂ pollution compared to days with lower air pollution (short-term).

In Bristol, an extra 4 adults are taken to hospital with asthma on days of high air pollution compared to days with lower air pollution (short-term).

Reduced lung growth and low lung function (p94-5)

Roadside air pollution in Bristol stunts lung growth in children by 5.3% (long-term).

Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth would increase children's lung capacity by around 2.3% (long-term).

Living near busy roads in Bristol may contribute to an 3.0% greater chance of reduced lung function in children (long-term).

Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth may contribute to a 1.2% greater chance of better lung function in children (long-term).

Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth would result in 199 fewer children with low lung function each year (long-term).

Lung cancer (p99)

Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth would decrease lung cancer cases by around 5.9% (long-term).

Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth would result in 18 fewer lung cancer cases each year (long-term).

Asthma symptoms in children (p101)

In Bristol, children with asthma are 0.2% more likely to experience asthma symptoms on high air pollution days than on lower pollution days (short-term).

On high air pollution days, 12 more children with asthma in Bristol experience asthma symptoms than on lower pollution days (short-term).

Term low birth weight (p103)

Living near busy roads in Bristol may contribute to a 0.2% greater risk of babies being born underweight (long-term).

Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth would decrease the risk of babies being born underweight by around 0.1% (long-term).

Respiratory admissions all ages (p106-7)

The risk of emergency hospitalisations for respiratory disease in Bristol is 1.4% higher on high air pollution days than on lower air pollution days (short-term).

On high air pollution days in Bristol, there are on average 43 more hospital admissions for respiratory disease each year than on lower air pollution days (short-term).

Lowering air pollution by 27.7% on high air pollution days in Bristol could save 43 hospital admissions for respiratory disease each year (short-term/alternative).

Each year on average, higher air pollution days in Bristol can send up to 68 more people to hospital for respiratory disease than lower air pollution days (short-term).

Cardiovascular admissions all ages (p110)

The risk of emergency hospitalisations for cardiovascular disease in Bristol is 0.5% higher on high air pollution days than on lower air pollution days (short-term).

On high air pollution days in Bristol, there are on average 10 more hospital admissions for cardiovascular disease each year than on lower air pollution days (short-term).

Lowering air pollution by 45.5% on high air pollution days in Bristol could save 10 hospital admissions for cardiovascular disease each year (short-term/alternative).

Each year on average, higher air pollution days in Bristol can send up to 19 more people to hospital for cardiovascular disease than lower air pollution days (short-term).

Coronary Heart Disease (CHD) Incidence (all ages) (p114)

Living near busy roads in Bristol may contribute to an 8.0% greater chance of coronary heart disease (long-term).

Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth would decrease the risk of coronary heart disease by around 3.1% (long-term).

Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth would result in 62 fewer cases of coronary heart disease each year (long-term).

Bronchitic symptoms (asthmatic children) (pp116-7)

Air pollution may contribute to asthmatic children that live near busy roads in Bristol may experiencing a 4.5% greater chance of developing bronchitic symptoms (long-term).

Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth would decrease the risk of bronchitic symptoms in asthmatic children each year by around 1.9% (long-term).

Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth would result in 94 fewer asthmatic children with bronchitic symptoms each year (long-term).

Acute bronchitis in children (p120)

Living near busy roads in Bristol may contribute to a 0.8% greater risk of a chest infection (acute bronchitis) in children (long-term).

Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth would decrease the risk of a chest infection (acute bronchitis) in children by around 0.3% (long-term).
Cutting air pollution in Bristol by one fifth would result in 114 fewer children with a chest infection (acute bronchitis) each year (long-term).

COPD admissions (all ages) (pp122-3)

The risk of emergency hospitalisations for COPD in Bristol is 2.0% higher on high air pollution days than on lower air pollution days (short-term).

On high air pollution days in Bristol, there are on average 20 more hospital admissions for COPD each year than on lower air pollution days (short-term).

