

Cabinet

Supplementary Information



Date: Tuesday, 7 March 2023

Time: 4.00 pm

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

2. Public Forum

(Pages
3 - 35)

Agenda item 8 - Homelessness Prevention Grant 2023 to 2025 and accommodation for ex-offenders (AFEO) bid

None

Agenda item 9 – Approval of the Company Business Plans – Bristol Waste, Goram Homes and Bristol Holding

PS09.01 Jeff Sutton

CS09.01 Jonathan Hucker

Agenda item 10 - Goram Homes - Pipeline of Housing Development Sites

None

Agenda item 11 – Whitehouse Street Framework and Bedminster Green Regeneration

PS11.01 Bristol Disability Equalities Forum (David Redgewell)

CS11.01 Tony Dyer

Agenda item 12 - Future of Youth Services

PS12.01 Rachel Robinson

PS12.02 Zoe Twinn

PS12.03 Steve Mills

PS12.04 Mark Coates

PQ12.01 Matt Peall, Rachel Robinson, Kirsty Wilson

PQ12.02 Mark Coates

PQ12.03 & PQ12.04 Elle Williams



PQ12.05 & PQ12.06	Jonathan Andrews
-------------------	------------------

PQ12.07 & PQ12.08	Questions withdrawn
-------------------	---------------------

PQ12.09	Carl Brown
---------	------------

PQ12.10 & PQ12.11	Kendal West
-------------------	-------------

CS12.01	Christopher Jackson
---------	---------------------

Agenda item 13 - UK Shared Prosperity Fund

None

Agenda item 14 - Sufficiency Strategy for Children in Care and Care Leavers 2023-2024
--

CQ14.01	Christine Townsend
---------	--------------------

Agenda item 15 - Recommissioning of services for Local Healthwatch

None

Agenda item 16 - Pathway to a single Adult Social Care framework: Existing Contracts

CQ16.01 & CQ16.02	Tim Wye
-------------------	---------

Agenda item 17 - Bristol One Front Door Service – Extension Funding Opportunity
--

None

Agenda item 18 - Portway Park & Ride Rail Station
--

PS18.01	Railfuture Severnside (David Redgewell)
---------	---

PQ18.01 & PQ18.02	David Redgewell
-------------------	-----------------

CS18.01	Mark Bradshaw
---------	---------------

Agenda item 19 – Hard Facilities Management Contract Extension

None

Agenda item 20 – Capricorn Quay
--

PS20.01	Kevin Slade
---------	-------------

PS20.02	Molly Petts
---------	-------------

PS20.03	Fraser Bridgeford
---------	-------------------

Agenda item 21 - City Regions Sustainable Transport Settlement – Maintenance and Integrated Transport Block Allocation 2023/24

PS21.01	David Redgewell
---------	-----------------

CQ21.01	David Wilcox
---------	--------------

Agenda item 22 - Financial update report - March 2023
--

None

Issued by: Amy Rodwell, Democratic Services

City Hall, Bristol, BS1 9NE

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

Date: Tuesday, 07 March 2023



Statement: PS09.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 9 - Approval of the Company Business Plans – Bristol Waste, Goram Homes and Bristol Holding

Statement submitted by: Jeff Sutton, Chair Avon and Wessex Branch GMB

I am bemused by the financial plans for year 2023-24 as they seem to contain the same promises that we were all given for 21-22 and probably were given for 22-23. Investment, building the business, making saving, enhancing the customer and employee experience, and making a return for the shareholder.

While I have found, in discussion with our members the opposite is true. There has been nil or very little of the investment promised, any savings have been at the staff's expense, customers and staff are despondent and far from making a profit they cost BCC money. You need to remember that when the HWRC's were transferred to BWC they were making over 2m profit, so any profit of less that that is in effect a loss.

The cleaning contract has been poorly managed from the beginning. BCC may be saving money but only because the actual cost of the service BWC were to provide was not calculated correctly. The extra services that they used to provide at an additional cost, chemicals, hand towels, toilet rolls, carpet cleaning, etc. services not in the contract, are provided but not charged for.

Security services and CVIT staff are concerned for their jobs. They have been told of possible shift changes and that CVIT will be outsourced for efficiency savings. They are responsible for the impress managing a float of between 80-100k of cash for BCC, Work for Trading with Schools, provide cash for the Asylum team, care homes, collect cash for parking Services and for BANES> What was once a team of 13 staff. is down to 6.

It's management inefficiency, we could almost say deliberate inefficiency that has made CVIT expensive. CVIT had always run daily routes that ensured all the cash tins across the city were collected each week. Now they have been directed to collect the tins with the most money in each day, makes sense? Not when the teams are driving all over the City virtually every day, in non-CAZ compliant vehicle which were meant to be renewed but the planned investment was diverted elsewhere. The team are now collecting daily about a fifth of the tins they used collect! Bearing in mind they are paying CAZ charges for two security vans.

Staff have pointed that the rounds need to be reintroduced and have been ignored. I mentioned this to management last Monday and was told it would be sorted that day. I went back on Wednesday, and nothing had been changed or even mentioned!

The only CAZ compliant van they had, it just need a minor modification to be used for CBIT, as it is an armoured vehicle which had cost over 100k, is being stripped out and given to another department in BWC.

We all have to ask, if BWC are outsourcing CVIT, shouldn't it go back to BCC and they can find another 'partner'. The staff, who have been there for years, passionately believe that putting the collection routes back as they were, would turn the business around. There may only be £100 in a tin but isn't it better to have it collected and in the bank rather than being left in a tin for another week or two?

Statement: CS09.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 9 - Approval of the Company Business Plans – Bristol Waste, Goram Homes and Bristol Holding

Statement submitted by: Cllr Jonathan Hucker

As a qualified accountant I have serious concerns about the Bristol Waste Company business plan that is being submitted to Cabinet for approval. Apart from the charges that I opposed in the council budget, there are other significant changes which are designed to cut costs of Bristol Waste to fit into the funding the Council has decided they will get.

