

Public Forum

Date: Tuesday, 14 March 2023



Agenda

1. Petitions and Statements Received

(Pages 5 - 86)

Ref No	Name	Title
PP01	Lizzie Sims	Safe road crossing on Ashley Down Road for Bru Field Primary School
PS01	Alderman Colin Smith	Best Wishes and Thanks
PS02	Mary March	Redcatch Park Budget Proposals
PS03	Edwin Moseley	Redcatch Community Garden
PS04	Adrian Stone	Redcatch Community Garden
PS05	Chris Thomas	Westbury on Trym Car Park
PS06	Bruce Saunders	Car Park Proposals
PS07	Sally Peterson	Westbury on Trym Car Park
PS08	Jane Hole-Jones	Westbury on Trym Car Park
PS09	Graham Barsby	Westbury on Trym Car Park
PS10	Bridget Niblett	Westbury on Trym Car Park
PS11	Karen Rich	Redcatch Community Garden
PS12	Christine Liddle	Westbury on Trym Car Park
PS13	Francis Cornish	Westbury Hill Car Park: Charging
PS14	Roger Woolley	Westbury-on-Trym car park
PS15	Lynn A Filby	Proposed Charges for Local Carparks
PS16	Tom Bosanquet	Double the Tree Cover in Bristol
PS17	Celia Davies	Bristol City Council Proposal to charge for parking Westbury Hill Car Park
PS18	Janet & John Walton Masters	Westbury-on-Trym carpark charges
PS19	David McGregor	Car Parking Charges for Council Meeting of 14th March
PS20	Ruth Barsby (Mrs)	Westbury on Trym Car Park
PS21	Patrick Harris	SILVER MOTION (CONSERVATIVE) CHANGES TO DISTRICT CAR PARKS
PS22	Jen Smith	SEND social media monitoring
PS23	Deborah Smith	Car park charging Westbury Hill

PS24	John Taylor	Silver Motion for Full Council on Tuesday 14th March
PS25	Gill O'Rourke	Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges
PS26	Frances Riley (President) and Carole Thorpe (Secretary) On behalf of Members of Westbury on Trym Women's Institute	Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges
PS27	Carole Thorpe (Chairman of the Westbury on Trym Village Show)	Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges
PS28	Andrew Renshaw	Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges
PS29	Derrick Sheppard	Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges
PS30	Alex Dunn – Chair - Sustainable Westbury on Trym	Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges
PS31	Lesley Powell	STOP THE CLOSURE OF REDCATCH COMMUNITY GARDEN
PS32	Jill turner	Silver Motion Transwomen and Transmen
PS33	Alexia Gardner	Westbury Hill Car Park
PS34	Brian Watson	Proposed parking charges for Westbury Hill car
PS35	M J Ainley (Mrs)	Westbury-on-Trym carpark
PS36	David Stephens	Westbury-on-Trym Village Car Park
PS37	Dr Tony Hoare on behalf of the local Transport and Placemaking group	Silver Motion concerning the proposal to charge car parking in Westbury Hill, Westbury-on-Trym
PS38	Brian Ainley	Proposals for car park charges at Westbury-on-T
PS39	Sue Creasy	VASSALL CENTRE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT
PS40	Wendy M Morri	Charge for the Council Carpark in Westbury on T (WoT)
PS41	David Redgewell	Scrutiny
PS42	Gillian Stone	Vassall Centre Planning Application 22/03476/F
PS43	Dinah Bernard	Council Budget re Westbury-on-Trym Car Park
PS44	Josephine Robinson	The Plant Based Treaty
PS45	Susan Tainton	Proposal to introduce parking charges at Westb Hill Car Park
PS46	Gina Eastman	Westbury on Trym Car Park
PS47	Hilary Long	Westbury on Trym Car Park
PS48	Jane Plummer	Westbury car park
PS49	Alison Freeman	Silver Motion (Conservative) changes to District Parks
PS50	Graham Plummer	Charge for Parking in the Westbury-on-Trym Ca Park
PS51	Mary and Malcolm Neave	Flat-rate charging system to various car parks ac Bristol
PS52	Ms Safia Yonis	Redcliffe Housing Conditions
PS53	Samira Abdi Shukri	Redcliffe Housing Conditions
PS54	Mrs Hamda Ismail	Redcliffe Housing Conditions
PS55	Nima Siyad	Redcliffe Housing Conditions
PS56	Nimo Abdi	Redcliffe Housing Conditions



PS57	Suad Omar	Redcliffe Housing Conditions
PS58	Hinda Jama	Redcliffe Housing Conditions
PS59	Khadra Hassan	Redcliffe Housing Conditions
PS60	Amanda Sharman	Bristol harbour new Fees and Charges proposal
PS61	Molly Petts	Harbour Fees Proposal

2. Public Questions Received

Ref No	Name	Title
PQ01	Tom Bosanquet	Digital Billboards
PQ02	Tom Bosanquet	St Luke's Road
PQ03	Lesley Powell	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ04	Sian Ellis-Thomas	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ05	Kate Swain	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ06	Claudia Collins	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ07	Alison Lauder	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ08	Carole Hall	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ09	James Jones	Plant Based Catering
PQ10	Keith Farley	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ11	Alex Gill	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ12	Haydn Gill	Park Row Active Travel
PQ13	Josephine Robinson	Plant Based Treaty
PQ14	Alex Hartley	Cumberland Basin Regeneration
PQ15	David Redgewell	Integrated Transport System
PQ16	Andrew Lynch	Bristol Port Company
PQ17	Suzanne Audrey	Bristol Harbour Review
PQ18	Suzanne Audrey	Mass Transit System
PQ19	Amanda Jones	Bristol Harbour Fees
PS20	Bristol Boaters Community Association	Bristol Harbour Review
PQ21	Simon James Lewis	HMOs
PQ22	Molly Petts	Bristol Harbour Review
PQ23	Trevor Gray	Bristol Harbour Review
PQ24	Phoebe Arrowsmith Brown	Bristol Harbour Review

(Pages 87 - 112)

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



PP01 Safe road crossing on Ashley Down Road for Brunel Field Primary School (429 Bristol signatures)

Petition Organiser: Ms Lizzie Sims

Families of Brunel Field Primary School need a crossing, or lollipop person, on Ashley Down Road near the bottom of Arthur Milton Street to help children safely cross this very busy main road in order to get to and from school.

There are no traffic calming measures on Ashley Down Road, and a crossing or lollipop person would help to slow the traffic down so that parents, carers and young children can cross the road safely and quickly. Our children have the right to walk to school safely! Please help us get something done before there is a serious accident.

Ashley Down Road is notoriously busy, and although the speed limit is 20 MPH there are no measures in place to enforce this and many vehicles exceed this limit. Families who live on the other side of Ashley Down road have to dodge the traffic in order to cross to get to school. If a crossing or lollipop person were in place then this would provide a safe place for families to cross, and would provide a much-needed traffic calming solution at peak times.

Please support the parents, carers and children of Brunel Field Primary by signing this petition! We will then send it to Bristol City Council and apply for funding to make this happen.

STATEMENT PS 01

Submitted by Alderman Colin Smith

Title: Best Wishes and Thanks

I am here to give thanks for the dedicated service and pastoral care to councillors, officers, aldermen/women and citizens of our great city given by the Lord Mayor's Chaplain, Rev Preb Harold Clarke who will be retiring from council employment on April 9th.

Harold has admirably and faithfully served the current and past Lord Mayors for the best part of 24 years, as well as providing support, wisdom and friendship to all the members of the Bristol City Council community. Harold's compatriot and esteemed colleague, the Director of Music, Dr. John Marsh will also be retiring on April 9th; John has been responsible for many years for producing the remarkable music for which the chapel is rightly famous.

I invite the Elected Mayor, Lord Mayor and councillors to join me and my fellow trust members in wishing Harold and John our very best wishes for the future.

It has been extremely disappointing as to the manner under which the transfer of the Lord Mayor's Chapel has been negotiated with insufficient and only belated input from the Friends of the Lord Mayor's Chapel Trust; however, the trust is reassured that the future of the fabric of the chapel is in good hands and wishes Bristol Cathedral well in its management of the chapel. The trust thanks Lucy Fleming (BCC) and Ben Silvey (Bristol Cathedral) for their professionalism and openness in helping the trust to become an effective and significant stakeholder in the discussions.

Finally, it is essential that this unique jewel of a building and the worship which takes place there continues to broadly mirror the character and content of the worship offered currently and is able to open its doors to more members of the visiting and worshipping public than hitherto. We would remind Bristol City Council of its ultimate legal liability for the chapel, irrespective of its granting of a lease to Bristol Cathedral, and the ongoing need for it to remain open for worship and visitor access should Bristol Cathedral withdraw from any future leases.

My personal best wishes and thanks to Harold and John for the friendship and support given to me and all the members of the trust.

STATEMENT PS 02

Submitted by Mary March

Title: Redcatch Park Budget Proposals

My wife and I have been regular users of Redcatch Park for over 50 years and have been extremely pleased to see the way it has developed and literally grown. We have been responsible for the planting of two new trees over the past year as a form of thanks.

Its development into a community hub with welcome facilities and events has fortunately coincided with the Covid-19 pandemic which has made it a vital sanctuary.

The park must not be allowed to die and fade away as a result of ill thought out budgetary proposals.

This area of the city has had to fight hard to get what little it has. First the councils ill disguised attempt to close the Jubilee Baths and now an attack on Redcatch Park.

STATEMENT PS 03

Submitted by Edwin Moseley

Title: Redcatch Community Garden

Redcatch Community Garden is a remarkable success. I used the Park for my own children and now use it for my grandchildren. Having the Community Garden there has transformed the feel of the park and vastly increased the available facilities for people of all ages.

The idea of increasing the rent for the Garden to £16,000 pa is ridiculous as it will lead to the closure of the Garden and a subsequent loss to the Council and more importantly a great loss to local residents.

I understand there is a relevant Council meeting on 13th March and I would be grateful if this e mail could be part of public support for the Garden.

STATEMENT PS 04

Submitted by Adrian Stone

Title: Redcatch Community Garden

It is with particular concern that I write to you about the RCG where I volunteer. I am Knowle born and bred and played football in the park in the 70s.

I understand that there is a possibility that the RCG may no longer be able to continue in existence due to financial demands proposed by the Council. Whilst I have some understanding of the reductions the Council has suffered at the hands of Central Government, I strongly believe that any shortfall should be very carefully targeted.

The RCG is a charitable organisation, started by crowd funding and now run mainly by volunteers. It ticks many of the present "boxes" in that it provides affordable and/or free services to children, those with mental and other health issues amongst others. It is also a Warm Hub. All this at no expense to the Council as the RCG relies on funds which it generates from events and its cafe as well as funding grants.

The RCG has only been in existence, using an abandoned and unwanted bowling green, for a short matter of 5 years. It has made great strides in that time (despite Covid) and has a great future, particularly once the Redcatch Quarter has been built.

It is extremely well attended (I understand with an estimated average of 4,000 people per week) and they have plans for numerous events to increase engagement across the local community and beyond. It is pleasing for me to bring friends from North Bristol to pop up events there.

A short term demand for money the RCG doesn't have could well bring to an end an asset for the community which the Council will subsequently need to replace. This would be "short-termism" at its worst. I would ask that the Council please consider providing the RCG with a Community Asset Transfer at an acceptable and affordable rent.

It is after all a success story in an area which very much needs them.

STATEMENT PS 05

Submitted by Chris Thomas

Title: Westbury on Trym Car Park

I wholly object to:

a) the proposal to charge for the use of Westbury car park. It will have a huge negative impact on the vitality and viability of Westbury. It will do nothing to enhance Westbury for the benefits of local residents and traders. The measure is designed solely fill the coffers of this (now almost defunct) Mayor's pockets for use on his other absurd projects; and

b) the way in which the charges have been proposed. There has been no public consultation nor any cost benefit analysis. This is again typical of this idiotic Mayor's way of doing business which is never to the benefit of residents.

The proposal should be scrapped; or at least subject to **meaningful consultation.**

STATEMENT PS 06

Submitted by Bruce Saunders

Title: Car Park Proposals

I write to support the amendment to be put by Cllr Mark Weston. While it may be necessary to raise revenue from council-owned car parks, it is unreasonable to apply one policy to all car parks, given the varieties of use and the varieties of location across the City. My local car park, in Westbury-on-Trym, is in my experience chiefly used by local residents for short-stay visits to the Health Centre or local banks and shops. (The No 1 bus service is so unreliable that I don't think it's much used for commuters into the City.) As long as parking can be reserved for Health Centre patients (not all of whom have blue Disability badges), there may be a case for charging during the week. But the car-park serves the local Methodist and Anglican churches on Sundays when neither the Health Centre nor most local shops are open. It may be bureaucratically more complicated, but it would be more democratic, fair and appropriate if these decisions were made individually in the light of local factors.

STATEMENT PS 07

Submitted by Sally Peterson

Title: Westbury on Trym Car Park

Proposed charging at Westbury Hill Car Park. This is the final straw for someone in my position...! I am a very elderly and disabled widow with no family locally. I am housebound and I have lived in Westbury village since 1980. I cannot drive any more and can only walk a few yards on sticks or crutches.

The free Car Park is vital to someone in my position as, apart from fortnightly home groceries deliveries, it enables me to get help each week from very kind friends to take me to the doctors surgery, collect my prescriptions, do local shopping for me, and go to the post office (now in Costco) for me. They all need to use the Car Park to do this.

I absolutely rely on their help but try not to abuse it! For all other regular return journeys to hospitals and any medical referral classes outside Westbury I need to use the locally based B'Driven taxis which are expensive but reliable and an absolute necessity.

On top of the council tax rises, utilities and cost of living increases, the proposed introduction of these parking charges at the present time is a disaster for someone in my position. PLEASE DON'T DO IT. After shielding, lockdowns, Covid etc. I am trying so very hard, with help, to continue living independently in my own home. Please don't make it impossible.

STATEMENT PS 08

Submitted by Jane Hole-Jones

Title: Westbury on Trym Car Park

Charging for all parking in this village facility will bring extra difficulties for the businesses that remain, for the majority of users who need a limited amount of time for voluntary work, church attendance etc. This plus the addition of the Brabazon village impact will cause the demise of West bury on Trym at present appreciated by all who live here & those who visit, because they can park

STATEMENT PS 09

Submitted by Graham Barsby

Title: Westbury on Trym Car Park

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 your local City Councillors.

I have just read and like the "SILVER MOTION (CONSERVATIVE) CHANGES TO DISTRICT CAR PARKS:"

STATEMENT PS 10

Submitted by Bridget Niblett

Title: Westbury on Trym Car Park

I am writing in support of the Silver Motion (Conservative) Changes to District Car Parks to be moved by Cllr Mark Weston.

I am concerned at reports that charges may be introduced for the Westbury Hill car park. There is very little opportunity to park elsewhere in Westbury Village, and any charges for this car park will only exacerbate the crowding on the surrounding residential roads.

