

Overview & Scrutiny Management Board 24 February 2021 Public Forum



Questions

Ref	Name	Agenda Item	Page
Q1 - 2	David Redgewell, South West Transport Network and Railfuture Severnside	10. Clean Air Zone	2
Q3 - 15	Berney Sharp	10. Clean Air Zone	2 - 6
Q16 - 35	Councillor Claire Hiscott	8. Bristol Beacon	6 - 10
Q36 - 37	Suzanne Audrey	10. Clean Air Zone	10 - 11
Q38	Toby Wells, co-chair, Bristol Cycling Campaign	10. Clean Air Zone	11 - 12
Q39	Joanna Booth	10. Clean Air Zone	12

Statements and Petitions

Ref	Name	Agenda Item	Page
S1	David Redgewell, South West Transport Network and Railfuture Severnside, and Gordon Richardson, Chair Bristol Disability Equalities Forum. (Registered to speak)	10. Clean Air Zone	13
S2	Lucy Travis Somerset, Catch the bus campaign; David Redgewell, South West Transport Network; and Gordon Richardson, Chair, Bristol Disability Equalities Forum.		16
S3	Clive Stevens (Registered to speak)	7. Scrutiny Annual report	17



Public Forum Questions

Questions 1 -2: David Redgewell, South West Transport Network and Railfuture Severnside - Clean Air Zone

1. What progress has been made on fitting Euro 6 engines to stagecoach west buses based at Patchway depot and Stroud Depot for the clean air zones in Bristol and Bath?

Stagecoach West provides bus service in Greater Bristol and in the area covered by South Gloucestershire council and into Bristol city centre with local bus services and commuter buses from the city centre and south Bristol to Aztec West and Severnside; we do not want the costs of higher bus fares passed on to passengers because of the clean air zones.

Answer

- This question might be best answered by Stagecoach themselves. However, the council did include them in our Expression of Interest sent out in December last year to gauge interest in operator uptake for financial support to retrofit their fleet. We have included a bid to retrofit all their outstanding vehicles, along with all the operators that returned their forms, in the Clean Air Fund Bid which has now been published.
2. What discussions are taking place with Tourist coach tours and the schedule coach operators, ie National Express Coaches Ltd and Megabus, about coach service into Bristol Bond Street coach station and Bristol bus and coach station, and railway replacement coach service operated by First Group Great Western railway for Network Rail and the department for transport?

Answer

- The council held a coach summit in December 2019 to gauge the level of support likely required if a Clean Air Zone is implemented. The council also worked with Bath and Northeast Somerset on this and liaised closely with MegaBus and National Express. The feedback from these companies was that they operate on various routes between London, Birmingham, Bath and Bristol and that as all of these cities have (or soon will have) a Clean Air Zone of some description, they planned to move their fleets around accordingly.
- We know that many modern coaches are fitted with additional features to minimize emissions, including telematics systems that encourage more efficient driving styles and engine stop/start systems to prevent unnecessary idling. Many operators now use a mix of vehicle types and sizes so that they can allocate smaller coaches (with lower emissions) to journeys with fewer passengers. Thanks to the changed legislation on vehicle dimensions resulting in increased

vehicle size, operators have been quick to invest in larger vehicles which have resulted in larger groups requiring fewer vehicles which in turn has reduced emissions per passenger.

Questions 3 – 15: Berney Sharp – Clean Air Zone

3. What are all the assumptions made in the model, and how sensitive is the analysis to each of those assumptions?

Answer

For detailed information about modelling, please see Full Business Case 27 Bristol T4 Transport Model Forecasting Report.

4. What was the decision making process used for the final CAZ shape and size? Please supply the modelling results of all CAZs investigated including those previously advertised. I have attached a picture with dates of different CAZs downloaded from clearairforbristol.org. Was any analysis done that includes Clifton roads in the CAZ? If not, why?

Answer

For detailed information on these decisions, please see Full Business Case 12 boundary report and Full Business Case 16 Options Assessment Report

5. How were journeys diverted into surrounding areas to avoid the CAZ modelled? Why were they modelled in this way? When asked by Councillor Clarke at the previous Scrutiny meeting, the project representative said that any diversion of journeys will be negated by a conversion of the rest of the fleet to cleaner vehicles. What is their evidential basis and sensitivity for this assumption? What distinction and assumptions does the model make between journeys that:
- begin or end inside the CAZ which may be assumed to switch to a non-polluting mode,
 - continue to begin or end in the CAZ and pay the charge,
 - diverted through surrounding areas to avoid passing through the CAZ,
 - continue to pass through the CAZ but switch to a cleaner vehicle,
 - those that will continue to pass through the CAZ and pay the charge?

Answer

For detailed information relating to all these points, please see Full Business Case 16 Options Assessment Report and associated appendices.

6. Has testing of specific 'test case' journeys been conducted for key industrial and residential hubs around the city? For example, a lorry subject to the CAZ restrictions travelling from

Sainsbury on Winterstoke Road towards Cheltenham. Where will this lorry divert to? What is the cumulative impact on pollution levels for those surrounding areas? These will also help with communication to the public of what the zones mean.

Answer

For detailed information relating to this point, please see Full Business Case 16 Options Assessment Report and associated appendices.

7. What is the baseline date for pollution data? In a previous report this was whilst Bridge Valley Road was closed, which would not give a fair assessment of pollution levels across the city.

Answer

For detailed information on this data, please see Full Business Case 18 AQ2 Modelling Methodology Report.

8. What was the simulation model used, how does it work, what independent validation has it had, and what are the qualifications and experience of the modellers?

Answer

For detailed information on this point, please see Full Business Case 16 Options Assessment Report and associated appendices. The consultancy firm Jacobs was commissioned by the council for assistance in developing Bristol's proposed CAZ.

9. Were the results of the public consultation used as part of the modelling? If so, in what way? If not, why not?

Answer

For information about the consultation, please see Full Business Case 28 stated preference survey report, Full Business Case 36 appendix M engagement report and Full Business Case 37 – Traffic Clean Air Zones Consultation Report.

10. Why were specific concerns raised by people during the public consultation (myself included, and some replicated here) not addressed directly or reported during the last scrutiny meeting? Can a full, anonymised list of all written comments be made publicly available. What analysis of themes/ trends was found from these comments? What is the Project's response to these questions/concerns?

Answer

For information on this point, please see Full Business Case 36 appendix M engagement report and FBC 37 – Traffic Clean Air Zones Consultation Report.

11. What assessment has been made of the total and average per car reduction in value of Bristol resident's vehicles as a result of this policy?

Answer

The primary focus of the CAZ is to ensure that Bristol City Council meets its legal and moral obligation to achieve air quality compliance in the shortest possible time (Please see Full Business Case 38 – Monitoring and Evaluation Plan)

12. What assessment has been made of the additional cost of deliveries to residents and businesses per annum both by total and average for resident and businesses?

Answer

For detailed information on this point, please see Full Business Case 5, Economic Case and Full Business Case 31, Distribution and Equalities Impact Assessment.

13. Why were the maps presented so small and not in a vector format that could be easily zoomed in for people with accessibility issues? It has been incredibly difficult to understand the intention South of Brunel Way.

Answer

This has been looked into previously and it was found that scalable maps were too slow to load so not accessible to people with older devices and we received feedback that pages were crashing, either due to older devices or slower internet connections. Respondents were prompted to click on the maps to see higher resolution images, which did allow them to zoom in.

14. Where can the full technical report be found?

Answer

Full Business Case documents have been uploaded to the Council website. Please provide further information if there is a particular technical report that you wish to access.

15. The previous Scrutiny meeting I heard mention of this being a temporary policy - what is the position on the permanence of the CAZ measures?

Answer

The CAZ would be installed in line with Joint Air Quality Unit guidance and includes costs for decommissioning. A charging CAZ may not be required in the future once vehicle fleets have upgraded or there is a sustained modal switch to sustainable modes. For further information on this, please see Full Business Case 27, Bristol T4 Transport Model Forecasting Report.

