

Growth & Regeneration Scrutiny Commission 16th November 2021 Public Forum



Public Forum Questions:

Ref	Name	Topic
Q1 – Q8	Clive Stevens	Agenda Item 14: Housing Delivery Plan
Q9 – Q10	Clive Stevens	Agenda Item 16: Housing Delivery Exempt
Q11 – Q15	Councillor Ani Stafford-Townsend	Agenda Item 13. City Centre & High Streets Recovery and Renewal Programme
Q16	Steven Webster	Agenda Item 12. Liveable Neighbourhoods Strategy Update
Q17 - Q21	Clem Attwood (on behalf of Bristol Cycling Campaign)	Agenda Item 12 Liveable Neighbourhoods Strategy
Q22	Sara Tullberg (On behalf of Bishopston and St Andrews Traffic and Parking Group)	Agenda item 12: Liveable Neighbourhoods Strategy Update

Public Forum Statements:

Ref	Name	Topic
S1	David Redgewell, South West Transport Network and on behalf of Railfuture Severnside	Corporate Strategy & iPoint Ticket Machines
S2	Clive Stevens	Agenda item 14: Housing Delivery Plan



Public Forum Questions**Questions 1 – 8: Clive Stevens**

Dear Officer, Thank you for this report. I understand that a housing delivery plan is mandatory as Bristol has recently fallen well below its Government-set, house building targets. I like the idea of Project 1000 it's something to focus the mind on and energise and coordinate different departments. Its success is key to Bristol's future success as a sustainable city. Without affordable housing we won't retain key workers. I hope you don't mind but I have some questions please:

The Strategic Housing Needs Assessment from 2009 (12 years ago) shows a housing list of 6,591 for 2002 growing to 8,365 in 2007. (This is now 16,000). Back then the annual rise in the housing list was about 400, now it's closer to 1,000 a year. Affordable housing delivery was 583 in the year 2008/9; much higher than recent years, which, presumably, is why the housing list wasn't going up so fast back then. It seems that the requirement (the need) has averaged about 1,000 per year consistently. The list grows because affordable housing has never met 1,000 per year.

This says to me that all existing methods to provide affordable housing in Bristol have failed; recent averages are about 19%. Therefore, I am constructively sceptical and interested to know what's going to change.

Q1: Out of the 1,000 affordable homes you hope to build in 2024 please estimate what % will be S106 funded? Homes England funded? New Council homes via the HRA? And provided by Goram Homes?

Q1 Officer reply:

It is difficult to predict this at this stage but based on current assumptions and current delivery patterns:

- 450 affordable homes will be delivered by the Council's HomesWest Registered Provider partners, Community-led housing providers and other specialist housing providers
 - Between 1/3 and 1/2 will come from subsidy-free s106 units secured through planning policy
 - The remainder of the 450 homes will be provider-led delivery with HE, BCC or other public subsidy funding
- The balance of 550 affordable homes will come from the HRA and Goram although the proportion and detail of this is not yet formalized and forms part of the Housing Delivery Plan work.

Q2: Do you plan on having a fifth (or sixth) delivery mechanism? If so what and an estimate please?

Q2 Officer reply:

Other routes to delivery are not being ruled out but there are no immediate plans to identify what these options might look like.

Our range of affordable housing provider partners is wider than just Registered Providers and includes community-led housing organisations, specialist housing providers and Alms House organisations. We will work with them to explore all options that increase affordable housing delivery for the city.

Q3: Is it true that Home England grants are UK tax payer funded? If not, how does the Government raise the money (if debt then it has to be paid back)?

Q3 Officer reply:

Officers have passed this query on to Homes England and have received the following response:

Homes England is commissioned by Department for Levelling up, Housing & Communities (DLUHC) as their Affordable Housing Provider (AHP) 21-26 delivery partner, which supports the Government's public policy objective to provide both affordable rental and home ownership housing. The DLUHC business case for the grant funded AHP 21-26 is signed off by Her Majesty's Treasury (HMT) which means the tax-payer plays a key part in how the Government finances meeting their policy objective.

Furthermore, in Homes England's published funding guidance Value for Money is a key element of the bid assessment framework and the programme is audited by the National Audit Office (NAO), which is responsible for auditing central government departments, government agencies and non-departmental public bodies. The NAO also carries out value for money audits into the administration of public policy.

Q4: I note that South Glos are achieving 36% affordable housing on their new builds? So much that when I last looked the 2019/20 figure for their housing waiting list was actually going down? Are these both correct?

