

Cabinet

Supplementary Information



Date: Tuesday, 8 February 2022

Time: 4.00 pm

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

2. Public Forum

Statements, Petitions and Questions

(Pages 3 - 67)

Issued by: Corrina Haskins, Democratic Services

City Hall, Bristol, BS1 9NE

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

Date: Monday, 07 February 2022



CABINET – 8 February 2022

PUBLIC FORUM ITEMS

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

Agenda item 8 - Budget Monitoring Outturn Report P9

Statements:

PS08.01 David Redgewell

Agenda item 9 - Sustainable Procurement Policy

Statements:

CS09.01 Cllr Martin Fodor

Questions:

CQ09.01&02 Cllr Heather Mack

Agenda item 10 - Expansion of Flax Bourton Mortuary Deceased Storage

None

Agenda item 11 – Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Petitions:

CP11.01 Cllr Guy Poultney

Statements:

PS11.01 Paul Collins
PS11.02 Ian Blantern
PS11.03 Rachel Couzens
PS11.04 Olly Alcock
PS11.05 Sophie Brown
PS11.06 Richard Timmis
PS11.07 Gene Joyner
PS11.08 Nigel Birkett
PS11.09 Michael Makriel
PS11.10 Laurence Adams
PS11.11 Martin Mullen
PS11.12 Tom Oldridge
PS11.13 Briony Waite
PS11.14 Rahul Immandira
PS11.15 Kitty Odell
PS11.16 Roger Caldwell
PS11.17 Sue Paterson
PS11.18 Christopher Elson

PS11.19 Geoff Collard
CS11.01 Cllr Gary Hopkins
CS11.02 Cllr Guy Poultney
CS11.03 Cllr Mohamed Makawi
CS11.04 Cllr Ed Plowden

Questions:

PQ11.01&02 Paul Collins
PQ11.03&04 Brian Glasson
CQ11.01&02 Cllr Gary Hopkins
CQ11.03&04 Cllr Chris Davies
CQ11.05&06 Cllr Gary Poultney
CQ11.07&08 Cllr Barry Parsons

Agenda item 12 - Community Resilience Fund

Questions:

CQ12.01 Cllr Tim Rippington
CQ12.02&03 Cllr Ani Stafford Townsend
CQ12.04 Cllr Christine Townsend

Agenda item 13 - Protect and Vaccinate Department for Levelling Up, Homes and Communities (DLUHC) Grant

None

Agenda item 14 - Project 1000: Affordable Housing Delivery Plan 2022-25

Statement:

PS14.01 Clive Stevens

Questions:

PQ14.01&02 Clive Stevens
CQ14.01 Cllr Tim Rippington
CQ14.02&03 Cllr Tony Dyer

Agenda item 15 - Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme Phase 3

None

Agenda item 16 - Stoke Park Estate Restoration

Statements:

CS16.01 Cllr David Wilcox

Questions:

CQ16.01&02 Cllr Marley Bennett

Agenda item 17 – Dynamic Purchasing System (DPS) Contracts – Children’s Play and Natural Stone Walls

None

Agenda item 18 – Tree Strategy and Tree Planting Plan

Statements

PS18.01	Bristol Tree Forum
CS18.02	Cllr Emma Edwards

Agenda item 19 - COP26 outcomes

Statement

PS19.01	Cllr Tim Wye
---------	--------------

Questions:

PQ19.01&02	David Redgewell
CQ19.01&02	Cllr Martin Fodor

Statement: PS08.01

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 8 – Budget Monitoring Outturn Report P9

Statement submitted by: David Redgewell

Whilst we are happy with the transport levy to the West of England mayoral combined transport Authority for support bus service Network and for the city region transport plan and the:

- A37 Street, Glastonbury, Wells bus station, Chewton Mendip, Farrington Gurney, Clutton, Pensford, Whitchurch Hengrove, Knowle, Bristol Temple Meads station Bristol Cabot circus Bristol city centre, park street , Clifton Down station, Henleaze, Southmead, Brenty, Henbury, Cribbs Causeway bus station.
- A4 Bristol bus station Bristol Temple meads, Arno vale, Brislington, Keynsham Salford Newbridge, Weston and Bath spa bus station.
- Mass transit corridor from Bristol city centre Bristol Temple meads station Arnos vale Brislington to Hengrove and Whitchurch and via Callington Road to Keynsham Salford Newbridge Weston and Bath spa bus station using the North Somerset railway line.
- A367 Bath bus and coach station bus and coach station to Peasedown St John, Radstock, Westfield, Midsomer Norton, Paulton, Chilcompton or Shepton mallet, wells bus station.

There is a need for bus stop maintenance in Bristol Bath and North Somerset council and South Gloucestershire council to be improved with up-to-date passengers information working realtime information displays out of Date Network posters removed and fares information.

There is an urgent need to remove graffiti from Bus shelters lighting working and shelters repaired we need to see this included in the 3 unity Authorities budgets. This must include money to remove Graffiti from public transport interchanges and infrastructure. We must also use the Avon and Somerset police and British transport police to taggers and people damaging property before the courts.

North Somerset bus corridors from Bristol bus and coach station to Pill, Portishead, Backwell, Nailsea, Clevedon, Long Ashton, Backwell, Yatton, Worle Parkway Weston super Mare transport interchange with 27 new buses being funded as Part of Bristol city centre clean air zone. Whilst the metro mayor Dan Norris and the west of England combined Authority committee has put £ 900 000 extra revenue support for the city region support bus Network and an Extra £ 400 000 for bus services. Bus stop maintenance and interchange maintenance should be a direct responsibility of the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority which should include North Somerset council.

We are still very worried that the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council will not be able to continue to maintain

the Great Bristol and Bath city region bus Network with services into North Somerset as passengers number are only at 63 % of pre covid levels without the Department for transport covid 19 bus operators recovery grant being extended we are seeing a 30 % proposal from the Bus companies First group west of England buses Stagecoach west hct group favesaver Bath bus company Rapt. The city region needs bus service improvements for economy growth access to jobs, Education, health care shopping, leisure and Tourism facilities.

We already have bus service reductions in Kingwood longwell green South Bristol, Ashton vale, sea mills, Shirehampton, Lawrence Weston Henbury area links to food shopping at cribbs causeway and the bus station interchanges facilities. The Department for transport is not clear on the revenue support for public bus services.

Whilst we welcome progress on bus back better the National bus strategy and the west of England mayoral transport Authority bus service improvements plan joint with North Somerset council and the Enhanced quality partnership. but this new money if we are awarded this money by the Department for transport cannot be used on maintenance of our existing bus and coach services.

We are not able to put the kind of reserve money from that the combined transport Authority that the North east of England combined transport Authority is doing even with services reductions.

The city region must make the case for maintenance of our bus and public transport services to the Department for transport and Baroness vere of Norberton the buses minister.

As well as protecting the support bus services in the Budget, public transport interchanges investment also requires public toilets including disabled and changing places.

Public transport is one of 12 points of the plan for levelling up the region of the England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and the English Regions United Kingdom.

On the capital programme budget it is disappointing that the levelling up fund from the government has failed to grant aid to the regeneration of Bristol Temple meads and Temple quay, one of the biggest regeneration project in South west of England. and is major Network rail station and public transport hub on the intercity rail Network and Region railway services.

With Railway services to the rest of South West England, Weston super mare, Taunton, Exeter, St David's, Plymouth and Penzance.
Bristol to the Birmingham Midland the North and Scotland.
Bristol Temple meads to Newport Cardiff central and south Wales.
Bristol Temple meads to Bath spa Westbury, Salisbury, Southampton and Portsmouth Harbour / westbury yeovil pen mill and Weymouth.
The London Paddington to Bristol Temple meads and line to Bristol Parkway and Patchway needs Electrification beyond Chippenham

The station still need upgrading of Disabled passengers' facilities changing places toilets New waiting room restaurants and buffets shops a new bus rail interchanges for buses and coaches.

Southern Entrance and car park and bus interchange for South Bristol and Bath and North east Somerset Towns and well bus and coach station Glastonbury and street. mass transit system platforms.

station improvements to the railway lines to parson street metro west railway to pill and Portishead. Ashton gate new station

Bristol Temple meads to Henbury via Ashley Down, Filton Abbey wood Filton North and Henbury for cribbs causeway and the loop line.

Bristol Temple meads to Gloucester central with new railway station s Filton Abbey wood Bristol parkway yate charfield cam and Dursey, stonehouse Bristol road and Gloucester.

Bristol Temple meads to Bath spa Westbury via keynsham oidfiled park Bath spa Freshford Avoncliff Bradford on Avon Trowbridge Westbury, warminster/ Frome. new station at St Anne's park and Salford.

Bristol Temple meads to Avonmouth and seven Beach line with shirehampton parkway station.

station at Lawrence hill , Stapleton road Montpellier,Redland ,Clifton Down sea mill ,shirehampton, Avonmouth Dock st Andrew road and seven Beach.

like leeds and London kings cross the leveling up the Temple meads and Temple quay area will provide homes shops a school conference centre university campus student flats offices

and quayside and canal side regeneration and a sustainable transport corridor to Bedminster green and is one of biggest leveling up site with public transport connectivity in South west England.

with the the need for Harbour side flood prevention this will home jobs and economic growth and a high quality sustainable environment

A project the Bristol one city transport Board has worked on with Network rail western firstgroup buses Great western railway cross country trains German state railway Department for transport

Home and community agency.

and we have had success with the station roof Eastern entrance and East junction

whilst their is money in the capital programme of the city council and the west of England mayoral combined Authority and North Somerset council for the Portishead Railway line .

