

DISCLAIMER

The attached minutes are DRAFT minutes. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information, statements and decisions recorded in them, their status will remain that of a draft until such time as they are confirmed as a correct record at the subsequent meeting.



Agenda Item No: 5

Bristol City Council

Minutes of Place Scrutiny Commission

Thursday 31st July 2014 at 10.00am

Members Present:-

Councillors Martin (Chair), Bolton, Khan, Jackson, Negus, Pearce, Threlfall, Windows

Officers in Attendance:- Zoe Willcox, Robert Orrett, Stephen Hilton, Peter Watts, Claire Teasdale, Kris Donaldson, Stuart Woods, Lucy Fleming, Johanna Holmes, Jeremy Livitt

1. Apologies for Absence (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies were received from Councillor Claire Hiscott.

2. Membership of the Scrutiny Commission (Agenda Item 2)

RESOLVED - that the membership for the 2014/15 Municipal Year be noted as set out on the front of the Agenda.

3. Confirmation of Chair (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED - that it is noted that Councillor Martin was confirmed as Chair for Place Scrutiny Commission for 2014/15 municipal year at Full Council on 10 June 2014.

4. Confirmation of Vice- Chair (Agenda Item 4)

RESOLVED – that it is noted that Councillor Hiscott was confirmed as Vice-Chair for Place Scrutiny Commission for 2014/15 municipal year at Full Council on 10 June 2014.

5. Public Forum (Agenda Item 5)

Members received statements from the following individuals:

- (1) David Redgewell – South West Trains Franchise Extension, North Fringe Centre Metro Bus Plans – Application Number 14/01187/FB, Metro West Economic Strategy for Transport and the Duty To Co-operate in the South West of England and Bus Service Review (Statements 01 to 03 + Additional Statement)
- (2) Richard Rankin, Number Seven Boat Trip Limited – Bristol Ferry Boat Company – Statement 04 (Redacted Statement)
- (3) Daphne Muir – Removal of a Pensioner from Park Street on 1st June 2014 – Statement 05

Members agreed that Statement Number 02 (North Fringe Centre Metro Bus Plans – Application Number 14/01187/FB) should also be referred to a future meeting of the People Scrutiny Commission (ie after 31st July 2014 meeting) to address the issues of Disabled Access.

The Commission discussed issues relating to Statement 04 as follows:

- (1) The reasons behind the redaction of parts of the statement were explained to members
- (2) Members needed reassurance that the complaint was dealt with but it was not for the Commission itself to deal with this matter. This issue did, however, raise concerns about how outstanding issues might not be properly picked up between different officers
- (3) The important role of ferries in transporting the citizens of Bristol across the city had long been missed and needed to be picked up as part of an overall Transport Strategy. A walking strategy was another important part of this strategy

The Service Director (Property) apologised to Mr Rankin and stated that he would examine this case and give him a response within 2 weeks (to be copied in to the Chair). He did, however, strongly refute charges of nepotism against him and the Harbour Master and emphasised that decisions were made on the basis of what was right.

Members agreed to take Statement 05 together with Agenda Item 11 to which the item relates.

Details of each of these Public Forum statements, including all appropriate paperwork for each of them, are included within the Minute Book.

RESOLVED – that

- (1) a copy of Statement 02 is submitted to the next available meeting of the People Scrutiny Commission**
- (2) the complaint outlined in Statement 04 will be dealt with by the Service Director (Property Services) within 2 weeks and the Chair advised accordingly**
- (3) a report addressing the need for any action arising out of the complaint under Statement 04, be submitted as part of the report on**

Transport Issues to be submitted to October 2014 meeting of the Place Scrutiny Commission.

6. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 6)

There were none.

7. Minutes of the Sustainable Development and Transport Scrutiny Commissions – 19th March 2014 and 27th March 2014 (Agenda Item 7)

Members commented that there were a number of actions within the minutes of 19th March 2014 meeting and that there was no indication of how these would be implemented.

The Democratic Services Officer confirmed that for future meetings of this Scrutiny Commission there would be an Action Sheet produced which would outline all actions for future meetings, together with individuals responsible for implementing them and any relevant timescales, together with progress in each case.

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the above meeting be signed and confirmed as a correct record by the Chair subject to an additional sentence being added to the 19th March 2014 minutes stating that the Mayor confirmed that his response to the Cross Party Working Group on the RPZ's would be available for the next scheduled Scrutiny Commission.

8. Whipping (Agenda Item 8)

It was noted that no notice had been given concerning use of the party whip for any item.

9. Chair's Business (Agenda Item 9)

The Chair asked that a copy of the Quality of Life Data Set be circulated to members.

