

# Full Council – 14 November 2023

## Agenda item 6 b

### Public questions



#### Procedural note:

##### Questions submitted by members of the public:

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



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

<b>Ref No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
PQ01	Lena Wright	RPZ Consultation
PQ02	Molly Sherlaw-Fryer	Food Sustainability Motion
PQ03	Dan Ackroyd	Arena Island
PQ04	Mike Oldreive	Independent Persons
PQ05	Jenny Harrison	Food Sustainability Motion
PQ06	Suzanne Audrey	Independent Persons
PQ07	Harry Simpson	Bus Services
PQ08	Jen Smith	Independent Persons
PQ09	Keith Farley	Independent Persons
PQ10	Lesley Powell	Independent Persons
PQ11	Railfuture Sevenside	Mass Transit and Transport Levy
PQ12	Bristol Disability Equalities Forum	Transport Accessibility
PQ13	Tim Hayes	Events at Lloyds Amphitheatre
PQ14	Veronica Wignall	Food Advertising
PQ15	Martin Rands	Avon Crescent
PQ16	Joanna Booth	Independent Persons
PQ17	Sian Ellis Thomas	Member Code of Conduct
PQ18	Joe Banks	Member Code of Conduct
PQ19	Megs Smith	Net Zero Transport
PQ20	Megs Smith	5G Masts
PQ21	Chris Johnson - Keep Bristol Moving	East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood



## QUESTION PQ 01

**Subject: RPZ Consultation**

**Question submitted by: Lena Wright**

I would like to thank the Mayor for his replies to my previous two questions on Windmill Hill RPZ, in the summer. In one answer the Mayor stated, “As we have stated many times, we will only bring forward residents parking schemes where overwhelming local support has been demonstrated, a criterion that has not yet been met.” In the other, the Mayor stated, “There is no consultation planned.” I looked online for ways to demonstrate the level of local support for something, and the Local Government Association's advice was: to do a consultation with local residents.

Q1. Can the Mayor please advise how residents are supposed to indicate their level of local support without doing a consultation?

## REPLY

**In terms of local support, we would encourage you to work with your local ward councillors who should engage with their communities to articulate and demonstrate overwhelming from the whole community.**

**We don't believe RPZs deliver modal shift and don't achieve strategic aims for the city. Our approach has been to pilot Liveable Neighbourhoods. The first one of which we are engaging residents in East Bristol about. We will commence early engagement about possible Liveable Neighbourhoods in South Bristol including Windmill Hill next year.**



## QUESTION PQ 02

### Subject: Food Sustainability Motion

### Question submitted by: Molly Sherlaw-Fryer

My question is directed at Marley Bennett as the cabinet member for climate. At the moment, there is a food sustainability motion tabled from Labour. While the sentiment is good, the details of the motion have many limitations when it comes to making a transition to more sustainable ways of eating and promoting this to residents.

Council has declared a climate emergency and has a 2030 goal that Bristol citizens will consume carbon neutral food and drink. In this context, Council must prioritise a motion that can truly reflect the nature of our collective situation and can realistically achieve the Council's own goals.

A comprehensive report by Harvard University from 2019 showed that if we free up and rewild the 48% of UK land that is currently being used to farm animals, the UK could be net negative in emissions. This shows the huge impact that making the switch from animal farming to a plant-based food system can make on our climate. If we continue as we are, over a billion people are expected to be displaced and seeking refuge by 2050, all due to climate disasters. Given the urgency of the situation we are in, a 100% plant-based transition is what is needed within society, and key institutions making that transition are key to bringing society closer to this change in order to save the world from total climate catastrophe.

So my question is, will Labour, as the leading party, please recognise the importance of drafting up a stronger and more ambitious plant-based motion and prioritise this as a matter of urgency?

## REPLY

- **We are committing significant resources to make our food systems more sustainable. As I stated, we've received Gold Standard Award for food sustainability – only the second city in the country to do so – for our efforts to reduce food waste, grow the city's good food movement, address food inequality, increase urban food growing, improve catering and procurement, and tackle the impacts of our food system on public health, nature, and climate change. We also have a commitment to growing sustainable food in every ward in the city. It is absolutely right to have a focus on local food production, as doing so massively reduces the airmiles of our food which is one of the main contributors to Co2 emissions from agriculture – both animal and otherwise.**
- **The Labour Party is committed to a just transition to a greener society, including through the way we decarbonise our food systems. Bristol has been leading the way on sustainable food production - as well as decarbonisation in general – as is evidenced in it being only the second city in the UK to achieve Gold Standard for food sustainability. While I agree that emissions from animal agriculture do need to be tackled, I have some reservations that some of components of this treaty will harm society's poorest.**
- **Changing behavioural habits, such as diets, takes time. Blunt instruments such as a tax on meat could well have no effect on meat consumption but will make already-struggling low income families struggle even further. The focus should instead be**



**on making fruit and vegetables as cheap as possible, so that healthy, sustainable diets are an option for everyone – this is the approach we're taking in Bristol.**



### QUESTION PQ 03

**Subject: Arena Island**

**Question submitted by: Dan Ackroyd**

My understanding is that the details of the commercial deal done with 'L & G' of the land previously known as 'Arena Island' that saw the land become unavailable to be used for an Arena were kept secret at the time, and still haven't been published.

Please can you provide a detailed explanation of the public interest test that was used and how it was evaluated, that led to the decision for the deal to be kept secret, both at the time, and why the details still haven't been published yet?

### REPLY

- **The decision made at February 2020 cabinet included the KPMG Value For Money report and some elements were and remain commercially sensitive.**
- **Drafts of the cabinet paper, heads of terms, value for money study, comments of the chief financial officer, and risk register plus copies of the equalities impact assessment, eco-impact checklist and counsel's opinion were made available to members of Growth and Regeneration Scrutiny Commission on Wednesday 22 January 2020.**

[\(Public Pack\) Temple Island - Scheme Content and Development Agreement Agenda Supplement for Cabinet, 04/02/2020 16:00 \(bristol.gov.uk\)](#)

- **Temple Island will delivery much-needed new homes and jobs, including affordable homes, new public spaces and improved connectivity in/through Temple Quarter and the Bath Road.**
- **As a sustainable, brownfield site next to our major railway station and close to the city centre, it is the right place to be delivering new homes.**
- **Details will be published when it's no longer commercially sensitive.**



## QUESTION PQ 04

**Subject: Independent Persons**

**Question submitted by: Mike Oldreive**

**Q1: The Monitoring Officer has told me in a written answer to Values & Ethics Committee (9 October 2023) that, during his tenure (2018 onwards):**

*” The appointment of Independent Persons was done through a formal recruitment and selection process carried out by the Monitoring Officer and the Head of Legal Services.”*

[the MO seems to imply that if individuals are appointed to actions other than “investigation” of a complaint, then that is a discretionary matter (which is true) and that therefore the “appointment” is outside the remit of LA2011 (which is incorrect). LA 2011 clearly sets out the arrangements a Council must have in place for setting standards and dealing with complaints. Any Independent Person must be appointed in accordance with s28 of the Localism Act 2011.]

Can the Monitoring Officer confirm that this approach, (where he and the Head of Legal Services appointed “Independent Persons”, apparently without Member approval) was lawful and fully met the requirements of s28 of the Localism Act 2011 for all “IPs” used in complaints handling, by completing the attached table.

### REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee.**
- **The administration has no responsibility for this area, it’s not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

**Q2: Since 2018 how much has been paid as allowances to the individuals “appointed” by the Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal Services as “Independent Persons”, and on what basis are these payments considered to be lawful? (please provide reference to relevant legislation).**

### REPLY

- **The answer from above is repeated**
- **The administration has no responsibility for this area, it’s not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**



## QUESTION PQ 05

**Subject: Food Sustainability Motion**

**Question submitted by: Jenny Harrison**

My question is directed to Cllr Marley Bennett, as the cabinet member for climate. In September, a Labour councillor spoke with a member of our Plant-Based Councils team and said that they would be willing to meet with members of the Green Party with a view to develop a cross-party plant-based motion for the Council to debate, in order to hopefully get a motion surrounding plant-based climate solutions heard sooner.

Animal agriculture is one of the leading causes of climate change and Councils who have declared and recognised we are in a climate emergency have a responsibility to take action on this. One of the key ways Council can do this is to introduce 100% plant-based catering in their own internal meetings and events, while also taking significant steps to promote plant-based eating to residents. This way we can make meaningful progress towards the Council's goal of Bristol citizens consuming carbon neutral food and drink by 2030. The current tabled Labour motion is much more limited in its scope than this and that's another reason why it's important for Labour and the Greens to meet to hopefully develop a stronger cross-party motion, more in line with what is set out in the Green's tabled plant-based solutions motion that has a greater chance of being heard.

Since September we have not had any further communication from Labour Party councillors regarding this, and so this important work has stalled. So my question is:

Would you, as the cabinet member with the brief for the Climate, please prioritise a meeting with the Green party, in order to establish a more ambitious cross-party motion that can be prioritised to be heard at Full Council?

## REPLY

- **If the Green Party want to send ideas to us, they'd be welcome to.**





## QUESTION PQ 06

### Subject: Independent Persons

### Question submitted by: Suzanne Audrey

Background. In relation to Section 28 of the Localism Act 2011, as far as I can tell Bristol City Council's Independent Persons have not been ratified by Full Council for the period between the appointment of Mr Christopher Eskell on 10 September 2013 until today (14 November 2023).

Q1. Please provide the names of all Bristol City Council Independent Persons appointed since September 2013, together with the dates of appointment.

### REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

Q2. Please explain why the appointment of Independent Persons has not been ratified by Bristol City Council Full Council in the ten years since September 2013. Please note it is not sufficient to say, for example, that the Monitoring Officer and/or Head of Legal Services appointed the Independent Persons. The question is about why the appointments were not ratified by Full Council in line with Section 28 of the Localism Act 2011

### REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



## QUESTION PQ 07

**Subject: Bus Services**

**Question submitted by: Harry Simpson**

The Dings has suffered from no bus service for a while and with new housing projects and the Temple Quarter regeneration scheme it is becoming paramount a service is implemented.

Will the administration encourage WECA and First to alter the 36 bus route to better serve the present and future residents?

## REPLY

- **We recognise public transport in the city needs improvement, which is why we are working on a segregated mass transit system including underground which will connect people to people, people to jobs and people to opportunity.**
- **We will continue to press WECA to come up for a solution for the city region while we wait for the mass transit approach.**



## **QUESTION PQ 08**

**Subject: Independent Persons**

**Question submitted by: Jen Smith**

Q1. Can the Monitoring Officer confirm that there has been no breach of data protection regulations by himself and the Head of Legal Services?

**REPLY:**

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

Q2. The Independent Person appointed in 2013 had a term limit of 4 years so they are no longer a lawfully appointed Independent Person. Any "Independent" Persons appointed directly by the MO & HOLS are not appointed in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 so they are not lawfully appointed. Under what legal authority has the Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal Services been sharing the personal information of complainants with those Independent Persons?

**REPLY:**

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



## QUESTION PQ 09

### Subject: Independent Persons

### Question submitted by: Keith Farley

Q1. What is the justification for the Council to refuse to disclose data (via FOI's etc) about the appointment of IPs (other than names) such as:

- number of IP's in post
- date of appointment
- Who appointed them and how their appointment was approved / whether they were appointed in accordance with the S28 of the Localism Act 2011

to assure the public that the MO / HOL are not acting in opaque isolation as is the current perception?

### REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

Q2. Can BCC provide the public and members with confirmation that a bone fide, legally appointed Independent Person has been available since 2016 (the last date seemingly an approval to appoint an IP was submitted to the Values and Ethics Committee for approval / onward journey to Full Council)?

### REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



## QUESTION PQ 10

**Subject: Independent Persons**

**Question submitted by: Lesley Powell**

Q1. The MO has confirmed that the appointment of IPs (following the advert\* for IPs in July 2023), which he is retrospectively asking Full Council to ratify today, did not follow the process required under S28 of the Localism Act 2011. As we have multiple examples of confirmation from Legal Services / the MO that the MO consults the IP in EVERY Code of Conduct Complaint,

How can the Code of Conduct complaints 'considered' during the period when an IP was not legally appointed, be valid and therefore what is the process for their resubmission for a fair hearing?

\*[https://ce0389li.webitrent.com/ce0389li\\_webrecruitment/wrd/run/ETREC107GF.open?VACANCY\\_ID=045280Qqqm&WVID=5153023bMp&LANG=USA&utm\\_source=LinkedIn&utm\\_medium=social&utm\\_campaign=Orlo](https://ce0389li.webitrent.com/ce0389li_webrecruitment/wrd/run/ETREC107GF.open?VACANCY_ID=045280Qqqm&WVID=5153023bMp&LANG=USA&utm_source=LinkedIn&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=Orlo)

### REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

Q2. In relation to the above, if the MO advises that a legally appointed IP, other than the ones requiring retrospective ratification today, were in post prior to today, to whom he referred Code of Conduct Complaints, why is he / Legal Services refusing to answer all the FOI's which ask for confirmation of this?

### REPLY

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



**QUESTION PQ 11****Subject: Mass Transit and Transport Levy****Question submitted by: Railfuture Severnside**

1. In view of the importance of a mass transit light rail system to the Economy and connectivity of the Greater Bristol and Bath city region.

What progress is being made by Mayor Rees in partnership with the leaders of North Somerset council, Banes ,south Gloucestershire county council and the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris on the future west mass transit, light rail overground part underground system? One option being funded through a new second Devolution with North Somerset council joining the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority in 2025

**REPLY**

- **At the October 6th joint committee meeting all three Unitary Authorities, Business West and WECA officers all supported taking the underground forward. That is progress.**
  - **But the Metro Mayor vetoed the underground options which meant none of the paper went forward.**
  - **This leaves us with no plan for mass transit going forward as no policy was carried and the solution is hanging by a thread.**
  
- **We need a system that is genuinely segregated from traffic, goes to the areas of highest patronage, connect areas usually underserved, connects to employment and is affordable. Once you set the criteria, the system designs itself - it requires us to go underground in the constrained areas.**
  - **We don't believe the overground options will ever get built, too expensive CPO, utility rerouting and road closures no councillors will ever agree to make.**
  - **On every criteria it fails – economic, modal shift and land hungry in a constrained city.**
  
- **We are optimistic that the matter will come back to committee in January.**

2. What progress is being made with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority, North Somerset council, Banes ,south Gloucestershire county council and the mayor of west England Dan Norris. On setting the Transport levy for the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority to pay for also Bus services and Public Transport improvements in the Bristol and Bath city region alongside money from the Department of Transport bus service improvement plan funding.