- The recycling centres will only open for 5 days per week
- Street cleaning will be reduced (still Further)
- Graffiti and fly-tipping resources will be reduced (20% reduction)

I think the changes are sufficiently serious to impact on many of our residents. I fear for the effect on fly tipping which can only increase if the centres are open less. Street cleaning already seems random so reducing it further will make it almost non-existent in most suburbs. The thought of reducing support for graffiti removal and fly-tipping is of great concern, especially as many areas of our city are seriously blighted by graffiti.

Ominously for such a critical service, the plan is only for 12 months until 31 March 2024 and it emphasises how difficult it will be to deliver a sustainable service within the funding available. It is clear from the plan that the core municipal service will be loss making. The company will therefore need to rely on its commercial activities being successful.

An informed assessment of the plan can only be made alongside up-to-date management accounts and the latest statutory accounts, which are not being presented. Currently the statutory accounts for 2021/22 are not available for inspection.

Although operating costs being constrained, the plan includes a 60% increase in overheads for 2023/24. There is no detail on what is driving this increase or if it includes anything which should be classified as an extraordinary item such as restructuring costs. The plan also contains a cash flow forecast which is very high level and it lacks a forecast balance sheet.

I think this plan could compromise the financial viability of Bristol Waste and its ability to operate as a going concern. If so, it would have serious implications for the residents and taxpayers of Bristol.

Statement: PS11.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 11 – Whitehouse Street Framework and Bedminster Green Regeneration

Statement submitted by: Bristol Disability Equalities Forum (David Redgewell)

We welcome the investment in new housing on Bedminster Green with Gorham Homes we wish to see some of these houses and flat made accessible to disabled people and wheelchair users.

We welcome the invest in the public realm and river corridor.

Bedminster is in need of major regeneration and Bedminster green framework is very welcomed.

But need to sustainable transport corridors to Bristol Temple meads university campus and also important in the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority public transport Network. In terms of Bus services through Bedminster with a lot of bus cuts happening to route on 2 nd April 2023 to Knowle, Hartcliffe, Hengrove and Bishopsworth and Ashton vale services 23 Bristol to Ashton vale ,52 Bristol to Bishopsworth 91, Bristol to knowle Hengrove Hartcliffe, 512 Bedminster to Hengrove 511 Bristol to Totterdown 672 Bristol to Highridge to Chew valley from June 2023

511 is a Demand response buses service from 3rd April 2023

We need to work with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council to

Improve bus links and metro bus links in South Bristol .

We need a public transport Network framework from the metro mayor Dan Norris for Bedminster and south Bristol

On Bedminster station in heart of Regeneration zone on Severn Beach Avonmouth Dock Clifton Down station line to Weston super mare.

We need better waiting facilities at Bedminster station, CCTV, cameras and improvement in access.

The Regeneration of Bedminster is very important for the growth of city South of the river with new homes and flats and improvement to the High street in the form of East street, North Street and west street.

We welcome progress on Bedminster green frame work .

But we want to see this regeneration area made fully accessible to disabled people.

Please bring our statement to the cabinet meeting 7th March 2023 .

Gordon Richardson Bristol disability equalities forum .

David Redgewell Bristol disability equalities forum.

Statement: CS11.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 11 - Whitehouse Street Framework and Bedminster Green Regeneration

Statement submitted by: Cllr Tony Dyer

This statement is on behalf of the 4 Green Party Councillors covering Southville, where the scheme is situated, and Windmill Hill which borders the edge of the Framework area.

We welcome the Framework overall, its quality reflects the time allowed to get it right and we are grateful to the consultants involved and particularly to Action Greater Bedminster for playing an important role in its development and the work done to reflect community concerns and aspirations. We also thank the other landowners alongside the City Council for allowing this to be developed at a sensible pace and with collaborative working. This is in contrast to the neighbouring frameworks, for example Bedminster Green where residents did not feel involved and felt that the Framework was imposed on them.

We welcome the commitment to maintaining employment within the Framework area, but are concerned that it may be difficult to maintain the current mix of employers and businesses, so efforts should be made to see if something like the current mix of businesses can be preserved.

On transport it is good to see permeability for walking and cycling but not for motorised through traffic; we hope that the layout of streets can accommodate biodiversity net gain and would like to see additional trees and other wildlife-friendly measures maximised and ideally ensuring there are provisions made for wildlife corridors to ensure it can thrive. Especially as BS3 has low levels of tree cover, and has lost several great trees locally to development already. We note that the transport proposals will be subject to further consultation, and hope that they will as far as possible be preserved or enhanced.

It cannot be ignored that the proposals will bring a large number of homes to our part of the city, one that is already seeing considerable traffic problems. This and other additional development are destined to add to those problems without suitable mitigation. In order to encourage more sustainable modes of travel such as walking and cycling we reiterate our calls for additional cycling and pedestrian bridges across the New Cut. This includes Whitehouse Street but also needs to take account of the lack of crossings all along the cut.

We also believe that there needs to be a review of the layout of the bridge based roundabout systems at both Bedminster Bridge and the Bath Road – at present both these systems are car dominated and intimidating for both cyclists and pedestrians, inhibiting active travel. In particular, Given that a Southern Entrance to Temple Meads Station is being proposed on the Temple Island side of the Bath Road to

serve residents in BS3, then there is a clear need to improve pedestrian and cyclist access to this site across the busy A4.

On height and massing it is good to see the framework includes a commitment to see these being limited, which demonstrates a better attunement with local residents' concerns. We would urge that anything going higher than 4-8 storeys is very carefully considered and subject to genuinely exceptional design inside, and outside as part of a quality public realm. Residents and users of Victoria Park remain anxious about the impact of the framework on the views from Victoria Park, although we do recognise that the location for proposed significant height is attempting to be sensitive to the Park in its placing. We would be concerned if the "sensitivity to the local area" were to extend to the nature and scale of development at Bedminster Green, which should not be taken as a local benchmark.

