

Public Forum

Date: Tuesday, 14 September 2021



Agenda

1. Public Forum Statements and Questions

(Pages 2 - 52)

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



www.bristol.gov.uk

CABINET – 14 September 2021

PUBLIC FORUM ITEMS

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

Agenda item 8 - Youth Zone – funding request

Statement:

PS08.01 Len Wyatt

Questions:

CQ08.01 Councillor Tim Rippington
CQ08.02 Councillor Steve Pearce
CQ08.03&04 Councillor Christine Townsend

Agenda item 9 - Children’s Independent Fostering Agency Framework – South Central

Statements:

CS09.01 Councillor Tim Kent

Agenda item 10 – Inpatient Detox and Stabilisation Contract

None

Agenda item 11 – Consultation on leisure investment options

Statements:

PS11.01 Brian Glasson
PS11.02 Carol Laider
PS11.03 Monika Smith
PS11.04 Keith Williams
PS11.05 Will Robinson
PS11.06 Cicely Postan
PS11.07 Clare Hartland
PS11.08 Simon Baines
PS11.09 Dr Yasmin Ismail
PS11.10 Neil Jacobs
PS11.11 Juliet and Paul Collins
PS11.12 Finn Cramer Jacobs
PS11.13 Carol Gough
PS11.14 Dr Helen Cramer
PS11.15 Lewis Cramer Jacobs

CS11.01 Councillor Philippa Hulme
CS11.02 Councillor Gary Hopkins
CS11.03 Councillor Ed Plowden
CS11.04 Councillor Mohamed Makawi

Questions:

CQ11.01 Councillor Mohamed Makawi
CQ11.02&03 Councillor Martin Fodor

Agenda item 12 – End User Compute and Deployment Services

None

Agenda item 13 - Microsoft Dynamics Agreement – Direct Award

None

Agenda item 14 - Digital Transformation Programme (DTP)

Questions:

CQ14.01&02 Councillor Heather Mack
CQ14.03&04 Councillor Emma Edwards

Agenda item 15 - 2021/22 Period 3 and 4 Finance Report

None

Agenda item 16 - Parks Capital Maintenance Programme

Questions:

CQ16.01 Councillor Ani Stafford Townsend

Agenda item 17 – DfT Active Travel Fund (ATF) Tranche 3

Statements:

PS17.01 David Redgewell
PS17.02 Mateusz Malinowski
PS17.03 Siobhan and Richard Martin
PS17.04 Charlotte Davies

Questions

CQ17.01&02 Councillor Marley Bennett
CQ17.03 Councillor Tim Rippington
CQ17.04 Councillor Fabian Breckels
CQ17.05 Councillor David Wilcox

Agenda item 18 - Bristol City Council Enforcement Policy in relation to Relevant Letting Agency Legislation

None

Agenda item 19 - Procurement of new Case Management System for Legal Services

None

Agenda item 20 - Integrated Community Equipment Services (ICES) Contract Extension

None

Agenda item 21 - Domestic Abuse Contract Extension

None

Agenda item 22 - Corporate Risk Management Report – Q1 2021/22

Statements

PS22.01 Suzanne Audrey

Questions

PQ22.01&02 Suzanne Audrey

CQ22.02 Councillor Katy Grant

Statement: CS08.01

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 8 – Youth Zones

Statement submitted by: Len Wyatt, Knowle West Future

Knowle West Future is a group of local residents, Councillors, organisations and individuals seeking to achieve a thriving and sustainable community in our area, through the Knowle West Regeneration Framework agreed in 2012 and other initiatives.

We note that this document as presented to you is about a financial decision, however within the same document are statements which significantly affect the interest of local residents in our area.

This statement is about the way the consultation/engagement process can be improved in the future. It is not about the views of local residents on the proposals; or about the detail of the proposals (eg: whether it is going to be a standardised design which takes little notice of the local situation).

Notice of consultations with local residents so far have been at best very short, with a day or two notice given, even though there is guidance from the City Council; and formal channels through the Knowle West Alliance using the pre-planning application Protocol agreed with the Council, designed to help developers get maximum benefit from pre-application consultations.

Yes, there is a desperate need for youth facilities and services in South Bristol.....

However, that is a not a reason to ignore the views of those likely to live next to or nearby the proposed facilities. Or not deliver a “fair consultation”.

The developers behind this project, On Side and the City Council, seem to be under significant pressure to deliver this to a strict timetable. See the chart attached to the report.

On that chart there is a Stage 3 – this involves (my emphasis).

Stage 3 Design period – 56 Days – 14/9/21 to 30/11/21

Public Consultation – 10 days – 6th October to 19 October.

Complete planning documentation – 25 days – 1st Nov to 3 Dec 21

Submit Planning Application – Tuesday 30 November 2021.

Planning Review period - 75 days 1 Dec 2021 to 15th March 2022

There is of course a consultation on the principles of a Youth Zone, but with no detail to ensure local residents have a say on matters that relate to them.

There have been references to another consultation for local residents on a “micro web site” and the possibility of two days face to face consultation as part of discussions being held with Knowle West Alliance, but as far as I am aware no detail on arrangements especially for those without internet access, and on timing etc.

In the timetable above, with the current consultation ending on the 17th October – there is no space to allow a consultation after that, with local residents that will make any difference to the location or design of the facilities before the application goes in at the end of November.

We call on the Cabinet to instruct the developers to start a conversation with local residents now; and allow for a formal face to face consultation before the design work is finished and a planning application made, so that local views can be taken into consideration and if necessary, change the design. This to us is a more nuanced approach to consultation and engagement than the current one.

Just in case the Cabinet feels this is another “Just Say No” situation, without offering a way forward. We have already asked the Developers to come along to two events at the end of September; a walkover of the site on Monday 27th September, and a Knowle West Future meeting on the 29th.

We are awaiting a response.

Question: CQ08.01

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 8 – Youth Zone – funding request

Question submitted by: Councillor Tim Rippington

It is fantastic news to see that the South Bristol Youth Zone is going ahead, and I am sure this will be an excellent investment for the future of young people in South Bristol. The area being looked at for the Zone in the current consultation is a long way from Brislington East, however, and I am not sure how much impact it is likely to have on youth provision in my ward. We do have an excellent opportunity at the moment for some additional provision in St Anne's House, which is being managed by Bricks on a Meanwhile Lease from the Council at the moment. **I am hopeful that this provision will be able to expand and continue over the next few years and wonder if we could look at what links could be made between the two sites going forward?**

Question: CQ08.02

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 8 – Youth Zone – funding request

Question submitted by: Councillor Steve Pearce

During the election, one of Labour's 'big ticket' pledges was to build a Youth Zone in south Bristol. Only a few months down the line and we've delivered it. Well done and thank you to everyone involved. I would like to pay special thanks to Cllr Godwin, as while she can't be here today, I know how much work she put into this in her old portfolio. This world-class Youth Zone is such an important development for south Bristol and will be brilliant for children, not only in south Bristol but across the city. In the age where Tory cuts have seen youth club after youth club close down, Bristol Labour's found a way to buck the trend and not only reopen a youth club, but a world-class Youth Zone.