The park is well used every day. Some people just come for a short time but for many, the stay is more lengthy, and it is these people that I am concerned about.

Doctor's surgery – a large proportion of patients are elderly and infirm, and cannot walk any distance. Charges could be imposed just for dropping off and collecting patients

People typically stay for more than one hour for the reasons set out below, so even a free first hour would not serve them:-

Churches - services, funerals, baptisms and weddings, social events, concerts, clubs and meetings at Westbury Methodist Church and Holy Trinity church – the whole range from Toddler groups to Older folk; Friday market, ballet classes and so on.

Shopping – local traders will lose footfall.

Services – banks, solicitors, accountants, hairdressers, etc.

Eating and drinking at the several pubs, cafes and restaurants – many also hold regular social events during the day.

There are reports that commuters regularly park all day and catch a bus into the city. The current free parking period is 3 hours, but is rarely monitored. However, they may be prepared to pay for a whole day to stay there but people who want to use the local amenities will not. The car park may become in effect a Park-and-Ride.

I understand that the City Council is required to raise money, but fear that introducing charges will drive people away. We should be doing all we can to support and encourage our local businesses and community.

STATEMENT PS 11

Submitted by Karen Rich

Title: Redcatch Community Garden

I just wish to make my feelings known about the possible closure of our beloved community garden in Redcatch Park. How can this be allowed to happen? Why is it that anything good and decent that makes people happy and brings them together has to be fought for tooth and nail? This is a huge asset to the area loved by both adults and children alike. Used for keep fit classes, treasure hunts, play dates, fetes and countless other activities. To impose a 5000% rent rise is both extortionate and imorale. You must know that it is impossible to raise this ridiculous amount therefore you must simply want it to fail. I have been the volunteer litter picker in Redcatch Park for nearly seven years now but if the gardens close I don't think I shall have the heart to continue, it would be too depressing.

Please, for goodness sake, do not destroy this amazing and cherished space. You will never be forgiven.

STATEMENT PS 12

Submitted by Christine Liddle

Title: Westbury on Trym Car Park

I am a regular worshipper at Westbury Parish Church and I also do voluntary work at Westbury Methodist Church. I live outside the Parish and rely on the village car park which I use several times a week. I am concerned for the many elderly people, including myself, who visit Westbury for banking (my local branch has closed), solicitors, shopping and to use the medical practice- the proposed charges will soon mount up and have a very negative effect on what is now a thriving community.

I hope this proposal will be modified accordingly.

STATEMENT PS 13

Submitted by Francis Cornish

Title: Westbury Hill Car Park: Charging

I write to express my concern at the proposal to introduce parking charges at Westbury Hill Car Park.

This is not a wealthy area and most residents are finding it very difficult to cope with the cost of living, particularly energy charge, increases. But there is one point of special importance: if charges are to be introduced I think it is extremely important that they do NOT extend to Sundays. Nearly all users of the car park on a Sunday are worshippers at Holy Trinity or the Methodist Church, and it would be a great mistake to make it more difficult or expensive for them to go to church.

I hope that you will give this point serious consideration.

STATEMENT PS 14

Submitted by Roger Woolley

Title: Westbury-on-Trym car park

As far as I am aware there is only one car park in Westbury handy to the shops/clinic/churches and with street parking rarely unoccupied the businesses would be seriously constrained. The churches, Methodist and Anglican are in use not only on Sundays but also during the week, day and evening with very limited dedicated parking.

To have a free car park available when there is likely to be a brief visit to commercial premises seems to be a very short-sighted proposal which would push customers to Cribbs Causeway or elsewhere.

Obviously there is an income to be had from the car park, but surely not one that would enhance the Council's coffers significantly but likely to be to the detriment of the public and the businesses. It is not as though it is a multi-storey with a large potential but it is a community facility which is very much needed.

Removing this asset must be an undesirable move.

STATEMENT PS 15

Submitted by Lynn A Filby

Title: Proposed Charges for Local Carparks

The overall financial gain for commencing charges in our local carparks is insignificant in comparison to the detriment to local residents, visitors and businesses.

I use the carpark in Westbury on Trym to attend Church on Sunday, to support local Charity Shops, to have coffee with friends, for groceries, baked goods and fresh fruit and vegetables.

If the idea for charging is to ensure the maintenance of the carpark, surely street parking is going to increase. Surely it is far easier and less expensive to maintain a limited area than to close off roads in order to maintain those! Has anyone costed these options?

Please think very seriously about this decision. It is NOT in the best interests of the local population nor will it be a vote winner!

STATEMENT PS 16

Submitted by Tom Bosanquet

Title: Double the Tree Cover in Bristol

The commitment to double the tree cover in Bristol over the next 20 years is quite positive - we all know the multitude benefits of urban trees. Alongside this, however, you've been busy allowing mature trees to be removed all around the city, often before planning permission has even been considered. Your continued trumpeting of "net biodiversity gain" means nothing when your backing band is busy performing a chainsaw solo.

STATEMENT PS 17

Submitted by Celia Davies

Title: Bristol City Council Proposal to charge for parking at Westbury Hill Car Park

I wish to object to the proposal to charge for parking at Westbury Hill Car Park. In general I believe the availability of free parking is important to allow local businesses to thrive, and patients of the GP practice situated here would be severely impacted.

On a personal level, as an elderly person who cannot walk long distances, I rely on this car park to attend Holy Trinity church both on Sundays and for weekday services, meetings and events at the Methodist church, my bank, Imperial Hearing for maintenance of my hearing aids, and local shops such as Mogfords and St. Peter's Hospice shop.

I respectfully ask that this proposal be withdrawn.

STATEMENT PS 18

Submitted by Janet & John Walton Masters

Title: Westbury-on-Trym Carpark Charges

We must protest at the threatened charges for using the Westbury-on-Trym carpark. This free carpark is vital for the village, on all counts. The shops will suffer drastically, those attending doctor's appointments will be unable to, those going to church and any local events will be denied, and the locals will be unable to park on their own roads, increasing an already impossible situation.

STATEMENT PS 19

Submitted by David McGregor

Title: Car Parking Charges

Please consider the points I raise below when coming to a decision on Cllr Mark Weston's submission on Changes to District Car Parks.

As I understand it there are 10 car parks that are subject to the draft decision on charging for car parks and the central reason is the need to reduce the Council's budget deficit for 23/24.

I understand the great pressure the council is under to balance its budget in light of cuts in grants from central government and am happy in principle that there is a charging regime in the Westbury on Trym car park.

My request is that the Council reconsider their proposals to have a blanket regime of charging across all its car parks and to consider the needs of local communities in coming to an individual charging regime for each car park.

In the case of Westbury on Trym there has not been any prior consultation on the proposals; there has been a sizeable protest of over 50 submissions to the budget setting meeting and there has been a lack of consideration of the impact of the proposed charging regime.

In particular

1. The presence of a Doctor's surgery with necessary drop off for ill patients, and the Methodist church with a wide range of activities for 1700 people per week including AA and Elder persons lunches and Ukraine Hub means that those attending such events will be penalised by the charges
2. The local businesses, banks and community facilities are an important facility for people from a wider area of Southmead, Henbury, Brentry as well as Westbury and Stoke Bishop. If parking charges are in place visitors are likely to try to park on already saturated roadside parking, including illegal parking; or not come into Westbury. The impact on already hard pressed banks and shops could result in businesses closing and take the economic heart from the village.

I urge the Council to consider alternative proposals that reduce these potential negative impacts while retaining revenue collection as follows

1. Introduce a first hour free regime with second and third hours at £2 per hour. This should lessen the impact of reduced revenue and encourage short term parking
2. Introduce a 6 day charging regime to allow free parking on Sundays to allow the sizeable number of church goers to the Methodist and Anglican churches to attend services without a penalty.

I trust this request will be given appropriate consideration

STATEMENT PS 20

Submitted by Ruth Barsby

Title: Westbury on Trym Car Park

The Westbury-on-Trym car park is used by those attending the doctors' surgery as well as those attending services at the Methodist Church and the Parish Church; Country Market, various clubs, toddler group and events held particularly in the Methodist Church building, several are aimed at older people to reduce loneliness which is one of the Council's concerns. If people cannot park for free some of these folk will remain isolated as they cannot afford the cost or inconvenience of paying for parking.

I understand that the Council need money but the people of the village of Westbury-on-Trym also need to maintain clubs and groups for the local children to avoid/reduce vandalism as well as local businesses needing to be supported.

Would it perhaps be possible to permit a certain length of time (at least an hour) parking for free so as to facilitate in particular the attendance at the Doctors' surgery? Parking charges could, if really necessary, then be introduced for time outside that period.

Perhaps those attending church services and Country Market could also be permitted to park for free... or a reduced cost... the churches could issue permits for the duration of events.

Increasing numbers of people are taking parking spaces all around the side streets and 'commuting' into the centre of Bristol already. Parking spaces are therefore very hard to find, particularly when there is a wedding or funeral in the village as well as normal activities.

We would appreciate proper consultation on this matter.

STATEMENT PS 21

Submitted by Patrick Harris

Title: SILVER MOTION (CONSERVATIVE) CHANGES TO DISTRICT CAR PARKS

Please consider the points I raise below when coming to a decision on Cllr Mark Weston's submission on Changes to District Car Parks.

I believe that there are 10 car parks across Bristol where Bristol City Council will be looking to introduce parking charges; these car parks vary in size and communities that they serve and before any decision is taken to introduce parking charges across all of these car parks I urge members of the Council's transport group to meet with representatives from the local communities and discuss what the impact of charging will be on that community, rather than just voting through charging at all the 10 car parks without any proper consultation.

My concern is with the Westbury Hill car park, where there has been no consultation before the budget proposal were voted through and I feel Councillors need to consider the following points, as up to now there has been a lack of consideration that the impact of introducing parking charges will have on the local community and its residents.

1. The presence of a Doctor's surgery where patients attend for a consultation with a GP, by the nature of visiting a doctor, patients will often be unwell or have short term mobility issues and need easy access to the surgery.
2. The presence of a Pharmacy (This is a separate entity to the doctor's surgery) potentially a person requiring a prescription may need to make two visits, one to drop the prescription off and a second to collect.
3. As well as holding services both the Parish Church (Holy Trinity) and the Methodist church make their buildings available to enable a wide range of activities to take place each week for some of the more vulnerable members of the Community. Examples of this are Holy Trinity providing free soup and a place of warmth over the winter months, which gave the opportunity for people struggling with the cost of living to come out, meet and talk to other people. Holy Trinity also gives the opportunity for those who are bereaved to come and talk to other people in the same situation and amongst other things the Methodist Church hosts a Friendly Club for elderly people in the Village, there is a Ukraine Hub their and uniformed organisations use the facilities. Introducing parking charges will penalise those who attend these activities, many of who come from neighbouring areas and could also potentially impact on donations both churches receive.
4. The local businesses, banks and community facilities are an important facility not just for the people of Westbury on Trym, but also the wider area, with people coming into the Village from Southmead, Henbury and Brentry. If parking charges are in place visitors are likely to try to park on already saturated roadside, including illegal parking by the Zebra Crossings around the Cenotaph or they just won't come into Westbury. The impact on the already hard pressed banks and shops could result in businesses closing and take the economic heart from the village.

5. Public Transport that serves the village is very unreliable or nonexistent, especially on a Sunday, so this forces people to drive rather than catch a bus.

I do understand the need to introduce some form of charges at this Car Park, but urge the Council to talk to representatives from the local community and consider carefully how it could be done without having a negative impact on those who have a need to use the car park. As a suggestion alternative proposals that reduce these potential negative impacts could be

1. Introduce a first hour free regime with second and third hours at £2 per hour. This should lessen the impact of reduced revenue from giving the first hour free.

2. Introduce a 6 day charging regime to allow for free parking on Sundays to allow the sizeable number of churchgoers to the Parish & Methodist churches to attend services without a penalty. To lessen the impact of reduced revenue, bring the start of the charging period forward by one hour over the 6 charging days.

I trust this request will be given appropriate consideration by Councillors.

STATEMENT PS 22

Submitted by Jen Smith

Title: SEND Social Media Monitoring

Five months ago, a motion was brought to Full Council regarding SEND social media monitoring.

The Mayor was called upon to agree for a genuine independent inquiry conducted by the LGA or similar body.

The motion was carried. To my knowledge, there has been no such investigation.

I find this unsurprising. A heavily redacted SAR I received six months after requesting it, shows that the surveillance of Send parents was a normal practice across several departments of the People Directorate, involving several executive directors and directors. It also included managers below them.

Surveillance took place from the work and private accounts of staff. It included collaboration with SENDIAS and at least one NHS manager. Bristol External Comms were also at the heart of it. And emails were sent in 2021 between the People Directorate, Public Relations and the Mayor's Office.

Emails about 'SEND Twitter' were marked 'high importance'.

Some of the emails, containing my personal information, were almost entirely redacted. So whilst I knew they were about me, I have absolutely no idea what they said. I'm not sure this is how the process is supposed to work.

What is absolutely clear from the data I have received is that Bristol City Council and the administration do not want anyone talking negatively about what goes on in Bristol. No matter how factual, how honest or correct.

The monitoring of social media has been systematic and part of an authoritarian administration in Bristol which consistently attempts to suppress the voices of Send families and control the narrative of disabled people.

I find this breach of human rights absolutely astounding. And that when democratically elected councillors have voted for a motion, that it can be swept aside.

STATEMENT PS 23

Submitted by Deborah Smith

Title: Car Park Charging Westbury Hill

I strongly support the Silver Motion (Conservative) changes to District car parks moved by Cllr Mark Weston.

I help to run a parent and toddler group at Westbury on Trym Methodist Church hall which is an essential community group. Charges for parking would impact families whose need is greatest.

The church hall is an amazing community resource and has hundreds of community users each week of all ages. Charging would create chaos as children are dropped off by parents who will try to avoid parking charges.

STATEMENT PS 24

Submitted by John Taylor

Title: Silver Motion for Full Council on Tuesday 14th March

I write representing both the worshipers and users of Westbury on Trym Methodist Church that adjoins the car park in Westbury on Trym. That the council seeks to introduce car park charges is perhaps understandable. However, it is the charging structure that is of concern. It is important that the council is aware of the usage of the church property and the impact of the proposed charge structure will have on the church and the people who use it. The property is also a vital community hub for the village. There is nowhere else that provides a wide range of services that are widely used.