Questions 16 - 35: Councillor Claire Hiscott – Bristol Beacon

16. Why has this important report mysteriously been pulled from the Cabinet agenda? In other words, what has happened in the interim between preparing and publishing today's OSMB agenda and that for the next Cabinet?

Answer

As explained to Chairs of G&R scrutiny and OSMB, the negotiations are ongoing with contractors to translate the revised programme into legal agreements. These negotiations are ongoing.

17. When will this report and its recommendations likely be published?

Answer

The administration instructed officers to prepare a Cabinet report with the intention of bringing it to the February Cabinet. In parallel officers have been working on the paperwork required to turn the new information into a set of binding commitments. The most important of these will be a Deed of Variation with the main contractor Willmott Dixon. It is our objective to sign the new documents as soon as possible following Cabinet approval.

Officers met with Willmott Dixon early last week to assess progress on this paperwork. Our assessment was that the teams required a little more time to confirm the details. As a result it is now our intention to bring the Bristol Beacon to the March Cabinet. A final decision will be made dependent on the progress of the negotiations.

18. Many of us have been privy to the confidential briefing on this matter, can you provide a cogent reason for continuing to keep – and treat – this as an exempt item?

Answer

The negotiations are ongoing.

19. I recall a similar delaying manoeuvre was attempted last year in relation to Bristol Energy, can you provide an assurance that disclosure of the, frankly, scandalous project management in this case, will not be put off until after this year's local elections?

Answer

This work is unrelated to Bristol Energy

20. As a result of this – and other notorious capital failures – Bristol City Council doesn't look capable of sensibly managing a proverbial 'knees-up in a brewery'. What steps will the Mayor be taking to ensure some control over this redevelopment is re-established?

Answer

This question is for the Mayor to respond to

21. Moving forward, can the Mayor advise who will be the senior officer with direct responsibility for adherence to and implementation of any rescue plan?

Answer

This question is for the Mayor to respond to following finalisation of the relevant Cabinet report

22. In January, the Bristol Post helpfully provided drone images of the current structure. On what date was the removal of the roof of the Bristol beacon authorised, and which officer and politician gave approval to this decision?

Answer

Removal of the roof was a key part of the demolition phase and would have formed an early part of any programme of redevelopment.

23. On what date were officers made aware of the additional structural problems with this building?

Answer

This information was set out in the report of July 2020.

24. On what date after the closure of this venue for performance was a full survey carried out?

Answer

Extensive intrusive surveys were not considered possible in advance of the closure of a live music venue. Many of the items which were discovered only revealed themselves once the demolition process was well underway.

25. Does the Mayor concede that the final figure for 'rescuing' this project is sure to cause reputational damage to the local authority and indicates both a lack of professional competences within the organisation and a need to hold decision-takers to account?

Answer

This question is for the Mayor to respond to

26. As a key member on the Project Board responsible for the delivery of this project, can the Mayor confirm when he was first made aware that the cost of this rebuild was going to exceed agreed budgets?

Answer

This question is for the Mayor to respond to

27. Can the Mayor provide a breakdown of each key stage that Cabinet/Full Council has agreed to (or voted upon) any form or kind of underwriting of this venture and the extent of that financial commitment?

Answer

This question is for the Mayor to respond to

28. Why were potential lucrative naming-rights (put at £3.3m in the original business plan) waived and who decided this was an acceptable course of action?

Answer

Naming Rights are a key part of the BMT fundraising campaign.

29. Has the Mayor considered offering these rights to a reputable roofing firm in return for expediting these essential repairs?

Answer

This question is for the Mayor to respond to

30. Does the Mayor accept there must be an investigation into the how this quite shocking level of incompetence was ever allowed to take place?

Answer

This question is for the Mayor to respond to

31. Without prejudging the outcome of any such enquiry, who does the Mayor think the Bristol public will want to hold accountable for lumbering local taxpayers with what could be some eye-watering extra costs and liabilities?

Answer

This question is for the Mayor to respond to

32. Were the project board ever made aware of or provided with any alternative strategies to pressing on regardless of the expense of this reconstruction?

