

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ01 - David Carslake</b>	<b>To: Cllr Plowden, Transport &amp; Connectivity</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>Contractors often close cycle lanes, requiring cyclists to divert over a short length of footway, and this is always accompanied by the putting up of "cyclists dismount" signs. This is despite the fact that the potential for cyclist-pedestrian conflict is often considerably less than exists in many areas which are shared-use by design.</p> <p>A recent example where these signs were used is the Temple Quarter site on Cattle Market Road, where cyclists were diverted over a wide pavement which rarely has any pedestrians on it at all. I suspect that contractors put these signs up to cover themselves if something does happen, but they have harmful consequences for the public perception of cyclists.</p> <p>People see cyclists (quite rightly) ignoring the instruction to dismount and it feeds into the narrative of cyclists as rule breakers and the consequent disregard for cyclists' safety. There's also a risk of a "crying wolf" effect if there were ever a real (but hidden) need to dismount.</p> <p>Does council guidance to contractors allow these signs only in special circumstances when they are absolutely necessary, or does it rather encourage their universal use regardless of the negative consequences for cyclists? Are alternative signs available?</p> <p>In the vast majority of cases a more appropriate sign would be "Cyclists proceed with caution" or "Cyclists give way to pedestrians".</p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There has been a lot of social media content recently regard the use of Cyclists Dismount signs and after discussions with our Traffic team can clarify that Bristol City Council only supports their use in the rarest of circumstances such as if a road is closed and cyclists and pedestrians are required to share a narrow footway.</li><li>• In all other occasions either cycle provision should be provided or cyclists should use the carriageway as they would elsewhere. It's also been confirmed that there is a preference for signs such as 'cyclists give way to pedestrians' as it supports the road user hierarchy in the highway code.</li><li>• Utilities and contractors are made aware of this policy and comments are provided where the sign may appear on a submitted traffic management drawing.</li><li>• However, due to resourcing, it isn't possible to approve drawings for every set of works and instead contractors are required to follow national guidance and codes of practice.</li><li>• If any instances of incorrect signage are brought to the attention of Bristol City Council they can be addressed.</li></ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ02 – Gary Hopkins</b>	<b>To: Cllr Dyer, Strategy &amp; Resources</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>Since being transferred to local control through an asset transfer Jubilee pool has performed brilliantly, membership is up, more schools are using it, a greater variety of sessions are taking place and improvements to the fabric are progressing. This is all despite the terms of the CAT, which the new pool management had to accept as the only alternative was closure, certainly not being generous to the pool. The pool is a wonderful local asset serving many people in Knowle and surrounding areas.</p> <p>1. Now that the mayor is no longer in charge can I get an assurance that the new administration of BCC will review the terms of the CAT to allow the pool to not only operate into the future but to invest for the longer term without facing additional costs?</p> <p>2. last financial year the area 5 area committee was prevented from making a local CIL grant to jubilee pool by an intervention from the Mayor’s Office with the statement that the terms of a previous cabinet decision prevented the granting of local CIL funds. Is this healthy? not only in terms of local democracy but also in terms of support for work that was in the interests of the city and our environment.</p> <p>3. Can I now get an assurance that in future jubilee pool will not be specifically penalised in this way and that the future committee will have these handcuffs removed?</p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Jubilee Pool was successfully transferred to a community leisure operator subject to a Community Asset Transfer (CAT) Group approved CAT lease of adequate duration to allow the lessee to attract capital funding and subject to what a peppercorn rent reflecting the investment and operating costs involved. As with all CAT leases there was an accompanying ‘Service Agreement’.</li><li>• If the question could be more specific about concerns in relation to the CAT transfer, (the terms of which were acceptable to the lessee at the time) officers will gladly investigate and be able to offer a more substantive response.</li><li>• Provided the use of Community Infrastructure Levy is in line with the relevant regulations then it is conceivable that an Area Committee could agree to an award of funding.</li><li>• The council will continue to work collaboratively with the leaseholder and ensure the CAT lease is adhered to and the pool continues to provide a valuable resource to the community.</li></ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ03 - Irene Evans</b>	<b>To: Cllr Parsons, Homes and Housing Delivery Chair</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>Gilton House is a block of 46 flats and is supported housing for the over-60s undergoing renovation works including the replacement of inflammable insulating cladding. Replacing the insulation began in February 2023 and finished in March 2024. For two winters we were without insulating cladding having either to endure the cold or pay hundreds of pounds extra in heating costs.</p> <p>On 28th February, the Council agreed to include in this year's budget £150,000 to compensate tenants in blocks that had been without insulation. To date we have received nothing. We now understand it is being referred to the Homes and Housing Delivery PCCB (whatever that is) on 15th July. If we are to receive anything it will be in August at the earliest, six months after the decision.</p> <p>Will compensation still be paid and, if so, how much each and when, and why have we been given no clear explanation of what is causing the delay?</p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
