

Public Forum

1. Public Forum Statements and Questions

(Pages 3 - 17)

CABINET – 3 November 2020

PUBLIC FORUM ITEMS

Statements and questions have been received as follows (full details are attached):

Agenda item 8 – Climate and Ecological Emergency Programme

Questions:

CQ08.01 Councillor Don Alexander
CQ08.02&03 Councillor Martin Fodor
CQ08.04 Councillor Anthony Negus

Agenda item 9 – Managing the development of houses in multiple occupation - Supplementary Planning Document

Statements:

CS09.01 Councillor Don Alexander
CS09.02 Councillor Clive Stevens

Questions:

PQ09.01&02 Andrew Waller
CQ09.01 Councillor Tom Brook
CQ09.02 Councillor Anthony Negus

Agenda item 10 - Next Steps accommodation funding to tackle rough sleeping

None

Agenda item 11 - Emergency Active Travel Fund - Bristol Streetspace

Statements:

PS11.01 David Redgwell
PS11.02 Christina Biggs

Questions:

PQ11.01&02 David Redgwell
CQ11.01&02 Councillor Jerome Thomas

Agenda item 12- Bristol Credit Union – Merger

None

Agenda item 13 - Print and Mail Strategic Review

None

Agenda item 14 - Data and Insights Delivery Partner and Procurement Approach

None

Agenda item 15 – Supplier Early Payment Initiative

None

Agenda item 16 - 2020/21 Period 6 Finance Report

None

Agenda item 17 – Extension of Contract for Provision of Sexual Health Services

None

Agenda item 18 – Director of Public Health Annual Report 19-20 Investing In Bristol's Mental Wealth

None

Question: CQ08.01

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 8 – Climate and Ecological Emergency Programme

Question submitted by: Councillor Don Alexander

The City Hall battery scheme mentioned in the report is both interesting and innovative. Could the Cabinet Member please explain more and update us on progress? Thanks.

Question: CQ08.02&03

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 8 – Climate and Ecological Emergency Programme

Question submitted by: Councillor Martin Fodor

Two years ago, November 2018, the council unanimously approved a Green " to declare a climate emergency and set a date of 2030 for the city to be carbon neutral. In July 2019 the council received a report, mandated by the motion, to set out the Mayor's Climate Emergency Action Plan. This stocktake set out what had been undertaken and promised to date.

Then in February 2020 we saw the One City Climate Strategy, developed by city partners. This list of ideas can be used and is a reference document for use by various organisations but is subject to change each year when the city partners review it.

In terms of the emergency we declared as a whole council we are now two years through the twelve years called for by international scientists. Today must therefore be a chance to show how the city and the council are responding to the emergency in concrete ways that cut emissions, and also give a timely stocktake of the pace and reach towards the carbon neutrality target.

I'm delighted that the council itself has continued its long commitment to progress in tackling its organisational emissions, and also supported some funding success to help 6 communities develop their own actions.

The programme listed in the report has 20 items

What's less positive is the number of them captioned: call, urge, invite, encourage, commission, train, investigate, assess, work with, develop recommendations, develop a plan, continue, even quantify. While all these are important they are not a demonstration of achievement, more hope and preparation.

Some actions are also halted by the redeployment of resources or revision in priorities due to the pandemic. Of course the goal is an extremely ambitious one and circumstances are tight. I endorse the values and the direction. But let's be clear where we have got to with ten years still to go.

Therefore my questions are:

1. Do we now need a report that builds on this preparatory work and stocktake, and have one documenting physical progress towards 2030?
2. Can we have regular reports of how the budget is being spent?

Question: CQ08.04

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 8 – Climate and Ecological Emergency Programme

Question submitted by: Councillor Anthony Negus

The suite of documents that make up this item tick all the boxes but we must remain flexible to inevitable developments and responses. Throughout there is reference to 'the mayors Plan', 'the One- city Plan' and 'working with partners' and while an institutional model is important this is just another example of keeping within a comfort zone. There is no reference to a Peoples' Plan' that blocks out all the messaging and the usual suspects so that this ecumenical project may be owned by anyone else. The great majority of our residents who are going to initiate, implement and so believe in this crucial step-change will want it made by them not passed down to them if there is to be the popular momentum to male possible better lives for us all.

I'm pleased that this didn't get the basics wrong but although I'm not surprised that the money and the actions will be tightly controlled from the top, I regret that there is little trust shared with those that will lead on a personal level and within their communities.

Q1.Please explain how, apart from an 'engagement plan', this is to become a vehicle for motivating citizens to want to be part of a grand movement for making changes to the way we currently live?

Statement: CS09.01

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 9 – Managing the development of houses in multiple occupation - Supplementary Planning Document

Statement submitted by: Councillor Don Alexander

This is a much needed policy and it will be welcomed, I'm sure, by all members of Development Control committees. I also want to commend the clear way in which it has been written with examples. This makes it accessible to members of the public as well as professionals which is very important. Thanks.

