

# Summons to attend meeting of Full Council



**Date:** Tuesday, 11 December 2018

**Time:** 3.00 pm

**Venue:** Council Chamber, City Hall

**To: All Members of Council**

Members of the public attending meetings or taking part in Public forum are advised that all Full Council are now filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's [webcasting pages](#). The whole of the meeting is filmed (except where there are confidential or exempt items) and the footage will be available for two years. If you ask a question or make a representation, then you are likely to be filmed and will be deemed to have given your consent to this. If you do not wish to be filmed you need to make yourself known to the webcasting staff. However, the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 now means that persons attending meetings may take photographs, film and audio record the proceedings and report on the meeting (oral commentary is not permitted during the meeting as it would be disruptive). Members of the public should therefore be aware that they may be filmed by others attending and that is not within the Council's control.

**Issued by:** Sam Wilcock, Democratic Services

City Hall, PO Box 3167, Bristol, BS3 9FS

Tel: 0117 92 23846

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

**Date:** Friday 30 November 2018



# Agenda

## 1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

## 2. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

## 3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

To agree the minutes of the previous meeting as a correct record.

**(Pages 17 - 38)**

## 4. Declarations of Interest

To note any declarations of interest from the Councillors. They are asked to indicate the relevant agenda item, the nature of the interest and in particular whether it is a **disclosable pecuniary interest**.

Any declarations of interest made at the meeting which is not on the register of interests should be notified to the Monitoring Officer for inclusion.

## 5. Lord Mayor's Business

To note any announcements from the Lord Mayor

## 6. Public Forum (Public Petitions, Statements and Questions)

Please note: Up to 30 minutes is allowed for this item. Public forum items should be e-mailed to [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)

Public forum items can be about any matter the Council is responsible for or which directly affects the city.

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 Monday 10 December 2018** 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 December 2018** at latest.



A maximum of 2 questions per member of the public is permitted. Questions should be addressed to the Mayor or relevant Cabinet Member.

## **7. Petitions Notified by Councillors**

Please note: Up to 10 minutes is allowed for this item.

Petitions notified by Councillors can be about any matter the Council is responsible for or which directly affects the city. The deadline for the notification of petitions to this meeting is **12 noon on Monday 10 December 2018**.

## **8. Gambling Act Policy Review**

**(Pages 39 - 120)**

## **9. Medium Term Financial Plan Update**

**(Pages 121 - 153)**

## **10. Treasury Management Mid Year Report 2018/19**

**(Pages 154 - 168)**

## **11. Council Tax Base 2019/20**

**(Pages 169 - 179)**

## **12. Collection Fund Surplus/Deficit 2018/19**

**(Pages 180 - 189)**

## **13. Audit Committee Terms of Reference**

**(Pages 190 - 198)**

## **14. Motions**

**Note:**

**Under the Council's constitution, 30 minutes are available for the consideration of motions. In practice, this realistically means that there is usually only time for one, or possibly two motions to be considered. With the agreement of the Lord Mayor, motion 1 below will be considered at this meeting, and motion 2 is likely to be considered, subject to time.**



**Details of other motions submitted, (which, due to time constraints, are very unlikely to be considered at this meeting) are also set out for information.**

## **MOTIONS RECEIVED FOR FULL COUNCIL – 11 DECEMBER 2018**

### **1. ENDING IMMIGRATION DETENTION (GOLDEN MOTION)**

Motion submitted by: Cllr Hance, Redland ward, Green

Date submitted: 29 November 2018

#### **Full Council notes that:**

1. Immigrants and asylum seekers who have committed no crimes continue to be detained in conditions that are sometimes worse than mainstream prisons.
2. The UK is the only country in Europe to not have a time limit on how long immigrants and asylum seekers can be detained. This means that many are detained for months or even years at a time, without any certainty about when they'll be released or deported, causing significant and unacceptable distress.
3. There are 11 detention centres used for this purpose in the UK, one of the largest number is Europe.
4. Between 2500 and 3500 people are detained at any time and 27,300 ended up in the Centres in 2017 at a cost of over £125 million a year. This is not only a waste of money, but indefinite detention without charge is a clear breach of people's human rights.
5. The Home Office is still arriving at asylum seekers' homes in the middle of the night, here in Bristol or stopping them when they are legitimately signing on at the police station in Patchway, whisking them away to another part of the country, where many are unable to have visits from family and friends due to the cost of travel. The majority of detainees are eventually released if they get the right legal support, as they have done nothing wrong, but many never get over the trauma of detention.

