

Summons to attend meeting of Full Council



Date: Tuesday, 11 March 2025

Time: 6.00 pm

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

To: All Members of Council

Issued by: Oliver Harrison, Democratic Services

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

Tel: 0117 3526162

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

Date: Friday, 28 February 2025



Agenda

6. Public Petitions, Statements and Questions

Members of the press and public who plan to attend a public meeting at City Hall are advised that you will be required to sign in when you arrive, and you will be issued with a visitor pass which you will need to display at all times. **(Pages 4 - 69)**

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

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

Please note that the following deadlines apply to this meeting:

- a. Public petitions and statements: Petitions and written statements must be received by **12 noon on Friday 7 March 2025** at latest. One written statement per member of the public is permitted.
- b. Public questions: Written public questions must be received by **5pm on Wednesday 5 March 2025** at latest. A maximum of 3 questions per member of the public is permitted. Questions should be addressed to the Leader or relevant Policy Committee Chair.

Public Questions and Statements should be submitted via our webform: www.bristol.gov.uk/publicforum

Petitions should be e-mailed to democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

Signed



Proper Officer
Friday, 28 February 2025





Public Forum

Date: Tuesday, 11 March 2025



Agenda

1. Public Statements Received

(Pages 3 - 43)

Ref No	Name	Title
PS01	Chris Honor	Van dwellers on the Downs
PS02	Arthur Hook	Van dwellers on the Downs
PS03	Josephine Maxwell	Van dwellers near St. George Park
PS04	Angela Howe	Flooding Prevention at Frome Terrace
PS05	Geoffrey Allan	Endorse the Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation Treaty
PS06	Andrew Paten	Bristol Zoo Gardens Planning Application
PS07	Ashley Williams	Nicholas Wanderers AFC
PS08	Simon Lovell	Keep Museums Open
PS09	Matt Sanders	Bus Gate condemned by Tribunal
PS10	Teoman Sevgen	Support Renters' Rights Bill
PS11	Anonymous	Blaise Museum Closure
PS12	Megs Smith	South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PS13	Thomas Pearce	Labour Government cuts to welfare benefits
PS14	Naresha Mcleary	Easton Leisure Centre
PS15	Ayan Mussa	Easton Leisure Centre
PS16	Haydn Gill	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PS17	Azmeena Haq	Easton Leisure Centre
PS18	Katherine Jacob	Easton Leisure Centre
PS19	David Redgewell	Bus service improvement plan
PS20	Janie Randell	Easton Leisure Centre
PS21	Erin Lee	Easton Leisure Centre
PS22	Michael Potts	Objection to bus gate proposal for Park St
PS23	Melissa Topping	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PS24	Caroline Dunn	Bristol an accessible and disabled-compassionate city
PS25	Merriel Waggoner	Easton Leisure Centre
PS26	Jo Sergeant	Public Toilets in Bristol

2. Public Questions Received

(Pages 44 - 66)

Ref No	Name	Title
PQ01	Natalie Calder	Crossing Guards
PQ02	Anthony Martin	Caravans Parked on the Downs
PQ03	Andrew Paten	Bristol Zoo Planning Application
PQ04	[Ruled Out]	
PQ05	Joe Thomas	Senior Councillor Diaries
PQ06	Siobhan Martin	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ07	Satwant Phull	Glebe Road Planters
PQ08	Melissa Topping	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ09	David Redgewell	Bus Services
PQ10	Matt Sanders	Bus Gates
PQ11	Stuart Phelps	Air Quality
PQ12	June Brennan	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ13	Megs Smith	South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ14	Elizabeth Staples	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood
PQ15	Merriel Waggoner	Loss of Sports Hall at Easton Leisure Centre
PQ16	Azmeena Haq	Easton Leisure Centre Refurbishment plans
PQ17	Joanne Brown	women's netball in Easton

Issued by: Democratic Services

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



STATEMENT PS 01

Submitted by Chris Honor

Title: Van Squatters occupying the Beautiful Downs

I would like to know how and when the council with all their excuses and lack of desire and professionalism are going to remove the Van Squatters and travellers from The Durdham Downs. All the hands tied, complicated issues, and human rights excuses are not sufficient and don't address the appalling mess and appearance of the Downs.

Introduce more parking restrictions, enlarge the residents parking zone, employ more traffic wardens, do something !!!

STATEMENT PS 02

Submitted by Arthur Hook

Title: Vans on the Downs

I'm writing to ask what is being done to remove the vans and buses parked around the Downs. Their number has risen so much in the last few years that I believe they present a major problem for the health and safety of Downs users and local residents. Children play and come to study on the Downs and shouldn't have to contend with human waste and litter. The presence of the vans is already in breach of parking regulations that are intended to limit the times at which any vehicle can lawfully be left in the area and which I imagine would be rigidly enforced elsewhere in Bristol.

I feel that for too long issues like the housing shortage, the cost of accommodation and the rights of travelling people have been allowed to distract the Council and the police from getting to grips with this situation. Please could you do your best to act to secure the future of a priceless amenity.

STATEMENT PS 03

Submitted by Josie Maxwell

Title: Van dwellers near St George Park, BS5

(Could not find the Homes & Housing Committee on the list.)

I live next to the park and for some years this narrow road with blind bends has been parked solidly with long term vans and caravans. The council acted this year to remove the vans and their litter. Plant tubs have been installed and now the only van dwellers that park are one or two and they tend to stay for a day or so. We will have to see what happens in summertime but hopefully the pattern will remain the same. The road safety aspect has improved enormously. I hope that the council will remain vigilant in moving on vans if the problem recurs.

STATEMENT PS 04

Submitted by Angela Howe

Title: Resident Statement re: Flooding Prevention at Frome Terrace

Angela Howe, & Frome Terrace

I am a resident of Frome Terrace, Stapleton. Frome Terrace is a row of eight homes that sit at the bottom of Blackberry Hill and Broom Hill and are accessed by a gate at the west end of the terrace. Since moving there nearly 20 years ago I have suffered flood damage from the road run-off.

In 2022 my house was severely flooded and I had to move out. The damp affected my health leaving me in hospital for a week, and meant I could not return for a further two weeks. The only way the flooding can be prevented is if all the drains along the route from the top of both hills to the bottom are properly cleared and maintained.

In 2022 mayor Marvin Rees visited my home twice. Mr Rees assured me, in person and in writing, that ALL the gullies on both roads would completely cleared. He said the ones on the hill would be delayed because they needed traffic lights. The drains and gullies outside the terrace and on the road opposite were done quickly. The drains on the hills were not cleared.

The drains and gullies contain grit, silt and other compacted debris and leaves making them almost entirely redundant. In addition to on-site rainfall, additional water comes off UWE's Glenside site entrance, which then cascades down Blackberry Hill.

Without the capacity of the drains on Blackberry Hill and Broom Hill taking some of the water, the drains further down the road cannot accommodate the volume they meet so it pours down the hill, over the kerb and into the terrace, compromising the homes - picture attached.

Since 2022, water has pooled outside our houses and come in under our front doors at least four more times – picture attached.

From then on, whenever there was heavy rain, as there regularly was, my neighbours and I would wade in two-foot high water on the path in front of our houses and out onto main road, to try and clear the drains on both sides. The amount of rain and stormy weather we were facing meant we were largely unsuccessful!

While clearing the drains in one downpour we heard a crash as one of the trees in Grove Wood fell across Blackberry Hill, blocking the entire road and going into the entrance of Eastville Park - photo attached. The tree had been destabilised by the wet ground conditions.

The most recent flooding was in January 2025 and included water from Dutchess Lake's broken banks - photo attached

At the moment, we try to protect our homes from water ingress with sandbags. As the climate becomes wetter and stormier, we need help to prevent this happening more and more.

I note that the council says it will clear drains and gullies every year and target problem areas – link to council website. Historically, they have not been done annually on Broom and Blackberry Hill despite being “problem areas”.

To prevent our homes and lives being compromised we need:

1. ALL the drains on both sides of the roads, up both hills and on the terrace, to be thoroughly cleared-out. (Sapphire, the clearing company, has not always been instructed to clear all the drains and gullies the length of both roads.)
2. Gullies and drains to be regularly cleared – not just after an event.
3. Overhanging trees and those in Grove Wood to be maintained to limit leaf-fall and instability.
4. Slower traffic down both hills to reduce the risk and occurrence of vehicle accidents during eventsvii.
5. A proper storm gate on the westerly access of Frome Terrace.
6. Attention given to Dutchess Lake to implement measures to prevent its banks bursting.

Action by the council to prevent future flooding is much needed

STATEMENT PS 05

Submitted by Geoffrey Allan

Title: Call for Bristol City Council to endorse the Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation Treaty

I'm calling on Bristol City Council to join other cities, councils, and others in supporting this Treaty.

Here's why:-

1. Why Bristol City Council?

As a foremost authority in tackling the climate crisis, Bristol is in a prime condition to endorse it, without further financial resource expenditure but as a statement of values.

2. What is the Treaty?

It is an initiative of the Global South led by Tuvalu and Vanuatu, to shift leadership on action to combat global heating away from the most polluting countries.

3. What does the Treaty aim to do?

It aims to complement the Paris Agreement, building an international coalition to counter the force of the fossil fuel industry and its supporting regimes and processes, alongside other movements such as divestment and debt relief. (The Council is already taking action on pension divestment).

4. Is there a precedent for the development of such an international treaty?

The precedent is the 1997 Land Mines Treaty which started with a similar initiative supported by local authorities before gaining international recognition.

5. What are the principles of the Treaty?

The three main principles are:

- i) a just transition to renewable energy for all workers, communities and countries;
- ii) non-proliferation, ending the expansion of fossil fuels;
- iii) a fair phase-out, so that nations with the capacity and historical responsibility for emissions transition fastest.

6. What is the current level of support for the Treaty?

Global support so far includes 16 governments, and multiple cities, including Bristol's twin city Bordeaux, and organisations including 15 UK local authorities. The support of Bristol City Council would help build pressure for the UK government to endorse it.