Answer

This information has been shared with members in closed session and will be referenced in the cabinet report

33. If so, what were these options and the reasons for dismissing, disregarding, discarding or rejecting them?

Answer

This information has been shared with members in closed session and will be referenced in the cabinet report

34. Why is this matter only now being brought to Cabinet when it is being confronted with something like a fait accompli or 'Hobson's choice'?

Answer

It was made clear to members last year that this issue would only be brought back to cabinet when the administration was confident that the revised scope, cost and programme was sufficiently developed.

35. Is the Mayor confident that the latest cost estimates in relation to decision which will have to be taken in this matter are not likely to increase as the result of any delay?

Answer

This question is for the Mayor to respond to

Question 36-37: Suzanne Audrey – Clean Air Zone

36. Background - It is important to state that TRESA is in favour of measures to reduce air pollution in Bristol and is not against a Clean Air Zone. However, Totterdown is on the edge of the proposed Clean Air Zone. As non-compliant vehicles try to avoid charges, we anticipate:

- more non-residents parking in Totterdown's narrow streets (and completing their journey on foot or bicycle)
- more rat running, especially between Bath Road and Wells Road
- more polluting traffic driving through Totterdown in search of alternative routes

There are measures to mitigate the impact of the clean air zone for drivers e.g. 1-year exemptions, grants and loans, travel subsidies. My questions are about monitoring, and mitigating, impacts on neighbourhoods at the edge of the clean air zone

What measures are proposed to **monitor** the impacts on parking, rat-running and vehicle movements in neighbourhoods at the edge of the Clean Air Zone?

Answer

The Council have developed a robust monitoring and evaluation plan to assess the success of the scheme following introduction. The Council is in the process of developing a Liveable Neighbourhood Strategy which would look to address any issues relating to displaced traffic as a result of the CAZ. The council is also installing 90 new pollution monitoring tubes across the city to monitor the change in pollution levels once the zone is in.

37. What **mitigation** measures are proposed for neighbourhoods at the edge of the Clean Air Zone affected by increases in non-residential parking, rat running and vehicle movements?

Answer

The Council is in the process of developing a Liveable Neighbourhood Strategy which would look to address any issues relating to displaced traffic as a result of the CAZ. Income generated by the CAZ will be ringfenced for air quality improvement measures including liveable neighbourhoods and proximity to the CAZ will influence the prioritisation of spend.

Question 38: Toby Wells, co-chair, Bristol Cycling Campaign

I write regarding the mitigating measures proposed alongside the implementation of the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) in Bristol.

Active travel is one of the most accessible ways for those affected by the CAZ implementation to access the area. This is particularly true for the inner city areas on the boundary of the zone where car ownership levels are low and the distances involved are shorter. In the council's own consultation, 53% of respondents suggested they would be prepared to walk instead of driving, and 50% said they would consider cycling instead of driving. This is compared with just 23% who said they would consider replacing their vehicle with a compliant one.

Despite this, the mitigating measures proposed to accompany the CAZ are focussed on allowing people to continue to drive through the city centre by subsidising the replacement of motor vehicles, rather than shifting them to zero emission options.

The "Full Business Case - Clean Air Fund Report" (FBC-17) outlines the process by which mitigating measures were selected. The long list (section 4.1) contains a large number of walking and cycling schemes, and the majority of these are highly rated and proposed for the short list. In fact, it seems that these schemes are considered to be more effective than the majority of the other proposals. These schemes are then included in the short list (section 4.2). Note that these schemes are different from, and separate to, the measures implemented elsewhere under the Emergency Active Travel Fund.

With little explanation, these measures then disappear in the revised short list (section 4.3), whilst measures to maintain motor vehicle traffic remain in place. The only relevant measures related to active travel remaining in this list are around signage and communication. Experience shows time and again that "encouragement" of walking and cycling has very limited effect - the way to get people walking and cycling is to enable them to do so through safe, high quality infrastructure and public realm.

Although several of the reports are contradictory on this point, we believe it is still proposed to implement the "Old Market Gap" cycleway as a fast track measure. While we support this measure, filling an important missing link in the cycling network, it is ultimately about 200 metres of cycleway, a far cry from what is needed to enable people from around the city to access the CAZ area safely, conveniently and sustainably.

