

# Summons to attend meeting of Full Council



**Date:** Tuesday, 16 March 2021

**Time:** 6.00 pm

**Venue:** Virtual Meeting - Zoom Committee Meeting  
with Public Access via YouTube

**To: All Members of Council**

**Issued by:** Sam Wilcock, Democratic Services

City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol, BS1 9NE

Tel: 0117 92 23846

E-mail: [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)

**Date:** Friday, 5 March 2021



# Agenda

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

(Pages 29 - 31)

## 2. Apologies for Absence

## 3. Declarations of Interest

To note any declarations of interest from the 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 declarations of interest made at the meeting which is not on the register of interests should be notified to the Monitoring Officer for inclusion.

## 4. Minutes of the Previous Meetings

To agree the minutes of the following previous meetings as a correct record;

(Pages 32 - 75)

- 11<sup>th</sup> February 2021
- 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2021
- 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2021

## 5. Lord Mayor's Business

To note any announcements from the Lord Mayor

## 6. Public Forum (Public Petitions, Statements and Questions)

Public forum items can be about any matter the Council is responsible for or which directly affects the city. Submissions will be treated in order of receipt and **as many people shall be called upon as is possible within the time allowed within the meeting (normally 30 minutes)**.

Further rules can be found within our [Council Procedure Rules](#) and [Virtual Meeting Procedure Rules](#) within the [Constitution](#).

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 15<sup>th</sup> March 2021** at latest. One written statement per member of the public is permitted.

b. Public questions: Written public questions must be received by **5pm on Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2021** at latest. A maximum of 2 questions per member of the public is permitted. Questions should be addressed to the Mayor or relevant Cabinet Member.

c. Members of the public who wish to present their public forum in person during the video conference must register their interest by giving at least two clear working days notice prior to the meeting by midday on **Friday 11<sup>th</sup> March 2021**.

Public forum items should be e-mailed to [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)

## **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 11 March 2020**.

## **8. Mayoral Commission Update: Youth Mayors/ Youth Council end of year progress report**

## **9. Pay Policy Statement 2020-2021**

**(Pages 76 - 91)**

## **10. Scrutiny Annual Report**

**(Pages 92 - 98)**

## **11. 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 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 also set out for information.

**FULL COUNCIL MOTIONS – 16 March 2021**

**1. Mayoral Referendum**

Council notes that the people of Bristol in 2012 decided to adopt a mayoral model following a referendum for Bristol City Council.

While noting that the current mayoral system of governance cannot be changed until 2024, there is a ground swell of opinion that the Council should review its current mayoral system of governance, from both the community and a number of elected members on the Council.

A new Mayor will be elected this May until 2024 and it will be up-to them how they use their power.

Council notes that the position of directly elected Metro Mayor has been introduced and powers and money have been transferred to that office.

This motion is to determine that a referendum should be held and to enable full consultation on the new governance arrangements and alternative system, Leader and Cabinet, with a view to holding a referendum in May 2022.

Therefore, this Council resolves:

- (i) That the holding of a referendum on the Council’s governance arrangements be approved and that the Council’s Returning Officer be requested to prepare to hold such a referendum on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> May 2022.
- (ii) That the governance review and referendum question be to determine whether to retain the mayoral model or change to a Leader and Cabinet governance arrangement.
- (iii) Delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with Party



Leaders, to make any decisions or clarifications on any proposed changes with regards to arrangements and Executive powers as per the Local Government Act 2000 that are required as part of the referendum.

**Motion moved by: Councillor Hopkins, Liberal Democrat Group**

**Motion submitted: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

## **2. Bristol's Clean Air Zone Western Boundary**

*“This Council acknowledges the difficult circumstances, challenges and choices which have had to be made to finalise the Full Business Case submission for Bristol's Clean Air Zone to DEFRA by 26th February 2021.*

*The local authority is under legal, moral, and political imperatives to tackle particulate pollution, especially in relation to reducing NO2 vehicle emissions in parts of the city where these regularly exceed permissible limits.*

*Delay in the production of an action plan led to Ministerial Directions the latest of which required implementation for nitrogen dioxide compliance, specifying a Medium Charging Clean Air Zone Class C with small Charging Clean Air Zone Class D... as soon as possible and at least in time to bring forward compliance to 2023.*

*Notwithstanding these facts, Council is extremely concerned over the unintended consequences or effect created by the western boundary of the presently proposed scheme. The inclusion of the A4 Portway – running into the Cumberland Basin road network – a major north-south transit route is certain to cause serious problems for commercial and commuter traffic.*

*The result of this measure will be to either raise costs or displace large volumes of vehicles onto alternative roads and residential streets. This, in turn, will lengthen journey times and increase environmental pollution in other areas previously spared this health hazard.*

*Accordingly, Council calls on the Mayor and Party-Group Leaders to urgently lobby the Under-Secretary of State at DEFRA and the Joint Air Quality Unit (JAQU) to review the Council's evidence to determine whether the current western perimeter of the CAZ could be revised whilst still complying with the overarching legal duties placed on the Council by legislation.”*

**Motion to be moved by Councillor Mark Weston**

**Motion Submitted: 4th March 2021**



### **3. Support for Student Tenants in Private Accommodation**

#### **This Council notes that:**

1. Covid-19 has hit all areas of our society hard, but students in Bristol have been particularly affected by continuously changing guidance on movement and travel.
2. Many students are stuck outside of Bristol or the country, advised not to return to a room for which they are paying full rent.[1]
3. The average rent for a student at Bristol University is £131 per week, and £160 per week for students at the University of the West of England.[2]
4. Many students are facing significant financial hardship during these times. The average student maintenance loan is not enough to cover rent and living costs in Bristol, meaning that many students usually rely on part-time jobs in the hospitality sector to stay afloat. With the entire sector closed down, many students have lost this essential income which they rely on to pay rent.

#### **This Council recognises:**

1. The University of Bristol has offered concrete measures to support their students in halls with rent. This includes a 100% rent rebate from 1st February to 26th March for students who do not return to halls. Students for whom it is better that they do not stay in their residence in Bristol have also been offered a no-penalty contract release without needing to find a replacement tenant. The University of the West of England have taken similar steps, whilst Unite Students have offered a 50% rebate from 18th January to 14th February for students not in residence.[4]
2. However, students in the private sector cannot access this support, despite facing the exact same issues and hardships. Since the majority of students rent in the private sector, this leaves many still facing significant hardship.
3. The University of Bristol, Bristol Students' Union, and a cross-party group of 67 Bristol councillors and candidates have called on Student Landlords, Accommodation Providers, and Letting Agents in Bristol to offer their student tenants a rent waiver, rent reduction or no-penalty contract release.[4]

#### **This Council believes:**

1. Given the dangers posed by new variants of Covid-19, it is vital for public health that students are supported to do the right thing



and minimise travel.

2. Nobody should face financial hardship for obeying the law and public health advice.
3. Student Landlords, Accommodation Providers, and Letting Agents in Bristol should make use of the financial aid the Government has put in place, such as mortgage holidays, to allow them to support student tenants.
4. The Government should provide the necessary financial support to universities and students during the pandemic to ensure that students do not face undue financial hardship, and receive adequate education and mental health support.

**Therefore this Council requests that the Mayor or relevant Cabinet member:**

1. Write to Student Landlords and Accommodation Providers in Bristol, to signpost the financial aid that Government has put in place to help landlords, and ask them to offer their tenants:
  - A rent waiver or a significant rent reduction for the period of lockdown if their tenant is unable to return to Bristol.
  - A no-penalty contract release without needing to find a replacement tenant if the tenant does not want to return to Bristol for the duration of the tenancy due to COVID-19.
  - A significant rent reduction (for example 50%) for students who are losing out financially but remain in residence for the period of lockdown.

If these exact requests are not possible due to the financial situation of the landlord, we ask that landlords enter discussions with tenants and come to an agreement about what level of support is feasible.

2. Write to Letting Agents, who do not have the power to set rents or make financial decisions on behalf of your landlords, to ask them to pass the letter on to landlords.
3. Write to the Minister of State for Universities demanding extended financial support to universities and students during the pandemic to ensure that students do not face undue financial hardship, and receive adequate education and mental health support.

**Motion moved by: Councillor Carla Denyer, Green Group  
Submitted: 3 March 2021**



**Notes:**

1. Advice not to return for most students:  
<https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/for-students/student-guide-to-coronavirus/returning-to-university-in-2021>
2. Average weekly rent for University of Bristol and University of West of England Students 2020:  
<https://www.savesthestudent.org/accommodation/universities-students-pay-the-most-rent.html>
3. The average Maintenance Loan is approximately £6,859 a year, or £132 per week, based on data from the National Student Money Survey and information supplied by the Student Loans Company.  
<https://www.savesthestudent.org/student-finance/maintenance-loans.html#amount>
4. Open letter: <https://www.bristolsu.org.uk/resources/councillor-and-council-candidate-open-letter>

**4. A Universal Basic Income Trial for Bristol****This council notes:**

1. The drastic impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on employment and household incomes in the city;
2. The threat to income and employment from automation and artificial intelligence, which could affect a great many more jobs in future;
3. The development of universal basic income (UBI) trials in other countries, which offer a non-means-tested sum paid by the state to cover the basic cost of living, which is paid to all citizens individually, regardless of employment status, wealth, or marital status, which has been widely debated in recent months;
4. That a trial of UBI was promised by the Labour party had the party won the last general election;
5. The resolutions of other local authorities including Sheffield, Birmingham, Lewes, and Brighton and Hove [with cross party support] calling for trials of UBI;
6. A network of Universal Basic Income Labs has been set up and works with local authorities across the UK developing UBI proposals to address problems such as poverty, inequality, discrimination and environmental damage, long-term and immediately, in relation to





coronavirus. One is operating in Bristol.

7. Birmingham City Council has issued a briefing on UBI[1]
8. UBI has been Green Party Policy since about 1973 and more recently taken up by other parties[2]

**This council believes:**

1. That the current benefit system is failing citizens, with Universal Credit causing hardship to many communities
2. A UBI is the fairest, most effective way to mitigate the effects of coronavirus on people's incomes as it does not discriminate between employment status, caring responsibilities, age, or disability when providing basic support;
3. There is a danger of increasing numbers of people facing poverty as a result of the coronavirus crisis;
4. Testing a UBI is needed, as a UBI has the potential to help address key challenges such as inequality, poverty, precarious employment, loss of community, and breach of planetary boundaries through:
  - i. Giving employers a more flexible workforce whilst giving employees greater freedom to change their jobs;
  - ii. Valuing unpaid work, such as caring for family members and voluntary work;
  - iii. Removing the harmful impacts of benefit sanctions and conditionality;
  - iv. Giving people more equal resources within the family, workplace and society;
  - v. Breaking the link between work and consumption, thus helping reduce strain on the environment in line with the One City Climate Strategy;
  - vi. Enabling greater opportunities for people to work in community and cultural activities or to train or reskill in areas that will be needed to transition to a lower-carbon economy.
5. The success of a UBI pilot should not be measured only by impact upon take-up of paid work, but also the impact upon communities and what the people within them do, how they feel, and how they relate to others and the environment around them; and,
6. Given its history of social innovation, wealth of expertise, and active networks across community, business and public services, Bristol is ideally placed to pilot a UBI.



**This council calls on the Mayor to:**

1. Send a joint letter with the other party leaders to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the leader of the party in Government, their counterparts in all opposition political parties in parliament, and all local MPs, to request a trial of Universal Basic Income in the city citing the above reasons.

[1][https://birmingham.cmis.uk.com/Birmingham/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=nb28HJzZZy8R6UE9qsv3LHJckreeBwn50Tbzg0riXhiHQcf3zr1WGQ%3D%3D&rUzwRPf%2BZ3zd4E7lkn8Lyw%3D%3D=pwRE6AGJFLDNih225F5QMaQWctPHwdhUfCZ%2FLUQzgA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3D%3D&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlG%3D%3D=hFflUdN3100%3D&kCx1AnS9%2FpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3D%3D=hFflUdN3100%3D&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2BAJvYtyA%3D%3D=ctNJFf55vVA%3D&FgPIIEJYlotS%2BYGoBi5oIA%3D%3D=NHdURQburHA%3D&d9Qjj0ag1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJFf55vVA%3D&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJFf55vVA%3D&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCpMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3D&fbclid=IwAR3v5XWzNYc\\_KENecR4\\_O6k4xSFL847QcMyKppBD6IUO5x2gLp5E3Gdl3\\_M](https://birmingham.cmis.uk.com/Birmingham/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=nb28HJzZZy8R6UE9qsv3LHJckreeBwn50Tbzg0riXhiHQcf3zr1WGQ%3D%3D&rUzwRPf%2BZ3zd4E7lkn8Lyw%3D%3D=pwRE6AGJFLDNih225F5QMaQWctPHwdhUfCZ%2FLUQzgA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3D%3D&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlG%3D%3D=hFflUdN3100%3D&kCx1AnS9%2FpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3D%3D=hFflUdN3100%3D&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2BAJvYtyA%3D%3D=ctNJFf55vVA%3D&FgPIIEJYlotS%2BYGoBi5oIA%3D%3D=NHdURQburHA%3D&d9Qjj0ag1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJFf55vVA%3D&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJFf55vVA%3D&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCpMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJFf55vVA%3D&fbclid=IwAR3v5XWzNYc_KENecR4_O6k4xSFL847QcMyKppBD6IUO5x2gLp5E3Gdl3_M)

[2]<https://www.bristol247.com/opinion/your-say/otherpartieswillriudiculegreenpolicies/>

**Motion moved by: Martin Fodor, Redland Ward Green Party Councillor**  
**Date submitted: 3 March 2021**

**5. Liveable Neighbourhoods for Bristol****This council notes:**

1. That streets in Bristol are often affected by rat-running, speeding vehicles, congestion, and pollution;
2. Residential streets across the city are frequently hostile places for children, older residents, and those with disabilities, yet the council has declared an aim to be an age friendly, child friendly, and inclusive city and has declared climate and ecological emergencies;
3. Redesigning our streets and neighbourhoods can create a healthier, safer, greener, and less stressful and more peaceful environment;
4. Progress to make neighbourhoods more liveable is underway in many cities in Britain and other countries;
5. There are groups in many parts of the city campaigning for liveable neighbourhoods, with a citywide Liveable



Neighbourhoods for Bristol [1] campaign supported by 38 groups representing a wide range of needs and interests;

6. The council has recently consulted on several innovative proposals for better street space in high streets and rat runs on 'Bristol Citizenspace' which may incorporate many of the same features as liveable neighbourhoods;
7. The basic features of liveable neighbourhoods are to **filter out rat-running and through traffic across an area**, and to **enable safer movement by active travel**, as well as the introduction of facilities for local people such as pocket parks, seating, shelter, nature, while maintaining essential access throughout;
8. In liveable neighbourhoods there is evidence that lives are healthier, overall levels of motor traffic reduce while active travel increases; emergency vehicles are consulted and do not report delays;
9. Streets can become more favourable for young families, children, older people and disabled people once there is less through traffic;
10. Support for liveable neighbourhoods has already been declared by the current Labour administration[2], Greens[3], and many other organisations[4] but a strategy does not yet exist to implement them and no resources have yet been identified.

**This council believes that:**

1. Developing liveable neighbourhoods can help tackle many of the problems affecting streets across the city and assist many local traders, hospitality and cultural organisations affected by the pandemic;
2. A participatory and inclusive process is needed to inform solutions and deal with many issues in different neighbourhoods, addressing inequalities in streets and different parts of the city, just as with the street space consultation process underway; there are many myths [5] and engagement is needed to discuss and dispel these;
3. Area based solutions are needed (to avoid traffic and parking displacement) and concerns about essential access, deliveries, disabled parking, and space for local traders has to be informed by evidence and examples from elsewhere, but there is no uniform model that should be imposed on areas of the city;
4. A mix of different facilities, layouts, amenities and traffic management options can be trialled and adopted to create liveable neighbourhoods depending on local needs, preferences and opportunities, e.g. to incorporate school streets.

**This council calls on the Mayor to:**



1. Commit to making Bristol a city of liveable neighbourhoods;
2. Build on the streetspace projects by working with residents and stakeholders across the city to enable residents and other partners to work together with council support to develop and trial liveable neighbourhoods;
3. Identify budgets (such as community infrastructure levy), support, and facilities that could be used to progress the introduction of liveable neighbourhoods in conjunction with government and WECA funds for active travel, play, and COVID recovery.

References:

1. <https://liveablebristol.org.uk/>
2. <https://thebristolmayor.com/2020/11/23/liveable-neighbourhoods/?fbclid=IwAR1yaEvgRknvDcRE0m3VhWUVlaRynNLIzPRhvpFdQuemK82E8RxfjFgtBxNM>
3. <https://sandy4mayor.co.uk/flourishing-bristol-liveable-neighbourhoods/?fbclid=IwAR1U3agx41GFfPxmVxjdlaw206t6IripFfDcoKvAsRbgJU1PYG1sTfpgl>
4. <https://bristolcycling.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/LNfB-Open-Letter.pdf>
5. For instance, these eight relating to low traffic neighbourhoods: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/nov/16/mythbusters-eight-common-objections-to-ltns-and-why-they-are-wrong>

**Motion proposed by: Martin Fodor - Redland ward Green Party councillor**

**Motion submitted: 3 March 2021**

**6. Motion to Support the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill**

**Full Council notes that:**

1. In November 2018 Bristol City Council became the first UK local authority to declare a Climate Emergency. In February 2020 it also declared an Ecological Emergency. The Mayor's Climate Emergency Action Plan was published in 2019, leading in early 2020 to the One City Climate Strategy: A strategy for a carbon neutral, climate resilient Bristol by 2030.
2. The UK Government's own target is for carbon neutrality by 2050. This is not satisfactory because the world is set to exceed the Paris Agreement's limit of 1.5°C warming over the pre-industrial level between 2030 and 2040, causing significant and irreversible harm. The UK Government has declined to declare a Climate Emergency, although the UK Parliament and the devolved administrations of Wales and Scotland have all done so.



3. In January 2021 the World Meteorological Organization confirmed that 2020 was one of the joint hottest years on record, with an average temperature that was 1.2°C above the pre-industrial level. This means that the warmest six years on record have all occurred since 2016, and that since the 1980s each decade has been hotter than the decade which preceded it. On current trends the world will see a catastrophic temperature rise of 3-5°C this century, compared to the pre-industrial level.
4. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has reported that avoiding significant harm by limiting heating to 1.5°C may still be possible with ambitious action from national and sub-national authorities, civil society, the private sector and local communities. The costs of failing to address this crisis will far outstrip the investments required to prevent it. Investing now will bring many benefits in the form of sustainable jobs, breathable cities and thriving communities.
5. Many local authorities have now established Citizens' Assemblies to assist them in their plans to achieve net zero by 2030 or before. Bristol City Council has established a Citizens' Assembly to help shape the city's recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.
6. There is a Bill before Parliament - the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill (published as the "Climate and Ecology Bill") – which has already attracted the support of around 100 MPs. The Bill would require the UK Government to develop an emergency strategy that:
  - a) requires the UK to play its fair and proper role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions consistent with limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial temperatures;
  - b) ensures that all the UK's consumption emissions are accounted for;
  - c) includes emissions from aviation and shipping;
  - d) protects and restores biodiverse habitats in overseas supply chains;
  - e) restores and regenerates the UK's depleted soils, wildlife habitats and species populations to healthy and robust states, thereby maximising their capacity to absorb CO<sub>2</sub> and their resistance to climate heating;
  - f) sets up an independent Citizens' Assembly, representative of the UK's population, to engage with Parliament and Government and help develop the emergency strategy.

**Full Council therefore resolves to:**



1. Support the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill;
2. Inform the media of this decision;
3. Write to Bristol’s MPs, asking them to support the Bill, or in the case of Darren Jones (Bristol NW) and any other Bristol MPs who have chosen to support the bill, thanking them for their action;
4. Write to the [CEE Bill Alliance](#), the organisers of the campaign for the Bill, expressing this council’s support (campaign@ceebill.uk).

