

STATEMENT PS 01

Submitted by Steve Roser - Global Goals Centre

Title: Twinning Officer Cut

I am writing to you regarding the proposed cut to the International Twinning Officer post.

I am the chair of trustees for the Global Goals Centre registered charity 1187048

The support of the Twinning Officer has been instrumental in establishing and developing the Global Goals Centre (GGC) <https://globalgoalscentre.org/>

We aim to inspire a better future. We are an education charity creating exciting engaging experiences that inspire learning and action on climate and equality in our everyday lives. We create our own projects and amplify the work of others, inspired by the UN Global Goals.

We are also developing the first physical, active learning centre in Bristol based on the UN Global Goals which is part of the One City Plan.

Cutting the Twinning Officer post in half will stop all the community based work which the officer does with the twinning associations and with the Global Goals Centre.

We understand the immense financial pressure that the City Council is under given the huge increase in Adult Social Care costs, the costs of the pandemic and the ever reducing funding coming from central government but it is vital that our children and young people learn about the UN Global Goals and so our board of trustees would urge you to reconsider this proposal as the negative impact it will have, will far outweigh the small savings that it offers.

STATEMENT PS 02

Submitted by Bristol International Twinning Association

Title: Bristol International Twinning Association

Bristol this year celebrates 75 years of twinning which started in 1947 with the first twinned cities of Hannover and Bordeaux. BITA and the seven twinning associations have always worked in partnership with Bristol City Council and as a result thousands of people from across the whole of Bristol and in our twinned cities have participated in various cultural, educational and economic events and projects. Thousands of young people have experienced educational exchanges with young people in Hannover, Bordeaux and Porto, economic links particularly with our twinned town of Guangzhou, fair trade links with Puerto Morazan, aid to Beira via fundraising after cyclones, and everyone should have seen Georgian dancing and singing at events such as the Harbour Festival and artists from all over at UPFEST. Together with all our twinned cities we are working together on the big issues such as the green agenda and climate change. Covid has taught us how important it is for cities and countries to work together. On behalf of the Bristol International Twinning Association we would ask Members to reverse the cut of 50% of the Twinning Officer's post because of the huge benefits of us all working together and engaging thousands of people each year from across the whole of Bristol and in our seven twinned cities of Hannover, Bordeaux, Tbilisi, Puerto Morazan, Guangzhou, Beira and Porto.

STATEMENT PS 03

Submitted by Bristol Tbilisi Twinning Association (BTA)

Title: Twinning Officer Cut

Bristol has been twinned with Tbilisi the capital of Georgia since 1988 when it was part of the Soviet Union. Georgia became independent again in 2012 and Bristol has worked with our colleagues and friends in Tbilisi to support it as it developed towards becoming a western style democracy. During the last 35 years there have been numerous initiatives between our two cities which have engaged thousands of people in both Bristol and Tbilisi which have added to the cultural, economic, environmental and educational lives of people in both cities. Twinning has always been a joint approach between the Bristol Tbilisi Twinning Association and Bristol City Council and together we have forged strong links with our twinned city. UPFEST is the next big festival that we are engaged in and several artists are due to come to Bristol from Tbilisi to participate plus a festival organiser from Georgia who wants to learn from our experiences. We became twinned with Tbilisi to gain friendship during the Cold War and again now in the Ukraine the Cold War issues re-emerge. It is vital that the twinning link Bristol has with Tbilisi has the support of Bristol City Council and the twinning Officer has provided that link for over 25 years and has proved to be invaluable. We understand the challenges that Bristol faces in setting its budget but please reconsider this particular cut because of its huge contribution and impact it has on the twinning activities and “friendship” in the City and beyond.

STATEMENT PS 04

Submitted by Bristol Oporto Association

Title: Twinning Officer Cut

BOA (Bristol Oporto Association) response to cut by 50% to the Twinning officer post

The Friendship Agreement with Porto was formally signed in 1984. A civic link connecting Bristol with a city with which it has much in common on so many fronts.

Since that time, with the support of the twinning officer co-ordinating role we have built up many lines of communication and developed, supported and maintained this long standing special association.

This has empowered and benefitted both local communities, generating links and learning between the cities, outcomes that fit well within Bristol's ongoing high profile international outlook.

Our Association is run by its members and with these dedicated supporters, all volunteers, we organise and carry out many cultural and educational projects for both of our communities. In terms of value for money there is no contest.

Through fundraising we have built up a charitable foundation (the Bristol Oporto Foundation) which enables us to provide small grants to support this ongoing work.

It encourages many youth and educational projects and exchanges and offers very wide ranging support funding for linked projects in many and different fields connected with Porto and Portugal. Currently we are supporting two language scholarships, a Primary school craft project and a street artist from Porto to take part in this year's UPFest.

If made, this relatively small cut in the overall budget of the City Council would have a much larger consequential effect on the working operations of all our twinnings.

We urge you to continue to support us and this twinning post as a full time role both for the good of the city's ongoing international activity and for the good of Bristol's many communal interests.

STATEMENT PS 05

Submitted by Bristol Link with Nicaragua (Blinc)

Title: Twinning Officer Cut/ Blinc Response to Proposal to cut by 50% the International Twinning Officer post

Bristol Link with Nicaragua (Blinc) is the long-established organisation that represents the twinning between Bristol and Puerto Morazan in North West Nicaragua.

This statement is in response to the proposal by Bristol City Council to cut the International Twinning Officer post by 50%, specifically the community engagement and development element, whilst retaining funding for the “municipality to municipality” element.

We note from the documentation on the council’s website (<https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/documents/>) that the Twinning Officer post in its entirety contributes an extensive array of benefits to the citizens of Bristol, especially young people and those from disadvantaged communities. We note also that it is hoped that the 50% shortfall in funding, if the cut is agreed, be made up from alternative “civic” sources (not specified).

Whilst we understand the severe budgetary pressures the city is facing we are disappointed with the proposal to cut part of this post. The Twinning Officer post was established 30 years ago to co-ordinate and develop the formally recognised twinning arrangements, initially as a Service Level Agreement with Bristol International Twinning Association (BITA) and latterly as a post fully funded by the city council. It is widely recognised that this post has been extremely successful at fostering these international links and delivering real benefits to the people of Bristol. We have always seen the roles of fostering international relationships and community development here in Bristol as two sides of the same coin, with one facilitating and enhancing the other. It appears very risky to cut one of these aspects in the hope of securing external funding to cover the shortfall. As is acknowledged in the above documentation without this input it is highly likely that the seven twinning associations will struggle to fulfil their objectives and to thrive, making it very difficult to continue to deliver benefits to the people of Bristol. We question whether the savings gained by cutting 50% of this post is really worth it in terms of lost benefits now and into the future?

With invaluable support from the Twinning Officer the twinning associations have managed to continue to operate throughout the Covid pandemic. To take one example, Blinc managed to host the annual Copa Sandino football tournament at Ashton Park school, which raised vital funds to help fund our under 5’s education programme in Puerto Morazan. As we begin to emerge from the pandemic we believe that the twinning associations have a vital role to play in helping to re-establish relationships between communities and believe it would be an error to cut the Twinning Officer post at this time. We urge Bristol City Council to reject the proposal and to continue funding a full time post.

STATEMENT PS 06

Submitted by Dr Ann Kennard, Chair - Bristol-Hannover Council

Title: Twinning Officer Cut

Bristol-Hannover Council is one of the oldest twinings in the country and certainly recognised as one of the most active today. There have been countless exchanges of groups of Bristol citizens since 1947 and when the city decided 30 years ago to hand over responsibility for the twinings to the voluntary associations, we all continued to work very hard to keep the links going. There was then no-one in the City Council who took any real interest in these international links, and the subject of the twinings got moved from one department to another, without any real interest, expertise or knowledge of what they did or were about.

Hannover City Council, on the other hand, has always had a very strong and positive approach to all its twinings; it has a team of 2/3 dedicated officers in the Cultural Office who deal with these matters, be they cultural, economic or other. **During a longish period when there was no officer in Bristol City Council who was responsible and no-one who knew about the issues or was in contact with Hannover's officers**, the Hannover colleagues tended to write to me, as a volunteer, along with the twinings coordinator, in order to set up projects or exchanges. It was a very frustrating time, but **the whole situation has changed out of all recognition since the reinstatement of the Twinning Officer in 2016.**

This year we celebrate the 75th anniversary of the partnership and are engaged in a planning process with the Council officers of both cities along with the two voluntary associations. Civic and citizens' visits are planned, and also exchanges of community groups of young people, choirs, sporting associations, all of which need input from the City Councils to ensure that they have the appropriate institutional support.

We realise that the Council needs to reduce the budget, but we feel that the small amount saved by making the Twinning Officer effectively a part-time post, will conversely do massive damage to the relationships which we have built up between these two European communities over so many years.