We have some concerns; firstly we do not understand why the requirement for 30% affordable housing is being relaxed and why viability assessments will not be required if only 20% is offered. This remains a high density development framework and this should already be advantageous to developers. There is little to explain this in the Cabinet Report except that this decision is as a result of "working collaboratively with developer partners". It does seem rather unsurprising that they might have suggested this and whilst one may assume that expensive decontamination works may be required, a fuller explanation would be welcomed – possibly this could be provided by Cabinet members in making this decision?

Secondly, there whilst there is a lot to like about the Framework, it still leaves a lot to be determined at the detailed design stage; we are concerned that the overall vision may be compromised by the specific design proposals brought through the development control system and urge both designers and planners to make every effort to make the broad principles in this Framework a reality.

Thirdly, we would ideally like to see developments on the different plots that are integrated as far as possible to create a thriving neighbourhood, if necessary by working together to create streets based on great public realm design rather than current landownership patterns. There is a risk that developments are brought forward in isolation that may meet the framework principles but do not create a neighbourhood design that is coherent across the area; too often we see individual blocks and buildings that seem individualised and insensitive to each other. We appreciate that this may be difficult to achieve, and hope that the City Council as a significant landowner might be able to broker deals that create the sort of thriving neighbourhood envisaged, even if this means that some current plots may need to be reshaped.

In summary - so far so good, especially in relation to the public realm, ongoing employment locally and a greater level of prescriptiveness and local sensitivity than previous neighbouring frameworks; however, the devil will be in the detail and there is still a lot to do to make the vision a reality.

Windmill Hill Councillors Ed Plowden and Lisa Stone
Southville Councillors Tony Dyer and Christine Townsend

Statement: PS12.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Future of Youth Services

Statement submitted by: Rachel Robinson

Statement to Bristol Council Cabinet meeting 7 Feb 2023 from Bristol play and youth voluntary sector organisations in respect of agenda item 19 Future of Youth Services

The Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise Sector (VCSE) in Bristol is alarmed by the level of cuts to the play and youth funding from Bristol City Council (BCC), and urges the Cabinet to reconsider these additional cuts.

This proposal would lead to BCC investment into the youth and play VCSE reducing by an annual average in the region of 30%. We understand the need for BCC to save money and understand that it has to come from somewhere. However, cutting early intervention and preventative services to children and young people only to pay more in high end crisis management services is not good economics. This is evidenced in point 4 of the youth service grant funding model, decision pathway report.

BCC made a commitment to children and young people through the Belonging strategy, and the play and youth VCSE is one of the most effective ways of delivering large elements of this strategy to children, young people and their families in the city.

If this funding cut gets passed by Cabinet there will be a significant and irreversible impact on the VCSE. There will be a significant reduction in the amount of services and spaces available to children, young people and families and a reduction in the amount of additional funding we can lever into the city.

We have been developing new and innovative ways of working with BCC, co-designing, planning and managing play and youth services strategically to make the best use of all the resources available to us all; it has not gone unnoticed nationally.

Youth is a Go Further priority in the Family Hubs model and whilst the details are not finalised, the plan submitted to the DfE includes reliance on the youth and play VCSE.

The sector thought the initial commitment to the Youth Zone was for a three year period and it looks like this is now over five years. Clarity on this would support the sector's planning.

This statement comes from the following organisations:

A.P.E. (St Paul's Adventure Playground)

Aspiration, Creation, Elevation
Baggator
BAND
Bristol Horn Youth Concern
Carers Support Centre
Children's Scrapstore
Creative Youth Network
Full Circle @ Docklands
Grassroot Communities
Groundwork South, the Vench
Growing Futures
Hartcliffe Club for Young People
Hillfields Community and Family Trust
Imayla
Learning Partnership West
Oasis Hub: North Bristol
Play Wooden
Robins Foundation
Southmead Development Trust
Street 2 Boardroom
Street Space
St Mary Redcliffe PCC
Talo
Umoja Youth and Community Services and Friends of St. Pauls Luxuriance
WECIL
Wesport
Young Bristol
Youth Moves

Statement: PS12.02

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Future of Youth Services

Statement submitted by: Zoe Twinn

I have been working as a Youth Worker in Bristol for the past 6 years and know how important youth services are to the city. I am very concerned about the upcoming proposed changes to these services, with the funding being cut massively and changes to a grants based process rather than a contract.

The level of services being proposed to provide to young people are simply not adequate or meeting the ever-growing high levels of need I have personally seen. Youth workers have been holding complex cases on their one-to-one caseloads as a result of social services and CAMHS being so stretched and not having capacity - youth workers have picked up this slack and have done an excellent job at managing it and providing strong outcomes. The council have always given positive feedback on the work we have done over the last 5 years, as evidenced in our quarterly reports.

The Council are looking to pour the majority of their funding into the Youth Zone in South Bristol - but there are limitations to this. From working in South Bristol, a lot of young people will not access this due to the ongoing BS4/BS13 postcode rivalry and not wanting to integrate. It also diverts key funding away from existing youth centres and wider services across the city. It is being presented as an "all-singing all-dancing" one stop shop doing everything, but from experience I know this will not be the case and there will be issues there.

This also means that many jobs are at risk of redundancy, with no TUPE process being put forward for the many qualified and experienced youth workers this city has, who's skills and knowledge will sadly be lost.

I urge you to reconsider these cuts and the restructure and question why they are being made, when we have a service which has been shown to work for the past 5 years and has consistently provided excellent outcomes for some of the city's most vulnerable young people?

Statement: PS12.03

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Future of Youth Services

Statement submitted by: Steve Mills

We note that Youth Services were earmarked for cuts of £400k in the April 22 budget, we also note that there is now an extension of the current Targeted Youth Services contracts until September at a cost of up to £440k from June. We also note the change to a grant funding for 7 years for multiple service providers. However, we wish to raise the concerned effect that this could have on Creative Youth Network (CYN) and the current services they provide and importantly for their union, the effect on jobs. We also want to note that CYN have provided high-quality services over the years, and this has been widely recognised.

