

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Full Council

15 March 2022 at 6.00 pm



Members Present:- Mayor Marvin Rees

Councillors: Lord Mayor Steve Smith, Donald Alexander, Lesley Alexander, Kerry Bailes, Jenny Bartle, Nicola Beech, Marley Bennett, Mark Bradshaw, Fabian Breckels, Andrew Brown, Sarah Classick, Asher Craig, Chris Davies, Carla Denyer, Kye Dudd, Tony Dyer, Richard Eddy, Emma Edwards, Jude English, Lily Fitzgibbon, Tessa Fitzjohn, Martin Fodor, Lorraine Francis, John Geater, Paul Goggin, Geoff Gollop, Zoe Goodman, John Goulandris, Katy Grant, Fi Hance, Helen Holland, Gary Hopkins, Katja Hornchen, Jonathan Hucker, Philippa Hulme, Farah Hussain, Chris Jackson, Ellie King, Tim Kent, Heather Mack, Brenda Massey, Henry Michallat, Yassin Mohamud, Graham Morris, Paula O'Rourke, Barry Parsons, Steve Pearce, Ed Plowden, Guy Poultney, Kevin Quartley, Tim Rippington, James Scott, Sharon Scott, Ani Stafford-Townsend, Lisa Stone, Christine Townsend, Andrew Varney, Mark Weston, David Wilcox and Tim Wye

1 Welcome and Introductions

The Lord Mayor welcomed all attendees to the meeting..

2 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were heard from Councillor Ali, Cheney, Clark, Cole, Hartley, Hathway, Makawi, Renhard and Windows.

3 Declarations of Interest

None received.

4 Lord Mayor's Business

The Lord Mayor invited Mayor Rees to speak to Full Council and outline details of the new scheme for supporting Ukrainian refugees arriving in the City.

5 Public Forum (Public Petitions, Statements and Questions)



Public petitions:

There were two public petitions received which were referred to the Mayor for his consideration and response.

Ref No	Name	Title
PP01	Sian Ellis Thomas	Residents Against the Mast!

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	Title
PS01	Rita Symes	Callington Road Link Proposal
PS02	Barbara van der Eerden	Protect views of the iconic view of Totterdown escarpment
PS03	Fergus Colville	Protect Iconic View of Totterdown
PS04	John Jones	Proposed RPZ Zone
PS05	Alan Brown	RPZ extensions in BS3 area
PS06	James Corrigan	Extension to Southville RPZ
PS07	Ann Hughes	Extension to Southville RPZ
PS08	Julian Warren	Protect views of the iconic view of Totterdown escarpment
PS09	Ruth Cochrane	Protect views of the iconic view of Totterdown escarpment
PS10	Roger Dickinson	Extension of Southville RPZ
PS11	Amy Evans	Extension of Southville RPZ
PS12	TRESAcic	Protect views of the iconic view of Totterdown escarpment
PS13	Lynsey Cox	Residential parking Carrington Road BD3
PS14	Sian Ellis-Thomas - co-leader of Residents Against The Mast	Objecting to the siting of a 24 metre telecoms mast by EE H3G in Redcatch Park, Knowle
PS15	Wendy Le Tocq	Extension of Southville RPZ
PS16	Judie Davidson	Extension of RPZ for All BS3
PS17	Tracey Stanford-Mcbride	RPZ Extension
PS18	Gerry Witcombe	RPZ Extension
PS19	Rev Matthew Norris - Residents Against the Mast	Objecting to the siting of a 24 metre telecoms mast by EE H3G in Redcatch Park, Knowle
PS20	Chris Yeo	No to RPZ in BS3
PS21	Nicola Harvey Everett	Protect the view of the iconic Totterdown escarpment
PS22	Susan Finerty	Parking Zone
PS23	Katharine Kinsler	Protect the view of the iconic Totterdown escarpment
PS24	Gemma Mathieson	RPZ Bedminster Objection



