

**WEST OF ENGLAND COMBINED AUTHORITY:  
OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
6 December 2017**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**Committee Members:**

Cllr Stephen Clarke, Bristol City Council (Chair)  
Cllr Steve Pearce, Bristol City Council (Vice-Chair)

Cllr Tim Ball, Bath & North-East Somerset Council  
Cllr Liz Richardson, Bath & North-East Somerset Council  
Cllr Kye Dudd, Bristol City Council  
Cllr Margaret Hickman, Bristol City Council  
Cllr Mark Weston, Bristol City Council  
Cllr Geoff Gollop, Bristol City Council  
Cllr Paul Hughes, South Gloucestershire Council  
Cllr Katherine Morris, South Gloucestershire Council  
Cllr Pat Hockey, South Gloucestershire Council

**Copies to:**

Cllr Chris Blades, North Somerset Council  
Cllr Charles Cave, North Somerset Council  
Cllr Donald Davies, North Somerset Council

1	<p><b>WELCOME AND EVACUATION PROCEDURE</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and advice was given on the fire evacuation procedure.</p>										
2	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b></p> <p>Apologies were noted from Cllr Katherine Morris.</p> <p>Cllr Brian Hopkinson, substituting for Cllr Katherine Morris, was welcomed to the meeting.</p>										
3	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>										
4	<p><b>MINUTES</b></p> <p>The Committee considered the minutes from the meeting of 24 October 2017.</p> <p>Cllr Paul Hughes noted a question about the mayoral budget had not been included in the minutes. It was agreed that he would speak to Tim Richens regarding this after the meeting.</p> <p>A minor error was noted on page five within the fifth bullet point; it was agreed that '6.5%' should be amended to '0.65%'. The sentence should read as follows, 'Green belt is national policy with which this plan must comply. The plan tries to protect overall function of Bristol and Bath greenbelt, some modest release (0.65%) proposed.'</p> <p><b>The Minutes were otherwise accepted as accurate record of the meeting.</b></p> <p>The Committee reviewed the actions from the meeting of 24 October, which will be included in a log to ensure actions are tracked.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="177 1272 1399 2069"> <tr> <td data-bbox="177 1272 815 1384">Minutes 22 September: 'Helen Edelstyn to follow up with Cllr Hughes regarding Mayoral Expenses question'</td> <td data-bbox="815 1272 1399 1384">In progress</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="177 1384 815 1529">Public forum: 'Officers to provide Scrutiny Committee with summary of arrangements for dialogue with groups such as FOBSR and Bus Users US and others'</td> <td data-bbox="815 1384 1399 1529">In progress</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="177 1529 815 1682">West of England Draft JSP: 'Comments from Overview &amp; Scrutiny to be shared with Joint Committee in advance of their meeting 30<sup>th</sup> October 2017'</td> <td data-bbox="815 1529 1399 1682">Completed</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="177 1682 815 1899">Funding for infrastructure feasibility studies: 'Comments from Overview and Scrutiny to be shared with WECA Committee in advance of their meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2017'</td> <td data-bbox="815 1682 1399 1899">Completed</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="177 1899 815 2069">WECA &amp; Mayoral Budget: 'Comments from Overview and Scrutiny to be shared with WECA Committee in advance of their meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2017'</td> <td data-bbox="815 1899 1399 2069">Completed</td> </tr> </table>	Minutes 22 September: 'Helen Edelstyn to follow up with Cllr Hughes regarding Mayoral Expenses question'	In progress	Public forum: 'Officers to provide Scrutiny Committee with summary of arrangements for dialogue with groups such as FOBSR and Bus Users US and others'	In progress	West of England Draft JSP: 'Comments from Overview & Scrutiny to be shared with Joint Committee in advance of their meeting 30 <sup>th</sup> October 2017'	Completed	Funding for infrastructure feasibility studies: 'Comments from Overview and Scrutiny to be shared with WECA Committee in advance of their meeting on 30 <sup>th</sup> October 2017'	Completed	WECA & Mayoral Budget: 'Comments from Overview and Scrutiny to be shared with WECA Committee in advance of their meeting on 30 <sup>th</sup> October 2017'	Completed
Minutes 22 September: 'Helen Edelstyn to follow up with Cllr Hughes regarding Mayoral Expenses question'	In progress										
Public forum: 'Officers to provide Scrutiny Committee with summary of arrangements for dialogue with groups such as FOBSR and Bus Users US and others'	In progress										
West of England Draft JSP: 'Comments from Overview & Scrutiny to be shared with Joint Committee in advance of their meeting 30 <sup>th</sup> October 2017'	Completed										
Funding for infrastructure feasibility studies: 'Comments from Overview and Scrutiny to be shared with WECA Committee in advance of their meeting on 30 <sup>th</sup> October 2017'	Completed										
WECA & Mayoral Budget: 'Comments from Overview and Scrutiny to be shared with WECA Committee in advance of their meeting on 30 <sup>th</sup> October 2017'	Completed										

	WECA & Mayoral Budget: 'Officers to prepare report on concessionary fares underspend, reasons why and how to use this'	In progress. Tim Richens noted that the concessionary fares underspend will be addressed fully in the next budget outturn.
	AOB, meeting dates 'Chair to discuss revised dates for circulation to members'	Completed
	AOB, Access to information: 'Access to information will be requested to advisory board minutes'	Completed
<b>5</b>	<b>ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC</b>	
	No public questions had been received.	
	Public statements had been received from David Redgewell (SWTN), Christina Biggs (FOSBR), Steve Maslin and Cllr Eleanor Combley (Bristol City Council). The Chair invited attendees to speak in the order their statements had been received.	
	<b>David Redgewell (SWTN)</b>	
	David's first statement was regarding Bristol Temple Meads Station and Portishead Railway Line and mentioned SWTN's concern about the lack of a master plan for the stations due to the works that are about to commence on listed buildings and consent for new entrances and a gate line.	
	David's second statement was regarding disabled access for public transport.	
	The Chair thanked David for his comments and confirmed that his statements would be appended to the minutes.	
	<b>Christina Biggs (FOSBR)</b>	
	Christina's statement urged WECA to develop a regional rail transport plan as part of the Joint Transport Plan 2018.	
	The Chair thanked Christina for her comments and confirmed the statement would be appended to the minutes.	
	<b>Steve Maslin</b>	
	Steve's statement was regarding the establishment of a West of England Inclusive Sustainability Unit and the regional pooling of resources.	
	The Chair thanked Steve for his comments and confirmed the statement would be appended to the minutes.	
	<b>Eleanor Combley (Bristol City Council)</b>	
	It was noted that Eleanor Combley was not in attendance. The chair confirmed that the committee would take her statement as read and would be appended to the minutes.	
<b>6</b>	<b>PETITIONS FROM MEMBERSHIPS</b>	
	There were no petitions.	
<b>7</b>	<b>EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT INNOVATION PILOT</b>	

Adam Powell, Director of Skills at WECA, and Sue Dobson, Skills Project Manager at WECA, introduced the report and drew attention to the following points:

- Providing the Committee with an introduction – and update on current position – to the Employment Support Innovation Pilot, a DWP-funded pilot programme secured through the West of England Devolution Deal.
- Seeking the Committee’s support in informing an Evaluation Strategy for the programme.
- Asking Committee members to advocate for the project within their wards and local authorities given the potential positive impact on residents participating.