Anyway, my question is, what manifesto commitment does the Mayor intend to deliver next?

Question: CQ08.03&04

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item – Youth Zones - Funding Requests

Questions submitted by: Councillor Christine Townsend

Question 1:

If the plan for this youth hub is achieved, who will own the assets of land and building when complete?

Question 2:

OnSide states its genesis emerged from 'three Victorian businessmen and church ministers who established the Bolton Lads Club in 1889'.

The Trust Deed enables Trustees to 'deposit or invest funds in a manner which the trustees see fit' from philanthropic donors who may choose to remain anonymous.

How will this administration ensure that the OnSide youth hub is funded in a way that reflects the promotion of social and environmental justice when it will not know the activity from which these philanthropic funds were raised or anything about those who fund it?

Statement: CS09.01

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 9 - Children's Independent Fostering Agency Framework – South Central

Statement submitted by: Councillor Tim Kent

Having read through the papers and the proposal by officers that the option to join the South Central Framework for acquiring independent placements I wanted to raise a few issues of concern that we would like the Cabinet to consider and if possible ensure that mitigation or assurances is in place.

In joining the new framework it is possible current providers of placements are not currently members of the framework. We hope that provision has been negotiated that we can either keep those arrangements and continue them or that aid and assistance will be made in getting them to join the South Central network.

Given the South Central Framework is made up of councils mostly in the south area of England it seems likely that their providers are geographically more located in that region as well. We hope that as part of our joining the network a good choice of provision will be available for placements within the West.

The above were some concerns shared by Scrutiny Members which I wanted to raise with Cabinet members.

Statement: PS11.01

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Brian Glasson

I am writing to express extreme concern about the possible closure of Kingsdown sports centre and the flawed and potentially misleading report which is being presented to Cabinet on 14th September.

I believe that if the Cabinet make a decision on the 14th to agree the recommendations of the report, as it stands this decision could be open to legitimate legal challenge, as it will not have been clear that in taking the decision that the cabinet members had all the necessary material evidence before them to be able to make an informed and rational decision. This is especially but not solely with regard to the proposed consultation on the 'options' regarding Kingsdown sports centre.

My concerns are as follows:-

(1) The bulk of the report appears to be about the future targeting of investment decisions for the council's leisure centres to which has been added seemingly as an afterthought a proposal to consult on 'options' to close or transfer two facilities, including Kingsdown Sports Centre

(2) The report at paras 45-48 makes a number of unsubstantiated, and in some cases irrelevant, observations about Kingsdown Sports Centre:

- The relatively poor level of membership

No data is provided in the report or background documents, or any suggestions as to how the operator might be supported to reverse this trend.

- The proximity of the Bristol University Sports Centre

This is described as new but in fact it has been there for at least 15 years or more.

The relevance of this statement is also questioned as this gym offers limited availability to the wider community. Kingsdown offers squash courts which are otherwise only available at Horfield.

- The sports centre does not contribute to the council's strategic outcomes for sport and leisure activity

In fact, the background documents to the report states "all existing sports halls with community use should be protected" (Sport and Active Recreation Facilities Strategy for Bristol 2018-2023). Further the report suggests with investment those centres with 4 or 5 court sports halls (such as Kingsdown) could be remodelled to better meet future user needs.

- The immediate demographic profile and geographical location

The issue here is not stated, but implied: Cotham is considered to be a relatively affluent ward. However, while this may be true at Ward level, this disguises a wide range of living experiences. Cotham contains an area (Local Super Output Area) which is in the top 10% of most deprived areas nationally, and is the 21st most deprived area in Bristol

(3) The report at para 49 states: -

“The consultation will seek views on the proposed strategy and the options that sit within it as set out below and set out as detailed alternative options that have been considered and rejected.”

This raises several critical questions which go to the heart of the probity of the report:-

-What strategy? Is this before members now? Or has it previously been before members? In either case it should be part of the report or background papers.

-If the strategy referred to is the three options which follow later in the report, how are they relevant to the Kingsdown proposals?

-where are the “detailed alternative options which have been considered”? Why are they not part of the report or background papers? How can Cabinet members take a decision without knowledge of these options, which presumably will form the basis of any consultation?

-who “has considered and rejected” the options? Is this officers or Members?

(4) The report is seriously misleading, to the extent that Cabinet members could find themselves being misdirected if they do not seek further information, which should come forward as a further report, before making their decision on the consultation recommendations.

I am particularly concerned about the apparent misrepresentation of information within the Equalities Impact Assessment at step 2. A graph is presented which purports to show: -

“Wards of the facilities and the indices of deprivation and whether they are significantly higher (red) or lower (green) than the Bristol average”

It appears this graph has been taken from the Quality of Life Survey 2021, but for some currently unexplained reason, it has been retitled. The graph in the original report is titled: -

“Number of indicators which are better, worse, or neither better or worse than the city average in each ward”

By using the phrase ‘indices of deprivation’ I believe the current report is highly misleading.

As good as it is, the ‘Quality of Life Survey 2021’ is only a subjective assessment of how the respondents who volunteered (on a self-selective basis) to take part feel about their part of the city. It is not an assessment of deprivation at all but an assessment of respondent’s satisfaction with their local area. It does not have a robust statistical basis.

If in fact you look at the national indices of deprivation, you find that contrary to the impression created (perhaps unintentionally) by this report, that Cotham Ward contains a Lower Super Output Area (LSOA) which is amongst the 10% most deprived areas nationally, and is the 21st most deprived area in Bristol, as noted above. There are further areas of high deprivation immediately beyond the ward boundary, and Kingsdown Sports Centre is the nearest facility to these communities.

(5) The highlighted options in the report focus on investment options only and consequently do not adequately address the secondary purpose of the paper which appears to be to consult on the options for closing two leisure facilities.

(6) The report appears to be giving the Cabinet 'options' but in fact only one set of proposals are presented, with no others being set out in the report for members to consider as alternatives. This does not seem right: I would expect to see a range of options (including 'doing nothing') being set out, with an officer assessment of each and a recommended way forward. All that is given is the officer recommended way forward, with no assessment of the alternatives to consider. This could result in flawed decision making.

(7) Cabinet members should request that prior to the consultation commencing they have sight of and agree the final format of the consultation, via a further report to the Cabinet.

In view of these concerns, I hope you defer any decision on the consultation until you have had the opportunity to consider a revised report which clarifies any potential misrepresentation of the issues, provides access to all the relevant background material, and has a full assessment of the options available. Making a decision on the basis of the present report could, I consider, lay the council open to a legal challenge on the probability of its decision making.