#### **Full Council:**

1. Believes that the Government must end immigration detention now.
2. Restates our commitment as a City of Sanctuary and recognises these issues form an essential part of the Dignity not Destitution Pledge, which has been signed by the Mayor.

#### **Full Council calls on the Mayor to:**

1. Endorse the These Walls Must Fall Campaign (<http://detention.org.uk/>)
2. Call on the Government to implement the recommendations of the All Party Parliamentary Inquiry into detention.
3. Recognise all the hard work that volunteers do to support local asylum seekers who are detained.
4. Ask our local MPs to support the spirit of the motion, to continue to raise the matter in the House of Commons, and to support changes in current laws and procedures to introduce alternatives to detention.
5. Seek further support for the motion via the Local Government Association, and by encouraging other Councils in the UK to raise the issue.



## 2. NO VEHICLE IDLING ZONES

Motion submitted by: Cllr Mark Wright, Hotwells and Harbourside ward (Lib Dem)

Date submitted: 29<sup>th</sup> Nov 2018 10.20am

### This Council Notes:

1. Bristol, like many authorities, has area of poor air quality and that pollutants in the air can exceed safe limit set by both the European Union and World Health Organisation.
2. Air pollution in Bristol has a massive impact on the health of our citizens. In the young and most health-vulnerable it can cause permanent lung damage, and in older people it exacerbates lung and heart diseases. In Bristol this equates to approximately 300 extra deaths each year.
3. A very welcome Clean Air Zone is currently in the planning stages as part of the city's Clean Air Action Plan - which will in future alter journey routes and vehicle purchases, but likely won't affect driving style. Implementation of the Clean Air Zone is some years away.
4. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and Public Health England (PHE) produced new guidance last year that recommended "no vehicle idling" areas in places where health-vulnerable people collect, such as outside schools, hospitals and care homes, and in areas where exposure to road-traffic-related air pollution is high.

This Council resolves to support and asks the Mayor to implement:

1. Introduce, by the end of 2019 an enforceable "no vehicle idling" zone outside every school, and in every park in the city - with at least four pilot zones of each by spring 2019.
2. Where practical, to extend the number of "no vehicle idling" zones to cover areas outside children's play areas where standing traffic is an issue.
3. Work with our NHS partners, to look at extending "no vehicle idling" zones outside medical buildings, in hospital pick-up areas, and outside care homes.
4. Use the experience of the pilot zones to determine whether these measures should be implemented via enforceable enhancements to existing Council policies, or via a new by-law.

Guidance proposes 'no vehicle idling' zones to tackle air pollution

<https://www.localgov.co.uk/Guidance-proposes-%E2%80%98no-vehicle-idling%E2%80%99-zones-to-tackle-air-pollution/43337>

Air pollution: outdoor air quality and health

<https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng70>

## 3. CROWN POST OFFICE, BROADMEAD

To be moved by Councillor Kye Dudd, Central ward, Labour

Date submitted: 29<sup>th</sup> Nov 2018 11.10am

### Bristol City Council notes with concern that:

1. On 11 October 2018 it was announced that 74 crown post offices across the UK, including the main Bristol Post Office in the Galleries will be franchised to WHSmith. The Galleries Post Office is the largest in the South West and the last major Post Office in Bristol. Taken together,



successive franchise announcements mean the loss of 60% of the crown office network since 2013. This is a privatisation by stealth following the separation of the Post Office and Royal Mail five years ago; the latter was sold off on the cheap by the Tory-Lib Dem Coalition, with the National Audit Office (2014) estimating that the then-Government's undervaluation saw the taxpayer lose out on some £750 million in just one day.

2. These privatisations are financed using millions of pounds of public money, despite the fact that the public has never endorsed the closures, indeed they have only ever protested against them. In 2014/15 alone, £13 million of public money was used to pay compensation to get rid of post office staff, and the Communications Workers Union (CWU) estimates that the staff compensation cost of the latest privatisation will be at least £30 million, affecting as it does, 800 staff.
3. Reports by Consumer Focus (2012) and Citizens Advice (2016) have identified issues with the franchising of post offices to WHSmith including poor accessibility for people with mobility impairments, longer queuing times, and inferior service and advice on products.
4. Franchising means the loss of jobs with good terms and conditions at the Post Office. WHSmith replaces experienced post office staff with new employees in typically minimum wage part time roles. This is clearly bad for jobs in the local area and the Post Office workers, many of whom are CWU members
5. The closure of our Crown post offices and relocation to a WHSmith, also means the loss of prime high street stores and this contributes to the demise of our town centres. No explanation has been given as to why the profit-making Crown post offices are being handed to a retailer with an uncertain future, and what will happen to these services if WHSmith folds.
6. All Crown post offices are under threat of closure and/or franchising in future, and if the latest round of privatisation is allowed to go ahead, it could prove the tipping point for the viability of the entire post office network.

