

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Extraordinary Full Council

29 June 2016 at 6.30 pm



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

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

Aldermen/women: R Griffey, A Massey, J McLaren, R Walker, CJN Williams

1. Welcome and safety information

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

2. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Peter Abraham and Councillor Chris Jackson.

3. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

4. Public Forum

In relation to agenda item 5 (Combined Authority and Devolution proposals), four public forum statements were received and noted, from:



1. David Redgewell, Martin Cinamond, Nigel Bray, Jenny Raggett and John Hassell.
2. Councillor Charlie Bolton.
3. James Durie.
4. Christina Biggs.

5. Combined authority and devolution proposals

The Full Council considered a report on the Combined Authority and West of England devolution proposals.

Prior to the debate on the report, the Lord Mayor advised the Full Council that the final decision on whether to approve the package of proposals detailed in the report was an executive decision.

The Cabinet had met earlier that day to give initial consideration to the proposals.

The Cabinet meeting had been adjourned. In adjourning the meeting, the Mayor and Cabinet had asked that Full Council to debate and scrutinise the proposals. Once the Full Council had debated and voted on whether to support the proposals, and concluded its meeting, the Cabinet would reconvene to consider the final decision, taking account of Full Council's views.

The Full Council then held a debate on the proposals.

Councillor Bolton moved the following amendment, setting out additional points (i.e. additional to the report recommendations) that the Full Council may wish to refer to the Cabinet:

Add at the end of the combined authority and devolution proposals on page 5 of the Full Council papers:

“Council expresses its view that:

1. The devolution deal must not be solely about economic growth; we must give equal importance to reducing inequality and enhancing environmental sustainability. Therefore equality and environmental sustainability must be given meaningful weightings in the economic model, in both
 - a. The criteria used for selecting projects to benefit from devolved funds, and
 - b. The metrics that determine whether the projects have been successful.
2. We welcome the mention of scrutiny and audit in the documentation. However, it does not state what level of support is given to each. It must be at a sufficient level to allow it to be fully effective and independent from the executive.”

Councillor Denyer seconded the amendment.



Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was LOST (18 members voting in favour, 47 against with 1 abstention).

Councillor Hopkins moved the following amendment, setting out additional points (i.e. additional to the report recommendations) that the Full Council may wish to refer to the Cabinet:

Add:

“This Council, although fully committed to the principle and practice of devolution, regrets the condition of a ‘Metro Mayor’ which represents an unnecessary and expensive extra layer of spending when public funds are in short supply.”

Councillor Jos Clark seconded the amendment.

Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was LOST (18 members voting in favour, 47 against with 1 abstention).

Councillor Kent moved the following amendment, setting out additional points (i.e. additional to the report recommendations) that the Full Council may wish to refer to the Cabinet:

Add:

“This Council regrets the lack of public involvement in the ‘devolution process’ and would wish to debate the proposals in the autumn after the public have had their say and before this Council commits itself irrevocably to the Metro Mayor and all that goes with it.”

Councillor Wright seconded the amendment.

Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was LOST (15 members voting in favour, 47 against with 4 abstentions).

The Full Council then voted on whether it wished to support the following comments submitted by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, as presented during the debate by Councillor Gollop (Chair of the Board):

“OSM comments for submission to Cabinet and Full Council:

OSM noted that the recommendations set out in the Cabinet and Full Council report will be determined / voted on as a “package” of interrelated recommendations.



Full Council will also consider any amendments proposed, setting out any additional points that Cabinet are asked to consider.

Having discussed all of the above, OSM agreed that, in considering the Combined Authority and Devolution proposals, Cabinet and Full Council be asked to note and endorse the following comments:

- a. **Robust scrutiny** – it will be essential to ensure that robust scrutiny is put in place, is ongoing, and appropriately resourced by each of the authorities. It is noted that there will be legislative backing for the scrutiny role (currently this is not the case at a West of England level).
- b. **Impact of reduced EU funding** – following the EU referendum result, it is important to note that there will be a potential impact resulting from reduced EU funding.
- c. **Environmental protection and equalities considerations:** whilst recognising the vital importance of securing ongoing economic growth, it is also essential that reducing environmental impacts and inequality are central to the devolution agreement, and are key elements within the economic model.
- d. **Metro-Mayor concerns:** whilst noting that the Metro-Mayor is a requirement of the deal, there are concerns and reservations about the need for this governance solution, and on the processes around the appointment and powers of the Metro-Mayor.
- e. **Consultation responses:** if the scheme is approved, OSM wishes to meet in early-mid August to give consideration to the public consultation responses, and in light of that further consideration, may wish to submit further comments to the Secretary of State by the closing date of 26 August. OSM also suggested that a provisional Extraordinary Full Council could take place before final consent is given by Cabinet if necessary.”

On being put to the vote, the Full Council

RESOLVED (64 members voting in favour, none against, with 2 abstentions):

That the comments submitted by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be supported and referred to the Mayor and Cabinet.

The Full Council then voted on whether to support the package of recommendations as set out in the report and

RESOLVED (59 members voting in favour, 2 against, with 5 abstentions):



That, noting that Full Council's views will be referred to the Mayor and Cabinet, support be given to the following recommendations as set out in the report (*noting that the final decision will be taken at Cabinet as an executive decision*):

1. To agree to proceed with the devolution deal as set out in the governance scheme.
2. To note the West of England Devolution Agreement (Appendix 1).
3. To consider the Governance Review for the West of England 2016 (Appendix 2) conducted under s.108 of the 2009 Act and to agree the conclusion that the establishment of a Mayoral Combined Authority for the area of Bath and North East Somerset, Bristol City Council and South Gloucestershire Council would be likely to improve the exercise of statutory functions in relation to the area.
4. Consider the proposed governance scheme for a Mayoral Combined Authority (Appendix 3) and agree the Scheme for public consultation under s.109 of the 2009 Act.
5. Authorise the City Director to subsequently submit:
 - a. the Governance Scheme.
 - b. the consultation responses received (or an appropriate summary); and
 - c. any further consultation response that the Council may itself wish to make to the Secretary of State for the Department of Communities and Local Government.
6. Authorise the City Director to make any minor amendments or corrections to the governance scheme to enable publication of the scheme for public consultation.
7. Refer any resulting Order back to the appropriate decision making body, Cabinet, for approval.



Meeting ended at 8.20 pm

CHAIR _____