PS25	Miranda Walker	Protect views of the iconic view of Totterdown escarpment
PS26	Steve Greenwood	Protect views of the iconic view of Totterdown escarpment
PS27	Daniel Templar	RPZ BS3
PS28	Katie Cookson	RPZ
PS29	Lucy Pope	Mast in Redcatch Park
PS30	Caroline Darts	Redcatch Park
PS31	Sofia Cuevas-Asturias	Park Mast Objection
PS32	Sam Gibson	Mast in Redcatch Park
PS33	Jacqueline Sullivan	Mast in Redcatch Park
PS34	Jemma Martin	Mast in Redcatch Park
PS35	Thomas Bennell	Disposal of Public Open Space: Land at Redcatch Park
PS36	Charlotte Friel	Mast in Redcatch Park
PS37	Bridget Woodard	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS38	Sam Thornton	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS39	Sally Carpenter	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS40	Megan Sharman	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS41	Beth Herbert	Statement of objection to telecommunications tower in Redcatch Park
PS42	Cheralyn	Redcatch Park
PS43	Rachael Oliver	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS44	Dennis Yates	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS45	Sorcha Downham-Johnstone	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS46	Jeremy Backhouse	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS47	Oliver Cosgrove	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS48	Janey Twigger	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS49	Kirsty Base	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS50	Chris Goulding	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS51	Will Hannan	Please Save Redcatch Park
PS52	Rebecca Hill	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS53	Dr Charlie Pope	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS54	Zoe Blackburn	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS55	Tony Watkin	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS56	Dr Roisin Dunwoody	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS57	Katrina Forster	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS58	Martine Kurth	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS59	Jenny Clarke	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS60	Hannah Burley	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS61	Rich Harryman	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS62	Sophie Palmer	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS63	Harriet White	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS64	Stephanie McKenna	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park



PS65	Adele Fletcher	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS66	Holly Oldfield	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS67	Heather Peet	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS68	Kaya Green	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS69	Sandra Stancliffe	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS70	Chris Stancliffe	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS71	Paul Turner	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS72	Sarah Brompton	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS73	Séamus McKenna	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS74	Elsbeth Crowley	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS75	Julie Loftus	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS76	Victoria Young	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS77	Sammy Cockhill	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS78	Helen Cusins	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS79	Julie Thomas	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS80	Craig Haywood	Redcatch Park
PS81	Sheridan Newman	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS82	Deborah Barringer	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS83	Matthew Brown	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS84	Joan Palmer	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS85	Matthias Kurth	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS86	Helen Woodman	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS87	Sally Curnow	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS88	George Maguire	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS89	Lesley Powell	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS90	Helen Drane	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS91	Jennifer Collings	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS92	Keith Farley	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS93	Helen Ward	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS94	Sarah Quick	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS95	Sue Templar	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS96	Clare Tinsley	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS97	Sarah Siva	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS98	Ellie Gregg	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS99	Gemma Lasseter	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS100	Beata Carson	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS101	Steve Hallam	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS102	John Moule	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS103	Mary Ross	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS104	Rosie Threlfall	RPZ on Bower Ashton Terrace
PS105	Katie Swain	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS106	Kathryn Cooper	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park



