

Statement: PS08.01

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 8 - MetroWest Phase 2 and Ashley Down Rail Station

Statement submitted by: Railfuture Severnside (David Redgewell)

We fully support the extra money from Bristol city economy Development fund .
For the metro west railway station at Ashley Down with fully disabled access
Lifts realtime information systems and shelters.

We wish to see Bristol city council

Transport executive councillor Don Alexander work with the metro mayor Dan Norris and
the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority

To make sure bus stands are in place for bus service connections to Southmead hospital
bus station route 25 Transpora

City centre to Horfield and Southmead hospital bus station.

Service 17 from keynsham, Kingswood staple hill Fishponds Eastville Ashley Down station
and Southmead bus station

This is a west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and part funded service and
require an evening service to and to meet the Henbury loop line trains

Service 24 service to lockleaze estate Horfield and Southmead hospital bus station.

And to Eastville and Tesco toward Bristol city centre.

The station needs a westlink Demand responsive bus service to Eastville Park and Easton ..

We welcome design work on the transport interchanges with the west of England mayoral
combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris and City and county of Bristol council.

On metro it's very good to see the station under construction at present at Ashley Down.

On the Bristol Temple meads station Bristol Lawrence hill, Bristol Stapleton road Ashley
Down station Filton Abbey wood Filton North for the Arena and Henbury for cribs causeway
bus station and Bristol zoo .

With bus links .

Our concern is South Gloucestershire county council have still not granted
planning permission for the new Henbury loop line station.

We would ask mayor Rees and Transport executive councillor Don Alexander to raise this
issue again with Dan Norris metro mayor for the west of England mayoral combined
transport who are funding the metro west railway Network

But councillor ian Boulton and councillor claire young leaders of South Gloucestershire
county council and transport executive councillor s christine Wilmore and councilor matt
palmer South Gloucestershire council .

To get this playing permission sorted out urgently for Network rail western route.

On metro west railways Network we are very pleased metro mayor Dan Norris

Has funded the 30 min service on Bristol Temple meads station to Gloucester central railway
line via Filton Abbey wood Bristol parkway station yate charfield future station for wotton
under edge.

Cam and Dursey some trains .Gloucester central Hourly to Cheltenham spa Ashchurch for
Tewkesbury Worchester shrub hill and fotgate street.

Bristol Temple meads station , keynsham oidfiled park Bath spa Freshford Avoncliff Bradford
on Avon Trowbridge Westbury half hourly service hourly to Ditton marsh warminste
Salisbury and extra service to Southampton central and Frome .

The funding of the Bristol Temple meads station, Bristol Lawrence hill ,Bristol Stapleton road
,Montpellier ,Redland Clifton Down station, sea mills shirehampton Portway parkway station
Avonmouth Dock ,st Andrew road and Severn Beach

Bristol Temple meads Bedminster Parson street pill and Portishead.
With a new station at Ashton Gate

Proposed new station at St Anne's park and saltford
Metro west railway is part of the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and
North Somerset council.
And the western gateway transport Board.

Metro west railway need to full intergrated with city region bus coach and ferry Networks.
And with the mass transit light railway Network to Bristol Temple meads station Bristol bus
and coach station city centre.
And to South Bristol via St Phillips marsh Arnos vale Bristlington Hengrove south Bristol
Bristol Airport.
Service Bristol bus and coach station city centre to Bristol Temple meads station Arnos vale
,Bristlington keynsham Salford ,Newbridge,Weston and Bath city centre transport
interchanges bus and coach station.

We welcome the investment in metro west railway Network and Ashley Down station on
Bristol Temple meads station to Filton Abbey wood Filton North Arena Exhibition station and
Henbury for cribbs causeway bus station and Bristol zoo.

We are also very concerned to see delays in transfer of the Bristol city council transport and
public transport Network staff to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority
As soon as possible.
We note railway staff have already transferred.

David Redgewell Railfuture Severnside and Brendon Taylor

Statement: PS08.02

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 8 - MetroWest Phase 2 and Ashley Down Rail Station

Statement submitted by: South Gloucestershire Disability Network (David Redgewell)

As a wheelchair users iam very convenient the the metro west railway Network is made fully accessible.

With good unchanges with bus and coach and ferry services.

Whilst Ashley Down Filton Abbey Filton North for Arena Exhibition station and Henbury for cribbs causeway .

All theses stations including Ashley Down will be fully accessible.

As with Portway parkway and Pill and Portishead and new station at Ashton Gate.

But Bedminster parson street on the Portishead line and Weston super mare line are not fully accessible.

St Andrew road and Bristol Stapleton road and Bristol Lawrence hill are not fully available to passengers with reduced mobility.

and Nalisea and Backwell and Weston super in North Somerset .

All theses station need lifts and ramps

Are not fully accessible and requires diversity impact assessments.

We ask Bristol city council mayor Malvin Rees and councillor Don Alexander transport executive to work with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council to make the metro west railway Network fully accessible.

Brendon Taylor South Gloucestershire disability Network.

And Bristol disability equilities Network.

Statement: PS08.03

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 8 - MetroWest Phase 2 and Ashley Down Rail Station

Statement submitted by: Gavin Smith

It is essential that plans for this new station link it into Bristol's bus network, in order to work towards integrated public transport in the city.

