

Summons to attend meeting of Full Council



Budget

Date: Tuesday, 20 February 2024

Time: 2.00 pm

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

To: All Members of Council

Issued by: Oliver Harrison, Democratic Services

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

Tel: 0117 3526162

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

Date: Friday, 9 February 2024



Agenda

6. Public Petitions and Statements

(Pages 3 - 16)

Under the Council’s constitution, there is no provision for public forum at the Budget Council meeting. However, in consultation with the Mayor and other party group leaders, the Lord Mayor has determined that public petitions and written statements will be accepted for this meeting on the following basis:

1. Petitions and statements for this meeting must be about the budget/reports included on the agenda.
2. The wording of all petitions and all written statements must be submitted by the deadline of 12 noon on Friday 16 February. Petition details / written statements should be sent to: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk
3. Questions are not permitted on this occasion.
4. Details of all petitions and statements submitted will be sent to the Lord Mayor, Mayor and all councillors as soon as possible after the above deadline.
5. At the meeting, the Lord Mayor will permit a brief opportunity for petitions to be presented at the start of the meeting (up to 1 minute for each petition), to allow petitioners to formally present their petitions and to confirm the final number of signatures. The Lord Mayor will ask Full Council to receive and formally note all petitions and written statements received.

Signed



Proper Officer
Friday, 9 February 2024



STATEMENT PS 01

Submitted by Bristol Reclaiming Independent Living

Title: Statement on Proposed Budget

Bristol Reclaiming Independent Living would like to make the following statement to the Council on the proposed budget.

First of all, we would like to welcome the withdrawal of the Fair and Affordable Care Policy for now. This policy would have resulted in Disabled people facing going without care and support or being forced into residential care against their own wishes. This will raise large amounts of safe guarding issues which will result in large costs for the local authority.

However, we are deeply concerned that the budget proposals for adult social care are in effect the same policy, in all but name. We wish to bring to the attention of all councillors the serious risks to the independence, choices and rights of Disabled people in Bristol in your community, should these proposals go ahead.

However, we do still have the following concerns.

1. BRIL would like to remind the mayor's office and all councilors' of a recent climb down and U-turn that had gained national press attention.
2. We are concerned the inquiry will not be independent of the Council.
3. We have been told it will be up to individual organisations to make everything accessible eg easy read. However, some groups will not have the finance or the expertise to do this.
4. We also wish to express our concern about the use of millions of pounds in public funds to pay private management consultants, including Impower and Peopletoo, to recommend cuts to vital support for Disabled adults and young people.
5. Despite the unevenced claims in the budget proposals that there "will not be a significant negative impact". In our experience decisions based on cost, rather than need, will lead to unlawful decisions contrary to the Care Act and Human Rights Act. For autistic people, people with learning disabilities and people with serious mental illness and other people with high needs, the results will be catastrophic in both human and economic terms.
6. We understand that some people have had significant increases in the contributions they are required to pay towards their Care Costs. This will force people in poverty or to reject their Care Package as it will be unaffordable. Neither disabled people nor Councilors should be reassured by officers' statement that following the extra reviews being planned for people with complex needs, that support plans will be the right ones because their assessed needs under the Care Act will continue to be met. We know from the proposed Fair and Affordable documentation that the Council believes the Care Act allows it to declassify authentic needs for wellbeing to be mere 'wishes' and therefore no longer has a responsibility to provide resources.

Far from reassuring, this is profoundly ominous and threatening as it permits cost cutting decisions regardless of impact on wellbeing.

7. The council must commit to genuine co-production with Disabled People, our organisations, and include the voices and experiences of the most marginalized people and communities. This work needs to start now, and not be kicked into the long grass after the local elections.

The Council has mentioned a program of work to review complex homecare packages and support, using existing capacity alongside additional locum resources through targeted negotiation and contract management.

This includes people receiving over 40 hours per week, or with personal budgets of £920 a week. We would like to know –

How are savings going to be made? Will people be asked to ‘make do’ with fewer hours of support?

Will people be asked to change their Care Provider for a cheaper option?

Will people be asked to ‘make do’ with less support or move into Residential Care?

How will you ensure eligible needs will be met within reduced budgets?

While we recognise the harm caused by 14 years of government cuts to local authorities, Disabled People and families are not to blame for this crisis. Nothing About Us Without Us!

