

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

Date: Monday 18 December 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 - 28)**

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

Signed



Proper Officer
Friday, 3 November 2023



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.

Ref No	Name	Title
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	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?

REPLY

In terms of local support, we would encourage you to work with your local ward councillors who should engage with their communities to articulate and demonstrate overwhelming from the whole community.

We don't believe RPZs deliver modal shift and don't achieve strategic aims for the city. Our approach has been to pilot Liveable Neighbourhoods. The first one of which we are engaging residents in East Bristol about. We will commence early engagement about possible Liveable Neighbourhoods in South Bristol including Windmill Hill next year.



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?

REPLY

- **We are committing significant resources to make our food systems more sustainable. As I stated, we've received Gold Standard Award for food sustainability – only the second city in the country to do so – for our efforts to reduce food waste, grow the city's good food movement, address food inequality, increase urban food growing, improve catering and procurement, and tackle the impacts of our food system on public health, nature, and climate change. We also have a commitment to growing sustainable food in every ward in the city. It is absolutely right to have a focus on local food production, as doing so massively reduces the airmiles of our food which is one of the main contributors to Co2 emissions from agriculture – both animal and otherwise.**
- **The Labour Party is committed to a just transition to a greener society, including through the way we decarbonise our food systems. Bristol has been leading the way on sustainable food production - as well as decarbonisation in general – as is evidenced in it being only the second city in the UK to achieve Gold Standard for food sustainability. While I agree that emissions from animal agriculture do need to be tackled, I have some reservations that some of components of this treaty will harm society's poorest.**
- **Changing behavioural habits, such as diets, takes time. Blunt instruments such as a tax on meat could well have no effect on meat consumption but will make already-struggling low income families struggle even further. The focus should instead be**



on making fruit and vegetables as cheap as possible, so that healthy, sustainable diets are an option for everyone – this is the approach we're taking in Bristol.



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?

REPLY

- **The decision made at February 2020 cabinet included the KPMG Value For Money report and some elements were and remain commercially sensitive.**
- **Drafts of the cabinet paper, heads of terms, value for money study, comments of the chief financial officer, and risk register plus copies of the equalities impact assessment, eco-impact checklist and counsel's opinion were made available to members of Growth and Regeneration Scrutiny Commission on Wednesday 22 January 2020.**

[\(Public Pack\) Temple Island - Scheme Content and Development Agreement Agenda Supplement for Cabinet, 04/02/2020 16:00 \(bristol.gov.uk\)](#)

- **Temple Island will delivery much-needed new homes and jobs, including affordable homes, new public spaces and improved connectivity in/through Temple Quarter and the Bath Road.**
- **As a sustainable, brownfield site next to our major railway station and close to the city centre, it is the right place to be delivering new homes.**
- **Details will be published when it's no longer commercially sensitive.**



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.

REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee.**
- **The administration has no responsibility for this area, it’s not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

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).

REPLY

- **The answer from above is repeated**
- **The administration has no responsibility for this area, it’s not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**



QUESTION PQ 05**Subject: Food Sustainability Motion****Question submitted by: Jenny Harrison**

My question is directed to Cllr 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?

REPLY

- **If the Green Party want to send ideas to us, they'd be welcome to.**



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).

Q1. Please provide the names of all Bristol City Council Independent Persons appointed since September 2013, together with the dates of appointment.

REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

Q2. 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

REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



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?

REPLY

- **We recognise public transport in the city needs improvement, which is why we are working on a segregated mass transit system including underground which will connect people to people, people to jobs and people to opportunity.**
- **We will continue to press WECA to come up for a solution for the city region while we wait for the mass transit approach.**



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?

REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

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?

REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



QUESTION PQ 09

Subject: Independent Persons

Question submitted by: Keith Farley

Q1. 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?

REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

Q2. 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)?

REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



QUESTION PQ 10**Subject: Independent Persons****Question submitted by: Lesley Powell**

Q1. 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

REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

Q2. 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?

REPLY

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



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

REPLY

- **At the October 6th joint committee meeting all three Unitary Authorities, Business West and WECA officers all supported taking the underground forward. That is progress.**
 - **But the Metro Mayor vetoed the underground options which meant none of the paper went forward.**
 - **This leaves us with no plan for mass transit going forward as no policy was carried and the solution is hanging by a thread.**

- **We need a system that is genuinely segregated from traffic, goes to the areas of highest patronage, connect areas usually underserved, connects to employment and is affordable. Once you set the criteria, the system designs itself - it requires us to go underground in the constrained areas.**
 - **We don't believe the overground options will ever get built, too expensive CPO, utility rerouting and road closures no councillors will ever agree to make.**
 - **On every criteria it fails – economic, modal shift and land hungry in a constrained city.**

- **We are optimistic that the matter will come back to committee in January.**

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.