The Cladding Replacement Discretionary Payment Scheme' is under review with the aim to provide an update at the end of July.	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ04 - Geoff Sutton</b>	<b>To: Cllr Parsons, Homes and Housing Delivery Chair</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>Will the Council recognise and attempt to resolve through negotiation problems created for residents of tower blocks with mobility issues caused by the enforcement of fire regulations?</p> <p>These require the removal of mobility scooters from landings. In Gilton House there is nowhere else to put them: flat entrances are too small and there is no charging room. The effect is to imprison elderly and disabled residents in their homes which, besides being cruel, is discriminatory. Fire hazard removal notices given without discussion or provision of an alternative have caused much distress. Disabled residents are also at risk from the lack of Personal Evacuation Plans and refuges.</p> <p>Gilton House Tenants' Association has proposed a quick, easy and cheap solution to the problem in our block by requesting the creation of a charging space in the foyer. We hope the Council will support this.</p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A comprehensive policy for ownership of mobility scooters and their storage is scheduled for presentation at the Homes and Housing Delivery Policy Committee in September.</li><li>• There is a programme to deliver solutions for mobility scooter storage in blocks. This is challenging programme to deliver, and solutions will vary from site to site.</li><li>• It would not be feasible to provide communal charging facilities within a foyer area, as this would compromise the fire safety of the building.</li></ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ05 - Sue Smith</b>	<b>To: Cllr Parsons, Homes and Housing Delivery Chair</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>It is the second anniversary of the scaffolding going up for the renovation of Gilton House. We have been told it will be finished in October but few of us hold out any hope.</p> <p>The whole project has been dogged by delays and slow progress. There have been weeks on end when no work was being done. At the moment work seems to stop at 3.00pm and can't be done when it is windy or raining because the cover protecting workers has been taken off. We have been given lots of excuses for the slow progress but few of them are convincing.</p> <p>When they started removing the inflammable polystyrene cladding it blew over a wide area of Brislington. Some new windows were fitted badly so builders had to return to fix them. Internal decoration was done before building work started so then had to be re-done when it was messed up. Now two, sometimes three blokes are sticking tiles the size of a mobile phone on the outside, one at a time.</p> <p>Our lives have been disrupted for two years by cold, noise, dirt, nowhere to sit outside and limited parking for residents with mobility difficulties. The centre of Brislington (which the community is trying to improve) looks awful. The whole project must be way over-budget.</p> <p>Will the Council learn the lessons of Gilton House and ensure that the lives of residents of the other blocks having cladding replaced are not as badly disrupted as ours have been?</p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Planned Improvements Service continually learn and strive to improve in the delivery of complex major planned improvement works.</li><li>• Programmes to replace cladding systems are a relatively new type of project to be undertaken by the sector, both locally and nationally, particularly with respect to directly fixed External Wall Insulation Systems, such as Gilton House.</li><li>• Significant lessons have been learnt from the project at Gilton House and will have a positive impact on future programmes.</li></ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ06 - Helen Hughes</b>	<b>To: Cllr Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Chair</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>1. On the Liveable Neighbourhoods page of the Bristol City Council website it is stated: "Designing changes with the local community means they'll meet local needs, this is known as co-design". Community engagement and "co-design" is emphasised throughout the council literature on the EBLN scheme, for example in the Decision Pathway Report of 4th April 2023. Special funding for this purpose was even drawn from the EU. Can the chair please say why, if the intention was to "co-design" and "meet local needs", the funding from WECA was only available for blocking roads, putting in cameras (known as "bus gates"), providing bicycle hangars and removing parking spaces, rather than for whatever creative ideas the residents themselves might have had to meet their needs?</p> <p>2. Can the Chair of the committee state honestly that it was the council's intention to truly listen to residents of the area and not simply to carry out pro forma "consultations" heavily nudging people towards the council's own plans?