

Member Forum

8 September 2020

Statements from Councillors



Procedural note:

STATEMENTS FROM COUNCILLORS:

- A maximum of 1 minute shall be allowed for the presentation of each statement (subject to overall time constraints).
- There shall be no debate on the statements and the Lord Mayor shall refer them to the Mayor for information/consideration.
- Statements will be dealt with in the order of receipt (subject to time).

The following statements have been submitted – full details are attached:

	Name	Subject
CS01	Councillor Gary Hopkins	Jubilee Pool
CS02	Councillor Jerome Thomas	City Leap
CS03	Councillor Paula O'Rourke	Charging In Clifton



CS01

Members Forum statement from Councillor Gary Hopkins

Subject: Jubilee Pool

There have been attempts to confuse and distract from the real issues regarding the planned closure of jubilee pool

I attach 2 sets of documents

1. The report and decision of the 2008 Labour Cabinet committing to the PFI with an Australian Bank to fund Hengrove Pool and to the closure of Jubilee Pool.
2. The 2011/12 Lib Dem Cabinet papers showing how despite that PFI being in place, we were able to invest in and rescue Jubilee Pool (also incidentally, putting in £4M for a new Speedwell Pool).

This recent Save Jubilee Pool Campaign, that I have been proud to be a part of, is the third time in ten years that we have fought against Labour closure plans for Jubilee Pool

https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/Data/Cabinet/201201261800/Agenda/0126_6.pdf

Capital Programme 2012-2015 & Treasury Management Strategy 2012-2015 & Fourth Capital Monitor
2011/12 Cabinet 26th January 2012

https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/Data/Cabinet/200907301800/Agenda/0730_9.pdf

Hengrove Healthplex - Selection of Preferred Bidder and Authority to Enter into Contracts – Cabinet 31
July 2008

<https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?Committeeld=135&MeetingId=6456&DF=31%2f07%2f2008&Ver=2>

Hengrove Healthplex - Selection of Preferred Bidder and Authority to Enter into Contracts – Decision
Recording Form - Cabinet 31 July 2008

****please see documents referred to, published as a supplement.***



CS02

Members' Forum statement from Councillor Jerome Thomas

Subject: City Leap

I note that after the failure of the previous City Leap procurement that the new City Leap procurement has been launched.

This specifies that the City Leap procurement has a tender value of £12 billion without specifying in the accompanying glossy video or the associated paperwork, what this procurement might involve, to any level of useful detail.

It is very concerning that significant sums of money are still being spent on a procurement that has already failed once at great expense, and that little appears to have been learnt from the excessive secrecy involved in the failure of Bristol Energy.

I call on the administration to be more open with the public about what City Leap involves.

Only then will we be able to see whether this 'emperor is wearing any clothes.'

CS03

Members' Forum statement from Councillor Paula O'Rourke

Subject – Charging in Clifton

Charging businesses in Princess Victoria St in Clifton £20 per day (that adds up to over £7,000 a year) to use parking bays is legally and morally wrong.

Let me put the context for the legal argument first.

To allow for social distancing, councillors, Clifton BID and highway officers agreed a design which created 'parklets' at pinch points for traders to move their tables from the pavement into parking bays. This was to stop people queueing for shops obstructing pedestrians. This offer was agreed by the cabinet member for transport, Kye Dudd and accepted by the BID. They then offered to purchase planters, at a cost of £10,000, to enhance the scheme. This offer was accepted by the Council.

This created a contract with Clifton BID, as, for a contract to be legal all that is needed is an offer, an acceptance and a 'consideration' - in this case, the consideration is the money spent on the planters. At no time during the negotiations did the council say that there would be a daily charge to trade from the bays, so I think that BCC is in breach of this contract and the BID will be getting legal advice to support this argument.

The moral argument is even clearer than the legal one. While I accept that making quick decisions in a rapidly changing situation was challenging, it seems clear that internal communications was inadequate. The decision to charge was imposed by the Finance/Business departments retrospectively and they are deaf to the argument that the situation in Clifton is different to other places due to the purchase of the planters.



We asked businesses to remove tables from pavements so that the elderly population could have the social distance required as they access their shops. In most cases, traders have a licence or planning approval for tables on the pavement. So, asking struggling traders to pay to move the tables, which they would have normally had on the pavement, is punitive. This is compounded when one considers that the same struggling traders have already spent £10,000 of their BID fund to make the area look more attractive to entice shoppers back and are then asked to pay over £7,000 a year for the right to do so. This is morally wrong and we have over 1,100 signatures to a petition which Jerome set up which shows that people agree with us.

I have been trying to get politicians and officers to understand these compelling points for over 2 months now; I hope that, by putting it in this public forum, it will make the Mayor realise that the right thing to do is to amend or reverse this decision.