Comments from BRIL meeting 15.2.24

Cost-effectiveness’ and ‘value for money’ are misused terms. Privatization has enabled companies to make very large profits from councils’ adult and children’s social care spending – to the detriment of disabled people reliant on homecare and unwaged family carers trying to make up for the drop in quality and availability of homecare, most of which is low-paid/zero-hour, contract homecare. Workers, mainly women get only a fraction of the fee’s councils pay to care agencies. Children suffer in privatized ‘care’ placements. As regards to children’s social care, BCC spends an enormous amount on children’s placements outside the city, in some cases over £600,000 for one child – <https://thebristolcable.org/2021/09/more-children-in-care-place-outside-bristol-as-covid-fallout-bites/> – September 2021), which would be better spent supporting families and families with disabled children/disabled mothers and keeping families together.

Appendix

This was part of BRIL submission to the Fair and Affordable Care Policy, however we feel it is very relevant to the budget.

SUBMISSION PREPARED ON BEHALF OF BRIL

Introduction

1. In April 2023 it was reported that Bristol City Council ("BCC") had cut £4m from its £153m adult social care budget. BCC published version 11 of its draft Fair and Affordable Care Policy ("the Draft Policy") on 21 June 2023, and the relevant Equality Impact Assessment was signed off on 30 June 2023.

2. This is one of two BRIL submissions in response to BCC's consultation on the Draft Policy and has been drafted by counsel instructed pro bono. In short, in response to questions 3-4 of the consultation survey, BRIL strongly disagrees with the Draft Policy and asks BCC to abandon efforts to adopt it.

The 'well-being principle' and meeting needs

3. BCC's overarching duty, under the Care Act 2014, is to exercise its adult social care functions in relation to individuals to promote their well-being. Well-being is broadly defined to include personal dignity; control by the individual over day-to-day life (including care and support, and the way in which it is provided); participation in work, education, training or recreation; domestic, family and personal relationships; and suitability of living accommodation (s.1(1)-(2)). The Care and Support Statutory Guidance ("the Statutory Guidance") is clear that the Act "puts wellbeing at the heart of care and support" (paragraph 1.1).

4. BCC should begin from the assumption that an individual is best-placed to judge their own well-being, and should ensure decisions about the individual are made having regard to all their individual circumstances, and is not based on unjustified assumptions (s.1(3)).

5. Central to any adult social care assessment are the outcomes the individual wishes to achieve in their day-to-day life (s.9(4)). Indeed, the first paragraph of the Statutory Guidance states that, "The core purpose of adult care and support is to help people to achieve the outcomes that matter to them in their life" (paragraph 1.1).

6. These core features of the Care Act 2014 regime are part and parcel of a deliberate paradigm shift in adult social care. As explained in the Statutory Guidance, "The Act... signifies a shift from existing duties on local authorities to provide particular services, to the concept of 'meeting needs'... The concept of meeting needs recognises that everyone's needs are different and personal to them. Local authorities must consider how to meet each person's specific needs rather than simply considering what service they will fit into" (paragraph 1.9-10).

7. Accordingly, under the Care Act 2014 there is a duty to meet an individual's eligible needs for care and support (s.18) and a non-exhaustive list of examples of how needs might be met (s.8).

8. The Draft Policy states at paragraph 3.1 that BCC's duty is to "try and meet all the needs that are agreed with the person". This is a misstatement of the law in two ways.

a. First, if BCC has made a determination under s.13 of the Care Act 2014 that an adult has eligible needs for care and support, then pursuant to s.18 of the Act, BCC "must" meet that person's needs if the person meets the criteria for ordinarily residence and if they are financially eligible (s.18(1)(a)-(c)). It is not a duty to "try". A lack of resources is no defence to a failure to discharge a statutory duty.

b. Second, the Draft Policy is inaccurate with respect to a person in need of care and support who lacks capacity pursuant to s.3 of the Mental Capacity Act 2005 to make decisions about care. In these cases, a person may be able to express wishes and feelings, and these must be taken into consideration when making a best interests decision. However, the person need not, and may not be able to, "agree" that their needs be met in a particular way. BCC still has a duty to meet the person's needs.

