

Louise Hidalgo statement

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this call in. I intend to speak to points 1, 2, 3 and 7 of the reasons for Call-in.

My statement is also partly inspired by the council's response to the call in which arrived late last night, and which I'm sure you've all had a chance to read.

Now that response says - the provision of a park and ride to the east is '**embedded** in council policy'. Well it might be 'embedded' in policy, and certainly lots of policies do mention it. But the crucial point here is that none **approve** it.

According to the Council's response, 'the evidential need for P&R has been identified' in 4.31 to 4.51 of the Cabinet report'. But that evidence falls far short of the evidence needed for a project of this sort. This evidence that they talk about is ...

--- A survey taken during the Christmas market - so, during an a-typically busy - in fact the busiest - time of year

--- The 2011 census analyzing work patterns - so, BEFORE the 3 Ministry of Defence sites in the city were closed - so not a proper picture of what work patterns are like now, in 2017, let alone in a few years time

-- And thirdly, research for the Transport Strategy which predicted that there would be 400 extra trips in the morning peak. However, the report to Cabinet omitted to say - this is one of a NUMBER of significant omissions in the report - that this research was updated by CH2M in 2016.

CH2M originally thought that 1,600 spaces would be needed, but it then revised this figure and NOW says only between four and five hundred spaces are needed.

The Council's response to the call-in says that there is more evidence of the need for an eastern Park & Ride in item 4 of the background information paper. Unfortunately, however, we have not able to find this background paper - and i don't know if anyone here has had better luck with that/

The response also says that sites A,B and F were three viable sites emerging from the Halcrow report. Now, I don't know - I wonder if they've actually read the Halcrow report. The BMA has.

The Halcrow report didn't evaluate Site F. Site F was in the report for 'comparison purposes only'. There are eight sites listed in the Halcrow Report - but the conclusion gives feedback on just seven of them. The site that was left out is Site F - and that was because in July 2011 the council RESOLVED not to go ahead with the eastern Park & Ride on site F.

And that same resolution asked officers to look for alternative sites for the Park & Ride - and the Halcrow Report WAS that search for alternatives to Site F.

Also - as for site A being viable - well, the Halcrow report pointed out that Site A was in a flood zone 3 (so, high risk), the access was too steep, it would affect the River Avon site of special conservation interest - and the playing field would have to be replaced.

And it concluded - 'it is considered that the issues; notably flood risk, rule against further consideration of this site.'

So, in short, neither site A or site F should ever have been included in the subsequent consultation.

We are told that the Cabinet members - in delegating powers under Section 122 of the Local government Act 1972 - understood the implications. But did they really? Given that - when Maria Lucas was asked what this meant - she told members that she would give them a briefing on this later - AFTER the vote!

And if you look on the webcam you can see that in the end Councillor Moss had to read out a definition on his laptop from Wikipedia.

These are not minor procedural errors. The Cabinet report was often misleading, and inadequate. And any decision that was made on the basis of this report is unsound. Please do the right thing. Send it back to Council and demand proper evidence and information from your officers.