At least two bus routes pass the junction of Muller Road with Station Lane but the stops are some distance away along *different streets*. Two of those separate routes terminate at Southmead Hospital, which is a regional medical centre. The new Ashley Down station will be the nearest railhead approaching from the South, but this opportunity to promote an integrated and legible transport interchange seems to be overlooked. Instead any potential outpatient, visitor, or hospital employee would have to juggle with different bus timetables and different bus stops, when it would be so much easier to bring both routes to one stop closer to the station.

This can be achieved by expending the aims of the bus-lane and bus-stop reorganisation currently occurring along Muller Rd adjacent at Ralph Rd.

This failure to grasp easy opportunities is not unusual in our region. Further up the line, Filton Abbey Wood station, in South Gloucestershire territory, continues to have no bus services at all, even though it has more local train services than Parkway. A bus interchange could easily be achieved by routing buses through the station carpark, by-passing the congested junction of Filton Avenue with the Avon Ring Road A4174.

Martin Garrett, Gavin Smith
Transport for Greater Bristol

Statement: PS08.04

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 8 - MetroWest Phase 2 and Ashley Down Rail Station

Statement submitted by: Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways

FoSBR welcomes the reopening of Ashley Down station.

However, the fullest benefit of suburban rail is to have adequate rail-bus interchange, such as currently at Clifton Down station, so that passengers have no need to use a car to get to the rail station. For this to work well, the bus stop should be within easy walking distance of the rail station, and adequate signage provided to promote easy interchange.

Ashley Down station presents a good opportunity to show the principle of railbus

interchange in action. At present, the two bus stops on Muller Road near the rail station site serve different bus routes and only serve one direction for each route. The corresponding bus stops in the opposite direction for the return journey are at a considerable distance and up a steep hill in one case, as shown by the map. We have also marked on this map the suggested location of stops serving both directions on both bus routes.

What hampers the provision of rail-bus interchange is that the positioning of rail stations and bus stops are currently under different jurisdictions. We urge Bristol City Council to work with the West of England Combined Authority to find a way to facilitate the co-provision of rail and bus, and in particular to ensure that rail stations such as Ashley Down are adequately served by bus routes, such as the no. 17 to Southmead Hospital.

Other opportunities at existing stations include Lawrence Hill, Filton Abbey Wood and Nailsea and Backwell station.

FoSBR continue to welcome the provision of Portway Park and Ride station, the new half-hourly service from Westbury to Gloucester via Bath, Bristol and Yate, and the ongoing work to deliver the Portishead Line and the Henbury Line. We commend the West of England Combined Authority's Rail Plan and continue to press for the full utilisation of the region's rail freight lines, such as the Thornbury Line to Tytherington Quarry, now in operational use for freight.

Christina Biggs, Rob Dixon and David Netherwood
Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways

Question: PQ08.01 & PQ08.02

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 8 - MetroWest Phase 2 and Ashley Down Rail Station

Question submitted by: James Crawford

Question 1: Can you outline how far the stretch of the Concorde Way expected to be made narrower?

Question 2: And can you confirm if there has been any consultation about the narrowing of the way specifically?

Question: PQ08.03 & PQ08.04

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 8 - MetroWest Phase 2 and Ashley Down Rail Station

Question submitted by: South West Transport Network & Railfuture Severnside (David Redgewell)

Question 1: We welcome the extra money from the Bristol Economy Development plan

To Network rail western route and First group plc for the construction of Ashley Down station Bristol.

What progress is being made? By the Bristol city council and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and metro mayor Dan Norris.

To deliver the Henbury loop line on time with the Train service from Ashley Down station to Filton Abbey wood Filton North Brabazan Arena and Exhibition station.

With Henbury for cribs causeway station not having planning permission

Will the new train service be delivered on time and on budget with fully accessible stations.

Question 2: Ashley Down station is important public transport Network interchanges.

What progress is being made on the provision of bus access.

For bus stop for bus service 17 to Bristol Southmead hospital bus station. First group plc west of England buses

Service 25 to Horfield and Bristol Southmead hospital. Transpora buse.

Service 24 to lockleaze ,Horfield and Southmead hospital bus station.

17, 24,25 to Tesco Eastgate shopping centre

With fully accessible routes between the stop on the proposed bus stop shelters and realtime information.

Working with Bristol city council as Highways Authority and West of England mayoral combined transport Authority as the provider of bus services and railway services from metro west railway

David Redgewell South west transport Network and Railfuture Severnside.

Question: CQ08.01

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 8 - MetroWest Phase 2 and Ashley Down Rail Station

Question submitted by: Councillor Tim Rippington

Background:

It is great to finally see some of our local rail projects coming to fruition. Both the imminent opening of the Portway Park and Ride and the accelerated development of Ashley station are very welcome. I believe that the only clean future for our city relies on the delivery of a public transport mix of rail, buses and mass transit, and the delivery of MetroWest 2 is an important part of that mix.

In my own ward, we have now been waiting over 18 months for a decision on whether to proceed to an Outline Business Case for St Anne's railway station through the government's Restoring Your Railways project. The SOBC for the station made a very strong strategic case, but the financial case was much weaker. This is not surprising based on the metrics which are currently used to calculate such things, which include the dis-benefit to travellers already on a train if it has to make an additional 30 second station stop. I personally believe that the strategic case far outweighs the financial one as we strive to reach Net Zero and clean up the air in our city – however, I realise that the final decision may go against us. When putting together the case, Network Rail admitted that none of Bristol's current suburban stations would likely pass the current financial test if they were not already operating.