RESOLVED - that a copy of the Quality of Life Data Set be circulated to members of the Scrutiny Commission.

10 Annual Business Report – including a supplementary report outlining the Mayor's response to the RPS Cross-Party Working Group (Agenda Item 10)

The Scrutiny Commission received a report confirming the Commission's Terms of Reference, proposing meeting dates for 2014/15 and discussing the Work Programme for 2014/15. They also received a supplementary report with the Mayor's response to the RPS Cross-Party Working Group.

Members made the following comments:

- (1) There was discussion concerning possible options for dates – it was agreed that the proposed dates for September, October, November and December 2014 should be as set out in the report with dates for January and March 2015 to be held at 11am on the suggested Thursday options. It was agreed that the February and April 2015 dates should be held at 6pm (February as set out in the report, April to be at an earlier date during the month to be confirmed in due course);
- (2) Members should be canvassed to confirm which future meetings they believe should be webcast;
- (3) Clarification was required as to whether or not issues relating to attractiveness in the city and travellers were within the Terms of Reference of the Scrutiny Commission;
- (4) It was also noted that the phrase “functions which are not the responsibility of the Executive” within the Terms of Reference seemed unclear and needed clarification since the Scrutiny Commission was not responsible for regulatory functions. This concern had also been raised at the OSM Board;
- (5) Clarification was required as to which meetings the Mayor/Assistant Mayor would be attending to give updates on key policy developments, decisions taken or to be taken and progress against corporate decisions, as confirmed would take place in the Terms of Reference;
- (6) In addition to the continuing need to identify items on the Forward Plan for scrutiny at an early stage, there needed to be a clear process under the new scrutiny arrangements by which items for up to 2 to 3 years in advance could be programmed in advance into the Work Programme to ensure proper and effective scrutiny. An item on Key Policy Issues should be included on each Agenda. The Policy and Scrutiny Manager confirmed that new scrutiny arrangements were being prepared under which “horizon scanning “ to identify such items would operate;
- (7) Work Programme – it was noted that (i) the Transport issues item in the October 2014 meeting of the Scrutiny Commission should include water travel (ie ferries), cycling and a walking strategy (ii) issues relating to property, regeneration and planning also needed to be included (iii) with the items on Metro West Rail Full Business Case (originally scheduled for October 2014) and Local Sustainable Transport Fund (originally scheduled for December 2014) to be brought forward to September 2014.

The Commission then discussed the supplementary report outlining the Mayor’s response to the Cross-Party Working Group on the RPS and made the following comments:

- (8) It was disappointing that it had taken so long to receive a response on this issue since it had been requested since the end of March 2014 and also that it had not been received prior to full Council on 10th June 2014. It was also disappointing that no officer involved in producing the report was in attendance
- (9) The issues which affected most wards outside Clifton who would be getting this scheme had not been addressed, such as flexibility and working within communities;

- (10) There were concerns about the cost of the scheme which would be one of the most expensive RPS schemes to implement in the country and more expensive than smaller consensual schemes which had been implemented by the previous administration;
- (11) An opportunity had been missed to identify those groups of workers with particular needs for transport, such as staff working in care homes and nurseries, as well as other groups such as unregistered health care workers;
- (12) There were concerns about the unquantified impact on the outer ring that currently had RPZ plans suspended;
- (13) The responses from business communities and colleges seemed to have been ignored;
- (14) Recommendations 8 and 9 would be too late to implement as decisions were already being made which would impact on these
- (15) Recommendation 2 required a comprehensive review of bus and transport – there were people at UWE who could have been used to help with this process;

RESOLVED – that

- (1) the following dates be approved for future meetings of the Scrutiny Commission:**

**11am on Friday 19th September 2014
11am on Thursday 23rd October 2014
11am on Monday 17th November 2014
11am on Friday 5th December 2014
11am on Thursday 8th January 2015
6pm on Thursday 5th February 2015
11am on Thursday 5th March 2015
April 2015 – yet to be fixed**

- (2) members to be canvassed as to which of these meetings should be webcast;**
- (3) clarification be sought on issues relating to the Terms of Reference – does it include attractiveness of the city and issues relating to travellers + the meaning of the phrase “ functions which are not the responsibility of the Executive” (also raised at OSM Board);**
- (4) clarification to be sought at which meetings the Mayor/Assistant Mayor would be attending to give updates on key policy developments, decisions taken or to be taken and progress against corporate decisions;**
- (5) the Work Programme for 2014/15 as tabled, together with the amendments set out in Paragraph (6) above, be approved**

(6) an item on Key Policy Issues to be included on the Agenda for future meetings