STATEMENT PS 07

Submitted by Jen Smith

Title: Equality Impact Assessment E8

Home to School Transport (HTST) costs feel demonised for their repeated reporting in what feels like a negative spin for their spiralling costs in ongoing budget papers.

Send pupils rely on HTST which can take them many miles from their home due to Bristol City Council's complete failure to ensure there is enough specialist provision within the city and around the city.

It is highly concerning to see an 'identified potential saving' for HTST in the same paper that a review of support will be taking place looking at independent travel training.

'Greater independence for children' in this context, is a euphemism for 'cuts' which is diabolical when it targets some of the city's most vulnerable children.

These children have already been treated shabbily in a local Send system that cannot even meet its most basic statutory duties.

Many children and young people needing taxi transport have already experienced a traumatic time with their education. The test for HTST is already high and in the past, my own child has had experience of where this was not lawfully applied and my appeal at City Hall was deliberately blocked.

It is not the fault of disabled children, young people and their families that their Local Authority has made an unlawful dog's dinner with their education, and we will not stand by and watch anymore barriers to their education put in place.

STATEMENT PS 08

Submitted by Withheld

Title: Taking away transport for SEND pupils

I have been made aware that in your full council budget meeting, you are looking at the option of taking away transport for SEND pupils, this is not acceptable I have a child who attends a special school for her learning needs and she has a EHCP, as it's a private school run by Ruskin Mill Trust, the council have a obligation to provide and pay for the transport, taking this away will be detrimental to my family and cause untold pressures and strains on us. My child cannot go on public transport on her own as you propose, its just Bristol council trying to save money from the people and families who need this.

I have a few proposals for you to save money. Get rid of the mayor, don't spend money on new diesel vehicles then bring in a clean air zone, don't spend £40,000 for flowers in the city centre. I could go on but hopefully you catch my drift.

I will be following this closely and if the council decides to go ahead with these cuts then I have done my research into how to take Bristol council to court to stop you doing this.

STATEMENT PS 09

Submitted by Vivien Brown - Bristol Bordeaux Partnership

Title: Twinning Officer Cut

As Chair of BITA Derek Pickup has written to you in connection with the Council plan to reduce the funding for the Council Twinning Officer by 50% and has expressed the feelings of the seven twinning associations very clearly.

As an Executive Committee member of the Bristol Bordeaux Partnership I would like to express concerns which relate particularly to our link with Bordeaux which has now been in existence for 75 years.

To give you an insight into our activities we are at present running several projects which involve primary schools in Bristol.

- 6 Masters students from the University of Bordeaux will be here in May spending 2 weeks working in 6 primary schools in south and east Bristol They were due to be here in January until Président Macron brought in the travel ban in mid-December and, thanks to the good contacts the Twinning Officer has with the primary schools, we have been able to reorganize the scheme to run it in May.
- We are just about to launch a Digital Teaching Pack about Bordeaux which will eventually be available to all Bristol primary schools.
- We have financed the production of a Bordeaux lantern by pupils in a Bedminster primary school for the Bedminster Lantern Parade which will now take place on February 12th.
- In the past we have financed the visit of Bordeaux artists to Upfest and provided art workshops for children during the festival – we hope to be able to do so again this year.
- In September to mark the 75th anniversary of our link with Bordeaux we will be running a Shared Memories Project which will involve pupils from May Park Primary School interviewing people who have taken part in past Bristol and Hannover school exchanges.

None of these projects would have been possible without the intervention, active participation and unflagging determination of the Twinning Officer. He has the contacts with the primary schools, the Lantern Parade, Upfest and the creators and designers of the Digital Teaching Pack. As a private individual I do not have access to the schools and would not be able to keep these projects going without the support of the Council Twinning Officer and if he/she was only working 50% of the time it isn't clear how this would be possible.

The scheme with the students from Bordeaux in primary schools has been working successfully for several years. I can only imagine the disappointment in Bordeaux if we were to have to tell them that the scheme will not be able to continue.

I have tried to provide a glimpse into the sorts of projects set up by the Twinning Officer in support of just one of the 7 twinings. I hope you will agree that a Twinning Officer working only 50% of the time would not be able to achieve the same remarkable amount for the city.

STATEMENT PS 10

Submitted by Nia Evans

Title: Support of Amendments for Public Toilet Provision

I am very pleased to hear that two parties today are proposing amendments which would fund the provision of public toilets in Bristol. As a carer during lockdown, I struggled to find anywhere to go to the loo when waiting for my friend's appointment at the hospital to finish. As an Acorn member, I was eager to join the campaign to do something about this. It is a basic dignity and necessity to have public toilets, and not providing these effectively blocks huge amounts of people from participating in public life. More public toilets means more chances for everyone to get outdoors, to shop at the high street, and enjoy exercise without having to worry about their basic needs being met.

There is no alternative to freely accessible public toilets, where nobody is beholden to anyone else to be able to use them as much as they like. I have been speaking to the public in Bristol about this issue and gathering signatures for our petition over the past few months, and the depth of feeling about this issue is incredible. I urge all councillors to vote in favour of funding public toilets in Bristol.

STATEMENT PS 11

Submitted by Barbara Segal

Title: Amendment Proposal to Revenue Budget 2022/23, Growth and Regeneration

Statement on Amendment Proposal to Revenue Budget 2022/23, Growth and Regeneration, proposed by Councillor Jenny Bartle, Green Group.

As an individual resident and a member of the Acorn toilets campaign I strongly support this part of the amendment. I've been working with Acorn on their campaign to reopen the public toilets closed in 2018/2019 and to review the whole question of toilet provision in the city, which is currently very poor. Others will no doubt be supporting this amendment in respect of the particular importance of toilet provision to groups of residents with specific needs, but what we have found while petitioning on city streets is that the lack of provision affects just about everyone, including those visiting the city from out of town. There are also serious public health issues related to the need for people to relieve themselves when there are no public facilities available. However, my statement addresses, in particular, the claim by the Council to have replaced public provision by a 'Community Toilet Scheme'.

According to this scheme a range of public buildings and businesses have signed up to allow access to their toilets, regardless of the user spending money in the business or having other reasons to visit the venue. A small (A6) booklet lists these premises, but is not widely available and may well now be out of date. Along with other Acorn members I have been checking out those toilets supposedly open to the public, and have visited around 30 of them. So what have I found out?

Of those that I've visited:

- only in three of them were the staff aware that their venue was part of the scheme.
- only two were displaying the poster indicating that they were part of the scheme. In any case this has to be printed out by the business or other provider and those I saw were A4 size and printed in black & white, so not easily noticed amongst the other publicity material displayed.
- A significant proportion of the toilets listed are in public buildings such as museums and libraries. These were available before the closures, so are by no means a replacement.
- Others, such as those in GP surgeries, were in side-streets where it is unlikely that those needing toilets would look.
- Many, such as those in youth or community centres, have extremely restricted opening hours
- There were very few in areas where people are 'out and about', such as suburban shopping streets. Some areas, including Easton where I live, has none listed at all.

In the city centre, I am not aware of a single finger post or sign pointing people to the nearest toilets. It is abundantly clear that this scheme is simply not fit for purpose, and a disgrace that a large city like Bristol, which prides itself on providing for all its communities and on its attraction to visitors, has virtually no easily identifiable public toilet provision. This is something that needs urgent attention. Important representative groups in the City, including Bristol Open People's Forum, Bristol Women's Voice and Bristol Trades Union Council, as well as a number of charities and community groups, are supporting the Acorn campaign.

Acorn believes that toilets should be publicly owned and run, and that there should be no charge for what is a basic human necessity. We nevertheless welcome the amendment from the Green Group, which will ensure that this matter is firmly on the Council's agenda and will go some way towards remedying what is a serious lack of provision in a city of this size.

STATEMENT PS 12

Submitted by Diana Swain -Chandos Neighbourhood Association

Title: Student Exemptions from Council Tax

With respect to today's Budget Report, in particular Paragraph 4.9 on local-government funding, we urge the council to make every effort to reduce the cost to the authority of Bristol's large student population.

Student exemptions from council tax now total about £15 million a year and the commercial student-accommodation blocks rapidly colonising the city centre don't pay business rates. This combined loss of revenue would cover two-thirds or more of the authority's £23 million budget gap.

We understand the reasons for tax and rates exemptions. We also accept that the universities bring broad economic benefits to the city. But the fairness of the council-tax system is fundamentally challenged when landlords can let a house for £50,000 a year but neither they nor their student tenants pay a penny towards local services. The cost is instead met by long-term residents through higher council tax or loss of services to balance the books.

Waiving business rates for student blocks run for profit makes even less sense. They get a free pass because they're classed as "domestic" property. But this is domestic on an industrial scale. The city plans 6,400 extra bed spaces over the ten years to 2027/28.