**This Council believes that:**

1. Our post offices are a key asset for the community and the expertise and experience of staff there is invaluable.
2. The relentless franchising and closure programme of the profit making Crown post offices, points to a lack of vision rather than the plan for growth and innovation that is needed.
3. Government should therefore halt these closures and bring together stakeholders, including the CWU, and industry experts to develop a new strategy that safeguards the future of the Post office.
4. Given the Post Office has recently decided not to proceed with the opening of a branch on Prince Street, also in our city centre, confidence is not inspired in future continuity of these crucial services.

**This Council resolves to:**

1. Thank the CWU and other campaigners, Mayor Marvin Rees, and local Bristol Labour MPs, who have a record of campaigning to protect and preserve local post office services, for expressing concerns and opposing these plans including through organising a protest on Saturday 1 December.
2. Ask the Mayor and local Bristol Labour MPs to write to the Government to raise concern about the apparent managed decline of the post office network and the impact on high streets across



- the UK as well as the service in the franchised premises, and the poor quality jobs that result.
3. Ask the Mayor to share with councillors, if/once received, the details he has requested from the Post Office including around future and predicted staffing levels, which fell outside the scope of the consultation, and to continue to urge a stop to the planned franchise.
  4. To join local campaigning to raise awareness of the value of our Post Office and the need for it to remain an asset of and for the people.
  5. Call on all Party Group Leaders to ensure that their members sign the national CWU petition via [www.saveourpostoffice.co.uk](http://www.saveourpostoffice.co.uk) and the local Bristol petition at [democracy.bristol.gov.uk/mgEPetitionDisplay.aspx?ID=72&RPID=2952113&HPID=2952113](http://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/mgEPetitionDisplay.aspx?ID=72&RPID=2952113&HPID=2952113)

#### 4. MOTION SUPPORTING LOCAL SHOPS

Motion submitted by: Cllr Morris, Stockwood ward, Conservative

Date submitted: 29<sup>th</sup> November 2018, 11.30am

“Council has growing concern over the future vibrancy of many of Bristol’s high streets.

Nationally, one study found that we are losing 16 shops per day through closure with an estimated 50,000 jobs lost between January and June in this year alone. Some of the latest casualties include such well-known retail chains as Toys-R-Us, Maplin and most recently Debenhams.

This is due to a ‘perfect storm’ of many interlaced factors including (i) spiralling rents; (ii) rising business rates; (iii) increased labour costs; (iv) declining foot-fall; and (v) the choice, convenience and competition provided by the internet.

With local authorities more dependent than ever before on retention of business rates to balance their budgets, Council believes it is essential that more is done to support struggling small businesses in secondary or satellite retail areas around the city.

The Chancellor’s cut in business rates by one third for two years for small businesses and the creation of a Future High Streets Fund and new High Streets Taskforce is a welcome step in the right direction.

A planned 2% tech-tax targeted at online retail giants should also help to level the playing field between digital shopping outlets and traditional bricks & mortar stores. The £10m ‘Love our High Streets’ pilot projects by the West of England Combined Authority (WECA) are also welcome.

However, even more needs to be done locally. To this end, Council calls on the Mayor to allocate resources from his capital budget to actually invest in these precincts to make them attractive places to visit. As one designer has put it, these destinations need to become ‘galleries of experience’ to draw people to them.

Consequently, consideration needs to be given to changing the city’s parking strategy/priorities, more free short-term parking provided at these locations, and improved CCTV coverage to increase public safety.



Council requests that a report be prepared for Scrutiny which outlines the existing options available for providing temporary business rate relief on particularly hard-pressed retailers. In addition, that this report forms the basis of a submission to the ‘High Streets Fund’ once the full details of the new scheme become available.

Finally, following the outcome of such a review, the Mayor is asked to lobby Ministers to consider a root-and-branch reform of the Business Rates system (which is based on rateable values and ignores important factors such as profit and turnover), to bring it up to date with current economic conditions and in order to save UK retailing.”