We need levelling up funding from the Department for Transport. The city mayor Malvin Rees and metro mayor Dan Norris must press the case with the Region MPs and members of the House of Lords Transport Select Committee western gateway transport Board and partnership South west transport Board and the prime minister, secretary of state for levelling up Michael Gove and Grant Shapps and secretary of state for transport on the budget question both as well as homes, Parks and Gardens Public and community toilets and Graffiti removal cleaning is very important services especially with a 5,4 billion pounds tourist economy in the Bristol city region. Money is also required for Tourist information centres in Bristol and Bath.

Disabled access and parking require further on the ability to pay for any new scheme.

The city region capital programme is very important to a sustainable public transport Network. We must follow Great Manchester Liverpool city region and Transport for the North and the mayor for the west Midlands and press central government for investment in Bristol and Bath city region capital programme around Bristol Temple meads and quays and Severnside North and south Bristol.

Statement: PS09.01

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 9 – Sustainable Procurement Strategy

Statement submitted by: Cllr Martin Fodor

I was invited to chair a Scrutiny Focus Group that was formed to review the proposed new Sustainable Procurement policy. This was a cross party and multi sector group [see membership in the report, Appendix B] which met twice to review and comment on the emerging policy.

We had the following Terms of Reference:

1. Collate feedback on the environmental requirements to go into tenders.
2. Seek feedback on the draft policy statement and were supported by the Lead officer and colleagues.

Our conclusions and recommendations

After briefing and extensive discussions over two meetings we agreed the following conclusions and recommendations:

Environmental requirements

- The focus group acknowledged the importance of addressing supply chain impacts in reducing BCC's environmental impacts.
- The group endorsed the policy and approach as set out to us.
- Some of the group emphasised that particular focus should be given to contracts with a significant environmental impact and that our approach will need to be flexible enough to deal with having a very limited choice of supplier - e.g. highways
- The group recommended that until there is a credible standard way of being carbon neutral or moving to carbon neutrality, then:
 1. Supplier responses would need to be qualitatively assessed by the Council and so should remain scored criteria rather than mandatory pass/fail
 2. BCC will need to be clear with suppliers what we're looking for in their responses
 3. The approach and what we're looking for might vary considerably from contract to contract as different issues matter for different goods and services.
- The group emphasised that we should be careful about adopting or accepting particular environmental standards in an immature situation, as some may not be credible (i.e. risk of labels used for "greenwashing").

- The Council recognise and expect that some cost implications may need to be accepted in order to implement the One City Climate and Ecological Emergency strategies. This could save revenue but cost capital.
- The group highlighted the importance of minimising red tape. As tender processes are already complex, one member was pleased to hear that only relevant requirements would be included. There was an emphasis to make it as easy as possible to reduce the risk of counter-productive effects by discouraging small local suppliers.
- Some of the group suggested there should be a clear “roadmap” of when requirements were expected to move to being scored or mandatory might help suppliers plan their adoption of particular measures. This should be in line with the timescale of being carbon neutral by 2030 including the supply chain.
- The group recommended that the progression to move requirements from information only to scored and scored to mandatory should be made explicit to suppliers and potential bidders.
- Some of the group highlighted that priority should be given to supporting local business with local manufacturing supply chains.

Sustainable Procurement Policy

- The group emphasised that the sustainable procurement policy and environmental requirements must be integrated into the contract management framework – and that it is ensured they remain integrated moving forwards.
- The group emphasised that it would benefit local suppliers if BCC and other neighbouring public bodies were able to take a common approach to environmental requirements in tenders. However it was recognised that whilst Bristol City Council can encourage this and collaborate, it’s not something the Council can decide on alone.
- The group voiced strong support for the new policy but recommended that we should learn from pioneers and share our learning if we are ahead of other organisations.
- Some minor amendments were suggested for clarity and coherence.

Support and guidance for prospective suppliers

- The group recommended that support and guidance should focus on the requirements that we will be mandating, as they could exclude suppliers. In addition, measures that are expected to become mandatory on a short timescale, as well as particularly critical measures such as carbon reduction should also be prioritised for supplier support.
- Some of the group emphasised that it is important to ensure this work is joined up with the wider one-city work so that it’s coherent with other work by

partners active in this area. It was recommended that where there are good resources already available these should be used or signposted where appropriate.

- Some of the group requested that sessions are held with suppliers to cover the new policy (when adopted), with a videoed session made available for people who could not attend.
- The group requested that when requirements are refreshed in future that Cllrs are given visibility and opportunity to comment on changes.
- Some of the group recommended that the sustainable Procurement policy should be considered as part of key decision process (Eco-impact assessment) to join up decisions and procurement practices.

Outcome

The group thanked the officers for their input and assistance and endorsed the revised Sustainable Procurement Policy, asking for these recommendations and points to be addressed.

I'm pleased to present these points to Cabinet so that the work can be noted and taken into account.

Question: CQ09.01&02

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 9 – Sustainable Procurement Policy

Question submitted by: Councillor Heather Mack

I welcome the addition of a number of food specific requirements, however I am concerned about vagueness of one requirement - "Initiatives such as Meat Free Mondays, plant based and culturally specific menus shall be offered".

1. How would this be assessed - if a caterer offers halal or kosher food would this be a tick, even though they don't have a specific environmental initiative?
2. When do we expect measurable progress from the policy being implemented?

Statement: CP11.01

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Petition submitted by: Cllr Guy Poultney

We, the undersigned, call on Mayor Marvin Rees and the Labour Party cabinet of Bristol City Council to reverse their decision to stop operating Kingsdown Sports Centre - a much-loved and well-used community asset.

Statement: PS11.02

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Paul Collins

I ask the Mayor to take into account the following matters and delay his decision on whether to withdraw funding/close Kingsdown Sports Centre:

1. The council is relying on misleading and inaccurate information.
2. The council has failed to properly involve young people in its decisions.
3. The council has not been transparent in its decision making.

The council is relying on misleading and inaccurate information

Some of the information that is meant to inform the decision-making process and has been put before the Mayor and those consulted is arguably misleading.

In relation to the draft Investment Strategy's description of those attending the Kingsdown Sports Centre, my understanding is that it does not reflect the actual number of individuals. For example, a booking for a badminton court at Kingsdown Sports Centre where four people attend is regarded by the council as one person in attendance (described as a 'unit attendance'). That represents flawed and misleading data on use of the centre.

The council has confirmed in their response to a Freedom of Information request (17 January 2021) that (1) the average monthly membership between April 2018 and January 2019 was 889 and (2) the average monthly membership between April 2019 and January 2020 was 1,173. That data does not show that Kingsdown Sports Centre is not attracting 'few' new members nor that it is not retaining members. The council has also confirmed that membership numbers for previous years (i.e. before April 2018) is not available. Therefore, the council has very little data on which to make the statement referred to above.

Further, Table 1 at page 31 of the Draft Leisure Investment Strategy (and now Table 1 of page 27 of the Final Leisure Investment Strategy) shows a 9% increase in attendance at Kingsdown Sports Centre between 2015-20 (the highest increase in attendance of the facilities listed).

All references in the draft Investment Strategy to the Kingsdown Sports Centre attracting few new members and retaining members has been removed from the final strategy document and has not been corrected, or referred to at all, in the Report to this Cabinet meeting. The absence of a proper explanation for the removal of that statement would suggest the statement was false and misleading.

The council's failure to properly involve young people in its decisions

The consultation process adopted by the council in this matter was not in line with the council's Code of Good Practice on Consultation requirement to reach out to hard-to-reach groups

The published Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) recognises that there is a statistically significant number of young people in the ward where Kingsdown is situated (i.e. Cotham ward). To mitigate that, the council states there is alternative provision in the area, including the facilities operated by Bristol University, but has not provided any explanation or evidence to support their statement that those facilities would be used.

The EqIA states that responses were under-represented in terms of population proportion from young people and under 24-year-olds.

Section 2.3 of The Consultation and Engagement Report of 21 January 2022 sets out how the consultation was communicated to 'reach as broad a range of audiences as possible to maximise response rate'.

The EqIA states that responses to the consultation were monitored throughout the consultation and because of the low numbers of respondents from younger people and that 'efforts were made by the council's external communications team to reach out to those specific communities'. However, there is no explanation of what those efforts were, how they were designed to maximise the response rate of those targeted, nor how effective those efforts were. The council's own data shows that of the 1,988 responses to the consultation received, less than 20 responses were from under 18-year-olds. That suggests the council's efforts to reach younger people were not adequate and points towards a major flaw in the consultation process that results in a flawed decision to the detriment of young people.

The council's lack of transparency

Important and relevant information that the Mayor seeks to rely on in making his decision has still not been made public, despite the council stating its disclosure would, 'provide accountability of public spending and would aid in the transparency in the actions of the council'.

This is still a live issue and will continue to be, even after today's meeting and decision. A complaint about the council's approach has been made to the council and depending on the council's response to the complaint, the Information regulator may pursue contempt of court proceedings against the council, which it has previously threatened.

Statement: PS11.02

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Ian Blanter

Dear Mayor Rees and Committee

I hope you will reconsider your proposal to close Kingsdown Sports Centre. I have been using various Bristol gyms, 4 times a week for over 60 years. I have found Kingsdown Sports Centre one of the best in that it is local, caters for the opportunity of gym training, cycling, squash and badminton all at one facility. In fact it caters for $\frac{3}{4}$ of all current available municipal squash courts and houses one of the largest sports halls with all its multiple uses.

