



Bristol Transport Board
Zoom meeting

Notes – Tuesday 8th September 2020 11:00-13:00

Board Members Present:	Cllr Kye Dudd Melanie Watson David Redgewell Brett Jon Usher Paul Hassan Ann O'Driscoll	<i>Transport Portfolio Holder, Bristol City Council (Co-Chair)</i> <i>Transport Focus (Co-Chair)</i> <i>Equalities</i> <i>UNITE</i> <i>Sustrans</i> <i>Communities</i> <i>Business West</i>	Graham Parkhurst Rupert Cox Peter Evans	<i>UWE</i> <i>Stagecoach</i> <i>Business West</i>
Associates Present:	Jason Humm	<i>WECA</i>		
Guests	Jake Pryor Pete Woodhouse	<i>Bristol City Council</i> <i>Bristol City Council</i>		
Apologies:	Sue Arrowsmith Stephen Peacock Patsy Mellor	<i>Women's Commission</i> <i>Bristol City Council</i> <i>Bristol City Council</i>	Simon Cowley Nuala Gallagher	<i>Mayors Office</i> <i>Bristol City Council</i>

Subject	Notes / action necessary	Officer responsible	Date
1.	Councillor Dudd opened the meeting and thanked everyone for attending. The apologies were noted.		
2. Update on Phase 1 and Phase 2 Covid	Jacob Pryor (Bristol City Council) shared a presentation of the temporary measures introduced to improve walking, cycling and public transport usage in Bristol. Bristol City Council had received a share of the £820k awarded to WECA by the government.		

Subject	Notes / action necessary	Officer responsible	Date
Recovery Schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that Bristol Bridge closure to general traffic was the most significant • Noted that the Lewins Mead Cycle lane was having an adverse impact on bus punctuality and was subject to ongoing monitoring. <p>Phase 2 measures being considered included: (WECA may receive up to £3m)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park Row – Upper Maudlin cycle lanes • More secure cycle hangars/storage <p>Discussion points/questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over cycle thefts, the need for further secure storage especially in the city centre, availability in evenings too, not just working hours. • Concerns over aggressive bike thefts – and bike jacking – the need for CCTV monitoring and police activity need to work with youth and community – possible gaps since the removal of youth workers. • The need for early engagement and cooperation to deliver for the community and with the community. • New DfT criteria were welcomed but they do require more road space to implement and therefore have a greater impact. <p>In response to questions on implementing more schemes on radials and not just the city centre, the officers explained that plans were being brought forward for other areas, not just the city centre, and whilst the new standards were welcomed, they would require more space, segregation and therefore more funding. The first schemes were generally simpler to implement and were already in the planning/design stages.</p> <p>On feedback via the public portal and map, officers regularly meet to discuss what had been received and how to act on it.</p> <p>There was a general feeling that there needed to be a greater level of evaluation with greater public visibility and more community involvement.</p>		

Subject	Notes / action necessary	Officer responsible	Date
	<p>Specific concerns were raised about the unintended consequences of the Lewis Mead changes which were having a serious impact on worsening bus punctuality, especially in the PM peak. Concern was also raised for the impact on disabled users and difficulties in boarding buses.</p> <p>Cllr Dudd undertook to look at measures to alleviate the bus punctuality issues including revising signal timings and to investigate the potential for a continuous bus lane in that area.</p> <p>Consultation:</p> <p>After a lengthy debate about consultation the limited engagement, issues arising from St Marks Road, the offer made by members of the Board to work on a different way to engage (which wasn't taken up), it was agreed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better levels of early engagement were needed • There must be a real effort to do things differently <p>Early engagement to listen to communities was far more likely to deliver better outcomes than what felt as 'officials asking residents to approve the plans already determined'.</p> <p>The need to explain the wider context and individual schemes are part of a wide co-ordinated plan. Think about the language – green spaces, or public space rather than 'road closure' as the road was still open to certain users.</p>		
<p>3. Clean Air Zone Update (Kye Dudd)</p>	<p>Cllr Dudd updated the meeting on the latest on the Clean Air Zone. A Transport Board subgroup had met and provided their comments which were fed into the Cabinet Meeting on 1st September. The Board were broadly supportive of the plan.</p> <p>The Cabinet approved the paper and would follow a twin track approach with a CAZ 'C'</p>		