## **5. MOTION ON ENFORCING PLANNING POLICY ON PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOMES**

Motion submitted by: Cllr Eddy, Bishopsworth ward, Conservative

Date submitted: 29<sup>th</sup> November 2018, 11.30am

“This Council is becoming increasingly alarmed that local policy guidelines on the amount of Affordable Housing to be included in new developments appear to be regularly undermined, circumvented or ignored.

For example, the recently approved plans by Legal & General to build 120 flats at Temple Quay was originally granted on the basis that 23 of these units would be reserved or retained as ‘affordable’ homes. This modest figure (20%) was subsequently radically reduced or downgraded to just 4 properties or (3%) of the total build.

Council is concerned that this kind of revisionism sets a dangerous precedent for private developer housing provision. Moreover, acceptance of this practice could also have implications in relation to the any future redevelopment plans for the vacant Arena Island site.

To avoid any misunderstanding on this issue, Council reiterates the conviction that any planning application to redevelop the land by Temple Meads for housing must comply with the principles contained in our adopted Local Plan and policy framework. Aside from very special dispensations granted by the Authority to deviate from the norm on a case-by-case basis, it is essential that such developments uphold our policy commitment of 40% Affordable Housing in the central areas of the city.”

## **6. MOTION TO REOPEN LOCAL LAVATORIES**

Motion submitted by: Cllr Steve Smith, Westbury-on-Trym and Henleaze ward, Conservative

Date submitted: 29<sup>th</sup> November 2018 11.30am

“This Council is concerned over the significant shortcomings and economic impact on tourism, and local high streets, arising from the Mayor’s decision to close nearly half of the city’s on-street public toilets.

Whilst appreciating the rationale behind this move, it was justified as an important money-saving measure, it is clear that the planned replacement of a network of conveniences provided by



businesses and organisations signing up to a 'Community Toilet Scheme' has been, at best, a mixed success.

Members of the public and the Council's own Communities Scrutiny Commission have identified continuing problems with this inadequate provision and many remain unconvinced over this policy.

As a result of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Autumn Budget, which exempts public toilets from business rates, these are now much cheaper to maintain. To reflect this change in circumstances, Council believes it should now be possible to reopen some of the public amenities – particularly those next or near to parks and formerly serving important local high streets – which have been boarded up.

Accordingly, Council calls upon the Mayor to recognise the very real and practical need for accessible public toilets at locations where families congregate and urgently reverse some of these closures.

Until this is done, it is inevitable that Councillors of all Parties and campaigners for those groups especially hard-hit by this short-sighted strategy will continue to press for changes to be made on this basic and most fundamental issue."

## **7. TRIAL OF RECYCLED PLASTICS FOR BRISTOL ROADS**

Motion submitted by: Cllr Hiscottx, Horfield ward, Conservative  
Date submitted: 29<sup>th</sup> November 2018, 11.30am

"Council notes with great interest the innovative road surfacing experiment currently being trialled in London which utilises recycled plastics.

In 2016, Cumbria County Council became the first authority in the country to use this material on its roads. It was found to be an affordable, more environmentally friendly alternative repair resource to address their road repair problems. For their project, resurfacing the A7 in Carlisle, the volume of plastic applied was equivalent to 500,000 plastic bottles and more than 800,000 one-use plastic carrier bags.

Council understands that many benefits are derived from these 'plastic roads' which can be constructed entirely out of recycled plastic or as a composite mix with traditional mineral aggregates and asphalt. For example, as well as obviously reducing resort to landfill, it uses a material which is plentiful, cost effective, easy to apply and proven durability.

With the LGA estimating it will cost around £11.8 billion to bring the nation's roads up to standard, any viable cheap alternative must be considered by cash-strapped authorities.

Accordingly, in order to better evaluate these claims, Council calls on the Mayor to commission a detailed report on this subject for scrutiny members, with particular attention given to the Enfield project and special consideration given to conducting our own trial(s) here in Bristol.

Any such local study should also seek to identify those component combinations which maximise surface noise reduction. No doubt, the really bad weather last winter took a heavy toll on the city's



road network and now we are entering a new seasonal cycle. So, it would seem to be especially timely to try out these plastic formulations as a repair solution at the earliest possible opportunity.”

