

# Summons to attend meeting of Full Council



**Date:** Tuesday, 12 September 2023

**Time:** 6.00 pm

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

**To: All Members of Council**

**Issued by:** Oliver Harrison, Democratic Services

City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol, BS1 9NE

Tel: 0117 3526162

E-mail: [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)

**Date:** Friday, 1 September 2023



# Agenda

## 6. Public Petitions, Statements and Questions

Public forum items can be about any matter the Council is responsible for or which directly affects the city. Submissions will be treated in order of receipt and as many people shall be called upon as is possible within the time allowed within the meeting (normally 30 minutes). **(Pages 3 - 67)**

Further rules can be found within our Council Procedure Rules within the Constitution.

Please note that the following deadlines apply to this meeting:

- a. Public petitions and statements: Petitions and written statements must be received by **12 noon on Friday 8 September 2023** at latest. One written statement per member of the public is permitted.
- b. Public questions: Written public questions must be received by **5pm on Wednesday 6 September 2023** at latest. A maximum of 2 questions per member of the public is permitted. Questions should be addressed to the Mayor or relevant Cabinet Member.

Public forum items should be e-mailed to [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)

---

Signed



Proper Officer  
Friday, 1 September 2023



# Public Forum

**Date:** Tuesday, 12 September 2023



## Agenda

### 1. Public Statements Received

(Pages 3 - 23)

Ref No	Name	Title
PS01	Liv Fortune	councillor code of conduct
PS02	Suzanne Audrey	Loss of Confidence in Bristol's planning system
PS03	Michaela Andrews	Concern over the climate emergency and how f systems contribute
PS04	Colin Millard	Junction - Wells Road
PS05	David Redgewell	A4 trunk road
PS06	Doris Smith	I Do Not Support LTN Proposals
PS07	David Wherrett	Redcatch Park Tennis Courts
PS08	Megan Smith	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood scheme
PS09	David Rexworthy	Proposed Bus Lane on the Wells Road
PS10	Brian Rexworthy	Proposed Wells Road Changes
PS11	Claire Rexworthy	Wells Road/West Town Lane Proposals
PS12	Stephanie Richmond	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PS13	C Johnson	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PS14	Helen Hughes	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood

### 2. Public Questions Received

(Pages 24 - 65)

Ref No	Name	Title
PQ01	Anita Pearce	Eagle House
PQ02	Margaret Rawlins	Eagle House
PQ03	Suzanne Audrey	Housing
PQ04	David Wherrett	Redcatch Park Tennis Courts
PQ05	Claire Gronow	One City Climate Strategy
PQ06	Sarah Cemlyn	Clean Air Zone
PQ07	Mark Ashdown	Planning Applications
PQ08	Michaela Andrews	Plant Based Solutions

PQ09	Helton Azzel	One City Climate Strategy
PQ10	Martin Rands	MetroBus Planning Conditions
PQ11	Claire Rexworthy	Wells Road
PQ12	Annette Catherine	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ13	Brian Rexworthy	Wells Road
PQ14	Ian Skuse	Wells Road
PQ15	Cliff Evans	Council Tax Benefits
PQ16	Laura Chapman	Broadwalk Development
PQ17	Helen Evans	Planning Decisions
PQ18	Rachael Fagan	Cultural Investment Programme
PQ19	Naomi Campbell	Cultural Funding Allocation
PQ20	Janet Adams	Arts Funding
PQ21	Helen Hughes	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ22	Helen Webster	Redcatch Quarter
PQ23	Peter Lidington	Wells Road
PQ24	Robin Millard	Broadwalk
PQ25	Caroline Owens	Broadwalk Development
PQ26	Stephanie Richmond	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ27	David Redgewell	Transport
PQ28	WITHDRAWN	
PQ29	Dan Ackroyd	Metro Underground
PQ30	Dan Ackroyd	Budget
PQ31	Ian Harris	Arts Funding
PQ32	Keep Bristol Moving	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ33	Meg Smith	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ34	Gerard Cooke	Arts Funding
PQ35	David Rexworthy	Wells Road
PQ36	Lesley Robinson	Broadwalk Development

**Issued by: Oliver Harrison**, Democratic Services  
City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol, BS1 9NE  
E-mail: [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)



## **STATEMENT PS 01**

**Submitted by Liv Fortune**

**Title: Statement regarding councillor code of conduct**

I was horrified to hear that veteran Conservative councillor Richard Eddy for the Bishopsworth ward recently referred to some of his fellow planning committee members and Green party councillors more broadly as “lentil eating amateurs”

Putting the obvious lack of respect and the offensive nature of Eddy’s behaviour to one side, I find it particularly ill conceived to deride the highly nutritious and very affordable lentil during the worst cost of living crises since the middle of the last century. A cost of living crisis that has been undoubtedly exacerbated by 13 years of chaotic and naval gazing Conservative governance.

Billions of people all over the world rely upon the humble lentil as an efficient and low cost source of protein, fibre and iron to name but a few of this superfood’s nutritional properties.

In my opinion to imply that people who eat lentils do so because it’s fashionable or because it’s a fad speaks volumes about the narrow and out of touch way in which councillor Eddy views the world, and raises the question: “is this man who seemingly lacks tact, diplomacy and common courtesy really fit to be a councillor in a city as diverse as Bristol?”

His tasteless remarks surely contravene the councillor code of conduct they all pledge to adhere to when they are elected as councillors?

I sincerely hope that Green, Labour and Liberal Democrat committee members have raised formal complaints about Councillor Eddy’s conduct that day.

I believe in the philosophy of killing rude people with kindness; so in that spirit I am inclined to invite councillor Eddy to sample some of my delicious and nutrient dense red lentil soup.

## **STATEMENT PS 02**

**Submitted by Suzanne Audrey**

**Title: Loss of Confidence in Bristol's planning system**

I hope to present a petition to Full Council in November concerning loss of confidence in Bristol's planning system (it already has nearly 3,000 Bristol signatures).

In the meantime, I would like to draw the attention of Full Council to the wording of the petition:

We, the undersigned, have lost confidence in the effectiveness and impartiality of Bristol City Council's planning system and seek a Full Council debate on this matter.

Our concern is that the Bristol City Council is currently failing to deliver an effective, impartial service; lacks consistency in the application of material planning considerations and policies, and; is being unduly influenced to 'get stuff done' by the elected Mayor's Office.

There are examples across the city in which the following material planning considerations are given inadequate weight or where there is inconsistency in their application: loss of light, overshadowing, overlooking, privacy; design and appearance; residential amenity and living conditions; character of the local area; local planning policies; loss of trees and landscaping; impact on listed buildings and conservation areas.

We urge the Mayor, cabinet members, and councillors of all parties to consider the harm done when residents no longer have confidence in the impartiality of officers and members of planning committees, and when decisions are made that will cause long-term, if not irreparable, harm to Bristol's neighbourhoods and city centre.

## **STATEMENT PS 03**

**Submitted by Michaela Andrews**

**Title: Concern over the climate emergency and how food systems contribute**

My name is Michaela & I have huge concern over the climate emergency and how food systems contribute.

I asked a question at council a year ago. After that, motions on plant-based solutions were tabled by 3 political groups, but they are not being prioritised & haven't been heard. Since these motions have been waiting for this council's attention, we've seen devastating wildfires, extreme heat and mass migrations across the world driven by global heating.

We know that meat and dairy produce many times more greenhouse gas emissions than plant foods. The science is unequivocal. Yet we currently eat twice the global average of meat. Public organisations must step up and show leadership to change this.

In the midst of a climate emergency as declared by this Council, Bristol should be leading the way, but on this we are lagging. Many other councils have voted for fully plant-based internal catering, to prioritise plant-based food options at all council-controlled external sites, and to promote plant-based eating to residents.

I would like to know when the Council will finally give this issue the attention it urgently deserves and debate the motion.

**STATEMENT PS 04**

**Submitted by Colin Millard**

**Title: Junction - Wells Road/West Town Lane/ Hengrove Lane/ A37**

Any no right turn from Warncliff Gardens to Airport Road would effect the following:

1/ WhitecrossAve/ Woodleigh Gardens/David's Road/ Kingsale Road/ Hazelbury Road/  
Mowbery Road / Imperial Road/Warrington Road/Beryl Grove/ West Town Lane.