**REPLY**

- **The levy that we pay to the West of England Combined Authority is already agreed at specific levels and we provide this funding to WECA each year. WECA agree how spend is used to fund services appropriately in discussion with the unitary authorities.**
- **BSIP funding is governed separately and WECA lead decisions on the BSIP funding on behalf of the Unitary Authorities. We are in discussions with WECA at present as to how best to use this funding as the scheme progresses.**
- **We are working closely with leaders of BANES, South Glos and North Somerset Councils as well as leaders from the business community to find a solution but ultimately we need the Combined Authority to fulfil its role as the regional lead for this project.**



## QUESTION PQ 12

### Subject: Transport Accessibility

### Question submitted by: Bristol Disability Equalities Forum

1. With the important of improvements public transport in the Greater Bristol and Bath city region including North Somerset council area .

Working in Partnership with Banes council, South Gloucestershire county council, city and county of Bristol and North Somerset council Working with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority and Mayor Dan Norris,

How does Bristol city council see progress being made on a fully accessible mass transit light rail system going forward in Bristol city Region.

It must be noted that most of uk and Europe have light rail system the compose of overground Street running Segregated tracks and sections and tunnelled sections in Newcastle upon Tyne, city centre, West Midlands metro in Birmingham on its new Extension to Five ways, their are tunnel section on Metrolink in Greater Manchester.

Must mass transit light rail system are a mixture of fixed track formation street running and overground underground. In Fact in Bristol the Bristol Temple meads station seven Beach via Clifton Down station and Avonmouth. Runs underground Clifton Downs in Deep tunnel and under Ashley Down near Montpellier Station.

**We therefore ask the city mayor Marvin Rees and councillor Don Alexander Transport what plans they have to move the future west mass transit light rail system forward that is fully accessible to passengers with reduced mobility and partly sighted passengers?**

REPLY

- **We know the city region needs an ambitious plan.**
- **If you are going to have an above ground mass transit system it will close Church Rd & Two Mile Hill, Gloucester Rd, St Lukes and Malago Rd.**

At the next west of England mayoral combined Authority committee and joint committee with North Somerset council who are supporting a mass transit route to Bristol Airport.

2. Whist we have seen a lot of progress on disability and equalities in the Greater Bristol city Region over the last 10 years we still have The Footbridge at kingsweston Lane being rebuilt with disabilities accessible ramps .

And we have a metro west railway Network without fully accessible stations at. St Andrews Road Avonmouth requires rails Bristol Stapleton Road is not accessible to cross platforms Bristol Lawrence hill has a platform accessible in the Severn Beach line and Filton Abbey wood directions. Parson street completely none accessible, Nalisea and Backwell station no access towards Weston super mare and Taunton. No lift Bridges at weston super mare. Highbridge and Burnham on sea, Bridgwater. Keynsham Oidfiled park Freshford and Pilning all have none accessible footbridges to cross platforms

Or Bridges over the Harbour that are Not accessible like the Banana bridge through the new cut .Or Ferry services and Terminal with out Being Wheelchair accessible.





Many street in Bristol have pavement parking making it difficult for disabled people and blind and partly sighted peoples to walk or wheel down the road and street in Greater Bristol laid out with Bristol sets cobbles ,

Or not enough standard housing in the city Region or even basic accessible to homes or shops .

But the New Bristol plan is make the city Region fully accessible with the New South Gloucestershire council North Somerset council and revised Banes plan.

**Bristol disability equalities forum would like to ask Bristol city council Working with the other unity council and west of England mayoral combined transport Authority working with the equalities act 2010 plan to Bring forward a fully accessible city to partly sighted and people with reduced mobility.**

#### **REPLY**

- **As you know, we have this challenge on several heritage bridges prompting conversations with Historic England**
- **We want to make as much of Bristol accessible as possible, which is why a modern mass transit system is essential.**



## QUESTION PQ 13

**Subject: Events at Lloyds Amphitheatre**  
**Question submitted by: Tim Hayes**

Q1) Can the Council indicate how the presence of several hundred residences close to Lloyds Amphitheatre, many of them recently built, is incorporated as a relevant factor into the Council's decisions about:

- a) the number and duration of Lloyds Amphitheatre events;
- b) the calculation of the specific noise levels that the Council decides are appropriate for events held at Lloyds Amphitheatre?

## REPLY

- Decisions about events and their impact on the local community are made by Licensing committee. You should enquire with them about the decision making process for events at the Amphitheatre
- The Amphitheatre is one of the premier event spaces in Bristol and should be celebrated giving a unique experience for events and festival goers and has been used as such for many years.
- Whilst there has been an influx of new properties in the area, the two are complementary appreciating the rich and diverse culture available within Bristol including events on the Amphitheatre.
- When events take place, event organisers will engage experts to produce noise management plans and liaise with our own experts within Environmental Health. These plans are then approved as part of premise licensing process under the Licensing Act 2003. These applications also afford the opportunity for any interested party to make representations when a new licence for an event is proposed.
- You get many advantages of living in the centre, but this comes with some disadvantages.
- This highlights the tension of choosing to buy or rent property in the centre of a busy and vibrant city.
- It is not clear which timeframe your question relates to.



**QUESTION PQ 14****Subject: Food Advertising****Question submitted by: Veronica Wignall**

I am deeply concerned about the climate crisis. I'm also very aware of the huge role advertising can play in cultural norms and consumer choice - for example, advertising for beef, unsurprisingly, pushes up likelihood to purchase and consume beef. In relation to the climate, the Advertised Emissions report first launched at COP26 in 2021 found that advertising adds an extra 32% to the annual carbon footprint of every single person in the UK.

This Council has a 2030 goal that "people in Bristol will consume carbon neutral food and drink". It seems very important that advertising within our city is addressed to enable more carbon neutral ways of eating, since it has a considerable influence on people's choices and social norms.

I know Council has already brought in an advertising policy that bans certain harmful ads. My question is, can this be taken a step further to include a ban on meat and dairy advertising, as this contributes massively towards Bristol citizens' choices to eat these foods - which are extremely emissions-intensive and environmentally damaging?

**REPLY**

- **Bristol has one of the most comprehensive advertising and sponsorship policies in the country, but we only own a small proportion of the advertising space in the city. The University of Bristol is currently evaluating the impact of the policy through a piece of research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research.**
- **When the council has the results of this research, it will consider how much time, effort and public money is justified to spend in reviewing and potentially expanding the policy. Its reach will always be limited, as it can only govern council-owned advertising sites, rather than advertising more broadly in the city.**
- **At the moment we would not rule any further restrictions in or out until we can see evidence of what impact our policy has. This will likely become a matter for a future committee system to consider.**



## QUESTION PQ 15

**Subject: Avon Crescent**

**Question submitted by: Martin Rands**

A white line has been painted on the highway at Avon Crescent to 'extend the pavement'  
No traffic regulation order has been obtained.

No equalities assessment has been done (there are no dropped kerbs)

No safety assessment has been carried out.

The justification for these failures, is that the 'solution' is temporary and of small scale.

A temporary solution must have a defined end date.

There is no certainty of if and when 'Western Harbour' will be built.

**Q1) My question is, when does this 'temporary' period end?**

### REPLY

- **We are taking a temporary approach while Underfall Yard is no longer publicly accessible. In the medium term the Western Harbour masterplanning will be going out for tender in the New Year.**

A Freedom of Information request exposed the minutes for the Quality Assurance Board discussion around Avon Crescent on 1.8.2023.

Information about 'small scale' and 'temporary nature' come from F.O.I. requests by a third party.

**Q2) My question leading from these minutes is what were the concerns with the use of bollards at Avon Crescent?**

### REPLY

- **I can't comment on the detail as it is not a meeting that I'm present at.**



## QUESTION PQ 16

**Subject: Independent Persons**

**Question submitted by: Joanna Booth**

Q1. Have any of the Independent Persons proposed for ratification today, already been consulted with as Independent Persons?