These exemptions are set by central government, which is why we urge the council to work closely with other authorities, as well as the city's MPs, to secure change in Westminster. For example, Thangham Debbonaire, MP for Bristol West, has opposed the business-rates "tax loophole".

The search for solutions should consider all options. Even a partial rollback, so that student landlords paid a percentage of the normal council tax or business rates, could make a huge difference.

The council might also review the Community Infrastructure Levy, highlighted by the Minister of State for Housing in a recent reply to Ms Debbonaire. Bristol sets a CIL of £148 per square metre on new student accommodation—higher than for residential development but less than retail. Is there scope to increase this charge?

With tens of thousands of students living in Bristol, it's vital the university sector pays its fair share in making the city a decent place to live. Chandos Neighbourhood Association believes the balance is not equitable and urges the council to do everything possible to correct it.

STATEMENT PS 13

Submitted by Jules Laming - Friends of Jubilee Pool (Bristol) Ltd

Title: Support of Agenda Item 7: Amendment proposals to Capital Programme 2022-2023

We welcome the proposal to provide the Friends of Jubilee Pool (Bristol) Ltd with the opportunity to secure Capital investment for future energy efficiency works to Jubilee Pool in Knowle.

To date we have submitted an Expression of Interest to take on Jubilee Pool through a Community Asset Transfer (CAT) process. We understand from the report produced for Cabinet on the 8th February 2022 that the Council is considering moving forward to secure the future of Jubilee Pool through a CAT Process.

It would be incredibly helpful to have the ability to use a Capital Grants fund to supplement any additional funding that we can secure through Grant applications. To date FOJP has secured funding from public fundraising events and from Charitable Grant Funds to enable us to complete Phase 2 of the CAT process. We are confident that future Grant funding can be secured to help with the Capital Costs works that Jubilee Pool requires after years of deliberate neglect, but welcome the security that this would provide

STATEMENT PS 14

Submitted by Jo Sparks

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 15

Submitted by Suzanne Williams

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city.

I need public toilets because everyone needs them. They're necessary not just for people with particular conditions but really for everyone. Too many of our public spaces have become semi privatised like shopping malls. Public toilets help everyone to be able to participate in public life without it having to become a consumer event. We shouldn't have to feel like we have to buy a coffee just to be able to use a loo. The community toilet scheme is not working. Re-open the public loos!

STATEMENT PS 16

Submitted by Rachel Legg

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

I need public toilets because I have a disability and I need to go to the toilet a lot. As there aren't many public toilets and in some areas not at all I am restricted to the amount of time I am out of the house and where I go. Toilets are a necessity not a luxury.

STATEMENT PS 17

Submitted by Judith Sluglett

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

There is nothing worse than a place with no public toilets. Think about it. People with health issues and frequent urination needs will have to stay at home. Revellers out on the lam of an evening will pee in the streets - they already do this. I don't go down to the City Centre in the evenings if I can avoid it as the spectacle is revolting.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly.

If you cannot provide homes for the homeless, at least provide public lavatories for those unfortunate enough to be on the streets.

We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

STATEMENT PS 18

Submitted by Rose Whitehorn

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 19

Submitted by Hedley Bashforth

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. A number of toilets have been closed across the city since 2018.

The people of Bristol rely on public toilets. They are essential for everybody. We need a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. In some cases where people have no choice but to relieve themselves it becomes a public health problem. The Victorians started opening public toilets to avoid the filth and disease that existed in the streets and public places. It is not simply an inconvenience to have no access to public toilets - public toilets are a necessity.

Everybody needs public toilets.

STATEMENT PS 20

Submitted by Christina Stokes

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

I need public toilets because, as is common with older people, I need to go more frequently than I used to. I believe that not having public toilets is not only a public health issue but also an equalities issue.

STATEMENT PS 21

Submitted by Helen Wheeler

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

I need public toilets because bars and cafes are often reluctant to let me use their toilets and I feel embarrassed to ask

STATEMENT PS 22

Submitted by Arvind Howarth

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

I need public toilets because it's a basic human necessity. We shouldn't have to fight for the basics.

STATEMENT PS 23

Submitted by Robert Ive

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

I need public toilets because access to toilets means equal access to the city. By not providing this service you deny people the ability to move around and live within Bristol.

I want to live in a place that respects individuals as equal citizens.

STATEMENT PS 24

Submitted by Andy Havill

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 25

Submitted by James Clemoes

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 26

Submitted by Edite Kasvanda

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 27

Submitted by Mary Montgomery

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 28

Submitted by Jon Hardy

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 29

Submitted by Caroline Hope

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 30

Submitted by Adrian Andrew

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

I need public toilets because I'm diabetic and sometimes get caught short with nowhere to go.

STATEMENT PS 31

Submitted by David Cobb

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 32

Submitted by Carol Billingham

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 33

Submitted by Jessica Winkler

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

In addition, women are more likely to need public toilets to freely access public life because while men can use both cubicles and urinals or even urinate outside, women can only use the former, and women also need safe spaces given their particular health and sanitary needs (for example, women who are menstruating, pregnant or at menopause, so need to use the toilet more often).

Women are also likely to feel less comfortable using mixed sex facilities, are more at risk in mixed spaces and require more space.

Women are more likely to be with babies and small children who need frequent access to toilets and changing facilities.

Therefore it is an issue of equalities that public toilets are available and are provided separately to males and females, in order to enable equal participation in public life.

STATEMENT PS 34

Submitted by Esme Roslin-Sprason

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

People (including myself) have been forced to wee in side streets and bushes when caught short due to lack of toilet access.

The current toilet scheme in place is not fit for purpose as many businesses don't even know they are part of it and it's poorly advertised.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city.

STATEMENT PS 35

Submitted by Fran Blishen – Emmaus Homeless Charity

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget that include funding for public toilet facilities. It is not viable to close public toilets if, as a City, we want to maintain hygiene and respect for all citizens.

Many homeless people have nowhere else to go to the toilet, and to close these toilets means they lose pride and dignity and a safe place to complete bodily functions you get to complete at home. it is shocking and disgraceful that this ever happened. It should not have been a money saving option. Put in a suggested donation box for those who can afford it, but don't take away an essential facility like this.

STATEMENT PS 36

Submitted by Deri Smith

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 37

Submitted by Alexander Croot

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

I need public toilets because I personally suffer from a bladder condition (overactive bladder) which can be a real problem at times and has on occasion limited my ability to be out and about around the city. It's not just about me though - countless parents with young children, elderly folks, and others with conditions similar to mine would benefit immeasurably from the reintroduction of public facilities in the years to come.

STATEMENT PS 38

Submitted by Nia Evans

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

I need public toilets because I could not find anywhere to go during lockdown - our ability to have our basic needs met should not depend on businesses. We should always have the safety and security of having access to public toilets. It's essential for everyone.

STATEMENT PS 39

Submitted by Doug Branch

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 40

Submitted by Michael McNeil

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

I need public toilets because I should not have to rely on private organisations to provide a basic necessity for living.

STATEMENT PS 41

Submitted by Camden Dixie O'Brien

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 42

Submitted by Chris Evans

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 43

Submitted by Nick Weber

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 44

Submitted by Janis Beavon

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

Have British City Council forgotten why municipalities introduced public toilets in the first place? Do we want to return to the state of the streets before there were public toilets?

STATEMENT PS 45

Submitted by Elinor Lower

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 46

Submitted by Teresa Mcilvenna

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 47

Submitted by Bristol Reclaiming Independent Living (BRIL)

Title: Proposed Budget Cuts

We the undersigned call on Bristol City Council to scrap its proposed budget cuts.

Bristol City Council's proposed budget cuts include more than £11 million cuts to adult social care^[3]. The council explain that the cuts are necessary to meet an overall budgetary shortfall of £19.5 million.

In an online announcement on 3rd December the Labour council provides no opposition to the budget cuts. Instead, the cuts are described as ways of 'working more efficiently', 'making best use' of property, 'removing unnecessary duplication, and getting best value from our suppliers'^[4]. The result of these apparently laudable aims is not to cut the salaries of highly paid council leaders. Instead, despite statutory obligations under the Care Act 2014^[5], the impact of the proposed budget is predominantly targeted at adult social care. Such cuts threaten the lives of Disabled people who are already struggling with reduced support services and have been the hardest hit by the pandemic.

A supposed consultation carried out in December was inaccessible to many of the city's residents and did not include details of the budgetary proposals. Local government decision making is subject to the need for adequate consultation as defined by the Gunning principles^[6]. There must be *"sufficient information to give 'intelligent consideration'. The information provided must relate to the consultation and must be available, accessible, and easily interpretable for consultees to provide an informed response"*

The importance of compliance with this, together with the Public Sector Equality Duty^[7] was demonstrated in the High Court ruling that the consultation for the Government's Disability Strategy was unlawful^[8].