It is a fact that the sports floor was only very recently refurbished at a cost of something like £100,000.00.

Closer, alternative Council sports centres would not be a viable option for me since there are no direct or indirect public transport routes available. I can't think how else I would get to any other affordable fitness gym.

I find it very difficult to believe that Kingsdown is not a viable venue since, apart from the lock-down periods, it has always been well supported. Indeed there have been many times when I have found some cycling classes over booked. To lose this facility would be one lost for ever at a time when physical and mental fitness has always been a Government aim. To sell and dispose of the venue for short term financial gain is very short sighted as it loses a valuable community asset which can never be replaced. This gym is a gem of an asset and should be kept open at all cost.

Statement: PS11.03

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Rachel Couzens

I fiercely support the petition that Kingsdown Leisure Centre not be closed.

This is a vital community resource that supports local people to stay fit and healthy, including supporting their mental health, and helps keep young people off the streets. Closing the centre is completely counter-productive. The notion that the people who use Kingsdown Centre will be able to use an alternative leisure centre is naive at best.

People need a facility within walking distance of their home or school or workplace. It is a well documented fact that attendance at gyms drops dramatically with distance.

My 13 year son, along with his friends, is a regular attendee at Kingsdown. I'm sure like many, closing the facility will have a huge detrimental effect on his physical and mental health as other centres are too far for him to travel as a teenager.

I urge the council in the strongest terms to reconsider their proposals and ensure that Kingsdown Leisure facilities are not lost.

Statement: PS11.04

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Olly Alcock

I am not able to attend the meeting and don't particularly require a verbal response. Rather I would like to raise a few points that have been made by anti-closure campaigners and to comment on these points. I take them as factually correct and am happy to be advised if they are incorrect:

- Over 2,000 people have signed a petition against Kingsdown Sports Centre's closure and this number is greater than the number who responded to the Mayor's consultation on the city council's sports and leisure services strategy.
- Of those who did respond to the consultation, less than 25% agreed with the proposals - with 70% disagreeing with the proposed strategy, mainly due to the decision to close KSC and the Jubilee Pool - is this correct?
- Further points that have been shared with me, concerning the data presented in the consultation are:
 1. Kingsdown Sports Centre was kept closed for four months longer than other leisure facilities during the Covid lockdown. This gives the perhaps false impression that it was less used than it actually was. Is this correct?
 2. The original report used data from the Cotham ward profile to analyse who was using KSC - ignoring the many people who use KSC from outside Cotham. If this is true, then it possibly reduces significantly the actual number of KSC users. Is this correct?
 3. The data analysis was weighted against recording accurate use of KSC compared to other similar facilities. For example, I gather that 4 people swimming at Horfield Sports Centre was counted as 4 users. However, 4 people playing badminton at KSC and 2 playing squash there were only counted as 1 user. Is this correct? If so, it clearly suggests flawed data and flawed data comparisons.
 4. The consultation documents claimed that the Centre had attracted 'few new members'. Yet, in stark contrast with this statement, KSC's membership has grown by almost 10% since 2015 - a growth greater than most of the facilities in the report.

Additionally, KSC is sited in a very diverse area of the city - not simply local residents but people working at the university, local schools and at Bristol's hospitals.. It is the only sports and leisure facility in the Cotham area that is affordable to lower-income households, many of whom, adults and children, live nearby in the council's Dove St. housing estate. I feel strongly that the growth in poverty in our city and its effects should not be overlooked. The city now has more than twice as many universal credit claimants than it did in February 2020; and we know that poverty can be an engine room for physical, emotional and mental ill health BUT that access to

affordable sports and physical exercise facilities can help to mitigate a wide range of health problems.

A number of local school students use KSC and, regardless of whether they live in Cotham, surely this is important to their physical and emotional development and, of course, in combatting the rise in obesity faced by young people.

The Cotham area has only one small park, Cotham Gardens, which is small and not wonderfully equipped; yet, in warmer weather is heavily used - thus revealing a huge demand for shared leisure and sports spaces. There are no other such affordable spaces in the area. The nearest would be St Andrews Park, some way away.

Of course, one might consider the University's indoor sports facilities but these are not inexpensive and are subject to high demand (from students and academic staff, for example). One might also mention Bannatyne's facility. However, this is expensive. I understand that my partner and I are not the only people who gave up their membership due to its costs.

The variety of services offered by KSC has always impressed me. I have played sport there, have taken my children to soft play activities there (a godsend to local parents), more recently have enjoyed seeing my kids at Tae Kwon Do and badminton classes there and have hired space there for children's birthday parties. If the notes above are accurate, then surely there is a very strong case to keep KSC open. This might involve transferring it to a socially-minded facilities operator. It might involve offering it as a community asset transfer. It could involve detailed consultation about how its current and future services could be changed, expanded and improved, to encourage greater footfall and membership. However, closing it would be a severe detriment to those who use it and, if the data flaws noted above are true, then without any reasonable justification.

I also think there's a financial risk - closing such a facility might make savings in the short term but the costs of reopening (there surely being a need) could be massive. Large spaces like KSC, if unused, can face dereliction very quickly.

I am aware that the council faces many challenges in balancing its post-covid budgets and this is no easy task. However, the clear benefits to Bristol's communities of retaining an affordable and accessible KSC, albeit not owned/managed directly by BCC, seem to me to outweigh the potential savings involved.

Statement: PS11.05

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Sophie Brown

Please don't take the gym down it's so easily accessible and close to where I live and clearly loved and used by lots of people. It holds a very friendly environment and is smaller than most gyms which is great especially for people with anxiety who struggle going to large gyms with many people and bright lights. This makes it so user friendly and has meant people who would only be able to do home workouts out of fear, can now gym.

Statement: PS11.06

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Richard Timmis

I am a user of Kingsdown Sports Centre, and I consider it to be a vital community facility that it should be retained by the council and continue to form part of the leisure centre package managed on behalf of the council.

From the survey we have carried out, we can show that the users of Kingsdown Sports Centre come from all walks of life and all age ranges, and come from a wider area than just the Cotham Ward, which is what is implied by the council report. School children within the catchment areas of the local schools (which extend well beyond the Cotham ward) and Bristol residents who live elsewhere but work locally are represented as well as local residents.

The centre runs a diverse range of activities appealing to parents with young tots, school children, students, young people, through to retired people. There are no other facilities locally that offer such a wide range of activities at the hours and prices that would make it as convenient and accessible for people to make the choice to have an active lifestyle.

I passionately believe that the council ownership and operation of this site as part of the portfolio of Leisure Centres should be safeguarded.

Statement: PS11.07

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Gene Joyner

I ask the Mayor to take into account the following matters and delay his decision on whether to withdraw funding/close Kingsdown Sports Centre:

1. Whilst the centre serves the local community, it also draws users from wider Bristol and beyond.
2. The ethnic and socioeconomic mix of users is far more diverse than has been suggested by the council.
3. The way in which badminton and squash court bookings are accounted for significantly under-estimates the number of actual users.

The centre draws users from wider Bristol and beyond

As Chair of Avon Badminton Association and Chair of Bristol and District Badminton Club, (a club that has played at Kingsdown since it first opened), I know from our membership that we have members who travel to the centre from local addresses, but also members from some of the more deprived areas of Bristol, as well as from the outskirts of the city; from North Somerset, Bath and even South Wales.

There are two main reasons for Kingsdown's broad appeal. The first is the quality of Badminton; Bristol and District count 'National' and 'International' Badminton Champions as part of their membership, but it also incubates and develops raw talent - it is a club for competitive badminton players and not just the elite. The second reason is that as a venue for Badminton, it's hall, unlike the other sports centres, was purposely designed for badminton. The sprung wooden floor, the colour of the walls, the height and the lighting, make this the best venue anywhere in the South West for the sport. For the entire city of Bristol, it's a unique and very special facility.

The ethnic and socioeconomic mix of users is far more diverse than report suggested

The suggestion that Kingsdown primarily caters to an affluent local community is very wrong. I am very much an example of the wider diversity of its users. My ethnicity includes West Indian and British heritage, I grew up in Easton. When I started playing badminton, I used Easton Leisure Centre, and the other sports centres, along with the Baptist Mills Youth Club, but the favourite place for me and my mates was always Kingsdown. Due to the variety of activities that use the various halls such as 'keep fit' classes, basketball, table tennis, etc., even with the choice of Horfield, Easton, St. Pauls, and Kingsdown, booking a court at a time suitable for you, and your mates wasn't always possible.

Back in the day, living in Easton, booking and playing in a venue like the University would have been very intimidating and was not a place we would have naturally considered or felt particularly comfortable in. Losing Kingsdown would certainly limit the opportunities even further for young black social players, as I was many years ago, to be nurtured and developed and go on and achieve unimaginable success. Opportunities, that saw me represent England, as well as win, National and European Championship gold medals.

The way in which badminton and squash court bookings are accounted for significantly underestimates the number of actual users

Kingsdown badminton and squash court bookings are counted by the council as one user when most people will know, the minimum number to play a game is two, but the reality is that very often there can be as many as four or even eight people (four on, and four off), sharing a court that has been registered to just that one person who booked the court. At Bristol and District Badminton Club we have had as many as 30 or more players turn up to the three courts, we use for our club nights. I suspect, this is a similar situation with Beaufort Park (another badminton club that use the hall), and also for the squash court bookings.