Management of the church and attached property show that there is a weekly footfall of 2000+ people who use the premises. This comprises of:

- Worshipers on Sunday morning and evening.
- Funerals, weddings and baptisms
- Toddler groups during the day.
- Women's Fellowship Group. A weekly meeting for ladies that provides company and fellowship.
- Pensioner/senior citizens – members of our Friendly Club
- Knit & Natter group. A weekly meeting of like minded ladies.
- Coffee Mornings. Currently held three times every week. Very much a social meeting point in a relaxed and friendly atmosphere.
- Uniform groups – Beavers, Cubs, Scouts, Rainbows, Brownies and Guides. These groups use the property every day. There can be two plus groups on certain days.
- Kumon. This is an educational group who seek to teach children English and Maths. They use several rooms within the property several days each week.
- Bristol Ballet Centre. This is a very popular organisation with children from a wide age range attending classes on at least 5 days a week.
- Alcohol Anonymous. This group meets weekly and is most important to the attendees who need the consistency and level of support they get.
- Ukrainian Hub. This group meets weekly to ensure help is available to the Ukrainian refugees that have arrived in Bristol. As a spin off the property is also used to teach English to Ukrainians and other refugees from other countries.

- Charade Drama Group. Using the hall this group puts on at least 4 shows a year over several days each. Rehearsals also require the use of the property.
- Foodbank. This is a drop off point for donations for this charity.
- Many one off but regular events. These are wide ranging but include local choirs and orchestras, a plant sale in aid of local charities which is part of the annual Community Fair, church meetings, parties, fund raising events and other social gatherings.

Without doubt the largest numbers of users are children. We adhere to a strict safeguarding policy part of which is that children must be dropped off at the door and collected at the door at the end of their session. This would usually only take a few minutes and as you can imagine the car park is ideal for a very short stay whilst children are dropped off and collected. Charging a £1 each time this occurs - £2 in total – seems very antisocial and tough on parents who are already trying to cope with high costs and inflation.

Sunday car park charges are also a concern. Both the Anglican (Holy Trinity) and Methodist Church worshippers use the car park on Sundays. With most shops closed there is very little other local activity to attract drivers and therefore on Sundays the car park is otherwise virtually unused. Is it too much to ask that consideration be given to free parking on Sundays?

We recognise that the council needs to generate income as it strives to balance the books and provide public services. The church and the property attached provides a very important community hub and the fear is that the introduction of car parking charges will have a serious impact for the users, the businesses associated with it and the general important role it plays within our village.

As a user of the car park myself I am fully aware of its vital role within the locality. My strong impression is that the 3 hour limit is rarely exceeded and that there is a continual turnover of cars. No doubt this can be verified. Westbury on Trym Methodist Church would like to propose a compromise solution. This is that the first hours parking is free of charge but that the rate of charge for the subsequent two hours are increased to compensate. This should be a happy result for both the church property uses and the council.

STATEMENT PS 25

Submitted by Gill O'Rourke

Title: Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges

Our attention has been drawn by neighbours and local service providers to the proposal to start charging for the Westbury on Trym village car-park. As a quick-fix income-raising measure without due consultation on the effect this might have on the neighbourhood this seems short-sighted.

Our concerns are as follows

1. Charges: on the face of it may not be high, but act as an inhibitor to any passing traffic or those who wish to use the amenities of Westbury Village
2. Local high street economy: As local residents we are committed to trying to use our local amenities as far as possible both for convenience and to reduce the need to travel elsewhere. But our local shops, banks, hairdressers and cafes etc depend not only on us, but others in areas that don't enjoy a local 'hub'. If people are discouraged from coming to WOT then we are concerned that some of our local amenities will fail through lack of custom.
3. Services to the wider community: WOT is a characterful village hub which offers a pleasant ambience due to its history and local colour, flowers provided by public subscription in the summer and a variety of historic buildings dating back to 13th century. It is near to several large post-war housing estates, and as such is an attractive destination for middle- and low-income families from eg Southmead and Henbury. Having to pay to park here, or a consequential reduction in the facilities here, will have the knock-on effect of depriving these nearby visitors of a pleasant venue for a morning or afternoon out
4. It seems punitive to charge those requiring to attend local GP services or collect medicines to have to pay an additional charge if they need transport to get there
5. Local churches, well attended and whose members do much to support the community, are reliant on this car-park for people to attend worship on Sunday as well as for weekday activities
6. It does seem that charging on Saturday and Sunday is particularly excessive, as even residents' parking schemes generally only operate on weekdays
7. Car-parking on the streets is already up to capacity during the day, with cars belonging to those who work a full day in the village. So any visitors requiring an extended stay for eg hairdresser or dentist will have difficulty finding anywhere to stop for long enough. Our driveway and road is often partially blocked by vehicles parked not always considerately and we anticipate an increase of pressure on any free parking space
8. Until local bus services are rendered reliable and more comprehensive people will continue to need to use a vehicle

Before any decisions are made we would urge a thorough consultation/trial/justification for parking charges which could threaten the balance of the local economy and community and it's service to this part of Bristol.

STATEMENT PS 26

Submitted by Frances Riley (President) and Carole Thorpe (Secretary) On behalf of Members of Westbury on Trym Women's Institute

Title: Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges

We write in support of the Silver Motion re Changes to District Car Parks. Our specific concern is the Car Park in Westbury on Trym. We have set out below the concerns of the Members of Westbury on Trym WI for the very real problems and consequences that will be caused by the imposition of car park charges.

Because we also appreciate that Bristol City Council is facing severe financial challenges to public services, we ask the Mayor or a Cabinet Member to begin discussions with the concerned residents of Westbury on Trym to find workable solutions, and to arrange a meeting within the Village.

We wish to make the following objection to the proposal to impose parking charges at the Westbury on Trym Car Park.

The Westbury on Trym Women's Institute meets monthly in the afternoon in the Methodist Church, moving from April to the Village Hall. The Car Park is vital to our members to enable them to access the meetings, but also for so many of their daily activities.

Our members are women of retirement age. They use the car park for many reasons:

- To visit their GP or collect prescriptions from the pharmacy.
- To shop in the village
- To access their banks
- To use the Post Office
- To support the Friday Country Market held in the Church Hall
- To socialise with their friends and support local businesses.
- To go to Church
- To attend clubs and societies at the Methodist Church or Village Hall

Charging for the use of the Car Park will be a threat to all 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 very wrong.

Parking charges will have a severe impact on the independent businesses and undoubtedly lead to more bank closures.

We understand the importance of using buses, cycling and walking. However not all our WI Members are fit enough to cycle or walk to the village and the village is surrounded by steep hills. Not everyone lives near a bus route. It is particularly difficult for anyone travelling from Henleaze / Horfield. The one bus, the 13, takes a very long route and is frequently cancelled.

Parking will be pushed to the surrounding roads causing huge difficulties for local residents.

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 would welcome the opportunity to meet with the Mayor to find a way forward.

STATEMENT PS 27

Submitted by Carole Thorpe (Chairman of the Westbury on Trym Village Show)

Title: Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges

We write in support of the Silver Motion re Changes to District Car Parks. Our specific concern is the Car Park in Westbury on Trym. We have set out below the concerns of the Members of Westbury on Trym Village Show Committee for the very real problems and consequences that will be caused by the imposition of car park charges.

Because we also appreciate that Bristol City Council is facing severe financial challenges to public services, we ask the Mayor or a Cabinet Member to begin discussions with the concerned residents of Westbury on Trym to find workable solutions, and to arrange a meeting within the Village.

We wish to make the following objection to the proposal to impose parking charges at the Westbury on Trym Car Park.

The Westbury on Trym is an annual event that takes place on the first Saturday of September. It takes place in the Village Hall and its garden. It is a traditional show which greatly adds to the cohesion of the community, and is well attended, having an annual footfall of around 1,000. Money raised goes towards the maintenance and development of the Village Hall.

Many of the stall holders need to park in order to be able to deliver their goods and displays. Most of them are small businesses or charities with small profit margins.

Charging for the use of the Car Park will be a threat to all the Show 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 very wrong.

Parking charges will have a severe impact on the independent businesses and undoubtedly lead to more bank closures.

Parking will be pushed to the surrounding roads causing huge difficulties for local residents.

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 would welcome the opportunity to meet with the Mayor to find a way forward. A first free hour which would allow dropping off time would go some way to mitigating the impact on the stall holders.

STATEMENT PS 28

Submitted by Andrew Renshaw

Title: Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges

The introduction of car park charges in the district car parks, such as in Westbury was proposed as a tool for transport policy, but is clearly designed to bring in revenue. The problem with the council's bald approach to this – an hourly charge of £1 - is that no account has been taken of the economic and social consequences to the centres affected by the proposals. The charges and their and duration will have serious consequences for the areas that they serve – generally district shopping centres that are struggling. In Westbury on Trym, in particular, the centre is barely holding its own.

All local retail centres have gone through traumatic times with Covid, internet shopping and the recession. The proposal comes at a time when we now have the **least frequent and most unreliable bus services in Bristol that there has ever been**. Westbury serves a wide area but regarding 'modal shift', the 1 bus route from Cribbs to City Centre which used to run every 10 minutes off peak is now every 20 minutes, with frequent gaps of 40 minutes due to cancellations, and no improvement forthcoming in the April timetable; no modal change can result from that. East west bus services are poor and **infrequent services on Sunday** so will not attract modal change either. **Charging on Sundays will certainly have no positive impact on transport policy, it will just add to on street parking**. Charging will of course also encourage motorists to search the surrounding residential streets for a free space.

Planning policies seek to retain healthy shopping centres. In planning terms Westbury on Trym is defined as a 'town centre', so it is of more than local significance. It remains a focus for banking for the wider area, **but HSBC recently announced its closure**. Shoppers in north west Bristol have a choice of other shops with ample free parking - Cribbs Causeway or to the discount Aldi and Lidi stores in Southmead and Henbury. The charges proposed are bound to impact on the large range of independents in Westbury, who need shoppers from a wider catchment area. Accordingly, they stand to lose as car borne shoppers visit less frequently.

Several of the other car parks proposed for charging are within a stone's throw of free Aldi and Lidl car parks - eg Machin Road, West Town Lane, Chalks Lane, Ducie Road. It can be anticipated that motorists will park free there instead and this will only add to their trade at the expense of local shops.

Westbury Hill car park also serves the health centre, which enabled a major upgrade of the car park, when it was built. The car park also serves churches, and especially the adjoining church hall with a **multitude of daytime classes, social and religious activities put on by volunteers** - club/ lunches for the elderly, the Ukrainian hub, toddlers, exercise classes, Warm in Westbury, Friday market to name but a few.

The equality review in the report to Cabinet showed that **the greatest impacts will be on the elderly, disabled people with impairments that are not blue badge holders, pregnancy and socio-economic deprivation**. Despite the heavy use of the car park on Sundays by the local churches, **the report failed to record any adverse impact on religion or belief** (not only relevant to Westbury); many of these will also be elderly who need to be transported by car and will have to pay £2 just to go to church.

I acknowledge that there is going to be a charge because of budget cuts for the sake of the social and economic health of the village (and also the other centres affected), but it must be done sensibly

- with local consultation – to limit damage to the social and shopping activities served by the Westbury Hill car park. A 'one size fits all' £1 an hour charge needs to be reconsidered. Please will the relevant councillors and officers discuss with the community before trying to implement a scheme, including a free period for short stays, no charge on Sundays the length of the maximum period and the ridiculous season ticket proposal, to avoid the worst damage that this would do. Thank you.

STATEMENT PS 29

Submitted by Derrick Sheppard

Title: Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges

This is to confirm my concerns about proposed actions for Westbury Hill Car Park.

I support the motion being proposed which is as follows:

SILVER MOTION (CONSERVATIVE) CHANGES TO DISTRICT CAR PARKS “This Council very much regrets the decision to introduce changes in the terms and conditions for the use of the City’s district car parks and, as stated in the Cabinet report on this issue, to sell four additional sites deemed to have ‘low occupancy’ and appropriate for disposal. These proposals were not subject to any prior public consultation. All identified car parks provide an important role in support of local shops and small businesses. Many serve vital public amenities such as GP surgeries, pharmacies, churches, and community centres. Council believes such a move is misconceived, based on a flawed premise and methodology, whilst ignoring the needs and social benefits of retaining some free provision in our suburbs. The exclusion of local input from local people and their elected representatives dictates that it should be revisited, reviewed and reversed. Accordingly, the Mayor is called upon to: (i) Listen to and acknowledge the strength of opposition to these ideas (ii) Commit to conducting full consultation prior to any introduction (iii) Work with local Councillors and communities to explore possible compromise solutions prior to implementation (iv) To pause the sell-off of the four secondary car parks to evaluate their impact on local high streets and then consult on those plans as well.” To be moved by Cllr Mark Weston (Conservative) Date of Submission: 1st March 2023

The reasons for my concerns include:

1. I appreciate Council’s need to cut costs and generate income to pay for our vital local community services, but excessive charges will harm WoT’s vital community services.
2. The Westbury Hill CP is a ‘vital magnet’ which enables easy access for WoT services.
3. Excessive CP charges will incentivise many to find alternative CP free centres for their shopping, banking, postal, pharmacy, health, religious, social and community activities.
4. The loss of custom due to excessive CP charges could be a ‘death knell’ to many small traders in WoT, who are already on a knife edge due to rising energy costs, rates, etc.
5. On the other hand, subject to these being reasonable, moderate tiered CP charges could deter abuse of Westbury Hill CP and be less harmful to WoT trade and businesses.
6. As a local resident for over 40 years, I greatly appreciate the vibrant mix of WoT’s shops, charities, community and social services, all available within easy walking distance.
7. These local facilities also enable a healthier lifestyle and less carbon emissions.

STATEMENT PS 30

Submitted by Alex Dunn – Chair - Sustainable Westbury on Trym

Title: Westbury-on-Trym Car Parking Charges

Sustainable Westbury on Trym is committed to making Westbury on Trym more sustainable and reducing the damage done to the environment by local residents and their activities.

A sustainable community provides services of all kinds to its members locally. If services are not available locally, or too expensive locally, or too inconvenient locally, people will be obliged to travel to obtain them. Ideally people will be able to get to local services on foot, bike or using other low carbon means.

Westbury, like many other places, is seeing a decline in local amenities and services of all kinds, although hairdressers seem to be an exception.

Once people have to pay to park for any visit, they will be discouraged from using the remaining amenities and services and travel further afield to places such as Cribbs Causeway. The viability of many local businesses is such that any small decrease in turnover may be the final blow and they will close. The loss of any local business makes Westbury less viable as a centre, reduces footfall for remaining businesses and takes away local jobs. In this way things are likely to get worse and car park revenue will decline too.

Ideally everybody would be able to walk, bus or cycle to their local amenities but some can't and are obliged to drive.

Were parking to be free for the first hour then a large proportion of visits to the village would be free and people would not be discouraged. The cost of the second and third hour could be increased to maintain the income generated through parking charges. Studies have shown that having spaces available, because they are not blocked by people staying all day or for several hours, can increase business in a place like Westbury. Similarly an annual parking pass would discourage visitors as some spaces would be permanently unavailable. So it may be that the introduction of parking charges could raise some money for the city and increase trade for local businesses too.

