

Public Forum

Date: Tuesday, 21 February 2023



Agenda

1. Petitions and Statements Received

(Pages 3 - 48)

Ref No	Name	Title
PS01	Vanessa Stewart	Parking
PS02	Jill Jones	WOT Car Park
PS03	Nadia Haq	Complaint about Council's proposed charges for Westbury Car Park
PS04	Graham Barsby	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS05	Valerie Snelgrove	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS06	Richard Snelgrove	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS07	Catherine Farrington on behalf of Westbury on Trym Primary Care Centre	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS08	Christine Williams	Beechwood Road Fishponds Car Park Charges
PS09	Terry King	Beechwood Road Fishponds Car Park Charges
PS10	Christopher J. Spivey JP	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS11	Dr Tony Hoare	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS12	Brenda Weeks	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS13	Mrs Victoria Legge	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS14	Michael Annan	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS15	Sarah Hazell	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS16	Janet Caswell	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS17	Audrey Callaghan	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS18	Neil Redman	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS19	Janet and James Wisheart	Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym
PS20	Kate Swain	Funding for Redcatch Community Garden
PS21	Mary Barrington	Beechwood Road Fishponds car park charges
PS22	Zac Barker	Jubilee Pool in Knowle
PS23	Susan Carter, Bristol Walking Alliance	Impact of transport and City Design proposals on walking
PS24	Mike Cardwell	Funding for Redcatch Community Garden

PS25	Alan Morris for Bristol Civic Society	Budget cuts and reorganisations – Transport and City Design
PS26	Dr Ann Kennard	THE REINSTATEMENT OF THE POST OF TWINNING OFFICER
PS27	Lesley Powell	Funding for Redcatch Community Garden
PS28	Lesley Powell on behalf of Friends of Redcatch Park	Funding for Redcatch Community Garden
PS29	BRIL and UNISON	Impact on disabled people of proposed job cuts BCC
PS30	David Redgewell	Bus service cuts in Greater Bristol
PS31	Suzanne Audrey	Jubilee Pool in Knowle

Issued by: Democratic Services

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

E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk



STATEMENT PS 01

Submitted by Vanessa Stewart

Title: Parking

IT IS THE WRONG TIME TO INTRODUCE PARKING CHARGES.

IN ADDITION, THERE ARE TWO CHURCHES THAT USE THE CAR PARK A LOT. PEOPLE HAVE JUST NOT GOT THE MONEY AND IT IS UTTERLY WRONG TO CHARGE FOR THE WORSHIP OF GOD.

IN ADDITION, IT IS NOT JUST £1 BUT ALL THE OTHER CHARGES FOR OVERSTAYING AND FINES ETC.

STATEMENT PS 02

Submitted by Jill Jones

Title: WOT Car Park

I would strongly like to object to the proposed car charged to WoT car park. As a resident of WoT and patient of the doctors surgery next to the car park I strongly think this would have a huge impact on the village. The school, which is already a road accident waiting to happen, would have more traffic parking outside as many school parents park at the car park and walk up to the school. There are many older residents that use the doctors surgery who nip in and out to collect prescriptions, this would create absolute havoc if people were having to buy a ticket for the sake of a quick visit.

In the current climate where some people can barely afford to feed their families, I feel this is adding extra pressure on people who cannot afford to pay for parking and want to nip to the doctors or to the church for an event.

STATEMENT PS 03

Submitted by Nadia Haq

Title: Complaint about Council's proposed charges for Westbury Car Park

I would like to register a complaint about the Council's proposed changes for Westbury Hill car park. I live on Stoke Lane, and as there is restricted parking outside my house, finding parking is already horrendous. Sometimes I have to park on the other side of Stoke Lane and walk 10 minutes to get to my house, or drive around for 20 minutes trying to find a space. At times I have had no choice but to park outside my house, and as a result have received parking fines (just for parking outside the home that I own).

This is already ridiculous but introducing charges to the car park mean it will be even more difficult to find parking near my house, as drivers who want to avoid the charge will look to the nearby streets. This is extremely unfair on residents and will contribute considerably to reducing the quality of daily life for those who live in the area.

STATEMENT PS 04

Submitted by Graham Barsby

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

I feel excessive use of Council Powers to impose wholesale charges in WOT car park is detrimental to community life.

While I can understand the need for some charges I do not agree that a bull-in-the-china-shop is a good approach.

Please will you allow free spaces for:

- * The Medical centre
- * The Methodist Church
- * The Anglican Church

We must support local community groups and not penalise them.

I think it is important to maintain a maximum of a 3 hour stay otherwise commuters will leave their cars there all day. I also think it important not to block sell spaces to local businesses because the spaces should be for ordinary people.

Please consult with Local Businesses and Local people. Please liaise with your local City Councillor.

STATEMENT PS 05

Submitted by Valerie Snelgrove

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

Introducing these charges with no initial free time would have a very detrimental effect on the following:-

Westbury Primary Care Centre

Patients will have to pay to obtain medical care.

The surgery has a high proportion of elderly patients who have frequent appointments and can only travel by car.

The surgery will be put under more pressure as patients will be anxious about waiting and people who assume that the carpark belongs to the surgery will waste staff time with complaints

Deliveries to the Pharmacy unreasonably affected.

Methodist Church and Village Hall

These venues hold many groups and functions. People would now have to pay to attend church and many parents and carers would have to pay twice, once to drop off and again to collect children and elderly people even though they are only there a few minutes each time

Shops and Banks

The charge will discourage shoppers who only need to spend a short time in the village. They will either look for street parking or shop elsewhere.

The following suggestions would help to mitigate these points.

A free initial hour to facilitate attendance at appointments and for short visits to the village e.g. drop-offs and quick trips to the bank.

An increase in the number of spaces for blue badge holders

Any pay machines to accept cash to protect those who are not able to use app technology/who do not carry cards.

An increase in signage to explain the car park is owned by the Council and not the Surgery to prevent people from addressing complaints to the surgery.

STATEMENT PS 06

Submitted by Richard Snelgrove

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

Introducing charges would have a very detrimental effect on the following:-

Westbury Primary Care Centre

To see my GP I will have to pay to park, a bus journey is not practical. Other patients will have to pay to obtain medical care. The surgery has a high proportion of elderly patients who have frequent appointments and can only travel by car. The surgery will be put under more pressure as patients will be anxious about waiting. Also people assume that the carpark belongs to the surgery hence staff time will be taken up with complaints about the car park which they do not own or have any control over. Deliveries to the Pharmacy will be unreasonably affected.

