

# Summons to attend meeting of Full Council



**Date:** Tuesday, 14 November 2023

**Time:** 5.30 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, 3 November 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 - 56)**

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 10 November 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 8 November 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, 3 November 2023



# Public Forum

**Date:** Tuesday, 14 November 2023



## Agenda

### 1. Public Petitions Received

(Page 3)

Ref No	Name	Title
PP01	Bristol Allotment Forum	Hosepipe Ban

### 2. Public Statements Received

(Pages 4 - 29)

Ref No	Name	Title
PS01	Suzanne Audrey	Appointment of Independent Persons
PS02	Jen Smith	Independent Inquiry into the facts, faults and failings surrounding 'Send surveillance
PS03	Donna Sealey	Support for Just Transition Declaration at Full Council
PS04	Karen Self	Golden Motion
PS05	Mike Oldreive	Appointment of Independent Persons for Coun Complaints
PS06	Suzanne Wilson	The Just Transition declaration
PS07	Sian Ellis-Thomas	Values & Ethic Committee
PS08	Abdul Malik Easton Jamia Mosque	The ongoing genocide and ethnic cleansing in G
PS09	Keep Bristol Moving	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood.
PS10	Norman Zahn	15 Minute Cities
PS11	Lesley Powell	Code of Conduct Complaints
PS12	Bristol Allotment Forum	Allotment Hosepipe Bans
PS13	Sally Bowman	Golden Motion
PS14	Mubashar Chaudhry	Show Solidarity with Innocent Civilians
PS15	Dan Ackroyd	Value and Ethics
PS16	David Redgewell	Transport
PS17	Lori Streich	Golden Motion
PS18	Ellie Keen	Israeli Colours

PS19	Megs Smith	Electric Vehicles
------	------------	-------------------

### 3. Public Questions Received

Ref No	Name	Title	(Pages 30 - 54)
PQ01	Lena Wright	RPZ Consultation	
PQ02	Molly Sherlaw-Fryer	Food Sustainability Motion	
PQ03	Dan Ackroyd	Arena Island	
PQ04	Mike Oldreive	Independent Persons	
PQ05	Jenny Harrison	Food Sustainability Motion	
PQ06	Suzanne Audrey	Independent Persons	
PQ07	Harry Simpson	Bus Services	
PQ08	Jen Smith	Independent Persons	
PQ09	Keith Farley	Independent Persons	
PQ10	Lesley Powell	Independent Persons	
PQ11	Railfuture Sevenside	Mass Transit and Transport Levy	
PQ12	Bristol Disability Equalities Forum	Transport Accessibility	
PQ13	Tim Hayes	Events at Lloyds Amphitheatre	
PQ14	Veronica Wignall	Food Advertising	
PQ15	Martin Rands	Avon Crescent	
PQ16	Joanna Booth	Independent Persons	
PQ17	Sian Ellis Thomas	Member Code of Conduct	
PQ18	Joe Banks	Member Code of Conduct	
PQ19	Megs Smith	Net Zero Transport	
PQ20	Megs Smith	5G Masts	
PQ21	Keep Bristol Moving	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhoods	

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

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



**PP 01 Bristol Allotment Forum – Hosepipe Ban (264 signatures)**

We the undersigned support Bristol Allotments Forum in seeking to overturn the total hosepipe ban imposed by Bristol City Council (BCC) due to a perceived risk of contracting Legionnaire's Disease.

The Forum believes:

1. There is no proven evidence that legionella bacteria can be contracted through hosepipes connected to mains water supplies. No horticultural or public health body advocate such a ban.
2. Distributing harvested rainwater via a hose poses no risk whatsoever as bio-aerosols cannot be created.
3. The ban discriminates against persons with medical or disability issues.

Lifting the current unjustified ban is a pre-requisite of the Forum partnering with BCC to reduce mains water use by increasing rainwater storage and other eco-friendly practices such as mulching.

Bristol Allotments Forum enables plot holders to meet and discuss issues directly with BCC officers.

## STATEMENT PS 01

**Submitted by Suzanne Audrey**

**Title: Appointment of Independent Persons**

At the Values and Ethics Committee on 9 October 2023 the Monitoring Officer stated that Independent Persons were appointed by the Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal Services, and there was no requirement in the legislation stating that the appointment was made by Full Council.

A post-meeting clarification dated 20 October 2023 indicated: "The recent recruitment process for Independent Persons will require the ratification of those appointments by Full Council and it is anticipated that this will be at the next ordinary meeting of Full Council on 14 November." ([Public Pack\)Minutes Document for Values and Ethics Sub-Committee, 27/09/2021 13:00 \(bristol.gov.uk\)](#))

Since the ratification of Mr Christopher Eskell on 10 September 2013 ([0910\\_mins2.pdf \(bristol.gov.uk\)](#)) a number of Independent Persons have been appointed but not ratified by Full Council. However, we do not know how many, who they were, when they were appointed, and why Full Council was not asked to ratify them in line with Section 28 of the Localism Act 2011.

This should not be dismissed as a minor issue that has been corrected by the ratification of three Independent Persons today. The public, and councillors, have the right to know who all the Independent Persons have been over the last 10 years.

Questions about this important issue have been submitted to Full Council today, and I hope they will be answered without evasion.

If clear responses are not provided, it seems inevitable that requests will be made through the Council's complaints procedure or Freedom of Information process which could lead to the involvement of the Legal Ombudsman, Local Government Ombudsman or Information Commissioner's Office.

Hopefully that will not be necessary and we will be provided with the information in response to our questions.

## **STATEMENT PS 02**

**Submitted by Jen Smith**

**Title: Independent Inquiry into the facts, faults and failings surrounding' Send surveillance**

It's been over a year since Full Council voted for the Mayor to agree to hold a 'genuinely independent inquiry, conducted by the LGA or similar appropriate body into all the facts, faults and failings surrounding' Send surveillance.

The Mayor has not agreed to this. A complaint I made to the Monitoring Officer regarding this has been rejected, despite the entire incident bringing the city of Bristol into disrepute.

I wonder why the council has gone to such lengths to bury it. It makes a mockery of every single councillor who voted for the motion and shows Bristol to be undemocratic.

That the investigation never took place implies that the council has things to hide. I would also question how many residents have been subject to surveillance, for what purpose and how much data has been collated to profile people?

Make no mistake, the surveillance affects people's personal lives. Services have been withheld because of it and senior members of staff conspired to come up with plans in retaliation.

I have found people from external sources, the ICB and Bristol City Council all in discussion at one time or another regarding the data that had collected, shared and stored.

Bristol is a place where human rights breaches are council sanctioned and when called out, covered up.

**STATEMENT PS 03**

**Submitted by Donna Sealey**

**Title: Support for Just Transition Declaration at Full Council 14.11**

Ambition Lawrence Weston has been working closely with the other community climate action partners across the city and this level of work is so important to ensure that communities are not left behind by both the climate and ecological emergencies. Ambition Lawrence Weston fully supports the Just Transition Declaration principles to ensure that all local residents are not left behind and have communities have a fair and just transition to Britain's future.



## **STATEMENT PS 04**

**Submitted by Karen Self**

**Title: Golden Motion**

I wish to show my support for the Golden Motion from Councillor Ellie King and make some additional points:-

- On dentistry, there is a national crisis in NHS provision caused by 13 years of Tory cutbacks and an inability to plan. It is a shame on this country that a prime cause of young children being admitted to hospital is a dental problem.
- There is a huge disparity in the city when it comes to healthcare, leading to poorer outcomes for more deprived parts of the city. For women living in Southmead life expectancy is 8 years lower than if you lived in Cotham. Child poverty in some parts of the city is chronic, leading to poor health outcomes in this demographic. A child in Westbury-on Trym / Henleaze is much more likely to be able to afford healthy food options and be able to access private healthcare than one in Lawrence Hill.