Question 1: Can I ask the Cabinet if they will continue to support the re-opening of St Anne's station via other routes such as MetroWest if the Restoring Your Railways bid eventually fails because of the short-sightedness of the current government?

Question: CQ08.02 & CQ08.03

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 8 - MetroWest Phase 2 and Ashley Down Rail Station

Question submitted by: Councillor Emma Edwards

Background:

While the news of the construction of Ashley Down Station being on schedule is welcome indeed. I am concerned that this report shows a reduction to the width of Concorde way. While residents in the area are mostly pleased about the new station, it cannot be understated what an impact the construction has had to those who use Concorde way as a main walking and cycling commuting route. These are not residents who will be frequently using the train station, but those who cycle or walk to work or school daily. This includes the 1000 cycle journeys a day Concorde way sees on average, and children walking to Fairfield School. The report talks about improvements to Boiling wells lane to make it a 'suitable' diversion. However our residents tell us that it is far from suitable, with places where they have to dismount, and places with conflict with pedestrians.

Section 9 states the width reduction, which would possibly reduce a section of Concorde Way to under 3m. The ATE LTN1/20 states cycle paths should be 3m minimum, which means yet again we are constructing a path that does not meet a standard, which would put future funding at risk. In section 10 measures have been identified to reduce conflict along the path but will only be implemented after funds are requested for a feasibility study. This very much sounds like kicking the can down the road (or cycle path).

Question 1: What are the measures that have been identified to reduce conflict between cyclists travelling in opposite directions and also pedestrians?

Question 2: If measures have been identified to reduce conflict along Concorde way, why are they being proposed as a possible mitigation action for the future rather than implemented before the path reopens?

Statement: CS09.01

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 10 - Bristol Active Travel Fund tranche 4 bid

Statement submitted by: Councillor Emma Edwards

The Green Group welcome this news and are delighted at the funding secured to deliver more cycling infrastructure for Bristol. We are pleased that the administration has listened to us when we have repeatedly called for improvements to cycle lanes and the need for a joined up network of lanes in Bristol. The route from old market in particular is welcome as it goes towards improving a vital cycling corridor.

We look forward to the continuation of creating a joined-up cycling lane network as we look to working within the committee system in future.

However while this securing of money is to be celebrated, in comparison with other cities there is far more that could be secured, which is why we hope that this administration will be mindful of how existing and developing cycle lanes are developed. In particular we must ensure new infrastructure is high quality and meets national standards (LTN1/20) to ensure that we can always bid for the funds Bristol deserves to invest in Active Travel.

Improving cycling and walking routes, as this report mentions, is a key towards achieving net zero. Sacrificing cycling routes at the expense of other transport schemes is counterproductive. I hope the administration continues to invest in cycling routes and deliver them swiftly.

Question: CQ09.01

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 9 - Bristol Active Travel Fund tranche 4 bid

Question submitted by: Councillor Tim Rippington

Background:

Active travel is also an important part of our transport mix if we are to reach our Net Zero and Clean Air targets, and I support the outcomes to be delivered by this project.

In my own ward of Brislington East we have huge areas which are devoid of any kind of public transport – only last week I was speaking to residents on Robertson's Drive in St Anne's who said they would never consider using public transport to get around because it was simply unfeasible.

Some of these residents might be encouraged to exchange a proportion of their car journeys for cycling if they had safe routes to make their journeys into the city. In 2019, I made a full submission to the WECA walking and cycling plan consultation on behalf of Brislington residents, and in particular, improvements to the cycling experience along the Feeder Road were flagged up to me by local residents as being hugely desirable given the lack of other transport options.

Question 1: The administration's regeneration of Temple Quarter will undoubtedly bring a sizable sum of S106 money into the council. Does the Cabinet Member for Transport know when plans of how this money could be spent will be drawn up, and will he ensure any proposals include active travel improvements on Feeder Road?

Question: CQ09.02 & CQ09.03

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 9 - Bristol Active Travel Fund tranche 4 bid

Question submitted by: Councillor Marley Bennett

Increasing the rate of cycling and walking is crucial to achieving our climate targets, so I'm pleased to see the council secure yet more funding for active travel improvements.

Question 1: Please could the Cabinet Member for Transport outline how much funding Bristol City Council received compared to other WECA authorities and other comparable cities?

Question 2: Does the administration intend to link active travel routes from Castle Park, through Old Market, to the Bristol to Bath cyclepath?

Statement: PS10.01

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 10 - Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review

Statement submitted by: Greg Cooper

I wish to make a statement about this.

Cossins Rd where I live was excluded from the last RPS Scheme. As a result our road has become an unofficial park and ride on weekdays. The road is heavily used by children at Redland Green and Westbury Park School and also has a busy nursery.

There are obvious safety concerns relating to the school pedestrian traffic. The influx of commuter parking and overspill from people in the RPS streets who do not wish to pay the charge has severely compromised the safety of pedestrians and impeded access to local facilities such as the park as well as local facilities such as St Albans Church for funerals and community events.