**Motion proposed by: Councillor Stephen Clarke**

**Motion submitted: 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021**

## **7. Mobilise community investments to tackle climate change**

### **Full Council notes:**

1. That this council unanimously declared a climate emergency in November 2018 following a Green Motion to Council
2. That motion committed the city to achieve net zero carbon impact by 2030 and there are now under 10 years left to this target date
3. The council has been progressing a package of low carbon opportunities called City Leap since May 2018. City Leap is still subject to a procurement process since a new process was started in 2020.
4. A new low risk model called Community Municipal Investments [CMI] has been developed by Leeds University and Abundance Investments platform with UK Government and EU support. This concept had the support of 4 local authorities including Bristol City Council. [1]
5. This model of green bond is proven to mobilise local and other investment and channels local savings into local projects with low risk and a modest return to investors [2] and after the first issue further calls can be automated.

### **Full Council believes:**

1. That offering local savers a way to support the city’s journey to carbon neutrality mobilises community engagement in the process of change, attracts significant sums for named projects, and should be developed. 72% of people want to lend savings to help councils develop Climate Emergency Plans [3]
2. That offering security and a modest rate of interest through municipal bonds is an established way to develop local infrastructure [4]. This could complement other projects such as the successful Bristol Energy Cooperative.
3. That CMIs can help us develop a series of practical projects for a low carbon transition now in partnership with others which



will be popular with local savers.

4. The Mayor should prioritise CMIs as part of the package of investments that will create positive economic opportunities and carbon neutrality while building community wealth.
5. Bristol should join the other 3 pioneers of CMI in developing local opportunities for local investors [5]

#### **Full Council resolves:**

1. To call on the Mayor to begin development of Community Municipal Investments for the city.
2. That the Mayor promote CMI as a way residents and institutions can be engaged and actively involved in contributing to a zero carbon city.
3. To request officers to identify carbon saving projects suited to CMI investment in conjunction with city partners.

#### References:

1. The report supported by Bristol:  
<https://baumaninstitute.leeds.ac.uk/research/financing-for-society/>
2. Initial proposed interest rate is 1.2%. See: Your questions answered on Green Community Bonds | Abundance Blog  
<https://medium.abundanceinvestment.com/community-municipal-investments-your-questions-answered-25218ed4d2cb>
3. Survey by One Poll, 2020, cited by the Local Government Association.
4. [https://medium.abundanceinvestment.com/community-municipal-investments-the-new-option-for-your-low-risk-money-a9cc5d72e03a?source=post\\_internal\\_links-----1-----](https://medium.abundanceinvestment.com/community-municipal-investments-the-new-option-for-your-low-risk-money-a9cc5d72e03a?source=post_internal_links-----1-----)
5. These are: Leeds Council, Warrington, and West Berkshire. Eg Invest now: <https://info.westberks.gov.uk/wbcmi>;  
<https://www.abundanceinvestment.com/invest-now/warrington-2025>

**Motion to be moved by: Cllr Martin Fodor, Redland ward Green Party**

**Date of submission: 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021**

### **8. Supporting In-House Security And Cleaning Staff**

*“This Council is concerned over the apparent disparity in interpretation, perception and understanding between the trade unions, senior management and the Labour Administration regarding the proposed implementation of changes in terms and conditions for some of our workforce.*

*More specifically, the recent announcement to co-source/outsource*





*security and cleaning staff to Bristol Waste seems particularly insensitive and ill-judged. The timing of such a proposal will strike many as egregious at this moment given that it involves disposal of some of our lowest paid employees who have proven themselves to be key workers during the health crisis.*

*Council does not believe moving these people off payroll represents an acceptable way to reward such service. Moreover, Members have not yet been provided with convincing information to justify such a controversial move.*

*Accordingly, Council calls on the Mayor to withdraw or remove this threat and provide an assurance that these workers will remain highly valued local government employees.”*

**Motion to be moved by Councillor Richard Eddy**  
**Motion submitted: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

### **9. Growing Provision Of Allotments Across The City**

*“This Council recognises the long-established benefits derived from the provision of small agricultural holdings and allotments to individuals and families. These sites give people the chance to take productive exercise and grow cheap food but, also, are valued for other reasons such as providing educational opportunities, help to build communities and offer some protection to the local environment.*

*Council notes the commitment previously given by the Mayor to ‘**have community gardens and allotments in every ward**’ but is anxious to ensure that such rhetoric translates into action.*

*At present, the Authority has 497 vacancies with a waiting list of 5665 people. Council is concerned that much suitable land held by the Authority for this purpose is either underutilised or could be de-registered for development, ironically, when there is likely to be a growing desire and demand to maintain an allotment.*

*Accordingly, Council calls on the Mayor to pledge to preserve, protect and promote existing sites; to increase the size of this network; extend the number which are accorded (limited) ‘statutory’ protection under current legislation; and ensure that all those who want access to a plot, are able to do so.”*

**Motion to be moved by Councillor Graham Morris**  
**Motion submitted: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

### **10. Enhanced Protection of The Green Belt**





*“This Council welcomes the Government’s recent recognition of the public consultation which has been received to the first stage of its reform of the Planning system. Of particular importance is the proposed strengthening of the status afforded to the statutory Green Belt following the efforts of such bodies as the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England.*

*Council is especially pleased to learn of the increased emphasis placed on redevelopment of ‘brownfield’ and previously used sites in urban centres, rather than ‘eating’ into our surrounding fields, farmland and countryside.*

*Partly in response to this announcement but also to reflect the substantial level of local opposition shown in public consultation, Council resolves to amend its draft Bristol Local Plan to delete the proposed de-registration of Green Belt protection within the South Bristol Link Road, in Bedminster Down and Highridge.*

*One practical consequence of this change will be the deletion of the proposed planned approval for the construction of 200 properties near Yew Tree Farm and 150 properties near Elsbet Drive.”*

**Motion to be moved by Councillor Kevin Quartley**

**Motion submitted: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

## **11. The government’s White Paper ‘Planning for the Future’**

This Council:

- appreciates the merit of the present hierarchy of planning in the UK. Where it works well the system allows for local neighbourhood plans and for consultation and engagement with the preparation of Local Plans and the Sub-Regional joint Spatial Plan
- accepts the need for such plans to be approved, and sometimes overruled, by central government to comply with overall national criteria
- acknowledges the necessity for certain infrastructure works to be subject to special Permitted Development rules where government restricts local consultation and democracy for strategic reasons
- recognises the value of transparency and fairness throughout the planning system so that citizens voices can be heard amid the wider assembly of guidance for the justification for new development and how this can or cannot be reasonably accommodated within suitable local policy frameworks formed



from national guidance and approved for use by central government

- supports the high target it has set for new housebuilding in and around Bristol to sustain its local growth and is generally satisfied with the way it has administered the present planning system to approve a high percentage of developers planning applications.

Council further notes that the Government Planning White Paper ‘Planning for the Future’ dated 6<sup>th</sup> August 2020 proposes:

- Local Plans are to be produced under government direction and with targets set nationally, even extending to local areas
- that areas are to be classified as Growth, Renewal or Protected with designated Conservation Areas not automatically ‘protected’.
- No planning consent will be required in Growth areas and only minimal checks will be required in Renewal areas.
- Domestic houses will be allowed up to two storey extensions with no approvals or objection from neighbours
- local planning committees will be effectively abolished or rendered toothless so inappropriate siting, quality, design and other impacts will no longer be capable of challenge
- buildings can be removed and replaced with poor quality housing without checks on reasonable space standards or even natural light so sanctioning worsening public health for volume housing and the creation of ‘modern slums’ \*
- The present overall development tax, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is to be nationally restructured so that it no longer reflects a locally-fair contribution; the individual development mitigation arrangements (S106), are to be abolished.
- no alternative is indicated to replace the affordable housing (currently 26,800 nationally or 50% of the affordable housing built last year) which was achieved through S106 arrangements, that are to be abandoned
- the size of development that requires a proportion of affordable housing is to be downgraded from 10 to 50 units which will seriously reduce the best source of essential affordable housing

Council regrets:

- the proposals do not address the fundamental acknowledged blocks, stemming from land valuation, finance and tenure limitations, particularly prevalent in the UK, to increasing the supply of housing, particularly affordable housing
- the government’s belief that the planning system is the cause of delay in building new housing whereas instead it is the way that housebuilding is financed within this country that encourages



developers to use planning permissions as a means of adding value over time

- the proposals restrict rather than enhance the present opportunities to provide much-needed affordable housing of an acceptable standard
- there is no acknowledgement, or attempt to resolve, the ‘log-jam’ to building which is the hoarding of planning permissions by developers due to the unrealistic relationship of land price to sales value and the reluctance of financiers to embrace large-scale rented development
- the escalation in Permitted Development Rights with its removal of sensible controls and enforcement over development that has already exposed poor quality and reduced numbers of affordable housing
- the proposals presage a very different relationship across the country between local and national government and a compact with the people with a clear loss of local and regional democracy
- this democracy and community support built in to the present system is being sacrificed because of a misapprehension that the current seven year cycle of Local Plans, derived from government timetables, is a block to development rather than a constantly evolving resource
- the proposals ignore the hard-to-improve results from the system at present: 90% of all developments are approved within the current planning system; 65% of refusals that go to appeal are turned down by the inspector
- nationally 1, 000, 000 homes granted planning permission in the last 10 years are still unbuilt despite, in some cases, having been required to be resubmitted for approval three times. This is twice the five years quoted by the Minister as the delay caused by the planning system “to getting a spade in the ground”
- The proposals make no attempt to address this virtually automatic serial re-approval with no penalty or requirement to complete the permitted development within the period of the permission
- the Local Government Association, the Town and Country Planning Association, the Royal Town Planning Institute, the Royal Institute of British Architects should all have seen the need to condemn the proposals

Council resolves to request the Mayor:

- to make early representations to government along with other members of the Core Cities Group and fellow planning authorities within WECA, leading the way for other councils around the country expressing concerns about the removal of local democratic control promised by previous governments as part of



the benefits of adopting a mayoral system

- to instruct officers to prepare a strong response to the consultation across the areas of governance, democracy, local knowledge, quality control and reduction in affordable housing delivered, and any others that become apparent during this process
- to advertise the consultation and invite representations from the Bristol public to the government
- to strive to maintain the consensus within this council to explore creative opportunities for maximising the delivery of sustainable housing, independently and with others, affordable by all our citizens whatever their need and circumstance.

Notes: \* a government commissioned study published in July 2020 (carried out by University College, London and the University of Liverpool) has shown that poorer quality homes are being created from Permitted Development than through the existing planning system. They are less likely to achieve national space standards, are more likely to be deficient with natural daylight

**Motion to be presented by Cllr. Anthony Negus (Cotham, LibDem councillor)**

**Date of submission: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

## **12. New Secondary School in Knowle**

Secondary School places in South Bristol are in short supply and the situation will get worse over the next couple of years. The problem becomes even more challenging as the public transport is woeful and travelling from Knowle to Brislington or Bedminster Down is very challenging for pupils.

After gap of 20 years with no secondary provision in the area, we now have a solution with the new school being built on part of the old Merrywood School site. The other part of the site will be given over to a great new community facility costing around £6M

This Council thanks the trustees of “The Park” Local Opportunity Centre for doing such a great job of providing community facilities over the last 20 years on the old school site and working so hard on the imaginative new plan.

Government, Oasis, funders and the community are to be thanked also and we must recognise that Officers and Cabinet Members gave full backing to this scheme (despite a couple of frankly silly objections).



This Council asks for one further contribution, with the present timetable a couple of the most critical years will not benefit from the new school. We ask that the school is set up earlier in temporary accommodation from September 2021.

Council notes that the site is, unlike the Temple Meads new site, large and open and that the failure of the plans for early opening at Temple Meads will put even more pressure on numbers over the next 2 years in East and South Bristol.

**Motion to be moved by: Cllr Gary Hopkins, Knowle Ward (Lib Dem)**

**Date of submission: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

### **13. No Supermarkets Compact**

This Council notes that retail and distribution workers have been at the front line of the Covid-19 crisis, facing a high-pressured environment and that supermarkets have made many adaptations to keep the city running during the lockdown. This commitment and innovation could be extended to deliver greater permanent benefits.

The Council notes a number of challenges within the retail and distribution sector that hamper the city's sustainability aspirations. These challenges include, but not exclusively:

- extensive usage of a wide range of packaging materials
- continuing use of materials, particularly plastics, with poor recycling outcomes
- excessive levels of wastage, particularly of food
- increasing heavy vehicular distribution-miles, both cross-countries and within the city

The Council regrets that it lacks the regulatory powers to control the negative outcomes from some large commercial organisations in the city and the resources required to resolve and mitigate some of these issues. This Council notes the announcements and actions by more conscientious firms to address some of these issues to reduce their costs and be more responsible.

This Council notes the unacceptable level of food poverty in our city.

This Council notes the increasing challenges around goods delivery vehicles in our city and the use of freight consolidation which is attempting to reduce the volume of traffic and improve air quality.

This Council notes that a successful plan to deliver carbon neutrality by 2030 will require committed leadership to inspire common purpose in everyone and across all groups in our city

This Council notes that much customer packaging places volume and



disposal demands on the city's waste services, while their bulk packaging is also unsustainable though disposed through commercial operators. This Council notes that a proposal to address these issues is supported by research and a dossier of detailed responses from all of the eight major supermarkets, which has been prepared by a BCC scrutiny committee and was commended by a committee of the Core Cities team.

The Council resolves to thank our retail and distribution workers.

A focused and co-operative approach might deliver multiple benefits, including a:

- reduction in the use of plastic
- reduction in food waste
- reduction in delivery-miles
- rewarding sustainable practice
- getting out our sustainability message through big players to the shopping public
- tackling at source some resulting issues currently funded through the public purse

The Council resolves to set up a working group to engage with key stakeholders, including supermarkets, councillors and trade unions, to resolve these challenges.

Council therefore resolves to launch the first core-city co-operative initiative of its kind:

Council resolves that this working group will explore a Supermarkets Charter with the major chains in Bristol where the City council sets a small number of key criteria that will benefit the city and promotes a 'Kitemark' - type scheme awarding recognition as each is achieved. This would recognise good practice in a competitive market increasingly sensitive to improving sustainability, and enable customers to make informed choices, with the 'Kitemark' displayed on their premises and promotional literature.

Such a scheme would be a simple and highly visible way of advancing our sustainability ambitions. It would be co-operative, competitive and catalytic while fair and sustainable. It would be a cost-effective way for this city to offer mutual solutions to long-standing common problems. It would be a bold advance in the crucial community engagement measures to deliver real-life sustainability, closer to source. We request the Mayor to take this forward through the most appropriate structures.

**Motion to be presented by: Cllr. Anthony Negus (Cotham, LibDem councillor)**

**Submitted: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

#### **14. Climate and Ecological Emergency**



**Full Council notes that:**

1. In November 2018 Bristol City Council became the first UK local authority to declare a Climate Emergency. In February 2020 it also declared an Ecological Emergency. The Mayor's Climate Emergency Action Plan was published in 2019, leading in early 2020 to the One City Climate Strategy: A strategy for a carbon neutral, climate resilient Bristol by 2030.
2. The UK Government's own target is for carbon neutrality by 2050. This is not satisfactory because the world is set to exceed the Paris Agreement's limit of 1.5°C warming over the pre-industrial level between 2030 and 2040, causing significant and irreversible harm. The UK Government has declined to declare a Climate Emergency, although the UK Parliament and the devolved administrations of Wales and Scotland have all done so.
3. In January 2021 the World Meteorological Organization confirmed that 2020 was one of the joint hottest years on record, with an average temperature that was 1.2°C above the pre-industrial level. This means that the warmest six years on record have all occurred since 2016, and that since the 1980s each decade has been hotter than the decade which preceded it. On current trends the world will see a catastrophic temperature rise of 3-5°C this century, compared to the pre-industrial level.
4. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has reported that avoiding significant harm by limiting heating to 1.5°C may still be possible with ambitious action from national and sub-national authorities, civil society, trade unions, the private sector and local communities. The costs of failing to address this crisis will far outstrip the investments required to prevent it. Investing now will bring many benefits in the form of sustainable jobs, breathable cities and thriving communities.
5. Our ambition is for Bristol to play a full and leading role nationally and internationally in the urgent task of halting climate change and tackling the ecological emergency and to reach net-zero carbon emissions as quickly as possible. There are many aspects of how we can fulfil that ambition and we have included some of them below. This is not an exhaustive list and we note that we need to focus widely across policy areas as well as deeply and urgently for sustainable, significant change.

5) For example, many local authorities have now established Citizens' Assemblies to assist them in their plans to achieve net





zero by 2030 or before. Bristol City Council has established a Citizens' Assembly to help shape the city's recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.

7. This year the UK hosts COP26, the international climate change conference. This is an opportunity to showcase Bristol's achievements on halting climate change.

8. We note that getting to net-zero on carbon emissions in order to achieve our ambition, we will have to use the best possible evidence, work closely with scientists, engineers, schools and colleges as well as the university and trade unions, in order to train the workforce we need at speed and to high levels.

9. We further note that getting to net-zero requires improvements to how we build and retrofit homes and work places, how we generate and conserve energy, how we design and operate transport systems, how we produce, distribute and consume food and more.

10. We also note that it is vital to work closely with the trade union movement on supporting the development of new jobs and any changes needed to existing ones, to ensure that training, terms and conditions are promoted and their expertise valued.

11. We note that there is a Bill before Parliament - the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill (published as the "Climate and Ecology Bill") – which has already attracted the support of around 100 MPs. The Bill would require the UK Government to develop an emergency strategy that:

- a) requires the UK to play its fair and proper role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions consistent with limiting global temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial temperatures;
- b) ensures that all the UK's consumption emissions are accounted for;
- c) includes emissions from aviation and shipping;
- d) protects and restores biodiverse habitats in overseas supply chains;
- e) restores and regenerates the UK's depleted soils, wildlife habitats and species populations to healthy and robust states, thereby maximising their capacity to absorb CO<sub>2</sub> and their resistance to climate heating;
- f) sets up an independent Citizens' Assembly, representative of the UK's population, to engage with Parliament and Government and help develop the emergency strategy.





12. We note that unfortunately the impact of the Covid crisis on the Parliamentary timetable means that this Bill will not be heard, debated or voted on as it is a Private Members' Bill which has now no listing. Parliament will end this current session within a few weeks at which point all Bills fall. We want to make sure that the commitment and aims of the current draft are brought into the next session of parliament, ideally in the form of a Government Bill.
13. We do not want our aims and ambitions for national change to be limited by this as our ambition is long term and focussed on the most important task, to halt climate change and ecological emergency.
14. We are focussed on promoting Bristol as an example of good practice as the country moves towards COP26 later this year, an opportunity to showcase Bristol's role in ending climate change.
15. We also note the work our MPs are already doing, for example, on the Environment Bill, the various select committees, on policy development on zero-carbon housing and sustainable transport.
16. We also note that to be effective, any change in law needs to be via a Government Bill, with full government support. The CEE Bill has highlighted and raised awareness of what that Bill should include, and we want to build on that, in order to fulfil our ambition of halting climate change and the ecological emergency.

Full Council therefore resolves to call on the Mayor or relevant Cabinet Member to:

1. Support the aims of the current draft of the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill;
2. Ask all our MPs to support these aims going into a new Bill in the next Parliamentary session.
3. Write to our MPs to ask them how we can work more effectively together to promote Bristol's work and to push Government for a Bill in government time to fulfil the aims of the CEE Bill and to thank them for the wide range of work they are already undertaking to halt climate change in their different roles.



4. Contact the relevant leads in the Universities in Bristol and the Policy Studies teams to ask them to brief the council on key policy changes we could make to improve what we are doing and how we measure it
- 1.5. Work closely with the scientists, environmental experts and consultants in our city who can help us to reduce our carbon footprint in buildings, transport and infrastructure as well as waste and energy.
- 2.6. Inform the media of this decision;
- 4.7. Write to the CEE Bill Alliance, the organisers of the campaign for the Bill, expressing this council's support (campaign@ceebill.uk) and asking them what their plans are for the new Parliamentary session.

