

Growth and Regeneration Scrutiny Commission Agenda



Date: Thursday, 29 September 2022

Time: 5.00 pm

Venue: The Writing Room - City Hall, College Green,
Bristol, BS1 5TR

Distribution:

Councillors: David Wilcox (Chair), Andrew Varney (Vice-Chair), Tim Rippington, Chris Jackson, Steve Pearce, Emma Edwards, Jenny Bartle, Mark Weston and Kevin Quartley

Issued by: Johanna Holmes, Democratic Services

City Hall, PO Box 3167, Bristol, BS3 9FS

Date: Wednesday, 21 September 2022

7. Public Forum

Up to 30 minutes is allowed for this item

(Pages 3 - 17)

Any member of the public or Councillor may participate in Public Forum. The detailed arrangements for so doing are set out in the Public Information Sheet at the back of this agenda. Public Forum items should be emailed to scrutiny@bristol.gov.uk and please note that the following deadlines will apply in relation to this meeting:-

Questions - Written questions must be received 3 clear working days prior to the meeting. For this meeting, this means that your question(s) must be received in this office at the latest by **5pm on Friday 23rd September.**

Petitions and Statements - Petitions and statements must be received on the working day prior to the meeting. For this meeting this means that your submission must be received in this office at the latest by **12.00 noon on Wednesday 28th September.**



Growth & Regeneration Scrutiny Commission 29th September 2022 Public Forum



Public Forum Questions:

Ref	Name	Topic
Q1	Mo Dymond	Item 12. Planning Enforcement
Q2 – Q4	Vassili Papastavrou Bristol Tree Forum	Item 12. Planning Enforcement
Q5	Martin Rands	Metrobus AVTM 2014 planning consent and Avon Crescent - Item 12 enforcement

Public Forum Statements:

Ref	Name	Topic
PFS1	Martin Rands	Metrobus AVTM 2014 planning consent and Avon Crescent - Item 12 enforcement
PFS2	Cllr Richard Eddy	Item 12. Planning Enforcement
PFS3	Cllr Ed Plowden	Item 12. Planning Enforcement
PFS4	Mark CD Ashdown Chair - Bristol Tree Forum	Item 12. Planning Enforcement
PFS5	Peter Wall	Item 12. Planning Enforcement
PFS6	Cllr Tom Hathway	Item 12. Planning Enforcement
PFS7	Cllr Philippa Hulme	Item 12. Planning Enforcement
PFS8	Stephen Barrett	Item 12. Planning Enforcement
PFS9	David Redgewell	Bus Tenders

Public Forum Questions

Question 1: Mo Dymond

I submit the following question in relation to a complaint I first made regarding the lack of planning consent for a development in my street, in March 2021. To my knowledge no planning application has been made, certainly no approval, and the development is now occupied as three separate dwellings.

My question is:

If a dwelling has been developed without planning permission and the developer continues to fail to submit plans for approval; what action can Planning Enforcement take?

And

If the development is found to fall short of planning requirements, what action can Enforcement take?

Q1: Officer Response:

A report of development taking place without permission will be investigated by Enforcement Officers. If a breach of planning control is identified and appears capable of regularisation in terms of its planning merits officers will seek the submission of a retrospective application from the developer. Once the application is deposited the application will be assessed on its merits and in line with adopted planning policies. If the retrospective application is refused then Enforcement Officers will move to serving a Planning Enforcement Notice. This approach is in line with our published Local Enforcement Plan.

Questions 2 – 4: Bristol Tree Forum

Question 2

Can Bristol City Council list all tree planning enforcement cases over the last ten years* which have resulted in a fine or court action? If the answer to this is none, can they explain why serious breaches of planning regulations have not been enforced?

*or similar period if data is not available for any part of this period.

Q2: Officer Response:

We can advise that there have not been any cases that have resulted in court action or fines within the 10 year period.

Each case received is considered against the provisions of our Local Enforcement Plan.

