

# Cabinet

## Supplementary Information



**Date:** Tuesday, 23 January 2024

**Time:** 4.00 pm

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

### 2. Public Forum

(Pages  
4 - 37)

#### Agenda item 8 - Purchase of properties for the provision of Children's homes

None

#### Agenda item 9 - Wrap Around Childcare – in Primary Schools and Academies

CQ09.01 Councillor Christine Townsend

#### Agenda item 10 - Increasing allocation for Bristol's Smoking Cessation Service - Stopping the Start a new smokefree generation funding

None

#### Agenda item 11 – Changing Futures – Bristol Multiple Disadvantage Strategy and Changing Futures programme contract extension

None

#### Agenda item 12 - Clean Air Zone (CAZ) Evaluation Report

PS12.01 Christina Biggs, Bristol Clean Air Alliance

PS12.02 South West Transport Network and Railfuture Severnside

PQ12.01 Suzanne Audrey

PQ12.02 & PQ12.03 Simon Hobeck

PQ12.04 Martin Firth

PQ12.05 Dan Ackroyd

CQ12.01 Councillor Christine Townsend

**Agenda item 13 - Application of Bristol Clean Air Zone net proceeds**

PS13.01	Ian Quaife, Bristol Older People's Forum
PQ13.01 & PQ13.02	David Redgewell
PQ13.03	Dan Ackroyd

**Agenda item 14 - Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review**

PS14.01	Catherine Cain
PS14.02	Izidora Holjar-Erlic
PS14.03	Withdrawn
PS14.04	Philippa Walker
CS14.01	Councillor Martin Fodor
PQ14.01	Suzanne Audrey
CQ14.01 & CQ14.02	Councillor Martin Fodor

**Agenda item 15 - Bristol Avon Flood Strategy Outline Business Case**

PS15.01	Ron Curtis, Environment Agency
PS15.02	Martin Rands
PS15.03	Haydn Gill
PQ15.01 & PQ15.02	Haydn Gill
CQ15.01	Councillor Patrick McAllister

**Agenda item 16 - Multi-Storey Car Park Pay on Foot Contract**

None

**Agenda item 17 – Mission Net Zero Project Delivery - Innovate Pathfinder Places Programme Phase 2**

None

**Agenda item 18 – Cemetery and Crematorium Capital Programme – South Bristol Cemetery Expansion**

PS18.01	Mark Ashdown, Bristol Tree Forum
PS18.02	Catherine Withers
CQ18.01 & CQ18.02	Councillor Ani Stafford-Townsend

**Agenda item 19 - Procurement of Insurance Cover for the Council's Leasehold Flats**

None

**Agenda item 20 – Procurement of Financial Systems including internet and telephony payment systems**

None

**Agenda item 21 - Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget Proposals 2024/25**

CQ21.01	Councillor Katja Hornchen
CQ21.02 & CQ21.03	Councillor Tim Rippington

**Agenda item 22 - Dedicated Schools Grant budget proposals 2024/25**

None

**Agenda item 23 - 2024/25 Budget Recommendations & Treasury Management Strategy**

PS23.01	Bristol Disability Equalities Forum
CQ.23.01 & CQ23.02	Councillor Steve Pearce



**Agenda item 24 - Q2 Quarterly Performance Progress Report – Q2 2023/24**

None

**Agenda item 25 - Q3 Corporate Risk Report 2023/24**

None

**Agenda item 26 - Finance Outturn Report (P8/Q3)**

None

**Agenda item 27 - Bristol's Just Transition Declaration**

None

**Agenda item 28 – Barton House Emergency Evacuation**

None

---

**Issued by:** Amy Rodwell, Democratic Services

City Hall, Bristol, BS1 9NE

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

**Date:** Tuesday, 23 January 2024



**Question: CQ09.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 9 – Wrap Around Childcare – in Primary Schools and Academies**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Christine Townsend**

**Question 1:** Without specific work to ensure those primaries serving the most disadvantaged children and families in our city are enabled to engage, this project will reflect existing entrenched structural inequalities. Can the Cab Member for CYP and families please outline the actions to be taken to ensure those primaries serving our most disadvantaged communities can be supported to engage fully?

**Statement: PS12.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 12 – Clean Air Zone (CAZ) Evaluation Report**

**Statement submitted by: Christina Biggs, Bristol Clean Air Alliance**

The Bristol Clean Air Alliance welcomes the preliminary report of the first 13 months of the Clean Air Zone. We note that the administration has put effort into providing a readable report, rather than a purely technical report, which is very welcome.

We note the following key points from the report:

- the average reduction within the CAZ was 12.8% (4.4µg/m<sup>3</sup>) and outside the CAZ it was 7.8% (2.5µg/m<sup>3</sup>).
- the key numbers are NO<sub>x</sub> levels at hotspots. Some hotspots show large falls (eg Upper Maudlin Street), but some do not (eg Lewins Mead).
- there remain 5 sites above the maximum 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> NO<sub>2</sub> level. If this is true for the average of the first calendar year then BCC is obligated to continue the CAZ for at least another year.
- some sites have seen an increase in NO<sub>2</sub>, such as site 621 which is close to the Ashley Road/Gloucester Road junction.

Operational points:

- even after a year of operating, 5% of vehicles entering the zone are non-compliant
- only 50% of fines have been paid on time. However, so far only 16% of cases have been written off.
- there is a financial surplus of £26m from the scheme over its first year.

We note that the governmental CAZ scheme rules state that the financial surplus has to be applied as follows:

"... to directly or indirectly facilitate the achievement of the Council's local transport policies in accordance with the following high level spending objectives, set out below:

- Supporting the delivery of the ambitions of the Scheme and promoting cleaner air by offering packages for non-compliant vehicles to upgrade or retrofit their vehicles to meet the standards required by the Scheme;
- Supporting active travel and incentivising public transport use;
- Supporting green infrastructure along the most polluted roads where public exposure is the highest;
- Supporting the maintenance of infrastructure to promote active travel and public transport use."