SusWoT has not discussed this subject formally and developed a group approach yet, so I am writing in a personal capacity although I have discussed this approach with other members.

SusWoT would welcome the opportunity to discuss this issue with Bristol council officers or elected representatives.

STATEMENT PS 31

Submitted by Lesley Powell

Title: STOP THE CLOSURE OF REDCATCH COMMUNITY GARDEN

The Garden is located in an economically and socially diverse area. Individuals come with many different needs and requirements. We serve many wards in South Bristol, including some of the most deprived in Bristol. Many of our customers and session attendees continue to feel the psychological impact of the pandemic and are now experiencing the impact of the cost of living crisis. The vision for the garden 5 years ago was to help those vulnerable members of our community and provide a garden family hub in which they can feel safe and included. The services provided by the staff and volunteers (and visiting providers) includes many activities for children from local primary schools, a nursery as well as services for adults and children with special needs, providing environmental learning in an outside setting that they would probably not get anywhere else. It has a reputation for building trust with groups who find daily life difficult.

The funding model for the garden is to cover overheads with income from events and the café so that we can subsidise the restricted funded projects – (those projects which impact the NHS, Social Care, the Council, by saving them money on services and reducing dependency) and to host educational visits from local schools and nurseries. Our model is recognised as a valuable provider of Green Social Prescribing. The garden activities are also subsidised by our wonderful volunteers, approximately 250 hours a week in free labour. We have 16 staff, 14 of whom are paid a living wage including the Manager / co founder (so just over £12 per hour). The only two staff paid more are the professionally qualified Art Therapists. Most of our staff and all our volunteers could earn more working elsewhere. Most staff not only work the hours for which they are paid but also help with events as volunteers.

Our model is as lean as it can be to ensure we can help the community as much as we can. We took a derelict bowling green 5 years ago, ('Agricultural Land) and turn it into a successful Social Value / Community space using personal funds and crowd funding. This same space that stood empty and barren is now productive, costs the Council nothing, in fact handing it over means it's less Park to maintain!

Here we now have, a **NOT FOR PROFIT** organisation that has not made more than £2k in profit in each of its 5 years (because it's been growing and investing in the model and investing in the services) which has created 16 jobs, manages circa 40 volunteers, some of whom have or have had struggles of their own (and some gone onto employment elsewhere or with us) now being asked to pay £17k pa in rent (currently £300pa, so a 5660% increase).

So,..... we considered how we might be able **to offer to offset that rent demand with action:**

- 1. We offered to unlock and lock the park gates and toilets 7 days a week. This often does not happen so the toilets get vandalised (at a repair cost to Parks budget we assume). NOPE – Park Works is contracted to do that so this action by the Garden won't save the Parks Dept money. (Despite the OBVIOUS that it would save Council Tax payers money.)**
- 2. We offered to fit a thermostat and time clock in the Pavilion –a mostly obsolete building used as a mess room for Parks Dept landscape team. Three 2kw heaters belting out at 25 degrees every cold day. Our estimates are of a saving in electricity of £6k to £10k PER YEAR. NOPE – Energy budget is centrally**

held so this won't save Parks Dept money (despite the OBVIOUS that it would save Council Tax payers money.)

It is unthinkable that that Council, who's business track record is so poor and has wasted multi millions of Council Tax payers money in failed projects and pipe dreams, could even be considering the destruction of this oasis because it needs a few coppers to help plug the multi millions of pounds budget shortfall. We never once considered that the Council, who always seem to agree we do so much good, would want to destroy our model by charging us a rent far more than we ever make in profit. Even the Mayor during a recent visit confirmed that he considers the work we do valuable to the community and does not want to see us disappear.

I wonder what our funders, service receivers, our wonderful community and the press will make of the above?

STATEMENT PS 32

Submitted by Jill Turner

Title: Silver Motion Transwomen and Transmen

On 5th July 2022 full council agreed the Silver motion which stated that this council recognises that transwomen are women and transmen are men. On the face of it, this appears to be a binding decision with legal effect.

Lord Mayor, you have now written and said that it is not a binding decision and that it has no legal effect.

In order to ensure that the public are not misled we need you to publicly confirm that that is the case at this meeting.

We also need you to confirm that members of staff and teachers who believe that sex is binary and immutable can express their views (in the appropriate circumstances) without any fear of discrimination, detriment or sanction.

STATEMENT PS 33

Submitted by Alexia Gardner

Title: Westbury Hill Car park

I would ask that the Council consider a face to face discussion with regard to the Westbury on Trym, Westbury Hill Car park. As with Shirehampton Car park it serves a doctors surgery and pharmacy and this situation means they are unlike the other 8 car parks considered for paid parking. Westbury Village has few alternative parking areas near the shops and businesses. My husband is 81 and has mobility issues so needs to use the car park frequently for diabetic screening. I attend Westbury WI and sewing classes where the Car park is used by many but payment parking would obviously be an added financial burden and for some may result in them no longer attending.

I do hope we will have a chance to share our thoughts with the mayor or cabinet member to find a workable step forward with this issue.

STATEMENT PS 34

Submitted by Brian Watson

Title: Proposed parking charges for Westbury Hill car park

I am writing in support of Councillor Mark Weston's motion submitted 1 March 2023 objecting to the Council's proposals to introduce charges 7 days a week for certain district car parks.

I write with particular reference to the Council's free car park at Westbury Hill. I live in Henleaze and I use this car park regularly. I mostly use it (1) when I attend one of the village churches for Sunday worship (c.2 hrs each visit), (2) when I attend rehearsals of the church choir (c.2 hrs each visit), (3) when I undertake voluntary work at the Ukrainian Refugee Hub in the Methodist Church hall adjacent to the car park (c.2hrs each visit) (4) when I visit my bank, its branch in Henleaze having closed (roughly 15 minutes each visit).

There are some roadside parking spaces on Westbury Hill and nearby. They are regulated, but they permit a short stay, and they allow free parking on Sundays. They are, however, whenever I visit, almost always fully occupied.

So I use the Westbury Hill carpark. I think it unfair that I should have to pay (1) to attend my church for worship or choir practice, (2) to undertake voluntary work, and (3) to make a short visit to my bank.

Westbury Hill car park is also used by persons attending (or providing lifts and then waiting for persons attending) medical appointments at the adjacent surgery. I also think it unfair, indeed, unkind, to charge such persons (not all of whom are blue badge holders) for using the car park. An exemption for a short visit would avoid that particular unfairness - which some have described as a tax on being ill.

Exemptions for short visits also avoid the need for car drivers to hover or drive around in circles while their passengers dash out for whatever reason (eg a visit to the bank).

Exemptions for Sundays would primarily benefit those (many of whom are elderly) who travel by car to worship at the adjacent Methodist and nearby Anglican churches. Some might describe imposition of Sunday charges as a tax on going to church.

If some charges do have to be introduced for use of the Westbury Hill car park, then what good reasons are there for not making an exception for (1) short stays, and (2) Sundays, maintaining consistency with (a) roadside parking in Westbury and with (b) roadside parking in other shopping areas (for example, the Gloucester Road, and, at least on Sundays, Whiteladies Road). I am puzzled as to why, if you must introduce some charge, there should be any difference between the parking restrictions applicable to the roadside parking in Westbury village, and the restrictions you propose introducing for use of the Westbury Hill car park.

If the Council has already conducted a full financial analysis (which I assume it will have done), I would like to know please (a) what revenue the Council expects to make from the charges imposed under the various alternative parking regimes (so I can see, for example, what additional income the Council expects to raise by imposing a charge on a Sunday) and (b) the cost of imposing and enforcing the various restrictions (so I can see, for example, how much the Council would have to pay traffic wardens to patrol the car park on Sundays, how much it will cost to collect charges and maintain ticket machines etc).

I would also like to know, please, how much the Council currently spends annually on “maintaining” the Westbury Hill carpark, so I can see how that compares with the potential net profit you expect to make from the Westbury Hill car park.

If the Council is intending to pass over the management of the car park to an independent parking contractor such as Parking Eye in return for some annual fee, I would like to know (a) what fee the Council expects to receive on the basis that the independent contractor's rights to collect parking charges spans the whole week and (b) what different fee it would receive if the rights granted spanned only Mondays to Saturdays.

STATEMENT PS 35

Submitted by M J Ainley (Mrs)

Title: Westbury-on-Trym carpark

The WoT carpark is bounded by two Churches, the GP Surgery and Pharmacy which serve Westbury Village and surrounding areas. The two Churches offer a wealth of religious and social events weekly and together with the Surgery, its Clinics and Pharmacy form a vital part of the life of our community. In addition many people travel to WoT for the shops, Banks, Dentist and other amenities.

WoT already has a severe traffic and parking problem. Those of us who live here are frequently unable to park near our homes and dangerous parking is commonplace. This can only worsen if drivers unwilling or unable to pay parking fees seek to park in the residential roads.

STATEMENT PS 36

Submitted by David Stephens

Title: Westbury-on-Trym Village Car Park

I write to express my objection to the proposal to make the Westbury Car Park a charged Car Park.

Westbury village is at present a successful commercial area with a wide selection of good and profitable shops as well as being the only area of North Bristol with branches of the major banks. This success is helped by there being a good car park - a park which is widely used and has a very rapid turnover by customers driving into the village to use the shops or to visit the banks. I suggest that the nature of their visits are short and if there was a chargeable park, they would try to park for their brief visit kerbside or with the inevitable difficulty in doing that, go elsewhere to shop.

The ability to park without charge undoubtedly contributes to the commercial success of the village, which is the strongest reason for maintaining the Car Park without charge

STATEMENT PS 37

Submitted by Dr Tony Hoare on behalf of the local Transport and Placemaking group

Title: Silver Motion concerning the proposal to charge for car parking in Westbury Hill, 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 wish to align our comments with the Silver Motion prepared by local Councillors for the Full Council meeting on 14th March. Like them, we believe that the Council's proposal for car parking, as currently framed, insufficiently reflects the interests of the local community in and around Westbury-on-Trym. We believe the Council has paid insufficient attention to these and we urge it to discuss their proposal with local representatives to reach an outcome reflecting them, as well as the Council's aims expressed in its original proposal of January 2023, a number of which we support.

So we support its 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 38

Submitted by Brian Ainley.

Title: Proposals for car park charges at Westbury-on-Trym

The proposal to charge to use the WoT car park will have the effect of limiting the footfall to the surrounding shops, and especially to the Westbury Surgery which is adjacent to the parking area, and to the churches providing local support across a wide spectrum of community services. If people cannot readily access these services (i.e. a variety of classes provided in the two local churches, toddlers groups, ballet, Friendly Club, lunches etc.) the support will decline and the community will be impoverished.

Local residents have already seen the effect of the changes to the bus routing, the difficulty of moving radially to and from Westbury to East Bristol (say) means more cars through the village, more congestion, and more parking off street and on side streets, to the detriment of local residents. Parking charges will add to this.

Westbury has a good number of cafés and new ones being built, but who would pay to stop to use them?

Westbury would become a place to bypass..

STATEMENT PS 39

Submitted by Sue Creasy

Title: VASSALL CENTRE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

I am submitting this as my objection to the proposed development of the Vassall Centre in Fishponds, on the following grounds:

1. The density and number of dwelling and people on the site. In particular it is a combination of groups of people who have additional needs in terms of health and social care.
2. The lack of adequate parking for such a large site because: (a) since November, Oldbury Court Estate is now charging for parking in the park which has resulted people more parking on the local streets in order not to pay. This extends to Vassall Road and Gill Avenue in addition to Oldbury Court Road (b) The local bus service to Gill Avenue is to stop completely from April 2023 so residents of the older persons units and others will need transport to get about for shopping, medical treatment, to visit others. (c) The residents fall into a category of age or need where social and medical workers will visit the site frequently, plus people visiting the community space and office rooms and guests of residents.
3. The proximity to local housing in Willow Bed Close and Little Hayes, in particular the height of buildings and loss of light and privacy.
4. The disruption that will occur during building works. Lorries arriving via Fishponds road will have to navigate Straits Parade which is narrow and one way with a road narrowing feature next to the Co-op.

My other objection is to the council. In the last few years the amount of housing built in Fishponds has increased considerably with no additional provision or anticipation of the need for schools, health services/GP premises, no improvement to roads and infra structure. When the development took place on the UWE site next to Oldbury Court Road, additional money was promised by the developers to enhance the area. The park area footpaths were upgraded but what else has been done? At a local meeting it seems that money was diverted to Lockleaze and did not enhance anything outside the park area.

New housing in Fishponds includes new estate from College Road to Warneford Road and Oldbury Court Road to College Court (BSA0501), the Laundry Field on Manor Road (BSA0502, the Manor hospital site being built at the moment (BSA0503). This is thousands of new people to the area with no additional provision for school places, GP surgeries, and no road improvements.

Why not build more in South Bristol where there is infinitely more space?

STATEMENT PS 40

Submitted by Wendy M Morri

Title: Charge for the Council Carpark in Westbury on Trym (WoT).

I would like to lodge my opposition to the plans to charge for the Council Carpark in Westbury on Trym (WoT). I have a number of reasons for this and would like you to reconsider the proposal.

- 1 The doctor's surgery and Pharmacy is at the end of the carpark. Charging for the carpark will impact patients attending the surgery. The staff have their own carpark – this is an issue for patients.
- 2 The WoT Village is already under pressure with empty shops. Charging for the carpark will escalate the decline of the Village Shopping. With free car parking on Cribbs Causeway there will be no incentive for customers to support the village businesses.
- 3 We are currently plagued by commuter parking in WoT. The side street are already blocked up with people dumping their cars for the day here and catching the bus into town. Residents parking further into town has pushed them out to us. Local schools have insufficient parking and staff are also using the side streets to park for the day. Charging for the carpark will push even more cars into these busy side streets.
- 4 The Methodist Church has a popular hall that is used by local events. I am a member of Westbury on Trym Country Market which holds a market there every Friday morning. We are a cooperative of local producers and are a social enterprise. The producers arrive at 8:30 (when the hall opens) every Friday with our goods, pull up into the carpark and pass the goods over the rear wall into the hall. We have dispensation to allow us to park until 12:00. We need to be able to unload (baking, plants and craft) at the very least. The market is already under extreme financial pressure with rising costs. If we also have to pay to park as well our only option is to pass these costs on to our customers who tend to be elderly and rely on us as a social outlet and a source for home produced food. This is inflationary. As we already have a dispensation to park longer than 2 hours what has been arranged for our market to be able to unload and keep this market going in the Village? Clearly we cannot carry our produce to the market and it has to be dropped off by a vehicle. We then need somewhere to park that vehicle while the market is open.
- 5 The Village Hall at the top of Waters Lane also has a popular hall. There is extremely limited parking there (perhaps 3 or 4 cars) and like the Methodist Hall is fronted by a road with double yellow lines. Again people use the carpark when attending Events. I am on the committee of the popular Village Show and profits from our show go towards helping keep this venue open. The village hall events draw people in from the surrounding areas and will be adversely impacted by the lack of free parking.