We would note that in the last 5 years we have investigated 28 cases concerning works to trees that were either protected by a TPO or located within a Conservation Area. For all cases where a breach of planning control was identified the Council issued a warning letter and/or secured some additional planting.

Question 3

An important lime tree in a conservation area was illegally felled on Woodstock Road in Redland, despite a planning application to fell it being rejected. Planning Enforcement was notified on 5 September 2021] and updates have been unsuccessfully sought at regular intervals since. Does BCC agree that this is a

high priority case? Can BCC confirm that the service guidelines state "Commence legal proceedings or resolve - Within 10 weeks".

Q3: Officer Response:

This case concerning the tree removal has been confirmed as a breach – we established early in the process that this is a high-profile case that the breach had occurred. However, it is also linked to other unauthorised works and is complex in its nature. The case is still under consideration at this time and we are engaging with BCC Legal Services regarding next steps. We also acknowledge that a Freedom of Information request has been made regarding this case.

Question 4

Can BCC confirm that six months is the time limit in law for any legal action to be commenced for felling of a TPO tree or a tree in a Conservation Area under the Town and Country Planning Act?

Q4: Officer Response:

6 months is the correct time limit.

Questions 5: Martin Rands

In 2013 local residents were called to the Nova Scotia pub to be told by Bristol City Council officers that the Metrobus AVTM scheme would be built opposite. The purpose of this meeting was to inform residents that Avon Crescent would become a shared space, where all motor vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists would have an EQUAL right to use ALL the space (pavement and highway) Trees would also be planted to improve the streetscape and to mitigate for environmental and heritage damage.

Metrobus has been built, but no shared space at Avon Crescent, which is a planning obligation.

Why has this 2014 planning consent breach not been enforced in relation to Avon Crescent?

Q5: Officer Response:

Given that you are named as the potential claimant in the judicial review pre-action protocol letter of 8 November 2019 and an active member of the Harbourheads Group who are legally represented, it is not appropriate for the Council to engage with you direct in this matter.

As soon as we have an update this will be communicated to your solicitor via the Council's solicitor.

Public Forum Statements

PFS1 Martin Rands

In 2013 local residents were called to the Nova Scotia pub to be told by Bristol City Council officers that the Metrobus AVTM scheme would be built opposite. The purpose of this meeting was to inform residents that Avon Crescent would become a shared space, where all motor vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists would have an EQUAL right to use ALL the space (pavement and highway) Trees

would also be planted to improve the streetscape and to mitigate for environmental and heritage damage.

Metrobus has been built, but not the shared space at Avon Crescent, which is a planning obligation.

Shared space should be enforced by Development Control to correct the ongoing breach of the consent Bristol City Council gave itself in March 2014.

PFS2 Cllr Richard Eddy

Dear Chairman & Scrutiny Commission Members,

Firstly, in my capacity as Chairman of the Development Committee 'A' Committee and speaking on behalf of all cross-party DC Members, may I thank the Growth & Regeneration Scrutiny Commission for making space in its busy Work Programme to examine the issue of Planning Enforcement in Bristol.

As ward councillors you will know the negative impact of planning conditions being breached- with often considerable disturbance for residential neighbours- but, equally, there is an important consideration here in policy terms for councillors serving on DC Committees. Often, permitted developments are 'on balance' decisions- with Members persuaded to vote for Approval on condition that there are sufficient protections inherent in the determination to control and mitigate the potential negative impact of consent on neighbouring residents. If DC Committees do not have confidence in the ability of the Planning Enforcement Team to uphold and enforce the planning conditions agreed then there may be a real crisis-of-confidence in the Planning system in Bristol- with Members possibly less willing to give 'on balance' consent to developments. One only needs to speculate for a minute on the impact of this potential change in Members' states-of-mind for Housing, Employment and other development!