</p> <p>3. Many residents of Barton Hill, including people with disabilities, members of the Somali community and people running local businesses, are upset and angry about the decision to implement the project despite their objections, because they fear their lives will be made much more difficult, if not intolerable, and their concerns have been brushed aside rather than listened to. What is the Chair of the committee going to do about this?</p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<p><b>Answer to Question 1:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Council has been engaging the communities of Barton Hill, Redfield and St George since January 2022 to develop the cities pilot Liveable Neighbourhood.</li><li>• Each stage of engagement has contributed towards the development of a trial scheme which will be installed later this year.</li><li>• The scheme will be installed using temporary materials so that the Council can review how the scheme operates and share the available data with residents and stakeholders.</li><li>• The Council will then re-engage the community and stakeholders before any decision is made on whether and how to make the scheme permanent.</li><li>• The Council will continue engaging the community and to help understand how the scheme is working, what aspirations people may have for how the new public space can be used.</li><li>• A programme of cultural and active travel events is being developed to support the introduction of the trial scheme.</li><li>• This will be shaped by local people and organisations and can look to meet the needs of the local community.</li></ul> <p><b>Answer to Question 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The different stages of engagement have helped shape the scheme and the trial is the next step in the process.</li><li>• Various design tools were introduced in the second stage of engagement, and the community asked to map where they wanted to see these measures on street.</li><li>• Officers then reviewed these suggestions and developed and amended a trial scheme that would present a positive business case and meet the requirements of the Department for Transport.</li><li>• Just yesterday I attended a meeting of local young people organised by Somali Voice and we will be amending the public questionnaires we will use as a result to include additional questions.</li></ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ06 - Helen Hughes</b>	<b>To: Cllr Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Chair</b>
<p><b>Answer to Question 3:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The trial scheme was amended following further public engagement in May 2023 – July 2023. The amendments improved the trial scheme and responded to some of the concerns raised by some members in the community.</li><li>• This includes several exemptions at the bus gates such as, Emergency service vehicles, refuse vehicles, taxi's and private hire vehicles, professional carers providing care in the community and those in receipt of the Personal Travel Budget to assist with home to school travel for children with SEND.</li><li>• Additional measures are being delivered to help support local businesses throughout the trial scheme such as parklets near the local shops on Avonvale Road.</li><li>• The engagement team will also help support local businesses and organisations through the trial by providing journey planning advice and active travel grants.</li></ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ07 - Melissa Topping</b>	<b>To: Leader</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>Why are you not listening to the voices of Lawrence Hill, Redfield and Barton Hill regarding the negative effects of EBLN Road blockages and very poor consultation process?</p> <p>Why are you continuing to spend such a ridiculous amount of money on this despite a huge majority being against the scheme in an area with such high levels of poverty and low traffic use?</p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Council has been engaging the communities of Barton Hill, Redfield and St George since January 2022 to develop the cities pilot Liveable Neighbourhood. Each stage of engagement has contributed towards the development of the trial scheme which will be installed later this year. The scheme will be installed using temporary materials so that the Council can review how the scheme operates. The Council will then re-engage the community and stakeholders before any decision is made on whether to make the scheme permanent.</li><li>• I do not accept that a huge majority of local people are against the scheme; Liveable neighbourhoods form a clear part of the Green party manifesto and local residents have voted Green party councillors in to all the wards that the scheme covers, except one retained by Labour.</li><li>• One of the reasons I personally was pleased to see Lawrence Hill being included in the first Liveable Neighbourhood area is that approximately 40% of all households have no access to a car but are disproportionately affected by poor – and indeed illegal - air quality, which as we now know is affecting our children’s in the short term with a high prevalence of conditions like asthma, and in the long term their ability to grow and learn.</li><li>• The scheme is grant funded by WECA as part of the City Regional Sustainable Transport settlement. Like many cities Bristol has a growing population, poor air quality, congestion, and stark inequalities in healthy life expectancy. These factors are in addition to the climate and ecological emergencies.</li><li>• Liveable Neighbourhoods help encourage more sustainable travel by preventing traffic from short cutting through residential streets whilst the whole area remains accessible to private car, although I accept that some car journeys may be slightly longer . This is achieved by introducing col-de-sacs in residential areas. The re-allocated road space can then be used for other measures such as tree planting, seating, and cycle parking.</li></ul>	



## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ08 - Stuart Phelps</b>	<b>To: Cllr Fodor, Environment and Sustainability Chair</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>Implementing traffic restrictions in the East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood was partly made in response to concerns about air pollution levels in the area. Please provide details on the specific air pollution data that informed this decision.</p> <p>Specifically, I would like to know:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What types of pollutants were measured?</li><li>• What were the timeframes for the data collection?</li><li>• What were the sources of the data (e.g., monitoring stations, modelling)?</li></ul> <p>Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. I look forward to receiving your response</p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The project’s objective of improving air quality is a general one, addressing the widespread problem of Nitrogen Dioxide pollution in the city. Whilst the focus of the Clean Air Zone has been to achieve the legal standard for Nitrogen Dioxide the council’s wider goals for air quality are to achieve air quality that is better than the legal standard to reduce the health effects of that pollution.</li><li>• NO2 diffusion tubes were installed within the EBLN project area December 2021 to complement the existing tubes centred on main roads such as Church Road and Whitehall Road.</li><li>• Data has been collected at these sites and is publicly available on the Air Quality Dashboard for 2022.</li><li>• This data will continue to be collected following the introduction of the scheme and thereafter so that the Council can understand what impacts the scheme may have on Air Quality.</li></ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

PQ09 - Matt Sanders	To: Cllr Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Chair
<b>Question</b>	
<p><b>QUESTION 1 Undersized Signage</b></p> <p>Since it started in January, the Cumberland Road Bus Gate has issued 40,000 Penalty Charge notices - putting it on course to become this year's highest-grossing Bus Gate in the entire country. Coincidentally, ALL of the Advance Warning Signs are SMALLER than the sizes specified in the Traffic Signs. I have repeatedly submitted diagrams and measurements to prove this claim, and received NO counter arguments from anybody. As the Council is aware, the Traffic Penalty Tribunal sets a very low bar, when it comes to adjudicating the "adequacy" of signage, so was always likely to turn a blind eye to these irregularities. Regardless of this, the Transport Department COULD have specified signage which MET, or even EXCEEDED, the official specifications - yet it chose NOT to. <b>If the Council's genuine priority is to PREVENT drivers from contravening this Bus Gate - then WHY did they specify undersized signs?</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 2 Bus Gate Refunds</b></p> <p>On May 17th, I submitted a document to Councillors, outlining twenty-five design faults, at the Cumberland Road Bus Gate. I also flagged that drivers were being sent MULTIPLE fines, for contraventions which ALL took place before they received their first letter. Since then, I've helped three drivers appeal to the Traffic Penalty Tribunal, by providing evidence of the non-compliance of signage, etc. In every case, the Council refunded or cancelled most of their fines - for contraventions dating back to January 5th. Perhaps these fines were cancelled, to prevent my evidence being seen by the Tribunal's Adjudicators. Unless of course, this policy of refunding multiple fines ALSO applies to all OTHER drivers, too. <b>Therefore, please clarify WHO is eligible for this refund policy - and explain WHY, if it is now deemed to be WRONG, the Council is STILL issuing multiple Penalty Charge Notices, to this day...?</b></p> <p><b>QUESTION 3 Red Surface Dressing</b></p> <p>While not a legal requirement from the Department for Transport, the Council's policy document "Designing for Buses" stipulates that Bristol's "24-hour bus lanes are implemented with a red surface dressing". Therefore, in August 2022 the Council's designers specified this measure for the Cumberland Road Bus Gate. A year later, in August '23, the Council issued a Press Release, which confirmed that a red surface WOULD be applied during its installation. Four weeks later, the installation was completed - WITHOUT a red surface dressing. The Transport Dept claims this was due to "Contractor Availability". But the contractors were there on site for a month, installing EVERY other element of the Bus Gate. Enforcement commenced on January 2nd. But a red surface was not added until April 5th, following adverse publicity in March. Published data shows that contraventions in April were 60% less than those in March. So the previous LACK of red surfacing was responsible for around 18,000 ADDITIONAL contraventions, in January to March. <b>WHEN was the decision taken, to OMIT the red surface dressing - and WHY?</b></p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<p><b>1. Undersized Signage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The council installed 11 signs on the approach to the bus gate which exceeds requirements set out in the Traffic Signs Manual.</li> <li>• Approximately 3,500 people and local businesses in the immediate area were written to about the installation of the bus gate, and 6,705 warning letters were issued to motorists before the enforcement started.</li> <li>• In addition, an electronic sign was installed close to the bus gate from 11/12/23 to 05/01/24 reading "BUS GATE 40 YARDS AHEAD   BUS, TAXI, MOTORCYCLE ONLY   ENFORCEMENT CAMERAS IN USE". This sign is in addition to the requirements of the Traffic Signs Manual.</li> <li>• This clearly demonstrates the council's intentions to prevent drivers from contravening the bus gate.</li> </ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