STATEMENT PS 06

Submitted by Andrew Paten

Title: The May Judicial Review for Bristol Zoo Gardens Planning Application for redevelopment and 196 homes

In April 2023, Bristol City Council recommended approval of the redevelopment of the unique historic Bristol Zoo Gardens into a luxury housing estate with 196 housing units. Despite great public resistance and controversy about the appropriateness of the development in a conservation area, the loss of over 150 mature trees, plus the significant cultural and environment loss, a majority of the then Councillors were persuaded it should go ahead, partly because they were advised:

- i) it would provide social/affordable housing
- ii) a separate agreement (a Section 106) would be negotiated that would secure free public access to the Gardens
- iii) the plans would deliver a 30% net gain in biodiversity

Among many other reasons this development has been opposed on grounds that:

- i) building luxury flats does nothing to solve Bristol's social housing crisis - and it is quite possible the small amount of designated so-called social/affordable housing may never be built - indeed, that scarce resources diverted by this expensive development may have the opposite effect
- ii) there is no money and no credible plan backing up the promise of free public access - plus after 5 years any developer can apply to have the condition of public access removed
- iii) the net gain in biodiversity suggested is wrong and completely fails to reflect the loss of over 150 MATURE trees in a mature ecosystem over 100 years old

In June 2024, the s106 was signed and planning permission was formally granted. In November 2024 a judge agreed to a Judicial Review of the planning process now scheduled for May 2025, with all three points presented as arguable:

- i) Bristol planners allowed BZS to use old unworkable methodology in its application and to show a biodiversity net gain as a result. Using the correct workings experts calculate the development would actually cause a 20% NET LOSS in biodiversity
- ii) The planners inconsistently used an old version of carbon factors to demonstrate a reduction in carbon emissions from the development
- iii) The Gardens are an Important Open Space in the Local Plan. Development on these protected spaces is generally not permitted.

ie. the reasons the planners gave to the Councillors to justify this development were arguably wrong in law.

No one knows what the outcome of the judicial Review will be. But if successful, it could lead to the planning permission being quashed and should certainly, strongly encourage the Council to reconsider its earlier decision.

The hope is that this can then foster a genuine and meaningful dialogue with all parties and community groups to create a plan for the Gardens that benefits everyone, not just the developers and the Zoo. I trust the Council will be willing to commit to this — the potential loss of Bristol Zoo

Gardens to a housing estate represents a significant, unique, and entirely IRREVERSIBLE historic, cultural, and environmental loss. This outcome of this review could present our new Council and the Zoo a second chance to be on the right side of history. I hope both will commit to taking a more open, collaborative, and thoughtful approach to securing a fitting future for our unique and historic Bristol Zoo Gardens, which have meant so much to hundreds of thousands of families and millions of visitors over the years.

STATEMENT PS 07

Submitted by Ashley Williams

Title: NICHOLAS WANDERERS AFC

What is your statement?

Over 5 years ago BCC asked if we would take full control of our compound, clubhouse and pitches at Dundridge Playing Fields St George, we relished the chance to move the club forward but we are no further on than we were 4 years ago we believe, it is staggering how long it is taking with nothing moving forward

Every time we get there BCC throw another curve ball !!

We agreed H of T's in October and now nothing has been sent to our solicitors, When i spoke to the Officer late last year he agreed that what was left was merely a copy and paste exercise with the lease, yet 5 months later we are still going backwards

It is holding the club back to the extent that players and committee members have looked at moving clubs with better facilities and ambitions, we cannot access the £65k plus vat SAT money until the lease is signed, this will get spent on improvements to the club include all new roofs, refurbishing the barn etc we sent a Schedule of works which the council agreed on

We cannot access the £80k CIL Funding from 2021 & 2022 until the lease is signed, we cannot start on the changing room extension until signed, we want to knock a wall down in the club to double the size of clubhouse but we are unable to because on the other side of wall is another changing room which is used every other week so until the extension is built and we put the changing rooms in the extension we can't knock the wall down and move forward

We cannot put solar panels up until lease is signed which will drastically reduce our electricity bills and improve the environment

We have been approached and met a small local company and they asked if they could use an area of dead space in our car park to put a mobile sauna (max 10 people) and plunge pools for 1 person (cold), with a couple of mobile changing and lockers etc there, it will be fenced off and quite private, this would be open to the public to book on line, they are popping up all over the country, they are very good for mental health and wellbeing and i believe excellent use of an unused area in the carpark for the local community to use, they have offered £300 per month and they will have staff managing it so we would have better security, this is extra funds per month to receive and to put back into the club, we do not want to turn this opportunity down really as they will put it somewhere else, we cannot proceed with this without the lease being signed

We hope you can help with these matters and fast track our lease this month

STATEMENT PS 08

Submitted by Simon Lovell

Title: Keep Museums Open

Dear whomever concerns. I would like to make a statement and the absolute need to keep these museums open for everyone, to find a way to create opportunities for additional funding/revenue from the museums - A small charge, hire for events like Blaise museum - indoor/outdoor. It would be such a shame and a real loss for any of the museums to close as it brings in a lot of families/individuals to Bristol and the people who live in Bristol. Also to find out about the history and that would be lost. Some sort of volunteer positions for staff. Thank you

STATEMENT PS 09

Submitted by Matt Sanders

Title: Bus Gate condemned by Tribunal

Since January last year, the Cumberland Road Bus Gate has issued 65,000 Penalty Charge Notices, and I have helped some of its victims with appeals to the Traffic Penalty Tribunal.

I won most appeals for drivers who had visited the SS Great Britain and Bristol Marina, due to inadequate signage on those routes.

But the Council won most appeals brought by drivers who had arrived from Cumberland Basin...

Advance warning signs on that route all have fatal flaws. But most adjudicators ignored those defects, and only considered the signs at the bus gate itself, which they deemed to be adequate.

Highways officers then pretended that this approval confirmed that ALL signage was OK.

But Adjudicator Robinson has recently agreed that — due to the defective signage at Cumberland Basin and elsewhere — the bus gate is NOT enforceable, after all.

These are his words:

“When considering whether a signage scheme is compliant, the standard is one of ‘adequacy’, so the Council is not held to a standard of perfection... However, importantly, the signage and road markings must be looked at as a whole, and this is the approach that Mr Sanders stresses, and his detailed appeal documents do bring in details of the overall signage scheme for the area which I have not previously had to consider.

“Routes leading into Cumberland Basin inform drivers of the route to take (‘city centre/other routes’), and warn of the bus gate near the SS Great Britain using the familiar blue-and-white roundel sign. The exception is for drivers heading south along Merchants Road. From that direction there are no signs advising drivers which road to take for ‘city centre/other routes’.

“A collection of signs is located at the junction of Merchants Road and Avon Crescent. ... a rather more complex yellow-and-black temporary sign, containing reasonably detailed information, in a cluster of other signs, and the full significance of it would only be apparent to the driver if he was aware of the location and extent of Cumberland Road.

“The signs do not state that there is no access to the city centre/Bath/Wells, or that other traffic should take another route.

“I do not find that the first three warning signs are likely to be that effective in terms of warning drivers, as they are not particularly well located...

“The yellow sign shortly after that point is fairly detailed, with relatively small text, and may be difficult to comprehend at normal driving speed.

“I am concerned that little use has been made of road markings diverting drivers towards the Council’s preferred alternative route... There are a number of possible measures that can be employed, such as directional arrows, wording on the road surface, broken white lines to delineate the route intended for the main traffic flow and so on...

“The need for something of that nature is particularly important since the bus gate commences some 15 to 20 m after the junction with Gas Ferry Road, not at the junction itself. None of the signs

at either of the turnings immediately before the bus gate mention the bus gate, or that the side turnings are a possible escape route.

“Even the wording ‘Bus Gate’ is painted towards the end of the red road surface colouration, meaning that as the driver approaches Gas Ferry Road, the most important signs and markings are still some 25-30 m away.

“To have a better indication at the actual junction itself of the need to turn left to avoid the restriction is, in my judgement, essential for the overall signage scheme to be adequate.

“I am aware that this bus gate has been the subject of a considerable amount of publicity and discussion in recent times, with those concerned pointing to the still disproportionately high number of PCNs that the bus gate generates.

“The Council has doubtless also considered the decisions of adjudicators, including myself, that have previously found the signage arrangement to be adequate. However it is the correct approach to revisit previous decisions if an unusually large number of PCNs are still being generated by a particular location, compared to other bus gates with higher volumes of traffic in the city centre of Bristol.

“A detailed analysis of the signage and road markings for the whole area was required, which led me to depart from my earlier view of the signage. I hope that the Council will find this decision helpful in identifying measures which will bring levels of compliance with this bus gate into line with other busy locations within Bristol.”

STATEMENT PS 10

Submitted by Teoman Sevgen

Title: Call for Support on Renters' Rights Bill

Dear Council,

I am Teo Sevgen, a Resident of Clifton Ward, and here today on behalf of the University of Bristol Students and the Student Union.

As many of you are aware, we are facing a chronic shortage of housing nationwide, to which Bristol is not an outlier, and students are affected just as much as other residents of the city.

The university cohort contributes close to 2 Billion Pounds to our local economy*, yet we remain the most vulnerable when it comes to housing policy. But fear not, I am not here today to ask for building more unpopular developments - but to ask for your support in writing. Bristol City Council recently introduced and approved a symbolic motion calling for a ceasefire in Gaza, and similarly, we encourage the council to introduce a motion indicating their cross-party support for the upcoming Renters' Rights Bill in parliament - which the Student Union already actively campaigns for.

Doing so will send a positive message to our 40 thousand-strong electoral cohort ahead of the elections in May.

Kind regards,

Concerned Youth Vote

STATEMENT PS 11

Submitted by Anonymous

Title: Letter regarding Blaise Museum Closure

Blaise Museum is absolutely imperative to the community. It is a place many of us grew up going to & learning the history of Bristol + Henbury regarding the rich & beautiful culture we have. Such fond memories of the location will be instilled into every person who's ever been local or is still local to it. Generations have visited, and many generations to come should still have the access. It is one of the last things we have in Henbury. We all complain of children being on their phones and not having an interest in their surroundings, but continue to shut down interactive places for their minds to flourish. Instead of promoting & using funds to restore these pieces of history you choose to just ignore it all. Funding these places would be a much better use of Bristol's capital than unnecessary roadworks & bus lanes people do not want.

The museum is filled with such history that delights all ages, as well as hosting various events that bring everyone together.

We need to keep our history alive & not bury & bulldoze over it. The castle is absolutely magnificent & you'd never want to knock that down, so why tear down the museum which is just as beautiful but also filled with centuries of art & culture.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my side of the conversation.

Yours faithfully,

A resident of Henbury who grew up with day trips here, and still goes. With hopes to take her future child in due course.

STATEMENT PS 12

Submitted by Megs Smith

Title: South Bristol Liveable

There is a very good reason to roll out the South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood scheme trial period without any further delay. The planners have had their engagement phase and heard from over 1,800 individuals but no-one will truly understand how the scheme will work until the trial begins. Let the residents in South Bristol who call for quieter and cleaner streets enjoy seeing the commuters take a different route to work every day, and let the commuters allay their fears of a possible extra mile or so to their destinations. For it is only when the action happens that the reality of the scheme can be fully experienced by all those it affects.

STATEMENT PS 13

Submitted by Thomas Pearce

Title: Effect of Labour Government cuts to welfare benefits on Bristol city council

The BBC website stated on its article titled "Chancellor set to cut welfare spending by billions" that "Last year, the government spent £65bn on sickness benefits, external – a 25% increase from the year before the Covid pandemic."