REPLY

- **The levy that we pay to the West of England Combined Authority is already agreed at specific levels and we provide this funding to WECA each year. WECA agree how spend is used to fund services appropriately in discussion with the unitary authorities.**
- **BSIP funding is governed separately and WECA lead decisions on the BSIP funding on behalf of the Unitary Authorities. We are in discussions with WECA at present as to how best to use this funding as the scheme progresses.**
- **We are working closely with leaders of BANES, South Glos and North Somerset Councils as well as leaders from the business community to find a solution but ultimately we need the Combined Authority to fulfil its role as the regional lead for this project.**



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?

REPLY

- **We know the city region needs an ambitious plan.**
- **If you are going to have an above ground mass transit system it will close Church Rd & Two Mile Hill, Gloucester Rd, St Lukes and Malago Rd.**

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.

REPLY

- **As you know, we have this challenge on several heritage bridges prompting conversations with Historic England**
- **We want to make as much of Bristol accessible as possible, which is why a modern mass transit system is essential.**



QUESTION PQ 13

Subject: Events at Lloyds Amphitheatre
Question submitted by: Tim Hayes

Q1) 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:

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

REPLY

- **Decisions about events and their impact on the local community are made by Licensing committee. You should enquire with them about the decision making process for events at the Amphitheatre**
- **The Amphitheatre is one of the premier event spaces in Bristol and should be celebrated giving a unique experience for events and festival goers and has been used as such for many years.**
- **Whilst there has been an influx of new properties in the area, the two are complementary appreciating the rich and diverse culture available within Bristol including events on the Amphitheatre.**
- **When events take place, event organisers will engage experts to produce noise management plans and liaise with our own experts within Environmental Health. These plans are then approved as part of premise licensing process under the Licensing Act 2003. These applications also afford the opportunity for any interested party to make representations when a new licence for an event is proposed.**
- **You get many advantages of living in the centre, but this comes with some disadvantages.**
- **This highlights the tension of choosing to buy or rent property in the centre of a busy and vibrant city.**
- **It is not clear which timeframe your question relates to.**



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?

REPLY

- **Bristol has one of the most comprehensive advertising and sponsorship policies in the country, but we only own a small proportion of the advertising space in the city. The University of Bristol is currently evaluating the impact of the policy through a piece of research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research.**
- **When the council has the results of this research, it will consider how much time, effort and public money is justified to spend in reviewing and potentially expanding the policy. Its reach will always be limited, as it can only govern council-owned advertising sites, rather than advertising more broadly in the city.**
- **At the moment we would not rule any further restrictions in or out until we can see evidence of what impact our policy has. This will likely become a matter for a future committee system to consider.**



QUESTION PQ 15

Subject: Avon Crescent

Question submitted by: Martin Rands

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.

Q1) My question is, when does this 'temporary' period end?

REPLY

- **We are taking a temporary approach while Underfall Yard is no longer publicly accessible. In the medium term the Western Harbour masterplanning will be going out for tender in the New Year.**

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.

Q2) My question leading from these minutes is what were the concerns with the use of bollards at Avon Crescent?

REPLY

- **I can't comment on the detail as it is not a meeting that I'm present at.**



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?

REPLY

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

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?

REPLY

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



QUESTION PQ 17

Subject: Member Code of Conduct

Question submitted by: Sian Ellis Thomas

Q1) 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?

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?

REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



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?

REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



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?

- **We have been pushing for a low-carbon, mass transit system which will transform Bristol's transport network. This will take thousands of car journeys off strategic routes and will reduce air pollution, carbon emissions and unlock economic benefits for communities disconnected from our transport system.**
- **A fully segregated underground will be reliable and frequent and allow people to reduce or even stop private car ownership and allow for more active travel interventions on our road surface.**
- **We are ambitious for Bristol and about the infrastructure needed to deliver net zero targets in energy, housing and transport – however we need to see this matched with support in the chamber or from the Metro Mayor.**



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?

REPLY:

- We have no evidence that 5G masts are being erected without the providers going through the appropriate application process.
- If masts have been erected without permission they should be reported to enforcement.
- The legislation for 5G Masts has been relaxed at national level over recent years;
- This means that many works to existing masts are permitted development.



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?

Reply:

- **We will share this as part of the Traffic Regulation Order response**

2. Please will you advise which external organisations have been involved in the planning & design of EBLN.

Reply:

- **As per the above we will share this as part of the Traffic Regulation Order response**

