

Cabinet Public Forum

Date: Tuesday, 22 June 2021



Agenda

1. Public Forum Statements and Questions

(Pages 2 - 32)

Issued by: , Democratic Services
City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol, BS1 9NE
E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk



www.bristol.gov.uk

CABINET – 22 June 2021

PUBLIC FORUM ITEMS

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

Agenda item 8 - Bristol Bus Stop Suspension Charges

Statements:

CS08.01 David Redgewell

Questions:

PQ08.01 David Redgewell

CQ08.01 Councillor Marley Bennett

Agenda item 9 - Blaise Plant Nursery

Questions:

CQ09.01 Councillor Brenda Massey

CQ09.02 Councillor Don Alexander

Agenda item 10 – Extension of The Cultural Investment Programme

Questions:

CQ10.01 Councillor Marley Bennett

CQ10.02&03 Councillor Tessa Fitzjohn

CQ10.04&05 Councillor Ani Stafford Townsend

Agenda item 11 – New Regeneration Service & Funding

Statements:

PS11.01 Merche Clark

PS11.02 Joanna Booth

CS11.01 Councillor Tony Dyer

Questions:

PQ11.01&02 Suzanne Audrey

PQ11.03&04 Lloyd Roberts

CQ11.01 Councillor Paul Goggin

CQ11.02&03 Councillor David Wilcox

CQ11.04 Councillor Tony Dyer

Agenda item 12 – South Bristol Light Industrial Workspace

Questions:

CQ12.01 Councillor Paul Goggin

CQ12.02 Councillor Tony Dyer

Agenda item 13 - Electoral Services specialist printing tender

Questions:

CQ13.01 Councillor Steve Pearce

Agenda item 14 - Microsoft Desktop Licensing Agreement

None

Agenda item 15 - 2020/21 Finance Outturn

None

Agenda item 16 - Childcare Development and Sustainability Service

None

Agenda item 17 - Future Bright Plus – Phase 2 of existing Future Bright Programme

None

Agenda item 18 - Approval to submit a Rough Sleeping Accommodation Programme Funding Bid

None

Agenda item 19 - PFI Benchmarking Outcome for Bristol Schools Ltd

None

Agenda item 20 - SLM Leisure Contract and Financial Assistance

Questions:

PQ20.01&02 Jules Laming, Friends of Jubilee Pool

PQ20.03&04 Sarah Piggot

CQ20.01&02 Cllr Martin Fodor

Agenda item 21 – Corporate Risk Management Report (CRR)

Questions:

CQ21.01&02 Cllr Christine Townsend

Agenda item 22 – Bristol’s first Citizens’ Assembly recommendations

Statements:

CS22.01 Cllr Paula O’Rourke

Questions:

PQ22.01&02 Rob Bryher

CQ22.01&02 Cllr Emma Edwards

Agenda item 23 - Report of Monitoring Officer: Local Government & Social Care Ombudsman Public Report

None

Statement: CS08.1

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 8 - Bristol Bus Stop Suspension Charges

Statement submitted by: David Redgewell

Whilst we support the new bus stop charges for disruption by utilities companies to a rate that cover the officers work we are still failing to understand why the city and county of Bristol has not transferred its public transport functions now fully with south Gloucestershire council and Banes to the metro mayor Dan Norris at the West of England Combined Authority.

We note from the report that in the other combined authority areas (Greater Manchester Mayor, Andy Burnham, Andy Street, Mayor of the West Midlands, Steve Rotherham Liverpool city region mayor) all control their public transport network infrastructure, bus stops, shelter realtime information, timetables and shelters.

As well as North Somerset council joining the west of England combined authority.

In fact, travel west is a WECA mayoral transport authority information company. All stakeholders in public transport network wish to see an integrated public transport Authority set up for the Greater Bristol and Bath city region. In fact in the government White paper “bus back better” the metro mayor Dan Norris is expected to draw up with first group, Stagecoach west and HCT group an advance quality partnership and make a submission to the Department for Transport buses minister Baroness Vere of Norbiton by June 2021 and full submission by October 2021 and this plan to be optional by April 2022. A Franchise can take 4 years .