Methodist Church and Village Hall

These venues hold many groups and functions. People would now have to pay to attend church and many parents and carers may well have to pay twice, once to drop off and again to collect children and elderly people.

Shops and Banks

The charge will discourage shoppers who only need to spend a short time in the village. They will either look for street parking or shop elsewhere. There are now few banks with branches and elderly customers have no choice to go elsewhere.

The following suggestions would help to mitigate these points.

A free initial hour to facilitate attendance at appointments and for short visits to the village e.g. drop-offs and quick trips to the bank.

Any pay and display machines should accept cash to protect those who are not able to use app technology or who do not carry cards.

An increase in signage to explain the car park is owned by the Council and not the Surgery to prevent people from addressing complaints to the surgery.

STATEMENT PS 07

Submitted by Catherine Farrington on behalf of Westbury on Trym Primary Care Centre

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

We are Westbury-on-Trym Primary Care Centre. We are a Surgery that cares for 12,000 patients. We serve a patient population with a varied range of ages and backgrounds. Many of whom need easy access to our building and the Westbury Hill car park is key to this access. Please find below our concerns relating to the proposed pay and display parking plans. Please be aware, the below comes from our surgery, it is not therefore one individual objection, but an objection by the Practice team.

- We are concerned that charging for parking will deter patients from attending appointments and potentially increase the number of home visits GPs will need to accommodate in an already over-stretched service. We would suggest free parking for the first hour to accommodate patient care. For any longer period, we would support the Council in charging for parking and would be in favour of an increased rate (i.e. £2 per hour after the first free hour). We are aware that other businesses and Councillor Geoff Gallop, have expressed support for 30 minutes' free parking. Whilst we understand the intention is to support both us and other businesses, limiting the free period to 30 minutes is problematic for the Surgery. Many appointments take longer than 30 minutes; for example, chronic disease reviews, complex wound dressings and appointments where both a nurse and GP are required to be seen simultaneously. Unfortunately, we also have to adapt to ever-changing daily situations. Increasingly, we manage urgent cases on the day which can cause clinicians to run late, resulting in patient waiting times being extended. This is regrettable but unavoidable. The concern is that patients may approach us with statements such as: 'I only have 10 minutes of free parking left and need to be seen now.' The Surgery cannot accommodate such requests which would increase pressure on an already struggling NHS Primary Care service.
- We are pleased to learn that there will be no charge or time limit for Blue Badge Holders. However, disabled parking spaces are in short supply in the car park and we would urge the addition of more.
- We are concerned about issues relating to the availability of an annual permit. The Surgery has a strong 'cycle to work' scheme and encourages those who are local to walk. We also have staff members who commute from further afield and may find a permit an attractive option. However, this does need to be put in perspective: we have 70 staff and potentially half of those would like a permit, which would significantly reduce the parking available for local people. These will include our patients and we are keen not to restrict their access. We suspect that local business providers/staff may also see an annual permit as an attractive option. This has the potential to reduce further the availability of spaces for those attending appointments at the Surgery as well as customers supporting local businesses. *Please note, our own*

car park is restricted to the use of clinicians who need to provide urgent services throughout the day, for example home visits.

- As the Surgery is located to the rear of the car park, many individuals mistakenly believe we own it. These include the Police and residents who occasionally come to us to ask for CCTV footage following an incident/minor car collision. Of course, we cannot provide such footage, as we do not monitor the car park. The introduction of charges is likely to increase the number of individuals mistakenly coming to the Surgery to complain about e.g. money being lost in machines, tickets etc. We therefore request that the signage is improved and clarity provided to state explicitly that the Surgery should not be approached for car parking concerns.
- We request that any parking meters should accept cash to support those who do not carry cards/have access to smart phones to use a parking app.

Our Patient Board have made us aware that the Cabinet member for transport (Cllr Alexander) told our local Cllr, Geoff Gallop, that our Surgery is mostly visited by patients collecting repeat prescriptions. Can I please ask for this information to be corrected. The surgery serves 12,000 patients who use our services for a variety of reasons, this includes, for example, urgent care, routine care for long-term medical conditions and preventative care. The Pharmacy on-site is independent from the Practice. An incorrect assumption has been made here with regards to footfall on the premises, we are keen for this to be corrected as it is most inaccurate.

STATEMENT PS 08

Submitted by Christine Williams

Title: Beechwood Road Fishponds Car Park Charges

I am writing to object strongly to the proposed introduction of charges for the car park in Beechwood Road. If charges are imposed, this will have a severe and negative impact on the local community.

The car park is situated between two well- used buildings - the Beechwood Health Centre and the Beechwood Club. The Health Centre has limited parking space available for patients and staff so most people have to use the Beechwood Road car park when visiting their GP or Practice nurse. It seems inappropriate for them to have to pay when attending appointments.

The Beechwood Club has no parking of its own and while the building is owned by Bristol City Council, it is leased, managed and maintained by a voluntary group - FLAG (Fishponds Locality Action Group) on behalf of the Council. FLAG committee members give their time freely to serve the needs of their community and maintain the gardens. They should not have to pay to visit the building while giving their services here.

The Club provides much needed accommodation for a variety of groups and activities during the day, evening and at weekends. Many of these groups are attended by older people or by young families with children and toddlers. There are also groups for adults and children with disabilities. If charges are imposed, many of those coming to these activities may withdraw, as this is an area of Bristol which experiences considerable deprivation in parts of Oldbury Court and Hillfields. The rising cost of living has already impacted on local residents, without the additional stress of having to pay for parking in future.

The consequences of people not taking part in social activities are well-documented - loneliness and increased deterioration in mental and physical health, which imposes further strain on our already over-stretched health services.

I hope that in view of all the above, you will reverse the proposal to implement charges for Beechwood Road car park.

STATEMENT PS 09

Submitted by Terry King

Title: Beechwood Road Fishponds Car Park Charges

I am writing to voice concern about the proposed car parking charges for the car park next to the Beechwood Club. Apparently, this charge is being considered across Bristol by the council.

Obviously, this would be detrimental to all users of the Beechwood Club, by imposing extra costs in these inflationary times.

Groups like the Alzheimer's group and The Respite Carers Group, rely on unpaid volunteers to run these groups. Any charge will lead to these volunteers having to pay this fee which could affect these groups existence should they choose not to continue. This also applies to many of the groups where people run them on a voluntary basis.