The council's assessment and the focus on gym users, along with the underestimate of Badminton and Squash users, gives a very misleading view of the actual number of users of Kingsdown Sports Centre.

Statement: PS11.08

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Nigel Birkett

Declaration of Interest: I am chairman of Beaufort Badminton Club who have used Kingsdown Sports Centre as it's home for club nights and matches since the Centre opened in April 1975. I have fought to have Kingsdown Sports Centre retained in Bristol City Council's Leisure Investment and Procurement Portfolio going forward since the announcement, out of the blue to us, that it would be excluded from that portfolio, revealed to us in September 2021. We use the badminton courts at Kingsdown every Monday evening throughout the year and most Wednesday and Thursday evenings in the badminton season. I have made submissions to the Mayor and written to him and Guy Fishbourne, the author of the report to Council for this strategy, pleading to have Kingsdown retained in the Council's portfolio and plans. I have enlisted the support of Badminton England, Thangham Debonnaire, Darren Jones and others in the campaign to keep Kingsdown in the procurement portfolio.

History of Kingsdown: Badminton at Kingsdown prior to 1974 took place on boards over the former Kingsdown Swimming Baths. When the old baths were pulled down the then Bristol Baths Committee promised the dispossessed clubs who'd used the baths first refusal when booking for the newly built Kingsdown Sports Centre opened. These clubs were Bristol and District, Beaufort and Parkside. This was agreed with Peter Forward the then manager of Bristol Sports Centres. The clubs were keen to start using the five badminton courts in the new hall as soon as possible as they were and have remained the best facilities for serious badminton play in the Bristol area. Three squash courts were also built and opened, with the five badminton courts in April 1975. The involvement of the then City Engineer's Department part of the then City of Bristol was a testament to discussions between the badminton clubs and the Manager of the Sports Centres (Peter Forward) and the mutual respect and understanding that existed at that time. It is a crying shame that no such respect and understanding has been shown towards badminton and the clubs that use Kingsdown by the current Council officials.

Statistical flaws: The statistics used in relation to counting users of the badminton courts at Kingsdown are seriously flawed. It is my understanding that a booking for one badminton court at the Centre has been logged as one user. If this is true then the count of actual users has been overwhelmingly underestimated. It takes at least two people to play a game of badminton. Most club games are doubles which takes four people. At club nights the model is actually eight or more to each court so it can be seen the one court one user approach has seriously underestimated the actual figures playing badminton.

Current Badminton Clubs at Kingsdown: Beaufort Park Badminton Club plays from 7pm until 10.30pm every Monday evening on 4-5 courts and has over 60 members. During the season we play matches there on Wednesday evenings two courts 7-10.30pm and some Thursday evenings one court 7-10.30pm. Bristol and District

Badminton Club play there every Tuesday evening on 3 courts from 8-10pm and has 30-40 members. Bristol Swifts which is Bristol's first LGBTQ+ badminton club uses courts at Kingsdown on Thursday evenings and Sundays and has approaching 100 members. University students use the courts at Kingsdown extensively on Wednesday afternoons, the traditional university sports session, and over the weekends. There are other group bookings of rehabilitating players from a variety of injuries and procedures. I myself had a hip replacement in April 2018 and attended one such session for several weeks on my road to recovery. There are coaching sessions for school age children and No Strings sessions for players to just turn up to and play.

Kingsdown's Gym: I'm not sure when the gym there was created but it has been a godsend for me to be able to use the gym facilities, especially after my hip replacement operation. One of the then instructors devised a programme of exercises to strengthen the muscles and ligaments around my new hip and this contributed massively to me recovery and ability to play badminton again.

Kingsdown Sports Centre has been like a second home for me since I moved to Bristol in 1983. I have played badminton at clubs there for nearly 40 years now. I have seen a myriad of players, young and old, from many diverse backgrounds, of abilities from club player, team player, county player and national and international player. Given the history I've described it will be a tragedy to lose the relationship that exists between the Bristol City Council and this Centre and the badminton community. It's still the best badminton facility, with it's very recently installed wood sprung flooring. I sincerely hope it remains such a revered badminton facility as well as squash and the gym, most preferably with support in some way from Bristol City Council.

Statement: PS11.09

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Michael Makriel

Having moved from London in the late 60's I was looking for a good standard of badminton club where I could improve my play in a friendly environment. I found several friendly clubs playing in what then was known as Kingsdown swimming baths. On completion of the new sports centre the facilities were some of the best in Bristol at the time, and thanks to this I was able to go on when lots of smaller church hall clubs were closing to play for Gloucester. My children have all benefitted from the facilities at Kingsdown whilst most of their colleagues roamed the streets looking for adventure!! It would be sacrilege to close a well run facility that gives young people the opportunity to do something useful with their lives rather than be a burden on society.

Statement: PS11.10

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Laurence Adams

I live in (address supplied), [near] the Sports Centre along with 32 other elderly residents. The housing association is managed by LiveWest. None of the residents are in favour of closing down the centre and redeveloping the site with a building which does not benefit the community at large. I use the sports centre and so do other residents.

LiveWest does not approve of the Mayor closing down the Centre for redevelopment involving the contractors spending months, years in demolishing the existing building and replacing it with a building which does not protect the health and fitness of the community and is not a focal point.

LiveWest do not approve of their residents lives being turned upside down by the noise, dirt pollution created by a thoughtless Mayor.

Statement: PS11.11

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Martin Mullen

I understand that there is an intention to close Kingsdown sports facility . I truly cannot understand why this decision has been taken ? I have used this facility throughout my life as has my whole family and in this busy world we need more facilities like this in the local community to encourage us all to stay fit by exercise at an affordable price . I do not live in cotham but in Bishopston but class Kingsdown as the friendliest local leisure facility and hope this decision is cancelled . Health and fitness needs encouragement.

My family and myself have played badminton there for 30 years and feel it is a great asset to our area. It is an essential part of the local community. Badminton courts are tricky to hire and Kingsdown closure will make it even harder. Now working from home and mental health are more important than ever this is a much needed facility to help maintain peoples fitness and well being.

Statement: PS11.12

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Tom Oldridge

I'm writing to you to encourage you to save Kingsdown gym. The gym has proved invaluable for the mental health of both myself and my partner. We both work long hours and would struggle to get our exercise in if we had to commute to a gym further field. More importantly, the gym is the only affordable space in our local area. Every time we go to the gym it is busy with people of all ages exercising and playing sports with their family and friends. It is an invaluable resource for the community - please don't shut it down. We need it!

Statement: PS11.13

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Briony Waite

I am resident of High Kingsdown and I consider the Kingsdown Sports Centre to be a vital community facility that it should be retained by the council and continue to form part of the leisure centre package managed on behalf of the council.

High Kingsdown and the wider area is a diverse and vibrant community, which in the absence of the Sports Centre would lack any other publicly run and accessible community facilities. Despite the assertions being made to justify the removal of the Sports Centre from the list of Council Leisure Centres, parts of the Cotham ward within which the Sports Centre sits, and areas immediately beyond this boundary, fall within the most deprived 10% of areas nationally. It is accepted that other parts of Cotham ward are more affluent, but it is this diversity and the ability for the Sports Centre to act as community focal point for bringing these residents together which is so important and should not be lost.

The High Kingsdown Community Association, of which I am the chair, has secured the registration of the Sports Centre as an asset of community value. We have done this not to frustrate any plans for investment in the site, but to underline its importance and value to the community. There are no community centres or facilities in the whole of this area.

Whilst the mayor has argued that council resources are limited and should be directed to communities in greater need, a recent Freedom of Information request has shown that the council could not identify any initiatives which itself had carried out to promote the Sports Centre to these more needy communities. It would surely make more sense and be more cost effective to put some resources at the disposal of the Sports Centre in order to target these communities and make sure the activities being offered were attractive to and met the needs of these residents. At the very least I consider this option should be tested before the site is released from the council's portfolio.

It is clear this site has had little if any strategic investment or direction being given to it from the Council in recent years – rather, it has been allowed to decline. Yet it is a site with huge potential - it could be quite easily be made more accessible and offer a wider range of benefits to the community. I would like to see this being realised as a council asset rather than subject the staff and our community to the uncertainty which will follow if the mayor confirms his decision today.

Statement: PS11.14

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Rahul Immandira

I am a resident in Bristol and a member of Beaufort Park Badminton Club. I first joined the club in 2018 and I found it to be a very welcoming and diverse club. People of all ages, races, genders and backgrounds come together on Monday nights to enjoy games of badminton together. Additionally, some members of our club also take part in league matches where we play badminton competitively against other clubs based in Bristol across several league divisions. As a citizen of Singapore, who spent my life growing up there, I have always been impressed by the spirit and culture cultivated by a simple badminton club, for which there does not exist an equivalent back home. I was surprised to learn how long the club has been going, and how many members have actually been with the club for as long as they have. And, in spite of that, new members like me are immediately welcomed and made to feel at home. To my disappointment, I heard of the plans to close Kingsdown leisure centre, and I believe this is a big mistake. I fear the closure would affect our club greatly as many members will find the alternate location inconvenient to get to. In addition, many other people also use the leisure centre for various classes and for the facilities in general, and they would be greatly inconvenienced as well since there is a lack of equivalent facilities in the area. I always admired the Bristol council for their progressive and forward looking decisions such as improving bus services, building new bike paths and ensuring a decent supply of affordable housing in the face of rising house prices. I personally was impressed by Marvin Rees showing up at the opening of the Muller Road Lidl at 8am in the morning (picture enclosed), as it showed he was a mayor in touch with the residents of Bristol. I hope that the council can once again show that their priority is indeed the wellbeing of Bristol residents and reconsider their decision to close Kingsdown Leisure Centre.

