

# Public Forum received for Cabinet meeting

Date: Tuesday, 12 July 2022



## 1. Statements and Questions received

### Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps

(Pages  
3 - 31)

PQ08.01 & PQ08.02	David Redgewell
PQ08.03 & PQ08.04	Fraser Bridgeford
PQ08.05	Joe Banks
PQ08.06 & PQ08.07	Joanna Booth
PQ08.08 & PQ08.09	Martin Rands
PQ08.10 & PQ08.11	Suzanne Audrey
PQ08.12 & PQ08.13	Mary Wildman
PQ08.14	Valerie Steel
PQ08.15 & PQ08.16	Sasha Lubetkin
CQ08.01 & CQ08.02	Councillor Bennett
PS08.01	David Mellor - Western Harbour Advisory Group (WHAG)
PS08.02	David Redgewell
PS08.03	Martin Rands
CS08.01	Councillor Dyer

### Agenda item 9 - Recommissioning of Care and Support Services in Extra Care Housing

None

### Agenda item 10 - Hackney Carriage Fare Review

None

### Agenda item 11 – New government funding for substance misuse support and treatment services

None

### Agenda item 12 - Estate Rationalisation – Surplus Asset Disposals

None

### Agenda item 13 - Digital Transformation Programme

CQ13.01 Councillor Wilcox

### Agenda item 14 - Events and Conference Catering contracts

PS14.01 Pamela Nowicka  
PS14.02 James Jones  
PS14.03 Michaela Andres

**Agenda item 15 - Business Improvement Districts**

None

**Agenda item 16 - Electricity Contract Procurement and Renewals**

None

**Agenda item 17 – Transfer of Heat Network assets from the Council to Bristol Heat Networks Limited**

CS17.01 Councillor Gollop

**Agenda item 18 – Bristol Apprenticeships Progress Report**

None

**Agenda item 19 - Quarterly Performance Progress Report (Q4 - 2021/22)**

None

**Agenda item 20 – Financial Outlook Update**

None

**Agenda item 21 – Financial update report - July 2022**

CQ21.01 Councillor Mack

**Agenda item 22 - Corporate Risk Management Report – Q1 2022/23**

CQ22.01 Councillor Wilcox

CQ22.02 Councillor Mack

CQ22.03 Councillor Edwards

**Issued by:** , Democratic Services

City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol, BS1 9NE

E-mail: [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)



**Question: PQ08.01 & PQ08.02**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: David Redgewell**

Question no 1 - Whilst we welcome the New framework for western Harbour especially retaining the Old Bond Buildings Garden centre etc, but the report fails to show a Transport framework for western Harbour.

**What discussion has the city mayor malvin Rees had with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and Mayor Dan Norris** about a public Transport provision to the western harbour ie Metro bus service Ashton Gate to Bristol city centre via Bristol Temple meads.

Bus services along the Portway and Hotwells road and bus lanes .

To Portway parkway and Avonmouth and towards m5 and Portishead.

New River crossings from long Ashton to Hotwells need to be designed with full bus coach and mass transit lanes Towards South Bristol/Bristol Airport.

Portishead and Weston super mare.

BUS service to the city centre and Cabot circus.

A station on the Bristol Temple meads to pill and Portishead line at Ashton Gate.

Ferry service to a new full accessible landings stage.

**Does the mayor agree that this item needs consultation with Bristol Transport Board and the Development needs a transport framework including a flooding prevention.**

Question no 2 - With more housing is required in the city centre and Harbour what provision of housing is affordable within this is major plan .

As Western Harbour is a major Development scheme **what cross boundary working is happening with the west of England mayoral combined Authority metro Dan Norris and his staff plus North Somerset council to bring about this very important Regeneration scheme.**

**Question: PQ08.03 & PQ08.04**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Fraser Bridgeford**

1. There is no support within the community for new four lane highways through Merchants Road and others. Why has this not explicitly been excluded?
2. Why is the controversy of the road system around Cumberland Basin not addressed as part of the vision?

**Question: PQ08.05**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Joe Banks**

According to its Terms of Reference, the Western Harbour Advisory Group was appointed by the Mayor to “help create objectives for the proposed future redevelopment of Western Harbour and shape its direction.” Since the start of 2021, Minutes available on the Council’s website show that nine members of the WHAG have attended less than half of the group’s meetings. Can the Mayor explain this low rate of attendance among his appointees, and does he think that the people of Bristol can have confidence that a thorough, transparent and representative process has taken place to get us to this point?