(7) that, in relation to the supplementary report setting out the Mayor's response to the Cross-Party Working Group on the RPS, the Mayor be required to attend the next meeting of the Place Scrutiny Commission at 11am on Friday 19th September 2014 in accordance with Standing Order OSR15 (2) to respond to the following issues concerning the Residents Parking Zone arising out of discussion at 31st July 2014 Place Scrutiny Commission of his response to the Cross Party Working Group:

- (a) The cost of the proposed scheme seemed arbitrary. It would be one of the most expensive RPS schemes in the country as currently planned and significantly more expensive than a series of smaller consensual schemes which had been implemented by the previous administration;**
- (b) Despite the use of the National Data Collection Agency in areas such as Montpelier and Clifton, data arising out of these surveys had never been produced;**
- (c) There is concern that the report is focused exclusively on Clifton and had not taken into account the needs of other wards within the scheme whereas the Cross-Party Working Group had considered the impact of the RPZ for the entire Inner City "Doughnut" and there is also concern with regard to the unquantified impact on the outer ring that currently has RPZ plans suspended;**
- (d) Particularly for the wards outside Clifton, there is a lack of an assessment of those with definable needs for flexibility within the proposed zones (ie care workers (including unregistered care workers), nursery staff etc.) and how this would be taken into account in the process;**
- (e) There is a lack of evidence to show that the proposed scheme will improve air quality and reduce pollution;**
- (f) There is concern at the lack of a comprehensive assessment review of bus and transport as part of this process;**

- (g) **There is concern at the lack of detail on responses to issues relating to the outer ring (mentioned in Recommendation 9) and a lack of Forward Planning.**

11 Event Security (Agenda Item 11)

The Scrutiny Commission heard the following Public Forum Statement in relation to this item:

Daphne Muir – Removal of a Pensioner from Park Street at an Event on Park Street on 1st June 2014.

A copy of this statement (and correspondence replying to the complaint which was included as part of it) is available in the Minute Book.

The Scrutiny Commission also noted the report which had been produced on this issue which set out the agreed procedure for facilitating public events associated with Bristol City Council and arrangements for providing security at such events.

Officers confirmed that there had been extensive correspondence on this issue and explained how public and private events were licensed. It was noted that Bristol City Council licensed between 300 to 450 events a year and that these frequently involved a long lead-in process during which the feasibility of holding the event was discussed. It was explained that the onus was on the third party organiser to provide guarantees for any event – they took full accountability and responsibility of events following appropriate consultation. Members were advised that responsibility for security staff being properly trained was the responsibility of the third party but was managed through the SIA (Security Industry Accreditation) whose responsibility it was to ensure such staff were trained.

Following this statement and the comments from officers, members raised the following concerns:

- (1) As a member of the public, I would be dissatisfied with the response I had received which required me to take the initiative in finding the answers to my questions, rather than these being passed to the appropriate person to respond to;
- (2) The privatisation of the public realm was a matter of concern, as well as the issue of where responsibility lay when events were held on private land;
- (3) There were civil liberty concerns relating to the incident in question
- (4) There should be an understanding by those involved in the licence process of the requirements that need to be put in place prior to such an event to ensure the kind of incident that took place on 1st June did not occur

- (5) A log should be kept of such incidents to ensure that Bristol City Council staff were aware of any concerns prior to licences being issued
- (6) In particular, the need to reinforce the right of individuals to peacefully protest and for event organisers to be clear of the circumstances under which people can be removed. There was a responsibility to the public in such instances.

RESOLVED – that

- (1) officers provide answers to all the questions raised by Daphne Muir as part of her complaint**
- (2) a report be scheduled for a future meeting: (i) identifying what went wrong in terms of security issues on 1st June event (ii) a review of methods to improve the process for future events, including enforcement in line with the licence and a follow up on private events when complaints occur (iii) addressing the issue of accessibility at events ie Balloon Fiesta**

12 Update on Bristol Green Capital 2015 (Agenda Item 12)

The Commission received a report outlining progress of plans for Bristol's year as the European Green Capital 2015, in particular relating to the emerging institutional and Governance arrangements, the progress in securing additional funding from Government and the Private Sector + setting out the outline programme.

