

# Summons to attend meeting of Full Council



**Date:** Monday, 15 January 2018  
**Time:** 2.00 pm  
**Venue:** Council Chamber, City Hall

**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](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)  
**Date:** Friday, 5 January 2018



# Agenda

## 1. Welcome and safety information

Members of the public intending to attend the meeting are asked to please note that, in the interests of health, safety and security, bags may be searched on entry to the building. Everyone attending this meeting is also asked please to behave with due courtesy and to conduct themselves in a reasonable way.

Please note: if the alarm sounds during the meeting, everyone 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 between the side entrance of the cathedral and the roundabout at the Deanery Road end of the building.

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 - 12 December 2017

To be confirmed as a correct record.

**(Pages 15 - 25)**

## 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 Mayors' business



## **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](mailto: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 Friday 12 January 2018 at latest. One written statement per member of the public is permitted.

b. Public questions: Written public questions must be received by 5.00 pm on Tuesday 9 January 2018 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 Friday 12 January 2018 at latest.

## **8. Collection Fund - Estimated Council Tax and Business Rates surplus/deficit report 2017-18**

**(Pages 26 - 35)**

## **9. Approval of Council Tax Base 2018-19**

**(Pages 36 - 45)**

## **10. Review of the Constitution - Human Resources matters**

**(Pages 46 - 62)**

## **11. Review of the procurement rules**

**(Pages 63 - 89)**

## **12. Licensing Committee membership change**

**(Pages 90 - 91)**



### 13. Motions

#### 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 below will be considered at this meeting, and motion 2 is likely to 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 also set out for information.**

#### Motion 1 - Planned Bristol Metro

Motion to be moved by: Cllr Mark Weston, Conservative, Henbury & Brentry ward

“This Council acknowledges the ambition behind the recently announced plan for Bristol to have its own underground metro system but is concerned over the lack of detail on how this idea is to be delivered, particularly around its price and build window.

Council notes that included in the Mayor’s manifesto he gave a commitment to achieving greater accountability and transparency in the priorities for capital spending of the West of England Joint Transport Board. Yet, to date, he has not been forthcoming in sharing information around this proposed major infrastructure project.

As a result, Members and the public are being asked to blindly support a scheme upon which they have no basis to judge whether this idea is a realistic proposition or a political flight of fancy.

Accordingly, Council calls on the Mayor to provide members of the public and this Council, via the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, with a report containing the following information:

- The results of the geological survey that apparently concluded widespread tunnelling was possible.
- How the price estimates have been arrived at including why the cost has already risen from £2.5bn to £4.5bn.
- How the proposed passenger numbers have been calculated.
- The results of discussion that must have been had with neighbouring



authorities on this project since the Mayor’s plans clearly show the routes and stations reaching beyond our boundaries.

- Explanation of how the proposed three routes were determined.
- A detailed account (including dates/minutes) of any meeting(s) held with key stakeholders in any such project, particularly local authority leaders in the West of England Partnership.
- What the actual time frame for delivery is and how this has been estimated, and
- What expressions of interest the Mayor has received so far in financing this project.

Unfortunately, without this information, Council cannot reasonably be expected to support such a large capital spend.”

## **Motion 2 - Safer Bristol Partnership multi-agency learning review**

Motion to be moved by: Cllr Mark Brain, Labour, Hartcliffe & Withywood ward

“This council is shocked and appalled that the Safer Bristol Partnership report into the 2013 murder of Bijan Ebrahimi found that, using the definition set out in the Macpherson Report into the 1999 murder of Stephen Lawrence, there was 'evidence of both discriminatory behaviour and institutional racism on the part of Bristol City Council and Avon and Somerset Constabulary.'

The murder itself was ghastly and council is pleased that the murderer was caught and is now serving a life prison sentence. Another neighbour, who assisted the offender, was given a four-year custodial sentence. Whilst most of the blame for the murder lies with the murderer that does not excuse employees of both Avon and Somerset Police and Bristol City Council from their share of responsibility.

