

Full Council Supplementary Information



Date: Tuesday, 15 March 2022

Time: 6.00 pm

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

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

Public Forum (Public Petitions, Statements and Questions)

(Pages 3 - 87)

The written answers to public forum questions are attached.

Issued by: Sam Wilcock, Democratic Services

City Hall, Bristol, BS1 9NE

Tel: 0117 92 23846

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

Date: Tuesday, 29 March 2022



Full Council – 15th March 2022 Agenda item 6 b Public questions



Procedural note:

Questions submitted by members of the public:

- Questions can be about any matter the Council is responsible for or which directly affect the city.
- Members of the public who live and/or have a business in Bristol are entitled to submit up to 2 written questions, and to ask up to 2 supplementary questions. A supplementary question must arise directly out of the original question or the reply.
- Replies to questions will be given verbally by the Mayor (or a Cabinet member where relevant). Written replies will be published within 10 working days following the meeting.



*point of explanation - where a person has asked two questions on the same topic they are on the same line. Where topics are different they have different lines.

Ref No	Name	Title
PQ01 & PQ02	Rob Bryher	Recommendation 9 from Bristol's first Citizens Assembly
PQ03 & PQ 04	Nigel Shipley	We need a lot more clean energy generation
PQ05 & PQ06	Howard Purse	Plot 5, Bedminster Green
PQ07	David Nash	Redcatch Park – Mast (proposal)
PQ08	Rachel Hall	Parking around Ashton Gate on match days
PQ10	Matt Gibbs	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ11	Steve Britton	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ12	George Sarudis	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ13	Dr Rahul Bhatnagar	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ14	Alan Smith	New RPZ in BS3
PQ15	Miranda Walker	Protect iconic view of Totterdown escarpment
PQ16	Ben Clifford-Kitching	new RPZ in Bedminster
PQ17	Robert Adams	New RPZ in BS3
PQ18	Sarah Leonard	New RPZ in BS3
PQ19	Jeremy Bray	extension of Southville's existing RPZ
PQ20	Anya Skatova & Joe Webb	extension of Southville's existing RPZ
PQ21	Sarah Cronow	extension of Southville's existing RPZ
PQ22	Lena wright	RPZ in BS3 Windmill Hill Ward
PQ23	Ed Pitt	RPZ for Ashton/extension to Southville
PQ24	AJ Gardham	RPZ in Windmill Hill
PQ25	Helena Wray	RPZ in BS3
PQ26	Ying Wang	Extension to Southville RPZ
PQ27	Harish Sharma	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ28	Mye Green	New RPZ in BS3
PQ29	Marta Haui Yazbek	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ30	Anna Francis	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ31	Katie Murton	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ32	David Jones	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ33	Louis Hunter	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ34	Laetitia Tempelman	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ35	Ken Gardner	RPZ in BS3
PQ36	Caroline Elzik	RPZ in BS3
PQ37	Andrew Wakely	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ38	Kirsty Craig	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ39	Janis Beavon	New RPZ in BS3
PQ40	Richard Smith	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ41 & PQ42	Sian Ellis Thomas	Telecoms mast by EE in Redcatch Park, Knowle
PQ43	Justin Elzik	new RPZ in BS3
PQ44	Simon Hill	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ45	Deb Edwards	New RPZ in BS3
PQ46	Jon Norman	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ47	Sarah Vass	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ48	Scott King	Match day restrictions in BS3
PQ49	Jack Clemoes	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ50	Emilie Hickman	Extension of Southville RPZ

PQ51	Helen Parham	New RPZ in BS3
PQ52	Nigel Maggs	New RPZ in BS3
PQ53	Michael Hodgson	New RPZ in BS3
PQ54	Eithne Hodgson	New RPZ in Bedminster Ward
PQ55	Matt Hughes	New RPZ for BS3
PQ56 & PQ57	Ollie Lax	Divestment from Fossil Fuels
PQ58	Jim Mayger	Divestment
PQ59	Stephanie McKenna	Proposed Mast at Redcatch Park
PQ60 & PQ61	Heather Peet	Effect of Mast on Parks Visits
PQ62	Tim Sully	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ63	Claire Gronow	Carbon neutral and climate resilient City by 2030
PQ64	Rob Porteous	Carbon Neutral Bristol
PQ65	Lauren Hennessy	Carbon Neutral Bristol by 2030
PQ66 & PQ67	Lesley Powell	Telecomms mast by EE in Redcatch Park
PQ68 & PQ69	Andrea Mackay	Air Pollution
PQ70 & PQ71	Suzanne Audrey	The Mayoral System and Decision Making
PQ72 & PQ73	Victoria Young	Redcatch Mast
PQ74	Nicola McGerty	New RPZ on Bower Ashton Terrace
PQ75 & PQ76	David Redgewell	Transport – passengers and mass transit
PQ77	Dr Hilary Farey	Home Insulation
PQ78	Hannah Mishan	Carbon Neutral Bristol by 2030
PQ79	Richard Baxter	Mass Transit
PQ80	Maria Wood	Bristol Airport Expansion
PQ81	Alison Allan	Greenwashing in Advertising
PQ82	Robina Mallett	Greenwashing in Advertising
PQ83 & PQ84	Moving Bristol Forward	Mass Transit Proposals
PQ85	Matt Jones	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ86	Isabella Harding	Carbon Neutral Bristol by 2030



PQ 01 & PQ 02

Subject: Recommendation 9 from Bristol’s first Citizens’ Assembly

Questions submitted by: Rob Bryher

Recommendation 9 from Bristol’s first Citizens’ Assembly includes two proposed actions:

- transferring 3-5% of road space to cycling, walking and green space every year (action 1. c.)
- transferring 3-5% of street car parking spaces in the city over to cycle parking and shared green space every year (action 1. d.)

The administration has not yet set a written target to do this in any plans and there is not a clear process for residents, community groups and businesses to establish permanent parklets (an idea that would fulfil both aspects of action 1. d. simultaneously).

However, the Citizens’ Assembly Tracker was finally unveiled in January and the response to Recommendation 9 did note that the administration “support reallocating car parking spaces to cycle parking and green space” but that they “challenge the target” because “as it is written could be considered arbitrary”.

Here is a short list of cities who have committed to very specific (non-arbitrary) targets for road space reallocation:

- Amsterdam conducted a feasibility study that made it possible to commit to remove 7,000 to 10,000 on-street parking spaces by 2025.
- Oslo committed to removing all of its parking spaces in the city centre (ring 1) area between 2015 and 2019.
- Milan committed to 22 miles of rapid, experimental citywide expansion of cycling and walking space.
- Copenhagen has for the last 50 years reduced its parking supply by cutting the total number of parking spaces by a small percentage each year.

These examples are included simply to show that political leadership requires setting specific targets to drive action.

Q1. Please can the administration put a **non-arbitrary** and **specific** target on how many parking spaces they will reallocate to cycling, walking and green space every year?

Labour-run Hackney Council is actively inviting ideas for community parklets on residential streets, with grants of up to £250 being made available to successful bidders. You can read more at: <https://hackney.gov.uk/parklets>

Q2. What assessments have been undertaken by the administration to understand the specific needs and demands of communities with regards to reallocating car parking spaces to cycling, walking and green space? Will the administration provide a clear process (similar to that used in Hackney) for residents to apply to install permanent parklets to help in this effort to decarbonise Bristol? Rob Bryher Submitted in a personal capacity

These questions received a verbal response at the Full Council meeting.



PQ 03 & PQ 04

Subject: We need a lot more clean energy generation

Questions submitted by: Nigel Shipley

On bath road Mid Group are building four blocks of flats which is one of the largest such projects in Bristol. They tell me that originally they planned that the flats would be heated electrically but the Council has instructed them to install gas heating instead because if all new construction were fitted electric heating there would be insufficient electricity generated to meet the demand. Many people in Bristol are also planning to buy electric vehicles which will increase demand for clean electricity.

To prevent the lights going out we need to urgently to build a great deal more sustainable energy generation. The Council must take the lead in encouraging and helping residents and businesses to fit solar panels to their roofs (about 1/3 of our homes have a roof which is suitable for this). You must also promote the building of wind turbines and the development of tidal power generation.

Please do not tell me that energy generation is not your responsibility when council planners have instructed developers not to install electrical heating and the council has taken credit for the building of a large wind turbine on its land in Avonmouth.

Question 1) What has the council done to urgently build up clean energy generation for Bristol?

Quite rightly you have prioritised the building of new homes in Bristol to address the chronic housing shortage. You now need to put the same energy and political capital into developing additional clean energy generation.

Question 2) When will you publish a report setting out how and when additional clean energy generation will be built, and list the ways in which you have promoted this?

REPLY:

Q1.

We have a strong record of supporting renewable energy generation in Bristol.

Through our solar investment programme, we have installed over 8MW of Solar PV across the city. These range from solar panels on our own buildings, to large solar farms and installation.

