

Summons to attend meeting of Full Council



Date: Tuesday, 17 January 2017

Time: 2.15 pm

Venue: The Council Chamber - City Hall, College Green,
Bristol, BS1 5TR

To: All Members of Council

Members of the public attending meetings or taking part in Public forum are advised that all Full Council are now filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the council's [webcasting pages](#). The whole of the meeting is filmed (except where there are confidential or exempt items) and the footage will be available for two years. If you ask a question or make a representation, then you are likely to be filmed and will be deemed to have given your consent to this. If you do not wish to be filmed you need to make yourself known to the webcasting staff. However, the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 now means that persons attending meetings may take photographs, film and audio record the proceedings and report on the meeting (Oral commentary is not permitted during the meeting as it would be disruptive). Members of the public should therefore be aware that they may be filmed by others attending and that is not within the council's control.

Issued by: Ian Hird, Democratic Services

City Hall, PO Box 3167, Bristol, BS3 9FS

Tel: 0117 92 22384

E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

Date: Monday, 9 January 2017

Agenda

1. Welcome and safety information

Please note: if the alarm sounds, everyone at the meeting should please exit the building via the way they came in, via the main entrance lobby area, and then the front ramp. Please then assemble on the paved area in front of the building on College Green by the flag poles.

If the front entrance cannot be used, alternative exits are available via staircases 2 and 3 to the left and right of the Council Chamber. These exit to the rear of the building. The lifts are not to be used. Then please make your way to the assembly point at the front of the building.

Please do not return to the building until instructed to do so by the fire warden(s).

2. Apologies for absence

3. Minutes of previous meeting

To agree the minutes of the Full Council meeting held on 13 December 2016 as a correct record.

(Pages 11 - 23)

4. Declarations of interest

To note any declarations of interest from the Mayor and councillors. They are asked to indicate the relevant agenda item, the nature of the interest and in particular whether it is a **disclosable pecuniary interest**.

Any declaration of interest made at the meeting which is not on the register of interests should be notified to the Monitoring Officer for inclusion.

5. Lord Mayor's business

To receive and note any announcements from the Lord Mayor.



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

Please note:

Up to 30 minutes is allowed for this item.

Public forum items should be e-mailed to democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

Public forum items can be about any matter the Council is responsible for or which directly affects the city.

Please note that the following deadlines apply to this meeting:

a. Public petitions and statements: Petitions and written statements must be received by 12 noon on Monday 16 January 2017 at latest. One written statement per member of the public is permitted.

b. Public questions: Public questions must be received by 5.00 pm on Wednesday 11 January 2017 at latest. A maximum of 2 questions per member of the public is permitted.

7. Petitions notified by councillors

Please note:

Up to 10 minutes is allowed for this item.

Petitions notified by councillors can be about any matter the Council is responsible for or which directly affects the city.

The deadline for the notification of petitions to this meeting is 12 noon on Monday 16 January 2017 at latest.

8. Collection fund - estimated council tax and business rates surplus 2016-17

To determine the estimated Collection Fund surplus as at 31 March 2017. **(Pages 24 - 31)**

9. Removal of council tax discounts on discretionary unoccupied and unfurnished properties

To consider and approve proposals regarding changes to existing council tax discretionary discounts. **(Pages 32 - 34)**



10. Revised criteria for the appointment of Honorary Aldermen/women

To consider and approve revised criteria (as recommended by the Audit Committee) for the appointment of Honorary Aldermen/women. **(Pages 35 - 38)**

11. Corporate Parenting Panel annual report 2016

To receive and consider the annual report of the Corporate Parenting Panel. **(Pages 39 - 80)**

12. Annual report from Youth Mayors and Youth Council

To receive and consider the annual report from the Youth Mayors and Bristol Youth Council. **(Pages 81 - 92)**

13. Motions

To consider motions as follows:

1. Bristol Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) – Protect our NHS and Social Care services

Motion to be moved by: Cllr Gill Kirk, Labour, Lockleaze ward

“Full Council notes that:

1. The government is dividing the NHS in England into 44 areas or 'footprints', each of which has a 'Sustainability and Transformation Plan' (STP).
2. Government requires these STPs to deliver collective cuts of at least £2.5bn nationally this year, and £22bn within the next five years, to wipe out the NHS' 'financial deficit' by implementing 'new models of care'.
3. The former head of NHS commissioning, Julia Simon, has denounced the STP process as 'shameful', 'mad', 'ridiculous' and the plans as full of lies [1].
4. Locally it is envisaged that there will be a cumulative funding gap of about £305 million by 2020-21 and that the STP will need to change service provision to eliminate it [2].