- 6 At the VERY LEAST there should be an hour's free parking. This would be of enormous benefit to the village and mean that the carpark is used most efficiently.

I recognise that the council is under great financial pressure. However, the sum raised will be far outweighed by the damage done to this community. I would welcome the ability to have a discussion with the Mayor or a Cabinet Member to help to find a workable solution and invite them to come and talk to us in Westbury on Trym.

STATEMENT PS 41

**Submitted by David Redgewell South west transport Network and Railfuture Severnside
Gordon Richardson Bristol disability equalities forum**

Title: Scrutiny

The West of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council is responsible for the Region public transport Network.

With the bus service improvement plan and the city region sustainable transport strategy
But with over£ 108 million pounds of bus service improvement plan money

We are still see some of deepest bus cuts in any city region.

Whole communities are losing their bus services in South/ East and North Bristol in April 2023 with no replacement bus services and in June 2023 in part of Bath and North East Somerset and South Gloucestershire council areas.

With Demand responsive bus services only being able to operate in Deep rural areas and a very small part of Bristol in Brislington, Keynsham, Totterdown, Avonmouth and Severn Beach. And just 2 bus service improvement plan service due to start operating on 522 Bristol bus and coach station to Arnos Vale Brislington Keynsham Marksbury Timbury Paulton, Midsomer Norton Westfield Radstock Peasedown St John and Bath spa bus and coach station.

On the Northern end of the Bristol city council to St Pauls St Werburges Eastville park Fishponds Road, Oldbury Court, Downend, Emerson green P5uckchurch westerleight yate bus station route.

From Emerson Green, Puckchurch, Westerleight Yate bus and coach station and Yate North as service 525.

With a large number of bus services being withdrawn in South Bristol being service on 1st April 2023.

96 Bristlington, Knowle, Hengrove hospital, Imperial Park Hartcliffe.

516 Whitchurch estate, Hengrove, Knowle

52 Bishopsworth to Hengrove hospital and Bristol city centre.

91 Bristol city centre, Bedminster, Knowle Hengrove , Hartcliffe

23 Ashton vale, Southville, Bedminster Bristol city centre and Broadmead.

636 Whitchurch, Stockwood, Keynsham.

In East Bristol the service.

47 Bristol city centre St Paul's, St Werburgess, Eastville Park, Fishponds Road, Oldbury Court Downend, Emerson green, Puckchurch, westerleight, Yate bus station and Yate been withdrawn leaving community's without public transport.

2 disability equality centre are left without public transport St Paul's learning centre and West of England centre for independence living in Oldbury.

508 Bristol city centre St Phillips, Lawrence Hill, Easton, Eastville and Southmead hospital bus station.

Service 17 Keynsham town centre, Hanham , Kingswood Corsham hospital, Hillfield, Staple Hill Fishponds, Eastville park, Horfield, Southmead hospital bus station.

Evening services.

In North east Somerset.

Bus service are being withdrawn in June 2023.

179 Bath spa bus and coach station to Timbury, Paulton, Midsomer Norton.

672 Bristol city centre Bedminster Highridge Bridgwater road to the chew valley.

172, Bath spa bus and coach station to Peasedown, St john Radstock Westfield Midsomer Norton, Paulton and wells bus and coach station.

Evening service.

768 Bath Spa bus and coach station to Timbury Paulton, Midsomer Norton Westfield Radstock.

82 Radstock, Town service.

Radstock Westfield, Midsomer Norton, Paulton Town service.

In North Bristol Greater Bristol and South Gloucestershire.

Service 10 11 Shirehampton / Avonmouth Dock, Lawrence Weston, Westbury on Trym Southmead hospital bus station UWE bus station Bristol Parkway station, Bradley Stoke Aztec, West Hortham, Alverston, Thornbury.

Section better Southmead hospital bus station UWE bus station and Bristol parkway Aztec West, Hortham, Alverston Thornbury.

Is withdrawn on 1st April 2023 .

Service 85 84 is planned to be withdrawn in June 2023 yate park and ride yate rail station yate bus station Chipping Sodbury, Wickwar, Charfield and Wotton under edge .

622 Cribbs causeway bus station Overton, Alverston, Thornbury yate bus station and chipping Sodbury.

With West of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council bus service improvement plan bus services.

A number of bus service were planned but never let at tendered.

Service we need looking at working with Bus operators to create new bus services.

St Anne's park, Brislington, Knowle Hengrove Whitchurch estate Hengrove hospital imperial park Hartcliffe Withywood long Ashton park and ride.

This was to be service 521 524 and could be incorporated into a new South Bristol commercial bus service.

A service could be developed in From Ashton vale Southville Bedminster St John lane Redcliffe Bristol Temple meads station Bristol Broadmead shopping centre, St Paul, St Werburgess Eastville park ,Stapleton ,Broomhill Fishponds, Oldbury court Downend Bromley heath winterbourne Frampton Cottrell.

A service Bristol city centre Anchor Road, Bedminster, Parson street,Highridge Dundry chew magna chew valley and onward to cheddar or wells bus and coach station

This was 527 with extended to wells bus and coach or cheddar.

Service 179 Bath spa bus service cuts Timbury, Farmborough ,Paulton,midsomer Norton Tesco and wells bus and coach station.

We also have Demand responsive bus services in Radstock, Westfield Midsomer, Norton Paulton.

We need fixed timing point on this route it could be subcontracted to Liberia travel with a 27 seater bus service.

The west of England mayoral combined transport Authority is with North Somerset council joint transport Authorities and need to deliver a full universal bus service.

The Act of parliament that set up the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority which put a joint Duty on the unity councils Bristol, Banes and South Gloucestershire council. and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and the metro mayor Dan Norris to maintain public bus services and cross border services.

In to North Somerset council.

We urgently need universal bus service plan for the Greater Bristol and Bath city region for a Network. Not just a bus service improvement plan that improve bus service on the following bus and sustainable transport corridors.

Bristol M32 to Bradley stoke Aztec west Alverston Thornbury.

Bristol M32, Hambroke ,Coalpit heath yate park and ride, Yate railway station yate bus station and chipping.

Cribbs causeway bus station , Henbury Brenty westbury on Trym, Southmead

Henleaze Clifton Down station park street city centre Broadmead Bristol Temple meads station Totterdown knowle Hengrove whitchurch/ stockwood.

Bristol bus station Totterdown Knowle Hengrove Whitchurch Pensford Clutton Farrington Gurney Wells bus and coach station Glastonbury and street.

Farrington Gurney,
Paulton, Midsomer Norton, Westfield ,Radstock, Peasedown st john Bath spa bus and coach station .

This corridor starts from wells bus and coach station via chilcompton Shepton mallet interchanges.

The Bristol bus and coach station Bristol Temple meads station ,Arnos vale Brislington, Keynsham, Salford Newbridge Weston and Bath spa bus and coach station

Bristol pill and Portishead.

Bristol to Nailsea.

Bristol to Clevedon.

Bristol bus and coach Backwell Congresbury Worle interchange and Weston super mare bus and coach station

London Transport peak hour service every 15 minutes actually Transport London frequency are every 5 to 7 minutes and universal service Network.

Many corridor have reduced Evening and Sunday services.

349 Bristol bus and coach station Bristol Temple meads station, Arnos vale Brislington Keynsham park estate loss it Evening service.

The corridor service contracted to first group plc.

Are £ 7 million pounds in the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority. to first group plc.

£4 million pounds on service by North Somerset council to First group plc.

Public transport Network is one of the main functions of setting up the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority with partnership with North Somerset council through the bus service improvement plan and metro west railway Network plan .

But mayor Dan Norris has no precepting powers and is reliant on the Transport levy from Bristol city council, Banes and South Gloucestershire county council.

As the Auditor have said the support bus services and Demand responsive bus services is very high risk strategy.

The bus service strategy need sort out with some bus service improvement plan services new and supported bus services as per Somerset council, Devon and Cornwall councils.

On metro west railway we welcome the investment in Bristol Portway parkway station.

A further £1, 2 million for station track and signalling work to Network rail western route.

But the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority is being asked to 02 million pounds of revenue support from the Seven Beach St Andrew road Avonmouth Dock station Portway parkway station Shirehampton sea mills Clifton Down station, Redland, Montpellier

Bristol Stapleton road Bristol Lawrence hill Bristol Temple meads train service which operates as a through service to Bedminster parson street Nailsea and Backwell Yatton for Clevedon Worle parkway Weston million. Weston super mare.

The revenue support is for 3 years to the Department for transport and First group plc Great western railway.

But we need more tickets machines to protect revenue on the Bristol Temple meads station to Severn Beach line train service.

The west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council. Will need to revenue support the Bristol Temple meads station Bedminster parson street pill and Portishead metro west railway service.

The Bristol Temple meads station Lawrence hill, Stapleton road Ashley Down Filton Abbey wood Filton North and Henbury for Cribbs causeway.

We still need planning permission granting by south Gloucestershire county council to Network rail western route and First Group plc Great western railway to start work on this line.

These routes will require 3 years revenue support from the metro mayor Dan Norris and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council. Banes council South Gloucestershire council and Bristol city council will need to add money to the subsidies via the Transport levy.

Like bus and ferry railway revenue support needs addressing. We welcome the half hourly train service from Bristol Temple meads station to Keynsham Oldfield park Bath spa Freshford Avoncliff Bradford on Avon Trowbridge and Westbury from May 2023 metro west railway with Wiltshire council.

Bristol Temple meads station to Filton Abbey wood Bristol parkway station yate Charfield new station cam and Dursley Stonehouse Bristol road new station and Gloucester central.

With Gloucestershire county council service starting in May 2023. We hope the Metro West railway branding can be applied.

On mass transit system light railway. Its important to develop the system for the Greater Bristol and Bath city region we need to develop on light rail system.

Mass transit system. Light rail system are operating in all other city regions Liverpool city region. Mersey Rail. Mayor Steve Rotherham West Midlands metro .

Expansion with mayor Andy street's.

South Yorkshire combined transport Authority.

Sheffield super tram .

Mayor of South Yorkshire combined Authority.

Nottingham super tram.

Newcastle upon Tyne.

Tyne and wear metro

North of Tyne mayor
Greater Manchester combined Authority Metrolink.

Metro Andy Burnham.

Blackpool tramways .

Scotland.
Scottish government.
Edinburgh Tramway.
Glasgow underground.
Transclyde

Wales .
Welsh government.
Transport for Wales.
New light rail system in Cardiff and the valleys

Ireland.
Transport for Ireland.
Dublin lus
And Dart .

West Yorkshire combined Authority.
and Transport for the North
With the Department for transport are Developing a mass transit system light rail system .

Gloucestershire county council are
Looking at Hardwick Gloucester Cheltenham and Bishop cleve.
Are looking at mass transit.

So why not in the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North
Somerset council area.

The Greater Bristol and Bath city region needs a mass transit system to be developed.

With Lee Rowley mp minister for levelling up Local government looking at the governance
review and plan for the Authority.

We need a west of England mayoral combined transport Authority with North Somerset
council and the local Enterprise partnership being a full member of the west of England
mayoral combined transport Authority.

We need the Transport and housing Board open to public as the Transport Boards are in the
west Midlands combined Authority.

Liverpool city region.

Great Manchester combined transport Authority.

We also need to the West of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council.

Bus service improvement plan meeting in public on line .

Like Somerset county council Devon county council and Cornwall council.

Unless in contract negotiations with public transport operators

Public transport meeting should be held in public at the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council.

Stakeholder business and passenger are the heart of everything the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council.

Carry out.

Please put passengers are the heart of the Transport Authority.

Passenger pay taxes and also vote for the unity councils at Bristol city council, South Gloucestershire county council.

Banes council North Somerset council and the west of England mayoral combined Authority metro mayor.

We need to transfer officer from the Transport Department's at Bristol city council Banes and South Gloucestershire council to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority.

And public transport infrastructure bus shelters interchanges facilities bus and coach and railway interchanges.

We need west of England mayoral combined transport Authority.

To run all universal bus service provisions.

Metro west railway Network.

Metro bus services.

Ferry services.

Coach services.

Ticketing and passenger information.

Main highways.

We need a transport Authority with North Somerset council as a full member.

And co production of services with Bristol city council Banes South Gloucestershire county council and North Somerset council.

We must make the governance review work for passenger and communities.

So we do not get constant monitoring by the Department for levelling up minister lee Rowley MP minister for local government and Mark HARPER MP secretary of state for transport.

Especially as all our transport project are subject to gateway reviews by the Department for transport.

It very important the Bristol city council Banes South Gloucestershire council and North Somerset council as partners

Make the west of England mayoral combined Authority works for the city region and we work with the Elected regional metro mayor Dan Norris with 40 000 votes majority

STATEMENT PS 42

Submitted by Gillian Stone

Title: Vassall Centre Planning Application 22/03476/F

Please listen to us. All in the name of making money, the physical and mental health and wellbeing of all the people concerned is bound to suffer. We want it to stop. Some existing residents are already suffering with illnesses and just need to quietly get on with their lives without stress and disruption.

I consider that there is plenty of space on this large site for a spacious two storey Vassall Centre style Business Hub for disability charities. This arrangement would create a less densely populated space with less traffic and parking requirements. The project would be cheaper to build and the timeline would be shorter. This would involve minimal disruption for the neighbouring residents and would be respectful of the wellbeing of all concerned, both neighbours and of those who would ultimately accommodate the new proposed development. I fear that if the present proposals were to be passed and if Phase 2 were ultimately to follow suit, then the building of this site would have a serious impact on the residents in the Willow Bed, Little Hayes area. The homes in these streets are relatively small, 2 storey homes with very average sized gardens and the roads referred to are narrower than those on Gill Avenue and Vassalls Road ie will be greater affected by the proposed development. As it stands, the gardens of the homes in the Willow Bed Close and Little Hayes development presently receive sufficient light and the area is subject to little disturbance from noise, litter, noise/air pollution, due to not being overlooked by high rise building. The Vassall Centre proposal to build so many homes in such close proximity, and so densely packed together, some of which are planned to be 3 storey, is going to seriously impact on the wellbeing of the existing residents and of the residents of the newly proposed development. There will be major implications for the roads and access and will lead to greatly increased noise, pollution and traffic chaos. The plans show very little green space and the development will be in danger of resembling a prison.

Consideration must surely be taken of the gradient of the ground from the entrance to the Oldbury Court Estate through the existing development towards the Vassalls Centre. The land rises so the impact of a dense 3 storey development on Vassall Centre is going to seriously affect the light reaching the existing houses and gardens. My concern when submitting this proposal, is that little or no regard is or has been taken of the impact upon the above mentioned area - It is as if it does not exist. Gill Avenue and Vassalls Road are the only roads mentioned.