PS107	Jacqueline Jarrett	Climate Emergency
PS108	Victoria Williams	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS109	Kim Renfrew	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS110	Alison Brown	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS111	Teresa Henstridge	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS112	Fiona	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS113	Ann Humphries	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS114	Rachel Heaton	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS115	Paul Swain	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS116	Rebecca Thompson	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS117	Martin Glancy	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS118	Georgia Rae Goodyer	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS119	Sally Spencer	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS120	Martha Crean	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS121	Kate Timney	Objection to Mast in Redcatch Park
PS122	Sue Cockle	Mast in Redcatch Park
PS123	Angela Truell	Mast in the Park
PS124	Dr Heather Booth di Giovanni	Mast in Redcatch Park
PS125	Stella Gradwell	No to Redcatch Park Mast
PS126	Caroline Darrall	Mast at Redcatch Park
PS127	Rachel Harrison	Objection to phone mast in Redcatch Park
PS128	Kavita Bhalerao	Mast at Redcatch Park
PS129	Christine Simpson	Mast in Redcatch Park
PS130	Sheeylah Price	Objection to EE mast in Redcatch Park Knowle
PS131	Richard Price	Redcatch Park, Knowle Mast
PS132	Zachary Barker	Electronic and Rare Earth Mineral Recycling Motion
PS133	Jessica Fowler	5g mast at Redcatch Park
PS134	Paul Jones	RPZ
PS135	removed	
PS136	Phil Walsh	Redcatch Mast
PS137	Sarah Goldsmith (Anderson)	Objection letter to phone mast in Redcatch Park
PS138	Rowena Killick	Mast in Redcatch Park
PS139	Vicky Powell	Mast in Redcatch Park
PS140	Carla Scherer	Redcatch Mast Proposal
PS141	Brad Pontin	Extension of Southville's existing RPZ
PS142	Heather Coburn	Proposed Redcatch Park Mast
PS143	Hannah Latham	Redcatch Mast Plans
PS144	Faye Weller	Redcatch Park Temporary Telecom Mast Statement of Objection
PS145	Nick Weller	Redcatch Park Potential Telecoms Mast - Statement of



		objection
PS146	Russell Edwards	Objection to Proposed Installation iPhone Mast in Redcatch Park
PS147	Jessica Bevan	Redcatch Park Mast
PS148	Steven Powell	Redcatch Park Mast
PS149	Olivia Ridout	Redcatch Park Mast
PS150	Steve Gordon	Redcatch Park
PS151	Tony Lansdowne	extension of RPZ
PS152	Alice Nunn	Mast in Redcatch Park
PS153	Janet Grimes	Avon Pension Fund divesting from fossil fuels
PS154	David Hobson	RPZ
PS155	Jude Brown	Objection for proposed Mast Redcatch Garden
PS156	Bristol S*x Workers Collective	Bristol Sex Workers
PS157	Andy Power	Southville RPZ
PS158	Helen Jones	RPZ allocation
PS159	Carla Smith	Divestment by Avon Pension Fund
PS160	Sasha Adams	Redcatch Park Mast

Within the time available, statements PS03, PS14, PS19, PS25, PS74, PS89 and PS156 were presented by individuals present at the meeting.

Public Questions:

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

Ref No	Name	Title
PQ01 & PQ02	Rob Bryher	Recommendation 9 from Bristol's first Citizens Assembly
PQ03 & PQ 04	Nigel Shipley	We need a lot more clean energy generation
PQ05 & PQ06	Howard Purse	Plot 5, Bedminster Green
PQ07	David Nash	Redcatch Park – Mast (proposal)
PQ08	Rachel Hall	Parking around Ashton Gate on match days
PQ10	Matt Gibbs	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ11	Steve Britton	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ12	George Sarudis	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ13	Dr Rahul Bhatnagar	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ14	Alan Smith	New PRZ in BS3
PQ15	Miranda Walker	Protect iconic view of Totterdown escarpment
PQ16	Ben Clifford-Kitching	new RPZ in Bedminster
PQ17	Robert Adams	New RPZ in BS3
PQ18	Sarah Leonard	New RPZ in BS3