The Committee raised several questions which were as follows:

- Cllr Margaret Hickman voiced her concern regarding the cost of childcare and its affordability for women who work. She felt that without this issue being addressed the scheme would not be effective for some of the clients. The officers assured Cllr Hickman that the scheme covers personalised budgets and could therefore help with this issue if relevant.
- Cllr Geoffrey Gollop raised concerns and a question which included the following:
  - The scheme being confined to social housing and not including people in private rentals who are struggling with the cost of this;
  - The scheme duplicating and/or undermining the work of other agencies like the Prince’s Trust;
  - Whether self-employed individuals or individuals wishing to move to a different job would benefit from the scheme, and;
  - Would there be any way of measuring the scheme in terms of tangible benefits?

The officers responded to Cllr Gollop’s concerns and question respectively as follows:

- This is a specific short-term project;
- The scheme does not intend to duplicate what is already out there and aims to fill in any gaps and signpost people to other service and schemes as appropriate;
- Self-employment is included within the scheme and;
- The scheme plans to capture details on benefits payments at points before and after the project so should be measurable in tangible terms
- Cllr Pat Hockey asked if the scheme would be working with housing associations and was assured by the officers that this would be the case.
- Cllr Mark Weston asked if the scheme would be engaging with council housing and was assured by officers that the scheme would work closely with the council in this respect.
- Cllr Steve Pearce stated that, in his opinion, using trade unions as sign posters and making use of trade union learning and education services would be useful

	<p>to plug into. He also confirmed that he thought that the scheme’s funding should be used to provide additional capacity and not seen as an alternative way to fund the work that partners are already doing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Tim Ball mentioned that, people with mental health difficulties are finding it difficult to find training and employment. He was assured by officers that the scheme would deliver a holistic service and that health and wellbeing would be part of this.</li> <li>• Cllr Stephen Clarke asked if there were enough people available to hit project targets if those on Universal Credit were excluded. The officers responded by saying that targets had been set using the national statistics that were available at the time and that Universal Credit full service is already in Bath and North-East Somerset, and will come to Bristol and South Gloucestershire later this year. It was also confirmed that even where there is already full service, there is no plan to migrate those on eligible benefits such as Working Tax Credit and Child Tax Credit for the next couple of years, after full service is implemented nationwide.</li> <li>• Cllr Steve Pearce asked if GPs and other healthcare professionals could be included in signposting for this scheme and officers confirmed that this would be possible.</li> <li>• Cllr Stephen Clarke asked if start-up businesses, especially in disadvantaged areas, could be included in the scheme. Officers confirmed that if all relevant criteria for these people are met then they could be included. Cllr Clarke added that it might be useful to market this scheme to small business associations.</li> <li>• Cllr Paul Hughes asked for the officers’ assurance that the Committee be kept updated on the scheme. A discussion was had and it was agreed that Adam Powell and Sue Dobson would report back to the Committee on the scheme’s progress every six months.</li> </ul> <p>It was noted for the minutes that the Committee welcomes this programme, supports it and looks forward to seeing its progress.</p> <p><b>Action. Adam Powell and Sue Dobson to keep the Overview and Scrutiny Committee updated on the progress of the Employment Support Innovation Pilot every six months.</b></p>
	<p>Committee pause. North Somerset members were invited to sit alongside the Committee for discussion of items 8, 9 and 10.</p>
<p><b>8</b></p>	<p><b>PROGRESS REVIEW OF LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP FUNDING STREAMS</b></p> <p>Pete Davis, Major Transport Scheme Co-ordinator at WECA, introduced the report which will be considered at the West of England Joint Committee meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> of December 2017 and drew attention to the following points:</p>

- A consistent approach has been developed, the ‘One Front Door’, for the identification, development, approval and change management for schemes seeking funding through the LEP Local Growth, Economic Development and Revolving Infrastructure Funds. This involves recommendations being made by an Investment Panel comprising the Chief Executives of the Local Enterprise Partnership and the four local authorities, oversight by the LEP Board and formal decision making by the West of England Joint Committee. For schemes within the Economic Development Fund advice will be provided to the four Council S151 officers as part of business case approval decision.
- It is recognised that transparency, accountability and ensuring value for money must be central to these arrangements, and Government have set out their expectations in this regards in the ‘Local Enterprise Partnership – National Assurance Framework’. The West of England assurance framework sets out the way in which these requirements are met.

Pete Davis confirmed that a formal evaluation process is in place.

There were several concerns and questions from the Committee members which were addressed as follows:

- Cllr Steve Pearce queried paragraph 2.1 in the report by mentioning that there doesn’t seem to be a specific requirement for the West of England Combined Authority (WECA) Chief Executive and asked if this post would feature. Pete Davies confirmed that the LEP CEO and the WECA CEO are the same person.
- Cllr Donald Davies raised questions which included the following:
  - Referring to point 5.3 on page 62, will Invest Bristol and Bath (IBB) be continuing under the West of England regime as before or are they are now a part of the West of England Combined Authority?
  - In the previous regime a risk assessment would be completed and councillors would receive a copy of this. Where can this information now be obtained from?
  - Job Centre attendees from North Somerset are now attending the Job Centre in Central Bristol. How will this work in practice?
  - Similarly, the X3 and X4 bus services travel between Bristol and North Somerset; how will this service work in practice? Who will be doing what and when?

Pete Davies responded to Cllr Davies’ questions respectively as follows:

- IBB will continue in the same way as before and will cover the same geographical area. The only change is that IBB staff have now been TUPE’d across to WECA.
- The risk assessments are still completed and are attached to the relevant reports as appendices.
- These progress reports are updated quarterly to address any changes.



- It was noted that Cllr Stephen Clarke and Helen Edelstyn did not have the answer to hand regarding cross-border issues but would take this away to get some clarity on this question.

In relation to the above points, Cllr Stephen Clarke confirmed that he would like the Committee to see these background papers to the published report on a quarterly basis. Pete Davis confirmed that he would include these reports on a quarterly basis for the Committee's information.