Independent living

9. The Statutory Guidance explains (emphasis added):

"1.18 Although not mentioned specifically in the way that wellbeing is defined, the concept of 'independent living' is a core part of the wellbeing principle. Section 1 of the Care Act includes matters such as individual's control of their day-to-day life, suitability of living accommodation, contribution to society - and crucially, requires local authorities to consider each person's views, wishes, feelings and beliefs.

1.19 The wellbeing principle is intended to cover the key components of independent living, as expressed in the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities (in particular, Article 19 of the Convention). Supporting people to live as independently as possible, for as long as possible, is a guiding principle of the Care Act. The language used in the Act is intended to be clearer, and focus on the outcomes that truly matter to people, rather than using the relatively abstract term 'independent living'." [emphasis added]

10. The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities ("CRPD") is a treaty that is binding in international law. The UK took an active part in negotiating the CRPD, and the UK ratified it in 2010. Although it is not incorporated into English law and does not bind BCC directly, it is clear from the Statutory Guidance that local authorities must consider the CRPD when meeting a person's needs for care and support as it is part of the wellbeing principle. BCC therefore needs to take Article 19 of the CRPD into account when deciding whether to progress its Draft Policy. BRIL considers that the Draft Policy is incompatible with Article 19 of the CRPD and that it should therefore be abandoned.

11. The premise of Article 19(a) CRPD is that disabled people have equal rights to choose where and with whom to live and are "not obliged to live in a particular living arrangement". The central premise of the Draft Policy is that a disabled person may be forced to live in a care home or other residential setting, because funding that would enable them to continue to live in their own home has been cut. On the face of it this would be a violation of Article 19(a) of the CRPD.

12. Article 19(b) of the CRPD sets out that disabled people should have access to a range of community support services that meet their needs, and these services should be designed in such a way as "to prevent isolation or segregation from the community". Article 19 was drafted to combat the global phenomenon of institutionalisation of disabled people, and to spur efforts towards closing institutions. It was intended to ensure that each disabled person can choose where to live in the community and has access to the support and public services that enable them to make decisions about their life, friends, workplaces and transportation. In short, they should have opportunities to flourish on an equal basis with others. Again, the Draft Policy seeks to increase segregation from the community by placing people against their will in congregate care settings.

13. In 2012, Thomas Hammarberg, the then Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe, published a report on Article 19 of the CRPD. He explained the concept of independence as a human right:

"people with disabilities may require supports to live a full life. The notion of independence is based on a social model of disability which recognizes that people are not limited in their choices because of any inherent feature or condition of the person him or herself, but by the social and physical environment in which they live. In enabling environments, things are not done to a person, but rather people are supported, just like anyone else, to make independent and autonomous (and in some cases supported) decisions".

14. The UN supports the social model of disability. The UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities ("CRPD Committee") is the body that oversees the implementation of CRPD rights in the countries that have ratified the CRPD. It consists of 18 experts in disability, drawn from around the world. It provides evidence to governments about how to interpret and implement the Convention.

15. In 2017 the CRPD Committee published General Comment No. 5, which focuses on Article 19 of the CRPD. It explains that any form of institutionalisation is contrary to Article 19 of the CRPD. It clarifies that the size of a living arrangement is irrelevant, but rather what is important is if the place of living has "defining elements of institutions or institutionalization". These defining elements include:

- a. obligatory sharing of assistants with others and no or limited influence over whom one has to accept assistance from;
- b. isolation and segregation from independent life within the community;
- c. lack of control over day-to-day decisions;
- d. lack of choice over whom to live with;
- e. rigidity of routine irrespective of personal will and preferences;
- f. identical activities in the same place for a group of persons under a certain authority;
- g. a paternalistic approach in service provision;
- h. supervision of living arrangements; and
- i. usually also a disproportion in the number of persons with disabilities living in the same environment.

16. If BCC were to adopt the Draft Policy, BCC would be placing itself into the invidious position of falling short of basic international human rights law. It would be a clear signal to disabled people in the Bristol area that their own Council is knowingly breaching their rights.

Meeting needs with limited resources

17. Chapter 10 of the Statutory Guidance is concerned with care and support planning. Paragraph 10.27 permits a local authority to take into consideration its own finances and budgetary position in determining how to meet a person's eligible needs. The paragraph says that a local authority "should not set arbitrary upper limits on the costs it is willing to pay to meet needs through certain routes - doing so would not deliver an approach that is person-centred or compatible with public law principles". It emphasises that the authority should take decisions on a case-by-case basis. While cost is a relevant factor in deciding between suitable alternative options for meeting needs, the Statutory Guidance says that this "does not mean choosing the cheapest option; but the one which delivers the outcomes desired for the best value" (emphasis added).