**Motion to be moved by Cllr Shah, Labour Group  
Submitted on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

**15. Nursery Funding**

Full Council recognize the vital role that early years provision and our nursery school network play in supporting communities across the whole city. Bristol should be justly proud of its achievements in this area. Throughout the hard times of austerity and COVID, dedicated and committed staff have ensured that children and families get the support they need, including those with complex needs. Yet the long-term financial sustainability of our nursery school network is under threat due to failure by government to review and revise the formula through which funding is provided, despite promises to do so. The Chancellor's recent announcement of an "above inflation" rise amounts to only a few pence per child and is therefore totally inadequate as a protection for the long-term future of this vital service, as it does not take into account the effect that a decade of austerity has had on child poverty rates.

Full Council resolves to:

1) Acknowledge the unique contribution that early years provision and our nursery schools play in offering the best start in life for children from all backgrounds and communities.

2) Ask that the Mayor, the Cabinet Member for Education, and the Cabinet Member for Women, Children, and Families organise a meeting



of Members of Parliament and interested councillors to discuss this vital matter and agree how best to continue to lobby the Government on the matter.

3) As that the Mayor, the Cabinet Member for Education, and the Cabinet Member for Women, Children, and Families, to write to the Minister for Early Years and to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to demand that they give priority to introducing a new fair funding formula and the necessary additional resources to ensure a stable long-term future for state provided nursery and early years provision.

**Motion to be moved by: Cllr Tincknell, Labour Group**  
**Submitted on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

## 16. Air Pollution

Full Council notes that:

The death of nine year old Ella Kissa-Debrah in London has been directly linked to air pollution by a coroner’s inquest, the first ruling of its kind in the UK. She was exposed to excessive nitrogen dioxide levels in excess of EU and national guidelines, and particulate levels above World Health Organisation guidelines, principally as a result of vehicle emissions. In a report investigating her death, it was found there was a “real prospect that without unlawful levels of air pollution, Ella would not have died”.

Full Council believes that:

UK cities’ clean air policies must now change urgently in response to this, to ensure that children and others vulnerable to poor air quality are saved from premature death. Cities have a massive role to play in this and Bristol can lead the way with innovative approaches.

The Council’s Clean Air Zone is one such step forward, and Bristol has opportunities to put in place an effective and innovative plan to reduce emissions from vehicles. Legal compliance should be the minimum aim of this scheme and the Council should press for Bristol to lead the way in bringing our air to healthy levels that are safe for children living in congested areas in both the short and long term.

Full Council:

- . Expresses sympathy with the family of Ella, and of those that have lost loved ones due to air pollution-related deaths;
- . agrees with the Mayor of London’ s view that this represents a ‘landmark moment’ and highlights how air pollution is now a major public health issue and should be treated with the highest priority by all cities across the UK;
- . Notes the Mayor’s and Council’s commendable work in this area, through the pedestrianisation of the Old City, the consultation on a Clean Air Zone, investment in electric vehicle charging points, and the



unprecedented investment in active travel.

. Notes that reaching both our air quality and carbon emissions is considerably more difficult in the absence of a mass transit scheme, and Full Council reiterates its support for one.

. Calls on the Mayor and Cabinet member to push for stronger measures to improve air quality in Bristol, backed up with financial assistance from the Government to implement these measures.

. Call on Government to give Bristol the powers and resources to implement measures that may include, but are not limited to, enforcing bans on wood-burners, and the banning of burning garden waste at inner-city allotments.

. Calls on both the Mayor and national Government to explore innovative ways to improve our air quality in Bristol.

**Motion submitted by : Cllr Wellington, Labour Group**

**Submitted on: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

---

Signed



Proper Officer

Friday, 5 March 2021



## Public Information Sheet

### Inspection of Papers - Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

You can find papers for all our meetings on our website at <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/council-meetings>

### Covid-19: changes to how we hold public meetings

Following changes to government rules, we will use video conferencing to hold all public meetings, including Cabinet, Full Council, regulatory meetings (where planning and licensing decisions are made) and scrutiny.

Councillors will take decisions remotely and the meetings will be broadcast live on YouTube.

Members of the public who wish to present their public forum in person during the video conference must register their interest by giving at least two clear working days' notice to Democratic Services of the request. To take part in the meeting, you will be required to register for a Zoom account, so that Democratic Services is able to match your named Zoom account to your public forum submission, and send you the password protected link and the instructions required to join the Zoom meeting to make your statement or ask your supplementary question(s).

**As part of our security arrangements, please note that we will not permit access to the meeting if your Zoom credentials do not match your public forum submission credentials. This is in the interests of helping to ensure a safe meeting environment for all attending or observing proceedings via a live broadcast.**

Please note: Members of the public may only be invited into the meeting for the duration of their submission and then be removed to permit the next public forum participant to speak.

### Changes to Public Forum

Petitions, Statements and Questions must be about a matter the Council has responsibility for or which directly affects the city. For further information about procedure rules please refer to our Constitution <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/how-council-decisions-are-made/constitution>

Your statement or question will be sent to the Committee Members and will be published on the Council's website before the meeting. Please send it to [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk). The following requirements apply:

**There is a limited amount of time available at the start of the meeting for the public forum section of the meeting, which is the point in the meeting where petitions and statements will be taken.**

In chairing the part of the meeting dealing with statements, within the time constraints, the Lord Mayor will try to allow as many statements as possible to be presented (where individuals wish to do this), covering as many topics as possible. Inevitably though, depending on the number of statements received in total, there may not always be sufficient time available to enable everyone to present their statements.



**Petitions from members of the public**

- Petitions will be presented to the Council first.
- Petitions must include name, address and details for the wording of the petition.
- The person presenting a petition will be asked to read out the objectives of the petition with one minute allowed.
- A written reply will be provided to the lead petitioner within 10 working days of the Full Council meeting.

**Statements**

- Statements should be received no later than **12.00 noon on the working day before the meeting**.
- There can be one statement per person and subject to overall time constraints, a maximum of one minute is allocated for presentation.
- Any statement submitted should be no longer than one side of A4 paper.
- For copyright reasons, we are unable to reproduce or publish newspaper or magazine articles that may be attached to statements.

**Questions**

- Questions should be received no later than **three clear working days before the meeting**.
- A maximum of two written questions per person can be submitted.
- At the meeting, a maximum of one supplementary question may be asked, arising directly out of the original question or reply.
- **Your intention to attend the meeting to speak must be received no later than two clear working days in advance. The meeting agenda will clearly state the relevant public forum deadlines.**

By participating in public forum business, we will assume that you have consented to your name and the details of your submission being recorded and circulated to the Committee, published on the website and within the minutes. Your statement or question will also be made available to the public via publication on the Council's website and may be provided upon request in response to Freedom of Information Act requests in the future.

We will try to remove personal and identifiable information. However, because of time constraints we cannot guarantee this, and you may therefore wish to consider if your statement contains information that you would prefer not to be in the public domain. Other committee papers may be placed on the council's website and information within them may be searchable on the internet.

**During the meeting:**

- There will be no debate on public forum statements or petitions.
- Public Forum will be circulated to the Committee members prior to the meeting and published on the website.
- If you have arranged with Democratic Services to attend the meeting to present your statement or ask a question(s), you should log into Zoom and use the meeting link provided which will admit you to the waiting room.
- The Chair will call each submission in turn and you will be invited into the meeting. When you are invited to speak, please make sure that your presentation focuses on the key issues that you would like Members to consider. This will have the greatest impact.
- Your time allocation may have to be strictly limited if there are a lot of submissions. **This may be as short as one minute, and you be muted if you exceed your allotted time.**



- If there are a large number of submissions on one matter, a representative may be requested to speak on the group's behalf.
- If you do not attend the meeting at which your public forum submission is being taken your statement will be noted by Members.

For further information about procedure rules please refer to our Constitution  
<https://www.bristol.gov.uk/how-council-decisions-are-made/constitution>

The privacy notice for Democratic Services can be viewed at [www.bristol.gov.uk/about-our-website/privacy-and-processing-notice-for-resource-services](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/about-our-website/privacy-and-processing-notice-for-resource-services)

### Webcasting/ Recording of meetings

Members of the public attending meetings or taking part in Public forum are advised that all virtual public meetings including Full Council and Cabinet meetings are now broadcast live via the council's [webcasting pages](#). The whole of the meeting will be broadcast (except where there are confidential or exempt items).

### Other formats and languages and assistance for those with hearing impairment

You can get committee papers in other formats (e.g. large print, audio tape, braille etc) or in community languages by contacting the Democratic Services Officer. Please give as much notice as possible. We cannot guarantee re-formatting or translation of papers before the date of a particular meeting.



# Bristol City Council

## Minutes of the Full Council

11 February 2021 at 5.00 pm



### Members Present:-

**Councillors:** Mayor Marvin Rees, Donald Alexander, Lesley Alexander, Nicola Beech, Mark Bradshaw, Mark Brain, Charlie Bolton, Tom Brook, Fabian Breckels, Tony Carey, Craig Cheney, Barry Clark, Jos Clark, Harriet Clough, Eleanor Combley, Asher Craig, Chris Davies, Mike Davies, Carla Denyer, Kye Dudd, Richard Eddy, Martin Fodor, Paul Goggin, Geoff Gollop, John Goulandris, Fi Hance, Margaret Hickman, Claire Hiscott, Helen Holland, Gary Hopkins, Chris Jackson, Hibaq Jama, Carole Johnson, Steve Jones, Anna Keen, Tim Kent, Sultan Khan, Gill Kirk, Cleo Lake, Jeff Lovell, Brenda Massey, Olly Mead, Graham Morris, Anthony Negus, Paula O'Rourke, Steve Pearce, Celia Phipps, Ruth Pickersgill, Kevin Quartley, Liz Radford, Jo Sergeant, Steve Smith, Jerome Thomas, Estella Tincknell, Jon Wellington, Mark Weston, Lucy Whittle, Chris Windows and Mark Wright

### 1. Welcome and Introductions

The Lord Mayor welcomed all attendees to the meeting..

### 2. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were heard from Councillors English and Rippington.

### 3. Declarations of Interest

The following declarations of interests were made:

Councillor Bradshaw declared a non pecuniary interest as a Council appointed non-executive director of Bristol Holdings Ltd and Bristol Heat Networks Ltd.

Councillor Brook declared a non pecuniary interest as a Council appointed non-executive director of Bristol Waste Company.

Councillor Gollop declared that in his role of Chair of OSMB he sits as an observer on the Shareholder Advisory Group.





Councillor Pearce declared a non pecuniary interest as a Council appointed director on the board of BE 2020 Ltd.

Councillor Don Alexander declared a non pecuniary interest as a Council appointed director on Goram Homes Ltd.

#### 4. Public Forum (Public Petitions, Statements and Questions)

##### Public petitions:

There were no public petitions submitted to this meeting

##### Public statements:

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

Ref No	Name
PS01	Clive Stevens
PS02	Suzanne Audrey
PS03	Merche Clark
PS04	Jen Smith
PS05	Caroline Gooch
CS01	Councillor Khan
CS02	Councillor Gollop
CS03	Councillor Hopkins

Statements PS01, PS02, PS03, PS05, CS01, CS02 and CS03 were presented by individuals present at the meeting.

##### Public Questions:

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

Ref No	Name
PQ01	Suzanne Audrey
PQ02 & PQ03	Caroline Gooch
PQ04 & PQ05	Merche Clark

The Mayor responded verbally to all the questions also responding to supplementary questions.



## 5. Motion

Councillor Hopkins moved the following motion:

“This Council notes with alarm the numerous failings identified in the recent review of governance arrangements for Bristol Holding Company and its subsidiaries.

The value-for-money assessment in respect of Bristol Energy was especially damning and exposed some glaring deficiencies in existing structures, methods of monitoring and information sharing. As a result, the conclusion was drawn that Cabinet was not properly informed when it came to making ‘high-risk’ investment decisions in that failed business.

These shortcomings inevitably raise continuing concerns over a lack of transparency and the ability or effectiveness of scrutiny to oversee executive/political decision-making for publicly-owned commercial companies.

In order to restore public confidence, protect the taxpayer, and discharge the Authority’s obligations to its employees in such enterprises, Council calls on the Mayor to accept and adopt (in total and without delay) the twelve recommendations contained in the report of our external auditors.

Furthermore, a cross-party board or panel needs to be established as an adjunct to the Audit Committee and OSM, the membership of which shall have full access rights to potentially exempt information. For the sake of clarity, the composition of this body will be made on the basis of proportionality and determined by Party Whips. It’s first meeting will take place within two weeks of formation, with the initial task being to examine a detailed action plan prepared by officers on how all of the changes advised by the independent auditor are to be delivered.

A report on the progress made towards implementation must then be brought back to Full Council within three months of the passing of this resolution. (Or no later than Annual Full Council.) In this way, appropriate checks and balances within the Council’s Constitution can be restored, rightly respected, and adequately safeguarded.”

The motion was seconded by Councillor Weston

There was a debate, following which the Lord Mayor then invited Councillor Hopkins, as mover of the original motion to speak.

Following final remarks, upon being put to the vote, the original motion was CARRIED (58 For, 0 against, 0 absentions) and it was

**RESOLVED:**



This Council notes with alarm the numerous failings identified in the recent review of governance arrangements for Bristol Holding Company and its subsidiaries.

The value-for-money assessment in respect of Bristol Energy was especially damning and exposed some glaring deficiencies in existing structures, methods of monitoring and information sharing. As a result, the conclusion was drawn that Cabinet was not properly informed when it came to making 'high-risk' investment decisions in that failed business.

These shortcomings inevitably raise continuing concerns over a lack of transparency and the ability or effectiveness of scrutiny to oversee executive/political decision-making for publicly-owned commercial companies.

In order to restore public confidence, protect the taxpayer, and discharge the Authority's obligations to its employees in such enterprises, Council calls on the Mayor to accept and adopt (in total and without delay) the twelve recommendations contained in the report of our external auditors.

Furthermore, a cross-party board or panel needs to be established as an adjunct to the Audit Committee and OSM, the membership of which shall have full access rights to potentially exempt information. For the sake of clarity, the composition of this body will be made on the basis of proportionality and determined by Party Whips. It's first meeting will take place within two weeks of formation, with the initial task being to examine a detailed action plan prepared by officers on how all of the changes advised by the independent auditor are to be delivered.

A report on the progress made towards implementation must then be brought back to Full Council within three months of the passing of this resolution. (Or no later than Annual Full Council.) In this way, appropriate checks and balances within the Council's Constitution can be restored, rightly respected, and adequately safeguarded.

Meeting ended at 6.20 pm

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

<b>Motion - Executive Decision Making and Scrutiny of Council-Owned Companies (Motion)</b>	
Marvin Rees	For
Councillor Donald Alexander	For
Councillor Lesley Alexander	For
Councillor Nicola Beech	For
Councillor Mark Bradshaw	For
Councillor Mark Brain	For
Councillor Charlie Bolton	For



Councillor Tom Brook	For
Councillor Fabian Breckels	For
Councillor Tony Carey	For
Councillor Craig Cheney	For
Councillor Barry Clark	For
Councillor Jos Clark	No vote recorded
Councillor Harriet Clough	For
Councillor Eleanor Combley	For
Councillor Asher Craig	For
Councillor Christopher Davies	For
Councillor Mike Davies	For
Councillor Carla Denyer	For
Councillor Kye Dudd	For
Councillor Richard Eddy	For
Councillor Martin Fodor	For
Councillor Paul Goggin	For
Councillor Geoff Gollop	For
Councillor John Goulandris	For
Councillor Fi Hance	For
Councillor Margaret Hickman	For
Councillor Claire Hiscott	For
Councillor Helen Holland	For
Councillor Gary Hopkins	For
Councillor Christopher Jackson	For
Councillor Hibaq Jama	For
Councillor Carole Johnson	For
Councillor Steve Jones	For
Councillor Anna Keen	For
Councillor Tim Kent	For
Councillor Sultan Khan	For
Councillor Gill Kirk	For
Councillor Cleo Lake	For
Councillor Jeff Lovell	For
Councillor Brenda Massey	For
Councillor Olly Mead	For
Councillor Graham Morris	For
Councillor Anthony Negus	For
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	For
Councillor Steve Pearce	For
Councillor Celia Phipps	For
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	For
Councillor Kevin Quartley	For



Councillor Liz Radford	For
Councillor Jo Sergeant	For
Councillor Steve Smith	For
Councillor Jerome Thomas	For
Councillor Estella Tincknell	For
Councillor Jon Wellington	For
Councillor Mark Weston	For
Councillor Lucy Whittle	For
Councillor Chris Windows	For
Councillor Mark Wright	For
<b>Carried</b>	



**Bristol City Council  
Minutes of the Full Council**

**23 February 2021 at 2.00 pm**



**Members Present:-** Mayor Marvin Rees,

**Councillors:** Mayor Marvin Rees, Donald Alexander, Lesley Alexander, Nicola Beech, Nicola Bowden-Jones, Mark Bradshaw, Mark Brain, Charlie Bolton, Tom Brook, Fabian Breckels, Tony Carey, Craig Cheney, Barry Clark, Jos Clark, Stephen Clarke, Harriet Clough, Eleanor Combley, Asher Craig, Chris Davies, Carla Denyer, Kye Dudd, Richard Eddy, Jude English, Martin Fodor, Helen Godwin, Paul Goggin, Geoff Gollop, John Goulandris, Fi Hance, Margaret Hickman, Claire Hiscott, Helen Holland, Gary Hopkins, Chris Jackson, Hibaq Jama, Carole Johnson, Steve Jones, Anna Keen, Tim Kent, Sultan Khan, Gill Kirk, Cleo Lake, Jeff Lovell, Brenda Massey, Olly Mead, Matt Melias, Graham Morris, Anthony Negus, Paula O'Rourke, Steve Pearce, Celia Phipps, Ruth Pickersgill, Kevin Quartley, Liz Radford, Tim Rippington, Jo Sergeant, Afzal Shah, Steve Smith, Jerome Thomas, Mhairi Threlfall, Estella Tincknell, Jon Wellington, Mark Weston, Lucy Whittle, Chris Windows and Mark Wright

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

The Lord Mayor welcomed all attendees to the meeting.

**2. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Abraham and Councillor M Davies.

**3. Declarations of Interest**

None received.

**4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

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

**RESOLVED:**



**That the minutes of the meeting of the Full Council held on the 12<sup>th</sup> January 2021 be confirmed as correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.**

## 5. Lord Mayor's Business

The Lord Mayor informed Full Council of the recent death of former Lady Mayoress Barbara Cook. Condolences were sent to her husband former Councillor Simon Cook and her family. A minutes silence was observed.

## 6. Public Forum (Public Petitions, Statements and Questions)

### Public petitions:

There were no public petitions received.

### Public statements:

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

Ref No	Name
PS01	Alison Allan
PS02	Rob Bryher
PS03	David Redgewell
PS04	Rob Logan, Carolyn Magson, Cllr Tim Rippington & Katja Hörchen
PS05	Aileen McLoughlin
PS06	Kerry Bailes
PS07	Councillor Jo Sergeant

## 7. 2021-2022 Budget Report

The Full Council considered a report setting out the Mayor's 2021-2022 budget recommendations.

The Lord Mayor drew member's attention to the budget procedure to be followed.

At this point, on the motion of the Lord Mayor, it was

### RESOLVED

**That the relevant standing orders (policy and budget framework procedure rules) be suspended, noting that the procedure to be followed at this meeting is at variance with the Council's standing orders.**

The Mayor introduced the budget report.



Councillor Cheney, Deputy Mayor for Finance, Governance and Performance seconded the report.

The leaders of each party group, Cllrs Hickman, Weston, Combley and Hopkins each responded to the budget proposals.

Councillor Clarke presented comments on behalf of the Resources Scrutiny Commission and Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

The Mayor responded to the points raised.

Full Council then considered and debated each of the proposed budget amendments as follows:

### **Liberal Democrat Group Budget Amendment**

Revenue - Increased budget for Children's Play Park Repairs, investment in SEND support through intervention and improvement team aimed at improving inclusion, increase in Capital Financing to pay for additional SEND school places, reduction in PR department, merged Mayor's Office and Executive Office, removal of Mayor's Fund.