Levelling up is needed in the City and this can only be achieved by a government committed to providing funding to do this.

- There is a chronic need to increase the local provision of GP medical centres. Some practices have thousands of registered patients located in some of the most deprived areas of the city. The impact of this is people being unable to get through to a GP reception to make an appointment, leading to delays in treatment and poorer outcomes.
- BNSSG ICB needs to understand the needs of its population and react accordingly. As the manager of a mental health charity that is focussed co-production I welcome the roll out of the MINTs (although not the acronym!). But we must gauge the success of these delivery models by appropriate monitoring and be prepared to adapt them as required
- BNSSG ICB needs to understand the specific needs of the local community and put in place plans that reflect the demand of those communities. The 2021 census and local population modelling are key to this.
- Of personal note to me is the number of people who identify as transgender or non-binary in Bristol according to the census and the appalling provision of trans healthcare. Recently there was a case of a young trans woman who took her own life as she was unable to access timely healthcare on the NHS – a trans person who refers themselves to an NHS GP today can expect to wait 20 years for a first appointment!
- There is a crisis in mental health, the city needs to respond to this with an integrated approach by healthcare professionals, the VCSE sector and decision makers. I welcome the proposed resolution in the motion to carry out a strategic needs assessment of health care provision and bring that report back to Full Council, the Health and Wellbeing board and the Health Scrutiny Committee.
- Prevention is better than cure and this is true for so many aspects of healthcare. The city needs to ensure that it publicises early interventions that can prevent worse outcomes. We need as a city to work as one to publicise things such as:-

- o Cancer screening (e.g. people with a cervix or a prostate, breast cancer screening)
- o Good oral hygiene (especially in children)
- o Preventative treatments (eg. Anastrozole for breast cancer, PrEP for HIV)
- o Physical exercise that is accessible for all

I urge all councillors to support this important motion

## STATEMENT PS 05

Submitted by Mike Oldreive

### Title: Appointment of Independent Persons for Councillor Complaints

Potentially Unlawful Actions Committed by the Monitoring Officer & Head of Legal Services -  
Concerns about the Management of the Members' Complaints Process

Agenda item 14 is presented as a straightforward "ratification" of appointments. I believe that the Monitoring Officer (MO) and the Head of Legal Services (HOLS) may have acted unlawfully in past appointments of individuals to the role of Independent Person (IP), dating back as far as 2018, when the MO was appointed. I want to alert Members to the background to this Item and to ask them to NOT ratify these appointments until they have clear and absolute confirmations from the Monitoring Officer & the Chief Executive to the 3 issues below. Namely that:

1. IP appointments made to date (since 2018) have been made lawfully, and by extension whether any payments made to individuals were lawful. Also, that complainants' information shared with these 3rd parties could be lawfully shared under the terms of GDPR.
2. the "robust process" mentioned by the MO at para 8, Agenda Item 14 met all the requirements of section 28 of the Localism Act 2011, and that Members and the public have a full understanding of what this "robust process" was. [ It refers to a "Council" process but who exactly was involved?]
3. None of these individuals had previously been instructed/appointed to any member complaints process by the Monitoring Officer or Head of Legal Services, nor been involved in any complaints work to date.

#### Background

I have attended the last 3 meetings of the Values & Ethics Sub-committee, which oversees the Members complaints process. The MO and HOLs responses & behaviours have been characterised by a lack of openness and accountability (under the reason of "confidentiality").

They have, amongst other items:

- refused to say how many IPs have been appointed in the past, the dates of appointment or the names of IPs
- failed to report to V&E significant delays to decide even if a complaint is valid (5 months in my case)
- failed to inform members that the reason for an update of the complaints process was a requirement of a LG Ombudsman findings report, which also asked that the Council apologise to me for the delay of 5 + months
- attempted to impose confidentiality on members of the public, and used perceived confidentiality breaches as a reason to refuse to decide complaints. (LGA guidance makes it clear that this is not possible to impose confidentiality on the public).
- attempted to cancel 25 September V&E on the grounds that there were "too many questions from public forum". A member of the public pointed out that this needed a member vote and Members voted to allow us to read our statements and had a brief discussion.

At 9 October V&E I asked the MO if he could confirm that the appointment of IPs by himself and Head of Legal Services met the requirements of s28 of the Localism Act. The MO answered:

“The process to appoint the IPs was carried out by myself & the HOLS. We advertised these roles; we undertook an interview process & we appointed a pool of independent persons. There is no requirement in the legislation, and in fact I think it would be a complete misreading of the legislation, to think that that appointment would need to be made by Full Council. Our constitution is clear that there's only some very discrete roles that are appointed by Full Council”. (this is a verbatim transcript from a video recording).

After the meeting I wrote to the Chief Executive to voice my concerns about this statement, as I now believed that the MO & HOLS may have acted unlawfully in making these appointments. A few days later Mr O’Gara wrote to me to “apologise for any confusion in the meeting” and said that: “Having reviewed the relevant legislation I would like to clarify the position ... the recent recruitment process for IPs will require the ratification of those appointments by Full Council”. Note that this correction does not extend clarify appointments made since 2018, or whether the individuals to be ratified today have already been working on complaints cases (without Member approval –which would be unlawful).

The MO did not attend V&E 3 November, so as of 7 November my questions as to the legality of the appointments made since 2018 remain unanswered and members have had only 1 meeting out of 3 to explore any concerns over the members' complaints process.

#### Conclusion

This issue of the process of IP appointments is not just a “technicality” and it is not a trivial matter. I believe that it may be an attempt to legitimise previous unlawful appointments. The Monitoring Officer has a lot of power: as regards members’ complaints his decision is final and cannot be challenged, as there is no right of appeal. This is why the integrity of the MO role is essential. The role of the IP is also a key backstop in the complaints process.

The Local Government Association says : It is vital that the public has confidence in the high standards of local government, and that there is transparency about the conduct of councillors and the mechanisms for dealing with alleged breaches of the Codes of Conduct. Equally, it is vital that councillors themselves have confidence in these mechanisms, and that investigations into such complaints abide by the principles of natural justice.

How can the public (or Councillors) trust the process if the Monitoring Officer has acted unlawfully in the appointment of IPs?

The Monitoring Officer is the statutory officer responsible for the legal governance of a local authority . They have a legal duty to ensure councils fulfil statutory obligations and apply their codes of conduct. This includes investigating and reporting on anything the authority does that has the potential to be an illegal action.

In this case I believe that the Monitoring Officer himself (together with the Head of Legal Services) may have acted unlawfully in undertaking the appointment of IPs without regard to the relevant legislation and in particular, in excluding members from their lawful role in the IP recruitment and appointments process during his tenure.

## **STATEMENT PS 06**

**Submitted by Suzanne Wilson**

**Title: The Just Transition declaration**

Climate impacts are most likely to affect those that are least likely to cause carbon emission and have least agency to protect themselves from the effects of climate change. The Just Transition declaration centres efforts to reduce climate emissions with the expertise of disadvantaged people, empowers them to take action and build resilience and stands in solidarity with those experiencing the worst climate and ecological impacts across the world.

The community climate action project has empowered 6 communities around Bristol to co-produce climate action plans and are now undertaking work to tackle the climate and ecological crisis led by those communities. By the end of our programme 18 communities across Bristol will have a co-produced action plan making a powerful network to provide community leadership and insight into a just transition to zero carbon Bristol. We hope the Just Transition will receive not just cross party support but create allies and advocates for it.