At Page community centre, there is a car park by this centre and places there are reserved for people that use it.

Should the charge go ahead, could people who use the Beechwood club be allowed such a system?

I attend the Beechwood club for groups for approximately nine hours per week, in helping run three of the groups. Also new and prospective groups have to be met and shown around the premises.

I along with others meet regularly to maintain the gardens at the Beechwood Club which would lead to additional cost.

I also carry out some maintenance, their, as well as being there for firms carrying out the necessary checks and maintenance on the building for gas, electrical items, pat tests etc. to give them access.

This would lead to having to pay over £10 per week should the charge be £1 per hour for my voluntary work, which clearly would not be acceptable.

STATEMENT PS 10

Submitted by Christopher J. Spivey JP

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

While I deplore the government's starvation of funds to local authorities and understand the need of Bristol City Council to raise more funding for local services, I wish to point out that the imposition of parking charges in Westbury Hill car park is self-defeating.

I write as a member of Westbury Methodist Church and would point out that fifteen hundred or more young people and elderly residents use the church premises on a weekly basis. Many parents need to wait for their children while attending uniformed organisations, the Bristol Ballet school and Kumon (education for vulnerable families). There are also many elderly and lonely people who attend such activities such as Knit & Natter, Friendly Club, the Women's Fellowship and the Ukrainian Hub. These activities will be put at risk if drivers are deterred by the costs.

In addition, the car park is used by two congregations who attend the parish church and the Methodist church on Sundays. Many of these members are elderly and will be deterred from church attendance if parking fees are imposed on Sundays.

Westbury village is a lively community with banks, shops the GP surgery (housed in the car park!) and local businesses which are at risk of closure if the footfall is reduced.

Please reconsider.

STATEMENT PS 11

Submitted by Dr Tony Hoare

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

This submission is from a 'Transport and Place-making' group of local residents, who are also members of several key stakeholder groups in Westbury-on-Trym affected by this proposal. Our specific local remit is to explore existing and future transport issues affecting the Westbury, and their links to its character, vitality, sustainability and attractiveness. We have pursued this in a number of ways, including carrying out detailed surveys of parking in the Westbury Hill car park and elsewhere.

We support the Council's general strategic aims to promote Bristol as a 'sustainable city', embracing 'vibrant local neighbourhoods', but are concerned that the proposal as it stands would have the opposite effect on Westbury-on-Trym. Our response to the current charging proposal for the Westbury Hill car park is based on ensuring the future sustainability of the Village and is summarised below, followed by our reasoning.

- Most importantly, the Westbury-on-Trym car park should be retained as a short stay car park.
- Long stay places should not be sold.
- The first hour should be free
- If charges are approved, an hourly rate of £1 is not unreasonable, with the exception of this first hour.
- If pay machines are to be used they should include cash and card options for those without mobile phone access to parking apps.

A short stay car park

The Westbury Hill car park is central to many of the Village's key amenities, serving shoppers and users of the wide range of its other services and community activities, particularly patients visiting the adjacent premises of the Primary Care Centre (PCC), those taking part in the very many activities at the Methodist church, and at the Village Hall at the top of Waters Lane. These include children's classes, scouts and guides, a toddler group, meetings for vulnerable adults and several more. Westbury Hill is also the main parking site serving the weekday social activities and Sunday services at Holy Trinity, the nearby Parish Church, which also lacks any sizeable car park of its own.

Parents, carers or others use the car park as a safe space to stop briefly and take children and others to activities in these venues, and to collect them later. It also offers a safe place for parents to park for a short time and walk with children to the local Primary School (Westbury Academy), so avoiding adding to the parking congestion at its entrance on Channels Hill.

In consequence, the car park is very well used, and is often full in the middle of the day. Our surveys have shown that almost all vehicles are just there for a short time. The Council's data accompanying the proposal report only occupancy rates based on raw counts at

different times, saying nothing about the turnover rates behind them. In contrast, our group's parking survey for the Westbury Hill car park, mid-week in January 2022, recorded numberplates of cars by specific parking space at 20-minute intervals between 10.00 and 12.50. Of the total of 95 spaces, only six had the same occupant for the whole survey period, and on average each space had a 37% chance of a change of occupant 20 minutes later.

In its wider context, Westbury is identified as a 2nd tier centre in the Bristol Local Plan, and rightly so. It serves a wide catchment area in NW Bristol needing not just local shopping but also banks, legal and other services described earlier. A substantial part of the catchment is not readily accessible by public transport and a substantial part of its population is not sufficiently mobile to be able to walk, scoot or cycle into Westbury. Those who can't drive also need to be dropped off in the Village. So access by car for short visits is much valued. Significantly, the proportion of the local ward population aged 65 or over is almost twice the city-wide average (<https://www.bristol.gov.uk/files/documents/1992-westbury-on-trym-and-henleaze-ward-profile-report/file>).

It is obviously important for local businesses and services that customers can access them. Without this the centre of Westbury will decline further, and people will travel further to find the goods and services they need, many to alternatives with ample free parking, as at Cribbs. This generation of additional road transport is not a sustainable option, and runs counter to the Council's own declared policy to move towards net zero carbon.

So the opportunity to visit for comparatively short periods by those who are not able to travel by modes other than the car is essential to enable the Village to function as a local centre.

The charging regime

For the reasons stated above we recommend the abandonment of any plan to sell annual permits. This would effectively block-book several spaces. They would also be vulnerable to 'copy and share' abuse, once purchased. Furthermore, a mixture of permit and 'pay on the day' parking would likely reduce overall revenue to the Council compared to the exclusive use of spaces by short-term parkers. If each space not allocated to a permit-holder is otherwise occupied for as little as one hour each day this is a financial gain for the Council. Its figures as provided in the proposal show occupancy is already high (the highest of the ten sites under review by some way), so there's little spare capacity, and more permits must mean fewer short-term parkers and less revenue.

We regret any imposition of parking charges at the Westbury Hill site and note that over all the sites identified the proposal will not make a significant contribution to the Council's budget. However, if charges are approved the proposed £1 per hour seems reasonable and might encourage more who can find alternative ways to access the Village to do so. However, as we have noted, there are many for whom this is not an option. An initial free period would greatly benefit them, including patients to the PCC, those transporting the less mobile, those bringing children and others into the Village, and thus supporting continued high footfall and turnover for local services.