To Block entry to any of the 5 roads would mean an increase in the amount of traffic  
increase on the other 4 roads which are residential.

Ref.Bus lane

I Suggest 7am to 10am from 519 Wells Road to Airport Road. That format has been working  
for many years at Broadwalk. No Bus lane required from Airport Road A37 South



## STATEMENT PS 05

Submitted by David Redgewell

**Title: Bristol Disability Equalities Forum stakeholders concerned about the proposal for a new road in Brislington to replace the A4 trunk road**

We have been asked by stakeholders in the Brislington and Arnos vale area that are very concerned about the proposal for a new road in Brislington to replace the A4 trunk road along the former North Somerset railway line from St Philips causeway to Arnos vale Brislington Callington road.

The proposal will move traffic from the Bristol to Bath A4 trunk road into the main residential area of Brislington and into the heart of the sandy park road shopping centre, Repton Road, Harrow Road, Winchester Road and Churchill Road.

Close to local junior school.

The bring 24 hour noise and pollution

Lighting from a trunk road into a residential area village community on the edge of Bristol.

With Air pollution leading to premature deaths in Greater Bristol the community very concerned.

The Brislington bypass was promoted by then Bristol Development corporation and stopped by Avon County Council and Bristol city council 40 years ago, from the spine Road to Callington road along the North Somerset railway section of the route.

So when the Metro mayor Dan Norris of the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority promised money for a improvement bus service From Bristol bus and coach station, Bristol Temple meads station, Arnos vale, Brislington, keynsham, saltford Newbridge Newton st loe ,Weston, Bath spa bus and coach station interchange, many local residents welcomed the improvements to the bus service.

Waiting facilities, shelters, cctv, seat lights, better design of shelters. Quality pavement and better public realm along the A4 and Brislington village.

Their was hope that the number 1 bus from Cribbs causeway bus station through Henbury westbury on Trym, Clifton Down station, park street, Bristol city centre, Bristol cabot circus, Bristol Temple meads station, Arnos vale, Brislington, sandy park my operate via St Anne's park, Guilford Road, Broomhill, Brislington Trading estate, Hungerford road, Brislington village, School Road Brislington, st Anne's park, sandy park and number 1 route. 1a via st Anne's, 1b via Alison road using some of the new bus priority measures.

Service 36 Would run from Bristol city centre via old market, Barton hill, st Anne's park, Brislington, Hungerford road, Knowle, Hengrove hospital, whitchurch estate, Hartcliffe.

Improvement to A4, Bath spa bus and coach station, weston Newbridge, saltford, keynsham, Brislington, Hengrove, Hartcliffe, Bishopsworth, Bristol Airport.

Higher frequency and Better bus services.

That there would be better bus service to keynsham Town centre, and bus lanes on the keynsham bypass and a stops on the bypass linked the town centre and railway station.

Better bus stops along the A4 with real-time information stop and lightning, Seating, CCTV.

Green lights through saltford Town centre for buses and a Green wave.

Better bus facilities at Newton st loe, Newbridge, Weston, Bath spa bus and coach station interchanges.

With major investment in the railway station booking office and hall, The station clock, Glazing on the station, Canopy lift repairs to platform 1 from the bus and coach station, Glazzers Restaurant, Better seating and lighting in the interchange, reopening of the Travel centre for passengers information, With the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority, First group plc, west of England buses, Favesaver buses, National Express coaches and Bath bus company Rapt sharing the costs with Banes council and Destination west.

There was a discussion about using the North Somerset railway corridor as a transport route for walking and cycling, and mass transit/ Bus lane Between the spine Road or Tramway Road and Callington road.

The proposal for a mass transit light rail system corridor Is option supported by Public transport user groups and mayor Marvin Rees, Between Bristol city centre, Bristol Temple meads station, Arnos vale, Brislington, keynsham, saltford, Newbridge, Weston, Bath spa Railway station, And to South Bristol via Callington road corridor, Hengrove park, whitchurch estate, Hengrove hospital, Hartcliffe and Bristol Airport.

With some regeneration of Brislington Square, with redevelopment of the shopping centre into mixed use shops and house retaining the flats.

But residents of Brislington including many older people and disabled people Feel let down by the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority, Bristol city council and Bath and North East Somerset council In to supporting a public transport improvement plan for their community and public realm, only to be told on a webinar by the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority That it was supporting the oid Brislington bypass scheme, the former Bristol Development corporation Expressway scheme, Which Bristol city council had objected to and stop 40 years ago, This time promoted by consultants for the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority, As part of a public transport Network scheme under the city Region transport fund .

So, concerned about the project, disabled residents contacted Bristol disability equalities forum and the older people forum. Many with respiratory illness many could not believe that plans were dusted down out of the Highway Engineer Department of Bristol city council and sent to consultants at the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority.

Following lots emails, phone calls from residents and disabled people, Bristol disability equalities forum contacted the Department for transport Who said whilst the bus upgrade

scheme, walking and cycling facilities scheme is funded between Bristol and Bath via Brislington, keynsham, saltford, The Brislington bypass from Bristol spine Road, St Philips causeway to Callington road was not. This project would be subject to a further bid in 2027 After the General election And would require full planning permission granted CPO to made, And support from Bristol city council as planning and Highway Authority, and similarly from Bath and North East Somerset council.

Under the present funding arrangement the government is only funding pinch point on National road Network in the south west, at A30 In Cornwall and A417, A419 at Birdlip Hill near Cheltenham in Gloucestershire.

The main funding being on bus and coach schemes, bus service improvement plans as per the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council.

Lights railway in the west Yorkshire combined transport Authority in Leeds, West Yorkshire.

Railway interchange and improvements

Reopening the railways project, Like metro west railway.

Sustainable transport. Urban bypass scheme were not a top priority for solving congestion in urban areas like Greater Bristol and Bath.

With the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority having very few staff in house due to the failure to transfer staff from Bristol city council to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority, due to industrial problems on going with the Trade unions, consultants are drawing up plans for Highway and Transport At the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority instead of full time west of England mayoral combined transport Authority officers

In view of the major concerns from local residents in Arnos vale Brislington area, Bristol city council as Highway and planning Authority, and mayor Malvin Rees who is opposed to the plan, Would the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council as Bus service improvement plans Authorities, And the would the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and Bristol city council and Banes council make it clear as public consultation Webinars, public meeting and session what part of the A4 Sustainable Transit corridor is funded for bus service improvement, bus priority measures, interchange bus stops, walking and cycling facilities improvements, So as people can give feedback on the delivery of the public transport improvement corridor between Bristol and Bath via Arnos vale, Brislington, keynsham, saltford, Newbridge, Weston, Bath spa bus and coach station interchange.

With their view on the Brislington bypass being made very clear it for a further bid to Department for transport after the General Elections

Bristol city council Elections and of course the road building elements of the scheme will only go ahead after the 2025 metro mayor Elections.

As this projects out for consultation we Ask that the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority Bristol city council and Banes council to make it clear the part of the A4

project that are funded and supported to improve the Public Transport Network, walking and cycling facilities, And the Brislington bypass on the North Somerset railway corridor That is subject to further funding bids, Which are subject to the planning permission being granted by Bristol city council, CPOs and public inquiry after a General election in 2027 and Bristol city council election May 2024 .

With the cost of living crisis hitting so many people in Brislington, this whole public consultation is causing untold stress to older and disabled people, Who are very worried about blit notice on their houses homes and property. Hope this issue will be addressed during the A4 public consultation.

Gordon Richardson, Bristol disability equities forum

David redgewell, Bristol disability equities forum.

Trustees.

## **STATEMENT PS 06**

**Submitted by Doris Smith**

**Title: I DO NOT SUPPORT LTN PROPOSALS**

Statement regarding Low traffic neighbourhood scheme – East Bristol

This will affect ALL businesses within the st George and Redfield area – This has been proven within Oxford and Bath and businesses have closed down. Is the idea to close down small business'?

All delivery drivers will be heavily affected, making their routes more complex, more time consuming . How does this lower traffic?

Emergency services will be greatly affected, this could mean the difference between life and death whilst an ambulance has to navigate one way systems with blocked roads.