**Question: PQ08.06 & PQ 08.07**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Joanna Booth**

**Question 1:**

The wards affected by this project are listed as: Harbourside and Hotwells, Southville, Bedminster & Clifton.

The equality impact assessment stated that “English is not the main language of 14.4% of the residents of Hotwells and Harbourside (top countries of birth outside of the UK are China and Other SE Asian countries), 8% of the residents of Southville (top countries of birth outside of the UK Poland and Other EU accession countries), 5% of the residents of Southville (top countries of birth outside of the UK are Poland and Other EU accession countries.)”

What kind of efforts were made to get the views of these groups, especially, Chinese, Polish and other South-East-Asian countries, in addition to those from groups in Easton and from such enterprises as Design West’s Shape My City walk?

**Question 2:**

The report is going to cabinet to seek endorsement of the Western Harbour Vision, which has apparently been developed through "extensive community engagement and consultation".

The first engagement, which was held over the summer of 2019, “received a total of 2,661 responses, of which: · 2,609 were online or paper responses to the survey · 43 were emailed responses · 9 were responses by letter”

[. https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/documents/s42624/Appendix%20B%20-%20Engagement%20Report.pdf](https://democracy.bristol.gov.uk/documents/s42624/Appendix%20B%20-%20Engagement%20Report.pdf)

While it is natural to see local residents more active in responding to the engagement, every single ward in Bristol was represented in those responses.

I have only seen the responses to Turner Works' engagement in the reports. How were these original and geographically varied 2661 comments incorporated into what is being presented to cabinet?

**Question: PQ08.08 & PQ08.09**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Martin Rands**

Question 1

Is the 'Eastern Option' of rebuilding the Plimsoll Bridge dual carriageway at the end of Avon Crescent, adjacent to Underfall Yard and numerous other listed heritage properties, and through the Riverside Garden Centre, still 'on the table' and a possibility?

Question 2

The Harbour Hopes Vision states that 49% of the Western Harbour development area is 'brownfied' Any quick look on Google maps shows about 51% of the land to be Greville Smyth Park and Ashton Meadows. If the roads are rebuilt at grade (lowered to ground level) they will occupy Sylvia Crowe's landscaped amenity land, which comprises a derelict playground, fountains, benches and public toilets. How was the 49% 'brownfield' figure calculated, and which definition of 'brownfield' was used?

**Question: PQ08.10 & PQ08.11**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey**

Question 1. Western Harbour

**Background.** The decision pathway report indicates: "In consultation with the Mayor, the Western Harbour Advisory Group will be revised to increase participation and diversity." The recent referendum result shows the importance people place on the ability of their local councillors to engage in decision-making processes for the city. While the development proposals are important for the whole city, any changes to the road layout and buildings in the area will affect existing residents and businesses within in proposed 'Western Harbour' boundary.

**Question.** Will any of the elected councillors from the wards most affected by the 'Western Harbour' proposals be permitted as members of the 'Western Harbour Advisory Group'?

Question 2. Western Harbour

**Background.** The results of this and the previous consultation show considerable concern about the road layout, especially as the previous report on road options included constructing a wide dual-carriageway closer into the city and alongside the historic Nova Scotia pub. The option of repairing and retaining the existing Plimsoll Bridge was dismissed.

**Question.** Please can you confirm whether the repair and retention of the existing Plimsoll Bridge is still being dismissed as an option?



**Question: PQ08.12 & PQ08.13**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 – Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Mary Wildman**

1. Question:

As a resident of the area who is keen to engage in the development of Western Harbour, I am confused about precisely what we are being asked to engage with and feel that I have insufficient information to enable me to do so.

Before any work on masterplanning or "vision" can start, we need to know where the viable land is and what it could, feasibly, be used for. I am finding it very difficult to discuss "value" when I do not know what I am ascribing that value to. If housing is not an option / will be very limited and the cost is high, this is likely to rank lower in my estimation of value than were the converse true. Equally so for moving the roads.