The secretary of state wishes to see improvement in Evening and Sunday bus service, more bus service in levelling up areas of the city region south Bristol East Bristol and North Bristol.

The Bristol ring road is in urgent need of bus lanes and priority walking and cycling facilities not capacity improvements for the private car.

Interchange facilities including Bus stops and shelters need better management of alternative facilities for disabled passengers with ramps and castle kerbs, Temporary shelter and women and LGBTQ members of society better lighting notices and realtime information.

And set a bus passengers advisor Board and public transport network forum at the west of England combined authority and North Somerset council level Including working with the Bristol one city mayor transport board.

We welcome raising of charges for works by utilities for Traffic regulations orders and Temporary bus stop closures order but we would like to see all public transport infrastructure maintenance and provision transferred to Dan Norris the Metro mayor at the west of England combined authority as part of an integrated transport authority and public transport staff within the council.

Question: PQ08.01

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 8 – Bristol Bus Stop Suspension Charges

Questions submitted by: David Redgewell

Question 1

Whilst we support the city council putting up the charges to the utilities companies from £82 to £250 per shelter for companies like Bristol water company Perron, Wessex Water Service WTL and covering another 31 of officers time as passengers information is now provided by the metro mayor Dan Norris under Travel west which includes passengers information on bus stop realtime information.

The city and county of Bristol suspended in conjunction with the WECA mayoral transport authority 362 Temporary traffic orders for bus stop closures 154 with Temporary regulations at a cost to the Authority of £7147.

In the future, bus stop maintenance would be better transferred to the West of England metro to save money on 3 unitary authorities carrying out a passengers transport function.

We also note from the Director report that in Greater Manchester, West Midlands and West Yorkshire that bus stop maintenance and suspension orders is a responsibility of the combined Mayoral transport authority. **Are these new charges taking account of WECA input into Bus service delivery under the Government White Paper “Bus Back Better” and the Bus Improvement Plan?**

Question 2

The equalities impact assessment is to be welcomed but often disabled passengers find bus and coach stops closed in the city and county of Bristol and across the west of England combined authority area without temporary drop kerbs and lack of temporary castle kerbs facilities for disabled passengers in fact the stops often have barriers around.

Passengers would like under these new charge for Bristol city council officer time working with west of England metro Dan Norris access to very important city wide alternative bus stops and shelters is going to be maintained both in terms of shelters drop kerbs, information and disabled access information at bus shelters need to improve both during temporary closures and permanently when the bus stop is opened up .

Disabled people and passengers need a hot line to the council or Travelwest to report if alternative facilities provided by utility companies are not accessible especially wheelchair users and mothers and fathers with buggies and older people. It must be noted when WECA mayoral transport authority or the city council find out the temporary stop is not accessible immediate action is taken. We also note that North Somerset council have officers on the ground supervising the works and charge £120 per bus stop and the stops are heavy cleaned afterward by the utility company to covid safety standards.

Will the city council and the Metro mayor commit to holding the utilities companies more to account when carrying out street works at bus and coach stop in the city region so passengers can use public transport easily?

Question: CQ08.01

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 8 – Bristol Bus Stop Suspension Charges

Question submitted by: Councillor Marley Bennett

I'm pleased to see this item on the agenda – a manifesto commitment I was elected on was increasing the penalties on delays to roadworks and this is in the same spirit as this commitment. Will this new system to charge for the suspension of bus stops result in speedier road repairs and other road works – as developers will be reluctant to cover the extra cost?

Question: CQ09.01

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 9 - Blaise Plant Nursery

Question submitted by: Councillor Brenda Massey

I was pleased to see the item on Blaise Plant Nursery in the Cabinet papers. Gardening has been one of the most useful hobbies over the last 18 months or so. Being able to grow something from a packet of very small seeds, whether it is a flowering plant or something edible, has been a source of consolation to those in enforced isolation, or trying to recover from the loss of a family member. Gardening is indisputably a positive occupation, even if it is not always good for the back or knees!