BCAA welcomes this clear and timely report. This shows that the CAZ is doing its job. We note that few of the possible adverse side-effects have materialised. We also note that there remain a number of sites where the level of pollution is above the legal level, so there is more to be done.

BCAA analysis and recommendations:

1. A key critique is that some of the 12% decrease in NO<sub>2</sub> must be due to the previously-noted effect of “natural” vehicle turnover, as old vehicles are scrapped and new, clean ones bought. Thus, the observed decrease of NO<sub>2</sub> may not be as significant as first appears.
2. However, this relatively small decrease in NO<sub>2</sub> may be due to the numerous exceptions in place in the first six months of operation, which have now been removed. This could mean that 2024 will see a more significant decrease in NO<sub>2</sub>.
3. We also note that the continuing hotspots at Lewins Mead and Colston Avenue would seem to justify the bus gate that was proposed for Park Street but then dropped.
4. We would also like to point out that the WHO standards are much lower than the standards being used as the benchmark for this scheme, and therefore that even when legal compliance to the current UK limit of 40 microgrammes per cubic metre is achieved, the medical evidence indicates that more stringent limits should be applied.
5. We further note that the CAZ does not address particulates, and therefore that the CAZ should be extended to legislate more strongly against pollution from non-traffic sources, such as industrial pollution and domestic wood-burning..
6. BCAA also recommends that a study be made of the modal shift and journey changes achieved as a result of the CAZ, including longer journeys to avoid the CAZ.
7. Although the extra income from the CAZ is welcome, this and the 50% non-payment of fines on time indicates that drivers are paying to pollute, which is not positive from a public health point of view.
8. We recommend that some the earnings from the CAZ should be used to pay a more generous Transport Levy to the West of England Combined Authority to improve bus services and active travel measures.

Christina Biggs, Katrina Billings, Alan Morris, Gavin Spittlehouse  
Bristol Clean Air Alliance.

**Statement: PS12.02**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 12 – Clean Air Zone (CAZ) Evaluation Report**

**Statement submitted by: South West Transport Network and Railfuture  
Sevenside, David Redgewell**

As a public health measure, Whist we very much welcome this clean air zone report which has reduced emissions in the city centre by 9% Reducing asthma respiratory illness and premature deaths , Especially around the city Region Hospital complex of the Bristol Royal infirmary and Regional children hospital, The is a need to continue to clean up the air in Bristol but reducing the impact of the private car in the city centre, The £ 26 million pounds is to be welcomed as mean of improving public transport, walking and cycling facilities.

To offer alternative to driving into Central Bristol for work shopping heath care hospital school College university leasure and Tourist facilities But with the Transport Authority being the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority jointy with North Somerset council for many Transport functions, And the need to pay the Transport levy to fund Public transport Network services under the control of metro mayor Dan Norris and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority act with South Gloucestershire county council and Bath and North East Somerset council and partly funded by North Somerset council We see the the Transport levy from Bristol city council is payment is £ 6.3 million pounds adding £1.57 million pounds to public Transport services But with £26 million pounds raise Need to be spent on bus services and Public Transport Network services To reduce access to Bristol by the private car and especially car that pollute the air quality, Their is a need to restore bus services to the part of Bristol without a bus service, on to the working class estate without left without any public transport services Network, Services 23 Bristol city centre to Ashton vale estate was withdrawn via Bedminster and Southville Services 5 / 47 Bristol city council to st Paul's st werburgess Eastville park Stapleton, Broomhill Fishponds oidbury court,Downend, Bromley Heath Leaving the vassal centre without a bus service for disabled people Services 36 Bristol city centre to Barton hill, st Anne's park Brislington has been withdrawn beyond st Anne's park Services, Services 10 11 Avonmouth Dock , shirehampton to Lawrence weston Westbury on Trym, Southmead hospital bus station uwe bus and coach station ,Bristol parkway station, uwe bus station, Bristol parkway station Bradley stoke Aztec west Hortham Alverston Thornbury, Chew valley south Bristol service, 672 52 Bishopsworth Hengrove South Bristol to the city centre, Parts of the Dings and Easton

Have no public bus services, As the priority should be offering alternative to the car for the clean air zone should not more money be allocated to Public transport services And restoration of the bus network using the Transport levy and clean air zone money plus car parking fees In the bringing into operation of the Bristol Temple meads, Bristol Lawrence hill, Bristol Stapleton road Ashley Down, Filton Abbey wood, Filton North and Henbury for cribs causeway and Henbury railway services With the city Region transport transport fund or walking and cycling facilities scheme, Giving people alternative to the private car and therefore improving health measures and Air quality in central Bristol, Whist we welcome the allocation of clean air money for bus and public transport infrastructure, Through the city Region transport fund the biggest proity is to invest in public transport Network alternative like Portway park and ride Railway station and interchange, Ashley Down station, Henbury railway station still waiting planning permission, Filton North Station, Or Ashton Gate station.on the Bristol Temple meads station Bedminster, Parson street Pill and Portishead line Or Charfield station The appear to be large allocation to highway related

schemes in city regional Transport strategy through the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council and western Gateway Transport Board plans But not enough money allocation to Get people on alternative transport walking and cycling, facilities, public transport bus service improvement Railway services improvement metro west railway Network top priority for west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council Mayor Dan Norris and Bristol city council and western Gateway Transport Board schemes.

With the proposal to pay the Transport levy from the clean air zone to the metro mayor Dan Norris west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council, Of £10 million pounds rather than from local taxes as per the west of England mayoral combined Authority act .

The supported bus network will not be improved in time for Department for Transport deadlines of a revised bus service improvement plan 25 26 for the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council, Greater Bristol city Region, Which has to include details of supported bus service revision changes to Demand responsive bus services The westlink Demand responsive bus services is being reviewed now on request from the western Traffic commissioner Kevin Rooney and the need for 20 minute zones,

The need to review the commercial bus corridor in the city Region, Provide details of staffing levels and Driver shortages at city region bus Depots le Bristol Lawrence hill, Bristol Hengrove, Bath western island Weston super mare and Wells First group plc Wales and West buses Division. Stagecoach west Bristol Patchway , Big lemon buses Depot parson Street, and need for Drivers, Supervisors Engineers and cleaning shortages, Integration of the bus rail coach and ferry Interchange facilities, Improvement to Bus shelter bus stop infrastructure, Cctv cameras system and lighting.