We note that the proposed extension of current target youth services suggests importance of service, but that the service will run at cuts that will impact delivery such as loss of offices and delivery space between now and September – impacting service users and staff immensely. We also note the impact this will have on current staff's working conditions and retention.

We welcome the move for some employees into BCC post 16 services, thereby retaining years of experience and commitment. However, this is not presented as a guarantee currently, and feedback from the job description of the proposed career coach roles is that it is not a like for like offer – making potential TUPE staff uncertain of their future.

The future for other staff members is even more ambiguous. We note that there will not be a like for like youth service moving forward from September, and that it is undecided what service providers will be providing which services. Furthermore, CYN will be potentially made responsible for all redundancy payments.

We note that a one-city jobs recruitment fayre is to be held, this does not guarantee work, or show support for current youth services workers who will be facing severe job vulnerability; and nor does it encourage the aim of keeping skilled and knowledge staff in the sector. Current CYN staff would be competing with any other job seekers, and would lose all current rights, terms, and conditions – some of which span over a decade.

We hope that Cabinet will instruct officers to further investigate future service provision and the opportunities for TUPE. Thereby retaining staff and good practice for the future of youth services in our fine city.

We note that the youth services grants budget will reduce in 2024/25 and 2025/26 budgets, to fund the revenue contribution to the Youth Zone for three years. We note that the proposed Youth Zone in South Bristol is not comparable to the current targeted youth services, we are concerned about youth service users that would be excluded from accessing the new Youth Zone provision in South Bristol, specifically North Bristol which has areas of high social deprivation. The TYS reports from June

2021-May 2022 show 1084 young people in North engaged in CYN's 1:1 service alone, we note that it is unclear where these young people would get this level of support from moving forward. We also note concern around the exclusion of 1:1 provision, and the plans to have a financial barrier on accessing the service of in some cases, 50p per visit.

Poor mental health in young people is now more common than not; and with waiting times for most mental health services over a year or more it is a worrying time to reduce provision. Schools are seeing record numbers of teachers going on strike and their resources and budgets being cut, which youth services feel the impact of this through 1:1 referrals. Schools, along with social care, make up the largest proportion of CYN referrals, the prospect of the current 1:1 provision being cut or disappearing completely in a time where young people need this youth service more than ever is irresponsible and could cause irreversible damage.

We urge cabinet to acknowledge the impact of this proposal on young people and to ensure our dedicated and skilled youth service workers are protected and able to continue to support the most vulnerable.

Steve Mills
Area Organiser
Bristol UNISON

Statement: PS12.04

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Future of Youth Services

Statement submitted by: Mark Coates, Creative Youth Network

I would like to start by thanking the council for its active, engaged approach to considering the future of Bristol's youth services – this has been a thorough process over the past 12 months, and it has been a breath of fresh air that the council has sought to co-design the way forward with the sector.

There is a lot in the proposals that is positive, and whatever is decided Creative Youth Network will stay active, through thick and thin, working to ensure that all of our city's young people have opportunities to achieve their potential.

The papers before Cabinet this evening do not, however, adequately explain the significant issues and risks that arise from these proposals. **Bristol currently has an OUTSTANDING youth service.** That word "outstanding" isn't mine, it's the quality mark accreditation awarded by the National Youth Agency to Creative Youth Network and the services that we deliver here. **But as a result of tonight's decisions, that service will be dismantled, and replaced by something very different and much smaller scale.**

Not in the papers but known within the sector, is that **the new grants will not fund any 1:1 support for young people.** Funding is of course ridiculously tight, and we fully accept that 1:1 support has to reduce. But to discontinue it entirely feels profoundly wrong. Of course, not all young people need 1:1 support. **But those who do need it are the most vulnerable young people in this city, and their service is about to be discontinued.** Your own Equalities Impact Assessment highlights that the current 1:1 support is most accessed by young people who are BAME, disabled, have caring responsibilities, and from lower socio-economic backgrounds. From our 1:1 caseload is also a significant number of often very complex safeguarding cases – for which Creative Youth Network is very often the lead agency. **You need to know that there is a real risk of inadequate safeguarding if you do not have adequately focused support for the most vulnerable young people.** It will also hamper our collective efforts to reduce school exclusions, and to build trauma informed practice into everything we do. And it will most likely also create additional cost elsewhere in the system – 1:1s prevent escalation to more expensive statutory services such as CAMHS, a cost to the taxpayer of between £3.20 and £6.40 for every £1 invested, as quoted on page 1 of tonight's report.

We are also desperately worried what tonight's decisions mean for jobs and workforce retention. The bottom line is that deciding to de-commission the existing service **means redundancy for the majority of the existing workforce** – yes they may well find new jobs in the sector, but they will lose their employment rights and continuity of service. Tonight's decision is, I'm afraid to say, a decision to make far more

redundancies than are necessary as a result of the budget reduction. In addition to the human costs of this, it will also land Creative Youth Network with a six figure redundancy bill – taking money out of the voluntary sector when the stated intention is to help bring in more.

I'll end by emphasizing that I'm not wanting to be critical or downbeat. We will stay 100% constructive, and as a local charity Creative Youth Network will always be here for our city's young people. But I do think that Cabinet needs to be aware that there are service delivery, safeguarding and workforce implications far beyond what is stated within tonight's 5 page report. Thank you.

Mark Coates
Chief Executive Officer

Statement: CS12.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Future of Youth Services

Statement submitted by: Cllr Christopher Jackson

I would like to record my support for this item. The council contributing £400,000 towards the Youth Zone will leverage an additional £900,000 of private funding for it, meaning the overall funding for youth projects is increasing. This is good news for Bristol's youth services and especially good news for children and young people in my ward and other wards across south Bristol. Youth centres have been closing across the country since 2010, and I am pleased that Bristol is bucking that trend and investing in new ones.