Blaise Nursery produces some amazing plants, and the aim to increase the output is to be welcomed. However, given that the therapeutic value of gardening is mentioned in the report, together with the possibility of having a glasshouse to educate citizens in growing plants, **I would like to ask if any thought has been given to using this as an opportunity for work placements for young people with mental or physical issues?** They would not only benefit from training in growing plants, but also from the retail side of the business.

Question: CQ09.02

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 9 - Blaise Plant Nursery

Question submitted by: Councillor Don Alexander

I'm pleased to hear that the Council's joint initiative with Blaise Plant Nursery – a joint initiative which is emblematic of this administration's collaborative working through the One City Approach - of giving plants to deprived communities. **Please could I have assurance this will continue to be available to my ward?**

Question: CQ10.01

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 – Extension of The Cultural Investment Programme

Question submitted by: Councillor Marley Bennett

Can the Mayor or Cabinet Member say whether there has been any increase in funding to assist with Post-Covid re-opening in the cultural sector, bearing in mind the recent extension of restrictions?

Question: CQ10.02&03

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 – Extension of The Cultural Investment Programme

Question submitted by: Councillor Tessa Fitzjohn

Whilst I fully appreciate the difficult choices the culture team has had to make, in cutting arts funding, I am pleased that there is funding at least for some of our city arts providers, as well as opportunities for individuals and less established organisations to apply to the originators fund in 2022-23.

Given the impact of the pandemic it seems to me there is an opportunity to re-evaluate the way funding decisions like these are taken. For example, both Arts Council England and National Lottery Heritage Fund have changed their emphasis and are now prioritising 'building back better' providing opportunities for training and jobs in particular for young people, supporting the local economy and using the arts to strengthening our communities mental health and wellbeing through co-production of art encouraging personal creativity.

Question 1: In light of this are the aims stated in the Council's Cultural Investment Prospectus 2018-2022 (last updated 2019) still fit for purpose?

Question 2: What work has been done to ensure that the individual organisations who will receive an extra years funding have robust and sustainable plans in place that support the wider arts community?

Question: CQ10.04&05

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 10 – Extension of The Cultural Investment Programme

Question submitted by: Councillor Ani Stafford Townsend

Question 1

I am very glad to see how many important organisations are being funded, however I note with concern how many did not receive funding in 20/21 or 21/22. They notably include many organisations that are in deprived wards or engaging with deprived demographics, mostly children. They include The Wardrobe Theatre in Lawrence Hill, Bold Brave Drama in Hartcliffe, Creative Youth Network in my own Central Ward and We The Curious, which is crucially important for inspiring passion in STEM.

Will the cabinet be ensuring these organisations get funding as part of this extension?

Question 2

I recognise it's crucial that the larger organisations and venues survive, but funding largely funds the administration of venues & organisations rather than the creative practitioners that create the soul of the venues. This sector has been largely unemployed for 18 months and we are all aware that universal credit is inadequate.

What support will Bristol City Council be bringing forward to support the mostly freelance & self-employed creative people in our city?

Statement: PS11.1

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - New Regeneration Service & Funding

Statement submitted by: Merche Clark

We are disappointed to see the proposal to cut £30,000 per year from the Bristol Libraries Book Fund with the money used as part funding for a new Regeneration Service.

The pandemic has seen a sharp rise in the use of the library's electronic offerings. The reopening of libraries for picking up physical books has been so important to so many people. Rather than reduce the Bristol Libraries stock, we believe it is important to bolster and improve the selection of electronic and physical books available to the public. Libraries should be at the core of communities as they offer the possibility for personal transformation and growth - regeneration hubs, if you like.

We support the concept of cross-department teams working to help regenerate communities and create new ones across the city. We also urge that this work recognises the important community service libraries can offer and trust that new libraries will be part of plans for all new communities.

We ask Cabinet to withdraw the cut to the Libraries Book Fund.

Statement: CS11.02

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - New Regeneration Service & Funding

Statement submitted by: Joanna Booth

I don't know if you've noticed, but another book swap has been set up in Bristol. This time it's in Montpelier whereas the last one a few months ago was in St Andrews. It made the news because that's how excited people are about being able to access books.