The Council's proposal targets 'discouraging all day parking, maximising the use of space and ensuring effective turnover of spaces to support the local economy'. The Westbury Hill site does this now. Many different short-term needs are already successfully met, and large numbers can visit the Village each working day by car for a variety of purposes. On that criterion alone, the further 'stick' of charging is not needed.

Whilst understanding the Council's wish to raise revenue from its car parks, and the particular appeal of the Westbury Hill site in its calculations, our group feels strongly that any charging regime needs also to maintain its value to local residents and businesses as a provider solely of short-term parking, with an appropriate free period to serve many of the current uses we have outlined.

And finally, would it be possible to install electric car charging points within the car park as a further way to support Bristol's sustainability agenda?

STATEMENT PS 12

Submitted by Brenda Weeks

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

I wish to convey my concern about making Westbury on Trym Car Park a pay and display.

As a very active member of Westbury on Trym Methodist Church I am concerned at how much I will be expected to pay in car parking fees, whilst trying to help the Community in events and support given at the Church by me and many others with tasks carried out there.

STATEMENT PS 13

Submitted by Victoria Legge

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

As someone who banks in Westbury on Trym, is a registered patient at Westbury On Trym Primary Care Centre (as is my primary school aged child and husband), my child attends the Westbury Methodist Church Hall weekly for dance classes and I routinely shop and visit various outlets in the village, all of which I can only do by driving to Westbury on Trym, I am extremely concerned about the proposed parking charges for the Westbury Hill Carpark.

Introducing parking charges with no initial free time would have a very detrimental effect on the following:

- Westbury Primary Care Centre - Patients will have to pay parking fees to obtain medical care. The surgery has a high proportion of elderly patients who have frequent appointments and can only travel by car. The surgery will be put under more pressure as patients will be anxious about waiting times and the parking charges increasing the longer they are in the surgery and people who assume that the carpark belongs to the surgery will waste reception staff time with complaints about parking charges/issues. Deliveries to the pharmacy will also likely be unreasonably affected.
- Methodist Church and Village Hall - These venues hold many groups, classes and functions. People would now have to, in addition to the cost of any classes/hire etc. they are already paying, have to pay to park to attend church and many parents and carers would have to pay twice for parking, once to drop off and again to collect children and elderly people even though they are only there for a few minutes each time.
- Shops and Banks - The charge will discourage shoppers who only need to spend a short time in the village. They will either cause congestion and other parking issues looking for street parking or most likely shop elsewhere resulting in a detrimental effect on local businesses.

In my opinion the following suggestions would help to mitigate these points:

- A free initial hour to facilitate attendance at appointments and for short visits to the village e.g. drop-offs and quick trips to the bank etc.
- An increase in the number of spaces for blue badge holders.
- Any pay machines placed in the carpark to accept cash to protect those who are not able to use app technology/who do not carry cards.
- An increase in signage to explain the car park is owned by the Council and not the Surgery to prevent people from addressing complaints to the surgery.

I would hope that these points are taken into consideration.

STATEMENT PS 14

Submitted by Michael Annan

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

Can I second the submission sent to you by my GP practice, Westbury on Trym Primary Care. As a member of patient board, we meet and discuss issues with the medical team and this proposal to charge for parking is really unacceptable even if free parking is extended to one hour. This is likely to be the only council car park that incorporates a GP surgery and needs special consideration and exemption from the Council's fund raising scheme.

This proposal will also have a major negative impact on the small local shops because it will be cheaper to drive to Cribbs Causeway where parking is free, and shops are a plenty. Or the Cooperative car park the other side of the village will just take the strain.

STATEMENT PS 15

Submitted by Sarah Hazell

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

I use Westbury Hill Car park for the pharmacy, Doctors Surgery and also the banks and shops.

I do not have a lot of spare money and walking is not an option as I live behind Tesco Golden Hill.

I'm often down to the pharmacy 2 or 3 times as my medication isn't always ready in the first visit. The visits to here are often 10-20 minutes long and paying £1 each time is not going to be feasible.

I also attend the Drs regularly as I have a tendency to get Chest infections regularly and these need to be checked each time as I don't want to be taking antibiotics if I don't need them.

As a solution may I suggest at least an hour free parking or some sort of free parking if you are attending the pharmacy or Drs.

I also second what Westbury Primary Care centre has also emailed you. I sit on their patient board and have regular meetings.

STATEMENT PS 16

Submitted by Janet Caswell

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

I am writing to express my disquiet at plans to introduce a car parking charge at Westbury-on-Trym carpark. I am a member of the adjacent Westbury-on-Trym Methodist Church and live off the Downs. I am temporarily unable to drive following an operation but as a Church Official I often need to attend weekday meetings and am currently reliant on lifts. I myself normally offer lifts to fellow members especially on a Sunday. In short, I use the carpark on a regular basis. Obviously, many members do, and I am conscious that several have mobility issues without being registered disabled and I feel the charge would be an issue for them and also those who are given lifts. Many of those attending the Parish Church at Holy Trinity - which has only limited parking - would find themselves in a similar position.

I am, however, very aware that the charge would affect non churchgoers too. I am particularly concerned about those attending the adjacent Westbury-on-Trym Primary Care Centre many of whom are elderly or infirm or need to travel some distance. It is perhaps worth noting that many people who use the carpark do not live locally but travel from Southmead, Brentry and further afield. I sense many of these people would find the charges onerous over time.

I appreciate your wish to raise funds and also to control use of the carpark. I have noted that Disabled Spaces are not always used correctly, and I wonder how well the time limits are controlled. (When we hold Day Conferences at Church, we regularly advise visitors to park elsewhere for this very reason). Perhaps there is scope here to raise revenue through enforcement of fines.

I certainly urge you to reconsider your plans and if you still feel the need to proceed to at least consider some ameliorations or amendments.

STATEMENT PS 17

Submitted by Audrey Callaghan

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

I fully object to the proposal of charging for the carpark.

When considering generating more income from taxpayers for the Bristol City Council overspend. Adding parking charges to an already struggling village is not going to solve the problem for the city. Although we have not been given any insight to your research and findings that you have based your decisions on? For example

- Have you measured the current pollution levels and are they currently within the guideline?
- How much income will it generate specifically, and will that income directly benefit the village?
- How much will it cost to manage the system including all the hidden costs of time and resources. Will the income generated cover the cost proportionately?
- Why do you think this is the solution, if this is to deter commuters parking What other options were considered? - what measures have been put in place to mitigate an increase in side street parking or all the new housing being built in Cribbs causeway that will ultimately increase car owners in the area and unless you provide a cheap reliable bus service into the village it will only encourage them to drive, (or not come at all, and therefore missing out on any therefore compounding the congestion which is a contradiction to why you want to impose this fee?