Statement: PS11.15

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Kitty Odell

I have been a loyal member of Kingsdown Gym since 2008.....to hear that it is under threat of closure is a moral disgrace, I am absolutely appalled and shocked that closing a gym could even be considered...especially at this time where peoples mental health has been greatly affected by the Covid pandemic....we all know the HUGE benefits of exercise on mental health and well being....also obesity is a massive growing issue...so need I explain further why Kingsdown Gym is a huge asset to the local community and a necessity.....it is well attended, the badminton courts have huge numbers of people using it....for every court booked by 1 individual, there can be at least 6 people using the court for the session.

I use the gym equipment upstairs which is well used by a diverse sector of the community, gyms are a vital community resource which help bind people together, at no time is it more necessary than now, as I am sure you must appreciate to keep ALL gyms open....I understand the need for economies BUT to threaten such a well established and important place such as our Kingsdown Gym is disgraceful.....

The staff themselves are so friendly and warm they contribute hugely to making it feel like a community hub where all are welcome.

I implore you to look again and reconsider, to lose this vital gym would be a HUGE loss to the whole community. And an immoral decision too....

Please do not respond by suggesting I could go to the other gyms such as Easton or Horfield, they are too far away, I am not a car owner and even if I was, do you not agree that it would be hugely counter intuitive for people to start driving to a gym??!!

Local is COMMUNITY!

Statement: PS11.16

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Roger Caldwell

As a local resident and pensioner I wish to voice my objection to the proposal that the Sports Centre in Kingsdown be closed.

I first joined the centre to participate in the yoga classes there following a discussions with my doctor and physiotherapist concerning treatments available to me for severe back pain. I have been attending these sessions for some time now and have begun to feel the health benefits. I am also no longer able to run or cycle owing to knee pain and have found the aerobic training available at the centre a useful supplement to my main exercise of swimming. Were the centre to be closed I would be obliged to drive (contrary to the councils overall strategy) should I wish to continue these therapeutic activities elsewhere.

As a Kingsdown resident in my upper 60s I have no wish to move to the private facilities available none of which are within, easy for me, walking distance of my home and would be considerably more expensive. I do, however, wish to continue to exercise and lighten the load on the NHS.

On a separate, but relevant, note see that a number of charging points for electric cars are being installed at the centre. This would be a most welcome use of the centre parking space which is not heavily used in an area where very few homes have off street parking and, hence, are not encouraged to make the change to electric vehicles (as promoted by both Bristol Council and the national government) surely this initiative would be at risk of being lost should the proposed closure proceed.

Statement: PS11.17

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Sue Paterson

I object to the proposed closure of Kingsdown Sports Centre (KSC) on the following grounds:

- a) The consultation was undemocratic and a sham. All three options included (and depended upon) the closure of KSC and Jubilee Pool, so the decision to close these facilities had clearly already been made. This decision was based on false or misleading information in the officer's report, including misrepresentation of usage figures, running costs and deprivation levels in the area served by KSC.
- b) Our local councillors, elected to represent the community, were shamelessly ignored and sidelined in the entire process.
- c) No evidence has been provided that investment in other parts of Bristol would be matched by an increased uptake in in those areas.
- d) This is clearly an asset stripping exercise by Bristol City Council at the expense of a close knit and mixed local community.

At the very least the Council should revisit the officer's report and demand that the errors and misrepresentation are corrected before any decision is made.

Statement: PS11.18

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Christopher Elson

I am writing to oppose the proposal to close Kingsdown Leisure Centre. The current premises were built in the early 1970s to replace pre-existing sports facilities. It was considered necessary then to provide leisure facilities in the area. Since that time the population of the local area and Bristol in general has increased and is predicted to continue to do so. In addition we are in the midst of an obesity crisis in Bristol as in the rest of the UK. Both of these factors are strong arguments for the provision of leisure facilities for the general public.

It is a normal function of Local Authorities to provide leisure facilities for their residents. Local towns such as Yate (population 30,369), Keynsham (population 18,860), Portishead (population 25,000) and Thornbury (population 13,651) all provide such facilities. Yet if Kingsdown were to be closed, about one quarter of Bristol's population would not have any such facilities in their areas. There are no such facilities in Bedminster, Southville, Ashton Gate, the Harbourside, Cliftonwood, Clifton, Redland, Cotham, Westbury Park, Stoke Bishop, Sneyd Park or Westbury on Trym. Why should Bristol residents be treated so shabbily in comparison to residents in nearby towns?

If Councillors vote to close down Kingsdown it will have very long term consequences as I believe these facilities will never be replaced due to the lack of suitable sites to build.

Kingsdown Leisure Centre is a community asset and surveys have shown that the public's opinion is that it should continue to provide facilities for sport and leisure activities.

I have benefited from using its facilities since it first opened.

I appeal to the Councillors to think of the long term quality of life for Bristol residents.

Statement: PS11.19

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Geoff Callard

I wish to make the following statement to the cabinet meeting taking place on 8th February at 4pm. It is regarding the council's Leisure Investment & Procurement Strategy (Agenda Item 11), and Kingsdown Sports centre in particular.

I object to the council's intention to stop operating Kingsdown Sports Centre (page 90). The intention seems to be to deprive Kingsdown and Cotham and the surrounding areas including Montpelier, St Pauls, Redland and Clifton of a highly valued public community sports facility. The council seems to assume that this area does not merit public support because of the relatively high income of some of the residents of this area. This smacks of discrimination. Whilst it is true that there are more relatively high income residents in this area than some other parts of Bristol, it is also true that there are a large number of local residents who are not well off, including some pensioners, single parent families and many school and university students, who are both unable to afford the prices of private gyms and unable to travel further distances to access facilities further away from their community.

The aim of the mayor and the cabinet seems to be to centralise sports and leisure facilities in larger sports centres such as Easton. In this age of climate change, it flies in the face of the council's (and government) stated policy to reduce carbon emissions. Bristol City Council was the very first in the whole country (and probably the whole world) to declare a climate emergency. Policies such as this leisure policy of centralising resources and cutting local community services in very local communities of Bristol such as Kingsdown and Cotham means more people making longer journeys by car or bus, adding to the emissions which contribute to climate change and also to the poor air quality of Bristol. That is assuming of course, that people are able to do this anyway. There are many local pensioners in Kingsdown and Cotham who are unable to move far from their homes, but need to get out of their homes, and at least get a bit of exercise for their general health and wellbeing. Kingsdown Sports Centre affords them that possibility, and the Centre is valued highly by many of them. To deny them this is quite frankly, wrong and against all reasonable policy.

Please keep Kingsdown Sports Centre open.

Statement: CS011.01

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Councillor Gary Hopkins

In paperwork accompanying the pools and leisure report there is a statement that the council will help with energy efficiency measures (pools can be energy hungry). This council will be presented with the opportunity to put that assertion into positive practice. I sincerely hope that the mayor will support the budget amendment.

Statement: CS011.02

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Councillor Guy Poultney

Kingsdown Sports Centre is a much-loved and well-used community asset in Cotham. It draws in a diverse range of people from across the city to improve their physical and mental health. It hosts national and international medal winners. It brings together people of differing age groups, genders, ethnicities and backgrounds. It is exactly the sort of community facility we should value and support.

The community, sports centre users, and local councillors object to the council's proposal to stop operating the sports centre in the strongest possible terms, and ask that cabinet include Kingsdown in the procurement package for leisure services.

Over the past few months several important pieces of information have come to light, and the report relies on heavily flawed data to conclude that Kingsdown should not be included in the procurement package:

- One dataset used was the Cotham Ward profile. We know from the previously presented petition of sports centre users, and the petition presented today that many people use the sports centre from across the city because of its proximity to where they work (rather than live); e.g. St. Michael's Hospital, The Bristol Royal Infirmary, and Bristol University. The original cabinet report did not take these users into account.
- The report seems to rely on usage data that made the centre look less well-used than it is compared to other facilities. For example, four people going swimming in Horfield are counted as four users, while four playing badminton, or two people playing squash in Kingsdown are only counted as one. There is a significant likelihood that whole teams and groups are being counted as a single user each time they visit.
- Kingsdown Sports Centre was kept closed for four months longer than other leisure facilities during the Covid lockdowns. This made it look less well-used than it actually was.
- Despite this, while the report claimed that the Centre had attracted 'few new members', the centre's membership has grown by almost 10% since 2015 - the most of any of the facilities in the report.
The data overall misrepresents how many people are using the centre, where they're from, and what they're using it for. The report fails to acknowledge that, in spite of everything, the number of members has grown faster than the other leisure facilities in the report.

We have also now seen the results of the council's consultation, and know the following:

- More than 70% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the overall approach.
- Less than a quarter of people agreed or strongly agreed with the overall approach.
- It seems an overall majority of people who responded did not support the strategy and specifically cite the need to keep Kingsdown Sports Centre and Jubilee Pool open as the reason.
- This is despite the choice made by cabinet to not include these options in the consultation.

Despite everything, the staff at Kingsdown Sports Centre have remained professional, courteous, and helpful. Their dedication to the communities they work with has been exemplary and should be an inspiration to us all.