Statement: PS11.02

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Carol Laidler

I have just heard that you may soon be closing down Kingsdown Sports Centre. I would urge you to please not do this.

I live in High Kingsdown within walking distance to the centre. Kingsdown Sports Centre is only small but it offers, not only a gym but classes including yoga, which provide the community a regular meeting space.

Many of the local residents are ageing like myself and this gym offers an excellent way of exercising and improving our mobility and health.

I joined in 2019 through my doctors referral. I had a personal trainer to help me use the machines correctly and to encourage my gradual improvement.

During the pandemic I have not been able to go but I intend to rejoin as soon as I think it is safe to do so.

The university gym would not be an alternative option for me, for reasons of cost, and I would not feel comfortable among the fitter younger students. I do not have a car so other options are also not viable.

Losing this gym would be a huge loss for our community. We have already lost our regular bus transport through cuts to the service. I wonder whether our community tax will be reduced accordingly?

Statement: PS11.03

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Monika Smith

I have already written to the Mayor and signed a petition. However most people using the sports centre do not know there is a plan to close it. So I have campaigned in the street and stopped anyone with a sports bag, clearly on their way to the centre!

Might I draw your attention to the Corporate Strategy 2021 Consultation, where one of the 7 main aims is:

“Helping people stay healthier and happier throughout their lives”. Are these just empty words??!!

Quite apart from health, in my view, the damage to the community would be immeasurable if the centre were closed. I hardly know anyone who has not used the centre at one time or another in this area until the pandemic struck. The long closure did not help and many of us older ones (I am 73), are still hoping to return, when other members of our various groups can (there are many who are vulnerable and cannot yet envisage being in a crowded sport centre). However, that is no reason to close it. Maybe more thought needs to go into the running of it.

50 years ago we (my husband and I) moved into the centre of Bristol, because politicians were pleading with us to revive a dead centre. Now living in the centre is constantly made more difficult (parking, owning a car, charging an electric car, allowing multiple student occupancy to a degree that affects the people who have lived here for decades, lousy public transport for those of us who are older, yet not disabled and trying to remain healthy, and now this planned closure of a sports centre, which originally was envisaged with a swimming pool that never happened!)

I believe in equality and was initially impressed by our mayor's efforts to establish greater equality. However, it now seems that only SOME groups of the population are eligible for equality! In this area we are mostly comfortably off but not rich. We cannot afford to drive mighty (and parking space blocking) SUV's to the outskirts to pools and expensive sport centres.

Could you please leave our community intact. It would also help if you communicated better (I do not remember any mention of the sport centre closure in Marvin Rees's e-mail update. Maybe this could be about more than just the latest Covid figures which even a computer dinosaur like me can get online).

Best wishes for wise decision making

Statement: PS11.04

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Keith Williams

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms about the above council proposal to close Kingsdown Leisure Centre.

The fact that even the manager of the centre was not notified of these plans and actually heard about them from a radio broadcast only five days ago is just another indication of the cynical way in which the current administration treats the residents of this once proud City.

The report being put forward says "Kingsdown Sports Centre is attracting few new members and is not retaining members in a very competitive environment," however, this is not the time to be assessing the performance of such a centre as there are still many people who have used the centre but are currently anxious about returning while the levels of Covid-19 infections are still so high and with the winter flu season also just about to hit us.

The comment that the centre is too close to the university sports centre is irrelevant as non students would not want to use the University facilities even if they were allowed.

The risk that the centre closes and is sold off for student accommodation is an appalling thought - there is already a far higher concentration of HMOs in High Kingsdown (actually registered or unregistered) than the current rules permit so it should not be possible for any developer to build further student accommodation on the site. Also, student accommodation does not give the Council any income from Council Tax as students are exempt so the council would not receive future income from the site in that case.

The report also states "As a dry side facility, it requires an annual revenue subsidy and due to its immediate demographic profile and geographical location, contributes less towards the council's strategic outcomes for sport and physical activity.". The very fact that it is a dry side facility is a failing of the Council. When the old swimming pool was demolished to be replaced by the current Leisure Facility there was meant to be a replacement swimming pool so the Council has seemingly set itself up for the facility to fail. Hardly a recommendation to go ahead now and close it down "because there is no pool"! Also, one of the main reasons for the high student population in the area is a failure of the Council's planning department to control the level of HMOs in the area which, as stated above, far exceeds the allowed level.

So I repeat my strong objection to the proposed closure of Kingsdown Leisure Centre.

Statement: PS11.05

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Will Robinson

Rumour has it that Kingsdown sports centre is planned for closure. This is a place I visit 3 times a week, for badminton and squash, along with 45 others every Monday, aswell as a further 30 on Tuesdays. The centre is therefore a hugely significant venue for me and many others for keeping fit, enjoying sport, meeting new people and making friendships. The venue is where I learnt to play racket sports, and I wish for many others to have the career I have had in sport, as its been the most prominent source of enjoyment growing up.

Please please do not close the sports centre, doing so would result in Bristol losing many sports clubs, and opportunities for people to take up sport, just like I did in Kingsdown Sports Centre.

Statement: PS11.06

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Cicely Postan

This response relates to the above named document and in particular Bristol City Council's (BCC) proposal to stop operating Kingsdown Sports Centre. I do not agree with the Decision Pathway Report (the Report) that selects Kingsdown Sports Centre as one of the two facilities that BCC proposes to stop operating.

Contrary to the inference of the Report the Sports Centre is a well loved and essential asset. It provides good quality and most importantly affordable sports facilities to residents of the local area and beyond.

This email sets out four principal reasons as to why the Council should retain operation of Kingsdown Sports Centre, these are:

- It is contrary to the Council's vision for Sports Facilities;
- Lack of evidence;
- Lack of accessible, affordable alternative provision; and
- Spurious justification for selection.

'Closure' Contrary to BCC Vision for Sports Facilities

Causing the closure of Kingsdown Sports Centre, or less affordable operation, is contrary to BCC's own Vision and Aims and Objectives for sports facilities as set in its recent strategy: 'A Sport and Active Recreation Facility Strategy for Bristol 2018-2023' and therefore should not be permitted by Council. The strategy states:

"...make the City a place where opportunity to be physically active is locally accessible and affordable to all." (Vision page 2)

"The main aims of the strategy are to identify the needs and priorities for sports facilities in Bristol, to protect, enhance and provide facility provision..." (Aims and Objectives, page 2).

Lack of Evidence

As a current and long term member of the Sports Centre I have found the Sports Centre well used by a demographically diverse clientele, especially older people and people with additional needs.

The Decision Pathway Report states:

"47. ...due to its immediate demographic profile and geographical location, contributes less towards the council's strategic outcomes for sport and physical activity."