PQ19	Jeremy Bray	extension of Southville's existing RPZ
PQ20	Anya Skatova & Joe Webb	extension of Southville's existing RPZ
PQ21	Sarah Cronow	extension of Southville's existing RPZ
PQ22	Lena wright	RPZ in BS3 Windmill Hill Ward
PQ23	Ed Pitt	RPZ for Ashton/extension to Southville
PQ24	AJ Gardham	RPZ in Windmill Hill
PQ25	Helena Wray	RPZ in BS3
PQ26	Ying Wang	Extension to Southville RPZ
PQ27	Harish Sharma	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ28	Mye Green	New RPZ in BS3
PQ29	Marta Haui Yazbek	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ30	Anna Francis	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ31	Katie Murton	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ32	David Jones	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ33	Louis Hunter	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ34	Laetitia Tempelman	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ35	Ken Gardner	RPZ in BS3
PQ36	Caroline Elzik	RPZ in BS3
PQ37	Andrew Wakely	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ38	Kirsty Craig	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ39	Janis Beavon	New RPZ in BS3
PQ40	Richard Smith	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ41 & PQ42	Sian Ellis Thomas	Telecoms mast by EE in Redcatch Park, Knowle
PQ43	Justin Elzik	new RPZ in BS3
PQ44	Simon Hill	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ45	Deb Edwards	New RPZ in BS3
PQ46	Jon Norman	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ47	Sarah Vass	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ48	Scott King	Match day restrictions in BS3
PQ49	Jack Clemoes	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ50	Emilie Hickman	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ51	Helen Parham	New RPZ in BS3
PQ52	Nigel Maggs	New RPZ in BS3
PQ53	Michael Hodgson	New RPZ in BS3
PQ54	Eithne Hodgson	New RPZ in Bedminster Ward
PQ55	Matt Hughes	New RPZ for BS3
PQ56 & PQ57	Ollie Lax	Divestment from Fossil Fuels
PQ58	Jim Mayger	Divestment
PQ59	Stephanie McKenna	Proposed Mast at Redcatch Park



PQ60 & PQ61	Heather Peet	Effect of Mast on Parks Visits
PQ62	Tim Sully	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ63	Claire Gronow	Carbon neutral and climate resilient City by 2030
PQ64	Rob Porteous	Carbon Neutral Bristol
PQ65	Lauren Hennessy	Carbon Neutral Bristol by 2030
PQ66 & PQ67	Lesley Powell	Telecomms mast by EE in Redcatch Park
PQ68 & PQ69	Andrea Mackay	Air Pollution
PQ70 & PQ71	Suzanne Audrey	The Mayoral System and Decision Making
PQ72 & PQ73	Victoria Young	Redcatch Mast
PQ74	Nicola McGerty	New RPZ on Bower Ashton Terrace
PQ75 & PQ76	David Redgewell	Transport – passengers and mass transit
PQ77	Dr Hilary Farey	Home Insulation
PQ78	Hannah Mishan	Carbon Neutral Bristol by 2030
PQ79	Richard Baxter	Mass Transit
PQ80	Maria Wood	Bristol Airport Expansion
PQ81	Alison Allan	Greenwashing in Advertising
PQ82	Robina Mallett	Greenwashing in Advertising
PQ83 & PQ84	Moving Bristol Forward	Mass Transit Proposals
PQ85	Matt Jones	Extension of Southville RPZ
PQ86	Isabella Harding	Carbon Neutral Bristol by 2030

Within the time available, the Mayor responded verbally to questions PQ01, PQ02, PQ05, PQ06, PQ10 and PQ41 also responding to supplementary questions.

6 Petitions Notified by Councillors

There were none.

7 The Council's Pay Policy Statement for the period 1st April 2022 to 31st March 2023

The Full Council considered a report which proposed adoption of the Pay Policy Statement for the year 2022-23.

Councillor Wye moved the report and the recommendations contained therein. Councillor Pearce seconded the report.

There was a debate and it was:

RESOLVED:

That the Pay Policy Statement for 2022/23 was noted.



8 Political Proportionality and Allocation of Committee Seats

The Full council considered a report which sought to confirm the political proportionality of the Council in line with statutory requirements.

The Lord Mayor moved the report and the recommendations contained therein.

Councillor Varney, Deputy Lord Mayor, seconded the report.

It was then:

RESOLVED:

That Full Council reviewed and approved the allocation of seats on committees in accordance with the statutory requirements concerning political balance and to approve the allocation of Committee Seats as set out in the report.