Q4 Officer reply:

Colleagues at South Glouc have confirmed that more recently their larger strategic green field sites are not delivering at a policy compliant level, with a range of 20-25% affordable housing being secured through s106.

It has been confirmed by their HomeChoice Services Manager that their housing register numbers are not going down despite their delivery rate of new affordable homes. It was over 4100 at the beginning of November and the number of new applications is at a steady rate of increase.

Q5: Much of Bristol's new building has to be on brown field sites, statistics show about 85%. This can be expensive, to pay for demolition, protect heritage and there will be less economies of scale; whereas much of South Glos building land is green field, ex-farmland or easy brownfield. Would these factors make it easier for South Glos to achieve a higher affordable housing %?

Q5 Officer reply:

Yes. The more straightforward a site is to build out, the more viable it will be for a developer to deliver at or near policy compliant levels of subsidy-free affordable housing. However, not all greenfield sites are automatically able to produce a full policy compliance for affordable. The larger strategic sites in South Gloucestershire are not all providing a policy compliance affordable housing offer; recent s106 agreement have ranged between 20-25% AH being secured

In 2020/21 South Gloucestershire had the same number of affordable housing completions as we did in Bristol. 80% of their delivery came through a s106 route (323 out of 403 new affordable homes) In Bristol only 36% of our completions came via s106 (145 out of 400 new affordable homes).

Q6: For Project 1000 to succeed, will it require a higher affordable housing % requirement in the new Local Plan?

Q6 Officer reply:

The timing of the new Local Plan means that decisions around a new affordable housing policy will not impact on Project 1000. Planning applications coming forward that are likely to deliver affordable homes in 2023/24 and 2024/25 will be determined under the current local plan

That notwithstanding, Local Plan policy still needs to base upon an assessment of what is viable and deliverable; this means that in setting any affordable housing percentage in the new Local Plan considering targets that take account of other policy objectives such as tackling the climate emergency and wider infrastructure requirements, while ensuring an appropriate return can be made to a willing landowner to enable development to progress.

Q7: In what ways are you working with South Glos Local Planning Authority to maximise the amount of affordable housing on land that is inside the Green Belt (not on or outside the Green Belt)?

Q7 Officer reply:

The West of England Spatial Development Strategy is Bristol's route to working alongside South Glouc on housing delivery issues, including establishing potential key development locations for housing delivery across the region. It is still too early to say to what extent strategic housing policy within the SDS will address affordable housing need across unitary authority boundaries.

Q8: How much of Bristol's affordable housing dwellings could be built on land that is currently green space? (I ask this as these are likely to be contentious sites and therefore higher risk).

Thank you, I have asked these questions hoping that, as you are updating the housing delivery plan, you will already have the answers.

Q8 Officer reply:

Work around the identification of development sites for affordable housing that support the emerging Housing Delivery Plan is underway but at this stage officers cannot accurately respond to this question.

Questions 9 – 10: Clive Stevens

Dear Chair,

I am a member of the public. When I read agenda item 16 I wondered if there is an exempt paper to go with it; or a presentation? You may recall that nowadays exempt papers need to be accompanied by a public paper that summarises the topics, issues and concerns that are in the exempt paper.

That was made clear in the recent inquiry into governance failures at Bristol City Council regarding Bristol Energy; the External Auditors at recommendation #4 wrote:

“Public reports should be consistent with the issues and concerns raised within exempt papers. The exempt papers should only provide confidential information which cannot be discussed within the public sessions.”

Exempt-ness is to protect confidential financial or business information (para 3 of the 1972 act); whereas good governance and the Nolan Principles require openness and transparency. The external auditors and Full Council accepted that the balance had been wrong and hence the recommendation in italics above.

Q9. If there is no report or presentation at all then I think Agenda item 16 should clearly say so, do you agree?

Q9 Officer reply:

Item 16 is the exempt discussion in relation to Item 14 – Housing Delivery Plan. The information that can be shared in open session can therefore be found in the report for Item 14.

Q10. If there is an exempt report or presentation, then there should be a public report along with item 16. Do you agree? In either case could Scrutiny remind officers about good Governance please.

Q10 Officer reply:

Please see above – the open report in relation to the Housing Delivery Plan can be found at Item 14.