Capital - Deliver more special places through support of Schools Expansion and SEND strategy, invest in additional sports and leisure facilities to deliver East Bristol Pool. Investment in Children's Play facilities, investment in Safer Neighbourhoods, create a new Cycle fund to improve cycle network, investment in Parks to improve standards. Assign funding from the capital contingency fund, capital finance raised through additional borrowing.

Councillor Kent moved the amendment, seconded by Councillor Hopkins.

Following debate, upon being put to the vote on both elements of the amendment, the amendment was LOST.

Vote 1 - 30 members voting for, 34 against and 1 abstention.

**ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned for fifteen minutes.**

### **Labour Group Budget Amendment**

Increased Waste and Litter Enforcement Officers with income from fixed penalty notices.

Councillor Don Alexander moved the motion, seconded by Councillor Pickersgill.

Following debate, upon being put to the vote the amendment was CARRIED.

Vote 2 – 65 members voting for, none against and no abstentions.

### **Green Budget Amendment (HRA)**

Increased HRA revenue available for increased 5 year capital programme, increased new Council House building and accelerate programme of improvement works on HRA stock, increased council rents by inflation +1%.





Councillor Denyer moved the motion, seconded by Councillor Bowden-Jones.

Following debate, upon being put to the vote the amendment was LOST.

Vote 3 – 19 members voting for, 42 against and 4 abstentions.

#### **Green Budget Amendment (Resources)**

Reallocate one off expenditure by reduced spend on developing strategy/asset management plan, additional £250k to develop and update strategic outline case for a workplace parking levy.

Councillor Thomas moved the motion, seconded by Councillor O'Rourke.

Following debate, upon being put to the vote the amendment was LOST.

Vote 4 – 18 members voting for, 45 against and 2 absentions.

#### **Green Budget Amendment (Capital)**

Reallocate the strategic CIL previously allocated to the Arena, create a strategic capital fund for Growth and Regeneration to spend on Parks and Green Spaces, create a strategic capital fund for Growth and Regeneration to spend on Transport.

Councillor Fodor moved the motion, seconded by Councillor Hance.

Following debate, upon being put to the vote the amendment was LOST.

Vote 5 – 18 members voting for, 46 against and 1 absention.

#### **Conservative Budget Amendment (Revenue)**

MRP revenue saving arising from slippage in borrowing in Capital programme, reduction in funding for Mayor's Office with view to merge with Executive Office, reduction in PR & Consultation (including social media monitoring), removal of parking charges at Blaise Estate and Oldbury Court, reduce bulky-item household collection charge, SEND support for investment in intervention and improvement team, support in provision for youth activities, one off allocation of funds for education, signposting and awareness of defibrillators.

Councillor Smith moved the motion, seconded by Councillor Radford.

Following debate, upon being put to the vote the amendment was LOST.

Vote 6 – 20 members voting for, 44 against and 1 abstention.

#### **Conservative Budget Amendment (Capital)**

Use or repurpose currently unallocated strategic CIL receipts, specific allocation of presently undefined strategic CIL funding, provide additional mitigation measures in respect of CPNN, increase spending on provision of outdoor equipment/facilities, reduce Corporate Contingencies, additional Spend on



enhancement/repair schemes in parks, new prefabricated housing scheme to accelerate delivery of key worker homes.

Councillor Hiscott moved the amendment, seconded by Councillor Quartley.

Following debate, upon being put to the vote the amendment was LOST.  
Vote 7 – 20 members voting for, 44 against and 1 abstention.

At the conclusion of the Full Council's consideration of, and voting on the individual budget amendments, the Lord Mayor clarified (under section 7 of the procedure) that the Labour Group Amendment no.2 had been CARRIED.

On the motion of the Lord Mayor, the Full Council noted the Section 151 Officer's statement regarding the robustness of the budget estimates.

**ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned for ten minutes.**

On the meeting being reconvened, there was then (under section 8 of the procedure) a general debate on the budget proposals.

At the conclusion of the debate, the Mayor responded to the debate and to the Full Council's earlier consideration of the budget amendments. The Mayor indicated at this point that he was minded to accept an amended budget i.e incorporating the Labour Group amendment.

**On the motion of the Lord Mayor, seconded by the Deputy Lord Mayor, the Full Council then RESOLVED that Full Council NOTED:**

- a) **The report from the Scrutiny Budget Task and Finish Group.**
- b) **The budget consultation process that was followed and feedback as outlined in Section 17 and Appendix 6.**
- c) **The categorisation of earmarked reserves and provisions set out in Section 16.**
- d) **That the consultation feedback and equality impact assessments relevance checks have been taken into consideration and have informed the final budget proposals.**
- e) **The feedback provided by the Schools Forum at Cabinet and Council, for their consideration in making final decisions on the Schools Budget for 2021/22.**
- f) **The uncertainty around COVID response spend, COVID income loss and central government COVID funding levels for the full impact 2021/22 and beyond, and that the estimates provided could be subject to significant change over the medium term.**
- g) **The comments of the Chief Finance Officer (s151 Officer) on the robustness of the Budget and adequacy of reserves as set out in Section 15.**
- h) **The Council's Ethical Investment Policy and Strategy is due for revision during 2021/22, which will be expended to incorporate Equitable Policy for Investment in addressing racial and other economic inequalities in the city.**



- i) **The delegation of authority to the Director of Finance after consultation with the Deputy Mayor, Cabinet Member for Finance, Governance and Performance and the Mayor, to make any necessary technical adjustments or adjustments to the figures upon receipt of the final Local Government Finance Settlement, West of England Combined Authority Budget and Department for Education funding clarifications; with transfers to and or from reserves as appropriate.**

**RESOLVED that Full Council AGREED:** (with 33 members voting in favour, 32 against with no absentions)

- j) **The Bristol City Council levels of Council Tax increase of 4.99%; which includes 3% precept to support Adult Social Care, noting the precepts of the Police and Crime Commissioner for Avon and Somerset and the Avon Fire Authority,**
- k) **The Council's General Fund net revenue budget for the year 2021/22 as £424.1 million and expenditure allocations as set out in Appendix 1; subject to any budget amendments properly notified to and approved by the Council in line with the Constitution.**
- l) **The temporary movement in general reserves of up to £3.9 million to mitigate the forecasted year end emergent pressures in the People directorate as outlined in Section 5 Current Revenue Budget.**
- m) **Agree the Council's capital budget for the years 2021/22 - 2025/26, totalling £890.1 million as set out in paragraph 13 and detailed in Appendix 2.**
- n) **The proposed Treasury Management Strategy for 2021/22 in Appendix 4, incorporating the Minimum Revenue Provision policy and the prudential indicators and limits.**
- o) **To approve the Strategy for the Flexible use of Capital Receipts as set out in Appendix 5.**
- p) **Delegation of authority to Cabinet, via a subsequent report to agree the detailed Public Health Budget and movement in the ring-fenced Public Health reserve upon receipt of the final grant allocation for 2021/22 and budget proposals from the Director of Public Health in consultation with the Deputy Mayor and Cabinet member for Communities, Equalities & Public Health and Director of Finance.**
- q) **the calculations for determining the Council Tax requirement for the year 2021/22 as outlined in Appendix 8 and in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992.**

**RESOLVED that Full Council AGREED:** (with 45 members voting for, 1 against with 19 absentions)

- r) **The distribution of the 2021/22 Dedicated Schools Grant of £404.7 million as recommended by Cabinet and the Schools Forum and set out in section 9**

**RESOLVED that Full Council AGREED:** (with 33 members voting for, 20 against with 12 abstentions)

- s) **No increase to dwelling rents for 2021/22 for existing tenants**
- t) **The 1-year Revenue budget for 2021/22 and 5-year Capital Programme 2021/22 – 2025/26, as detailed in Appendix 2, noting there is no additional borrowing requirement before 2024/25.**
- u) **An in-year draw-down from the HRA General Reserve to fund planned HIP works carried forward from 2020/21 due to Covid restrictions.**



v) Approve the delayed draw-down in 2021/22 from general fund reserve, of an agreed 2020/21 budget amendment (£100k) which was previously approved by Full Council Feb 2020, due to delays during the pandemic. This reserve was set aside to finance training for Housing and Landlord Services that would provide in-house skills to retrofit energy efficiency measures to council homes.

w) Authorise the Executive Director of Growth and Regeneration, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance, Governance and Performance, to set service charges in line with the anticipated and actual cost of delivery.

Meeting ended at 6.25 pm

CHAIR \_\_\_\_\_



<b>Lib Dem Amendment (Amendment)</b>	
Marvin Rees	Against
Councillor Donald Alexander	Against
Councillor Lesley Alexander	For
Councillor Nicola Beech	Against
Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones	Against
Councillor Mark Bradshaw	Against
Councillor Mark Brain	Against
Councillor Charlie Bolton	For
Councillor Tom Brook	Against
Councillor Fabian Breckels	Against
Councillor Tony Carey	For
Councillor Craig Cheney	Against
Councillor Barry Clark	Against
Councillor Jos Clark	No vote recorded
Councillor Stephen Clarke	For
Councillor Harriet Clough	For
Councillor Eleanor Combley	For
Councillor Asher Craig	Against
Councillor Christopher Davies	For
Councillor Carla Denyer	Abstain
Councillor Kye Dudd	Against
Councillor Richard Eddy	For
Councillor Jude English	For
Councillor Martin Fodor	For
Councillor Helen Godwin	Against
Councillor Paul Goggin	Against
Councillor Geoff Gollop	For
Councillor John Goulandris	For
Councillor Fi Hance	For
Councillor Margaret Hickman	Against
Councillor Claire Hiscott	For
Councillor Helen Holland	Against
Councillor Gary Hopkins	For
Councillor Christopher Jackson	Against
Councillor Hibaq Jama	Against
Councillor Carole Johnson	Against
Councillor Steve Jones	For
Councillor Anna Keen	Against
Councillor Tim Kent	For
Councillor Sultan Khan	For



Councillor Gill Kirk	Against
Councillor Cleo Lake	For
Councillor Jeff Lovell	Against
Councillor Brenda Massey	Against
Councillor Olly Mead	Against
Councillor Matthew Melias	For
Councillor Graham Morris	For
Councillor Anthony Negus	For
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	For
Councillor Steve Pearce	Against
Councillor Celia Phipps	Against
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	Against
Councillor Kevin Quartley	For
Councillor Liz Radford	For
Councillor Tim Rippington	Against
Councillor Jo Sergeant	Against
Councillor Afzal Shah	Against
Councillor Steve Smith	For
Councillor Jerome Thomas	For
Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	Against
Councillor Estella Tincknell	Against
Councillor Jon Wellington	Against
Councillor Mark Weston	For
Councillor Lucy Whittle	Against
Councillor Chris Windows	For
Councillor Mark Wright	For
<b>Rejected</b>	
<b>Labour Group Amendment (Amendment)</b>	
Marvin Rees	For
Councillor Donald Alexander	For
Councillor Lesley Alexander	For
Councillor Nicola Beech	For
Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones	For
Councillor Mark Bradshaw	For
Councillor Mark Brain	For
Councillor Charlie Bolton	For
Councillor Tom Brook	For
Councillor Fabian Breckels	For
Councillor Tony Carey	For
Councillor Craig Cheney	For
Councillor Barry Clark	For
Councillor Jos Clark	No vote recorded



Councillor Stephen Clarke	For
Councillor Harriet Clough	For
Councillor Eleanor Combley	For
Councillor Asher Craig	For
Councillor Christopher Davies	For
Councillor Carla Denyer	For
Councillor Kye Dudd	For
Councillor Richard Eddy	For
Councillor Jude English	For
Councillor Martin Fodor	For
Councillor Helen Godwin	For
Councillor Paul Goggin	For
Councillor Geoff Gollop	For
Councillor John Goulandris	For
Councillor Fi Hance	For
Councillor Margaret Hickman	For
Councillor Claire Hiscott	For
Councillor Helen Holland	For
Councillor Gary Hopkins	For
Councillor Christopher Jackson	For
Councillor Hibaq Jama	For
Councillor Carole Johnson	For
Councillor Steve Jones	For
Councillor Anna Keen	For
Councillor Tim Kent	For
Councillor Sultan Khan	For
Councillor Gill Kirk	For
Councillor Cleo Lake	For
Councillor Jeff Lovell	For
Councillor Brenda Massey	For
Councillor Olly Mead	For
Councillor Matthew Melias	For
Councillor Graham Morris	For
Councillor Anthony Negus	For
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	For
Councillor Steve Pearce	For
Councillor Celia Phipps	For
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	For
Councillor Kevin Quartley	For
Councillor Liz Radford	For
Councillor Tim Rippington	For
Councillor Jo Sergeant	For





Councillor Afzal Shah	For
Councillor Steve Smith	For
Councillor Jerome Thomas	For
Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	For
Councillor Estella Tincknell	For
Councillor Jon Wellington	For
Councillor Mark Weston	For
Councillor Lucy Whittle	For
Councillor Chris Windows	For
Councillor Mark Wright	For
<b>Carried</b>	
<b>Green Group HRA Amendment (Amendment)</b>	
Marvin Rees	Against
Councillor Donald Alexander	Against
Councillor Lesley Alexander	Against
Councillor Nicola Beech	Against
Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones	For
Councillor Mark Bradshaw	Against
Councillor Mark Brain	Against
Councillor Charlie Bolton	For
Councillor Tom Brook	Against
Councillor Fabian Breckels	Against
Councillor Tony Carey	For
Councillor Craig Cheney	Against
Councillor Barry Clark	Against
Councillor Jos Clark	No vote recorded
Councillor Stephen Clarke	For
Councillor Harriet Clough	For
Councillor Eleanor Combley	For
Councillor Asher Craig	Against
Councillor Christopher Davies	For
Councillor Carla Denyer	For
Councillor Kye Dudd	Against
Councillor Richard Eddy	Against
Councillor Jude English	For
Councillor Martin Fodor	For
Councillor Helen Godwin	Against
Councillor Paul Goggin	Against
Councillor Geoff Gollop	Against
Councillor John Goulandris	Against
Councillor Fi Hance	For
Councillor Margaret Hickman	Against



Councillor Claire Hiscott	Against
Councillor Helen Holland	Against
Councillor Gary Hopkins	For
Councillor Christopher Jackson	Against
Councillor Hibaq Jama	Against
Councillor Carole Johnson	Against
Councillor Steve Jones	Against
Councillor Anna Keen	Against
Councillor Tim Kent	For
Councillor Sultan Khan	For
Councillor Gill Kirk	Against
Councillor Cleo Lake	For
Councillor Jeff Lovell	Against
Councillor Brenda Massey	Against
Councillor Olly Mead	Abstain
Councillor Matthew Melias	Against
Councillor Graham Morris	Against
Councillor Anthony Negus	For
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	For
Councillor Steve Pearce	Against
Councillor Celia Phipps	Against
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	Against
Councillor Kevin Quartley	Against
Councillor Liz Radford	Against
Councillor Tim Rippington	Abstain
Councillor Jo Sergeant	For
Councillor Afzal Shah	Against
Councillor Steve Smith	Against
Councillor Jerome Thomas	For
Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	Against
Councillor Estella Tincknell	Against
Councillor Jon Wellington	Against
Councillor Mark Weston	Against
Councillor Lucy Whittle	Abstain
Councillor Chris Windows	Against
Councillor Mark Wright	Abstain
<b>Rejected</b>	
<b>Green Group Revenue Amendment (Amendment)</b>	
Marvin Rees	Against
Councillor Donald Alexander	Against
Councillor Lesley Alexander	Against
Councillor Nicola Beech	Against



Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones	Against
Councillor Mark Bradshaw	Against
Councillor Mark Brain	Against
Councillor Charlie Bolton	For
Councillor Tom Brook	Against
Councillor Fabian Breckels	Against
Councillor Tony Carey	For
Councillor Craig Cheney	Against
Councillor Barry Clark	Against
Councillor Jos Clark	No vote recorded
Councillor Stephen Clarke	For
Councillor Harriet Clough	For
Councillor Eleanor Combley	For
Councillor Asher Craig	Against
Councillor Christopher Davies	For
Councillor Carla Denyer	For
Councillor Kye Dudd	Against
Councillor Richard Eddy	Against
Councillor Jude English	For
Councillor Martin Fodor	For
Councillor Helen Godwin	Against
Councillor Paul Goggin	Against
Councillor Geoff Gollop	Against
Councillor John Goulandris	Against
Councillor Fi Hance	For
Councillor Margaret Hickman	Against
Councillor Claire Hiscott	Against
Councillor Helen Holland	Against
Councillor Gary Hopkins	For
Councillor Christopher Jackson	Against
Councillor Hibaq Jama	Against
Councillor Carole Johnson	Against
Councillor Steve Jones	Against
Councillor Anna Keen	Against
Councillor Tim Kent	For
Councillor Sultan Khan	For
Councillor Gill Kirk	Against
Councillor Cleo Lake	For
Councillor Jeff Lovell	Against
Councillor Brenda Massey	Against
Councillor Olly Mead	Against
Councillor Matthew Melias	Against



Councillor Graham Morris	Against
Councillor Anthony Negus	For
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	For
Councillor Steve Pearce	Against
Councillor Celia Phipps	Against
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	Against
Councillor Kevin Quartley	Against
Councillor Liz Radford	Against
Councillor Tim Rippington	Against
Councillor Jo Sergeant	Abstain
Councillor Afzal Shah	Against
Councillor Steve Smith	Against
Councillor Jerome Thomas	For
Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	Against
Councillor Estella Tincknell	Against
Councillor Jon Wellington	Against
Councillor Mark Weston	Against
Councillor Lucy Whittle	Abstain
Councillor Chris Windows	Against
Councillor Mark Wright	For
<b>Rejected</b>	
<b>Green Group Capital Amendment (Amendment)</b>	
Marvin Rees	Against
Councillor Donald Alexander	Against
Councillor Lesley Alexander	Against
Councillor Nicola Beech	Against
Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones	Against
Councillor Mark Bradshaw	Against
Councillor Mark Brain	Against
Councillor Charlie Bolton	No vote recorded
Councillor Tom Brook	Against
Councillor Fabian Breckels	No vote recorded
Councillor Tony Carey	No vote recorded
Councillor Craig Cheney	Against
Councillor Barry Clark	Against
Councillor Jos Clark	No vote recorded
Councillor Stephen Clarke	No vote recorded
Councillor Harriet Clough	No vote recorded
Councillor Eleanor Combley	No vote recorded
Councillor Asher Craig	Against
Councillor Christopher Davies	No vote recorded
Councillor Carla Denyer	No vote recorded



Councillor Kye Dudd	Against
Councillor Richard Eddy	Against
Councillor Jude English	No vote recorded
Councillor Martin Fodor	No vote recorded
Councillor Helen Godwin	No vote recorded
Councillor Paul Goggin	No vote recorded
Councillor Geoff Gollop	No vote recorded
Councillor John Goulandris	No vote recorded
Councillor Fi Hance	No vote recorded
Councillor Margaret Hickman	No vote recorded
Councillor Claire Hiscott	No vote recorded
Councillor Helen Holland	No vote recorded
Councillor Gary Hopkins	No vote recorded
Councillor Christopher Jackson	No vote recorded
Councillor Hibaq Jama	No vote recorded
Councillor Carole Johnson	No vote recorded
Councillor Steve Jones	No vote recorded
Councillor Anna Keen	No vote recorded
Councillor Tim Kent	No vote recorded
Councillor Sultan Khan	No vote recorded
Councillor Gill Kirk	No vote recorded
Councillor Cleo Lake	No vote recorded
Councillor Jeff Lovell	No vote recorded
Councillor Brenda Massey	No vote recorded
Councillor Olly Mead	No vote recorded
Councillor Matthew Melias	No vote recorded
Councillor Graham Morris	No vote recorded
Councillor Anthony Negus	No vote recorded
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	No vote recorded
Councillor Steve Pearce	No vote recorded
Councillor Celia Phipps	No vote recorded
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	No vote recorded
Councillor Kevin Quartley	No vote recorded
Councillor Liz Radford	No vote recorded
Councillor Tim Rippington	No vote recorded
Councillor Jo Sergeant	No vote recorded
Councillor Afzal Shah	No vote recorded
Councillor Steve Smith	No vote recorded
Councillor Jerome Thomas	No vote recorded
Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	No vote recorded
Councillor Estella Tincknell	No vote recorded
Councillor Jon Wellington	No vote recorded