## **STATEMENT PS 07**

**Submitted by Sian Ellis-Thomas**

**Title: Values & Ethic Committee**

I was present at the Values & Ethics committee meetings on 25th September and 9th October. Earlier this year I also attended and spoke at a meeting for the Committee System Working Group. Each time it was to shed light on the Member Code of Conduct and the systematic failure of the procedures behind it.

I am here today to do the same.

As stated in a report submitted to the Values & Ethic Committee on 25th September. From 17/10/22 until 25/8/23 there had been 13 complaints received. Since then, we know there have been a further three complaints. So in a period of 12 months (at least) 16 complaints have been received, with 50% of them being about a single member.

Not one of the complaints has been upheld by the Monitoring Officer.

More worrying, is that a recent FOI request has uncovered that not one single complaint has been upheld for the last 6 years. Nor have these results been submitted to the relevant committee.

If the members of this chamber are not concerned about these statistics, then you are not paying attention. Stats that should be indicating a red flag are being completely ignored thus enabling and encouraging further bad behaviour.

The Member Code of Conduct is in place to protect the public and officers from the bad behaviour of some members. Do you think we feel protected? We do not. We are being failed.

Without robust and transparent procedures behind it, any Member Code of Conduct is purely lip service.

There is a culture of covertness, an extreme lack of transparency, stock replies and apparent obfuscation when it comes to complaints. It appears that it is more expedient to dismiss all complaints and to keep the process as opaque as possible.

The MO role is that of a gatekeeper who is apparently impervious and this acts as a shield for all councillors and the leadership of the Council. There is no scrutiny of the MO's objectivity, fairness or decision making and having already admitted clear failures in process regarding data reporting and the appointment of Independent Persons, it is time to review the parameters of this role and to set in place more robust procedures that properly safeguard the public and restore trust in the complaints process.

We are asking you all to care more, question more and do more.

## **STATEMENT PS 08**

### **Submitted by Easton Jamia Mosque**

#### **Title: Profound Sorrow and Concern Over the Ongoing Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing in Gaza**

To the members of Bristol City Council

We gather here today to express our profound sorrow and concern over the ongoing genocide and ethnic cleansing in Gaza, which has resulted in the tragic loss of innocent lives, both among adults and children. The recent numbers of casualties paint a grim picture of the human toll this conflict has taken on the region.

We must stand united in our call for an immediate ceasefire to protect the lives of innocent children and adults who continue to suffer in this dire situation. The numbers of lives lost, both among adults and children, remind us of the urgent need for a peaceful resolution to this conflict.

In addition to our call for a ceasefire, we urge the international community to ensure immediate access to food, clean water, and medical aid for Palestinians affected by the conflict. It is imperative that we address the basic humanitarian needs of the innocent civilians caught in the crossfire.

The suffering of families, children, and adults trapped under the rubble of their homes is a harrowing consequence of this ongoing conflict, and we must prioritise their rescue and assistance. Their lives hang in the balance, and our duty is to act swiftly.

In the spirit of unity and solidarity with all affected parties, we propose that Bristol City Hall be illuminated in the colors of the Palestinian flag following the display of the colors of the Israeli flag. This gesture demonstrates our commitment to equality and peace for all, regardless of nationality or background. As a council, we must send a message that we value every human life and stand for peace and reconciliation in the face of tragedy.

Let us join together in condemning the violence and loss of life, and let our actions reflect our dedication to a future where all can live without fear and in harmony. We also wish to inform this council that our initial intention was to submit a petition to trigger a motion and discussion in this council following the successful gathering of the required petition signatures. However, due to the deadlines and procedures, democratic services have regrettably not allowed us to do so at this time. We have been informed that this intended action will be more likely to take place at the next council meeting in December, and we have a right to expect your understanding and support as we work to bring this matter to the council's attention.

Let us collectively work toward a resolution that not only calls for a ceasefire but also addresses the immediate humanitarian needs and the plight of those trapped under the rubble, as we await the opportunity to formally submit our petition for the intended council motion for a further discussion and contributions by council elected members at a future full council meeting.

## **STATEMENT PS 09**

**Submitted by Keep Bristol Moving**

**Title: Regarding East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood.**

Since early summer it has stated, on a number of occasions, and through multiple channels (including the Mayor's blog) that there would be a full consultation on EBLN in autumn of this year.

This suggests that the original consultation was inadequate.

At a meeting on the 9th October I pressed the project manager for the details of the full consultation, he said "what we mean by full consultation is there will be an opportunity to object to the individual Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs)".

To attempt to say what is meant by full consultation is the opportunity to object to each individual measure at the TRO application stage is ridiculous, as many members of the community would agree.

After the manager's statement at the meeting, I put it to him that he is tasked with getting this scheme in place come what may, regardless of public support.

Therefore cannot carry out a proper consultation, as it would expose the lack of support, and the scheme would not go ahead. He offered no reply.

As it is the intention to initially install two of these schemes, followed by two per year going forward, the consultation should be citywide.

Closing a large area to through traffic does not just affect those within the boundary, but also people from all over Bristol as well as its visitors.

This administration needs to do the right thing by the people, in order to re-gain some trust, and honour its word to fully consult.



**STATEMENT PS 10**

**Submitted by Norman Zahn**

**Title:** 15 Minute Cities

I think that 15 minute cities may have a negative effect on the ability of people to move freely around their neighbourhoods, and restrict the ability of ambulances is to get their destinations quickly.

I think that the way that decisions are made, decisions that have far reaching consequences for the Citizens of Bristol, should be made in a way that incorporate a much larger range of points of View than is presently done.

## **STATEMENT PS 11**

**Submitted by Lesley Powell**

**Title: Code of Conduct Complaints**

My very personal and painful experience of the public side of the Code of Conduct Complaints 'Process' is that it is woefully lacking being disrespectful and dismissive of the honesty, intellect of and / or the emotional turmoil that the complainant may have suffered. Even the correspondence, in my opinion, is unprofessionally sloppy, indicating a lack of engagement. The 'process' appears to be totally opaque, and secretive, with such scant detail being shared, there is nothing to audit. Indeed, it was failing to comply with reporting to Values and Ethics Sub Committee (VE) (its audit gateway) at all until prompted by an FOI. That does not convey confidence....

In Sept / October a 'report' was submitted to VE summarising the Code of Conduct Complaints. This 'report' was a table of one line summaries, which had such scant detail it didn't even confirm to VE how long a complaint had taken to respond to let alone give any form of detail regarding the seriousness of the complaint or how many complaints were about the same Cllr. In fact, absolutely nothing to generate debate to enable the VE committee to provide the assurance I assumed they were in place to provide. Until several aggrieved complainants, who felt very let down by the complaints 'process' started asking questions, attending VE meetings and asking questions publicly, there was, it seemed an opaque screen between the gatekeepers of the 'process', the Cllrs who had been the subject of the complaints and the audit process.

At least some change has started to occur:

- The Complaints Process is moving to the LGO model
- The Member Code of Conduct is being amended (although 'confidentiality' is embodied).
- Code of Conduct complaints are being tabled at Value and Ethics sub committee (Committee Cllrs are now questioning the detail being presented).
- Appointment of IP(s) – Approval of Full Council being sought albeit retrospectively having not seemingly followed due process.