Q11 – Q15: Councillor Ani Stafford-Townsend

Q11: I welcome the strategy, it's much needed, desperately required and I am sure will be thankfully received. I note a couple of omissions areas not named as part of the City Centre, whilst being in the City Centre and requiring support. These are Park Street, The Christmas Steps Arts Quarter, and Redcliffe Hill. Both Redcliff Hill and Christmas Steps Arts Quarter are excluded from existing BiD schemes and are almost entirely independent small businesses which are led and owned by women, people of colour or members of the LGBTQI+ community. These areas are also being, or feel they are being adversely affected by the crucial changes to the traffic flows of the city. Whilst I appreciate that these areas can apply for the Welcome Back fund, I know that they would greatly benefit from inclusion within the City Centre remit. Can assurance be given that these areas are being included in the term 'City Centre', as they were originally led to believe because they are very clearly part of the city centre?

Q11 Officer reply:

Businesses and organisations across the whole of the City Centre (as defined by planning) are able to access support from the programme, including the Welcome Back Fund, the £1.3m Vacant Commercial Property Grant scheme, business engagement and support, marketing and promotion.

The targeted street scene and green infrastructure improvements, and culture and events activities are primarily focused on the main retail and hospitality areas of Bristol Shopping Quarter, Park Street and Queens Road, the Old City and King Street.

The BID boundaries and rules were developed following consultation by the BID proposer (Destination Bristol in these cases) with businesses in the retrospective areas. Part of Redcliffe Hill is included in the Redcliffe and Temple BID boundary and Christmas Steps is included in the boundary of the City Centre BID, although many of the businesses fall below the levy threshold.

Q12: Please can I have a clear list of exactly which areas are included in the city centre area for the purpose of the renewal programme

Q12 Officer reply:

See above.

Q13: I would like more information on the social media marketing strategy for the Shop Local Bristol campaign. There is an excellent amount of activity and followers on Twitter, however Instagram & Facebook has less engagement. Visual social media like Instagram is crucial for most retailers, what is the plan for increasing the reach & engagement.

Q13 Officer reply:

Each week we profile a new high street in the Where's it to? shop local Bristol campaign. Starting on Thursday evening, a video of the area is shared across social channels: Facebook, Twitter and Instagram, Throughout the week (Thursday to the following Wednesday) we stagger sending photo messages across the three social channels to maintain engagement with the campaign. Two photo posts are sent out on each channel.

The @ShopLocalBris Twitter account has been running for 10 years and has built up a strong following of 20,000. The @ShopLocalBris Instagram account was created at the start of the campaign in May 2021 and the Facebook account at the start of October 2021, so both are in their infancy in terms of followers (Instagram 1,405 followers, Facebook 392 followers).

As we build a following on our @ShopLocalBris social accounts, content is shared across both @BristolCouncil and @ShopLocalBris social channels to ensure we are reaching as wide an audience as possible. Businesses featured in the campaign each week are tagged in the posts and are asked to share with their networks to increase engagement and reach.

Content and updates are also shared in the business newsletter and citizens newsletter to raise awareness of the Where's it to campaign, asking people to follow the campaign on social channels.

We have also partnered with social media consultant Maybe to providing businesses with free access to social media tools and training to increase their customer base and drive sales.

Q14: St James Barton Roundabout, aka The Bearpit, what are the long term plans for this area? As an entry point to Broadmead it is currently lack lustre. Previously there were several schemes to make fuller use of the area, will such schemes be considered again?

Q14 Officer reply:

The long-term future of St James Barton Roundabout is being considered as part of the City Centre Development and Delivery Plan as detailed in the Scrutiny report.

The council has been working to address the condition of the Bearpit and as part of this we have developed a programme of works which will support our efforts to make it a more usable space and a space which is a more welcoming environment for the public. The work we have developed to date has introduced new planting areas into the Bearpit along with new trees, greening of walls with plants and seasonal baskets. Since the introduction of the new planting schemes, we have seen the site being transformed and it becoming a usable public space again. The improvements made have only provided improvements to part of the site and we have been developing a new scheme which will see the site being turned into a pollinator rich garden that will bring new life to the area and promote biodiversity. Alongside these plans, we are also aiming to introduce a green roof to the old toilet block which will help soften the landscape around the Bearpit.

Q15: Could excellent local group Incredible Edible be permitted to return to The Bearpit?

Q15 Officer reply:

We appreciate that Incredible Edible had a number of challenges in trying to address the maintenance of the area they had planted, but it had got to the point where the council needed to step in to address this. With the development of the proposed plans for the Bearpit it will not be possible to accommodate Incredible Edible at this location. However, we have been in contact with Incredible Edible to see how we can support them in identifying a new location in the city which would support the aims and objectives of their organisation.