This justification for the Council to stop operating Kingsdown Sports Centre is based on a lack of evidence and overly simplistic assessments. Kingsdown Sports Centre should not be identified for 'closure', even through consultation, until a full and robust comparative assessment is completed of all centres. Assessment needs to take into consideration evidence of who actually uses the Sports Centre and their specific needs and characteristics. Importantly, any data used in assessment should exclude the last 18-months and since reopening. As this will not be representative of use or membership, especially for older and vulnerable people who may take longer to return to indoor sports activities.

The Equality Impact Assessment, which is reflected in the Report itself, is also overly simplistic in assessing the profile of the population the Sports Centre served. It is correct that Cotham has lower deprivation, but the Sports Centre within easy access of Central ward, the 9th most deprived, as well as Ashley ward, and many users will be found outside Cotham. It is therefore not possible to say this Sports Centre is not equally important to the others in meeting the Council's strategic outcomes for sport. In addition, it appears to be focused on Jubilee Pool, with very little mention of Kingsdown.

Lack of Alternative Accessible, Affordable Provision

As set out above many users of the facilities would not be well served by other affordable sports centres and gyms (such as the University, Pure Gym etc). These other facilities may be available but they do not provide a comparable setting for exercise, as their demographic profile is very different and many, me included, would not feel comfortable exercising there. There is also very poor public transport access to these sites.

Furthermore, the University Sports Centre identified as an alternative in the Report operates at or overcapacity, so consideration must be given to local affordable capacity. There is no easy public transport access to the other Bristol run sports centres.

There are no other local affordable facilities. If the Sports Centre was to stay open, under another provider, it is very unlikely it would be as affordable.

Spurious justification for the selection of the Kingsdown site

As it is unlikely that a new provider will be found for the Sports Centre, it could be argued that the investment strategy has selected this facility for 'closure' based solely on being the one with highest anticipated land value. The reasoning in the Report that Kingsdown must be closed to better implement the Council's sports vision is spurious, if financial value is the principal consideration then it is better to state this clearly.

Finally, the Sports Centre is more than just a sports facility as it also serves as a community hub, for instance through the under 5 group that ran pre-Covid, providing an affordable indoor activity for young children.

Before taking these steps to close any facilities in Bristol greater consideration should be given to retaining and enhancing the current offer, including strategies for encouraging use and membership.

Thank you for taking my response into consideration.

Statement: PS11.07

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Clare Hartland

I'm writing to register my shock and disappointment about the proposed closure of Kingsdown Sports Centre. My thoughts are as follows.

Lack of provision for teens in this ward. Two play parks for small children, but nowhere else for teens. The gym has been consistently popular with the after school crowd.

The nearby University gym excludes non-students, so should not be an argument for closure of our gym. The only other nearby facility is the financially exclusive Bannatynes.

This is a very poor time to judge the financial health of the gym. My own family and many others that I've spoken to are waiting for the Covid threat to reduce before resuming membership.

We already have an extremely dense student population in Cotham, with the density of HMO's exceeding the councils own guidelines. We don't want more student flats. We pay high levels of council tax in Cotham. Do we not deserve this Sports Centre?

If the site were sold to developers for student flats the council would benefit from the initial sale, but since students pay no council tax there would be no ongoing benefit to the Council.

When the old Kingsdown Swimming Pool was demolished to make way for High Kingsdown, residents were promised a new pool. If the Sports Centre doesn't attract as many users as similar facilities, it could well be due to the council's failure to provide it with a pool.

Statement: PS11.08

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Simon Baines

I am writing to you to voice my strong opposition to the proposed closure of the Kingsdown Sports Centre, of which I am a member.

It is an important facility in the area, especially for those of us without a car. It's closure would also mean that the local residents who do have cars will drive to get their exercise, going against the council's attempts to reduce traffic in our city.

Statement: PS11.09

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Dr Yasmin Ismail

I am writing to strongly voice my objection regarding this proposed closure (Kingsdown gym).

1. I have used the gym several times a week for over 17 years. Through the pregnancies of 3 children, I attended the Spin bike classes, use the gym 3-4 x a week now. My children are members as is my husband: we all use it. My son played badminton regularly from the age of 9-13. What a great urban resource. It's pretty basic compared to more expensive private gyms and is therefore crucial to the community
2. Covid pandemic has shown us how vital health if the population is. Please don't close this facility. The local community needs it. As a local hospital consultant, I see the impact of obesity, sedentary lifestyle and lack of fitness every day in my patients: the council should be supporting public health measures to improve health status of its residents.
3. I understand that this is prone real estate but there are SO many disused sites around the centre that could be used (near the Ashton Gate flyover/allotments for example!) Please consider using other abandoned sites instead of this one.

Statement: PS11.10

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Neil Jacobs

I'm writing to express deep concern at the proposed closing of Kingsdown Sports Centre. This has been a centre of the local community for many years, and is used by a very wide range of people, not least the children from local schools. I understand that the Council is under constraints, but would urge you to look more actively for solutions that ensure the continued operation of the Centre.

Statement: PS11.11

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Juliet and Paul Collins

We were dismayed to discover last week that the council is proposing to close Kingsdown Sports Centre. We've been members for eight years and have made regular use of both the gym facilities and the classes.

The staff are the friendliest, most approachable we've known in the many gyms we've used over the last few decades. One thing that stands out about the gym is the cross-section of ages and shapes and sizes of the users. It has a very inclusive atmosphere, and a wide range of people who might not feel comfortable in a commercial gym feel able to use it without fear of judgment and knowing that they will be supported and encouraged, both by fellow users and by staff.

We strongly suspect that if the gym were to close, a significant proportion of users wouldn't move to an alternative gym: they'd simply stop going. The detrimental impact on their health (both physical and mental) would be serious. It's hard to overstate this. We've also witnessed numerous instances of the staff patiently helping stroke patients and people with other conditions use the gym equipment to help with rehabilitation.

Before the pandemic started, the spin classes we used to go to were always over-subscribed and excellent. As well as the physical benefits of the exercise itself, we've met fellow users and made good friendships. We've seen and heard of numerous friendships that have been formed at the gym, and its value as a community hub shouldn't be under-estimated. The university sports centre is simply not a suitable alternative, and many local residents who have no connection with the university would feel uncomfortable there.

It would be unreasonable if usage of the gym over the last 18 months were to be cited in support of the proposed closure. It's obviously not been a "normal" time, and even when the gym has been open, there will, inevitably, have been some people who are too concerned about the risk of infection to use it. But that's not a permanent state of affairs, and shouldn't be used as an indication that the gym isn't popular.

In short, if the sports centre were to close, a crucial and unique asset would be lost, with a serious detrimental impact on the local residents. Please reconsider the proposal.

Statement: PS11.12

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Finn Jacobs

I want to send a statement in protest of the closure of kingsdown sports centre. For me this sports centre is a hub for students and young people from nearby schools and universities to begin and work on their fitness in a time where most end up going to local chip shops, getting e scooters and going home to play video games. I think local sports centres like this are essential in enabling young people to start a life of fitness and physical well-being in a safe and convenient environment.