When my children were small I helped provide road safety training at Westbury Park School. As well as small group training on local streets with the children, we encouraged parents to drop children off in Cossins Road instead of clogging up Bayswater Ave outside the school. It is notable that since the RPS scheme was introduced the number of children cycling to school has reduced dramatically. The road is simply not safe for young children to cycle.

Along with many of my neighbours I would like to see RPS extended to our area, and ask that the council take steps to revisit this option.

Statement: PS10.02

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 10 - Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review

Statement submitted by: Simon Bull

I wish to share my concern about the premises made in the report, and the potential impact to the introduction of future RPZs in Bristol.

- This report raises the issue of “mode shift” in RPZ areas. Yet, the report acknowledges that understanding the impact of RPZs on mode shift is challenging. Therefore raising it as an issue seems to create a faulty premise.
- This report fails to consider the value of RPZs in a holistic way, stating “It is difficult to test the effectiveness of RPZ schemes due to these issues”. There is a risk that RPZs are presumed ineffective, when the desired benefits to climate and air quality are only one consideration for their use.
- The report fails to mention the benefits of RPZs, such as:
 - The air quality and climate benefits of reducing & discouraging commuter parking both for the city and wider region, through shortened commuter journeys to Park & Rides and other climate-friendlier transport.
 - Designated parking areas with marked bays improves the quality of parking in an area, reducing the impact of pavement parking and other inconsiderate parking. This is currently a detractor to active transport for residents, in particular walking.
 - Improved quality of life for residents, where parking and unimpeded pavement use would be a lesser stress on everyday life. Indeed, this report includes a tactic acknowledgement that it is desirable to increase stress for residents as “residents can be more confident of a parking space when they return home” with an RPZ! This language in particular is not reflective of a council operating in residents’ interests.

With respect to the report on proposed policy changes, due no later than October 2023, section d) “**Review zoning for general parking within RPS areas and size of areas**”:
I would urge the committee to ensure the October report includes a complete and holistic view of the benefits and costs of RPZs, including matters such as those mentioned above, whether or not the proposed Regional Modelling approach in Recommendation 4 does so. To consider the future of RPZs only through the lens of climate and air quality, using potentially faulty assumptions such as mode shift, risks poor decision-making relating to the future of RPZs.

Statement: CS10.01

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 10 - Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review

Statement submitted by: Councillor Martin Fodor

This report is significant as it has quite a few implications but also raised unanswered questions.

After years of requests and frankly frustrations some residents may have some interesting comments given the magnitude of the implications for them. As you know many groups of residents in several areas of the city have been asking for the Mayor's support to start managing parking in the unsafe and chaotic streets near many of the current RPS zones that were established up to 2016. Despite many promises to look at parking or corner protection from blocking vehicles and rogue parking nothing has been done for years.

Most significant is that the report's implications are divided between the certainty of charges being raised - as these can be done with a Cabinet decision on Tuesday - and the likelihood a consultation of some sort on much wider issues and less certain, future possible changes like scheme boundary changes.

Knock on effects

There will be definite knock on effects from new and raised charges, inc the formerly exempt 'clean vehicles' and the proposed increases for all 2nd and 3rd cars. Doubling costs for a 2nd permit to £224, and 3rd permit x2.5 to £560 will obviously have an impact - hence the uncertain revenue implications noted in the report. The behavioural outcome could of course be simply to find other places to store vehicles.

I'm sure residents in the city's current parking zones will have comments on the possible scheme hours and criteria changes.

But meanwhile the report proposes looking at a wider RPS Policy Review - something the Mayor and his various Cabinet members for Transport over the years - have not discussed with ward councillors despite several of us trying to engage with them for many years.

The report notes possible changes that have to be consulted covering:

- No more free permits for vehicles below 100g emissions
- Considering who is eligible for permits
- Reviewing allocation of visitor permits
- Review of multiple permit number limits - 1-3 for most addresses except where there's a driveway at the address.
- Proposed to review size of RPS areas and consideration of adjustments. Something many groups of adjacent street residents have asked for for many years since the RPS near them came into operation.
- Reviewing operational hours

- Review daytime restrictions and shared bays etc.

There will have to be a consultation for any of these changes but not the fees charged.

Displacement of parking

While many people in unmanaged areas of the city have been seeking extension areas for years we don't know what might be suggested. But if charges go up later this year the risk of extra displacement is beyond doubt and could be immediate. So what assurances will there be for the affected areas with displaced car storage about how fast the council will respond to the impacts this report will cause? Highway projects are notoriously slow and take years even when funded and committed, so what does the Mayor have to say to residents about the knock on effects of today's decision on charges? What is he going to leave unresolved for the future committee system of governance to deal with?

I also note the report estimates the budget raised by these variation of charges measures. If the department has been given as fund raising target as suggested then what else is to be done to fill the budget gap?

Cllr Martin Fodor
Redland ward Green Party councillor

Statement: CS10.02

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 10 - Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review

Statement submitted by: Councillor Ed Plowden

The people of Bristol will be disappointed by this Cabinet Report, as yet more evidence of the ongoing failure to implement the Mayor's own Transport Strategy. Since 2019 there has been a Parking Strategy promised, and the Citizen's Assembly recommendations included the development of a strategy to systematically reduce parking in the City.