So to improve bus services in 2025 2026 after the local elections and General election but missing the Department for transport funding allocation as well for the bus service improvement plan, Will leave many working class community without a public bus service or any public transport and risks match funding from the Department for Transport And still having to drive dirty car into the city centre and paying penalty charges ,We must use some of this money in the 2024 2025 budget to improve the city Region public Transport Network. Only Stoke on Trent has the levy of bus services cuts as Greater Bristol effecting many working Class estates and communities ability to access the city centre for health care, Hospital Education, basic food shopping and shopping leisure trips and tourism, Can please look at the amount of money being allocated to Highway schemes ,and not alternative public transport Networks walking and cycling facilities to help further clean up Bristol clean air and prevent asthma and respiratory illness and premature deaths, The same applies to Bath city centre schemes,

David Redgewell South west transport Network and Railfuture Severnside vice chair  
Bristol disability equities forum Trustee,



**Question: PQ12.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 12 – Clean Air Zone (CAZ) Evaluation Report**

**Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey**

**Background:** Bristol's Clean Air Zone started at the end of November 2022. Some cities, e.g. Birmingham and Sheffield, published a report about progress after 6 months but I understand your administration decided to wait for a full year of operation before publishing a report. Having waited for over a year, the papers for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB), 18 January 2024, stated: "The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board will be receiving the following two reports prepared for the Cabinet Meeting 23 January 2024 for discussion in advance. These papers will be made available on publication of the Cabinet agenda on 15th January 2023 [sic] and can be found here: Cabinet – Tuesday 23rd January 2024 - Clean Air Zone (CAZ) Evaluation Report - Application of Bristol Clean Air Zone net proceeds." But at the time of submitting these questions (6pm 16 January 2024) the reports are still not available for the public to examine and formulate questions for the OSMB meeting, or for the Cabinet meeting 23 January (since questions are required by 5pm 17 January).

**Question 1:** Please will you explain why the reports 'Clean Air Zone (CAZ) Evaluation Report' and 'Application of Bristol Clean Air Zone net proceeds' were not published by 15 January 2024? (If this is simply because the reports were not ready, please will you include in your response the specific reasons why the reports were not ready, rather than just stating they were not ready.)

**Question: PQ12.02 & PQ12.03**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 12 – Clean Air Zone (CAZ) Evaluation Report**

**Question submitted by: Simon Hobeck, TRESA**

**Question 1:** What has been the impact of the Clean Air Zone on air quality along Wells Road through Totterdown to Three Lamps junction, and along St Johns Lane (from the junction with Wells Road to Victoria Park Primary School)?

**Question 2:** What has been the impact of the Clean Air Zone on rat-running between Bath Road and Wells through the Three Lamps estate, Totterdown?

**Question: PQ12.04**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 12 – Clean Air Zone (CAZ) Evaluation Report**

**Question submitted by: Martin Firth**

**Background:**

I am a 76 year old Bristol resident who, although a car driver, makes all journeys into Bristol by bicycle. I warmly welcome the introduction of the Clean Air Zone and the findings after one year in operation. I am concerned, however, on two related issues which have had an unintended consequence: the inclusion of the Cumberland Flyover appears illogical as it forms part of a road system which actually takes traffic AWAY from the city. Its inclusion in the scheme is counter-intuitive.

Its inclusion raises a far more important issue: the City has become, for many residents, a divided one based on social and economic class. For residents of South Bristol who own non-compliant vehicles, there is now no access across the River Avon to reach North Bristol as all bridges now fall into the CAZ. Residents of Southville, Knowle, Hartcliffe, Withywood, etc., can only cross the river at St. Philip's Causeway or Totterdown Bridge - both requiring extensive detours to reach - or across the M5 Bridge at Avonmouth. So these residents are effectively restricted from shopping at Cribbs Causeway, visiting friends in Redland, Westbury on Trym, St. Andrews, Horfield, etc., or from using the leisure facilities of The Downs or attending the many events staged there. Given that some of the most socially and economically deprived areas in Bristol lie South of the river, it follows that these are the very folk who are least able to afford new or compliant vehicles.

The solution is to remove the Flyover from the scheme and start the Zone at Holy Trinity Church in Hotwells Road, to enable traffic to use the old bridge when there is a 'swing'. This discrimination of South Bristol residents can therefore be solved at a stroke.

**Question 1:** My question to Mayor Ress is whether he is happy for his legacy to include the disenfranchisement of a large part of Bristol's population?

**Question: PQ12.05**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 12 – Clean Air Zone (CAZ) Evaluation Report**

**Question submitted by: Dan Ackroyd**

**Question 1:** On Wednesday the 17th the BBC Points West program had a segment about the Clean Air Zone. They clearly had the report early in the day and spent a considerable amount of time preparing that segment during the day. Why was the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) Evaluation Report made available to the BBC before it was published as a paper for the Overview and Scrutiny Management committee, and the Cabinet meeting?

**Question: CQ12.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 12 – Clean Air Zone (CAZ) Evaluation Report**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Christine Townsend**

**Question 1:** The CAZ report tells us that 49% of the charges have been paid during the course of the year, with 16% or 91,125 written off. Given that we are told this is as a result of the DVLA being 'unable to trace keeper details' or 'Enforcement Agents are unable to trace the keeper or recover the debt' These cars are on the road illegally and therefore pose a threat to us all - what happens as a result of this? Are A and S Police informed of these driving offences and tasked with follow-ups within their traffic resources?