Statement: PS11.13

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Carol Gough

Please make every effort to keep Kingsdown Sports Centre open. It is a wonderful resource for local people, young and old, to stay fit and keep healthy. We are all encouraged by the NHS to exercise more. By keeping healthy we benefit ourselves and lessen the burden on our health services.

Statement: PS11.14

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Dr Helen Cramer

I am writing to voice my strong objection to closing this gym. It's so important to the local community. I feel it is so short sighted for one arm of Bristol's governance (eg public health and police) to be tearing their hair out about the huge challenges of things like childhood and adult obesity, loneliness and mental health challenges or how to tackle knife crime and youth delinquency but then for another arm of governance to be closing something so important for the prevention of many social, health and public health ills like closing a community gym AND one that is right next to a primary and secondary school and therefore which is so important especially for secondary school kids to use after school.

Personally, all my family have used it at all stages of life - when my kids were young we used to take the kids to soft play type activities so crucial for young parents and their kids - especially now coming back after so much covid isolation, when my kids were young teens doing badminton club and now as older teens doing gym workouts with their peers, my partner also goes to the gym and its essential for keeping his core muscles strong.

Please please do some joined up thinking. I know you will be under economic pressures, but prevention is much cheaper than continually mopping up and crisis management

Statement: PS11.15

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Lewis Cramer Jacobs

I was informed of a proposal to close down Kingsdown Sports Centre. I am writing to let you know I am highly worried about the effect of closing this centre on the local community.

For instance, as the past year has demonstrated people desperately need places to let off steam, meet other people and enjoy being active. Sports centres are perfect places for such opportunities. We need more places to be active, Furthermore, the centre is located around several local schools. Regularly young adults attend this centre for exercise, from Cotham, Redland and beyond. Surely we should be encouraging people to be physically active? Closing down a sports centre would mean they spend longer periods of time cooped up inside.

As a regular user, I wish to see Kingsdown Sports Centre remain open.

Statement: CS11.01

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Councillor Philippa Hulme

I'm pleased to see this item come to Cabinet as I'm very grateful to see that Horfield Leisure Centre is being considered as one of the three leisure centres benefitting from increased funding. We had a manifesto commitment to improve access to sport across Bristol and Horfield leisure centre is the only leisure centre accessible to many residents of north Bristol.

Of the proposals going to consultation, I would like to place on record my support for option two. A leisure centre the size and standard of Horfield is a huge asset to my ward and Bristol as a whole – something reflected in the Cabinet papers, as it states it's the most used and most profitable of all the Council leisure facilities. It also serves some of the most deprived wards in Bristol, so investing in it aligns with our Labour values. Any investment the Council can give to make it even better will be warmly welcomed by all.

It is, of course, a shame to see that two leisure facilities are facing closure, but it is unrealistic to expect the Council to be able to indefinitely prop up unviable businesses, especially in the face of continued Tory austerity - but I'm pleased to see that any additional revenues will be reinvested into our leisure centres.

Statement: CS11.02

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Councillor Gary Hopkins

The recent consultation on Jubilee pool was in fact a failed hatchet job. It was another attempted forced closure. The result, despite skewed questions and misleading information was overwhelming with the demand that Jubilee stay open. The number of participants swamped any previous consultation and in particular the previous citywide consultation which had a tiny response and had the biggest comment being “keep Jubilee”

The response to the previous closure attempt in 2017 should have taught you to work with the community but the administration and officers continued to plan in private with disastrous results.

In our petition to prevent the most recent closure plan we were very clear that we regarded community ownership and management as an option we could support if done fairly.

Instead, you tried to close the pool under cover of COVID. Local Cllrs were very clear that it must reopen, and it has. Business is booming and if given a fair deal we are very confident that the community will do a far better job than the present BCC management. There are staff shortages at present which handicap an even more profitable performance and the more efficient use of the many willing local volunteers will have a big effect.

We know though that an asset transfer takes time, and we have a classic example of this in Redcatch park where a hugely beneficial takeover is delayed because of lack of capacity in BCC legal dept.

Despite your limited commitment to not closing in March 2022, which we have passed to the community there is still massive distrust of the council. This report is poor and unimaginative but at least in Knowle and surrounding wards we have the resources to protect us locally from its negative effect.

A couple of questions that I know will not be answered but do illustrate the real value of what we have.

Barring another unwise hatchet attack from the council Jubilee pool should in the not too distant future be safely in nurturing local hands .

1 BCC receives funds for public health improvement. Given that Jubilee provides health and well-being benefits that are not available elsewhere and will certainly not be available through the councils stripped down provision what part of these funds will be passed on to jubilee.

2 The mayor claims commitment to dual aims of reducing Bristol’s carbon footprint and improving accessibility for all.

Given the vital role that Jubilee makes on both of these aims what monetary benefit can it expect to get from the mayor.

Statement: CS11.03

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Councillor Ed Plowden

It is disappointing but not surprising to read of the most recent proposal to close Jubilee Swimming Pool, which is a significant local asset much loved and well used by the local community.

Both Cllr Lisa Stone and I are very willing to be part of any future solution that can keep the pool open, and would be extremely willing to continue the cross-party working of local councillors to achieve this end. Most importantly I welcome the potential for this site to be subject to a Community Asset Transfer, as the recent success of the pool in attracting users back demonstrates that this should be a viable solution.

Other examples of this sort of work, such as Bramley Baths in Leeds, where the business has thrived since being handed over to local community control, give me further optimism that this is a viable solution, especially given the high levels of support and energy demonstrated by the local community in campaigning for the pool to be kept open. It would be a significant relief to all to put a stop to the endless threats to this much loved and well-used local resource

I trust that there will be sufficient time allowed for this to be fully investigated and, hopefully completed, whilst making sure that the pool remains open in the meantime.

Statement: CS11.04

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 11 - Consultation on leisure investment options

Statement submitted by: Councillors Mohamed Makawi (on behalf of himself and Councillor Guy Poultney

We oppose the proposed closure of Kingsdown Sports Centre in the strongest possible terms. This proposal will be devastating news for our community and the users of Kingsdown Sports Centre. In particular we would raise concerns over the following statements made:

45. Kingsdown Sports Centre is attracting few new members and is not retaining members in a very competitive environment.

* Following the Covid-19 pandemic, during which Kingsdown was closed for longer than many of Bristol's leisure centres, membership of Kingsdown has been climbing rapidly. The start of the new University term will provide more members still. It isn't surprising that sports centre membership has been low, but this was an extraordinary period, and we are now seeing the centre beginning to thrive again.

46. The Centre is in close proximity to the University's new Sports Centre.

* The community does not wish to rely on the University for community facilities. The university sports centre is full, almost exclusively used by students, and is more expensive than Kingsdown. Many students have used the Kingsdown facility historically as well due to it providing extra facilities.