Bristol City Council has previously failed to carry out lawful prebudget consultation in relation to its SEND budget^[9]. The court ruled that rather than aiming to comply with statutory duties the council's decision making process was *"driven entirely from the standpoint of ensuring a balanced budget"*^[10]

The Council does not appear to have learned from that ruling. There has been no significant consultation with social care users in Bristol as to the impact of the budget reductions.

Social care services have been under serious pressure for some time, with the council relying on the low pay and over work of many outsourced care providers. The council must understand the impact of further proposed budget cuts.

A member of the Disabled People's Organisation, 'Bristol Reclaiming Independent Living' explained, *'I feel terrified of the social care budget cuts. The immediate impact is to reduce my ability to function and make decisions'*. Other members expressed similarly deep fear and concern.

The council claims to wish to 'continue to deliver high-quality services for everyone'. Yet this proposed budget does the opposite.

Bristol Labour has made a choice as to which services to cut in order to balance their budget. We reject their choice and call for them to respect the choices of disabled people.

We call for this budget to be scrapped immediately.

Provision of social care is a statutory obligation under the Care Act 2014. Social care is already underfunded and individual disabled people are already paying the price. These

services are essential for daily life and should therefore be non-negotiable.

Support for people under Section 117 of the Mental Health Act 1983 is also a statutory obligation which cannot be cut without serious impact on people in crisis.

Instead, we call for publicly accessible and meaningful consultation on alternative solutions to the council's budget crisis.

Signed by

Bristol Reclaiming Independent Living (BRIL)
Bristol Defend the Asylum Seekers Campaign (BDASC)
Care and Support Workers Organise (CasWO)
Disability Murals
Disabled People Against Cuts (DPAC)
National Survivor Users Network (NSUN)
Recovery In The Bin
Shaping Our Lives
Social Workers Union
Andrew Bolton, Disability Murals
Beth Richards
Dr Aurelien Mondon, University of Bath
Dr Harriet Lupton MRCGP, MRCP, former GP
Dr Navin Kikabhai, University of Bristol
Dr Rebecca Yeo, University of Bristol
Prof Bridget Anderson, Professor of Migration, Mobilities and Citizenship, University of Bristol
Fleur Perry, Disabled activist
Frank Spencer, Redweather Productions Ltd
Jan Berry, Family Carer
Jeff Slade
Jo Benefield, BDASC
Jo Booth, journalist
Joanna Stevens
John McGowan, General Secretary, Social Workers Union
Linda Burnip, Disabled People Against Cuts (DPAC)
Louise Ainsworth
Mark Williams, Co-Founder BRIL
Naomi Roach
Jack Coley
Robina Mallett (Family Carer and ex-member of the Standing Commission on Carers)
Val Stansfield, BRIL
Waltraud Pospischil, BRL
Beverly Green

STATEMENT PS 48

Submitted by David Redgewell - South West Transport Network and Railfuture Severnside

Title: Budget and Transport

public transport users and voters are concerned about the Bristol city council and the city mayor Banes and South Gloucestershire council passporting the support bus subsidies to the west of England mayoral combined Transport Authority for the supported service bus Network which provides bus services to some of the poorest communities in Greater Bristol in South, East and west Bristol.

At present the metro mayor Dan Norris has no precepting powers to main bus services and public transport infrastructure like the mayor of the west Midlands Andy Street and Andy Burnham mayor of Greater Manchester.

The support bus and coach Network is important alongside covid 19 bus operators recovery grant from the Department for transport grant to maintain the important Great Bristol and Bath city region and North Somerset council bus Network.

which is under threat from the Department for transport buses minister Baroness Vere of Norberton. we need to retain covid 19 bus operators recovery grant past April 2022 we have been given a supplement of £ 29 million of covid 19 uplift in England only until the 5 th April 2022 .

As bus service in the west of England mayoral combined Transport Authority and North Somerset council. area no buses are commical and carrying 60 % on pre covid 19 levels.

we have bus service cut from 30th January 2022 on services 4 Bristol city centre sea mills Shirehampton, Lawrence Weston and Henbury no longer services Cribbs Causeway bus station and food shops services 23 24. Ashton vale to Bristol city centre has no Evening and Sunday service. Services 3 3 a Bristol bus and coach Ashton Gate, Bower Ashton, Pill and Portishead. services 17 Keynsham Kingswood Southmead hospital bus station. the services is withdrawn in the Longwell Green and Speedwell and Soundwell.

services 71 is no longer serving Gloucester road North Filton Ave now operating Along Gloucester road from Uwe Bus station to Parson Street. but not Uwe at Bower Ashton. Bristol city centre Gloucester road Bristol Parkway station and Cribbs Causeway bus station is diverted in Bradley Stoke area whilst there is a link between Bristol city centre Lawrence Hill St George Hanham Longwell Green Bitton Cherry Garden service 45 change for Bath service 19 via Bitton, Kelston, Weston, Bath Spa bus station whilst we welcome the connections the the Public transport interchange at Cherry Gardens has no lighting CCTV cameras or proper passengers facilities. this is the same at Henbury Crow Lane Portishead town centre with need for the Town services to meet the x4 x5 to Bristol via Pill or Avonmouth x5 to Clevedon and Weston Super Mare and Bristol city centre via Avonmouth and the Portway and to provide the Bus interchange at Avonmouth with bus shelters and bus stops for connections to services 3 to Cribbs Causeway bus station. first group and services 10 Avonmouth, Westbury Southmead hospital bus station, Uwe bus station and Bristol Parkway and Thornbury.

We welcome the funding by the mayor of the 178 from Midsomer Norton, Paulton Timbury, Marksbury, Keynsham Bristlington, Arncliffe, Bristol Temple Meads and Bristol bus and coach station. Main of these bus services are extended on contact to 24 th April 2022 .

We must restore bus service 18 from uwe Bus station to Downend staple hill Hillfields ,kingswood ,warmley North common oidland willsbridge and keynsham Railway station and town centre Salford and Bath spa bus station.

we also need proper budgets for bus stops,bus shelters and interchanges coach stops which are part of the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority Network. in all other mayoral combined transport Authorities all the infrastructure and staff work for the combined transport Authority. As is the case in all the other mayoral combined transport Authorities in England.

we also clear budgets for graffiti removals from Public transport interchanges and bus stop and more enforcement by the police and Crime commissioner and the Avon and Somerset police and the British transport police. Alex Reake Public transport safety partnership is work well with the public transport operators, Taxis, Ferries British transport police Avon and Somerset police and police and crime commissioner office the west of England mayoral combined Transport Authority North Somerset council Banes council and South Gloucestershire council. but Public transport interchanges and bus stops are very important and well must remove Graffiti repair shelters lighting realtime information systems. so we must have clear maintenance budgets and prosecution by the city council west of England mayoral combined Authority and the Avon and Somerset police.

The community even with budget savings to keep the city clean as per the Bristol mayor marvin Rees campaign for cleaner street and for Bristol waste limited to remove Graffiti from across the city again another successful city mayor policy which must be funded. we must remove graffiti from buildings and Bus infrastructure in Bristol city centre area and across the bus Network in the city region. we need to repair broken bus shelters and stops - a large number of bus shelters need repair and Passengers information timetable upgraded

As these are City region transport corridor and we need public bus shelter upgrade and repairs this is a west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council bus service improvements plan responsible .

During covid 19 we successfully fund Public toilets in city centre and the harbour. we must have a public toilets policy and community toilets funding within the budget - Bus drivers staff and passengers need access to good quality public toilets.

Of course maintaining public service is very difficult at present with covid 19 . Especially around housing and social care parks and Gardens,spots and leasure centres.

we need to invest in Tourism Bristol and Bath Tourist west as it worth 4 Billion pounds in the Bus economy and we need a tourist information centre in Bristol and Bath one option is to use empty shops in Bristol and Bath spa bus station.

But without access to public transport many people in Bristol city Region can not access Employment Education and shopping facilities Heath care and leasure and Tourism.

on capital budget it import we fund the works to Bristol harbour flood defences.

Bristol city region can not function without investment in high quality public transport.

The Disappoint of the lack of leveling up money for Bristol Temple meads station and Temple quay with the Electrification of the London Paddington to through Bath spa Bristol Temple meads Bristol Parkway and patchway is disappointing. and that would improve metro west railway Services from Bristol Temple meads to Keynsham oidfiled park Bath spa Freshford,Avoncliff ,Bradford on Avon Trowbridge ,Westbury warminster and Frome.