The current complaints system appears, to me, to be geared only to protecting the Councillor:

- It fails to 'investigate' a complaint using multiple excuses to avoid this and thus reject the complaint.
- It fails to probe whether a Councillor response is truthful or not, it merely responds to the complainant with the Cllrs response seemingly accepting it all to be true.
- It fails to be unsympathetic in any shape or form to the complainant disregarding the intellect, integrity or emotional suffering of the complainant.
- It fails to consider the safeguarding of the person making the complaint (or indeed whole committees making their complaint). Fear of reprisals has delayed a number of complainants submitting, despite years of issues. The time delay has then been the reason for the complaint dismissal because it wasn't 'current'.
- It fails to be a complaints system in any shape or form, save its name

- It has failed to investigate ANY of the 16 complaints, (amounting to over 32 people) in 12 months, of which 50% have been about one Cllr, with no red flags, no investigations, no acceptance of any wrongdoing.
- It fails to provide any assurance about the detail of appointment of IP 'consulted' about the complaint.

I and others thought the Member Code of Conduct was in place to support us and enable us to make complaints if a Cllr's conduct is not deemed conducive with expectation, yet it's nothing of the sort. It falls short of even being lip service with complainants (singly or in groups via committees) left terrified of being the subject of further targeting (and indeed being so) because the Cllr has been emboldened by the 'decision' to find in their favour, and even publicly bragging about the outcome in published material. Is this the expectation when we vote a Cllr into post and fund their 'allowances'? 'No. Of course not' should be the answer of anyone who has integrity. But it is not the reality.

Seemingly, there is no investigation of the 'facts', no interview, no follow up, nothing. Just a poorly written excuse of refusal.

- 'Too late';
- 'Too similar to another complaint';
- 'Vexatious';
- 'The Cllr denies it all.....'

And that's it. Complaint over. No appeal, no transparency, no consideration of the complainants suffering; no red flags....so the behaviour continues without fear of redress.

This is certainly not what we should expect but it's what we have got and there's seemingly very little we can do about it.

## STATEMENT PS 12

### Submitted by Bristol Allotment Forum

#### Title: Allotment Hosepipe Bans

A 'temporary' hosepipe ban was imposed by Bristol City Council (BCC) on all its allotment sites in 2017, pending water infrastructure improvements. Tenants were advised that the water authority had insisted on the ban due to the risk of contaminated water being drawn back into the public water supply.

When the infrastructure improvements were completed, tenants were advised that the ban was to remain in place, with the justification now shifting to a supposed risk of Legionnaire's Disease, even though the Council's legionella risk assessments do not identify a ban as a required control measure.

Legionnaire's Disease is a form of pneumonia and can **only** be contracted when minute water droplets containing the bacteria, known as bio-aerosols, are inhaled, and drawn deeply into the lungs. It requires significant pressure to create such tiny aerosols. **No other form of contact with water contaminated with legionella bacteria poses any risk of contracting the disease.**

Allotment tenancy agreements already prohibit the use of hosepipes for the direct watering of crops, but tenants have been allowed to use hosepipes for filling water butts and tanks from the mains supply.

The current ban prohibits *all* use of hosepipes, both for filling water butts from the mains supply *and* for the movement of harvested rainwater within individual plots – neither of these scenarios can generate the kind of pressure required to create bio-aerosols and there is no justification for banning the use of hoses for either context. Indeed, the BCC risk assessment states, 'If the water pressure is too low to enable water aspiration [creation of bio-aerosols] then there is NO RISK of Legionella'.

The ban has potentially serious implications for many tenants, especially those for whom the manual handling risks of carrying water over long distances are such that they are now being exposed to significant risks to their health and safety. Many may be forced to give up their plots.

An Equality Impact Assessment of the ban was carried out by the Allotments & Smallholdings Manager and signed off by the Director, Management of Place, in October 2022. The assessment identified that 'Any allotment tenant with the following protected characteristics: disability, age, pregnancy/maternity will be negatively impacted, by the ban.'

The ban also very seriously limits the potential uptake of rainwater harvesting, as systems often involve the use of hosepipes. Banning the use of hosepipes for the movement of harvested rainwater is unjustified and excluded as a risk by the very risk assessment used to implement it and is, we believe, beyond the scope of Bristol City Council's legal remit – BCC may be acting unlawfully, especially since its own risk and equality assessments do not require such a ban and identify significant discrimination arising from it.

None of the main authorities, including the Royal Horticultural Society, the National Allotment Association nor the Royal Society for Public Health (RSPH), advocate banning the use of hosepipes in their guidance on Legionnaire's Disease – in fact the RSPH has carried out extensive research and concluded that such a ban would be not only unnecessary but counter-productive.

Bristol Allotment Forum was forced to resort to two separate FoI requests before we had sight of the risk assessments. They clearly rule out the need for such a ban, despite being quoted as the basis for it. The supporting documentation we received was heavily redacted, and we cannot be sure precisely who was responsible for it, but we understand it originated in Property Services

We have attempted to engage with officers to discuss the matter but have been rebuffed. Correspondence provided in response to the FoI request confirms that '[name(s) redacted] are unwilling to meet any representatives of allotment holders'. We regard this as totally unacceptable behaviour from public servants.

We wish to engage proactively with BCC to promote and encourage rainwater harvesting for environmental reasons and potential cost savings to the Council but unless there is an option to incorporate the use of hoses this will be severely curtailed.

**We now call for:**

- **the ban to be amended, to allow both the filling of water butts and the use of hosepipes within tenants' own rainwater harvesting systems.**

## **STATEMENT PS 13**

**Submitted by Sally Bowman**

**Title: Golden Motion around health needs assessment**

"As someone who currently works within mental health in the NHS in Bristol, I would like to add my support to the golden motion around health needs assessment. The staff I work with are doing extraordinary work to support those who need it while dealing with significant staffing and funding issues. They still work to provide the best care they can to the residents of Bristol and surrounding area though. I echo the sentiment that our doctors and nurses and other NHS staff deserve our appreciation and thanks for the work they do under intense pressure.

I agree action is needed to improve provisions of healthcare within Bristol. I live in St George in the East of Bristol and an improvement in capacity and facilities in Cossham Hospital would be widely appreciated and utilised by those living in this part of the city. Improved services in this part of the city is vital if we want to improve health outcomes. I would encourage a review into the healthcare facilities at this hospital, as well as across the city.

I also think it's incredibly important to consider, and where possible implement, progressive delivery models. In particular, I want to draw attention to the Mental Health Integrated Network Teams. Treating physical and mental health together is often overlooked, with them being seen as two separate issues. Multi-morbidity is increasing and mental health problems alongside physical health ones is increasingly common. Ignoring mental health issues that coincide with physical ones risks worsening individual's health. Working to integrate different services such as GPs, social services and mental health services could greatly improve health outcomes in the city.

Lastly, I welcome the comments around improving access to dentistry within the city. Too many people lack access to an NHS dentist and so may forgo an important healthcare service where they can't afford to pay for it privately. This could widen health inequalities across the city. As such, I agree this an area that needs to be prioritised for improved provisions."

## **STATEMENT PS 14**

**Submitted by Mubashar Chaudhry**

**Title: To show solidarity with innocent civilians**

Bristolians Always stand on the right side of history. Bristol always played a lead role in supporting war zone victims. To show solidarity with innocent civilians who died in Israel without any hesitation, without any protocol city hall been lit with Israeli flag. Leadership feel the need for it and has done it. Soon after a collective punishment, a massacre started in Gaza. Hospitals, Schools, Refugee Camps, Ambulances, Densely populated residential buildings, water reservoirs been bombed without any discrimination. Food, water, electric, fuel, medicine, humanitarian aid been stop and let lot of children starved to death, let patients to die without basic medical needs. We have seen the highest number of UN officials being killed. More than 4000 children died. More than 10000 civilians lost their lives. Densely populated areas been converted to piles of rubbles. The world have seen horrific scenes of parents finding body parts of their children, animals eating human bodies.