### REPLY

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**

Q2. Have the Independent Persons who have already been appointed and consulted with been made aware that they may have been consulted as Independent Persons unlawfully (i.e., without complying with the legislation requirements), and that they may have received personal information without legal authorisation?

### REPLY

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



## QUESTION PQ 17

**Subject: Member Code of Conduct**

**Question submitted by: Sian Ellis Thomas**

Q1) given the results of the member complaints data finally uncovered this year and for the last six years; (that not one single complaint has been upheld and that information has not been provided to the Values & Ethic committee to enable proper decision making), do you think that it is time for the role of the Monitoring Officer to be reviewed and altered in such a way that does not facilitate a closed system and which allows for more transparency and scrutiny?

Given the results of the member complaints data finally uncovered this year and for the last six years; (that not one single complaint has been upheld and that information has not been provided to the Values & Ethic committee to enable proper decision making), do you think that it is time for the role of the Monitoring Officer to be reviewed and altered in such a way that does not facilitate a closed system and which allows for more transparency and scrutiny?

### REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



## QUESTION PQ 18

**Subject: Member Code of Conduct**

**Question submitted by: Joe Banks**

This is a yes or no question. Has the council's Member Code of Conduct complaints process been carried out in full accordance with the law (Localism Act 2011) at all times during the Mayor's period in office?

## REPLY:

- **These questions have already been covered at Values and Ethics committee and the administration has no responsibility for this area, it's not an executive function and therefore I cannot comment on it.**
- **Therefore, these questions need to be resubmitted to the Values and Ethics Committee where both the monitoring officer and cross-party committee responsible can respond.**



## QUESTION PQ 19

**Subject: Net Zero Transport**

**Question submitted by: Megs Smith**

Q1. Dear Mayor, as Bristol City Council supports Net Zero emissions incentives, which will mean the eradication of all petrol and diesel cars within the decade, what public transport provision is being planned for those who cannot afford expensive EVs and who choose not to cycle or use the e-scooters?

- **We have been pushing for a low-carbon, mass transit system which will transform Bristol's transport network. This will take thousands of car journeys off strategic routes and will reduce air pollution, carbon emissions and unlock economic benefits for communities disconnected from our transport system.**
- **A fully segregated underground will be reliable and frequent and allow people to reduce or even stop private car ownership and allow for more active travel interventions on our road surface.**
- **We are ambitious for Bristol and about the infrastructure needed to deliver net zero targets in energy, housing and transport – however we need to see this matched with support in the chamber or from the Metro Mayor.**





## QUESTION PQ 20

**Subject: 5G Masts**

**Question submitted by: Megs Smith**

Q2. Dear Mayor, why is Bristol City Council allowing the installation of sporadic 5G masts without a planning application? Is this not both unlawful and illegal, necessitating their immediate investigation and possible removal, when detected and reported by members of the public?

### REPLY:

- We have no evidence that 5G masts are being erected without the providers going through the appropriate application process.
- If masts have been erected without permission they should be reported to enforcement.
- The legislation for 5G Masts has been relaxed at national level over recent years;
- This means that many works to existing masts are permitted development.



## QUESTION PQ 21

**Subject: East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood**

**Question submitted by: Chris Johnson – Keep Bristol Moving**

1. Regarding EBLN; Please will you provide me with the documentation relating to consultation with stakeholders, emergency services any other relevant organisations?

**Reply:**

- **We will share this as part of the Traffic Regulation Order response**

2. Please will you advise which external organisations have been involved in the planning & design of EBLN.

**Reply:**

- **As per the above we will share this as part of the Traffic Regulation Order response**



# Full Council – 12 December 2023

## Agenda item 6 b

### Public questions



#### Procedural note:

##### Questions submitted by members of the public:

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



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

<b>Ref No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
PQ01	Rachel Fagan	Arts Funding
PQ02	Joanna Booth	US Embassy
PQ03	Danica Priest	Yew Tree Farm
PQ04	Ian Pond	Greenbank View
PQ05	Stephen Williams	Canford Lane
PQ06	Sally Kent	Children with EHCPs
PQ07	Adam Chivers	Planning Petition
PQ08	Rob Dixon	Ashley Down Station
PQ09	Mark Ashdown	Local Government Act
PQ10	Derek Giovanni	St Johns Lane
PQ11	Jack Slater	Plant Based Motion
PQ12	Sally Roberts	Barton House
PQ13	Rayhan Ismail	Barton Houes
PQ14	Nicholas Watts	Bristol Zoo Gardens
PQ15	Chantelle Osmond	Barton House
PQ16	Jama Hussein	Barton House
PQ17	Jamila Sajid	Barton House
PQ18	Syeda Ahmed	Barton House
PQ19	Nigel Varley	Gilton House
PQ20	Wesley Bear	Barton House
PQ21	Fadumo Farah	Barton House
PQ22	Name Withheld	Barton House
PQ23	Isaac Caffrey	Barton House



## QUESTION PQ 01

**Subject: Arts Funding**

**Question submitted by: Rachel Fagan**

1. Can the Mayor confirm the reason for the £75,000 per annum cut from Originators funding strand compared to the previous budget, that was reported in the news on Weds 29 November?

**Reply:**

- **No funding has been cut this year from the Cultural Investment Programme.**

2. Can the mayor confirm how much money earmarked for culture funding was left unspent/unawarded in the 2022/23 and the 2023/24 budgets?

**Reply:**

- **No money is left remaining in the 2022/23 budget.**
- **The unspent remaining budget of £201,726 from 23/24 will be carried over to 24/25 and will be spent across Imagination and Originators strands.**
- **We are pleased to see new organisations recommended represent a real shift in diversity by reaching out to areas that are often missed in grant based funding processes.**
- **It is worth noting that now 63% of organisations recommended for Imagination funding have identified that they will be working with audiences/participants from equalities groups including people with disabilities, refugees and asylum seekers and BAME women.**
- **And 67% of organisations recommended for Openness funding and 64% of organisations recommended for Imagination funding have stated that over 50% of their trustees, workforces and members come from an equalities group.**



## QUESTION PQ 02

**Subject: US Embassy**

**Question submitted by: Joanna Booth**

What has the council been doing in its work with the US embassy for years, as mentioned by Marvin Rees at a previous meeting? Please be detailed in the response.

- **The just transition declaration at Full Council today was made possible because of the link with the US Embassy. In 2022, community activists representing Bristol were invited to learn and collaborate with other UK climate activists and US counterparts.**
- **This is an example of how Bristol has a presence on the world stage. The US is an important partner for us and it is right that we work cross border to share lived experience and perspectives.**

Was the work between the council and the US embassy the reason the embassy lobbied on behalf of Rees so he could win the World Mayor competition?

- **You'd have to ask the Embassy.**
- **I was honoured to be nominated, and humbled to make it into the final round, alongside inspiring city leaders such as Manuel De Araújo, Mayor of Quelimane, Mozambique, Sharon Dijksma, Mayor of Utrecht, Netherlands and Vitaliy Klitschko, Mayor of Kyiv.**
- **This recognition shows how important city leaders and mayors can be on the world stage, raising the profile of their cities and policy agenda.**
- **We continue to have contact with delegations and missions from all over the world, recently including Somalia, France, China, Poland, Moldova and Australia.**



### QUESTION PQ 03

**Subject: Yew Tree Farm**

**Question submitted by: Danica Priest**

Earlier this year the planning department made an error which resulted in an ancient hedgerow being cut by mistake on yew tree farm. In the council's statement they said: 'The Mayor's Office are conducting inquiries into how this situation has arisen to seek assurances that any issues with process or procedure are fixed immediately'.