47. As a dry side facility, it requires an annual revenue subsidy and due to its immediate demographic profile and geographical location, contributes less towards the council's strategic outcomes for sport and physical activity.

* The sports centre is well-located for most of our ward residents and even to our neighbouring Central ward because the sports centre is almost on the edge of the border between the two wards. If Kingsdown Centre is closed many people in the ward will have no alternative affordable sports centre anywhere nearby. This statement is also misleading – our information suggests that the council has not provided a subsidy to the centre for at least three years. We would seek confirmation as to what, if any, public money has been spent subsidising the centre since 2018.

48. The council is including Kingsdown Sports Centre in this consultation because we propose to stop operating this facility and are seeking views as part of the consultation

* The Community around the sports centre is deeply upset by this proposal and we believe object both to its closure, and any attempt to redevelop the site as anything other than an improvement of current facilities. As all three options being consulted on include the closure of Kingsdown Centre residents have been deprived of the opportunity to have their voices heard – this is unacceptable.

Question: CQ11.01

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item - Consultation on leisure investment options

Question submitted by: Councillor Mohamed Makawi

What assurances are there for residents using Kingstown Sports Centre about the future of these facilities?

Question: CQ11.02&03

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item - Consultation on leisure investment options

Question submitted by: Councillor Martin Fodor

Preamble

As Chair of Communities Scrutiny I'm attending Cabinet to pose questions and make a statement in a personal capacity, but informed by my role as the Bristol City Council Chair of the Communities Scrutiny Commission. I can't presume to speak for the Commission members as we have not met yet, due to the induction and preparation period following the recent election. Our scrutiny agenda is due to be set in September for meetings after that. However, we have started work and last month we met to discuss the city council's draft Ecological Emergency Action Plan and to initiate a sub-group that is also underway. I have welcomed helpful conversations with the three Cabinet members in our scope and the service managers whose work we scrutinise. We are currently drafting priority topics for scrutiny this municipal year. Our work is supported by a partnership with the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny, who are supported by the Local Government association, and who are working with the council on the vital role of member scrutiny. Effective scrutiny is validated by them when they say:

"Governance and scrutiny are essential for the successful working of any organisation. Now, more than ever, trusted decisions are needed. We believe that decisions are better made when they are open to challenge and involve others – [whether that's] democratically elected representatives, those affected by decisions, or other key stakeholders." [emphasis added].

What's hampered our work and been a barrier to effective pre-decision scrutiny – the best kind – is the absence of reports in the council Forward Plan. We can't plan meetings when we have minimal notice and no draft reports to study, and without a discussion on policy options we can't debate the choices being made and their implications for the city. We were waiting for the draft Ecological Emergency Action Plan since it was promised last December 2020, but received it this August, already designed for publication. Our 90 minutes of deliberations with the author and the Cabinet member were detailed, wide ranging, and fruitful. Our summary of recommendations does not however seem to have led to any significant change to the plan.

Last month we knew there might be Cabinet report 11, but then had to wait to know what was in them.

The Leisure Investment Options report says:

"This report presents the council's proposed leisure investment strategy and describes the scope of the forthcoming public consultation in relation to this strategy. 5. The council's proposed leisure investment strategy includes the retention of seven sites, improvements at up to three of these sites and to stop operating two of its other facilities. 6. The proposed leisure investment strategy puts forwards options for consultation which the council believes can have the greatest impact from both a financial and social value perspective and contributes towards the delivery of the Bristol Sports and Physical Activity Strategy."

But the cross party scrutiny members have not been able to discuss the proposed strategy or discuss the merits or alternatives to the proposed facilities before your decision. This is despite lengthy procedures to prepare and draft reports and informal news that major strategies like Parks and Open Spaces or Leisure Facilities investment are being planned.

Questions:

Does the Mayor agree that 1. Cross party pre decision scrutiny is a valuable contribution to good governance and decision making; and,
2. Will the Mayor commit to including the scrutiny function in his decision pathway so adequate cross party scrutiny can be scheduled in advance of the Cabinet's key decisions?

Question: CQ14.01&02

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 14 - Digital Transformation Programme (DTP)

Question submitted by: Councillor Heather Mack

Predicted savings of £5.3m p.a. are listed, but with an acknowledgement that more work is needed.

Questions:

1. If the predicted saving does not outweigh the spend (as currently predicted) when the business cases come forward to the Executive Director for Resources and the cabinet member, will all aspects of this project definitely go ahead?
2. Will these business cases be made available to Resources scrutiny members?

Question: CQ14.03&04

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 14 - Digital Transformation Programme (DTP)

Question submitted by: Councillor Emma Edwards

I welcome BCC's investment in its Information Technology Infrastructure. Looking at the table of indicative costs, I am concerned that the contingency fund of 20% is not realistic as we are already halfway through the first financial year, and IT projects, as a rule of thumb consistently overrun. Six of the stated projects do not have any spending associated with them in 22/23, and the allotted contingency figure for 22/23 from an "optimism bias adjustment" is only £53,321.

Questions:

1. Can you provide reassurances that the contingency fund is realistic?
2. Given the recent history of missing decision pathway goals in the IT Transformation Project, how often will the Digital Transformation Governance Board provide updates to Full Council?

Question: CQ16.01

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 16 - Parks Capital Maintenance Programme

Question submitted by: Councillor Ani Stafford Townsend

In February this year the Green Group brought forward a budget amendment that would seek to make £12.5 million of CiL money available to parks and liveable neighbourhoods projects across Bristol. The administration stated that said CiL money was allocated to fund several park projects to a total of £24 million, including projects in Castle Park. Councillor Beech, then Cabinet Member for City Design and Spatial Planning, told the Bristol Post: “By using a funding pot called Strategic CIL we can get on with designing an improved Castle Park and don’t have to wait for any of the surrounding developments”.

Question:

Seven months on, could Cabinet confirm the precise amount allocated to improvements in Castle Park?

Statement: PS17.01

Cabinet – 14th September 2021

Re: Agenda item - DfT Active Travel Fund (ATF) Tranche 3

**Statement submitted by: David Redgewell (Bristol Disability Equalities Forum/
south west transport network and Railfuture Severnside)**

We would like to support the sustainable transport bid and plans for especially the Queen Road, park row upper colston street upper maudlin street and very much welcome the improvements to walking and cycling strategy but wish to be sure that bus services can operate to and from the city centre pass the Bristol Royal infirmary and university hospital Bristol and Weston.

For bus route y1 to and from Yate

T1 to and from Thornbury 13 to and from sea mills and shirehampton.

72 Bristol Temple meads station to cabot circus Broadmead Bristol Royal infirmary kingdown and Cotham Gloucester Road, lockleaze and cheswick University of the west of England.