RPI inflation from January 2019 to January 2024 was 33.5%. This means that there has been an 8.5% real terms cut in welfare spending since 2019. The insistence from the government that the current situation is "unsustainable" is therefore untrue and reveals their political priorities. The Labour government have decided the previous Conservative governments were too generous in supporting those in our society with the most need.

In 2014 our chancellor Rachel Reeves made a speech as the then current shadow work and pensions minister in 2013 stating "Labour will be tougher than Tories on benefits". Margaret Thatcher may have described Tony Blair as her "greatest achievement" but only because she couldn't have foreseen Rachel Reeves.

The impact of "several billion pounds" spending cuts on the most in need Bristolians would be severe. It would mean residents unable to afford their rent, potentially becoming homeless, pushing up the burden on Bristol city council. It would increase the demand on existing foodbanks in the city. More people would be choosing between heating and eating. It would increase demands on our local NHS due to mental health issues & exacerbate physical health issues caused by financial stress. In short, it would damage our communities and our own families. We all would be less secure, knowing we are one accident away from being in dire circumstances.

I think the time has come for Labour councillors to ask themselves why they came into politics. Was it to punish disabled people for being disabled? Was it to force unwell people to jump through hoops for their perverse satisfaction? Was it to watch their own government allow billionaires wealth to skyrocket while also directly impoverishing their elderly, sick or disabled?

If it wasn't, then they should take action. We voters are watching.

STATEMENT PS 14

Submitted by Naresha Mcleary

Title: Easton leisure centre netball

I am deeply concerned about the proposed changes to Easton Leisure Centre, which threaten the future of netball and other sports that require a full-sized court. Netball is more than just a game—it provides a vital space for women and girls to stay active, build confidence, and foster a sense of community. Removing the full-sized court in favour of a soft play area and café disregards the needs of those who rely on this facility for structured sport. Sports like netball, basketball, volleyball, cricket practice, and indoor five-a-side football cannot be squeezed into smaller spaces without significantly impacting participation and accessibility. The lack of meaningful consultation with those who use the centre is deeply disappointing. I urge the council to reconsider these plans and engage with the community to find a solution that truly serves all users.

STATEMENT PS 15

Submitted by Ayan Mussa

Title: Easton Leisure centre - Netball

I am deeply concerned about the planned changes to Easton Leisure Centre, as they threaten the future of netball and other sports that rely on a full-sized court. Netball is not just a game, it is a critical space for women and girls to stay active, boost their confidence, and build a sense of community.

Replacing the full-sized court with a soft play area and café disregards the needs of those who depend on this facility for structured sports. The lack of meaningful consultation with the centre's users is very disappointing. I urge the council to reconsider these plans and engage with the community to find a solution that truly benefits all users.

STATEMENT PS 16

Submitted by Haydn Gill

Title: Support for East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood

I write this following the harrowing news from Kendal, where a 10-year-old girl was killed by a driver, whilst playing football on a football pitch. It must be devastating for the family involved, and a clear example of the dangers of cars and their drivers driving near anything or anyone. This echoes an incident in Wimbledon, London in July 2023, where a driver killed two children, having a picnic in their own school field.

To the detractors of the East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood, who support all drivers being able to drive past schools, playgrounds and parks in Barton Hill at any time of day at any speed. I would highlight that these incidents happen in an instant, any driver could easily cause similar devastating harm to a child in Barton Hill.

Therefore, the sooner the streets are calmed with the liveable neighbourhood in place, with only local drivers driving down local streets, would the risk to children in Barton Hill finally be reduced. I look forward to Bristol City Council improving the futures of our children, where decisions made today will save someones life tomorrow.

STATEMENT PS 17

Submitted by Azmeena Haq

Title: Easton Leisure Centre (Netball)

I am deeply concerned about the proposed changes to Easton Leisure Centre, which threaten the future of netball and other sports that require a full-sized court. Netball is more than just a game—it provides a vital space for women and girls to stay active, build confidence, and foster a sense of community. Removing the full-sized court in favour of a soft play area and café disregards the needs of those who rely on this facility for structured sport. Sports like netball, basketball, volleyball, cricket practice, and indoor five-a-side football cannot be squeezed into smaller spaces without significantly impacting participation and accessibility. The lack of meaningful consultation with those who use the centre is deeply disappointing. I urge the council to reconsider these plans and engage with the community to find a solution that truly serves all users.

STATEMENT PS 18

Submitted by Katherine Jacob

Title: Easton Leisure Centre cuts (netball)

I am writing to express my anger and frustration with the undemocratic processes leading up to the proposed “refurbishment” of Easton Leisure Centre and subsequent plans to cancel provision for a number of regular team sports at the site including netball, basketball, volleyball, cricket practice and indoor 5 a side football, all of whom need a full size sports hall to operate.

As a 59 yr old member of the netball team, I’ve seen the shabby way local residents and regular paying members of the Centre have been treated. Far from communicating with them in a timely manner, empowering them to be involved in decisions, supporting resident led activity and growing community sports provision – Bristol City Council and Everyone Active have instead cobbled together a bunch of random proposals that no one has asked for but have a massive impact on regular sports provision. Off the back of a weak consultation in 2022 (in which the focus was South Bristol and only 32 Easton Leisure Centre users offered their views), the Council and its partners are downsizing the main sports hall, turning a third of it into soft play. They are spending money on a new reception area and a women’s gym – of which there are plenty around the city. Hardly good use of precious finances!

The consequence of these changes is to force a host of team sports out of Easton. Having read the Sports and Leisure Strategy, it’s unclear how such changes support either the Strategy or the health of our neighbourhoods as existing residents participating in sport can no longer get their preferred exercise or be part of a chosen team offering sociable contact and friendship.

Our own netball team has discovered the wide range of sports groups who will be affected are actually unaware of these imminent proposals. We’ve also been unable to find an Equalities Assessment to ensure any real impact has been properly examined. For example, the sports groups include a significant proportion of older people (50 plus), people from African, African Caribbean or Asian backgrounds and women along with intergenerational activity. All the positive objectives you could wish for, if anyone from Public Health really cared about them!

Easton Leisure Centre serves a huge area that includes Eastville and Fishponds which have no sports facilities of their own. We cannot operate with a downsized sports hall or bumped over to St Pauls Sports Centre which currently has no space or time available!

I call on Bristol City Council to halt the current proposals at Easton Leisure Centre, review the 2022 consultation, undertake discussions with existing sports groups and explore options for expanding sport in an appropriate way.

STATEMENT PS 19

Submitted by David Redgewell

Title: Bus service improvement plan

One of the main services of the Authority is the provision of public Transport services jointly with North Somerset council.

Which has now been accepted for membership of the west of England mayoral combined Authority after the mayoral Elections in may 2025

Details to be set out by the secretary of state Anglia Rayner.

The issue around the bus service improvement plan are the need to plan and provide bus services through an enhanced Quality partnership.

With First group plc Wales and West buses Division and Stagecoach Group plc west buses.

And bus operator like big lemon buses of Brighton Sussex, Faresaver buses Euro coaches Abus libra travel Rapt Bath bus company.

The issue are the spending of £105 million pounds of bus services improvement plan money.

The need to work more closely together with Bristol city council /Banes / North Somerset council and south Gloucestershire county council on Planning bus and coach services

Networks .

This is being to happen with the new services in Bristol.

Service 36 St Anne's park Brislington Hungerford road knowle, Hartcliffe Bishopsworth and Highridge.

Services 37 Hartcliffe, to Avonmouth and severn Beach via the Portway

And Fishponds to Bristol Temple meads station, Bristol city centre via Kingswood and St George Redfield .

and in Bath with Evening journeys on the park and ride bus services

and improvement to services 8

On a Sunday Bath bus and coach station to Kingsway.

and in North Somerset council.

With improvement to x1 Bristol bus and coach station to weston super mare bus and coach station night bus services.

X5 Weston super mare bus and coach station to Clevedon and Portishead

X 8 has changed to x7 x7a

Between Bristol and Clevedon.

Service 5 in weston super mare.

and 126 Wells bus and coach station to cheddar and weston super mare bus and coach station.

Via weston super mare Hospital.

Service X 12 Clevedon to Yatton worle interchange and weston super mare bus and coach station

But in south Gloucestershire county council area

No service changes were made despite

Request from passengers groups stakeholders residents and community's and south Gloucestershire county council Councillor Chris willmore and Matt Palmer transport Executive members

On bus services Y 1 y2 Bristol city centre and Y 6 To Yate and chipping Sodbury via Winterbourne and Frampton Cotterell.

And the y6 Bristol city centre to Gloucester road montpellier station approach Horfield Common Southmead hospital bus station ,Cribbs causeway bus station, Bristol Parkway station, Winterbourne Frampton Cotterell Yate Park and ride site Yate railway station yate bus station and chipping Sodbury.

With chipping Sodbury.

Being left with no direct service to Bristol city centre.

Only 90 2 hourly frequency via Cribbs causeway bus station.

Y8 big lemon buses west local still does not operate from yate bus and coach station to Wotton under Edge via Wickwar and Charfield from Hawkesbury Upton Pond.

And service 40 Bristol bus and coach station to yate park and ride site Yate railway station yate bus station chipping Sodbury, Wickwar,Charfield Wotton under Edge Charfield and Stroud a proposal by Gloucestershire county council and stagecoach west not moved forward.

The service 19 Bath spa bus and coach station to weston Kelston Swinford Bitton oidland Common Warmley Kingswood Staple Hill ,Downend Bromley Heath Uwe bus and coach station and Bristol Parkway station

Has still not be reroute via Frenchay Stapleton,Stoke park.

and Evening services operate to Downend only

With no connection to Bristol park for care workers, Nurse and Doctors to get back from East Bristol.

Whist meeting are now happening to sort out the £ 13 .716 185

Bus service improvement plan funding with North Somerset council funding of £4.830 .390

Bus grant for 20 25 2026 .

With councillors in charge of Transport (Highways) on the 2025 2026 .

Bus plan for the Department for transport.

There have been no bus service Advisory panel or Broad input .

It was raised at the last panel meeting but no plan was given to members

This plan has to be submitted to the Department for Transport by the End of March 2025

The most concerning issue was the fact the panel was chaired by an officer of the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council joint transport arrangements.

But not an Elected councillor Hannah Young transport executive for North Somerset council in charge of the Transport Authority in North Somerset council raised this issue passengers groups and operators were of support a elected members should chair the panel and Bus services advisory Board.

Which is the case in Somerset unity council and Gloucestershire County council.

Reports on the new bus service Proposal and infrastructure have gone to or going to the cabinet for sign off and new services will start on April 2025 or September 2025

With the 126 being a cross boundary services from wells bus and coach station to cheddar and Weston super mare bus and coach station and Railway station.