**Statement: PS13.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 13 – Application of Bristol Clean Air Zone net proceeds**

**Statement submitted by: Ian Quaife, Bristol Older People's Forum**

Bristol Older People's Forum would support the allocation of CAZ funding to reinstate the bus services in Ashton Vale and Oldbury Court. Residents in these areas believe the savage cut by First Bus, which disproportionately affects older and disabled people, is a growing scandal, and based on discrimination and the focus on profit.

'We are isolated, we can't go to the shops or the doctors, or family gatherings - we are completely cut off. This is affecting our mental and physical health. We have to use taxis to go to the local supermarket. Our number 23 bus service, ran every hour was lovely. We need it back!' (Aston Vale resident).

**Question: PQ13.01 & PQ13.02**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 13 – Application of Bristol Clean Air Zone net proceeds**

**Question submitted by: David Redgewell**

**Question 1:** What percentage of the clean zone money be used to add to Bristol city centre payments of the £6.3 million by more the £1.57 million as whist bus infrastructure is very important to the city Region has no public transport to work school College university heath provision hospital and even food shopping is devastating to people lives?

**Question 2:** The Bristol city centre clean Air zone is a heath measure to clean up city centre area and prevent asthma and respiratory illness and early deaths for pollution, So what percentage of money will be allocated to walk and cycling provision in better facilities for pavements and cycle routes to get people out of their cars?

**Question: PQ13.03**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 13 – Application of Bristol Clean Air Zone net proceeds**

**Question submitted by: Dan Ackroyd**

**Background:** The document "Detailed Five Year Programme for Application of Bristol Clean Air Zone net proceeds" says "£10.3m is proposed to be committed to meeting the council's contribution to the Transport Levy in year 2023/24 and 2024/25 while from 2025/26 to 2027/28 this will fall to £6.3m". There are rules for how money raised from Clean Air Zones is spent.

From government guidance.

"The Transport Act 2000 requires any excess revenue that may arise from charges above the costs of operation to be re-invested to facilitate the achievement of local transport policies and these should aim to improve air quality and support the delivery of the ambitions of the zone, while ensuring this does not displace existing funding. **Such charges may not be used as a form of taxation to raise revenue generally.**"

From the "Bristol Clean Air Zone Charging Order 2022" -

<https://www.cleanairforbristol.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/2022-08-25-FINAL-CAZ-Charging-Order.pdf>

"In the event that net proceeds are generated from the Scheme over the opening ten year period, these proceeds would be applied, in such proportions as may be decided by the Council, to directly or indirectly facilitate the achievement of the Council's local transport policies in accordance with the following high level spending objectives, set out below:

- Supporting the delivery of the ambitions of the Scheme and promoting cleaner air by offering packages for non-compliant vehicles to upgrade or retrofit their vehicles to meet the standards required by the Scheme;
- Supporting active travel and incentivising public transport use;
- Supporting green infrastructure along the most polluted roads where public exposure is the highest;
- Supporting the maintenance of infrastructure to promote active travel and public transport use."

The WECA transport levy is a regularly recurring cost for Bristol Council. It seems completely inappropriate to use the money raised from the CAZ to pay the levy as that would be in breach of both how the Transport Act 2000 and the Bristol Clean Air Zone Charging Order 2022.

**Question 1:** Why is there a proposal to spend money on items that were not listed in the "Bristol Clean Air Zone Charging Order 2022" or as specified in Transport Act 2000 ?



**Statement: PS14.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 14 – Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review**

**Statement submitted by: Catherine Cain**

Written statement in opposition to Bristol City Council's proposed changes to the scheme

The Resident Parking Schemes (RPS) were introduced to prevent commuters parking in central areas.

The volume of commuters coming into Bristol to work has significantly reduced since the COVID pandemic and a greater number of people are now working from home, either full time or certain days a week.

It appears the Council wish to now use the RPS to discourage private car ownership and to raise funds.

Is this permitted?

The Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review states that prioritising parking for residents may have the effect of encouraging more short local trips by car. What is the evidence of this?

The Review also states that this issue could be addressed by improving walking, cycling and bus infrastructure. Again, what is the evidence for this?

There is no adequate public transport system. I live in Hotwells, if I need to do a full supermarket shop I have to drive to the shops, there is no alternative.

Introducing measures that could address an issue that may exist does not seem very scientific. In addition, an increase in over 300% to the cost of the first permit, at a time when everyone is being hit hard by an increase in the cost of living is wholly inappropriate. Any increase should be no more than inflation.

The proposal to reduce the number of visitor permits available to residents who are within a RPS is detrimental and seems penal, particularly for those who are elderly, vulnerable and need care visits.

It would seem those residents where there is a RPS are being penalised whereas residents of other areas of Bristol, for example Bishopston where there is no RPS, avoid these restrictions. Why should residents of Bishopston or indeed those residents lucky enough to have their own driveway in Clifton for example, be able to do short trips in their cars and have numerous visitors without penalty, whereas other residents are having a scheme put in place to prevent this?

I would suggest that the RPS in its current form is working. An increase to the cost of permits in line with inflation would seem sensible but anything above this penalises those residents caught by an RPS at a time when everyone is struggling with increased costs due to the cost of living crisis. In addition, spending funds to assess a possible issue seems a waste of costs and time when the council should be doing the opposite.

**Statement: PS14.02**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 14 – Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review**

**Statement submitted by: Izidora Holjar-Erlic**

**Situation:**

I am a homeowner of a flat in a very old building attached to Georgian House Museum which was converted from offices into flat in 2014. That made me ineligible for even applying for parking permit in CPZ, due to decision of Executive Member for Transport almost 20 years ago (Residential Properties where planning consent for a new developments and changes to properties were approved or granted after 13/10/2005) which doesn't reflect current situation in my street.

At that time Great George Street was full of offices and majority of the houses now are residential, so it will be fair that it will be treated as a residential street with benefits of RPS (possibility to apply and get a parking permit for homeowner car/cars and to get a possibility to park more than only 2 hours and to get a visitors parking tickets).

I can understand why new developments like multistorey buildings with potentially large number of cars can justified that clause in application form, however conversion from offices into flat essentially reduce number of cars. Giving a parking space to homeowner who live and work in city centre should be a priority and there are enough empty parking spaces in Great George Street to share them with visitors.