Question: PQ12.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Future of Youth Services

Question submitted by: Matt Peall, Rachel Robinson, Kirsty Wilson

Question 1: This is a substantial drop in funding. This will impact the voluntary sector's sustainability, and therefore the wellbeing of children and young people. There is £1.025m worth of grants in 2024/25 and then £625k in subsequent years due to £400k moving to the Youth Zone. We understand the council may not be able to move money between financial years easily. Would it be possible to award the £400k difference in 2024/5 to a grant making organisation to continue with the youth sector support fund. This organisation could then award grants over more than one year. This money could then be used to fund work in response to emerging needs, innovative pilots, and allow leverage of further funding into the city. (The main grant pot would then be £625k in every year).

Question: PQ12.02

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Future of Youth Services

Question submitted by: Mark Coates, Creative Youth Network

Question 1: We are grateful to see the commitment to a One City recruitment fayre, to help the existing workforce (who face redundancy as a result of the decision to de-commission the TYS service) secure roles elsewhere in the sector. We thank the cabinet member and officers for proposing this when we raised our grave concerns regarding the redundancy and workforce risks – we had a constructive meeting and agreed what felt like a viable way forward.

The Cabinet report is however very light on detail about this. Please can you confirm that the proposed One City recruitment fayre will be more than simply a single day event, but rather part of a 4 month matching process (running from confirmation of new grant awards until the new services are operational) through which there will be transparency of what roles have been newly funded/created through the grants process, and opportunities for at risk staff to apply for vacancies as and when they arise? Without a commitment that all recipients of the new funding will confirm the posts they are creating and will engage with the recruitment fayre process, there is inadequate guarantee that the existing workforce will have fair access to replacement roles, and a real risk of far larger numbers of job losses than are necessary as a result of the budget reduction.

Question: PQ12.03 & PQ12.04

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Future of Youth Services

Question submitted by: Elle Williams

Background:

With 1084 Young People in North Bristol receiving 1:1 support during the period of June 2021-May 2022, alongside an increase in waiting times post-pandemic, its clear demand is high and growing in this locality. You mention an aim of the new model is to ‘offer youth and play services that are local, diverse, culturally aware, trauma informed, flexible, skilled, and supported’ [page 1 of Future of Youth Services document], but without the current level of service; schools and social care (two of the highest referrers into CYN) would struggle to find an alternative provision to send young people who need help. As you and the commissioners mention, CYN have offered an excellent service to young people; in the current proposals we would be losing this excellent service and with it harming one of the most disproportionately affected members of society post pandemic – the children and young people. Current 1:1’s provided by the targeted youth provision is often the only available help for young people, there is over a year wait for other services and schools are struggling as we have seen from the recent strikes. North-based young people who are often in crisis due to poor mental health, isolation and discrimination/bullying won’t have a 1:1 service to go to, because the funding won’t be there. The South Bristol Youth Moves Hub plans, geographically, has no benefit or impact to these Young people whatsoever and seems to be what is going to take priority by 2025. Youth groups also seem to take priority in this proposal, but when so many young people are anxious and isolated , 1:1 work is an integral part of the re-engagement process for many young people.

Question 1: So, my question is 1. Where are north young people considered in this proposal?

Question 2: Why isn’t 1:1 services being prioritised when they currently are in high demand in every area?

Question: PQ12.05 & PQ12.06

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Future of Youth Services

Question submitted by: Johnathan Andrews

Background:

You have stated in your evidence base that you:

- 1) *“have a statutory duty under Section 507B, Education Act 1996 to secure, so far as is reasonably practicable, sufficient provision of educational and recreational leisure-time activities for young people which are for the improvement of their well-being, and sufficient facilities for such activities!”*
- 2) *“have a statutory duty under the Education and Skills Act 2008 to support and promote effective participation of young people in education, employment, and training (EET) up to the age of 18 (or up to 25 for young people with special educational needs and disability (SEND))”*
- 3) *Have a vision “for youth services to be local, diverse, flexible, skilled and supported”*

Question 1: *How can it therefore be justified to slash budgets by such a disproportionate amount and seem to imply that there will not be a significant reduction in youth services? These actions are in contravention of the UN Convention for the Rights of a Child*

Question 2: *There is a clear and unarguable correlation between reduction in Youth Service funding and increased young persons’ mental health crisis, antisocial behaviour, crime, lack of attainment and many more societal issues – what plan do you have to address the very predictable increases in these areas that are coming in the near future, as a direct result of what has been decided to propose – in insult to the sector and, more importantly, the young people of the city that you clearly stated you have a duty to provide, support and nurture?*

Question: PQ12.09

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Future of Youth Services

Question submitted by: Carl Bowen

Question 1: This paper is proposing that the City Council fund the whole city's youth and play service to the tune of on average £745K per year for the next 7 years. Youth and Play work's purpose is to equip young people with the skills and confidence to overcome some of the biggest obstacles we - the wider society - puts in their way, and the report itself says there is an investment of over £5 for every £1 spent. £745K is less than cost of just 2 average houses in this city, and if only targeted to benefit the 15,300 in poverty, would still only amount to £50 p/h p/a. As a slice of the tax payers pie, this is almost so thin you couldn't see it. Is the Cabinet confident this all their service deserves from our pot?

Question: PQ12.10 & PQ12.11

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Future of Youth Services

Question submitted by: Kendal West

Background:

I am a Youth Worker, that has been working in Bristol city youth services for 6 years. Whilst I have seen funding cuts and worked through two different contracts including one TUPE process. Whilst I can see there isn't much opportunity for TUPE and/or job matching with this new proposal it ultimately dramatically cuts youth services in the city to next to know support or provision for our young people. I see that skilled workers will be put out of work in a time to real economic hardship, faced with have to make completely new directions in profession.