The west of England mayoral Transport Authority and North Somerset council bus service improvements plan and city Region plan . The A37 Bus corridor From street Glastonbury,wells bus and coach station chewton mendip Farrington Gurney Clutton Pensford,Whitchurch, Hengrove knowle ,Bristol Temple meads and Bristol bus and coach station. A4018 Bristol city centre park street Clifton Down station ,Westbury, Henleaze Southmead, Brenty ,Henbury and cribbs causeway bus station. we need bus priority to cribbs causeway bus station.

we want to see progress on The Bristol to Thornbury metro bus corridor Bristol city centre to yate and chipping sodbury metro bus corridor. A367 Bath spa bus and coach station Peasdown st john,Radstock ,Westfield midsomer Norton paulton shepton mallet wells bus station. A369 Bristol city centre to pill and Portishead. A370 Bristol city centre to Weston super mare. A38 Bristol bus and coach station and Bond street to Bristol Airport, churchill Brent knoll, Bridgwater Taunton Wellington, cullompton ,Exeter ,Newton Abbott and Plymouth. as far as the Somerset border.

Metro west railway services Funding - we need to progress the funding of railway services with the Department for transport and west of England mayoral combined transport Authority

Bristol city council need to provide money through the Transport level .metro west railway Network.

Portway parkway is now under construction after money from Bristol city council Department for transport and west of England mayoral combined transport Authority. First new station in Bristol after 95 years in the city. operators first group Great western railway. Bristol Temple meads to Portishead via pill . we must make progress on this project with the secretary of state for transport Grant shapps and Network rail western.

New station at Ashton Gate.

Bristol Temple meads Lawrence hill Stapleton road,Ashley Down ,Filton Abbey wood ,Filton North ,Henbury for cribbs causeway.

Bristol Temple meads to Gloucester central with station at Lawrence hill, Stapleton road ,Ashley Down, Filton Abbey wood ,Bristol parkway yate charfield cam and Dursey , stonehouse Bristol road and Gloucester central.

Bristol Temple meads to Avonmouth Dock and Severn Beach via Lawrence hill, Stapleton road ,Montpellier ,Redland Clifton Down station ,sea mills shirehampton, Avonmouth Dock st Andrew road and Severn Beach .

Bristol Temple meads to keynsham oidfiled park, Bath spa Freshford ,Avoncliff, Bradford on Avon Trowbridge Westbury and warminster.

Bristol Temple meads station to Bedminster parson street Nailsea and Backwell yatton for clevedon ,worle parkway Weston million , Weston super mare. Highbridge and Burnham on sea Bridgwater and Taunton.

metro west is a very important public transport project for the Bristol and Bath city region. with accessible station at Bedminster parson street Nailsea and Backwell Weston super mare ,Freshford, Lawrence hill ,Stapleton road, Avonmouth,pilning. on Mass transit system the key corridor is Bristol city centre bus station Bristol Temple meads Arnos vale, Bristlington keynsham, Salford, Newbridge, Weston and Bath spa bus station.

and one option is to use the North Somerset railway line as a cycling route walking and mass transit bus route to callington Road then the ring road to Bath Road to Hick Gate along the keynsham

bypass with interchanges for Keynsham town centre, saltford Newbridge, Weston Bath spa bus and coach station.

we need mass transit line in Bristol. to the South, East kingwood and North of the city region. Brislington and Odd Down park and ride site need to be Developed into bus and coach interchanges On Brislington to Bristol Temple meads and Bristol city centre park and ride services with service 178 349 x39 39 services calling instead it very important to support the city region Public and sustainable transport fund through the west of England mayoral combined Authority.

we also need the 106 planning agreements from YTI arena and housing Development to be released by the mayor for the west of England mayoral combined Authority jointly with Bristol city council to make progress on bus service provision to Bristol city centre. and to make progress on Bristol Temple meads to Ashley Down Filton Abbey wood Filton North Arena station and Henbury for cribbs causeway bus station.

we still wish to see the mayor of the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council set up a bus Advisory Board with passengers and and Passengers forum. like Somerset county council and Wiltshire council.

we note the new time line for the bus services improvements plan and enhanced quality partnership from.the Department for transport.

David Redgewell South west transport Network and Railfuture Severnside.

STATEMENT PS 49

Submitted by Louise Delmege

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 50

Submitted by Cate Jackson

Title: Support of amendments for public toilet provision

I'm a Bristol resident and a member of ACORN the Union. I'm writing in support of the amendments to the Budget from multiple parties that include funding for public toilet facilities. My union has been calling for a number of toilets across the city to be reopened after their closure in 2018.

ACORN members and the people of Bristol rely on our public toilets for our basic dignity at work, in our leisure time or travelling around our city. They are essential for those of us with disabilities, those with bowel and bladder conditions, those of us without a home, and the elderly. We deserve a city that we can live and work in, without fear of the indignity of being caught short. It is not simply an inconvenience for us - public toilets are a necessity.

I need public toilets because it's a basic human right. I live in fear that when I'm out in Bristol I won't be able to access a toilet - as a result I don't drink enough liquid, the health effects of this can be horrendous. With Bristol's toilet 'situation' as it is my only alternative is to stay home - not exactly good for Bristol's economy if people aren't spending in it's shops!

STATEMENT PS 51

Submitted by GMB Wales and South West Region

Title: Budget Statement

GMB are opposed to any aspect of the Budget that:

1. Causes significant job losses or withdrawal of services
2. Increases the workload on front line staff by reducing staffing levels whilst having to maintain the same level of service/workload.
3. Leads to services being outsourced.
4. Use of Consultants
5. Unequitable Succession Planning
6. Reduction by common activities work, succession planning, which are not properly researched.
7. Privatisation of Social Services

1. Causes significant job losses or withdrawal of services.

GMB believe that it is a 'predictable' way to meet budget cuts by shedding staff. GMB was involved in the Voluntary Redundancy policy. Unfortunately, we believe this process was abused by the fact that whilst existing staff were being offered VR, the Council were advertising similar (if not the same job role) jobs but with different titles. We cannot condone such practise and call upon Full Council to ensure that this practise is not repeated.

2. Increases the workload on front line staff by reducing staffing levels whilst having to maintain the same level of service/workload.

It is unacceptable to reduce frontline staffing levels, only to expect them to continue to meet the same targets/service provision when staffing levels have been radically reduced. GMB believe that the people who undertake the role should be asked where efficiencies can be made at the start of the process, before any decision has been made. Consider new ways of working; value for money in procurement; rationalising management streams. We therefore call upon Council to reconsider any cuts to staffing levels until they are satisfied that staff have been meaningfully involved at the start of the process

3. Leads to services being outsourced.

GMB would call upon Full Council members to reflect on the impact of outsourcing services which can lead to greater cost or diminished service that the Council has no control over. The City Council should look at bringing Home Care back under its responsibility, enabling all the issues currently being considered by the Ethical Care group would be successfully implemented. GMB believe that an in-house service would result in staff being treated fairly and the service users' needs better met. There is a duplication of management structure between the City Council and Bristol Waste Company, therefore, greater savings could be made by bringing BWP in-house.

4. Use of Consultants

We asked Council members to consider the overall consultancy costs that they have paid over the last few years, as this would probably equate to the current deficit. Why is the Council having to bring external consultants, as well as having a Senior Management Team? If there is lack of skill

set/competency then surely this should be dealt with through the Council's existing policy and procedures – not through bringing external consultants in. How can the Council justify spending taxpayers' money on external consultants?

5. Unequitable Succession Planning

In the Budget report it states the council will be offering VR for those workers above BG13. GMB is keen to see how this fits in with the City and council strategy for the next five years or is it yet another excuse for those on high salaries to get a nice package and then come back as consultants? What about the low paid workers of the council who deliver front line services and continue to do so throughout the pandemic why can't they have options? Good to see that Bristol still prides itself as an 'employer of choice'!

The GMB consider this is just another opportunity for staff on BG13 to have the option to access voluntary redundancy. Why can't the Council be open and transparent? Why is the Council not offering this to all staff which would be a fairer and equitable process?

This policy is VR in another disguise and decisions are being made with management input to a trio from the SLT. However, is it succession planning or has it morphed into? Are people being moved up the ladder as was originally suggested or are gaps being left in the service?

6. Reduction by common activities work which are not researched properly

GMB would draw members' attention to the previous rationalisation of ABS (Admin and Business Support Services), where decisions were made on what was required from ABS. many staff found themselves without any ABS support that they needed which resulted in additional workload. Equally, a number of ABS staff were put into positions which resulted in them leaving the Council and having to be replaced, resulting in the loss of experienced staff.

7. Privatization of Services

The proposed decision to outsource rehabilitation services across Bristol (the two remaining South and East Bristol Rehab Centres); the proposal to outsource Bristol Community Links; potential outsourcing of Concord Lodge; potential outsourcing of Shared Lives and potential outsourcing of Pest Control Services.