Footway and cycle stands are certainly required around Bristol bus and coach station.

That footway and design protect disabled people and especially visitors to the Bristol Royal infirmary.

Support for the oid market cycle way and walkway.

We just need to be certain for bus passengers joining the network bus network and people walking in to the oid market area disabled people using wheelchair and with sight difficulties.

Are taken in account at design stage.

But cycling facilities and improve walking facilities are required in Old market and we would like to see improvements in the gay quarter in west street.

We certainly very keen on improving pavements widening cycle way and access to bus stops and interchanges.

We welcome the policy of the mayor and Bristol city council and the Metro mayor Dan Norris and the west of England combined authority to improve pedestrians footway around the city centre for health reasons and to reduce journeys on the private car and clean up the city centre area quality.

Statement: PS17.02

Cabinet – 14th September 2021

Re: Agenda item - DfT Active Travel Fund (ATF) Tranche 3

Statement submitted by: Mateusz Malinowski

I would like to highlight safety concerns at Crews Hole Road. I live at number 153, just next to Lamb Hill. I must say that at this section of the road the pavement is unsafe to use - curbs are at the road level which encourages drivers to use the pavement. It is a notorious behaviour as the road is narrow and drivers tend to drive faster than the 20mph limit. The only safe place for walks is the walking trail by the Avon river, but access there is very difficult - especially for people with prams and babies, or people with disabilities.

Secondly, while discussing the safety at Crews Hole Road, I would like to bring to your attention an unsafe joint of the walking trail near Dundry Park where Crews Hole Road changes into Conham Road. Pedestrians need to cross the road to get to the pavement on the other side. From the trail, there is good visibility into both roads. However, when coming from the pavement (Conham Road), there is obscured visibility of the Crews Hole Road. It is even more problematic in the late spring and summer when the vegetation reduces the field of view further. Speeding drivers do not help either.

Crews Hole Road needs safety improvements. I believe they are desperately needed not only because of the sheer number of people using the trail but also because of the traffic congestion which is too big for the road of its size.

Statement: PS17.03

Cabinet – 14th September 2021

Re: Agenda item - DfT Active Travel Fund (ATF) Tranche 3

Statement submitted by: Siobhan and Richard Martin

We would like highlight our concerns regarding pedestrian and cyclist safety in our neighbourhood specifically Crews Hole Road BS5 between Strawberry Land and Riverside Chapel.

- Along the whole section the road and pavement is extremely narrow and vehicles will on occasion mount the pavement to allow two-way traffic flow putting pedestrians at risk.
- The layby opposite Riverside Chapel and the entrance to Troopers Hill Nature Reserve has over the past few years been used by van owners/drivers to park (at present there is also a caravan there) this means pedestrians are forced to walk in the road as the vehicles have completely obstructed any walkways.
- The route between Strawberry Land and Riverside Chapel is frequently used by parents taking their young children to the local nursery (Mama Bears) and is the main access by foot to the nature reserve. This stretch of road/pavement is hazardous to parents and their young families for the reasons mentioned above. We are aware of families who no longer walk or cycle to the nursery and due to the risks now drive a matter of a few hundred metres as the route on foot is dangerous.
- Vehicles speed along this stretch of road and dramatically exceed the 20 mph speed limit – we walk our dog along here and have nearly be struck several times or have had to run to across the road to avoid traffic. It is also very dangerous trying to exit from Lamb Hill in a vehicle as other road users speed along this stretch of road. In addition it is dangerous for cyclists.
- When walking from the direction of Strawberry Lane towards Troopers Hill the road must be crossed at Lamb Hill or Riverside Chapel. Neither of these points are safe to cross and we are concerned there is going to be a serious accident.

We believe vehicle speed needs to be slowed along this stretch of road (i.e. speed table) and a pedestrian crossing point (i.e. zebra crossing at Riverside Chapel) installed to enable the safe passage of pedestrians. We understand some CIL funding is available to alter the layout of the layby, it would seem logical to install a pedestrian crossing point at the same time any works are undertaken.

SUMMARY

We are hoping that road safety improvements can be made to this stretch of Crews Hole Road to reduce the chance of an accident occurring and to encourage more pedestrians and cyclists and therefore reduce the carbon footprint in this conservation area and route in and out of the city.

Statement: PS17.04

Cabinet – 14th September 2021

Re: Agenda item - DfT Active Travel Fund (ATF) Tranche 3

Statement submitted by: Charlotte Davies

I am writing to highlight the safety concerns I have about Crews Hole Road, to be discussed at the Public Forum and Questions section of the Cabinet Meeting of Bristol City Council on Tuesday 14th September 2021 at 4pm.

We live on Crews Hole Road and are becoming increasingly concerned about the road safety for pedestrians on the road.

The stretch of Crews Hole Road we are concerned about is between the Woodwise Academy and Strawberry Lane. There are several difficult parts of this section of the road where the pavement is non-existent or you are forced into the road due to large vehicles parking on the pavement.

Crews Hole is a family area, with a lot of young families like us. There is a nursery just past the end of this section of the road, which means it is often used by people with prams or buggies or with young children.

Owing to the above issues, they are often forced to walk parts of it on the road which is made particularly dangerous because the entire section of the road is narrow and in places not wide enough to fit two cars.

Two areas of particular concern are:

1. A lay-by just left out of Lamb Hill which has no parking restrictions and is frequently used by a number of large vans and other vehicles which block the pavement and force pedestrians to walk in the road before reaching the point where you can cross over and access the river path by the side of Woodwise Academy. There is no pavement at all on the other side of the road so the lay-by cannot be avoided by pedestrians. It is also becoming a dumping ground for abandoned vehicles and industrial waste, both of which no doubt cost the council considerable money to clean up. In our view the area could very simply and cheaply be improved by installing something such as large planters on the wasteland, which would improve the attractiveness of the area as well as preventing the large vehicles from parking there illegally in the first place, and leaving the pavement unobstructed for pedestrians.

2. A supposed crossing point to/from the river path just right from the bottom of Lamb Hill appears to be part finished. There is path here that is frequently used by pedestrians walking along the river path to access Crews Hole Road. However it leads directly on to the road (i.e. it does not feed on to any pavement on that side of the road). Matters are not assisted by the fact that the pavement on the opposite side is very narrow (too narrow for a buggy or pram to fit on it or for a parent and child to walk side-by-side) and also stops short of the path. The crossing from the

path on to the pavement on the opposite side is also on a blind corner and the road is particularly narrow in this spot.

Further along past The Bull Inn where Crews Hole Road meets Conham Road there is also another dangerous crossing point as there is a blind corner where the river path ends and you are forced to cross over and rejoin the pavement on the road.

All of these safety issues are made worse by the fact that many vehicles are exceeding the 20mph limit on Crews Hole Road. We really believe someone will be seriously injured if improvements are not made to the road safety for pedestrians. With the location of our home we are unable to leave our house and walk safely in either direction, meaning the only safe mode of transport is by car.

