

# Cabinet

## Supplementary Information



**Date:** Tuesday, 12 July 2022

**Time:** 4.00 pm

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

### 2. Public Forum

(Pages 3 - 20)

Please find attached answers to questions submitted.

**Issued by:** Sam Wilcock, Democratic Services  
City Hall, Bristol, BS1 9NE  
E-mail: [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)  
**Date:** Wednesday, 27 July 2022



## Question: PQ08.01 & PQ08.02

Cabinet – 12 July 2022

Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps

Question submitted by: David Redgewell

Question no 1 - Whilst we welcome the New framework for western Harbour especially retaining the Old Bond Buildings Garden centre etc, but the report fails to show a Transport framework for western Harbour.

What discussion has the city mayor malvin Rees had with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and Mayor Dan Norris about a public Transport provision to the western harbour ie Metro bus service Ashton Gate to Bristol city centre via Bristol Temple meads.

Bus services along the Portway and Hotwells road and bus lanes .

To Portway parkway and Avonmouth and towards m5 and Portishead.

New River crossings from long Ashton to Hotwells need to be designed with full bus coach and mass transit lanes Towards South Bristol/Bristol Airport.

Portishead and Weston super mare.

BUS service to the city centre and Cabot circus.

A station on the Bristol Temple meads to pill and Portishead line at Ashton Gate.

Ferry service to a new full accessible landings stage.

**Does the mayor agree that this item needs consultation with Bristol Transport Board and the Development needs a transport framework including a flooding prevention?**

- Future consultation will take place with the Bristol Transport Board as this is developed.

Question no 2 As Western Harbour is a major Development scheme **what cross boundary working is happening with the west of England mayoral combined Authority metro Dan Norris and his staff plus North Somerset council to bring about this very important Regeneration scheme?**

- This document recognises that we will ask WECA to fund the masterplan and we intend to work fully with the combined authority in the transformation of this important harbour area.
- We are working collaboratively with officers at WECA and keeping officers at North Somerset informed as we develop the masterplan

**Question: PQ08.03 & PQ08.04**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Fraser Bridgeford**

- 1. There is no support within the community for new four lane highways through Merchants Road and others. Why has this not explicitly been excluded?**
  - The vision is moving to the masterplanning stage. The document includes a section that covers 'Why does Western Harbour need to change' and acknowledges the ageing infrastructure is one of a number of challenges that will need to be addressed.
  
- 2. Why is the controversy of the road system around Cumberland Basin not addressed as part of the vision?**
  - Highways solutions will be considered as part of the masterplanning phase and all options remain on the table.
  - This development will benefit the entire city and provide homes in a sustainable location so that people and families are not dependent on cars.

**Question: PQ08.05**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Joe Banks**

According to its Terms of Reference, the Western Harbour Advisory Group was appointed by the Mayor to “help create objectives for the proposed future redevelopment of Western Harbour and shape its direction.” Since the start of 2021, Minutes available on the Council’s website show that nine members of the WHAG have attended less than half of the group’s meetings.

**Question: Can the Mayor explain this low rate of attendance among his appointees, and does he think that the people of Bristol can have confidence that a thorough, transparent and representative process has taken place to get us to this point?**

- The Western Harbour Advisory Group is not the sole way we have engaged with the city. Two of the appendices that accompany report sets out the Engagement that took place at the end of last year and the Consultation report sets out the consultation response to the draft vision that took place in March/April this year.
- We are currently reviewing the role and membership of WHAG, in consultation with the Chair.

**Question: PQ08.06 & PQ 08.07**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Joanna Booth**

**Question 1:**

The wards affected by this project are listed as: Harbourside and Hotwells, Southville, Bedminster & Clifton.

The equality impact assessment stated that “English is not the main language of 14.4% of the residents of Hotwells and Harbourside (top countries of birth outside of the UK are China and Other SE Asian countries), 8% of the residents of Southville (top countries of birth outside of the UK Poland and Other EU accession countries), 5% of the residents of Southville (top countries of birth outside of the UK are Poland and Other EU accession countries.)”

**What kind of efforts were made to get the views of these groups, especially, Chinese, Polish and other South-East-Asian countries, in addition to those from groups in Easton and from such enterprises as Design West’s Shape My City walk?**

We sought views from across the city, and specifically wanted to benefit from the perspectives of people and communities from across the city and backgrounds not usually heard from, but we know there is always more to be done. The vision was created from a programme of public engagement to start a citywide conversation to shape the future of the area.

