

Question: PQ08.01

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 8 - Bristol City Docks - Harbour Revision Order

Question submitted by: David Redgewell, Equalities and Diversity Director for Bristol Ferry

Question 1: With sustainable transport being very important part of the city region Transport Network on the Harbour revision order for Bristol Harbour (Former city Docks) What discussion are planned with the ferry boat companies that provide Tourist and public transport ferry services in the city Harbour?

Answer:

A Harbour Revision Order is a process which allows a Statutory Harbour Authority to amend and repeal legislation, update powers of disposal, powers to set charges and set out a pathway on how a Harbour should be managed under good guidance.

Both the Mayor's Office and the harbour officer team have met with ferry boat operators. Changes were made to proposals around bridge swing operations to support the ferry operations. We continue to be in dialogue with them and the future aspirations of transport in the harbour with ferry boat companies will be looked at within the Harbour Place Shaping Strategy.

Early stakeholder engagement undertaken last year to inform the Harbour Place Shaping Strategy has demonstrated a desire to expand the use of water-based transport (better integrating it with other forms of transport, making it more accessible and extending its frequency and hours of operation). It is anticipated that the consultants appointed to prepare the Harbour Place Shaping Strategy will explore this aspiration further. This will need to be informed through further stakeholder engagement, including the existing ferry services.

Question: PQ08.03

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 8 - Bristol City Docks - Harbour Revision Order

Question submitted by: Ben Ewing

Question 1: Regarding the extent and proposed extent of boundary of the Harbour, the public document pack states the following.

Page 2, bullet point 9, states the new HRO will “• Identify extent of Harbour Estate”

Page 3, bullet point 5, states that “• Appendix A shows the proposed extent of the boundary of the Harbour Estate to be included in the new HRO submission. This is unchanged from the 1998 HRO.”

I can clearly see the maps within Appendix A which shows the proposed extend of boundary of harbour Estate, but cannot see a copy of the current map of harbour estate. On requesting a copy of the current boundary map of the Harbour Revision order currently in force (1998), it was said that “this map will not be shared”

How can this cabinet, Mayor office, and wider council, stand up to scrutiny when the current and proposed estate boundary are not available to compare and contrast. Please can you make both maps available.

Furthermore, the current revision order in force (1998), and the previous revision order (1993) make no reference to “boundary of the Harbour Estate to be included in the HRO submission”

Answer:

This answer was provided during the meeting, recording is available at [Cabinet - Tuesday, 4th July, 2023 4.00 pm - YouTube](#)

Question: CQ08.01

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 8 - Bristol City Docks - Harbour Revision Order

Question submitted by: Councillor Patrick McAllister

Appendix E of this agenda item's papers – the Equality Impact Assessment – does not make reference to the fact that the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller community is disproportionately represented within the harbour community, and the harbour community as a whole can be considered a distinct cultural group in some aspects. What steps will the Council take to ensure that the Harbour Review process is accessible towards these groups and takes their views into formal consideration?

Answer:

This answer was provided during the meeting, recording is available at [Cabinet - Tuesday, 4th July, 2023 4.00 pm - YouTube](#)

Question: CQ10.01

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 10 - Net Zero Investment Co-innovation Lab

Question submitted by: Councillor Martin Fodor

Background

I've been calling for action on this since I first tabled a motion to BCC in 2020 when the council was the only authority not progressing Community Municipal Investments out of the authorities involved in the original development of the concept.

It's therefore great that this is finally being progressed to help Bristol tackle the climate emergency. People want to support climate action and there's increasing popular interest in ethical savings and investments - about £1m a year could finally be channelled into council endorsed green initiatives from individuals, and (hopefully) much more from businesses if this gets going.

[I'd be supporting item 19 funding for energy efficiency but most of us aren't allowed more than one statement and two questions.]

Question 1: What's the timescale for community investment to lead to funds being put to use in BCC backed projects in the city?

Answer:

This answer was provided during the meeting, recording is available at [Cabinet - Tuesday, 4th July, 2023 4.00 pm - YouTube](#)

Question: CQ10.02

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 10 - Net Zero Investment Co-innovation Lab

Question submitted by: Councillor Katy Grant

Background

I welcome this initiative, and applaud the city and the council for getting Bristol chosen for this opportunity by the Horizon fund. The finance that the city (and partners) will receive appears to be intended to do two quite different things – 1) create innovative green investment products that community members can afford, and 2) identify and disentangle barriers to investment in low-carbon opportunities.

Question 1: Can you give a bit more information on how the grant fund will be split between these two objectives, and also between the three stated funding platforms to be established – Citizen Community Climate Investment scheme, Net Zero Venture Fund and the Carbon Multiplier Fund?