Secondly, over recent years, the Report of Enforcement Notices produced for every DC Committee is increasingly troubling: There have been six meetings of the DC 'A' Committee since May 2021 which have reported that no Enforcement Notices were issued. One advantage of having served on DC Committees for most of my 30 years' service on Bristol City Council is the possession of a long-memory. I recall- not that long ago- that the Report of Enforcement Notices issued would often fill one or two pages of A4. Just in case I could be accused of having a faulty memory, I recently asked Cllr Helen Holland (who was elected the year before me, in 1991) her recollection: Helen recalled vividly that Enforcement Notices issues were much more regular in the past!

Thirdly, though I have many experiences where the involvement of BCC Planning Enforcement Team has not led to a particularly good result for my constituents, an excellent example for your deliberations is a 2017 case of planning breaches carried out by one of a number of 'shell-companies' owned by the Litt Brothers. The example in my ward relates to the development of 14 properties at 131 Bridgwater Road, Bedminster Down (now named Litfield Court)- though a subsequent two TV documentaries carried out by BBC West revealed that the last half a dozen housing developments by the Litt Brothers in Bristol and South Gloucestershire all had substantial planning breaches (but NONE were rectified by Planning Enforcement). In this case, the height of the properties, dormer-windows employed and an additional bedroom in each home broke the planning consent granted. I eventually forced it to come back to DC Committee to obtain Retrospective Planning Consent. On the advice of Officers, it was refused on lack of Affordable Housing grounds, but NOT because of the Urban Design deficiencies uncovered. The Litt Brothers successfully Appealed to the Planning Inspectorate, which granted the Appealed application, and which criticised Bristol City Council for not partly refusing the application on Urban Design grounds (hence the Planning Inspectorate were unable to broaden the grounds of their own adjudication).

The saga for my Litfield Court constituents continues unabated years after this 'cowboy-builder' constructed their homes. Since the developer used a private company (NOT the Council) to supervise the construction standards through Building Control, the significant structural problems of the properties can only be compensated for if every home-owner successfully sued the Building Control company which 'signed-off' the construction works.

I wish the Scrutiny Commission well in its deliberations.

Cllr Richard Eddy

City Councillor, Bishopsworth Ward,
Chairman, Development Control 'A' Committee.

PFS3 Cllr Ed Plowden

This is a statement on behalf of over a dozen households in the Madcot Rd and Brendon Rd area of Windmill Hill.

"For the council: INTERNAL REVIEW (made public) INTO THE NON-ACTION OF ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

As well as the developer, we believe the council's enforcement team should be held to account regarding the lack of action. We note the challenge of under funded departments, but time was spent assessing issues but formal action by the team was not forthcoming. Had complaints been taken seriously, action could have been taken six months earlier, reducing the anxiety many of us have felt."

PFS4 Mark CD Ashdown - Chair - Bristol Tree Forum

Tree Planning Enforcement: statement by the Bristol Tree Forum

The Bristol Tree Forum is calling for an independent review/inquiry into Planning Enforcement pertaining to tree issues in Bristol for the reasons outlined below. We understand that Enforcement cases are necessarily complex and cannot be summarised in a few lines. We have analysed the current [Development Management Register of Enforcement and Stop Notices](#) which dates back to 2002 and can find not one case of a breach relating to the protection trees in the 470 plus cases reported. Despite this, in our experience, there have been many instances of breaches of tree protection legislation or of planning conditions protecting trees over the years. Below are a few recent examples (we can provide others). We are aware of other neighbouring Local Planning Authorities that do take enforcement action regarding trees.

1. Bristol City Council has a history of being unable to take enforcement action regarding trees it owns.

- **Cotham School - 2009.** A row of huge trees felled illegally in a conservation area on the Thursday afternoon before Good Friday in 2009. Police called but did not stop it. Despite agreement that this had been done without permission, and amidst widespread shock and outrage, no action taken.
- **Land To Rear Of Silbury Road (Ashton Rise), Alderman Moores, Bristol – 2019.** Land owned by BCC. Around six oak trees removed on a Bristol City Council development site despite being scheduled for retention on the development plans. 'No action taken' and the reason 'Minor breach/De minimus'.
- **Little Paradise Carpark, Bedminster – 2021.** A large tree cut down in the Bristol City Council Little Paradise Carpark in Bedminster on a Friday evening in the dark - the people who did it were aggressive

when approached by a local person, and once finished, ran off with their chainsaws. It is not stated under whose instructions the tree was felled and whether any proper investigation was conducted - case registered 15 March and closed very quickly by 30 March. 'Minor breach', 'de minimus' etc. Amazing that felling a large tree that had not been scheduled for removal in the dark in a public council carpark by thugs is considered a minor breach. No action taken.