Q1: What was the result of that enquiry?

- **We are confident that those processes have been corrected.**

Q2: Since making that statement what changes have you made to the planning enforcement department to ensure this will never happen again as promised?

- **We have appointed a chief planning officer who is in the process of recruiting to posts and recovering the service's performance. We have every confidence in her to get it right.**



## QUESTION PQ 04

**Subject: Greenbank View**

**Question submitted by: Ian Pond**

Regarding the “proposed closure of part of the road to motor traffic and a new cycle lane” on Greenbank View BS5.

Your Transport Engagement Department have put forward a proposal to spend what appears to be a significant sum of money to close a short section (150m) of Greenbank View BS5 to all motor vehicles using removeable bollards to both ends and install a cycle lane.

This road has no through access to motor vehicles due to the long-standing modal filter at the junction with Thurlow Rd, which means that it is already a safe & pleasant road to cycle on. I see no cycling benefit of this work and suggest that there are other places that would be more appropriate for new cycle lanes.

The proposal describes work that entails; the existing modal filter being removed, new bollard closures to be installed, 32 tree pits to be dug in the road and trees planted, the painting of a new cycle lane and installation of a pedestrian crossing.

My two questions are:

Q1 What is the total cost estimate for the proposed works as described?

- **The project is estimated to cost around £45,000.**

Q2 Which specific budget will be used to fund this work?

- **We are using the opportunity to look at ways to stop the highway being used as an encampment.**
- **We’re taking this approach because of the cost of continually clearing up, and this is a way to stop us incurring that cost.**
- **No budget has been identified to deliver this project in full. A very small maintenance budget has been set aside to develop the project designs.**





## QUESTION PQ 05

**Subject: Canford Lane**

**Question submitted by: Stephen Williams**

Question1 What is the timetable for installation of the pedestrian crossing on Canford Lane?

- **The design work has been completed**
- **The work was submitted to contractors, but they've all declined because of the increase in material prices caused by inflation.**
- **This project will be reissued to contractors with a new price in February 2024**
- **We will then need a contractor to accept the work by a contractor and the availability of their workforce.**
- **We aim for an update in March 2024**
- **An update will be provided to councillors shortly on the position of all local Area Committee Schemes**

Question 2 What criteria, beyond that set out in the Localism Act 2011, does the council apply when considering whether to approve an application to list a property as an asset of community value and where is that criteria published?

**Reply:**

- **The Council can only apply the criteria set out in the Localism Act 2011 when considering a nomination for a property to be added to the list of Assets of Community Value.**
- **The Council does not have discretion in this process and it cannot apply other criteria in reaching its decision.**



**QUESTION PQ 06**

**Subject: Children with EHCPs**

**Question submitted by: Sally Kent**

Please can you break down in numbers and % where children with EHCPs are educated in Bristol? Please provide data for the last 3 years.

- Mainstream school
  - Special school
  - Independent special school
  - Alternative provision
  - Home school
  - Education other than at school (EOTAS)
  - Hospital education
  - Unknown
- Please add any categories I may have missed.

**REPLY**

<b>Bristol CYP with an EHCP with a start date in calendar years 2023, 2022, 2021 at one of the following types of provision.</b>						
<b>Type of Provision</b>	<b>2023</b>		<b>2022</b>		<b>2021</b>	
	<b>Count</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>%</b>
Alternative Provision	53	1.2	34	0.8	24	0.7
Apprenticeship	2	0.0	2	0.0	2	0.1
Children's Centre/Nursery	45	1.0	19	0.5	5	0.1
CME	10	0.2	10	0.2	8	0.2
EOTAS	100	2.3	96	2.3	80	2.4
Home School	22	0.5	22	0.5	20	0.6
Hospital Education	71	1.6	58	1.4	37	1.1
Independent Special School	59	1.3	59	1.4	55	1.6
Mainstream FE College	408	9.3	401	9.8	382	11.3
Mainstream School	1756	39.9	1555	37.9	1064	31.5
NEET	112	2.5	111	2.7	107	3.2
OLA Alternative Provision	12	0.3	12	0.3	11	0.3
OLA Children's Centre/Nursery	3	0.1	2	0.0	2	0.1
OLA Independent Special School	167	3.8	166	4.0	153	4.5
OLA Mainstream College	16	0.4	16	0.4	15	0.4
OLA Mainstream FE College	120	2.7	119	2.9	112	3.3
OLA Mainstream School	79	1.8	67	1.6	52	1.5
OLA Special School	50	1.1	50	1.2	50	1.5
Special FE College	41	0.9	41	1.0	39	1.2
Special school	1093	24.8	1090	26.6	1017	30.1
Unknown	282	6.4	246	6.0	188	5.6
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4401</b>		<b>4100</b>		<b>3376</b>	



This data set accounts for all children and young people in service, not just those who are of statutory school age.

The reliance on alternative learning provision has increased due to the volume of demand into the service and the requirement for specialist provision.

Unknown category – Incomplete establishment listed on our internal electronic system due to either an educational institution not contained within the database, which requires a manual override, or pupil enrolment data has not successfully pulled through into the reporting suite. These issues are being addressed by the service 1. through periodical data cleansing and 2.

The wider technical issue in review with BCC data teams.

**Can you also please clarify how many children are currently waiting for a special school placement?**

**REPLY**

213.

This figure accounts for children and young people with an EHCP and those currently moving through a EHC Needs Assessment, where it has been identified may require a specialist setting.

Since 2020, BCC has been working with partners to increase the SEND estate, within the city, through the Specialist Sufficiency Project. The project has delivered a total of 288 specialist places.

The delivery of an additional 130 placements is underway and further opportunities are being explored.

The DfE has accepted BCC's application for a special free school, which will deliver, an additional 164 places for the city. This provision is forecasted to open in academic year 2026.



**QUESTION PQ 07****Subject: Planning Petition****Question submitted by: Adam Chivers**

1. Bearing in mind the need for impartiality and transparency in the planning process, how can it be that Bristol's Planning System allowed the Case officer responsible for consideration of the proposal by Bristol Zoo for car parking on the West Car Park (application 21/01999/F) to send his Officer's Report in draft form to the Zoo/its representatives and invite/allow it/them to make such amendments to it as it/they wished and to do so covertly without advising the hundreds of objectors thereby giving the Development Committee and the general public the impression that his report was the product of his impartial, objective assessment when it was nothing of the sort?

**Reply:**

- This is good practice. Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that local authorities should "...work proactively with applicants to secure developments" and that "decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible".
- The planning officer engaged with the applicant in line with best practice. Given the complexity of the application this aided the correct understanding of all the various elements of the proposal.
- The finalisation of the report was done purely by BCC on the basis of the planning merit and officers' professional judgement.
- The final report was published as part of the agenda for the DC Committee and set out the officer's recommendation.

2. Why should Bristol City Council permit of a system whereby in relation to a major planning application (the application of Bristol Zoo for development of the Zoo gardens 22/02737/F) which attracted massive local objections it allowed insufficient time for public representations thereby depriving significant members of the public the opportunity to have their say?

**Reply:**

- Sufficient time has been allowed for public representations as standard times have been followed including for neighbour letters, site notice and press advert.
- Standard protocol was followed at the committee meeting where 30 minutes of public forum was included to hear summaries of public statements received.
- It is Bristol City Council's Standing Orders for Committees, that has defined that a total of 30 minutes for all people who have submitted Public Forum Statements per application to speak at the meeting is given.
- Since all public statements are also submitted in writing it is not necessary to hear a spoken summary of all of them.