All roads where traffic IS allowed will be heavily used and there will be congestion, queuing traffic causes more air pollution than traffic free to move.

Families will be divided. It will be harder for family members to visit each other, having to go miles out of their way to get to a place that used to be direct.

Parents will have difficulties getting children to school, again causing excess traffic on useable roads.

Not everyone is fit enough to walk or cycle, and not everyone wants to do this. Taking people's choice away, eroding freedom of choice.

The consultations were not widely publicised and therefore the majority of the public do not/did not know about the changes.

The council are spending public money to implement this scheme and the people need the money spending elsewhere like a GP surgery, Children's play areas, green areas improved.

If this is a trial ONLY why does the council already have the plan in place for permanent measures ?

Will this scheme mean more of those damn scooters? They are a menace to society, they go along the pavement much too fast and when a child comes out of a gate from home they should not need to feel unsafe on a pavement. The council needs to implement some sort of test for people using both those and mobility scooters! And their speeds need limiting further. Use our money to do that instead.

## **STATEMENT PS 07**

**Submitted by David Wherrett**

**Title: Statement for Bristol City Council related to keeping Redcatch Park Tennis Courts Free to all users**

I have written this statement as a protest and an opposition to the attempt by City Council Officers to force the Tennis Courts Operating Model and the Tennis Courts In Redcatch Park. Which I will from now on call "Pay to Play".

The model requires an outside organisation to maintain and repair the courts, and it is suggested the operator will fund this using the income gained from the rental or subscriptions paid for use of the pitches.

I maintain that the processes and tactics the officers used included misinforming, lying and hiding the facts, to both the City Councillors and the public of Bristol, in particular the people of Knowle Ward.

They have confounded and compounded these lies and deceptions into a consultation document, so biased towards progressing their plan, that they actually state in their consultation document, they are not going to "propose...as an option in this consultation". So they are not going to consider alternative options even if the public opinion, the council and the facts are against them.

These lies and deceptions include suggesting there is no money available for the refurbishment of the courts and the maintenance of them. Thus suggesting that the only way for them to be refurbished and kept in good condition was by bringing in the Pay To Play option.

This as Councillor Hopkins, will tell you, and has argued with both the officers and the members of the public, is incorrect. The courts will cost only approximately £13, 000 to refurbish back to a high standard. That money is available through pots which He has identified and some of this is actually set aside for Redcatch Park maintenance and improvements.

The lies, deceptions and deliberate omissions within the document continues throughout. In section 3, It boasts the operators would ensure "all courts will be jet washed and repainted, floodlights would be added (but only if "planning permission" can be gained so may not happen) and the courts would be "regularly maintained" by the subcontracted operator. There would be active and inclusive tennis programme including tennis coaching opportunities, community tennis initiatives and opportunities for free play. "Holiday tennis activities, competitively-priced for children, sessions for refugees, and free tennis sessions and loan of equipment for those who can afford to pay".

But the truth of this is all barring two of those (the jet washing and the floodlighting) already happen at Redcatch and the courts remain free to play for everyone.

So what this proposal actually introduces more discrimination between people, mainly on the basis of socio economic status. Ie those who can afford to pay and those who can't. In the current economic situation even many working class people are finding it difficult to pay

rent, power bills and for food. So asking them to pay for an active session in the park, where they should be able to go and play to help with their wellbeing will not be achievable or affordable for them.

Also the introduction of Pay to Play will increase tensions between users by a booking system and arguments over times etc.

Further related to this is the booking system, which will be heavily reliant on whether a person has access to or can use the technology to book a court, and of course a bank account.

Many children, elderly or those with special learning needs in particular, may not be able to do so they would be also excluded.

Currently there is no discrimination, whether you are a refugee, child, and all the other equalities based groupings ie of different culture, heritage, gender, religion, abilities and different abilities, rich or poor it doesn't matter, you are accepted. No one argues.

So with the introduction of this model Council Officers are actually breaking Bristol City Councils own 2023 Equalities and Inclusion policies. Which says is based on the Equalities Act 2010 Which provides protection if you experience discrimination on behalf of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexuality orientation.

They are also in breach of the councils Health and Wellbeing Strategy. Which states on the website as "our vision is for citizens to thrive in a city that supports their mental and physical wellbeing...free from adverse childhood experiences...and gaps in health outcomes between the most deprived areas and the most affluent in Bristol significantly reduced".

Also the Councils Sport and Physical Activity Strategy for Bristol 2020 – 25, especially outcome 2 which focusses on getting 50% more people socio economic deprivation doing more physical activity per week. According to its website. And this was and is being heralded and supported by the Elected Mayor.

However the elected Mayor is also actively supporting the 'Pay Per Play' model being introduced into Redcatch Park. He can't support both and be in line with the councils policies.

Now to the results of their own Consultation which they chose to ignore the results of before they (the Officers and the Elected Mayor) made their decision behind closed doors and before this debate could be heard in the council house. This was because it was so embarrassing for them.

However in doing so they were actively concealing the evidences they had themselves gathered at great amount of council tax payers money that would show the majority of people do not want their proposed model before they pushed it through.

The results were finally officially published on 7th September. Even though the Consultation was strongly biased towards having no other option but to accept the Pay Per Play Model, the figures clearly show;

123 (42.86%) of respondents strongly disagreed with the proposal to change towards Pay Per Play Model. And a further;

39 (13.59%) disagreed with the introduction.

Total 56.15% were not in favour of introducing the Pay Per Play model.

And only 109 (38%) supported it. With the other 16 (6%) neither agreed nor disagreed.

Also of question is the amount of time and council tax payers money put into this exercise. They say they e mailed 7,000 subscribers of which only 295 responded. Social media posts were seen 17,000 times but only 83 people "clicked" to link to the proposal.

80 posters were put up around the area including Redcatch Park. But even those required completion of the consultation online or by telephone if or emailing the council for a paper copy of the document. In my opinion this excluded those who are unable to use the technology etc for all the reasons I have discussed before. Socio economic, age or ability/ or disability. So even the methodology of delivering the consultation is discriminatory.

Also this proposal has decided the community, as can simply be seen by the complaints made to the council related to Councillor Hopkins, by some members of the community, which after consideration and review at the councils expense, were thrown out. And now a pending court case being raised against those members of the community.

So this was a divisive tactic by the officers as well, because several, previous attempts they had made to do introduce Pay Per Play In Redcatch Courts were dismissed by the whole community working together. The officers whom I believe many are the same officers saw their chance to have their way again and have successfully divided the community through their deliberate manipulation, lies, misleading information. This includes that they apparently knew all the time the funding was available for the refurbishment, and will be looking to spend it as the operating company will not adopt the courts unless they are up to the standard they require in the first place. This includes an estimated extra £5,000 to enhance the gating systems so that the courts will be locked. so again costing the council money, not saving it.

Lastly after requests have been made for them to reconsider, using the new information related to funding and the outcomes of the consultation they are refusing to do so. So they are not democratic officers but dictators wasting the tax payers money.

Finalising I say to all Councillors that the council officers involved in this should at least be ignored and should be removed from post. I believe they could and should be accused of abuse of their powers. The process towards pay to play should be stopped, and free play continued. Or if this is not done then I question the will of the councillors to assert the democratic rights of the people of Bristol. I also wish it noted that I will be making an official complaint through the City Councils complaints procedure and if necessary the ombudsman.

Thank you.



**STATEMENT PS 08**

**Submitted by Megan Smith**

**Title: Eat Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood scheme**

Dear Mayor and Councillors

The EBLN is part of a much bigger global initiative that is aiming for Net Zero emissions by 2030, the goal being to cease independent travel of citizens outside of their local areas.

## **STATEMENT PS 09**

**Submitted by David Rexworthy**

**Title: Statement Regarding Proposed Bus Lane on the Wells Road**

Dear Mr Mayor,

Please see below my concerns and thoughts regarding this absurd proposal for a 12hour bus lane being installed onto the Wells Road.

By integrating a new bus lane onto the Wells Road this will force traffic through one of the many adjoining side roads, Mowbray Road being one of them. At the top of Mowbray Road is an open green space and popular children's play park which sits at the top of a blind hill. Increasing the influx of traffic through Mowbray will increase the risk of hazards towards children, animals, and other human beings. Is it worth putting young children and adult lives at potential risk? By enforcing the installation of a bus lane, that is exactly what you are doing.