2. Bristol City Council has a history of being unable to take effective enforcement action against developers regarding the removal or damage to trees

- **Woodstock Road, Redland – 2021.** Large lime tree with a value of £131k taken down soon after a planning application to fell it was rejected. Report received 6 Sept 2021, resolution target date 15 November 2021. Status is still pending. Request for updates and information including via FOI refused on the grounds that disclosure of investigation documents would prejudice an investigation. We have asked for an Internal review -

https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/steps_taken_by_bristol_city_coun#incoming-2122131.

- **Ravenswood Road, Cotham – 2018.** Huge beech tree in a conservation area removed before the planning application had been determined. Despite numerous requests, and an FOI, no planning enforcement case has been opened. The planning application remains undetermined. BTF complaint rejected after internal review using the unexpected argument that as the case is still ongoing it is not possible to determine whether any fault

on the part of the service has happened. Response to complaint states 'no action taken since summer 2018' but apparently this is not a fault. Additional Catch-22 advising BTF that there is a 12 month limit to following up a complaint.

- **Lower Ashley Road - 2020-2021.** Dangerous tree felling by unqualified people next to a busy highway on four separate occasions. On each occasion effectively the same breaches of the planning conditions were perpetrated; felling of trees using machinery by unqualified individuals, well outside permitted working hours (as specified in the Management Plan), without proper licences in place, with none of the statutory safety procedures applied (as specified in the Planning Approval), where local residents had to intervene, and on two occasions were assaulted by the 'workmen'. On each occasion the Police needed to intervene, and indeed for the latest incident had to close one of the busiest roads in Bristol for 5 hours due to life threatening dangers to the public resulting from incompetent tree works. Each incident was properly reported and, on each occasion, different excuses were given why no action was taken, or indeed no case registered. On the third occasion, the reason given was that this was 'an isolated incidence'.

- **Stoke Hill – 2022.** Two large trees in front of BT Telephone Exchange in Conservation Area felled with no S211 Notice having been submitted. Trees were worthy of Tree Preservation Orders, which is probably why no Notice was served by the owner. Planning Enforcement slow to act. When they did act, rather than attempt to impose a penalty, they merely requested two small trees as replacements. Others (local Councillor and Mayors' Office) negotiated a much larger contribution to Bristol's tree stock much to the apparent consternation of Planning Enforcement.

3. Bristol City Council, if it does take any action, refuses to continue any investigation or enforcement action if the conditions set at the first attempt are then not adhered to.

- **Trymview - 2019-2020.** Developers stacked boulders in the RPA of a TPO Yew tree in the grounds of a development site (former Southmead Police Station). This reported to Enforcement, who visited and set conditions banning this practice. Developers continued to abuse several trees, stacking masonry against a Yew tree and changing soil levels around

Yew and Ash trees. Enforcement refused to investigate further – ‘case closed’.

Bristol Tree Forum

28 September 2022

PFS5 Peter Wall

The building site alongside my home has been run by cowboys not adhering or even trying to adhere to the Construction Management Plan conditioned by Bristol City Council.

The Developer and the new site manager agree that there have been multiple problems with the way the site has been run.

The Councils Planning Enforcement Team has visited the site but have not done anything formal. The HSE visited the site and has issued formal directions.

The lack of consideration for neighbours has resulted in unacceptable nuisance

The lack of consideration for neighbours has resulted in damage to property including the councils, yet no-one is being held to account

Our life, health, family life and a right to quiet enjoyment have been severely affected, by this failure to uphold the conditions the council themselves imposed.