5. Demands for the area STPs have been imposed by NHS England, with short deadlines, and senior health staff and managers have been expected to pull complex plans together, without the time or resources to carry out proper consultation with clinical staff, councillors or the public. This has led to a lack of transparency, and loss of trust in a process that has been imposed top down. The documentation made publicly available has been lacking detail and though an initial report on the STP has been made to council scrutiny committees there has been insufficient clarity about the power of democratically elected councillors to adapt, amend or influence the plan and its implementation.
6. Although closer integration between health services and the local authority is in principle a sound idea likely to result in better outcomes for residents, it cannot be achieved whilst at the same time making the huge cuts demanded by central government. It will be impossible for the STP for the area to make these cuts without measures which will seriously impact on the health and welfare of the local population. Pressure on acute services will not be reduced unless councils get the extra investment in social care, public health and early interventions to prevent ill health.

This Council believes:

1. That the cuts demanded by central government of £305 million are unfeasible and that there is no safe way of implementing such reductions.
2. That the only way to provide adequate integrated health and social care is through adequate funding.
3. That central government should increase NHS funding to at least 10.1% of GDP, to match the average of other EU countries.
4. That the government must address the crisis in social care funding, to allow councils to provide the adult social care needed to keep people well in their own homes and reduce the unnecessary costs of keeping people in acute hospitals when they could be supported in the community.
5. The STP does not have democratic accountability. BCC will have no accountability for the STP as it is 'owned' by Health. We are named as a delivery partner but our only entitlement is to question and scrutinise. We are expected to participate in a cost cutting process that will negatively impact on the health and wellbeing of our citizens, with no democratic power to change it, to pass it or reject it. This disempowers democratically elected councillors and the public.



6. Although the authors of the local STP have tried to minimise the impact of these cuts, published the plan in full and opened it to democratic scrutiny, any consultation on the plan or on individual elements of the plan is essentially meaningless if there is no option to refuse the cuts. The only way to resist these cuts, which will seriously damage the health of the people of Bristol, is for the people of the City to learn what is being planned and to be able to respond vigorously.

Full Council resolves to ask the Mayor to:

1. Write to thank the BNSSG STP group for their efforts in trying to meet impossible demands.
2. Write to the relevant government Ministers to make them aware of this motion and of our opposition to their unreasonable funding cuts.
3. Write to the City's MPs asking for their support. Particularly in pressing for cross party talks to resolve long term issues of health and social care funding and in calling for an increase to NHS funding.
4. Empower the appropriate Scrutiny bodies (being the Health & Wellbeing Board, and People and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny in the case of Bristol) to identify the health impacts of changes outlined in the proposed plan, and to collaborate with neighbouring Councils by establishing a formal joint Scrutiny process to be set up as a matter of urgency.
5. Publicise likely impacts on key services and our opposition to these funding cuts to the people of Bristol and encourage them to make their views known and campaign against the national cuts to the NHS."

[1] <http://www.gponline.com/shameful-pace-stp-rollout-risks-financial-m%eltdown-warns-former-nhs-commissioningchief/article/1410546>

See also <http://www.nationalhealthexecutive.com/Health-Care-News/just-16-of-finance-directors-think-sustainable-stps-achievable-by-2021>

[2] https://www.bristolccg.nhs.uk/media/medialibrary/2016/11/bnssg_stp_10-2016_M722a8w.pdf



2. Living Rent

Motion submitted by: Cllr Charlie Bolton, Green, Southville ward

“Full Council notes:

- The desperate situation faced by many Bristol residents in the private rented sector. While welcoming recent government moves to stop up-front letting agent fees, there is clearly a need to take further action to limit the amounts tenants are forced to pay out just to have somewhere to live.
- That the London Assembly is consulting on proposals for a 'Living Rent', after both Sian Berry (Green) and Sadiq Khan (Labour)'s mayoral campaigns focused on getting a better deal for renters.