It maybe that on paper Westbury on Trym seems like an Affluent area, those that use the car park are most likely not, as residents can walk to the amenities.

At the very least there ought to be as least 1-hour free parking to support local community and maybe weekends to help local businesses, and if you want to discourage commuters then after 3 hours have an increase that will deter them.

I appreciate that because of poor management of funds within the council have resulted in a deficit, and you need to find solutions, but acts like this only seem to punish those already struggling. And ultimately won't encourage people to get out of their cars but force people to then park on already crowded side streets.

How do you plan on managing the carpark and ensuring those that don't follow the rules are managed and as well as the inevitable increase in parking in residential areas – have you budgeted for Traffic wardens? Or are you thinking that once it's in place it will manage itself via your 3rd part contractor (who by the way will need paying which reduces and income generated and once again defeats the purpose charging for parking?), Have you done a long-term budget plan against costs verses income to see if it will actually help reduce the deficit? Do you have to tender for the supplier...how much will that cost, and have you calculated the pro rata rate that is relative to the carpark specifically?

This carpark supports the wider community, and aside from the many care, retirement, and retired residents in the area (who mostly likely need some kind of travel assistance whether able bodied, disabled, or blue badge holders or even, volunteers for their transport (who aren't visible in your statistics) It also supports those visiting the Doctors Surgery, church goers, schools, local business, shoppers, and many more

There may be reasons for this proposal and "hard decisions to be made but the council are meant to represent the people it SERVES and has a duty of care to all its citizens to put in place something that will benefit the community as well as the pockets of the council.

STATEMENT PS 18

Submitted by Neil Redman

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

I would like to second the submission made to you by Westbury on Trym Primary care regarding the introduction of Pay and Display Parking in District Car Parks - Westbury Hill

I do not believe the idea has been thought through properly and wish to register my objection.

STATEMENT PS 19

Submitted by Janet and James Wisheart

Title: Car Park Charges at Westbury-on-Trym

We have become aware of proposals to introduce charges at Westbury Hill Car Park and wish to make the following comments.

We have lived in Westbury-on-Trym for 26 years although we do not do so at present. We are frequently in the village and remain active members of the Methodist Church.

Westbury-on-Trym is a real community with schools, churches, GP surgery, shops and businesses centred on the village itself of which the Westbury Hill Car Park is a vital part.

The Car park is a crucial facility for:

- Folk doing their shopping or business in the village; they may go elsewhere.
- The patients of the GP surgery which is accessed from the Car Park; will they have to pay for parking in order to see their GP?
- People of all age, including many parents bringing their children who are attending activities in the Methodist Church in the morning, afternoon or evening.
- Worshippers attending the Parish Church or the Methodist Church on Sundays; will these folk now have to pay to attend worship?

Charging for the use of the Car Park will be a threat to all of these activities and will undermine, not enhance, the life of the community. At a time when social interaction, considered to be so vital for mental health, is returning after the lockdowns of the Covid period, to discourage participation in this way seems to be inappropriate.

In addition to being a place of worship, the premises of the Methodist Church which is immediately adjacent to the Car Park, serve the local community, hosting many church and non-church organisations with a weekly footfall of 1500-1700 people of all ages. This includes many young people's activities the most important being Guides with Brownies and Rainbows and Scouts with Cubs and Beavers. Many of these children are brought by their parents who use the Car Park as a 'dropping off' point; are they to be charged for bringing their children to these organisations?

We object to the proposal to make Parking Permits available as this will reduce the number of parking spaces available to the general public.

We particularly object to the imposition of charges on patients consulting their GP, attending church on Sundays and in the evenings when the youth organisations meet.

STATEMENT PS 20

Submitted by Kate Swain – Founder - Redcatch Community Garden

Title: Funding for Redcatch Community Garden

I am, along with Mike Cardwell, a founder of the Redcatch Park Community Garden. I was passionate about delivering a community asset that served, enriched and gave something back to the community, so I gave up my well-paid job, despite having a young family and set about, with Mike and some of my own money and a handful of very willing volunteers to turn a derelict bowling green in Redcatch Park into a thriving Community Garden. What we have achieved in 5 years is incredible and valued by many council, education and NHS departments. Whilst we are still living 'hand to mouth' (less than £2k profit pa and very limited reserves to protect our 16 staff) our impact has been hugely significant, our conservative social value calculations estimated at over £1M last year savings to public funds. We are recognised as being such an asset in supporting vulnerable people to be less dependent on public services that we are being given repeat commissions from HAF, NHS, Green Social Prescribing etc. We are relatively 'young' and we have such ambition, supported by a passionate (volunteer) Board of Directors and an army of versatile, amazing volunteers

Being that we are so dependent on income from funders and customers it is incredibly upsetting to learn, knowing where we've come from, that we save public money, that we used our own money to get going and that we are clearly not here for profit that benefits us, that funding we were told was earmarked to support us has 'gone elsewhere'. We would like to understand where the £57k has gone and why this can no longer be put to use to benefit Redcatch Park and the Community Garden as we understand it would be?

STATEMENT PS 21

Submitted by Miss Mary Barrington

Title: Beechwood Road Fishponds car park charges

I would like to echo the sentiments in the following letter sent by Mrs C Williams.

STATEMENT PS 22

Submitted by Zac Barker

Title: Jubilee Pool in Knowle

I speak in favour of the amendments for Jubilee Pool in Knowle.

Jubilee Pool is a vital community asset that has endured despite a frankly unsupportive stance from our Mayor. It is both a vital source of public health and recreation in Knowle and a focal community hub. Because of this a capital investment in the pool will be of great benefit to the wider community.

I have been inspired by the way many in which much of Knowle's community has come together in support of the "Save Our Pool" campaign, in particular during the periodic clean ups. Because of this I believe that even during this time of limited resources this council must do right by the pool and the Bristolians who support and use it.

STATEMENT PS 23

Submitted by Susan Carter, Bristol Walking Alliance

Title: Impact of transport and City Design proposals on walking

1. The Bristol Walking Alliance (BWA) is a consortium of organisations and individuals which campaigns to improve the walking environment. We are concerned by proposals to:

- cut discretionary transport expenditure.
- transfer transport staff to the West of England Combined Authority (WECA); and
- disband the City Design Group.