**QUESTION PQ 08****Subject: Ashley Down Station****Question submitted by: Rob Dixon**

1) The site of the new Ashley Down station is only about 200 metres from Muller Road, where there is currently a bus stop under the railway bridge for northbound buses but not for those heading south.

Given that it would be at a location where the road is sufficiently wide for traffic to pass, does the council agree with its officers that a southbound bus stop on Muller Road to serve the new Ashley Down station is inappropriate because it would cause congestion? If so how does this fit with the council's stated aim to promote active travel and public transport?

**REPLY**

- **The project has been considered closely with the Muller Road corridor enhancement project which is improving public transport facilities along the Muller Road corridor. Improvements to the northern section of Muller Road have been delivered.**
- **The Ashley Down Rail Station project seeks to make improvements in the immediate vicinity of the station so that the station is accessible to all members of our community. For example, there will be an Equality Act compliant path with handrail from the disabled parking spaces on Station Road to the station entrance.**
- **Muller Road and Ashley Down Road are two important bus corridors and appropriate directional signage will be installed to connect the station to them.**
- **To connect the station to Muller Road, Station Lane has recently been improved.**
- **Public engagement on potential improvements for the southern section of Muller Road will take place in January.**

2) What actions do the council plan to take to enable interchange between bus and train? Or do they consider that walking 600-700 metres up steep hills is acceptable, including for those with limited mobility and encourages people to use public transport?

**Reply:**

- **Bristol City Council welcomes participation in the engagement/consultation process which will provide an opportunity to feed into designs and improvements and will consider options for new and upgraded bus stops on Muller Rd near to the station noting that there are a variety of constraints that would have to be addressed.**
- **Given the station's historic location on the site of the former Ashley Hill station, within the residential area of Ashley Down, a bus interchange at the station itself would not be feasible due to narrow streets and the detours that would be required for services.**



## QUESTION PQ 09

**Subject: Local Government Act**

**Question submitted by: Mark Ashdown**

This question is directed to the Mayor, the Cabinet Member responsible for Development Management. We require a written response, please.

On a number of occasions when we have attended Council meetings, our requests to adjourn the meeting because of breaches of Section 100B of the Local Government Act 1972 (reproduced below) have been refused or not dealt with.

Is it the intention of the Planning Authority to continue to do this and so subvert the purpose this section of the Act?

100B Access to agenda and connected reports.

(1) Copies of the agenda for a meeting of a principal council and, subject to subsection (2) below, copies of any report for the meeting shall be open to inspection by members of the public at the offices of the council in accordance with subsection (3) below.

(2) If the proper officer thinks fit, there may be excluded from the copies of reports provided in pursuance of subsection (1) above the whole of any report which, or any part which, relates only to items during which, in his opinion, the meeting is likely not to be open to the public.

(3) Any document which is required by subsection (1) above to be open to inspection shall be so open at least [F3 five clear days] before the meeting, except that—

(a) where the meeting is convened at shorter notice, the copies of the agenda and reports shall be open to inspection from the time the meeting is convened, and

(b) where an item is added to an agenda copies of which are open to inspection by the public, copies of the item (or of the revised agenda), and the copies of any report for the meeting relating to the item, shall be open to inspection from the time the item is added to the agenda; but nothing in this subsection requires copies of any agenda, item or report to be open to inspection by the public until copies are available to members of the council.

(4) An item of business may not be considered at a meeting of a principal council unless either—

(a) a copy of the agenda including the item (or a copy of the item) is open to inspection by members of the public in pursuance of subsection (1) above for at least [F4 five clear days] before the meeting or, where the meeting is convened at shorter notice, from the time the meeting is convened; or

(b) by reason of special circumstances, which shall be specified in the minutes, the chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency.

(5) Where by virtue of subsection (2) above the whole or any part of a report for a meeting is not open to inspection by the public under subsection (1) above—

(a) every copy of the report or of the part shall be marked “Not for publication”; and

(b) there shall be stated on every copy of the whole or any part of the report the description, in terms of Schedule 12A to this Act, of the exempt information by virtue of which the council are likely to exclude the public during the item to which the report relates.

(6) Where a meeting of a principal council is required by section 100A above to be open to the public during the proceedings or any part of them, there shall be made available for the use of members of the public present at the meeting a reasonable number of copies of the agenda and, subject to subsection (8) below, of the reports for the meeting.



(7) There shall, on request and on payment of postage or other necessary charge for transmission, be supplied for the benefit of any newspaper—

(a) a copy of the agenda for a meeting of a principal council and, subject to subsection (8) below, a copy of each of the reports for the meeting;

(b) such further statements or particulars, if any, as are necessary to indicate the nature of the items included in the agenda; and

(c) if the proper officer thinks fit in the case of any item, copies of any other documents supplied to members of the council in connection with the item.

(8) Subsection (2) above applies in relation to copies of reports provided in pursuance of subsection (6) or (7) above as it applies in relation to copies of reports provided in pursuance of subsection (1) above.]

**Reply:**

- **The question does not specify exactly how it is considered that we depart from the requirements of S100B in Council meetings.**
- **We are confident that there have not been any breaches of s100B Local Government Act and that the allegations are unfounded.**
- **The reference to “reports” in S100B – in the context of a planning committee - is a reference to the case officer’s report on each application rather than a reference to any reports or other documents submitted with (or in relation to) the planning application;**
- **The case officer’s report is and always has been published as part of the agenda papers, in line with the timings set out in the Act. It is not general practice to also provide with the agenda copies of reports or other documents submitted with the application, and this is not a requirement of the legislation.**



**QUESTION PQ 10****Subject: St Johns Lane****Question submitted by: Derek Giovanni**

I live just off St. John's Lane in BS3, which is one of the new routes taken by non-compliant vehicles avoiding the CAZ. It feels like routing traffic outside of the presumably less populated centre of Bristol through neighbouring areas has just shifted a pollution problem into primarily residential neighbourhoods and has additionally caused non-compliant vehicles to have to make longer journeys, resulting in an overall increase in pollution within the surrounding areas.

**Question 1**

As I understand it, there was a predicted traffic increase of 400 vehicles per day along St. John's Lane. When will figures for the actual increase of traffic along St. John's Lane as a result of the CAZ boundaries be published for comparison?

**Reply:**

- **We will be providing an update report in January on the progress of the CAZ which will set out how the scheme has worked and the impacts it has had. Further updates will be provided after that report as data becomes available.**

**Question 2**

Whilst I question the routing of non-compliant vehicles through residential neighbourhoods, I'm not necessarily against the CAZ and do support attempts to reduce pollution and congestion throughout our city. I assume the planned forecast is that newly busier routes like St. John's Lane will, in time, become less congested and non-compliant vehicle usage and pollution will decrease. What are the timescales for a reduction in non-compliant vehicle usage along the perimeter of the CAZ and how frequently will measurements be taken and published along the way to check progress?

**Reply:**

- **The closure of Malago Rd inbound as part of the Bedminster Green highway works will have impacted traffic flows on St John's Lane and the two impacts cannot be easily separated**
- **While there was predicted to be an increase in flow along St John's Lane it was not predicted to be in exceedance of the air quality limits the scheme is designed to meet.**
- **In general as the scheme cleans up the emissions of the whole vehicles fleet by encouraging and funding vehicle upgrades, air quality both inside and outside of the zone improves and this effect increases with time as more people upgrade their vehicle**





## QUESTION PQ 11

**Subject: Plant Based Motion**

**Question submitted by: Jack Slater**

My question is directed to councillor Bennett as the portfolio holder for climate. All of the existing food strategy documents that Bristol City Council have produced recognise that animal products are amongst the most environmentally damaging foodstuffs, and it is therefore important for consumption of these products to be significantly reduced if the Council is to achieve its stated goal of “carbon neutral food and drink” consumption in the city by 2030.