- Cllr Stephen Clarke confirmed that it was agreed in the pre-meeting that this agenda item will become a recurring item.
- Cllr Stephen Clarke mentioned funding being £25 million short and asked how the decision will be made on which projects are not funded. Pete Davies confirmed that multiple projects are currently in development and that some schemes may not be brought forward. He also confirmed that there is still a lot of work to do behind the schemes to ensure that we don't over-commit and are still able to deliver.
- Cllr Stephen Clarke asked how geographical equity is ensured with the funds. Pete Davis responds by saying that the LEP Growth Fund is allocated on a priority basis; these priorities have been agreed by the councils.

**Action. Pete Davies to provide the committee with quarterly progress reports on the Local Enterprise Partnership Funding Streams.**

## 9 2016/17 CITY DEAL ANNUAL PERFORMANCE

***Please note that this item should have been an addendum to Item 8 rather than an additional item on the agenda.***

Tim Richens, Director of Investment and Corporate Services at WECA, introduced the report which will be considered by the West of England Joint Committee meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> of December 2017 and provides the following purpose:

- This report provides a summary of the West of England's City Region Deals Pooled Business Rates performance for 2016/17, as used for the Economic Development Fund and in accordance with the requirements of the Business Rates Pooling Principles Agreement.

Tim Richens confirmed that this report provides further background on the Economic Development Fund (EDF) and confirmed that this is South Gloucestershire's report as they are the accountable body for the EDF Business Rates Pool.

There were several comments and questions from the Committee members which were addressed as follows:

- Cllr Donald Davies queried whether the growth and projection rates are matching what was expected. Tim Richens confirmed that each council provided their own

projections but mentioned that over the first three years growth has matched and slightly exceeded what was predicted. He confirmed that the Pooling Board have commissioned an independent review to look at future projections over the next twenty years.

- Cllr Stephen Clarke asked what the impact of the national Business Rates scheme would be on this scheme. Tim Richens responded by saying that it is currently unclear what the impact will be as HMG have not set out their parameters for the national scheme. He confirmed that the Pooling Board are modelling different scenarios to ensure that we are prepared for any potential impacts.
- Cllr Geoffrey Gollop mentioned that he'd like to see a table depicting both current figures and what we can expect to see in the future. This information together with the programming of future would be very useful with regards to scrutinising information. He mentioned that this should be presented in such a way that will make it easy for members to follow this information and that will facilitate understanding of risk. Cllr Stephen Clarke confirmed his agreement with this and requested that Tim Richens request future reports include these accompanying and easy to understand tables. Tim Richens confirmed that he would take this back to the Board.

**Action. Tim Richens to report back to the Pool Board to ensure that future Pool reports and tables are presented differently to facilitate easier understanding for members.**

## 10 METROWEST UPDATE

James White, Interim Head of Transport at WECA, introduced the report which will be considered by the West of England Joint Committee meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> of December 2017 and aims to update members on WECA's MetroWest project.

There were several questions from the Committee members which were addressed as follows:

- Cllr Mark Weston raised questions which included the following:
  - Clarity regarding the main differences between MetroWest Phase 1 Stage B and Phase 1 Stage C;
  - If the report on MetroWest Phase 2 had been delayed as he was under the impression that this was being released this year;
  - An early decision will need to be made regarding the location of Henbury station as this will determine where the Park and Rides will go;
  - Will the decision on the Henbury loop be re-visited?



James White responded to Cllr Weston's concerns and questions respectively as follows:

- The main differences would be that for Phase 1 Stage C line speeds would be increased for regular trains, there would be sections of double tracking, more signalling in place and that the implementation of Phase 1 Stage C would bump the project cost up to £175 million;
  - The GRIP Stage 3 report for Phase 2 has been delayed by 3-4 months;
  - The understanding is that a decision on the Henbury station location will be put forward in January/February 2018;
  - The focus is on Phases 1 and 2 currently but all travel schemes will be looked at as part of the Joint Local Transport plan. The understanding from Bristol City Council colleagues is that whilst currently unfunded, there is reserve funding available when the appropriate point in Phase 1 is reached. Also, in James' opinion, the Joint Local Transport Plan will provide another opportunity to look at other rail aspirations, not just the Henbury Loop.
- Cllr Donald Davies mentioned his scepticism and concern about Phase 1 Stage B namely that, in his opinion, Network Rail are overcomplicating things, Pill needs a station on the map, whether there will be good interchanges with other transport modes, whether there would be parking and whether there would be disabled access. James White responded by saying that work on the bus strategy is about to begin and as part of this, key interchanges and facilities will be considered. He also confirmed that any new station must be accessible.
  - Cllr Steve Pearce raised concerns and questions which included the following:
    - How robust are these new costs and have we got a Plan B for funding?
    - Is there scope to put some stabling in Portishead for an extra train during rush hour?
    - Feels that the Henbury Loop should not be discounted.

James White responded to Cllr Pearce's concerns and questions respectively as follows:

- A piece of work has been done by North Somerset to review the costs of MetroWest Phase 1 and it has been concluded that, give or take some risks, there wasn't a huge amount of difference in Network Rail's and an independent reviewer's figures; the estimated overall cost of the two trains per hour scheme is £165 million.
- A 40 or 45 minutes service could be possible during peak hours with a five-carriage train to Portishead which could then be split either at Portishead or Temple Meads into two and three carriages.
- There is a risk that funding might not be obtained from the bid and that additional funding might need to be obtained from elsewhere.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Stephen Clarke referred to point 2.4 in the report and commented that, in his opinion, the statements seem overly optimistic and queried whether this would all be completed by 2021. James White responded by saying that it is key that the remodelling of Bristol East Junction in 2020 is key for Phase 1 and 2 services. Network Rail have the money available to do the design work for this but full funding for the scheme is still to be confirmed. He mentioned that MetroWest is an ambitious scheme but if there are no major issues with the completion of Phases 1 and 2, the timescales should be achievable. He confirmed that he would report back to the committee in six months' time as he would have more information on the outcome of the funding application then. He assured the committee that he'd let them know if any of the project timescales do change.</li> <li>• Cllr Pat Hockey asked if we would be able to influence an increase in rolling stock due to expected growth over the next thirty years as what is adequate in 2022 will not necessarily still be right in 2032. James White confirmed that we will need to begin planning beyond Phases 1 and 2 through the new Great Western Franchise. He confirmed that rolling stock is critical to meet future passenger needs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action. James White to report back to the committee in six months to let them know the outcome of the application for funding to the Department for Transport's 'Large Local Major Transport Scheme Fund'.</b></p>
14	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p><b>Document packs.</b> It was mentioned that officers (and the public) still find the navigation of the paperwork for these meetings challenging. Officers will investigate solutions.</p> <p><b>Informal Scrutiny and Overview meetings.</b> An informal Skype meeting has been scheduled for the 10<sup>th</sup> of January 2018 and another invite will be sent out shortly for another Informal meeting to happen in February 2018 as well.</p> <p><b>Action. Officers to investigate solutions for issuing document packs.</b></p> <p>The Chair declared the meeting closed at 12.35pm.</p>