The impact upon the outsourcing/privatisation of these services will have a significant affect upon the most vulnerable across the city. Service cuts affect the lower paid disproportionately to the better off. Bristol citizens on lower pay place a triple whammy – 2.99% rise in Council tax, 4% rent rise and possibly a 20 – 30% rise in their service charges, coupled with the national increase in energy charges, increase in NI contributions and cost of living escalating.

South Bristol Rehabilitation Centre

As this is part of the 2022/23 budget cuts - the amount of saving is very little after cost of redundancies and keeping the building open - (report states possible saving of £500k re building revenue and potential £50k re staffing costs after redundancy etc for those staff out of TUPE scope) why not trawl for VR across the whole Rehab workforce. These cost savings may well not be realised if the building is used by other groups it will need to be adapted as currently my understanding is it is specially configured for rehabilitation not for general use – unless you are planning to offer it up for

student accommodation as was one home in Withywood and a school in Sea Mills which were left by the council for years and incurred security costs to the people of Bristol.

The GMB would also like Cabinet to consider the fact that SIRONA are finding difficulty in opening the remaining 15 beds due to lack of staff – what is the reason for this difficulty in recruitment? Why is Bristol City Council so keen to off-load these experienced, qualified and dedicated staff to an employer who cannot recruit in an area with relatively high unemployment and lack of employment?

Point of clarity – in the report it states there will not be any loss of capacity if the South Bristol Rehab Centre is closed – there will actually be a loss of two beds as there are currently 17 beds available. To say the demand has diminished is unfair and frugal with the truth – we are in the midst of a pandemic therefore it is inevitable that demand has diminished as hospital operations have diminished due to COVID. However, once staffing shortages in the NHS have been addressed and they start to get back on track then the need for rehab intervention will increase significantly. I understand the Mayor has stated that Bristol needs people to remain independent for longer in order to reduce the cost of social care for the future. Many people will echo that wish to remain independent for as long as they can but sometimes they need that six week period after an operation to get them back on their feet (literally).

Many of these council staff have worked for 30+ years and yet they now feel the council does not want them or care about what happens to them – no-one has asked them what they want or how they think the service could be provided. Clearly this process has not just happened but has been ongoing over a significant period of time – without any dialogue with staff or the trade union side. Even now staff have continued to work throughout the pandemic when most of us -including you have been attending teams/zooms meetings rather than put ourselves and our families at risk – they did not have that option!

We call upon Elected Members to fully consider all of the budget implications before making your decision.

STATEMENT PS 52

Submitted by Catherine Farrington, Westbury On Trym Primary Care Centre

Title: Westbury On Trym Village Car Park

It has come to our attention that you are considering introducing parking fees for those who use the car park in Westbury-on-Trym village. Our surgery is situated at the back of the car park. I hope it is therefore understandable that as many of our patients use the surgery car park we have discussed this as a Surgery and with our Patient Board. As part of your discussions we would like to kindly request that you consider the below as part of your proposals:

- Please could we ask that you protect disabled car parking spaces within the Car Park. Our Partners and Patient Board would like to see the number of disabled spaces increased, if at all possible, to help those who require the spaces to access our services.
- As a surgery we are keen to be as environmentally friendly as we possibly can be. Our Partners have added that they would like to see an increase in bike racks to the car park. A large number of our service users live locally and would happily cycle to the surgery rather than drive (and avoid encountering a fee) but would like to see more secure bike storage available in order to facilitate this.

We do appreciate how difficult decisions relating to fees must be for services such as yours but if you could consider the above we would appreciate it; it really would help us to support our patients to access our NHS services.

STATEMENT PS 53

Submitted by Edith Cowan-Hughes

Title: Support for amendments for public toilet provision

This statement has been provided to the Mayor, Lord Mayor and Councillors

STATEMENT PS 54

Submitted by Councillor Tessa Fitzjohn

Title : Projected cuts to Bristol's Museum and Archives sector

In times of financial hardship Local Authorities invariably cut funding to the culture budget first.

I've never understood this logic and I'm in no doubt the projected cuts to Bristol's Museum and Archives sector is just as illogical.

As I mentioned in my statement at Cabinet on the 14 December commenting on agenda item no 20, the UK Museum sector is an important asset in the success of the UK's arts and creative industries, who contribute £2.8 billion a year to the Treasury via taxation and generate a further £23 billion a year and 363,700 jobs so their value financially and educationally is an important resource.

Similarly, Museums are part of the cultural offer of Bristol City, they are an amazing and wonderful educational resource for families, schools and visitors alike. It is only 1% of the Bristol City Budget, and generates half of its own income through canny tickets sales and fundraising. The proposed cut of £436,000 over three years will remove up to 12 jobs in the programming and curatorial team. The last budget cuts in 2018 lost three posts from the same team.

Bristol Museums stand to lose these highly trained professionals with years of experience who provide the context and the interpretation for the works they show, they create 'meaning' by the choice of works, and then by placing them in such a way it enhances the 'meaning/story' increasing public awareness and understanding. For instance the History Commission, the statue of Colston will be shown in the Museum. Who will undertake to do that work in a way that contributes to the story, a story that has many opposing and challenging issues and without which is meaningless. Putting a team together takes time, effort and money and losing up to 12 experienced curators will be hard to replace, and will have a noticeable impact on the quality of 'exhibitions' and standard of 'telling their stories'.

I'm aware that the Head of Culture has an ongoing options appraisal, so this cut is pending not decided. So I ask you to consider what is the long term rationale for these cuts; the long term vision when Bristol Council is talking about putting in an application in 2025 for the next City of Culture, or (as advertised by the City Culture Board) placing culture as a key ingredient of our offer to visitors to Bristol?

I ask you to reconsider this decision.

Statement PS 55

Submitted by UNISON

Title: Budget Proposals being submitted to Full Council

We welcome the ability to engage on the next round of cuts to our services and the workforce at Bristol City Council. We understand the difficulties faced by BCC with funding streams from Central Government and the budget pressure occurring due the demise of Bristol Energy.

We also recognise that the majority of the proposals are only at the information stage and more detail will be offered for a consultation process. However, we are unsure how this consultation will occur, please see below the piece on Trade Union Facility time.

We would like to raise some issues on some of the proposals and would welcome your consideration and input.

Review of the Rehabilitation Service Budget Proposal [ASC6]

The proposal is as follows

“Health and social care leaders have specified the need for Sirona to fully open beds on the rehabilitation ward as soon as possible to help manage overall system pressures. There is already contract provision and funding in place to operate these beds, but currently insufficient available workforce is limiting the number that are available for use. The closure of South Bristol centre and transfer of workforce would enable them to fully open all beds (which is not currently possible), thus ensuring no overall reduction in rehab beds in the city ”

Whilst we understand the limitations of the existing building and that it has been allowed to fall into disrepair. We do not agree with the treatment of the staff in this setting.

The proposals will transfer care staff under TUPE regulations and attempt to redeploy support staff, like cleaners and admin.

We do not understand or agree with transferring the staff to Sirona. Even though the consultation started in November, staff only met with Sirona for the first time on 12/1/22. Sirona could not be clear about future services, or terms and conditions. The consultation process can only be described as shambolic. We are still seeking basics like the pension comparators. Though to be fair, BCC HR have said that they can provide this.

We have asked why the staff cannot retain their employment with BCC and continue to serve the public within Sirona’s setting. This would still free up the existing building for sale or refurbishment. We are yet to receive an answer and we do not feel that this proposal from staff is being taken seriously.

We are unsure how financially secure Sirona are and we all know about the existing problems facing outsourced social care. With some facing financial difficulties and all having staffing problems due to poor pay and terms and conditions.

There is not a need to transfer these staff out of BCC and we are asking you to instruct BCC officers to take this seriously and investigate this possibility.

Members have made the significant point that they worked hands on throughout the pandemic, and now they are being treated like this. They are upset and angry and deserve a lot better.

Furthermore, support staff will not be transferred, but put into the ever decreasing redeployment pool. We all know that their chances of successful redeployment are very small. We have asked for them to be offered voluntary severance in the first instance. Better still, they should go with the rest of their staff team, to the new setting as BCC employees.

Please see Appendix 1 for statements from staff/

- Review Bristol Community Links service delivery Budget Proposal ASC7

The proposal is as follows

“ To conduct a review of day opportunities currently provided within Bristol Community Links by developing options to deliver cost efficiencies. This is subject to consultation.”

Whilst we recognise that this is start of the consultation process, we need to put a marker down now.

We are opposed to the transfer of staff out of BCC, especially in social care. The reasons are the same as South Bristol Rehab, that social care is in crisis at the moment and this transfer is very unlikely to improve services to some of the most vulnerable within our community.

The report goes further by stating that “ Staffing model is considered outdated and expensive”. It is unclear who considers this. But if a proper TUPE is followed, then terms and conditions and pay will continue.