It would not be unfair to say that, in this respect, existing strategies do not meet this ambition. They have only very limited plans for meat and dairy reduction, and lack a serious commitment to the promotion of plant based food.

So my question is: in light of the importance of food systems in combating the climate crisis as recognised by the recent COP 28 climate meeting, can you commit to developing, debating, and implementing a plant-based motion as a matter of urgency?

### Reply

- **We are committing significant resources to make our food systems more sustainable. As I stated, we’ve received Gold Standard Award for food sustainability – only the second city in the country to do so – for our efforts to reduce food waste, grow the city’s good food movement, address food inequality, increase urban food growing, improve catering and procurement, and tackle the impacts of our food system on public health, nature, and climate change. We also have a commitment to growing sustainable food in every ward in the city. It is absolutely right to have a focus on local food production, as doing so massively reduces the airmiles of our food which is one of the main contributors to Co2 emissions from agriculture – both animal and otherwise.**
- **The Labour Party is committed to a just transition to a greener society, including through the way we decarbonise our food systems. Bristol has been leading the way on sustainable food production - as well as decarbonisation in general – as is evidenced in it being only the second city in the UK to achieve Gold Standard for food sustainability. While I agree that emissions from animal agriculture do need to be tackled, I have some reservations that some of components of this treaty will harm society’s poorest.**
- **Changing behavioural habits, such as diets, takes time. Blunt instruments such as a tax on meat could well have no effect on meat consumption but will make already-struggling low income families struggle even further. The focus should instead be on making fruit and vegetables as cheap as possible, so that healthy, sustainable diets are an option for everyone – this is the approach we’re taking in Bristol.**



## QUESTION PQ 12

**Subject: Barton House**

**Question submitted by: Sally Roberts**

1. Are residents to able to go home for Christmas or not?
2. The holiday inn lack of variation dietary needs. One resident has a stomach bag so does not get the dietary needs.

### Reply

- Thank you for submitting your questions. It was unfortunate that the constraints of Public Forum and the addition of November's questions meant that these were not heard at the meeting.
- As the Lord Mayor explained, questions are taken in order of receipt as the most fair way to conduct the meeting, however I appreciate residents wanted to use this forum.
- Investigations at Barton House continue.
- Survey results require analysis and decisions taken based upon what they tell us. Residents are being provided with an update on Monday 18<sup>th</sup>.
- Please inform housing officers or hotel staff of dietary needs so these can be factored into catering arrangements.
- Following resident feedback, the Holiday Inn is sharing a meal plan for lunch and dinner so there is advanced notice of the food served at the hotel every day.



**QUESTION PQ 13****Subject: Barton House****Question submitted by: Rayhan Ismail**

1. Mayor Marvin Rees,

Considering the complex interplay of safety issues, mental health impacts, and inadequate responses for Barton House residents, how do you envision establishing a multifaceted support system that addresses not only immediate rehousing needs but also provides comprehensive health and well-being assistance, acknowledging the intricate challenges faced by the affected community?

2. Mayor Marvin Rees,

Given the multifaceted challenges at Barton House and the reported breakdowns in communication and crisis management, can you outline a detailed and proactive strategy to rectify the systemic issues, rebuild community trust, and ensure that future responses to such crises are not only prompt but also encompass a holistic approach, considering both physical and mental well-being?

**Reply:**

- **Thank you for submitting your questions. It was unfortunate that the constraints of Public Forum and the addition of November's questions meant that these were not heard at the meeting.**
- **As the Lord Mayor explained, questions are taken in order of receipt as the most fair way to conduct the meeting, however I appreciate residents wanted to use this forum.**
- **Plans for each potential scenario emerging from Barton House are being developed in parallel with the work taking place at the block.**
- **Each plan identifies potential needs of households (housing, physical, wellbeing, travel etc.) and services that can support any required actions.**
- **City partners are kept apprised of the ongoing situation and will be engaged as, and when a particular scenario plan is identified as being required.**
- **Any points of learning identified during the current response are being fed into a process of reflection to inform plans for future crisis responses.**
- **Any specific needs should be shared with a housing officer so these can be fed into this planning process.**



**QUESTION PQ 14****Subject: Bristol Zoo Gardens****Question submitted by: Nicholas Watts**

First, Bristol Zoo Gardens and Gloucester County Cricket Ground are up for sale for £40 million each, and both of their replacements will be located in South Gloucestershire. Please can you tell us what the resulting loss of revenues to Bristol City Council will be, and the gains to South Gloucestershire?

REPLY

- **This is difficult to estimate as some (current or new) occupiers may receive relief because of their status and others will not. The same with the residential developments, depending upon which band they are entered into whether the occupier lives alone.**
- **We would not anticipate an overall net loss of income from either of these proposals as any business rate losses are likely to be offset by council tax and business rate incomes following the redevelopment of the sites.**

Secondly, please can you explain why the biodiversity metric applied to the loss of biodiversity resulting from loss of, or damage to the non-native trees at Bristol zoo Gardens in the process of redevelopment is not the latest version, applying state of the art knowledge to mitigation of climate change and preventing loss of biodiversity?

REPLY

- **When the development proposals first came forward the applicant was using the latest biodiversity metric.**
- **The guidance released by DEFRA on the 21st of April 2022 which contained an updated Biodiversity Metric recommends that metrics are not changed mid-project. (As explicitly stated in the FAQ section)**
- **It is noted that Biodiversity net gain is not mandatory until January 2024. LPAs are not given powers to enforce that an applicant uses the most recent (or statutory) version of the metric until BNG is mandatory in Jan 2024.**
- **There is no significant difference between the urban tree biodiversity unit scoring between versions 3.0 (i.e. the one used by the project), 3.1 (the one published just prior to the submission of the application), and the latest draft statutory metric.**



## QUESTION PQ 15

**Subject: Barton House**

**Question submitted by: Chantelle Osmond**

1. Myself and my children have been staying at my daughters grandmother's in a living room since the evacuation with two dogs and birds and weren't found accommodation where we can stay all together as a unit why is that?
2. What will happen to family's that don't want to return to the building because they are scared and traumatised will they be made homeless through no fault of their own?

### Reply:

- **Thank you for submitting your questions. It was unfortunate that the constraints of Public Forum and the addition of November's questions meant that these were not heard at the meeting.**
- **As the Lord Mayor explained, questions are taken in order of receipt as the most fair way to conduct the meeting, however I appreciate residents wanted to use this forum.**
- **We cannot make guarantees at this time about future housing arrangements should they be required.**
- **Options for providing alternative accommodation across all potential scenarios are currently being reviewed.**
- **These plans include using our own council housing and that of partner housing providers should we need to decommission the block.**
- **Alternative accommodation offers are being prioritised for those with medical needs and can only be made if suitable properties can be found.**
- **Much of this accommodation is provided from outside of the council's own estate and means we have little control over their suitability.**



## QUESTION PQ 16

**Subject: Barton House**

**Question submitted by: Jama Hussein**

I am one of the Barton House residents.

My two questions to the mayor are as follows:

1) When Barton House assessment and survey finishes, will you publish and share with residents the full report with its findings and recommendations?

2) After survey's report and assessment is completed, after whatever decision that you made there will be questions and concerns for the residents. Will you personally and your team allocate enough time meet all residents and address our concerns fully?