Likewise the many people of Windmill Hill who write to us about parking problems in the area will be disappointed. They regularly tell us of the problems that commuter parking causes, including the blocking of access for bin lorries and emergency services. They will not be able to understand why the £700,000, collected from the developers at Bedminster Green and ringfenced for parking controls – to protect the further problems heading for Windmill Hill – remain sitting in the bank account.

Residents in Southville who were promised an RPZ in 2021 by the Mayor, Cllr Dudd and Labour candidates will be similarly mystified as to why they continue to be neglected and overlooked.

Instead we are given an evidence-lite proposal to tinker round the edges of a fraction of the parking in the City. The Mayor's blog states that there is a lack of evidence as to the RPZs effectiveness. This is misleading, and true only because there appears to have been no real attempt to collect any. There is also an assertion that it may have created more local journeys, but no evidence to support this statement, nor judge the overall (net) effectiveness of the schemes.

In actual fact there is a wealth of peer-reviewed evidence as to how to improve transport at a citywide scale, (for example here, [A dozen effective interventions to reduce car use in European cities: Lessons learned from a meta-analysis and transition management - ScienceDirect](#)) . The mayor's transport strategy contains most of these excellent suggestions. Sadly there is little sign of Bristol's Transport Strategy being implemented in a strategic, determined and evidence based way – in fact the Mayor is unbelievably proposing schemes that work in opposition to his own policy, for example with the proposal to re-open University Road.

The Labour administration's inconsistency and rejection of evidence-based decision making on this matter is most obvious in their claim that new RPZs require 'overwhelming support', while rejecting the results of multiple surveys showing such support from residents (even those commissioned by the Council for tens of thousands of pounds).

Councillor Ed Plowden
Councillor for Windmill Hill

Question: CQ10.01

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 10 – Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review

Question submitted by: Councillor Steve Pearce

Question 1: I'm pleased to see this increase – we are in a climate emergency and we cannot be subsidising cars at the expense of cleaner forms of transport. Can the Cabinet Member for Transport confirm whether this any revenue (in excess of covering the cost of enforcement) can be spent on active travel improvements, and confirm how much revenue this increase is expected to raise?

Question: CQ10.02

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 10 – Residents Parking Scheme Policy Review

Question submitted by: Councillor Christine Townsend

Question 1: The Low car zone policy came into place in August 2018, the paper does not mention this or its specific link to existing RPZ areas. Please explain the current implementation approach so I can understand why the RPZ review excludes this exclusive, directly paired policy with the RPZ areas.

Question: CQ11.01

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 11 – Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Stock Condition Surveys

Question submitted by: Councillor Brenda Massey

Question 1: I really welcome the decision to carry out a housing stock survey on Council properties. Will consideration be given to adapt as many properties as possible to improve the living conditions for the elderly and disabled to enable them to stay in their current accommodation, so that they can remain within the communities they know?

Statement: PS12.01

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 – Southmead Regeneration

Statement submitted by: Deana Perry

From the launch of our community plan in 2015 and Housing needs study done the following year it has become clear that the regeneration of Arnside and Glencoyne Square is vital for Southmead.

Our group of residents, councillors and stakeholders have been meeting monthly for over 6 years with the sole aim of making a better future for Southmead.

Cabinet approval today would be a massive step forwards for our regeneration project. As a lifelong resident I can honestly say that Arnside is the heart of Southmead and for this development to be built is a dream that I hold very close to my heart.

Statement: PS13.01

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 13 – Refurbishment Works to Existing “New Cut River” Bridges, and Future Feasibility Studies to Manage Other Assets

Statement submitted by: Disability Equalities Director Bristol Ferry, David Redgewell

We welcome the work on Vauxhall Bridge. Gaol Ferry Bridge ,
Banana Bridge
Bedminster new Bridge
Bedminster old Bridge .
All of which are looking for completion
By 2025 2026 .

These Bridges across the New cut to Harbour also connect with metro bus route m 2 Bristol Temple meads via Cabot circus Broadmead shopping centre city centre, Redcliffe and the Harbour to long Ashton park and Ride .
With a future link to Hartcliffe and Hengrove.
Metro bus stops are fully accessible

And to the Bristol Harbour and river Avon ferry services some ferry stops are fully accessible but there is a need to make quayside fully accessible and ferries.

Also design contract preparation completion .
To include sparke Evan park Bridge
By 2027

New Bristlington Bridge / Netham lock .
St Phillips causeway.

We welcome this investment in New cut River Avon and Bristol Harbour.

We would like to see provision made for disabled access and people with reduced mobility under the equalities act 2010 .

All these bridges must be made fully accessible by Bristol city council and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris.

With provision being made for sustainable transport corridors and bus priority measures on the main road bridges over the new cut and st Phillip causeway which need cycling and pedestrian routes.

We welcome the feasibility study which we hope we including an fully equalities impact assessments

We welcome investment in the city and county of Bristol bridges and pedestrianians access to the Harbour .

With the city region transport funding

From the metro mayor Dan Norris and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority.

With the transfer of staff for Bristol city council to the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority.

We need to make sure we have staff continue to undertake these projects .

Bristol disability equities forum.

Bristol ferry company would like to be kept fully consulted on the very important works to the River Avon and Harbour Authority bridges.