The report also recognises that “ Local research has highlighted how long term underinvestment and lack of equity in funding and procurement has eroded the local Voluntary and community sector”. This coincides with our collective concerns about outsourcing and why social care is in such a crisis within our city.

Lastly, it has been suggested that consultation will only take a month. This will not be adequate for proper consultation and due diligence on a TUPE transfer. Leaving the Council open to legal challenge. If BCC really need to do this, then do it properly.

Concord Lodge Budget Proposal ASC12

The proposal is as follows “ Concorde Lodge is a 7-bedroom, short-term (6-12 month) assessment residential unit (no permanent living) providing support and accommodation to people with learning difficulties and complex needs who’s behaviour challenges services.

- The proposal would be to close Concord Lodge and transfer the service to an external strategic partner. Indicative savings may be produced by staff reduction / efficiency savings – TUPE would apply. Approx. 33 staff”

Once again, whilst we recognise that this is the start of the consultative process. However, we are opposed to outsourcing staff, especially to save money. This is an essential service for many vulnerable citizens and their families. The staff have worked hands on throughout the pandemic and deserve better. If savings are being proposed then this is likely to be at the expense of these staff members. UNISON will vigorously oppose this and urge you to reconsider.

Management of change – Culture & Creative Industries.

Unfortunately, we are in the process of forwarding a collective dispute. This is because the Equalities Impact Assessment was out of date and wrong when it went to Cabinet. Senior officers confirmed this during a meeting on Monday 7th and apologised. However, Cabinet took the decision on this erroneous paperwork and voted it through. Therefore, passing this decision to Full Council. The EQIA is extremely important with this cut, as it will impact users of the museums and archives. The museum is one of the last free activities that working families on low budgets can access.

The UNISON members working within museums would like to make the following points on this proposal.

our overriding concerns are that the full impact of what is being proposed have been ‘hidden’ from public scrutiny:

- A presentation was made at our weekly staff meeting at which staff were told that one of the proposals to make savings involved a review of the Museums & Archives service with a view to reducing costs by £400K pa.
- The Cabinet papers published on the BCC website reference the review and savings of £83K but do not reference the anticipated level of reduction to be achieved by it and therefore the consequent level of impact on service delivery or significant job losses this will entail. The anticipated level of reduction we are told is 5x more than expressed publicly.
- When the discrepancy was queried it was confirmed that Council anticipated making savings of up to £430K from the Museum & Archive service . This does not tally with what staff were told at the briefing, nor what has been published in Cabinet papers.

- There is no public transparency about either what is being proposed, or the level of cuts that will be made. What is being expressed publicly is an £83,000 saving in the 2023/2024 financial year and not £400-430K . This does not allow anyone outside the Council to know or understand the true impact of what is being proposed or to ask questions informed by the facts.
- It is not clear why these anticipated savings have not been detailed, the impact of which has not been made available for public scrutiny in advance of a public meeting when there must also be a rationale/scoping document that supports this somewhere that has clearly has also not been made publicly available.
- This level of reduction, we are told, will necessitate job losses - we estimate at the very least 8 – 10 people being made redundant but the real number will likely to be considerably more and possibly double. Our staffing levels will literally be decimated, as will the service we provide.
- These job losses will not be at SLT level since we are told that SLT restructure and recruitment will be expedited to deliver the proposed review – this is completely at odds with the “deleting budgeted vacancies, to ensure we retain capacity in priority areas and reduce the impact on employees.” One SLT post is currently ½ vacant with the temporarily appointed postholder seconded to another role with no backfill in place, whilst another is a permanent post being covered by secondment from within – the EqIA is misrepresentative of this. The overall budgeted expenditure on 3 SLT posts related to Museums & Archives is in the region of £160K alone – not appointing to one of these posts would save at least £50k per annum.
- The proposed SLT restructure was framed in advance of the now proposed service-wide review - as yet it has not been delivered and to do so in advance now, would be like putting the cart before the horse since SLT needs to be relevant to whatever is left of the service after the review. It is impossible to believe that it is appropriate to separate the two activities and doubts were expressed that what was proposed was appropriate especially as it was not made clear which museum teams would report to which SLT post and an imbalance of responsibilities.
- The EqIA supplied largely refers to the SLT restructure and not the Museum & Archive review, consequently it shows that only 1 x FTE is directly impacted when this will not be true of a service-wide review.

Questions that arise from the proposed budget cuts and papers sent to Cabinet for Tuesday, 18th January, 2022 4.00 pm

Item 9 - 2022/23 Budget Report and Treasury Management Strategy (Including Public Health)

1. There is inconsistency in the messaging about proposed budget cuts and the impact on CCI. Staff have been told by senior managers that the Museum & Archive team faces ‘a budget saving of up to 10% on salary costs by 2023/24 depending on the findings of review work’. (Email to all CCI staff from Jon Finch, Mon 10/01/2022). This figure seems to vary from £400,000 to £430,000 depending on which manager is reporting to the staff team. Only £83,000 is clearly specified in the Public Report Pack Agenda - Section 1: Proposals that may be subject to consultation (p11).

How and when will the full extent of the proposed savings be made public , especially since these will clearly have a major impact on a public-facing service, and why was this detail not supplied from the outset?

2. We estimate that the Museum & Archive team makes up around 1% of the total BCC workforce yet it would appear that the anticipated staff cost savings of up to £430k associated with the Museum & Archive review represents a disproportionately large percentage of the £5.5m savings to be made over the whole of the projected BCC workforce savings. This is almost 8% of what is proposed to be being saved.

Why is the Museum & Archives team which is a workforce group comprising of about 1% of all BCC staff being targeted for savings in such a disproportionate way?

3. BCC has stated that it will be taking steps to reduce the impact on employees when it comes to workforce change. For example, through vacancy management with the common activities programme, by deleting budgeted vacancies and also reducing the number of managers through succession planning. The proposed SLT restructure is completely at odds with this strategy.

How can a recruiting to an as yet undelivered (uncosted) restructured version of SLT be justified in advance of a further workforce review of the Museum & Archives teams and why are senior management posts not being bought into the scope of the same review? How can a restructured SLT be delivered in advance of the wider review be guaranteed as fit for purpose if the results of the wider review are as yet unknown?

Questions about the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) Management of change document for Cabinet Tuesday, 18th January, 2022 4.00 pm

1. The Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) Management of change – Culture & Creative Industries (Appendix E, p344) only focuses on proposed changes to SLT and does not discuss the huge changes/impact that the proposed budget reduction of up to 10% (£430k) by 2023/24 will have on the current staffing structure. Though wider workforce changes are addressed in the Workforce implications of budget proposals for 2022/23 (p 177), no specifics are given. Why is this ?

2. The rationale for change within the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) Management of change – Culture & Creative Industries (Appendix E, p344) states as its reasoning, that:

‘The quality of life survey shows a continued reduction to engagement and satisfaction with CCI services from Bristol citizens – particularly from our priority groups. Only 33% of Bristol residents participate in cultural activities at least once a month, down from 43% in the previous year (QoL 2020).’

There is however, no reference to the fact that between 2020 and 2021 museum and archive services were not allowed to open or were operating on reduced capacity due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Why has such an important mitigating factor been left out and do the figures represented here refer directly to all types of cultural activity or just those provided for by the BCC museums and archives team?

The following statements within the Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) Management of change – Culture & Creative Industries also require clarification/further information:

1. 'The current service does not sufficiently reflect the needs of Bristol citizens and the culture sector, further emphasised by the Black Lives Matter protests and toppling of Colston statue in 2020'.

Please could we have further clarification as to how the current service does not sufficiently reflect the needs of Bristol citizens and the culture sector. Staff from CCI have a proven track record of reflecting the needs of Bristol citizens and delivered an important display/public consultation on the Colston statue.

2. Recent events have highlighted the need for the service to be more resilient and flexible i.e. have the capacity to recover from difficulties and respond to changing demands on the service. Please could we have examples of these recent events? Staff have responded to the difficulties surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic in a resilient and flexible way, changing ways of working and ensuring the needs of audiences are met – we have robust data sets that demonstrate this.

3. Rapid growth of service in recent years through new services being added to CCI has put pressure on staff and management in terms of time and ability to support staff to deliver service objectives. If rapid growth of the CCI service is putting pressure on staff and management, then why is it that only museum and archive staff are being reviewed and restructured?

4. Under 'Obstacles to improving CCI service provision', the document states that 'The service has been working towards the 'future service' state for a number of years.' We would like clarification on what this means as this has not been communicated to staff. The museum and archive service has modelled and adopted new ways of working and delivery mechanisms that are emulated by many others.

5. Under 'Likely interventions & timescales', the document states that 'It is recommended that CCI deliver a transformation programme over 18-24 months with a focus on: workforce (July – March 2022)'. These dates do not match the dates given to staff. Please clarify.