1 3 storey buildings are not in line with the predominant character of the local area. Existing 2 storey homes on Vassall Road, Little Hayes, Willow Bed Close and Gill Avenue are all nearer neighbours than the 3 storey flats, which are set away from the road and in grassland, sufficiently spaced and further down on Gill Avenue. These are not 'local building style'

2 3 storey buildings impacting on neighbouring houses, which under legislation are protected by 'right to light' Homes and gardens around the immediate perimeter will be

overshadowed by taller buildings losing privacy, natural light and sunlight. Houses backing onto the site will experience constant noise from vehicle parking, service vehicles, bin collections etc. all proposed to be situated at the rear of the site right next to residential housing. This would cause disturbance, unacceptable intrusion in the form of noise nuisance, general disturbance, odour, pollution and so on.

3 The development may lead to a significant impact upon road safety.

4 Consideration must surely be taken of the gradient of the ground from the entrance to the Oldbury Court Estate through the existing development towards the Vassalls Centre. The land rises towards Gill Avenue so the impact of a dense 3 storey development is going to seriously affect the light reaching the houses and gardens which are closer to the park. My concern when submitting this proposal, is that little or no regard is or has been taken of the area nearest to the Oldbury Court Estate. It is as if it does not exist. Gill Avenue and Vassalls Road are the only roads mentioned.

5 The new proposed development must blend in with the surrounding neighbourhood.

6 3 storey buildings cannot be approved as this will lead to more 3 storey applications in phase 2 of Bristol Charities project at the Willow Bed Close and Little Hayes end of the site.

There will be greatly reduced car parking on the site, along with the high density of accommodation, leading to yet more traffic and cars parking on our streets which already have restricted parking due to the recent addition of double yellow lines on our roads and imposed parking charges in the Oldbury Court Car Park.

The area to the rear of Vassall Centre leading towards the park is presently a wildlife haven for bats, foxes and birds and we wish to retain this. The area presently has minimal light and noise pollution.

STATEMENT PS 43

Submitted by Dinah Bernard

Title: Council Budget re Westbury-on-Trym Car Park

I quite understand and appreciate that you have to raise as much money as you can from every possible source, but I would ask you please NOT to charge parking fees in the Westbury -on- Trym Car Park.

I must say how useful and welcoming the Car Park is for me and for the whole community. Finding walking much more difficult now due to arthritis, I use it frequently for shopping, going to the Post Office, the Health Centre, Church and other activities. The small streets and roads around the village are always very crowded but this is especially the case at weekends when everyone tries to park outside their homes. The car park is obviously less busy then and has plenty of space - especially on Sundays. You wouldn't really make much money from parking fees on that day!

The Car Park is an essential community facility for the numerous activities that take place in the area - from Ukrainian Support Groups, "Warm -in-Westbury" Free Lunches, frequent church services and meetings and, MOST importantly, the ONLY place that the Health Centre patients and staff can safely and easily park - and, in the absence of a regular and efficient bus service that covers the whole area, the Westbury-on-Trym Car park should be FREE

STATEMENT PS 44

Submitted by Josephine Robinson

Title: The Plant Based Treaty

"Kerry McCarthy, MP for Bristol East, said, "We know that producing plant-based food results in far fewer emissions, is better for nature and is a healthier option than meat. We need a public debate as to how this can best be achieved, so I am pleased to see advocates for the Plant Based Treaty setting out some proposals as to how we can stop stalling and start to act."

In July last year, Haywards Heath was the first UK town council to endorse the treaty. A Conservative led council. Followed by Edinburgh, the first UK capital city, who held a debate and vote only after they had published an Impact Assessment Report for the councillors to consider.

Would Bristol consider publishing its own Impact Assessment Report for the consideration of yourself and Bristol City councillors?"

I understand that your lobby is too busy for an outreach table the days when there are full council meetings. Is there any other opportunity to have an outreach table or give a presentation at the Town Hall?

I look forward to hearing back from you to confirm that our Statement and Questions are included, time allowing on the day.

STATEMENT PS 45

Submitted by Susan Tainton

Title Proposal to introduce parking charges at Westbury Hill Car Park Test

I would like you to reconsider introducing parking charges at Westbury Hill car park.

Parking charges would directly impact patients attending the Westbury GP practice, the elderly and young families going to the weekly groups at the Methodist church, shoppers using the high street and the shops and small businesses in Westbury.

The bus services in Westbury-on-Trym have, in recent years, become unreliable and public transport may not be an easy option for the elderly or those caring for young children.

I live in Cambridge Crescent which has a very limited amount of street parking for the residents, I often have to use the car park for a few hours until a space becomes available in my street or a road near my house. The council has agreed planning for two more houses and an office in Cambridge Crescent which will limit parking options even further.

I think the introduction of parking charges will have a negative affect on locals and those visiting the area.

STATEMENT PS 46

Submitted by Gina Eastman

Title: Westbury on Trym Car Park

I am writing as Churchwarden of Holy Trinity Church, Westbury on Trym to support the Silver Motion proposed by our local councillors to be debated at Full Council next Tuesday.

- Both Holy Trinity Church and the Methodist Church are central to community life in Westbury on Trym with many regular services and activities which enhance both those who worship with us and the local community. Many of those who attend Sunday Services use the car park, as neither church has adequate parking facilities, and we feel it unreasonable to expect people to pay when they come to church to worship every week. We would therefore ask for Sundays to be exempt from charging.
- Both churches provide activities to counteract social isolation, for example the Friendly Club, the Ukraine Hub, a weekly lunch, a monthly bereavement group, and parking charges would severely inhibit those who come and those who run these groups.
- The Methodist Church provides many activities for children, eg ballet classes, educational tutoring etc. and the car park is used to deliver children safely for these activities. Parking charges again would affect parents and lead to unsafe dropping off of children and a decrease in footfall for these activities.
- We understand the need for the Council to find a way of increasing their revenue, but this should not be to the detriment of a thriving local community whose businesses depend on the easy footfall of those coming into the village for the banks and the shops
- Annual long stay passes would severely affect the number of spaces available for the community. The car park is in constant flux, often at capacity level and a reduction in spaces would severely affect those coming into the village to shop etc.

I am quite sure others will have made representations about the effect of car parking fees on those attending the Doctors' Surgery and the chemist (now the only one in the village) and the effect on the businesses in the Village.

I would urge the Council to consider carefully the motion put forward by our local councillors on behalf of the community, and particularly to respond to the request for consultation so that together we can come up with a workable solution that will allow our community to continue to thrive in every capacity.

STATEMENT PS 47

Submitted by Hilary Long

Title: Westbury on Trym Car Park

May we ask the Mayor and his budget committee to re consider the proposal to charge for parking in the ten small district car parks situated in local shopping areas for the following reasons:

-This proposal runs completely counter to the latest draft Bristol Plan, which devotes considerable space to plans to improve local shopping areas and to encourage people to shop locally in order to cut back on traffic congestion city wide and reduce air pollution.

-If this is to happen and short visits are to be made for daily food, hygiene and social contact -especially by families and the many older citizens now resident all over Bristol in both private and civic accommodation, freedom to come and go easily must be encouraged and protected.

-The City does NOT consist of just young people in their twenties and thirties in city business posts or as part of the dominant University that has taken over the entire centre of our city- to the detriment of familiar use by its ordinary citizens. There are thousands who need to use daily services and cannot carry or balance shopping on scooters and bicycles-strangely enough! They need places to park a car for a short time in order to keep their lives going. Nor can they easily use a bus-there are none in outlying districts, except along main routes and people who try to use them often have to wait for 40 minutes or more in cold winds.

-In Westbury on Trym we have a CAR PARK that has served our village admirably for many years. The change-over of car traffic there is rapid and regular as people come to the multi-service Health Centre just at its edge, travel in from other wards in North Bristol to use the many banks and so add to local footfall with quick retail visits while there, accompany children to Scouts, Brownies, exercise, dance and extra education classes after school and visit the busy pharmacy at the Health centre for essential medicines, there being no chemists at all in the village. SURELY THIS IS EXACTLY WHAT THE PLANNERS WANT US TO DO IS IT NOT?

- Why must the budget committee interfere with a system that works well by impeding use and speed by imposing charges? Getting tickets will slow up movements in and out and worse still, in order to avoid over-running timed slots and being fined, people will pay for more time than they need and then linger as they have paid for it! This is basic psychology. We would welcome the chance to discuss the implications of this new charging policy with members of both planning and budget committees.

-There are very few places now in and around the village where daily shoppers can park anyway - the streets are filled with commuters into Bristol who take advantage of free on street parking all day and arrive early morning to bag their slots, before taking folding

bicycles out of the boot or getting one of the buses into the centre. Also, many employees come from other parts of Bristol to work in Westbury.

-Our Car Park represents the welcome to our village to all comers from the surrounding area -it is the GATEWAY to a pleasing and efficient visit for essential supplies, or a much needed meeting with a friend for an elderly person who cannot walk long distances for either purpose. Some of our politicians should try carrying heavy bags up the hills here and no doubt, later on will experience the isolation of being elderly and also unable to do without a toilet for very long- as those too have been closed to them. Please do not discourage use of our car park by charging -it represents one of our last civic freedoms and is to be lauded not restricted.

STATEMENT PS 48

Submitted by Jane Plummer

Title: Westbury Car Park

I would like to object to the proposal to charge for Westbury car park. I have lived in Westbury-on-trym for over sixty years and I am the secretary and a trustee of Westbury village hall so I am speaking as a resident and on behalf of the village hall which is a community venue.

The car park is located outside the doctor's surgery which is used by many elderly or disabled residents who rely on their cars and imposing charges will greatly impact them. Westbury-on-trym has one of the largest demographics of elderly people in Bristol and imposing car park charges is discriminating against the age and vulnerability of local residents.

Many people from surrounding areas including families with children use the car park as Westbury has many banks and services together with the local shops, the fact that there is a free car park attracts people and if there are charges then businesses in the village will suffer. Businesses are already struggling and this could result in some closing.

The village hall and the churches are used by community groups very regularly, these buildings do not have their own car parks and most users rely on the Westbury car park. They may not be able to continue with community groups or to worship if they have to pay for parking as the proposal is to charge from 9-5pm seven days a week. Surely you can consider allowing free parking on Sundays to take into account the many worshippers otherwise you are discriminating against people of many faiths using all of the churches including the one on Eastfield road and the one in Trym road (river of life). There is in addition a prayer house (Elsie Briggs house) next to the Holy Trinity church which is used as a community space for support groups, advice and healing. All of these buildings have no parking at all or have a few very restricted spaces for staff and they all rely on the free car park at the moment.

The Village Hall is not part of the Holy Trinity Church, it is an independent building and it is a charity that relies solely upon hirers for its income. The regular hirers are a diverse group including brownies, karate, badminton, a choir, children's sports etc. There is no sports centre in Westbury so it is an important venue where people can participate in sports and healthy activities. We have no car park and very limited parking outside on the street, our users rely on the car park and many come from areas all over Bristol so they need to park and stay for the duration of their class or their children's activities at the hall.

The roads around the village are congested with parked cars already and they will become even more congested if car park charges are imposed as people will try to park for free in residential streets. This makes it very difficult for residents who have no garage or off road parking, they are currently competing for spaces with people who work in the village and

there are now camper vans that people live in parked indefinitely on residential streets as well.

I thought that the council is supposed to be supporting local businesses, promoting shopping locally and encouraging people to do so via the "Where's it to" website. On this website it says that you are championing retail streets in Bristol and Westbury-on-trym is included. It actually says "the village has free parking too" so how can you now justify charging for our car park?

As charging has now been voted through can I make a plea that to mitigate the damage that this will undoubtedly cause to the village that you allow one hour free parking so that people can at least visit the doctors, the pharmacy and the banks. An element of free parking allows cars to move in and out quickly and creates more parking spaces for everyone to use. Parking permits would restrict the parking spaces available so should not be allowed at all.

STATEMENT PS 49

Submitted by Alison Freeman

Title: Silver Motion (Conservative) changes to District Car Parks

I strongly support the silver motion (Conservative) changes to District Car Parks moved by Cllr Mark Weston.

The Church Hall is an amazing community resource and is used by hundreds of people every week. The impact on families would be enormous.

In addition, the local shops and businesses would be severely affected. High rates, amongst other factors, has led to the demise of many. Charging to park would add to the problem and bring about the demise of many more.

Please make sure that this matter is thoroughly researched. It would be a huge mistake if charges were introduced.

STATEMENT PS 50

Submitted by Graham Plummer

Title: Charge for Parking in the Westbury-on-Trym Car Park

I would like to object to the proposal to charge for parking in the Westbury-on-Trym car park on Westbury Hill. I have lived in Westbury for some seventy years now and am the Chairman of Westbury Village Hall, so I know what terrible effect this will have on the village. The car park is essential for so many people who visit the village especially when they need to visit the Westbury Primary Care Centre.

There is also the Holy Trinity church, the Methodist church and the village hall, all very important community venues nearby and who's visitors regularly need to use the car park.

All retail businesses such as the shops/cafes/banks will also be greatly effected too as shoppers will end up going to places like Aldi and Lidl for their groceries as parking there is free.

The car park is also used for voting on polling days and would mean having to pay for voting, which I'm sure would discourage people from voting.

I feel the very minimal should be at least 1 hour free parking, the same time that you can park in the High Street without having to move on.

STATEMENT PS 51

Submitted by Mary and Malcolm Neave

Title: Flat-rate charging system to various car parks across Bristol

We are writing to express my concerns over the proposals to introduce a flat-rate charging system to various car parks across Bristol, including our local one in Westbury on Trym.

This car park is used by people from Westbury and surrounding areas who are attending appointments at the Doctors' Surgery, visiting the Banks and attending meetings at the Village Hall, Methodist and Parish churches. While understanding the need to reduce the cost of maintaining car parks and to alleviate pressure on the budget, this will have a deleterious effect on elderly people who are unable to attend without transport and, in many cases, can least afford to pay. I would strongly advise revisiting the charging structure - perhaps allowing the first hour to be free or low-cost and adjusting the charges for subsequent hours upwards if necessary. Also, charging on a Sunday will only affect people attending church services, as the few shoppers will use on-street parking.

STATEMENT PS 52

Submitted by Ms Safia Yonis,

Title: Redcliffe Housing Conditions

I have a really bad leak in my flat it comes through every room in my flat it comes streaming in mostly all the time including the bedrooms. My daughter's room has water coming in and its getting unhealthy for her to sleep in there. I get worried for her health because she always has a cough. It's always cold in my flat because of the draft.

I have reported it 4 times to the council and they have not done anything about it. They have just come up and looked at it and done nothing. The walls are all damp to the touch and my furniture keeps on getting wet because of the damp. I am being treated like I'm not a human being no human should be living in those conditions.

It is not only my flat it,s in all my friends' flats. I pay £400 rent for this flat and £103 for council tax. I am a single parent.