## Appendix 1 : Public Statements

### Statements Received

	Name, organisation
Item 1	David Redgewell, SWTN <b><i>Bristol Temple Meads Station and Portishead Railway Line</i></b>
Item 2	David Redgewell, SWTN <b><i>Disabled Access for public transport</i></b>
Item 3	Christina Biggs, Friends of Suburban Bristol Railway <b><i>Regional Rail Plan</i></b>
Item 4	Steve Maslin <b><i>West of England Inclusive Sustainability Unit</i></b>
Item 5	Cllr Eleanor Combley, Bristol City Council <b><i>MetroWest Update</i></b>

## Statement 1

David Redgewell, SWTN

### Bristol Temple Meads station

We are concerned about the lack of a master plan for the station due to the works that are about to commence on listed building consent for new new entrances and a gate line.

Our concerns are :-

1. On the Bonnaparte corridor it is the effect of having new gates on the platform of the listed building.
2. The need for full disabled access and ticket gates wide enough for wheelchairs.
3. a full DIA of the scheme by Network Rail including the addressing the issue of the bollards on the North entrance.
4. The need to design the scheme to be adaptable for when Platforms 1 & 0 are brought into use to allow cross platform interchange and connections with buses/taxis in the Friary and the ferry terminal. How will this work when these platforms are open?
5. Queen Annes gate should be fully accessible and the cobbles/setts need to be removed for full disabled access. This could mean relaying the setts for wheelchairs/buggies. A full DIA is required.
6. The ferry terminal needs to be fully accessible.
7. Bus shelters should be provided on the approach road.
8. Zoe Willcox needs to fully involved in the decision making process.

### Portishead railway line

1. Portishead railway station needs a full DIA of interchange between modes bus/taxi/wheelchair space.
2. Ease of connection to local buses needs to be designed into the scheme.
3. Pill station - a full DIA is required including links to the X4 bus stops from Station Road to the main road including Castle kerbs/dropped kerbs and waiting shelters.
4. with regards to the ramp an evaluation should be made for a lift alongside it.
5. Ashton Gate - the ramp is useful but not essential but passive provision should be made for the station at Barons Court.
6. Parson Street - provision should be made for a lift within Phase 2 of MetroWest.
7. Handrails and access improvements to the subway and CCTV are required at Bedminster station.
8. Lawrence Hill and Stapleton Road station need full disabled access.
9. Avonmouth station requires handrails for disabled access.
10. Sea Mills and Shirehampton need CCTV as does Severn Beach which should have a new car park.
11. MetroWest Phase 2 needs fully accessible stations at Charfield, Ashley Down, Henbury for the Mall, Filton North.
12. An evaluation is required for Saltford, Ashton Gate, Corsham, Stonehouse Bristol Road, Horfield and St Annes as part of ongoing works on MetroWest with MetroBus connections to Yate, Wotton-Under-Edge, Thornbury, Clevedon, Whitchurch and Clevedon.
13. On tram-train evaluation needs to take place on the Thornbury line, Whitchurch line and Midland Railway line from Bath to Bristol and Yate shared with a cycle path similar to Midland Metro.

14. We urgently require a WECA bus strategy and work on interchanges such as Bath Spa bus station and MetroBus to Bristol Parkway/Temple Meads/Cribbs Causeway.

A lack of a master plan means that the project is going ahead in a piecemeal fashion.

Regards  
DAVID REDGWELL SWTN

## Statement 2

David Redgewell, SWTN

### **Disable access for public transport**

Please find our response to the following issues :-

#### RAIL

We wish to see a rolling programme of fully accessible stations with each Network Rail route having a budget eg the .Western Region should be able to provide full disabled access at Lawrence Hill, Stapleton Road, Patchway, Parson Street as part of Metro West, lifts at Weston-Super-Mare, Nailsea and Backwell and Cheltenham Spa. Rural stations Saltash, Crediton, Yeoford, Bruton, Dorchester West, Yeovil Pen Mill and Junction also need to be fully accessible. There should be no derogation to Network Rail under the Equalities Act.

First Group has been pushing hard for Network Rail to adhere to design standards for accessible railway stations to include fully accessible toilets and baby changing places.

The Access For All Programme is far too slow and needs speeding up on a Mayoral and regional basis especially around Temple Meads station North entrance.

We believe it is important to maintain buffets to be specified with railway branding by Network Rail and the DFT with adequate opening hours in the same way as they did with British Rail (Travellers Fayre). On train catering is very important to disabled people and should be maintained in the franchise agreements by the DFT and Welsh/Scottish Governments.

We are concerned over the move away from maintained buffet services to trolleys and no buffet/trolley service whatsoever on Chiltern Railways and Southern Railways.

Action Point 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 & 16 we want to see the delivery of fully accessible trains speeded up by 2020. The scrapping of all Pacer units in the South West, all units refurbished to PRM-TSI standards. There should be no derogation by DFT/ORR and the Welsh Government.

Action 20 all buses should be fully accessible with folding ramps including rail replacement services which should be specified by the DFT as part of franchises.

Many areas of the South West don't have fully accessible taxis and this needs to be rectified in West Dorset and Stroud.

All new franchises should have an Equalities Customer Panel including Network Rail routes and disabled mystery travellers in all franchises similar to First Group operations.

All disabled facilities should be tested.

We need to respond to the new Great Western franchise keeping it as one whole unit with Network Rail Western. We do not support a loss making West of England Seven County franchise + the line to London.



You should also respond to the South West Railways consultation Bristol - Exeter - London/Weymouth lines.

#### COACHES/BUSES

All coach stations should be audited and fully accessible including Megabus and National Express.

The worst examples of poor facilities are Bridgwater services, Birmingham Hill St, Newcastle library.

Coach stations and stops need improving including dropped kerbs, shelters, RTI and subsidy.

#### FERRIES

These should be fully accessible on estuary's and local services eg Falmouth, Bristol Harbour.

#### AIRPORTS

Need improvement in customer service assistance to disabled people in the Airport Master Plan.

#### METROBUS

It needs to be developed at Bristol Parkway with access to the station as a matter of urgency and we support the UWE - Parkway link to Cribbs Causeway.

We must not use standard wheelchair widths from the DFT as it traps my wheelchair at Temple Meads.