We ran:

- 10 Creative Workshops in person
- 2 Creative Workshops online
- 7 Listening Labs online
- 2 In-person sessions at Riverside Garden Centre and at Docks Heritage

Weekend

- 2 ‘Walk and Talks’
- 2 Visioning Days
- 1 Month-long exhibition

Online, we have received over:

- 599 Comments on the Harbour Hopes Map, with 1818 ‘likes’
- 81 online Place Principles, with 139 ‘likes’
- Over 120 comments and over 1000 ‘likes’ on Instagram

The EQIA will inform the consultation strategy during the master planning phase

**Question 2:**

The report is going to cabinet to seek endorsement of the Western Harbour Vision, which has apparently been developed through "extensive community engagement and consultation".

The first engagement, which was held over the summer of 2019, “received a total of 2,661 responses, of which: · 2,609 were online or paper responses to the survey · 43 were emailed responses · 9 were responses by letter”

. <https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/documents/s42624/Appendix%20B%20-%20Engagement%20Report.pdf>

While it is natural to see local residents more active in responding to the engagement, every single ward in Bristol was represented in those responses.

I have only seen the responses to Turner Works' engagement in the reports. **How were these original and geographically varied 2661 comments incorporated into what is being presented to cabinet?**

- The consultation and engagement reports (Appendix B1 and B2) relate to the engagement around the vision rather than the earlier consultation that took place in 2019, which were specifically focused on the opportunities for changes to the road. Cabinet has already considered the response to this earlier consultation and as a result embarked on the developing the vision document. This consultation report from 2019 formed part of the background information that was given to the consultants at the beginning of their commission.

**Question: PQ08.08 & PQ08.09**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Martin Rands**

Question 1

**Is the 'Eastern Option' of rebuilding the Plimsoll Bridge dual carriageway at the end of Avon Crescent, adjacent to Underfall Yard and numerous other listed heritage properties, and through the Riverside Garden Centre, still 'on the table' and a possibility?**

- No decision has been made and we're not making one here by agreeing the vision for the area on the future layout of the area. This will come as the masterplan is developed in consultation with the community.

Question 2

**The Harbour Hopes Vision states that 49% of the Western Harbour development area is 'brownfied' Any quick look on Google maps shows about 51% of the land to be Greville Smyth Park and Ashton Meadows. If the roads are rebuilt at grade (lowered to ground level) they will occupy Sylvia Crowe's landscaped amenity land, which comprises a derelict playground, fountains, benches and public toilets. How was the 49% 'brownfield' figure calculated, and which definition of 'brownfield' was used?**

- You may have misread the document as it does not include that reference to brownfield land. The report states that "Much of Western Harbour is brownfield, previously developed land. Currently 49% of the land is currently taken up by roads, parking and other hard surfaces".

**Question: PQ08.10 & PQ08.11**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey**

**Question. Will any of the elected councillors from the wards most affected by the 'Western Harbour' proposals be permitted as members of the 'Western Harbour Advisory Group'?**

- Officers have provided updates separately to ward members and provide regular updates to the Growth and Regeneration Scrutiny Commission. Elected members will continue to be engaged on the project in this way moving forward.

**Question. Please can you confirm whether the repair and retention of the existing Plimsoll Bridge is still being dismissed as an option?**

- Spending millions to refurbish a failing 1960s road layout and thereby retaining an inefficient car dominated landscape instead of using this as an opportunity to free up land for sustainable homes is not an option we would support.
- The vision work does not focus on layout and design. Highways solutions will be considered as part of the master planning phase. Until there is a solution to the road changes required, no options have been excluded.



**Question: PQ08.12 & PQ08.13**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 – Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Mary Wildman**

1. Question:

As a resident of the area who is keen to engage in the development of Western Harbour, I am confused about precisely what we are being asked to engage with and feel that I have insufficient information to enable me to do so.

Before any work on masterplanning or "vision" can start, we need to know where the viable land is and what it could, feasibly, be used for. I am finding it very difficult to discuss "value" when I do not know what I am ascribing that value to. If housing is not an option / will be very limited and the cost is high, this is likely to rank lower in my estimation of value than were the converse true. Equally so for moving the roads.