**Proposal:**

1. To prioritise parking for residents in Great George Street by redrawing the boundaries of CPZ and move the boundaries so that Great George Street comes under Clifton Woods/Hotwells residents parking scheme.

If that is not possible than:

2. To change clause in application for CPZ (to remove "changes to properties") or to withdraw it at all.

I hope you will take my statement in consideration and discussion in Cabinet Meeting of Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review. I will appreciate to receive a written reply on my statement.

**Statement: PS14.04**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 14 – Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review**

**Statement submitted by: Philippa Walker**

REF: Portland Square and surrounding areas parking (currently CPZ)

Over the last 10 + years, the mix of occupants in Portland Square has shifted significantly to more residential and less business use. For the residents of Portland Square the following points apply:

1. Portland Square is in the Central Parking Zone. It is not possible to park there without buying a ticket except between midnight and 8.00 am.
2. The majority of parking spaces (on a meter) in Portland Square remain underutilized except at very busy times e.g. Christmas. So most of the spots are empty most of the time which is a waste of spaces.
3. While the residents in Portland Square and some neighbouring streets can apply for a single CPZ parking permit, they cannot do so if their household has an allocated parking space for their home. Where two or more drivers live in the same household with one allocated parking space, only one of them can park their car as it is not possible for the second driver to apply for a CPZ permit. This discriminates against the second or third driver.
4. Portland Square residents, living in the CPZ, are not entitled to visitors parking permits which means any visitors, family, friends, carers or workers have to pay for parking, which is discriminatory – all residents of St Pauls should all be entitled to visitors permits.

Petition / Request:

Extend the St Pauls residential parking permit scheme to include residents of Portland Square and neighbouring streets currently in the CPZ and outside the CAZ.

## Statement: CS14.01

Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024

Re: Agenda item 14 – Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review

Statement submitted by: Councillor Martin Fodor

My statement relates to the policy confusion in item 14, the lack of coherence and context around parking issues. Most comparable local authorities recognise the joined up measures that ensure safe and healthy streets people can enjoy, meet, and get around where they live - a mix of:

- speed limits,
- traffic calming,
- parking management,
- tackling rat running in residential roads, and
- the allocation of street space to prioritise active travel, buses, and accessibility measures plus all the new features needed like shade, seating, play, sustainable drainage, and so on.

In Bristol the first elected mayor introduced 20mph speed limits across most Bristol in the years 2012-2016. Many inner city neighbourhoods also had parking management for the first time - with permits for residents, business vehicles and visitors. A few steps towards safer, traffic free streets e.g. in the old city were started. A few experimental sustainable drainage features to soak away heavy rain have been trialled.

Under the second Mayor there were reviews of speed limits after May 2016: by 2019 all the city roads had speed limit reviews and none at all were changed.

At the same time all the city RPS areas were reviewed from 2016, all were found to have majority local support, and after a few minor amendments none were removed - but no more schemes have been allowed since a minor extension already approved in my ward. Even after detailed local surveys showing majority support, no new schemes have been allowed despite problems in other areas like Bishopston and Southville. This means half my ward has managed parking and the other half of Redland is completely unmanaged; some streets have no corner protection at all, no enforcement, and no attention to access issues despite known problems for basic council services gaining routine access to some roads.

In November 2019 council officers presented in public a detailed talk on what a forthcoming Bristol parking strategy would contain to the Bristol Walking Alliance and Bristol Health Partners. Nothing has been heard of this document since and no consultation has taken place.

For about five years the mayor's stated policy has been for low traffic neighbourhoods instead of RPS. Alone among comparable authorities the mayor does not believe parking should be managed to complement such calming and improvements in local roads to cut rat running.

The original design of RPS is as self-funding schemes in a single financial pot to pay off the capital investments and provide for enforcement and periodic updating of details in all schemes - with any surplus reinvested in transport schemes. This report shows that model is now being abandoned.

There is extensive evidence collated and compiled by public health and published on the Travel West website, but none of this is cited in the paper.

But the current ad hoc changes now proposed a few months after fees were reviewed do not seem to offer a coherent approach to how vehicle ownership will be influenced; no answer is offered to residents in unmanaged streets outside the current schemes, and no long term budget focus is envisaged. It doesn't promise more club cars - which do in fact reduce car ownership.

It's well known how additional private vehicles get stored in unmanaged areas when owners want to avoid charges, yet this report ignores the observable facts. Dependence on short term parking income isn't going to help the council achieve its transport goals if the permit fees do work; if they don't there's no answer.

This paper frankly appears to be a damaging, incoherent intervention just before the outgoing mayor and his policies are replaced by the more collaborative cross party committee system. They don't relate to any budget, transport, or community policies and have certainly not been consulted with the people either directly or indirectly affected. It's not clear they demonstrate a mix of carrot and stick measures as fees get stepped up. As such they are in no one's interest and seem designed to leave chaos behind.

My initial questions on this agenda item:

Q1) Please can the evidence for outcomes that car use will be replaced by use of lower impact travel alternatives following the proposed increased in permit charges in RPS areas be provided?

Q2) Please can the evidence for car dependency reduction through not providing parking management schemes on streets just outside the RPS areas where charges are to be raised (i.e. an assessment on the effect on RPS boundary streets), be provided?

**Question: PQ14.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 14 – Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review**

**Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey**

**Background:** In the report relating to Residents Parking Schemes, it is stated that they encourage short car journeys. This is an interesting assertion with implications for transport policy and public health, but there are no references to support it. I am aware that you have two masters degrees and trust you are familiar with the need to reference sources of evidence.

**Question 2:** Please will you give the references (including lead author, title and date) to support the assertion that RPS encourage short car journeys?

**Question: CQ14.01 & CQ14.02**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 14 – Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Martin Fodor**

**Question 1:** Please can the evidence for outcomes that car use will be replaced by use of lower impact travel alternatives following the proposed increased in permit charges in RPS areas be provided?