More importantly the impact that this will have on our young people will be extensive. At a time when mental health is at it's worst, young, poverty is at it's highest and drop out rates at school are growing by the day. Youth services have never been needed more than they are now. The impacts that this will have on the local economy will be seen for years to come. We know we can't rely on already over stretched services at schools highlighted by the recent strikes, schools don't have capacity to deal with the increasing list of issues facing young people and families. Creating one super hub in an inaccessible part of Bristol is not the answer, we need to be able to work in our localities to deliver a high quality service. Although the grant funding model was not ideal and comes with it's own set of challenges, it still makes it possible for us to deliver a service.

Question 1: I would like to ask you where does this leave the most vulnerable people in our city and how are you going to bridge these gaps with the new proposed minimal funding at a time when youth services are needed more than ever?

Question 2: You state in your proposal that you have a statutory duty to prioritise young peoples needs, how does this new proposal best support the needs of young people?

Question: PQ14.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 14 – Sufficiency Strategy for Children in Care and Care Leavers 2023-2025

Question submitted by: Cllr Christine Townsend

Background

This paper states that:

“Since the closure of St Christopher’s in 2019 there have been no residential children’s homes for disabled children within Bristol.”

This is a huge gap in SEND provision that impacts on this administration’s ability to ensure suitable place sufficiency for those for whom it has a statutory responsibility. The deficit within the High Needs Budget (HNB) has been growing as a result of this SEND provision gap and is now the biggest financial risk facing this council – this will take years to deal with.

Question 1: Will the administration support an application for an Asset of Community Value (ACV) for SEND provision on the St Christopher’s site if such an application comes forward?

Question: CQ16.01 & PQ16.02

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

**Re: Agenda item 16 – Pathway to a Single Adult Social Care framework:
Existing Contracts**

Question submitted by: Cllr Tim Wye

Background

I welcome the move to a single adult social care framework. In particular it will give providers a simpler process. I still do some tender writing and recently helped a client fill out a 30,000 word application to get on a framework. This is beyond the means of small organisations that can be really important for 'niche' provision.

I know that the item on the agenda is predominantly about the decision to extend/align current contracts in order to achieve the outcome but I do have a couple of questions on the Single Framework:

Question 1: Can you say provide assurance and give more detail about how the single framework will be simplified for providers? For example, I would like to know number of method statements and word counts envisaged for applications.

Question 2: I note in the EQIA that some consultation has occurred. Please give a summary of feedback from prospective providers who have been consulted to give a flavour of how this has been received?

Statement: PS18.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 18 – Portway Park & Ride Rail Station

Statement submitted by: David Redgewell, Gordon Richardson & Ian Beckey

We welcome the update on the Portway parkway station and interchange.

We support the Bristol city council providing extra money for the station as Promoter of the scheme of £ 1.9 million pounds and the requests to metro mayor Dan Norris west of England mayoral combined transport Authority for £ 1.2 million pounds of revenue support for 3 years to First group plc Great western railway and the Department for transport.

Metro west railway Network is a very important mass transit project for Bristol and Bath city region.

So we need to ask the west of England mayor Dan Norris and the joint committee meeting on 17 th March 2023 to fund the revenue support from the Transforming city fund .

We also need to ticket machines on all stations like Bristol Lawrence hill and Clifton Down station.

Revenue leakage is still very high on the Bristol Temple meads station to Clifton Down station Avonmouth Dock and Severn Beach railway line .

So if the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority is to fund revenue support we must provide revenue protection on the line .

At stations Lawrence hill, Stapleton road Montpellier, Redland, Clifton Down station sea mills ,shirehampton, Portway parkway Avonmouth Dock, st Andrew road and severn Beach.

We must also provide bus link from shirehampton parkway/ Avonmouth Dock station 10, 11 to Lawrence Weston Westbury on Trym, Southmead hospital bus station uwe bus station ,Bristol parkway station, Bradley stoke Aztec west Hortham Alverston Thornbury.

Stagecoach west Deutsche bank

These service need to operate to Bristol uwe bus and coach station and Bristol parkway station.

Service 13 shirehampton to sea mills

Southmead hospital bus station Horfield Bishopton BR1 Bristol city centre

Stagecoach west Deutsche bank

Services to 3, 4 to Avonmouth and st Andrew road to Lawrence Weston Henbury and cribbs causeway bus station.

First group plc owner pension, funds staff unions and small shareholders runs West of England buses and First Great western railway.

and of course stagecoach west Deutsche bank.

Park and ride Portway parkway station to shirehampton station, shirehampton, sea mills Hotwells, Bristol city centre, Broadmead Bristol Temple meads station to Brislington park and ride link service.

We also need the first group bus and rail touch cards to work on all buses and trains.

The station tickets machines sales at present no bus and tickets
We e bikes and scooter at Portway parkway interchange.

We welcome the fully accessible station and CCTV cameras its important all bus and railway interchanges.

Bedminster also needs CCTV.

Metro west railway is a very important railway Network for our Greater Bristol city Region.

The seven Beach line from seven Beach st Andrew road, Avonmouth Dock Portway parkway station, shirehampton sea mills shirehampton, Sea mills, Clifton Down station, Redland, Montpellier Stapleton road, Lawrence hill Bristol Temple meads station, Bedminster parson street, Nailsea and Backwell yatton for clevedon, worle parkway Weston million, Weston super mare

But we now have the Bristol Temple meads station Ashley Down. Filton Abbey wood, Filton North arena and Henbury .

With a terminal station.

Henbury at present still has no planning permission

We need to push Network rail western route and First group Great western railway to push South Gloucestershire county council to sort and Grant planning permission.

This phase of metro west must go ahead .

And plan for a full Henbury loop service to Avonmouth Dock to link with the Avonmouth Dock to Bristol service via Portway parkway.

Metro west railway Network is very important part of joining our Railway Network into Mass transit system like Greater Manchester city Region Andy Burnham west

Midlands mayor Andy street . Tyne and wear metro .

All linking trains trams light rail systems buses and ferries.

We need to fully fund Portway parkway station station and its revenue support at the cabinet meeting on 7 th march 2023

And at the 17 th March 2023 west of England mayoral combined transport Authority joint committee meeting on 17 th march 2023 with mayor Dan Norris.