Will the council please confirm why active travel infrastructure measures were removed from the

CAZ mitigating measures in favour of measures promoting continued use of motor vehicles in the city centre, and why this rationale was omitted from the report?

Answer

The Council has worked closely with the Joint Air Quality Unit on the development of the mitigation measures that form the Clean Air Fund. A number of walking and cycling improvements were highlighted as a potential method of mitigating impacts of the Clean Air Zone. The Joint Air Quality Unit's primary aim for the funding it provides is to deliver compliant air quality as quickly as possible. The schemes could not be shown to be able to mitigate the impact if they were deemed not to be acceptable for funding by the Joint Air Quality Unit. This is in part because these schemes would not have been deliverable in time to meet the funding timescales i.e. implemented before the forecasted compliance date January 2023.

The Joint Air Quality Unit has provided informal feedback throughout the development of the Clean Air Fund bid and has provided guidance on what mitigations are likely to be funded through the funding available. We were advised that a cycling scheme inside the zone that enabled modal switch from vehicles to cycling could be considered to aid implementation of the scheme (rather than mitigate it) and so could be more likely to be awarded funding, providing adequate justifications could be made.

The Old Market Gap cycling scheme has therefore been included as a 'fast track' measure as this scheme is further developed and can be delivered within timescales to reach compliance in the shortest possible time.

Question 39: Joanna Booth

As noted in the following piece on Bristol247 <https://www.bristol247.com/opinion/your-say/walking-and-cycling-improvements-have-again-been-ignored-in-favour-of-cars/> and in the Full Business Case document #17, ten infrastructure measures designed to increase areas for walking and cycling were considered for CAZ funding and then removed entirely from the final list.

In the traffic consultation undertaken to accompany the introduction of the CAZ, only a fifth of respondents said they would change vehicles but half said they would switch to walking and cycling.

Why then were the walking and cycling mitigation measures removed from the final, costed mitigation measures that are to be pursued, please? and by who?

Answer

Please refer to the response above

Statements

Statement 1: David Redgewell, South West Transport Network and Railfuture Severnside, and Gordon Richardson, Chair Bristol Disability Equalities Forum.

Whilst we welcome the Clean Air Zone in Bristol city centre it's very important to clean up the city air with 135 deaths a year for respiratory illness from poor air quality caused by motor vehicles. In Bristol we have major south west regional Hospitals in the city at the Bristol Royal infirmary, Bristol children's hospital, Bristol Heart Institute and Bristol Dental hospital. It's very important to have good air quality around the hospital complex and a Green travel plan. We welcome the charging of dirty vehicles entering the city centre. We need of course to improve sustainable transport and public transport in the city region; the showcase bus service will help between Cribbs Causeway bus station 2 2a service to Stockwood via Southmead, Henleaze, Clifton Down Station, City Centre Broadmead, Bristol Temple Meads railway station, Knowle Hengrove and Stockwood. We would like the 2a operated from Southmead hospital bus station. Other showcase bus routes are planned across the city region in the future with First Group west of England buses are 1 Cribbs Causeway, bus station to Brentry, Henbury, Westbury on Trym, Clifton Down station, City centre, Broadmead, Bristol Temple Meads station, Arnos Vale, Bromhill, Brislington.

75 Cribbs Causeway bus station to Patchway, Filton, Horfield, Bishopston Cheltenham Road, for Montpelier station, Stokes Croft, city centre, Bedminster station, Parson Street station, Bishopsworth Highridge, Withywood, Withywood Hartcliffe, Hengrove, Hospital.

76 Cribbs Causeway bus station, Southmead, Southmead hospital bus station, Henleaze, Clifton Down station park street, Broadmead Bedminster railway station Bedminster, Parson Street, Bishopsworth, Highridge, Hartcliffe, Hengrove hospital bus interchange

Other routes will follow in the bus deal between WECA Mayoral transport authority and Bristol city council and South Gloucestershire council.