Following the report of the Independent Police Complaints Commission two PCSOs and two police officers were dismissed by Avon and Somerset Police and two were jailed, one for four months and one for ten months for misconduct in public office.

By contrast no action has been taken against any Bristol City Council employee despite the fact that:

- He made 44 allegations to the police that he had been a victim of crime.
- This included 5 allegations of harassment, 5 allegations of criminal damage, 17 allegations of assault, and 7 death threats.
- Boiling water was thrown over his head.
- Council officers regularly sided with Mr Ebrahimi's abusers.
- Mr Ebrahimi was arrested repeatedly and council officers obtained an ASBO against him, rather than his persecutors.



- Authorities took no action to dispel the rumours that he was a paedophile leaving his persecutors to believe the rumours were true.

The Multi-Agency Learning Review judged there to have been a ‘collective failure of both Avon and Somerset Constabulary and Bristol City Council to provide an appropriate and professional service to Bijan Ebrahimi’ while also reporting that ‘[n]o evidence has been provided to this review that any individual representative of either agency intentionally behaved in a racist manner’ and that ‘[t]here is nothing racist in the intentions or established policies and procedures of either organisation.’

Actions taken by Bristol City Council officers at the time were considered but they did not identify any issues that warranted any internal disciplinary action.

This council rejects the idea that no council officer was intentionally racist towards Bijan when four employees of Avon and Somerset Constabulary have already been dismissed for that very thing. It calls upon the Mayor to ensure there is a rigorous investigation of the behaviour of individual council officers involved in this case and that disciplinary action is taken where appropriate and training be given to all officers employed in those and similar roles.”

## **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:**

### **Motion 3 - Expansion of Bristol International Airport and climate change**

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

“Full Council notes:

1. The consultation being run by Bristol Airport over the preparation of a new master plan which could cover the period up to the mid-2040s.
2. The master plan could result in a more-than-doubling of passenger numbers from the current figure of 8 million to 20 million.
3. That air travel remains the most climate-damaging form of travel, and significant expansion of air travel will therefore have a significant climate impact.
4. That such an increase will lead to an enormous increase in the number of journeys to get to the airport to meet the increased usage – a fact which in itself will lead to significant issues around congestion, pollution and infrastructure.



5. The commitment – in Bristol – to be carbon-neutral by 2050, and the Climate Change Act which requires an 80% cut in emissions across the UK.
6. The Joint Spatial Plan – which includes North Somerset and the geographical area covered by the airport– contains an explicit commitment to making a 50% cut in emissions by 2036.

Full Council believes that:

1. The airport must conform to the commitment contained in the Joint Spatial Plan, and such a commitment should include emissions from the aircraft using it

Full Council resolves to call on the Mayor to:

1. Pass on these views to the airport, North Somerset Council, WECA, the Joint Committee; and
2. Respond directly to the consultation making the points above.”

#### **Motion 4 - Supporting the Financial Transactions Tax (FTT) (also known as the Robin Hood Tax)**

Motion submitted by: Cllr Carla Denyer, Green, Clifton Down ward

“Full Council notes that:

1. According to the Institute for Fiscal Studies, English councils have had their revenue budgets cut by £15bn (in today’s prices) between 2009-10 and 2016-17;<sup>1</sup>
2. According to the Local Government Association, English local government still faces a challenging overall funding gap of £5.8 billion by 2019/20.<sup>2</sup>
3. In introducing a Robin Hood Tax/FTT - by closing much-abused loopholes around the existing Stamp Duty on share transactions, and modernising it to include other, more speculative transactions (such as derivatives) - the Treasury could raise more than £5bn of additional revenue in the UK every year;<sup>3</sup>
4. At least 10 European nations including France, Germany, Italy and Spain are moving ahead with FTTs on shares, bonds and derivatives estimated to raise £19bn a year.