No details of the likely impact have been given, but the proposals seem certain to have an adverse impact on walking. All expenditure on walking is discretionary. We owe recent improvements in Bristol's walking environment in large part to transport and city design officers.

2. The proposals seem likely to involve:

- conflict with the Council's declared priorities. In the Bristol Transport Strategy 2019, the Council committed to making walking: "... safe, pleasant, accessible and the first choice for local journeys and combined with public transport for longer journeys". In its current Corporate Strategy, it pledged to increase the number of people travelling actively to work by walking and cycling.
- conflict with public and councillor priorities. The recent Quality of Life survey revealed that transport was respondents' main concern. At January's Full Council, councillors called for a pause in implementing proposals relating to the strategic transport and city design teams.
- loss of expertise. BWA has had frequent contact with both transport and city design officers. Accessible and knowledgeable, they have overseen significant improvements in the walking environment, for example in the City Centre, the Old City and the Whiteladies Road. Traffic has been reduced and the public realm visibly improved. Their multiple skills and knowledge of Bristol cannot be replaced easily by external consultants and more distant, inexperienced, WECA staff.
- loss of Bristol focus. In its strategic planning WECA has often appeared dominated by Bristol's surrounding authorities, with little regard for Bristol. It has encouraged roadbuilding rather than sustainable transport. We have doubts about its current capacity to deliver. We fear ceding further transport responsibilities to WECA now will be bad news for walking in Bristol. It may make sense in the longer term.
- loss of impetus on current plans. The City Design Group is involved in several initiatives, such as the Green Infrastructure Strategy and the preparation of design guides, that should protect and improve the walking environment. Similarly transport officers are engaged in initiatives such as Liveable Neighbourhoods, school streets, and pedestrianisation.

- Loss of future opportunities. Government funding often depends on the preparation of speedy and convincing bids. Local environmental improvements often depend on making good use of the community infrastructure levy (CIL) from developments. When the Government is putting increasing emphasis on design and Bristol has plans for many major developments, the city will need the capacity to bid for central funds and to make good use of CIL. This capacity will come best from staff employed by the council. Consultants are more expensive and less flexible. They anyway need an intelligent 'customer' to oversee them.

STATEMENT PS 24

Submitted by Mike Cardwell

Title: Funding for Redcatch Community Garden

In case you're not aware, we (Kate Swain and I) had an inspirational idea 5 years ago to take over a derelict corner of the highly used Redcatch Park, the former bowling green, and form a community garden. We gave up paid jobs to do this and funded the beginning with our own money and with much help from amazing volunteers, some of who are still with us, some as employees. To turn a derelict Bowling green into a £200k pa turnover organisation in 5 years is amazing enough but to do it on a shoestring, as we do, only paying our staff, including us, the founders, a living wage AND to have the recognition we have won as an organisation for supporting the wider community to live better, more enriched and healthier lives is breath-taking. It's not just us saying that; we're recognised by many leading organisations including BCC and the NHS who provide funding to enable us to deliver some of these services! our annual profit, if we're lucky, is less than £2k. We have, as yet no reserve so we're working hard to achieve that to secure the jobs of our 16 staff and retain a facility that our 40 volunteers find so valuable not to mention the visitors who (verified by the recent park survey) sing our praises saying we're the 'beating heart of the community'.

We rely on our visitor's buying coffee and the goods we produce from the garden to support us to exist, and we also constantly bid for external funding to support delivery of workstreams which supports vulnerable people in our community. We could not exist without our 40 volunteers who help us to fund raise with a constant stream of events.

It is incredible, therefore, to learn that our highly used park and community garden will not get the expected share of the £57k from the sale of Salcombe Rd land as was promised, which we had hoped to use to provide some undercover shelter for the garden so that people could sit out of the rain / be encouraged to use the garden on inclement days.

We had been advised of this funding and were eagerly relying on it. it is yet another disappointment from BCC (along with the devastating news about the CAT delay and incredible lease rent demand). It will be interesting to learn where this money has gone that we had been told was earmarked for our community Park and Community Garden.

STATEMENT PS 25

Submitted by Alan Morris for Bristol Civic Society

Title: Budget cuts and reorganisations – Transport and City Design

Bristol Civic Society continues to be concerned about the Council's proposed budget cuts and reorganisations for Transport and City Design.

The changes cover two areas:

- Transport: the proposals refer to focusing on core functions, and transfer of staff to the Combined Authority and to specialist contractors.
- City Design: the proposals refer to disbanding of the City Design team to focus on core priorities functions and statutory functions, absorbing the work into a single City Planning service.

A budget decision is being made at Full Council without the details of the proposals being published. The implications of the changes are unclear, and difficult for anyone to assess, which is concerning. Organisation restructure and transfers of work may be reasonable, but cuts in capacity and numbers of staff may have lasting impacts on Bristol's urban environment.

We are particularly concerned about the cuts in City Design. It seems folly to scrap the capacity to do work on spatial frameworks/ design codes at a time when the government is requiring all local authorities to prepare design codes.

Spatial frameworks/ design codes are the key planning tool to ensure that places undergoing major development and regeneration work well for those who will live and work there. It is such frameworks that bring together the different elements that make up a city area to make them work well economically, socially and environmentally.

Similarly, why take away capacity to work on a Green Infrastructure Plan at a time when Bristol has declared an ecological emergency?

Why leave this work to external consultants, paying more to buy in skills with less knowledge and understanding of the city and its neighbourhoods, habitats and places, rather than maintain a body of ongoing expertise ? We cannot see the sense in this.

Please could the Council explain its reasoning. The public and Full Council members need to know.

STATEMENT PS 26

Submitted by Dr Ann Kennard

Title: THE REINSTATEMENT OF THE POST OF TWINNING OFFICER

Bristol International Twinning Association (BITA) wishes to state in unequivocal terms the need for the reinstatement of the Twinning Officer role at the start of the upcoming financial year. This post was already reduced to 50% after the retirement of the full-time Twinning Officer in 2022, and with the resignation of his successor, who was unable to manage financially on the half-post, BITA has been left with no functional link with the City Council. We are aware that the financial cut was not made lightly, but having already been cut by half, we would urge the City Council not to abolish the role altogether, for reasons stated below.