The failure to use the council’s powers seems to have encouraged the site manager to abuse and provoke my family and myself

The failure is a green light to terrible construction companies across the city and the council needs to understand the human impact of these failures.

Peter & Geraldine Wall

PFS 6 Cllr Tom Hathway

I have a great deal of sympathy for the small team of officers that work in the planning enforcement team considering the huge scale of development that the city is under, and the sometimes lengthy legal process that their work entails.

Unfortunately as a Councillor I begrudge having to raise an issue with enforcement. In my experience I may get a response as soon as the next day, but I may also not get a response at all. I have little idea about ongoing cases, only receiving an update when chasing, and often unfortunately there has been little visible progress on the big cases that residents frequently raise with us as their ward councillors, though I appreciate that statutory deadlines can often play a part in this. Where a case has followed through, there seems to be little material consequence for flouting planning rules in the first place.

Two example ongoing cases in my ward are:

Redmayne House, where in May 2021 Prior Approval was granted to Urban Creation for change of use for offices to C3 residential. 4 months later, these were being advertised as serviced apartments.

Permitted Developments for office to C3 were designed to increase residential housing stock, not to facilitate the development of hotels and serviced apartments, which come under use class C1. You can

still today book a stay in a single apartment for around £160 a night – there appears to have been no consequence for the developer.

And 46 St Pauls Road, for which permission was granted in 2019 for subdivision of a grade II listed property into 2 family sized homes and 1 single dwelling, all class C3. At the time of application, residents raised concerns about their conversion to HMOs (class C4), but this was not considered at the application stage specifically because the applicant had applied for family homes, C3 class. By November, a case was raised with enforcement - the submitted plans had not been adhered to, and the properties were also now under HMO occupation. Only now, just shy of 2 years down the line, and after raking in money from use as HMOs where families could have been housed, the developer has been forced to simply submit a retrospective planning application.

In my limited time on Development Control Committee A since May 2021, I can only count a handful of cases included in our papers detailing where enforcement notices have been served. What I would like to understand is how we as a council can better equip the enforcement team and how we can better promote when an enforcement case is successful. Is it enforcement policy at a local level that is slowing down cases, a national level, a lack of access to up-to-date tools, or simply that the workload is too high?

PFS8 Cllr Philippa Hulme

I am very concerned that developers apparently “get away with” constructing buildings that do not match the plans for which permission was given by development control committees.

For example, the flats in the HMO at 56 Filton Avenue were constructed with a greater number of bedrooms than permitted, and the outer cladding apparently does not match that on the plans. In spite of repeated representations by local residents and councillors, it appears that the situation remains unresolved several months later.

I appreciate that legal issues like this are complex, but in my view it is vital that developers know that they will be penalised significantly and promptly if they do not construct the buildings for which permission has been given.

Philippa Hulme

Labour Councillor for Horfield

PFS8 Stephen Barrett

Statement in regard to agenda item 12. Planning Enforcement.

"To provide the Growth & Regeneration Scrutiny Commission the opportunity to review the Planning Enforcement function within Development Management, its operational set up, staffing levels and its performance."

Planning Enforcement has many tasks to fulfil not only to meet the requirements of planning legislation but also to ensure an adequate response to all forms of development, big or small, as the need arises City wide.

However, it is clear an 'adequate response' cannot be demonstrated for many enforcement cases and to highlight this my statement is concentrating on HMO developments in North Bristol.

North Bristol has seen a considerable increase in the number of HMOs or other rental properties over the past ten or so years including house conversions into multiple rental flats, complete houses being converted into HMOs with several bedrooms suitable for students, and even housing stock (still suitable for families) being demolished to make room for new build HMOs.

In general, in my opinion, there is a reduction in family suitable housing in the area with a distinct movement towards short term rental for the younger generation. In this regard I am somewhat relieved to see the HMO additional licensing scheme for Horfield (Article 4 Direction) now in place, though I believe this scheme should be extended to all wards of North Bristol.