Q16 Steven Webster

In respect of Liveable Neighbourhoods Strategy, I note that the proposed mini-holland purple area ends at Bath Road.

Q16: Will the committee consider the following suggestion?

Problem

Talbot Road in Brislington has numerous problems related to excess traffic and sits just outside the current proposed area for Liveable Neighbourhoods shown in the update for this meeting.

It is a C Road with a tight corners at one end and a humped back bridge at the other. It is the only cut through between the A37 and A4 as a result it gets enormous amounts of traffic this results in:

- Pollution
- Congestion
- Aggression
- Crashes
- Speeding
- Decreased community feel.

Suggested Solution

Place ANPR cameras where the Wells Road meets Priory Road, Somerset Road, Beaconsfield Road and Marston Road as well where Kensington Park Road meets the Bath Road.

An LTN could then be set up in the same manner as others in the country. ANPR cameras could then set to allow the following full access; residents (up to 3 cars), blue badge holders, emergency Services, taxis and buses. Other drivers could then be allowed in but not through.

This would:

- Solve the issues mentioned above
- Prioritise the Wells Road and Bath Road for buses
- Improve the number 3 cycle route which crosses Talbot Road

Allow children easier access to the Arno's Park.

Improve safety for active travel users and e-scooters.

Q16 Officer Reply

Thank you for your enquiry. The boundaries shown on the Mini Holland proposal map are indicative only and will need to be re-considered in respect of whether our proposal is successful, and the level of funding granted to us. Identifying boundaries for our Mini Holland pilot will also be influenced through the community engagement process to ensure improvements are tailored to local conditions and needs. With regards to the inclusion of Talbot Road in the scheme, we are currently developing a strategy that will set out the design principles for LN's including how they can be applied across different city contexts.

Q17 - Q21: Clem Attwood (on behalf of Bristol Cycling Campaign)

As the presentation acknowledges, the content and timing of stakeholder engagement for liveable neighbourhood type schemes is central to effective rollout. With regard to the strategy and the Barton Hill pilot scheme, what are the measures of success that Bristol City Council will use to evaluate whether schemes are successful? More specifically:

Q17 What outcomes are you looking to measure?

Q17 Officer Reply

The forthcoming Strategy will set out in detail how we intend to monitor the success of Liveable Neighbourhoods. We intend to include a broad range of indicators from health and wellbeing markers, to mode shift and crime statistics recognising the range of benefits the schemes provide.

Q18 For which populations will outcomes be measured?

Q18 Officer Reply

We would want our monitoring to include all demographic groups.

Q19 Over what timescales will success be measured - the effects of these schemes can take a while to bed in?

Q19 Officer Reply

This will somewhat depend on the requirement of the funding body, but currently we'd be seeking monitoring at 6-, 12- and 2-year intervals subject to finalising the details of the strategy. The success of schemes post-implementation will be benchmarked against data collected prior to schemes being developed and delivered. Monitoring and evaluation will also be undertaken in the areas surrounding scheme boundaries, to ensure any wider impacts are captured pre and post implementation. The extent of this will depend on the context of each scheme.

Q20 What best practice has been considered in relation to this e.g. the Gear Change: One Year On https://urldefense.com/v3/https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1007815/gear-change-one-year-on.pdf ;!!KUxdu5-bBfnh!oj-P9WbVbATnO6D6d-whveOrXq13WT5ct2xSNyr1MCpDor4DzUP41SiKMQbEUDssYUgFKMQudUiusw\$?

Q20 Officer Reply

We have received advice on our Monitoring & Evaluation strategy through partners who have assessed best practice across the UK, including reference to Gear Change and other relevant guidance.

Q21 What is the city-wide ambition for the strategy beyond the pilot schemes mentioned?

Q21 Officer Reply

Our Strategy will set out how Liveable Neighbourhoods could be implemented across the city, across different city contexts.

Q22 Sara Tullberg (On behalf of Bishopston and St Andrews Traffic and Parking Group)

What are the criteria on which areas have been selected for LTN pilots and when will St Andrew's and Bishopston be considered?

Q22 Officer Reply

- The Liveable Neighbourhood pilot in East Bristol was selected on the basis of the following criteria:
 - o A Low Traffic Neighbourhood approach for the area was identified in our adopted [Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan](#)
 - o The scheme scored highly against the funding criteria set by WECA, including the potential to address issues such as road safety, access to education, investment in areas of deprivation
 - o East Bristol was considered a good candidate for a trial as it covers an area that represents a diverse range of experiences of living in the city, be this cultural, economic or access to opportunities.