In this regard, I would be grateful for clarity as to when and how we should expect information as to the extent of usable land for (a) buildings / housing and (b) the roads that we have and are being asked to comment on, bearing in mind:-

- Flood risk (decision on the old Police training ground refers):
- Current infrastructure (e.g. locks, bridge, railway line);
- Biodiversity / ecology (proximity of the SSSI);
- The cricket ground and allotments

2. Question:

The report by Turner Works states there was extensive community engagement. I understand from a member of the Cumberland Basin Stakeholder Group that they and opposition councillors have effectively been excluded from the Western Harbour Advisory Group, with substitutions at meetings not being allowed. I am concerned that this points to a lack of community engagement.

Specifically, the Cumberland Basin Stakeholder Group are the only community group allowed to attend this group and can only send one person with no substitutions. This is despite the fact that the chair can have a substitute, and as both the mayor's own pastors are on the group they can substitute for each other.

I understand that many of the members of the advisory group have not shown up for most of the meetings.

If the Western Harbour Advisory Group actually was created to provide further community engagement, how can the exclusion of both the CBSG and relevant ward councillors be considered to have achieved that aim?

**Question: PQ08.14**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 – Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Valerie Steel**

My question: Why are the residents of Ashton Avenue specifically, being offered regular meetings if nothing has been decided? It looks like a decision to knock down their houses has already been taken.

**Question: PQ08.15 & PQ08.16**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Sasha Lubetkin**

**Question one:**

The 2661 responses were summarised in a report to cabinet as follows:

Key priorities of residents. High priorities include heritage, open space, views of the gorge, and air quality.

Views of the existing transport arrangements. Consistent negative comments were made around road safety, traffic noise and air pollution. Getting round the area was raised as a positive benefit.

The priorities were listed as follows:

Public open space to relax or exercise

Preserving heritage/history

Views of the gorge / suspension bridge

Reduced air pollution

Better cycling routes

Access to the water

Better road safety

Better bus services

Less traffic noise

Roads for local traffic to access Hotwells

Less crime/better personal safety

Roads for through traffic to drive between...

Leisure facilities

local clubs /sports groups

simplifying the existing road network

more jobs

more housing

more parking for residents

more/better shops

more parking for visitors

In contrast, the Turner Works survey received 786 responses to with 620 comments in the free text box. One third of those comments, 233 of them, stated that there was a lack of detail in the plans.

£150k of public funds were used to pay an organisation, Turner Works, to hold workshops using clay models, paying people in Lawrence Weston, and holding group sessions across the city only to come up with the same ideas that the initial 'engagement' provided.

The 'vision' could also not comment on highways infrastructure or housing.

How was this a useful way to use public money, especially since it came after an initial engagement and precedes a further consultation that will now need to take place?

**Question two:**

Starting at the basics, I would like to know when and how they will determine the extent to usable land for (a) buildings / housing and (b) the road, bearing in mind:-

- Flood risk (decision on the old Police training ground refers):
- Current infrastructure (e.g. locks, bridge, railway line);
- Biodiversity / ecology (proximity of the SSSI);
- The cricket ground and allotments (oddly silent on this)

To my mind, before any work on masterplanning or "vision" can start, we need to know where the viable land is and what it could, feasibly, be used for.

**Question: CQ08.01 & CQ08.02**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Bennett**

1) As a significant proportion of the land is owned by the Council, this presents an opportunity to have Goram Homes provide a large amount of social housing. What thought has been given to this, and, at this stage, are you able to say what involvement Goram will have in the Western Harbour process?

2) I note one of the bonded warehouses is being reserved as a multi-use cultural hub. As large, industrial buildings, this site will be an attractive prospect for night-time economy businesses, such as bars or nightclubs. Will the Council consider reserving an amount of this building for night-time economy purposes?

**Statement: PS08.1**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 - Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Statement submitted by: Western Harbour Advisory Group**

The Western Harbour Advisory Group supported this wide consultation programme and is in agreement with its main conclusions. We note that these are at a high level and appreciate that priorities and choices will have to be made. However these do set clear objectives which must form a key part of the brief for the master planning for a high quality development of Western Harbour.

In this prominent area- almost entirely owned by the City Council – there is an opportunity to create an exemplar of 21st century urban living amidst a vibrant landscape and waterway, with a real mix of accommodation for all, a rich public realm and cultural and leisure components.

The procurement methods chosen for both the Master Planning and subsequent Architectural Design should ensure that the urban design and the architecture are of the highest quality. This development must respect its setting and be fully sustainable in line with City Council policy.