Did you know that Mowbray Road was a 20mph zone? It's alright if you didn't, most of the drivers using Mowbray as a shortcut do not know that either. The speed limit is hardly adhered to because it is not being enforced by the local council. It is because of these reckless and uncontrolled conditions that most residents on Mowbray Road have turned their once lovely and green front gardens into asphalt driveways due to the fear and previous incidents involved around speeding vehicles crashing and damaging parked cars of residents. Adding a bus lane onto the Wells Road is going to increase the risk of this happening more often than previously.

Turning right into West Town Lane from the Wells Road causes enough backlog currently, but the council must like backlog, so much so they have decided to put a 12hour bus lane in place where bus routes RARELY travel. The buses that do use the Wells Road are mainly country run buses which run significantly less frequent than the Bristol routes. So, does it really make sense to put a 12hour bus lane in place which will only be used 3 or 4 times a day? All while other accidents and incidents caused by this unnecessary closing of 1 lane are happening around them. In addition to this, if and when an accident does occur if this bus lane becomes operational, imagine the delays it will cause for the service that you are trying to improve. Very, unhappy customers and bus drivers...

Overall, if the implementation of this bus lane goes ahead, here are a list of potential risks that may occur:

1. Increased risk to young children, animal and adult lives which regularly visit the popular park on Mowbray Road.
2. Increased traffic through multiple side roads.
3. Increased damage to vehicles that belong to residents who live on these side roads.
4. Increased risk of accidents on the Wells Road itself.

To be honest with you. I think the first risk of potentially endangering a life would be enough to make you rethink this decision. But there are a few other options in case you

think young and innocent lives can be sacrificed to make sure that a bus that makes roughly 4 trips a day stays on time.

But the council wouldn't think like that... Would they.

## **STATEMENT PS 10**

**Submitted by Brian Rexworthy**

**Title: PROPOSED WELLS ROAD CHANGES**

I have lived on Mowbray Road for 29 years and over that time the quality of life on the road has been slowly eroded by the increasing number of vehicles using the road as a short cut to West Town Lane from the Wells Road or the reverse.

There are large numbers of vehicles using the road particularly at certain times of the day, many not adhering to the speed limit, driving on pavements to avoid each other, all with the back drop of a children's park at the end of the road.

Your proposal to stop traffic turning right into West Town Lane from the Wells Road can do nothing but increase this already existing problem. I understand that if you decide on a bus lane then something needs to be done on the Wells Road, I would suggest stopping the right turn into West Town Lane is not the answer. If you do this then the same needs to be done for all the right turn roads off the Wells Road, David's Road, Mowbray Road, Clive Road etc.

## **STATEMENT PS 11**

**Submitted by Claire Rexworthy**

**Title: Wells Road/West Town Lane Proposals**

Dear Mr Mayor

Here is my statement, for your consideration.

I have been a resident in Mowbray Road for the best part of 30 years and have seen serious rises in the amount of traffic using it. It is horrifying at the speed at which the majority of drivers come through.

With regard to your proposals, here are my thoughts.

If road users are prohibited from turning right from Wells Road into WTL or turning left from WTL on to the Wells Road, then it is obvious that drivers will turn into Hazelbury Road and cut through Mowbray Road (or continue up to the top and into Davids Road).

This will prove extremely dangerous for anyone using the green space.

Drivers already park along one side of Mowbray, opposite the park, which reduces the carriageway down to a very narrow and dangerous one lane. A lot of the parked vehicles belong to those who either work at the veterinary practice, opposite, or people parking up and continuing their journey into the centre of Bristol either on their bikes (which they get out of their vehicles once parked) or by using the bus.

Perhaps a time restriction should be placed for parking in Mowbray Road or a residents parking scheme be introduced. Just a suggestion!

The play park also sits at the brow of a 'blind' hill and it is sometimes difficult to see drivers approaching from the opposite direction, until the top of it is almost reached. Drivers are then in a 'face off' situation to see who will give way to who and move out of the way. I have witnessed drivers mount the kerb alongside the park railings to enable them to pass oncoming traffic!

Residents in Mowbray Road have mostly turned their front gardens into parking areas for their personal vehicles as the road has been used more regularly as a 'rat run' and collisions have occurred. Incidents increase during poor weather when it becomes icy. Often drivers do not realise how steep Mowbray Road falls at its junction with Hazelbury Road, causing them to lose control of their vehicles and skid and slide.

Whilst front drives give peace of mind to the residents in knowing that their vehicles are safe, it has allowed traffic to drive faster along the road as they now don't have to avoid parked cars and pull in.

Instead car drivers now just keep driving, mostly in excess of the 20mph speed limit, swerving up on to the pavement as they go! The dropped kerbs residents have paid to have installed have made it easy for other drivers to do this, sadly!

The majority of drivers using Mowbray as a cut through do not observe the 20mph speed limit. It is imperative that this speed limit is enforced for the safety of everyone. Even better, a one way system, or no access through Mowbray would be a safer solution!

The proposal regarding turning in to or out of West Town Lane/Wells Road should be scrapped!

Regarding the proposal of the bus lane.

It would make a lot more sense if the proposed bus lane was only operational at peak times morning and afternoon, just like the section running from the junction of Crossways Road, Knowle. The buses which travel along the A37 are predominantly 'country' buses which run less frequently than the Bristol routes. This system has also been in operation for many, many years on the A4 Bath Road in various sections along its length from the A4 Park & Ride.

If the bus lane goes ahead then it will make it more of a reason for drivers to cut around side roads on both sides of the Wells Road to avoid unnecessary delays.

Also, residents on the Wells Road will lose the ability to park their vehicles roadside.

On a final note, I was horrified to learn that Stockwood Ward has previously been let down by the Council by being 'forgotten' to be included in various consultations. Should it not be the duty of our Mayor to know all of the constituencies under his leadership? Or, failing that, are there not advisors employed to remind him of such matters? This seems a very poor state of affairs and Bristol City Council should be mortified at these failings!!

Thank you!

**STATEMENT PS 12**

**Submitted by Stephanie Richmond**

**Title: Trial Scheme of East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood**

Dear Lord Mayor,

“Rank Engineering, as shareholders of Barton Hill Estate Management Ltd, think it is categorically unacceptable to implement this scheme, whereby traffic is diverted through Barton Hill Trading Estate as a cut through; resulting in severe, detrimental, Health & Safety ramifications for Barton Hill Trading Estate employees and customers.”

Kind regards,

Stephanie Richmond, on behalf of Rank Engineering.

## **STATEMENT PS 13**

**Submitted by C Johnson**

**Title: Statement regarding East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood**

After a very questionable consultation process regarding this scheme (and the associated backlash from residents) it seems the council is embarking on another questionable consultation exercise (calling very short notice meetings to undisclosed invitees). It would appear the council is hand-picking individuals to negotiate with, instead of consulting the wider community. At a public meeting regarding this scheme (attended by approx 160 local people, who were highly representative of the community affected) the consensus was overwhelmingly against this idea. The only people who are in favour are a small (unrepresentative) minority. It's interesting that central government has lost its appetite for such schemes (with the prime minister calling for a review of these policies) and the local residents don't want it, yet Bristol forges ahead regardless. It has now been proven in other parts of the country that these schemes are ineffective at achieving their stated goals, and they are now starting to be abandoned. This scheme is supposed to be about making streets & roads safer and cleaner, but it will displace traffic onto congested boundary roads causing more traffic & pollution, making them less safe and clean. I asked my 5 year old son a multiple choice question about this scheme after showing him the map; If cars are stopped from driving through this area, will there be more cars on the roads around the edge, less cars, or the same? He answered "more cars". If it is obvious to a 5 year old, why is it not obvious to the council?