Anyone who have their heart at right place could and should cry for a Cease Fire. We are witnessing all these atrocities and yet we need to go through all the protocols of taking public signatures just to say a word Cease Fire now. Just to show solidarity and lit City Hall with Palestinian colours. We have never seen such a huge crowd before on the streets of Bristol chanting Cease Fire now. What is stopping our representatives from saying this?

We need to stand unite, we need to stand on the right side of the history, we need to use our power, our influence, our voice to stop this injustice. As Injustice anywhere is a threat to Justice everywhere. Thank you

## **STATEMENT PS 15**

**Submitted by Dan Ackroyd**

**Title: Values & Ethics committee**

The Monitoring Officer misled the Values & Ethics committee on the 9th of October. When asked if the 'Independent Persons' involved in the complaints process have been appointed lawfully he gave the answer "it would be a complete misreading of the legislation to think that that appointment would need to be made by full council".

Anyway, the appointment is now agenda item 14.

The last lawfully appointed Independent Person had their term expire in 2017, and since then it appears that the complaints process against members has not been lawfully conducted by Bristol City Council.

Questions were submitted to the V&E committee on the 3rd of November about this matter but the answers written by the M.O. were evasive and non-responsive to the questions asked. The Monitoring Officer failed to attend that meeting[1], and so supplementary questions could not be answered in the meeting. The supplementary questions were submitted in writing, with the expectation that they would be answered.

They have not been answered, as of the 10th of November.

One of those unanswered supplementary questions is: "Please can you say in very simple terms, why you believe you don't need to write a Section 5 report?"

For those that don't know, under section five of the 'Local Government and Housing Act 1989' one of the personal public duties of a Monitoring Officer is to 'monitor' the council and write a report if 'any proposal, decision or omission by the authority..constitutes, has given rise to or is likely to or would give rise to a contravention by the authority...of any.. rule of law'.

The Monitoring Officer has said he will not be writing a Section 5 report in relation to the failure of the council to lawfully appoint Independent Persons or to conduct the complaints process lawfully.

He has not explained why he is not going to write that report.

It is a terrible situation when the chief authority on the law at Bristol City Council is failing to answer questions that he could very easily answer, except that the answers might be embarrassing to himself and his department. I'm not sure exactly what would constitute 'bringing the Council into disrepute' but I think an Officer failing to answer what is a very simple question should probably do it.

I encourage Councillors to demand a clear answer to the question above, and the other questions asked on this topic in this meeting. Members of the public do not have the tools to cross-examine someone who is not co-operating.



[1] - Failing to attend a meeting is at least a more lawful way of avoiding answering awkward supplementary questions than trying to just 'skip' public forum questions, which is what happened at the V&E committee on the 25th of September. It is not good that a member of the public has to interrupt a meeting and strenuously inform the Monitoring Officer that his advice is a breach of BCC's constitution.

## STATEMENT PS 16

Submitted by David Redgewell

### Title: Transport

Whilst we full support a very inclusive City Region which is accessible for people with disabilities and partly sighted people.

We still have a lot to do on the city Region transport and public realm

In Greater Bristol we still have Bridges Like Kings Weston, Bridge .

Over Kings Weston Lane is being constructed without ramps for disabled people with reduced mobility mother and Father's with buggies .

This has been stopped from being made accessible by English Heritage and Historic England.

As is the entrance ramp to Blaise castle House

The same with the Railway stations in the city Region at Avonmouth Dock station needs rails to access the station, as does Bristol Stapleton Road, Bristol Lawrence hill, has access to one platform towards Filton Abbey wood and the seven Beach railway line .

Bristol Temple meads station needs, work on access arrangements to the to platforms and lifts changing places toilets, automatic Doors etc need to be fitted to the waiting rooms and Cafes

The new Eastern, south and Friary entrance Need to be accessible.

As does the redevelopment of the station and new Friary bus and coach interchange with Temple Gate.

Bedminster needs better Disabled access Parson street is not accessible

Nailsea and Backwell not accessible

Needs a lift Bridge

As does Weston super mare railway Needs lifts

Highbridge and Burnham on sea needs a lift Bridge

Bridgwater needs a lift Bridges

Keynsham needs a accessible Bridge between the platform

Oldfield park and Freshford need lift Bridges.

As does Bradford on Avon and Trowbridge.

The New metro west railway Network station at Ashton Gate if funding is found, Pill, Portishead, Ashley Down, Filton North, Henbury for Cribbs Causeway and Bristol zoo.

We need a fully accessible public transport Network in Greater Bristol

We also need all the River Cross to be accessible banana Bridge.

But all the crossing need to be accessible across the New cut as progress is made .

The city Region pavement are still being parked making it difficult for disabled people and people with reduced mobility mother and Father's with buggies to use .

We understand that this requires National government legislation.

We welcome the work in the old city and Bristol Bridge on pavement and the Public realm. But all west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council funded transport scheme need to be fully accessible Under the equalities act 2010.

As does the public realm with very limited use Bristol sets or cobbles Sheets. We need public pavement of stone fully accessible and infrastructure.

All our buses are fully accessible as are National Express coaches limited Megabus Falcon City link coaches and Flixbus coaches. But not all tourists coaches or railway replacement coach services.

On Housing we more m type housing and Flats in the city Region. And offices and shop and housing is not full accessible in Bristol with Victorian and Georgian house and streets . So we need more housing for disabled people and their families.

On mass transit light rail system

This must be fully accessible of the same standards as Newcastle upon Tyne and Wear combined transport Authority soon to be North East mayoral combined transport Authority. Or Manchester metro link as part of the Beeline Network with mayor Andy Burnham or Liverpool City Region with mayor Steve Rotherham Mass transit system with fully accessible need new trains and overground underground sections or West Midlands metro with mayor Andy street.

Greater Bristol and Bath city region need a mass transit light rail system Overground and some Tunnelled Sections.

With routes From Bristol city centre Bristol Temple meads station Arnos vale Brislington, keynsham Salford Newbridge Weston Bath spa interchange.

Bristol city centre, Bristol Temple meads station, Arnos vale, Brislington Callington road corridor Hengrove park Whitchurch estate Hartcliffe Bishopsworth and Bristol Airport

Route to North Bristol to Link with Cribbs causeway and the need housing Development at Filton former Airport.

To Kingswood and East Bristol

Link from Bristol city council, Bristol Temple meads station Lawrence hill Fishponds, Staple Hill ,Mangotsfield Warmley Bitton. Kelson Weston Bath spa bus and coach station.

Bristol Airport via A38 long Ashton park and ride via Harbourside city centre Broadmead shopping centre and Bristol Temple meads station.

So we need to make progress on a mass transit light rail system fully accessible.

Jointly With North Somerset council Banes ,south Gloucestershire county council, Bristol city council and the west England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris and western Gateway Transport Board

Linked to buses ferry services and metro west Railway Network.

We must have a fully accessible metro west railway and future west overground underground light rail system in the Greater Bristol and Bath city region.

And the restoration of support bus services in East and South Bristol through the transport levy to Ashton vale, Brislington Eastville park Stapleton Broomhill Fishponds Oldbury court Downend Bromley Heath The Ding Barton hill Eastville park.

## STATEMENT PS 17

### Submitted by Lori Streich, Fishponds Community Planning Group

#### Title: Golden Motion

We note the Golden Motion put to Full Council by Cllr Ellie King, calling for a Health Needs Assessment in areas where there are sites for significant new housing developments.