Just last week we welcomed representatives from the Committee on Climate Change to Bristol and showed them the Castle Park Energy Centre – the largest water source heat pump in England. Contrary to your claim that we are not putting enough political capital into decarbonising our city’s energy supply, the committee’s representatives called us a model in how local authorities can deliver on the net zero agenda. City Leap, of course, will further build on this record of delivery with a £1billion investment in low carbon energy.

You mention the wind turbine in Lawrence Weston. This is one of a number of community energy projects we have supported through to completion, including a hydro electric scheme at Netham



Weir.

Q2.

We regularly publish reports on action we are taking to support renewable energy generation.

These include governance papers such as Cabinet reports which are available for public scrutiny and comment, and our Climate and Ecological Emergency Action Plans.

At next month's cabinet meeting we will announce the preferred partner for the City Leap Energy Partnership to deliver over £1bn of investment in sustainable energy. This will be a major contributor to maximising the energy efficiency and energy generation within the city.

However, Bristol will never be fully self-sufficient in energy. We will continue to rely on national government creating the conditions for successful low carbon energy projects across the UK.



PQ 05 & PQ 06

Subject: Plot 5, Bedminster Green

Question submitted by: Howard Purse

1) Re; Plot 5 Bedminster Green. Hereford St Car Park, St Catherines Trading estate and land to the North of the railway.

I have previously requested via FOI details of how this public land is being transferred to the Private Sector. So far only the first agreement between the Council and Urbis has been forthcoming. I have received no information about the current agreement. Please can you let me know how a developer was chosen and what procurement or equivalent competitive process was used to ensure best value has been obtained to the City of Bristol in the transfer of this City Council land to the private sector, currently the offshore registered Dandara, and how State Aid regulations are being adhered with?

2) The treatment of Plot 5, Bedminster Green.

This plot is key to the success of the redevelopment of South Bristol. I have grave concerns about the current proposal. The council has a duty to safeguard the health, wellbeing and assets of the citizens. Why has the Mayor not looked at other options or sought proposals for the site from a range of potential, reputable developers for the development of Plot 5 that could better utilise the space, provide more affordable homes, safeguard employment and better promote health, wellbeing and community cohesion.

REPLY:

Q1.

The current agreement is the original Development Agreement, entered into with Urbis Living in September 2017. The agreement was then subsequently novated as permitted in the Development Agreement, to Dandara in February 2018 and is still in place today.

As part of the novation process, Urbis Living provided evidence of Dandara’s financial position demonstrating its ability to perform the obligations of the Development Agreement. This evidence was reviewed by BCC and the novation was approved by senior officers.

Since this date there have been some amendments to the redline boundary to remove non-BCC land and some of the longstop dates have been extended. No other changes have occurred.

BCC has included a series of conditions within the Development Agreement which must be met before the land is disposed of, including 30% affordable housing, and there is also an overage clause to ensure best consideration is achieved in accordance with S123 (2) Local Government Act 1972.

Q2.

BCC is in a contractual agreement with Dandara, through the Development Agreement, to bring forward the redevelopment of Plot 5 and therefore is not in a position to seek proposals from other



developers for the site.

The proposals for Plot 5, currently under consideration by the Local Planning Authority, include policy-compliant 30% affordable housing and incorporate proposals for the River Malago restoration project, which will improve flood storage capacity and increase biodiversity along the de-culverted river.



QUESTION PQ 07

Subject: Redcatch Park – Mast (proposal)

Question submitted by: David Nash

Please could I ask why the Council has not offered the site of its derelict library on Redcatch Road for the above, subject to demolition.

REPLY:

The Broadwalk Shopping Centre (which houses the local library) is not owned by Bristol City Council. Therefore the Council is not in a position to offer this location as a site for the installation Mast.

The Council understands, however, that Waldon who are acting on behalf of EE /H3G have been offered part of the site of the Broadwalk Shopping Centre by the owners of the shopping centre and EE/H3G have to now establish if this is a viable option.



QUESTION PQ 08

Subject: Parking around Ashton Gate on match days

Question submitted by: Rachel Hall

I would like to make a statement regarding the parking situation on match days around the Ashton Gate area and also to ask a question about it.

The statement is this: On our road and the adjoining narrow one way streets (Wells St, North Rd and Bath St), on match days- both rugby and football, as well as on concert dates, we constantly have to deal with dangerous, stupid, selfish parking which has been awful for years and is now even worse. People park on or over corners, on pavements and often partially block the entrance and exit on to Ashton Rd. We have long been resigned to not being able to use our cars at these times but if an emergency vehicle had to get down, it would not be able to. Both the Council and Bristol Sport seem unconcerned about this. I attach a photo of such parking- on the corner, over the junction and away from the kerb, which minutes later was made worse by another car parking in front of where I was stood.

My question is this: Why is it so difficult to restrict parking to residents only on match days with residents permits?



ANSWER:

Parking is always a difficulty near sports stadiums and entertainment venues.

A residents’ match day parking scheme would need to cover a wide area to ensure issues aren’t just displaced to another area. Match day parking schemes also require ongoing funds to cover the enforcement and implementation of the scheme.

We are considering funding for a residents match day parking scheme in this area. In the meantime, we will continue to work with Bristol Sport to address parking issues around the ground. We have identified a limited number of interventions (such as double yellow lines) to implement parking restrictions around the stadium that will improve safety at key areas such as the corners of roads.



QUESTION PQ 10**Subject: RPZ in BS3****Question submitted by: Matt Gibbs****Question:**

I was delighted to read the Council's 22/23 budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I'd like to take this opportunity to resubmit this timeline of locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville's existing RPZ to cover the rest of the Ward. **May I ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville's existing RPZ.**

During the May 2021 elections, both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor's own office. All referenced in the timeline. Extending Southville's RPZ would address the current imbalance of people's rights across our Ward, with the less expensive houses, more often the homes of working class families, having fewer RPZ rights & a lower quality of life, when compared to other more affluent areas of the same Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to, and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, boost cycling on safer roads, increase the use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens in our area being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor's team please honour election pledges and prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

This question received a verbal reply at the meeting.



QUESTION PQ11

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ
Question submitted by: Steve Britton

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville's existing RPZ.**

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.
- As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ 12

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: George Sarudis

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville's existing RPZ.**

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ13

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Dr Rahul Bhatnagar

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ.**

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

During the May 2021 elections, Both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ14

Subject: new RPZ in BS3

Question submitted by: Alan Smith

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the mayor and team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3.

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.
- As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ15

Subject: Protect views of the iconic view of Totterdown escarpment

Question submitted by: Miranda Walker

Does the Mayor of Bristol feel that although there is a need for additional housing, the iconic and unique views of Bristol, including the Totterdown Escarpment, are worth preserving?

REPLY:

It depends on what you mean by preserving. If you mean the physical city stays exactly the same, while the world changes around it, then I'd find that a challenge. If you mean we're respecting and protecting the character of Bristol, while the city goes through physical change, then I agree.

Arguments about where we bring forward homes have to grapple with the scale of the challenge we face. We are a city of 42 square miles, and a population of 460,000 people (which is projected to rise by a further 100,000 by 2050). Already we face a housing crisis, with 15,000 people on the waiting list and 1,000 in temporary accommodation.

We face these challenges in the context of a climate and ecological emergency. This requires us to build the most efficient homes in the most sustainable locations at a higher density. It requires us to overhaul our existing building stock, particularly where it was built without planetary limits in mind. The ecological emergency also requires efficiency, particularly in land use. Housing and employing more people on less land safeguards against sprawl and protects land for nature.

All of this means we have to consider building higher and at greater density than we have in the past. Totterdown is a densely populated urban area, and is an appropriate place to bring forward homes that can help us alleviate the housing crisis.

Ultimately, however, cross-party planning committees will say yes or no on schemes brought forward. But they will have to do this within the law. Delivering development often requires a careful balancing of issues, such as the views of local landmarks. I will however caution that if the development of sites in the city seeks to protect every view, then more greenfield sites will ultimately be needed to meet the City's housing need.



QUESTION PQ 16

Subject: new RPZ in Bedminster

Question submitted by: Ben Clifford-Kitching

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ on Chessel Street and surrounding roads in Bedminster.** I understand this was promised prior to the last council elections.