This being said the fact remains short term rentals, with the potential for nuisance, alarm, harassment or distress which may be caused to near neighbours by the way the property is used cannot be ignored and it is this issue which can be exacerbated by the way the HMO is developed in the first place, which leads me to the relevant planning enforcement matters associated with new HMO developments and building conversions for room or flat rental.

There have been several instances over the past twelve months where, on the back of planning permission for a house conversion into an HMO with 'x' number of bedrooms, the final number of bedrooms after the build ends up as 'x' plus 'y' number of bedrooms, an increase which can be borderline acceptable in terms of room size, bathroom facilities and kitchen/living room space/facilities. Clearly aimed at the student rental market with small HMOs (Class C4) classification but the end result is a large congested HMO.

There are also a number houses converted to HMOs under Permitted development rights (The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015), an automatic grant of planning permission which allow certain building works and changes of use to be carried out without having to make a planning application.

These converted properties are somewhat off the radar and frequently are not registered as HMOs. If the building is located within an Article 4 Direction area (which removes permitted development rights) then the owner of the building should request a Lawful Development Certificate for an existing use or operation.

Hopefully more applications of this nature will help the Council's HMO team trace all the HMOs in the Horfield Ward though, as said above, extending the Article 4 direction to include all wards of North Bristol should help identifying all HMO developments.

Finally, there is the new build HMO after existing housing is demolished. In September 2020 planning permission was given for two family houses in Horfield to be demolished and a single building constructed to contain six flats each with 4 single bedrooms, a lounge and a kitchen/dinner room. What became clear after the build was finished is the Developer used a rather significant loophole in the Planning and Building Regulations to amend what was approved into a 3 flat five double bedroom plus 3 flat six double bedroom development through the use of build/Technical drawings, which seemingly were fundamentally different from the approved application plans, without further planning approval.

In other words, changing the development from a 24 single bedroom building into a 33 double bed building without further public consultation or Authority scrutiny.

If the developer had used a Building Control officer (Inspector) from the Authority, then the Authority would at least see the build drawings as they would have to check all calculations, etc. As it is an independent Building Inspector was employed removing the requirement to present any build drawings to the Authority which has 'quietly' allowed the over-development of the site as detailed above.

I believe there is one aspect of the planning process which does warrant correction, and perhaps some serious questions being asked of the appropriate Government agencies, and that is the lost link between the drawings being supplied as part of any planning application and the build (Technical) drawings for the build. I would suggest that, in all circumstances, an Authority should be allowed to carry out a basic desktop check of all Build plans to ensure compliance with the approved planning application and authorise accordingly.

To summarise, for planning enforcement to take place the general test applied is “would planning permission have been granted for the development if it had gone through a planning application”. Well, the new build HMO above went through a rather contentious planning process with the planning committee voting 4 for and 4 against with the Chair casting a second vote in favour. It is therefore doubtful that the voting would have been in favour for a 33 double bed HMO as opposed to a 24 single bed HMO. Indeed, I would argue that the developer should seek further planning approval for what he has built.

Other smaller HMO developments may, or may not, have planning permission but in all cases will have some impact on the local community if only by reducing the housing stock available for families.

I would suggest that the core issue for Planning Enforcement is to ensure any deviation from what has been approved both in terms of the build itself or the classification given for that build does not impact the wellbeing of near neighbours, and to ensure any non-approved building works again do not adversely affect near neighbours.

To conclude, the Planning Enforcement team has to meet the requirements of the Bristol Local Enforcement Plan not to mention legal responsibilities, but the lack of team resources is showing diminishing results when compared to the number of cases per annum. Whilst recognising there was an impact from Covid on work productivity, there does appear to be a case for improved staffing levels for the enforcement team to ensure more than just the most significant of planning breaches are being subjected to detailed investigation, and perused accordingly.

This in turn may be beneficial to the Authority and Residents alike in highlighting to developers, etc. the Authorities’ willingness and capability in enforcing planning law.

Thank you.