With joint funding and not operating via the uphill Hospital but with through ticketing and bus connection to the hospital and a better Saturday service

Other services in September include

A Sunday and Evening services

On 376 Yeovil bus and coach station to Ilchester, Somerton ,Street, Glastonbury Wells bus and coach station Bristol bus and coach station.

With Somerset unity council and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority.

But unlike Somerset council/ Gloucestershire county council.

And North Somerset council no

Bus passengers and stakeholders forums have been held at the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority with passengers.

We have had good input to bus advisory panel working groups.

But Passengers input is required at the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority with North Somerset council including disabled and equalities forums

Quality of bus services is very important with bus shelter and interchanges facilities cleaning information displays but also cleaning of buses the standard on which are poor in Bristol.

With Gloucestershire county council no progress has been made on the Bristol City centre Yate Yate railway station yate bus station chipping Sodbury Wickwar Charfield Wotton under Edge Stroud Merry Walk bus and coach station service.

So at present the proposals at Gloucestershire county council cabinet are just to enhance the Wotton under Edge to Stroud Merry Walk bus and coach station section and not to and from Bristol and yate bus stations

It's very very important that we make progress on cross boundary services with Gloucestershire county council. And Western Gateway Transport Board.

Bus 62 Dursley may lane bus and coach station to Cam Cam and Dursley railway station, Berkeley sharpness Falfield Thornbury but without the option to Extend Alverston Olverton Hortham Lower Almondsbury and Bristol zoo Cribbs causeway bus station Bristol Southmead hospita bus station

As planned with south Gloucestershire county council

Working together with Gloucestershire county council need improving and has been raised by simon opher mp and roz savage mp Clare young Mp with buses minster simon Lightwood mp in house of commons. and at Gloucestershire county council.

Working need to improve with Western Gateway Transport Board/ Wiltshire Council and Swindon borough Council.

Especially with Devolution of public Transport powers.

And unity council for Gloucestershire and Swindon North Somerset council

Looking at joining the combined Authority in future.

Or the proposed wessex mayoral combined Authority.

Their is a need for the Audit commission to look at west local bus services and the effectiveness in service to the community

Services 61 Bristol Harbourside Bristol cabot circus to oid market The Ding and Bristlington carrier 1 or 2 passengers an hour .

Services y8 Yate. bus and coach station to chipping Sodbury Wickwar Charfield Hawkesbury upton carrier limited passengers because it does not serve Wotton under Edge the main shopping centre Heath centres hospitals links to Gloucester or Schools.

Service 99 is Paulton to ubley via the Chew valley is not allowed to connect with main line buses to Bristol Temple meads station and Bristol Bus and coach station wells Glastonbury street/ yeovil bus and coach station/ Bridgwater bus and coach station and Taunton town centre

For heath care hospital Schools college's shopping centres

Somerset/ west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council boundary issues on funding.

532 Emerson green to Keynsham via Warmley oldland common request to run longwell Green retail park not been allowed to happen.

With westlink demand response bus service failing to turn up at Yatton Railway station to take people to Clevedon or yate Railway station to and from Wotton under Edge.

Or cancel at short notice.

West of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council have given notice to Ezeec medical services Ambulance services company's and cangorm capital services from the 3rd April 2025

Slough bases Thames Valley Transport is taking over with we DRT with we DRT

And staff being transferred and tupe over with some staff have to take Taxis license tests.

Thames valley Transport runs services for the Cambridge and Peterborough mayoral combined Authority.

Mayor Nik Johnson.

Their urgent need to audit the bus service improvement plan.

For the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council

West metro railway contacts with First group plc Greater Western trains company limited.

And the Portway trunk road bus lane and sustainable transport corridor

Where at present money is not being spent on disability access to shirehampton stations but on road maintenance £ 9 million pounds

the money should allocated to improvements in Walking cycling footway and cycle way improvements

Drop kerbs and castle kerbs

With the government intergrated white paper on intergrated Transport it to join up interchanges between buses coaches Railway services ferry services walking and cycling facilities

With the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council, funding both bus services Especially the Portway park and Ride services service 9 with stagecoach west from April 2025 .

With First Wales and West buses Division service 37 Hartcliffe withywood Parson street Parson street railway station, Portway, Sea Mills Shirehampton railway station, Avonmouth and Severn Beach. Peak hour service.

Service 41 Avonmouth village via Shirehampton sea mill the joins the Portway to Bristol city centre then oid market Bristol, Lawrence hill, St George Kingswood.

Service.

So with the need for Bus rail and coach interchange.

Whilst we welcome the works at shirehampton Portway park and ride site for bus services to operate to Avonmouth St Andrews Road and severn Beach towards Lawrence weston and Henbury.

Dispite the new labour government policy of integrated Transport Networks.

We have 2 city Region Transport prodjects where integration is being carried out .

The one is the muller Road bus lanes and sustainable Transport corridor with the new Ashley Down station but with no Bus interchange facilities built for buses for Southmead hospital bus station and Eastville park Fishponds Staple Hill, Kingswood, Hanham keynsham Railway station, Keynsham Town Centre.

Their are plans to move bus stop and build a interchange facilities now .

But passengers groups are now very concerned when the Portway Bus prority scheme is the second scheme where Bristol city council has failed to intergrate bus coach and Taxis schemes in Bristol using money and sign off from the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris.

Their a feeling amongst the eqlities groups that their a tick box exercise is going on when it comes to disability discrimination act and the 2010 eqlities act and protected characteristics.

We would want to see the Portway full eqlities impact assessments by the west of England mayoral combined Authority officers.

Access across the Portway is very important at sea Mills ,shirehampton and Portway park and ride to passengers with reduced mobility and partly sighted passengers wheelchairs users trying to access the metro west railway Network station on the Bristol Temple meads station to Clifton Down Avonmouth Dock and seven Beach railway line .

With the stations at Sea Mills, Shirehampton and Portway park and ride.

Everyone of the City Region Transport corridor Bath spa bus and coach station to peasdown st john, Radstock Westfield midsomer Norton Paulton Pensford whitchurch Hengrove Knowle Totterdown Bristol Temple meads station Bristol bus and coach station corridor.

Or the Bristol to Bradley stoke Aztec west roundabout Alverston Thornbury

Bristol to Yate park and ride site Yate railway station yate bus station chipping Sodbury .corridor need eqlities impact assessments by the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council.

The Queen road and Park street scheme in Bristol.

By the Authority's eqlities officer separate to the Highway Authority's.

Bus service improvement plan panel needs to be inclusive with west of England mayoral combined transport Authority railway Directorate.

On metro west Railway Network.

We need to make progress on a construction programme on the delivery and construction dates .

For Bristol Temple Meads station to Lawrence hill Bristol Stapleton Road Ashley Down Filton Abbey wood extension to Filton North for the Arena Henbury for cribs causeway and Bristol zoo including bus interchanges and at Bristol Lawrence hill Station.

Fully accessible station.

Bristol Temple Meads station to pill and Portishead line including Bus interchanges and future station at Ashton Gate.

Bristol Temple Meads station to Filton Abbey station Bristol Parkway railway station yate Charfield for Wotton under Edge, cam and Dursley Gloucester central Cheltenham spa Ashchurch for Tewkesbury Worcester Shrub Hill Worcester Forgate Street Line .

With design and bus connection at Charfield for Wotton under Edge to Thornbury Wotton under Edge kingswood Charfield Wickwar chipping Sodbury yate and Dursley may lane bus and coach station.

Delivery of metro west railway Network is very important on budget and delivery on time with bus rail coach ferry interchanges .

Setting up a passengers transport Authority and transferring staff from Bristol city council, Banes , south Gloucestershire county council and North Somerset council to the Regional Transport Authority to get away from duplication of Highways, Transportation and Regional planning services.

We welcome the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority coming out of special measures.

Kind regards David Redgewell

But also making the west of England mayoral combined Authority bigger after the mayoral Elections with North Somerset council and then made be Gloucestershire unity Council and Swindon borough Council.

STATEMENT PS 20

Submitted by Janie Randell

Title: Statement for Full Council – Easton Leisure Centre Changes

I am deeply concerned about the proposed changes to Easton Leisure Centre, which threaten the future of netball and other sports that require a full-sized court. Netball is more than just a game to us, it provides a vital space for us to stay active, build confidence, and foster a sense of community. Removing the full-sized court in favour of a soft play area and café disregards the needs of those who rely on this facility for structured sport. Sports like netball, basketball, volleyball, cricket practice, and indoor five-a-side football (which all take place using this court) cannot be squeezed into smaller spaces without significantly impacting participation and accessibility. The lack of meaningful consultation with those who use the centre is deeply disappointing. I urge the council to reconsider these plans and engage with the community to find a solution that truly serves.

As a member of Easton Leisure Centre I am baffled as to why we have not been informed of the imminent changes, why have no plans been put in reception or emails been sent to let us know of the changes? I have even spoke with class instructors who are not aware of what is going on.

These changes do not just affect me as a netball player they affect me as a member that attends classes at the centre. The proposed changes will have an affect on class sizes in the future (reduced hall size), as well as an undoubted affect over the next 8 months' timetable of classes and yet there has been no communication regarding this by the manager at Easton, BCC or Everyone Active.

What is referred to as “a full consultation” regarding these changes (conducted during COVID) was not a “full” consultation or even a true reflection on what is actually being proposed. I answered the consultation at the time, it was very vague and unspecific about what would be happening. A true consultation of members should of happened once some specific plans were decided on to gage how people felt about the proposed changes. Having read the consultation report, hardly any of the respondents were users of Easton and the primary responses were from people angry about the proposed closure of Jubilee and Kingsdown and not about the changes to Easton at all.

I have picked out some key points form the consultation; of the responses specifically for Easton almost half the respondents said they wanted improvements that benefit the local community - not eliminating us. Forty people specifically said not to decrease the size of the sports hall, 4 times more than the 10 who said to increase the size of the gym and at no point was a soft play consulted on or even mentioned and only 1% of people even mentioned childcare. However, a larger gym and soft play is what has been decided on.

I hope this statement helps you to discuss the issue at your next meeting and understand how the decisions you make without consultation affect the users of a community venue.

STATEMENT PS 21

Submitted by Erin Lee

Title: Easton leisure centre

I am deeply concerned about the proposed changes to Easton Leisure Centre, which threaten the future of netball and other sports that require a full-sized court. Netball is more than just a game—it provides a vital space for women and girls to stay active, build confidence, and foster a sense of community. Removing the full-sized court in favour of a soft play area and café disregards the needs of those who rely on this facility for structured sport. Sports like netball, basketball, volleyball, cricket practice, and indoor five-a-side football cannot be squeezed into smaller spaces without significantly impacting participation and accessibility. The lack of meaningful consultation with those who use the centre is deeply disappointing. I urge the council to reconsider these plans and engage with the community to find a solution that truly serves all users.