Full Council believes that:

1. By 2020, local government will have seen a 7% decrease in government grant funding every year for a decade;<sup>4</sup>
2. Local government deserves to receive a significant proportion of FTT revenues, making an important contribution to both capital and revenue expenditure such as reversing cuts to adult social care;
3. Whilst an FTT might have a negligible effect on jobs in the City of London, investing FTT revenues in a smart and progressive way would see a significant increase in employment levels in other



sectors.

Full Council resolves that:

1. The UK government should extend the current FTT on shares to other asset classes, such as bonds and derivatives.

Full Council further resolves to ask the Mayor to:

1. Write to the Prime Minister, Deputy Prime Minister, Leader of the Opposition, Chancellor and Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government stating this council’s support for extending FTTs;
2. Write to all local MPs outlining the Council’s position;
3. Support or host a meeting to discuss the ways of supporting this proposal.”

Notes:

1. <https://www.ifs.org.uk/uploads/Presentations/British%20Local%20Government%20Finance%20in%20the%202010s%2C%20David%20Phillip.pdf>
2. [https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/5.20%20budget%20submission\\_06.pdf](https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/5.20%20budget%20submission_06.pdf)
3. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2908464](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2908464)
4. <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Overview-Local-government.pdf>

Background:

In a nutshell, the big idea behind the Robin Hood Tax is to generate billions of pounds – hopefully even hundreds of billions of pounds. That money will fight poverty in the UK and overseas. It will tackle climate change. And it will come from fairer taxation of the financial sector.

The Financial Transactions Tax –also known as the ‘Robin Hood’ or ‘Tobin’ Tax – would roll out the current tax on the purchase of shares to other financial assets, such as bonds and derivatives. This could raise £25 billion of additional revenue every five year parliament, potentially providing a new source of funding for local councils.

The FTT would also help encourage traditional longer term approaches to investment as opposed to extremely short-term, speculative behaviour that characterised the conditions that led to the financial crisis. Changing such behaviour is necessary to create a more responsible and stable financial system going forward. The UK already has an FTT on share sales, but loopholes mean a large portion of this is lost.

Extending the FTT would not require an entirely new system to be introduced.



**Motion 5 - Closing the cold homes loophole**

Motion submitted by: Cllr Martin Fodor, Green, Redland ward

“Full Council notes:

1. The private rented sector is a major source of housing for families in the city, with many living in fuel poverty due to poor energy efficiency standards. Fuel poverty is defined by having to spend at least 10% of income after housing costs on fuel bills. For many it means a choice of ‘heat or eat’. An estimated 25,000 people in Bristol are classed as being in fuel poverty, many in the private rental sector.
2. After many years of delay, Government regulations will now require landlords of poorly insulated properties to upgrade them in order to make life more comfortable for their tenants and to cut carbon emissions. Homes rated in energy bands F and G (e.g. the coldest) must be brought up to band E.
3. However, an exemption exists allowing landlords to not undertake this work if it will cost them money - which it almost certainly will since government energy efficiency schemes that they could have applied to have mostly closed or been significantly scaled down. As long as this loophole is open, the hardest to heat homes in the city will be left uninsulated.
4. Living in a cold home is bad for your physical and mental health; it damages children's educational development and affects many families in the city as well as many older people who then risk hypothermia.
5. The Mayor has done commendable work so far in bringing together Fuel Poverty stakeholders and with winter approaching more must now be done.

Full Council believes:

1. With colder weather on the way, the campaign to close the loophole that allows private rented sector landlords to duck their obligations to make their homes warmer is very timely.
2. There should be a replacement for the Green Deal Finance scheme which enabled investment to be made to upgrade homes at no upfront cost to the landlord or owner (with financing costs being paid for out of savings gained for the occupier from improved energy efficiency and lower bills – this is known as a Pay As You Save Scheme).