Full Council resolves to ask the Mayor to:

1. Investigate the pros and cons of introducing a Living Rent in Bristol.
2. Report back to Council the progress in Bristol towards setting up and resourcing a Bristol Renter's union to support the implementation of a Living Rent.
3. Determine the level at which such a rent should be set and produce a plan to determine how best to make such a 'Living Rent' fully effective, including whether it should apply to the whole private rental sector or a subset (as London's is proposed to do);
4. Lobby MPs and Government for the power to implement such a 'Living Rent'."

Note:

Under the Council's constitution, 30 minutes are available for the consideration of motions. In practice, this realistically means that there is usually only time for one, or possibly two motions to be considered. With the agreement of the Lord Mayor, motion 1 above will be considered at this meeting, and motion 2 may be considered subject to time. Details of other motions submitted, (which, due to time constraints, are very unlikely to be considered at this meeting) are set out below for information.



3. Parking

Motion submitted by: Cllr Gary Hopkins, Liberal Democrat, Knowle ward

“This Council believes that parking on grass verges and pavements is a widespread problem that requires localised solutions to find the right balance between the needs of pedestrians, particularly disabled and parents, and those seeking to park their vehicles. In some areas the need for effective enforcement is clear and it is the lack of appropriate regulations that is the easily identifiable problem. In others, the balance of need is less clear.

This Council therefore calls upon the Mayor to thoroughly examine and, unless found to be unsuitable, adopt the strategy used in Milton Keynes. This is to have one blanket traffic regulation order but to only enforce where there is clear, positive local demand to do so.

This approach could reduce cost, remove traffic officers from having to make difficult value judgements and allow local residents to help find solutions.”

4. Call for changes to council tax exemption scheme covering student households

Motion submitted by: Cllr Mark Weston, Conservative, Henbury and Brentry ward

“This Council welcomes the success of our internationally acclaimed Universities in attracting students to live and study in the city.

Whilst recognising that this is generally a positive development which contributes greatly towards enriching and promoting Bristol’s unique identity, it also has to be conceded that a student population of over 50,000 places a strain on local infrastructure and services.

Students in full-time education enjoy a 100% exemption on paying Council Tax under the current rules and regulations governing discounts and dispensations. This potentially represents a very substantial loss of income to local authority coffers. Given the extraordinary amount of student accommodation springing up around the city, this position is financially simply unsustainable.

Accordingly, Council calls on the Mayor to make representations to central government for changes to be made to the Council Tax exemption scheme covering student households. This should aim to enable at least a proportion or percentage of this charge to be levied on all student occupied properties.”



5. Clause 21 – The Bus Services Bill

Motion submitted by: Cllr Eleanor Combley, Green, Bishopston and Ashley Down ward

“Full Council notes:

1. That the Bus Services Bill currently passing through Parliament, as originally proposed, included Clause 21 that will effectively “prohibit a local authority from forming a company for the purposes of providing a local bus service”.
2. The House of Lords voted for an amendment that got rid of clause 21.
2. That the Localism Act (2011) provides general powers of competence to local authorities.
3. That municipal bus companies like Reading and Nottingham provide some of the best bus services in the country and have a successful track record of increasing bus passenger numbers and providing high quality bus services.
4. That polling by We Own It found that a majority of the public (57%) oppose clause 21, whilst just 22% support it. The opposition to Clause 21 is consistent across voters from all political parties.

Full Council believes:

1. Clause 21 contradicts the general powers of competence and the spirit of the Localism Act 2011.
2. If there is a need and a demand from their public, then Councils should be able to provide their own bus services.
3. Should they wish, Councils should be legally able to follow the model developed by Reading and Nottingham.
4. Consequently Clause 21- or any clause to a similar effect - should be omitted from the Bus Services Bill and the government should refrain from bringing such a clause back into the Bill as it goes through the Commons.

Full Council resolves to ask the Mayor:

1. To write to Lord Ahmad and to call on the Department for Transport to omit Clause 21 – or any ban of new public bus companies - from the final legislation.
2. To write to all Bristol MPs to ask them to oppose or continue to oppose Clause 21 or similar in the House of Commons and ask them to write to Lord Ahmad and the Department of Transport to raise concerns about Clause 21.
3. To publicise our opposition to Clause 21 and any ban on public ownership of buses in the local media.”



Signed

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Baya', with a period at the end.

Proper Officer
Monday, 9 January 2017