I am a cleaner I work hard so I should have a nice home to live in with my children. The furniture cost me three thousand pounds to buy this and it is being ruined because of the damp conditions

I don't deserve to have to pay this amount of money for these conditions.

STATEMENT PS 53

Submitted by Samira Abdi Shukri

Title: Redcliffe Housing Conditions

I live in a two-bedroom flat with 5 children. My oldest child is 19 in May it's very overcrowded I also have an 18 year in June and a 17-year-old in September they are sharing a bedroom which they shouldn't be at their age. They fight a lot because of the space they always get in each other's way so they have quit violent arguments because of the cramped conditions.

I also have a 10-year-old boy and a girl 6 years old and there both sleeping in the same room as their dad and me. My ten-year-old boy also suffers from asthma which is made worse with the amount of people in the same room.

I have been on HomeChoice for 9 years, 4 years band 2 higher because of the overcrowded conditions and health conditions.

Whenever I bid I am always offered places miles away from here and I don't want to move that far because my children are settled at Redcliffe schools. I would like to know why I'm on a long waiting list for the local area but I'm only offered places in Hartcliffe and Knowle.

STATEMENT PS 54

Submitted by Mrs Hamda Ismail

Title: Redcliffe Housing Conditions

My husband is sleeping in the living room because he has had a stroke so he can't manage the stairs to go to the toilet. My 4 children are sleeping in the same room, which is really overcrowded.

My flat is really damp I have mould patches all over the flat I am always worried that my children will suffer breathing conditions because of the damp my walls are always wet to the touch. My windows are drafty and my flat is always cold even when we have the heating on.

STATEMENT PS 55

Submitted by Nima Siyad

Title: Redcliffe Housing Conditions

I am living with two adults (my grown-up children) and two young children in a two-bedroom flat. It is really overcrowded and damp.

A two-bedroom flat with five people means we are all living on top of each other. One of my children has special needs and autism. My oldest is on the last year of university and he has no privacy and my daughter is 20 and they both share a room together. It is very unhealthy for them they are always arguing with each other.

I also have damp in my house we are all living on top of each other and we all haven't got enough space. I have problems with the neighbour because of my son making noise I have explained to them that my son has autism so he can't understand so the neighbour bangs on the wall and tries to intimidate me.

STATEMENT PS 56

Submitted by Nimo Abdi

Title: Redcliffe Housing Conditions

I have lived in my 3 bedroom flat for nearly 15 years with my husband and 8 children.

I first reported problems with water entering my flat at the beginning of November 2022. For two months we lived with water in two bedrooms, the kitchen and the bathroom. For one month we didn't have any light in the kitchen and one bedroom.

The electric was giving shocks and water was dripping through the light. I reported it as an emergency but the repairs said it was not an emergency. Someone came out and said it was safe but there was still water dripping through the light fitting.

Our Housing Officer organised different repair people who were visiting the flat every day towards the end of December. Each one was saying that they couldn't repair it. The council moved me, my husband and 8 children into temporary accommodation at the beginning of January.

We were in a hotel for 3 weeks, then moved to another hotel for 2 weeks and then a temporary flat with 4 bedrooms for 2 months.

The flat in Underdown House has still not been repaired. Two months underwater means that the front door, the floor, all the kitchen units, oven, walls, ceilings and the two bedrooms are completely ruined. Mattresses, bedding, electrical appliances are no longer useable.

No work has yet started on repairing the property. I am due to move back to my flat on 24th April. I am really worried that the work will not be completed by the time we are due to move back and we will be in a property that is damp and overcrowded.

None of the children want to return to the property. We are in accommodation now where they are finally able to study. My son is due to start university in September, will be still living at home and will need space to do his work. One of my children is severely asthmatic and there is no space for him to sleep at Underdown House.

I am on HomeChoice searching for a 4 bedroom property but I am still 40 or 30- something in the queue. Me and my family just want somewhere safe with enough space to live.

STATEMENT PS 57

Submitted by Suad Omar

Title: Redcliffe Housing Conditions

I live in a 3-bedroom flat with my husband and 5 children. The flat has water coming into the kitchen, bathroom and toilet.

I have asthma and I am constantly coughing due to the damp and having to use my inhaler all the time. The children always have coughs and blocked noses and one has constant headaches.

I first reported the problem one year ago. They come and make small repairs, or they say the problem is too big and they cannot fix it.

They came again to visit two weeks ago to fix the toilet but said that the whole bathroom needed repair as water is coming from everywhere. They have said they will come back in May.

May is really far away for me and my health and my children's are suffering.

STATEMENT PS 58

Submitted by Hinda Jama

Title: Redcliffe Housing Conditions

In my flat water is leaking through the windows and streaming down the walls in my son's room, daughters' room, and my bathroom. When it rains there is a lot of water that streams through the windows I have damp everywhere. My daughter is not sleeping properly at all because of the damp also my daughter is going to school and ending up in the nurse's office because of her health caused by the damp. The windows are so old that the insulation around the windows are falling off. I have a bad draft coming through them its very cold. The walls feel really wet and cold my daughters' bed is always soaking and it is wringing wet like I just got the sheets out of the washing machine. I have damp and mould patches in my bathroom which I have to keep cleaning.

STATEMENT PS 59

Submitted by Khadra Hassan

Title: Redcliffe Housing Conditions

I am a single parent and live in a 2-bed flat with my two children, aged 5 and 7. There is has been water coming into my bathroom, kitchen, and bedroom for the past 15 months. The council have been out several times, but the problem is worse than ever and they also cut the power to the heater in my bathroom.

I first reported the problem in January 2022. A surveyor came on 29 March 2022 and looked at the damp issue. The contractor came in June and July but only looked at the fans and cut the cable to heater accidentally when making repairs to the fans. They did not come again until October. They did some painting and plastering in the kitchen to solve the issue.

I reported again in early December as water was coming into the property and someone came out to check the electrics in the kitchen as an emergency. A surveyor came on 6 December 2022 and said that the water is coming in above the property took a lot of photos.

I followed up this repair a few times since the contractor only visited again in February. They arranged two appointments but didn't show up. They came on the 21st Feb and only looked at the fans. They visited again on 23rd February and said that the flat is really bad and I need to go back to the council.

One of my son's is autistic. I could not give him a bath in the bathroom for 7 months as it was too cold as they cut the cable to the heater during the repairs. I had to take a baby bath through to the living room as it's the only room in the flat warm enough.

The water is coming down with paint and plaster and he is eating it from the floor. He is too scared to go to the toilet because of the black mould in the room and I have had to go back to nappies.

Me and my youngest child sleep downstairs in the living room as we are having breathing problems and cannot sleep in the bedroom.

STATEMENT PS 60

Submitted by Amanda Sharman

Title: Bristol harbour new Fees and Charges proposal

Regarding the Bristol harbour new Fees and Charges proposal, the opportunity to obtain an appropriate Residential license is a much welcomed solution for many of the issues faced by boatdwellers.

However, pricing it in line with market rates for private marinas, and the following years of increases above inflation to exceed that market rate comparison, has made this solution of a residential license unobtainable for most within the community.

If the council wish to look after its long-standing boat-dweller community, then please I ask how will you to ensure these fee increases for residential license are affordable.

I cannot understand why on one hand, Bristol council are lobbying the government to grant it powers to implement rent controls thru the

Renters Reform Bill, hoping to give your council more power to enforce and protect renters' rights, and tackle out of control rent prices.

And then on the other hand, Bristol Council are inflating mooring fees (some to almost triple) within a matter of weeks! leading to housing insecurity for boatdwellers potentially pushing them to the edge of homelessness. Fee increases being benchmarked by market rate comparisons for privately owned fully serviced marinas is an unjustifiable parameter to use given the housing crisis in the City.

I urge you to address the issue of affordability of mooring fees and curb these rent increases, so the community that significantly contributes to the security and surveillance all along the harbourside can continue to exist.

This drastic increase in harbour fees should be exactly the sort of behaviour the Renters Reform Bill should be protecting us from.

STATEMENT PS 61

Submitted by Molly Petts

Title: Harbour Fees Proposal

I've been living in the harbour for 7 years. Half of that time I have been fighting to keep my home. This happens to be the majority of my sons life.

When one thing resolves the next begins.

This premature approval of fees has been done in panic, in attempt to save money for the council. But this is done at the cost of the community with no consideration of the impact this will have on the harbour. The immense, sudden increase in fees with no increase in service provision is outrageous. With the cost due to overtake our neighbours in the Private Bristol Marina next year is completely unjustifiable.

Everyone deserves to feel safe in their home. I'd hoped I would be able to whilst welcoming my second child in the word. This feels like it is again at some Jeopardy.

Full Council – 14 March 2023

Agenda item 6 b

Public questions



Procedural note:

Questions submitted by members of the public:

- Questions can be about any matter the Council is responsible for or which directly affect the city.
- Members of the public who live and/or have a business in Bristol are entitled to submit up to 2 written questions, and to ask up to 2 supplementary questions. A supplementary question must arise directly out of the original question or the reply.
- Replies to questions will be given verbally by the Mayor (or a Cabinet member where relevant). Written replies will be published within 10 working days following the meeting.



*point of explanation - where a person has asked two questions on the same topic they are on the same line. Where topics are different they have different lines.

Ref No	Name	Title
PQ01	Tom Bosanquet	Digital Billboards
PQ02	Tom Bosanquet	St Luke's Road
PQ03	Lesley Powell	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ04	Sian Ellis-Thomas	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ05	Kate Swain	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ06	Claudia Collins	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ07	Alison Lauder	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ08	Carole Hall	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ09	James Jones	Plant Based Catering
PQ10	Keith Farley	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ11	Alex Gill	Redcatch Community Garden
PQ12	Haydn Gill	Park Row Active Travel
PQ13	Josephine Robinson	Plant Based Treaty
PQ14	Alex Hartley	Cumberland Basin Regeneration
PQ15	David Redgewell	Integrated Transport System
PQ16	Andrew Lynch	Bristol Port Company
PQ17	Suzanne Audrey	Bristol Harbour Review
PQ18	Suzanne Audrey	Mass Transit System
PQ19	Amanda Jones	Bristol Harbour Review
PS20	Bristol Boaters Community Association	Bristol Harbour Review
PQ21	Simon James Lewis	HMOs
PQ22	Molly Petts	Bristol Harbour Review
PQ23	Trevor Gray	Bristol Harbour Review
PQ24	Phoebe Arrowsmith Brown	Bristol Harbour Review



QUESTION PQ 01

Subject: Digital Billboards

Question submitted by: Tom Bosanquet

Digital advert screens have spread like a nasty rash around Bristol in the last few years. There have been an increasing number of large ones on major routes, such as the highly distracting, ultra-bright ones that make me & others wince each time we drive back into Bristol on the M32 (I'm yet to meet *anyone* who likes them - they are widely loathed), along with a multitude of small ones both on bus-stops and plonked in shopping streets. They're intrusive, use (/waste) vast amounts of energy, distract, steal our space (both physical & mental) and push destructive consumerism. Each time new ones come for planning there are plenty of public comments against them, but your administration has continued to allow them to spread unabated. Perhaps they earn some funds for the Council? I can't otherwise think of any reason to continually welcome them to our (theoretically) public space - though wonder if selling all our citizens out to the advertisers is worth it on balance.

What benefits do Bristolians actually get from these intrusive consumerist displays?



QUESTION PQ 02

Subject: St Luke's Road

Question submitted by: Tom Bosanquet

Still no sign of our pedestrian crossing on St.Luke's Road that was lined up by our previous Labour Councillor. When will all residents, who daily have to risk their safety dodging speeding cars there, finally get their crossing?



QUESTION PQ 03

Subject: Redcatch Community Garden Community Asset Transfer

Question submitted by: Lesley Powell

1. I understand that the 'land' which constitutes the Community Garden was classed as 'agricultural' at inception of the Garden licence, hence £300 pa rent. With a rent proposal now on the table at £16,000pa (5000% increase) when was the land re-categorised / revalued and to what?
2. How does the Mayor suggest the Community Garden (not for profit organisation) finds the money for this huge rent increase when it makes a maximum of £2,000 pa profit year on year and has inadequate reserves, runs everything as lean as possible yet provides over £1m worth of social value services per annum to the community which are not considered within the rental calculations by the Council?



QUESTION PQ 04

Subject: Redcatch Community Garden

Question submitted by: Sian Ellis-Thomas

1. On his recent visit to the Garden, the Mayor confirmed that he recognises and values the significant contribution it makes to the community in terms of its social value (calculated to be in excess of £1m+). However, despite this contribution, because of shortfalls in Council budgets, we are told there needs to be an extreme hike in the Garden rental of over 5000%.

Does the Mayor think it would be more sensible to accept the offer of affordable rent from the Community Garden, to allow it to sustain its growth and become resilient, in order to continue to support the community, rather than insisting on an unsustainable rent that would result in it closing down?

2. In order to help mitigate some Parks costs, the garden organisation have offered to take over the responsibility of opening and closing park gates and the public toilets, which as well as savings in man hours, would reduce the incidence of the toilets being left open resulting in regular vandalism and the ensuing cost associated with that. Does the mayor not accept that saying this saving is irrelevant, because the cost is met from a different budget, shows the council in a very poor light? Surely a saving is a saving?



QUESTION PQ 05

Subject: Redcatch Community Garden

Question submitted by: Kate Swain

1. Can the Mayor explain how the proposed rental increase at Redcatch Community Garden truly understands and supports community enterprise and Asset Based Community Development and the social value they bring to their communities?
2. The Mayor has confirmed in writing to Redcatch Community Garden “he wants Redcatch Community Garden to continue operating to its full extent” How does he propose this will be possible given the proposed rental increase?



QUESTION PQ 06

Subject: Redcatch Community Garden

Question submitted by: Claudia Collins

1. Over two years ago Redcatch Community Garden and Park Knowle Football Team applied to BCC to request a Sport Community Asset Transfer of the Pavilion building to run youth and disability activities. How does the experience of nil response or action to progress this encourage them or any other community groups to step forward and be involved especially when the building has continued to degrade and is costing £000'S in electricity to heat, even when empty?
2. If the Community Garden is forced to shut because of excessive rent demands what plans and available budget does the parks dept have for the Garden site that will derive either the commercial rent it says is required and / or a £1m of social value?



QUESTION PQ 07

Subject: Redcatch Community Garden

Question submitted by: Alison Lauder

1. On his recent visit to the Redcatch CG, the Mayor confirmed that he recognises and values the significant contribution and “hope” it brings to the community in terms of its social value (calculated to be in excess of £1m+). However, despite this contribution, because of shortfalls in Council budgets, they are told there needs to be an extreme hike in the Garden rental. How does the Mayor believe the public will respond to the news that the Council wants address it’s shortfalls by charging Charitable Community organisations such as the highly valued, respected, award winning, unique community resource of the Garden?
2. The founders of the Redcatch CG have worked tirelessly for 5 years, investing their own money, community crowd funding and have had very, very little help from BCC. What sort of message does the Mayor think this sends to other community minded people who are considering doing something good for its community, yet see that once it’s worked hard for 5 years, BCC can come along and pull the rug from under it despite the Social Value it delivers?