We must see progress on Portway parkway station opening this summer 2023 .

David Redgewell South west transport Network.

Railfuture Severnside.

Gordon Richardson Bristol disability equities forum

Ian Beckey Gloucestershire catch the bus campaign and Somerset catch the bus campaign.

Statement: CS18.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 18 – Portway Park & Ride Rail Station

Statement submitted by: Cllr Mark Bradshaw

I am pleased that this new rail connection will be finally open to the public this year. It was envisaged in the original planning application for the park and ride. A commitment to secure funding for a new halt was made by the then Labour administration when opening the extended P&R in 2008.

The scheme is illustrative of the national challenge of obtaining technical approval and funding for modest new rail facilities. I recall many of the discussions with Network Rail, GWR, transport ministers and our fellow council partners to secure this new connection, which will benefit Bristol residents and those from the extensive travel to work area centres on our City.

Many officers and politicians have been involved over the years – all could see the potential for integrated travel linking P&R and rail.

Investing in overground rail is a win-win. Our investment in the Severn Beach rail line has proved very effective with over a million passenger journeys a year. There is much to do, including building Ashley Down (another rail project with its origins some years ago) as well as access challenges at Parson Street and Lawrence Hill.

Until now, Parson St was the newest rail station in Bristol. Delivering rail projects needs to be made more possible under Great British Railways - even ministers recognise the deficiencies of the current system. In future, rail proposals need to be hardwired into the local plan so that funding and phasing is more transparent and strategic.

Mark Bradshaw
Bedminster Labour Co-Op Councillor
6.3.23

Question: PQ18.01 & PQ18.02

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 18 – Portway Park & Ride Rail Station

Question submitted by: David Redgewell

Question 1: Whilst we welcome the progress on Portway parkway station by Network rail western route. First group plc Great western railway. a company owned by pension funds staff unions and small shareholders. Department for transport. West of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris and Bristol city council. To see the station open on the Weston super mare Bristol Temple meads Clifton Down Avonmouth Dock Severn Beach railway service. Can mayor rees explain what progress is being made on the bus rail interchange At the station for bus other than the stagecoach west Deutsche bank Operated park and ride service to Shirehampton, sea mills ,Hotwells, Bristol city centre Bristol Temple meads station and Broadmead. It bus route to From shirehampton to Westbury on Trym Southmead hospital bus station uwe bus station and Bristol parkway. Service 11 stagecoach west. Or service 10 stagecoach west Avonmouth Dock Lawrence Weston, Westbury on Trym Southmead hospital, bus station uwe bus station Bristol parkway station Bradley stoke Aztec west Hortham Alverston Thornbury. Or service 3,4 first group plc buses To Avonmouth or Lawrence Weston to connect at the station.

Question 2: With the in future in phase 2 on of Henbury loop becoming a full loop passenger service. In long term west of England mayoral combined transport Authority plan. Phase 1 Being From Bristol Temple meads, Ashley Down, Filton Abbey wood Filton North station and Henbury. What progress is being in getting work underway on this route by Network rail western route First group plc Great western railway west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris With still lack of planning permission granted for this station by South Gloucestershire council. Both scheme are seen as part of a mass transit system for Greater Bristol and Bath city region. Will the mayor Rees please progress this scheme.

Statement: PS20.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 – Capricorn Quay

Statement submitted by: Kevin Slade

Creating Bristol Harbour's biggest Eyesore and Litter Dump is the inevitable result of this hurried and ill-considered proposal, with no funding in place to allow for the extensive ongoing cost of litter removal and maintenance.

This Reed Bed structure is proposed to be placed directly below a 50-metre stretch of the busiest part of the Harbourside walkway, outside the Brandon Yard Development, with no means of access for litter removal. This will result in inevitable extensive littering with no apparent means of clearance.

No cognizance has been made for the fact that the reed beds will be located next to the listed Harbour Wall – and very close to a Bat (protected species) corridor.

In summary

NO financial provision for regular litter removal

NO means of access from the Harbour side

NO Study has been carried out on the effect on a protected species – 6 metres away

NO access to the listed Harbour Wall for inspection and maintenance

YES Ongoing financial expense to the BCC Ratepayer for inevitable high upkeep cost.

The WECA grant money would be far better spent on placing these reed beds in Harbour locations not directly exposed to littering by the Public.

Statement: PS20.02

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 – Capricorn Quay

Statement submitted by: Molly Petts

I support the proposal for WECA funding to improve the biodiversity and love that the harbour is an asset which benefits the whole city. One which should also be financially sustainable.

My concern is the referenced decision pathway within the Background Documents. 'Cabinet 3 September 2019 Harbour Infrastructure Improvements and Technologies – Capital Investment Programme - report'

Within this report it is stated that:

A decision is required to allocate £885k of the agreed £1.05M, as follows:

- a. £485K for the installation of new pontoon moorings situated at Capricorn Quay*
- b. £350k – 400k for upgrade of facilities and services – **to increase revenue streams including licence fees (with any increase over inflation following consultation, and an uptake of additional moorings once available) to include upgrades to shower and toilet facilities.***

and

*The Terms of Reference for the Harbour Review will be developed to include implementing comparable market rate fees and charges, **once the planned provision of high quality facilities has been put in place.***

My concern is whether Cabinet can support extra funding for a project when the historic aims have still not been met, and past decisions have been bypassed.

The planned provisions of high quality facilities have not been put in place, nor has the consultation taken place for the new fee increase way over inflation which was previously promised.

The planning application clearly lacks support from land based residents which is unfortunate. This potentially could be due to the lack of public consultation and involvement in the whole Harbour Review process.