PFS8 David Redgewell

Topic – Bus Tenders

With the deepest bus service cuts anywhere in south-west England, we are very concerned that despite the bus driver shortages and recruitment campaign by First group plc and Stagecoach group, we are seeing the transfer of resources from secondary bus network in Greater Bristol and Bath city region.

The 178 has not been tendered - Radstock, Westfield, Midsomer Norton, Paulton , Timsbury, Marksbury, Keynsham, Brislington, Arnos Vale, Bristol Temple Meads station, Bristol bus and coach station and need to be urgently tendered. Award to Abus and Citistar.

82 has been tendered - Radstock, Westfield, Midsomer Norton, Paulton town services. Award to Libra travel.

Service 20 - Bath circular, 11 - Bath to Whiteway, 12 - Bath to Bathampton have been tendered.

22 bus service in Bath has been tendered.

And HCT group contract in Bristol.

North Somerset and Gloucestershire.

52, 53, 54, 55, 505,506, 512, 511 have been tendered

These services were used by residents in Whitchurch village.

55 - Whitchurch, Hengrove, Dundry to Bristol Airport

55 - Whitchurch airport to Clevedon via Yatton

53 - Clevedon town services.

515 - Stockwood, Whitchurch, Hengrove Hospital, Imperial Park

516 - Whitchurch, Hengrove, Knowle

Services tendered.

505 - Long Ashton park and ride to Clifton, Cotham and Southmead hospital bus station.

506 - Bristol city centre, Lawrence Hill, Easton, Eastville, Horfield.

But not tender key route in South Bristol.

96 - St Anne's park, Brislington, Knowle, Hengrove. Add on to 36.

Bristol city centre to St Anne's.

Y3 - Bristol to Yate. Via Winterbourne

Y4 - Bristol bus and coach station, Eastville park, Stapleton, Frenchay, Winterbourne, Frampton Cotterell to Yate

This service needs to be tendered urgently so Eastville park, Stapleton, Frenchay, Hambrook, Winterbourne, Frampton Cotterell, Coalpit Heath, Iron Acton ,Coalpit Heath and Yate have a bus service.

Services 5 is withdrawn.

Replaced by Bristol bus and coach station, St Paul's, St Werburghs, Eastville park, Stapleton, Broomhill, Fishponds, Oldbury Court, Downend.

By services 47 - Bristol bus and coach station, St Paul's, St Werburghs, Eastville park, Fishponds Road, Oldbury Court, Downend, Emerson Green, Pucklechurch, Westerleigh, Yate bus and coach station.

But this service will not serve Stapleton and Broomhill and part of Fishponds without a bus service.

HCT group former bus service 515 – Stockwood, Hengrove hospital, Imperial Park.

516 - Whitchurch Park, Hengrove hospital, Knowle

505 - Long Ashton park and ride, Clifton, Cotham, Southmead hospital, bus station.

506 -Southmead hospital, bus station, Horfield, Eastville, Easton, Lawrence Hill, Bristol city centre.

May be operated by Big Lemon bus company of Brighton, Sussex.

But have no western traffic commissioner operating licence.

Or Depot at present.

All routes which should have been tendered as along with 178 is tendered and awarded.

379 Bristol bus and coach station - Bristol Temple Meads station, Knowle, Hengrove, Whitchurch, Pensford, Clutton, Farrington Gurney, Paulton, Welton, Westfield, Peasedown St John, Bath is a great service every 15 mins along the Wells Road .

But is not the same route.

178 Radstock, Westfield, Midsomer Norton, Paulton, Timsbury, Marksbury, Keynsham, Brislington, Arnos Vale, Bristol Temple Meads station, Bristol bus and coach station.

Now awarded to Abus and Citistar.

379 Bath spa bus and coach station to Bristol bus station via Peasedown St John, Radstock, Midsomer Norton, Paulton, Wells Road, Clutton, Pensford, Whitchurch, Hengrove, Knowle, Bristol Temple Meads, Bristol bus and coach station.

Good service should have started April 2023.

As use up drivers.