STATEMENT PS 22

Submitted by Michael Potts

Title: Objection to the bus gate proposal for Park St

Submission to the consultation on the plans for the central section of A37/A4018 route; specifically reducing Queens Road to one lane in both directions from Whiteladies Road to the Triangle, closing Park Street to through traffic using a bus gate at the top of Park Street and a bus lane at the College Green and Canons Road junction and removing some parking on Queens, Road, the Triangle and Park Street

This submission is from a group of traders on Queens Road, the Triangle and Park St affected by the proposal, called "Save Park St". We believe the above proposal should not proceed on the following basis.

1. Most Bristolians oppose the idea. This is based on responses to Facebook posts, Bristol Live articles and a survey conducted by Bristol Bid.
2. The proposed scheme will not achieve any of the proposed benefits that can be measured reliably. The major concern is the grossly misleading statements that this proposal will increase economic activity by 28.5% when evidence suggests that removing traffic from the high street will have devastating consequences. A rebuttal of this claim, along with the other proposed benefits is detailed in this submission.
3. At a cost of £15m to taxpayers, we believe the money can be put to better use if redirected back to the West of England Combined Authority (WECA).

If Bristol City Council does not stop this proposal, then we seek a meeting with Ed Plowden to discuss our views along with a debate at a Bristol City Council meeting. This is to ensure all parties are aware of all the relevant facts on the proposal.

1. Most Bristolians oppose the idea - references

Facebook posts by Bristol City Council

Facebook post by Bristol City Council dated 16 January 2025. 172 comments – 95% opposed with less than 5 comments favourable to the scheme. The most popular comment with 43 likes "Any chance you could work on ... the housing problem before another useless set of roadworks for busses that never turn up anyway?"

Facebook post by Bristol City Council dated 24 January 2025 on sharing the plans of the proposal. 188 comments – 95% opposed with less than 5 comments favourable to the scheme. The most popular comment with 43 likes "Spend the money on fixing what we have before anymore harebrained ideas wasting our Council tax!"

Facebook post by Bristol City Council dated 7 February 2025 on sharing the plans of the proposal. 72 comments – 100% opposed with no comments favourable to the scheme. The most popular comment with 27 likes "If you're so confident people want it, put it to a vote"

Facebook post by Bristol City Council dated 15 February 2025 on sharing the plans of the proposal. 391 comments – 95% opposed with less than 5 comments favourable to the scheme. The most popular comment with 90 likes "Just a corrupt council who don't care about the basic needs of their residents."

Facebook post by Bristol City Council dated 19 February 2025 on sharing the plans of the proposal. 90 comments – 95% opposed with less than 5 comments favourable to the scheme. The most popular comment with 29 likes “The aim of the Council is ... to make it as difficult as possible to drive into or through the City, regardless of the public opinion and that’s a terrible idea.”

Bristol BID survey of Park St traders

Bristol BID survey of Park St traders in 2022 when the proposal was first put forward found 76% of traders opposed the idea.

2. The proposed scheme will not achieve any of the proposed benefits that can be measured reliably – references

The benefits listed in the proposal are as follows:

1. Make the number 2 bus service faster and more reliable and benefit other buses that use this route.

The current number 2 bus route starts at Cribbs Causeway, makes 63 stops and takes 92 minutes to get to the city centre. The proposed bus gate would be 0.3 miles in length and is on a section of the route that is rarely congested. It will make little to no difference on the journey time or the reliability of the bus service.

The first stop of the 2 bus route is The Coats, Stockwood and the last stop is Bus Station, Cribbs Causeway. 2 (Cribbs Causeway) is operational during everyday. Additional information: 2 has 63 stops and the total trip duration for this route is approximately 92 minutes. (source Moovit app)

I have timed a bus using Park St and it took 1minute and 10 seconds to drive the length of Park St and pick up 2 passengers at 8.45am on a Saturday morning.

I have taken screen shots of Google Maps traffic over 10 different times during the day and Park St is largely green, whilst Park Row and Upper Maudlin St are red.

2. Create quieter, cleaner, greener and safer roads.

One of the most polluted roads in Bristol is Upper Maudlin Stand Marlborough St opposite the Bristol Royal Infirmary. The proposal to send more cars down this street opposite the BRI will only increase congestion, noise and pollution.

3. Boost the number of people who walk, wheel, cycle and catch the bus.

The national bus cap was raised from £2 to £3 on 1 January 2025. While West Yorkshire, Greater Manchester and Liverpool City Region councils that have pledged to keep the cap at £2 to encourage bus use, Bristol has allowed First Bus to set the price that is expected to rise to £2.40. How is this policy consistent with the aim to encourage more people to use a bus?

4. Create attractive and useable public spaces to make the area more people friendly.

This is a very vague statement that can’t be measured. CGI’s pictures do not represent reality.

5. Support and revitalise the high street by creating spaces where people want to shop and spend time.

Bristol City Council have told traders who have raised concerns about catastrophic impacts for the high street, that the bus gate would provide positive economic benefits based on modelling. (*Bristol BID notes from webinars held in February 2025*) We asked for a summary of how the modelling was done and was sent a report produced by Arcadis in July 2022 titled "*Bristol Queens Road, Triangle and Park Street – Economic Benefits Review.*"

The conclusion you would take from reading the report, is that the bus gate proposal would generate a 28.5% increase in economic activity for the Retail, Community and Food and Beverage sector and a 19.64% increase for the Office, Education and other uses sector. This was based on a sample of 20 case studies from around the world. Upon closer review, we have concluded that the Arcadis report is grossly misleading.

Firstly, all 20 case studies Arcadis used show a positive benefit from removing traffic. Arcadis state that "*A wide range of relevant case studies were found, in the UK and globally, that demonstrate positive economic benefits of similar schemes.*" However, there was not one case study included in the report that showed a negative impact when traffic was removed. Perhaps the best data set available globally, on the impact of removing traffic from a mall, is in the US, when they pedestrianised over 200 malls in the 1950's and 1960's. There are countless articles on this issue available before July 2022 that Arcadis should have been aware of, but none are mentioned in the report. For example, a Bloomberg article from 9 September 2021 titled "*Lessons From the Rise and Fall of the Pedestrian Mall*" states that only 43 malls still exist in their original form due to declining vacancy rates, thin crowds and public perception for safety. On those numbers, almost 80% of US malls were reopened to traffic due to the negative impact pedestrianisation had.

The most thorough review was a research paper produced by Cole E Judge in 2013 titled "*The Experiment of American Pedestrian Malls: Trends Analysis, Necessary Indicators for Success and Recommendations for Fresno's Fulton Mall*". They reviewed all 200 malls and concluded that there was an 89% failure rate due to the same reasons cited by the Bloomberg article.

Why didn't the Arcadis report reference the high failure rate of US malls? Maybe they thought the US was not comparable to the UK when it comes to the pedestrianisation of malls? However, the Arcadis report included 4 case studies from the US so we must assume they believe they are comparable.

Secondly, 12 of the 20 case studies used by Arcadis are all lifted from the same source. The Arcadis executive summary includes a quote stating "*Many business proprietors believe that having parking spaces outside their premises is an essential element for their trade. Yet, experience shows that in many cities the conversion of these areas to pedestrianisation which allows for access solely by public transport as well as loading and unloading has actually increased their business income.*" This exact quote, along with 12 of the 20 case studies, is directly taken from another study conducted in 2013 (*Economic impact of pedestrianisation in historic urban centre, the Valdemoro case – study (Spain) - Sastre et al*). This study in turn lifted the exact same quote and the same 12 case studies from a report from 2000 (*Better Mobility in Urban Areas – Union Internationale des transports Publics, Solution 4 More trade after pedestrianisation*). The 2000 report however, contains no citations, references or dates on which the % increase in trade was based on for the 12 case studies included. We have concluded that most, if not all of the case studies, relate to the pedestrianisation of the malls that were undertaken back in the 1950's and

1960's. This data is over 60 years old and in 3 cases, the malls were reopened to traffic to arrest the economic decline caused by pedestrianisation (*Alchison, Kansas - 2021, Kalamazoo, Michigan - 1998, and Polomo, California – 1977*). How is this data set relevant to a bus gate in Queens Road, Triangle and Park St in 2025? It is my belief that the Arcadis report is grossly misleading and cannot be relied upon as it has:

- a. only included positive data and ignored the large amount of data available that shows a negative impact when removing traffic, and
- b. has clearly cherry-picked data as 60% of the case studies revert back to the 1950's and 1960's. It is our view that if the bus gate is implemented it will have a materially detrimental impact on trade and the high street. As it stands several independent businesses have already stated that they would leave Park St if the bus gate was introduced. *"Businesses say 'we will leave' in response to Park Street bus gate" Bristol Live 24 February 2025*

6. Connect people to jobs, education, services and one another.

Unsure what this statement means in practice. It is very vague and can't be measured.

7. Improve local air quality and reduce CO2 emissions from transport.

Air quality is currently measured by NO2 particles per cubic metre. The latest report on air quality produced by Bristol City Council in 2024 states "In 2023 ... all sites again achieved compliance with air quality objectives." That is, the air levels in Bristol are currently below 40 µg/m³ micrograms per cubic metre of air. In the UK, the law on nitrogen dioxide (NO2) pollution – one of the most harmful pollutants – says annual average concentrations cannot exceed 40 µg/m³ (micrograms per cubic metre of air).

While the report shows the steady decline in the levels of NO2 since 2010, it makes no mention how the improvements in vehicle emissions (3-way catalytic converters, electric and hybrid vehicles and automatic stop/start functions) have contributed to the improvement in air quality. This goes a long way to explain why there has been a slow and steady decline in particulate matter over the past 13 years whilst seeing an increase in population and vehicle use. It is unlikely that NO2 levels will increase given the trend over the past 13 years as shown in the graph.

Regarding CO2 levels, Bristol City Council does not measure this currently and will not be able to substantiate any claims they will reduce CO2 levels from transport. In fact, most people believe that NO2 and CO2 levels will increase on Upper Maudlin St and Marlborough St, which is opposite the Bristol Royal Infirmary and one of the top 10 most polluted streets in Bristol, as traffic is diverted from Park St.

The other key measure that Bristol City Council looks at is "particulate" pollution, measured in terms of PM2.5 and PM10 concentrations (the number of soot / dust particles of different sizes that are in the air). There is no reliable monitoring of this in Bristol, and none in Park St / Park Row. So again, Bristol City Council will not be able to substantiate any claims they will reduce "particulate" pollution from transport.