9 Motions

Motion 1 – Golden Motion: Green Mass Transit for Bristol

Councillor Edwards moved the following motion:

Full council notes that:

1. WECA has committed £5 million to conduct a feasibility study for an underground rail network for (Greater) Bristol, for ‘pinch points’ such as Temple Meads and the Gloucester Road.
2. This is an ambitious idea which could potentially help with efficiently moving large volumes of people in Bristol.
3. The proposed mass transit system represents a huge investment.
4. Significant challenges will need to be overcome to deliver subterranean tunnels, such as flood risk, ensuring it serves enough people to justify the cost, and that large scale construction projects of this nature also generate significant carbon emissions.
5. A mass transit system that relies on underground tunnels, as currently proposed will take many years to complete, well beyond the IPCC warning that we have just 8 years to make significant reductions in carbon emissions.
6. We are in a Climate Emergency and decarbonising transport has to be implemented as soon as possible

Full council believes that:

1. Due to the “once in a generation” size of investment involved, the proposed underground mass transit system is a potential opportunity cost both financially and in terms of carbon emissions.



2. There is a risk that alternative mass transit options, which might be at least as effective or have a better benefit to cost ratio, may not be taken forwards if all political focus is on underground rail.
3. Only by comparing all options will Bristol be able to most wisely spend funding and deliver a world class mass transit system in a timely manner.
4. Other mass transit system options such as: improving, increasing and greening bus infrastructure; a tram system or similar mass transit such as electric trolley cars, should be assessed alongside the underground network.
5. This comparative approach is entirely consistent with all project and programme management approaches, including the latest Governmental guidance (i.e. Infrastructure and Projects Authority: assurance review toolkit) that suggests that the business case of projects of this sort should be kept under constant review.
6. If the study were to show that different transport systems would be more impactful than the underground proposal then these will need to be implemented instead

Full council resolves that:

1. The Council and WECA must include in the £5million plan a strategic review of the business case by assessing the feasibility of other strategic options such as those listed above.
2. The review must assess the ongoing business case with comparisons of other options, with an independent assessment of what the options are and the criteria to be considered. This is likely to include (but not be limited to):
 - Cost
 - Delivery time
 - Environmental impact of project, to include construction as well as eventual impact · How many cars it would take off the road
 - How many areas/people of Bristol it could serve
 - Impact on deprived areas
 - How much space for active travel it could also deliver
 - Accessibility
 - Expected passenger numbers
 - Public interest and enthusiasm
 - Return on investment

The motion was seconded by Councillor Plowden

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

Following final remarks, upon being put to the vote, the original motion was unanimously CARRIED and it was:

RESOLVED:

Full council notes that:



1. WECA has committed £5 million to conduct a feasibility study for an underground rail network for (Greater) Bristol, for 'pinch points' such as Temple Meads and the Gloucester Road.
2. This is an ambitious idea which could potentially help with efficiently moving large volumes of people in Bristol.
3. The proposed mass transit system represents a huge investment.
4. Significant challenges will need to be overcome to deliver subterranean tunnels, such as flood risk, ensuring it serves enough people to justify the cost, and that large scale construction projects of this nature also generate significant carbon emissions.
5. A mass transit system that relies on underground tunnels, as currently proposed will take many years to complete, well beyond the IPCC warning that we have just 8 years to make significant reductions in carbon emissions.
6. We are in a Climate Emergency and decarbonising transport has to be implemented as soon as possible

Full council believes that:

1. Due to the "once in a generation" size of investment involved, the proposed underground mass transit system is a potential opportunity cost both financially and in terms of carbon emissions.
2. There is a risk that alternative mass transit options, which might be at least as effective or have a better benefit to cost ratio, may not be taken forwards if all political focus is on underground rail.
3. Only by comparing all options will Bristol be able to most wisely spend funding and deliver a world class mass transit system in a timely manner.
4. Other mass transit system options such as: improving, increasing and greening bus infrastructure; a tram system or similar mass transit such as electric trolley cars, should be assessed alongside the underground network.
5. This comparative approach is entirely consistent with all project and programme management approaches, including the latest Governmental guidance (i.e. Infrastructure and Projects Authority: assurance review toolkit) that suggests that the business case of projects of this sort should be kept under constant review.
6. If the study were to show that different transport systems would be more impactful than the underground proposal then these will need to be implemented instead

Full council resolves that:

1. The Council and WECA must include in the £5million plan a strategic review of the business case by assessing the feasibility of other strategic options such as those listed above.
2. The review must assess the ongoing business case with comparisons of other options, with an independent assessment of what the options are and the criteria to be considered. This is likely to include (but not be limited to):
 - Cost
 - Delivery time
 - Environmental impact of project, to include construction as well as eventual impact
 - How many cars it would take off the road



- **How many areas/people of Bristol it could serve**
- **Impact on deprived areas**
- **How much space for active travel it could also deliver**
- **Accessibility**
- **Expected passenger numbers**
- **Public interest and enthusiasm**
- **Return on investment**

Following a short adjournment, it was moved by the Lord Mayor that standing order CPR2.1(xi) be suspended to allow the item to go past the 30 minutes time limit for motions. Following a vote it was agreed to proceed up until the limit of 2 hours and 30 minutes for the meeting was reached.

Motion 2 – Ukraine and the Borders and Nationalities Bill

Councillor Bennett moved the following motion:

This Council notes

1. The Russian Federation has launched an unprovoked, full-scale invasion of Ukraine – a sovereign, democratic country. The brutality of the Russian invasion, notably, the alleged use of cluster munitions, thermobaric weaponry, and the direct targeting of civilians in Ukraine.
2. Ukraine’s longstanding ambitions to join the European Union (EU) and North Atlantic Treaty Alliance (NATO), and believes these ambitions are legitimate, and that Russia has no right to dictate whether Ukraine can enter these organisations if Ukraine democratically chooses to do so.
3. There is currently a Bill in Parliament titled the ‘Nationalities and Borders’ Bill that would reform the asylum system and make it much more difficult for people seeking sanctuary to claim asylum in the UK, and will create a two-tier system, penalising people seeking safety based on the journeys they make.

This Council believes

4. Russia’s invasion of Ukraine should be condemned in the strongest possible terms, and Bristol should stand in solidarity with the people of Ukraine against Russian aggression.
5. President Putin’s claim that “Ukraine has never had any real claim to statehood”, and that it is just an “administrative region created by the Russian/Soviet Empires” is abhorrent and an attempt to assimilate Ukrainian identity with Russian identity – while the two are distinct.
6. The invasion highlights the need to introduce measures that tackles the influence of Russian oligarchs on British politics and prevents them from being able to launder money in the UK.
7. Proposals for the strongest possible sanctions imposed by the UK, the EU, and its allies, such as removing Russia from the SWIFT financial system are necessary.



8. This conflict has already displaced over a half million Ukrainians, and as a City of Sanctuary, Bristol has a duty to accept as many refugees as possible – Ukrainian or otherwise. The Government’s Nationality and Borders Bill would hinder these efforts, as it would treat such people forced to make dangerous journeys to safety as criminals, and should not become law.
9. The Nationality and Borders Bill will lead to greater poverty and homelessness in Bristol and will undermine people’s ability to rebuild their lives. This Bill also risks undermining our obligations in international law.
10. The UK needs an asylum system that empowers people seeking safety to rebuild their lives and enables communities to welcome them;

Full Council resolves to:

1. Call on Party Group Leaders to collectively write a public letter to the Government stating the views laid out in this motion, calling on it to scrap the Nationality and Borders Bill, legislate to allow more refugees to be granted asylum in the UK, provide Councils with the necessary funding to support them, and call on the UK Government to work with Local Authorities and communities to build a fairer and more effective asylum system.
2. Use Council resources to support drives providing aid to the over half a million refugees that have been forced to leave Ukraine.
3. Support, where possible, the Russian citizens who have bravely protest their Government’s actions, - knowing full well of the potential consequences of protest in President Putin’s Russia - and look at ways to offer political asylum to outspoken critics of Putin’s regime, if given the support of the UK Government in these efforts.

Councillor Hussain seconded the motion.