Other public transport improvements measures include improved Train services between Severn Beach St Andrew's Road, Avonmouth Dock Portway Parkway Park and Ride new station and transport interchange Shirehampton, Sea Mills, Clifton Down station, Redland, Montpellier, Stapleton Road, Lawrence Hill station, Bristol Temple Meads proposed new station, Anne's Park station, Keynsham, Saltford proposed new station, Oldfield Park, Bath Spa, Freshford, Avoncliffe, Bradford on Avon, Trowbridge, Westbury with some trains to Dillton Marsh and Warminster or Frome. New train service is due to start this December 2021 along with Portway Parkway Station. A new Park and ride service is due to open in 2021 2022 at Yate with a Express bus service by First Group Lynx buses to the city centre Y1 via A420 Ring Road and Bristol city centre. And a railway service from Yate Railway station to Bristol Stapleton Road Lawrence Hill and Bristol Temple Meads

Other important areas to clean up the city's area include removing of traffic from the old city, Bristol Bridge bus gate walking and cycling route, Baldwin Street and Victoria Street restrictions and Cumberland Road with local access. We would like to see Park Street as a public transport walking and cycling corridor with access by car only to the shops, museum, Music centre, business and homes. Other important issues is access for Coaches on schedule services to Bristol Bond Street coach terminal and Bristol bus and coach station.

Megabus and Falcon part of stagecoach Group operate Express and Region Coach services from Bristol as does National Express Coaches from Bristol bus and coach station. Eurolines operate from Bond street to Poland and Hungary.

All the service Coaches are Euro 6 but duplication services are not and we do not want region coach service charges as these provide vital links across south west England, especially towns and cities without Railway stations.

Has the Western gateway Transport board and South West Transport board been consulted on the Coaches issue with the confederation of passengers transport and Road Haulage Association Coach operators group?

On railway replacement services, these are run for the Department for Transport and Network Rail by First Group West of England for First Group, Great Western Railway and South Western Railway and others service for Cross Country trains German state railway.

These are for schedule engineering work like rebuilding Bristol Temple Meads station and east entrance, works on East junction, Metro west works to Bristol Temple Meads station to Pill and Portishead line or the Henbury Ashley Down station, Filton North and Henbury station line and loop. All these projects will require line closures and First Group to run rail replacement services, most will be euro 6 engines with full disability access.

But in an emergency railway will be closed due to bad weather, train breakdowns, incidents where tracks are closed and Coaches are brought in and First Group cannot use its own euro 6 bus and coach fleet, no euro 6 Coaches maybe used with wheelchair access. We would request a full exemption for Railway replacement service.

With the Department regulation needs to be fully accessible by September 2021 although at present good reason needs to be given to the Department for Transport for not operating non-compliant vehicles now.

We were shocked at the Department's Government owned Road company Highway England who were given exemption where the motorway network closes for an emergency or motorway maintenance was given an exemption to charging for vehicles through Bristol to pollute the city centre and the hospital air by dirty diesel lorries and cars through the city centre. But the Departments of Transport Network Rail western routes will be charged at £100 per coach for Emergency Railway replacement service's. We believe that Public transport users on railway replacement service Coaches should be exempted.

We wish to see time given to Stagecoach West buses to be given a years exemption to fit euro 6 engine conversion to its fleet based in its Bristol Depot in Patchway. A number of route operators for the WECA Mayoral transport authority, Route 13 city centre, Bristol Royal Infirmary, Bishopton, Henleaze, Southmead hospital bus station, Southmead West of Trym to Sea Mills and Shirehampton, Service from south Bristol via the city centre, some service via Clifton, Henleaze, Filton, Patchway to Aztec West or via Cheltenham Road and Bishopston Gloucester Road to Filton Patchway and Aztec West. Public transport users should not have to pay higher fares for this clean air zone. Exemption should be made for hospital visits and WECA Mayoral transport authority should urgently improve bus service to the Bristol Royal Infirmary hospital complex with First Group Stagecoach West and University Hospital Trust Bristol and Weston Super Mare and a green travel plan.