"Save Park St" - list of members

168 Oriental (Louis)

All in One (Paul)
Antix Nightclub (Laz)
Audio T Bristol (Tony Revelle)
Clifton Suits (Andrew Webber)
Crafty Beans Cakes and Cafe (Bilal)
Diamond Kebab
Diane Porter (Claire Wheeler)
Karwan Barber Shop (Karwan)
Last Bookshop (Lisa)
Moltobuono (Simone)
Mrs Potts Chocolate House (Michael Potts)
Pizzarova (Jack Lander)
Pocket Geek (Mir)
Stationery World (Ramin)
Sue Ryder (Karen)
Swoon Gelato (Bruno)
Territos Tailors (Mike Territo)
Uncle Sams (Kate)
Woodes Café (Rudy De Souza)

STATEMENT PS 23

Submitted by Melissa Topping

Title: East Bristol Liveable neighbourhood failings

This project suffers from critical failures. Residents, businesses, especially those with disabilities and low incomes, were excluded from meaningful consultation, violating the Equalities Act 2010. The Equalities Impact Assessment is inadequate, ignoring local disability groups and low-income voices. Key decisions were made without recorded meetings, demonstrating a lack of accountability.

Many in East Bristol rely on vehicles for work, a reality ignored by this scheme. Alternative options are insufficient. Consultation was primarily online and in English, with false claims of disability engagement.

We demand the withdrawal of the East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood in its current form. Remove the roadblocks and bus gate. Re-engage with all stakeholders transparently. Consult local disability and elderly groups. Provide resources for Lawrence Hill residents and businesses. Develop future traffic calming measures collaboratively with residents, businesses, Lawrence Hill neighbourhood forum and the police, ensuring safety without disproportionate harm. Include emergency services in all stages.

We need safe, usable streets for all, not just a select few. This is a chance to show real leadership, to create a fair, inclusive, and practical neighbourhood. We already have a liveable neighbourhood we need a safe, usable, workable neighbourhood accessible for all. On behalf of the Lawrence Hill Neighbourhood Forum. Thank you.

STATEMENT PS 24

Submitted by Caroline Dunn

Title: Bristol must be an accessible and disabled- compassionate city and observe Article 149

I wish to discuss disability , the need for a sea change in attitudes to us from those of the previous regime , & the unforeseen consequences of “simple” decisions .

I am concerned that Bristol is ignoring section 149 of the Equality act 2010 and its public sector duty under this act .

At full council I mentioned about how I live in a disabled world & most of you live in the “normal world”. My life like many people who are disabled revolves around ill health, struggling to exist, isolation often enforced by serious illness , & being got at almost constantly in various ways , which often includes Hate Crime. Now , By your decisions you can make our lives closer to “normal “ through a process of consideration and trying to make things easier for us - by including us IN . You can live in a world of happy social events doing whatever you wish, when you wish - seeing friends & family as you please. Shopping where you like whenever you want ! We want to do this !

We just want you with your decisions to help make our lives more normal , not less.

You need to be aware that what you do greatly impacts us in ways you may not realise . Sadly we are different to most of the population , but in fact there are more of us than is obvious because we tend to be shut away in our homes . I think its around 20 to 25 % are disabled in some way - and of course we all get older , and people get to have mobility issues through age

I know from experience that even trying to understand as a kind person when dealing with disadvantaged client groups, I still had no real idea when younger. Your picture of the future Ducie Road in east bristol livable neighbourhood scheme actually shows someone pushing a rollator up the hill . I have a rollator . I visit the barton settlement outside this tiny parklet you want to put on the road . I would not have known back then that I would have trouble on some days walking up that slope at all - The rollator does not help the heart , it gives it more weight to push when going up a slope. Going up a slope is the thing the heart hates most . Things that don't look like slopes to you ? HAH ! If it is even very slight the heart will noticeAll the rollator does is give me somewhere to sit down, take some of my weight on the flat , and for many something to steady themselves . A lot of people can't walk far even with a rollator : it doesn't mean we can then walk places like other people. Whoever drew that in didn't even ask a disabled person or try to understand/ imagine AT ALL. And you have removed the access to the bit where I can park to go to the settlement . There are no blue badge bays - NONE !

So , even when we are not airbrushed out of all your lovely artistic impressions of what things will look like , the outcome doesn't help people like me - and I am NOT unusual - at all . It is just picture-speak.

SO : You need to put disabled people front & centre in all your decisions & I do not feel you have been.

You need to consult with disabled people WHILE you are drawing your plans up .

- At the moment I feel you are risking having to add a few bays here and there at great expense as an afterthought if people complain . The number mentioned for the galleries redevelopment eg was as I recall 20 in total... This is ridiculous ! I think most people are not bad people, they just do not realise what it is like & cannot understand. I feel a lot don't even try ... the reality does not occur to them :

how could it be possible for a younger person to imagine ? But it just doesn't seem important to people to try ,because they have no idea what a massively different world the disabled world is ; How difficult it is to live some form of "normal" life.

The answer to all of this is TO CONSULT US . It's obvious that your decisions have a major impact on everyone but you have to accept that many have a particularly major Impact on us as Disabled. LISTEN , and CHANGE PERSPECTIVE . . You have to realise that it is essential you consult us EVERY STEP OF THE WAY. I think its obvious that collectively you have not previously been doing so. It seems to me vis a vis the last planning meeting on monday 20th YOU ARE STILL NOT DOING SO .

But my feeling is this is some steamroller full of out dated attitudes in the council executive .

But the councillors will carry the potentially very large can.

Transport Committee : every time you block off a route you are reducing our ability to join in, into normal life & events in some way. You are preventing us supporting the local economy & local shops. You have to accept that you need to allow disabled people ACCESS to OUR CITY. We need access, not gates; disabled parking, not loading bays. If Bristol eg close access to Park street it will prevent my accessing city hall ; closing the triangle will prevent my accessing the city museum ??? This is not normalising my life. Sadly some of us NEED OUR CARS! Almost wherever I go, there are not enough disabled bays IF there are any. There are huge problems as everyone knows with accessing toilets : for many people for various reasons, not just the Disabled, they are crucial. Why not plan some back in ? For Disabled people in particular they can make the difference between being able to leave our homes & go out at all.

Now none of this is new : people have been here before me , before us . Many times in many ways we disabled people seem to have to repeat the processes to be heard and seen and considered. And sometimes we have achieved things with the help of many people .

E.g. :-

We have had the UN CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES .

We have Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ("EA 2010") which is contained in Part 11 of the Act. It creates a "public sector equality duty" (PSED).

I am greatly concerned that the Council is breaking the rules previously set up in law .

I urge the transport committee to ensure that they fully understand what this means (and if necessary revisit previous matters) in order to ensure that BCC decisions comply with our UK legislation.

STATEMENT PS 25

Submitted by Merriel Waggoner

Title: LOSS OF SPORTS HALL AT EASTON LEISURE CENTRE

Two weeks ago we were notified that Easton Leisure Centre sports hall would no longer be available for full court sports eg basketball, volleyball and netball as a quarter of it is to be turned into a soft play with works starting April.

We are a longstanding community social netball team which started in St Paul's over 15 years ago under England Netball's Back to Netball programme. After many years in St Paul's Everyone Active turned our outdoor court into another football pitch and discontinued any indoor netball provision. The group moved to Horfield, which was then also closed to netball. We moved to Easton Leisure Centre 8 years ago and since then the group has continued to thrive and is a mainstay of dozens and dozens of women, their children and even grandchildren. There are 90 players in our what's app and dozens more who have come and moved on, sometimes to return with another buggy to pull up.

Everyone active's Diversity Policy states:

(Our aim is to) Provide equality of opportunity to all customers to participate in sport and leisure activities at all levels whether as a customer using our services for the first time, or as a member or club member who use our centre facilities on a regular basis. We do not discriminate on the grounds of age, disability, gender reassignment, marital or civil partner status, pregnancy or maternity, race, colour, nationality, ethnic or national origin, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation.

That is exactly what we do. A totally diverse group of women of all ages, backgrounds and experience, rooted in the local area but with players from all over Bristol too.

Having played a lot of netball at different levels and clubs, I can truly say this social community netball session is the most joyous and diverse I have ever experienced. I have never experienced a group as welcoming and inclusive as this session run by the legend of netball Sue Anderson. Easton Leisure Centre should be hugely proud of this gem that it hosts.

In other clubs/sessions it is sadly quite rare that Muslim women attend in numbers with the security and confidence that they can play in conditions that respect their faith. It is an absolute joy and privilege to play with the talented and diverse bunch of women as we laugh from beginning to end of the session.

It has not been possible to talk to the management as yet, as they have been unwilling to meet us. It seems that other user groups of the sports hall have not been informed and none of the Leisure Centres members have been contacted about the drastic changes planned, removing full court sports and constructing a soft play.

A Consultation was conducted in 2021 (during covid) which makes no mention of any proposed softplay nor does it explain that the full sports hall will be lost. The data on respondents shows that very few people replied from the Easton area of whom a tiny number (under 10) were actually even users of the facilities.

Last year 20 netballers wrote to the centre in alarm over changes to provision. Their emails were ignored.

The Equalities Impact Assessment is entirely inadequate with no mention of our longstanding, inclusive and diverse group of women from all ethnic and socio economic groups who are in fact

deeply impacted by proposals. Instead of consideration we have been roundly ignored as irrelevant. Airbrushed out even.

So much for the Everyone Active equalities policy..

We have been offered an hour on a day that we cannot make at the St Paul's centre that has no court markings or posts that we were moved out of 10 years ago when the court was taken away.

Alternatively those who should know better have assumed we would like to continue on the 3/4 of the hall left next to the softplay. Would you play ping ping on a table with a quarter of it missing? It's an insult to women's sports to think 'oh that'll do them'.

It absolutely won't do and I urge the Council to adapt its plans, and conduct an honest consultation. Talking to us would be a fantastic start please.

STATEMENT PS 26

Submitted by Jo Sergeant

Title: Public Toilets in Bristol

We need to have public toilets in every part of our city. It may be that we need a mixed model of provision.

Continuing with the Community Toilet Scheme

Many people don't know about it.

Some restaurants/bars/shops have given up providing, arguably because they have not had enough support from the Council.

We need to ensure that any business providing this service is properly rewarded and supported.

Ensuring that public buildings, such as libraries and community centres are able to offer a clean and accessible toilet during their opening hours.

They will need funding for:

Cleaning

Additional staffing for security (when there are no other staff on site).

Adaptation of existing toilets or addition of new toilets.

Reopening public toilets

Some of these buildings are larger than necessary and other services could be co-located there.

Local community organisations could run them and have the benefit of income generation from a co-located services (this can be done via a Community Asset Transfer [CAT])

There may be suitable alternatives nearby, such as a community space or a business prepared to provide a toilet. However this needs to be sustainable and 'guaranteed' before the permanent disposal of any public toilet blocks.