- The size of signage and its typeface does not counter its intent to be clear about and warn motorists of the Bus Gate .
- In all situations the council uses its best judgement to implement the most suitable layouts for each situation encountered including things like clearance to the carriageway as well as sign size. As you note in your report, the Traffic Penalty Tribunal has agreed with the council that the layout and its intent is clear and upheld fines issued on that basis.

### **2. Bus Gate Refunds**

- The Council does not believe there to be any fault with the Cumberland Road Bus Gate, which continues to be enforced as usual.
- Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) appeals have been made to the Traffic Penalty Tribunal where independent adjudicators (who are themselves legal professionals) have ruled in the Council's favour.
- Each PCN appeal is considered on its own merits and failure by drivers to observe the signage and road markings and adhere to the bus gate restriction is not an acceptable ground on which the Council can cancel a PCN.
- However, elected members have asked officers, where appropriate, to be sympathetic towards those who say they were not aware of the Bus Gate and who have received multiple PCNs within a short timescale i.e. where subsequent PCNs were incurred before an individual received notification of their first contravention. Where officers receive such appeals, and the circumstances of the individual case warrant it, a sympathetic approach is duly being taken.
- None of this is subject to the direct influence of elected members regarding specific cases, although we do of course support our residents in raising issues with officers.

### **3. Red Surface Dressing**

- There is no requirement for bus gates to use red surfacing.
- The bus gate is clearly marked with signage and road markings which exceeds the guidance.
- Red surfacing treatment cannot generally be installed during inclement weather as this can lead to premature failure and is therefore not planned for installation during winter months to avoid this. Hence it was installed in March when the weather was suitable for doing so.