Answer:

This answer was provided during the meeting, recording is available at [Cabinet - Tuesday, 4th July, 2023 4.00 pm - YouTube](#)

Question: PQ12.01

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 - Western Harbour Master Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Question submitted by: David Redgewell, Equalities and Diversity Director for Bristol Ferry

Question 1: With the importance of the Regeneration of western Harbour including new Homes and Tourism facilities and a new Transport highway Network to be developed by Bristol city council as Highway and Port Authority and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and North Somerset council. Will there be a public consultation to include the Harbour ferry companies?

Answer:

Yes, we expect the consultation and engagement to be extensive and include voices from across the city including water users.

Question: PQ12.02

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 - Western Harbour Master Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

Background

The initial consultation relating to the Western Harbour project and the establishment of the Western Harbour Advisory Group were not well-handled and resulted in concerns about lack of transparency. The report, Refresh of the Western Harbour Advisory Group, states that "new ambitions" for the group include "adopting a transparent process" and an "open application process". However, it also states: "John Savage will remain as chair". Unfortunately, the original Western Harbour Advisory Group was widely regarded as unrepresentative, there were some concerns about cronyism, and attendance was poor. It is also worth noting, since the aim is for a "city-wide advisory group", that John Savage lives in South Gloucestershire, not Bristol.

Question: Given the stated commitment to transparency, please explain the process through which it was agreed that John Savage should remain as chair of the "refreshed" Western Harbour Advisory Group including who was involved in the decision.

Answer:

The chair is appointed by the mayor who is elected by the city. It's difficult to be more transparent.

John Savage is a director of Bristol Chamber of Commerce representing businesses across the city and region. His experience in working in partnership with the city council over several decades and administrations will be valuable during the early stages of the refreshed group. We trust him to do the work well.

Question: PQ12.03 Q PQ12.04

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 - Western Harbour Master Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Question submitted by: Martin Rands

Question 1: John Savage will remain as chair of the 'refreshed' Western Harbour Advisory Group. Stakeholders will have to apply to be included, but will be selected due to the limit on numbers. No elected ward councillors will be included. Apart from the fact that the residents association chair will now have to apply and be selected, whereas previously their membership was automatic, what exactly has changed?

Answer:

The project is moving into a new phase. And we need to look at the skills and experiences of the group members. This feels like a good opportunity to consider that in the round.

There will be an open call for applications to become part of the refreshed group.

Applicants will be selected based on how they will be able to champion the different elements of the vision, how they can collate and disseminate views from their networks and how they can bring diverse views to the table. We anticipate there being local and city-wide representation on the group.

Councillors will remain involved and informed through briefings and Growth & Regeneration Scrutiny Panel.

While residents are important, it's worth adding the harbour is owned and managed for the whole city. One of the key drivers for the development of the Western harbour, as well as building homes in a sustainable location, is to make the harbour more inclusive.

Question 2: Who will appoint the membership?

Answer:

Project officers will evaluate the applications and make a recommendation to the Harbour Programme Board and Mayor's Office.

Question: PQ12.05

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 - Western Harbour Master Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Question submitted by: Dan Ackroyd

Question 1: There are very few usable crossings from south to north Bristol. It would be an incredible tragedy if and when Bristol actually gets around to building a tram network that we found that the Cumberland Basin crossing should be a vital part of it, but because the masterplanning didn't factor that in, it was impossible. Is it possible to set a requirement that the design of any road reorganisation includes reserving space for tram stops in the work done?

Answer:

This answer was provided during the meeting, recording is available at [Cabinet - Tuesday, 4th July, 2023 4.00 pm - YouTube](#)

Question: PQ12.06

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 - Western Harbour Master Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Question submitted by: Andrew Lynch

Question 1: How can people take seriously the intention that the Western Harbour Advisory Group should hear the voices of the community and then re-appoint a 78-year-old businessman who does not appear to live in the city, whose leadership has rarely seen half the members attend meetings and who has said publicly that he should have retired from the post? If the group is being refreshed it needs a new chair.

Answer:

This answer was provided during the meeting, recording is available at [Cabinet - Tuesday, 4th July, 2023 4.00 pm - YouTube](#)

Question: CQ12.01

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 - Western Harbour Master Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Question submitted by: Councillor Katy Grant

Background

In answer to a recent question posed at the 16th June WECA meeting, the Metro Mayor said the Western Harbour Master planning process will “set out in detail where the new homes, jobs and green/blue, physical, social and community infrastructure that Bristol needs **could** go, and how the existing community, natural and heritage assets can be best served and celebrated.”