**Question 2:** Please can the evidence for car dependency reduction through not providing parking management schemes on streets just outside the RPS areas where charges are to be raised (i.e. an assessment on the effect on RPS boundary streets), be provided?

**Statement: PS15.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 15 – Bristol Avon Flood Strategy Outline Business Case**

**Statement submitted by: Ron Curtis, Environment Agency**

Bristol Avon Flood Strategy Outline Business Case statement of support

We are working with the council to develop a flood risk management strategy that works for the city, protecting existing housing and infrastructure as well as enabling new development in the city. This outline business case builds on the principles that were agreed in the strategic outline case and sets out a clear achievable pathway to deliver the council's vision for defences that provide a multitude of benefits to the city. We continue to support the proposed approach and will do what we can to enable the council to deliver these defences.

Yours sincerely



Ron Curtis  
Area Flood & Coastal Risk Manager  
Environment Agency – Wessex Area



**Statement: PS15.02**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 15 – Bristol Avon Flood Strategy Outline Business Case**

**Statement submitted by: Martin Rands**

The 'solution' to tidal flood risk in Bristol, is simply NOT hard flood defences. The preferred sustainable water management policy is 'make space for water'

Concrete flood walls are environmentally very damaging, and merely push flood water elsewhere. They would also be very environmentally damaging from a heritage perspective. 'Western Harbour' Cumberland Basin, is the west end of Bristol City Docks, and at the heart of Bristol's growth as a great maritime city.

Don't ruin it with concrete and glass viewing panels. It is not Disneyland. It is also peripheral and on the edge of the city. Not a central new 'quarter' It's where city meets countryside, and high river water runs off and drains away.

The City should revisit the possibility of a downstream tidal flood barrier, before development of housing. It only wants concrete because it thinks a developer might pay for it as part of its concrete and steel development. I cannot believe that a tidal barrier is not very feasible.

## Statement: PS15.01

Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024

Re: Agenda item 15 – Bristol Avon Flood Strategy Outline Business Case

Statement submitted by: Haydn Gill

On the Flood Strategy, I would suggest that Bristol City Council names the flood defences after international fossil fuel companies, which have contributed the most to human-induced climate change and rising sea levels. Why not call it the British Petroleum flood wall? It is a cost-free way of putting Bristol on the international stage, without a Mayor flying across the world.

I welcome the planned outline business case for an updated Brislington Bridge, better provision must also be provided for people walking, wheeling and cycling who have contributed least to the increased flood risk arising from under their feet as they cross the River Avon. The proposed improvements to Feeder Road, including the drainage system are also overdue. Frequent and heavy storms in December 2023 flooded Feeder Road near Netham Lock halving the road width for weeks, reducing the road to a single lane for both directions of traffic.

On the parking scheme policy review, I welcome the findings and recommendations to Cabinet to remove the third permit for homes and to increase the cost of the first permit, although it is still below the cost of providing on-street parking and a car will still have cheaper rent in this city than people.

There are further improvements possible in Bristol, which the Lib Dems are championing in Bath, such as emissions based charging, or removing permits for homes with driveways, so it is a start. With only 3 months to go until the Mayor is removed from office, I hope that all councillors continue to advocate for the full cost of on-road parking to society and the council to be paid by owners of vehicles stored on our public land across more parts of Bristol.

On the Clean Air Zone, it is good to see air pollution improving, and a steady stream of revenue to put towards improving public transport and active travel. I am intrigued by the councils decision to fund road surface maintenance, I do hope this is targeted on bus and active travel routes highlighted in the LCWIP and not used to resurface roads with little value to people taking public transport or walking and wheeling, such as the ring road. I would draw the Cabinet's attention to the Bristol Clean Air Zone Charging Order 2022, which states the following:

*In the event that net proceeds are generated from the Scheme over the opening ten year period, these proceeds would be applied, in such proportions as may be decided by the Council, to directly or indirectly facilitate the achievement of the Council's local transport policies in accordance with the following high level spending objectives, set out below:*

- 1) Supporting the delivery of the ambitions of the Scheme and promoting cleaner air by offering packages for non-compliant vehicles to upgrade or retrofit their vehicles to meet the standards required by the Scheme;*
- 2) Supporting active travel and incentivising public transport use;*
- 3) Supporting green infrastructure along the most polluted roads where public exposure is the highest;*
- 4) Supporting the maintenance of infrastructure to promote active travel and public transport use.*

The Clean Air Zone has raised millions for improving alternatives for people who can't afford to insure or drive climate-wrecking SUVs, but can at least get a £2 bus ticket or cycle to

work. It has also improved air quality and life expectancy for everyone living in Bristol, including 1 in 4 people in Bristol who don't drive at all.

I hope that alongside this progressive policy, councillors will continue to advocate for a workplace parking levy in Bristol, targeting those who drive large polluting vehicles to work, in order to assist those households with the least amount of wealth and who are least likely to own a car, who just want to get to work safely and affordably.

On the Just Transition Declaration, there is the principle of a fair distribution of costs and benefits. I'd argue that the Clean Air Zone, Residents Parking Scheme Policy and a Workplace Parking Levy strongly align with the fair distribution of costs. The wealthiest in society contribute the most to climate change, they must pay their fair share of the cost of mitigating climate change. For example, the most wealthy decile of households drive the largest, most polluting vehicles, they drive the most car miles per year on average and are the most likely to own more than 2 cars in the household.

**Question: PQ15.01 & PQ15.02**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 15 - Bristol Avon Flood Strategy Outline Business Case**

**Question submitted by: Haydn Gill**

**Question 1:** Naming flood defences. Cllr Beech, in relation to the proposed new flood defences, fossil fuel companies have contributed heavily to human-induced climate change alongside funding climate denial over the past century. Bristol must honour their contribution to our climate crisis. Will the council name the flood defences after fossil fuel companies, such as the 'British Petroleum flood gate' or the 'Royal Dutch Shell flood wall'? This will put Bristol on the international stage, millions of visitors will want to see these fossil fuel company flood defences, all for very little cost to the council.