Regards

DAVID REDGWELL SWTN

### Statement 3

Friends of Suburban Bristol Railway

## Friends of Suburban Bristol Railways (FOSBR) Statement to West of England Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee Wednesday 6 December 2017



FOSBR note that WECA still do not have a regional rail plan, and urge WECA to develop such a rail plan as part of the Joint Transport Plan 2018, along the lines of the attached FOSBR Rail Manifesto 2017. In particular we urge WECA to:

#### **A. Henbury Loop re-examination**

We note that the proposed Bristol City Council Rail Resilience Study referred to by WECA at the meeting on Monday 30 October 2017 is currently unfunded. We ask that WECA address FOSBR's challenges (attached) to the flawed 2015 CH2MHill report that we consider grossly underestimated the potential ridership on the Henbury Loop at that time, as follows:

1. recalculating the benefit–cost ratio (BCR) by including Severnside employment, the boost to existing Severn Beach Line stations from connectivity with the Henbury Loop, and ridership from Portway Park and Ride (none of which were considered in 2015);
2. carrying out a well-publicised public survey of likely new orbital journeys around the Henbury Loop and comparing rail transit times with bus times (not assuming everyone has a car, as in the 2015 study);
3. keeping the BCR on a level playing field by not assuming (as in 2015) a 30-year subsidy for the Loop line as against a 3-year subsidy for the Spur, and bringing the study up to date by:
4. revisiting the case for extending the Henbury Loop to Bristol Parkway now that Parkway's fourth platform has been built, and considering double-tracking across the Filton Diamond;
5. considering recent employment growth at Severnside and a possible station at Chittingen;
6. including the potential of the Brabazon hangar at North Filton, whether for the arena or another public amenity;
7. considering engineering solutions to mitigate the effect of the current level crossing at St Andrew's Gate on road traffic to the port, whether by resignalling or alternative road access;
8. investigating sources of funding from Highways England and the DfT (e.g. their fund for eliminating level crossings) for solving the port access issue;
9. considering other park and ride sites around the Henbury Loop, such as Henbury West and an A38 park and ride to serve Filton College.

#### **B. Rail Infrastructure – Bristol East Junction and Westerleigh Junction**

We draw WECA's attention to the works currently proceeding well on Filton Bank, just four years after Filton Bank was made a campaign priority by local politicians. Please continue to make the case for Bristol East Junction to be funded in Control Period 6 (2019–24) to allow MetroWest Phase 1 and 2 local services to run. In addition we note that Westerleigh Junction is currently inadequately configured for the current high volume north–south and east–west services.

### **C. Maximising use of existing suburban rail stations**

We note that WECA is being offered further funding from central government, and urge that those funds are not simply spent on feasibility studies alone. We suggest WECA construct a list of minor infrastructure improvements that can be delivered by using the new funding, such as replacing the footbridge at Pilning for £2m to permit a Park and Ride service. This could be used by Thornbury residents, for example, as soon as 2018.

### **D. Joint Transport Plan 2018**

We also ask WECA to consider station and line reopenings not mentioned in the Joint Transport Study (September 2017). We are cheered that WECA has promised to look again at our Thornbury Line proposal, and we draw WECA's attention to the full list of stations (including Chittening, Coalpit Heath, Corsham, Long Ashton and Locking) contained in our FOSBR Rail Manifesto 2017. We believe the FOSBR proposals would better serve the needs of the Joint Spatial Plan.

Christina Biggs (FOSBR Secretary)

## **Response to CH2M Hill's MetroWest Phase Two report**

**Statement to West of England Joint Transport Board, July 17th 2015, together with additional information for the Bristol City Council West of England Scrutiny (Call-in) meeting, 7th August 2015:**

- Rob Dixon, FOSBR/TFGB transport campaigner

### **PART ONE: Original Statement to West of England Joint Transport Board, July 17th 2015**

#### **Summary:**

Many things have been ignored or not considered in the MetroWest Phase 2 report: access to/from Severnside is not considered or even an objective of the scheme, despite the councils saying how important this area is for our economy and the fact that public transport in that area is very limited. We find this astonishing. We also find it hard to believe that only four extra journeys would be made each day from Henbury station on a loop service in view of the comparative ease of travelling to the Severnside employment area on that service. Related to these issues the report fails to acknowledge the impact of poor public transport journey times and their improvement (particularly by Henbury Loop) on attractiveness and patronage.

The demand forecasts are inadequate. They do not consider the impact on the network as a whole and demand that will be created by improved services, only the number of journeys from new stations. Worryingly the forecasts are calculated using incorrect and outdated Network Rail figures. This is an obvious example of the poor standard of analysis shown throughout the report. Having failed to consider key issues at all we believe the report is fatally flawed and wholly inadequate and does not provide an effective basis for good decision making.

This report illustrates the total lack of ambition of our local authorities. The most important objective appears to be to provide a rail scheme within the existing funding rather than creating an integrated and attractive network. Having carried out their analysis, under instruction from the councils, an option has been adjusted to make it cheaper with minimal further analysis.

Additionally the report has been produced ten days before the decision will be made and without any scrutiny whatsoever. This is poor practice and indicates the councils do not believe in what they are doing or have confidence in the consultants report. We certainly do not have confidence in the report.

**1) Despite saying that the Severnside and Northern Fringe would be the area that would benefit most from rail improvements, access to Avonmouth - Severnside enterprise zone has not been considered and is not even one of the objectives of the MetroWest Phase Two!**

The report lists objectives including access to areas of economic growth (section 2.4). However access to Avonmouth-Severnside is not listed as one of them. In addition to the 14,200 people employed in Avonmouth-Severnside in 2010, the LEP estimates there will be 6,000 to 12,000 additional jobs by 2026. The report notes that local employers are already concerned about the lack of public transport to serve their

employees who travel to work from a wide area. Much of Severnside is not currently served by any public transport and journey times to Avonmouth can be poor.

The report refers repeatedly to the need to promote economic growth and for rail improvements to avoid constraining growth and talks of the need for regeneration. However nowhere does it mention the need or desire to improve access Severnside and it is clear that this has not been considered.

The report draws on Atkins' *GVA Impacts of Major Transport Schemes*. However, Atkins also failed to consider the potential for improved access to Severnside. (The working assumption was of a Henbury spur). Atkins stated that "the impacts of rail schemes are likely to be concentrated on Temple Quarter and Bath." They considered that phase 1 (the Severn Beach line) was the relevant scheme for Severnside and ignored the potential for accessing Severnside via Henbury Loop. This historic ignorance of the line's potential is why access to Severnside has also not been considered in the current report.

We believe the potential impact of the Henbury Loop on access to employment around the network would be considerable. As well as the line enabling direct travel from elsewhere, the Park and Ride rail station at Portway could act as a park and ride for the North Fringe, while a park and ride at North Filton station (on the A38) would serve Severnside.