## **8. BUS FRANCHISING FOR BRISTOL**

Motion submitted by: Cllr Hopkins, Knowle ward, Lib Dem

Date submitted: 29<sup>th</sup> November 2018, 12 midday

### **Council notes:**

1. The distrust and disappointment among residents of Bristol with their bus services.
2. That large numbers of Bristol residents find themselves unable to access work opportunities due to the lacklustre service or find fares taking up a disproportionate amount of their income.
3. That Bristol City Council has no direct control over the routes, timetables or vehicles that bus operators use in the city, but must use its influence to help address these problems.
4. That in recent years congestion has worsened, increasing air pollution within the city leading to hundreds of deaths every year.
5. That First Bus currently operates an effective monopoly in Bristol which has led to disdain for the people who pay their fares.
6. That due to ill advised past slashing of the railway network we are wholly reliant on our bus services as the only means of public transport.
7. That London currently operates a successful bus franchising scheme, with Cambridge and Greater Manchester and others currently developing schemes for the future.
8. That in the Bus Services Act 2017, bus franchising powers were devolved to the mayors of combined authorities.

### **Council believes:**

1. That to address all of the above problems that there needs to be a fundamental change with buses in Bristol to a system that recognises public transport as a vital service.
2. That a franchising model would allow greater competition within our public transport, making new operators available for local services.

### **Council resolves:**

1. To request the Mayor to use his position on the West of England Combined Authority Committee to push for the establishment of a bus franchising system in Bristol, to gain control on behalf of the citizens of Bristol of routes, timetables, fares and emissions.
2. That under a franchising system, all buses operating within the city should run on ultra-low-emission or zero-emission fuels within five years.



## 9. EXPANSION OF BRISTOL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Motion submitted by: Cllr Thomas, Clifton ward, Green

Date submitted: 29<sup>th</sup> November 2018, 4.20pm

### Full Council notes:

1. That Bristol Airport Limited<sup>1</sup> is expected to / has applied to North Somerset Council (due on December 3rd) for infrastructure development that include a 50% increase in passenger numbers from the current figure of 8 million to 12 million, with an anticipated more than doubling to 20 million passengers per year in the longer term. The public will be able to comment on the application until the first week of January.
2. That the proposals include an aspiration to be carbon neutral by 2030 but the Airport has no intention to include emissions from flights in its target. 2
3. That air travel remains the most climate-damaging form of travel, and expansion of air travel will therefore have a significant climate impact. 3
4. That such an increase will lead to an enormous increase in the number of journeys to get to the airport to meet the increased usage – a fact which in itself will lead to significant issues around congestion, pollution and infrastructure.
5. The commitment – in Bristol – to be carbon-neutral by 2030, and the Climate Change Act to achieve an 80% cut in emissions across the UK by 2050.
6. The Joint Spatial Plan – which includes North Somerset and the geographical area covered by the airport– contains an explicit commitment to making a 50% cut in emissions by 2036.
7. The widespread concern that the expansion of Heathrow Airport which was supported by MPs on 25th June will make it even harder to meet the UK’s commitments under the Climate Change act.<sup>4</sup>
8. That airport expansion, whether in Bristol or Heathrow, locks the UK into emissions increases.
9. That 47% of the UK population has flown in the last year, and this figure has been stable over the last 15 years. Most (31%) only make one or two trips per year. This means that 10% of the population makes about 60% of all flights, and these people are mainly from the highest income groups.<sup>5</sup>

### Full Council believes that:

1. The airport must conform to the commitment contained in the Joint Spatial Plan to make a 50% cut in emissions by 2036 and such a commitment must include emissions from the aircraft using it.
2. Airport expansion disproportionately benefits high income households while negatively affecting all households through climate change, air pollution and noise pollution.

### Full Council resolves to call on the Mayor to:

1. Pass on these views to the airport, North Somerset Council, the West of England Combined Authority, the Joint Committee; and
2. Respond directly to the consultations making the points above.

### Notes:

1. In 2017, Bristol Airport Limited employed 283 people, had sales of £100 million, made a pre-tax profit of £36 million and paid tax of £3.8million.