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ17

Subject: new RPZ in BS3

Question submitted by: Robert Adams

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3**

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ18**Subject: new RPZ in BS3****Question submitted by: Sarah Leonard**

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resources for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3 Bedminster ward. Since the introduction of the RPZ which benefits the Southville ward it has made parking for residents impossible on the Bedminster side of north street. In particular on our road Luckwell Road and other roads directly linked to north street. Since the RPZ was introduced in Southville it has pushed all visiting, commuting and second cars (from Southville) onto the Bedminster side causing congestion, terrible parking, and road safety issues. Two Cllr led surveys, show overwhelming support for RPZ in our area. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

Introducing the RPZ onto roads directly linking to North Street on the Bedminster side as originally planned would even out the disparity between the two sides of north street. Currently it clearly favours only the residents of Southville putting the Bedminster residents at risk.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor's team please prioritise the development of RPZ in BS3?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ 19

Subject: extension of Southville’s existing RPZ

Question submitted by: Jeremy Bray

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ.** Particularly from North Street extending south towards and including Duckmoor Road, and preferably beyond.

I feel this matter is even more relevant considering the impact the Bristol ULEZ will have on drivers of non-compliant vehicles who might choose to park in these areas to avoid charges. A further extension towards Winterstoke road might further encourage those users who park on our residential streets to attend places of work or appointments to use the Long Ashton park and ride.

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

During the May 2021 elections, Both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ20

Subject: extension of Southville’s existing RPZ

Question submitted by: Anya Skatova & Joe Webb

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ.**

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

During the May 2021 elections, Both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ21

Subject: extension of Southville’s existing RPZ

Question submitted by: Sarah Curnow

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ.**

We have been asking and asking for this, we have done all we can to show that this is wanted and needed, indeed I consider it highly likely that the Labour candidates at the last local election did not win a seat in Southville because the Labour Council has not listened to residents on this point. This has to be one of the only areas in the country, so close to a football ground, that does not have some form of controlled parking. This is not just an issue with the football, it is also about people driving to our streets in the morning, parking, and then getting a bike out of their boot and cycling in to work, or walking in. Even though we are so close to a park and ride. It’s also about second cars from Southville residents being parked here, its about cars with expired Southville permits being parked here, I have even heard of people parking here to walk up the Chessels to get the airport bus!

Please listen to residents on this point.

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.
- As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ22

Subject: RPZ in BS3 Windmill Hill Ward

Question submitted by: Lena Wright

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3 windmill hill ward.**

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for RPZ in our area.

Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor's team please prioritise the development of RPZ in BS3?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ 23

Subject: RPZ for Ashton/extension to Southville

Question submitted by: Ed Pitt

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if, given the extreme pressures Ashton Gate is under from 100s of new flats, commuter parking, and daily events at the stadium, which is set to grow, they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise either an extension to Southville RPZ, or a new one for Ashton. RPZs are not about convenience for homeowners, they are about protecting the safety and amenity of neighbourhoods damaged by commuters & visitors, and reducing car journeys into the city. RPZs are proven to achieve these goals.

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ24

Subject: RPZ in Windmill Hill

Question submitted by: AJ Gardham

I understand the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor and team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise a new RPZ in Windmill Hill. Parking is already at a premium due to commuters walking to work or using Bedminster Station and with the development of Bedminster Green this will only get worse. In addition, poor parking by those who do not live in the area is already limiting access to pavements and roads. As a result emergency vehicles/refuse collections/wheelchair users//people with buggys are not able to easily use streets and pavements in Fraser Street. Finally the impact of developers/trades vehicles over the next few years will also impact on the area.**

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ25

Subject: RPZ in BS3

Question submitted by: Helena Wray

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in my area of BS3, which is just to the south of North Street. I live in Hebron Road and this is, in effect, an overspill car parking area for residents in areas close by who have an RPZ, as well as for shoppers to North Street, commuters and travellers those taking the airport bus. Parking on our road is frequently impossible and we waste hours and money, and emit fumes, by driving around for sometimes 20 minutes or more to find a place to park legally and safely. The difficulties represent a major downside to what is otherwise a delightful area.

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ26

Subject: extension to Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Ying Wang

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ.

I live along the North Street and I often park my car around Dunford Ave area. It is easier and closer to my home especially with a pushchair. However, I often struggle to find a space in the morning after drop off my older kid to school as the spaces along the streets are occupied by the people who works on the high street. It was very frustrated with a crying baby at the back seat when I drove round and round to find a parking. On weekend, especially the match day, it was also struggle to find a space to park. For these reasons, I would like to request you to consider extend the existing Southville's RPZ. This would be benefit the people who live on southern side of North street and especially on the match days.

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ27

Subject: Extension of Southville existing RPZ

Question submitted by: Harish Sharma

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for Resident's Parking Zones (RPZs) across Bristol.

I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville's existing RPZ?

There is overwhelming support of 74% in favour in the Ashton area for a new RPZ. Furthermore, it would be especially prudent to prioritise these changes in advance of the Clean Air Zone (CAZ), due to be introduced in summer 2022. The CAZ is likely to increase the amount of traffic in the above area. For further information please use the below link.

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ28

Subject: new RPZ in BS3

Question submitted by: Mye Green

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3 and specifically Ashton Road.

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for RPZ in our area.

Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor's team please prioritise the development of RPZ in BS3?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.
- As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ29

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Marta Haui Yazbek

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resources for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ.

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

During the May 2021 elections, Both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ30

Subject: Extension of Southville existing RPZ

Question submitted by: Anna Francis

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol.

I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville's existing RPZ?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ31

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Katie Murton

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol.

I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will PLEASE use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ.

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

During the May 2021 elections, both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ32

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: David Jones

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ.**

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

During the May 2021 elections, Both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ33

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Louis Hunter

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville's existing RPZ to include as a minimum Truro Road, Balfour Road, Friezewood Road and Carrington Road.

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ34

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Laetitia Tempelman

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville's existing RPZ to cover streets on the south side of North Street, and those around Ashton Gate stadium?**

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ35

Subject: RPZ in BS3

Question submitted by: Ken Gardner

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3 2EQ**

Namely Ashton Road area as we feel trapped and ignored with RPZs to the west and East making this the go to area to park so either scrap them all or treat us fairly

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ36

Subject: RPZ in BS3

Question submitted by: Caroline Elzik

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ to cover BS3 Ashfield Road.

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for RPZ in our area.

Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor's team please prioritise the development of RPZ in BS3?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ37

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Andrew Wakely

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ.**

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

During the May 2021 elections, Both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ38

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Kirsty Craig

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville's existing RPZ.** (I would also be in favour of the zone from Duckmoor Road to Winterstoke having one, provided residents are in favour).

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ39

Subject: New RPZ in BS3

Question submitted by: Janis Beavon

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in Bedminster BS3.**

I am a resident of Chessel Street, which, as well as being a very convenient rat run between West Street and North Street, in both directions, also lies conveniently just outside the Southville RPZ. This makes it a favourite place to park for getting into the city, Harbourside, and the shops and facilities of North Street. In addition, the Bristol Airport bus service stops just at the end of the street on West Street, so that Chessel Street and adjoining roads offer a free parking space for a week or two if you're flying out of Bristol Airport for a holiday.

During 2018-2020 there have been two residents' surveys, one independently provided free of charge by a local consultancy, and one in 2020 conducted by Councillor Kye Dudd. Both surveys came out clearly in favour of a RPZ. In addition local people, including myself, have been active through Let's Walk Bedminster in efforts to keep footpaths clear of clutter, including bins and overhanging hedges as well as pavement parked cars. We have been working very hard to make safe walking routes for all pedestrians including disabled, the young and elderly and sight impaired, and I feel it is time the Council supported us to make Bedminster a safe and healthy place to live.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor's team please prioritise the development of RPZ in BS3?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ40

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Richard Smith

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3. The existing Southville RPZ has simply displaced parking to the south of North St, and extension to this RPZ needs to go beyond Duckmoor Rd and cover the properties between Duckmoor and Winterstoke Rd as they are already congested with commuter parking

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ41 & PQ42

Subject: Telecoms mast by EE in Redcatch Park, Knowle

Question submitted by: Sian EllisThomas

I am the co-leader of Residents Against The Mast, a community action group objecting to the siting of a 24 metre telecoms mast by EE h3G in Redcatch Park, Knowle

1. Is council aware that the invocation of the **'emergency'** measure utilising the Electronics Communications Code (introduced within part 2 of the Digital Economy Act 2017) to site the temporary mast in Redcatch Park, was stated to have occurred in **October 2021** when EE H3G say the previous mast was removed from The Friendship Inn/Tesco site and the signal was affected. Despite **clear and irrefutable** photographic evidence that the mast was removed from The Friendship Inn as early as September 2020 (and possibly earlier), and that the telecoms company would have been given **12 months notice** to quit that site, which would be around April 2019. (photo attached taken by Google earth in September 2020 **which shows the mast gone** and July 2019 with it clearly in position). So why did it take them over a year to invoke the emergency measure?
2. What are the rules, parameters and scrutiny of the invocation of the emergency measure when exercised, as in this case?

REPLY:

Q1.

While I need to make it clear that decisions regarding Planning matters are taken by the council as part of its regulatory functions as Planning Authority, I appreciate your frustration over this matter.