Councillor Mark Weston	No vote recorded
Councillor Lucy Whittle	No vote recorded
Councillor Chris Windows	No vote recorded
Councillor Mark Wright	No vote recorded
<b>Rejected</b>	
<b>Conservative Group Revenue Amendment (Amendment)</b>	
Marvin Rees	Against
Councillor Donald Alexander	Against
Councillor Lesley Alexander	Against
Councillor Nicola Beech	Against
Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones	Against
Councillor Mark Bradshaw	Against
Councillor Mark Brain	Against
Councillor Charlie Bolton	For
Councillor Tom Brook	Against
Councillor Fabian Breckels	Against
Councillor Tony Carey	For
Councillor Craig Cheney	Against
Councillor Barry Clark	Against
Councillor Jos Clark	No vote recorded
Councillor Stephen Clarke	For
Councillor Harriet Clough	For
Councillor Eleanor Combley	For
Councillor Asher Craig	Against
Councillor Christopher Davies	For
Councillor Carla Denyer	For
Councillor Kye Dudd	Against
Councillor Richard Eddy	Against
Councillor Jude English	For
Councillor Martin Fodor	For
Councillor Helen Godwin	Against
Councillor Paul Goggin	Against
Councillor Geoff Gollop	Against
Councillor John Goulandris	Against
Councillor Fi Hance	For
Councillor Margaret Hickman	Against
Councillor Claire Hiscott	Against
Councillor Helen Holland	Against
Councillor Gary Hopkins	For
Councillor Christopher Jackson	Against
Councillor Hibaq Jama	Against
Councillor Carole Johnson	Against



Councillor Steve Jones	Against
Councillor Anna Keen	Against
Councillor Tim Kent	For
Councillor Sultan Khan	For
Councillor Gill Kirk	Against
Councillor Cleo Lake	For
Councillor Jeff Lovell	Against
Councillor Brenda Massey	Against
Councillor Olly Mead	Against
Councillor Matthew Melias	Against
Councillor Graham Morris	Against
Councillor Anthony Negus	For
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	For
Councillor Steve Pearce	Against
Councillor Celia Phipps	Against
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	Against
Councillor Kevin Quartley	Against
Councillor Liz Radford	Against
Councillor Tim Rippington	Against
Councillor Jo Sergeant	Abstain
Councillor Afzal Shah	Against
Councillor Steve Smith	Against
Councillor Jerome Thomas	For
Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	Against
Councillor Estella Tincknell	Against
Councillor Jon Wellington	Against
Councillor Mark Weston	Against
Councillor Lucy Whittle	Against
Councillor Chris Windows	Against
Councillor Mark Wright	For
<b>Rejected</b>	
<b>Conservative Group Capital Amendment (Amendment)</b>	
Marvin Rees	Against
Councillor Donald Alexander	Against
Councillor Lesley Alexander	For
Councillor Nicola Beech	Against
Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones	Against
Councillor Mark Bradshaw	Against
Councillor Mark Brain	Against
Councillor Charlie Bolton	Against
Councillor Tom Brook	Against
Councillor Fabian Breckels	Against





Councillor Tony Carey	For
Councillor Craig Cheney	Against
Councillor Barry Clark	Against
Councillor Jos Clark	No vote recorded
Councillor Stephen Clarke	Against
Councillor Harriet Clough	For
Councillor Eleanor Combley	Against
Councillor Asher Craig	Against
Councillor Christopher Davies	For
Councillor Carla Denyer	Against
Councillor Kye Dudd	Against
Councillor Richard Eddy	For
Councillor Jude English	Against
Councillor Martin Fodor	Against
Councillor Helen Godwin	Against
Councillor Paul Goggin	Against
Councillor Geoff Gollop	For
Councillor John Goulandris	For
Councillor Fi Hance	Against
Councillor Margaret Hickman	Against
Councillor Claire Hiscott	For
Councillor Helen Holland	Against
Councillor Gary Hopkins	For
Councillor Christopher Jackson	Against
Councillor Hibaq Jama	Against
Councillor Carole Johnson	Against
Councillor Steve Jones	For
Councillor Anna Keen	Against
Councillor Tim Kent	For
Councillor Sultan Khan	For
Councillor Gill Kirk	Against
Councillor Cleo Lake	Against
Councillor Jeff Lovell	Against
Councillor Brenda Massey	Against
Councillor Olly Mead	Against
Councillor Matthew Melias	For
Councillor Graham Morris	For
Councillor Anthony Negus	Abstain
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	Against
Councillor Steve Pearce	Against
Councillor Celia Phipps	Against
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	Against



Councillor Kevin Quartley	For
Councillor Liz Radford	For
Councillor Tim Rippington	Against
Councillor Jo Sergeant	Against
Councillor Afzal Shah	Against
Councillor Steve Smith	For
Councillor Jerome Thomas	Against
Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	Against
Councillor Estella Tincknell	Against
Councillor Jon Wellington	Against
Councillor Mark Weston	For
Councillor Lucy Whittle	Against
Councillor Chris Windows	For
Councillor Mark Wright	For
<b>Rejected</b>	
<b>Recommendations J to Q (Resolution)</b>	
Marvin Rees	For
Councillor Donald Alexander	For
Councillor Lesley Alexander	Against
Councillor Nicola Beech	For
Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones	Against
Councillor Mark Bradshaw	For
Councillor Mark Brain	For
Councillor Charlie Bolton	Against
Councillor Tom Brook	For
Councillor Fabian Breckels	For
Councillor Tony Carey	Against
Councillor Craig Cheney	For
Councillor Barry Clark	For
Councillor Jos Clark	No vote recorded
Councillor Stephen Clarke	Against
Councillor Harriet Clough	Against
Councillor Eleanor Combley	Against
Councillor Asher Craig	For
Councillor Christopher Davies	Against
Councillor Carla Denyer	Against
Councillor Kye Dudd	For
Councillor Richard Eddy	Against
Councillor Jude English	Against
Councillor Martin Fodor	Against
Councillor Helen Godwin	For
Councillor Paul Goggin	For



Councillor Geoff Gollop	Against
Councillor John Goulandris	Against
Councillor Fi Hance	Against
Councillor Margaret Hickman	For
Councillor Claire Hiscott	Against
Councillor Helen Holland	For
Councillor Gary Hopkins	Against
Councillor Christopher Jackson	For
Councillor Hibaq Jama	For
Councillor Carole Johnson	For
Councillor Steve Jones	Against
Councillor Anna Keen	For
Councillor Tim Kent	Against
Councillor Sultan Khan	Against
Councillor Gill Kirk	For
Councillor Cleo Lake	Against
Councillor Jeff Lovell	For
Councillor Brenda Massey	For
Councillor Olly Mead	For
Councillor Matthew Melias	Against
Councillor Graham Morris	Against
Councillor Anthony Negus	Against
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	Against
Councillor Steve Pearce	For
Councillor Celia Phipps	For
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	For
Councillor Kevin Quartley	Against
Councillor Liz Radford	Against
Councillor Tim Rippington	For
Councillor Jo Sergeant	For
Councillor Afzal Shah	For
Councillor Steve Smith	Against
Councillor Jerome Thomas	Against
Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	For
Councillor Estella Tincknell	For
Councillor Jon Wellington	For
Councillor Mark Weston	Against
Councillor Lucy Whittle	For
Councillor Chris Windows	Against
Councillor Mark Wright	Against
<b>Carried</b>	
<b>Recommendation R (Resolution)</b>	



Marvin Rees	For
Councillor Donald Alexander	For
Councillor Lesley Alexander	Abstain
Councillor Nicola Beech	For
Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones	Against
Councillor Mark Bradshaw	For
Councillor Mark Brain	For
Councillor Charlie Bolton	For
Councillor Tom Brook	For
Councillor Fabian Breckels	For
Councillor Tony Carey	Abstain
Councillor Craig Cheney	For
Councillor Barry Clark	For
Councillor Jos Clark	No vote recorded
Councillor Stephen Clarke	For
Councillor Harriet Clough	Abstain
Councillor Eleanor Combley	Abstain
Councillor Asher Craig	For
Councillor Christopher Davies	Abstain
Councillor Carla Denyer	For
Councillor Kye Dudd	For
Councillor Richard Eddy	Abstain
Councillor Jude English	For
Councillor Martin Fodor	Abstain
Councillor Helen Godwin	For
Councillor Paul Goggin	For
Councillor Geoff Gollop	Abstain
Councillor John Goulandris	Abstain
Councillor Fi Hance	For
Councillor Margaret Hickman	For
Councillor Claire Hiscott	Abstain
Councillor Helen Holland	For
Councillor Gary Hopkins	Abstain
Councillor Christopher Jackson	For
Councillor Hibaq Jama	For
Councillor Carole Johnson	For
Councillor Steve Jones	Abstain
Councillor Anna Keen	For
Councillor Tim Kent	For
Councillor Sultan Khan	For
Councillor Gill Kirk	For
Councillor Cleo Lake	For



Councillor Jeff Lovell	For
Councillor Brenda Massey	For
Councillor Olly Mead	For
Councillor Matthew Melias	Abstain
Councillor Graham Morris	Abstain
Councillor Anthony Negus	For
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	For
Councillor Steve Pearce	For
Councillor Celia Phipps	For
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	For
Councillor Kevin Quartley	Abstain
Councillor Liz Radford	Abstain
Councillor Tim Ripington	For
Councillor Jo Sergeant	For
Councillor Afzal Shah	For
Councillor Steve Smith	Abstain
Councillor Jerome Thomas	For
Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	For
Councillor Estella Tincknell	For
Councillor Jon Wellington	For
Councillor Mark Weston	Abstain
Councillor Lucy Whittle	For
Councillor Chris Windows	Abstain
Councillor Mark Wright	For
<b>Carried</b>	
<b>Recommendation S to W (Resolution)</b>	
Marvin Rees	For
Councillor Donald Alexander	For
Councillor Lesley Alexander	For
Councillor Nicola Beech	For
Councillor Nicola Bowden-Jones	Against
Councillor Mark Bradshaw	For
Councillor Mark Brain	For
Councillor Charlie Bolton	Against
Councillor Tom Brook	For
Councillor Fabian Breckels	For
Councillor Tony Carey	Against
Councillor Craig Cheney	For
Councillor Barry Clark	For
Councillor Jos Clark	No vote recorded
Councillor Stephen Clarke	Against
Councillor Harriet Clough	Against



Councillor Eleanor Combley	Against
Councillor Asher Craig	For
Councillor Christopher Davies	Against
Councillor Carla Denyer	Against
Councillor Kye Dudd	For
Councillor Richard Eddy	Abstain
Councillor Jude English	Against
Councillor Martin Fodor	Against
Councillor Helen Godwin	For
Councillor Paul Goggin	For
Councillor Geoff Gollop	Abstain
Councillor John Goulandris	Abstain
Councillor Fi Hance	Against
Councillor Margaret Hickman	For
Councillor Claire Hiscott	Abstain
Councillor Helen Holland	For
Councillor Gary Hopkins	Against
Councillor Christopher Jackson	For
Councillor Hibaq Jama	For
Councillor Carole Johnson	For
Councillor Steve Jones	Abstain
Councillor Anna Keen	For
Councillor Tim Kent	Against
Councillor Sultan Khan	Against
Councillor Gill Kirk	For
Councillor Cleo Lake	Against
Councillor Jeff Lovell	For
Councillor Brenda Massey	For
Councillor Olly Mead	For
Councillor Matthew Melias	Abstain
Councillor Graham Morris	Abstain
Councillor Anthony Negus	Against
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	Against
Councillor Steve Pearce	For
Councillor Celia Phipps	For
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	For
Councillor Kevin Quartley	Abstain
Councillor Liz Radford	Abstain
Councillor Tim Ripington	For
Councillor Jo Sergeant	Against
Councillor Afzal Shah	For
Councillor Steve Smith	Abstain



Councillor Jerome Thomas	Against
Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	For
Councillor Estella Tincknell	For
Councillor Jon Wellington	For
Councillor Mark Weston	Abstain
Councillor Lucy Whittle	For
Councillor Chris Windows	Abstain
Councillor Mark Wright	Against
<b>Carried</b>	





**Bristol City Council  
Minutes of the Full Council**

**2 March 2021 at 4.00 pm**



**Members Present:-**

**Councillors:** Mayor Marvin Rees, Donald Alexander, Lesley Alexander, Nicola Beech, Mark Brain, Charlie Bolton, Tom Brook, Tony Carey, Craig Cheney, Barry Clark, Stephen Clarke, Eleanor Combley, Asher Craig, Chris Davies, Carla Denyer, Kye Dudd, Richard Eddy, Jude English, Martin Fodor, Helen Godwin, Paul Goggin, Geoff Gollop, John Goulandris, Fi Hance, Margaret Hickman, Claire Hiscott, Helen Holland, Gary Hopkins, Chris Jackson, Hibaq Jama, Carole Johnson, Steve Jones, Anna Keen, Tim Kent, Sultan Khan, Gill Kirk, Cleo Lake, Jeff Lovell, Brenda Massey, Olly Mead, Graham Morris, Anthony Negus, Paula O'Rourke, Steve Pearce, Celia Phipps, Ruth Pickersgill, Kevin Quartley, Liz Radford, Tim Rippington, Jo Sergeant, Afzal Shah, Steve Smith, Jerome Thomas, Mhairi Threlfall, Estella Tincknell, Jon Wellington, Mark Weston, Lucy Whittle and Chris Windows

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

The Lord Mayor welcomed all attendees to the meeting..

**2. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were heard from Councillors Abraham, Bradshaw, Mike Davies and Wright.

**3. Declarations of Interest**

There were none.

**4. Public Forum (Public Petitions, Statements and Questions)**

**Public petitions:**

There were none.

**Public statements:**

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



<b>Ref No</b>	<b>Name</b>
PS01	Ashley Westlake
PS02	Tara Lily Klein
PS03	Vicki West
PS04	Anny Heinrich
PS05	Holly Supka
PS06	Jolana Curejova
PS07	Charlie Mourant
PS08	//Kabbo Hue Ferdinand Akamma James Qua Van Tura
PS09	Ollie McMorrow
PS10	Mena Telfer
PS11	Jennifer Cassidy
PS12	Alice O'Brien
PS13	Olivia Norman
PS14	Isabella Brunt
PS15	Lucille Corby
PS16	Spike Rees
PS17	Lucy Horwood
PS18	William Balsom
PS19	Frances Adam
PS20	Renee Berkhout
PS21	Becca McCormack
PS22	Richard Jones
PS23	Mhairi O'Connor
PS24	Rachel Hutchings
PS25	Oona Kendall
PS26	Peninah A-Kindberg - On Behalf of AVF
PS27	Katherine Wall
PS28	Jendayi Serwah, Afrikan ConneXions Consortium
PS29	Harriet Thompson
PS30	Uma Dodd
PS31	Tilda Lawrence
PS32	Joanna Poulton
PS33	Jess Hawker Meadley
PS34	Olivia McCallum
PS35	Cameron Bate
PS36	Cat Chappell
PS37	Jodie Fitzhugh
PS38	George Morgan
PS39	Sia Janjua



PS40	Diego Maeso
PS41	Ella McDonald
PS42	Lewis Wedlock
PS43	Madeleine Stephens
PS44	Xavier Cywinski
PS45	Harvey Watt
PS46	Lidia Bennet
PS47	Izaak Levy
PS48	Maude Hardy
PS49	Alice Nicholas
PS50	Kaira Touray
PS51	Casey Paige
PS52	Katie Derrick
PS53	Lucy Touray
PS54	Freddie Pearce
PS55	Ali Hughes
PS56	Eve Thompson
PS57	Jake Colvin
PS58	Amirah Cole
PS59	Raphael Van Arkadie
PS60	Barbara Witter
PS61	Bethany Richards
PS62	Arthur Holt
PS63	Hannah Ritchie
PS64	Katherine Quinn
PS65	Iah Yetunde
PS66	Rosa Crosserz
PS67	Tegan Rickwood
PS68	Abeje Chinangwa
PS69	Dr Shawn Sobers
PS70	Lisa Whitehouse
PS71	Veresteen Walcott
PS72	Victoria De Portele e Prado

Statements PS08 and PS28 were presented by individuals present at the meeting.

**Public Questions:**

There were none.

**5. Motion- Atonement and Reparation for Bristol's role in the Transatlantic Traffic in Enslaved Afrikans (TTEA)**



Councillor Lake moved the following motion:

### **Atonement and Reparation for Bristol's role in the Transatlantic Traffic in Enslaved Afrikans (TTEA)**

Differences in power manifest in asymmetrical access – a privilege which continues to run along racial lines. To re-imagine race equality, we have to be mindful of the past and how inequalities continue to manifest. We should reflect on how racial inequalities are embedded in the current economic system. Afrikan heritage people and communities systematically have poorer economic outcomes. Unless these systemic failures and their drivers and sources are identified and addressed, we are in danger of replicating them in any attempt to design a fair and resilient economy.

Historical attempts to disenfranchise these communities have resulted in the disproportionate health, economic and policing impacts experienced today. Alternative solutions and spaces are therefore needed, spaces which do not seek to privilege certain groups over others but seek to centre these voices, change the template, and create alternative solutions and spaces for Afrikan heritage people to thrive.

'**Reparations**' is a legal term defined by the UN which calls for 'holistic repair'. Our city and our country need a 'process of repair' to re-examine the reality and impact of Afrikan enslavement and its ongoing impact on communities today. As outlined by the UN, reparations should be holistic and can include many initiatives including public apologies, social justice initiatives, education, cultural projects, commemorative ceremonies and affirmative action. Nobody has the answers as to exactly what reparations should look like – that's why what we are calling for is a process of repair which hears from many of the voices in our communities that have been impacted and are often not heard.

#### **Full Council notes:**

1. The racial wealth divide is an economic archaeological marker rooted in the multigenerational history of the Transatlantic Trafficking of Enslaved Afrikans (TTEA). To repair this division and to address the uncomfortable truth that lighter skin did (and continues to) confer greater advantage, reparations for this legacy must be part of the equation. The historical legacy of centuries of enslavement is fundamentally at the core of current poverty amongst people of Afrikan descent and this legacy has been left untreated.
2. Reparative justice is about far more than money and is an acknowledgement of a crime against humanity. It is a recognition that no crime against humanity can occur with impunity. Reparations programs for victims of human rights violations are intended to bring justice to the victims. They are distinct from development, reconstruction, and victim assistance programs because they are a legal entitlement. They signal recognition that a human rights violation occurred and that victims were harmed and are therefore entitled to redress.
3. Bristol played a major role in the Transatlantic Traffic in Enslaved Afrikans (TTEA) which saw over 15 million Afrikans forcibly trafficked to the Caribbean and America with many thousands losing their lives during the crossing from Africa to the Americas on ships registered in Bristol. A significant amount of the institutional and corporate wealth of our city was founded through this atrocious episode in our collective history. 'By the latter half of the century, Bristol's position had been overtaken by Liverpool. But even as late as 1789, the trade to Africa and the West Indies was estimated to have comprised over 80 per cent of the total value of Bristol's trade abroad.'<sup>(1)</sup>



4. Around 2 million people of Afrikan descent live in the United Kingdom itself, including an estimated 30,000 plus in Bristol which includes a high percentage of Afrikan Caribbean descendants. (2)
5. Racism and racial hierarchy continue to be a key driver of the divisions that have undermined the efforts to identify the common cause and build the united voice against other drivers of social hierarchy and injustice, such as class and sexism.
6. While Bristol City Council is regarded as a leading council on tackling racial injustice and delivering social justice, Bristol as a city is only recently, and slowly, coming to terms with its role in the TTEA. Efforts need to be made to expedite the atonement process, and work needs to be done to achieve holistic reparations for the TTEA
7. Bristol City Council have taken major strides forward in understanding, facing up to and addressing the legacies of the TTEA and racial hierarchy throughout the city. This progress is being made through educating people in Bristol on Afrikan Caribbean and Black history, through the One Bristol Curriculum and the recently-established History Commission.
8. The History Commission will assess the legacy of the TTEA in Bristol, and will identify institutions that benefitted from it with a view to help foster a broader understanding of their role in the TTEA, so they can work towards atonement and reparations for Afrikan Heritage Communities (ACH).