Hybrid models

Fully accessible 'container' or portakabin outside a community building, or near to a business, such as a food truck, where lease of that site is dependent on maintaining the toilet and/or includes a discount for doing so.

There are so many ways that we could offer toilets to people living, working, and enjoying our city. We could get started today by contacting the business who could join the Community Toilet Scheme but so far haven't, or who dropped out of it, to ask them what Bristol City Council needs to do to get them to join (again).

This would be a good thing for ward councillors to do (with support from community activists and BCC officers), as it would give them a chance to engage with local businesses and get to know their patch better.

Full Council – 11 March 2025

Agenda item 6 b

Public questions



Procedural note:

Questions submitted by members of the public:

- Questions can be about any matter the Council is responsible for or which directly affects the city.
- Members of the public who live or own a business in Bristol may submit up to 3 written questions, and may ask a maximum of 2 supplementary questions. A supplementary question must arise directly out of the original question or the reply.
- Replies to questions will be given verbally by the Leader or Chair of a Policy or Regulatory Committee. Written replies will be published within 10 working days following the meeting.



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

Ref No	Name	Title	To
PQ01	Natalie Calder	Crossing Guards	Plowden
PQ02	Antony Martin	Caravans parked on the Downs	Parsons
PQ03	Andrew Paten	Bristol Zoo Planning Application	Parsons
PQ04	[Ruled Out]		
PQ05	Joe Thomas	Senior Councillor Diaries	Dyer
PQ06	Siobhan Martin	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood	Plowden
PQ07	Satwant Phull	Glebe Road Planters	Plowden
PQ08	Melissa Topping	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood	Plowden
PQ09	David Redgewell	Bus Services	Plowden
PQ10	Matt Sanders	Bus Gates	Plowden
PQ11	Stuart Phelps	Air Quality	Fodor
PQ12	June Brennan	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood	Plowden
PQ13	Megs Smith	South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood	Plowden
PQ14	Elizabeth Staples	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood	Plowden
PQ15	Merriel Waggoner	Loss of Sports Hall at Easton Leisure Centre	Williams
PQ16	Azmeena Haq	Easton Leisure Centre Refurbishment plans	Williams
PQ17	Joanne Brown	Women's Netball in Easton	Williams



QUESTION PQ 01

Question submitted by: Natalie Calder

To Cllr. Ed Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Committee Chair

Subject: Crossing Guards

Why are lolly pop ladies/people /crossing guards being cut? Surely their few hours a day on minimum wage don't put much of a dent in the budget ? Cutting the service which provides safety to our most vulnerable trying to get to and from school is an accident waiting to happen Roads haven't become safer over the years , they have become absolutely horrendous in some places , especially during school run times. It's dangerous enough with the lolly pop ladies , and you want to take them away???

Shame on you !!!!



QUESTION PQ 02

Question submitted by: Anthony Martin

To Cllr. Barry Parsons, Homes and Housing Delivery Committee Chair

Subject: Caravans Parked on the Downs

The continuous illegal parking of the ever growing number of caravans on this beautiful part of our city is not acceptable. This has been a constant problem for residents and visitors for too long it is time for our city council to take action and resolve this problem



QUESTION PQ 03

Question submitted by: Andrew Paten

To Cllr. Barry Parsons, Homes and Housing Delivery Committee Chair

Subject: Bristol Zoo Planning Application

Question One: Could you please clarify the total budgeted legal costs for Bristol City Council related to defending the Bristol Zoo Planning Application in the May 25 Judicial Review, in the event that the judge rules in favour of either the applicant or the defendant?

Question two: Is the legal defence of the Bristol Zoo Gardens Judicial Review at risk of diverting limited resources from more urgent social housing projects that could be delivered more quickly?

Question three: If the Bristol Zoo Gardens Judicial Review finds against the defendant, can the Council commit to ceasing further legal expenditure defending the application and encourage better public engagement by the Bristol Zoo?



QUESTION PQ 04

[This question was Ruled Out under CPR 9.5]



QUESTION PQ 05

Question submitted by: Joe Thomas

To Cllr. Tony Dyer, Leader of Council

Subject: Senior Councillors Diaries

On 19 February the Information Commissioner’s Office (ICO) ruled that Bristol City Council “failed to demonstrate that the exemption is engaged” when responding to this request from me for the diaries of the senior-most councillors, including you:

https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/senior_councillors_diariesintere#outgoing-1815677

The ICO also found that your organisation breached section 10(1) of the FOI Act by failing to respond within twenty working days of my request. My request was on 2 June 2024, I chased a response on 29 June and 8 July, requested an internal review in the case on 16 July, and finally received a substantive response on 24 July.

The ICO noted that “the Council has not provided the Commissioner with any detail as to the burden involved in reviewing, considering and redacting the diaries for disclosure/publishing, or any estimates for the time it would take to carry out these tasks”: <https://ico.org.uk/action-weve-taken/decision-notices/2025/02/ic-327913-r8v1/>

That is despite the diary of the previous council leader being published monthly, and the diary of the Lord Mayor still being published routinely. And despite the Council confirming, via a separate Freedom of Information (FOI) request, that it now spends almost £1.4 million a year on the salaries and pension contributions etc for the Democratic Services team, Leader & Civic Affairs Office, and Policy Committee team – around five times more than the amount that was previously spent on the office of the former leader:

https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/committee_system_fois_and_office#outgoing-1729021

The ICO has in its decision notice ordered your council to respond properly within thirty calendar days of 19 February, or face the matter being dealt with as contempt of court.

You (Councillor Tony Dyer) said at the January Full Council, that you were looking to publish his own diaries, but, month later (4 March), they seem yet to have materialised. This, and the initial refusal, may be due to the prioritisation of international travel so early on in the Green Party's administration, which was very belatedly published here: <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/council/data-protection-and-foi/open-data>

These extended delays appear to contradict your pre-election promise in the Bristol Cable, as follows: “The ability for the public to access information that helps them understand decision making is an essential part of confidence in the system,” Dyer says, adding that if the Greens end up leading the council they would look to communicate “proactively” with citizens, including by helping them clarify requests, routinely publish more data and keep this process under review:

<https://thebristolcable.org/2023/11/transparency-matters-why-is-bristol-city-council-failing-freedom-of-information/>



Where are your diaries, and those of your senior councillors colleagues, and why is it taking so very long to complete the very basic task of publishing them?



QUESTION PQ 06**Question submitted by: Siobhan Martin****To Cllr. Ed Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Committee Chair****Subject: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood**

Question one title: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood - Road Safety Measures on Crews Hole Road

Question one: Thank you for your response to the three questions I submitted at full council in January regarding road safety measures on Crews Hole Road. Unfortunately I feel the responses are somewhat inadequate. The authority agrees permanent road safety measures are needed on Crews Hole Road, I myself regularly walk the narrow stretch between Strawberry Land and Riverside Chapel and have witnessed vehicles mounting the footway, speeding and road rage incidents. To blame driver error is a poor response, regardless of whether you believe it to be bad driving, the problem and the risks exists due to the width of road and lack of traffic calming. This narrow stretch of road would not only benefit from pedestrian crossing points but also a series of Give Ways and a speed camera in addition to any other measures you have been considering. Please could you clarify the date when the interim measures will be installed rather than stating it is going through quality assurance, and explain why the safety of residents in Crews Hole are being put at risk by Bristol City Council failing to implement the permanent safety measures. In your response please could you expand on what the pedestrian crossing improvements will be at Riverside Chapel and the informal parking layby as it was previously agreed a pop-up pedestrian crossing would be installed and not just dropped pavements.

Question two title: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood - Traffic Monitoring on Crews Hole Road

Question two: The data on vehicle use, cycling and walking is being collected through traffic monitoring throughout the area that will help to inform you of any permanent proposals on Crews Hole Road. There is no air pollution monitoring on Crews Hole Road and you have confirmed air quality can be inferred from traffic levels. The traffic monitoring map details a monitor at the top of Troopers Hill Road and another located at the top of Blackswarth Road/Netham Road. Please can you explain how you are monitoring traffic on Crews Hole Road when there are no monitors along the entirety of the road?

Question three title: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood - Free Bus Tickets & Bus Gate Passes

Question three: The aim of the EBLN is to encourage walking, cycling, scooting and the use of buses. By offering incentives such as free bus tickets and expanding bus gate applications to workers on low incomes this would indicate you do not wish to encourage people to use public transport. It also suggests it would cost more to travel by public transport or use your vehicle without a bus gate pass, when driving in the EBLN. Therefore, why is the bus gate exemption not being offered to all residents within the EBLN, or those of 60 years of age (other areas of the country allow over 60's to travel for free on public transport)? How is the authority going to ensure bus tickets and bus gate passes will not be used fraudulently i.e. bus tickets being given away or sold on at a reduced price or that low income families work as the website information lacks clarity? How many bus gate exemptions can a low income working family apply for as there does not appear to be any set criteria whilst blue badge holders are only permitted one per household.





QUESTION PQ 07

Question submitted by: Satwant Phull

To Cllr. Ed Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Committee Chair

Subject: Glebe Road Planters

Question one title: Why haven't planters on Glebe Rd and The Avenue been removed?

Question one: Why haven't planters on Glebe Rd and The Avenue been removed? Context - On 03 Mar 2025, construction teams had to remove the planters on Glebe Road due to a huge concrete truck not being able access Glebe Road via Beaconsfield Road. The council have consistently given statements to EBLN residents such as "“The scheme has been designed by our engineers and gone through various levels of quality assurance to ensure large vehicles will still be able to access the whole area and track around corners”". This is clearly not true based on video evidence captured here:
<https://youtu.be/mdQNcxfzSLw>

Question two title: Where did the money come from for equipment facing the Glebe Road Planters?

Question two: Less than 24 hours after construction teams had to remove the planters on Glebe Road due to a huge concrete truck not being able access Glebe Road via Beaconsfield Road, 2 vans turned up from centregreat.co.uk to install what appeared to be cameras facing the planters on Glebe Road. The council is supposedly facing huge budget issues, where did the money come from to pay for 2 vans to turn up to install this equipment?



QUESTION PQ 08

Question submitted by: Melissa Topping

To Cllr. Ed Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Committee Chair

Subject: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood

Question one title: EBLN claims of engagement since January 2022

Question one: With regards to stating, "we've been consulting on ebln since January 22" With evidence now available that all engagements held no transparency with regards to what was being planned, other than safer cleaner streets, With no cabinet member meetings taking place between April 22 and April 23 and no minutes recorded for cabinet member meetings from 16th June 23 to December 23 inclusive, along with evidence from early meetings showing actions to be carried out not having being followed up, will you now admit you can't possibly know the actions listed were completed and engagements fully transparent please.