Mayor Rees in his State of the City Address said: "... we have a global responsibility. We are increasingly sought out by fellow city leaders and city global networks, think tanks and global organisations. They see us as a city which has a meaningful contribution to make in organising and governing ourselves in the face of the political, economic, social and environmental challenges in front of us." The twinning organisations in Bristol are key to making this work, they have links and contacts all over the world and can facilitate partnerships and visits between the twin city organisations and the City Council. They can also make formal approaches to Embassies, European bodies, British Commonwealth organisations, UK High Commissions and municipal councils.

Conversely, the input from the Twinning Officer role in the city's International Office acts as an extremely important conduit enabling BITA to elevate its plans and projects into higher reaches of civic and international governmental bodies - areas we would find it hard to forge connections with as single smaller and voluntary entities. We can keep BITA members informed of City Council strategies, policies and initiatives and make other Bristol city stakeholders aware of twinning links and BITA member activities, not to mention the use of the City Hall twinning rooms!

A recognised central civic role visibly demonstrates how we can work both as individual twinings and also together when beneficial. We are after all civic twinings, essentially inspired and conceived by our civic representatives. We trust that the City Council will be able to continue its role and influence by maintaining the part-time Twinning Officer post, this being a small cost contribution with a much larger ongoing payback to the city.

Signed

Chairs of:

Bristol-Hannover Council

Bristol-Bordeaux Partnership

Bristol-Oporto Association

Bristol-Tbilisi Association

Bristol Link with Beira

Bristol Link with Nicaragua

Bristol and West of England China Bureau

STATEMENT PS 27

Submitted by Lesley Powell

Title: Funding for Redcatch Community Garden

There is a very disappointing and recurring theme emanating from the Council currently and as a former company director and passionate community volunteer I find this theme very concerning.

Firstly, the Council reneges on providing funds to the Park / Garden by way of provision of £57k from the sale of the land at Salcombe Road to enable enhancements to the garden and park to benefit the local community, deemed to have suffered a loss of the Salcombe Rd land and

Secondly the extensive, nationally recognised contribution the Redcatch Park Community Garden makes to the community, in respect of physical and mental health is threatened by being torn apart with a lease rental so penal it would close the garden! We regularly receive accolades not only from our wonderful regular customers but also those corporate, public (including BCC and the NHS) and charitable organisations who have seen what we achieve with our amazing (Living Wage) staff and 40 incredible volunteers who support us to ease the difficulties some of our community are experiencing and help them move onto a better life and become less dependent on our public services. So.... we employ 16 local people (some who previously struggled with employment themselves), we are held very dear by the locals, we are held in high esteem by those who fund us to help those struggling and we, in turn, save public funds by supporting people to be less dependent on public services.....yet the Council apparently needs us to pay in excess of £15,000 a year more than we make in profit in rent because, as Marvin recently told me 'things are tough back there'! Come and tell our punters how tough life can be at BCC Marvin! I'm not sure you'll get much sympathy especially when your Parks Manager told us that they've all received pay rises (even our Garden manager is on £10ish an hour despite being in a highly paid job prior....).

Both scenarios are incredible, and the public really need to understand the thinking behind this 'theme'.

STATEMENT PS 28

Submitted by Lesley Powell on behalf of Friends of Redcatch Park

Title: Funding for Redcatch Community Garden

Within the Park we could not exist without the support of our amazing volunteers. The park relies on funding from external bodies, generous local people and those funds raised by hard working volunteer led events to support what Bristol City Council cannot or will no longer do – repair / replace benches, keep borders tidy, litter pick, keep football changing rooms in good repair within the Pavilion building (the lack of facilities within which has caused the loss of 3 football teams in the park because the changing rooms are obsolete) etc, etc. At times it's even been muted that the football club could cut the grass on the football pitches and line the pitches! Meanwhile they cannot keep teams because the changing facilities have been neglected and are no longer usable! (Yet they're charged a fee for the pitches they do use....).

It is incredible therefore to learn that our highly used park has been 'robbed' of the £57k of promised money, when the neighbourhood lost a green space to provide new homes, yet the money from that sale does not end up benefitting the neighbouring park which provides those new and old residents with their healthy recreation space!

Where this money has gone, whilst green space facilities are falling into disrepair and local people are disadvantaged, needs explaining.

STATEMENT PS 29

Submitted by BRIL and UNISON

Title: Impact on disabled people of proposed job cuts by BCC

Bristol City Council (BCC) plan to make devastating cuts to jobs and services in the middle of a cost-of-living crisis.

For many Disabled people, this is a life and death situation. Adult social care is struggling to meet its legal duties and people may be dying unnecessarily. They could die while on a waiting list for an assessment or while waiting for a service having been assessed as needing one.

BRIL already has one member who, owing to waiting for an Occupational Therapist (OT) assessment, ended up in hospital due to having the incorrect equipment at home and the stress caused by the lack of an assessment.

Bristol UNISON fully support the work by BRIL in highlighting the impact on Disabled people by the impact of the cuts proposed by BCC. Whilst the Branch recognises that this is not entirely of BCC's making, the decision on where the cuts are made are fully with the Mayor and Councillors.

These cuts will make it increasingly difficult for our dedicated members, and staff of BCC, to support Disabled people in their struggle for independence, including increased stress for our members and BCC service users. We include older people within this group.

Our members will also potentially suffer a double whammy by the impact of these cuts, as they may be service users themselves, or informal carers (family members) of those Disabled people impacted by these proposed cuts. These members are already some of the most disadvantaged within society, by the impact of their impairment against their challenges to work.

The Branch would also like to highlight the impact of the wider cut within other services such as the Library Service, which currently provides a warm place for people to go in the current financial crisis, where they are struggling to eat and heat their homes.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

STATEMENT PS 30

Submitted by David Redgewell

Title: Bus service cuts in Greater Bristol

Unless Bristol city council add extra money to the transport levy at it budget on Tuesday 22nd February 2023, many bus services will be will be withdrawn on 1st April 2023 .

There is a budget amendment on buses.

Buses are part of climate change as well as access to Economy growth and Development of our city region

Regional Transport mayor Dan Norris - unlike all other combined Transport Authority mayor has no council tax raising powers or precepting powers to run buses, coaches, trains, trams and ferries.

So, Bristol City Council needs to pay the Transport levy along with Banes and South Gloucestershire council to The West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority.

Mayor Rees has always made it clear that Bristol City Region needs good a public transport bus Network.

Metro west railway Network which Mayor Rees has supported with Mayor Dan Norris of The West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority and a good mass transit system link to the Metro West Bus and Ferry Network. But the bus network along with Metro West Railway Services are essential to keep the city region moving.