One such area is Central Fishponds, as described in the draft Local Plan (Policy DS7), where at least 1,500 new homes proposed. A second development on UWE's Glenside Campus could see a further 300 homes developed in the area. This is in addition to approximately 350 new homes on the Blackberry Hill site (nearing the end of construction) and approximately 250 new homes which have been completed on the St Matthias (Barrett Homes) site – both in Frome Vale ward.

Despite this large number of newly built or proposed homes and consequent increase in the local population, the level of health care provision has remained the same.

The Fishponds Community Planning Group supports good development on the brownfield sites in our area. However, residents have raised concerns about the current levels of healthcare provision in Fishponds, and the additional demand that will be placed upon them when additional homes are built. From our discussions, and from social media comments, this is at the top of the agenda for local people.

We have started to explore this issue.

- There are three GP practices in Fishponds, one of which also acts as the health centre for UWE students. As far as we are aware, there are no known plans for expansion, and waiting times are already a significant challenge for health care professionals and residents alike.
- There are two dentist practices that offer NHS dentistry. Neither, as far as we are aware, are accepting new NHS patients onto their lists. For both, the demand is greater than the supply of dentists in place to carry out NHS work.
- There are several group homes in the Fishponds area for people with mental health difficulties and/or learning disabilities, and several care homes for people of older age. Each will be registered with a local GP practice. We have no information at this time about access to health care for residents in these homes, and how this might be impacted as our local population increases.
- Accessing hospital services can be challenging for many people in Fishponds, due to the patchy and often disconnected nature of public transport services/buses.

Therefore the Fishponds Community Planning Group

- Supports Cllr King's motion for a strategic needs assessment of health care provision in Fishponds (and other areas of Bristol where high numbers of new homes are proposed).
- Will support consultation of local residents and other delivery partners to survey what form of additional health infrastructure is required to meet need.
- Will be keen to be involved with the dialogue about actions to take forward the outcomes of this consultation.

## **STATEMENT PS 18**

**Submitted by Ellie Keen**

**Title: Council Lit with Israeli Colours**

I am writing to express my disgust at the Council building having been lit up in Israeli colours, without, at the very least, doing the same for Palestinians. Given the horrendously indiscriminate and disproportionate show of force that Israel has inflicted on Gaza since the awful events of the 7th October, I find it astonishing that Council has made no statement at all either in solidarity with those suffering, as it did for Israelis, or in condemnation. Nor has it called for a ceasefire.

I have spent over 30 years working in the field of human rights, and have devoted a great deal of attention to learning from the Holocaust in order that such a catastrophe should never again befall a people. I could not conceive it possible that we would allow mass slaughter and ethnic cleansing to take place on the scale we are now seeing in Gaza, supported by our politicians, armed by companies based in this country.

We cannot claim ignorance: my timeline is flooded with images of dead and wounded children, entirely innocent, close to starvation, unable to receive the medical treatment they need, unable to leave, because the occupying power - Israel - has placed them under an illegal siege. Yet the vast majority of our politicians remain silent, at best, and offer encouragement to Israel, at worst. In Bristol, we are home to Israel's largest private arms company, Elbit Systems, which provides the vast majority of the drones used to inflict ongoing terror on the Palestinian people. We have now broadcast to the world, by means of the lights in Israeli colours, our support for a nation carrying out collective punishment.

Whatever led to this massacre, and whatever Israel claims to be trying to do, their actions are not proportionate, and have been judged by numerous international bodies to constitute some of the worst violations of international law. Please, Councillors, speak out against this horror. Please call on your party leaders to withdraw support for these brutal and illegal actions. We are all culpable for allowing this to happen on our watch. Please add your voices, and help to end it now.

## **STATEMENT PS 19**

**Submitted by Megs Smith**

**Title: Electric Vehicles**

The 'Green' agenda supports Net Zero emissions, the eradication of petrol and diesel cars and the uptake of Electric Vehicles, but how 'green' are EVs in reality and how ethical? Green technology has highly polluting products, an inability to be recycled, are produced by the exploitation of child labour, let alone the risk to the public of EVs exploding . Lithium batteries for EVs are environmentally horrific ; every year a single lithium mine causes millions of tonnes of permanent waste laced with sulphuric acid and radioactive uranium polluting the water supply for 300 years, not to mention the unacceptable human costs of child labour to mine the Cobalt. Children directly handle toxic cobalt with many crushed to death in collapsing mine shafts . The biggest threat to our survival isn't the weather, it's people blindly following orders without question or thought to support what is essentially environmental terrorism. Parliament obligations are not ours.

# Full Council – 14 November 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	Lena Wright	RPZ Consultation
PQ02	Molly Sherlaw-Fryer	Food Sustainability Motion
PQ03	Dan Ackroyd	Arena Island
PQ04	Mike Oldreive	Independent Persons
PQ05	Jenny Harrison	Food Sustainability Motion
PQ06	Suzanne Audrey	Independent Persons
PQ07	Harry Simpson	Bus Services
PQ08	Jen Smith	Independent Persons
PQ09	Keith Farley	Independent Persons
PQ10	Lesley Powell	Independent Persons
PQ11	Railfuture Severnside	Mass Transit and Transport Levy
PQ12	Bristol Disability Equalities Forum	Transport Accessibility
PQ13	Tim Hayes	Events at Lloyds Amphitheatre
PQ14	Veronica Wignall	Food Advertising
PQ15	Martin Rands	Avon Crescent
PQ16	Joanna Booth	Independent Persons
PQ17	Sian Ellis Thomas	Member Code of Conduct
PQ18	Joe Banks	Member Code of Conduct
PQ19	Megs Smith	Net Zero Transport
PQ20	Megs Smith	5G Masts
PQ21	Chris Johnson - Keep Bristol Moving	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood



**QUESTION PQ 01**

**Subject: RPZ Consultation**

**Question submitted by: Lena Wright**

I would like to thank the Mayor for his replies to my previous two questions on Windmill Hill RPZ, in the summer. In one answer the Mayor stated, “As we have stated many times, we will only bring forward residents parking schemes where overwhelming local support has been demonstrated, a criterion that has not yet been met.” In the other, the Mayor stated, “There is no consultation planned.” I looked online for ways to demonstrate the level of local support for something, and the Local Government Association's advice was: to do a consultation with local residents.

Q1. Can the Mayor please advise how residents are supposed to indicate their level of local support without doing a consultation?



## QUESTION PQ 02

**Subject: Food Sustainability Motion**

**Question submitted by: Molly Sherlaw-Fryer**

My question is directed at Marley Bennett as the cabinet member for climate. At the moment, there is a food sustainability motion tabled from Labour. While the sentiment is good, the details of the motion have many limitations when it comes to making a transition to more sustainable ways of eating and promoting this to residents.

Council has declared a climate emergency and has a 2030 goal that Bristol citizens will consume carbon neutral food and drink. In this context, Council must prioritise a motion that can truly reflect the nature of our collective situation, and can realistically achieve the Council's own goals.

A comprehensive report by Harvard University from 2019 showed that if we free up and rewild the 48% of UK land that is currently being used to farm animals, the UK could be net negative in emissions. This shows the huge impact that making the switch from animal farming to a plant-based food system can make on our climate. If we continue as we are, over a billion people are expected to be displaced and seeking refuge by 2050, all due to climate disasters. Given the urgency of the situation we are in, a 100% plant-based transition is what is needed within society, and key institutions making that transition are key to bringing society closer to this change in order to save the world from total climate catastrophe.

So my question is, will Labour, as the leading party, please recognise the importance of drafting up a stronger and more ambitious plant-based motion and prioritise this as a matter of urgency?