The Bristol Library service is still funded at £3m less than it used to be, with some libraries even outside of lockdown only open three to four hours, three to four days a week. There are children who will never have been inside one because they're not open outside school hours, and school library funding is not ringfenced so many schools don't have libraries either.

You have allowed the library service to decline and now with your proposed creation of a Regeneration department, you are planning to take away 4286 books from Bristol's taxpayers. We paid for our library service and not so that money for the poorest in society can go to salaries for interim workers such as the interim Executive Director - Growth and Regeneration and then Project Manager in the same department (£272,000) and Project Manager, Growth and Regeneration (£234,000).

Please consider the cuts you are making to the library service for the poorest. £30,000 may only be 20 days of a £272,000 salary but it's over 4000 books for Bristol (average cost of library book in Bristol is £6.97 --CIPFA 2017 data).

Statement: PS11.01

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - New Regeneration Service & Funding

Statement submitted by: Cllr Tony Dyer

Bristol is facing rapid change with multiple major developments either in the pipeline or rumoured to be in the pipeline. It is possible that our city may change more in the next decade than it has done in half a century.

At the same time, there are concerns from many of our citizens, and from our local businesses, that their voices are not being fully heard. This is not new. For as long as I can remember, there has been a feeling that development in this city is something that is done to the people rather than something that involves them in the decision making.

One of the problems highlighted is not having a single point of contact to discuss the often complex and interleaving issues that major developments invariably generate.

There has long been a dedicated team within Bristol City Council to work with developers at the pre-planning stage to help bring forward proposals for important sites. I am hopeful that the Regeneration Service can provide a similar single point of contact for all those who will be directly affected by major development proposals. As in many things, the success of this new service will be measured on how well it is able to respond to often conflicting demands – and to do so in a way that generates confidence that it is operating in an open, transparent and inclusive manner.

I wish it well.

Question: PQ11.01&02

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 – Regeneration Funding

Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

Background

I read with interest: "A new multi-disciplinary Regeneration Team will now work across the Council, improving internal systems and co-ordination to provide a single coherent voice for the Council when working with communities, developers, stakeholders and partners in areas of growth and regeneration."

I believe it is important that local councillors, who are elected to represent the people living in their ward, should be involved in issues and decisions affecting their wards. For example, it seems strange to me that the elected councillor is not a member of the Western Harbour advisory group.

Question 1

Please could you explain how you anticipate the new Regeneration Service will work with the elected councillors of the wards affected by regeneration proposals?

Background

You will be aware of concerns about the prolonged employment of the same person as Interim Executive Director of Growth & Regeneration, Interim Project Director, and Project Manager in the Growth and Regeneration Directorate through an agency at a reported cost to the council of £1,450 per day. [E.g.

<https://www.bristolpost.co.uk/news/bristol-news/highest-paid-official-bristol-city-3378172>]

Question 2

Will all members of the new Regeneration Service be directly employed by Bristol City Council?

Question: PQ11.03&04

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 – New Regeneration Service and Funding

Questions submitted by: Lloyd Roberts, Bristol Libraries Forum

A) We note the proposal to cut the Bristol Library Book Fund budget by £30,000 per annum and to use this amount as part of the funding for the new Regeneration Service.

What is the current annual Library Book Fund by category (Books, eBooks, Newspapers, on-line services etc) and which areas will be impacted by this cut?

B) What further cuts are planned to the Bristol Library budget?

Question: CQ11.01

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 – Regeneration Funding

Question submitted by: Councillor Paul Goggin

I welcome this item as it will help accelerate this administration's much-needed regeneration of central Bristol, Bedminster, and Temple Quarter.

Is there scope to expand this directorate to include other areas of the city, especially to areas in some of the more deprived suburbs? Doing so would be aligned with the One City approach and would help build on this administration's work to address regional equality.