It will be very important that these objectives are not unduly compromised by the inevitable pressures of cost and viability. We will continue to work constructively with the City Council and its officers to help ensure that we achieve an outcome all Bristol can be proud of.

**Statement: PS08.02**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 – Western Harbour vision and next steps**

**Statement submitted by: David Redgewell**

Bristol Harbour is now one of the top Residential and Tourist areas in South west England. The regeneration of the western Harbour is to be welcomed especially the retaining of the Garden centre and Bonded warehouses. Especially if these are turned into affordable flats for local residents. And some social housing. We need to provide homes in Bristol and the city region. So waterfront housing should be developed but we must stop the area becoming second homes and Air and Bed and Breakfast. We also need shops and restaurants and Tourist facilities whilst carefully preserving the Avon Gorge and Historic Harbour. The local parks need improvement Smyth Park near Ashton Gate needs upgrading including public toilets and a cafe. The site needs a Development brief. Without tall buildings

Transport Development framework with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council . To include improvements in metro bus links from south Bristol via the Cumberland road and south Bristol link With an updated services to Bristol Airport. This route through the Harbour and Redcliffe Hill should become alight railway route to Bristol Temple meads and city centre loop and back to the Harbour and Cumberland road. The Portway need bus lanes from South Bristol and North Somerset council. Destination of Hotwells road, Portway parkway station and on to Severn Beach Severnside. Bus service and train from shirehampton. Bristol, Portishead,clevedon Weston super mare. Via m5 x5 bus service X 1 to Weston super mare. X 4 to Portishead. X6 x7 to clevedon Falcon bus to Bristol Airport churchill East Brent, Bridgwater, Taunton Wellington, cullompton ,Exeter Newton Abbott and Plymouth coach station

A new Harbour crossing must be in keeping with the Harbour setting and the Avon Gorge The bridge and road link must be good architecture design with bus and coach lanes and a sustainable transport corridor. The road design and bus coach and Taxis lane will need to be designed with Dan Norris the metro mayor west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council. With high quality landscaping and good Harbour navigation. To a working Harbour. The Bristol Temple meads to Portishead Railway line should provide a new station at Ashton Gate and Pill. Ashton gate with a interchanges for metro bus / light rail link to South Bristol and Bristol Airport.

The Weston Harbour also need to improve under fall yard and especially facilities for disabled access residents and Tourists.

We also need to provide a ferry interchange with a fully accessible landing stage and ferries with wheelchair accessible ramp or lifts

The Ferry landing stages should be restored in Hotwells road.

Pavements toward to Portway and Rock railway should be improved.

Building design for home most involve some private housing along the social and affordable housing so we have a mixed Development like the rest of Bristol Harbour.

Leisure and Tourism facilities should be developed cafe restaurants shops and public toilets.

Hotel.

Not mass students flat we homes for local residents.

This should include the lower floors of the Bonded warehouses owned by the city council.

Partnership working with North Somerset council which should join the west of England mayoral combined Authority along with the local Enterprise partnership.

Especially for City region planning and Transport.

We need a city regional plan.

We should be able to look at Development land to the South of western Harbour alongside A370 for mixed used Development including Housing / hotel / business park.

The city also needs to provide a caravan parks for Tourist within the city region.

To replace the one in the Harbour.

We look forward to a Development brief and further consultation with the Bristol Transport Board and Disabled Group and equalities forums.

And co production with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris North Somerset council and the Harbour Authority.

We hope that we can engage in more Detail on the Transport frame work with the public transport operators.

With councillor Don Alexander transport executive and mayor Dan Norris and city mayor malvin Rees, Councillor steve Bridger in North Somerset councillor and steve Hogg

This scheme and transport framework must have agreement with North Somerset council.

Please Bring our statement to the cabinet meeting.

David Redgewell South west transport Network and Railfuture Severnside.

Peter travis Somerset bus partnership and Somerset catch the bus campaign



**Statement: PS08.03**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 8 – Western Harbour vision and next steps**

**Statement submitted by: Martin Rands**

Cabinet should consider an alternative flood defence scheme to the one proposed. Building tiered concrete and steel flood walls is unsustainable, and will contribute to the rising tide levels it is built to counter. It will require hundreds of thousands of tonnes of unsustainable materials.