2. Correspondence between Bristol Councillor Carla Denyer and the Bristol Airport consultation team in June 2018 confirmed that emissions from flights are not included in the Airport's carbon neutrality targets (copy available on the Bristol Green Party website: [https://bristolgreenparty.org.uk/library/Appendix\\_-\\_Airport\\_emails.pdf](https://bristolgreenparty.org.uk/library/Appendix_-_Airport_emails.pdf)).
3. In the UK the Carbon Trust's recent report sets aviation emissions at 0.68 tonnes per person per year. (Our individual annual total is 10.92 tonnes). This is 6.2%. If one then adds a factor of 3 by which CO2 at high altitudes is contributing to global warming (radiative forcing) then our flying accounts for 18.6% of the UK's climate change effects from CO2. This is more than any other category in the Carbon Trust's list. (Thanks to John Grimshaw for this research).
4. The Committee on Climate Change found that the UK target of reducing emissions by 80 per cent below 1990 levels could be achieved only if emissions from the UK aviation industry do not exceed 37.5 million tons – the level seen in 2005. And yet, a report released by the Department for Transport has already revealed that aviation emissions will hit 43 million tons by 2030 if the Heathrow expansion goes ahead. <https://www.independent.co.uk/infact/heathrow-airport-expansion-vote-third-runway-climate-change-chris-grayling-a8415881.html>  
Calculated by David Banister based on the National Travel Survey data and the Civil Aviation Authority's Air Passenger Surveys: <https://theconversation.com/heathrows-third-runway-is-expensive-polluting-and-unequal-why-the-poor-will-lose-out-98781>

## 10. CLEARWAYS FOR WALKERS: RECLAIM OUR STREETS

Motion submitted by: Cllr Negus, Cotham Ward, Lib Dem

Date submitted: 29<sup>th</sup> November 2018, 4.50pm

### Council recognises:

1. The obstruction, inconvenience and injury to people walking around this city, often the most disadvantaged, the disabled and those with young children from a range of ill-considered and uncontrolled infringements that affect the quality of life and freedom of movement for all those affected.
2. Principal amongst these is pavement or verge parking but there are many other instances of organisations and individuals assuming rights to restrict other street users. Victims are only too aware of the inaction on their behalf which increases feelings of frustration, worthlessness and despair.

### Councillors will be aware:

1. That while the vehicular part of the public highway is protected by a wide range of legislation, the small parts intended for pedestrians have few controls, even less enforced, which makes them vulnerable to many types of unrestrained insult from individuals and organisations.
2. There is an increasing and un-resisted annexation of our public space, limiting personal freedom and making a mockery of our walking strategy. In addition to pavement parking by private cars and delivery vehicles, these include poor quality and often long-standing temporary works by utilities companies, advertising boards (A-boards), chairs and tables, public and private signs, poles and infrastructure, speed cycling/skating/scootering, thoughtless household waste management, overgrown hedges and epicormic growth, dropping of litter, gum and dog-poo and antisocial behaviour.
3. Pavements appear to be prioritised as a zone for above and below ground utilities rather than for unfettered circulation.



4. 1 metre is now institutionalised as an acceptable width for passage between obstructions for wheelchairs, buggies and mobility scooters. This restricted pathway commonly ends in a ramp at junctions in a dirty puddle. Quite apart from the message this lack of consideration shows to our citizens it conflicts with this city's aim to encourage people to leave their cars behind and take more exercise.
5. Some of these affronts are covered by poorly enforced legislation and protocols. But we recognise that without some further legislation council enforcement officers are prevented from taking action and the police are too stretched and busy to respond as the public may want.
6. Above all there needs to be a clear commitment to giving back our streets to our residents and better organising our response to the gaps in our ability to deliver this message. This will doubtless require multi agency co-operation and support from local people who generally know what is best for their street or area.
7. The DfT walking and cycling safety review consultation response and action plan includes an action that government will recommend councils spend 15% of transport expenditure on cycling and walking. This action has no funding commitment.

**This council therefore asks the mayor to:**

1. Study and adopt in Bristol the Milton Keynes solution to this problem which involves a citywide bye law banning pavement parking and other insults This only triggers enforcement action where residents in a street or area request and advertise it. This local choice will allow residents to take back control and commitment over their own neighbourhood and so enforcement will be seen to be fair and be cost effective for this council
2. Apply for funding from WECA through the Bristol Transport Strategy to adequately support the development of the Walking and Cycling strategy
3. Set up a team of officers from BCC, Avon and Somerset police, councillors and other agencies to support the Bristol Walking Alliance to accelerate the delivery of a refreshed Walking and Cycling Strategy for Bristol that will comprehensively address these issues and related affronts
4. Review all relevant aspects of Bristol's opportunities to address these issues and identify areas needing further powers.
5. Liaise with other authorities through the Local Government Association to lobby Westminster for those powers for Bristol or from WECA as appropriate

---

Signed



Friday 30<sup>th</sup> November 2018