A number of applications for prior approval were made to replace the monopole taken down at the Friendship Inn as early as July 2020. These were all rejected, though one of these applications is now the subject of an appeal against us as the Planning Authority.

In the absence of an approved application, EE have applied for a temporary emergency order under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). This requires EE to give written notice of development to Bristol City Council as the Planning Authority as soon as possible after the emergency begins.

We received a covering letter accompanying the emergency notification on 17th November 2021. It states that the development is required "to prevent a loss of service or network disruption following the impending loss of an existing site within the network whilst a permanent solution is secured."

Q2.

There are two separate issues in this case. The decision to be taken at the end of this month by the Executive Director for Growth and Regeneration is in relation to the Council as landowner granting a license to install the mast on Council land. The second issue relates to planning and the lawfulness of any development that may be brought forward under this license. The granting of a licence is therefore a separate issue to any planning considerations and is determined separately.



For planning, permitted development rights for electronic communications code operators are set out in Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). In particular, Class A(b) permits “the use of land in an emergency for a period not exceeding 18 months to station and operate moveable electronic communications apparatus required for the replacement of unserviceable electronic communications apparatus, including the provision of moveable structures on the land for the purposes of that use”.

In the case of an emergency, development is permitted by the General Permitted Development Order subject to the condition that the operator must give written notice of such development as soon as possible after the emergency begins, to the Local Planning Authority. There is no formal application assessment process under this procedure.

Written notice regarding this emergency proposal was received by the Local Planning Authority on 17th November 2021. This was submitted by Waldon Telecom on behalf of EE Ltd and Hutchison 3G UK Ltd.

In response to this notice, Development Management have contacted Waldon Telecom to seek further information regarding the situation and the nature of the emergency. Further information has been received from Waldon Telecom. In response, Waldon Telecom have been advised informally that on the basis of the information provided to date regarding the situation, the Planning Authority considers it is insufficient to demonstrate that the proposed use of the emergency provisions would be justified in this instance. As things stand, in the council’s opinion as local planning authority, the proposal would not likely constitute permitted development under Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

However, there appears to be no mechanism available to the Local Planning Authority to make a formal determination on this. If a license is granted and the mast is installed based on reliance on the emergency permitted development rights, the Planning Authority could consider further investigation to determine whether a breach of planning control has occurred and, if so, whether it is expedient to enforce. The question of whether the development was in response to an emergency would likely be central to this investigation.



QUESTION PQ43

Subject: new RPZ in BS3

Question submitted by: Justin Elzik

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3 3ER?

I live on Ashfield Road which is on the Boundary of the Southville and Bedminster wards and I would like you to consider that if allocation is given to the former over the latter then we're are disadvantaging residents of this street purely based on arbitrary boundaries rather than geographical need considering the proximity of Ashfield Road to North Street and Ashton Gate Stadium

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ44

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Simon Hill

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ and to ensure that it covers Ashton Road. Given the planned increase in housing with little or no parking provided, increased traffic from use of Ashton Gate Stadium for Rugby, concerts etc, the increased hire of Greville Smyth park by the Council and the planned expansion of Ashton Gate Stadium it is critical to deliver on this promise.

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

During the May 2021 elections, Both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ45

Subject: new RPZ in BS3

Question submitted by: Deb Edwards

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ46

Subject: Extension of Southville existing RPZ

Question submitted by: Jon Norman

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ. Please see the further information provided but this imbalance in our Ward needs addressing urgently on safety and environmental grounds.**

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

I see the extension of the RPZ as the only way to proceed - I feel utterly betrayed by the Council and let down by the situation - our road now has become a car park for shoppers, commuters and most frustratingly those in RPZ areas who do not want to pay for a permit or second permit. Junction protection has been put in place in some non-RPZ areas but bafflingly not our road so we get all the safety problems!

During the May 2021 elections, Both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. My vote was based on these promises. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ46

Subject: Southville Existing RPZ

Question submitted by: Sarah Vass

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville's existing RPZ.**

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ48

Subject: Match day restrictions in BS3

Question submitted by: Scott King

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise match day restrictions in BS3.**

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ49

Subject: extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Jack Clemoes

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ.

A residents parking scheme in the local area is a necessity. At the very least it will provide a mechanism to ensure that any future 'car-free' residential developments will not exacerbate the current chronic parking issues - at the moment it is a complete nonsense.

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

During the May 2021 elections, Both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ50

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Emilie Hickman

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ.**

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

During the May 2021 elections, Both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the extension of the RPZ across the remainder of the Southville Ward?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ51

Subject: new RPZ BS3

Question submitted by: Helen Parham

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3 [Bedminster] (specifically the streets within the Chessels, which do not currently have an RPZ).**

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for RPZ in our area.

Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the development of RPZ in BS3?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ52

Subject: new RPZ in BS3

Question submitted by: Nigel Maggs

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3.**

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for RPZ in our area.

Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor's team please prioritise the development of RPZ in BS3?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ53

Subject: New RPZ in BS3

Question submitted by: Michael Hodgson

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise new RPZ in BS3.

Further information:

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for extending Southville’s existing RPZ to cover the whole Ward.

During the May 2021 elections, Both Green and Labour candidates campaigned to extend RPZ in our area. The message was supported by Labour Party leaflets, publicly supported by the then Cabinet member for transport Mr Dudd, who has recently been re-elected, and even publicly supported by the Mayor’s own office. All referenced in the timeline.

Extending Southville’s RPZ would address the current imbalance of people’s rights across our Ward. It would stop one side of Southville being used as a free car park, with the Council in-effect encouraging drivers to commute to and park in these residential areas. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the development of RPZ in BS3?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ54

Subject: New RPZ in Bedminster Ward

Question submitted by: Eithne Hodgson

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol.

I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3 to include Bedminster Ward.

The current partial RPZ in Southville is not satisfactory and my concern is that to just extend the RPZ in the rest of Southville ward alone will only exacerbate the issues experienced across BS3. Areas already have issues with parking and as a result the areas surrounding Southville are used as an extended free car park. The commuter issues that are well documented for Southville will only extend further into other BS3 areas and the only way to provide a truly environmentally friendly approach is to apply a consist approach to RPZ across the whole BS3 area.

This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for RPZ in our area.

Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

So, in relation to the new budget, will the Mayor’s team please prioritise the development of RPZ in BS3?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ55

Subject: new RPZ for BS3

Question submitted by: Matt Hughes

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ in BS3 for roads adjoining North St for Southville, Ashton and Bedminster wards. Since the Southville RPZ was introduced, including North St, shop workers, shoppers and some households within this RPZ have added a difficult burden to these narrow roads.**

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ56 & PQ57

Subject: Divestment from fossil fuels

Question submitted by: Ollie Lax

With the failures at COP26 of global leaders to secure an agreement to ensure we limit global temperatures below the recommended 1.5 degrees it is becoming ever more important that local authorities take the lead in taking climate action. I am also aware that local authorities don't have the necessary powers to instigate all the changes required to enable us to significantly reduce our carbon emissions. However, with power comes influence and it is essential that we use this now to try and mitigate the most devastating impacts of climate change.

The argument to divest the Avon Pension Fund from fossil fuels has been put to Bristol City Council many times and I know this is one such area that the Mayor and Bristol City Council do not have direct control. I also know that the Mayor is in support of divestment and has actively requested that the Avon Pension Fund consider reviewing their statement of investment principles with a view to moving out of fossil fuel markets. I thank you for your support in this matter.

Avon Pension Fund have recently stated that one of the reasons that they have not committed to divestment is because they believe they have more room to engage with fossil fuel companies as investors. However, it is not clear what the details of this engagement are and whether they have managed to have any success with this. It certainly seems unlikely to me as most fossil fuel companies have signed up to keep drilling and mining for decades and this will likely continue whilst the industry is still profitable.

My questions are as follows:

1. Will the council recommit themselves to using their influence to persuade Avon Pension Fund to divest from fossil fuels?
2. Will you push Avon Pension Fund to share how they are engaging with fossil fuel companies to decarbonise and whether they have any evidence of success?

REPLY:

Q1.

I have called on Avon Pension Fund to divest from Fossil Fuels in the past, and I am pleased to have seen this statement from the fund: "those companies that are intentionally failing to take account of climate transition risk and adapt their business models accordingly should be candidates for divestment, due to the financial risk they pose."

Q2.

The fund carries out analysis of its exposure to fossil fuels annually – this information is available in their Annual Carbon Metrics Report available on the pension fund's website. According to this analysis, the value of holdings in "fossil fuel" companies in the fund was 1.4% as of December 2020. Information about the governance process of the fund relating to the climate emergency is available at: <https://www.avonpensionfund.org.uk/climate-emergency>



QUESTION PQ58

Subject: Divestment

Question submitted by: Jim Mayger

What percentage of Avon Pension Fund investments are in fossil fuels and what actions can BCC take to force divestment by the Avon Pension Fund from fossil fuels.