Question: CQ11.02&03

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 – Regeneration Funding

Question submitted by: Councillor David Wilcox

I would like to ask two questions about this decision pathway:

1. I welcome the creation of this new service to provide a single point of contact for both the general public and councillors, which will hopefully enhance the council's ability to deliver projects for Bristol. I note that it is proposed to remove headcount from Development Management, Traffic & Highways, Parks & Green Spaces and the Energy Programme Manager – I can assume that the EPM is a role made redundant from the sale of Bristol Energy, but what other projects will not now be completed?
2. The new regeneration service is setup to provision projects in Central Bristol – the City Centre, Western Harbour, Frome Gateway, Central Bedminster and Temple Quarter. These sites will not meet the strategic requirement for 2000 new homes per year for the next 5 years. So why aren't areas like Lockleaze and Whitchurch where the majority of new homes are destined to be built included in its remit?

Question: CQ11.04

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 – Regeneration Funding

Question submitted by: Councillor Tony Dyer

Firstly, I welcome the creating of a team to act as a single point of contact for local communities and local businesses seeking to engage with the council regarding major developments, developments that will have considerable impact upon their communities and environment. The council has, historically, had a less than stellar record of engagement with local communities about changes to their local areas – this is not a recent phenomenon, many of us have old scars to prove it, and it is good to see proposals to address that deficiency of service.

My question is this: **How will the Regeneration Service measure its effectiveness in engaging with local residents, local businesses, and with local councillors who have been elected to represent those communities?**

Question: CQ12.01

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 12 – South Bristol Light Industrial Workspace

Question submitted by: Councillor Paul Goggin

The Cabinet report states there are two options for the workspace:

Option 1 - Maintain existing levels of WECA funding and agree a circa 18.5% reduction in floor area delivered through omission of 'Block C', In this instance Block C would be replaced with an external storage compound, which would be available for remaining units to lease.

Option 2 – Increase funding by £538,913k to maintain the full designed floor area.

The paper recommends option two. **Please could the Mayor confirm that option two – the one that maximises economic benefit to south Bristol - is his preferred option, and will he liaise with our new Metro Mayor to convince him of the benefits of option two?**

Question: CQ12.02

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 12 – South Bristol Light Industrial Workspace

Question submitted by: Councillor Tony Dyer

It is good news to see new industrial workshops being created in Bristol and I fully support the change request to WECA.

I am also aware that, in areas like Bedminster Green for example but also in the TQEZ, we are seeing some industrial workspaces being replaced by residential led development. As a result we have existing businesses facing potential closure due to a lack of alternative workspaces being available.

Question:

What assessment is being made of the overall need for all industrial workspace in South Bristol to replace those being lost due to existing and proposed major developments?

Question: CQ13.01

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 13 - Electoral Services specialist printing tender

Question submitted by: Councillor Steve Pearce

Analysis of the numbers of ballot papers issued, of block votes and split votes at the recent election indicates that many voters did not use all of their votes. The same thing has happened previously.

I am concerned that this may indicate that the electors are being failed by the official communications or messaging that they receive ahead of Polling Day and at the Polling Station. Some members of our communities appear to have been seriously and serially disadvantaged in their ability to participate in our democracy. This could be better recognised in the EqIA.

This contract only covers canvass materials, polling cards, ballot papers and absent voter materials.

My question tries to discover how much discretion is given over the content of print matter in this contract:

Can the messaging on the materials in this contract be made more clear within the legislation and can those items not within the contract (such as other signage at Polling Stations) be made more comprehensive and useful to the voter so that there is greater clarity over what we can and cannot do in the polling booth? It varies from ward to ward!"

Question: PQ20.01&02

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 20 – SLM Leisure Contract and Financial Assistance

Questions submitted by: Jules Laming, Friends of Jubilee Pool

Question 1:

Section 9 of the report states that existing leisure contracts may require short term extensions in order to facilitate service continuity and best value. It is assumed that this is an holistic statement that relates to all leisure provision within the City and not just the centres covered by SLMs contract. Can the Mayor confirm that this position will be taken with the contract for Jubilee Pool to bridge the period of time between 31st March 2022 and the next stage in the building's control and continued operation. Can he also confirm when negotiations on the extension of these contracts will start?