18. Elsewhere, the Statutory Guidance repeats that consideration of resources does not permit local authorities to elect the cheapest option. In relation to personal budgets, the Statutory Guidance states: "At all times, the wishes of the person must be considered and respected. For

example, the personal budget should not assume that people are forced to accept specific care options, such as moving into care homes, against their will because this is perceived to be the cheapest option" (paragraph 11.7).

19. The Statutory Guidance maintains a focus on the outcomes an individual wishes to achieve in their day-to-day life, and on an individualised and person-centred approach to care-planning.

20. The core content of the Draft Policy at paragraphs 3.8 to 3.9 is fundamentally inconsistent with the structure and purpose of the Care Act 2014 and the Statutory Guidance. The Draft Policy states that where a care package at home would substantially exceed the affordability of residential care, BCC will move the person into residential care. Although BCC is careful to emphasise that this is not a blanket policy, the Draft Policy states that "exceptions are likely to be rare". Accordingly, the Draft Policy establishes a strong presumption that a person living at home with a substantial care package will have their funding cut. The result is that if they want their care needs to be met (which in many cases means survival), they will have to live in a residential setting.

21. BCC's Draft Policy is wholly at odds with the Care Act 2014's focus on individualised care-planning and promotion of well-being, to which the Draft Policy pays only lip service. The Draft Policy takes a cookie-cutter approach and makes resource considerations determinative (with rare exceptions only). Care planning carried out in accordance with the Draft Policy will be unlawful.

22. Moreover, the Draft Policy states at paragraph 3.12 that if the person with eligible needs under the Care Act 2014 disagrees with BCC's decision to offer a care home placement, then BCC will offer the amount of that placement in a budget that the person can use to purchase home care. This appears to be an upper limit (i.e. the cost of a care home placement) that risks falling foul of the Statutory Guidance at paragraph 10.27.

23. Compliance with the Care Act 2014 regime is necessary for BCC to avoid breaching Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights ("ECHR"), the right to respect for private and family life, home and correspondence. Like well-being, "private life" is a broad concept, encompassing a person's physical and psychological integrity, the right to personal development and the notion of personal autonomy. The very essence of Article 8 of the ECHR is respect for human dignity and human freedom: *McDonald v UK* at paragraphs 46-7.

24. Where a public authority removes existing care or support provided to an individual, this will amount to an interference with their right to respect for their private life: see *McDonald v UK* at paragraphs 48-9. Such an interference will be a breach of Article 8 of the ECHR, unless it is justified as being "in accordance with the law" and "necessary in a democratic society" to achieve one of the aims specified in Article 8(2) of the ECHR. If adopted, BCC's Policy will result in decisions to reduce funding that are not "in accordance with" the Care Act 2014 for the reasons set out above. Accordingly, a removal of funding to enable a person to receive care and support in their own home will likely breach Article 8 of the ECHR, which is directly enforceable in courts in England.

25. In 2017-18, the Equality and Human Rights Commission ("EHRC") condemned similar policies adopted by 13 Clinical Commissioning Groups ("CCGs") (now Integrated Care Boards). The EHRC sent legal letters challenging policies which in effect capped the amount of money available for NHS Continuing Healthcare, creating a risk that disabled people with high support needs would be moved from their homes into care homes against their wishes. The EHRC made clear that it was not sufficient for the policies to state that the cap would not apply in "exceptional" circumstances, because this did not "allow the decision-maker properly to undertake... a full evaluation of the particular considerations in favour of provision... as required by [amongst other things] ... Article 8 of

the ECHR, Article 19 of the UNCRPD, the [Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act] ...". All 13 CCGs accepted the failings of their policies and agreed to revise them. The Chief Executive of the EHRC said at the time, "Those who need help are individual human beings with individual circumstances which need to be taken into account."

26. Similarly, in 2018, the Ombudsman found maladministration in relation to Hertfordshire County Council after that authority refused to increase a disabled adult's care package because it would exceed the cost of a care home placement. The ombudsman held: "While councils must always have due regard to the public purse, care provision should be based on assessed needs and where there is no evidence of appropriate assessment such remarks may be indicative of attempts to inappropriately ration limited resources."