**Reply:**

- **Thank you for submitting your questions. It was unfortunate that the constraints of Public Forum and the addition of November's questions meant that these were not heard at the meeting.**
- **As the Lord Mayor explained, questions are taken in order of receipt as the most fair way to conduct the meeting, however I appreciate residents wanted to use this forum.**
- **We cannot make guarantees at this time about future housing arrangements should they be required.**
- **Options for providing alternative accommodation across all potential scenarios are currently being reviewed.**
- **These plans include using our own council housing and that of partner housing providers should we need to decommission the block.**
- **Alternative accommodation offers are being prioritised for those with medical needs and can only be made if suitable properties can be found.**
- **Much of this accommodation is provided from outside of the council's own estate and means we have little control over their suitability.**



## QUESTION PQ 17

**Subject: Barton House**

**Question submitted by: Jamila Sajid**

"When did you first know about the structural problems with Barton House?"

National government sent you a letter about these problems in 2017, so you have known about this situation, and the risk to people's lives, since at least that time.

"Why didn't you act earlier and make for a proper plan of action for a dignified evacuation of Barton House of its residents? Why evacuate us at 6pm in the evening? Why were media outlets made aware of the situation before us residents?"

Ms Jamila Sajid, Barton House Resident.

### Reply:

- **Thank you for submitting your questions. It was unfortunate that the constraints of Public Forum and the addition of November's questions meant that these were not heard at the meeting.**
- **As the Lord Mayor explained, questions are taken in order of receipt as the most fair way to conduct the meeting, however I appreciate residents wanted to use this forum.**
- **Senior officers and political leaders were briefed about the findings of a peer review on a previous building survey on Monday 13 November**
- **The decision to evacuate the building was taken on the morning of Tuesday 14 November. The process of evacuating the building began approximately four hours after that decision was taken.**
- **Members of the press were briefed about the need to temporarily evacuate the block at 5pm on Tuesday, after the process of informing residents had begun.**
- **No information was shared with the media before this briefing, and we do not know how local reporters became aware earlier in the afternoon.**
- **This was an emergency evacuation which took place on the same day that the decision was made, so unfortunately the urgency meant action was required to prioritise resident safety.**



## QUESTION PQ 18

**Subject: Barton House**

**Question submitted by: Syeda Ahmed**

What will be the fate of residents living in limbo? How much longer are we expected to live like this ?

When can we get a real concrete answer regarding the multiple failure by the Council to act in a timely and appropriate manner?

My name is syeda ahmed, and my address is Barton House.

### Reply:

- **Thank you for submitting your questions. It was unfortunate that the constraints of Public Forum and the addition of November's questions meant that these were not heard at the meeting.**
- **As the Lord Mayor explained, questions are taken in order of receipt as the most fair way to conduct the meeting, however I appreciate residents wanted to use this forum.**
- **Investigations at Barton House continue.**
- **Survey results require analysis and decisions taken based upon what they tell us. Residents will be provided with an update by the end of the week (15 December).**
- **Senior officers and political leaders were briefed about the findings of a peer review on a previous building survey on Monday 13 November**
- **The decision to evacuate the building was taken on the morning of Tuesday 14 November. The process of evacuating the building began approximately four hours after that decision was taken.**





## QUESTION PQ 19

**Subject: Gilton House**

**Question submitted by: Nigel Varley**

1. Will the Council recognise and learn from mistakes made in planning and oversight causing an unacceptable delay in replacing insulating cladding at Gilton House, which has resulted in distress and expense to its residents, so that the residents of the other tower blocks having cladding replaced do not have to endure uninsulated homes during the cold weather period?

2. Will the Council negotiate with the tenants of Gilton House compensation payments to cover the considerable cost of additional electricity required to heat uninsulated homes?

- **It is important to learn these lessons.**
- **We are aware of the problem caused by the removal of cladding to make people safe. The calculation of any costs would be the starting point for any discussions about costs incurred.**
- **We are currently looking at options as part of the HRA business planning, which is currently facing the consequences of inflationary pressures.**
- **Please contact my office to discuss this further**



## QUESTION PQ 20

**Subject: Barton House**

**Question submitted by: Wesley Bear**

Why have the community done more for the residents of Barton House than the council?

Some 20% of Barton House residents are members of ACORN. Why is it that the council refuse to acknowledge ACORN as representatives of the residents, when the residents themselves have named ACORN their voice?

## REPLY

- **We disagree with your question. Almost every support service delivered by the council is engaged in the Barton House response and the provision of care for residents.**
  
- **The steps taken by the council to support residents includes:**
  - **Providing hotel accommodation on a full board basis.**
  - **Catering to provide three meals a day with packed lunches available for school age children.**
  - **Free taxi journeys to essential locations such as school and work.**
  - **Bus passes.**
  - **Regular cleaning and laundry services.**
  - **Childcare and support.**
  - **Translations of regular email updates.**



## QUESTION PQ 21

**Subject: Barton House**

**Question submitted by: Fadumo Farah**

My two questions are:

Is the land of Barton House being sold?

Is the council willing to pay compensation to the residents because it affected us mentally and financially?

### **Reply:**

- **Thank you for submitting your questions. It was unfortunate that the constraints of Public Forum and the addition of November's questions meant that these were not heard at the meeting.**
- **As the Lord Mayor explained, questions are taken in order of receipt as the most fair way to conduct the meeting, however I appreciate residents wanted to use this forum.**
- **There are no plans to sell the building or land.**
- **Residents living with friends or family are eligible for daily payments to cover costs incurred such as energy or food.**
- **These payments are up to £50 per household per day.**
- **The amount received depends on the composition of the house.**
- **In the event that the block requires decommissioning, all residents would be eligible for loss of home payments as set out in legislation.**



## QUESTION PQ 22

**Subject: Barton House**

**Question submitted by: name withheld**

What are your long term plans for the residents if they were to get rehoused and would they remain a priority throughout until they get rehoused?

### Reply:

- **Thank you for submitting your questions. It was unfortunate that the constraints of Public Forum and the addition of November's questions meant that these were not heard at the meeting.**
- **As the Lord Mayor explained, questions are taken in order of receipt as the most fair way to conduct the meeting, however I appreciate residents wanted to use this forum**
- **We cannot make guarantees at this time about future housing arrangements should they be required.**
- **Options for providing alternative accommodation across all potential scenarios are currently being reviewed.**
- **These plans include using our own council housing and that of partner housing providers should we need to decommission the block.**
- **If decommissioning is required, residents would have the highest Band 1 Priority as other people with a critical housing need on the housing waiting list.**



## QUESTION PQ 23

**Subject: Barton House**

**Question submitted by: Isaac Caffrey**

Why, if the Council is aware, have residents of Barton House, removed from the building over unexplained safety concerns some weeks ago, still been paying rent on the property?

### Reply:

- Thank you for submitting your questions. It was unfortunate that the constraints of Public Forum and the addition of November's questions meant that these were not heard at the meeting.
- As the Lord Mayor explained, questions are taken in order of receipt as the most fair way to conduct the meeting, however I appreciate residents wanted to use this forum
- Ceasing rent charging would end our contractual relationship with tenants.
- This is an important relationship that ensures many protections for residents, and places duties on the council that would not exist in the absence of this relationship.
- Likewise, the ending of rent charging would result in the recalculation of benefits received by the majority of residents of the block.
- Such recalculations may negatively impact people's incomes and potentially create a debt that would need to be paid out of future benefit entitlement.
- During this temporary evacuation we believe our approach is in the best interests of the majority of residents, but we will keep our policy under review should the evacuation become longer term.