Exemption should be for one year only on low incomes to replace their car with euro 6 engines, especially working class people on low incomes should have grant aid for replacement vehicles or Public transport credits for tickets. The disabled exemption for Blue badge holders causes mayor concern with a Region hospital complex and key region service for the west country. Main public service is provided from Bristol.

We have a WECA Mayoral transport authority area with North Somerset council and a North Somerset Bristol and South Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group area. Disabled people are referred to Hospital from Bath, Swindon Wiltshire clinical commission group areas and from the rest of the south west region. Why should disabled people from Devon Cornwall Somerset Dorset Gloucestershire, and

Wiltshire be charged for visiting Bristol hospitals and city centre, have to pay? The city and county of Bristol is a small part of the Bristol, Bath city region. Blue badge holders should not be charged. We welcome exemption for community transport vehicles.

Breaking down freight loads is very important to prevent HGV entering the city centre. On Tourist Coaches this is a major concern as we are a west country city and Tourism is worth £1.4 Billion Pounds a year and 6000 job pre covid 19. We must discuss coach access to Bristol city centre with no coach park or station in the city centre. Bath has coach parking at odd Down park and ride and First Group Weston island depot. No coach parking is allowed at Bristol park and ride sites or the Long Ashton park and ride in North Somerset council area. This issue need addressing as does the school coach service which needs exemption to upgrade Coaches because wheelchair access to schools, Coaches become law in July 2021. One year exemption are required for Coaches on school services. Exemption and Grant's need to be worked out with the Taxi trade.

The council should work with NHS South West Ambulance Service to clean up the ambulance fleet and NHS staff vehicles. A large numbers of NHS Doctors and nurses are pushing for the clean air zone and is to be welcomed but the NHS Trusts in Bristol for the south west region need to clean up their vehicles fleet. We welcome the clean air zone in Bristol, we need to reduce dirty vehicles entering the city centre, work with the city region WECA and North Somerset council which must join WECA Mayoral transport authority, to improve Public transport network, this involves park and ride sites being built in South Gloucestershire county council area at Cribbs Causeway top of the M32 in Yate station car parking at Severn Beach station and Patchway station, Coach based park and ride at Fairfield and new station on the Henbury line and Charfield stations on the Gloucester line. South Gloucestershire local plan consultation finishes on 4th March 2021. In Banes new park and ride sites are required at Whitchurch and Hickgate to replace Brislington park and ride with bus priority lanes on the A4 and A37. Push the Department for Transport for Electrification of the Chippenham to Bristol Temple and Taunton main line through Bristol and up to Bristol Parkway and Patchway, to electrify the Henbury loop Severn Beach line and Portishead line, to remove dirty Diesel trains from the city region and Bristol city centre. Consultation on the Bath transport plan finishes on the 1st March 2021.

We are pleased that Bristol city council is working closely with Banes in the clean air zone and learning from Bath scheme which goes live on the 15th March 2021. It's very very important that we charge dirty vehicles entering the city centre with pollution, and dirty air cost lives and respiratory illnesses. We urge the council to move forward with this plan for charging from Oct 2021 as there is legal Action by client Earth against the UK Government and the city council.

To make one year exemption to the scheme with grants and address the Coaches and railway replacement service issue; To be careful on polls that are carried out which have not been carried out by city council officers on the public Transport network due to covid 19. On the clean air zone it is very important today that Bristol puts in a clean area zone in the City centre and charges like Bath in the city centre from October 2021. A lot more still has to be done to clean up the city air quality and this is a start. We must remove dirty vehicles from Bristol city centre.

Statement 2: Lucy Travis Somerset catch the bus campaign; David Redgewell, South West Transport Network; and Gordon Richardson, Chair, Bristol Disability Equalities Forum.

We would like to raise the following issues; the extension to the contractor is welcomed and the restrictions on unhealthy food advertising, similar to the contract with Transport for London and the mayor on the city public transport network.

On the shelter we are concerned about cleaning and Covid 19 security standards, the repairing of Class maintenance of lighting for community safety issues; and working realtime information. The design of shelters are very important with good seats and turning circle for wheelchairs with castle kerbs and drop kerbs. The metro bus shelter are passenger friendly and easy to use for wheelchair users, mother and father with buggies.