## **STATEMENT PS 14**

**Submitted by Helen Hughes**

### **Title: Statement regarding East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood**

As a keen cyclist and walker, and someone who is fully supportive of having fresh, clean air to breathe as well as of increased safety on our roads, I find Bristol City Council's strategies for achieving these important goals alarming. I would like to see time and resources being focused on creating the infrastructure needed to make our residential streets more pleasant to live in first, rather than on starting with the blunt tool of putting up barriers to motor vehicles, restricting freedom of movement, in the hope that the rest will follow. If the health and well-being of residents is to be the priority, then we will need, for example, to be reassured that local businesses can continue to thrive (the opposite is happening in towns which are already experimenting with 15-minute cities, such as Oxford), money will be spent on existing but run-down green spaces (of which several exist in the trial area) and public transport will be vastly improved - through seeing action on these matters, not just words. It is also clear to me that the Council's chosen strategy is creating further divisions in society, whether inadvertently or not, through the usual "good versus bad", "if you are not for us you must be against us" playbook we see in so many polarising subjects in today's world. It is further alarming to me that, should the planned barriers prove to be unhelpful, then the Council may resort to setting up surveillance cameras to catch motorists out, as well as even more fines: a strategy that has people as well as planet at its heart will not be one that spies on and punishes people who are trying to go about their daily lives within the system they have been born into, not chosen themselves. I would like to call for more consultation, suggesting that a valuable resource would be to involve for example permaculture designers, who would have a much broader view of all the many factors that need to be taken into account and who would listen fairly to all the stakeholders involved in such a project.

# Full Council – 12 September 2023

## Agenda item 6 b

### Public questions



#### Procedural note:

##### Questions submitted by members of the public:

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



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

<b>Ref No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
PQ01	Anita Pearce	Eagle House
PQ02	Margaret Rawlins	Eagle House
PQ03	Suzanne Audrey	Housing
PQ04	David Wherrett	Redcatch Park Tennis Courts
PQ05	Claire Gronow	One City Climate Strategy
PQ06	Sarah Cemlyn	Clean Air Zone
PQ07	Mark Ashdown	Planning Applications
PQ08	Michaela Andrews	Plant Based Solutions
PQ09	Helton Azzel	One City Climate Strategy
PQ10	Martin Rands	MetroBus Planning Conditions
PQ11	Claire Rexworthy	Wells Road
PQ12	Annette Catherine	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ13	Brian Rexworthy	Wells Road
PQ14	Ian Skuse	Wells Road
PQ15	Cliff Evans	Council Tax Benefits
PQ16	Laura Chapman	Broadwalk Development
PQ17	Helen Evans	Planning Decisions
PQ18	Rachel Fagan	Cultural Investment Programme
PQ19	Naomi Campbell	Cultural Funding Allocation
PQ20	Janet Adams	Arts Funding
PQ21	Helen Hughes	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ22	Helen Webster	Redcatch Quarter
PQ23	Peter Liddington	Wells Road
PQ24	Robin Millard	Broadwalk Development
PQ25	Caroline Owens	Broadwalk Development
PQ26	Stephanie Richmond	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ27	David Redgewell	Transport
PQ28	WITHDRAWN	
PQ29	Dan Ackroyd	Metro Underground
PQ30	Dan Ackroyd	Budget
PQ31	Ian Harris	Arts Funding
PQ32	Keep Bristol Moving	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ33	Meg Smith	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ34	Gerard Cooke	Arts Funding
PQ35	David Rexworthy	Wells Road
PQ36	Lesley Robinson	Broadwalk Development

**QUESTION PQ 01**

**Subject: Eagle House**

**Question submitted by: Anita Pearce**

The occupants of the ex youth facility Eagle House, Newquay Rd have repeatedly broken the terms of their contract.

Why have no steps been taken to remove them?



**QUESTION PQ 02**

**Subject: Eagle House**

**Question submitted by: Margaret Rawlins**

When asked at the last Council to consider re-opening the Newquay Rd Youth Club, the Mayor pointed to the new proposed facilities at Inns Court.

Does the Mayor not realise the need is for a local service to tackle a local problem now?



**QUESTION PQ 03**

**Subject: Housing**

**Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey**

[for Cllr Tom Renhard, Cabinet Member for housing delivery and homes]

Question 1.

The 2022/23 housing completion figures should have been submitted by Bristol City Council to the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) by Friday 14 July 2023. As it is now September, please can you tell me the total number of new homes completed in 2022/23, of which how many are classed as affordable, and how many of those are for social rent?

Question 2.

As the cabinet member for housing delivery and homes, please will you give your understanding of the problems associated with single-aspect homes in hyperdense developments?



## QUESTION PQ 04

**Subject: Redcatch Park Tennis Courts**

**Question submitted by: David Wherrett**

I am writing to you in opposition to the current proposals, by council officers and the Elected Mayor, to make Redcatch Park Tennis Courts “Pay Per Play” through the proposed “Bristol Parks Tennis Courts Operating Model” as well as to challenge the consultation process and tactics by Council officers to change these, the only remaining free to play Park Tennis Courts in the City of Bristol.

This proposal, and tactics used by the officers, have resulted in division in the community, where previously there was unity. I will discuss this later.

My complaint is that the process to implement the consultation and the consultation itself is, misleading, biased and deeply flawed.

I plan to put this to the Mayor at the Council Meeting to discuss this via the council Public Forum system on 12th September 2023 at which I intend to be present.

To introduce myself, My name is David Wherrett I am a retired Community and Youth Worker, BA (Hons). Although I no longer live in the area, I do own a rental property in Knowle, which is currently occupied by a young working class family who have two children and I am still a Trustee of a local Charity ‘Rework Ltd’ that works with people and young people in the area, including those with housing and educational/ behavioural issues. So I have an active interest in ensuring local facilities are available for those people, who especially with today’s economic crisis and rising inflation face financial pressures that often mean they cannot afford to feed themselves or their children after paying rent and fuel/ power bills, even if they are working a full week.

In the past I have been heavily involved in both youth and community work, mainly in the Knowle Ward, but also in the Filwood ward. This work was all voluntary and included being the Chairperson of and lead youth worker at both Redcatch Community Centre and latterly for KEY projects (both centred around Redcatch Park). Both of these youth clubs were voluntary sector and self sustainable. All funds were found through outside sources so were not funded by Bristol City Council. It never cost the council a penny.

What it did do was to reduce spending through policing and costs in damages, caused by anti social behaviour, not just In Redcatch Park but also in the wider community. This paved the way for the Park to become the relatively peaceful, enjoyable space for residents it is now.

I was also a committee member of Redcatch and Knowle Community Centres. I was the first Chairperson of Redcatch Community Gardens, and assisted in advising and setting up the Park Knowle football Club. At one time was on the committee of Bristol Junior Football League as child protection officer.

As part of the above work I was the main signatory on the bid to get external funding to improve the facilities for leisure in Redcatch Park for example to MUGA, The Community Shelter and the refurbishment of Redcatch Park Tennis Courts.



I especially remember that I returned the documentation for the Tennis Courts because the forms for me to sign suddenly included that once the work was completed the courts would become 'pay to play'.

I returned the forms then, to the officers in charge of the paperwork because this had not been part of the original plan and, more importantly was not in the interests of young people and others who could not or would not be able to play. As a youth and community worker my work was to include all community members including those most vulnerable.

I argued, as I do now, that Pay Per Play is exclusive rather than inclusive. It is in my opinion against national legislation and probably against Bristol City Councils own ethos rules and regulations. It does not fit with the current drive to get more people involved in active lifestyles and as now is being identified and being brought into consideration would not help, those being excluded from these facilities, with either their physical or mental wellbeing.

The officers in charge of the paperwork quickly removed the statement leaving them free to play. And I duly signed. So this meant after that refurbishment they remained free to play to this day even though council officers have on more than one occasion used somewhat devious tactics to change this and impose Pay Per Play. Most of which have been blocked by the community and community councillors.

Currently Redcatch Park Tennis Courts are free for all to use. There are simply no exclusions. And they are an example of how a community can, without restriction, be fully inclusive. I have been at the courts on many occasions, although no longer play myself. When there I have never seen anyone argue over who has the right to be there. They don't ask about whether they have the money to play, no one challenges anyone about their ethnicity, gender, sexuality, religious beliefs, age or colour. I have never seen an argument about time spent on the court or people arguing over them. Everyone just accepts and respects everyone else wanting to play tennis.

This is a significant factor, and one the people of Knowle and of Bristol can and should be proud of.

So that's the background and the history.

Now to tackle the current attempt by council officials to impose Pay Per Play by using deceit, inaccurate, language and misinforming some members of the local community. And not informing those they spoke to of the full facts.