As does the 349 - Bristol bus and coach station, Temple Meads, Arnos Vale, Brislington, Keynsham which follows the 349 cost £70000 and uses drivers

that could have been used on local services.

Service 4 - operating Odd Down park and ride to Bath city centre bus and coach station to Royal United hospital.

Replacement for service 42.

Odd Down park and ride to the RUH via Twerton.

Royal united hospital would not fund the services from its car park money.

No tender.

Service 3 - Bus station yo Bathford

Will not serve Elmhurst estate.

Cars BLOCKING the buses.

X2 - tender services Yatton to Bristol bus and coach station.

Tender by North Somerset council.

126 - Wells bus and coach station to Cheddar, Axbridge, Winscombe, Banwell, I

Locking, Weston bus and coach station.

Tendering by North Somerset council and Somerset County council.

D2 - Bath to Frome via Midford, Norton St Phillip, Rode and Beckington.

Not tendered by Somerset county council, West of England mayoral combined transport Authority not asked for money.

Now award to First group plc.

Train services - Bath spa to Frome .

But village with no evening service.

Sunday services still operating.

2 hourly.

Service 20 - Weston super Mare bus and coach station, Railway station, Uphill hospital, Brean, Barrow and Burnham on Sea.

Sunday services not tendered, Somerset county council and North Somerset council.

No Sunday bus service to Weston super Mare hospital.

Train for Highbridge and Burnham on Sea to Weston super mare railway station.

But no hospital link.

We need to promote bus railway tickets.

Freedom pass and plus bus tickets - where passengers will need to make bus rail journeys.

Bus tickets where they are on more operator services:

Bath rider

Avon rider

Weston super Mare rider

Wiltshire Rambler.

Faresaver is looking at taking over services in the Bath area

Kevin and yourself should meet them

A bus on the 22 - Twerton to the university and 82 – Radstock, Westfield, Midsomer Norton, Paulton town services.

CTC coaches may be interested in running local bus services if it is tendered by the West of England mayoral combined transport Authority.

But you need to talk to them.

May be a service – Radstock, Westfield, Midsomer Norton, Paulton, Timsbury, Marksbury, Keynsham, Brislington park and ride - connections to Bristol.

The issue for First group plc is they are putting all their resources on the most profitable route with government funding and main line buses.

University and college services which make money but drop secondary social bus network.

This is an issue needs to be addressed through the enhanced quality partnership schemes - west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council.

Or with North Somerset council joining the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority with the LEP.

A bus Franchise area needs to be established by the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority Dan Norris, if an enhanced quality partnership does work including the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council to improve bus and public transport interchanges and infrastructure.

Including repairs bus and coach stops and shelters and removing tagging.

The metro mayor Dan Norris needs to take over bus infrastructure bus coach stations and interchanges.

And precept to fund public transport like the West Midlands combined Authority

Mayor Andy Street and Greater Manchester combined transport Authority

Mayor Andy Burnham.

A special urgent West of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council joint committee and west of England mayoral combined Authority committee meeting are required on

the bus service cuts by First group plc.

And the winding up of HCT group bus services.

Plus a West of England scrutiny commission meeting.

Temple Meads station/ Temple Quay

We welcome a bus interchange and ferry interchange facilities.

But these must be designed to make easy access from the train services including Metrowest to through the station to the bus and coach interchanges which need to be fully covered and accessible.

Including the Friary and Temple Gate.

Including Glass canopies and waiting facilities for buses and Regional coaches.

Provision should be made for a full accessible ferry landing stage and waiting facilities including covered walkways.

The station needs to be fully accessible, at levels in platform to bus interchange.

Shopping facilities for passengers, supermarkets, chemists. Restaurants and cafes plus disabled changing places.

With regards to staff car park, this needs to be included in the plan to replace the high level car park.

Provision needs to be made for light rail system and a station at Bristol Temple Meads station.

Kind regards

David Redgewell, South West transport Network and Railfuture Severnside.

Peter Travis, Somerset bus partnership and Somerset catch the bus campaign.

Ian Beckey, Gloucestershire catch the bus campaign.