Since 2016 Bristol City Council has gone further than any previous administrations in developing an understanding of and facing up to and addressing the legacies of the TTEA, Race and Racial hierarchy both within the Council itself and the wider city. From:

- Public recognition of institutional racism, to the
  - Establishment of the Commission on Race Equality and the Legacy Steering Group
  - Publication of the UK's first citywide Equality Charter
  - Delivery of the multi-award winning [Stepping Up](#) Leadership Programme
  - Recruitment of Black and Asian Magistrates
  - Implementation of Ban the Box
  - Pioneering work on Migrant and Refugees including the Global Compact on Migration,
  - The Transforming Race and Equality Report - A review of Council processes including HR recruitment by David Weaver which has resulted in the
  - Refreshment of BCC's Equality and Inclusion Policy and strategy in the context of recent global and local events e.g. COVID-19, Black Lives Matter movement
  - Introduction of new FGM guidelines in response to community concerns leading to a drop in referrals.
  - Securing £500,000 of funding for a new HIV/Sexual Health Project for people of Afrikan Caribbean heritage
  - Delivery of two major conferences on [Race and the City](#) and [Race Discrimination and Housing](#)
9. The aforementioned policies were all implemented alongside the Council's work to tackle hunger and poverty, ensure economic development strategies have inclusion at their core, and its leadership on Climate, Ecology and the Sustainable Development Goals that has ensured it pursues a just transition.
  10. In 1833 the British Government used £20 million to compensate enslavers, the debt for which was not paid off until 2015. Formerly enslaved persons received no compensation. (3)



11. 'The United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on the 'Right to A Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law' provides a framework for the reparatory justice system including, among other measures: an investigation of the facts, an official acknowledgment, and apology, a receipt of answers; an opportunity for victims to speak in a public forum about his/her experiences and to be actively involved the reparatory justice process.
12. The various efforts made by community activists and movements including the Afrikan Connexions Consortium, Afrikan Voices Forum, the Council's Legacy Steering Committee, the International Network of Scholars and Activists for Afrikan Reparations (INOSAAR), the Pan-Afrikan Reparations Coalition in Europe (PARCOE), the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM) Reparations Committee, the Stop The Maangamizi Campaign, the Global Afrikan People's Parliament (GAPP), The Afrikan Emancipation Day Reparations March Committee; and many others who have been working for many years to raise awareness of the lasting impact of enslavement.
13. That in 1993 Bernie Grant, MP tabled Early Day Motion (EDM) #1987 in the House of Commons welcoming the Abuja Proclamation after the first Pan-African Conference on Reparations sponsored by the Organisation of African Unity urging all countries who were enriched by enslavement and colonisation to review the case for reparations for "Africa and to Africans in the Diaspora".
14. Since 2015, the Stop the Maangamizi Campaign (The Maangamizi is the Afrikan Hellocaust of chattel, colonial and neo-colonial forms of enslavement) in association with the Afrikan Emancipation Day Reparations March Committee have been organising the annual Afrikan Emancipation Day Reparations March. The campaign presents the Stop the Maangamizi Petition to the Office of the UK Prime Minister annually calling for the establishment an All-Party Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry for Truth and Reparatory Justice.
15. Collaborative working between Green Party members, Green Party politicians and campaigners leading to further cross party working, enabled reparations motions similar to this one being passed in Lambeth and Islington in the summer of 2020.
16. The Green Party passed a reparations motion at their Autumn conference in 2020 with 95% support by members.

#### **Full Council believes:**

1. It must be a priority for Bristol to actively acknowledge this history and actively seek to bring about reconciliation and reparations by lending and leading its voice as an institution towards remedial holistic reparations and action towards the legacies that continue to plague contemporary life for descendants of the Afrikan Caribbean enslaved. The continuation of harm and discrimination manifests itself in but is not limited to:
  - over representation in the mental health system,
  - discrimination within the criminal justice system,
  - poverty and disadvantage.
2. The International Decade for People of Afrikan Descent, proclaimed by UN General Assembly resolution 68/237 and to be observed from 2015 to 2024, provides a solid framework for the United Nations, Member States, civil society and all other relevant actors to join together with people of Afrikan descent and take



effective measures for the implementation of the programme of activities in the spirit of recognition, justice and development. Such a process is long overdue in Bristol.

3. Reparations are necessary for achieving social justice, as racism and racial hierarchy continues to be a key driver of the divisions that have undermined the efforts to identify the common cause and build the united voice against other drivers of social hierarchy and injustice such as class and sexism.

**Full Council resolves:**

To call on councillors, the Mayor or other appropriate council agency to:

1. Write to the Speakers of both Houses of the UK Parliament, Chair of the Commons' Women and Equalities Committee, and Chair of the Commons' Home Affairs Committee to express Bristol City Council's view that they should consider establishing, and seeking UK Government support for, an All-Party Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry. The purpose of this unprecedented commission would be to work on the scope of how reparations may be delivered and may also include for example raising concerns about how tax payers were until 2015 paying back compensation paid to enslavers.(4)
2. Support Afrikan Heritage Community (AHC) organisations in Bristol to galvanise support for the emerging Bristol AHC led 'Reparations Plan' from, and in collaboration with, wider stakeholders including institutions, city strategic leaders, corporate leaders, key strategic programmes/initiatives and cross-party politicians.
3. Implement Community Wealth Creation strategies that support and encourage community wealth building to produce more sustainable equitable growth whilst alleviating systemic poverty. The social economy, civil society and community wealth are the key to fair employment and equitable growth. The community wealth building model of economic development is emerging in our cities and communities offering real, on-the-ground solutions to localities and regions battered by successive waves of extraction, disinvestment, displacement, and disempowerment. If the source of racial injustice in the twenty-first century is the economic injustice or domination of the global economy established in the seventeenth century, then a more just economy is the only way to sustainably achieve racial justice.
4. Recognise that reparative justice should be driven by Afrikan Heritage Communities experiences, voices and perspectives to ensure that advocacy messages not only reflect but also respond to the real needs of the community in order to recognise inequalities.

Footnotes

1. <https://www.bristolmuseums.org.uk/stories/bristol-transatlantic-slave-trade/>
2. Estimates based on most recent census (2011)
3. A petition gaining 10,000 signatures expresses the disgust at this fact, which many people, not just those of Afrikan Caribbean heritage, find completely abhorrent: <https://www.change.org/p/refund-our-taxes-paid-to-compensate-enslavers>
4. The terms of reference for this commission of inquiry should focus on the need to inform the public of the nature of colonialism and enslavement, as well as its long-term consequences including present-day impacts





upon both individuals and communities. The Commission's work should be of a participatory nature, calling for submissions from all those with knowledge of the nature and impacts of colonialism and slavery.

This will aim to include, but not be limited to, testimony from: individuals, organisations, academics, communities, and nations. Affected communities and individuals must have their own voice, agency, and self-determined solutions in effecting reparatory justice and steps must be taken to facilitate their participation in any reparatory process in which the United Kingdom is engaged.

Ultimately the goal is to secure holistic reparations - including but not limited to financial compensation - as defined by the UN's 'Basic Principles and Guidelines'. These include mechanisms for restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction and guarantees for non-repetition. See notes below.

#### Notes:

- *Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law: [OHCHR | Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation](#)* (see in particular IX. Reparation for harm suffered point 19. Restitution)
- Legacies of British Slave-ownership - UCL: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/>
- Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation – UN Office of the High Commissioner: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/remedyandrepairation.aspx>
- Stop the Maangamizi Campaign: <https://stopthemaangamizi.com/>

The motion was seconded by Councillor Craig.

There was a debate, following which the Lord Mayor invited Mayor Rees to speak.

Councillors Craig and Lake the summed up as mover and seconder of the motion.

Upon being put to the vote, the original motion was CARRIED (47 For, 12 against with no absentions) and it was

#### **RESOLVED:**

**Differences in power manifest in asymmetrical access – a privilege which continues to run along racial lines. To re-imagine race equality, we have to be mindful of the past and how inequalities continue to manifest. We should reflect on how racial inequalities are embedded in the current economic system. Afrikan heritage people and communities systematically have poorer economic outcomes. Unless these systemic failures and their drivers and sources are identified and addressed, we are in danger of replicating them in any attempt to design a fair and resilient economy.**



Historical attempts to disenfranchise these communities have resulted in the disproportionate health, economic and policing impacts experienced today. Alternative solutions and spaces are therefore needed, spaces which do not seek to privilege certain groups over others but seek to centre these voices, change the template, and create alternative solutions and spaces for Afrikan heritage people to thrive.

'Reparations' is a legal term defined by the UN which calls for 'holistic repair'. Our city and our country need a 'process of repair' to re-examine the reality and impact of Afrikan enslavement and its ongoing impact on communities today. As outlined by the UN, reparations should be holistic and can include many initiatives including public apologies, social justice initiatives, education, cultural projects, commemorative ceremonies and affirmative action. Nobody has the answers as to exactly what reparations should look like – that's why what we are calling for is a process of repair which hears from many of the voices in our communities that have been impacted and are often not heard.

**Full Council notes:**

17. The racial wealth divide is an economic archaeological marker rooted in the multigenerational history of the Transatlantic Trafficking of Enslaved Afrikans (TTEA). To repair this division and to address the uncomfortable truth that lighter skin did (and continues to) confer greater advantage, reparations for this legacy must be part of the equation. The historical legacy of centuries of enslavement is fundamentally at the core of current poverty amongst people of Afrikan descent and this legacy has been left untreated.
18. Reparative justice is about far more than money and is an acknowledgement of a crime against humanity. It is a recognition that no crime against humanity can occur with impunity. Reparations programs for victims of human rights violations are intended to bring justice to the victims. They are distinct from development, reconstruction, and victim assistance programs because they are a legal entitlement. They signal recognition that a human rights violation occurred and that victims were harmed and are therefore entitled to redress.
19. Bristol played a major role in the Transatlantic Traffic in Enslaved Afrikans (TTEA) which saw over 15 million Afrikans forcibly trafficked to the Caribbean and America with many thousands losing their lives during the crossing from Africa to the Americas on ships registered in Bristol. A significant amount of the institutional and corporate wealth of our city was founded through this atrocious episode in our collective history. 'By the latter half of the century, Bristol's position had been overtaken by Liverpool. But even as late as 1789, the trade to Africa and the West Indies was estimated to have comprised over 80 per cent of the total value of Bristol's trade abroad.'<sup>(1)</sup>
20. Around 2 million people of Afrikan descent live in the United Kingdom itself, including an estimated 30,000 plus in Bristol which includes a high percentage of Afrikan Caribbean descendants. (2)
21. Racism and racial hierarchy continue to be a key driver of the divisions that have undermined the efforts to identify the common cause and build the united voice against other drivers of social hierarchy and injustice, such as class and sexism.
22. While Bristol City Council is regarded as a leading council on tackling racial injustice and delivering social justice, Bristol as a city is only recently, and slowly, coming to terms with its role in the TTEA. Efforts need to be made to expedite the atonement process, and work needs to be done to achieve holistic reparations for the TTEA



23. Bristol City Council have taken major strides forward in understanding, facing up to and addressing the legacies of the TTEA and racial hierarchy throughout the city. This progress is being made through educating people in Bristol on Afrikan Caribbean and Black history, through the One Bristol Curriculum and the recently-established History Commission.
24. The History Commission will assess the legacy of the TTEA in Bristol, and will identify institutions that benefitted from it with a view to help foster a broader understanding of their role in the TTEA, so they can work towards atonement and reparations for Afrikan Heritage Communities (ACH).

Since 2016 Bristol City Council has gone further than any previous administrations in developing an understanding of and facing up to and addressing the legacies of the TTEA, Race and Racial hierarchy both within the Council itself and the wider city. From:

- Public recognition of institutional racism, to the
  - Establishment of the Commission on Race Equality and the Legacy Steering Group
  - Publication of the UK's first citywide Equality Charter
  - Delivery of the multi-award winning [Stepping Up](#) Leadership Programme
  - Recruitment of Black and Asian Magistrates
  - Implementation of Ban the Box
  - Pioneering work on Migrant and Refugees including the Global Compact on Migration,
  - The Transforming Race and Equality Report - A review of Council processes including HR recruitment by David Weaver which has resulted in the
  - Refreshment of BCC's Equality and Inclusion Policy and strategy in the context of recent global and local events e.g. COVID-19, Black Lives Matter movement
  - Introduction of new FGM guidelines in response to community concerns leading to a drop in referrals.
  - Securing £500,000 of funding for a new HIV/Sexual Health Project for people of Afrikan Caribbean heritage
  - Delivery of two major conferences on [Race and the City](#) and [Race Discrimination and Housing](#)
25. The aforementioned policies were all implemented alongside the Council's work to tackle hunger and poverty, ensure economic development strategies have inclusion at their core, and its leadership on Climate, Ecology and the Sustainable Development Goals that has ensured it pursues a just transition.
26. In 1833 the British Government used £20 million to compensate enslavers, the debt for which was not paid off until 2015. Formerly enslaved persons received no compensation. (3)
27. 'The United Nations Basic Principles and Guidelines on the 'Right to A Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law' provides a framework for the reparatory justice system including, among other measures: an investigation of the facts, an official acknowledgment, and apology, a receipt of answers; an opportunity for victims to speak in a public forum about his/her experiences and to be actively involved the reparatory justice process.
28. The various efforts made by community activists and movements including the Afrikan Connexions Consortium, Afrikan Voices Forum, the Council's Legacy Steering Committee, the International Network of Scholars and Activists for Afrikan Reparations (INOSAAR), the Pan-Afrikan Reparations Coalition in Europe (PARCOE), the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM) Reparations Committee, the Stop



The Maangamizi Campaign, the Global Afrikan People's Parliament (GAPP), The Afrikan Emancipation Day Reparations March Committee; and many others who have been working for many years to raise awareness of the lasting impact of enslavement.

29. That in 1993 Bernie Grant, MP tabled Early Day Motion (EDM) #1987 in the House of Commons welcoming the Abuja Proclamation after the first Pan-African Conference on Reparations sponsored by the Organisation of African Unity urging all countries who were enriched by enslavement and colonisation to review the case for reparations for "Africa and to Africans in the Diaspora".
30. Since 2015, the Stop the Maangamizi Campaign (The Maangamizi is the Afrikan Hellocaust of chattel, colonial and neo-colonial forms of enslavement) in association with the Afrikan Emancipation Day Reparations March Committee have been organising the annual Afrikan Emancipation Day Reparations March. The campaign presents the Stop the Maangamizi Petition to the Office of the UK Prime Minister annually calling for the establishment an All-Party Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry for Truth and Reparatory Justice.
31. Collaborative working between Green Party members, Green Party politicians and campaigners leading to further cross party working, enabled reparations motions similar to this one being passed in Lambeth and Islington in the summer of 2020.
32. The Green Party passed a reparations motion at their Autumn conference in 2020 with 95% support by members.

Full Council believes:

4. It must be a priority for Bristol to actively acknowledge this history and actively seek to bring about reconciliation and reparations by lending and leading its voice as an institution towards remedial holistic reparations and action towards the legacies that continue to plague contemporary life for descendants of the Afrikan Caribbean enslaved. The continuation of harm and discrimination manifests itself in but is not limited to:
  - over representation in the mental health system,
  - discrimination within the criminal justice system,
  - poverty and disadvantage.
5. The International Decade for People of Afrikan Descent, proclaimed by UN General Assembly resolution 68/237 and to be observed from 2015 to 2024, provides a solid framework for the United Nations, Member States, civil society and all other relevant actors to join together with people of Afrikan descent and take effective measures for the implementation of the programme of activities in the spirit of recognition, justice and development. Such a process is long overdue in Bristol.
6. Reparations are necessary for achieving social justice, as racism and racial hierarchy continues to be a key driver of the divisions that have undermined the efforts to identify the common cause and build the united voice against other drivers of social hierarchy and injustice such as class and sexism.

Full Council resolves:

To call on councillors, the Mayor or other appropriate council agency to:



5. **Write to the Speakers of both Houses of the UK Parliament, Chair of the Commons' Women and Equalities Committee, and Chair of the Commons' Home Affairs Committee to express Bristol City Council's view that they should consider establishing, and seeking UK Government support for, an All-Party Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry. The purpose of this unprecedented commission would be to work on the scope of how reparations may be delivered and may also include for example raising concerns about how tax payers were until 2015 paying back compensation paid to enslavers.(4)**
6. **Support Afrikan Heritage Community (AHC) organisations in Bristol to galvanise support for the emerging Bristol AHC led 'Reparations Plan' from, and in collaboration with, wider stakeholders including institutions, city strategic leaders, corporate leaders, key strategic programmes/initiatives and cross-party politicians.**
7. **Implement Community Wealth Creation strategies that support and encourage community wealth building to produce more sustainable equitable growth whilst alleviating systemic poverty. The social economy, civil society and community wealth are the key to fair employment and equitable growth. The community wealth building model of economic development is emerging in our cities and communities offering real, on-the-ground solutions to localities and regions battered by successive waves of extraction, disinvestment, displacement, and disempowerment. If the source of racial injustice in the twenty-first century is the economic injustice or domination of the global economy established in the seventeenth century, then a more just economy is the only way to sustainably achieve racial justice.**
8. **Recognise that reparative justice should be driven by Afrikan Heritage Communities experiences, voices and perspectives to ensure that advocacy messages not only reflect but also respond to the real needs of the community in order to recognise inequalities.**

Meeting ended at 5.00 pm

CHAIR \_\_\_\_\_



<b>Motion- Atonement and Reparation for Bristol's role in the Transatlantic Traffic in Enslaved Afrikans (TTEA) (Motion)</b>	
Marvin Rees	For
Councillor Donald Alexander	For
Councillor Lesley Alexander	Against
Councillor Nicola Beech	For
Councillor Mark Brain	For
Councillor Charlie Bolton	For
Councillor Tom Brook	For
Councillor Tony Carey	For
Councillor Craig Cheney	For
Councillor Barry Clark	For
Councillor Stephen Clarke	For
Councillor Eleanor Combley	For
Councillor Asher Craig	For
Councillor Christopher Davies	For
Councillor Carla Denyer	For
Councillor Kye Dudd	For
Councillor Richard Eddy	Against
Councillor Jude English	For
Councillor Martin Fodor	For
Councillor Helen Godwin	For
Councillor Paul Goggin	For
Councillor Geoff Gollop	Against
Councillor John Goulandris	Against
Councillor Fi Hance	For
Councillor Margaret Hickman	For
Councillor Claire Hiscott	Against
Councillor Helen Holland	For
Councillor Gary Hopkins	For
Councillor Christopher Jackson	For
Councillor Hibaq Jama	For
Councillor Carole Johnson	For
Councillor Steve Jones	Against
Councillor Anna Keen	For
Councillor Tim Kent	For
Councillor Sultan Khan	For
Councillor Gill Kirk	For
Councillor Cleo Lake	For
Councillor Jeff Lovell	For
Councillor Brenda Massey	For



Councillor Olly Mead	For
Councillor Graham Morris	Against
Councillor Anthony Negus	For
Councillor Paula O'Rourke	For
Councillor Steve Pearce	For
Councillor Celia Phipps	For
Councillor Ruth Pickersgill	For
Councillor Kevin Quartley	Against
Councillor Liz Radford	Against
Councillor Tim Rippington	For
Councillor Jo Sergeant	For
Councillor Afzal Shah	For
Councillor Steve Smith	Against
Councillor Jerome Thomas	For
Councillor Mhairi Threlfall	For
Councillor Estella Tincknell	For
Councillor Jon Wellington	For
Councillor Mark Weston	Against
Councillor Lucy Whittle	For
Councillor Chris Windows	Against
<b>Carried</b>	







# Full Council

16<sup>th</sup> March 2021

**Report of:** Human Resources Committee

**Title:** The Council's Pay Policy Statement for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022

**Ward:** N/A

**Officer Presenting Report:** Councillor Jon Wellington (Chair of Human Resources Committee)

**Contact Telephone Number:** (0117) 92 22000

## Recommendation

That the full Council approves the Pay Policy Statement for 2021/22.