27. For all the above reasons, while BCC can take into account resources in care planning, the Draft Policy's strong presumption in favour of care homes is inconsistent with BCC's legal obligations under the Care Act 2014.

28. BRIL acknowledges the significant financial pressures experienced by BCC and other local authorities. Recent observations of the Supreme Court are relevant here. In the case of *R (Imam) v Croydon London Borough Council* a disabled person took their local authority (Croydon) to court for failing to secure her suitable accommodation when Croydon had a duty to do so under the Housing Act 1996. The local authority resisted the claim on the basis of severe budgetary constraints. At paragraph 56, one of the Supreme Court Justices Lord Sales stated: "A public authority which has limited resources available for use to meet its statutory duties and to fulfil functions which are merely discretionary is obliged to give priority to using them to meet its duties."

29. In the face of budgetary constraints, BCC is required to prioritise budgetary allocation so that it can meet its duties under the Care Act 2014.

Discrimination

30. BRIL considers that BCC has failed to comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under s.149 Equality Act 2010 in relation to the Draft Policy. The PSED requires BCC to have due regard to the need, amongst other things, of eliminating discrimination and advancing equality of opportunity between disabled and non-disabled persons. This includes removing or minimising disadvantages faced by disabled persons.

31. Although BCC has carried out an Equality Impact Assessment ("EQIA"), it is deficient for the following reasons.

32. First, BCC states the Draft Policy was adapted from a similar policy implemented by Devon County Council, concluding on this basis that "there is evidence of other local authorities successfully implementing an approach to ensure a more consistent and fair application of social work practice when considering how we meet the needs of individuals with eligible care and support needs". However, there is no publicly available evidence that Devon County Council has conducted a review of its Policy, so the basis upon which BCC asserts that Devon's Policy has been "successful" is unclear. Further, BCC says that success is defined in terms of consistency and fairness. This cannot be the only metric to measure "success" and indeed should not be the main metric. "Success" must at a bare minimum include whether the relevant local authority has complied with its statutory duties, including under the Care Act 2014 to ensure that a person's eligible needs are met in accordance with the well-being principle.

33. Second, although the EQIA assumes that there may be exceptions to the approach of moving a person to a care home where this is cheaper than a package of care at home, the EQIA fails to acknowledge that the Draft Policy states in terms that any exception will be “rare”. The failure of the EQIA to consider that exceptions will be “rare” means it does not accurately reflect the likely impact of the Draft Policy. BRIL is concerned that BCC will think it is complying with its policy if it offers one of the 162 at-risk individuals funding that is greater than a care home placement.

34. Third, the EQIA identifies that as of 17 May 2023, 162 persons were receiving a personal budget over the rate for residential care and thus would likely be impacted by the Draft Policy. However, the EQIA does not provide a demographic breakdown of this group. This is remarkable, given that BCC knows who each of those 162 people are and has completed needs assessments in relation to each of them. Demographic data is available to BCC without the risk of identifying individuals.

35. Further, it is unsafe to assume that the demographics of this cohort will map onto the demographics of all individuals receiving care and support at home, which is the basis upon which the EQIA proceeds. For example, BRIL considers it highly likely that individuals with significant physical impairments (as opposed to those who are frail) who use a team of Personal Assistants 24/7, and those with learning disabilities and/or who are autistic who require complex and specialist support, will be overrepresented in the cohort of individuals with expensive home care packages. It also seems plausible the cohort will include a higher proportion of younger individuals, on the basis that older individuals with high levels of need are more likely to have moved into residential care already.

36. BRIL is acutely concerned that autistic persons and/or those with learning disabilities who are living with support at home will be forced to move out of their homes and away from family. They will be denied the carers that they trust, who are skilled at meeting their individual needs, and placed in a care home where they know none of the residents or staff, and where their autonomy and independence will be severely curtailed. For many people, this is an absolutely terrifying prospect. There is a very real risk that a person in these circumstances forced into residential care will display behaviours that challenge. In turn, this could lead to detention under the Mental Health Act 1983 in inappropriate mental health units. While an admission to hospital would of course save BCC money (as the NHS pays for an inpatient stay), BCC should be taking steps to prevent admissions under the Mental Health Act 1983, rather than taking steps that make such admissions more likely.