Question two title: Disability group engagements

Question two: With WECIL and the non existent Barton hill disabilities group being used as engagements. When these clearly did not take place. Will you now admit to breaching the Equalities Act 2010 by continuing with a scheme that has clearly failed on social many aspects of this act.

Question three title: Will you now call a halt to the EBLN

Question three: Will you now halt the EBLN. Revisiting the consultation process, reengage with stakeholders, design traffic calming members in collaboration with the community, to bring fresh ideas, regarding our streets, to any future planned projects. With possibly a referendum held to implement future projects. Following the majority decision.



QUESTION PQ 09

Question submitted by: David Redgewell

To Cllr. Ed Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Committee Chair

Subject: Bus Services

Question 1

With the new bus services being operated from April 2025 .

In Bristol funded by the Clean air money jointly with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris.

On the following routes

Service 37 Hartcliffe to Severn Beach via the Portway and Avonmouth.

Service 16 Fishponds, Kingswood, East Bristol , Bristol Temple meads and Bristol city centre.

Service 36 St Anne's park Brislington Hungerford road knowle Hengrove hospital imperial park Hartcliffe Bishopsworth Highridge common.

With some Clean Air zone money left .

And the west of England mayoral combined Authority being allocated

£13. 716.185 with North Somerset council allocated £4.830.390

What progress is being made to improve Nighttime bus services in Bristol and Bus services in East Bristol?

Services 19 Bath spa bus and coach station to weston Kelston Swinford Bitton oidland Common Warmley Kingswood ,Staple Hill, Downend Bromley Heath, Uwe bus and coach station, Bristol Parkway station.

With need it Evening services restored

Beyond Downend to Uwe Bus and coach station and Bristol Parkway station.

For Connection at uwe Bus and coach station for other services and at Bristol parkway with Inter city cross country train Arriva 1sq capital service.

Metro west railway Network operator First group plc Greater Western trains company limited GWR and operator of Regional and inter city train services.

Extra services on 17 keynsham town centre, keynsham Railway station Hanham Kingswood, Staple Hill ,Fishponds,Eastville Ashley Down station and Southmead hospital bus station

Both these city region bus service need improving.

With Night bus services.

The west of England mayoral combined transport Authority North Somerset Council and Bristol city council could look at operatoring at Friday and Saturday services.

On Bus routes 1 Broomhill Bristlington,

Arnos vale, Bristol Temple meads station. Bristol city centre Clifton Down station Westbury on Trym Henbury cribs causeway bus and coach station.

Services 2 ,2a cribs causeway bus station Southmead hospital bus station Henleaze, Clifton Down station, Bristol city centre, Broadmead shopping centre Cabot circus Bristol Temple meads station to knowle Hengrove and Stockwood.

Services

3 and 4 Bristol city centre Broadmead Clifton Down station Sea Mills shirehampton Lawrence weston Henbury and cribs causeway bus station .

And and a south Bristol circle route



Bristol city centre to Bedminster Parson street Hartcliffe Hengrove Whitchurch Stockwood, Bristlington ,Bristol Temple meads station, Bristol city centre.

These services could test the market from September 2025 .

Which could then be made commercial

Like night buses in North Devon.

Question 2

What progress is being made in Bristol on removals of Graffiti on the Public Transport Network With damage bus shelters like thoses in Bond Street Bristol and centre Bristol?

Derelict building Graffiti covered building and passengers transport infrastructure give a very poor impression of Bristol city Region Especially the Grosvenor hotel at Bristol Temple meads Transport hub.

Many Bus and coach shelter are tagged and damage it would be better to transfer all shelters and bus coach and ferry interchanges to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority similar to Liverpool City Region mayor Steve Rotherham and Greater Manchester combined Transport Authority mayor Andy Burnham

Question 3

With west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council.

Changing with we Dart

Changing the westlink Demand responsive bus services contractor.

From Aztec medical services cangorm capital services the Ambulance services company's to Thames valley Transport of Slough Berkshire who already operate for the Peterborough and Cambridgeshire mayoral combined transport Authority mayor .

This Ambulance company failed to operate many journeys leaving passengers unable to travel from main bus stops railway stations or Southmead hospital bus station and South Bristol Hospital.

This the main services of public Transport in part of Keynsham Bristlington Whitchurch Hengrove Knowle Totterdown windmill Hill area link to Bus services and railway station

And in North Bristol link to Bus and Train station at Uwe Bus and coach station/ Southmead hospital bus station, Filton Abbey wood Bristol Parkway station.

What monitoring is West of England mayoral combined transport Authority Bristol city council with Banes and South Gloucestershire county council doing to monitor this service?

Some which will be operated by Taxi's services from April 2025 and plan for a replacement service in April 2026 when the Department for transport funding stops



QUESTION PQ 10

Question submitted by: Matt Sanders

To Cllr. Ed Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Committee Chair

Subject: Bus Gates

On Thursday February 6th, I won a significant appeal at the Traffic Penalty Tribunal, as Adjudicator Robinson confirmed that signage for the Cumberland Road Bus Gate is inadequate for any drivers approaching from the Merchant's Road swing-bridge, in Cumberland Basin.

His criticisms included: -

- 1) the decision to place the bus gate halfway along Spike Island is the root of all the problems -
- 2) the only option for people who mistakenly drive along Cumberland Road, is to go back the way they came -
- 3) the number of PCNs issued is disproportionate -
- 4) there is no sign in Merchant's Road, to warn of the bus gate and advise an alternative route -
- 5) instead of blue signs which comply with the TSRGD 2016, the Council has used yellow signs which do not -
- 6) at Avon Crescent, the yellow sign is too complicated, presented with several other signs, meaningless to anybody who does not know the location of Cumberland Road, and fails to advise a different route -
- 7) the failure of this sign places more importance on the adequacy of subsequent signs -
- 8) in Avon Crescent, a blue sign is badly located -
- 9) in Cumberland Road, another blue sign is badly located (obscured by an enormous bush) -
- 10) the next yellow sign is too complicated and too small -
- 11) the two advance direction signs have blue "bus route" symbols which are too small -
- 12) there should be painted arrows and words on the tarmac, to direct drivers into the side roads -
- 13) broken white lines should guide drivers into the final side road -
- 14) this is vital, as the Bus Gate is 20 metres after the final junction -
- 15) there should be signs at the final junctions, to guide drivers into those side roads -
- 16) The "BUS GATE" painted letters are at the END of the red tarmac zone -
- 17) Improving the final junction is vital to the enforcement of the bus gate.

On February 6th, I sent this Decision document to all members of the Transport Committee. And of course the Transport and Highways officers will have received it directly from the Tribunal. I have waited four weeks, before going public, in order to give the Committee and Officers time to consider their response.

QUESTION 1:

Following this notification of the adjudicator's many criticisms of the Cumberland Road Bus Gate, please tell us which members of the Transport Committee have raised this matter with officers, and inform us of any developments and decisions.

QUESTION 2:

As the same designers are responsible for the new Bus Gates in the EBLN, and proposed Bus Gates at



Bedminster Roundabout, Redcliff Hill, and Park Street, has this Tribunal decision inspired them to re-examine those designs?

QUESTION 3:

Please tell us how many PCNs were issued at the Cumberland Road Bus Gate, on each day in January 2024.



QUESTION PQ 11

Question submitted by: Stuart Phelps

To Cllr. Martin Fodor, Environmental and Sustainability Committee Chair

Subject: Air Quality

Question one title: Comprehensive Air Quality Network

Question one: Will the Council work with RADE [Residents Against Dirty Energy], Universities, and others to develop a dynamic Air Quality Network for the city that integrates all available sensors under the British Standard PAS 4023?

Question two title: STEM work with Young Citizens

Question two: Will the Council encourage STEM work around Air Quality with existing networks linking Young Citizens, after-school groups, and Higher Education, in Easton and Lawrence Hill, with a view to extending it across the city?

Question three title: Environment Agency "Air Quality, Inequality Working Party"

Question three: Will the Environment and Sustainability Committee make time to consider the work of the Environment Agencies "Air Quality, Inequality Working Party"?



QUESTION PQ 12

Question submitted by: June Brennan

To Cllr. Ed Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Committee Chair

Subject: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood

Were any traffic studies done in the surrounding area before implementation of the scheme?



QUESTION PQ 13

Question submitted by: Megs Smith

To Cllr. Ed Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Committee Chair

Subject: South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood

Question one title: South Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood

Question one: When can we expect to see the Engagement Report publication that was due out in early 2025?

Question two title: Feedback from East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood

Question two: Will the events happening regarding the trial in East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood have any effect on what's being planned for the south, and eventually the north and west liveable neighbourhoods too?



QUESTION PQ 14

Question submitted by: Elizabeth Staples

To Cllr. Ed Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Committee Chair

Subject: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood

Question one title: EBLN

Question one: I want to ask why we need Parklets like I'm Beaufort road when we have some great parks near the EBLN, we have St George park, Netham, troopers hill and meadowvale to name a few. We have other green spaces such as plumbers hill. We have magpie bottom and troopers hill in fact on line I habd found a 2 page long list of all the green spaces that the community can access for their health and well-being. We need to teach our children road safety and with Beaufort road currently like a car park with bikes zooming out is this a place we want to encourage play. The answer in 'no' we want kids to be safe when going out with parents/ grand parents on school outings teaching them crossing the road safely and the parks are set up as spaces they can climb, run and play. I am also interested to hear that Weca have funded 1m in investing in green spaces why do we need 6million for plant pots and riad closures !!???

Question two title: EBLN

Question two: How are you monitoring the wellbeing of residents in the EBLN it's causing an awful lot if stress, longer journey times and fumes pouring out by schools and on the boundary roads ? I would like to hear from BCC / EBLN / councillors on this aspect ? These issues are being raised by thousands so there are many impacted



QUESTION PQ 15

Question submitted by: Merriel Waggoner

To Cllr. Stephen Williams, Public Health and Communities Committee Chair

Subject: Loss of Sports Hall at Easton Leisure Centre

Given the lack of information, meetings consultation and consideration of equalities impact is the Council prepared to meet with users of the Easton Leisure Centre Sports Hall to discuss revising their plans to deprive numerous community sports and groups of the facilities they need?



QUESTION PQ 16

Question submitted by: Azmeena Haq

To Cllr. Stephen Williams, Public Health and Communities Committee Chair

Subject: Easton Leisure Centre Refurbishment plans

Who was consulted about this plan and can a further consultation be carried out before starting this work - one which actually involves talking to patrons and members of the Centre?



QUESTION PQ 17

Question submitted by: Joanne Brown

To Cllr. Stephen Williams, Public Health and Communities Committee Chair

Subject: Women's Netball in Easton

The St Paul's Back to netball team session has been moved twice already. Why are you valuing women's netball so poorly & why won't officers entertain anything other than plans built from a farcical 'consultation' that took place during the pandemic?