I hope that you will give consideration to these concerns and look at allocating funding to improve our road before an injury or worse occurs.

Question: CQ17.01&02

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 17- DfT Active Travel Fund (ATF) Tranche 3

Question submitted by: Councillor Marley Bennet

Question 1)

I'd like to state on record that I welcome this item, as I understand how necessary it is, and that this is significantly more than some other local authorities are spending on active travel. I appreciate that there's limited funds and other areas may need to be prioritised, so I understand why my ward of Eastville didn't get funding on this occasion, but is there another tranche of funding, and if so, when, and can we expect Eastville to be eligible for that funding?

Question 2)

I note it also states: 'The competition also seeks to identify Local Authorities (LA) interested in receiving development funding to deliver a national pilot Liveable Neighbourhood scheme and/or partake in a GP Prescribing Pilot.' Please could you provide an update on our liveable neighbourhoods policy?

Question: CQ17.03

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 17 - DfT Active Travel Fund (ATF) Tranche 3

Question submitted by: Councillor Tim Rippington

I am very pleased to see that we are applying for additional money to help progress both our walking/cycling plans and also our ambitions to roll out Liveable Neighbourhoods across the city. Last week I brought a petition to Full Council signed by 91 residents of Wyndham Crescent calling for improvements to their neighbourhood to counter the disruption regularly caused by large numbers of visitors to Eastwood Farm. The transport department has suggested a Liveable Neighbourhoods approach would be appropriate in this location and I agree – the area is small, self contained, has a lot of social housing and occupied by a significant number of people with mobility issues. It is also an area of relative deprivation compared with many other parts of the city where citizens are calling for similar measures. **I would therefore ask if this area can be considered a priority area when plans are drawn up for the initial schemes to be rolled out in the city?**

Question: CQ17.04

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 17 - DfT Active Travel Fund (ATF) Tranche 3

Question submitted by: Councillor Fabian Breckels

I'm pleased to see this administration has found even further funding for active travel improvements. While it can be used to improvements such as cycle lanes, it can also be used to improve road safety, which in turn encourages people to cycle rather than use polluting vehicles.

In a case relating to my ward, residents have been asking me for road safety improvements on the western part of Crews Hole Road, as the section between Strawberry Lane and Riverside Chapel isn't currently safe for pedestrians. There's also a blind entrance that leads straight on to Crews Hole Road which raises obvious safety concerns; I've been told by officers that all these issues will cost up to £100,000 to fix.

Unsafe roads like this make active travel a less attractive prospect for pedestrians and cyclists, so if we want less people using polluting vehicles, it's essential that we invest in road safety projects.

Please could the Mayor or Cabinet Member for Transport let me know if funding can be used for projects like this, and if any is earmarked for Crews Hole Road?

Question: CQ17.05

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 17 Active Travel Fund (ATF) Tranche 3

Question submitted by: Councillor David Wilcox

I welcome the Active Travel Schemes investment as part of the Gear Change programme from Central Government. However, I hope it is 'ambitious' enough to meet the government criteria and is not dragged down by the other WECA participating councils bids.

I note that the Old Market Scheme is part of the changes announced in the Clean Air Zone Plan. Previous announcements have reported this (e.g. <https://www.bristolpost.co.uk/news/bristol-news/bristols-clean-air-zone-delayed-5601638>).

Question:

Which scheme is actually funding this change and what does the scheme form? I would be thrilled to be told these are different schemes!

Question: CQ22.01

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 22 Corporate Risk Management Report – Q1 2021/22

Question submitted by: Councillor Katy Grant

In Appendix A of the Q1 Corporate risk report, reference to climate change is only mentioned as a key potential challenge to Organizational Resilience, rather than an entire risk area in its own right.

Question:

In the context of the declared climate emergency, why is the risk that the City Council will not meet its emissions targets year by year, until 2030, not being measured as a threat risk?

Statement: CS22.01

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 22 Corporate Risk Management Report – Q1 2021/22

Statement submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

Sub-standard high-rise homes for children in Bristol

The Corporate risk management report indicates "Failure to deliver enough affordable homes to meet the City's needs" is a critical threat risk. However, I am worried that chasing the numbers of new homes proposed by the current administration in the election manifesto is encouraging and enabling developers to submit proposals for high-rise housing developments that will not provide good quality homes for the future, especially for families with young children.

Bristol's Urban Living Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates:

- Residential schemes that are likely to accommodate children and young people should facilitate opportunities for play and informal recreation and enable children and young people to be independently mobile. Under 5s should be within 100m of a suitable play facility/area, and all other children should be within 400m of a suitable play space
- Providing 10sqm of play space for each child that is expected to live in a scheme. This should normally be integrated into the scheme. However, off-site provision, including the creation of new facilities or improvements to existing provision, secured by an appropriate financial contribution, may be acceptable where it can be demonstrated that it addresses the needs of the development whilst continuing to meet the needs of existing residents. This is likely to be more appropriate for the provision of play facilities for older children, who can travel further to access it, but should still usually be within 400 metres of the development and be accessible via a safe route from children's homes.

The 17-storey development at Totterdown Bridge has a 'child yield' of 40. This tower is sandwiched between the fast-flowing River Avon and the busy Bath Road dual carriageway. No ground level public space is provided for children's play. However, it was approved with private outdoor space, including children's play areas, being provided by "5sqm balconies and 400sqm outdoor communal roof terrace space". Citing this approved scheme, Totterdown is now faced with another high-rise development proposal that fails to provide for children, with only balconies as outdoor space, stating: "due to the tight nature of this brownfield site the scheme is unable to deliver formal built in play facilities to meet these [Urban Living SPD] standards".

I suspect this is being replicated across the city, and Bristol is in danger of encouraging sub-standard accommodation for children rather than implementing the aims of the Urban Living SPD. I urge the Mayor, Cabinet, members and officers of Bristol City Council to take this matter seriously and insist on appropriate provision for children.

Question: PQ22.01&02

Cabinet – 14 September 2021

Re: Agenda item 22 - Corporate Risk Management Report – Q1 2021/22

Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

Background

Please see my statement to Cabinet in which I express concern that the housing 'targets', which the Corporate risk register suggests are a critical threat risk, may be undermining the provision of good quality 'affordable' homes. In answering my questions, please note I am very familiar with the arguments in favour of building on brownfield sites at density, although I do not accept that high density should equate with high-rise developments especially when providing 'affordable' homes for families. I would be grateful if the replies to my questions could focus specifically on provision for, and the well-being of, families with children.

Question 1

What importance do you place on the aims of the Urban Living SPD in relation to children living in high-rise developments when considered in the context of the corporate risk relating to delivery of affordable homes?

Question 2

What measures, if any, are in place to enforce compliance with the Urban Living SPD aims in relation to children?