It has been said people walk to alternative bus stops in 15 minutes - that is not true as there are no alternative services.

The following routes will not run or be reduced:

- 96 St Anne's Park, Brislington, Knowle, Hengrove Hospital, Hartcliffe - No alternative service.
- 516 Whitchurch, Hengrove, Knowle - Withdrawn no alternative
- 514 ,513 Brislington Town service - Part replacement Demand responsive bus not in Knowle area.
- 636 Whitchurch to Keynsham - No alternative service
- 52 Bishopsworth to Bristol city centre - No alternative service.
- 47 Yate Bus station westerleight, Puckcle Church, Emerson Green ,Downend, Oldbury Court ,Fishponds Road St Werburgh's, St Paul's Bristol - Part funded by covid 19 bus operators recovery grant. No alternative.
- 506 Bristol city centre to Easton Eastville Horfield Southmead hospital bus station - No alternative.
- 626 Wotton under edge, Iron Acton, Hambrook, Frenchay, Stapleton, Eastville park Bristol - Only service in Stapleton - No alternative service.

- Service 11 Shirehampton, Westbury on Trym, Southmead hospital, bus station - No longer serving UWE Bus station and Bristol Parkway station.
- Service 10 Avonmouth, Lawrence Weston, Westbury on Trym, Southmead Hospital, bus station, Uwe Bus station, Bristol Parkway station, Bradley Stoke, Aztec West, Hortham, Alverston, Thornbury - This service will no longer operate beyond Southmead hospital bus station.
- 512 Hengrove to Bedminster service withdrawn - No alternative service
- 511 Totterdown to Bristol city centre - Withdrawn Demand responsive in Totterdown.
- Service 17 Keynsham town centre railway station Hanham, Kingswood, Cosham Hospital, Hillfield, Staple Hill, Fishponds, Eastville Park, Horfield, Southmead Hospital bus station – Late evening services withdrawn for hospital staff.
- 672 Bristol Bedminster, Bishopsworth, Chew Valley - Service extended until June. Banes council and west of England mayoral combined transport Authority.
- No Demand responsive bus services are to operate in Greater Bristol except Brislington, Totterdown and Keynsham.
- BANES council have extended their main bus contracts until June 2023 in North East Somerset and Bath, city services for 12 months with The West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority.
- 179, Bath Midsomer Norton via Timsbury.
- 82, Radstock, Westfield, Midsomer Norton, Paulton town service.
- 672 chew valley to Bristol via South Bristol.
- 174 Bath spa bus and coach station to Peasedown St John, Radstock, Westfield, Midsomer Norton, Paulton and Wells bus and coach station.
- 688 Bath to Midsomer.
- South Gloucestershire County Council has extended it bus contracts with The West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority until June.
- 622 Cribbs causeway bus station to Olverton, Alverston, Thornbury, Yate and Chipping Sodbury
- Service 84, 85 Yate Park and Ride, Yate Railway Station, Chipping Sodbury, Wickwar, Charfield, Wootton-under-edge - Gloucestershire County Council may pay for this service as well.

Bristol city council need to amend it budget to keep socially important bus services operating in the city and county of Bristol by funding The West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority to run the support bus Network.

Bus service improvement plan money is not available from the government to support bus services.

Most of the money that supported bus service money in Bristol has been spent on Park and Ride bus service with Stagecoach West.

Brislington Park and Ride - Bristol Temple meads Bristol city centre.

Portway Parkway Railway Station, Shirehampton Sea Mills Hotwells city centre, Bristol Temple meads Station, Broadmead.

First group had offered to run this service as part of the 349 Keynsham, Brislington Park and Ride, Brislington, Arnos Vale, Bristol Temple meads station and Bristol city centre, Broadmead but the offer was not taken up by The West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority.

Only bus service improvement plan route in Bristol is 522 Brislington Park and Ride - Keynsham, Marksbury, Timbury, Paulton, Odd Down Park and Ride site.

We would urge you to look at amendments to the budget, so communities do not get cut off from Public transport to get them to work, school, college, hospital, medical centre, railway stations, shopping and leisure facilities. Many residents will be left stranded.

90 % of West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority and North Somerset support service bus services are operated by smaller companies (Abus, citistar, big lemon etc coaches) as well as bus and railway operators first group plc part staff and union owned with pension funds.

Stagecoach group owned by DML German Deutsche bank but all companies have regulated profits.

We would ask you to look at amendments to the budget.

Please note it must be very clear we have no Network of Demand responsive bus services in Bristol except Brislington, Keynsham and Totterdown so the most vulnerable people including disabled people will be left without public transport.

It would be possible to work with The West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority and North Somerset council to use some bus service improvement plan money on new bus routes in South Bristol between St Anne's Park, Brislington and Hengrove hospital, Whitchurch, Hengrove, Hartcliffe, Withywood to long Ashton Park and Ride, Bristol through South Bristol to Chew Valley to fill some gaps in the bus Network but this requires Bristol City Council to maintain its public bus service subsidies.

STATEMENT PS 31

Submitted by Suzanne Audrey

Title: Jubilee Pool in Knowle

I hope, during the Full Council budget debate, that careful consideration and support can be given to the amendments proposing financial assistance to Jubilee Pool, Knowle. Enabling the pool to survive, and thrive, depends on supporting the valiant group of local people who have agreed to take it on. Below are extracts from an article about my research into the use of local swimming pools. This research showed the importance of supporting local pools in order to enable young people from financially disadvantaged backgrounds to take up public health initiatives. Please support Jubilee Pool!

'The current proposal to close Jubilee Swimming Pool in Knowle is wrong' (bristol247.com)

“in contrast to many public health interventions, the results showed that free swimming uptake across the city was not related to the index of multiple deprivation. Children from more deprived areas were as likely to take advantage of free swimming as their more affluent peers.

“However, proximity to pool was a strong predictor of uptake: 70 per cent of swims were at the pool nearest to home and the average number of swims per swimmer increased the closer the pool was to home.

“Negative effects of living further away from a swimming pool were most evident for the most deprived children.

“The Bristol study showed that a critical factor in enabling young people from poorer backgrounds to access of this popular form of physical activity was how close they lived to a swimming pool.

“The pool is within a mile of one of the most deprived neighbourhoods in Bristol.

“100 years ago the Bristol Baths Committee was farsighted in its ambition that every home in the city should be within one mile of a swimming facility. The current administration should do everything in its power to retain what is left of their legacy and keep Jubilee Pool open.”