## Summary

The Localism Act 2011 requires local authorities to agree and publish a pay policy statement annually before the start of the financial year to which the statement relates.

## The significant issues in the report are:

- The pay policy introduces a new pay range in relation to the Chief Executive following the creation of the post in May 2020 and a new provision that the pay ratio between the lowest and highest earner cannot exceed a ratio of 1:10.
- The proposed pay range for the post of Chief Executive is £171,500 to £182,500 with a proposed salary of £171,500 for the job holder with effect from 1 April 2021. The increase in salary for the job holder is £2,000 per annum.
- The proposals for the pay of the Chief Executive take account of the advice from external pay specialists (Korn Ferry) to the Human Resources Committee which highlighted that the Chief Executive post should have a different pay scale to other posts.
- The average pay of a Core City Chief Executive is currently £192,000 per annum (excluding Bristol).
- Korn Ferry also confirm that the current pay ranges of Executive Directors and Directors are in line with the market rate.





## Policy

1. The Localism Act 2011 requires local authorities (the Full Council) to agree and publish a pay policy statement annually before the start of the financial year to which the statement relates. It is recommended to full Council by the HR Committee.
2. The current policy of the Council in respect of Executive Director and Director pay is set out in the Council's Pay Policy Statement which states:

*"The salary for Executive Director and Director roles will be reviewed each year through this Pay Policy Statement. The Council will be mindful of pay awards agreed by the Joint Negotiating Committee for Chief Executives of Local Authorities and the Joint Negotiating Committee for Chief Officers of Local Authorities."*

3. Full Council has delegated to the Human Resources Committee the discretion to determine whether national pay settlements should be awarded to the Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors.

## Consultation

4. **Internal**  
Deputy Mayor, Finance, Governance and Performance and the Chief Executive have been consulted on these proposals.
5. **External**  
None required.

## Context

6. The Pay Policy Statement explains the Council pay policies for its highest and lowest-paid employees. It is written and published in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 and guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
7. External pay specialists Korn Ferry have reviewed the pay of our Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors against the market. Their report and recommendations are included at Appendix A.
8. The proposed pay band for the Chief Executive is below the market rate when compared to Core Cities and other benchmarks. It ensures that the ratio between the lowest and highest earner is no more than 10:1. The proposed salary of the Chief Executive is at a ratio of 9.36:1, which is below the market rate. The Council does need to be mindful of this from a retention and attraction perspective.
9. The jobs of Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors are graded using the Hay methodology and the salaries are informed by market data. The information in Appendix A includes comparative information and highlights that the current pay ranges for Executive Directors and Directors continue to be competitive. Therefore, it is proposed that they remain at 2020/21 levels.

10. There is a requirement to take into account any national pay settlements agreed by the Joint Negotiating Committee for Chief Executives of Local Authorities and the Joint Negotiating Committee for Chief Officers of Local Authorities. Government policy on pay in the public sector suggests that the national pay awards of any significance are unlikely in 2021/22 and no budgetary provision has been made for pay settlements for the Chief Executive and Chief Officers. In the unlikely event of a national pay award, this committee will be asked to consider the implications.
11. The number of Directors has now fallen from 13 FTE to 12 FTE following the resignation of the Director: Commercialisation last Summer. The Chief Executive decided not to replace the role and allocated the job accountabilities to others, which generated a saving of £142k per annum.
12. The Pay Policy Statement has also been amended to state that increases in pay during employment for Executive Directors and Directors that are within 10% of the minimum of the pay ranges can be approved by the Chief Executive and Director: Workforce and Change. Now that the Council has a Chief Executive, these arrangements are appropriate. All other increases above this will require Human Resources Committee approval. The Human Resources Committee will also determine any pay changes for the Chief Executive within the proposed pay bands.
13. The Public Sector Exit Payments Regulations 2020 came into force on 4 November 2020 but were revoked on 12 February 2021. The Pay Policy Statement will be updated to reflect any new legislation which may be introduced to replace these regulations.

### **Proposal**

14. That full Council approves the Pay Policy Statement for 2021/22.

### **Other Options Considered**

15. None.

### **Risk Assessment**

16. Failure to pay in line with market rates is likely to hamper the Council's ability to recruit and retain effective leaders and managers.

### **Public Sector Equality Duties**

- 17a) Before making a decision, section 149 Equality Act 2010 requires that each decision-maker considers the need to promote equality for persons with the following "protected characteristics": age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. Each decision-maker must, therefore, have due regard to the need to:
  - i) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited under the Equality Act 2010.
  - ii) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected

characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to --

- remove or minimise disadvantage suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic;
  - take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of people who do not share it (in relation to disabled people, this includes, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities);
  - encourage persons who share a protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low.
- iii) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to –
- tackle prejudice; and
  - promote understanding.

17b) An Equality Impact Assessment has not been completed as no major change to policy is proposed by this report.

## **Legal and Resource Implications**

### **Legal**

The Pay Policy Statement 2021/22 fulfils the legal requirement placed on the Council by s.38(1) of the Localism Act 2011 to produce an annual pay policy statement.

Husinara Jones, Solicitor/Team Leader, 26 February 2021

### **Financial**

#### **(a) Revenue**

This report recommends Full Council approval of the Pay Policy Statement 2021/22.

Significant points within this Pay Policy Statement include a new pay range for the salary of the Chief Executive of £171,500 to £182,500 and proposes £171,500 for the job holder from 1 April 2021. This proposal represents an annual increase of £2,000 which can be managed within the HR division's approved Revenue Budget for 21/22.

The report also implements new guidance that the pay ratio between the lowest and highest earner should not exceed a ratio of 1:10 and confirms that the recommended salary of the Chief Executive is within this ratio.

Finally, it should be noted that HM Treasury have announced that the Public Sector Exit Payment Regulation 2020 which imposed a £95k cap on public sector authority exit payments is to be disapplied from 12 February 2021 and revoked.

Jemma Prince, Finance Business Partner, 2 March 2021

#### **(b) Capital**

Not applicable

**Land**

Not applicable.

**Personnel**

The Chief Executive's contract will be amended to include the new pay range if the proposals are approved at Full Council.

Mark Williams, Head of HR, 3 February 2021

**Appendices:**

A – Korn Ferry – summary market report

B – Draft Pay Policy Statement

C – Draft Minutes of HR Committee - 18 February 2021

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

**Background Papers:**

None.



# Review of Chief Executive's Role

**KORN FERRY LTD**



## Bristol City Council

# Chief Executive Pay – Job Evaluation and Market Benchmarking

### 1. Introduction

This paper summarises outputs from our review of the Chief Executive’s post. The analysis provided will support the Council to develop a pay policy for this role.

To prepare it, we have:

- Reviewed the job description of the CE’s role and evaluated it using the Korn Ferry Hay method of job evaluation, which is widely used in local government and elsewhere.
- Reviewed and provided Korn Ferry Public Sector market pay data.
- Collected and reviewed pay practice data for Core Cities, Greater Manchester Authorities and the new unitary councils.

At the end of this report, we have also provided summary market pay data for the Council’s Director level roles.

### 2. Job Evaluation

We have evaluated the Chief Executive’s role using the information provided. The evaluation score is summarised below:

	Score	KF Reference Level
Chief Executive	2328	26

### 3. External Comparisons

The provision of market pay data enables the Council to review how current remuneration arrangements sit against other organisations and to test whether current arrangements are appropriate and justifiable.

They also help to understand whether they are likely to enable the recruitment and/ or retention or provide appropriate incentives for the behaviours needed.

#### 3.1 Korn Ferry Hay National Public Sector Market

We have summarised below market pay data for jobs of similar job size and complexity in the Public and Not for Profit Sector.

The benefits of these comparisons are:

- Firstly, it allows the Council to consider the market for some of the roles with close equivalents outside the local government sector.
- Secondly it helps to inform the determination of the pay policy and position for the Chief Executive’s role at the Council.



	External market lower quartile	External market median	External market upper quartile
Chief Executive level roles	£165,000	£195,000	£227,000

### 3.2 Core Cities Chief Executive pay data

The table below draws from data that we have collected directly from the Core Cities local authorities and published pay disclosures. These are sometimes part of the Pay Policy Statement agreed by the Council; sometimes they are in separate publications covering senior structures and salaries.

Although these authorities vary in population size, scope, structure and are differently configured, they are all part of the Core Cities with similar broader aims and objectives and therefore form a useful and relevant comparator group.

Core Cities	Population Size	Chief Executive's base pay
Bristol	463,377	£169,500 (figures rounded)
Birmingham	1,141,816	Range from £180,000 to £220,000*
Cardiff	364,248	
Glasgow	633,120	
Leeds	793,139	
Liverpool	498,042	
Manchester	552,858	
Newcastle	302,820	
Nottingham	332,900	
Sheffield	584,853	
Average	566,717	

\*base pay of £220,000 - no Council pension contribution payable. We have reduced the total pay by a nominal sum to take into account the pension arrangements to support the base pay analysis.

Belfast City Council has a different pay market in Northern Ireland and has been excluded from this analysis.

We have also provided some additional local government benchmarking data below covering Greater Manchester councils excluding Manchester and three new unitary councils.

### 3.3 Greater Manchester Councils

The median pay range for 9 Greater Manchester Councils excluding Manchester City Council ranges from £150,000-£160,000, with an average population size of 247,000.

Bristol is a Core City, with larger budgets, population size and scale of operation.



### 3.4 New Unitary Councils

Three new Unitary Councils have been established in the last 2 years. These are Buckinghamshire, Dorset, and Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Councils. The pay for Chief Executives ranges from £168,300 to £200,000, with an average of £182,300. One of the Council's also operates a non-consolidated performance bonus. The average population size is approximately 439,000.

## 4. Policy issues and options for Bristol City Council

We assume the Council will want a pay structure for the Chief Executive's post which:

- Enables it to recruit and retain the necessary talent.
- Is aligned with and justifiable in relation to local government in England.
- Is affordable and not disruptive to apply.
- Is fair.
- Is in line with the recommendations of the Hutton review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector. This review also recommends that local authorities define what they mean by 'lowest' salary.

The current pay level for the Chief Executive appears to be relatively low when compared to the overall market. It is the lowest paid role in Core Cities (excluding Belfast) at approximately 10% below the average and over 12% below our national Public Sector market. There is an argument based on the analysis above that some adjustments may be needed to recognise the weight and responsibilities of the role. How this is done will be informed by the answers to several questions:

- a. How far do you want to reflect job size in pay? The CE's role is the highest paid role in all local government organisations, with a separate pay scale and associated governance arrangements.
- b. Should the role be linked to a pay range? And should salary within the range be a spot rate or should there be increments which indicate the possibility of progression? This approach creates some flexibility for recruitment and retention purposes but also requires clear criteria and processes for pay management.
- c. Should pay setting and review take any account of performance? Most organisations expect there to be some difference between a newly promoted member of staff and an established contributor; the question is whether there should be a more formal link. If there is any pay flexibility, there will have to be clear guidance about how it is exercised.
- d. What is the appropriate level and mix of pay considering more than just base salary, such as any benefits and additional payments of a Total Remuneration approach that may be available for the post?
- e. What level of pay is likely to be affordable and justifiable within the current salary bill and Council governance arrangements?

Bearing these questions in mind and the information provided, the Council should be able to develop a fair and affordable pay structure for the Chief Executive's role that reflects both the job size, comparable roles in local government and broader public sector, and the need to attract and retain the talent the Council needs to lead the organisation and deliver its strategy and priorities.





## 5. Director Pay Bands

The Council's current Director pay structure is summarised below.

Director Level (KF Reference Level)	Bottom of BCC band	Mid-point of BCC band	Top of BCC band
Service Director D1 (KF RL 21)	£87,338	£97,613	£107,888
Service Director D2 (KF RL 22)	£96,585	£109,943	£122,300
Executive Director GD (KF RL 24)	£138,713	£154,125	£169,538

We have provided below our Public and Not for Profit market pay data to review your base pay for your Director level roles.

KF Reference Level	External market lower quartile	External market median	External market upper quartile	External market average
21	£86,625	£95,960	£112,093	£102,129
22	£102,087	£114,462	£135,972	£120,192
24	£147,812	£162,500	£184,750	£167,176

It appears that the Council's pay policy for Director level roles is broadly line with the external market.

**Bristol City Council**

**Pay Policy Statement**  
**for the period**  
**1<sup>st</sup> April 2021 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022**

**1. Introduction**

- a. It is essential that the Council attracts and keeps people with the right talents and commitment to lead and deliver great services to Bristol's citizens. At the same time the Council has to get the best value for the taxpayer.
- b. This Statement explains the Council pay policies for its highest and lowest-paid employees. It is written and published in line with the Localism Act 2011 (the Act) and guidance issued by the Secretary of State (the Guidance).
- c. The Guidance is clear that decisions on pay policies should be made by councillors. The Council is committed to making sure that all councillors have a say on how pay decisions are made, especially about its highest-paid employees. To achieve this, the Statement is reviewed every year. The Mayor is consulted, and any proposals made are taken into account. The draft statement is considered by the Human Resources Committee and approved by full Council. Both meetings are open to the public.
- d. In line with the law (the Local Authorities (Elected Mayor and Mayor's Assistant) (England) Regulations 2002), the pay of the Mayor's Assistant is set as the Mayor thinks fit, within the financial resources available to the Council. The Mayor's Assistant is currently paid at Director (Level 1).
- e. As recommended by the Guidance, this Statement sets out clearly and separately its policies on each of the requirements listed in the relevant sections of the Act. The Guidance says that this is to help enable taxpayers to decide whether they are getting value for money in the way that public money is spent on local authority pay and reward.
- f. The Council is committed to equal pay for all its employees and to removing any bias in its pay systems related to age, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, marriage and civil partnership and pregnancy and maternity. Equal pay applies to all contractual terms and conditions as well as pay.
- g. The Council became an accredited Living Wage Employer with effect from 5<sup>th</sup> November 2018. The Council has paid its own employees no less than the Real Living Wage since 1<sup>st</sup> October 2014.
- h. Apprentices aged 18 years and over are paid the Real Living Wage (as set by the Living Wage Foundation); those under 18 are paid 80% of the Real Living Wage.

## **2. Development priority for 2021/22**

- a. The Council continuously reviews its pay offer to adapt to legislation changes and ensure we have a competitive offer to attract and retain the best talent. Improving the diversity of our organisation through attracting, promoting and retaining diverse talent is a key priority in our new Workforce Strategy and our Advancing Equalities Action Plan. As part of service planning process for 2021/22 all services have a diversity plan which sets out the action that will be taken to address workforce diversity gaps.

## **3. Pay of the Council's highest-paid employees**

- a. The Council's highest-paid employees are the Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors. These roles are graded using the Hay methodology and the salaries are informed by market data. For the period covered by this Statement the salary range for the Chief Executive will be £171,500 to £182,500 with a mid-point of £177,000.
- b. Executive Director roles will range from £138,713 to £169,538 with a mid-point of £154,125.
- c. The salary for Director (Level 2) roles will range from £96,585 to £122,300 with a mid-point of £109,943. The salary for Director (Level 1) roles will range from £87,338 to £107,888 with a mid-point of £97,613.

## **4. Pay of the Council's lowest-paid employees**

- a. The Council's lowest-paid employees are those who are paid the Real Living Wage. The Council has adopted this definition because it has decided that none of its employees should be paid less than the Real Living Wage. The Real Living Wage is £9.50 per hour with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021, which equates to a minimum salary of £18,328 (based on a full-time week of 37 hours). The rate of the Real Living Wage is refreshed each November, and the Council applies the new rate from the following 1<sup>st</sup> April.
- b. From 1st April 2020 apprentice pay levels increased to the Real Living Wage rate for apprentices 18 years old and over and 80% of the Real Living Wage for apprentices under 18 years old. An additional allowance of £25 per week is paid to apprentices who have left local authority care, and this is paid throughout their apprenticeship for as long as they live in independent accommodation.
- c. Interns, student placements and trainees are normally paid the Real Living Wage.

## **5. Relationship between the pay of the Council's highest and lowest-paid employees**

- a. Will Hutton's 2011 Review of Fair Pay in the Public Sector recommended that all public service organisations publish their top to median pay ratio to allow the public to hold them to account. The Government's terms of reference for the Hutton review suggested that no public sector manager should earn more than 20 times the lowest paid person in the organisation.

- b. The change in these ratios at the Council over recent years is shown in the following table:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Top to median pay ratio</b>	<b>Top to lowest salary ratio</b>
31 <sup>st</sup> March 2012	-	15.6:1
31 <sup>st</sup> March 2013	-	12.35:1
31 <sup>st</sup> March 2014	6.68:1	12.87:1
31 <sup>st</sup> March 2015	6.29:1	11.85:1
31 <sup>st</sup> December 2015	6.75:1	11.33:1
31 <sup>st</sup> December 2016	6.23:1	10.05:1
31 <sup>st</sup> December 2017	5.24:1	8.34:1
31 <sup>st</sup> December 2018	6.03:1	9.77:1
31 <sup>st</sup> December 2019	5.89:1	9.50:1
31 <sup>st</sup> December 2020	5.73:1	9.45:1

## **6. Pay of Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors when they start**

- a. Pay on commencement of employment will be within 10% of the minimum of the range unless otherwise agreed by the Selection Committee. Payment above the mid-point is reserved for roles where there is clear evidence that the market rate is significantly higher than the mid-point.
- b. The Guidance says that full Council or a meeting of Members should have the opportunity to vote before salary packages totaling £100,000 or more are offered for new appointments. Through its Constitution full Council delegates this to the Selection Committee.

## **7. Increases and additions to pay for Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors**

- a. The salary for Chief Executive, Executive Director and Director roles will be reviewed each year through this Pay Policy Statement. The Council will be mindful of pay awards agreed by the Joint Negotiating Committee for Chief Executives of Local Authorities and the Joint Negotiating Committee for Chief Officers of Local Authorities. The Human Resources Committee will determine whether any national pay settlements should be applied.
- b. Any changes to the pay of the Chief Executive will be determined by the Human Resources Committee. Requests for increases in pay for, Executive Directors and Directors during employment that are within 10% of the minimum of the pay range can be approved by the Chief Executive and Director: Workforce & Change. All other increases above this will require Human Resources Committee approval.

## **8. Performance-related pay for Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors**

- a. There is no performance-related pay for Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors.

## **9. Bonuses for Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors**

- a. There are no bonuses for Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors.

## **10. Pay of Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors when they leave**

- a. When a Chief Executive, Executive Director or Director leaves they will be paid in line with what they are entitled to under their contract of employment (their notice period is three months) and the Council's policies.
- b. The Public Sector Exit Payments Regulations 2020 which came into force on 4 November 2020, were revoked on 12 February 2021. This Pay Policy Statement will be updated to reflect any new legislation which may be introduced to replace these regulations. The Council's constitutional arrangements in relation to any exit payments will continue to apply as set out below.
- c. The dismissal and/or compensation for loss of office of Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors is determined by the Human Resources Committee (except for the Head of Paid Service, Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer, where this is a matter for Full Council).
- d. Employees who leave due to voluntary severance will not be re-employed by the Council in a paid job or engaged directly or through a company on an "off-payroll" basis for 12 months after they leave. (Off-payroll means a person who is paid via a company rather than through the payroll as an employee). Employees who leave due to compulsory redundancy are free to apply for re-employment with the Council at any point after they've left.

## **11. Paying Chief Executive, Executive Directors and Directors "off-payroll"**

- a. Any Executive Director or Director appointed on an interim basis and supplied by a third party are regarded as employees for tax purposes.

## **12. Returning Officer fees**

- a. The Council's Returning Officer for elections and referenda is appointed by full Council. Fees are paid for these duties. They vary depending on the type of poll and are published prior to each election. Fees for most polls (including national elections and referenda) are set and paid by the Government (rather than the Council).