I also believe the consultation cannot be considered to be a consultation based on the statements I have made above. I also consider the methods used do not include the whole of the community as it is mainly online or by telephone. This excludes those who for one or more reasons do not have access or cannot access these or use these technologies. So it does not include all members of the public.

My questions to the Mayor will be;

**1) The council officers on this issue have not fully investigated all of the options or financial packages available and failed relate to local councillors before releasing "facts" to members of the**





**community of Knowle on this issue. But instead continuing to mislead members of the local community into a false assessment of this situation.**

**2) Why, after several other attempts to make Redcatch Park Tennis Courts Pay to Play, are the council officers so determined to push through and such a biased consultation document that, not only embellishes their misleading statements released to the public, but actually states that any other options to the one they are proposing is not an option they recommend or are prepared to take forward, and as it does not contain an option to say “No” to the proposal then cannot be seen as anything other than biased and non democratic and why does the elected mayor allow himself to be associated with this consultation and plan when he knows that this is misleading and also is against what is both city council guidelines and policy on equalities and possibly against current legal practice, as it excludes the lower social economic classes, and those of different learning abilities or the elderly all who cannot afford, have access to, or understand the technologies required to book courts and thus from free access to sporting and play opportunities?**

I also understand the results of the Council Officers ‘Consultation’ is not going to be released until the very last minute or even after the full council meeting to discuss this issue on 12 September 2023.

However I have carried out my own survey, which was carried out in Redcatch Park on two separate occasions in which I asked the question whether people wanted the Courts to Stay Free to everyone to play or whether they were “happy to pay to play”.

Based on that I now release those replies as a petition as a true voice of users of Redcatch Park on this issue as it reflects what those users actually said.

These are;

Do you want Redcatch Park Tennis Courts to remain free to play for everyone?

Of 156 replies

Yes = 156 (98%)

No = 3 (2%)

The number of people who recorded a Knowle BS4 postcode was 108 (70%) showing many people 36 (23%) were from outside Knowle and 11 (7%) didn’t want to reply.

Further, I also did an online survey via survey monkey which was available for two months and advertised both online and through local newsletters. This asked exactly the same question but recorded only 51 responses of which 47 (92.16%) replied Yes and 4 (7.84%) replied No. there was not the option to put a postcode into this survey.

Notice the low take up on the online survey. This tends to show that most people actually do not take part in online surveys, so just doing online or telephone does not reach the masses. Neither does placing a poster which advocates writing to a council department, especially of its an e mail address as this is also unobtainable to the groups I mentioned above..



So with both surveys showing the great majority of people who actually use the park saying they want the courts to remain free for everyone I base this as my Petition and urge the council to follow the people's wishes, especially as Councillor Gary Hopkins advises that there is indeed the money available through Pots of money that he has identified to meet the refurbishment costs of these courts and keep them free for all players for at least another five years.



**QUESTION PQ 05**

**Subject: One City Climate Strategy**

**Question submitted by: Claire Gronow**

The Bristol Advisory Committee on Climate Change review (Feb 2023) noted that “a series of delivery plans were anticipated to follow from publication of the [One City Climate] Strategy, which would plot the course of implementation. At present, there are no delivery plans to deliver the goals and objectives of each theme.” It’s been 3.5 years since the One City Climate Strategy was delivered. When can we expect to see the delivery plans? If you are unable to answer this, who should I direct this question to?



**QUESTION PQ 06**

**Subject: Clean Air Zone**

**Question submitted by: Sarah Cemlyn**

I welcome the fact that the clean air zone extends up Whiteladies Road (a wealthy part of Bristol), but why does it not equally extend up the (more polluted but less affluent) A38, at least as far Horfield Common? I hope it will soon be so extended, to reduce health problems for pedestrians, cyclists and local residents, and reduce climate damage.

And why has the bike lane on the A38 beside Horfield Common still not been restored? I also hope this will happen soon. It is a very well used route for bikes, but really difficult to negotiate safely alongside heavy, polluting motor traffic.



## QUESTION PQ 07

### Subject: Planning Applications

Question submitted by: Mark Ashdown

These questions are directed to the Mayor, who is identified as the Cabinet member responsible for Major projects (i.e. MetroBus) and Development Management.

Yes/No answers will suffice.

For nearly ten years, the Council has been subject to a number of planning obligations which it has failed to discharge. More recently, it has tried twice to remove these obligations. The first planning application to remove them, 18/02968/X, was refused; the second, 22/05943/X, is pending but no longer being actively prosecuted and Planning Enforcement refuses to enforce the planning obligations. The situation is at an impasse.

#### Question 1

**Does the Council intend to bring planning application 22/05943/X back before the Development Control Committee to be decided?**

#### Question 2

**Will the Local Planning Authority now be instructed to take steps to require the Council to comply with the outstanding 2014/2017 conditions?**

A planning application, 22/05943/X, was issued on 15 December 2022 seeking permission for the removal of conditions 4, 10 and 13 following grant of planning application 16/05853/X for the variation of condition number 18 - Phase 1. for planning permission - 13/05648/FB.

The 2013 application was for a revision to the route of the rapid transit scheme authorised by the Ashton Vale to Temple Meads and Bristol City Centre Rapid Transit Order (the Order). The development comprised construction of a new junction with Cumberland Road, a new bridge at Bathurst Basin, flood protection measures, demolition and reconstruction of walls, realignment of highway, crossings, traffic signals and temporary construction areas, bus stops and shelter. The application was granted subject to conditions on 27 March 2014. These included conditions requiring, amongst other things:

1. A scheme for parking layout within Avon Crescent to ensure that an appropriate means of access is retained to Underfall Yard
2. A review of crossing points in Avon Crescent so that they observe pedestrian desire lines, and associated landscaping.
3. A requirement for 55 replacement trees to be planted in the approved locations. No development was to take place until these had been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

These conditions were to ensure that:

- A coordinated design of the elements identified so as to ensure the satisfactory appearance and functioning of the development, in the interest of the protecting and enhancing the



character of the site and the area its appearance is satisfactory.

- The development provides adequate mitigation for the loss of the trees on the site and complies with the Bristol Tree Replacement Standards.

The proposed scheme was then amended in 2017, 16/05853/X, but the above conditions were not changed.

To date, these conditions have not been discharged, save that some of the 55 trees (24) required have been planted.

In 2018 an application, 18/02968/X, was made which sought the removal of proposed 'Shared space' highway surface treatment, including hard and soft landscaping. - Proposed speed table in the north of Avon Crescent, adjacent entrances to pedestrian / cycle access to the MetroBus stop at Cumberland Basin. - Proposed extended footway area between Avon Crescent and McAdam Way. - Proposed refuge 'island' between the one-way exit from Avon Crescent to Cumberland Road and contraflow cycleway, to protect cyclists. - Removal of realigned retaining wall between Cumberland Road and Avon Crescent. - Proposed retention of existing retaining wall between Cumberland Road and Avon Crescent, with proposed build out and crossing point across Avon Crescent.

All other features proposed for Avon Crescent by planning permission 13/05648/FB would be retained in the amended scheme, including a one-way exit from Avon Crescent to Cumberland Road, reconfigured junction between Avon Crescent and McAdam Way and an echelon parking layout on Avon Crescent.

Despite officers recommending that the application be granted, subject to conditions, it was refused on 5 February 2019. The reasons for refusal were that the proposed development would be harmful to conditions of highway safety, especially for pedestrians, contrary to Policy BCS10 (Transport and Access Improvements) and Policy DM23 (Transport Development Management), which seek design developments to provide safe and adequate access to all road users. The Council has not appealed this decision.

The current 2022 application is still pending, having been withdrawn by the Council on the day it was due to be considered by DCC B on 10 May 2023. The application has not been represented even though the Council was granted an extension to 7 July 2023.

Despite asking, we are unable to ascertain whether or not the Council intends to bring the 2022 application back before the Development Control Committee. Planning Enforcement also refuse to enforce the original 2014/2016 conditions, citing the pending application as its excuse. In the meantime, Avon Crescent has been reopened to traffic, albeit with some token, but wholly unsatisfactory 'safety' measures which do not appear to have been approved with a Traffic Regulation Order.