## **2) Accessing Severnside by public transport is simply not possible at the moment and the report fails to acknowledge this.**

*"The Henbury Loop would provide quick and efficient public transport from North Bristol and the North Fringe where currently none exists".*

This report compares journey times to Severnside by public transport but fails to acknowledge that buses only serve Avonmouth or an hourly bus to Severn Beach, which does not run at times convenient for most shift workers. At the moment there is no public transport to most of the business parks at Severnside. There is no acknowledgement that those without a private car have difficulty accessing the area and that only rail services on the Henbury Loop could provide an opportunity for this, particularly for those living in areas of significant deprivation in the inner city.

## **3) There is no acknowledgement or analysis of the impact of better journey times or more convenient public transport journeys on car use and congestion by Henbury Loop**

While the report notes that a Henbury Loop would provide faster journey times to Severnside destinations from North Bristol and the North Fringe in comparison to a Spur, the importance for this in terms of attractiveness of service or to encourage people to use public transport instead of their car is not considered.

There is no acknowledgement that current journey times by bus (or service timings) are unattractive and unacceptable to most potential users or that proposed journey times via the Henbury spur and Severn Beach line would be little better and unlikely to encourage use of public transport. It would take 65 minutes to travel from Henbury to Severn Beach or 56 minutes to Avonmouth via Henbury spur train, rather than 26 minutes or 11 minutes by the Henbury Loop. Such journey times via the spur would not encourage people to use

public transport.

The Henbury Spur would only provide quick public transport into central Bristol. It would do nothing for people wanting to travel between Henbury and Avonmouth. We do not believe that the long journey times by Henbury Spur would not make these journeys attractive by public transport or encourage people out of their cars. The report has not considered this at all."

#### **4) The importance of cost rather than quality of service:**

Having considered the different service options, since all four options exceed the current budget the consultants have proposed removing Constable Road (Horfield/Lockleaze) station from the cheaper option in order to stay within the budget. The impact of this is not considered in any detail.

The most important objective appears to be to provide a rail scheme at the minimum cost.

Rather than attempt to seek funding for better, more attractive options that maximise the potential of the whole network the report appears to value ensuring that any proposed scheme is within the current budget, over its effectiveness. This highlights everything that is wrong with the values of the consultants' report and of our local authorities: cheap is valued over ambition, attractiveness and effectiveness.

#### **5) Inadequate demand forecasts that do not consider the impact on the network as a whole, only the demand at new stations**

- there is no mention of journeys to/from Severnside and no forecast of demand travel to new stations, i.e. there is no recognition that people may want to travel between Avonmouth and Henbury, e.g. to access work at Severnside or North Fringe.
- there is no forecast of any impact of Metro Phase 2 on demand at existing stations, i.e. the potential for increases in passenger numbers due to more convenient and new journeys around the network as a whole.
- other stations are only mentioned in relation to the negative impact of new stations on existing ones, not any stimulation of demand.

#### **6) There is no consideration of the potential for rail improvements encouraging people to use public transport.**

Despite mentioning the large increases of passenger numbers on the Severn Beach line, it fails to consider that these have resulted from service improvements which made the service more attractive. We believe a more attractive rail network would have a similar but greater impact.

The report predicts minimal change to road congestion based on current "low" rail usage. As found throughout the report, it does not consider the potential for a more attractive service across the local network to encourage more people to use public transport rather than driving, as has been seen on the Severn Beach line where passenger numbers doubled when the service was improved.

#### **7) The report report predicts that only *four* more journeys would be made from**



## **Henbury and North Filton stations with a Loop compared to the spur. This seems highly unlikely!**

Do the consultants honestly think that *only four people* will take advantage of easy access to employment at Severnside from North Bristol and the North Fringe or travel in the opposite direction to employment from Severnside?! As elsewhere this ignores the effect of convenience on people's willingness to take the train.

## **8) Poor assumptions of the growth of demand based on the use of incorrect and outdated Network Rail figures**

The use of old and incorrect figures illustrates a poor standard of analysis, shown throughout the report.

It is concerning to note that the figures used in the report for future growth are outdated ones from old Network Rail reports (3% p.a. to 2019 and 2.3% p.a. 2020-2023) and which have subsequently been revised upwards (5% p.a. 2012-2023). As it is Network Rail's future forecasts have been criticised as too low by the West of England authorities and Severnside Community Rail Partnership.

Despite highlighting and listing the large increases in passenger numbers on local rail lines in the last 10 years, the report refers to a lower regional average as the current rate of growth. It also makes the assumption that increases will reduce from 10-12% per annum at Bristol and South Glos local stations to only 3% by 2017 – in two years' time. There is no sign of this happening.

There is no mention of growth around the network due to the release of latent demand by service improvements.

9) Finally we see that the report notes that there has been **no passive provision made for construction of stations on Filton Bank** at Ashley Hill and Constable Road so the costs of building these stations include costs for resignalling and/or the movement of electrification equipment. This, despite the need having been highlighted by campaigners three years' ago.

## **PART TWO: Further information for the Bristol City Council West of England Scrutiny (Call-in) meeting, 7th August 2015**

“CLARITY OF AIMS AND DESIRED OUTCOMES” – ACCESS TO SEVERNサイド  
Peter Mann's '*Officer Response to Councillors*' in Appendix E of the documents prepared for this meeting that, “The Business Case has identified that the stated objectives for MetroWest can be achieved through the progression of Henbury Spur...” is disingenuous.

**Access between the North Fringe and Severnside is *not* an objective of MetroWest Phase Two. It has been considered only in terms of its impact on the economy. How to best serve this passenger demand has not been considered. This indicates a lack of strategic thinking.**

The stated objectives of MetroWest Phase Two (listed in Section 2.4 of the report) do

*not* include access to and from Severnside and Avonmouth, i.e. between Severnside and the North Fringe. **Access to Severnside is considered an objective of MetroWest Phase One, the half hourly service on the Severn Beach line. As is repeatedly made clear in the CH2M Hill report, MetroWest Phase Two provides access to Severnside via the Severn Beach Line from Temple Meads or Stapleton Road, which is considered sufficient.**

Comparison timings are given for buses for journeys to Severnside but these are also inaccurate (see below) and only relate to journeys to Avonmouth. Such inaccuracies may have an impact on passenger demand predictions.

**Despite the Henbury Loop providing more attractive and quicker access to Severnside and around the over the network as a whole the report states that only twelve extra journeys a day would be made over the whole network with the Loop in comparison to the Spur in 2031 – which equates to about eight journeys (four returns) a day in 2021** after the report's (low) predicted increases in demand are taken into account. These figures seem highly unlikely in view of the West of England LEP's estimate of 6,000 to 12,000 new jobs in Severnside by 2026, in addition to the 14,200 employed there in 2010.