37. The lack of analysis of the actual cohort affected by the Draft Policy prevents any proper understanding of its likely equality impacts. BCC has denied civil society the opportunity to respond to the consultation using the data that BCC holds but has not published.

Access to the courts

38. BRIL anticipates that none of the 162 people who the Council has identified with home care packages costing more than a care home placement will want to move into a care home. There is likely to be a dispute between the Council and each of the 162 persons who do not agree to move into a care home.

39. BRIL asks BCC to confirm that it will inform each of these at-risk persons about local charities such as Bristol Law Centre, and law firms that could provide legal advice and representation, to challenge the decision made to cut home care funding which puts them at risk of institutionalisation.

40. BRIL anticipates that many of the people at risk may need an Independent Advocate to support them with assessments, reviews and challenging decisions. Some of the people being affected by the Policy will have learning disabilities, other cognitive impairments and/or are autistic. Some may lack capacity to make decisions about their residence and/or care, pursuant to the Mental Capacity Act 2005. It is important that the Council allocates an Independent Mental Capacity Advocate ("IMCA") to each of these people, pursuant to BCC's duty under s.39 of the Mental Capacity Act 2005. BRIL asks that BCC confirms this will happen if the Draft Policy is passed. BRIL is aware that local advocacy providers are under pressure and are concerned that they may not have spare capacity to take on further IMCA clients, so BRIL asks BCC to explain how each of these people will have access to IMCAs and Independent Care Act Advocates (ICAAs).

41. BRIL would like BCC to clarify where the 162 people would go. Which care homes in Bristol that specialise in meeting the needs of working age disabled adults can accommodate 162 people between them?

42. BRIL also asks BCC to confirm in respect of each of the persons affected who lack capacity to make decisions about their residence and/or care, and that BCC will make an application to the Court of Protection to invite the court to decide where it is in the person's best interests to live and receive care. Again, BCC should ensure that each affected person has access to a solicitor specialising in welfare applications in the Court of Protection. BRIL asks BCC to confirm that it will not move any person who lacks capacity to make a decision about residence and/or care without first making an application to the Court of Protection.

Conclusion

43. BRIL strongly disagrees with the draft Fair and Affordable Care Policy. The presumption in favour of moving disabled people to care homes rides roughshod over BCC's obligations under the Care Act 2014 including the obligation to promote well-being and to support people to live as independently as possible, for as long as possible, and Article 8 ECHR and Article 19 CRPD. Moreover, BCC has not complied with the PSED in preparation of the Draft Policy.

44. BRIL asks BCC not to adopt the Draft Policy as it is fundamentally flawed, likely unlawful, and would cause misery to many disabled people and their family and friends in Bristol. BRIL invites BCC to confirm its decision as soon as possible, given that many disabled people and their friends and families have suffered significant worry and distress since BCC published the Draft Policy.

STATEMENT PS 02

Submitted by David Redgewell

Title: Full Council Budget Setting

We are very concerned about the Transport levy to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council. To pay for public transport services and bus services under the joint power under the west of England mayoral combined authority Act with Bristol city council city and county of Bristol, South Gloucestershire county council Banes council and North Somerset council because of joint transport Authority powers on bus services improvement plan and metro west Railway Network.

The powers in including all public transport Railway services, buses, coaches and ferry services. Sustainable transport Networks. As the Bristol city Region has had major bus service cuts, and many estates in the city Region are unable to access schools college's universities work, food, shopping, shopping centres health care hospital and leisure facilities.

Especially Ashton vale estate, Stapleton Broomhill Fishponds oidbury court Downend Bromley Heath. This includes the vassal centre the Regional centre for Disabled people and conferences facilities has no public bus service. The Dings parts of Bristlington and St Anne's park, Westbury on Trym links to uwe bus station, Bristol parkway station Bradley stoke Aztec west Hortham Alverston Thornbury, Evening services, Sunday services.

We would like a proper negotiation over the Transport levy between Bristol city council South Gloucestershire county council, Banes and North Somerset council Over the level of Transport levy Required to run the public transport Network. Scrutiny commission discuss and joint committee and west of England mayoral combined Authority committee and joint committee oversight.

We also welcome the transferring the clean air zone money to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority for spending on public transport including Bus services and railway ferry service walking and cycling facilities.