**In this regard, I would be grateful for clarity as to when and how we should expect information as to the extent of usable land for (a) buildings / housing and (b) the roads that we have and are being asked to comment on, bearing in mind:-**

- **Flood risk (decision on the old Police training ground refers):**
- **Current infrastructure (e.g. locks, bridge, railway line);**
- **Biodiversity / ecology (proximity of the SSSI);**
- **The cricket ground and allotments**

- Thank you for your interest in the project. We want to work with the community to deliver something that is great for the whole of Bristol.
- We are not asking for people to comment on the viable development land – this will be considered as part of the masterplanning process.
- The engagement and consultation on the vision has drawn out the priorities for the masterplanning which will consider the future transformation of the area.
- A further report to Cabinet to seek approval for the costs and programme for this work is anticipated later in the year.
- Please note the Cricket ground and allotment site fall outside of the project boundary.
- This question shows the tightrope we have to walk in public consultation as we were previously criticised for identifying more detail (on transport in particular) rather than shaping a vision, but now being criticised for not setting out more detail.

2. Question:

The report by Turner Works states there was extensive community engagement. I understand from a member of the Cumberland Basin Stakeholder Group that they and opposition councillors have effectively been excluded from the Western Harbour Advisory Group, with substitutions at meetings not being allowed. I am concerned that this points to a lack of community engagement.

Specifically, the Cumberland Basin Stakeholder Group are the only community group allowed to attend this group and can only send one person with no substitutions. This is despite the fact that the chair can have a substitute, and as both the mayor's own pastors are on the group they can substitute for each other.

I understand that many of the members of the advisory group have not shown up for most of the meetings.

**If the Western Harbour Advisory Group actually was created to provide further community engagement, how can the exclusion of both the CBSG and relevant ward councillors be considered to have achieved that aim?**

- The Western Harbour Advisory Group has a role in community engagement but is not the sole channel for this and consultation. This report sets out the extensive engagement that took place at the end of last year and the consultation on the draft vision that took place in earlier this year.
- The Cumberland Basin Stakeholder Group are a member of the Western Harbour Advisory group. The current terms of reference for this group state that substitutes are not allowed at meetings. This was to ensure a level of continuity during the meetings.
- As stated in the report, we are currently reviewing the group to increase diversity and participation moving forward.

**Question: PQ08.14**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 – Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Valerie Steel**

Question: Why are the residents of Ashton Avenue specifically, being offered regular meetings if nothing has been decided? It looks like a decision to knock down their houses has already been taken.

- As the only residents within the redline boundary, we felt it important to offer individual meetings with Ashton Avenue as the project develops. No decision has been made on the future of the road layout – as the report states, this will be considered during the masterplanning phase.

**Question: PQ08.15 & PQ08.16**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Sasha Lubetkin**

Question one: £150k of public funds were used to pay an organisation, Turner Works, to hold workshops using clay models, paying people in Lawrence Weston, and holding group sessions across the city only to come up with the same ideas that the initial 'engagement' provided. The 'vision' could also not comment on highways infrastructure or housing.

**How was this a useful way to use public money, especially since it came after an initial engagement and precedes a further consultation that will now need to take place?**

- Thank you for your questions. It does highlight the challenge in balancing public consultation on large developments.
- Previously with engagement on Western Harbour members of the public felt the decisions were already being taken given the potential road layouts proposed. We undertook this new approach in order to capture the city's views on a significant development opportunity.
- To ensure we listened to the views of both local residents, stakeholders and the wider city on their aspirations for the future of Western Harbour, the Council undertook an inclusive, collaborative, creative art-led approach to the vision.
- The previous engagement focused solely on the transport options and not on the wider view of the wider place making.
- The number of people commenting on the draft vision document was 786 but many more were involved in the co-creation of the document as set out in Appendix B1.
- It is always a balance between providing detail and getting people to think openly and imaginatively about the area. You will be able to see more as the masterplanning comes forward.

Question two: Starting at the basics, I would like to know when and how they will determine the extent to usable land for (a) buildings / housing and (b) the road, bearing in mind:-

- Flood risk (decision on the old Police training ground refers):
- Current infrastructure (e.g. locks, bridge, railway line);
- Biodiversity / ecology (proximity of the SSSI);
- The cricket ground and allotments (oddly silent on this)

**To my mind, before any work on masterplanning or "vision" can start, we need to know where the viable land is and what it could, feasibly, be used for.**

- The masterplanning work will be informed by the vision document and through consideration of Biodiversity, Flood risk, infrastructure requirements etc. The extent of the usable land for homes, infrastructure and open space will be determined as part of the masterplan.
- The cricket ground and allotments are not in the report as both outside of the project boundary but as near neighbours the masterplan will need to consider how new development relates to these important uses.