ANSWER

The fund carries out analysis of its exposure to fossil fuels annually – this information is available in their Annual Carbon Metrics Report available on the pension fund’s website. According to this analysis, the value of holdings in “fossil fuel” companies in the fund was 1.4% as of December 2020. Information about the governance process of the fund relating to the climate emergency is available at: <https://www.avonpensionfund.org.uk/climate-emergency>.



QUESTION PQ59

Subject: Proposed Mast in Redcatch Park

Question submitted by: Stephanie McKenna

1. Will the Bristol Mayor support the refusal to hand over the park land for the mast to be erected and sign for this?
2. Why are the council allowing the emergency planning application to be used in such an abuse of process manner when this clearly does not fall within the law as it was intended?

ANSWER:

Q1.

While I need to make it clear that decisions regarding planning matters are taken by the council as part of its regulatory functions as planning authority, I appreciate your frustration over this matter.

There are two separate issues in this case. The decision to be taken by the Executive Director for Growth and Regeneration is in relation to the Council as landowner granting a license to install the mast on Council land. The decision will be taken after full consideration of all the views expressed and facts relating to this matter. The second issue relates to planning and the lawfulness of any development that may be brought forward under this license. The granting of a licence is a separate issue to any planning considerations and is determined separately.

Q2.

For planning, permitted development rights for electronic communications code operators are set out in Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). In particular, Class A(b) permits “the use of land in an emergency for a period not exceeding 18 months to station and operate moveable electronic communications apparatus required for the replacement of unserviceable electronic communications apparatus, including the provision of moveable structures on the land for the purposes of that use”.

In the case of an emergency, development is permitted by the General Permitted Development Order subject to the condition that the operator must give written notice of such development as soon as possible after the emergency begins, to the Local Planning Authority. There is no formal application assessment process under this procedure.

Written notice regarding this emergency proposal was received by the Local Planning Authority on 17th November 2021. This was submitted by Waldon Telecom on behalf of EE Ltd and Hutchison 3G UK Ltd.

In response to this notice, Development Management have contacted Waldon Telecom to seek further information regarding the situation and the nature of the emergency. Further information has been received from Waldon Telecom. In response, Waldon Telecom have been advised informally that on the basis of the information provided to date regarding the situation, the Planning Authority considers it is insufficient to demonstrate that the proposed use of the emergency provisions would be justified in this instance. As things stand, in the council’s opinion as



local planning authority, the proposal would not likely constitute permitted development under Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

If a license is granted and the mast is installed based on reliance on the emergency permitted development rights, the Planning Authority could consider further investigation to determine whether a breach of planning control has occurred and, if so, whether it is expedient to enforce. The question of whether the development was in response to an emergency would likely be central to this investigation.



QUESTION PQ60 & PQ61

Subject: Effect of Mast on Parks Visits

Question submitted by: Heather Peet

1. Has the council considered the potential reduction of park visits, based on the unsightly positioning of the mast and the reduction in park space?
2. Is the council looking at this holistically in terms of potentially reduced park visits and the associated reduction of health and wellbeing benefits for those in the vicinity?

Reply:

Q1.

The decision to be taken by the Executive Director for Growth and Regeneration is in relation to the Council as landowner granting a license to install the mast on Council land. While, the council has not assessed the potential for reductions in parks visits, the decision will be taken after full consideration of all the views expressed and facts relating to this matter.

Q2.

I refer you to the answers above to questions 41, 42, 58 and 59 which sets out the broader legislative context we are working in.

Notwithstanding this, we will of course try and take a holistic view (including considering potential reductions in health and wellbeing) in our decision-making.



QUESTION PQ62

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Tim Sully

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. **I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville’s existing RPZ so that it includes the area to the west of Southville including Duckmoor Road and the surrounding streets.**

Unfortunately, with the introduction of the RPZ to the East, those residents with 2 cars dump their second cars to the west of North Street or sometimes both their cars if they don’t want to pay. We have also had a local garage in Beaulley Road dumping their unsold vehicles in Duckmoor Road and residents of Clifton dumping their camper vans. Can we have our streets back please?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ63

Subject: carbon neutral and climate resilient city by 2030

Question submitted by: Claire Gronow

In his article in The Economist (Nov 8th, 2021), Bristol Mayor, Marvin Rees, quite rightly accused national leaders of being “unable to move beyond high-profile commitments to tackle the climate and ecological emergencies by offering clear, measurable plans with proper funding and a clear timeline for delivery.” When can we expect to see clear, measurable plans with cost estimates and a clear timeline for delivery to back up Bristol City Council’s high profile commitment that Bristol would be a carbon neutral and climate resilient city by 2030?

REPLY:

We have been undertaking this work.

As part of our work with the UK Cities Climate Investment Commission we have identified that the cost of decarbonising Bristol is at least £10bn. We are working with them to produce business cases in order to attract the finance we need to undertake the systems changes we have set out.

But as you also know, the responsibility for making Bristol Carbon Neutral is not just the council’s – many partners are working to implement it. The One City Climate Strategy Sets out the framework for action for all organisations and people across the city and work is underway on delivery plans. Some of these BCC is playing a key role in and others will need to be led by other city partners.

For example, to ensure zero carbon new developments we are producing the new Local Plan and will consult later this year. On transport we are working with West of England Partners to create the new Joint Local Transport Plan and to deliver over £500m of sustainable transport investment. At April’s cabinet meeting we will announce the preferred partner for the City Leap Energy Partnership to deliver over £1bn of investment in sustainable energy.

As well as these strategic plans we are also working with 6 communities to develop and deliver their [Community Climate Action Plans](#).

BCC has developed a new Corporate Strategy which put climate action as a priority for the city council. We are currently updating our Climate Emergency Action Plan and that will be published in the summer. That plan will include some of the things we are practically doing in areas under our control, including:

- o Installing 50 KW of solar photo voltaic panels on schools or other council buildings**
- o Replacing all streetlighting in Bristol with energy efficient LED bulbs**
- o Planning to replace the 4 gas cremators at Canford Crematorium with 2 electric ones powered by renewable electricity.**



QUESTION PQ64

Subject: Carbon Neutral Bristol

Question submitted by: Rob Porteous

Please could you explain how you intend to achieve a carbon neutral city by 2030, especially in regard to the huge task of changing the heating systems in nearly all the Victorian housing from gas central heating to something else.

REPLY:

You rightly underscore the scale of the challenge we face in terms of our city’s housing stock.

In terms of retrofitting our own housing stock, we are investing £80 million in our recent budget to invest in decarbonising and improving the energy efficiency of council homes. However, we face a challenge in upgrading privately-owned homes to realise our ambition to make Bristol a carbon neutral and climate resilient city by 2030.

In this regard, we seek every opportunity to attract government funding to help residents across the city upgrade their domestic heating systems to improve their efficiency and minimise the impact on the planet of powering Bristol’s homes. Through our Bright Green Homes project, we plan to complete retrofits on over 230 homes using government sustainable warmth funding and have completed retrofits on 90 homes so far since starting in April 2021. We will add another 50 homes with new funding from April 2022.

We are also developing district heating networks in central areas of the city particularly for larger buildings and apartments. For lower-density homes heat pumps are likely to be the solution and we are joining partners in an innovation bid for heat pump deployment.

Our message to government, however, is that sporadic competitive funding pots do not allow local authorities to plan the long-term investment that is needed to decarbonise domestic energy. We estimate that the cost of decarbonising Bristol’s city systems is £10bn.

That is why we are bringing forward a £1bn investment in our city’s energy systems through City Leap, and working with the UK Cities Climate Investment Commission to develop business cases to attract the funding we need to deliver at the scale and pace we need to make Bristol carbon neutral by 2030.



QUESTION PQ65**Subject: Carbon Neutral Bristol by 2030****Question submitted by: Lauren Hennessy**

Does Bristol City Council still maintain that it is on track for a carbon neutral Bristol by 2030 and if so, where is the timeline for delivery? When will tracking of carbon emissions be made publicly available?

REPLY:

The council is on track to meet our net zero target by 2025. Emissions from energy and road transport within Bristol is monitored by the Government who produce figures for each local authority area. These are reported by the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy [here](#), where you can also find the definitions and methodology. We report the council's Corporate CO2 emissions as part of our performance reporting. See [our website](#) for further information.

However, we have been clear that the goal for Bristol to be carbon neutral by 2030 is not solely under Bristol City Council's control. In setting the goal for Bristol to be carbon neutral by 2030 and adopting the One City Climate Strategy we are also very clear that this can only be achieved with substantial national action – in laws, policies and funding.