But with priority toward bus services to excluded communities. With the bus service improvement plan having to be Resubmitted to the Department for Transport by 12th June 2024 for the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council. With a new submission including details of the supported services next and community's without bus services and access to school, College university health provision hospital basic food shopping trips and leisure facilities.

Community facilities safety partnership working with the police on safety at interchanges ,bus and coach stations Bus stops and shelters railway interchange, Access for disabled passengers and people with reduced mobility to the bus and coach network Castle kerbs ,Drop Kerbs,

In Greater Bristol as a priority such as 505 Bristol Southmead hospital bus station, Horfield, Downs, Clifton village Hotwells ,Ashton Gate Long Ashton park and ride site 505 To Ashton vale. Service 23 ,24 Ashton vale estate, Southville Bedminster Bristol city centre, Bristol cabot circus Service should start by Transpora buses and First group plc Wales and West buses Division on the 8th April 2024,

The 36 / 5 Bristol city centre Barton hill st Anne's park needs to extend to Bristlington, Hengrove knowle Hengrove hospital imperial park Hartcliffe,

Services 1 1a from Cribbs causeway bus and coach station, Bristol city centre, Broadmead shopping centre Bristol Temple meads station Arnos vale Bristlington sandy park road St Anne's park, Guilford Road, Bristlington Hungerford road Bristlington. 1a 1 b splitting at sandy park road.

Services 5 25 restore Between Bristol city centre, st Paul's, St werburges Eastville park Stapleton Broomhill Fishponds oidbury court Downend Bromley Heath,

Services 52 Bishopsworth to Bristol city centre via Hengrove restore for Chew valley services 672.

Services 10 11 shirehampton Avonmouth to Lawrence weston Westbury on Trym Southmead hospital bus station uwe bus station Bristol Parkway railway station Aztec west roundabout, Hortham, Alverston Thornbury to serve the Railway station and the North Bristol employment sites and colleges,

The Dings theses are some of service need restored and need discussion with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council Mayor Dan Norris.

On budget its in growth and Regeation Directorate, the Budget needs to use some of the £26 million pounds clean air zone money to improve walking and cycling and especially bus service improvement to Other alternative to the private car Entering Bristol city centre.

The clean air has reduced emissions by 9% In city centre and save lives from early deaths due to respiratory illness Asthma attacks from poor air quality. But we must offer alternative to the private car.

The council cabinet and mayor Marvin Rees took decision to transfer the staff to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority. To carry out public transport Network function and Transportation function of the combined Authority. Bristol city council being now only a Port Authority and Highway Authority

We do understand why the bus shelters and infrastructure have not been transferred to the combined Authority With Banes ,south Gloucestershire county council and jointly with North Somerset council.

At present the service is confusing to the travelling public that bus and coach shelter are the responsibility of the Highway Authority but timetable real-time information is the responsibility on the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority

So theses function in all other combined Authority's control of bus and coach station interchange, Bus and coach stops and shelters are with them mayor of the Greater Manchester combined Authority, mayor Andy Burnham Liverpool City Region mayor Steve Rotherham, mayor Andy street west Midlands combined Authority. West Yorkshire combined transport Authority, South Yorkshire combined transport Authority,

Mayor Rees and cabinet decision to transfer the service but the Transport Trade union then refused to agree the transfer.

We need to make progress as Bristol city council, South Gloucestershire county council and Bath and North East Somerset council are not transport Authority's. We need to make progress on transferring staff and duties under the west of England mayoral combined Authority act.

On revenue we agree to bring in car parking charges on charges in Town centre car parks this has not happened in Westbury on Trym Bristlington village, sandy park road and progress should be made to generate income for the city council to maintain the car parks 48 % of people have no access to a private car so the revenue passport to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority will help provide bus service across the city Region and the poorest communities without bus services Ashton vale, Bristlington part of St Anne's, Easton, the Dings Stapleton, Broomhill, Fishponds oidbury court Downend Bromley, Bishopsworth, Hengrove hospital, Bedminster city centre Broadmead. Southmead hospital bus station to uwe bus station, Bristol parkway station Filton shopping centre, Bradley stoke, Aztec west Hortham Alverston Thornbury. Service to shops and universities work and colleges.