Cabinet should take proper advice on the feasibility of a flood barrier downstream, or a barrage, that could also be used to divert some of the ridiculously large volumes of motor through-traffic coming down the A4 into Hotwells, and then out across the Plimsoll Bridge, and vice versa. Most of the Portway traffic goes south or north across the Plimsoll Bridge, and does not go down the Hotwell Road into town.

The Council should work with the Highways Agency and central government, to try to reduce (re-route) this motor traffic, before simply rebuilding the existing dual carriageway deeper into the city. Again using huge quantities of unsustainable concrete and steel, and again exacerbating global warming, adding to the rising tides flood problem it is trying to solve. The Council has declared a Climate and Ecological emergency. It ought to act on this commitment.

## **Statement: CS08.01**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 08.01 – Western Harbour Vision and Next Steps**

**Statement submitted by: Councillor Dyer**

As councillors for Southville ward, our comments are reflective of the views shared with us by our local residents and businesses, many of whom feel that, until there is a greater level of certainty about the proposed road layout, it is difficult to engage fully with the Western Harbour proposals.

As highlighted in the report, Western Harbour is largely previously developed “brownfield” land with almost half of the area taken up by roads, parking and other hard surfaces. The report also highlights the need to update or replace the Cumberland Basin road system, and how this is done will clearly have a major impact on Southville ward which, along with Bedminster ward, will form the southern approach to the resulting road layout.

Any proposal which fails to reflect the ambition towards increasing active and public transport usage, and thus reducing motorised traffic levels, will be unlikely to generate majority support from within our ward – and would be unlikely to build a resilient community within Western Harbour itself. We have seen elsewhere in the city the divisive effect of major roads with high traffic levels, and the negative impact on the local communities left isolated as a result.

We also hope the Western Harbour proposals will encourage the ambition to deliver a safe cycling and pedestrian route from Vauxhall Bridge to Ashton Avenue Bridge and beyond, will support rather than threaten the Riverside Garden Centre, and will encourage the development of a renewable energy centre and connected district heat network south of the new cut as we continue on the path to carbon neutrality.

Meanwhile, the commitment to provide 50% affordable housing is laudable and welcome, as is the decision to respect the architecture pre-eminence and heights of the existing Tobacco Bonds. We are also pleased to see the recognition of the need to respond to flood risk and resilience, which, of course, places the Western Harbour within a much wider context.

Finally, we welcome the decision to revise the membership of the Western Harbour Advisory Group. To be blunt, the failure of several members of WHAG to attend multiple meetings has been a blemish that has damaged the reputation of WHAG and has undermined its legitimacy for many of our residents. Increasing the diversity of participation in such a key group is to be supported, but if those selected to represent do not attend and participate, then the lack of representation continues.

WHAG is an important group which will directly influence the outcome of a major regeneration project at a key gateway to the city – alongside increasing diversity and participation there also needs to be transparency about how participants are selected.

Cllr Tony Dyer and Cllr Christine Townsend

Southville ward

**Question: CQ13.01**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 13 - Digital Transformation Programme**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Wilcox**

Question:

Why is procuring and implementing a Digital Strategic Partner only an “Enabler” not a “Must Do”? Page 260 - Scope Project Breakdown, BCC IT does not have the capacity to deliver the Digital Transformation Programme without having a partner and will delay the entire project if one is not selected.

**Statement: CS14.01**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 14 - Events and Conference Catering contracts**

**Statement submitted by: Pamela Nowicka**

I'm writing because I would like Bristol City Council to commit to plant-based catering for all its conferences and events.

A substantial reduction in meat and dairy consumption is vital to reduce carbon and methane emissions. Intensive animal farming accounts for 14.5% of global greenhouse emissions and 85% if land use change and opportunity loss are taken into account, so this would be an immediately effective start in reducing emissions, as well as sending a clear signal that BCC is serious about tackling catastrophic climate breakdown.

In these times of fuel and food poverty, households struggling to pay for essentials like food and heating might be inspired to follow BCC's lead.

There is a common misconception that a plant-based diet is more costly than one that includes animal bodies and secretions, but is only if the diet consisted entirely of expensively packaged, processed food.

Plant-based meals prepared freshly from veg, pulses, tofu and the like are far cheaper than those made from dead animals, and that's even more the case now that Lurpak butter has reached an eye-watering £10 per pack and people are talking about a cheese 'crisis'.