## QUESTION PQ 08

**Subject: Plant Based Solutions**

**Question submitted by: Michaela Andrews**

My name is Michaela & I have huge concern over the climate emergency and how food systems contribute.

I asked a question at council a year ago. After that, motions on plant-based solutions were tabled by 3 political groups, but they are not being prioritised & haven't been heard. Since these motions have been waiting for this council's attention, we've seen devastating wildfires, extreme heat and mass migrations across the world driven by global heating.

We know that meat and dairy produce many times more greenhouse gas emissions than plant foods. The science is unequivocal. Yet we currently eat twice the global average of meat. Public organisations must step up and show leadership to change this.

In the midst of a climate emergency as declared by this Council, Bristol should be leading the way, but on this we are lagging. Many other councils have voted for fully plant-based internal catering, to prioritise plant-based food options at all council-controlled external sites, and to promote plant-based eating to residents.

My question is simple. Will Council please give this issue the attention it urgently deserves, and debate the motion?



**QUESTION PQ 09**

**Subject: One City Climate Strategy**

**Question submitted by: Helton Azzel**

In February 2023, the Bristol Advisory Committee on Climate Change released its One City Climate Strategy Progress Report with 12 recommendations. Please provide an update of progress against these recommendations in the eight months since the report was released.

What target has Bristol City Council set for private car journeys by 2030 & what measures are proposed to achieve this?





## QUESTION PQ 10

### **Subject: MetroBus Planning Conditions**

#### **Question submitted by: Martin Rands**

Q.1 A planning application 22/05943/X was brought on 15.12.22 to remove all the Metrobus planning conditions attached to the 16/05853/X Metrobus AVTM planning consent.

These conditions were for the provision of a shared space scheme at Avon Crescent, and for the replacement of 55 trees, as mitigation for those felled around Avon Crescent during the construction of Metrobus AVTM. Why was this application pulled on the morning of the development control committee hearing, by the Mayors Office?

Q.2 It was said at the time that this application was to allow 'for further consideration' Exactly when will a s73 variation to the 16/05853/X conditions be re-submitted to the development control committee, or the shared space and trees be provided?

Until consent is given by the development control committee, and Metrobus services continue to run, Bristol City Council remains unlawfully in breach of the planning conditions it imposed upon itself. This sets a very poor precedent for any future 'Western Harbour' development planning conditions.



**QUESTION PQ 11**

**Subject: Wells Road**

**Question submitted by: Claire Rexworthy**

1. Has the council given any thought to the fact the increased volume of traffic being channelled through side roads will have a huge impact on everyone's safety at the well supported childrens play park and green space in Mowbray Road?
2. The Wells Road is not served particularly well by buses, it is predominantly for 'country' buses which are not as frequent as First Bus routes, so why is there a proposal for a 12 hour bus lane from Gilda Parade to the junction of Airport Road/Callington Road?



**QUESTION PQ 12**

**Subject: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood**

**Question submitted by: Annette Catherine**

Please can you advise re the EBLN:

- 1) What responses did you receive from small local businesses, : newsagents, take aways, cafés etc about the economic impact of the proposed zone?
  
- 2) How much income does the council expect to earn from cameras and fines in the zone after the trial?



**QUESTION PQ 13**

**Subject: Wells Road**

**Question submitted by: Brian Rexworthy**

- 1) Why is the proposed bus lane operating longer hours than the one feeding the A4 Park & Ride?
- 2) How are you going to stop speeding drivers using the narrow side streets such as Mowbray Road to gain access to West Town Lane following the proposed No Right Turn at its junction with the Wells Road?



**QUESTION PQ 14**

**Subject: Wells Road**

**Question submitted by: Ian Skuse**

- 1) Why is the proposed bus lane operating longer hours than the one feeding the A4 Park & Ride?
- 2) How are you going to stop speeding drivers using the narrow side streets such as Mowbray Road to gain access to West Town Lane following the proposed No Right Turn at its junction with the Wells Road?



**QUESTION PQ 15**

**Subject: Council Tax Benefits**

**Question submitted by: Cliff Evans**

Given that the Mayor has wasted taxpayers money on projects not wanted by the electorate can he explain why you are now looking at taking money from those that really need it ie. the old and vulnerable of the city by removing their council tax benefits?



**QUESTION PQ 16**

**Subject: Broadwalk Development**

**Question submitted by: Laura Chapman**

Have the circumstances of the Broadwalk planning application raised concerns that the cooling-off period may not be fit for purpose?



**QUESTION PQ 17**

**Subject: Planning Decisions**

**Question submitted by: Helen Evans**

Does the Mayor agree that planning decisions should remain nonpartisan in Bristol?





**QUESTION PQ 18**

**Subject: Cultural Investment Programme**

**Question submitted by: Rachel Fagan**

Can the Mayor tell us why the Cultural Investment Programme 2023-2027 is only scheduled for approval during December Full Council when Bristol workers are losing their jobs right now and arts companies are ceasing trading this month? Can the decision not be placed on the agenda at an earlier Full Council meeting?



**QUESTION PQ 19**

**Subject: Cultural Funding Allocation**

**Question submitted by: Naomi Campbell**

Can the Mayor tell us who the external advisor for the review of the 2023-24 cultural funding allocation will be and what is the process for their appointment?



**QUESTION PQ 20**

**Subject: Arts Funding**

**Question submitted by: Janet Adams**

Arts Funding in Bristol is in crisis thanks to the un-transparent decision making of the Mayor and this Council. The Mayor announced in June that a new independent panel would review the entire cultural funding allocation for 2023-24, but no details about this panel have been forthcoming. Through a high-profile campaign our Trade Union Equity successfully put this issue of transparency on the agenda and in the press across the city. So, in the spirit of transparency, can the Mayor confirm who will be represented on the new independent panel?



**QUESTION PQ 21**

**Subject: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood**

**Question submitted by: Helen Hughes**

1. Can the council please provide the public with the statistics for traffic flow, accidents, and air quality in the area concerned that they are basing the necessity for their scheme on, particularly in comparison with much busier streets such as the adjacent Church Road, along which people also live and work?
2. Can the council please clarify why they have chosen to trial a scheme which restricts motor mobility so drastically, by blocking off roads completely, possibly installing cameras and using financial penalties, rather than the more traditional traffic calming measures such as speed bumps, speed cushions and chicanes?



**QUESTION PQ 22**

**Subject: Redcatch Quarter**

**Question submitted by: Helen Webster**

Does this council believe it was valid for Development Committee A to debate affordable housing in the Redcatch Quarter application on 5th July, even though affordable housing was not cited as a reason for refusing the application on 31st May, and there had been no material changes?



## QUESTION PQ 23

**Subject: Wells Road**

**Question submitted by: Peter Liddington**

[FAO: Don Alexander - Cabinet member for Transport.]

1) Can you please explain why a bus lane is needed (if at all?) but for the proposed 12 hours (7am - 7pm) on the A37 Wells Road between New Fosse Way Road and Callington Road/Airport Road when there are only 4 buses each hour going each way (2 x 172 & 2 x 376). There is no traffic problem and the problems this will cause with residents parking are enormous - most houses do not have driveways!

So, there is no need for it.

2) If you go ahead with your proposals to prevent a right-turn from the Wells Road into West Town Lane, how do you intend to stop Beryl Grove, Mowbray Road, Imperial Road, Hazelbury Road becoming more of 'rat runs' than they already are? Surely a more sensible solution is to abandon the bus lane proposal and to implement a right turn filter at the traffic lights on the West Town Lane junction. The alternative would be to make Beryl Grove, Mowbray Road, Imperial Road & Hazelbury Road 'no-through' roads so that traffic has to keep to the main A37 Wells Road. The side roads, I have mentioned, have large numbers of children walk to and from school each day and their safety would be jeopardised.



**QUESTION PQ 24**

**Subject: Broadwalk Development**

**Question submitted by: Robin Millard**

Does this council feel it was appropriate for Richard Eddy to be meeting with Mr Slocombe and advocating on behalf of the Broadwalk developers AFTER a resolution had been passed, directly resulting in Cllr Eddy making statements like “I'm expecting (hopefully not forlornly) to see the positive fruits of that chat early next week- before Wednesday's DC 'A' Committee” and (on 4th July) “I am considerably more confident about the appropriate determination for Broad Walk than when I spoke to you today”?