Officers made the following points:

- (1) Bristol City Council, the Green Capital Company and the Key Partnership Community Interest Company were the three main bodies involved in BGC (Bristol Green Capital) 2015;
- (2) Central Government held a grant agreement with Bristol City Council who had an SLA;
- (3) The Cross-Party Working Group had met for the first time recently. It had been carefully constructed to ensure that it did not replicate the Scrutiny role. Its next meeting would be to set out activities across all Departments aligned to the BGC 2015 Work Programme;
- (4) Appendix 2 of the report set out the Board Members of Bristol 2015 (Bristol European Green Capital 2015 Company). Information about each of the Board members was provided to the Scrutiny Commission. All appointees were unpaid. Two Board Members had been appointed through an open process;
- (5) The process would now be speeding up significantly and would act as a vehicle for commercial sponsorship with a role to deliver 2015 and to provide a legacy;
- (6) In addition to £1.2 Million originally obtained to start the process, there had been an announcement at the end of April 2014 for a

- further £11 Million by Danny Alexander and BGC were close to announcing their Tier 1 partners. This increased funding would make a significant difference to the grants programme;
- (7) A portion of the Arts Council funding contribution came from Bristol University. The future cities catapult was supporting the concept because of its remit. All private cash partners shared BCG 2015's values and objectives;
 - (8) Key issues to form part of the programme included sustainable urban living, creating a happy and healthy city, the built environment role and social equality;
 - (9) The Grants Programme is important – a Small Grants Programme was being developed for August 2014 and a strategic programme for September 2014;
 - (10) The encouragement of young people at Primary School level to become involved in the project was important;
 - (11) There was a need to take advantage of the significant expertise available in the green sector;
 - (12) BGC 2015 would work closely with other bodies such as the LEP to take the city's sustainability footprint to another level. The vision for the scheme involved the city making a significant contribution to the UN's strategy on climate change;

Members made the following comments:

- (13) Whilst it was good to see that things were progressing, there did not seem to be a legacy for ordinary people;
- (14) There remained insufficient detail in view of the fact that there remained only a few months before 2015. It was a concern that the programme was still "under development";
- (15) The volunteering programme needed to be robust with a proper insurance system;
- (16) Empowerment needed to be a key element of BGC 2015 – social inclusion and diversity should be integral aspects of this. It needed to take into account issues such as energy prices, health and climate change refugees, as well as the current proposals outlined for the schools programme;
- (17) Criteria for small grants had been developed and should be on the Bristol City Council website;
- (18) The promotion of local sourcing needed to be considered ie the Bristol Pound. All staff and suppliers should be encouraged to take Bristol Pounds. Food would be a key issue as part of the approach towards ensuring sustainable growth. For this reason, it should not be assumed that the promotion of economic development was always acceptable.

RESOLVED – that

- (1) a chart showing the organisation structure of the Green Capital Programme be sent to all Scrutiny Commission members**

(2) regular progress reports are brought back to the Commission including a draft programme with much greater detail, including clarification on the criteria and process for Green Capital Small Grants.

13 Bristol Arena Project (Agenda Item 13)

The Commission received a written presentation outlining the latest situation concerning an Arena for Bristol.

Officers made the following comments:

- (1) In addition to the Arena itself, the Arena Development site would include a combination of mixed use and residential development;
- (2) A master plan for the entire site was being developed which would be completed in 2 to 3 months;
- (3) The financial model had varied since the original proposal in 2004/2007 but was currently estimated at a cost of £90 Million for a stadium with a 12,000 capacity area. The business case had been approved in January/February 2014 – a composite cost plan had been partly based on similar projects in Leeds (opened 2013) and Liverpool (opened 2008) but also on other projects and placed in a Bristol scenario;
- (4) Officers were in negotiation with three operators – once the final operator was known, a more detailed breakdown of the estimated £38 Million could be provided for the operator lease costs and the car parking income. At the moment, this was commercially sensitive information and so could not be provided;
- (5) A design competition for the Arena was being prepared for a multi-disciplinary design team and would be sent out next week;
- (6) Part of the RIF Programme was to make the site more accessible to the public and more permeable. There was a £21 Million Infrastructure Programme for the site. There would be another new bridge built on the site to aid direct access for those living to the south of the river.
- (7) The project was being funded through a repayable EDF grant which had been approved via a February 2014 LEP Board decision.

Whilst acknowledging the limitations of not being able to release commercially sensitive information, Members requested that more detail be provided showing a breakdown of the £38 Million of estimated operator lease costs and car parking income. They stressed the importance of the Bristol Council taxpayer knowing how much of this cost they would be funding.

RESOLVED – that a further report on this issue be brought back to the November 2014 Scrutiny Commission, as indicated on the Work Programme.

14 Impact of the Cribbs Patchway New Development on Bristol (including supplementary report setting out the Mayor's response) (Agenda Item 14)

Members noted the final report dated May 2014 of the former Sustainable Development and Transport Scrutiny Commission concerning the Impact of the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood Development on Bristol, including a supplementary report setting out the Mayor's response.

RESOLVED – that this item is deferred until the next scheduled meeting at 11am on Friday 19th September 2014.

15 Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting would be held at 11am on Friday 19th September 2014.

The meeting ended at 1.55pm

CHAIR