Cost comparisons of meat and plant-based meals, have shown that when traditional favourites like spaghetti bolognese and shepherd's pie are made using soy mince and lentils they are far cheaper than their meat-based versions, with equivalent protein and significantly higher fibre.

If the council offers delicious and appealing plant-based meals it will help to raise awareness and normalise plant-based eating, encouraging people to move away from consuming animal body parts and secretions and so helping to promote a healthier and more equal and just society...as well as saving money.

In a culturally diverse city like Bristol, plant-based catering is the most inclusive, as it takes away the need to provide and label Halal or Kosher meat and circumvents the challenges sometimes associated with religious food requirements.

Plant-based food encourages communal eating by removing concerns about slaughter methods and meat preparation – everyone can choose from the same range of dishes. It's fair for all members of our society and lays a foundation of ethics and justice concerning other animals.

A plant-based diet is also more healthy; processed and red meat consumption causes cancer, stroke and heart disease, while a plant-based diet can meet every nutritional requirement.

A move towards carbon-friendly catering will be a win for climate justice and social justice, and I hope that is what this council supports.

**Statement: PS14.02**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 14 - Events and Conference Catering contracts**

**Statement submitted by: James Jones**

I'm writing because I would like Bristol City Council to commit to plant-based catering for all its conferences and events.

A substantial reduction in meat and dairy consumption is vital to reduce carbon and methane emissions. Intensive animal farming accounts for 14.5% of global greenhouse emissions and 85% if land use change and opportunity loss are taken into account, so this would be an immediately effective start in reducing emissions, as well as sending a clear signal that BCC is serious about tackling catastrophic climate breakdown.

In these times of fuel and food poverty, households struggling to pay for essentials like food and heating might be inspired to follow BCC's lead.

There is a common misconception that a plant-based diet is more costly than one that includes animal bodies and secretions, but is only if the diet consisted entirely of expensively packaged, processed food.

Plant-based meals prepared freshly from veg, pulses, tofu and the like are far cheaper than those made from dead animals, and that's even more the case now that Lurpak butter has reached an eye-watering £10 per pack and people are talking about a cheese 'crisis'.

Cost comparisons of meat and plant-based meals, have shown that when traditional favourites like spaghetti bolognese and shepherd's pie are made using soy mince and lentils they are far cheaper than their meat-based versions, with equivalent protein and significantly higher fibre.

If the council offers delicious and appealing plant-based meals it will help to raise awareness and normalise plant-based eating, encouraging people to move away from consuming animal body parts and secretions and so helping to promote a healthier and more equal and just society...as well as saving money.

In a culturally diverse city like Bristol, plant-based catering is the most inclusive, as it takes away the need to provide and label Halal or Kosher meat and circumvents the challenges sometimes associated with religious food requirements.

Plant-based food encourages communal eating by removing concerns about slaughter methods and meat preparation – everyone can choose from the same range of dishes. It's fair for all members of our society and lays a foundation of ethics and justice concerning other animals.

A plant-based diet is also more healthy; processed and red meat consumption causes cancer, stroke and heart disease, while a plant-based diet can meet every nutritional requirement.

A move towards carbon-friendly catering will be a win for climate justice and social justice, and I hope that is what this council supports.

**Statement: PS14.03**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 14 - Events and Conference Catering contracts**

**Statement submitted by: Michaela Andrews**

I'm writing because I would like Bristol City Council to commit to plant-based catering for all its conferences and events.

A substantial reduction in meat and dairy consumption is vital to reduce carbon and methane emissions. Intensive animal farming accounts for 14.5% of global greenhouse emissions and 85% if land use change and opportunity loss are taken into account, so this would be an immediately effective start in reducing emissions, as well as sending a clear signal that BCC is serious about tackling catastrophic climate breakdown.

In these times of fuel and food poverty, households struggling to pay for essentials like food and heating might be inspired to follow BCC's lead.

There is a common misconception that a plant-based diet is more costly than one that includes animal bodies and secretions, but is only if the diet consisted entirely of expensively packaged, processed food.

Plant-based meals prepared freshly from veg, pulses, tofu and the like are far cheaper than those made from dead animals, and that's even more the case now that Lurpak butter has reached an eye-watering £10 per pack and people are talking about a cheese 'crisis'.

Cost comparisons of meat and plant-based meals, have shown that when traditional favourites like spaghetti bolognese and shepherd's pie are made using soy mince and lentils they are far cheaper than their meat-based versions, with equivalent protein and significantly higher fibre.