QUESTION PQ 08

Subject: Redcatch Community Garden

Question submitted by: Carole Hall

1. Redcatch Community Garden runs community services such as the Community Hub and Holiday Activity Fund/Your Holiday Hub for SEND children. These are funded by BCC. Who is going to run these services should RCG have to close due to the proposed rental increase?
2. The narrative around the rent being demanded of the Community garden - £4,000, £8,000, £16,000 over the first 3 years advises that the Community Garden is being treated the same as similar organisations in Bristol in that their rent is based on a percentage (6.7% in their case) of turnover. As you can imagine, we have a lot of connections in our field and our enquiries have led us to understand that there are no other such agreements with other comparable organisations. Please therefore can you enlighten us as to who else is signed up to this commercial approach to rental charges for charity / community / not for profit based organisations?



QUESTION PQ 09

Subject: Plant Based Catering

Question submitted by: James Jones

I have attended multiple Bristol City Council meetings over the last three years to talk on this issue - the most recent being July 12th 2022, in which myself and other Bristol residents spoke regarding agenda item 14, the renewal of council catering contracts with Cafe Gusto, Parsnip Mash, and Pegasus until December 2023.

In that meeting, myself and others voiced our concerns regarding the consumption of meat and dairy and its effect on the climate crisis - a problem that has since worsened, and will continue to worsen until it is properly addressed. Councillor Craig Cheney and others present at the meeting listened to our public statements which detailed how meat and dairy consumption causes more CO2 emissions, biodiversity loss and deforestation. In turn, contributing to rising temperatures and the eventual displacement of millions of climate refugees globally. Myself and others are not alone in raising these concerns, Exeter City Council also recognise the problems that meat and dairy consumption cause, and took the initiative to successfully carry a motion on 14th December 2022 to cater fully plant-based meals to actively mitigate the effects of climate breakdown aforementioned.

As a Bristol resident, I take pride in the progressive nature of the city and this council. However, the council appears to be continually sweeping this issue under the carpet. In the July 12th 2022 meeting, Councillor Craig Cheney explained that the councils resistance to amending the terms of the catering contracts was largely due to the logistics of the contract renewals - stating that myself and others should return in 2023 to discuss future amendments, once all three contracts had been brought in line with each other to terminate in December 2023. Today, I am here to ask:

“This year, will the council finally hear the motions which have already been tabled, agreeing to fully plant-based catering, and amend the terms of these three catering contracts, so that plant-based eating is showcased and normalised by Bristol City Council?”



QUESTION PQ 10

Subject: Redcatch Community Garden

Question submitted by: Keith Farley

On his recent visit to the Garden, the Mayor confirmed that he recognises and values the significant contribution it makes to the community in terms of its social value (calculated to be in excess of £1m+). However, despite this contribution, because of shortfalls in Council budgets, we are told there needs to be an extreme hike in the Garden rental because it's 'tough' back at City Hall.....

1. How does the Mayor believe the public will respond to the news that the Council wants to put a knife through the 'beating heart of our community' (quote from visitor), bleed a highly valued, highly respected, award winning, unique community resource to death because it has haemorrhaged £millions from its own failed 'businesses' (Bristol Energy, Bristol Waste, wasted fees on Arena, Cumberland Basin, Underground.....) and needs to plug the budget gaps?

We understand that the Council is to outsource the catering commissions it currently runs directly because it cannot make them pay.

2. Why then does the Mayor think that Redcatch Community Garden, which delivers so many Social Value projects from its café and restricted income, can make more 'commercial' profit than its own operations and can therefore afford a 5660% increase in rent?



QUESTION PQ 11

Subject: Redcatch Community Garden

Question submitted by: Alex Gill

In the current rent negotiations at Redcatch Community Garden, in order to highlight that the Garden is not about commercial profit, but value derived from activities in order to deliver socially rewarding projects for the most needy and vulnerable in our community and make a difference to people's lives, RCG asked BCC for a Social Value calculator. RCG were told "BCC does not have one that is recognised and understood" and so RCG developed their own.

1. In order to value an 'asset' that is providing so much 'value' to a community, BCC should have developed a model for all to use so that it can demonstrate that it understands that some 'businesses' are more valuable than commercial profit. Does this indicate that BCC does not consider Social Value as a contribution?
2. As part of their Community Asset Transfer, Redcatch CG have offered to take over the responsibility of opening and closing the public toilets which would save the council money. Does the Mayor not accept that saying this is irrelevant because the cost is met from a different budget does not demonstrate an overarching strategy of an efficiently managed Council?



QUESTION PQ 12**Subject: Park Row Active Travel****Question submitted by: Haydn Gill**

I bring the councils attention to Annex D of the CRSTS funding paper presented to Cabinet in February 2023. If you can find it.

This risk register on active travel scheme delivery was published as part of Cabinet papers, before being removed following my submission of questions to the Mayor on this. Clearly there is something to hide.

Regarding the Park Row active travel improvements, it seems to be that the Mayor is not "getting stuff done", but is actively delaying active travel schemes and putting funding at risk.

The risk register highlighted a risk of the Mayor's making. Issue 1004. The Mayor opposed one part of the scheme, where due to space constraints, a bus boarder is proposed to be installed instead of a bus stop bypass.

Bus boarders are already in place in Bath, Cardiff (both cities without mass transit) and other cities with strong active travel delivery. With no major issues reported, they are in the national active travel design guidance, issued by the Secretary of State for Transport (Local Transport Note 1/20), for when road space is constrained.

Active Travel England is the government agency providing funding and design guidance for active travel. If schemes fail to adhere to national design guidance, funding may be withdrawn.

Bath & North East Somerset has published a video on bus boarders for those who may not understand exactly how they work:

<https://youtu.be/J9ZqfMZfdd0>

The risk states:

28/07/2022 update - the Mayor's Office does not accept the solution re: bus stop boarders. We are now notifying Active Travel England, (since ATE is not supportive of their removal) and asking them to confirm whether proceeding with flag and pole arrangements (the only viable alternative) would mean that our funding is to be pulled (i.e.that the scheme cannot proceed). In the unlikely event that ATE does not pull funding, the project would now need to be re-planned and would be significantly delayed as a result (which would in turn have a range of implications). Assuming that funding is pulled, implications include comms, overspend to-date, loss of asset improvement and arrangements re: the temporary scheme.

Q1: Can the Mayor expand on his specific objections to the Park Row bus stop boarders and the resulting delay and overspend this decision has led to?

Q2: Why is the Mayor making design decisions on an active travel scheme, against guidance from highly experienced Active Travel England officers, who design active travel schemes, and contrary to the consultation results, when 68% of consultees approved of the bus stop boarder?



QUESTION PQ 13

Subject: Plant Based Treaty

Question submitted by: Josephine Robinson

1. What are the direct and indirect ways that the council can: offer, manage, let, control, regulate or influence what get provided or sold to be eaten in the city - based on the council's operations, licensing, regulation or commercial concessions?
2. What has the council done in line with official advice to reduce meat and dairy consumption in what's offered across the catering it provides or can influence?



QUESTION PQ 14

Subject: Cumberland Basin Regeneration

Question submitted by: Alex Hartley

1. At Cabinet last month, the report stated “The council has submitted a bid for £5.6 million funding from the combined authority for the development of the Western Harbour masterplan and infrastructure delivery plan project.”

Can the Mayor please release the bid so it can be scrutinised by local people to highlight what this large amount of taxpayer money is being spent on? If the Mayor can/will not release the bid, could he please explain why?

2. The timetable for the redevelopment of Cumberland Basin stated that masterplanners were supposed to be appointed in Autumn 2022. As is clear from the funding request from WECA, this has yet to happen. While I understand the future is impossible to predict, can the Mayor please lay out an updated timetable including;
 - When will masterplanners be appointed
 - When will the masterplanning development take place
 - When will the planning applications take place
 - When will building work commence & finish



QUESTION PQ 15

Subject: Integrated Transport System

Question submitted by: David Redgewell

1. What progress is Bristol city council and mayor Rees making with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council over the very urgent need for the west of England mayoral Transport Authority to develop new bus services improvement plan for bus services routes across South, East and North Bristol?
2. Will mayor Marvin Rees work with our other city Region council leaders to make sure that a mass transit / light rail system budget is kept at the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council committee meetings on 17th March 2023 to make sure we have an integrated transport system and the west of England city region of Greater Bristol and Bath is not left behind?



QUESTION PQ 16

Subject: Bristol Port Company

Question submitted by: Andrew Lynch

With a tightened council budget, every little helps. Yet about a year ago the Bristol Port Company - in which Bristol City Council is a shareholder - donated £10,000 to Liam Fox, the Conservative MP for North Somerset. I believe that Councillor Alexander represents us on that board. Did that donation deprive Bristol of any amount of the company's dividend, however small? If so, did Councillor Alexander raise any objection at the board meeting that approved either the donation or the accounts?



QUESTION PQ 17

Subject: Bristol Harbour Review

Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

You have made several references to a Harbour Review report which has shaped your policies in relation to Bristol's Harbour. Please can you provide the actual report, a link to it, or an explanation as to why the report is not being made available to the public?



QUESTION PQ 18

Subject: Mass Transit System

Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

You have made reference to a third report, about Bristol’s proposal for a mass transit/underground system, which has been rejected by your office because it is based on a “flawed approach” by WECA. Please can you provide the actual report, a link to it, or an explanation as to why the report is not being made available to the public?



QUESTION PQ 19

Subject: Bristol Harbour Review

Question submitted by: Amanda Jones

I urge you to address the issue of affordability of mooring fees and curb these rent increases, so the community that significantly contributes to the security and surveillance all along the harbourside can continue to exist

Q1 Does the council wish to look after its long-standing boat-dweller community? If so then please I ask how will you ensure these fee increases for residential license can be affordable?

Q2 Is this drastic and sudden increase in harbour fees not exactly the sort of behaviour the Renters Reform Bill should be protecting us from?



QUESTION PQ 20

Subject: Bristol Harbour Review

Question submitted by: Bristol Boaters Community Association

1. The premature approval of fees increase will have a detrimental impact on the harbour's sense of place. Pushing the diverse mix of vessels out of the harbour and replacing with the more luxury and uniform leisure craft, not only reduces the level of safety surveillance currently supplied by the long-standing community, but also has the potential to lose the harbour's charm. The Placeshaping Vision was intended to run along side the Harbour Review to enable the outcomes to be influenced by both pieces of work and feed into the 20 year plan of the harbour. Due to the delay in the Placeshaping vision, the Harbour Review outcome is premature and lacks consideration of this vision.

Will the Council halt the fees increase and other outcomes of the Harbour review until the Placeshaping vision is complete as previously intended?

2. The council are withholding their benchmarking activity so BBCA have produced their own. This has been sent to the Harbour team, Ward Councillors and the Mayor and Cabinet. It is also available on our website <http://bristolboaters.org/documents/>

As demonstrated in the photos contained within this document, the facilities or availability in Bristol are not a uniform standard, they also fall far below that of those in the 4 marinas used in BCC's assessment which has not been recognised or considered.

How can the council justify charging fees inline with the privately run marina in Bristols Floating Harbour without the same level of facilities, safety or service provision?



QUESTION PQ 21

Subject: HMOs

Question submitted by: Simon James Lewis

By an Order made by the City Council commencing on 29th June 2020, permitted development rights were removed for the change of use from Class C3 (dwelling houses) to Class C4 (houses in multiple occupations) in central wards, including; East Bristol to prevent the character of the area being threatened by and becoming overrun with shared homes and the loss of communities, along with antisocial behaviour, parking, litter and noise complaints.

These restrictions withdraw permitted development rights for small HMOs so that they would need consent after being considered against planning policy and the effect they would have on the local community.

However, despite properties having been refused planning permission when compared to planning policy (due to the number of HMOs already at maximum capacity), why is Bristol City Council's licensing authority granting licences to landlords of privately rented HMOs that do not have planning permission in the East Bristol area without first checking that planning consent for this change of use has been granted?

1. Can I implore the Mayor to review the operation of the separate planning and licencing so that they work in a coordinated way to address HMOs?
2. Is this why there are insufficient family homes available for rent? And is this why the Bristol rental market is in crisis?



QUESTION PQ 22

Subject: Bristol Harbour Review

Question submitted by: Molly Petts

1. An Accommodation needs assessment of boaters is a statutory duty under Section 124 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016. I have included guidance from the NBTA below.

https://www.bargee-traveller.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/2019-03-12_V7_NBTA_Best_Practice_Guide_Boat_Dweller_Acommodation_Needs_Assessments_S124_HPA2016.pdf

This guidance document amplifies and complements the guidance to local housing authorities published by the Department for Communities and Local Government.

Why hasn't an accommodation needs assessment of boaters been carried out?

2. The Harbour had previously been allocated 400k and I quote for the 'upgrade of facilities and services – to increase revenue streams including licence fees (with any increase over inflation following consultation'.

Why hasn't either the upgrade in facilities or the consultation prior to the increase above inflation been fulfilled?



QUESTION PQ 23

Subject: Bristol Harbour Review

Question submitted by: Trevor Gray

(1) It's widely accepted that Bristol Harbour is no longer a commercial operation and today has many uses, mainly leisure and residential. Managing the harbour is no longer simply about dealing with commercial operations. The intricacies of today's harbour uses and users surely requires a much broader set of skills to ensure its managed efficiently and correctly. The mayor stated on Bristol Live 17th March 2023 that the HR would change how the harbour is managed. How will it therefore be managed in the future, is there to be a harbour board made up of councillors, professionals and stakeholders who will make decisions on its future interests.

(2) Despite any official line the harbour has for decades knowingly accommodated a community. Many are low income or retired. Could the mayor please give reassurance that concessions can be put in place for those members that are unable to afford the new fees in April. Please don't let us work against each other, working together is in the best interested of the harbour, together we can ensure the harbour pays its way whilst also becoming the incredible asset we all desire it to be. Please, can we find some middle ground and ensure we limit gentrification of the Harbour where the long-standing community is simply displaced for those can afford it.



QUESTION PQ 24

Subject: Bristol Harbour Review

Question submitted by: Phoebe Arrowsmith Brown

Parks get allocated funds from the central budget as it is a benefit to the wider community. Recently the proposed cuts of £1.5m to the Parks Service, as listed in the budget consultation, have been withdrawn. The Capital Plan has £3.5m of spending on parks and green spaces in 23/24. This is welcome news as shared spaces need to be supported. Why can't Bristol harbour be set up in the same manner as it is a city asset funded by many?

The new proposed license fee includes a liveaboard category, if these are being introduced why is the housing minister Tom Renhard not being involved and why has an accommodation needs assessment not been undertaken to ensure longstanding members of the community needs are met?