**QUESTION PQ 25**

**Subject: Broadwalk Development**

**Question submitted by: Caroline Owens**

I would like to ask the council why the decision to refuse the application for Broadwalk redevelopment was overturned when the original reasons for rejection still exist. Can you also explain why council members were still engaged with the development / planners after the scheme had been refused still advocating for the development? The democratic process doesn't seem to have worked here at all.





## QUESTION PQ 26

**Subject: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood**

**Question submitted by: Stephanie Richmond**

Q1: Why is BCC adopting an unnecessary overarching macro approach to traffic management across East Bristol? For example, if an initiative cuts everyone arms off, then only the ones with gangrene for instance would benefit. Beaufort Road clearly has issues. A potential way to cope would be turning Beaufort Road into a one way road, or even directing the flow one way in the morning and another way in the afternoon/evening for example. This approach need not necessarily negatively affect those living in streets whom don't require traffic management.

Q2: What analysis has been done to ensure that 'Young Lungs At Work' will not be exacerbated by this scheme? For example, the proposals will cause even more queuing outside Briarwood Special School and Summerhill Academy, which has already been recently negatively affected by the recent CAZ displacement. Bristol's inner city streets have been designed to cope with heavy traffic, not the outer city streets; the infrastructure is not there. Thus, this could lead to an increase in toxic air, which has been proven to increase child mortality and decrease the life expectancy of children.



## QUESTION PQ 27

### Subject: Transport

Question submitted by: David Redgewell

#### Question 1 .

What discussion has taken place between Bristol city council and mayor Marvin Rees and Dan Norris west of England mayor and the combined transport Authority Department for transport and Bath and North East Somerset council and Bristol East MP Kerry McCarthy. On the A4 Bristol city centre Bristol Bus and coach station Bristol Temple meads station, Arnos vale, Bristlington, keynsham, saltford, Bath spa bus and coach station. On bus services improvement plans. New bus stops interchanges. At Bristol Temple meads station, Arnos vale, Bristlington, keynsham, Saltford, Newbridge, Weston, Bath spa bus and coach station. Walking and cycling facilities.

And the proposal for the Extention of St Philips causeway through Bristlington to Hick Gate as replacement Road For the A4 through Arnos vale and Bristlington and the Trunk road Bristlington bypass. To which we understand there is no Department for transport funding allocated. And the Highway Authority is still Bristol city council and Banes council.

#### Question 2

In view of the importance of mass transit and a light rail system for Greater Bristol and Bath city region. Has mayor Rees and Bristol city council raised with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and mayor Dan Norris and Bath and North East Somerset council. The use of the North Somerset Railway Corridor as a light railway mass transit / Bus Corridor Between Bristol Temple meads station, Arnos vale, Brislington, Talbot road station Callington road corridor to both to keynsham saltford Newbridge Weston Bath spa bus and coach station.

And to Hengrove Whitchurch estate Hartcliffe and Bristol Airport Both corridor could include walking and cycling facilities alongside a mass transit system. With a mass transit interchange at Bristol Temple meads station. These options were first looked at by James Freeman former Md of first west of England buses. Will the mayor Rees promote this sustainable transit corridor?



**QUESTION PQ 28**

WITHDRAWN



**QUESTION PQ 29**

**Subject: Metro Underground**

**Question submitted by: Dan Ackroyd**

Metro Mayor Norris has said that there is no chance of Bristol getting an underground, at least from the current 'Metro' proposal. I realise the proposal includes both overground and underground elements. What odds do you think the Metro proposal that you're backing will actually progress?



## QUESTION PQ 30

**Subject: Budget**

**Question submitted by: Dan Ackroyd**

When you became mayor, you inherited a council that was not entirely fit for purpose. The Bundred report gave a list of problems that included, according to contemporary reporting from Bristol Live [https://urldefense.com/v3/\\_\\_https://www.bristolpost.co.uk/news/bristol-news/shock-report-bungling-council-mismanagement-323\\_\\_!!KUxdu5-bBfnh!6De8WUII8R09D\\_RFTuEZU4\\_XdgJb7vbCNxT2vjz1xvsOUSemoGMFOP009RAUF4Lwf2tFhPsiKxeVIANRrqp4ie9S4VAaZwS5\\$](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https://www.bristolpost.co.uk/news/bristol-news/shock-report-bungling-council-mismanagement-323__!!KUxdu5-bBfnh!6De8WUII8R09D_RFTuEZU4_XdgJb7vbCNxT2vjz1xvsOUSemoGMFOP009RAUF4Lwf2tFhPsiKxeVIANRrqp4ie9S4VAaZwS5$):

- \* A collective failure of leadership within the council for which several people, including politicians, bear responsibility;
- \* An entire annual budget (for 2016/17) approved on the basis of a "false" assumption that previously agreed cuts had been fully carried out and savings delivered.
- \* An unwillingness to accept bad news among the council's senior leadership team;
- \* Reports which "misled" councillors because they were so "consistently over-optimistic";
- \* The "routine practice" of which saw officers "bury information in big reports";

Obviously your administration has addressed many of the problems noted by the Bundred report by implementing some of the proposed changes, but what do you think is the chance that the next administration is going to inherit similar budget problems, due to similar dysfunction at high levels in the council?



**QUESTION PQ 31**

**Subject: Arts Funding**

**Question submitted by: Ian Harris**

Given that arts organisations are being lost, and workers in the arts in Bristol are losing jobs right now as a consequence of the Mayor's decision to severely delay funding decisions in the Cultural Investment Programme, when will arts organisations/ individuals be able to apply for further funding?

Can the Mayor commit to our trade union, Equity, that he will not put workers jobs at risk in this way again?



**QUESTION PQ 32**

**Subject: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood**

**Question submitted by: Keep Bristol Moving**

Please will you provide risk assessment details for emergency services, commercial / towing and service vehicles (accessing, manoeuvring & exiting) East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood streets which are blocked at one end with physical obstructions?



**QUESTION PQ 33**

**Subject: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood**

**Question submitted by: Meg Smith**

Can the council guarantee a further consultation with the public after a set trial period for the East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood scheme?

Can the council inform me if they are in support of Net Zero emissions for the EBLN rather than purely traffic management?





**QUESTION PQ 34**

**Subject: Arts Funding**

**Question submitted by: Gerard Cooke**

In July our trade union, Equity, held a rally outside City Hall to support of the workers whose contracts had been put at risk by the damaging and kneejerk decision making by the Mayor to delay and cut arts funding in the city. The rally was attended by many workers who do not know if they will have contracts come September. So can the Mayor tell these workers when the announcement will be made to arts organisations on the 23/24 funding award?



**QUESTION PQ 35**

**Subject: Wells Road**

**Question submitted by: David Rexworthy**

1. The bus services along the Wells Road are mainly country routes which run few and far between and nowhere near as often as First Bus Bristol routes. So, why does this proposal detail the need for a 12-hour bus lane from Gilda Parade all the way down to the junction with Airport Road/Callington Road?
2. Have the council, or yourself, given any thought into the additional risks these proposed changes will present to the extremely popular and well-loved children's play park and green space in Mowbray Road?



**QUESTION PQ 36****Subject: Broadwalk Development****Question submitted by: Lesley Robinson**

I am concerned, and would question why, when the plans for the above redevelopment were unanimously refused on 31 May, it was acceptable for them to be passed on 5 July because the developer intended to use Homes England grants to increase the number of affordable housing. Surely this should not have been permitted. This is particularly concerning when the lack of affordable housing was not cited as a reason for the refusal on 31 May. There were a large number of objections and concerns raised; particularly regarding the inappropriateness of the mass and structure in relation to the local area and current surrounding residential buildings. I understand that Councillor Eddy also attempted to sign off factually inaccurate minutes for the meeting on 31st May.

Is the Mayor concerned that a senior member of his office (Kevin Slocombe) was in extensive conversation with Savills planning consultants and the Chair of DCA regarding this planning application after DCA had resolved to refuse the scheme. Is it appropriate for Richard Eddy to be meeting with Mr Slocombe and advocating on behalf of the Broadwalk developers after a resolution had been passed.