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ10 – Laura Chapman</b>	<b>To: Cllr Brown, Economy and Skills Chair</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Does BCC consider that the Urban Living SPD has (or will be) incorporated into the new local plan?</li><li>2. If the SPD will cease to exist, do you feel satisfied that the new local plan offers an equivalent (or improved) level of protection against inappropriate development?</li><li>3. During pre-app consultations for privately owned sites, do BCC ever advise/impose a minimum quantum of housing development (units)?</li></ol>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<b>Answer to Question 1:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bristol’s Urban Living Supplementary Planning Document (November 2018) is part of the council’s suite of planning policies and guidance and is aimed at making successful places at higher densities.</li><li>• It will be one of the supporting documents for the new local plan and is directly referenced in the relevant policies in the new local plan.</li></ul>	
<b>Answer to Question 2:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The new local plan has a chapter of seven policies for design which have the purpose of delivering well-designed and inclusive places.</li><li>• These policies will be accompanied by local design guidance and codes in accordance with national planning policy.</li><li>• The new local plan is undergoing examination by planning inspectors at present and the inspectors will take into account representations that were received about the local plan publication version. The inspectors will consider whether the new plan policies are effective.</li></ul>	
<b>Answer to Question 3:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pre-application advice covers matters such as who to engage in the local community and what policies a proposal will be assessed against.</li><li>• Where relevant this advice may include reference to policies for making efficient use of land such as local plan Core Strategy policy BCS20 ‘Effective and Efficient Use of Land’.</li></ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ11 - Caroline Lee Smith</b>	<b>To: Leader</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>Can you clarify that PD rules do not apply to full planning applications? Surely this is a waste of officers time and they have better things to do than squabble over 0.7m on a domestic extension, when they should be spending their time dealing with the more pressing planning issues in Bristol?</p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Some extensions and alterations to houses can be carried out without the need for planning permission using permitted development rights. These rights are subject to limitations and conditions set out in legislation. A development would only be considered lawful if it complies in full with these limitations and conditions; planning permission would otherwise be required.</li><li>• Applications for planning permission are assessed on their merits having regard to local and national planning policies and other material considerations.</li><li>• For domestic extensions, the Council has a Supplementary Planning Document titled “A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions” which provides detailed design guidance.</li><li>• A planning officer may seek amendments to a proposed development during the course of the assessment of a planning application in order to address planning concerns, such as the potential impact of a proposal on the amenity of a neighbouring occupier.</li><li>• Requests for amendments to planning applications for proposed extensions would be made based on planning policy and other material considerations. In some instances, the size of a domestic extension that could potentially be constructed without the need for planning permission using permitted development rights may be a relevant consideration.</li></ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ12 – Helen Evans</b>	<b>To: Leader</b>
<b>Question</b>	
Are there any minimum proficiency standards a Cllr should reach/maintain in order to sit on their respective committee(s)?	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Councillors are provided with a comprehensive induction programme.</li><li>• All Members serving on regulatory committees such as Development Control (planning), Licensing and Public Safety and Protection are required to complete the relevant training prior to serving on the Committee, as set out in Part 5 of the Council’s Constitution.</li><li>• All Members serving on all other committees are provided with relevant policy training in line with the committees’ terms of reference and work programmes.</li></ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ13 - Suzanne Audrey</b>	<b>To: Cllr Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Chair</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>With regard to the proposed pedestrian bridge linking the former Filton Airfield and the Brabazon Hangar site over the Henbury Loop railway line, Bristol City Council planning website currently indicates: Construction of a new pedestrian bridge linking the former Filton Airfield and the Brabazon Hangar site over the Henbury Loop railway line, including earthworks and associated development.</p> <p>Arnold Laver Brabazon Hangar Railway Bridge West Way Bristol BS34 7DU Ref. No: 23/00055/F   Validated: Fri 06 Jan 2023   Status: PENDING CONSIDERATION</p> <p>However, South Gloucestershire Council planning website currently indicates: P22/06722/F   Construction of a new pedestrian bridge linking the former Filton Airfield and the Brabazon Hangar site over the Henbury Loop railway line, including earthworks and associated development (amendment to previously approved scheme P19/16742/F). WITHDRAWN</p> <p>While this may be considered a planning issue, the transport plan for YTL’s proposed arena is an issue for Bristol’s transport officers and the Transport committee. The movement of pedestrians, and the proposed pedestrian bridge, are important elements of the transport plan.</p> <p><b>Question. Please will you give an update, providing as much information as you can, on the proposed pedestrian bridge linking the former Filton Airfield and the Brabazon Hangar site over the Henbury Loop railway line?</b></p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The application referred to has also been withdrawn from BCC. This is in the process of being actioned which will then also update the website.</li><li>• However, the bridge already has permission as part of the original set of planning permissions that relate to the site (19/05514/F).</li><li>• The application referred to in the question is a revised application which the applicant has decided not to pursue. As such, the current position is that we are expecting the bridge to be delivered as set out in the original consent.</li></ul>	

## Public Forum Questions and Answers – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024

<b>PQ14 - Ben Staples</b>	<b>To: Cllr Plowden, Transport and Connectivity Chair &amp; Leader</b>
<b>Question</b>	
<p>With a mandatory consultation being issued for the East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood Scheme, in which the results showed an overwhelming majority response of the community being against this scheme coming into place, how can the council justify still going ahead with this scheme; ignoring over 1000 negative comments or requests for changes where so many people will be negatively affected by this scheme. What makes the council think it doesn't have to represent the community in this issue?</p>	
<p><b>To the Leader:</b> The council has been elected to represent the people of Bristol, listen to their concerns, fears, worries and act on behalf of the best of interest of those that believed you would speak and act for them - giving a voice to those who struggle to have one.</p> <p>So, after you have heard all of the concerns this evening for the East Bristol Liveable Neighbourhood, reading over 1000 comments from the official consultation asking for this to stop; what makes you think you are still acting on behalf the community by voting in favour of and pushing forward this scheme?</p>	
<b>Formal answer from officer</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Council has been engaging the communities of Barton Hill, Redfield and St George since January 2022 to develop the cities pilot Liveable Neighbourhood.</li><li>• Each stage of engagement has contributed towards the development of a trial scheme and made changes seeking to respond to concerns raised by the process. The Council undertook statutory consultation on the proposed changes to the highway known as Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs).</li><li>• This process is not a referendum and only invites objections as to why the Council cannot implement the scheme. The decision was made to progress with the scheme in full and the trial scheme is now due to be installed later this year.</li><li>• The scheme will be monitored to understand its impact and the TROs can be amended following further public engagement.</li><li>• Whilst I agree that 1000 objections seems like a lot, not all were from local residents and the total local population is 27,600 so that is not necessarily an overwhelming majority.</li></ul>	