**Question: CQ08.01 & CQ08.02**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Bennett**

Question: As a significant proportion of the land is owned by the Council, this presents an opportunity to have Goram Homes provide a large amount of social housing. **What thought has been given to this, and, at this stage, are you able to say what involvement Goram will have in the Western Harbour process?**

- The vision includes a commitment to create “Quality Homes”. As the primary landowner the commitment here is for 50% of homes being affordable which could include social housing. The community engagement work highlighting this to be a priority for the city, and we’ve made building mixed communities in sustainable locations the cornerstone of our approach to tackling the housing crisis.
- As part of the next stage of work, we will consider how the overall project can be delivered and will consider more fully Goram’s role in the future of the area.
- In March 2022 Cabinet approved allocating A & B Bond as part of Goram Homes’ development pipeline. The Council will work collaboratively with Goram to explore if/ how these buildings can come forward for residential mixed use development once the masterplan is complete.

Question: I note one of the bonded warehouses is being reserved as a multi-use cultural hub. As large, industrial buildings, this site will be an attractive prospect for night-time economy businesses, such as bars or nightclubs. **Will the Council consider reserving an amount of this building for night-time economy purposes?**

- We want Western Harbour to be a vibrant area of the city with mixed retail, hospitality use, just like the rest of the harbour, while retaining its own identity.
- The masterplanning phase will consider the building in more detail and how this iconic structure can be central to the future.
- The masterplan is developed in consultation with the community.

**Question: CQ13.01**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 13 - Digital Transformation Programme**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Wilcox**

**Question: Why is procuring and implementing a Digital Strategic Partner only an “Enabler” not a “Must Do”? Page 260 - Scope Project Breakdown, BCC IT does not have the capacity to deliver the Digital Transformation Programme without having a partner and will delay the entire project if one is not selected.**

- We need a partner to assist us with delivery, and work is underway on the procurement process for this.
- As the report notes, several projects within the Digital Transformation Programme could fit in to multiple categories. Page 260 itself categorises the Digital Strategic Partner project as “Enabler – however reflective to all categories”.
- The Digital Strategic Partner is listed primarily as an ‘Enabler’ because having one enables the work to be done, as opposed to “must dos”, which this report refers to as “addressing critical infrastructure risks”. It is largely semantics, and I completely agree that some external support will be essential.
- If the need arises, we could work with multiple partners, but our preference and expectation is that we will have a single partner and we are confident this will be possible.
- Several projects are already underway without the support of a partner, and these are in the capable hands of our in-house IT and support teams. Of course, their capacity is limited, so this makes procuring a partner to assist with new projects one of IT’s key priorities for 2022.

**Question: CQ21.01**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 21 - Financial update report - July 2022**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Mack**

**Question: Can all councillors, especially shadow cabinet members, who have a watching brief, have full details of our savings programme, which are at risk, and actions we are taking to secure them?**

- All councillors have a responsibility to stay on top of the Council and its business.
- We've made that easier because section 3 of Appendix A – Revenue Budget Monitoring provides an overview of the delivery of the 2022/23 General Fund savings programme.
- Further detail of the savings at risks are contained in the following appendices:
  - People Directorate – Appendix A1
  - Resources Directorate – Appendix A2
  - Growth and Regeneration Directorate – Appendix A3
- The directorate appendices will be available for each of the respective Scrutiny Commission meetings, where officers will be available if required to provide the context for the risks and progress update.



**Question: CQ22.01**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 22 - Corporate Risk Management Report – Q1 2022/23**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Wilcox**

**Question: From the corporate risk register - CRR7 Cyber Security: Why is Action 3, implementing the audit actions at 0% when it should have been completed in June 2022?**

- Thank you for this question. It has raised an error on the part of the risk owner in not amending the due date and progress of the specific action in time.
- The action has now been updated to reflect the current position at 75% complete.
- The main outstanding action is in relation to a Security Operations Centre (SOC), and DLUHC funding has been secured that will be used to progress this area of work (along with others).
- If you would like a specific briefing on this, officers are available to speak direct.

**Question: CQ22.02**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 22 - Corporate Risk Management Report – Q1 2022/23**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Mack**

**Question: Workplace resilience is evaluated as high threat risk, and yet there are no mitigation actions. Considering the two years we have had, I can't see that this risk was a surprise – what actions are we taking to recruit and retain staff?**

- A verbal answer was given in the meeting

[Cabinet - Tuesday, 12th July, 2022 4.00 pm - YouTube](#) (agenda item 22)

**Question: CQ22.03**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 22 - Corporate Risk Management Report – Q1 2022/23**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Edwards**

**Question: Lack of progress for the Mass Transit Programme is high threat risk, with high likelihood, why, therefore, are there no mitigation actions we can or should take to reduce that on our register?**

- A verbal answer was given in the meeting

[Cabinet - Tuesday, 12th July, 2022 4.00 pm - YouTube](#) (agenda item 22)