Councillor Denyer then moved the following amendment:

‘That the motion be amended to read as follows:

This Council notes

1. The Russian Federation has launched an unprovoked, full-scale invasion of Ukraine – a sovereign, democratic country. The brutality of the Russian invasion, notably, the alleged use of cluster munitions, thermobaric weaponry, and the direct targeting of civilians in Ukraine.
2. Ukraine’s longstanding ambitions to join the European Union (EU) and North Atlantic Treaty Alliance (NATO), and believes these ambitions are legitimate, and that Russia has no right to dictate whether Ukraine can enter these organisations if Ukraine democratically chooses to do so.
3. There is currently a Bill in Parliament titled the ‘Nationality and Borders’ Bill that would reform the asylum system and make it much more difficult for people seeking sanctuary to claim asylum in the UK, and will create a two-tier system, penalising people seeking safety based on the journeys they make.



This Council believes

1. Russia's invasion of Ukraine should be condemned in the strongest possible terms, and Bristol should stand in solidarity with the people of Ukraine against Russian aggression.
2. President Putin's claim that "Ukraine has never had any real claim to statehood", and that it is just an "administrative region created by the Russian/Soviet Empires" is abhorrent and an attempt to assimilate Ukrainian identity with Russian identity – while the two are distinct.
3. The invasion highlights the need to introduce measures that tackle the influence of Russian oligarchs on British politics and prevents them from being able to launder money in the UK.
4. Proposals for the strongest possible sanctions imposed by the UK, the EU, and its allies, such as removing Russia from the SWIFT financial system are necessary.
5. This conflict has already displaced over a half million Ukrainians, and as a City of Sanctuary, Bristol has a duty to accept as many refugees as possible – Ukrainian or otherwise. The Government's Nationality and Borders Bill would hinder these efforts, as it would treat such people forced to make dangerous journeys to safety as criminals, and should not become law.
6. The right to seek asylum is a universal right. It is deeply unfair of the UK government and EU to treat asylum seekers from Ukraine differently to those from countries such as Syria, Afghanistan and Iraq. This council supports refugees from all parts of the world regardless of race or creed.
7. The Nationality and Borders Bill will lead to greater poverty and homelessness in Bristol and will undermine people's ability to rebuild their lives. This Bill also risks undermining our obligations in international law.
8. The UK needs an asylum system that empowers people seeking safety to rebuild their lives and enables communities to welcome them. This not only includes people fleeing from wars or oppression but in the future will also include those fleeing the effects of climate change.

Full Council resolves to:

1. Call on Party Group Leaders to collectively write a public letter to the Government stating the views laid out in this motion, and calling on it to:
 - scrap the Nationality and Borders Bill,
 - waive visa requirements for refugees trying to enter from Ukraine (as the EU has already done) and any other conflict areas.
 - provide Councils with the necessary funding to support refugees,
 - work with Local Authorities and communities to build a fairer and more effective asylum system, including providing safe and legal routes to claim asylum, lifting the ban on asylum seekers working, and lifting the ban on asylum seekers receiving benefits (the 'No Recourse to Public Funds' condition).
2. Use Council resources to support drives providing aid to the over half a million refugees that have been forced to leave Ukraine.
3. Publicly restate its commitment to refugees through its website, public statements and its partnership with City of Sanctuary.
4. Support, where possible, the Russian citizens who bravely protest their Government's actions - knowing full well of the potential consequences of protest in President Putin's Russia - and look



at ways to offer political asylum to outspoken critics of Putin's regime, if given the support of the UK Government in these efforts.

5. Review the Council's policies and practices regarding housing, social care, education and information provided on our website to ensure that we are helping asylum seekers and refugees to the maximum of our legal ability, with reference to the LGA guidance 'Resettling refugees' and the NRPF Network's 'Guidance for Councils'.
6. Encourage partners through the One City partnership to pledge active measures they can take to support any asylum seekers and refugees who live in our city, and ask them to report back in a similar approach to the "One City Climate Ask".

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Mohamud.

Following debate and final remarks from the mover of the amendment and the mover of the original motion, upon being put to the vote, the amendment was CARRIED (42 Members voting for, 12 against, 2 abstentions).

There was a debate on the substantive motion (as amended). The Lord Mayor then invited Councillor Bennett, as mover of the original motion, to speak.