- To the second part of the question, we will be identifying future Liveable Neighbourhood pilot areas once the East Bristol pilot has been delivered and a Strategy developed that incorporates our learnings from that experience.

Public Forum Statements

Statement 1: David Redgewell, South West Transport Network and on behalf of Railfuture Severnside Corporate Strategy:

Whilst we welcome the sustainable transport chapter in the Corporate Strategy, connectivity the walking and cycling strategy should also make reference to the walking and cycling strategy of the west of England Combined Authority.

We welcome the plans commitment to equalities.

There does not appear any reference to the National bus strategy and bus back better and the West of England Combined Authority Metro Mayor Dan Norris and North Somerset council bus service improvements plan or the enhanced quality partnership which will deliver the bus service from next April 2021 with the A37 Whitchurch Banes via Hengrove, Knowle, Totterdown, Bristol Temple Meads station, Cabot Circus Bristol, city centre Park street closure to through traffic except for access to the local residents and shops and welcome cycle lanes pavements widening and bus priority for buses or Glider buses to Clifton Down Station the Downs, Westbury-on-Trym, Henbury and Cribbs Causeway bus station in south Gloucestershire.

Also the upgrade of the Bristol bus and coach station Bristol Temple meads station, Arnos vale, Brislington, Keynsham, Salford, Newbridge, Weston and Bath spa bus and coach station route.

But the plan lacks delivery plan details in line with Bus back better the National bus strategy and the west of England metro mayor Dan Norris combined authority and North Somerset council bus service improvements plan with first group west of England buses and Stagecoach west Hct group and Rapt Bath bus company.

Which requires timelines from the secretary of state for transport.

On Railway service investment in metro west railway services, it's great to see support in the plan from the City Mayor Marvin Rees and the west of England combined authority metro mayor Dan Norris and North Somerset council.

But again on the important delivery target which are very very important for growth and regeneration of the Bristol and Bath city region we have no date for reopening the Bristol Temple Meads Station to Bedminster, Parson street, Pill and Portishead railway line reopening and a new station at Ashton Gate, the Bristol Temple Meads station to Henbury loop line with station at Lawrence Hill, Stapleton road, Ashley Down, Filton Abbey wood, Filton North and Henbury for Cribbs Causeway bus station and a future extension to Avonmouth Dock.

This is very important for access to The Arena and the Development of homes office and shops of the YTL site at Patchway.

The Severn Beach, St Andrew Road Avonmouth dock, Portway parkway Shirehampton, Sea Mills, Clifton Down station, Redland, Montpellier, Stapleton Road, Lawrence Hill, Bristol Temple Meads station which is operating every 30 mins from December 2021.

But the line from Bristol Temple meads Keynsham, Oldfield park, Bath spa Freshford, Avoncliffe, Bradford on Avon, Trowbridge Westbury route of metro west is losing this December 2021.

The Bristol Temple meads station Keynsham, Oldfield park, Bath spa Bradford on Avon, Trowbridge Westbury Warminster Salisbury London Waterloo service which is cancelled this December 2021 without any passengers or local authorities West of England Combined Authority Metro Mayor Dan Norris or the city mayor Malvin Rees.

This line should have a Bristol Temple meads Keynsham, Oldfield park Bath spa Freshford Avoncliffe Bradford on Avon, Trowbridge Westbury metro west service in December 2022 with proposals for station at St Anne park and Salford, subject to railway capacity studies.

The metro west service from Bristol Temple meads station to Gloucester central via Lawrence hill, Stapleton road, Ashley down and possible Horfield, Filton Abbey wood Bristol parkway station, Yate, Charfield, Cam and Dursey, Stonehouse Bristol road and Gloucester.

This is a very welcome by transport stakeholders group and people living around Charfield and Wotton under Edge of the new transport link to Bristol Temple meads.

Support for Stroud district council and Gloucester county council.

But we don't have a 30 minute timetable signed off by the Department for Transport.

Or each service on the Bristol Temple meads Bedminster station parson street Nailsea and Backwell, Yatton for Clevedon worle parkway Weston million and Weston super mare Highbridge and Burnham on sea Bridgwater and Taunton.

To Delivery railway service in the Bristol and Bath city region and the western gateway transport board area .

We need a delivery plan from the west of England combined authority metro mayor Dan Norris and North Somerset council.