**Question 2:** Feeder Road floods. Cllr Beech, in the Outline Business Case, Feeder Road is highlighted as being at risk of flooding with with a 'severe flood', with mitigation planned for 2029 onwards. However, it is already being flooded with a little bit of rain on eight different sections of the 2 mile road. These floods cover between a quarter and half of the running lanes and at times the entire pavement. After reporting all floods to the council in January 2023 and again in December, they were closed with a response "as this issue is not urgent, we'll deal with it as part of a future planned work scheme in this area". Will I have to wait until 2029 for any of the flooding issues on Feeder Road to be fixed?

**Question: CQ15.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 15 - Bristol Avon Flood Strategy Outline Business Case**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Patrick McAllister**

**Background:**

I welcome the Flood Strategy Business Case. It is an essential piece of work to ensure the safety of thousands of Bristolians and their properties, as well as to unlock significant areas for development while enhancing Bristol's natural environment.

On page 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment the Whole Life Carbon (WLC) emissions are indicated as 1,540,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent (tCO<sub>2</sub>e).

On page 6 of the same document, it is listed as only 55,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.

The 55,000 tonnes figure is repeated in the Business Case with the added context of nearly 1.4M tCO<sub>2</sub>e anticipated to be prevented by the scheme, making the scheme net carbon-negative. This latter figure rests on an assumption that the flood defences will avoid flood-related emissions of over 1.1M tonnes.

**Question 1:** Please could we have clarification over the expected gross and net Whole Life Carbon emissions, and can the assessments and appraisals that were carried out to arrive at these figures please be made available?

**Statement: PS18.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 18 – Cemetery and Crematorium Capital Programme – South Bristol Cemetery Expansion**

**Statement submitted by: Mark Ashdown**

We take issue with the evidence base, the conclusions drawn of the environmental and neighbouring interests and the number of burials projected.

There is no need to use the Colliter's Brook SNCI land to provide for the needs of those for whom burial over cremation is linked to religious and cultural beliefs. There is sufficient capacity in the proposed burial ground in the southern part of the expansion area, known as Site 1, which is outside the SNCI, for such burials.

The planned works in the areas within the SNCI – Site 3, the proposed attenuation pond and the drainage needed to drain both burial grounds within Sites 1 & 3 and then discharge into Colliter's Brook - will cause permanent harm to the SNCI. This is prohibited under Local Plan Policy DM19 which states that: *'development which would have a harmful impact on the nature conservation value of a Site of Nature Conservation Interest will not be permitted.'*

The statement that *'The forecast net reduction in available grazing land is 4% for the first phase of development'* is incorrect. The installation of the fencing required around Site 3 and the attenuation pond will make the upper fields to the south of them largely inaccessible for grazing, causing a decline in their biodiversity.

If the remaining council-owned land here is leased to anyone other than the current farmer, Catherine Withers, then this will cause neighbouring Yew Tree Farm to become unviable and lead to yet more deterioration in the SNCI there.

Furthermore, the projected number of burials for the expanded cemetery, and its predicted active lifetime until 2039, assumes that the majority will be double depth burials.

However, Cemetery Development Services analysis has made it clear that only single burials will be possible in Sites 1 & 3 because of the shallow soil depth. This reduces the number of burials by around 2,500 and so reduces the projected, active lifetime until only 2033. Therefore, in less than a decade we will be back where we are, looking for an alternative site when possible alternative sites, that may be available now, may no longer be available.

As such, this is not the long-term solution to Bristol's need for additional burial capacity, and therefore the benefits do not outweigh the clear negative impacts of this proposal on the Colliter's Brook SNCI.

We urge Cabinet not to adopt this proposal but to delay its decision until such time as a proper consideration of the alternatives, including a public consultation, can be conducted.

**Statement: PS18.02**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 18 – Cemetery and Crematorium Capital Programme – South Bristol Cemetery Expansion**

**Statement submitted by: Catherine Withers**

I am writing to urge you to reject this proposal. The document that is presented is flawed and inaccurate.

There has been no public consultation or strategy approved and this site is a matter of convenience and not necessary. It will cause harm to an SNCI and not provide the burials anticipated.

The methods and evidence used to get this passed at planning were inaccurate and leave the council open to dispute.

The approval you seek today still inaccurate regarding the single/ double burials and to ignore this information is not prudent for any long term planning (the burial spaces will run out approx. 2033) and for value for money- £2.9m approx. £1k per burial space just for the infrastructure.

There is no agreed LEMP and it will not be possible to prepare a 30- year management plan without involving me at the farm. You have tried to discredit the care and management I have spent over my lifetime living on the farm.

As the application was rushed through it appears this agenda item is unnecessarily being rushed through.

The planning system is being looked at evermore closely due to decisions that appear severely flawed. To many in the cabinet who will not have to live with the fall out of poor decisions it will matter very little, but those who are seeking re-election I would urge you not to commit public funds to this project.

**Question: CQ18.01 & CQ18.02**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 18 - Cemetery and Crematorium Capital Programme – South Bristol Cemetery Expansion**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Ani Stafford-Townsend**

**Background:**

I've received significant communication from members of the community regarding the repeated flooding of graves and even the requirement to pump out graves at South Bristol Cemetery. The flooding is causing graves to begin to collapse in some instances. I am informed this is particularly an issue in the dedicated Muslim plot, which is upsetting to those who have their loved ones resting there or are in the process of holding a funeral.

I understand some work that been carried out to increase drainage, but the works were not successful.

**Question 1:** What work will be carried out at South Bristol Cemetery to prevent this from continuing to be an issue?

**Question 2:** Will Bristol City Council be footing the bill for this work, or will they be expecting faith groups to carry the financial burden of ensuring respectful burial plots?



**Question: CQ21.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 21 – Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget Proposals  
2024/25**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Katja Hornchen**

**Background:**

To support residents in hardship, a hardship fund of £500,000 is included in each year of the business plan.