#### FORECASTS OF INCREASE IN PASSENGER NUMBERS

Peter Mann is technically correct to say that “historic growth” levels have been considered. However they have only been used to show buoyant demand for rail as evidence of the need for MetroWest but that is all. **CH2M Hill report assumes that high levels of growth seen for the last 10 -15 years will suddenly cease, dropping from 10-12% in 2013-4 to 3% in 2017.**

As noted in my statement to the Leaders' Board, the figures used in Section 3.3.4 are outdated and/or misleading and lower than Network Rail's cautious predictions:

- Current and past increases in passenger numbers are assumed to suddenly taper off by 2017.
- Rather than taper the increase from figures for the area in which the new stations are located – Bristol (12%) and South Glos (10%) – the lower West of England average of 5.6% is used for 2014.
- The figure tapers down to reach “the RUS average rate” of 3.0% for 2018 and 2019. This figure was that proposed for 2009-19 in Network Rail's Rail Utilisation Strategy. These growth predictions were exceeded at most regional stations by 2013/4. Their predictions were superseded and twice revised upwards in the Great Western Route Strategy and its preparatory work (2013/2014), to 47% then 54% (for 2012-23), i.e. 4% per annum. These figures were also considered by many to be too cautious. This has been confirmed by growth of about 20% in Bristol & South Glos for 2012-14 (five years' predicted growth).
- **The MetroWest report uses irrelevant figures for 2023 to 2043.** Although Network Rail's Route Strategy gives four different economic scenarios with different growth rates (6%, 14%, 35% and 54% for 2012-23, and 22%, 52%, 64% and 121% for 2023-43), Network Rail focus on the highest figures (54% for 2012-23 or an average of 4% p.a. and 121% for 2012-2043 or an average of 1.8% after 2023). Their investment plans are made on those assumptions.

However the MetroWest report uses an average of Network Rail's scenario figures for 2020 onwards, despite two of these already having been exceeded for 2012-23. Instead of 4% p.a 2012-23 tapering to 1.8% p.a after 2023, they describe tapering from 3% in 2019 to 2.3% in 2023 reducing to 1.3% after this.

**To summarise, the figures in the CH2M Hill MetroWest report used are lower than Network Rail's (already cautious) figures and unlikely to give an accurate picture of passenger demand. CH2M Hill's figures assume growth of 29% to 2023, whereas Network Rail's are almost double at 54%. The figures after 2023 This weakens the business case and the Benefit Cost Ratio for both Loop and Spur.**

DEMAND FORECASTS – comparison with existing stations

**The CH2M Hill Report predicted passenger numbers for the new stations are unrealistically low.** They have 'paired' them with existing stations to which they are supposed to be similar. **The predicted use is much lower, lower in fact than any Bristol or South Glos station except Shirehampton and Sea Mills. For example the 2013/4 figure for Ashley Down (paired with Montpelier) is 63,295 (spur) / 63,331 (loop) compared to Montpelier's 121,294.**

CH2M Hill give figures for 2021. To compare them to existing stations' use in 2013/14 (for when most recent data is available), these have been reduced by 29.2% in line with CH2M Hill's own predicted passenger increases, (which we consider unrealistically low). This suggests the following:

Constable Road 26,692 (spur)/ 26,727 (loop)  
Ashley Down 63,295 (spur) / 63,331 (loop)  
Montpelier (paired with Ashley Down) 121,294  
Henbury 69,986 (spur) / 70,800 (loop)  
Patchway (paired with Henbury) 90,404  
North Filton 65,348 / 65,986 (loop)  
Avonmouth 111,440  
Bedminster 83,242  
Redland 93,176  
Parson Street 102,654

Additionally, according to CH2M Hill's report, between 78,000 and 120,000 extra journeys will be made at existing stations in 2031. Reducing these figures to consider growth in passenger demand from 2014 to 2031, these equates only to between 44,600 and 68,200 journeys per annum. If we consider that Bristol and South Gloucestershire's local stations had 2,117,270 passengers in 2013/4, this assumes an increase of only 2 – 3%. Since the improved service on the Severn Beach line (from hourly to approximately every 45 minutes) resulted in an increase of 37% at those stations this appears low.

As noted previously, there are also low figures given for the impact of Henbury Loop in comparison to the spur, which appear unlikely in view of easier access to Severnside, which is largely inaccessible by bus at present.

**These low figures and poor growth assumptions will have impacted**

**negatively on the assumptions about revenue support, the business case and the Benefit Cost Ratio for both Loop and Spur.**

#### WEST OF ENGLAND ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

Peter Mann states in the '*Officer Response to Councillors*' that a Loop option could not be chosen because it commits the West of England authorities to only approve schemes that have a BCR exceeding 2:1. This is not, as he suggests, because government insist on this, but because the authorities have chosen to do this.

**Other authorities, such as those in and around Manchester and Birmingham, have different rules that allow the building of strategically important schemes, (such as Docklands Light Railway), that do not meet BCR requirements.**

#### THE BUDGET

Much has been made of the current budget of £41.6 million. It should be noted that **this figure was arrived at in the study of the proposed costs of the Henbury Spur, not by any process to consider what was required.**

Due to the need for resignalling around Avonmouth and the Port of Bristol, which has not been included in Network Rail's resignalling programme, and issues of access to the port, **the budget for Henbury Loop is likely to unfairly include items for which the local councils should not be responsible. It is vital that the councils put continuous and active pressure on government and Network Rail to pay for these issues for which they are and should remain responsible.**

#### DUE CONSULTATION

A decision was made on July 10th, three days after the report was released. The media report a decision had been made and it had been announced to staff of one of the local authorities by their Chief Executive the previous month. There was no consultation whatsoever. Regular meetings with stakeholders about MetroWest have taken place over the last two years but these are of an 'information provision' nature, rather than to seek or encourage stakeholder views.

#### CONCLUSION

**In conclusion, FOSBR believes that the CH2M Hill report is of poor quality, fails to consider key issues, in particular access to Severnside, and includes poor predictions of passenger numbers and growth. It fails to adequately consider strategic objectives and needs. These factors mean that the the business case and the Benefit Cost Ratio for both Loop and Spur are inaccurate and the report is flawed.**

## FOSBR Rail Manifesto 2017

FOSBR calls on the West of England Combined Authority, our MPs and councillors to secure funding for the following projects for Network Rail to deliver within Control Period 6 (2019-2024):

- four-tracking of Filton Bank and remodelling of Bristol East Junction;
- cross-regional plan for Park and Ride, prioritising Portway P&R;
- MetroWest Phase 1 to Portishead via Pill and a half-hour service from Avonmouth to Bath, as these are long overdue and urgently needed;
- MetroWest Phase 2 to Henbury, Yate and Gloucester via Ashley Hill;
- electrification to Bristol Temple Meads via Filton and Bath;
- Temple Meads Spatial Plan to include Station Street as a minimum;
- redeveloping and regenerating suburban stations for best use of land.