As a lot of the staff duplicate west of England mayoral combined transport Authority officers this not best value for the Taxpayer and need to look at as part of budget process.

On the planning service its financial unsustainable to pay item manager and Directors to run the service and council must look recruitment of planner and officers the same rates as Bath and North East Somerset council ,North Somerset council and South Gloucestershire county council.

On one of biggest costs to the Taxpayer is the level of interim Directors and consultants running services public services in the including public transport services to the poorest communities in society should be run by local authorities officers employed by the west of England mayoral combined Authority Local Enterprise partnership and North Somerset council and western Gateway Transport Board all of which run from the west of England combined Authority headquarters in Bristol.

We also need to work with the Bristol waste company on removal of graffiti from Buildings and especially Public transport Network infrastructure.

Welcome investment in local railway station with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority on metro west Railway Network

Bristol Temple meads station To Ashton Gate , pill and Portishead.

Bristol Temple meads station To Lawrence Hill Station ,Bristol Stapleton road,Ashley Down, Filton Abbey wood Filton North, Henbury for cribs causeway on the Bristol Temple meads station Filton Abbey wood station Bristol parkway station, Yate, Charfield cam and the Dursley Gloucester central Cheltenham spa Ashchurch for Tewkesbury Worcester Shrub Hill and Worcester Forgate Street.. With a new station at Charfield.

Progress with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council on a mass transit light rail system for the Greater Bristol and Bath Region.

Walk and cycling investment in city Harbour and New cuts Bridges. Work to make ferry's and ferry services full accessible. Improvement for passengers waiting for coach services and Bond Street shelter ect and Tourist coaches.

On income generation as Bristol and Bath are major Tourist destinations and part of the Tourist economy. We would welcome the bring in of a Tourist Tax like Greater Manchester combined Authority and the city of Manchester. Especially to fund service in the city Region including public transport Network service public realm, and the Arts and the Environment Bristol should look at

It's is very important money is spent for the public transport Network in the city. Poorest communities and estates through the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris or Director jointly with South Gloucestershire county council Banes or North Somerset council on bus services improvement in Bristol poorest communities,

We also want to see the built Environment and public transport Network and investment in Public toilets at public transport Network interchange at Bristol, Long Ashton park and ride, Bristlington park and ride, and port way park and ride bus and Rail interchange site.

David Redgewell
South west transport Network
Railfuture Severnside
Bristol disability equalities forum
South Gloucestershire disability equalities network

STATEMENT PS 03

Submitted by Dan Ackroyd

Title: Statement on Budget

Quoting from the 'Resources Scrutiny Commission Comments on 2024/25 Budget Proposals' document:

"We would, however, stress the ongoing desirability of engaging the public more comprehensively...We would suggest that in the next year, the new Strategy and Resources Committee should consider carefully the detail around how budget consultations/proposals/reports are produced, in terms of content, narrative and the display of financial detail, with a view to making the content as public friendly as possible."

I think Councillors should provide guidance about exactly what type of feedback they want from the public, rather than just saying "make the content more public friendly".

It is incredibly difficult for members of the public to engage with the council on most topics, and the budget is, by its very nature, even more difficult to engage on.

I recall hearing one Officer describe how the Council had previously run a consultation was done in a more meaningful way previously, where members of the public were asked the hard trade-off questions. The result of that was a very high number of people abandoning the questionnaire.

I'm reasonably sure we elect politicians because it's too difficult for members of the public to engage on some topics.

However I think it should be easier for members of the public to give engage on the "budget amendments", as these are smaller in scope that the whole budget.

But the budget amendments were only published on the 14th of February, giving people less than 48 hours to submit statements or otherwise give feedback on the proposals.

You'd get better public engagement if you get in the habit of publishing information far enough ahead that people can actually give feedback, and for that feedback to be accepted, and result in a change of proposal.

That also applies to consultations carried out by the Council. I'm aware of a couple of consultations done recently where, through no-ones fault, just due to the nature of how this Council operates to a timetable, the results of each consultation could not result in any changes to the thing being consulted on, as there was no time or opportunity for Councillors to consider adjusting the proposal.

One other area where there is a distinct lack of information available to the public is the 'City Region Sustainable Transport Settlements' applications. I may have missed it, but neither BCC or WECA seem to be engaging the public in those applications for funding. This seems an obvious area for improvement.