Full Council resolves to call on the Mayor to:

1. Support a national campaign by climate change charity 10:10 which is campaigning to close the loophole.
2. Write to all the local MPs and ask them to press the government to remove the exemption and provide a source of finance for landlords to upgrade their homes as required by the legislation.
3. Look into what the Council can do to further alleviate fuel poverty



- and encourage insulation through the Private Housing team.
4. Support Warm Up Bristol to play a role in this.”

### **Motion 6 - Action on residents parking**

Motion submitted by: Cllr Stephen Clarke, Green, Southville ward

“Full Council notes:

1. That the Mayor has recently refused to allow an extension of the Southville RPS scheme across to the South side of North St in Southville to include a small number of roads with terraced houses such as Friezwood Rd, Carrington Rd and Truro Rd.
2. This refusal is despite many requests that local councillors have received from residents in these roads to protect them from overspill from the Southville RPS schemes and traffic from the football and rugby crowds at Ashton Gate.
3. The recent consultation on changes to the Southville RPS also demonstrated strong support from the residents of these roads to an RPS extension to cover their area.
4. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that these few roads are squeezed between the Southville RPS scheme and newer housing that has off street parking.

Full Council believes that:

1. When residents of a specific area ask for help from the council in this way they should be listened to, otherwise they will perceive the whole process of consultation as being a meaningless tick-box exercise.
2. Inevitably there is going to be spillover problems from many existing RPS schemes but this is a specific area of only a few streets where intense problems have been caused by a council decision regarding parking. At very little expense this could now be solved by the council listening to the residents’ request.
3. If a change is not made now it will probably not be made for many years.

Full Council resolves to call on the Mayor to:

1. Carry out a swift review of the situation in this specific area.
2. Depending on the results of that review, implement a strictly limited extension to the Southville RPS to cover the relevant roads.
3. Explain to the local residents what is happening and why such a clear request from residents and local councillors (who are supposed to be in charge of the process) has been ignored for so long.”



**Motion 7 - Bristol's housing shortage: providing key worker homes**

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

“This Council welcomes the moves made by the Chancellor to support the Housing market in the Autumn Statement whilst, at the same time, maintaining fiscal discipline aimed at reducing the budget deficit to 1.5% of national income by 2020-21.

Council has previously endorsed the region's ambitious house building target of 105,500 new dwellings in the Joint Spatial Plan. Whilst supportive of the Mayor's pledge to supply 2,000 homes a year (800 affordable) by 2020, and the steps taken through the housing delivery company, Council believes much more needs to be done to meet the accommodation needs of the relatively low paid.

Bristol is now one of the least affordable cities in the UK, with the cost of buying a home requiring an income multiplier of ten times the national average wage.

Accordingly, Council calls on the Mayor to conduct an audit of the Authority's property portfolio, with a view to identifying those buildings – classed as brownfield or previously developed sites – which could be converted for the exclusive or predominant purpose of providing 'key worker' homes.

Two possible candidates for such conversion would be the two historic ('A' and 'B') bonded warehouses near to the Cumberland Basin. These huge structures have enormous potential to create hundreds of units for rent or affordable purchase and are ideally located near to the city centre. The feasibility of this proposal should be fully explored. Council considers such a change-of-use would help to alleviate a chronic housing shortage and recognise the vital contribution that professionals such as nurses, teachers and the police etc., make to the continuing success of the Bristol economy.”

**Motion 8 - Getting waste back on track**

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

“Council notes with concern the declining environmental performance of Bristol City Council on waste over recent years. Whilst it is undoubtedly true that since 2015 British central government has placed less emphasis on recycling rates, that is not an excuse for the poor recycling rates which have declined rapidly since the 50% peak some 5 years ago.



<https://www.bristol.gov.uk/documents/20182/33395/Towards+a+Zero+Waste+Bristol+-+Waste+and+Resource+Management+Strategy/102e90cb-f503-48c2-9c54-689683df6903>

This Council had a policy, which is no longer adhered to, of refusing to use mass burn incineration for waste disposal and there is now a dangerous drift to increasing our dependence on incineration.