– Modernise Trade Union Facility Time Arrangements

Once again, as with museums, we are forwarding a collective dispute with our sister trade unions. We cannot let this attack on our abilities to represent our members pass without dispute. The proposal states that this is not a cut, but a realignment of funds. However, officers cannot explain why the proposal is within the Budget cuts paperwork. Furthermore, the proposal is very vague on how the consultation will transpire, and what will happen in the interim.

The proposal is as follows " The Council currently has a budget to fund trade union time spent on council-wide matters (such as negotiations on terms and conditions of employment, consultation on HR policies and major change across the organisation). When an employee is elected to a corporate trade union role, the budget is used to reimburse the service where they work for the time they spend on corporate trade union duties. The budget and internal agreement around corporate trade union duties have not been reviewed in many years. This proposal removes £145k of the budget for corporate trade union duties, leaving £50k to cover the cost of employees who are elected to regional and national trade union roles, which the Council is required to do by the National Agreement on Pay and Conditions of Service for local government – known as "the Green Book".

This will significantly curtail our ability to represent members and consult efficiently. Even the day to day running of the Branch will be compromised.

This is a serious attack on democratic standards within BCC as members will lose their voice and ability to engage. Within the budget proposals consultation with the trade unions is mentioned numerous times. If this cut goes ahead, then this will be unachievable.

The corporate time is also used for organising and running the Branch Committee. Allocating case work and supporting stewards. Health and safety inspections and supporting risk assessments. Representing members, collectively and individually. This work could cease and leave the Council open to legal challenge.

Throughout the pandemic our workload has grown, but we have continued to support members throughout. This is a real kick in the teeth for Council employees and their employment law rights. To be frank, it is unbelievable that a Labour led administration is even considering this cut to our facility time.

CF10 - Reduce contractual value of the council's commissioned youth services

The budget summary implied that this was a straight £200k cut to our city's targeted youth services with a further £200k cut the following year, a 19% reduction over 2 years. These cuts in and of themselves will hit disadvantaged young people the hardest and put jobs at risk in the community sector. What is further noted in the EQIA is that a further £400k is reserved for the new Bristol Youth Zone. This means the actual value of the contract dropping by nearly 38% and it is impossible to see how that won't result in redundancies for our members in the organisations that provide the city's youth services.

We have since been told by Cllr. Asher Craig that they are in fact not just reducing the value of the contract but are also "seeking to grant fund and not commission the youth sector service eliminating the negative impact of competitive tendering."

The introduction of a grant-based funding model to replace tendered services is of great concern to us. Implemented incorrectly it can easily result in a market of fixed term contracts for workers as organisations have access only to project-based funding. Removing job security for hundreds of workers in the city is obviously something we are strongly opposed to. Those who serve our communities and help young people through some of the most difficult of situations should not be rewarded with uncertainty for their own futures.

Any system must ensure that TUPE rights are afforded to workers if and when project funding comes to an end. As a bare minimum the council must guarantee provision within any grant agreements for transfer of responsibility and the associated TUPE protections. We expect the council to closely monitor the kinds of contracts that are being offered should this change be made and if there is a marked increase in fixed-term working in relevant organisations then the funding model must be reviewed.

Whilst we continue to believe that the best services are delivered through public bodies where workers have good terms and conditions, we will fight for the right of protection of terms those who have already been outsourced or who are hired on public money. There is a duty on the city to ensure that its money is not being used to further precaritise the job market.

Furthermore, we strongly believe that this is a political decision. Made by a labour run authority, to outsource our services and BCC staff to “ strategic partners”.

We sincerely hope that you will reconsider this and allow future trade union representation in Bristol City Council and not make budget cuts at the expense of BCC employees.

Steve Mills Area Organiser on behalf and with the of Bristol UNISON.

Appendix 1; Staff statements relating to Review of the Rehabilitation Service Budget Proposal [ASC6].

“ I have worked as health&social care assistant at Bristol City Council for 19 half years,I have dedicated my role into helping others throughout this time. I have also been redeployed twice due to other council buildings being shut. Since being told about our closure on 16th nov 2021, I feel very let down especially with the lack of communication from management at BCC. Our 1st meeting on 29th nov consisted of mixed messages about the tupe job, we were told we would be going over to sirona health care with no other choices , we are still waiting to this day to have questions answered regarding job roles at the sirona hospital ward. What I do know is as a employee of BCC who alway offers person centred care, choices, & equality none of this has been offered to myself or my colleagues, we have been told we WILL move over to sirona- where is my choice? My decision? I am more than capable of making my own decision to what job role I do in my career. Unfortunately I have never chose to work in a clinical position so going over to a hospital is not for me, I would be expected to carry out clinical jobs such as observations, taking bloods, more clinical care, I dont choose to do that as a job so why should I be forced into it by anyone? My choices are being taking away from me.

Throughout the pandemic our team worked 24 hrs a day providing care to service users, including service users with covid, this put ourselves at risk and our familes at risk, but we still went in every day and gave 100%, we still continue to do this now, but we never received any thanks from anyone, we were just expected to carry on which we all did and thats what makes us a good solid team, being there for our service users and each other, I feel sad that this is going to be taken away from us. Throughout my whole working career I have never felt so let down before, ive gave 19 half years to BCC and now I have feel I have nothing to show for it.

Not knowing what is happening to my future is upsetting and putting stress and strain on my life, I am unable to make any future plans due to being in limbo with my current job status.

“ Following our meeting with councillor Chris Jackson on 14/1/22. We were advised we could put forward personal statements to our union representatives for submission to Cabinet. I have worked for BCC for 36 years as a frontline worker in various roles serving the people of Bristol. Since November when I received a letter in the post informing me of the intended shutting of the service at SBRC and that I WOULD be TUPE'd to Sirona to work in the South Bristol Community Hospital, this has put enormous strain on my mental health and untold pressure on us at work. Communication has been poor from management. We handed questions that the team had compiled over to management at the first meeting on the 29/11/21 and to date not one question has been answered. We have worked everyday throughout the pandemic providing care and rehabilitation to the citizens of Bristol. We have looked after service users who were admitted to the centre with Covid putting ourselves and our families lives at risk made worse as there was no testing or vaccines in the beginning. We were scared everyday we came to work. During the first lockdown I witnessed an ambulance on the road in front of me being ambushed by four men forcing me to stop. They surrounded my car opening the door one of them had a knife, I managed to get away. I still went to work that day as I did everyday that's who we are as a team. We ask for you to consider that we all chose to work in adult social care. We do not want to be forced into working for an employer who is clinical based in an alien environment of a hospital, doing a job which will require

us to follow a very different role. We would like to be offered choices about our future and I ask for you to consider option 3 redeployment and redundancy for all staff.

“ As advised from union reps I am writing a personal statement regarding the closing of SBRC. I have worked for Bristol city council for 34 years and have worked in several job roles over this period. I have remained working for bcc for so long due to them being recognised as a very prided and equal company to work for. I have spent many many lost precious days away for my family due to working Christmas's, bank holidays, Easter's ect. My job role at present is a rehab support worker and part of this role is to manage staff and the building at certain times.

When covid arrived my job role expanded from not only RSW but to manager,cook,domestic, handy person and apart from nursing, job roles that needed to keep the centre up and running but also safe and ready to accept service users from hospitals on a weekly basis.

Several members of staff were unfortunate to have to isolate for long periods of time leaving the centre with skeletal staff which was then mentally and physically exhausting. Staff were under a massive amount of pressure and was frightened at the danger of taking covid to their own families but we still arrived to work daily to care for both covid and non covid service users. We also prided in ourselves that we kept the covid to a minimal at the centre.

When I returned from a well earned holiday I was greeted with an impersonal letter to inform me that the centre was to close due to it being 'unfit for purpose' and then went on to inform me that I was to tupe to a hospital setting without any choice apart from resigning. As I have never desired or worked in a clinical setting this have been very worrying and have affected my mental health drastically!!

As I feel the decision to close the centre have already been decided I am asking for my rights as a dedicated and loyal member of staff for a choice of either redeployment or redundancy.

Also to add insult to injury as I am writing this statement service users are still being admitted to the ' unfit for purpose ' South Bristol Rehab Centre.

'I have work right though Covid long shifts . We are a team like a family . We help each other out and this what we gets has a thanks.. not one, manager has said thank you what the team has done . Over the years and last few years . We didn't expect it we just got on with it because we loved our job .this has been a kick in the teeth we all don't want to go over there we want redundancy .and shouldn't be told we got to all lose our job . That like there bullying us'.

'I have worked for Bristol City Council for a long time at the rehabilitation centre . I feel that we have been let down big time Personally I don't want to go over to South Bristol hospital to work . I feel I won't settle and shouldn't be told that we have to go or lose my job. This is not helping my mental health'.