We also press WECA and the constituent local authorities to make sure the following is included in the Great Western Franchise 2020—2027/2030:

- maximising use of the existing local rail network by optimising public access to all local stations (disabled access, local signposting and cycle storage at stations and on trains, rail-bus interchange, shelter);
- multi-modal smart ticketing, with guards for safety on all trains;
- improve the timetable to complete a 30 minute service to currently ill-served local stations such as Parson St, Bedminster and Patchway;
- ensuring that the Phase 1 hourly service to Severn Beach is reliable;
- increasing service frequency to 20 or 15 minutes according to passenger demand, by providing passing loops such as at Sea Mills;
- replace the footbridge at Pilning to permit a meaningful commuter service, starting with a trial daily commuter service to build the business case for a Park and Ride serving the M49.

In the longer term, we also urge WECA to make sure the following are included in the Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) and Joint Transport Study, and that these elements are funded by the 30-year devolution deal as a priority:

- JSP stations Horfield, St Anne's, Saltford, Ashton Gate & Charfield;
- Completion of Henbury Loop and double-tracking Severn Beach Line;
- Adding FOSBR MetroWest Phase 3 proposals for five further stations at Coalpit Heath, Chittening, Uphill/Locking, Corsham & Long Ashton;
- electrification of local lines using hybrid or battery trains;
- extending the Tytherington freight line to Thornbury.





## The Future of MetroWest Phase 3



© FSBR 2017



**Statement 4**  
Steve Maslin



**Proposal:**

- To establish a unit to support public sector entities within the West of England (former Avon area) with regards to fostering and delivering Inclusively Sustainable Environments under the Social Value Act, Health and Social Care Act, Health and Social Impact Assessments, and the Equality Act (including its Public Sector Equality Duty). In other words providing technical support in relation to wellbeing of diverse people in the region, including disabled people, younger people and older people, whilst also seeking to help public sector organisations to address short term and long term costs.
- There is also scope to source/ provide additional assessment capabilities within a Systems approach to wider Sustainability, such as: Social Return on Investments assessments, Environmental Accounting, Environmental Impact Assessments, Strategic Environment Assessments and Economic Evaluations. This could then provide opportunity of wider contextual insights if sought after - in addition to diverse public engagement and inclusive health and social (environment and service) assessment.
- Envisaged participants include:
  - Public sector entities such as:
    - West of England Combined Authority (WECA),
    - West of England Local Enterprise Partnership,
    - Bristol, South Gloucestershire and BANES within WECA,
    - North Somerset,
    - local NHS trusts,
    - local Universities
    - and other organisations within the region who undertake public functions, such as utilities;
  - Other organisations within and outside the region wishing to participate, who wish to better address their duties under legislation
- Incubated via the Schumacher Institute as a Social Enterprise (possibly CIC) aimed at assisting participating organisations with their statutory duties - in keeping with the Schumacher institute's' People Matter theme.

- To provide a context in which expertise and public engagement can influence decision making as it impacts on the people who live in, work in and visit our region – particularly disabled, younger and older people.
- To provide means by which members of existing representative / stakeholder groups can, not only continue to interact with decision makers, but that outcomes might also improve as a result of a change of approach.

### Reasons:

- Strategic opportunities are being missed as it applies to considering the health, welling, living, education, employment and economic implications of project decisions.
- Meanwhile, It is apparent that projects are being delivered in the region (either through public bodies or through the planning and building regulations) process that often fail to engage with people and fail to properly scrutinise proposals nor properly apply legislation, regulations, standards and guidance.
- By establishing such a unit, one could achieve economy of scale through regional pooling of resources.

### Core Aims:

- To provide strategic Inclusive Sustainability Design thinking on **Policy** to the extent that it impacts on project briefs through to execution.
- To provide brief development input and scrutiny to:
  - o **Project Proposals** emanating within participating organisations and
  - o through the pre-application and **Planning** application processes of Local Planning Authorities and Building Control

### Core Objectives:

- To enable participating organisations to better consider health and diverse social needs, including disabled, younger and older people during decision making processes - *with* the intention of raising the quality of the User Experience / Usability of environments for everyone – (including people from different cultures and identities) - ranging from young children through to older people.
- To enable participating organisations to better instruct their project managers, design consultants, contractors and facilities managers – whilst better understanding the implications and impacts upon their own overall duties under the Public Sector Equality Duty, Equality Act and Social Value Act etc.

### Additional Opportunities:

- To develop methodology, standards and means for evaluating and accrediting cities and regions with regards to the organisational **Attitude** and **Action** towards inclusive sustainability and the level of **Accessibility** achieved within given contexts relating to disabled, younger people, older people etc...
- To foster and engage in action research.
- In order to sustain and support the core aims there are potential opportunities:
  - o To facilitate training and to mentor members of representative / stakeholder groups wishing to upskills and participate in audits and reporting.

- To facilitate Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and mentoring to employees of participating organisations involved in policy, decision making, facilities management and scrutiny.
- To facilitate CPD and mentoring to members of external organisations contracted into project delivery - ranging from design team members through to construction team members.

#### **Core Cost Drivers:**

- Base, Oversight, Administration, Employing Expertise, Transport, use of Engagement Venues and Inclusive Communication / Interpretation.

#### **Revenue Sources:**

- Baseline membership fee from participating organisations in order to sustain a core functions.
- Not for-profit based fees for undertaking virtual in-house project by project support services
  - In order to enable participating organisations to address their statutory duties
  - supported by standing orders within participating organisation to submit their projects
- Not for profit fees for supporting project by project core planning and building control scrutiny processes.
- Training course fees
- Research grants.

***Strap Line: A region where everyone – i.e. “We is You” - are included in project decisions and outcomes: We is You - WE IS U - WEISU - West of England Inclusive Sustainability Unit***

## **Statement 5**

Cllr Eleanor Combley, Bristol City Council

### **MetroWest Update**

I welcome the ambitious rail infrastructure here – new local lines and stations are sorely needed. I know the proposed Ashley Hill station in my own ward would have a big impact on relieving transport issues as well as being of benefit to our local football and cricket clubs. That said, given that large projects like this are prone to slippage, I do wonder how realistic the deadline of 2021 is for all the stated work.

I also note with disappointment the continued refusal to reopen the Henbury loop to passenger services. This seems to me a missed opportunity to add flexibility and resilience to our rail network.