If we are to attract people back to bus and coach service across the city and county of Bristol and the Bristol and Bath city region, bus shelters must be of high quality design standards with dry rain proof shelters, good waiting areas, seating, lighting, passengers timetable information interchange, maps for other bus services, railway stations and ferry stops and Taxis stands; high cleanliness standards and maintenance and proper seating, not seating designed to prevent people sleeping on the bench.

We must update safe information and passengers timetables at Bus stops across the WECA mayoral transport authority and North Somerset council areas.

Bus stops and interchanges shelters which must be of good design and also have CCTV and litter bins. Good quality bus shelter are part of WECA mayoral transport authority and North Somerset council's bus strategy and important in the recovery of good quality public bus services.

I also note that these shelters are at the main Taxi stands in Bristol city centre; and in future could be added to Ferry stops and Terminals.

The metro bus stops are of good quality design. We welcome the contract extension, on the new contract we would like to see public consultation with public transport users and the with Bristol Transport board and the WECA mayoral transport authority.

We believe in the future that bus shelters and infrastructure should be like Greater Manchester, West Yorkshire, West Midlands combined authority, be under the control of the WECA mayoral transport authority in the city and county of Bristol, South Gloucestershire, Banes and North Somerset council which must join WECA mayoral transport authority.

We note public bus services are now under the control of the WECA mayoral transport authority and metro mayor.

We also note the lack of equalities input by equalities officers into the equalities impact assessment. Bus shelters have issues for disabled people and community safety issues of passengers and especially for single people, women BAME community and LGBTQ communities.

Please bring our statement to Overview and Scrutiny Management Board meeting 24th February 2021, and 25th February cabinet meeting of Bristol city council.

Statement 3: Clive Stevens

Q. What do you find at the heart of every poor decision by a public authority?

A. Poor scrutiny at the policy development stage.

This applies in National Government, Local Government and here in Bristol. "Value-for-Money" reports discarded by Audit Committees litter our country. Bristol Councillors will soon get their own Public Interest, Value-for-Money Report on Bristol Energy. I dare anyone of you to predict that the Auditors will find there was good policy development scrutiny at the heart of the decisions taken in 2014 and 2015.

Value-for-Money reports are a form of scrutiny, but after the event. The cost and damage has already happened. Their purpose is learning and improvement. And when information is shared it will help identify failings. Often these will be systemic failures in scrutiny. It is great to read that you are preparing to tackle the likely issues (OSMB agenda 7). This includes:

Policy development scrutiny:

This type of scrutiny should occur months, maybe years in advance of any decision. Doing this leads to better decisions. This is because a wider range of people will be involved: Seeing issues from different angles and maybe public involvement too. Consultants might be good technically but how many of the bright, well paid, young things (young in comparison to me) live in council houses, and/or are on low earnings and/or live in deprived areas and can see issues from such perspectives. Perhaps if there had been a better approach to providing social value to those living in energy poverty, BCC wouldn't have set up an energy company at all?

Poor policy development scrutiny was also in evidence at HR Committee last week; discussing the transfer of Facilities Management (cleaning, security staff) to Bristol Waste Company. The meeting on 18th February 2021 should have been six months earlier, in 2020, and with more information provided.

Good policy development scrutiny gets better buy-in from Councillors, the public and potentially an easier ride before Cabinet.

Pre-decision scrutiny (the third type of scrutiny) occurs a few days before Cabinet and would work much better if policies and implementation had been worked on together, cross-party, over prior months and years.

Bristol has good examples of policy development scrutiny, some is best practice: Better Lives task and finish, SEND (EHCP) evidence day, Social Value task and finish and the Local Plan process. One thing they all have in common: Cabinet Member buy-in, attendance often, officer buy-in and much openness, transparency and willingness to learn.

As a member of the public I wholly support your attempts to improve the deal for hard pressed residents and businesses: Possibly less decisions, but a higher percentage of successful ones with a more effective Council providing the public with value for money services.