**QUESTION PQ 03**

**Subject: Arena Island**

**Question submitted by: Dan Ackroyd**

My understanding is that the details of the commercial deal done with 'L & G' of the land previously known as 'Arena Island' that saw the land become unavailable to be used for an Arena were kept secret at the time, and still haven't been published.

Please can you provide a detailed explanation of the public interest test that was used and how it was evaluated, that led to the decision for the deal to be kept secret, both at the time, and why the details still haven't been published yet?



**QUESTION PQ 04**

**Subject: Independent Persons**

**Question submitted by: Mike Oldreive**

Q1: The Monitoring Officer has told me in a written answer to Values & Ethics Committee (9 October 2023) that, during his tenure (2018 onwards):

*“ The appointment of Independent Persons was done through a formal recruitment and selection process carried out by the Monitoring Officer and the Head of Legal Services.”*

[the MO seems to imply that if individuals are appointed to actions other than “investigation” of a complaint, then that is a discretionary matter (which is true) and that therefore the “appointment” is outside the remit of LA2011 (which is incorrect). LA 2011 clearly sets out the arrangements a Council must have in place for setting standards and dealing with complaints. Any Independent Person must be appointed in accordance with s28 of the Localism Act 2011.]

Can the Monitoring Officer confirm that this approach, (where he and the Head of Legal Services appointed “Independent Persons”, apparently without Member approval) was lawful and fully met the requirements of s28 of the Localism Act 2011 for all “IPs” used in complaints handling, by completing the attached table.

Requirement of Localism Act 2011- references to subsections of section 28.	MO confirms that requirements met  YES/NO
IP 1  Date appointed:	
8 c (I) the vacancy for an independent person has been advertised in such manner as the authority considers is likely to bring it to the attention of the public,	
8 c (ii) the person has submitted an application to fill the vacancy to the authority	
8 c (iii) the person’s appointment has been approved by a majority of the members of the authority;	
Subsections 8a and 8b and 10	
IP 2  Date appointed ... etc	



Q2: Since 2018 how much has been paid as allowances to the individuals “appointed” by the Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal Services as “Independent Persons”, and on what basis are these payments considered to be lawful? (please provide reference to relevant legislation).

Please provide as a table:

Financial Year ending:	Value of allowances paid, £		
	IP 1	IP2	IP 3 etc
2018			
2019			
2020			
2021			
2022			
2023			
2024 to date			



## QUESTION PQ 05

**Subject: Food Sustainability Motion**

**Question submitted by: Jenny Harrison**

My question is directed to Marley Bennett, as the cabinet member for climate. In September, a Labour councillor spoke with a member of our Plant-Based Councils team and said that they would be willing to meet with members of the Green Party with a view to develop a cross-party plant-based motion for the Council to debate, in order to hopefully get a motion surrounding plant-based climate solutions heard sooner.

Animal agriculture is one of the leading causes of climate change and Councils who have declared and recognised we are in a climate emergency have a responsibility to take action on this. One of the key ways Council can do this is to introduce 100% plant-based catering in their own internal meetings and events, while also taking significant steps to promote plant-based eating to residents. This way we can make meaningful progress towards the Council's goal of Bristol citizens consuming carbon neutral food and drink by 2030. The current tabled Labour motion is much more limited in its scope than this and that's another reason why it's important for Labour and the Greens to meet to hopefully develop a stronger cross-party motion, more in line with what is set out in the Green's tabled plant-based solutions motion that has a greater chance of being heard.

Since September we have not had any further communication from Labour Party councillors regarding this, and so this important work has stalled. So my question is: would you, as the cabinet member with the brief for the Climate, please prioritise a meeting with the Green party, in order to establish a more ambitious cross-party motion that can be prioritised to be heard at Full Council?



## QUESTION PQ 06

**Subject: Independent Persons**

**Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey**

Background. In relation to Section 28 of the Localism Act 2011, as far as I can tell Bristol City Council's Independent Persons have not been ratified by Full Council for the period between the appointment of Mr Christopher Eskell on 10 September 2013 until today (14 November 2023).

Question 1. Please provide the names of all Bristol City Council Independent Persons appointed since September 2013, together with the dates of appointment.

Question 2. Please explain why the appointment of Independent Persons has not been ratified by Bristol City Council Full Council in the ten years since September 2013. Please note it is not sufficient to say, for example, that the Monitoring Officer and/or Head of Legal Services appointed the Independent Persons. The question is about why the appointments were not ratified by Full Council in line with Section 28 of the Localism Act 2011.





**QUESTION PQ 07**

**Subject: Bus Services**

**Question submitted by: Harry Simpson**

The Dings has suffered from no bus service for a while and with new housing projects and the Temple Quarter regeneration scheme it is becoming paramount a service is implemented. Will the administration encourage WECA and First to alter the 36 bus route to better serve the present and future residents?



**QUESTION PQ 08**

**Subject: Independent Persons**

**Question submitted by: Jen Smith**

Q1. Can the Monitoring Officer confirm that there has been no breach of data protection regulations by himself and the Head of Legal Services?

Q2. The Independent Person appointed in 2013 had a term limit of 4 years so they are no longer a lawfully appointed Independent Person. Any "Independent" Persons appointed directly by the MO & HOLS are not appointed in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 so they are not lawfully appointed. Under what legal authority has the Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal Services been sharing the personal information of complainants with those Independent Persons?



**QUESTION PQ 09**

**Subject: Independent Persons**

**Question submitted by: Keith Farley**

1.

What is the justification for the Council to refuse to disclose data (via FOI's etc) about the appointment of IPs (other than names) such as:

- number of IP's in post
- date of appointment
- Who appointed them and how their appointment was approved / whether they were appointed in accordance with the S28 of the Localism Act 2011

to assure the public that the MO / HOL are not acting in opaque isolation as is the current perception?

2.

Can BCC provide the public and members with confirmation that a bone fide, legally appointed Independent Person has been available since 2016 (the last date seemingly an approval to appoint an IP was submitted to the Values and Ethics Committee for approval / onward journey to Full Council)?



## QUESTION PQ 10

**Subject: Independent Persons**

**Question submitted by: Lesley Powell**

1. The MO has confirmed that the appointment of IPs (following the advert\* for IPs in July 2023), which he is retrospectively asking Full Council to ratify today, did not follow the process required under S28 of the Localism Act 2011. As we have multiple examples of confirmation from Legal Services / the MO that the MO consults the IP in EVERY Code of Conduct Complaint, how can the Code of Conduct complaints 'considered' during the period when an IP was not legally appointed, be valid and therefore what is the process for their resubmission for a fair hearing?

\*[https://ce0389li.webitrent.com/ce0389li\\_webrecruitment/wrd/run/ETREC107GF.open?VACANCY\\_ID=045280Qqqm&WVID=5153023bMp&LANG=USA&utm\\_source=LinkedIn&utm\\_medium=social&utm\\_campaign=Orlo](https://ce0389li.webitrent.com/ce0389li_webrecruitment/wrd/run/ETREC107GF.open?VACANCY_ID=045280Qqqm&WVID=5153023bMp&LANG=USA&utm_source=LinkedIn&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=Orlo)

2. In relation to the above, if the MO advises that a legally appointed IP, other than the ones requiring retrospective ratification today, were in post prior to today, to whom he referred Code of Conduct Complaints, why is he / Legal Services refusing to answer all the FOI's which ask for confirmation of this?



## QUESTION PQ 11

**Subject: Mass Transit and Transport Levy**

**Question submitted by: Railfuture Severnside**

1. In view of the importance of a mass transit light rail system to the Economy and connectivity of the Greater Bristol and Bath city region.