I also feel it's important to thank the volunteers, sports centre users and members of the community who have helped support the campaign to keep Kingsdown Sports Centre operating as a council-run facility.

I would note that more people have signed the petition to keep Kingsdown Sports Centre open than participated in the consultation. My ward partner's inbox and mine have been flooded since this policy was announced. There is huge support for keeping Kingsdown open as a civic sports centre.

Please consider the option supported by the community, the sports centre users, the local councillors, and council's own consultation. We ask cabinet to include Kingsdown Sports Centre in the procurement package for leisure services.

Statement: CS011.03

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Councillor Mohamed Makawi

I won't mention the history of the place, as it is present in the memory as well as in the city's archives.

This edifice extends within the lives and memories of the residents of Cotham and its surroundings for more than half a century. It is the heart of the neighbourhood and the only outlet for the residents of the neighbourhood to remain healthy for all generations, as well as a social centre for their meetings and events, different types of birthdays, graduations or community meetings to discuss various matters, etc.

The closure of the sports centre is the closure of everything that has preceded and more. It would kill a community that has gathered in this place for half a century and more than ever since it was a swimming pool and then became a sports centre. Relationships were formed in it, including marriages, love relationships, or friendships that continued and continue, in addition to the aspect of physical health and wellbeing and the important role played by the centre and the consequent psychological and mental state of the users of the centre.

Statement: CS011.04

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Statement submitted by: Councillor Ed Plowden

The pool and the community campaign to save it are going from strength to strength. It looks like it can run without subsidy. The biggest risk to its continued operation under a Community Asset Transfer is unreasonable timescales or other conditions imposed by the Council. We know from many other examples across the country that pools can flourish under local management

The Council needs recognise the strength of local feeling and organisation and play a genuinely enabling role in leaving no stone unturned to keeping this much loved local facility going.

Question: PQ11.01&02

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Questions submitted by: Paul Collins

QUESTION 1:

Page 13 of the Draft Leisure Facilities Investment Strategy states that: 'Kingsdown Sports Centre is attracting few new members and is not retaining members in a very competitive environment'.

The Mayor will see from the background information I've supplied (below) that the Council's own data does not support that statement and that all references to the centre attracting few new members and retaining members has been removed from the final strategy document and has not been corrected, or referred to at all, in the Report to this Cabinet meeting.

Could the Mayor please explain where the data to make that statement came from?

I ask that this question be answered by Mayor Marvin Rees, as decision maker for Bristol City Council, and that in addition to a verbal response I be given a written reply.

Background context to the question:

The Council has confirmed in their response to a Freedom of Information request (17 January 2021) that (1) the average monthly membership between April 2018 and January 2019 was 889 and (2) the average monthly membership between April 2019 and January 2019 was 1,173. That data does not show that Kingsdown Sports Centre is not attracting 'few' new members nor that it is not retaining members. The Council has also confirmed that membership numbers for previous years (i.e. before April 2018) is not available. Therefore, the Council has very little data on which to make the statement referred to above.

Further, Table 1 at page 31 of the Draft Leisure Investment Strategy (and now Table 1 of page 27 of the Final Draft Leisure Investment Strategy) shows a 9% increase in attendance at Kingsdown Sports Centre between 2015-20 (the highest increase in attendance of the facilities listed).

QUESTION 2:

The Equalities Impact Assessment recognises that there is a statistically significant number of young people in the ward where Kingsdown is situated (i.e. Cotham ward). According to the Council's data, of the 1,988 responses received on the draft strategy less than 20 (less than 1%) were from under 18-year-olds.

Could the Mayor please confirm what specific efforts were made to consult those young people of school age who either live in Cotham ward or attend

schools in the ward, and what evidence does the council have to support their statement that those young people would either want to, or be able to afford, using the facilities operated by Bristol University?

I ask that this question be answered by Mayor Marvin Rees, as decision maker for Bristol City Council, and that in addition to a verbal response I be given a written reply.

Background context to the question:

The Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) recognises that there is a statistically significant number of young people in the ward where Kingsdown is situated (i.e. Cotham ward). To mitigate that, the Council states there is alternative provision in the area, including the facilities operated by Bristol University.

The EqIA states that responses were under-represented in terms of population proportion from young people and under 24-year-olds.

The EqIA states that responses were monitored throughout the consultation and because of the low numbers of respondents from younger people, efforts were made by the council's external communications team to reach out to those specific communities.

Section 2.3 of The Consultation and Engagement Report of 21 January 2022 sets out how the consultation was communicated to 'reach as broad a range of audiences as possible to maximise response rate'.

Question: PQ11.03&04

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Questions submitted by: Brian Glasson

(1) Has the Mayor, since his election, ever visited Kingsdown Sports Centre?

(2) The Save Kingsdown Sports Centre Steering Group wrote to the Mayor three months ago on the 8th November and then another three times, inviting the mayor to visit the Sports Centre and to engage with the local community directly to discuss what the group or others could do to enable the Mayor to reconsider his decision. Does the mayor believe the timing and content of his response upholds the best principles of a publicly accessible and accountable leadership?

Question: CQ11.01&02

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Questions submitted by: Councillor Gary Hopkins

1. It finally appears that there is likely to be a six month extension to the Parkwood contract at Jubilee pool. This is to allow the asset transfer to complete. What is clearly stated is that if the transfer has not completed by September the pool will close anyway despite the fact that Parkwood are happy to carry on longer and that profits are being made despite the council providing no subsidy.
Given the previous track record on this matter what assurances can the mayor give that he will not seek to impose unfair conditions upon the transfer agreement?
2. In the reports made available for this meeting officers have failed to take any account of the dramatically improved situation at Jubilee since the community got involved with the management. Despite high energy bills there is a trading profit and at the recent 24hr swimathon 207 swimmers swam 14,216 lengths (312,752M 193 Miles) and raised over £27,000. This does not square with the negative comments and the community now demand that the mayor get up to date and recognise the positive progress? Because the council failed to run the pool well does not mean that community progress should be ignored.

Question: CQ11.03&04

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Questions submitted by: Councillor Chris Davies

1. Will the Mayor commit to the terms of the Jubilee asset transfer being made available to the all-party working group on Jubilee so that the group can check for fairness and advise?
2. Jubilee pool makes a considerable positive contribution to public health. Now that the council is abandoning the pool will a proportionate amount of the public health grant be given to the community operators?

Question: CQ11.05&06

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Questions submitted by: Councillor Guy Poultney

1. What is the estimated financial saving Bristol City Council will make by not including Kingsdown Sports Centre in the leisure services procurement package?

2. On Page 237 of the document under 4.1 of the Equalities Impact Assessment it states "Although travel times and costs may increase for some users if alternative management options are not realised, conversations have been undertaken with WECA to ensure that there is sufficient public transport to alternative facilities."

What does the Mayor consider 'sufficient' and what assurances has he received from WECA that this will be delivered?

Question: CQ11.07&08

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 11 - Leisure Facilities Investment and Procurement

Questions submitted by: Councillor Barry Parsons

Public consultation has overwhelmingly rejected this leisure investment strategy, which could result in the loss of both Jubilee Pool and Kingsdown Sports Centre. The public has never been presented with an adequate account of how the decision to stop operating these facilities was made, or what options were considered. We can therefore have no confidence that a proper assessment of the alternatives has been made.

1. Isn't it time to admit that the strategy is flawed and go back to the drawing board?
2. What alternatives were considered to stopping operating Jubilee Pool and Kingsdown Sports Centre?

Question: CQ12.01

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 12 - Community Resilience Fund

Question submitted by: Councillor Tim Rippington

Unlike other areas in Bristol, there's almost no community buildings in Brislington. Can this funding be used towards investing in new community facilities, or can it only be used by existing organisations to carry out and enhance their work?

Question: CQ12.02&03

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 12 - Community Resilience Fund

Question submitted by: Councillor Ani Stafford Townsend

We welcome community engagement in how funds are spent within our communities.

1. Bristol's Voluntary Sector organisations have already engaged in reports and workshops, how will these recommendations ensure an incentive for communities to engage with this additional process without there being a guarantee of meaningful funds at the end of it and value for money?
2. How will the spending be ultimately decided, councillors across the city, ward councillors, officers or someone else?

Question: CQ12.04

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 12 - Community Resilience Fund

Question submitted by: Councillor Christine Townsend

We welcome the opportunity to deliver additional funding into the 30% most deprived areas of Bristol.

In our ward of Southville, we have two areas that qualify for the funding, and they cover a part of our ward that is undergoing tremendous change and disruption as thousands of homes are being built or planned.

What we are still unclear about, is who will be making the final decision regarding how funding is allocated. These concerns have also been raised with us by existing community groups.

Question:

Will it be all councillors within the relevant Area Committee regardless of whether they have areas eligible for the funding or just those ward councillors within eligible areas?

Statement: PS14.01

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 14 - Project 1000: Affordable Housing Delivery Plan 2022-2025

Statement submitted by: Clive Stevens

Dear Cabinet – I am so pleased to read about Project 1000, if it works, and with time, it could be transformative to Bristol.

It is clear the housing market is not working for many. Even the Government admit it, their definition of an affordable home is now, “housing for sale or rent, for those [people] whose needs are not met by the market”. In Bristol there are perhaps as many as 100,000 who’s needs are not met by the market. Many live in council, social or association housing, but the housing list and planning studies show many more aren’t and it seems to be getting worse. Therefore it is totally appropriate and right for the state to increase the level of market intervention locally and nationally. I will cover some wider benefits I see coming from Project 1000 and then some concerns.