As a Council we are playing a very full and active part in aiming for the goal and our 2nd Climate Emergency Action Plan due to be published this summer will demonstrate the range of activities. Some examples, just on energy in buildings, include:

- Through our Bright Green Homes project, we plan to complete retrofits on over 230 homes using government sustainable warmth funding and have completed retrofits on 90 homes so far since starting in April 2021. We will add another 50 homes with new funding from April 2022.
- We are developing district heating networks in central areas of the city particularly for larger buildings and apartments. For lower density homes heat pumps are likely to be the solution and we are partners in an innovation bid for heat pump deployment.
- We are planning to improve the energy efficiency of council homes and have allocated £80m to contribute to this.
- We are establishing City Leap, a long-term partnership between the council and a private sector organisation to accelerate green energy investment in Bristol and help us achieve our net zero carbon ambitions. We aim for this partnership to rapidly accelerate retrofit in council homes and create potential funding opportunities for private homes.



QUESTION PQ66 & PQ67

Subject: Telecomms mast by EE in Redcatch Park

Question submitted by: Lesley Powell

I am the co-leader of Residents Against The Mast, a community action group objecting to the siting of a 24 metre telecoms mast by EE h3G in Redcatch Park, Knowle

Q1 – Since the refusal by Bristol City Planning Dep’t of the three Prior Applications by Waldon on behalf of EE/ H3G for permanent masts on Land on Broadwalk has the Council had dialogue with Waldon (EE/H3G) on the location for a proposed mast in an attempt to find an appropriate solution that might be more palatable to the majority?

- Application 21/05624/Y Land On North Side Of Broad Walk (South Of Redcatch Park) Broad Walk Bristol BS4 2RG,
- Application 20/05899/Y, Outside 126 Broad Walk Bristol BS4 2RS and
- Application 21/03467/Y Telecoms Outside 126 Broad Walk Bristol BS4 2RS, (information from <https://planning.org.uk/app>)

Q2 – The Case Officers reasoning for refusal for the three above applications (in respect of the Park being adjacent to those sites) are even more applicable to the current proposal to erect the even taller mast and much greater infrastructure IN THE PARK! How can Planning not be applicable to the current proposal when the mast this temporary one purports to be replacing was removed by September 2020?

*Extract from Case Officer’s report: It is noted that the proposed mast and associated equipment would be located within an area of green open space which contributes positively to the open, verdant character of the wider environs. The application site lies within the Knowle Park estate, which was built during the interwar period and designed on garden city principles. As such, the existing development surrounding the site is generally low rise and set back from the public highway by wide grass verges on either side of the footpath. There is an area of **designated Important Open Space** immediately adjacent to the site which contributes positively to the green and open character of the surrounding area. There are several mature trees in close proximity of the site which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the local area.*

REPLY:

Q1.

Officers have put forward possible locations within the adjoining adopted highway to try and avoid the loss of any green space and Waldon on behalf of EE/H3G are currently looking at these proposals.

Car parks within the Broadwalk locality have also been discussed as a less sensitive location than the park itself and again Waldon on behalf of EE/H3G will also consider if these alternative locations are viable in terms of network coverage.

Q2.



Part 16 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) permits, subject to limitations and conditions, “development by or on behalf of an electronic communications code operator for the purpose of the operator’s electronic communications network in, on, over or under land controlled by that operator or in accordance with the electronic communications code”.

Part 16, Class A(b) permits “the use of land in an emergency for a period not exceeding 18 months to station and operate moveable electronic communications apparatus required for the replacement of unserviceable electronic communications apparatus, including the provision of moveable structures on the land for the purposes of that use”.

In the case of an emergency, development is permitted by the General Permitted Development Order subject to the condition that the operator must give written notice of such development as soon as possible after the emergency begins, to the Local Planning Authority. There is no formal planning application assessment process under this procedure.



QUESTION PQ68 & PQ69

Subject: Air Pollution

Question submitted by: Andrea Mackay

In September 2021, WHYO renewed its warnings on air pollution, describing it as one of the biggest environmental threats to human health, alongside climate change, and rating it as a public emergency. The new WHO Global Air Quality Guidelines (AQGs) provide clear evidence of the damage air pollution inflicts on human health, at even lower concentrations than previously understood. The guidelines recommend new air quality levels to protect the health of populations, by reducing levels of key air pollutants, some of which also contribute to climate change. Air pollution is the biggest environmental threat to human health and is a public health emergency, [according to the WHO](#), costing trillions of dollars a year. Cutting air pollution brings huge and cost-effective health benefits and reduces the carbon emissions driving the climate crisis.

This view of the seriousness of air pollution is confirmed in the BCC’s own executive summary on Air Quality from 2020, where it states that “Air pollution is associated with a number of adverse health impacts. It is recognised as a contributing factor in the onset of heart disease and cancer. Additionally, air pollution particularly affects the most vulnerable in society: children and older people, and those with heart and lung conditions.”

The same reports states that within the One City Plan there are commitments on air pollution including:

- Making progress towards cleaner air in the fastest time possible by working with city partners on successfully planning the launch of the Clean Air Zone in 2021;
- A target to achieve WHO Guideline values for air quality by 2030. P12

In the most recent monitoring of schools, two of them – **Montpelier High School** (formerly Colston's Girls' School) and Parsons Street Primary school exceeded legal limits for the level of nitrogen dioxide - a traffic pollutant with over 40 is $40 \mu\text{gm}^{-3}$ (micrograms per metre cubed). Significantly 42 out of the other 47 schools had readings of over $20 \mu\text{gm}^{-3}$, twice as high as the WHO recommended guidelines. City Council has taken one major step towards cleaner air by working on creating a clean air zone, which should improve air quality within a prescribed area when it is finally introduced. Unfortunately this will not benefit many of the schools with these high readings.

Question 1.

Other than the Clean Air Zone, which doesn’t directly benefit a lot of schools, and the School Street scheme, which is extremely limited in scope, what other actions are the council taking to improve air quality around Bristol Schools where young children are spending most of their waking hours?

Question 2.

It states on the BCC Clean Air dashboard that that the monitoring of schools with legal limits of nitrous oxide waws going be discontinued. Which schools are still being monitored, and should not all schools be monitored to see measure the progress being made towards the One City goal for 2030 of conforming to WHO guidelines?

REPLY:

Q1

The modelling for the Clean Air Zone shows that it will accelerate the trend of improving air quality right this across the city, not just within the zone. If someone purchases a less polluting vehicle



because they use the zone it will reduce the pollution they cause on every they make, whether in the zone or not.

We also have our Slow the Smoke campaign which asks all residents to consider turning their engines off while stationary (especially outside schools) and avoid using polluting forms of heating such as wood burning stoves which generate particulate emissions.

Following the Citizen’s Assembly recommendations, BCC has recently begun engagement on the city's pilot Liveable Neighbourhood in East Bristol. The project covers the area south of Church Road (Barton Hill, parts of Redfield and St George).

Liveable Neighbourhoods are designed in partnership with the community and can make them quieter, safer, healthier and improve air quality for everyone.

The team will work closely with local schools in the project area to bring young people’s views to the table.

Q2.

All currently operating monitoring sites are shown on [our open data portal](#).

It is not necessary or cost effective to continue measurement at all schools due to the low concentrations recorded in the original monitoring campaign at most sites.

Bristol has added around 90 extra diffusion tubes to the monitoring network to assess the effects of the CAZ. These are located where we believe the highest concentrations or displacement effects will be realised and they provide a clear picture of progress towards reduced air pollution everywhere.

The monitoring network gives good coverage of the city and will accurately identify pollution hotspots to prioritise for action, but we review it annual and will consider amendments as necessary.



QUESTION PQ70 & PQ71

Subject: The Mayoral System and Decision Making

Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

Question 1

Background. You may be aware of the recent report ‘The Bristol Referendum 2022, Thinking through the options’. The report includes the following concern identified through research undertaken in Bristol: “5.9 The research found areas where various actors felt less positive about the introduction of the mayoral system. In areas such as the representation of views in the city, levels of trust in the decision-making system, and timeliness of decision-making, the introduction of mayoral governance appeared to have had little impact, or impacted negatively on perceptions on these matters. There was also evidence that people in the less well-off parts of Bristol saw the move to mayoral governance more negatively than those in other parts of the city. Many were also concerned about the concentration of powers in the office of the mayor.”

Question 1. What measures should an elected Mayor take to improve levels of trust in the decision-making system in Bristol?

Question 2

Background. Also in relation to the Mayoral referendum, one of your ex-Cabinet members has written an article in which he states: “The subversive element of the mayoral system is the lack of any effective democratic checks or balances. Under the committee system a decision made at a committee could be overturned by the vote of the full council. In our parliamentary system we are used to hearing of the primacy of parliament. If the Government loses a key vote it must take notice. In the US system the Congress and Senate act as counterweights to the president. In the mayoral system almost every decision voted through in the council can be ignored.”

Question 2. What measures should an elected Mayor take to improve democratic checks and balances?

REPLY:

Q1.