Following final remarks, upon being put to the vote, the original motion was CARRIED (42 Members voting for, 12 against, 2 abstentions) and it was:

RESOLVED:

This Council notes

1. **The Russian Federation has launched an unprovoked, full-scale invasion of Ukraine – a sovereign, democratic country. The brutality of the Russian invasion, notably, the alleged use of cluster munitions, thermobaric weaponry, and the direct targeting of civilians in Ukraine.**
2. **Ukraine's longstanding ambitions to join the European Union (EU) and North Atlantic Treaty Alliance (NATO), and believes these ambitions are legitimate, and that Russia has no right to dictate whether Ukraine can enter these organisations if Ukraine democratically chooses to do so.**
3. **There is currently a Bill in Parliament titled the 'Nationality and Borders' Bill that would reform the asylum system and make it much more difficult for people seeking sanctuary to claim asylum in the UK, and will create a two-tier system, penalising people seeking safety based on the journeys they make.**

This Council believes

1. **Russia's invasion of Ukraine should be condemned in the strongest possible terms, and Bristol should stand in solidarity with the people of Ukraine against Russian aggression.**
2. **President Putin's claim that "Ukraine has never had any real claim to statehood", and that it is just an "administrative region created by the Russian/Soviet Empires" is abhorrent and an attempt to assimilate Ukrainian identity with Russian identity – while the two are distinct.**



3. The invasion highlights the need to introduce measures that tackle the influence of Russian oligarchs on British politics and prevents them from being able to launder money in the UK.
4. Proposals for the strongest possible sanctions imposed by the UK, the EU, and its allies, such as removing Russia from the SWIFT financial system are necessary.
5. This conflict has already displaced over a half million Ukrainians, and as a City of Sanctuary, Bristol has a duty to accept as many refugees as possible – Ukrainian or otherwise. The Government’s Nationality and Borders Bill would hinder these efforts, as it would treat such people forced to make dangerous journeys to safety as criminals, and should not become law.
6. The right to seek asylum is a universal right. It is deeply unfair of the UK government and EU to treat asylum seekers from Ukraine differently to those from countries such as Syria, Afghanistan and Iraq. This council supports refugees from all parts of the world regardless of race or creed.
7. The Nationality and Borders Bill will lead to greater poverty and homelessness in Bristol and will undermine people’s ability to rebuild their lives. This Bill also risks undermining our obligations in international law.
8. The UK needs an asylum system that empowers people seeking safety to rebuild their lives and enables communities to welcome them. This not only includes people fleeing from wars or oppression but in the future will also include those fleeing the effects of climate change.

Full Council resolves to:

1. Call on Party Group Leaders to collectively write a public letter to the Government stating the views laid out in this motion, and calling on it to:
 - scrap the Nationality and Borders Bill,
 - waive visa requirements for refugees trying to enter from Ukraine (as the EU has already done) and any other conflict areas.
 - provide Councils with the necessary funding to support refugees,
 - work with Local Authorities and communities to build a fairer and more effective asylum system, including providing safe and legal routes to claim asylum, lifting the ban on asylum seekers working, and lifting the ban on asylum seekers receiving benefits (the ‘No Recourse to Public Funds’ condition).
2. Use Council resources to support drives providing aid to the over half a million refugees that have been forced to leave Ukraine.
3. Publicly restate its commitment to refugees through its website, public statements and its partnership with City of Sanctuary.
4. Support, where possible, the Russian citizens who bravely protest their Government’s actions - knowing full well of the potential consequences of protest in President Putin’s Russia - and look at ways to offer political asylum to outspoken critics of Putin’s regime, if given the support of the UK Government in these efforts.
5. Review the Council’s policies and practices regarding housing, social care, education and information provided on our website to ensure that we are helping asylum seekers and refugees to the maximum of our legal ability, with reference to the LGA guidance ‘Resettling refugees’ and the NRP Network’s ‘Guidance for Councils’.



6. Encourage partners through the One City partnership to pledge active measures they can take to support any asylum seekers and refugees who live in our city, and ask them to report back in a similar approach to the “One City Climate Ask”.

Meeting ended at 8.45 pm

CHAIR _____