Question 2:

Section 13 of the report states that officers are in the process of preparing for a forthcoming procurement exercise, presumably for tendering all of the Council's Leisure contracts and not just SLMs. Can the Mayor explain how this process would affect the situation of Jubilee Pool as the Friends of Jubilee Pool progress the CAT process?

Question: PQ20.03&04

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 20 – SLM Leisure Contract and Financial Assistance

Questions submitted by: Sarah Piggot

I have read with interest the cabinet paper relating to the operator SLM who run 6 of the city's leisure centres and pools.

I note that you will be instructing offers to prepare documents for tender for procurement of these services soon for contracts which end in March 2022.

I would like to ask the following questions and am happy for the responses to be in writing as I am unable to attend the meeting on Tuesday next.

1. If tender documents are to be prepared for the SLM pool stock in the City, are they to be prepared for Hengrove and Jubilee also? And if not why not?
2. If the Mayor is (as he says he is) willing to consider a Community Asset Transfer for Jubilee Pool, will he confirm that Friends of Jubilee may go ahead and prepare an expression of interest **now** and that the same or similar extensions past March 2022 for the procurement process, that will be granted to pools going through a tender process, will be granted to a Community Group to complete the Cprocess which we understand can take up to a year to complete? (Supplementary question, will a CAT EIO take Jubilee out of any tender process until a decision is reached?)

Question: CQ20.01&02

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 20 – SLM Leisure Contract and Financial Assistance

Questions submitted by: Councillor Martin Fodor

The report brings us up to date on the interim position regarding the city leisure facilities contract.

This highlights the need to assess a choice between contractual and non-contractual options.

In view of this situation the 5th purpose listed in the report identified needs careful consideration: to **prepare for future leisure facilities' procurement**.

Recent experience has shown how important access to leisure facilities is and the report shows the marginal position we are in currently.

It is noted meanwhile that a leisure investment strategy is under development currently [para 9]. This clearly has to be settled before the procurement of services from April 2022.

This report, however, does not show any **timescale** to enable us to ensure adequate, timely, and early enough scrutiny has been undertaken.

Questions

Can you confirm:

1. That there will be both a clear chronology with stages and stakeholder input identified, so we will know when the key options are being assessed and choices that are being researched and drafted?

And;

2. That this will be early enough to allow the council and scrutiny function space to discuss this and feed in early direction – i.e. giving the procurement process space to be scheduled for scrutiny?

Question: CQ21.01&02

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 21 – Corporate Risk Management Report (CRR)

Questions submitted by: Councillor Christine Townsend

- 1) Can you outline the process by which something gets onto the CRR?
- 2) What actions does this administration intend to take in light of the high levels of assessed risk in relation to our most vulnerable children and adults?

Statement: CS22.01

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 22 – Bristol’s first Citizens’ Assembly recommendations

Statement submitted by: Cllr Paula O’Rourke

I would like to thank the citizens who took part in the assembly for their work which has led to these 17 challenging recommendations. It is clear that the citizens know their city and, having been given access to expert advisors, they were able to make informed decisions on how to recover from Covid.

I am delighted that the process of citizens’ assemblies are to be embedded into the city’s decision making, as these forms of deliberative democracy can only make for a more inclusive society. A post-assembly survey of the citizens who took part shows that they are much more likely to take part in all forms of democracy now - from voting to even considering standing for election - so, I think we can say that we ‘rebooted democracy’!

While I acknowledge that now is a time to celebrate this achievement, I would also like to draw attention to the motion of the Full Council which I proposed back in 2019, as it suggested two pilots, one the citizens’ assembly and the other was a participatory budget. I suggested that devolving some funding to the Area Committees would be another way to ‘reboot democracy’ and I remember that Marvin spoke positively about this. I would like this to be considered as we progress towards next year’s budget.

