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?

Answer

The narrowing you reference is to facilitate the required width of one of the new station platforms. The stretch of Concorde Way expected to be impacted by being made narrower by varying degrees will be from the area adjacent to the new station footbridge to the southern entrance of the station platform. This will be approximately 115m in the direction from Station Road towards St Werburghs.

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

- The narrowing of the way was an operational decision and not consulted on specifically. This is because it is not a standalone scheme but is required for the delivery of the new station.
- In Autumn 2023 there will be discussions with the local community to encourage active travel and seek thoughts for any potential improvements in relation to the whole Concorde Way route.
- As part of these discussions, information about changes to the Concorde Way
 path in the vicinity of the new rail station will be made available.
- Bristol City Council is currently working with the West of England Combined Authority to investigate options to make improvements to the path. Should any proposals be taken forward, public engagement would be included as part of the development process.

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 cribbs 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.

Answers:

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 of 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 addition 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?

Answers:

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?

Answers:

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?

Answers:

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?

- Bristol City Council received the largest proportion of the funding in the region and were awarded £2,526,204 for Active Travel schemes, along with a share of £915,599 for a regional cycle hangar programme. The share for the cycle hangar programme has not yet been decided by WECA.
- Bath & North-East Somerset's schemes were not taken forward by Active Travel England and South Gloucestershire received £200,000 for scheme development.
- WECA received £3,641,803 which was about average compared to other authorities with the same Active Travel England Capability rating. WECA generally received less than other combined authorities, for instance Liverpool City Region, Greater Manchester and West Yorkshire all received over £10m of funding, albeit they are larger areas than the West of England.

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

- We have been developing this route over time with improvements to Baldwin Street, Old Market Roundabout, and recent improvements to the Bristol to Bath railway path. We have also ensured that developers are contributing to this route, such as via the segregated section along Castle Street.
- Among our planned improvements are Bristol Bridge junction; Tower Hill and more recent plans to promote Braggs Lane as a quiet way.

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 subsiding 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?

- It is a key policy aim of ours to reduce private car ownership in the city centre
 where road space is at a premium. This will free up space for bike hangars,
 suds, and other active travel improvements to help provide people with a
 genuine alternative to private car ownership. The most transformative solution
 to the domination of the car is of course a decarbonised, segregated masstransit system.
- At this stage we do not know how much revenue the changes to the RPS will generate and what we can put it towards, but we will keep members updated.

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.

Answers:

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?

Answers:

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 Bristollians 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?

Answer: The installation of the vehicle concrete barriers (VCB), at this bridge is temporary, as the vertical concrete hangers of the upper bridge were found to be understrength for HGV impact.

Once the bridge is fully restrengthened the VCB's would be removed, and the road width returned to original width.

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

Answer:

We always explore the possibility of further improvements for walking and cycling as part of this process. We consider issues of equality and accessibility needs.

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 equlities 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 equlities act 2010.

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

Gordon Richardson Bristol disability equlities forum.

Brendon Taylor Bristol disability equlities forum.

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

Answers:

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?

Answers:

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 dispite 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 equlities 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 equlities impact assessments under the equlities 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 disablity equlities forum Robby Bentley.
David Redgewell
Bristol disablity equlities forum.

Answers:

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?

- Baseline for LEQ scoring can be found here <u>Code of practice on litter and</u> refuse (publishing.service.gov.uk)
- But as the document and table is large it has been shared direct via email to the questioner.

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?

Answers:

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?

- The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' 'Part 1A Effective enforcement Code of practice for litter and refuse' from September 2019 (and updated February 2022) states that local authorities may spend the income from fixed penalties issued for littering offences on their functions relating to litter (including keeping their relevant land clear of litter and refuse, keeping relevant highways clean, and enforcement against littering), and on enforcement against graffiti and fly-posting offences.
- This may include spending on communications and education to abate littering, or on the provision of bins and other street litter disposal infrastructure
- In line with government guidance, any surplus has been and will continue to be used to fund anti-littering and fly-tipping communication campaigns, signage, and equipment; to pay for litter picking and graffiti removal kits and paint; and to provide support to the neighbourhood enforcement service.

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;
- 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?

Answers: