

# Bristol City Council Minutes of the Full Council

13 September 2016 at 6.00 pm



**Present:** Jeff Lovell, Lord Mayor; Marvin Rees, Bristol Mayor

**Councillors:** Donald Alexander, Lesley Alexander, Nicola Beech, Nicola Bowden-Jones, Harriet Bradley, Mark Bradshaw, Charlie Bolton, Fabian Breckels, Tom Brook, Tony Carey, Craig Cheney, Barry Clark, Jos Clark, Harriet Clough, Eleanor Combley, Asher Craig, Chris Davies, Mike Davies, Carla Denyer, Jude English, Martin Fodor, Helen Godwin, Geoff Gollop, John Goulandris, Fi Hance, Margaret Hickman, Claire Hiscott, Helen Holland, Gary Hopkins, Chris Jackson, Hibaq Jama, Carole Johnson, Steve Jones, Anna Keen, Gill Kirk, Cleo Lake, Olly Mead, Matt Melias, Graham Morris, Anthony Negus, Paula O'Rourke, Steve Pearce, Ruth Pickersgill, Kevin Quartley, Liz Radford, Jo Sergeant, Afzal Shah, Paul Smith, Clive Stevens, Jerome Thomas, Mhairi Threlfall, Estella Tincknell, Jon Wellington, Mark Weston, Lucy Whittle and Mark Wright

**Aldermen/women:** John McLaren, Brian Price, Colin Smith, Pat Roberts, Rosalie Walker

## 1. Welcome and safety information

The Lord Mayor welcomed all attendees to the meeting, and made a safety announcement in relation to the fire/emergency evacuation procedure.

## 2. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Abraham, Brain, Campion-Smith, Clarke, Eddy, Goggin, Kent, Langley, Massey, and Windows.

## 3. Minutes of previous meeting

On the motion of the Lord Mayor, seconded by Councillor Weston, it was

### **RESOLVED:**

**That the minutes of the meeting of the Full Council held on 19 July 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.**



#### 4. Declarations of interest

Councillor Smith declared an interest in relation to agenda item 10 (Appointment of Returning Officer and Electoral Registration Officer). It was noted that he would not participate in or vote on this item of business.

#### 5. Lord Mayor's business

None.

#### 6. Public forum (public petitions, statements and questions)

##### Public petitions:

None received.

##### Public statements:

The Full Council received and noted the following statements (which were also referred to the Mayor for his consideration/information):

Statement PS 01 - Review of parking around Gloucestershire County Cricket ground - submitted by Dr Sion Hannuna

Statement PS 02 - West of England devolution and transport issues - submitted by David Redgewell, Martin Cinamond, Nigel Bray, Jenny Raggett and John Hassell

Statement PS 03 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Claire Liddell

Statement PS 04 - Bedminster Green - submitted by Sarah Watkins

Statement PS 05 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Jane Hewer

Statement PS 06 - Residents parking zones - submitted by Brian Inglis

Statement PS 07 - Southville residents parking scheme – parking bays in Coronation Road - submitted by Mark and Pearl Reed

Statement PS 08 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Rita Youseph

Statement PS 09 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by David and Helena Branfield

Statement PS 10 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by C J Evans



Statement PS 11 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Stephen Hall

Statement PS 12 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Jim Plumley

Statement PS 13 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Michael Warren

Statement PS 14 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by John Button

Statement PS 15 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Norman Jennings

Statement PS 16 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Mr and Mrs P Prytherch

Statement PS 17 - no. 51 bus service - submitted by Josephine Fisher

Statement PS 18 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Sue Rosewarne

Statement PS 19 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Mr and Mrs J Carnell

Statement PS 20 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Tracey Martin

Statement PS 21 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Naomi Jones

Statement PS 22 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Margaret Brown

Statement PS 23 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Shirley Webster

Statement PS 24 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Dani Lott

Statement PS 25 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Katrina Coulton

Statement PS 26 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by John Condon

Statement PS 27 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Ross Whittard

Statement PS 28 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Beth Tarleton

Statement PS 29 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Joanne Mullins

Statement PS 30 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Jan and Antony Willson

Statement PS 31 - Hengrove Park development - Submitted by Alana Wilson and Martin Ford



Statement PS 32 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Linda Sparks

Statement PS 33 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Richard Davies

Statement PS 34 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Kenneth Pitchers

Statement PS 35 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Phil Tonkin

Statement PS 36 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Terence Andrews

Statement PS 37 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Linda McCann

Statement PS 38 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Mervyn Walters

Statement PS 39 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Ruth Andrews

Statement PS 40 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Madeleine Harris

Statement PS 41 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Angela Garland

Statement PS 42 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Faith Ooi

Statement PS 43 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Marie Werrett

Statement PS 44 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by David Self

Statement PS 45 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Brian Garland

Statement PS 46 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Simon Garland

Statement PS 47 - Homelessness, rough sleepers in Bristol - submitted by Eileen Means

Statement PS 48 - Hengrove Park development - submitted by Rev. Alister Palmer

Statement PS 49 - Bristol for Europe - submitted by Harry Grayson

Statement PS 50 - Disposal of the freehold of the docks estate at Avonmouth and Portbury - submitted by Alderman Royston Griffey

Statement PS 51 - Residents parking zones / transport issues - submitted by Edward Bowditch

Within the time available, statements were presented by individuals present at the meeting. The Mayor responded verbally to issues raised in the statements.



**Public questions:**

The Full Council noted that the following questions had been submitted:

Question PQ 01 - Tall buildings policy - sites adjacent to Malago Road, south Bristol  
- submitted by Nigel Biggs

Question PQ 02 - ACORN ethical lettings charter and accommodation for homeless households  
- submitted by Ann Cullum

Question PQ 03 - Investment in Icelandic bank  
- submitted by Philip Morris

Question PQ 04 - Bedminster - air quality and Bedminster Green development  
- submitted by Cynthia Goldstein

Question PQ 05 - Bedminster Green development  
- submitted by Nick Townsend

Question PQ 06 - Bedminster Green development  
- submitted by Dianne James

Question PQ 07 - Combined heat and power generation inside the Bristol air quality management area  
- submitted by Sarah Watkins

Question PQ 08 - Red Lodge museum  
- submitted by Christine Townsend

Question PQ 09 - Residents parking income  
- submitted by Michael Owen

Question PQ 10 - Residents parking zones  
- submitted by Dianne Livingstone

Question PQ 11 - Residents parking zones - Southville  
- submitted by Anne Sutton

Question PQ 12 - Residents parking zones  
- submitted by Cliff Jeal

Question PQ 13 - Residents parking zones  
- submitted by Kim Davies



Question PQ 14 - Clifton village pay and display parking  
- submitted by Edward Bowditch

Question PQ 15 - Council's budget  
- submitted by Jack Hazeldine

Within the time available, the Mayor responded to the following questions (also responding to supplementary questions where asked): PQ 01, PQ 02, PQ 03, and PQ 04.

## **7. Petitions notified by councillors**

The Full Council received and noted the following petition:

Petition CP 01 – “Petition requesting highways department to address safety issues on Church Road and Julian Road in Sneyd Park”

Petition presented by Councillor Goulandris

Petition organiser: Alderman Brenda Hugill

## **8. Petition debate - "Save the 51 bus"**

The Full Council considered a report of the Service Director - Legal and Democratic Services setting out details of a petition entitled “Save the 51 bus.” The petition had reached the threshold (3,500 signatures from people who live, work or study in Bristol) for a Full Council debate.

Councillor Clough, one of the petition organisers, was invited by the Lord Mayor to present the objectives of the petition.

The Full Council then debated the petition.

Following the debate, it was:

### **RESOLVED:**

**That the petition be noted and referred to the Mayor for consideration and response.**

**ADJOURNMENT** – At this point the Lord Mayor advised that the Full Council meeting would adjourn for a 20 minute refreshment break.



## **9. Appointment of statutory officers: Head of Paid Service and Statutory Scrutiny Officer**

The Full Council considered a report of the Service Director – Legal and Democratic Services recommending the appointment of the authority’s Head of Paid Service and Statutory Scrutiny Officer.

The Lord Mayor moved the report and the recommendations set out therein.

Councillor Davies, Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded the report.

Upon being put to the vote, it was

### **RESOLVED:**

**1. That Stephen Hughes, Interim Chief Executive be appointed as the authority’s Head of Paid Service, as an interim appointment to ensure legislative requirements are met.**

**2. That Anna Klonowski, Interim Strategic Director - Business Change be appointed as the authority’s Statutory Scrutiny Officer, as an interim appointment to ensure legislative requirements are met.**

## **10. Appointment of Returning Officer and Electoral Registration Officer**

The Full Council considered a report of the Service Director – Legal and Democratic Services recommending the appointment of the authority’s Returning Officer and Electoral Registration Officer.

Note: having declared an interest in relation to this item of business (see item 4 above), Councillor Smith did not participate in or vote on this item of business.

The Lord Mayor moved the report and the recommendations set out therein.

Councillor Davies, Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded the report.

Upon being put to the vote, it was

### **RESOLVED:**

**1. That Stephen Hughes, Interim Chief Executive be appointed as the Returning Officer and Electoral Registration Officer for Bristol City Council, as an interim appointment to ensure legislative requirements are met.**

**2. That Yvonne Dawes be re-confirmed as Deputy Electoral Registration Officer.**



**3. That other deputy appointments are revoked and the appointments reviewed by the Returning Officer once confirmed in post.**

**11. Licensing Committee - membership changes**

The Full Council considered a report of the Service Director – Legal and Democratic Services recommending that Council note the resignation of Councillor Hance from the Licensing Committee and approve the appointment of Councillor Combley to the committee.

The Lord Mayor moved the report and the recommendations set out therein.

Councillor Davies, Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded the report.

Upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED:**

**That the resignation of Councillor Hance from the Licensing Committee be noted and that the appointment of Councillor Combley to the Licensing Committee be approved.**

**12. Information report - Exception to call-in procedure**

The Full Council considered a report of the Service Director – Legal and Democratic Services advising Council (as required under the Council's constitution) that an exception to the call-in procedure had been made in respect of the following decision taken by the Mayor at Cabinet:

- Cabinet decision – 29 June 2016 – Combined authority and devolution proposals

The Lord Mayor moved the report.

Councillor Davies, Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded the report.

**RESOLVED:**

**That the report be noted.**

**13. Information report - ACORN's ethical lettings charter**

The Full Council considered a report of the Service Director – Housing Solutions and Crime Reduction recommending that Council note that in line with arrangements made at the Cabinet meeting of 6 October 2015, ACORN's Ethical Lettings Charter has been formally endorsed by the Service Director – Housing Solutions and Crime Reduction on behalf of the Council.



Councillor Smith moved the report.

Councillor Shah seconded the report.

Following debate, it was

**RESOLVED:**

**That the report be noted.**

## **14. Motions**

### **a. Motion 1 – Bristol Arena traffic plan**

Councillor Weston moved the following motion:

“This Council confirms its continuing support for the Bristol Arena and looks forward to it being delivered on time and within budget. Nevertheless, there is still considerable concern over the potential impact of this 12,000 capacity entertainment venue. Without appropriate mitigation measures in place, the opening of this site could have a devastating effect on the quality of life of local people.

Therefore, Council calls on the Mayor to instigate a review of the Traffic Management and Transport Plans, making particular reference to parking provision for those who will still choose to travel there by car. In addition, attention needs to be given to ensure there will be adequate Bus and Taxi services for the anticipated large audiences, many of whom are likely to be young - and excitable. The safety of such vulnerable patrons must be made a priority consideration.

This evaluation should also take into account the redevelopment at Ashton Gate. Council believes that the options surrounding rail and a new station servicing both the stadium and the Arena need to be fully explored to ensure this is in the public transport mix or offer.

These two welcome major leisure destinations are extremely important to our city. However, such attractions must be carefully integrated so that they are a benefit to all and not a burden to those who happen to live or work in their immediate vicinity.”

Councillor Goulandris seconded the motion.

Following debate, upon being put to the vote, motion was CARRIED and it was

**RESOLVED:**

**This Council confirms its continuing support for the Bristol Arena and looks forward to it being delivered on time and within budget. Nevertheless, there is still considerable concern over the**



**potential impact of this 12,000 capacity entertainment venue. Without appropriate mitigation measures in place, the opening of this site could have a devastating effect on the quality of life of local people.**

**Therefore, Council calls on the Mayor to instigate a review of the Traffic Management and Transport Plans, making particular reference to parking provision for those who will still choose to travel there by car. In addition, attention needs to be given to ensure there will be adequate Bus and Taxi services for the anticipated large audiences, many of whom are likely to be young - and excitable. The safety of such vulnerable patrons must be made a priority consideration.**

**This evaluation should also take into account the redevelopment at Ashton Gate. Council believes that the options surrounding rail and a new station servicing both the stadium and the Arena need to be fully explored to ensure this is in the public transport mix or offer.**

**These two welcome major leisure destinations are extremely important to our city. However, such attractions must be carefully integrated so that they are a benefit to all and not a burden to those who happen to live or work in their immediate vicinity.**

#### **b. Motion 2 – Opposing forced academisation**

Councillor Pickersgill moved the following motion:

“Bristol City Council notes that, despite significant opposition from professionals across the political spectrum to the proposals in the White Paper, *Educational Excellence Everywhere*, (March 2016), the Government has reiterated that it wants all schools to become academies within multi-academy trusts (MATs) by 2022. This Council further notes the Government plan to force schools to become academies if they are considered to be ‘under-performing’ or even, in some cases, just ‘coasting.’

Bristol City Council notes with concern that if the Government deem that a local authority can ‘no longer viably support its remaining schools because a critical mass of schools in that area has converted’ this will trigger conversion of all its schools.

As a Council we note Cllr. Roy Perry, Conservative Chair of the LGA opposition to forced academisation and welcome his view that ‘schools should have the choice to stay with their own Council’.

As a Council we recognise forced academisation will not only take away the LA’s ability to plan strategically and carry on supporting our schools in their successful journey of improvement, but will also remove the power from those who have the best knowledge of the school (the Head, staff and parents/carers) to determine how they want to be governed.

We believe that these plans:



- **Are not a good use of scarce resources.** The NUT estimates the cost of forced academisation to the taxpayer as high as £1.3 billion, at a time when funding per pupil in real terms is set to fall by as much as 8% per cent or more, and Bristol is likely to experience reduced funding due to the new National Funding formula, alongside a cut in the Education Services Grant.
- **Will not improve standards.** Ofsted judged around 81% of local authority maintained schools as good or outstanding, compared to 71% of academies. Even the House of Commons Education Select Committee (2015) says ‘We have sought but not found any convincing evidence of the impact of academisation on attainment’.
- **Reduce accountability to the community.** Academies will no longer be required to have elected parents on their governing body. (They are already not required to have staff, local authority or community representatives if they do not want to).
- **Will have an adverse impact on teachers’ pay and conditions.** Academy trusts or individual academies will make decisions at a school level and can vary salary levels and terms of employment and employ unqualified staff.
- **Make it harder for the LA to plan strategically for the new school places** we need, as we cannot open new maintained schools and are dependent on proposals for Free Schools to emerge-not necessarily in areas where they are needed.
- **Perpetuate inequality in admissions processes.** Academies are their own admissions authorities, and the Office of the Schools Adjudicator (2015) reported concerns that they can manipulate them to their own ends. There are fears that the ground is being prepared to allow for new grammar schools.
- **Make it harder to plan for vulnerable children.** The LA has limited powers to influence the support given to children with SEND, preventing exclusions etc.in academies.

Bristol City Council therefore resolves to:

- States its clear opposition to the Government’s proposals outlined in the White Paper and will work with other Councils, trade unions, parents and governor groups to campaign to oppose them.
- Write to all its maintained school governing bodies to state its position and to urge them not to rush or feel pressurised into converting to academy status.
- Explore the options for developing alternative models to MATs (such as the Schools Partnership in Tower Hamlets, Leeds Cooperative Primaries Academy).
- Highlight the Council’s position on the White Paper in briefings for Heads, school staff, governors and parents/carers.”

Councillor Don Alexander seconded the motion.

Following debate, upon being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED and it was

**RESOLVED:**



Bristol City Council notes that, despite significant opposition from professionals across the political spectrum to the proposals in the White Paper, *Educational Excellence Everywhere*, (March 2016), the Government has reiterated that it wants all schools to become academies within multi-academy trusts (MATs) by 2022. This Council further notes the Government plan to force schools to become academies if they are considered to be 'under-performing' or even, in some cases, just 'coasting.'

Bristol City Council notes with concern that if the Government deem that a local authority can 'no longer viably support its remaining schools because a critical mass of schools in that area has converted' this will trigger conversion of all its schools.

As a Council we note Cllr. Roy Perry, Conservative Chair of the LGA opposition to forced academisation and welcome his view that 'schools should have the choice to stay with their own Council'.

As a Council we recognise forced academisation will not only take away the LA's ability to plan strategically and carry on supporting our schools in their successful journey of improvement, but will also remove the power from those who have the best knowledge of the school (the Head, staff and parents/carers) to determine how they want to be governed.

We believe that these plans:

- Are not a good use of scarce resources. The NUT estimates the cost of forced academisation to the taxpayer as high as £1.3 billion, at a time when funding per pupil in real terms is set to fall by as much as 8% per cent or more, and Bristol is likely to experience reduced funding due to the new National Funding formula, alongside a cut in the Education Services Grant.
- Will not improve standards. Ofsted judged around 81% of local authority maintained schools as good or outstanding, compared to 71% of academies. Even the House of Commons Education Select Committee (2015) says 'We have sought but not found any convincing evidence of the impact of academisation on attainment'.
- Reduce accountability to the community. Academies will no longer be required to have elected parents on their governing body. (They are already not required to have staff, local authority or community representatives if they do not want to).
- Will have an adverse impact on teachers' pay and conditions. Academy trusts or individual academies will make decisions at a school level and can vary salary levels and terms of employment and employ unqualified staff.
- Make it harder for the LA to plan strategically for the new school places we need, as we cannot open new maintained schools and are dependent on proposals for Free Schools to emerge-not necessarily in areas where they are needed.
- Perpetuate inequality in admissions processes. Academies are their own admissions authorities, and the Office of the Schools Adjudicator (2015) reported concerns that they can manipulate them to their own ends. There are fears that the ground is being prepared to allow for new grammar schools.



- **Make it harder to plan for vulnerable children. The LA has limited powers to influence the support given to children with SEND, preventing exclusions etc.in academies.**

**Bristol City Council therefore resolves to:**

- **States its clear opposition to the Government’s proposals outlined in the White Paper and will work with other Councils, trade unions, parents and governor groups to campaign to oppose them.**
- **Write to all its maintained school governing bodies to state its position and to urge them not to rush or feel pressurised into converting to academy status.**
- **Explore the options for developing alternative models to MATs (such as the Schools Partnership in Tower Hamlets, Leeds Cooperative Primaries Academy).**
- **Highlight the Council’s position on the White Paper in briefings for Heads, school staff, governors and parents/carers.”**

Meeting ended at 9.04 pm

**CHAIR** \_\_\_\_\_