For 2024/25, £350,000 is set aside for residents accessing the Local Crisis Prevention Fund, with the remainder set aside for other schemes. This will include a newly introduced cladding removal support scheme to support residents affected by increased energy bills resulting from the removal of EPS cladding

Cllr Rippington and I have been campaigning on behalf of Gilton House residents for them to receive some form of financial support for the delays to their repairs, as these delays have meant they have been without insulation in Winter - driving up their heating bills.

**Question 1:** Please can the Mayor confirm that Gilton House residents will be eligible for financial support?

**Question: CQ21.02 & CQ21.03**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 21 – Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget Proposals  
2024/25**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Tim Rippington**

**Question 1:** I welcome the £210k being set aside for an enhanced damp and mould taskforce, building on our work bringing homes up to a decent standard. Please could the Mayor provide more details on this taskforce and how it will work?

**Question 2:** I welcome the proposal to increase the pipeline of new council homes on 3,000 homes over the next five years. Please could the Cabinet Member for Housing Delivery share more details about the plans?

## **Statement: PS23.01**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

### **Re: Agenda item 23 – 2024/25 Budget Recommendations & Treasury Management Strategy**

**Statement submitted by: Bristol Disability Equalities Forum, David Redgewell**

Whilst we welcome this balanced budget we still concern that the money to fund the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council joint Bus services improvement plan area for bus and public transport services is frozen at £10 235 million. With the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council being told to Resubmit the bus service improvement plan by June 2024. This is the opportunity to restore some of bus services to some of the most deprived estates in Greater Bristol. Many working class communities have been left without a public bus service since the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council joint support bus was underfunded last year by Bristol city council, Bath and South Gloucestershire county council,

The following areas in Bristol have lost Public bus services: Ashton vale estate, Parts of Bishopsworth, Whitchurch, St Paul's, St Werburghes, Eastville, Stapleton Broomhill, Fishponds, Oldbury Court, Bromley Heath Downend, Southmead, Uwe bus station, Bristol Parkway railway station, Aztec West, Hortham, Alverston, Thornbury corridor, Part of St Anne's park, Brislington Easton and the Dings have no access to Public bus service or Westlink Demand responsive bus services. This is preventing some of the most vulnerable people in society from being able to access schools, colleges, universities, work, basic food shopping, community facilities, warm spaces, Oldbury Court estate, Vassal Centre. The Regional Centre for Disabled People has no public bus service. With £26 million pounds of clean air money and allocation for Public bus service we don't understand how the clean air money can be paid to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council for bus service and Public Transport Network levy. When the west of England mayoral combined Authority act makes it clear, money should be from Bristol city council, Bath and North East Somerset council and South Gloucestershire county council. Council Tax payers each year,

So using the clean air zone money in Bristol city council area and Bath and North East Somerset council, does not appear to support the west of England mayoral combined Authority act. In both cases the money is short term funding so we need to address this issue in the budget setting process. Especially as the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council has to Resubmit its bus services improvement plan to the Department for Transport funding by 12th June 2024, including community safety partnership for bus, coach and Public Transport passengers Network, including bus stop and interchanges shelter maintenance which at present appear to be very poor with bus shelter and interchanges covered in graffiti and tagging and lighting not working. In Old Market, Lawrence Hill, Broadmead shopping centre, Cabot Circus city centre, Park Street, the lack of coach shelter provision within Bond Street Bristol, with both the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council, having staff to maintain bus stop shelters. Bristol city council clean carrying out maintenance and West of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council maintaining the bus timetable displays duplicate of Public money and staff at a time when public money is very tight. We need to transfer the Bristol city council Transport staff with South Gloucestershire county council and Bath and North East Somerset council, staff to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority,

25 million pounds to capital is transferred to Bristol city council of which 8.7 million pounds for maintenance, But we need to see the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority Acting like an intergrated Transport Authority So we need work towards improving the public transport Network

The other issue is investment in Local Railway station improvement jointy with west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council, Metro west railway Network Including Bristol Temple meads station to Bedminster, Parson street station Pill and Portishead line with a station at Ashton ,Bristol Temple meads station, Bristol Lawrence hill, Bristol Stapleton Road, Ashley Down station, Filton Abbey wood station Filton North and Henbury for cribs causeway and Bristol zoo,

So we also need to work with west of England mayoral combined transport Authority to improve the city Region railway Network and make station fully accessible at Bristol Lawrence hill, Bristol Stapleton road, Parson street Bedminster need accessible stations, Through access for all schemes with the Department for transport,

But also in Transport the city Transport hub for bus services need accessible public Toilets with Bristol city council investment in community toilets scheme and new public toilets Especially at park and ride interchange at Bristlington Portway park and Ride and long Ashton

Public transport is very important to well being of the city and city region To fund the Transport levy so as we can restore the city Region bus network,as soon as possible.

Gordon Richardson Bristol disability equilities forum.  
David Redgewell Bristol disability equilities forum Trustee  
Ian Beckey living Easton.

**Question: CQ23.01 & CQ23.02**

**Cabinet – 23 JANUARY 2024**

**Re: Agenda item 23 – 2024/25 Budget Recommendations & Treasury Management Strategy**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Steve Pearce**

**Question 1:** Considering the climate emergency, and the effect rising sea levels would have Bristol, I'm relieved to see the council and its partners bringing forward a comprehensive flood defence strategy and that no funding is cut from the flood defence budget.

I do recall, however, in the 2022 Budget, Cllr Mack tabled an amendment, which the Green Party, supported, that sought to cut the flood defence budget to stave off a staffing restructure for a year, with no plans to replenish the funding. Considering the climate emergency and the effect that flooding has had on the UK in the past few months, can the Mayor confirm that he would not accept a budget that would deplete our flood defence funding?

**Question 2:** I'm pleased that despite budgetary pressures, we have found a way to maintain the Council Tax Reduction Scheme in full – the only major UK city to do so.

Please could the Mayor provide a ballpark estimate for how much funding this budget dedicates to supporting Bristol's worst-off?