Both mayor Dan Norris and Don Davis leader of North Somerset council have written to Grant Shapps, Secretary of State for Transport about the delays to the Bristol Temple meads station to Portishead line delays and Mayor Norris about the loss of the Bristol Temple meads and Bath Spa to London Waterloo service via Salisbury.

For all the Railway delivery proposal from metro west we need partnership working with the west of England combined authority metro mayor Dan Norris and North Somerset council which needs to join weca, Department for Transport, Network rail western route, First group Great western railway and First group MTR south western railway and cross country trains db, Western gateway transport board.

Whist great progress is being made with Network rail western route at Bristol Temple meads station the city corporate plan is short on delivery details.

The Network rail western route Capacity study for the west of England combined authority and North Somerset council should be published.

We need a strong regional Authority in the West of England combined authority metro mayor Dan Norris, North Somerset council and western gateway transport board to set up a railway executive to deliver our Railway services similar to Greater Manchester mayor Andy Burnham West Midlands Mayor Andy Street Liverpool city region metro Steve Rotherham.

The city corporate plan need timeline for delivery.

As Mayor Rees and metro mayor Dan Norris understand, this city region has failed the community on a modern public transport system.

The Residents and passengers of Greater Bristol and Bath city region need a plan for CONSTRUCTION and Delivery not a plan list of promised public transport that never get built Bristol history with the exemption of metro bus.

And under bus back better the National bus strategy we have to set up with the metro mayor Dan Norris west of England combined Transport authority and North Somerset council a Bus service advisory board with stakeholders and a passengers' forum we need to make progress on this as part of the enhanced quality bus partnership.

We also note with deep concern the lack of effective communication and consultation on the retendering of the support bus network in the city region in south Gloucestershire council Bath and North east Somerset council the city and county of Bristol and cross boundary service into North Somerset council. There are no notices on buses bus stops interchange railway station or on realtime information system.

Only a questionnaire online can we talk to the metro mayor about public consultation.

iPoint Ticket Machines:

Whilst we welcome the purchase of iPoint Ticket Machines as a funding agreement with metro mayor Dan Norris and the combined transport authority for the Bristol parkway station to Patchway station approach Filton North station for the YTL arena and Cribbs Causeway Patchway new Town and we welcome the real-time information and new bus stops, it's a pity that the I point tickets machine do not sell a complete list of integrated transport tickets for Avonrider Bristol Rider bus rail freedom passes.

No review was undertaken of the Bristol south loop missing route from Whitchurch, Hengrove, Hartcliffe, Withywood, Highridge, Yandley Lane, South Bristol link road, Ashton gate park and ride Bristol Temple meads, Bristol Broadmead and city centre route which need shelters realtime information system and I points for a commission metro bus service by the West of England combined authority metro mayor Dan Norris and North Somerset council. As I points and shelter provision could have been made on the route as well.

We need to complete the metro bus network with additional routes Bristol to Yate and Chipping Sodbury, Bristol to Thornbury, Bristol to Nailsea and Clevedon, Bristol to Keynsham, Brislington, Keynsham, Saltford, Saltford and Bath, South Bristol to the Portway, Shirehampton Portway Park and Ride and Severn Beach Cabot park at west of England combined authority and North Somerset council joint committees and an update on metro bus plans to the metro mayor Dan Norris and the joint committee.

Statement 2: Clive Stevens

Since making my statement to OSMB on 18th October 2021 I have been informed of more key workers leaving Bristol due to the high cost of housing here. These contacts don't want to be made public but I'm sure you can verify this for yourselves via Bristol City Council and the NHS. Ask for their findings from exit interviews. Also, I see retention and recruitment in Social Care is on the agenda for People Scrutiny next month.

Bristol City Council Planning and Housing reports going back well over a decade have said that Bristol (and presumably this applies to other cities mainly in the South) is becoming more and more unaffordable. This, I think, is the market at work when demand outstrips supply. The market "works" by putting up prices (rents) to reduce demand. That leads to hugely undesirable and damaging side effects and is a market in need of intervention.

Homes England grants for landowners and developers to subsidise the building of affordable housing will lead to some more affordable houses in the short term. But as developers and landowners will still make good profits, land prices will continue to rise. Why? Because developers compete and bid up the price of land; they can still make good profit from it due to these tax payer grants.

My question (which I don't expect an answer to today) is whether you think the interventions presented by officers will be enough? It might be all they can do, but if it's not enough, then they need to explain

the inevitable long term consequences to get agreement from WECA or even Government to do more and in different ways.