As somebody who grew up Bristol when its decision making didn’t take into account people like me or the communities I was part of, I can recognise how council decision making seems out of reach. We’ve expanded decision making by including diversity in our cabinet, and using the convening power of the role to build the One City Plan, we’ve trialled citizen assemblies and other participative democracy, I make myself available to journalists at regular press conferences and this is on top of the usual governance mechanism of full council and public cabinet meeting where decisions are taken.

I think we should also reflect on the role of media, and social media, in how it chooses to show politics in this city. So often it focuses on conflict, conspiracies and falsehoods, and suggests that there are simple solutions to complex, inter-related challenges we need to grapple with as a city.



It is unclear how a committee system will solve any of those problems you highlight. Decision making will be more opaque, with difficult decisions likely to be delayed or avoided. This creates a real risk that communities with more social capital and influence will continue to have disproportionate impact on decision-making.

Q2.

I am not sure there is much of an equivalency between Bristol's Full Council and the US President and congress.

The role of the Mayor and its decision making powers is set out in legislation (passed by Parliament).

Being accountable to the entire city of Bristol every four years is itself a check and balance, but just last month we had full council pass a cross-party budget. The idea that councillors don't have power and agency in the city is clearly wrong.



QUESTION PQ72 & PQ73

Subject: Redcatch Mast

Question submitted by: Victoria Young

I understand that section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 requires that the Council does not dispose of land for consideration less than the best that can be reasonably be obtained. However, for the reasons set out above, the disposal of this land to allow for a 24m mast will give rise to prejudice that cannot be adequately compensated in money.

We note the importance of ensuring access to telecommunications. However, from a proportionality perspective, there must be other suitable locations for the mast. Is the telecoms operator and / or Council really considering where the least intrusive locations are for this mast? At the very least, we must require the telecoms company to consider other sites and provide its full reasoning as to why other sites may have been discounted and why this particular site is preferred. Redcatch Park is designated an Important Open Space, no doubt to reflect the value to the community of this green space in a built up area. It cannot be the case that the Council will simply hand over this important area of land because the telecoms company has put pressure on it to do so.

I understand that there is a public law duty to consult with those that may be impacted by a decision. I would be grateful for clarity as to what the proposed process is in relation to making decisions about the erection of a phone mast within Redcatch Park. Will local residents have a proper opportunity to engage and make representations in response? For example, will we be able to access full information about why this particular site is being proposed, what alternative sites were considered and not pursued?

Save for the brief notice in the newspaper, there appears to be limited information available as to what the reasons are for making this proposal. Without making that information easily available, those impacted by the decision are unable to properly engage and provide representations.

Additional questions

1 - What decision is the Council currently considering? Is it making a decision as to whether to dispose of land under section 123 Local Government Act? Or is it a decision relating to Permitted Development rights, Code Rights under the Electronic Communications Code, licencing or something else? In answering this question, please confirm upon what sections of the Code / Statute etc the decision is being made upon?

2 - Presumably any decision that is being made is a provisional one such that those impacted by any proposed decision will be given an opportunity to properly engage and set out any representations? With that in mind, please clearly set out what considerations are being taken into account when making any provisional decision. This will allow those impacted by the proposed decision to understand the basis for any proposed decision. They will then have a fair opportunity to engage in the decision making process.

Q1.

The Executive Director – Growth and Regeneration will, on behalf of the council in its capacity as landowner, take a decision on whether or not to grant the licence which EE/H3G have formally



requested. His decision will include consideration of the application of s.123 of the Local Government Act 1972 and the Electronic Communications Code.

If a license is granted and the mast is installed based on reliance on the emergency permitted development rights, the Planning Authority could consider further investigation to determine whether a breach of planning control has occurred and, if so, whether it is expedient to enforce. The question of whether the development was in response to an emergency would likely be central to this investigation.

Q2.

A decision on granting the license will be made by the Executive Director Growth and Regeneration. Although the decision will not be made in a public forum, representations made by the public will be available to and considered by the Executive Director when coming to his decision.



QUESTION PQ74

Subject: new RPZ on Bower Ashton Terrace BS3

Question submitted by: Nicola McGerty

I understand that the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resource for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor & team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the new RPZ on Bower Ashton Terrace, BS3

Reasoning:

1. We are the closest street to Ashton gate stadium. No parking for residents on these days. Stadium is due to expand need to be able to prioritise parking for residents when the stadium is in use.
2. Overspill from southville RPZ
3. This timeline outlines locally-led RPZ activity in BS3 since 2018, (<https://bit.ly/BPRBS3timeline>), which includes two Cllr led surveys, showing overwhelming support for RPZ in our area.
4. Over 80% of residents in Ashton want RPZ
5. All residents on the terrace want an RPZ
6. Evidence shows it would support environment policies, it would boost cycling on safer roads, use of public transport, improve air quality, access for emergency vehicles, reduce rat running, and stop valuable urban gardens being paved over.

Will the mayor and his team be able to allocate more RPZ funding for bower Ashton terrace?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.
- As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ75 & PQ 76

Subject: Transport – passengers and mass transit

Question submitted by: David Redgewell

question 1

With the £150 million pounds of funding extension for bus services recovery grant in England with public transport use at 65% of pre covid 19 passengers levels - what steps is the city mayor marvin Rees taking to support the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council bus service improvements plan and mayor Dan Norris to get passengers back on to the city region bus and coach Network including more services bus service to Bristol and Bath park and ride site.

Including review the support bus Network in South, East and North Bristol, by better cleaning of buses and coaches, bus washing and cleaning of bus shelters and graffiti removal and interchanges to makes passengers feel safe as per the Department of transport, by working on a marketing campaign to use public transport, First group and stagecoach group have stop all publication maps and timetables, intergration with ferries and railway services for both local residents and Tourists.

question 2

With mass transit system a key priority of the city and county of Bristol the west of England mayoral transport Authority and North Somerset council, what progress is now being made on making sure that public consultation is carried on the Bus rapid transit system metro bus phase of the scheme and then the lighting rail / underground overground sections. with a light rail system taking 15 year to deliver we must plan the system now.

We also welcome proposals in Gloucester and Cheltenham for similar schemes by Gloucestershire county council. The bus rapid transit system bus lane and metro bus scheme will take 4 to 5 years when will public consultation start on this very important scheme for the economy growth and climate change of the Greater Bristol and Bath city region.

REPLY:

Q1.

Bristol City Council continues to support the recovery of the bus industry through the provision and maintenance of its public transport infrastructure, including giving buses priority at key locations such as Bristol Bridge.

We will support the West of England Combined Authority in the delivery of the Bus Services Improvement Plan, and the significant bus infrastructure improvements proposed under the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement.

Q2.

Bristol City Council is working with WECA and the West of England authorities on the mass transit project. WECA are leading the project and they are progressing details of the consultation, we await further updates from them.



QUESTION PQ77

Subject: Home Insulation

Question submitted by: Dr Hilary Farey

With reference to the One City Climate Plan, which has a target of 35% of domestic homes in Bristol to be insulated to a high standard (C+) by 2023, I would like to ask a question about home insulation. What percentage have been insulated to this standard so far, and is this target likely to be met? With energy price increases this is increasingly important.

REPLY:

Bristol has a residential housing stock of 204,930, according to the Valuation Office Agency (September 2021).

There are 180,355 Energy Performance Certificates (EPC) lodged for properties in Bristol (Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities December 2021), so we have energy efficiency data for 88.01% of Bristol's domestic properties.

Of these, 71,986 properties have an EPC rating of C or better, so 35.13% of the housing stock is at EPC C or better.

Bristol City Council has made a substantial contribution to this target. Twice as many Bristol City Council homes, some 70%, are EPC C+. This means that council tenants are twice as likely to live in a more energy efficient home than those in the private sector.

An additional 79,813 homes have recommendations which would bring them up to C or better, meaning approximately 38.95% of the housing stock can be brought up to EPC rating C with appropriate retrofit measures.



QUESTION PQ78

Subject: Carbon Neutral Bristol by 2030

Question submitted by: Hannah Mishan

The One City Climate Plan includes a goal that “major developments in Bristol are net carbon negative and smart-energy-enabled by 2031”. This doesn’t seem consistent with the need to get to carbon neutrality by 2030. Will you bring this target forward to help with getting to carbon neutral Bristol by 2030?

REPLY:

We are developing a new planning policy to come into effect through the Local Plan which we aim to be in place by 2024. This will include the requirement for all developments to be working towards carbon neutrality.

Following the statutory process we have to go through we aim to have the Local Plan in place in 2024 so new development consented after that should be zero carbon. This will be a big step forward.

We are focusing our resources on securing standards through the local plan which will be the legal starting point for all planning decisions thereafter its adoption.

However, the One City Plan Goal isn't just for the city council and I would hope that major developers will be looking to go beyond the statutory local plan requirements in line with the aspiration of the One City Plan.