## **13. More information about the pay of Chief Executive, Executive Director and Directors**

- a. The Council is committed to being open about its policies on pay. Approved pay policy statements are published on the Council's website at [www.bristol.gov.uk/council-spending-performance/senior-officers-pay](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/council-spending-performance/senior-officers-pay). Other information that the Council has to publish under the Local Government Transparency Code 2015 is available via that webpage.

## **14. More information about Pay Gap Reporting**

- a. We publish our gender, ethnicity and disability pay gap every 12 months on the Council's website at <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/people-communities/measuring-equalities-success>

## Public Document Pack

**Bristol City Council  
Minutes of the Human Resources Committee  
(Zoom Meeting)****18 February 2021 at 10 am****Members Present: -****Councillors:** Richard Eddy, Gary Hopkins, Ruth Pickersgill, Paula O'Rourke, Jon Wellington (Chair)**Officers in Attendance:** - John Walsh (Director Workforce & Change), Mark Williams (Head of Human Resources), David Martin (Facilities Management), Jane Taylor Head of Service (Employment, Skills & Learning), Darren Perkins (Apprenticeship Manager), Steve Gregory (Democratic Services)

## DRAFT EXTRACT

### 9. Pay Policy Statement

The Committee received a detailed report from the Director Workforce & Change to consider the Pay Policy Statement (PPS) for 2021/22. It was noted that the Localism Act 2011 required local authorities to agree and publish a pay policy statement annually before the start of the financial year to which the statement related to.

The Committee's attention was specifically drawn to the following points –

1. The Pay Policy introduced a new pay range to the post of Chief Executive following its creation in May 2020 and a new provision that the pay ratio between the lowest and highest earner must not exceed 1:10.
2. The proposed pay range for the post of Chief Executive was £171,500 to £182,500 with a proposed salary for the existing postholder with effect from 1 April 2021, this would mean an increase in current salary of £2,000.
3. The proposals for the pay of the Chief Executive took account of advice from external pay specialists (Korn Ferry) who highlighted that the Chief executive post should have a different pay scale to other posts.
4. The average pay of a core city Chief Executive was currently £192,000 per annum (excluding Bristol City Council).
5. Korn Ferry had confirmed that the current pay ranges for Executive Directors and Directors were in line with the market rate.
6. The Pay Policy had been updated to reflect the introduction of the Exit Cap to limit exit payments however on 12 February 2021 the Government had revoked this, new legislation would replace this. The Council's constitutional arrangements in relation to exit payments would therefore continue to apply.

The Committee then received a summary of the report from Korn Ferry representatives Abul Uddin and Matthew Wilton.

Key points highlighted during discussion were –

1. Noted that some members of Council for the last three years had consistently voted against the PPS as it was considered that the bandings were heavily weighted at rewarding senior leaders at the expense of the rest of the organisation.
2. There was currently no cap or restrictions on remuneration for Director posts or external consultants.
3. Concern that the extra pay for the Chief Executive post, whilst modest, could lead to a further increase and this could further lead to increases in senior officers pay generally. It was clarified that the HR Committee would have a role overseeing a further pay rise of the CX post.
4. Senior officers and consultants were consistently in a better position than employees lower down in the organisation in terms of how they were treated.
5. Proper recognition for rewarding staff was appropriate, especially having regard to recruitment and retention, so the proposal to increase the Chief Executive pay was in line with the new pay range for the new post of Chief Executive. Noted that it was a Council decision to create the post of Chief Executive and so the situation was not about a pay rise rather that the role must have the correct remuneration which in this case was the lowest point on the pay scale.
6. Regarding employing consultants, the Council now had a new strategic partner engaged to limit the use consultants to resolve this issue. Regarding employees working outside normal hours, as highlighted during public forum, this was something that the Committee could review soon. Regarding Chief Executive pay this was a post reinstated by the Council and so could not allow a pay anomaly in terms of the basic pay of the grade of the post.

It was then moved and seconded that the Pay Policy Statement and the recommendations as set out in the report be accepted.

On being put to the vote there were three in favour and two against. Therefore, the motion was carried.

**Resolved –**

- 1. That the Human Resources Committee recommend to Full Council, that the Pay Policy Statement 2021/22 take effect from 1 April 2021.**
- 2. That the annual salary of £171,500 for the Chief Executive to take effect from 1 April 2021, subject to Full Council approval of the Pay Policy Statement on 16 March 2021, be approved.**

**CHAIR**

Meeting ended at 12.10 pm

# Full Council

16<sup>th</sup> March 2021



**Report of:** The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board

**Title:** Scrutiny Annual Report 20/21

## Recommendation

That Members note the Scrutiny Annual Report 20/21.

## Summary

It is considered best practice for Members to submit an annual report to Full Council to highlight work completed during the municipal year and make suggestions for the future approach to Scrutiny, including any work programme topics.

The attached report has been prepared by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

## The significant issues in the report are:

As set out in the report.

*Appendix A – Scrutiny Annual Report 20/21*





## **Scrutiny Annual Report – 2020/2021**

### **Foreword from the Chair, Councillor Geoff Gollop**

2020/21 has been a memorable period, during which Members have worked together to tackle the myriad of conflicting pressures relating to the Coronavirus pandemic that have affected our work and constituents in so many ways. Collectively, Members have risen to the challenge and adapted our procedures and practices in order to focus Scrutiny resources on the areas where we can make the most impact.

In my view, Scrutiny is about so much more than acting as the ‘critical friend’ or opposition and I believe decision making is greatly enhanced by taking a collegiate approach. One of the positives during these unprecedented times has been the success of our series of Covid related Task Groups where we took a number of ‘deep dives’ into areas that were pressing concerns for local residents. These Groups were set up in a very short period of time, yet because they were properly scoped and looking at the right topics, they achieved a demonstrable impact on the Council’s response to the pandemic.

Clearly, one of the most fundamental components of successful Scrutiny lies in partnership working and, as demonstrated by the Task Groups, there’s great strength in enabling cross party Members, and the public, to feed into early stage policy development. I recommend that this model of working becomes more routinely embedded in our structures going forward. Not only because Task Groups are far less demanding of officers’ time, thus helping with productivity, but also because there’s much less political difference of opinion when ideas are in the initial stages of formation.

It’s been encouraging to see the positive response to our Task Groups when presenting findings to Cabinet, and we were pleased to hear that on several occasions this has led to follow up work directly with Cabinet Members, which I hope has been mutually beneficial.

I suggest that further strengthening of the relationship between Scrutiny and the Executive would be another component to our ongoing success. OSMB have made many referrals to Cabinet during the last year on a broad range of topics, all of which have been prepared with full cross party support and consensus, and I hope that the Executive will continue to value our considered contributions.

On a related note, the publication of the Mayor’s Forward Plan is a fundamental tool to enable Scrutiny to plan its work effectively. Where the minimum (statutory) requirement of 28 days’ notice of items going to Cabinet is provided it does present some challenges for Scrutiny, and I hope that we move towards a best practice approach during 21/22 and beyond.

To conclude, 20/21 has been an unusual year for so many reasons, but I would like to take this opportunity to thank my Scrutiny Member colleagues for their support, flexibility and commitment during this period. This includes my fellow Scrutiny Chairs who have fully played their part in making our work this year so effective. However, specific thanks must go to Councillor Celia Phipps as Vice Chair of OSMB for her continued support and for playing a major role in moderating our views to ensure they are genuinely cross party. None of this would have been possible without the dedicated Scrutiny team, led by Lucy Fleming, Head of Democratic Engagement alongside Johanna Holmes, Scrutiny Co-ordinator and Dan Berlin and Bronwen Falconer, Scrutiny Advisors. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to Tom Gray, Public Participation Officer, for his technical expertise around the delivery of virtual meetings.

*Councillor Geoff Gollop, February 21*

## **Key stats**

- Number of formal Scrutiny meetings – 23
- Meetings of the OSMB Lead Members - 16
- Task and Finish Groups - 5
- Reports to Cabinet – 8

## **Scrutiny Successes in 20/21 – Summary**

The main achievements of Scrutiny during 20/21 are set out below;

- The style of Task Groups adopted; this has been very successful with the topics selected being priority issues with focussed objectives. The outcomes of the Task Groups have directly influenced policy development and this approach is recommended for future years.
- Members have adapted to 'virtual meetings,' which have been rolled out across the Scrutiny function and bring many benefits, most notably in terms of engaging with the public.
- Scrutiny has become truly 'Member led' in line with best practice, and the cross-party Lead Members of Scrutiny have maintained an effective structure for managing the function.
- A new approach to Health Scrutiny, with activities being picked up via a Health Sub Committee of the People Scrutiny Commission, has been introduced and is working well.

## **Scrutiny Work Programme 20/21 – Key Highlights**

### **Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (OSMB)**

OSMB has had a busy year focusing on both oversight of the Scrutiny Work Programme and looking into issues that are cross cutting and/or of significant interest city wide. Main areas of focus include;

- Conducting several sessions reviewing the Council's Clean Air Proposals in order to feed into the Cabinet decision in February 21.
- Carrying out the annual review of the Council's Companies' Business Plans, which ensures good governance.
- Reviewing the Council's Advertising and Sponsorship Policy; providing detailed feedback which helped shape the approach.
- Reviewing and monitoring the Council's plans in relation to Bristol Beacon.
- Keeping a watching brief of all items going to Cabinet for decision, raising queries as appropriate and providing comments. OSMB routinely submit cross party comments to Cabinet on forthcoming reports which help to ensure that a broad range of views feed into decision making.
- Taking a strategic review of the Council's performance and risk reports.
- Monitoring progress around all Scrutiny activities to ensure resources are being used effectively and concentrate on the areas where Members can add the most value. This includes receiving regular Chairs' progress reports on Task Group activities.
- Providing a vital interface for the public to raise issues of concern relating to work across the whole Council.

## **Communities Scrutiny Commission**

The role of the Communities Scrutiny Commission is the overview and scrutiny of matters that affect Bristol's neighbourhoods. Unlike other Scrutiny Commissions, it is not attached to a single Directorate and examines cross cutting issues. Key points of interest from the 2020/21 year include:

- In setting the 2020/21 Work Programme the Commission undertook a prioritisation exercise and survey with Members to ensure a focus on the most significant topics.
- The Commission received reports relating to Homelessness Support; Moving Forward Together; Decarbonisation of Residential Properties; HMOs and Licensing; Future Parks; Waste Management; Estate Security; and the Community Safety Partnership Needs Analysis Update.
- A strength of the Commission has been the ability to recognise where issues may span several areas, for example well-received items such as Homelessness Support (October 2020) which involved input from multiple Bristol City Council teams.
- The impact of Covid-19 on the Communities Scrutiny Commission, like much of Scrutiny, has been substantial. This has resulted in a number of items being either postponed or received in an amended format, and it is recommended that these be prioritised in the 21/22 Municipal Year.

## **People Scrutiny**

The Council's adult care provision, child and family support, safeguarding and education and skills fall under the remit of this Commission. The Health Sub-Committee of the People Scrutiny Commission carries out the statutory health scrutiny role. The highlights from the 20/21 Work Programme include;

- There has been a focus on mental health and well-being, with the update on the Mental Health Strategy and a review of how isolated older people could be supported.
- After representations from a local parents' group Members added the Temple Quarter school proposals to the Work Programme. Following the effective SEND Evidence Day last year, the full response and update from the administration was brought to the Commission in 2020. Both education items included constructive input from parents and carers.
- December's Commission meeting saw the Public Health team present a paper on the impact of COVID-19 on Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic Communities. This enabled scrutiny of responses to findings of the rapid review conducted by the National Institute for Health Research and the University of Bristol, including the establishment, and ensuing work, of the Race Equality Covid-19 Steering Group.

### **Task Group;**

- 20/21 began with a detailed review of the Council's response to COVID-19 and recovery planning with regards to safeguarding children and young people in Bristol. The Task Group's aims remained focused on informing policy development and good practice so as to build resilience in light of ongoing issues relating to the pandemic.
- In August 2020 evidence was heard from 22 participants and the Task Group also considered 5 further submissions. There was also strong engagement from the Executive, city partners, local and national experts, and practitioners.
- Findings and recommendations have been referred to the Cabinet and partnership bodies, including Keeping Bristol Safe, for consideration. Positive feedback has been received that this has been a constructive and effective way of conducting scrutiny, and invaluable in terms of lessons learnt as we continue to tackle the pandemic.

## **Health Scrutiny Committee (Sub-Committee of the People Scrutiny Commission)**

The role of the Health Scrutiny Committee is to undertake scrutiny of local Health Service provision in accordance with Section 7 of the Health and Social Care Act 2001, the Health and Social Care Act 2012 and Local Authority (Public Health, Health and Wellbeing Boards and Health Scrutiny) Regulations 2013. Key areas of focus in 20/21 include;

- The Committee has been briefed by the NHS and the executive on the closure of the Banksy Ward at the Priory and this item was brought to the Health Scrutiny Committee in February 21.
- Committee Members received a briefing on the development of the Drug and Alcohol Strategy which informed the full discussion at the Committee meeting in February 21.
- The Committee commented on this year's NHS Trusts' Quality Accounts.
- The Joint Health Scrutiny Committee will meet in March 21 to consider the development of the new stroke services and hear from Bristol North Somerset South Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group about its system plan, including the move to an Integrated Care System and Covid-19 recovery planning. The CCG will provide a formal response in due course.

### **Task Group;**

- The Committee started 20/21 with a focused review of how COVID-19 has affected how people can access planned health care in the city. The focus of the Task Group was to act as a critical friend to the Council's partners and inform good practice and policy around health care, whilst keeping people safe during the recovery period and supporting individuals where there were delays.
- In August 2020 evidence was heard from a range of participants and Members received strong engagement by the executive, the Bristol North Somerset South Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG); NHS Trusts; and other city partners, local and national experts. The CCG Governing Body considered the report and will bring a response back to the Committee in due course.
- Findings and recommendations have been to Cabinet and partnership bodies, including the Health & Wellbeing Board, for consideration. Members' feedback has been positive and there's agreement that this has been a constructive and effective way of carrying out scrutiny.

## **Growth and Regeneration Scrutiny**

The Commission set a comprehensive Work Programme for the municipal year and where possible the meeting agendas were themed. Some of the key topics of focus this year were housing delivery, the Mayor's Climate Emergency Action Plan, local flood strategies and strategic transport.

In September the Commission were invited to input into the draft One City - Economic Recovery Strategy.

An extraordinary meeting was held in early January to consider the pros and cons of the potential expansion of the West of England Combined Authority.

In late January the Commission's whole meeting agenda focussed on some of the major regeneration projects across the City such as Temple Quarter (including Temple Meads Station), Western Harbour and the development of the City Centre.

### **Task Group;**

- Early in 2020 Central Government released Emergency Active Travel Funding (EATF) to local authorities to help mitigate the loss of capacity on public transport due to social distancing.

- The aim was to provide safe walking and cycling routes in a short space of time to enable people to move around more easily.
- During August the Task Group held three sessions that focused on the overarching strategy applied by Bristol City Council's Strategic Transport Team and the approach taken to deliver the individual projects. One session enabled a number of external stakeholders to engage and provide valuable feedback on their experiences.
- The Task Group's final report made seven recommendations and all those involved felt this was a positive and valuable piece of scrutiny work.

### **Resources Scrutiny Commission**

The Resources Scrutiny Commission has worked in a slightly different way choosing to have fewer formal public meetings and instead prioritising intense activity in several areas;

- Budget Scrutiny – OSMB have delegated responsibility for budget scrutiny to the Resources Scrutiny Commission and Finance Task Group. A robust process was devised to ensure that Members had access to comprehensive information in the run up to the budget setting process, which was delivered via the Finance Task Group. This culminated in a budget specific meeting of the Resources Scrutiny Commission where detailed comments were agreed and submitted to Members in advance of the budget setting Full Council meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2021. The approach to budget scrutiny adopted this year was a particular highlight and generally thought to reflect best practice.
- Another key piece of work for the Commission was the continued focus on the Council's Social Value Policy. A Scrutiny Task Group had previously been involved in developing the Social Value Policy. The policy had now been in place for some time so a review was scheduled to determine the outcomes and agree any changes that were required. The Task Group held three sessions, one of which included external organisations including Bristol University, Voscur, the Federation of Small Businesses and the Social Value Portal Ltd. All those involved commented that this was a very constructive process that produced a set of clear proposals to improve the policy and associated outcomes. The refreshed Social Value Policy & Tool Kit would be considered at a Cabinet meeting in March 21.

### **Opportunities for Scrutiny in 2021/22 and beyond;**

Since the implementation of Scrutiny as a model of governance in 2000, the function in Bristol has been constantly evolving in order to ensure it provides the best vehicle for Members and the public to influence and inform decision making. The 20/21 Municipal Year has accelerated change in many areas and also provided new opportunities for doing things differently. Detailed below are the areas suggested as future priorities;

- **Structure** – it's appropriate that the structure and style of scrutiny continuously adapts in order to meet current needs. A number of Scrutiny reviews have been completed in recent years, and all of this learning should be shared with the new cohort of Members post-election to inform their approach. Members will wish to carefully consider the way that Scrutiny is managed in order to find the right balance between formal Committee meetings and Task Groups (which could include Inquiry days) that look into a specific area of policy development. Whilst formal Committee meetings will always have an important role in raising the profile of issues, particularly in the public domain, Task Groups offer a more nimble and flexible approach where excellent outcomes can be achieved within a short space of time. It is strongly recommended that Task Groups be used more routinely going forwards.

- **Work Programme Setting** – the Work Programme is perhaps the most important aspect for Scrutiny Members to get right. There will inevitably be far more topics than Members can reasonably cover and it's vital that the most suitable items are selected at the outset, ideally with input from Cabinet Members and senior officers. It is also recommended that a prioritisation task be utilised to ensure topics taken forward align with the Council's priorities; are being considered at the right time; and are the subjects that matter most to local residents. Differing formats have been used to set the Work Programme in recent times, and whilst it's clearly important that all Scrutiny Members have the opportunity to share their views on potential topics, it's suggested that the OSMB Leads be empowered to finalise the selection as they are best placed to take the necessary strategic overview.
- **Executive/Scrutiny Relationship** – there are a number of good examples during the 20/21 Municipal Year where there has been a strong working relationship between Scrutiny and the Executive, which has led to very positive outcomes. Going forwards, developing a more established 'two-way conversation' for reporting to Cabinet and receiving regular feedback could be one way to further strengthen the relationship.
- **Member Development** – with a new cohort of Members arriving in 21/22, consideration will need to be given to the range of support and training available. In recent years Members have benefitted from the high-quality Scrutiny training provided by both the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny, and the LGA, and it is recommended that similar provision be available for 21/22. The Member Induction Programme for 21/22 will be very comprehensive and cover related areas around governance, decision making, effective chairing skills etc, and new and returning Members are encouraged to take advantage of the full offer.
- **Public Engagement/Remote meetings** – it is not yet known whether the legislation to enable the continuation of virtual meetings will be extended into the longer term. However, should it be made permanent, this will bring many opportunities around enhanced engagement with the public which should be fully explored. The Council is also working on plans to improve diversity amongst public forum participants and these two aspects together could bring many benefits and mark a significant shift in opening up Scrutiny to a much broader audience.
- **Scrutiny Forward Plan** – in order for the public to have maximum opportunity to contribute to Scrutiny debates, it's suggested that from 21/22 a 'Forward Plan' of items for the coming year be published, similar to that for the Executive Forward Plan.
- **Continual Improvement** – Scrutiny Members are encouraged to continually evaluate their progress in order to ensure that resources are being used as effectively as possible. It is recommended that for 21/22 a more structured way of Members reviewing their own performance be introduced. This could include producing a regular annual report to Full Council, but also informal discussions by the OSMB Lead Members.
- **Partnership Working** – there are some areas where additional clarification around the respective roles and remit of Scrutiny would improve efficiencies and prevent duplication. Examples include relationships with the Audit Committee, Human Resources Committee, and Health and Wellbeing Board.