Lowering air pollution by 27.7% on high air pollution days in Bristol could save 20 hospital admissions for COPD each year (short-term/alternative).

Each year on average, higher air pollution days in Bristol can send up to 30 more people to hospital for COPD than lower air pollution days (short-term).

Pneumonia admissions in children (p126)

The risk of emergency hospitalisations for pneumonia in children in Bristol is 2.2% higher on high air pollution days than on lower air pollution days (short-term).

On high air pollution days in Bristol, there are on average 1 more hospital admission for pneumonia in children each year than on lower air pollution days (short-term).

Lowering air pollution by 27.7% on high air pollution days in Bristol could save 1 hospital admission for pneumonia in children each year (short-term/alternative).

Each year on average, higher air pollution days in Bristol can send up to 1 more people to hospital for pneumonia in children than lower air pollution days (short-term).

Statement: CS19.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 19 - Q4 2020-21 Performance Report

Statement submitted by: Cllr Paula O'Rourke

Reading the KPIs reminds us of how large and wide the function of the council is.

Especially over the past year and a bit, the organisation has faced tremendous challenges and has fared well. I would like to thank the leadership team for steering the Council and the City through the pandemic and adding to the reputation of the organisation and the City.

I know we often come here with questions and statements on single topics of importance and concern, but the range of responsibilities sometimes gets lost. Concern about deaths due to particulates might come in focus when there are decisions being made about a CAZ, but that does not mean that the underspend in the apprenticeship levy is of less importance. Reviewing the Quarterly Performance report is a reminder that the organisation is keeping a whole heap of plates spinning at once and that dropping a single one can be hugely diminishing for citizens. Thank you for all you have done in very challenging times.

I am pleased that, as I now lead a larger Green group, we have the bandwidth to focus on all areas targeted by these KPIs. As we have elected a shadow cabinet, we now have the benefit of a shadow member for each of the portfolios. This will allow each shadow cabinet member to gain insight into policy and decision-making in their portfolio and to build relationships with the corresponding Labour member.

Question: PQ19.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 19 - Quarterly Performance Progress Report 2020/21.

Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

Background

The Quarterly Performance Progress Report indicates that the target to 'Reduce the proportion of deaths attributed to particulate air pollution' is well below target; and the target to 'Increase the % of monitoring sites that meet the annual air quality target for nitrogen dioxide' has not been met and seems to be heading in the wrong direction. Nevertheless, implementation of Bristol's Clean Air Zone has been delayed again, with a new date of 'summer 2022'. (Summer is officially between 21 June and 22 September, and so this is a further delay of between 8 and 11 months).

The latest delay was announced in a celebratory press release. We were told that the overall compliance date would not be affected, and reminded of the measures to reduce the impact of any charges on low income groups. There was no mention of the ongoing health implications of poor air quality, which also disproportionately affect people from low income groups.

No specific reason was given for the latest delay.

Please note I am aware of the arguments about why the zone is necessary, concerns about the costs for some businesses and members of low income groups, and the mitigation measures that have been agreed. There is no need to reiterate those points. My specific question is about the reason(s) why implementation of the zone has been further delayed. Is it, for example, to do with signing off the plans with the government; getting local transport regulations and cameras in place; the hope that other measures for public transport/walking/cycling may reduce air pollution and make implementation unnecessary?

Question

Given the public health implications of poor air quality, please can you explain the specific reason(s) why implementation of Bristol's Clean Air Zone has been further delayed?

Question: CQ19.01

Cabinet – 13 July 2021

Re: Agenda item 19 - Quarterly Performance Progress Report 2020/21.

Question submitted by: Cllr Heather Mack

The progress report states that deaths related to air pollution are above target (5%) and the main sources of this within the city are traffic and combustion, and that the air quality data for 2020 has not yet been ratified for reporting.

Question:

How can this delay in reporting be justified whilst we are delaying the implementation of the CAZ and air pollution related deaths are above target?