QUESTION PQ79

Subject: Mass Transit

Question submitted by: Richard Baxter

I understand from the meeting agenda that the council will be considering an allocation of £5million towards a feasibility study of building an underground railway as well as other mass transit options. Is this a waste of public money given that such huge infrastructure projects never seem to be completed in time and on budget and given the fact that any such engineering project will not be finished in time to make much of a contribution towards the city achieving its 2030 net-zero carbon target?

We do not have the luxury of time on our side. Surely the actual construction of a modern-day underground will be quite carbon-intensive so is likely to be a significant carbon emitter before it offers carbon reduction?

REPLY:

The £5m allocation you reference is an allocation we secured from the West of England Combined Authority for developing mass transit proposals across the region. We need to bring forward projects across all areas of transport to meet our climate change targets.

In order to meet our obligations it is critical that we move forward quickly with our mass transit proposals and progress the scheme as quickly as we can. Any scheme will have a full carbon emissions audit to ensure that it is net positive in terms of meeting our targets and construction emissions will be included as part of that assessment.



QUESTION PQ80

Subject: Bristol Airport expansion

Question submitted by: Maria Wood

As BCC declared the expansion of Bristol Airport to be incompatible with their undertaking to realise net zero CO2 emissions by 2030, what specific actions will the Mayor and the Council take to ensure that the planned expansion does not proceed?

And do they have any contingency plans for the millions of additional CO2 emissions that will be released as a result of this expansion?

REPLY:

Firstly, reducing carbon emissions in the city is not just the responsibility of the city council. Because of the scale of the challenge, we need action from everyone. Every organisation and every household has a role to play. In setting the goal for Bristol to be carbon neutral by 2030 and adopting the One City Climate Strategy we are also very clear that this can only be achieved with substantial national action – in laws, policies and funding.

The Clean Air Zone is being implemented to reduce local air pollution and protect health and the City Council has been required by Government to implement it. We have developed proposals which best achieve that goal, according to the government's rules, and ensured that we minimise the adverse impacts on Bristol lower income residents and small businesses.

The decision to permit Bristol Airport's expansion was made by national government and the airport is located in North Somerset.

As a council we are leading by example and have cut our own direct carbon emissions by about 50% since the emergency was declared. We are implementing a wide range of projects to help reduce the city's emissions, from homes, from travel and from new development - including the City Leap Energy Partnership which plans to secure investment of over £1bn in energy decarbonisations projects.



QUESTION PQ81

Subject: Greenwashing in Advertising

Question submitted by: Alison Allan

The Advertising Standards Authority's current project on greenwashing in advertising is in full swing. Which amendments to the Council advertising standards are being introduced to ban advertisements for climate destroying products like fuel, SUVs, fast food and plastic?

REPLY:

We have one of the strongest advertising policies in the UK, including being the first city outside London to ban junk food advertising. We agreed this policy at Cabinet in March 2021, and our approach has been used nation-wide as an exemplar policy.

At present we do not have plans to restrict all of your suggested categories of advertising on council-owned sites and platforms, and we have no legal powers to dictate the content of advertising on private sites.

When making our policy we considered restrictions related to high carbon and other climate damaging goods and services. However, in the absence of any defined legal standards or precedents we have limited options – only targeting specific known high-polluting goods and services.

We note the ASA's project but also that it relates to the accuracy of advertising, and as the ASA notes, its role does not involve banning whole categories of such advertising.



QUESTION PQ82

Subject: Greenwashing in Advertising

Question submitted by: Robina Mallett

Having taken the initiative to declare a Climate Emergency in 2018 I would be proud of Bristol if it were to refuse permission for misleading advertising within the city's limits. In the light of the Advertising Standards Authority's current project on greenwashing in advertising, will you amend Council advertising standards to ban advertisements for climate destroying products like fuel and, SUVs and plastic?

REPLY:

It is important to distinguish between false or misleading advertising, and lawful, accurate advertising of goods or services that we may disagree with.

The council will refuse misleading advertising in line with its commitment to restrict advertising with claims or representations in violation of advertising or consumer protection laws. This would be on the basis of the ASA's judgement and the council is not the arbiter of what advertising can be considered misleading.

At present we do not have plans to restrict all of your suggested categories of advertising on council-owned sites and platforms, and we have no legal powers to dictate the content of advertising on private sites. However, our Advertising and Sponsorship Policy does already restrict High Fat, Salt and Sugar food and drink advertising.

We note the ASA's project but also that it relates to the accuracy of advertising, and as the ASA notes, its role does not involve banning whole categories of such advertising.



QUESTION PQ83 & PQ84

Subject: Mass Transit

Question submitted by: Moving Bristol Forward

Moving Bristol Forward is a West of England wide campaign to improve active travel and public transport for a less car-dependent West of England. Our manifesto sets out our objectives, which include full decarbonisation and full access to mobility for all (<https://www.movingbristolforward.co.uk/>). Our Manifesto is clear that any mass transit plan needs to be embedded in a transport and active travel strategy for the wider West of England and North Somerset area.

As part of our work building up to the Manifesto we commissioned a study of the potential of trams as a partial solution to some of the West of England mass transit challenges, and found that there are no major technical barriers to a tram system (<https://www.movingbristolforward.co.uk/tram-study>). Any mass transit solution should also integrate with an improved local rail system, in line with FoSBR plans (<https://fosbr.org.uk/campaigns/fosbr-plan-for-rail/>), with local buses and, very importantly, with increased investment in improved active travel. A key aim of mass transit is to remove cars from the road, making active travel safer and more accessible, as well as improving air quality.

Question 1: What input has the administration sought from civil society groups and Bristol's residents about their mass transit proposals so far?

Question 2: Does the Mayor agree with us that a West of England Strategic Transport Forum would be a good development if it meant stronger community buy-in for forthcoming conversations and decisions about the region's mass transit proposals?

REPLY:

Q1.

Our ambitious mass transit proposals are now being taken forward by WECA. They are currently finalising proposals for consultation and this will include engaging with local stakeholder groups.

We have previously carried out a variety of consultations from the Bristol Transport Strategy to the Joint Local Transport Plan that have all included mass transit options.

As you will have seen from the most recent WECA board and future commitments, in the most dense urban areas, by far the most likely outcome is some form of underground.

Q2.

Bristol already engages with key stakeholders through the One City Transport Board which will be relaunched later this month. While we can't comment on WECA forums we would support measures that would improve engagement on and buy in to the mass transit proposals.



QUESTION PQ85

Subject: Extension of Southville RPZ

Question submitted by: Matt Jones

I understand the 22/23 Council budget allocates more resources for RPZs across Bristol. I would like to ask the Mayor and team if they will please use this new budget allocation to prioritise the extension of Southville's existing RPZ?

REPLY:

The budget has provided funding for a potential RPZ where:

- **We believe that a parking zone would make a technical difference to parking and traffic flow.**
- **As we have said since 2016, where there is overwhelming public support.**

We are also in the process of reviewing the rules and charges for Residents Parking Zones.

We have surveyed residents in Southville and Bedminster before, and the only overwhelming support is for a match day parking scheme, for which we are considering funding. We are, however, with the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, looking at identifying a second trial site for Liveable Neighbourhoods once we have learned some clear lessons from the first pilot scheme in East Bristol.



QUESTION PQ86

Subject: Carbon Neutral Bristol by 2030

Question submitted by: Isabella Harding

I would like to ask you - when you are going to make good on your commitment to a carbon neutral Bristol by 2030? This is a huge commitment and I am very anxious that items such as the clean air zone or indeed the supposedly permitted expansion of Bristol Airport are inimical to achieving this, and are passed by means of greenwashing away the evidence that this takes us off track. It is extraordinarily important that we meet this target of carbon neutrality, not least because the IPCC latest report shows that action is urgent and that we are at the tipping point of irreversibly change.

REPLY:

Firstly, reducing carbon emissions in the city is not just the responsibility of the city council. Because of the scale of the challenge, we need action from everyone. Every organisation and every household has a role to play. In setting the goal for Bristol to be carbon neutral by 2030 and adopting the One City Climate Strategy we are also very clear that this can only be achieved with substantial national action – in laws, policies and funding.

The Clean Air Zone is being implemented to reduce local air pollution and protect health and the City Council has been required by Government to implement it. We have developed proposals which best achieve that goal, according to the government’s rules, and ensured that we minimise the adverse impacts on Bristol lower income residents and small businesses.

The decision to permit Bristol Airport’s expansion was made by national government and the airport is located in North Somerset.

As a council we are leading by example and have cut our own direct carbon emissions by about 50% since the emergency was declared. We are implementing a wide range of projects to help reduce the city’s emissions, from homes, from travel and from new development - including the City Leap Energy Partnership which plans to secure investment of over £1bn in energy decarbonisations projects.