Statement: CS09.02

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 9 – Managing the development of houses in multiple occupation - Supplementary Planning Document

Statement submitted by: Councillor Clive Stevens

To Cllr Nicola Beech

I'd like to use this opportunity to thank you, your officers and the other councillors who I know from my own efforts have all been working long and hard on this.

Residents' groups have been lobbying hard for action for a decade maybe, but I realised the Bristol wide impact when I asked a supplementary question late in 2016. I explained that students could outcompete other types of HMO occupants due to their ability to draw down future earnings via their access to large loans. And this was having a deleterious effect on the housing market especially for those at the lower end of the income scale.

So here we are three years and eleven months later.

This Supplementary Planning Document is a great step forward, improving the quality of HMO conversions and new builds and ensuring that not too many family homes are converted to satisfy university growth plans. It should help to prevent an overconcentration of student housing in some areas and promote a more balanced housing mix for the city.

Let's hope it works. It does require more purpose built student accommodation or reduced university growth, probably both. At the moment in this unsure world we can't be certain that either will happen. But this SPD is sure to improve the wellbeing and lives of many thousands of people across Bristol.

Thank you from me and thank you from them.

Question: PQ09.01&02

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 9 – Managing the development of houses in multiple occupation - Supplementary Planning Document

Questions submitted by: Andrew Waller

Question 1

I would like to ask about possible next steps if, as I hope, the SPD gains approval.

I am concerned about the damaging impacts of high concentrations of HMOs that already exist in some areas, particularly those with high student populations. These impacts are acknowledged in the SPD, which is a good start, but the SPD can deal only with future HMO applications, not the legacy issues we already experience.

So I would like to know whether there is any plan to complete the mission of the SPD by seeking ways to mitigate those existing problems by, for example, systematically targeting the council's enforcement functions—whether in relation to planning, noise, waste disposal or other issues—on those areas that already have “harmful concentrations” of HMOs and if there is currently no such plan, would Cllr Beech be prepared to take that idea forward for discussion with colleagues?

Question 2

On a point of detail, I would like to ask Cllr Beech if the Planning Department might be urged to actively encourage HMO developers to adopt noise-mitigation measures. In my SPD submissions, I provided a list of such measures—for example, installing soft-closers to prevent the slamming of both internal and exterior doors. While I'm delighted to see that the SPD now advises developers to adopt such measures voluntarily, I'm disappointed the document does not give specific examples. Might Planning be asked to maintain a list of such measures and to make sure when evaluating applications that developers have given appropriate consideration to whether any might apply?

Question: CQ09.01

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 9 – Managing the development of houses in multiple occupation - Supplementary Planning Document

Questions submitted by: Councillor Tom Brook

Article 4 protections were extended to Bishopston & Ashley Down in July 2019. Could the Mayor/Cabinet Member confirm the impact of this additional intervention in slowing the growth in HMOs since then and outline the potential further benefits of the new SPD for communities across the city?

Question: CQ09.02

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 9 – Managing the development of houses in multiple occupation - Supplementary Planning Document

Questions submitted by: Councillor Anthony Negus

The supplementary Planning Document for Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO SPD) was finally accepted as necessary to regulate the apparently unstoppable increasing number of students coming to Bristol and seek to prevent hot-spots and mitigate the issues arising in the city areas agreed with the Universities, principally UoB, where they may live. It is formulaic, focused on local density of existing student residences. The councillors working alongside officers were assured that this would take into account Purpose-built? Student Accommodation (PBSAs) but this was withdrawn without them being told. All types of businesses, educational and non-educational, can manage PBSAs with identical groups of residents, and none of them contribute to the costs of council-provided services. But because of an 'oddity' in the Act only a few need to be licensed. While central government has set the law that makes it difficult for Licensing and Planning departments across the country to co-operate deliver local policy, in this case a licensing anomaly has crossed over to subvert our emerging planning policy. So although all these premises should be licensable they are not licensed and so will not be counted as agreed. This long-overdue HMO SPD is like a balloon created to overcome problems but with this panel missing it won't get off the ground. While it has merits, it is fatally flawed and should be withdrawn until it can be patched.

Q: Please provide the estimates of bedspaces for the following types of student accommodation across the city this year and in 5 years' time?:

2020 2025

Licensed HMOs

Legally un-licensed HMOs

Illegally un-licensed HMOs

Licensed PBSAs

Un-licensed PBSAs

Statement: PS11.01

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 - Emergency Active Travel Fund - Bristol Streetspace

Statement submitted by: David Redgewell

We welcome the investment in the city region by this fund especially the works in the old city, Baldwin Street and Victoria Street and especially the bus gate on Bristol Bridge which allows important improvements to the cross city bus network service 1 and 2 plus 2a Stockwood to Bristol Temple Meads, City Centre, Clifton Down Station and Southmead Hospital, Southmead we believe this bus service should operate via the southmead hospital bus station.

We would hope that the Bristol Bridge scheme will lead to much needed regeneration of the eyesore derelict bank buildings in Castle Park and a New High Street.