Subject	Notes / action necessary	Officer responsible	Date
	<p>wider zone which would charge commercial vehicles and a smaller CAZ 'D' zone based on the City Centre only, which would charge all non-compliant vehicles. These twin tracks were being followed in addition to monitoring to establish whether Covid measures and the emergency active travel changes would reduce harmful emissions sufficiently to avoid the need for a charging zone.</p> <p>A full business case was required by the Government on 26 Feb 2021 with a clear plan for implementation, if required, by October 2021. The following points were raised in discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Businesses in particular wanted certainty so that they could make appropriate plans, this was lacking at present. • Request for the Transport Board to be involved earlier in the process to help shape thinking rather than be consulted after proposal formed (Kye explained particular legal challenge and complications specifically around Clean Air). • The CAZ 'D' zone would charge all non-compliant vehicles which meant non Euro 6 diesels and petrol engines before 2005. • Suggestion that all possible tools should be used including workplace charging and CAZ's to ensure target of Net Zero by 2030 is achieved. • The need to work together with neighbouring authorities to have a coordinated approach within WECA. • In response to a question about the previous proposal to charge all diesel cars it was explained that the government would need to lay new legislation in parliament and given all other parliamentary business, this would take some time and therefore wouldn't meet the test of delivery in the shortest time. • Concern was raised over tourist coaches being charged and deterred from bringing visitors and damaging our tourist economy and recovery. • Concerns also raised over scheduled coaches which might not all be Euro 6 compliant and no grants were available. Also Stagecoach raised concerns as they operated contracted services with buses that were not Euro 6 and the commercial case would be challenging to upgrade without a contract price change. 		

Subject	Notes / action necessary	Officer responsible	Date
	<p>Cllr Dudd undertook to meet Stagecoach and any other operators to explore options.</p>		
<p>4. Multi Board Update</p>	<p>Melanie Watson updated the Board on the previous days One City Multi Board Meeting.</p> <p>The key points were centred around the refresh of the One City Plan and how to build back the City. Various ideas were discussed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggesting we follow three themes of focusing on public health, a child friendly city and economic growth, rather than transport in its own right. • How to engage people but retain reality checks/evaluation and ensure deliverability. • Be more visionary in future dates rather than too specific for 3 tasks in later years such as 2047. • Transport tends to be discussed as projects rather than its wider contribution. • Need to engage communities and bring people along e.g. Clean Air is about the type of city we want, not just the air pollution. <p>Action: Guidance will be issued on 16 September – guidance will be reviewed and members updated on the proposed plan to develop the One City Plan.</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>30/9/20</p>
<p>5. LTP 5</p>	<p>Jason Humm gave a brief summary of the position and Melanie Watson wanted the Transport Board to agree what key elements they wanted to see as the new plan was being formulated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The JLTP4 had too much road building within it and many plans were to mitigate additional traffic from housing developments contained in the Joint Spatial Plan – which had not been agreed/adopted. • The measures were insufficient to meet Net Zero by 2030. • The Bus Strategy would need to change to take account of Covid/social distancing. • Far more account of Climate Change was required. • The rail plan was not sufficiently ambitious and timescales for Metro West enhancements were slipping. • More active transport (walking, cycling, public transport) measures were needed. 		

Subject	Notes / action necessary	Officer responsible	Date
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very clear set of objectives and delivery plans to achieve them were required. • The Vision needs to be front and centre to sell the message to residents and the need for change. <p>Action: All to consider further points and email to AP by 9 October for consolidation and feedback to WECA.</p>	All	9/10/20
6. AOB	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request for a Sub Group meeting to update the Board on the transport elements of the Temple Quay developments. AP to arrange Sub Group post mtg. 1100 on 15 October 2020 2. Request for a meeting to consider how bus and rail services are meeting customer needs in the Covid restrictions/changes recently made. 3. Question as to whether the Board will be formally responding to the consultation on pavement parking. 4. Request for a written briefing on the 'e' scooter trial by WECA for the region. 5. Cycling Works – a campaign by employers in Bristol and S Gloucestershire – note to circulate <p>Meeting Closed 13:00</p>	<p>AP</p> <p>AP</p> <p>AP</p> <p>AP</p> <p>AP</p>	<p>15/10/2020</p> <p>Nov/2020</p> <p>Oct 2020</p> <p>30/9/2020</p> <p>30/9/2020</p>