David Redgewell disability equities Director Bristol ferry boat company.

Gordon Richardson Bristol disability equities forum

Question: PQ13.01 & PQ13.02

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 13 - Refurbishment Works to Existing “New Cut River” Bridges, and Future Feasibility Studies to Manage Other Assets

Question submitted by: Haydn Gill

Background:

Subject: Considering walking, wheeling and scooting when refurbishing "New Cut River" bridges

Many of the "New Cut" bridges are polluted and dangerous for anyone not in a car. The ongoing closure of Gaol Ferry Bridge has highlighted how important it is for provision to be made for those with reduced mobility, and how diversion routes must be upgraded in advance of works starting. The renewal of bridges is also an opportunity to allow Bristolians to cross the river without being killed. When the Bedminster and Bath bridges are renewed, the lane arrangements and space allocated to people walking or cycling must be changed or it will forever prevent people from safely crossing the river. As you know, Bath Road Bridge has 4 lanes (12m wide) for driving in one direction and one shared pavement (2m wide) for both directions.

Question 1: With the confirmation that concrete barriers have been installed on New Brislington Bridge on both sides, for safety reasons. Will the Mayor use the opportunity with the in-situ concrete barriers to provide a safe segregated route across New Brislington Bridge for people scooting and cycling, for safety reasons. Surely an 8 year old child cycling along the bridge can't demolish a concrete bridge support?

Question 2: Will the Mayor commit to ensure that as part of all feasibility studies for bridge renewals, the 'quick-wins' of also improving the bridges for people walking, wheeling and scooting would be considered, both during construction work and after refurbishment?

Question: PQ13.03 & PQ13.04

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 13 - Refurbishment Works to Existing “New Cut River” Bridges, and Future Feasibility Studies to Manage Other Assets

Question submitted by: Bristol Disability Equalities Forum and Bristol Ferry Equalities and Diversity Director (David Redgewell)

Question 1: Whist we welcome the restoration of the New cuts Bridges and the money from the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority city region transport strategy.

And the access to the Harbour and metro bus bus route m2 and the city Harbour ferry service.

What planning is going to planning diversion routes for pedestrians people with reduced mobility and cyclist whilst the works are taking place? Under the equalities impact assessments.

Questions 2: With the Works to the Bridges over the New cut in Bristol Harbour . With the feasibility study what consultation is taking place by Bristol city council as Highways Authority and port Authority with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority on making the Bridges fully accessible to all under the equalities act 2010 .

Will the feasibility study be subject to public consultation with the Bristol disability equalities forum and Bristol disability equalities commission Bristol Harbour forum and Bristol ferry operators Bristol older people forum.

Gordon Richardson Bristol disability equalities forum.

Brendon Taylor Bristol disability equalities forum.

David Redgewell Bristol disability equalities forum and Bristol ferry equalities and diversity Director.

Question: CQ13.01 & CQ13.02

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 13 - Refurbishment Works to Existing “New Cut River” Bridges, and Future Feasibility Studies to Manage Other Assets

Question submitted by: Councillor Patrick McAllister

Question 1: Firstly, let me just say that I am thrilled to see the City spending money on these essential repairs. Reliable and safe access across the New Cut is fundamental, and we never realise that more than when it disappears as at Gaol Ferry Bridge.

The Refurbishment Works to Existing “New Cut River” Bridges, and Future Feasibility Studies to Manage Other Assets report, under Evidence Base, point 4, allocates £11.50M of capital funding to the maintenance of four bridges – Langton Street footbridge, Vauxhall footbridge, Bedminster New Bridge, and Bath New Bridge.

Can the administration please provide a breakdown of how this money is expected to be apportioned between these bridges, which of this group will be prioritised for maintenance first, and how long repairs on each are expected to take? If not, when will this information become available?

Question 2: Bedminster New Bridge and Bath New Bridge are significantly larger than the other bridges listed under point 4: both are twin bridges acting together as roundabouts and are vehicle-bearing as opposed to pedestrian-only.

The paper only seeks funding for the New Bridges in these roundabout configurations, and not the older two. Can the administration please outline why funding is not being sought for repairing the older two in the pairs?

Statement: PS14.01

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 14 – Kingsweston Lane Footbridge

Statement submitted by: Bristol Disability Equalities Forum (David Redgewell)