Statement: PS20.03

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 – Capricorn Quay

Statement submitted by: Fraser Bridgeford

1. No discussion took place before the decision to create a major marina with 5m of our homes and we were not informed of the decision before one was taken back in 2019 to create this major development.
2. No updated financial projects have been provided to show the viability of the proposed marina
3. The provision of reed beds has been used to disguise the size and impact of the major 34 berth marina development on our doorstep.
4. There is no chance that the reed beds will be maintained in the required manner to industry standard as Bristol City Council are unable to maintain the green and blue spaces that we already have to the required standard.
5. There is an overarching focus on gaining revenue rather than the quality of life of local residents. This is unacceptable.
6. There is mention of making the harbour for 'all of Bristol'. The harbour is already the most used park in the city with thousands of people using it for leisure every day and especially as a walk route at the weekend with 1000+ people per hour using the round-harbour walkway.
7. The neighbours of the proposed major marina development have overwhelmingly rejected the proposals.

Given the points above a more suitable location should be investigated for the marina and a halt put to this proposal at 'Capricorn Quay' immediately.

Statement: PS21.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

Re: Agenda item 21 – City Regions Sustainable Transport Settlement – Maintenance and Integrated Transport Block Allocation 2023/24

Statement submitted by: David Redgewell, Gordon Richardson & Robbie Bentley

We welcome the city region Transport plan

And the maintenance block grant from the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority.

For maintenance and Highway schemes

But we are also concerned about making progress in Delivery of the city region sustainable transport corridor.

For walking cycling and public transport services.

With the award of money from the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority to Bristol city council.

We are concerned in the delay to some the upgrading of the city bus corridors and sustainable transport corridor.

Stockwood, Hengrove, knowle ,Bristol Temple meads station , Broadmead,city centre,Park street, Clifton Down station, westbury on Trym Brentry Henbury and cribbs causeway bus station

Or Henleaze Southmead Henbury cribbs causeway bus station

A37 A4018 corridor.

Service 1 and 2 2a First Group west of England buses.

Bristol bus and coach station/ City centre Bristol Temple meads station Arnos vale,Bristolington, keynsham Salford ,Newbridge, Weston and Bath spa bus and coach station.

X39 39 349 522 .stagecoach 9 service

Whist this corridor has good evening services their are major reductions in the Evening service from Bristol bus and coach station Bristol Temple meads Arnos vale,Bristolington, Keynsham estate is withdrawn.

The west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and Mayor Dan Norris should secure evening service's

Through the enhanced quality partnership with First group plc.

This is also a important mass transit corridor Between Bristol bus and coach station and Bristol Temple meads Bristolington Keynsham, Salford and Bath spa

Other corridor that need progress is A37 Bristol bus and coach station Bristol Temple meads station, Arnos vale,Totterdown, Knowle Hengrove, whitchurch, Pensford , ,Farrington Gurney, Wells bus station Glastonbury ,street 376,172 First group plc west of England buses

Farrington Gurney ,paulton,midsomer Norton Westfield, Radstock, peasdown st john
Bath spa bus and coach station.

172 ,173 ,174 First group plc west of England buses.
Well bus and coach station chilcompton,Midsomer Norton Westfiel Radstock
peasdown st john Bath spa bus and coach station

This another corridor for bus services with reduced Evening bus service.
On 172 Bristol bus and coach station.
Bristol Temple meads station via A 37 A367 .
Farrington Gurney Paulton,Midsomer Norton Westfield Radstock peasdown st john
Bath spa bus and coach station.
Evening service run Bath spa bus and coach station, Peasdown st john Radstock,
Westfield, midsomer Norton paulton wells bus and coach station.

We also have work in south Gloucestershire council.
From Bristol bus and coach Bradley stoke Aztec west Alverston Thornbury.
Bristol bus and coach station, Hambroke Coalpit heath, Yate park and ride Yate
Railway station yate bus station and chipping sodbury.
Bristol Temple meads station city centre Hotwells, sea mills,shirehampton Portway
Parkway and Park and ride.

Bristol bus and coach station via Hotwells To Portishead, Clevedon Nalisea and
Backwell and Weston super mare. Bus station.
Whist we welcome the bus and sustainable transport corridors across the city
region.
We need to maintenance bus shelters stops and interchanges facilities.

The Delivery of theses corridor are being carried out by the 4 local unity councils .
City and county of Bristol Banes council South Gloucestershire council and North
Somerset council with Mayor Dan Norris and the west of England mayoral combined
transport Authority.

With Bus and coach shelters in Bristol sometime in very very poor delivery state of
Cleaning and Graffiti removal.
Unless officers at Bristol city council and west of England mayoral combined
transport Authority chase the contractor

We need well designed bus shelters and interchanges facilities help points .

We need clear delivery of the bus and sustainable transport corridor,
By Bristol city council Banes South Gloucestershire council and North
Somerset through a Delivery unit .

With Bristol city council transport staff being transferred to west of England mayoral
combined transport Authority.
Is essential to get good delivery of
the city region transport plan.
Especially with Gateway reviews at the west of England mayoral combined transport
Authority by the Department for transport.

With local Government minister lee Rowley mp from Department for leveling up taking an interest in the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority.

Its is very important to deliver theses transport corridor with improved bus services by Stagecoach west and first group plc. as part of the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council bus service improvement plan.

We welcome today's report we wish to see all public transport and sustainable transport corridor made full accessible for disabled people and passenger with reduced mobility.

David Redgewell.

Gordon Richardson.

Robbie Bentley Bristol disability equalities forum.

South west transport Network.

Question: PQ21.01

Cabinet – 7 MARCH 2023

**Re: Agenda item 21 – City Regions Sustainable Transport Settlement –
Maintenance and Integrated Transport Block Allocation 2023/24**

Question submitted by: Cllr David Wilcox

Background

Using the money from CRSTS should be a priority of this administration - before too much is lost to inflation. I note from the spreadsheet on page 339, that the spending on highways & pothole maintenance is ten times the scale of investment in School Streets, casualty reduction and flood prevention - £8.897m versus £0.825m.

Question 1: Can more be spent on improving existing facilities for walkers and cyclists – like providing lighting along the Concorde Way, improving facilities for the Bristol to Bath Path or the Malago Greenway?