On other schemes we are still concerned about the delay to the city region bus network from North Somerset and South Bristol when buses join the traffic flow on City Centre Lewins Mead Stokes Croft cycle lanes scheme with conflicting movements of buses terminating at Lewins Mead and Bristol Bus Station and metro bus routes to East and North Bristol and to Cribbs Causeway Bus Station.

The other schemes are most welcomed.

The cycle lanes outside the Bristol Royal Infirmary Marlborough Street may again need looking at for bus services operating to Southmead Hospital service 13 and those terminating in the city centre - bus services from Yate Bus Station Y1 and T1 Bus service from Thornbury and Aztec West.

We are disappointed that at present no way forward has been found for the St Mark's Road area with the local shop owners and, as there are access points to Stapleton road station, we are concerned that no consultation has taken place with Rail user groups like the Severn Side Railway Partnership, Friends of Bristol suburban railway and Railfuture Severnside. We still hope a way forward can be found on this scheme with community leaders.

The Bedminster scheme again should have looked further into public transport needs of bus passengers and safe walking routes to Bedminster Railway station.

We welcome the scheme in Clifton village and the other social distance schemes.

The Cumberland road scheme needs to address access to Harbourside and SS Great Britain and coach parking plus art centre facilities, metro bus routes and the harbour railway.

When the scheme are consulted on as permanent schemes, the role of the public transport needs to be addressed and the role of access to bus stops and Railway stations addressed also along with disabled access arrangements.

We would as ask for consultation with the Mayor One City Transport Board.as the schemes become permanent.

We very welcome the improvements to walking, cycling and public transport in the Bristol Bath city region that this department for transport and WECA mayoral transport authority funding is achieving.

We are also very pleased that both Bristol City Council and South Gloucestershire Council now have Covid 19 marshals and hope that these officers will also look out for lack of social distancing at public transport network bus stops and interchanges. Along with journeys makers and Avon and Somerset police British transport police and Bristol port police.

We would also welcome enforcement on the city region bus and rail services of the wearing of face coverings unless you are exempt.

Statement: PS11.02

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 - Emergency Active Travel Fund - Bristol Streetspace

Statement submitted by: Christina Biggs (Bristol Clean Air Allowance) and Martin Garrett (For Transport for Greater Bristol Alliance)

I write as a member of Bristol Clean Air Alliance. BCAA is an alliance of campaign groups across Bristol who are keen to see Bristol's air cleaned up in the fairest, fastest and most sustainable way.

We support BCC's recent initiative to reduce traffic flows in the city centre by introducing a bus gate on Bristol Bridge and reducing lanes in Lewins Mead and Park Row to Marlborough Street. We recognise the strong adverse impact of Covid-19 on local business and the impact of charges on lower income groups, and therefore support the principle of finding roadspace reallocation solutions that may, subject to monitoring the impact on roadside pollution, result in a Clean Air Plan that does not involve charging private vehicles.

We also support the planned point closures in other areas of the city, as this will help prevent pollution being spread wider through vehicles travelling along rat runs through residential areas.

Question: CQ11.01&02

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – Emergency Active Travel Fund - Bristol Streetspace

Question submitted by: Councillor Jerome Thomas

I welcome the speed in which funding bids have been pulled together for the Active travel fund by Bristol City Council and hope for the Tranche 2 schemes that the council will be able to share as early as possible detailed plans for the proposed schemes in each neighbourhood so that meaningful community engagement is possible with each scheme.

- 1) Can the council confirm the level of spend and the location of the secure on-street cycle shelters which have been allocated tranche 2 funding?
- 2) Will the council be funding cycle parking that is non secure (eg Sheffield stands) and what level of budget will be allocated for this in what locations?

Question: PQ11.01&02

Cabinet – 3 November 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – Emergency Active Travel Fund - Bristol Streetspace

Question submitted by: David Redgewell

Question 1

Whilst welcoming the government grant to the WECA mayoral transport authority and Bristol City Council, the provision of cycling and walking facilities in the old city Kings Street and especially the Bus gate on Bristol Bridge and the regeneration project around Castle Park, we would like to know how much account has been taken of the needs of Bus operators and passengers on the City Centre Lewins Mead to Stoke Croft cycle lanes scheme and what action Bristol City Council and WECA mayoral transport authority are taking to reduce the delays to Bus services terminating in Lewins Mead or Bristol bus station from North Somerset and south Bristol?

The scheme also delays cross city Bus service to Gloucester Road to North Bristol and Cribbs Causeway bus station including metro bus services.

Question 2

With the provision of bus stops safety scheme of city centre to the following corridors bus stops A38 North and South A4018, A37, A4, A420, A431, A432 .and stops around the city centre.

What account has been taken of social distancing for passengers safely at these bus stops and is the city council or WECA mayoral transport authority going to bring in additional journeys makers or Covid 19 marshals to protect passengers safety as has been the case in other transport authority areas?