Whilst we welcome the investment and restoration of this historic bridge .
But we are concerned that this footbridge is not being made fully accessible with extra money being allocated to people with reduced mobility.
Equalities and Disabled groups were told that there was no extra money to make the path and Bridge compliant with the Equalities Act 2010 .
And that the port lorry route was more important to Kingsweston Lane than disabled people using the pathway across North Bristol from South Gloucestershire County Council from Filton through the Southmead area and toward Blaise Castle to Shirehampton to join the route via the Avon Bridge and Portishead Clevedon and the coastal path toward Weston Super Mare, Brean, Berrow and Burnham-on-Sea.
This part is being upgraded as a wheelchair accessible route and for mothers and fathers using buggies and cycling.
We were told that there was no money at the planning committee for this Bridge to be made fully accessible and NO further money would be allocated to the project .
It would appear that English Heritage and Heritage England opposed disabled access to the paths and Bridge .
But the Department for Transport Disability Equalities Plan .
Has instructed all Government agencies to make historic structures fully accessible under 2010 Equalities Act .including instruction and guidance to Heritage England and English Heritage.
Shirehampton conservation group raised the issue of disabled access and making the Bridge fully accessible.
The Bristol Disability Equalities Forum has raised this issue on deep concern with councillor Nicola Beech who is in charge of planning and the Department for Transport and Ministers.
We have also advised both agencies in Bristol on Blaise Castle Estate and the Harbour.
As work on access plans for visit West in the city and county of Bristol and Bristol City Region and also on historic Bridges in North Somerset Council and in Bath Somerset
We have seen a Equalities Impact Assessment for this scheme.
And Bristol City Council is going to invest more taxpayers money in this scheme or the West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority and Mayor Dan Norris. On footpath scheme.
Would ask the Mayor to instruct his transport officials to make Kingsweston Bridge can be made fully accessible for residents and tourists to Bristol and the city region.
If the footpath which can be used by wheelchair users and cyclists the city council should ask the West of England Mayoral Combined Transport Authority to use some sustainable transport fund Monday on this scheme.
We very much support this Bridge restoration but not in 2023 as city of access for people as a museum piece for a few residents with very loud voice to use .

Gordon Richardson Bristol Disability Equalities Forum
Support by Bristol Disability Equalities Forum Trustees
Brendon Taylor.

Statement: CS14.01

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 14 – Kingsweston Lane Footbridge

Statement submitted by: Councillor John Geater & Councillor James Scott

We write to express relief that this long delayed project is at last facing its final hurdle, the approval to spend allocated money currently held in the Capital programme, with a view for restoration to start later this year.

Cabinet Members will be aware of the history of this damaged bridge and the repeated HGV impacts which eventually led to its closure and encasement in scaffolding since 2015. The report before you today alludes to some of the obstacles which have prevented an easy or quick resolution of this problem.

This is an important “Grade 2” listed structure, of historical significance not just for the community in the Ward but also citywide, as part of a shared architectural and cultural (engineering) inheritance. The acceptance by Historic England of the need for compromise by raising the crossing – even though this design may impact disproportionately (in terms of accessibility) on those with mobility issues, is a pragmatic decision.

If politics is the art of the possible, then we should also never *“let the perfect be the enemy of the good”*. It is clear that the Council cannot continue paying £15k per annum to maintain an unusable footway indefinitely. Moreover, we genuinely feared that the ever-growing cost of dismantlement, removal and refurbishment would eventually be pushed beyond the Authority’s means or reasonable public expenditure.

Consequently, it was felt necessary to include the saving of the Iron Bridge as part of the Conservative Group’s negotiations with the Mayor over support for his budget in 2022. We are grateful that he is now following through with this part of that agreement.

The granting of consent to the revised planning application by the Development Control “A” Committee last December was a major milestone in this saga. Local people have been encouraged by these moves but remain cautious that something might still take place to scupper their aspirations.

For example, there have been cited examples of structures being 'temporarily' taken away for repair, only for their reinstatement to be later abandoned for financial or operational reasons. So, there will be a need to continue to monitor progress and be on the lookout for any warning signs of further unexpected delays or hurdles.

That said, we would like to reiterate our thanks to all who have campaigned for this result. A special mention here to Janet Poole. Another shout out goes to the Kingsweston Action Group (KWAG) and Shirehampton Planning Group (SPG) who have done so much to keep this issue at the forefront of our thoughts and

actions. No doubt, they will continue to be vigilant and exercise oversight on this development until its completion.

In addition, recognition should be given to the Highways and urban design teams which have done such good work to address previous, seemingly intractable planning concerns.

So, we urge you to endorse the Officer recommendations and enable these repairs and reinstatement of the footbridge/ PROW to finally take place.

**COUNCILLOR JOHN GEATER
SCOTT**

Avonmouth & Lawrence Weston Ward
Ward

COUNCILLOR JAMES

Avonmouth & Lawrence Weston

Question: PQ14.01 & PQ14.02

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 14 - Kingsweston Lane Footbridge

Question submitted by: Bristol Disability Equalities Forum (David Redgewell)

Question 1: As the Kingweston lane Bridge is being built unlike every other footbridge is being built with any access for people for reduced mobility and wheelchair users and mothers and Fathers with buggies despite guidelines from the Department for transport in its National disabled access plan within a all prodject involving refurbishment of Historic bridges including direction from the Department to Heritage England and Historic England Why if disabled and equilities group told that their was a financial constraint On making the bridge and its access fully accessible is extra public money being allocated to an historic Bridge Being raised for heavy lorries to Avonmouth Dock.

Questions 2: If extra money is being allocated to this historic Heritage Bridge at Kingsweston lane will the mayor carry out a full equilities impact assessments under the equilities act 2010 as a public body and the city and county of Bristol and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority. And make this Bridge fully accessible in the 650 year of the city and county of Bristol council to all residents and visitors with in Bristol. In view of the fact the North Somerset council is making the coastal path South of Avonmouth and shirehampton fully accessible including Bridges south of kingweston and south Gloucestershire council is making the Frome valley walk accessible north of Kingsweston lane .

Gordon Richardson Bristol disability equalities forum
Robby Bentley.
David Redgewell
Bristol disability equalities forum.