What progress is being made by Mayor Rees in partnership with the leaders of North Somerset council, Banes ,south Gloucestershire county council and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris on the future west mass transit, light rail overground part underground system? One option being funded through a new second Devolution with North Somerset council joining the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority in 2025

2. What progress is being made with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority, North Somerset council, Banes ,south Gloucestershire county council and the mayor of west England Dan Norris. On setting the Transport levy for the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority to pay for also Bus services and Public Transport improvements in the Bristol and Bath city region alongside money from the Department of Transport bus service improvement plan funding?



**QUESTION PQ 12**

**Subject: Transport Accessibility**

**Question submitted by: Bristol Disability Equalities Forum**

1. With the important of improvements public transport in the Greater Bristol and Bath city region including North Somerset council area .

Working in Partnership with Banes council, South Gloucestershire county council, city and county of Bristol and North Somerset council Working with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and Mayor Dan Norris,

How does Bristol city council see progress being made on a fully accessible mass transit light rail system going forward in Bristol city Region.

It must be noted that most of uk and Europe have light rail system the compose of overground Street running Segregated tracks and sections and tunnelled sections in Newcastle upon Tyne, city centre, West Midlands metro in Birmingham on its new Extension to Five ways, their are tunnel section on Metrolink in Greater Manchester.

Must mass transit light rail system are a mixture of fixed track formation street running and overground underground. In Fact in Bristol the Bristol Temple meads station seven Beach via Clifton Down station and Avonmouth. Runs underground Clifton Downs in Deep tunnel and under Ashley Down near Montpellier Station.

**We therefore ask the city mayor Marvin Rees and councillor Don Alexander Transport what plans they have to move the future west mass transit light rail system forward that is fully accessible to passengers with reduced mobility and partly sighted passengers?**

At the next west of England mayoral combined Authority committee and joint committee with North Somerset council who are supporting a mass transit route to Bristol Airport.

2. Whist we have seen a lot of progress on disability and equalities in the Greater Bristol city Region over the last 10 years we still have The Footbridge at kingsweston Lane being rebuilt with disabilities accessible ramps .

And we have a metro west railway Network without fully accessible stations at. St Andrews Road Avonmouth requires rails Bristol Stapleton Road is not accessible to cross platforms Bristol Lawrence hill has a platform accessible in the Severn Beach line and Filton Abbey wood directions. Parson street completely none accessible, Nalisea and Backwell station no access towards Weston super mare and Taunton. No lift Bridges at weston super mare. Highbridge and Burnham on sea, Bridgwater. Keynsham Oidfiled park Freshford and Pilning all have none accessible footbridges to cross platforms

Or Bridges over the Harbour that are Not accessible like the Banana bridge through the new cut .Or Ferry services and Terminal with out Being Wheelchair accessible.

Many street in Bristol have pavement parking making it difficult for disabled people and blind and partly sighted peoples to walk or wheel down the road and street in Greater Bristol laid out with Bristol sets cobbles ,



Or not enough standard housing in the city Region or even basic accessible to homes or shops .

But the New Bristol plan is make the city Region fully accessible with the New South Gloucestershire council North Somerset council and revised Banes plan.

**Bristol disability equalities forum would like to ask Bristol city council Working with the other unity council and west of England mayoral combined transport Authority working with the equalities act 2010 plan to Bring forward a fully accessible city to partly sighted and people with reduced mobility.**



**QUESTION PQ 13**

**Subject: Events at Lloyds Amphitheatre**

**Question submitted by: Tim Hayes**

Can the Council indicate how the presence of several hundred residences close to Lloyds Amphitheatre, many of them recently built, is incorporated as a relevant factor into the Council's decisions about:

- 1) the number and duration of Lloyds Amphitheatre events?
- 2) the calculation of the specific noise levels that the Council decides are appropriate for events held at Lloyds Amphitheatre?





**QUESTION PQ 14**

**Subject: Food Advertising**

**Question submitted by: Veronica Wignall**

I am deeply concerned about the climate crisis. I'm also very aware of the huge role advertising can play in cultural norms and consumer choice - for example, advertising for beef, unsurprisingly, pushes up likelihood to purchase and consume beef. In relation to the climate, the Advertised Emissions report first launched at COP26 in 2021 found that advertising adds an extra 32% to the annual carbon footprint of every single person in the UK.

This Council has a 2030 goal that "people in Bristol will consume carbon neutral food and drink". It seems very important that advertising within our city is addressed to enable more carbon neutral ways of eating, since it has a considerable influence on people's choices and social norms.

I know Council has already brought in an advertising policy that bans certain harmful ads. My question is, can this be taken a step further to include a ban on meat and dairy advertising, as this contributes massively towards Bristol citizens' choices to eat these foods - which are extremely emissions-intensive and environmentally damaging?



## QUESTION PQ 15

**Subject: Avon Crescent**

**Question submitted by: Martin Rands**

1. A white line has been painted on the highway at Avon Crescent to 'extend the pavement'

No traffic regulation order has been obtained.

No equalities assessment has been done (there are no dropped kerbs)

No safety assessment has been carried out.

The justification for these failures, is that the 'solution' is temporary and of small scale.

A temporary solution must have a defined end date.

There is no certainty of if and when 'Western Harbour' will be built.

My question is, when does this 'temporary' period end?

2. A Freedom of Information request exposed the minutes for the Quality Assurance Board discussion around Avon Crescent on 1.8.2023.

Information about 'small scale' and 'temporary nature' come from F.O.I. requests by a third party.

My question leading from these minutes is:

What were the concerns with the use of bollards at Avon Crescent?



**QUESTION PQ 16**

**Subject: Independent Persons**

**Question submitted by: Joanna Booth**

Q1. Have any of the Independent Persons proposed for ratification today, already been consulted with as Independent Persons?

Q2. Have the Independent Persons who have already been appointed and consulted with been made aware that they may have been consulted as Independent Persons unlawfully (i.e., without complying with the legislation requirements), and that they may have received personal information without legal authorisation?



**QUESTION PQ 17**

**Subject: Member Code of Conduct**

**Question submitted by: Sian Ellis Thomas**

Question:

Given the results of the member complaints data finally uncovered this year and for the last six years; (that not one single complaint has been upheld and that information has not been provided to the Values & Ethic committee to enable proper decision making), do you think that it is time for the role of the Monitoring Officer to be reviewed and altered in such a way that does not facilitate a closed system and which allows for more transparency and scrutiny?



**QUESTION PQ 18**

**Subject: Member Code of Conduct**

**Question submitted by: Joe Banks**

This is a yes or no question. Has the council's Member Code of Conduct complaints process been carried out in full accordance with the law (Localism Act 2011) at all times during the Mayor's period in office?



**QUESTION PQ 19**

**Subject: Net Zero Transport**

**Question submitted by: Megs Smith**

Q1. Dear Mayor, as Bristol City Council supports Net Zero emissions incentives, which will mean the eradication of all petrol and diesel cars within the decade, what public transport provision is being planned for those who cannot afford expensive EVs and who choose not to cycle or use the e-scooters?



**QUESTION PQ 20**

**Subject: 5G Masts**

**Question submitted by: Megs Smith**

Q2. Dear Mayor, why is Bristol City Council allowing the installation of sporadic 5G masts without a planning application? Is this not both unlawful and illegal, necessitating their immediate investigation and possible removal , when detected and reported by members of the public?



**QUESTION PQ 21**

**Subject: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood**

**Question submitted by: Chris Johnson – Keep Bristol Moving**

1. Regarding EBLN; Please will you provide me with the documentation relating to consultation with stakeholders, emergency services any other relevant organisations?
2. Please will you advise which external organisations have been involved in the planning & design of EBLN.