There are a number of reasons for the decline in performance and it is a matter of concern that some of these are now hidden from most Councillors and the public under the guise of confidentiality.

Council regrets that as an example, of a matter of concern, the waste calendar which provided great information as well as collection days and was on display in so many kitchens has been withdrawn without information or proper discussion.

Council calls for the Mayor to come forward with a clear plan and strategy for reinvigorating performance, including the opening date of the South Bristol recycling centre, to be discussed by Full Council.”

### **Motion 9 - Building an Arena in Bristol**

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

“Full Council notes:

1. That Bristol is the only one of the UK’s major Core Cities to have no city centre arena.
2. That approximately £10 million of Council funds have already been invested into the development of a site near Bristol Temple Meads for a Bristol arena, and any alternative site would require significant preparatory work as a minimum with WECA and arena management companies before a site could be decided on. It would therefore result in further significant delays before Bristol has an arena.

Full Council believes there are three major benefits to building an arena on 'arena island' in the heart of Bristol City Centre:

1. The ease of access by public transport, for both visitors and locals from across the city, due to the proximity to Bristol Temple Meads Station and key bus routes.
2. Increased numbers of visitors to Bristol, as well as the likelihood that visitors will take advantage of the other city-centre attractions, therefore further contributing to the local economy and generating further revenue for the Council itself.



3. The potential for an arena at this site to unlock further sustainable and balanced regeneration in this part of the city.

Concerning a possible move to Filton, Full Council notes:

1. That moving the arena to Filton could generate millions of additional car journeys to an already heavily congested area.
2. That current public transport arrangements at Filton are significantly worse than at Temple Meads.

Council therefore believes that:

The current proposed location of the arena at Temple Meads is the best site, and should be retained unless it can conclusively be shown to be unaffordable or that arguments for alternative sites are overwhelming. That means that they are better for access, sustainable travel, local business, and meet the Mayor's 'Good growth' goals.”

### **Motion 10 - National Joint Council pay and conditions and the public sector pay freeze**

Motion submitted by: Cllr Mark Brain, Labour, Hartcliffe & Withywood ward

“Full Council notes that:

1. For most workers in local government and schools, pay and other terms and conditions are determined by the National Joint Council (NJC) for local government services.
2. On average, across the country, NJC basic pay has fallen by 21% in real terms since 2010.
3. NJC workers had a three-year pay freeze from 2010-2012 and have received only 1% pay increase annually since then.
4. NJC pay is the lowest in the public sector.
5. Differentials in pay grades are being squeezed and distorted by bottom-loaded NJC pay settlements needed to reflect the increased Statutory National Living Wage.
6. The likelihood of rising inflation following the vote to leave the European Union will worsen the current public sector pay inequality.
7. The drastic ongoing cuts to local government funding and calls on the Government to provide all additional resources to ensure local authorities can fund a decent pay rise for NJC employees and the pay spine review.

Full Council believes:

1. That the NJC pay claim for 2018, submitted by Unite, UNISON and the GMB on behalf of council and school workers should be supported and calls for the immediate end of public sector pay restraint. NJC pay cannot be allowed to fall further behind other parts of the public sector.
2. That the joint review of the NJC pay spine to remedy the turbulence



caused by bottom-loaded pay settlements is welcome.

Full Council resolves:

1. To call on the Mayor to write to the LGA asking it to make urgent representations to Government to fund the NJC claim and the pay spine review.
2. To write to the Prime Minister and Chancellor supporting the NJC pay claim and seeking the additional resources needed to fund a decent pay rise and the pay spine review.
3. To write to local NJC union representatives to convey support for the pay claim and the pay spine review.”

---

Signed

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Baya'.

Proper Officer  
Friday, 5 January 2018