Question: PQ21.01

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 21 - Increase in Littering Fixed-Penalty-Notice Rate and Household Duty of Care

Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

Background:

In the report about the Increase in Littering Fixed-Penalty-Notice Rate and Household Duty of Care, it is stated that "the cleanliness of the city has improved in many parts as measured by our independent Local Environmental Quality scoring". Sadly, although I fully support efforts to clean up the city (I regularly litter pick, arrange group litter picks, am a member of the Clean Streets Forum etc.) my impression is that cleanliness has not improved in many areas of the city.

Question 1: Please will you provide a table showing all the areas across Bristol where the independent Local Environmental Quality scoring has been undertaken, together with the dates and the baseline and subsequent scores?

Question: CQ21.01 & CQ21.02

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 21 - Increase in Littering Fixed-Penalty-Notice Rate and Household Duty of Care

Question submitted by: Councillor Martin Fodor

Background:

The Cabinet is considering a review of the fixed penalty notice charges [FPN] made by civil enforcement officers.

Ideally there would be behaviour change and we would no longer have a problem with litter and flytipping in the city. Everyone would know and observe their Duty of Care. However we don't and these contractors have been used to issue charges for some offences.

The report says the cleanliness of the city has improved in many parts as measured by our independent Local Environmental Quality scoring, but notes that more work still needs to be done particularly in relation to behaviour change.

The report also says the FPN fines are there to fund this service of private enforcement officers and any excess over costs of the scheme will be used to "tackle environmental issues". It's not clear what these extra funded issues have been or would be, eg whether better facilities for reducing waste or for changing behaviour. The last few years it's been argued that people should take their litter home and there's been less money to provide litter bins at busy locations.

Question 1: What surplus or otherwise has been retained since 2017 and how has it been spent?

Question 2: The Mayor has called for cleaner streets and the level of cleanliness has been measured.

Since the scheme was introduced what have the measured levels of street cleanliness been and where are the areas considered to still be below standard?

Question: CQ21.03

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 21 - Increase in Littering Fixed-Penalty-Notice Rate and Household Duty of Care

Question submitted by: Councillor Steve Pearce

Question 1: I fully support this item. It's right to raise the Fixed Penalty Notices for littering – it acts as a deterrent and will give the council more funding for essential services. Please can Cllr Dudd outline what the additional revenue raised from increasing the fees will be spent on?

Statement: PS25.01

Cabinet – 6 JUNE 2023

Re: Agenda item 25 – Adult Social Care Transformation Programme funding and emerging plans

Statement submitted by: Bristol Reclaiming Independent Living

Under Item 25 (Adult Social Care Transformation Programme), BRIL welcomes the opportunity to make this statement. While we understand BCC's financial situation, we question why Disabled People are once again being targeted.

There are a few points BRIL would like to raise:

1. BRIL questions the comment that the Fair and Affordable Care Policy, mentioned in s.3.3.1 of the agenda item, has been co-produced. If we refer to the ladder of co-production, produced by the National Co-production Advisory Group (NCAG), in no way has the Council been involved with co-production. The lack of understanding of what co-production really means proves that if Disabled people in Bristol had genuinely been involved in co-production, the concerns that BRIL and other local DPOs has about the policy would have already been raised before it had been drafted. How different the policy may have looked if that had been the case.
2. The Fair and Affordable Care Policy mentions 'best value for the Local Authority'; however, the Statutory Guidance of the Care Act 2014 cites 'best value in delivering the outcomes desired'. In the case of person-centred care and support, 'best value' would be the individual's outcomes – not the Local Authority's.
3. Under s. 27 of the Care Act, the Duty to Review, 'the review must not be used as a mechanism to arbitrarily reduce the level of a personal budget... this means that those decisions must be based on the law and not on individual choice or discretion', which indicates a review cannot be carried out for the purpose of cutting care.

BRIL would finally like to remind Adult Social Care that under the Social Model of disability, which BCC endorses, independent living does not mean doing everything for yourselves. It means having the support to live independently, whatever that support may require.

For more information about BRIL, please e-mail: [**bristol.ilag@gmail.com**](mailto:bristol.ilag@gmail.com)

Question: CQ25.01 & CQ25.02

Cabinet – 6 June 2023

Re: Agenda item 25 - Adult Social Care Transformation Programme funding and emerging plans

Question submitted by: Councillor Tim Wye

Background:

The fair access to care policy is obviously causing concern amongst disabled people. People I have spoken to think the latest version is an improvement and they understand that this is trying to put some local structure around what is already legal under care act.

However, whilst they acknowledge the cost pressures in Social Care and understand this is about controlling spend, they are worried this is the beginning of moving away from a person-centred approach and best value is not always about money. They have three reservations:

1. They don't feel it's been co-produced and some of the statements are still not very clear, particularly about the consequences of the policy;
2. They would like more detail about how this will be monitored. This is especially in regard to a possible scenario where the policy might lead to people feeling pressurised to move into residential care. They seek assurance that they will be involved in any review and monitoring of the policy;
3. There are still concerns about the lack of an appeal system, especially if someone is to be put in residential care. They don't feel the complaints system is robust enough.

Question 1: What assurance can you give that these matters will be covered in the consultation?

Question 2: How will service users be involved in future review?