If the council offers delicious and appealing plant-based meals it will help to raise awareness and normalise plant-based eating, encouraging people to move away from consuming animal body parts and secretions and so helping to promote a healthier and more equal and just society...as well as saving money.

In a culturally diverse city like Bristol, plant-based catering is the most inclusive, as it takes away the need to provide and label Halal or Kosher meat and circumvents the challenges sometimes associated with religious food requirements.

Plant-based food encourages communal eating by removing concerns about slaughter methods and meat preparation – everyone can choose from the same range of dishes. It's fair for all members of our society and lays a foundation of ethics and justice concerning other animals.



A plant-based diet is also more healthy; processed and red meat consumption causes cancer, stroke and heart disease, while a plant-based diet can meet every nutritional requirement.

A move towards carbon-friendly catering will be a win for climate justice and social justice, and I hope that is what this council supports.

## **Statement: CS17.01**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 17 – Transfer of Heat Network assets from the Council to Bristol Heat Networks Networks Limited**

**Statement submitted by: Councillor Geoffrey Gollop**

There are a number of concerning matters in this report.

The general proposal to develop the heat network as part of the decarbonisation of the City is not disputed, but the importance of decarbonisation is not a justification for ignoring normal commercial considerations.

My concerns arise from comments in the report itself and specifically Appendix G the Financial Commentary. On Page 26 there is a heading “Current estimated value of the assets to be transferred in.....”

However, the note says that the value is based on book value. Book value is not a valuation, it reflects what it says, historic cost of creating the asset.

I would expect there to be a valuation of the assets which should also reflect the impact of inflation, to arrive at a current value of the assets. There is no suggestion of this being done. The network should be worth more than it cost because it is now generating income and its completion is more certain. That increased value must be reflected in the transfer in to BHNL otherwise no uplift will be realised when it is transferred into City Leap.

If there was no added value from expanding the network, the expansion should not have been allowed to take place. Given the significant fees paid to professional advisors a proper valuation of the assets should have been made. I understand this would not be made publicly available, but had it been made it would have been referred to in the report

Of equal concern is the comment in para 6 of appendix G. Why is a detailed fixed asset register being compiled just before the transfer? Surely it would have been maintained throughout the development of the heat network. Even if that had not happened, the work to prepare a detailed register should have started as soon as the proposal to sell the assets was established. If a detailed register does not exist there can be no certainty that the full book value is itself a correct figure

Over the last 3 years reports to scrutiny and to cabinet on City Leap and Heat networks have been delayed because of due diligence being carried out by the Council or Bristol Holdings on Heat Networks and its assets. If that work had been properly completed the register should now be complete.

The Council has recently received a damning Value for Money report from its external auditors. Today it appears cabinet is making a decision based on a report which provides the auditors with specific evidence of further failures.

Using book value to value an asset is not evidence that an asset is being transferred at fair value, it is evidence that a proper valuation has not been arrived at. Council has a responsibility to achieve best

value on an asset transfer. Whilst this transfer is internal, it effectively sets the value at which the City Leap transfer will take place. I believe this is not acceptable for the reasons outlined above

**Question: CQ21.01**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 21 - Financial update report - July 2022**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Mack**

Question:

Can all councillors, especially shadow cabinet members, who have a watching brief, have full details of our savings programme, which are at risk, and actions we are taking to secure them?

**Question: CQ22.01**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 22 - Corporate Risk Management Report – Q1 2022/23**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Wilcox**

Question:

From the corporate risk register - CRR7 Cyber Security: Why is Action 3, implementing the audit actions at 0% when it should have been completed in June 2022?

**Question: CQ22.02**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 22 - Corporate Risk Management Report – Q1 2022/23**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Mack**

Question:

Workplace resilience is evaluated as high threat risk, and yet there are no mitigation actions. Considering the two years we have had, I can't see that this risk was a surprise – what actions are we taking to recruit and retain staff?

**Question: CQ22.03**

**Cabinet – 12 July 2022**

**Re: Agenda item 22 - Corporate Risk Management Report – Q1 2022/23**

**Question submitted by: Councillor Edwards**

Question:

Lack of progress for the Mass Transit Programme is high threat risk, with high likelihood, why, therefore, are there no mitigation actions we can or should take to reduce that on our register?