Question 1: Based on the use of ‘could’ here, does this mean that a list of scenarios, including the possibilities on renewed road infrastructure, or new roads, will be presented, so that the public can see a range of options, rather than just one proposed plan?

Answer:

This answer was provided during the meeting, recording is available at [Cabinet - Tuesday, 4th July, 2023 4.00 pm - YouTube](#)

Question: CQ12.02

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 - Western Harbour Master Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Question submitted by: Councillor Patrick McAllister

Background

I applaud the ambition of delivering 50% affordable housing in the Western Harbour area – this target would go some way towards alleviating the chronic housing pressures that Bristol faces.

However, much of the development works required in the area are highly complex and therefore expensive – in particular the redevelopment of the Bond warehouses. Additionally, expensive flood defences are likely to be required to enable residential buildings to be constructed safely.

Question 1: With this in mind, how confident is the administration that the target of 50% affordable housing is a realistic one?

Answer:

This answer was provided during the meeting, recording is available at [Cabinet - Tuesday, 4th July, 2023 4.00 pm - YouTube](#)

Question: CQ12.03

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 12 - Western Harbour Master Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan

Question submitted by: Councillor Christine Townsend

Question 1: The 'Advisory Group' is to be refreshed but with the same politically appointed and endorsed Chair of John Savage, an ex Merchant Venturer, ex Labour candidate for Avon and Somerset Police PCC – why does the Mayor not have confidence that those who will also be politically appointed to this Advisory Group will have sufficient agency to elect their own chair from amongst their number?

Answer:

This answer was provided during the meeting, recording is available at [Cabinet - Tuesday, 4th July, 2023 4.00 pm - YouTube](#)

Question: CQ22.01

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 22 - Estate Rationalisation – Surplus Asset Disposals

Question submitted by: Councillor Martin Fodor

Background

The report says £36m capital receipts has to be raised from asset sales this year. Of course due to austerity the council budget needs all the funding we can find, so selling off land and buildings has to be considered, however worrying the cannibalisation of public assets. But we have to look at how this affects future services and community initiatives too.

This report identifies about £850,000 to come from those 7 places listed in this report.

Question 1: How many more reports and more properties or land parcels are expected to achieve the target?

Answer:

This answer was provided during the meeting, recording is available at [Cabinet - Tuesday, 4th July, 2023 4.00 pm - YouTube](#)

Question: CQ22.02

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 22 - Estate Rationalisation – Surplus Asset Disposals

Question submitted by: Councillor Paula O'Rourke

Background

The Equality Assessment asks 'Will the proposal have an equality impact on ... quality of life, health, education... etc'. The assessor has ticked the 'NO' box. While this may be correct for the majority of the items in the list to be disposed, it is wrong in the case of Jacobs Wells Baths.

The building has been used for education and health for over 30 years and was intended to be used for swimming, dance and youth provision, until the recent failed CAT proposal (as referenced in the paper). There are two further live CAT proposals which aim to bring the building back into use for youth provision and for more general community and cultural use. The Jacobs Wells Hub has been supported by elders in the community, who used the building for craft and social purposes and would do so again.

Clifton has no community rooms – none! We have an isolated population, many who are asset rich but cash poor, whose needs could be met by this building. Also, there are no places for youth to use.

Question 1: Please review the Equalities Impact Assessment in the light of the above information and justify how the loss of the building does not have a negative impact on the community?

Answer:

The dance centre handed the keys back in August 2016 and the building has been un-used since that date.

The building is still subject to the Community Asset Transfer (CAT) process, as stated in the paper. This administration has transferred more community assets than any before and this building will also be transferred as a community asset if any organisation can make a business case at no cost or risk to the council.

The EqIA impact reflects the disposal of an unoccupied, unused site which needs significant investment and is costing the council circa £60k per annum. In the current financial situation,

we cannot afford costs or risks against such assets. The agreed budget acknowledges the necessity to raise capital receipts against council properties.

If the building was disposed, then the council could consider a restricted covenant to ensure new community provision is included.

Question: CQ25.01

Cabinet – 4 July 2023

Re: Agenda item 25 - Annual Report of Write Offs

Question submitted by: Councillor Christine Townsend

Question 1: The table at point 18 appears to show that about £3.4m of parking relating charges are to be written off from the last financial year, CAZ charges are excluded. Out of all the parking penalty notices BCC issues in a given year, what percentage end up being forgiven or remitted?

Answer:

This answer was provided during the meeting, recording is available at [Cabinet - Tuesday, 4th July, 2023 4.00 pm - YouTube](#)