1) Wider benefits:

- Having 1000 new affordable homes each year will mean more money going into the local economy as some of those 1000 households exit the private rented sector and finally have some disposable income to spend (if energy prices don’t grab it all). There is the obvious positive impact on high streets, and in due course this spend will support some sectors of the local economy currently priced out by high rents like artists, some hospitality and local music. These are things that give Bristol its flavour. It could even partially mitigate the impact of gentrification in some areas.
- Also Project 1000 makes it easier for key workers to live here. In London they have added all key worker jobs to the priority list for housing. In Bristol we should consider this too. Access to affordable housing will reduce pressure on them to leave Bristol or live far out. It could also reduce cost pressures on Bristol City Council itself and others who employ lots of key workers.
- There are even wider benefits to Bristolians. In Bristol the private rented sector is about 60,000 dwellings. Adding affordable housing in large quantities will start to tip the balance between supply and demand and bring a boost to tenant power. Whether this takes 10,000, 20,000 or more, I don’t know. Eventually this should have a longer term impact on private rents. Then tenants can use their newly found disposable income to spend in the local economy and/or take the chance to save and if they wish, buy a home.
- May I suggest that all Council departments start adding up the benefits to them and so contribute to Project 1000.

2) My concerns:

- A lot of this relies on Government subsidies, currently via Homes England. If this is cut then another funding source is necessary. The Goram Homes cross subsidy model could help substitute over time e.g. build half at market price and half affordable. The advantage this brings is the building of mixed communities. Extend that and add some Extra Care Housing (for older

people) plus some student housing too, all of which would generate more income within the scheme to accelerate the programme. In addition extra income could perhaps enable better room sizes, community and child's play areas and all with better insulation.

- This supply of new builds needs to add to the density of accommodation in an area. It is population density which brings greater productivity to a City, supporting bus services, high streets, infrastructure, local schools indeed local 15 minute neighbourhoods and all less reliant on the car.
- In some markets, private sector demand for new building is strong and it is where developers make money. These sectors include Purpose Built Student Accommodation, high quality offices, "non-affordable" homes and to a lesser extent Airbnb type accommodation. The market in itself brings hardly any affordable homes. It seems the retail sector is struggling too. The demands of developers need to be managed by the Council otherwise the private sector will continue to bid up the price of land to satisfy their profit needs and many Bristolians won't then get their affordable homes.
- Private sector build may well leave lots of unused and unwanted shops and offices. If these are going cheap then the Council should consider buying them up for conversion to homes. If the Council do this then enough can be made affordable; whereas, if developers do this, they can convert to homes too, but under permitted development rights they can offer substandard, high rent accommodation. Not what we need at all.
- This all requires proper Planning; perhaps of the zonal type. I see WECA's Spatial Development Strategy comes out for consultation on the 8th April. I hope it is consistent with this type of activity and supports what you are trying to do.

Managing the market, shaping it, requires even more funding from the Council (or Goram) to buy up derelict buildings, car parks and the like. Even more reason for the whole Council to join the Project 1000 mission.

Finance Department, you have a huge role to play in this – don't be too cautious, do be far sighted. You need to join the mission.

Question: PQ14.01&02

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 14 - Project 1000: Affordable Housing Delivery Plan 2022-2025

Questions submitted by: Clive Stevens

It's so exciting that we have a homes mission in Bristol, not quite landing a person on the moon, but our equivalent. Building 1000 (or more) affordable homes a year is a mission. It will have huge payoffs which I will describe in my statement (to follow). This is the opportunity for questions. Whilst I guess there will be many about the climate and ecological emergencies, I'll take on the more humdrum topics of risk assessment and budgeting approach.

Q1. The management of Bristol's Land. Regarding a key risk within R01 (Capital cost increases). Appendix 1 states that Bristol Council has enough land for just 4,600 affordable homes. Project 1000 looks to build over 20,000 affordable homes in 20 years (so 15,400 on non-Council land). Additionally estimates put the non-affordable homes targets at a further 20,000 to 40,000 over the same time period. What can and will be done to ensure that Council and private land is prioritised for the most needy?

Q2. Budgets. A recent book written by Mariana Mazzucato, one of the world's leading, good economists, describes the need for different budgeting approaches when there is a mission to be achieved. Called outcome-based budgeting, it involves, I'm told, the whole mission having a budget line which gathers the costs and benefits from different departments. How will Finance Department implement mission-based budgeting for Project 1000?

Question: CQ14.01

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 14 - Project 1000: Affordable Housing Delivery Plan 2022-2025

Question submitted by: Councillor Tim Rippington

As sites like the Western Slopes have had their housing plans withdrawn due to ecological concerns, the numbers for housing will need to be made up elsewhere, because, as we all know, despite the administration's good work, Bristol still faces a housing crisis – something that comes up regularly in my conversations with residents. Brislington East has industrial land by the river that is currently designated as flood risk.

If flood defences are secured, does the administration have an estimate of how much brownfield land might be freed up for affordable housing?

Question: CQ14.02&03

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 14 - Project 1000: Affordable Housing Delivery Plan 2022-2025

Question submitted by: Councillor Tony Dyer

Preamble:

The rising cost of market rate housing, either to purchase or to rent (with the latter often bearing a direct relation to the former), has a massive impact on the disposable income of thousands of Bristol residents as they find themselves having to spend an increasing proportion of their income to keep a roof over their heads. As the previous item has shown, for an increasing number of households, this has often led to homelessness.

Clearly, if the phrase “levelling up” is to have any meaning beyond a media lite soundbite then reducing housing costs has to be a major element of any strategy to reduce inequality, and I also include in those housing costs the increasing cost of heating energy wasteful homes. It is therefore good news to see these proposals come forward and I look forward to working with the cabinet member for housing delivery and homes to bring these plans to fruition, and in cooperation with ward councillors and local residents across the city.

Question 1:

Given the fanfare regarding the announcement of the Government’s “Levelling Up” strategy, has the Cabinet Member and/or housing officers, been able to identify any concrete funding proposals within the flurry of announcements made by the Government since last Wednesday that would enable more genuinely affordable, energy efficient homes to be built in Bristol, over and above the proposals going to Bristol’s budget meeting next week?

Preamble:

Sadly the term “affordable housing” has lost considerable credibility – often this has been due to the misuse of the term to describe homes that are barely affordable and offered at a rate only a relatively small percentage below market levels. For many members of the public (and some councillors) there is a concern that “affordable housing” more often or not means homes at 80% of market rate, far beyond the reach, for example, of most of the 16,000 tenants and families on the housing register.

Question 2:

Can the cabinet member clarify that all homes built for, or acquired by, the Council’s Housing Revenue Account will be homes for rent at social rent levels, and that the minimum expectation is for these new homes to have an energy efficiency rating of A?

The cabinet member may choose to make a similar statement regarding the makeup of affordable housing delivered by the Council's arms-length housing company, Goram Homes.

Statement: CS16.01

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 16 - National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF) grant application for Stoke Park

Statement submitted by: Cllr David Wilcox

Stoke Park Estate is a massive asset for Bristol; it is more extensive than Clifton & Durdham Downs and is closer to the centre of the city. Hundreds of people visit the site of Nature Conservation Interest daily, there has been a massive increase in footfall during the pandemic to get fresh air and exercise.

It is vitally important that Stoke Park is removed from the Heritage at-risk register and preserved for the benefit of the city.

I am delighted that Historic England and the National Lottery Heritage Fund is prepared to partner with Bristol's City Council to achieve this aim.

Many Lockleaze residents and I are delighted that the plans do not include a car park but do include two Food & Beverage sites and some much needed public toilets.

I welcome this investment into the council-owned park and grade II registered landscape, enhancing and protecting it for future generations.

Question: CQ16.01&02

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 16 - Stoke Park Estate Restoration

Question submitted by: Councillor Marley Bennett

- 1) Can the funding be used for improving active travel?
- 2) Are officers looking at the possibility of extending cycle paths through the park to join with existing infrastructure in my ward, such as the Frome Cycleway?

Statement: CS18.01

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 18 – Tree Strategy and Tree Planting Plan

Statement submitted by: Bristol Tree Forum

Statement attached



Statement - Cabinet paper on the Tree Strategy and Tree Planting Plan - 8 February 2022

We applaud this plan to commit significant Council funds to develop a Tree Strategy for Bristol and plant more trees during the financial year 2022/2023. We accept the premises of the report as well as the opportunities and risks identified. However, we have a few caveats.

1. Setting the correct baseline tree canopy cover value

Item 1 of the Evidence Base states: *'The One City Plan includes a target to increase Bristol's tree canopy by 25% by 2035 and to double it by 2046, from a baseline given by the 2018 i-Tree Eco study which stated Bristol's tree canopy at around 12%'*.

We have long argued that, given the range of evidence available, setting the baseline canopy cover value at 12% is too low. In our view, credible baseline is more likely to be around 18%; see our blog [Bristol's tree canopy](#).

We do not understand the statement, *'achieving a 24% tree canopy is equivalent to adding 660 hectares canopy cover'*. Where does the 660 hectares figure come from? If a 12% baseline is adopted then, on the basis that the area of Bristol is just under 11,000 hectares, we calculate that 1,320 hectares of new tree canopy will be needed. If an 18% baseline is adopted, then 1,980 hectares will be required.

2. Funding requirements and strategy development

We note the list of achievements in place (some of which will need updating) and those required at paragraph 14. We would like to have seen more detail about how the £40,000 proposed will be delivered to fund the preparation of a Tree Strategy and Tree Planting Plan.

Any strategy will need to plan for delivery at least until 2046 and should be based on SMART goals.¹ The document will need to provide methodologies and tools for measuring progress. Tree strategy documents developed by other councils should be reviewed for comparison.²

There is a substantial risk that inner-city tree cover may decline because it is easier to find planting sites on the edge of the city. We need trees in city centres to mitigate the urban heat-island effect and help reduce pollution. The strategy should address this.

3. Protecting existing urban trees

It is essential that you adopt the [Mitigation Hierarchy](#) approach to the care of existing trees: firstly, protect the trees; secondly, minimise their loss wherever possible; next, remediate any damage caused and, lastly (and only when all other options have been exhausted), compensate for inevitable tree loss by sufficient replacement planting.

If the goal of doubling tree canopy cover over the next 24 years is to succeed, it will be essential to manage trees to maximise all the benefits that existing trees bring. If not then, at the current rate of tree loss, it is likely that net tree canopy cover will decline rather than grow.

Any tree strategy and tree planting plan should become a core part of and inform the Local Plan.

We are delighted to see that plans to develop a future strategy for Bristol's trees are being revived and enthusiastically offer our services to help the Council achieve this.

¹ Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and anchored within a Time Frame.

² Indeed, it could be a very helpful piece of research to find out how such strategies have been developed, how much they have cost and how successful they have been.

Statement: CS18.01

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 18 – Tree Strategy and Tree Planting Plan

Statement submitted by: Cllr Emma Edwards

The Communities Scrutiny Commission carries out overview and scrutiny of matters that affect Bristol communities, including environmental issues and parks and the ecological emergency action plan. When developing our programme for the 2021-22 municipal year, we prioritised convening a Working Group to examine the challenges and opportunities surrounding the target to double the tree canopy target by 2046; explore the controversies and issues regarding tree management and protection; and identify ways to clarify and improve the policies in the city.

The Working Group has held three sessions, informed by officers from across the authority and have also received evidence from West of England Nature Partnership, Bristol Tree Forum, and the Woodland Trust. Its membership is cross party and we've also had Cabinet members in attendance. We compiled and addressed a great many questions relating to trees.

Initial findings and recommendations are scheduled to be brought to the Communities Scrutiny Commission on the 21 February. This statement, with reference to the scrutiny work the Working Group has undertaken, is submitted to Cabinet as a preliminary summary of issues in order to comment on the proposal for the preparation of a Bristol Tree Strategy and Tree Planting Plan.

The Working Group commends the proposal to prepare a tree strategy and tree planting plan. Members are in agreement that this is a key and necessary proposal and the absence of such strategy was one we were concerned by and led to our working group. The group recommend that it is approved.

In this context we have the following observations and recommendations:

1. Tree planting and tree canopy are not the same thing and while the former proceeds the latter can shrink due to loss of mature trees. This is a significant issue for the city as the benefits of tree canopy are wide ranging but the city has many ageing trees and much development affecting trees. As the report says, the 2046 target is very ambitious and new or replacement trees take decades to develop their canopy.
2. The unequal distribution of trees is a priority and we are conscious that the cost of remedying this with new street trees or new green spaces with trees where there are none or few is considerable and needs to be addressed in the strategy. This should be addressed in the Liveable Neighbourhoods Strategy and in highways and parking schemes.
3. Funding for tree planting is reliant on many sources and the current pace of planting would need to accelerate significantly to meet the target, while the land needed is also subject to many competing demands and pressures, including related matters like green infrastructure and leisure. Not all the same benefits can be met by

planting and protecting trees. If resources are applied to tackling the unequal access to trees then far fewer trees can be planted. We agreed that the Bristol Tree Scheme should be refreshed and the council should consider joining the national Trees for Cities scheme as ways of driving more tree sponsorship.

4. The issues around risk and tree protection are complex and we think much more attention is needed to clarify and communicate how the decisions are arrived at in both management of council owned trees like street trees and the protection that can be afforded in planning. The need to protect trees in parks and open spaces needs to be clear to contractors.

5. We think a briefing about the planning issues would benefit council Members. The range of material considerations is vast and policies are not always understood, not the weight given to them. Decisions to fell trees could be better explained. Where consultation takes place the scope of the issues and options needs to be clear.

6. Measuring and monitoring progress with the targets and the strategies needs to be developed and kept under review. The choice of measures needs to be chosen and explained and a system to show how the city is progressing and the roles of different partners.

7. We recognised that trees have a great many benefits and attributes so they can affect climate protection, climate adaptation, including shade and heat impacts, biodiversity, mental well being, flood protection, childrens play, food, fuel, pollution, and they can also cause damage to property, affect highways, access issues, and street cleansing costs. The interaction with a great many other council strategies and services, plus the work of other city partners is therefore complex and will need to be communicated when the strategies are consulted.

8. The selection and sourcing of trees and finding the right tree for the right place needs to be addressed, including the implications of the changing climate.

The Working Group were very grateful for the extensive input from many officers and from stakeholder who attended and fed into our discussions.

Statement: CS19.01

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 19 – COP26 Glasgow Outcomes

Statement submitted by: Cllr Tim Wye

We note the report celebrating the efforts of Bristol’s administration in relation to COP 26. We would support these aims but also feel that it is important to put it into context given the catastrophic outcome of the appeal by Bristol Airport Authority over the Bristol airport expansion.

The airport has previously been criticised by climate experts for underestimating the climate impact of airport expansion – estimating this at 154ktpa CO₂e – six times lower than the 920ktpa CO₂e calculated once other factors are taken into account. This figure will rise way over 1 million tonnes, once the new multiplier of 3 confirmed in the new EU research is accounted for (the previous 920ktpa CO₂e used a multiplier of 1.9). A multiplier is the additional impact that non-CO₂ emissions and contrails have on the climate.

On top of the environmental damage, the decision also, as North Somerset Leader Donald Davies puts it, “flies in the face of local democracy”. Quite literally in this case.

In summary, expanding Bristol airport will therefore generate a million tonnes of CO₂ equivalent every single year – that’s 50% of Bristol’s current carbon emissions. This sadly negates the efforts and, albeit limited, progress made during COP and we would like to put on the record that the Mayor’s representative at the WECA meeting (Craig Cheney) abstained on a vote opposing the airport expansion, despite Bristol Council’s vote in favour of a Green motion which noted that the airport expansion is incompatible with our local and regional carbon targets and “must not go ahead.”

This seems entirely inconsistent to the aspirations to use city leadership to tackle carbon emissions. City Leadership on the environment means supporting difficult decisions to put climate needs at the forefront of what we do.

Question: PQ19.01&02

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 19 - COP26 Glasgow Outcomes

Question submitted by: David Redgewell

Question 1

What progress is being made:

- with the West of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council on the 27 new buses for the clean air zone in Bristol city centre, new and hybrid buses for routes into the city centre from North Somerset Towns of Weston super mare, Clevedon, Portishead Nailsea and Pill and south Bristol through Bower Ashton, Ashton Gate Hotwell Road.
- on Electrification of the Network rail western route railway line from Chippenham Bath spa Bristol Temple meads and Patchway and Bristol Parkway, electrification of metro west railway Network and hydrogen fuel trains and an electric mass transit system for Bristol and Bath city region?
- As at cop 26, the first group and stagecoach group had Electrification of the bus fleet in progress with the Scottish government and Glasgow city council, is the council on track with euro 6 Engines with stagecoach west for the Bristol clean air zone. Decarbonisation of the city region public transport fleet should be a top priority for mayor Rees and metro mayor Dan Norris for the city region what budget is being put aside for Decarbonisation of the city region public transport fleet.

Question 2

What progress is being made in supporting the city region bus network with the Department for Transport Covid-19 Bus Operators Recovery Grant and what discussions have taken place between the city mayor and the metro mayor Dan Norris with the regions MPs and Baroness Vere of Norbiton, the bus minister, through the core cities sub region Transport Board and the M10 as public transport is an essential resource of the city region in climate change (as pointed out in Glasgow) in cities across the world?

Question: CQ19.01&02

Cabinet – 8 February 2022

Re: Agenda item 19 - COP26 Glasgow Outcomes

Question submitted by: Cllr Martin Fodor

I'm glad the council is engaged with other cities and financial institutions to mobilise climate finance. Large scale solutions need to be created – we know what needs doing and this takes resources and powers.

But smaller scale action is equally important for many reasons. Incremental and localised projects are essential and we can't wait to tap existing funds for projects waiting to be delivered. In September 2020 I first proposed* an effective way to mobilise local savings from across the city and beyond - a method that's worked well in other authorities as a way to tap existing savings and fund vital projects of around £1m on a regular basis: Community Municipal Investments. Bristol is a city with large scale ethical, social and environmental private investment resources. The CMI approach has been endorsed by the Local Government Association and CMIs are now gathering savers' funds and being invested in projects in several other places. This supports popular engagement, carbon saving, and most importantly real progress on the ground while we wait to see if City Leap can get going. We should not miss out on this relatively low risk council-endorsed private finance that complements all the other solutions.

Q 1. What study has been carried out to assess the potential for doing this in Bristol?

Q 2. When will Bristol start to mobilise funds from its own communities to tackle climate breakdown?

* motion 9 - Mobilise community investments to tackle climate change.

<https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/documents/g8368/Public%20reports%20pack%2008th-Sep-2020%2018.00%20Full%20Council.pdf?T=10>