I would like to thank everybody on the steering group. We were lucky to have skilled and enthusiastic officers working on this project. I know that there is a convention not to use officers names in these public forums, however, I will risk breaching this now to thank Jon Toy for his leadership on this project; from the very earliest meetings, I realised that we had a trusted pilot for this voyage into new waters. Finally, I must thank Asher. Her initial support for this project was essential. I hope she’ll agree that we worked very well together and that our decisions were better for having been made jointly; we heard each other’s views and then came to shared, improved conclusions.

Question: CQ22.01&02

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 22 – Bristol’s first Citizens’ Assembly recommendations

Question submitted by: Cllr Emma Edwards

I was delighted to read the report of the first Citizen's Assembly, a motion put forward by the Green Party and taken forward and overseen by Mayor Rees and Cllrs Paula O'Rourke and Asher Craig. I think this is a really positive step by the council, as a democratic process and in the topics that were raised, so I first wanted to congratulate the Mayor and Councillors for their work on it, and hope it will be something that will be repeated in the future. The questions posed and discussed in the Citizen's Assembly reflect the urgency of the climate emergency, and I believe the responses to the questions reflect how people in Bristol feel about the need to address this, and for cross party action on these issues.

The recommendations that came out of the assembly were very strong. Where recommendations were asked to be prioritised, certain ones (3, 8 and 17) were particularly strongly supported. Recommendation 8 which was 'Urgently reduce air pollution levels caused by vehicle use to safe and legal levels' got a particularly high recommendation, which is unsurprising as it affects the health and wellbeing of Bristol citizens, as well as being a contributing factor to climate change.

The report says that these outcomes will be shared and form part of the evidence base for the update of the Council's Corporate Strategy and to help shape Bristol's future.

I would like to ask:

1. How much influence will these results have?
2. What will they be balanced against?

Question: PQ22.01&02

Cabinet – 22 June 2021

Re: Agenda item 22 – Bristol’s first Citizens’ Assembly recommendations

Question submitted by: Rob Bryher

It's great that Bristol has innovated in this way and I am really thankful to all who have worked so hard to pull the Citizens' Assembly process together - including Cllr Asher Craig and Cllr Paula O'Rourke - and of course to the people who gave up their free time to take part.

Amongst the many exciting actions (too many to list here) being proposed are:

- Establishing a city-wide bike, e-bike and cargo e-bikes, e-scooters scheme and car share schemes;
- Transferring 3-5% of road space to cycling, walking and green space every year;
- Transferring 3-5% of street car parking spaces in the city over to cycle parking and shared green space every year;
- Create a budget to invest in active travel, with annual incremental targets so that by 2030 it is equal to what is spent on roads, with a dedicated fundraising unit.
- Ensure more remote and deprived areas are served by public and active transport network;
- 5 pilot liveable neighbourhoods in the most deprived areas by the end of 2021
- A city-wide consultation on Liveable Neighbourhoods by the end of 2022
- The removal of bureaucracy in closing streets and a streamlining of planning/consultation processes;

Given that the original Full Council motion didn't provide a specific policy adoption route or plan, it is difficult to see how the take-up of these recommendations and actions by the Citizens' Assembly will be monitored by the public at large.

The Decision Pathway - Report that you are considering today states that "the Council's Policy, Strategy and Partnerships division has developed a tracker for the assembly's recommendations and proposed actions, which will provide a source of ongoing information and assurance as to if and how the assembly's recommendations have been acted upon."

Recommendation 7 of the report reads: "Create an inclusive, transparent and accountable process where the council engages together with citizens, businesses and stakeholders to better communicate our climate commitments through a sustainable transport system."

Question 1:

In the spirit of recommendation 7 above, please can you tell me when the aforementioned tracker will be made available to the public and the best route for the public to take if it turns out the recommendations haven't been acted upon?

Question 2:

In relation to this, the first action of recommendation 7 is to "appoint a champion to work with the chair of the One City Transport Board to have responsibility for these recommendations, with a focus on accessibility in local communities."

Please can you tell me who will appoint this champion, what the process will be for applying for the role, whether this person will also report to the Growth & Regeneration Scrutiny commission to ensure accountability in the process and whether this will be a paid or voluntary role?